

Problematic Settlers: Settler Colonialism and the Political History of the Doukhobors in  
Canada

by

Adam Burke Carmichael  
B.A., University of British Columbia, 2007  
M.A., University of British Columbia, 2010

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

Doctor of Philosophy

in the Department of Political Science

© Adam Burke Carmichael, 2016  
University of Victoria

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

## **Supervisory Committee**

Problematic Settlers: Settler Colonialism and the Political History of the Doukhobors in  
Canada

by

Adam Burke Carmichael  
B.A., University of British Columbia, 2007  
M.A., University of British Columbia, 2010

### **Supervisory Committee**

Dr. Avigail Eisenberg (Department of Political Science)  
**Supervisor**

Dr. Matt James (Department of Political Science)  
**Departmental Member**

Dr. Jordan Stanger-Ross (Department of History)  
**Outside Member**

## Abstract

### Supervisory Committee

Dr. Avigail Eisenberg (Department of Political Science)

Supervisor

Dr. Matt James (Department of Political Science)

Departmental Member

Dr. Jordan Stanger-Ross (Department of History)

Outside Member

Over the last ten years, there has been extensive scholarly debate about the nature of settler colonialism and the category ‘settler’. The central problem animating this dissertation is the question of how we understand the position of a settler group like the Doukhobors in Canadian settler colonialism. In 1899 approximately 7,500 members of the Doukhobor religious movement fled oppression in Russia and arrived in Canada with the hope of creating an earthly paradise based on communal economy, mutual aid, pacifism, and an anarchistic theology. Less than a decade after fleeing Tsarist oppression in Russia and settling in the Canadian prairies, the Doukhobors once again came into conflict with a government; this time the conflict revolved around land and compliance with homestead regulations. This moment marked the beginning of more than half a century of provincial and federal government attempts to assimilate recalcitrant factions of the Doukhobor community. A number of tactics including opportunistic land policy, imprisonment, removal and forced education of children, legislation targeting communal property and inducements to integrate into mainstream Canadian society were employed by provincial and federal governments to make the Doukhobors into proper settler-subjects. By examining these government attempts to re-make Doukhobor subjectivity in the image of an idealized Anglo-settler identity, this project sheds light on the broad process through which ‘settlers’ are ‘made’ by government action. Drawing on archival

sources, this dissertation exposes the intersection of Canadian government policy, and colonial ideas, directed towards Indigenous peoples and the Doukhobors from 1899 until 1960. I examine this intersection through the themes of land, education, and colonial knowledge creation in government reports. The dissertation finds that the twin elements of settler colonialism—settlement and dispossession—must be considered as a unified political project. During the period under study there is significant transfer of ideologies and policies between those officials working on the assimilation of settlers and those working toward the dispossession of Indigenous peoples. The dissertation concludes that an important element of the category ‘settler’ is its political nature, and therefore its contingent and contestable nature.

## Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee .....	ii
Abstract .....	iii
Table of Contents .....	v
List of Figures .....	vi
Acknowledgments .....	vii
Dedication .....	viii
Introduction: Problematic Settlers: Settler Colonialism and the Political History of the Doukhobors in Canada.....	1
Chapter 1: Displacement by the displaced: the colonial context of the Doukhobor communal experiment.....	54
Chapter 2: Land and Settler-subjects: Overlap between Indian Affairs and Homestead policy, 1898-1907 .....	89
Chapter 3: Education: From Racial Assimilation to Welfare Apprehension.....	144
Chapter 4: Harry Hawthorn and the Migration of Colonial Knowledge .....	204
Chapter 5: The Doukhobors of British Columbia and The Indians of British Columbia: Two Reports, One Vision .....	235
Conclusion .....	271
Bibliography .....	280

## List of Figures

Figure 1 Map of the North West of Canada .....	107
Figure 2 Poster advertising the opening of Doukhobor land .....	137
Figure 3 Photograph, 1907, Yorkton, SK .....	138
Figure 4 Photograph, Sons of Freedom bombing .....	180
Figure 5 Photograph, New Denver .....	197
Figure 6 Photograph, sign .....	242

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank everyone who helped to bring this project to fruition. In particular, I am indebted to Avigail Eisenberg for her mentorship as my supervisor. Matt James and Jordan Stanger-Ross provided thoughtful feedback on the first draft, which led to a much stronger dissertation in the end.

I would also like to acknowledge James Tully for introducing me to an ethics based approach to colonialism wherein colonial and decolonial subjectivities are tied to daily lived practice. Thanks to Rita Dhamoon for introducing me to much of the settler colonial studies literature cited in the introduction. Additionally, a number of scholars including Renisa Mawani and Barbara Arneil provided useful critiques and queries as co-presenters on conference panels or as panel chairs.

My research was greatly aided by the library staff at UVic, UBC, and SFU.

Thanks to Rachel Taylor, Anne Lomas, and Laura Anctil for a second, third, and fourth set of eyes on the final draft. Sorry for all the typos.

Finally, I acknowledge financial support for my doctoral program from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated to Anne. Without her constant support and partnership throughout my doctoral program this project would not exist.

## Introduction: Problematic Settlers: Settler Colonialism and the Political History of the Doukhobors in Canada

“Colonization has much for which to thank persecution.”<sup>1</sup>

—Clare V. Fitz-Gibbon, 1899

In 1899 approximately 7,500 members of the Doukhobor religious movement fled oppression in Russia and arrived in Canada with the hope of creating an earthly paradise based on communal economy, mutual aid, pacifism, and an anarchistic theology. Less than a decade after fleeing Tsarist oppression in Russia and settling in the Canadian prairies, the Doukhobors<sup>2</sup> once again came into conflict with a government; this time the conflict revolved around land and compliance with homestead regulations. This project focuses on this era in Doukhobor-Canadian history, the subsequent creation of a successful communal Doukhobor economy in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century in BC, and the rise of government conflict with the radical Sons of Freedom faction throughout the mid-20th century. This dissertation critically analyzes the process through which “settlers” are “made” by government action. Drawing on archival sources, the dissertation exposes the intersection of Canadian government policy, and colonial ideas, directed towards

---

<sup>1</sup> Mary Agnes FitzGibbon (Lally Bernard), *The Canadian Doukhobor Settlements: A Series of Letters* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1899), 8. In the year that the Doukhobors arrived in Canada, Clare FitzGibbon remarked that the persecution of minorities in other countries benefited the settler-colonial project in Canada by providing refugees who would become settlers.

<sup>2</sup> This initial conflict led to the creation of various factions of Doukhobors in Canada. I use the terminology “Doukhobor” as an umbrella term for the three factions: the Community Doukhobors (those who followed Peter V. Verigin’s religio-political vision and maintained a communal lifeway), the Independents (those who broke away from the communal hereditary leadership of Verigin), and the Sons of Freedom (those who rejected the previous factions for perceived materialism and assimilation and engaged in acts of peaceful protest as well as terrorism against fellow Doukhobors and the Canadian state). The umbrella term of ‘Doukhobor’ is necessary because during the period analyzed in this dissertation government officials and the public often treated the groups as homogenous despite the internal factionalism.

Indigenous peoples and the Doukhobors from 1899 until 1960. I examine this intersection through the themes of land, education, and official knowledge creation (government reports).

The central problem animating this dissertation is the question of how we understand the position of a settler group like the Doukhobors—that is, a group targeted by the governments of Canada for assimilation—in Canadian settler colonialism. In one sense, the Doukhobors can be understood as a non-Indigenous population arriving on the scene of an ongoing process of settler colonial expansion, and thus structurally implicated in colonialism as settlers. In this formulation, all non-Indigenous people can be considered settlers regardless of their relationship to the colonial project. By simply existing as a non-Indigenous population in Canada the Doukhobors can be seen as contributing to the settler colonial project by enlarging the non-Indigenous population that permanently resides on Indigenous territory without recognition from the local Indigenous nation. The Doukhobors arrived in Canada through Minister of the Interior Clifford Sifton's policy of rapidly populating Western Canada with immigrants lured by homesteading land. The federal government carried out an illegal expropriation of Cote, Key and Keeseekoose First Nations' reserve land in order to make room for the Doukhobor settlement in Saskatchewan.<sup>3</sup> After the loss of much of this homesteading land to the federal government in 1907, the Community Doukhobors, who relocated to British Columbia, continued the process of displacing Indigenous peoples. The new Doukhobor community at Brilliant, British Columbia was also known as kp'itl'els by the Sinixt people and the last remaining family, the Christians, were forcibly evicted by

---

<sup>3</sup> Renée Dupuis, *Report on the Mediation of the Fort Pelly Agency, Pelly Haylands Claim Negotiations* (Ottawa : Indian Claims Commission, 2008).

Doukhobor encroachment in 1919.<sup>4</sup> As a migrant population, especially as an agriculturalist group, the Doukhobors were, and continue to be, settlers in the sense of a non-Indigenous group that has settled on Indigenous territory.

The Doukhobors, and later the Sons of Freedom faction, can also be understood as problematic settlers. They are problematic to the Canadian state in the sense that the communal religio-political organization of the group conflicted with the economic development of the settler colony and Canadian sovereignty. With the notable exception of the Independent Doukhobors, the Doukhobor communal project represented a distinct political community with a political project that was also distinct from the state-led settler colonial project. This political community within the state was a public challenge to the supremacy of the Canadian state as the sole authority able to control people within a given territory. The Doukhobor community also created a Doukhobor orientation to the world (a subjectivity) that was not always compatible with state aims. The anarcho-Christian subjectivity of the Doukhobors, which locates sovereignty in the immanent divine spark in each individual, clashed with the dominant modern juridical conception of the sovereign state as the sole source of law. Provincial and federal governments used a number of tactics including opportunistic land policy, imprisonment, removal and forced education of children, legislation targeting communal property, and inducements to integrate into mainstream Canadian society in order to re-make Doukhobor subjectivity in line with an idealized settler identity that was compatible with the colonial project. In this sense, as “settler-subjects” rather than “settler population,” the category *settler* is a thoroughly political construct.

---

4 Myler Wilkinson and Duff Sutherland, “‘From our side we will be good neighbour[s] to them’: Doukhobor-Sinixt Relations at the Confluence of the Kootenay and Columbia Rivers in the Early Twentieth Century,” *BC Studies* no. 174 (Summer 2012), 33.

This project focuses on the category settler as a political construct rather than as an innate identity. To treat settler identity as innate de-politicizes the category because this treatment tells us very little about the way colonial actors used ideology and policy to further settler colonialism by making settler-subjects. Long before theorists of settler colonialism debated the concept of the settler,<sup>5</sup> politicians, intellectuals, missionaries, and other members of Canadian settler society publicly argued about what made a settler a good settler. The historical record, as this dissertation demonstrates, suggests that the category settler, as used by the practitioners of settler colonialism, has always been a contested concept and category that is not synonymous with non-Indigenous. Historical colonial actors agreed that a settler must be useful to the colonial project, even as they disagreed on exactly what the project was. The settler colonial project was and is fundamentally about the imposition of a new political community that supercedes pre-existing Indigenous communities, but colonial political actors faced the same perennial question all political societies face: what is the best political form that allows the fulfillment of the good life? Was Canada to be a project primarily about resource use and industrial development by capitalists? Was Canada capable of absorbing “alien races” and cultures, or should the new community be exclusively British and white? Did cultural pluralism matter as long as settlers followed the law? All of these questions were asked by colonial actors when the Doukhobors arrived in Canada in 1899, and different answers led to different conceptualizations of what type of settler-subject was ideal and how to attain that ideal through various governmental means such as education and land policy.

---

<sup>5</sup> See the literature review below in the introduction.

For settlers to be useful to the colonial project, they must embody a certain type of subjectivity that is compatible with the new constitutional order. Over time, different colonial actors have had different, and sometimes competing, ideal types for the settler-subject and different minimum requirements for settler-subjects. These ideals have been based around several diverse factors such as racial identity, agricultural ability, an orientation towards land as a resource to be exploited, an attachment to private property, knowledge of and attachment to British political institutions, respect for Canadian laws, a commitment to individualism, participation in the patriarchal nuclear family, conformity to dominant gender roles, adoption of the English language, willingness to send children to public schools, and cultural manners. In its most demanding form, the ideal settler-subject would embody all of these characteristics and more. In its least demanding form, the settler-subject must not pose an existential threat to the authority of the state and should contribute to the settler economy.

As a non-Indigenous “population” the Doukhobors are directly complicit in settler colonialism; however, as “settler-subjects” the relationship between Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples is mediated by the state. The anarchist, theocratic, and communist aspects of the Community Doukhobors in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, and these same aspects of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors in the 1950s, presented a problem for further development of the settler colony—development being based on exclusive state control over land and people for the purposes of resource-based capitalism. It is certainly not a novel insight that settler national identity is constructed relationally against Indigeneity<sup>6</sup>—or more accurately “Indianness”—but what is perhaps more novel and

---

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, Sunera Thobani, *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007).

controversial is the way that problematic settlers are made into settler-subjects through state action. In the following chapters I argue that during the process of making settler-subjects out of the Doukhobors, the state tactics directed at, and knowledges created about, distinct groups—settler and Indigenous—intersect and overlap in a process that the dissertation calls relational overlap. The dissertation’s focus on state action should not be read as an exclusive explanation; the making of settler subjectivity certainly occurred in civil society, and the cross-pollination of colonial ideologies targeting settler minorities and Indigenous peoples also took place in non-governmental venues. However, settler colonialism as a process of making a new political community, did, in the Canadian context, rely heavily on the modern state apparatus and thus a state-centric approach is taken in this study.

This historical case study of the Doukhobors traces the history of state-led attempts to re-make Doukhobor subjectivity beginning with the theme of land. The first conflict between the Canadian government and the Community Doukhobors was over landholding patterns and the Doukhobor conceptualization of land. The settler colonial context in which the Doukhobors arrived meant that government actors had preconceived ideas about ideal land use that had been developed in the process of dispossessing Indigenous peoples of their land. What politicians and commentators would later call the “Doukhobor problem”<sup>7</sup> was initially the problem of using land policy to break up the communal project in order to create in the Doukhobors a settler orientation toward land.

---

<sup>7</sup> The expression “the Doukhobor problem” seems to have first appeared in 1906 in a government commissioned report on the Doukhobors relation to land and government. Letter from McCallum enclosed in Letter from Cash to Oliver, 19 December 1906, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.

With only marginal success in the assimilation of the Community Doukhobors through land policy, colonial actors turned to the education of Doukhobor children, and the separation of these children from the influence of their parents, in order to inculcate an ideal settler-subjectivity. Government officials saw educational assimilation as a solution to the “Doukhobor problem” that originated as a problem of land.<sup>8</sup> Part of the educational project was based on the content of the curriculum—teaching patriotism and attachment to British-Canadian institutions—and part of it relied on the institution of formal education as a way of undermining the collective subjectivity that resulted from Doukhobor experiential learning in the community. As with land, there was significant ideological overlap between those working to dispossess Indigenous peoples and those working to assimilate settlers. In this case, both dispossession and settler-subject making relied on a theory of racial assimilation that was later superseded by a discourse of child welfare. The post-WWII historical shift away from the ideology of racial assimilation toward child welfare occurred simultaneously amongst Indian Affairs administrators and those tasked with an educational solution to the resistance of Sons of Freedom Doukhobors.

Finally, this project examines the theme of colonial knowledge and ideology in the making of Doukhobor settler-subjects. Knowledge production and ideology were central to the re-making of Doukhobor subjectivity. The rationale behind the inclusion of this theme is that it helps to explain the mechanisms through which overlap occurs between the two aspects of settler colonialism: settlement and dispossession. As previously mentioned, both the land- and education-based projects of assimilation relied

---

<sup>8</sup> Doukhobor land commissioner Michael White quoted in Kathlyn Rose Marie Szalasznyj, “The Doukhobor Homestead Crisis 1898-1907” (master’s thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1977), 236.

on broadly circulating colonial ideologies of land use and racial assimilation. In addition, these projects relied on specialized knowledge, often commissioned by the government. The commissioning of specialized knowledge was one of many instruments for the diffusion of colonial ideologies. For example, agricultural production statistics played an important role in debates about the suitability of Doukhobors as settlers, and this helped to reinforce colonial conceptualizations of land as a resource to be exploited (and of who was fit to hold land). During the long history of conflict over Doukhobor education several government commissions were called, all of which were important in framing the political “problem” to be solved. These knowledges did not always map neatly onto an overarching, coherent colonial ideology; they were contested and developed as responses to specific and complex political realities on the ground. However, these specialized knowledges were also not divorced from colonial ideologies. They represented political thought that drew on, but also subverted existing ideologies. The theme of colonial ideology and knowledge is explored through a single actor, Harry Hawthorn, who in the 1950s produced two government-commissioned reports: one on the Doukhobors and one on Indigenous peoples of British Columbia. By focusing on a single actor, this thematic section of the dissertation is able to explicitly demonstrate how colonial knowledge moves and is transferred through a network of actors resulting in overlap in the policies and knowledges regarding Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples.

The rest of this introductory chapter will provide the necessary background for the reader to engage with the original research of the dissertation. It begins with the scholarly rationale for the project and locates the dissertation in the existing literature on settler colonialism and the Doukhobors. The introduction also makes explicit the anti-colonial

political rationale for the project. The chapter then unpacks key conceptual jargon used throughout the dissertation. Finally, the introduction ends with a chapter overview.

## **Scholarly Contributions**

### **Theorizing Settler Colonialism**

This project contributes new knowledge to two different areas of study: the study of settler colonialism and, secondarily, the study of Canadian Doukhobors. First, the study addresses in a concrete, geographically- and historically-bounded case study what has been largely an abstract debate about who and what a settler is. Scholars of settler colonialism, discussed below, continue to debate how one should think about the role of marginalized groups—especially displaced people and people of colour—in settler colonialism. By focusing on a case study of a problematic settler group—a group not entirely excluded from the settler political community, yet requiring state intervention to shape them into settler-subjects—this dissertation will shed light on how settlers are made by the state. This process of settler-subject making may, but it also may not, apply to other marginalized settler groups in Canada or in other settler colonies. The project is not comparative in this sense, and thus the generalizability of its findings is somewhat constrained. However, this type of more focused study is, I believe, what is required to move the current debate about who/what a settler is forward. It is a building block, or a piece of the puzzle, in understanding this larger question and theorizing the process of settler colonialism.

A brief comment on the emergence of “settler colonialism” as a distinct object of study from “colonialism” or “imperialism” is necessary in order to understand the current state of theorizing settler colonialism. Stephen Howe, in his historiographical overview of

the framework of colonialism in Native American studies, argues that the use of “colonialism” to describe North American history is a relatively new phenomenon—emerging with Indigenous resurgence in the 1960s and 1970s.<sup>9</sup> He characterizes the turn to settler colonialism as something unique and distinct within the study of colonialism, and its core association with the “elimination” of Indigenous peoples, as emerging from the work of Patrick Wolfe and Lorenzo Veracini.<sup>10</sup>

The turn to redefine colonialism with the description “settler” returns us full circle to earlier debates about the nuance and complexity of colonialism. Early critiques of colonialism and imperialism often rested on a series of binary oppositions such as colonizer/colonized and oppressor/oppressed.<sup>11</sup> Edward Said has himself noted that his *Orientalism* overly simplified imperialism by neglecting the diverse ways that imperial subjects resist and change imperialism.<sup>12</sup> Moves to better understand the complexities of colonial processes and identities were not confined to cultural studies and postcolonial schools of thought, as these themes were taken up in a reflexive turn in anthropology. As early as 1945, Bronislaw Malinowski was calling for anthropology to turn its attention inward and understand not only the complexities of Indigenous peoples, but also the

---

<sup>9</sup> Stephen Howe, “Native America and the study of colonialism, Part 1: contested histories,” *Settler Colonial Studies*, 3, no. 1 (2013): 104.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 116.

<sup>11</sup> See for example, Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press, 2008); Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Joan Pinkham (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972); Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, trans. Howard Greenfeld (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991). Although each of these authors provides their own nuance in understanding these binaries—e.g. Fanon’s dialectical approach to overcoming colonial identities, Césaire’s analysis of the psychological damage done to colonizers in colonialism, or Memmi’s conceptualization of self-accepting and self-rejecting colonizers—they all take colonialism to be a coherent project with clearly identifiable agents.

<sup>12</sup> Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993), xii.

complexities of colonial societies and anthropologists' roles in colonization.<sup>13</sup> Ann Laura Stoler self-identifies as a part of the self-reflexive tradition of anthropology of colonialism and her work, therefore, nuances colonial processes and identities.<sup>14</sup> The consequence of this turn to complexity in studying colonialism is an attentiveness to the agency of the colonized as well as to the internal divisions—based on class, race, ethnicity, and gender—of both colonized and colonizer.<sup>15</sup> It was this movement to nuance theories of colonialism that led scholars to make the distinction between settler colonialism and other forms of imperialism.

Two prominent scholars in the development of settler colonial studies come at the problematic of settler colonialism through the existing demand for nuance in an attempt to understand anthropology's place in colonialism. Nicholas Thomas' *Colonialism's Culture* begins from what he sees as a problematic understanding of colonialism and colonial discourse as a "unitary totality"; he argues that the specificity of *settler* colonialism must be addressed if postcolonial studies is not to become irrelevant.<sup>16</sup> Likewise, Patrick Wolfe's work on settler colonialism and anthropology begins: "For all the homage paid to heterogeneity and difference, the bulk of 'post'-colonial theorizing is disabled by an oddly monolithic, and surprisingly unexamined, notion of colonialism."<sup>17</sup> The apparently logical next step in complicating colonialism was to distinguish the uniqueness of settler colonialism, and in doing so this scholarly turn raised questions

---

<sup>13</sup> Ann Laura Stoler, "Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31, no. 1 (1989), 134.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 134-5.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>16</sup> Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1994), x.

<sup>17</sup> Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology* (London: Cassell, 1999), 1.

about both the political and scholarly significance of the binary opposition of settler and Indigenous.

The influential 2006 piece “Decolonizing Antiracism” by Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua provides one entry point into current debates about who and what a settler is. The authors argue that, although facing racist exclusion, people of colour are in fact settlers, and are implicated in settler colonialism.<sup>18</sup> They call for scholarly attention to be paid to the complex histories that implicate people of colour in settler colonialism.<sup>19</sup> Soon after its publication, Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright responded to Dua and Lawrence’s position with a scathing critique of Indigenous nationalisms as well as what Sharma and Wright read as a conflation, in the original piece, of migration with settlement.<sup>20</sup> According to Dua and Lawrence’s logic, argued Sharma and Wright, all migrants were automatically categorized as settlers regardless of their relationship with colonialism.<sup>21</sup> Sharma and Wright were ungenerous in their critique,<sup>22</sup> and argued that the binary of settler/Indigenous not only creates an unbridgeable divide that ignores migrant/Indigenous relations, but relies on a neoliberal ideology that disables radical claims for redistribution of wealth and a rethinking of property in terms of “the commons.”<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua, “Decolonizing Antiracism,” *Social Justice* 32, no. 4 (2005), 134.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>20</sup> Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright, “Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States,” *Social Justice* 35, no. 3 (2008), 121.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 123.

<sup>22</sup> In making the argument that all Indigenous nationalisms are likely to replicate the structures of the colonial state, the authors fail to engage with Lawrence’s 2004 work that examines precisely the problem of the replication of racist identity provisions of the Indian Act in reserve communities and the challenges of incorporating the excluded diaspora of urban Indigenous people into nation-building projects. See Bonita Lawrence, *‘Real’ Indians and Others* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004).

<sup>23</sup> Sharma and Wright, “Decolonizing Resistance,” 126.

This exchange led to a flurry of writing on the question of the settler/Indigenous binary and how to think of racialized and otherwise marginalized non-Indigenous people in the process of settler colonialism. Many scholars of settler colonialism have explicitly defended the binary and its usefulness in understanding historical and current forms of settler colonialism.<sup>24</sup> Others have called for intersectional analysis that examines the multiple binaries of settler colonialism while paying attention to the unique nature of colonization for Indigenous peoples and the different forms of oppression faced by marginalized non-Indigenous peoples.<sup>25</sup> A recurrent theme, even among those defending the binary,<sup>26</sup> is a call to understand the different ways that differently marginalized groups are implicated in settler colonialism.<sup>27</sup>

One of the problems with this current debate is the level of analysis at which it operates. Different scholars are engaged in a debate about settler identity that remains highly abstracted. The debate jumps between the context of Hawai'i, Canada, and

---

<sup>24</sup> See for example Patrick Wolfe, "Recuperating Binarism: a heretical introduction," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3-4 (2013): 257-279.; Adam Barker, "The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State," *The American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (2009): 328; Beenash Jafri, "Privilege vs. Complicity: People of Colour and Settler Colonialism," *Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences* (Equity Matters Blog), March 21, 2012, <http://www.ideas-ideas.ca/blog/privilege-vs-complicity-people-colour-and-settler-colonialism>; Malissa Phung, "Are People of Colour Settlers Too?" in *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity*, eds. Ashok Mathur, Jonathan Dewar and Mike DeGagné (Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2011): 289-298.; Waziyatawin, "Understanding Colonizer Status," 6 September, 2011, *Unsettling America* (Blog), <http://unsettlingamerica.wordpress.com/2011/09/06/understanding-colonizer-status/>.

<sup>25</sup> Dean Itsuji Saranillio, "Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and Indigenous difference," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3-4 (2013), 282.

<sup>26</sup> For example, Barker argues that questions about refugees, racialized minorities and slaves are too complex to be addressed in his use of the binary. Barker, "Contemporary Reality," 328. Phung argues that while the binary is useful, people of colour are differently implicated in settler colonialism than Canadians of French and British origin. Phung, "People of Colour," 292.

<sup>27</sup> For a discussion of queer communities' implication in settler colonialism see Scott Lauria Morgensen, "Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16, no. 1-2 (2010): 105-131.; Tuck and Yang, like Morgensen, caution against conflating oppression with colonization and recommend that analysis engage with various groups' actual relationship to settler colonialism. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization is not a metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012), 17.

Australia while making broad claims about refugees, slaves, and people of colour. Despite calls for scholars to pay attention to historically different forms of complicity with settler colonialism, it seems that those theorizing settler colonialism rarely engage in a sustained way with the scholarship that provides grounded historical analysis of the relationship of various non-ideal settler groups to the process of settler colonialism. In the Canadian context, for example, Sarah Carter and Adele Perry have provided historical accounts of the development of racialized sexual identity in relation to the colonial project.<sup>28</sup> Renisa Mawani's work, in a similar vein, examines how juridical truths about the "race" of immigrants and Indigenous peoples are relationally constructed during the expansion of settler colonialism in British Columbia.<sup>29</sup> These literatures remain isolated from one another as they tend to draw on separate theoretical traditions; the settler colonial inflected histories of sexual minorities and racialized minorities stand apart from the present-oriented theorizing of the category "settler" in settler colonial studies. This dissertation bridges this divide by studying political contestation around the category settler through an historical case study.

### **A New Perspective on Doukhobor History**

While the primary focus of this project is a grounded theorizing of settler identity, it also contributes to a well-established literature on the history of the Doukhobors in Canada. While most studies of the Canadian Doukhobors have examined some aspect of

---

<sup>28</sup> Adele Perry, *On The Edge of Empire: Gender, Race and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); Sarah Carter, *The Importance of Being Monogamous: Marriage and Nation Building in Western Canada to 1915* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2008).

<sup>29</sup> Renisa Mawani, *Colonial Proximities: Crossracial encounters and juridical truths in British Columbia, 1871-1921* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009).

the conflicts with the Canadian state,<sup>30</sup> no study to date has examined the political history of the Doukhobors through the lens of settler colonialism. A wealth of older texts, some more scholarly than others, provide important historical background on the Doukhobors in Canada and their belief system<sup>31</sup>; however, these works tend to provide historical and ethnographic description without any overarching political analysis. Another body of literature consists of early 20<sup>th</sup> century texts that provide first hand accounts of the Doukhobor persecution in Russia and the early days in Canada. These texts tend to provide non-scholarly personal assessments of the Doukhobors as a people.<sup>32</sup> Finally, there is a disparate array of scholarly works that approach the study of the Doukhobors through legal history,<sup>33</sup> comparative study of religious liberty,<sup>34</sup> autobiographical study,<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> The majority of historical works on the Doukhobors in Canada treat conflict with the Canadian state as a central theme in the Doukhobor story while also emphasizing that this is not the sum total of Doukhobor experience. Representative works include George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968); Koozma Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors* (Grand Forks, BC: Mir Publication Society, 1982).

<sup>31</sup> Woodcock and Avakumovic, *Doukhobors*; Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*; John P. Zubeck and Patricia A. Solberg, *Doukhobors at War* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1952); John Stoochnoff, *Toil and Peaceful Life: Doukhobors As They Are* (Vancouver: Liberty Press, 1961); J.F.C. Wright, *Slava Bohu: The Story of the Doukhobors* (Toronto: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1940); J.W. Friesen and M.M. Verigin, *The Community Doukhobors: A People in Transition* (Ottawa: Borealis Press, 1989).

<sup>32</sup> Vladimir Tchertkoff ed., *Christian Martyrdom in Russia* (London: The Brotherhood Publishing Co., 1897); Fitzgibbon, *Canadian Doukhobor Settlements*, 1899; Alexander Evalenko, *The Message of the Doukhobors* (New York: The International Publishing Co., 1913); L.A. Sulerzhitsky, *To America With the Doukhobors*, trans. Michale Kalmakoff (Regina, SK: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1982); Aylmer Maude, *A peculiar people: the Doukhobors* (New York: AMS Press, 1970).

<sup>33</sup> John McLaren has written extensively on the Doukhobors as a legal historian. See for example John McLaren, "The Failed Experiments: The Demise of Doukhobor Systems of Communal Property Landholding in Saskatchewan and British Columbia, 1899-1999," in *Despotic Dominion: Property Rights in British Settler Societies*, eds. John McLaren et al. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005): 222-247.; John McLaren, "The State, Child Snatching, and the Law: The Seizure and Indoctrination of Sons of Freedom Children in British Columbia, 1950-60" in *Regulating Lives: historical essays on the state, society, the individual, and the law*, eds. Dorothy E. Chunn, John McLaren and Robert Menzies (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002): 259-293.; John McLaren, "The Law and Public Nudity: Prairie and West Coast Reactions to the Sons of Freedom, 1929-32" in *Laws and Societies in the Canadian Prairie West, 1670-1940*, eds. Louis Knafla and Jonathan Swainger, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005): 309-322.

<sup>34</sup> William Janzen, *Limits on liberty: the experience of Mennonite, Hutterite and Doukhobor communities in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

<sup>35</sup> Julie Rak, *Negotiated Memory: Doukhobor Autobiographical Discourse* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004).

conflict resolution,<sup>36</sup> and geography.<sup>37</sup> Ashleigh Androsoff's historical study of the Doukhobor "problem" is a particularly important contribution to the literature because of the breadth of research as well as the fact that the author relies heavily on Doukhobor voices in order to understand how they understood the various conflicts themselves.<sup>38</sup>

The analysis of settler-subject formation presented in this dissertation does not provide the rich picture of Doukhobor history that the combined body of literature above does; however, it does pick up stray threads of analysis in the literature that remain un- or under-examined. A case in point is the comparison to the Métis made by Woodcock and Avakumovic: "The Doukhobors, as much as Louis Riel's Métis, can be seen as representatives of simple cultures caught in the trap of a closing frontier, with nowhere farther to go in their efforts to escape from the modern state."<sup>39</sup> Putting aside the many problematic elements of this assertion, it does raise the question of what historical forces of colonialism have driven government responses to Indigenous peoples and Doukhobors. The analysis of this dissertation digs deeper into this question and argues that the Canadian government's initial conflicts with the Community Doukhobors cannot be adequately understood apart from ideologies and policies on land developed during the dispossession of Indigenous peoples on the Prairies. This thread of analysis is also under-examined in John McLaren's otherwise exceptional work that examines government

---

<sup>36</sup> Gregory Cran, *Negotiating buck naked: Doukhobors, public policy, and conflict resolution* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006).

<sup>37</sup> Carl J. Tracie, *Toil and peaceful life: Doukhobor village settlement in Saskatchewan, 1899-1918* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1996).

<sup>38</sup> Ashleigh Brienne Androsoff, "Spirit Wrestling: Identity Conflict and the Canadian 'Doukhobor Problem,' 1899-1999," (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2011).

<sup>39</sup> Woodcock and Avakumovic, *Doukhobors*, 10.

Doukhobor land policy and colonial ideas about land.<sup>40</sup> McLaren does not analyze how two key players in the conflict over Doukhobor land developed their ideas about land directly through their involvement in dispossessing Indigenous people of their land. A central insight of this dissertation is that settlement and dispossession should be considered as one colonial project; treating them as clearly demarcated histories can lead to overlooking important factors in the genesis and development of the Doukhobor “problem.”

This dissertation also picks up on and expands upon Julie Rak’s important insights into Doukhobor subjectivity. Rak’s work on Doukhobor autobiography relies on the premise that not only were some Doukhobors “bad subjects” in their resistance to Canadian law and institutions, but that Doukhobor beliefs and life-ways constituted a subjectivity that “could not be written into the Canadian national script except as curiosities or as a threat to nationhood.”<sup>41</sup> While Rak’s work focuses on autobiographical writing as a Doukhobor act of hybrid subjectivity—a way of communicating across Canadian and Doukhobor difference<sup>42</sup>—the present work examines the state action aimed at eradicating Doukhobor subjectivity and the political tools used toward this end.

Finally, this project helps to historicize the frameworks being used in some works on the Doukhobors. For example, Koozma Tarasoff’s influential work relies on a framework of multicultural integration as a way of making sense of Doukhobor history.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> McLaren, *Experiments*.

<sup>41</sup> Rak, *Memory*, x.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> For example, the final chapter of *Plakun Trava* argues that despite conflicts of the past, multiculturalism in Canada provides a way to respect the contributions of Doukhobors to the building of Canada, and that respect for pluralism will allow the integration of Doukhobors without loss of their identity. Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*, 240. Also see: Koozma Tarasoff, “Multiculturalism and the rise of a new spirit,” in *Spirit-*

Writing in the 1980s and 1990s, Tarasoff examines conflict between the government and Doukhobors through a multicultural framework that at times obscures how historical actors framed the Doukhobor “problem.” As Chapters 4 and 5 on the history of the Hawthorn Doukhobor report demonstrate, the introduction of proto-multicultural, integrationist discourse into Doukhobor affairs has a colonial history. It is from Hawthorn’s work on Indigenous peoples and Doukhobors in British Columbia that Tarasoff picks up the framework of integration. Tracing the shift away from racial assimilationist discourse and toward integrationism demonstrates that multicultural integration has a complex history of its own and is more than an analytical approach that can be applied retrospectively.

Historical attention to the colonial source of state conflict with the Doukhobors also has the effect of calling into question the framing of this conflict as an issue of religious liberty and state accommodation. Like multiculturalism, the framework of religious liberty and accommodation has been applied retrospectively on Doukhobor history.<sup>44</sup> While this framework might be appropriate for a retrospective normative assessment of government action, archival evidence suggests that these conflicts were not understood in terms of liberty and accommodation; rather, they appear to be conflicts about survival of political communities.

### **Political Rationale**

Political history can be used to denaturalize current forms of ongoing colonialism in Canada, and it is my hope that this dissertation contributes something in that direction.

---

*Wrestlers’ Voices: Honouring Doukhobors on the Centenary of their migration to Canada in 1899*, ed. Koozma Tarasoff (Toronto: Legas, 1998): 329-345.

<sup>44</sup> This is the framework used by William Janzen. Janzen, *Limits on Liberty*.

The nature of settler colonialism, as a process in which settlers come to stay on Indigenous territory, means that any process of decolonization will require not only Indigenous resistance/resurgence, but also significant changes in settler mentality, law, and institutions. However, a basic requirement for this profound change is that settlers actually understand themselves as settlers and thus as implicated in the process of settler colonialism. The concept of the problematic settler complicates the line from arrival in a settler colony to settler-subjectivity. It suggests that because of different settler groups' specific, and often conflictual, relations to the Canadian state, specific segments of the settler population will be differently implicated in settler colonialism. Various groups that have either been excluded or forcefully included in the provincial and national political communities of Canada merit their own historical narratives detailing their implication in the process of settler colonialism. The political history of certain factions of the Doukhobor population serves as a case study in how a problematic settler group is implicated in settler colonialism, and can perhaps serve as an example for future projects that study other minority groups in Canada.

This project is also politically significant as a genealogical study that strives to undermine settler colonial formations of the present by examining their contingent political origins. One of the criticisms of settler colonial theory is that it can unwittingly reify settler colonialism as a unified structure that spans time and geographic context, thus making the imagining of a decolonized future difficult.<sup>45</sup> In the following chapters, I demonstrate that behind the stable colonial project that seeks access to land and exertion of Canadian sovereignty there are political battles over competing visions of colonialism.

---

<sup>45</sup> Alissa Macoun and Elizabeth Strakosch, "The ethical demands of settler colonial theory," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3-4 (2013): 426-443.

While I put colonial actors at the forefront of the analysis, the very fact that these actors must defend their colonial ideas, and must reinvent colonial government techniques in the face of colonial failures, demonstrates the agency of Indigenous peoples and Doukhobors in resisting the colonial project. The present that we—settlers and Indigenous peoples alike—inherit, including ideas and norms around land, productivity, progress, cultural integration, and education, is contingent not only on macro cultural, political, and economic forces, but also on the individual agency of political actors working within these structures.

Throughout the dissertation, the analysis balances historical continuity and disjuncture with the aim of denaturalizing settler colonialism. The archival evidence suggests that during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, all of the colonial actors engaged in the Doukhobor land dispute held a view of land as something to be tamed and exploited. However, when Community Doukhobors challenged this conceptualization, cracks emerged on the surface of what appeared to be a united colonial ideology. This period in Doukhobor-state relations was dominated by acrimonious debate about how best to conceptualize ideal land use and the ideal settler. During the Sons of Freedom education conflict of the 1950s one can see a definite shift away from an earlier colonial ideology of racial assimilation in the language of public officials. This disjuncture is balanced, however, by continuity in the policy of removing children from the influence of parents. The chapters on the movement of colonial knowledge through Harry Hawthorn in the 1950s also provide an example of the balancing of historical disjuncture and continuity. Hawthorn's reports frame both the "Indian problem" and "Doukhobor problem"—as they were known at the time—largely as problems of economic integration. By examining

these two reports in tandem, it becomes clear that the policy recommendations in these reports offered no clean break from the colonial past, but rather refinements of previous failed attempts at assimilation in a human rights-conscious, post-WWII environment.

By showing that there existed alternatives to the dominant colonial vision, I demonstrate that settler colonialism is not an unchangeable structure, but rather a politically contingent process. Genealogical attentiveness, however, also demonstrates continuities with the present. When Mark Milke of the Fraser Institute responds to the grassroots Indigenous movement Idle No More by framing reserve poverty as the result of inadequate integration into modern urban economies,<sup>46</sup> this is not simply the result of a neoliberal ideology, but also of over 60 years of formulating the solution to the “Indian problem” as economic development and integration—often at the cost of deprioritizing questions of land and sovereignty.

### **Conceptual foundations**

#### **Settler Colonialism**

This initial outline of the main problem animating the current research and the political and scholarly importance of the work suggests the need to clarify certain concepts. First and foremost, given the desire to understand the Doukhobors’ place in settler colonialism, one needs at least a working concept of settler colonialism. Luckily, Indigenous studies scholars as well as scholars in the emerging field of settler colonial studies provide a productive and ongoing debate about what settler colonialism is. To put it succinctly, whatever else settler colonialism is about,<sup>47</sup> it is about a settler state’s

---

<sup>46</sup> Mark Milke, “For Aboriginals, Life is Better Off-Reserve,” *Huffington Post*, January 21, 2013, [http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/mark-milke/aboriginals-reserve\\_b\\_2507978.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/mark-milke/aboriginals-reserve_b_2507978.html).

<sup>47</sup> In taking up the position that land and sovereignty are central aspects of settler colonialism, I do not mean to imply that settler colonialism only operates through these concepts. Racist belief in the biological

attempt to take over Indigenous territory and impose its own version of sovereignty.<sup>48</sup> As Tuck and Yang argue, “Settlers are not immigrants. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies.”<sup>49</sup> Similarly, Veracini frames his triad of settler/Indigenous/exogenous other around the principle that settlers bring their sovereignty with them to a new territory to establish a new political order.<sup>50</sup> For the Doukhobors this means that settler-subject making projects were most forceful when government actors perceived a threat to this aspect of the colonial project.

Many analyses of settler colonialism rest on formulations of what settler colonialism does, rather than what it is. For example, Taiaiake Alfred explains that present day colonialism acts to keep Onkwehonwe—original people—separated from “the sources of our goodness and power: from each other, our cultures, and our lands.”<sup>51</sup> At its most basic level, settler colonialism is an ongoing process through which non-Indigenous people come to impose a new political community on Indigenous territory. The consequence of this process is the need to destroy or at the least neutralize Indigenous communities, insofar as they are perceived as a threat to Canadian

---

superiority of whites, the missionary project of saving souls, and attempts to impose gender norms and marriage customs are all aspects of colonialism that may support the land and sovereignty project, but may also stand on their own as distinct aspects of colonialism. For example, my examination of Reverend John McDougall’s writing (Chapter 2) suggests that while his missionary work ultimately worked for state dispossession, at certain points the reverend positions himself as someone working on a spiritual project of greater importance than mere material benefit and puts himself in opposition to the exploitative vision of colonialism envisioned by Indian Affairs. All of this is to say that although I privilege land and sovereignty, these categories cannot be seen as the be-all and end-all of settler colonialism. This position is in opposition to Patrick Wolfe’s assertion that “territoriality is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element,” and that other aspects of colonialism are always subordinate to this overriding concern. Patrick Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism and the elimination of the native,” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006), 388.

<sup>48</sup> I take up the concept of sovereignty later in the introduction.

<sup>49</sup> Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is not a metaphor,” 6.

<sup>50</sup> Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 3.

<sup>51</sup> Taiaiake Alfred, *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 20.

sovereignty. As Alfred and Corntassel explain, present day colonialism maintains the same imperative to “eradicate” Indigenous peoples as in earlier periods, yet the tactics have shifted away from physical killing of the body to a type of political death that destroys “their existence as *peoples* through the erasure of the histories and geographies that provide the foundation for Indigenous cultural identities and sense of self.”<sup>52</sup> One central element of what settler colonialism does is assimilate and “contain” peoples that pose a threat to the creation of a sovereign settler state.

Even as historical evidence shows continuity in the material process of Indigenous dispossession and the imposition of settler political institutions, the multiplicity of competing colonial motivations and government practices requires that care be taken to not impose a unified logic on settler colonialism. An example of this problematic imposition can be seen in the centrality given to “elimination” of Indigenous peoples. Patrick Wolfe’s assertion that settler colonialism is essentially about elimination for access to territory<sup>53</sup> unnecessarily flattens the process of settler colonialism, making it into a monolithic structure. He draws a direct line between contemporary colonialism and historical iterations when he writes,

An inclusive rhetoric of egalitarianism also makes Natives readily assimilable into the immigrant mix—so long, that is, as their difference is reconstituted in terms of ethnicity rather than sovereignty. Minus their real estate, Natives can be merged into the melting pot.<sup>54</sup>

This simplification is dangerous because it masks the most insidious aspect of current day settler colonialism: its ability to appear postcolonial by rejecting earlier practices of

---

<sup>52</sup> Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel, “Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism,” *Government and Opposition* 40, no.4 (2005), 598.

<sup>53</sup> Patrick Wolfe, “Elimination,” 388.

<sup>54</sup> Wolfe, “Binarism,” 266.

coercive assimilation while “containing” parts of Indigenous communities that threaten the ongoing material process of settler colonialism. Current forms of settler colonialism do not necessarily require assimilation or complete abandonment of Indigenous title to land so long as the remaining Indigenous forms are compatible with the economic and political goals of settler society. The logic may have shifted from elimination to containment. As Moreton points out, in the Australian context, the state has conceded some Indigenous land rights, but these rights are based on a continued assumption of Australian sovereignty and settler epistemologies.<sup>55</sup> Alfred makes a similar point regarding the BC Treaty Process and Canadian legal conceptualizations of Aboriginal title.<sup>56</sup> John Borrows likewise thinks through Canadian legal assessment of Aboriginal rights by drawing on the example of Nanabush, the shapeshifting Trickster.<sup>57</sup> Ongoing colonialism can change shape, and even appear as the granting of legal land rights, without fundamentally altering the sovereign territorial basis of the colonial project. As Tuck and Yang argue, “The desire to reconcile is just as relentless as the desire to disappear the Native; it is a desire to not have to deal with this (Indian) problem anymore.”<sup>58</sup> This state dominated process of reconciliation can recognize Indigenous identities and land claims, but only “insofar as this recognition does not throw into

---

<sup>55</sup> Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *Sovereign Subjects: Indigenous Sovereignty Matters* (Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin, 2007), 4.

<sup>56</sup> Taiaiake Alfred, “Deconstructing the British Columbia treaty process [Paper in: Indigenous Peoples in the International Sphere.]”, *Balayi: Culture, Law and Colonialism* 3 (2001): 37-65.

<sup>57</sup> John Borrows, *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).

<sup>58</sup> Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is not a metaphor,” 9.

question the background legal, political and economic framework of the colonial relationship itself.”<sup>59</sup>

This process of colonial recognition, as distinct from overt forms of domination and assimilation, demonstrates the continuity of settler colonialism over time as a process aimed at sovereignty and land, while also demonstrating the dynamic nature of techniques and ideologies of colonialism. Present day techniques of settler colonialism are better understood as “containment” rather than elimination.<sup>60</sup> Adam Barker contends that “[i]n the Canadian context the implication is that the Canadian state can simultaneously remain colonial through creative adaptation and also be portrayed as ‘postcolonial’ due to a lack of resemblance with earlier imperial and colonial forms.”<sup>61</sup>

“Containment” as an important feature of settler colonialism plays a central role in the architecture of the dissertation’s argument. The dissertation presents evidence for the historical development of strategies of containment, for Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples, as a response to the inadequacy of pre-WWII racial supremacist approaches to assimilation and dispossession. The archival evidence suggests that while strategies of containment became dominant with the rise of integrationism in the 1940s and 1950s, some colonial practices and ideologies of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century promoted a form of “containment” that was less interventionist than dominant colonial attempts to fully assimilate problematic settlers and Indigenous peoples. Although these approaches to containment were sometimes less interventionist than assimilationist approaches, they

---

<sup>59</sup> Glen Coulthard, “Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the ‘Politics of Recognition’ in Canada,” *Contemporary Political Theory*, 6 (2007), 450.

<sup>60</sup> I am indebted to Tobold Rollo for pointing me in the direction of theorizing settler colonialism as “containment” rather than elimination or assimilation.

<sup>61</sup> Barker, “Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism,” 334.

were similarly founded on theories that required the re-shaping of Indigenous and Doukhobor subjectivities, and sometimes (as was the case with the removal of Doukhobor children) were even more coercive than overtly assimilationist projects.

Another central element of settler colonialism involves land. In actual fact, this is not a separate element from the creation of a new political community out of the destruction of another. As Alfred and Corntassel point out above, the destruction of Indigenous peoples as *peoples*—and the attendant destruction of sense of self, or subjectivity, that flows from existence as a people<sup>62</sup>—requires the severing of the bond between community and land, as these are intimately related. Glen Coulthard argues that despite the fact that Indigenous resurgence in the 1970s caused a shift from colonial tactics and ideologies that were explicitly based on coercive exclusion/assimilation to a language of “recognition,” the relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples remains colonial.<sup>63</sup> He maintains that a colonial relationship is a relationship of domination that is, at base, about access to land.<sup>64</sup> Settler access to land and its resources is the key to understanding the continuity of settler colonialism even as justifications for dispossession change. Here we can see that there are historical disjunctures in colonial ideology, but continuity in colonialism as a material process. Unlike other forms of

---

<sup>62</sup> For an English introduction to Cree concepts that explain how a sense of the recursive relationship whereby individual subjectivity flows from the nation (expansively understood to include the spiritual and natural worlds in a holistic system), while the nation flows from the individual, see: Harold Cardinal and Walter Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders of Saskatchewan* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2000). For a Western political philosophy understanding of the historically and politically contingent nature of subjectivity see: Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

<sup>63</sup> Glen Coulthard, “Subjects of Empire?: Indigenous Peoples and the ‘Politics of Recognition’ in Canada” (PhD diss., University of Victoria, 2009), 10.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

imperialism that rely heavily on the exploitation of colonized labourers, “Canadian state-formation and colonial-capitalist development required first and foremost *land*....”<sup>65</sup>

In the emerging field of settler colonial studies many thinkers also use land and sovereignty as central to their conceptualization of settler colonialism. Veracini’s theoretical study relies heavily on characterizing settler colonialism as a project of asserting sovereignty over the population in a given territory. His overarching argument is that the creation of a new political body on Indigenous territory requires assertion of sovereignty through the management—and ultimate disappearance—of Indigenous populations as well as non-Indigenous “exogenous others.”<sup>66</sup> Writing a decade earlier about settler colonialism in Australia, Patrick Wolfe likewise characterizes the fundamental characteristic of settler colonialism as the violent replacement of Indigenous societies with a sovereign settler society on the Indigenous land base.<sup>67</sup> The connection between destruction of Indigenous communities and dispossession of land is, in the view of Tuck and Yang, not simply a story about the theft of land as a resource, but also about the “disruption of Indigenous relationships to land.”<sup>68</sup> Even Sharma and Wright, who enter into debates about settler colonialism by denying “autochtony” as a legitimate basis for claims to resources, understand the problematic at hand to be about territory and sovereignty.<sup>69</sup>

The Doukhobors arrived in Canada in the middle of the colonial project and its focus on land and sovereignty. It was to their detriment that the Community Doukhobors

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>66</sup> Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 33.

<sup>67</sup> Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation*, 27.

<sup>68</sup> Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is not a metaphor”, 5.

<sup>69</sup> Sharma and Wright, “Decolonizing Resistance”, 121.

held beliefs about landholding and sovereignty that directly contradicted the settler colonial project. Communal landholding, as championed by the Doukhobor spiritual leader Peter Vasilevich Verigin, was meant to build a religio-political sovereign community free from earthly government that would usher in the kingdom of God on Earth. When confronted with this challenge, colonial actors' responses were conditioned by the colonial ideologies and tools developed in the dispossession of Indigenous peoples.

### **Indigeneity**

As noted earlier, the move to elaborate a theory of settler colonialism as distinct from other forms of colonialism leads back to a scholarly debate about heterogeneity within the categories colonizer/colonized. If one were to focus solely on this contemporary debate about settler identity—carried on mostly by non-Indigenous scholars—it might appear as if the identity 'Indigenous' had never been critically interrogated. Alfred and Corntassel provide a useful starting point to think about Indigeneity in contrast to settler identity. They write:

Indigenousness is an identity constructed, shaped and lived in the politicized context of contemporary colonialism. The communities, clans, nations and tribes we call *Indigenous peoples* are just that: Indigenous to the lands they inhabit, in contrast to and in contention with the colonial societies and states that have spread out from Europe and other centres of empire. It is this oppositional, place-based existence, along with the consciousness of being in struggle against the dispossessing and demeaning fact of colonization by foreign peoples, that fundamentally distinguishes Indigenous peoples from other peoples of the world.<sup>70</sup>

This understanding of Indigeneity as politically constructed and tied to colonialism could, at first glance, be interpreted as an entirely constructionist appeal to a strategic

---

<sup>70</sup> Alfred and Corntassel, "Being Indigenous," 597.

essentialism. Alfred and Cornthassel's argument, however, is much more nuanced than that. They suggest that rather than flattening differences between the many Indigenous peoples of the world, the appeal to Indigeneity is an overarching demand to respect the specific identities that emerge from "lived collective and individual experiences as Indigenous peoples," in contrast to identities that are derived solely from colonial-state imposition.<sup>71</sup> Framing Indigeneity as an identity that is oppositional to imposed colonial identities complicates the simplistic notion that the settler/Indigenous binary automatically reveals the structural workings of settler colonialism.

The political nature of Indigeneity as a constructed identity that draws on primordial national identity as well as contemporary resistance to colonialism has been well developed by many Indigenous scholars who examine gendered oppression in Canadian settler colonialism. As Patricia Monture-Angus argues, the simplistic binary colonizer/colonized does little to explain the colonial situation in Canada where Indigenous people sometimes replicate and mimic settler society and political structures.<sup>72</sup> Likewise, Bonita Lawrence argues that exclusion of urban "mixed-blood" Indigenous people by some Indigenous leadership is the ongoing legacy of highly gendered state policy aimed at destroying the link between Indigenous nations and the land through the gendered racialization of Indigenous identities.<sup>73</sup> Lina Sunseri, while supportive of Oneida nation rebuilding, also notes the internal complexity of Indigenous identities when she argues that given the context of ongoing colonialism, Indigenous

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 600-601.

<sup>72</sup> Patricia Monture-Angus, *Journeying Forward: Dreaming First Nations' Independence* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1999), 11.

<sup>73</sup> Lawrence, *'Real' Indians and Others*, xvi.

national identities have the potential to replicate colonially imposed patriarchal exclusion.<sup>74</sup>

The aforementioned scholars bring clarity to the political nature of the terms of the settler/Indigenous binary. Appeals to primordial Indigenous identity without attention to the historical complexities of colonial power can do little to further decolonization. To use the Indigenous/settler binary to understand continuity in settler colonial projects into the present day does not necessitate an unquestioning and simplistic uptake of the binary. On the contrary, just as different Indigenous people and peoples are differently related to settler colonialism,<sup>75</sup> so too are various settlers differently related to settler colonialism. The binary exposes a fundamental truth about settler colonialism—its primary target is land-based *Indigenous* sovereignties—yet, just as Indigenous decolonization requires attention to both difference across nations and within them, decolonization from the settler side requires specificity in various groups’ actual relationship to settler colonialism.

### **Settler-Subject**

The concept of the “settler-subject” at the heart of this dissertation should not be confused with the more narrow legal historical use of “subject” in Canada. While British subject and Canadian citizen have been synonymous at times, this is not the meaning I wish to convey. Instead, settler-subjectivity includes both being subjected to Canadian

---

<sup>74</sup> Lina Sunseri, “Moving Beyond the Feminism versus Nationalism Dichotomy,” in *First Voices: An Aboriginal Women’s Reader*, Patricia Monture and Patricia McGuire eds. (Toronto: Inanna Publications and Education Inc., 2009), 253, 259.

<sup>75</sup> Not only does each Indigenous nation have its own historical relationship with the colonial state, but these relationships are also mediated by state imposed identities through the Indian Act and the Canadian constitution. The Canadian legal regime recognizes Indians, Métis, and Inuit as three categories of “Aboriginal” Canadians, and each category legally mediates the relationship with the state. Throughout this dissertation I use the term Indigenous to cover all of these categories, but use the names of specific nations where appropriate.

laws and sovereign power as well as having one's subjectivity—one's sense of self and way of being in the world—shaped to ensure this subjection. This understanding of subjectivity is similar to some expansive conceptualizations of how the state creates citizenship; for example, Alan Cairns writes,

...by the socialization processes directly under its control in education, supplemented by its extensive powers of persuasion, exhortation, and manipulation of symbols, the state seeks to mould the citizen's perception of self, community, and rights and duties in line with the requirements of the constitutional order.<sup>76</sup>

In a settler-colony, the moulding of subjects by the state is done to further the needs of the colonial project, which vary over time. For example, during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries the westward expansion of Canada required first and foremost agricultural labourers to “settle” territory, thus governments placed emphasis on a subject's relation to the land and the subject's ability to “settle” it. However, by the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century industrial exploitation of resources was secured and a majority European-Canadian population was in place, making the language of “settlement” obsolete in government circles. With the emergence of an increasingly civic, rather than ethno-racial, nation-building project in Canada<sup>77</sup> civil society experts and government officials replaced the language of the “settler” and “racial assimilation” with “civic and economic integration” of Canadian “citizens.” The moulding of citizen-subjects continued, however, to promote the “instrumental” or material project of settler colonialism<sup>78</sup>—that is, the acquisition of land as a resource and the building of political institutions—by

---

<sup>76</sup> Alan Cairns, “The Past and Future of the Canadian Administrative State,” *University of Toronto Law Journal* 40, no. 3 (1990), 322-3.

<sup>77</sup> For a very brief overview of this transition see, Raymond Breton, “From ethnic to civic nationalism: English Canada and Quebec,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 11, no. 1 (1988): 85-102.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

shaping subjects toward the ideal of becoming individualist, law-abiding contributors to the economy. Therefore, this dissertation refers to “settler-subject” making, even after the term “settler” falls out of use in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century.

Despite the affinity between settler-citizenship and settler-subjectivity, I specifically use the concept of subject, rather than citizen, to avoid confusion on several fronts. First, problematic settlers might be excluded from the rights and responsibilities of citizenship at the same time as being brought under the power of the Canadian state—being “subject” to Canadian law can apply to non-citizen residents. Secondly, citizenship can act as one tactic in the broader process of subject making. For example, in Chapter 2 I detail historical political debates between one vision of colonialism that emphasizes settler-citizenship and an alternate vision that prioritizes settler-labourers. Political actors did not universally agree on what form the “settler” should be moulded to. Commentators on the Doukhobors in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century refer to “bona fide settlers,” “real settlers,” “settler-citizens,” “good settlers,” and “settler-labourers.” All of these names refer to different ideal settler types, which commentators either hoped government action would impose on Doukhobors, or which were used to justify the exclusion of Doukhobors from membership in the Canadian polity. All of these ideals are concerned with making settler-subjects, but only one specifically uses the language of “citizenship.” Thirdly, subject making refers to a much more profound political intervention than managing legal citizenship; it is about completely reshaping peoples’ relation to land, to political structures and authority, to history, and to perceptions of the good. In short, it is a process of making people.

### **Relational Overlap**

The concept of relational overlap helps to explain the *how* of settler-subject making. The process of defining settler identity against, or in relation to, the colonial other is what is meant by “relational.” In a conceptualization not dissimilar to the idea of relational overlap, Aimé Césaire explains the “boomerang effect” of colonialism:

Colonization ... dehumanizes even the most civilized man; that colonial activity, colonial enterprise, colonial conquest, which is based on contempt for the native and justified by that contempt, inevitably tends to change him who undertakes it; that the colonizer, who in order to ease his conscience gets into the habit of seeing the other man as an animal, accustoms himself to treating him like an animal, and tends objectively to transform *himself* into an animal.<sup>79</sup>

The argument that colonial ideas and policy targeting Indigenous peoples overlap with ideas and policy targeting problematic settlers (and vice-versa) operates alongside the central thesis that the category settler is politically constructed by state action. With the above understanding of settler-subjects in mind, the relational construction of settler-subjects, and overlap with colonial ideologies and policies, is to be expected given the nature of settler colonialism. Since settler colonialism is primarily about the creation of a sovereign political community through the expropriation of land, rather than being about the exploitation of overseas Indigenous labour, the making of settler-subjects and the dispossession of Indigenous peoples occur simultaneously in the same political system. In fact, the twin elements of settler colonialism, settlement and dispossession, were institutionally wedded to one another at two different points during the historical period under study. From 1876 to 1936 the Minister of the Interior, who was responsible for administering immigration and Canada’s homesteading program, was also the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs. Then, from 1950 to 1966 the Branch of Indian

---

<sup>79</sup> Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, 5.

Affairs was made part of the newly created Department of Citizenship and Immigration. While the formal institutionalization of a single ministry responsible for Indigenous peoples and settlement aided in overlap, provincial politicians and members of civil society also engaged in this colonial cross-pollination.

In this formulation of relational overlap, the colonial context, comprised of the ideological context as well as the practical political context of settlement, provides the opportunity for the above-mentioned practical colonial cross-pollination that occurs when individuals and institutions actively work on both settler-making and Indigenous dispossession. These colonial actors then produce colonial knowledge that is spread through various mechanisms of dissemination—e.g. news print, government reports, academic conferences, learned societies—which reinforces the colonial conditions that allow relational overlap.

Throughout this dissertation the creation of colonial knowledge is taken as a key site where relational overlap occurs. The creation of colonial knowledge about Indigenous peoples served to create an ideal of the settler while it simultaneously denigrated Indigenous peoples. Christopher Bracken explains that “when Canada finally delivered itself to its western border, it found Europe already embodied in a group of cultures that white Canadians wished to define themselves against.”<sup>80</sup> Bracken is arguing that the knowledge created about Indigenous peoples was more a relational self-definition project of white Canada, than an attempt at real understanding of the other. While not speaking specifically to *settler* colonialism, Barbara Arneil makes the case that the liberal citizen, within an ideology of liberal colonialism, is defined against the “idle, irrational

---

<sup>80</sup> Christopher Bracken, *The Potlatch Papers: A colonial case history* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 2.

[and] custom-bound.”<sup>81</sup> According to Arneil, this ideology was used to justify not only colonization of Indigenous peoples, but also the colonization of non-Indigenous “idle poor” and “mental deficient” in what she terms “domestic colonization.”<sup>82</sup> While Arneil provides keen insights into the ways in which colonial ideology—and the technique of improvement through agricultural labour—moves between Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups, her use of “colonization” to describe this process masks the way that oppressed settlers are still complicit in settler colonialism. To say that there is relational overlap between ideologies and policies aimed at Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples in Canada is not to say that the Doukhobors were colonized. There is an important distinction between being colonized and being used as a tool of colonization. Some Doukhobors were oppressed in the process of making settler-subjects of them, but this was a process of subjectification, not colonialism.

Relational overlap can be further understood when it is contrasted with problematic analyses that equate different forms of oppression with colonialism. Tuck and Yang agree that colonial projects aimed at differently located groups are sometimes collapsed on one another;<sup>83</sup> however, this makes it particularly easy for oppressed non-Indigenous groups to make claims of “equivocation,” arguing that they too are colonized without detailing their historical relation to settler colonialism.<sup>84</sup> Scott Lauria Morgensen similarly argues that there is a danger of evading complicity in settler colonialism when

---

<sup>81</sup> Barbara Arneil, “Liberal Colonialism, Domestic Colonies and Citizenship,” *History of Political Thought* 33, no. 3 (Autumn 2012), 492.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 493.

<sup>83</sup> Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is not a metaphor,” 18. An example of this “selective collapsing” of categories can be seen in the “Canadianization” programs of the 1950s and 1960s aimed at Indigenous peoples and new immigrants alike. See Heidi Bohaker and Franca Iacovetta, “Making Aboriginal People ‘Immigrants Too’: A Comparison of Citizenship Programs for Newcomers and Indigenous Peoples,” *The Canadian Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (2009): 427-462.

<sup>84</sup> Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is not a metaphor,” 17.

non-Indigenous queer activists and scholars conflate their history of sexual oppression by the state with the violent imposition of sexual norms on Indigenous communities through colonialism.<sup>85</sup> Doukhobors may have been targeted by the state because of the perceived threat to Canadian sovereignty, but to call them “colonized” is analytically confusing and could severely undermine the political claims being made by Indigenous peoples through the settler/Indigenous binary. In settler colonies, only those who are Indigenous to the territory can be colonized because they are the original inhabitants that the colony is meant to replace. Indigenous political identities tied to the land are the basis for specific decolonial justice claims on settlers and the settler state such as territorially based self-determination. Chapter 3, on assimilatory education, provides an example of how, in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, an ideology of racial assimilation and improvement operates in the education of both Indigenous peoples and the Doukhobors, yet the Doukhobors are targeted specifically as quasi-assimilable *settlers*.

Relational overlap can be compared to the overlap in a Venn diagram. In this case, the two circles represent settlement and dispossession within the shared context of settler colonialism. Both elements represent different aspects of settler colonialism that cannot be collapsed on one another, and yet cannot be fully understood without taking into account significant areas of overlap that fundamentally shape each aspect of settler colonialism. For example, this dissertation demonstrates that the ideologies regarding land used to justify the dispossession of Indigenous peoples were taken up against the Community Doukhobors with the aim of changing their relation to land and making them into governable subjects. This land-based subject-making project was simultaneously

---

<sup>85</sup> Morgenson, “Homonationalism,” 120.

present in Indian Affairs land policy and in Canada's homesteading policy regarding settlers. This overlap, however, does not mean that the settlement and dispossession are mirror images of each other. As problematic settlers, the Community Doukhobors in the early 20<sup>th</sup> had the distinct possibility of accepting Canadian authority and becoming the settler-subjects that the government desired them to become. For Indigenous peoples, however, even when they demonstrated adaptability to the agrarian settler ideal, Indian land policy effectively prevented their successful entry into the developing settler economy and society.<sup>86</sup> While there was significant overlap in subject-making projects for Indigenous peoples and settlers, at times Indigenous dispossession relied on naked expropriation rather than attempts to make Indigenous peoples conform to a settler ideal.

### **Sovereignty**

At this stage we have come some way in understanding what it might mean to interpret the political history of the Doukhobors in Canada through the lens of settler colonialism. First, this approach emphasizes the importance of territory and sovereignty in the process of expansive nation building. The logical hypothesis that flows from this interpretation is that attempts by the Canadian state to construct settler-subjects out of the Doukhobors will likely target problematic elements of this group that conflict with territorial expansion and assertions of sovereignty over this territory. As argued earlier, sovereignty is central to settler colonialism since the colonial project is fundamentally about the creation of a new political community that supercedes pre-existing political

---

<sup>86</sup> Sarah Carter, "'They would not give up one inch of it': The rise and demise of St. Peter's Reserve, Manitoba," in *Indigenous Communities and Settler Colonialism: Land Holding, Loss and Survival in an Interconnected World*, eds. Zoë Laidlaw and Alan Lester (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Sarah Carter, "Erasing and Replacing: Property and Homestead Rights of First Nations of the Northwest, 1870s-1920s," in *Place and Replace: Essays on Western Canada*, eds. Esyllt W. Jones, Adele Perry, and Leah Morton eds., (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2013).

communities. According to Veracini, the violent foundation of these new polities creates a problem for settlers who wish to view their polities as ideal; settler polities must create fantasies to justify their foundations and “cleanse” themselves of their Indigenous populations.<sup>87</sup> As Audra Simpson argues, assertions of Indigenous sovereignties are “nightmarish for the settler-state” as these assertions fatally undermine settler sovereignty.<sup>88</sup>

For the purposes of this dissertation the working concept of sovereignty refers to the highly simplified notion of *a territorially based political community that is able to govern itself toward some vision of the good life*. This broad conceptualization is aware of several traditions of theorizing sovereignty but aims to avoid the specificity of these theories in order to encompass Indigenous, Doukhobor, and colonial forms of sovereignty under one umbrella term. While this conceptualization may not grasp the complexity of specific Indigenous nations’ concepts of sovereignty<sup>89</sup> or provide the specificity of western political theories of sovereignty, this lack of specificity provides the concept with more explanatory power by including diverse political formations within the concept of sovereignty. In this spirit, this definition lacks the specificity of monopoly on physical

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 33, 77.

<sup>88</sup> Audra Simpson, “Settlement’s Secret,” *Cultural Anthropology* 26, no. 2 (2011), 211.

<sup>89</sup> An excellent comparison between Anishnaabeg and Western conceptualizations of sovereignty can be found in Leanne Simpson, *Dancing on Our Turtle’s Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence* (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2011). Simpson explains the difference between Western conceptualizations of nation and sovereignty and Nishnaabeg concepts through the idea of change and movement compared to fixity; the attempts to fix the nation in the institution of the state is contrary to an Indigenous nationhood that is tied to the fluctuations of nature, p. 89. She further explains that this relational fluidity applies to territorial boundaries: “...’boundaries’, in an Indigenous sense, are about relationships. As someone moves away from the centre of their territory—the place they have the strongest and most familiar bonds and relationships—their knowledge and relationship to the land weakens. This is a boundary, a zone of decreasing Nishnaabeg presence ... This is a place where one needs to practice good relations with neighbouring nations,” p. 89.

force in Max Weber's concept of the modern state.<sup>90</sup> It lacks specific attention to the biopolitical elements of modern power as in Foucault's assessment of sovereign power<sup>91</sup> or Giorgio Agamben's linking of sovereign power to bare life.<sup>92</sup> The definition also does not make a judgment on any one conceptualization of sovereignty from the long tradition of social contract theory.

The working definition strives to be broad enough to encompass the diversity of ways that various Indigenous traditions conceptualize sovereignty, without attempting to impose unity on this diversity.<sup>93</sup> One should heed the warning given by Robert Nichols about assuming that Euro-centric conceptualizations of land and sovereignty are adequate to understand Indigenous political forms:

Although it is undoubtedly true that indigeneity is important in part because of 'the challenge that it poses to current patterns of sovereignty and property rights', it is not the same as saying that indigeneity can be fully captured *within* the current, Euro-American logic of sovereignty or property rights, at least not without significant revision.<sup>94</sup>

Time and time again, Indigenous scholars, writing from various national perspectives, have made the case that their concepts of territorially grounded political identities differ

---

<sup>90</sup> Max Weber, "The Profession and Vocation of Politics." In *Weber: Political Writings*, Peter Lassman and Ronald Speirs eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 310-311.

<sup>91</sup> Michel Foucault, *The history of sexuality: Histoire de la sexualité* (New York: Vintage Books, 1990).

<sup>92</sup> Giorgio Agamben, *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1998).

<sup>93</sup> Andrea Smith argues that the desire to know the inherent, singular, ethnographic truth of Indigenous peoples is symptomatic of a broader aspect of colonialism that constructs Indigenous people as passive objects to be acted upon. Attempts to give a singular definition of sovereignty as the basis of Indigenous political demands not only ignores differences across Indigenous political communities, but also within them, and this leads to a shutting down and depoliticization of Indigenous assertions of sovereignty. Andrea Smith, "Native Studies at the Horizon of Death," in Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith eds., *Theorizing Native Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 230.

<sup>94</sup> Robert Nichols, "Indigeneity and the Settler Contract Today," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 39, no.2 (2013), 174.

from Western concepts of sovereignty. Aileen Moreton-Robinson provides a concise contrast between ways of understanding sovereignty when she writes:

Our sovereignty is embodied, it is ontological (our being) and epistemological (our way of knowing), and it is grounded within complex relations derived from the intersubstantiation of ancestral beings, humans and land. In this sense, our sovereignty is carried by the body and differs from Western constructions of sovereignty, which are predicated on the social contract model, the idea of a unified supreme authority, territorial integrity and individual rights.<sup>95</sup>

Likewise, Patricia Monture-Angus argues that Western notions of sovereignty—as exclusionary ownership of territory and control of population within that territory—do not map well onto Mohawk traditions in which a lived relationship to the land creates a relational “right to be responsible.”<sup>96</sup> Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard writes of how testimony at the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry of 1975 by Phillip Blake reveals a Dene conceptualization of land simultaneously as resource, as identity and as a system of relations between land, animals, generations, and other peoples.<sup>97</sup> While this foundation for an ethical-political community is a challenge to settler sovereignty, it certainly is not the same type of sovereignty.<sup>98</sup> An important insight to take away from these competing conceptualizations of sovereignty is that Indigenous sovereignties are multiple and internally contested and therefore thwart attempts at singular definitions.

In these understandings of sovereignty, territory and a sense of a community ordered around the good life remain central, but land and political community are conceptualized differently from European political traditions. Likewise, during the period

---

<sup>95</sup> Moreton-Robinson, *Sovereign Subjects*, 2.

<sup>96</sup> Monture-Angus, *Journeying Forward*, 36.

<sup>97</sup> Glen Coulthard, “Place Against Empire: Understanding Indigenous Anti-Colonialism,” *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4, no. 2 (Fall 2010), 81-82.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 82.

under study, the Doukhobor conceptualization of sovereignty does not neatly align with statist definitions of sovereignty. It can, however, find a place under the broad conceptualization of sovereignty as defined above. The Doukhobor conceptualization of sovereignty begins from the egalitarian premise that God is the sole sovereign and that the divine spark of God resides in each individual Doukhobor.<sup>99</sup> This is the spiritual foundation for a land-based Doukhobor community that aims to bring about the kingdom of God on Earth through the perfection of human relations in the Doukhobor commune.<sup>100</sup> This religio-political community challenged Canadian sovereignty by providing a system of governance that provided a radical alternative to the dominant legal, political, and economic systems. In short, this community provided an alternative political way of life.

### **Colonial Ideologies and Colonial Knowledge**

The concept of ideology as used throughout this dissertation should not be mistaken for the classical Marxist understanding of ideology as an effect of material conditions that creates a false consciousness, maintaining the power of the capitalist class. This study suggests that colonial ideologies are multiple and contested, and while all serve to maintain the colonial project, some are less supportive of the capitalist class.<sup>101</sup> Colonial ideology, then, should be understood simply as a set of interconnected ideas that occur with enough regularity that an historical investigation can reveal a pattern of thought. An ideology can be characterized as a “political language” that is

---

<sup>99</sup> See discussion of Doukhobor conceptualization of the commune in Chapter 1, 77.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> For example, the widespread nativist sentiment against Doukhobors and other Eastern Europeans on the Prairies in the early 1900s was also strongly linked to a populist opposition to capitalist land speculation and the power of the railroad companies.

shared by many political actors and that is always informed by the material and political conditions in which it is deployed.<sup>102</sup> Since ideologies, in this characterization, develop through political action, in response to political problems of the day, it is rare for any one individual to espouse an internally coherent, systemized school of thought. Colonial ideologies, however, are more than socially diffused ideas because they are not politically neutral. Colonial ideologies justify the colonial project and give meaning to it. This meaning giving is not solely an after-the-fact justification, but is itself a central part of the settler colonial project. On this point, the conceptualization of colonial ideology aligns with David Scott's position on colonial *governmentality*<sup>103</sup> and Nicholas Thomas' take on colonial *cultures*: "Colonial cultures are not simply ideologies that mask, mystify or rationalize forms of oppression that are external to them; they are expressive and constitutive of colonial relationships in themselves."<sup>104</sup> These ideologies constitute the political projects of colonial subject making, and thus ideology plays a central role in the investigation of the Doukhobor "problem."

The simultaneous presence of continuity and fluidity in settler colonialism helps to explain certain shifts in ideologies without seeing these shifts as a clean break from the past. As mentioned earlier, Chapter 3 exposes an ideology of racial assimilation at play in early 20<sup>th</sup> century education and also demonstrates that politicians rapidly abandoned this ideology after WWII. However, it is in the 1950s that the government of British Columbia undertook its most ambitious experiment in assimilating the Sons of Freedom children through education. At this stage, the dominant political problem of the

---

<sup>102</sup> James Tully, "The Pen is a Mighty Sword: Quentin Skinner's Analysis of Politics." *British Journal of Political Science* 13, no. 4 (1983), 489-509.

<sup>103</sup> David Scott, "Colonial Governmentality," *Social Text* 43 (1995), 193.

<sup>104</sup> Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture*, 2.

Doukhobors was no longer complete assimilation, or elimination, as the vast majority had accepted Canadian institutions of governance and were well on their way to being integrated into the wage economy. The problem was about “containing” the radical elements of the Sons of Freedom that continued to pose a stubborn threat to the sovereign power of the state, while fostering the integration of moderate Doukhobors. The justifications for this program were different from earlier racialized imperialism, yet the project remained colonial in the sense of fostering the territorial sovereignty of Canada. The concept of containment allows for a diversity of ideologies within the process of colonialism.

In putting forward a framework for understanding settler colonialism that allows competing and contradictory ideologies—sometimes simultaneously—this project retains an important place for ideas in settler colonialism. At times, the Doukhobors are connected to colonial ideologies through specific individuals, as is the case with Harry Hawthorn in the 1950s. In this case, a network of policy actors can be identified and one can trace the relational overlap of colonial knowledges about the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples in British Columbia and the impact, or lack thereof, of this knowledge on government policy. At other times, however, the ideological connection is less amenable to this type of micro-analysis. When JTM Anderson—Premier of Saskatchewan from 1929 to 1934—framed the problem of educational assimilation of the Doukhobors as a great challenge for British imperialism in Canada,<sup>105</sup> he was certainly drawing on a colonial ideology of Anglo-supremacy and racial assimilation. The fact that his vision was thwarted by the institutional reality of Saskatchewan’s public education

---

<sup>105</sup> J.T.M. Anderson, *The Education of the New-Canadian* (Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1918).

system does, however, remind us that colonial ideology should not be viewed as deterministic.

### **A Note On Method**

My training in political theory inspires the approach to historical materials in this dissertation. Specifically, the approach is inspired by James Tully's historically sensitive method of critical political philosophy.<sup>106</sup> This method of interpreting historical political thought draws on the Cambridge school's historicist, contextual approach to textual interpretation as well as various critical theorists who emphasize the power of historical interpretation to disrupt dominant political thought in the present.<sup>107</sup>

Quentin Skinner, a key figure of the Cambridge school's approach to historical political thought, provides a method of interpreting political thought that can be contrasted with Leo Strauss' rejection of historicism and Strauss' reading of political thought as a source of perennial questions about the human condition and universal truths.<sup>108</sup> According to Strauss, the historicist approach to political thought limits the ability of political thought to inform the present since, "all human thought is bound to perish with the situation to which it belongs and to be superseded by new, unpredictable thoughts."<sup>109</sup> To a certain extent, Strauss is correct in his assessment, as some historicists like J.G.A. Pocock explicitly argue that when theorists attempt to find practical knowledge for the present in historical thought, their work cannot be legitimately deemed

---

<sup>106</sup> James Tully, "Political philosophy as a critical activity," *Political Theory* 30, no. 4 (2002): 533-55.

<sup>107</sup> For an example of Tully's interpretation of Quentin Skinner's historicist approach see James Tully, "The Pen is a Mighty Sword: Quentin Skinner's Analysis of Politics," *British Journal of Political Science* 13, no. 4 (1983): 489-509. For an example of Tully's integration of this approach with other critical thinkers see, Tully, "Political philosophy".

<sup>108</sup> Leo Strauss, *Natural right and history*, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 23.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

historical.<sup>110</sup> Tully's interpretation of Skinner's method is appropriate for the current study because it rescues the Cambridge school's approach from political irrelevance by emphasizing the critical aspect of this approach that makes the history of political thought a history of the present.

According to Tully, Skinner's method involves five steps. First, one investigates the ideological context in which historical thought is located in order to understand what the author was doing in this ideational context.<sup>111</sup> Second, one attempts to get a grasp on what the author was doing as a political action.<sup>112</sup> One asks, "What intervention, to what contemporary political problem, was the author intending?" Third, one attempts to understand how ideologies form and are changed by past thinkers. By putting a text into its practical political context and its ideological context, and tracing these contexts over time, one is able to determine when an author is breaking with the status quo.<sup>113</sup> The fourth step uses the information gained in the previous steps to make an assessment of how ideologies both constrain certain political action and positively promote other forms of political action by changing political consciousness of the time.<sup>114</sup> The final step asks of scholars that they examine how historical political thought is disseminated and made conventional through instruments of dissemination.<sup>115</sup>

What makes this method a critical history of the present is the way that it has been used by Skinner and taken up by Tully. Skinner's work *The Foundations of Modern*

---

<sup>110</sup> J. G. A. Pocock, *Political Thought and History: Essays on Theory and Method* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 52.

<sup>111</sup> Tully, "The Pen is a Mighty Sword," 491.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 492.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 495.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 496-7.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 498.

*Political Thought* is not only an attempt to render a more historically accurate reading of political thinkers, but also an attempt to reveal the contingency of the modern ideology of the state and provide a republican alternative.<sup>116</sup> Unlike a purely historicist approach, as described by Strauss, that attempts to understand the past on its own terms, for its own sake, there is a political reason for engaging in this type of scholarship. Tully explains that the critical project uses historical analysis to destabilize current forms of governance:

“...this practical and critical objective is achieved in two steps. The first is a critical survey of the languages and practices in which the struggles arise, and various theoretical solutions are proposed and implemented as reforms. This survey explicates which forms of thought, conduct, and subjectivity are taken for granted or given as necessary, and so function as constitutive conditions of the contested practices and their repertoire of problems and solutions. The second step broadens this initial critique by using a history or genealogy of the formation of these specific languages and practices as an object of comparison and contrast. This historical survey has the capacity to free us to some extent from the conditions of possibility uncovered in the first step and so to be able to see the practices and their forms of problematisation as a limited and contingent whole. It is then possible to call these limits into question and open them to a dialogue of comparative evaluation and thus to develop the perspectival ability to consider different possible ways of governing this realm of cooperation.”<sup>117</sup>

There are several important insights in this approach that are influential throughout the dissertation. The first is that political thought is conceptualized as an intersubjective political action. Political language cannot be meaningfully divorced from its practical political context.<sup>118</sup> This means that political theorists are also political actors. Political actors, however, are also political theorists in the sense that by engaging in political contestation they inevitably put forward justifications that are constrained by and contribute to the development of political ideologies. Despite the fact that scholars of

---

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., 500.

<sup>117</sup> Tully, “Political Philosophy as Critical Activity,” 534.

<sup>118</sup> Tully, “The Pen is a mighty sword,” 491.

the history of political thought often focus on the traditional canonical thinkers of Western political thought, there is no reason why, in this formulation of political thought as political action, minor political actors should not also be treated as important in the development of ideologies. This is what the dissertation attempts to do by examining the practical architects of settler-subject making. The main figures in this dissertation (Sifton, Oliver, McDougall, Mavor, Anderson, and Hawthorn) are important political thinkers in the development of Canadian colonial ideology, and can only be considered minor when placed beside the likes of John Locke or Karl Marx (great thinkers who arguably had less impact on the ideological development of Canadian settler colonialism than the aforementioned minor actors).

The dissertation examines both the political context in which the aforementioned figures make political speech acts as well as the incidental works by these thinkers that reveal the broader thought processes behind their proposed solutions to the Doukhobor problem. At times, the complexity of the political context requires a narrative about Doukhobor conflicts with the state in order to familiarize readers who do not know this background. It is not, however, the primary objective of this dissertation to provide a comprehensive history of the Doukhobors in Canada.<sup>119</sup> Nevertheless, where the analysis of the colonial context and ideologies brings new insights to the Doukhobor historiography, the analysis will turn at times to how these insights differ from previous historical scholarship.

A second key insight of this method is the importance of attending to constrained agency by historical actors. Political speech acts, even when they are subverting the

---

<sup>119</sup> See p. 14-18 of this introduction for citations of key historical works on the Doukhobors.

status quo, always draw on existing ideologies to some extent in order to be understood and taken up by others.<sup>120</sup> This is a recurrent theme throughout the dissertation. For example, chapters 1 and 2 demonstrate that John McDougall, even though he largely subscribed to dominant colonial ideologies, also argued, within this ideological constraint, against the paternalism of Indian Affairs. Similarly, chapters 4 and 5 show how Hawthorn draws on the colonial thought and political conditions of his day to challenge pre-existing colonial ideology, while simultaneously holding fast to some of its core assumptions. I specifically focus on the writings of individual colonial actors because it reveals the working of settler agency—and thus the political contingency of settler colonialism—within the confines of macro material processes and dominant colonial ideologies. These actors in the history of the Doukhobors should be considered political agents, but agents within the broader settler colonial conditions of their place and time.

Finally, this critical history approach to political thought gives a privileged place to instruments of dissemination in explaining the spread and uptake of ideologies. All of the main political actors in the development of ideologies and policies regarding settler-subject making had privileged access to some form of ideological dissemination such as scholarly networks, newspapers, or government commissioned reports. Given the importance of these instruments of dissemination, chapter 4 is dedicated to tracing the movement of colonial thought through the figure of Harry Hawthorn.

The above methodology, with its focus on historical context and constrained agency, assumes that changes over time to political thought and colonial

---

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 496.

problematizations are possible. Additionally, the earlier review of literature demonstrates that scholars of settler colonialism have convincingly argued that settler colonialism is able to change its surface appearance while maintaining a core colonial approach to land and sovereignty. The tension between continuity and disjuncture in settler colonialism is particularly present in chapters 3, 4, and 5, which trace the change over time away from coercive assimilatory approaches to subject formation, towards an integrationist approach. The chosen methodology of this study aids in the development of an analysis that is attentive to both change and continuity.

It would be disingenuous to argue that nothing changed regarding the problematizations of Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples between the homesteading period and the 1950s when Hawthorn wrote his two reports on the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples of British Columbia, just as it would be disingenuous to argue that there was no continuity between the colonialism of one period and the other. The practical political and ideational context changed considerably over the period under study. The ideational context of post-WWII Canada allowed access to non-racial, or even anti-racist, problematizations of differences between groups of people. Furthermore, the material conditions of the settler colony had significantly changed. The consolidation of Canadian political authority and the dominance of a capitalist economy with well-developed primary, secondary, and tertiary sectors meant that settlers were no longer being targeted based primarily on norms of subjectivity tied to agricultural labour as was the case in the homesteading period. Attention to the practical political and ideological context explains why Hawthorn's problematization of Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples shifts toward labour market participation and welfare. However, the genealogical

approach demonstrates that this move toward a less interventionist, market-based approach to subject making was not entirely novel. Fifty years earlier, materialist colonialists such as Mavor and Sifton had made similar arguments about the power of economic participation to create governable subjects. Furthermore, attention to the development of political problems over time shows that the novel problematizations proposed by Hawthorn were an attempt to successfully resolve the core problems of settler colonialism (land and sovereignty) through new means.

The analysis of settler-subject making through the political history of the Doukhobors relies on a diversity of sources and kinds of sources: historical newspaper, several personal archival fonds, Hansard transcripts, the Doukhobor archival collections of UBC and SFU, Indian Affairs archival material through Library and Archives Canada, and several Royal Commissions and other government reports. One obvious methodological risk of relying on these archival materials is that the colonial archive is not simply a source that can be mined for knowledge of the colonial project, but rather the archive itself can be understood as one technique in the production of colonial ideology and colonial subjects.<sup>121</sup> The archive can be thought of as one of many ways of legitimizing ideologies and disseminating them. In order to address this risk, I treat the colonial archive as only one part of the story. In addition, the dissertation relies on secondary sources as well as sources by Indigenous authors and Doukhobors in order to understand and interpret the archival material in its political context.

## **Chapter Overview**

---

<sup>121</sup> Ann Laura Stoler, "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance," *Archival Science*, 2, 2002, 87-109.

The central thesis that settler-subjectivity is constructed through relational overlap is developed thematically around land, education, and official knowledge. To some extent these themes follow each other chronologically with the chapters on education and official knowledge overlapping each other. Chapters 1 and 2 deal with the arrival of the Doukhobors in the Canadian prairies and the conflict that arose between Community Doukhobors and the federal government regarding communal landholding. These chapters provide background information on the religio-political organization of the Community Doukhobors and the Doukhobor conceptualization of communal landholding that brought the community into conflict with Canada's homestead laws. This section demonstrates that official concerns about Doukhobor landholding were part of a larger political battle over the ideal form of colonization. Within this political struggle, the ideologies regarding land, its spiritual value, and the ability of land to shape subjectivity were not invented to address the Doukhobor community, but rather were the result of earlier ideologies used to justify the dispossession of Indigenous peoples. This is most obvious in the writings of Reverend John McDougall and Minister of the Interior Frank Oliver, who both develop their ideas about ideal land use in contrast to what they see as problematic land use by Indigenous peoples. These ideas were put into action through government policy aimed to break up communal Doukhobor landholding and reshape Doukhobor relations to land in order to make them into governable subjects with individual exploitative relations to the land. The flipside of this coercive policy was the idealization and encouragement of Independent Doukhobors who had left the religio-political community led by Peter V. Verigin. Chapter 1 focuses on the background to the land crisis as well as Indigenous, Doukhobor, and colonial conceptualizations of land and

its ability to shape subjectivity. Chapter 2 examines the political thought of major government and non-government actors regarding the Doukhobor land crisis through archival materials.

Chapter 3 picks up on further attempts to shape Doukhobor character after the land crisis. Government officials, concerned that their land policy would only be partially successful in changing Doukhobor character and religio-political organization, suggested that public education would be the key to a multigenerational solution to the problematic Community Doukhobors. In Saskatchewan, J. T. M. Anderson, a school inspector turned Premier, developed a full-fledged theory of racial assimilation through education, with special attention paid to the Doukhobors. This theory of intergenerational racial assimilation was not dissimilar to theories of educational assimilation developed in the context of the Indian Residential School program run by Indian Affairs and various Christian churches. This chapter also examines the conflicts between Community Doukhobors in British Columbia and the provincial government regarding public education. This conflict culminated in the mass incarceration of Sons of Freedom Doukhobors and apprehension and education of their children as wards of the province in a residential school setting in New Denver, BC. I examine public education as a tool of subject making both through its British nationalist curriculum and also through its institutional role in distancing children from parents. A key insight of this chapter is that the justification for state education shifts from an overtly imperialist theory of assimilation to justifications based on child welfare; this post-WWII shift is paralleled in the administration of Indian Affairs and is taken up by the figure of Harry Hawthorn in the final two chapters.

Chapters 4 and 5 take up the theme of *official knowledge* and relational overlap through the figure of Harry Hawthorn, an anthropologist at the University of British Columbia (UBC) commissioned in the 1950s to produce two reports: one for the Government of British Columbia on the Doukhobors and one by the Branch of Indian Affairs on Indigenous peoples in BC. Chapter 4 looks at the colonial network through which Hawthorn developed and disseminated an integrationist ideology that he applied to both Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples. This chapter provides an empirical analysis of the way that colonial ideologies and government tactics move between contexts (national, subnational, government departments, and civil society) and create relational overlap. Chapter 5 delves into a close reading of the integrationist ideology shared between the two reports and how this ideology envisioned the shaping of subjectivity through economic integration and an abandonment of heavy-handed government intervention in subject formation. The ideas presented in the reports represent a shift away from subject making as a project of coercive assimilation toward containment of Sons of Freedom and Indigenous peoples through economic integration.

I conclude the dissertation by looking forward and asking what political and scholarly work the category settler can do for us. I look to promising scholarship and activism that is currently reimaging minority migrant-Indigenous relations and the implications of the current research on these developments.

## **Chapter 1: Displacement by the displaced: the colonial context of the Doukhobor communal experiment**

The first two chapters of this dissertation take up the challenge of examining the complex, relationally overlapping histories of the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples in Canada through a case study of Indian Affairs and homestead land policy during the period 1898 through 1907. The Doukhobors arrived in the Canadian West as ideal agriculturalist settlers and their arrival directly resulted in the expropriation of Cote, Key and Keeseekoose First Nations' reserve land. Initially the government of Canada defended the character of these settlers, but by 1905 the communal landholding system of the Doukhobors, and the religio-political community it fostered, led government officials to characterize the Doukhobors as problematic settlers. In 1907 more than half of the original homestead land reserved for the Doukhobors was taken back by the government and opened to non-Doukhobor settlement.<sup>1</sup> This early period in Canadian-Doukhobor history reveals how the federal government used land policy, and the ideologies behind the policies, to shape the Community Doukhobors into settler-subjects.

Existing literature on this period of Doukhobor history details the context of the Doukhobors' arrival during rapid westward expansion of Canada as well as their arrival through the homestead policy created by the Dominion Lands Act. Absent from nearly all accounts is a critical analysis of exactly why and how the settler colonial context, into which the Doukhobors arrive, matters for the subsequent problematization of Doukhobor landholding and the development of solutions to the supposed problem. The Doukhobors arrived on the scene of an unfolding settler colonial project that conditioned the available

---

<sup>1</sup> George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), 222.

responses of colonial actors dealing with the Doukhobor land “crisis.” Decades of Indian Affairs land policy had operationalized a widespread liberal-colonial ideology about land. This colonial context limited the government practices and conceptual framing available to actors engaging with the Doukhobors. This is not to say that colonial ideology was unitary or deterministic; this era is characterized by relentless political debate about how best to understand land and its relation to the ideal settler-subject.

The colonial context not only conditioned the government conflict with the Doukhobors, but also provided the very possibility of the Doukhobor communal project in the first place. The “unsettled” nature of the Prairies gave the Doukhobors the leeway needed to settle in a territorially concentrated block and develop an independent political community. One need only try to imagine a similar mass settlement (of a group of refugees who hold a shared vision of political autonomy)<sup>2</sup> in present-day Canada to see that this communal experiment required a certain era of settler colonialism as much as it was undone by the historical forces of this era.

The next chapter delves into archival sources to provide grounded evidence for land-based settler-subject making by examining two key political partnerships during this period: the first between Minister of the Interior Clifford Sifton and political economist James Mavor, and the second between Sifton’s successor, Frank Oliver, and the Reverend John McDougall. The current chapter provides the background that the reader requires in order to understand the colonial context that informs the actions of these historical figures. To best accomplish this goal, the current chapter is organized by beginning with a brief historical overview of the Doukhobor land conflict, as this episode

---

<sup>2</sup> As a thought experiment, imagine the political feasibility of a mass settlement of Kurdish people, who have engaged in struggles for independence from Turkey, settling in Canada and creating a territorially bounded “New Kurdistan” based on the political principles of the Kurdistan Workers’ Party.

in Canadian history is likely to be unfamiliar to most readers. Then, in order to bring the larger frame of settler colonialism to the forefront, the chapter examines late-19<sup>th</sup> century Indian Affairs land policy. The Indian Affairs project of undermining Indigenous relations to the land in order to supplant them with an individualistic, exploitative relation to the land was a project of naked material expropriation as well as a project of making governable subjects under newly imposed Canadian sovereignty. The colonial ideology of land at the heart of Indian Affairs land policy is also part of the contextual foundation of the “Doukhobor problem.” As such, the chapter takes a closer look at two variants of colonial ideology of land, and the challenge that Plains Indigenous and Doukhobor conceptualizations of land pose to this colonial ideology. The interplay of these four conceptualizations of land is the ideational context in which the political actors examined in the next chapter operate. The chapter concludes by critically assessing existing scholarship on the Doukhobor land crisis and how a lack of attention to the colonial context limits one’s understanding of the meaning behind government action.

**“Of what use is land anywhere in the world unless it is occupied and cultivated?”<sup>3</sup>: An overview of the Doukhobor land conflict**

The Doukhobor land crisis was, on the surface, a conflict between the Community Doukhobors, led by Peter Vasilevich Verigin, and the Federal Government over compliance with the *Dominion Lands Act*. The conflict, however, was also about competing ways of relating to land and the types of subjectivity and government to which these relations give rise. *The Dominion Lands Act* was Canada’s homestead policy that aimed to encourage the rapid influx of settlers to Canada’s North-West by offering 160

---

<sup>3</sup> Minister of the Interior Clifford Sifton explaining concessions made to the Doukhobor settlers. Sifton to Ivan and Feodor Suchorukoff, February 15, 1902, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.

acres (a quarter section) to each settler for a nominal fee of \$10. Since the policy was an attempt to operationalize John A. Macdonald's National Policy of developing an agricultural industry in the North-West connected by railroad to industrial manufacturing markets in central Canada, it placed certain requirements on homesteaders to encourage the desired pattern of economic development and to shape the character of the nation and its subjects. The homestead policy of Canada has been studied as a nation-building tool that shaped the familial, gender, and economic norms of the North-West.<sup>4</sup> Among the requirements of the homestead act was the need, within three years of making entry for a homestead, to cultivate a minimum of 15 acres of land, reside on the land, and become a naturalized British subject (which required taking an oath of allegiance). To further entice homesteaders, settlement policy allowed for the government to pay a sort of finder's fee of \$5 per head to steamship and colonization companies that promoted colonization and transported settlers to Canada.

The era preceding the arrival of the Doukhobors in Canada was marked by a drought and economic depression that resulted in stagnant settler population growth, and even the exodus of many homesteaders to the United States.<sup>5</sup> When Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberals came to power in 1896, Laurier appointed Clifford Sifton as Minister of the Interior with the goal of more successfully pursuing the Conservative National Policy. This was to be accomplished by aggressively promoting immigration from Eastern Europe; the central object of Sifton's policy was to acquire good agriculturalists even if it

---

<sup>4</sup> Carter, *The Importance of Being Monogamous*, 74-75; Sarah Carter, "'Daughters of British Blood' or 'Hordes of men of alien race': the homesteads-for-women campaign in Western Canada," *Great Plains Quarterly* 29, no. 4 (2009): 267-286.

<sup>5</sup> James Mavor, *My Windows on the Street of the World, Vol. 1* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons Limited, 1923), 313.

meant sourcing them from outside Britain.<sup>6</sup> Sifton saw peasant farmers from Russia and Galicia (what would become Ukraine) as a source of previously untapped agricultural labour,<sup>7</sup> and so when James Mavor, Chair of Political Economy at the University of Toronto, contacted Sifton with a proposal to bring several thousand Doukhobor refugees to Canada, the proposal was quickly accepted with only minimal discussion of the potential political difficulties of settling an anarchistic, pacifist, and increasingly—at the time of arrival—communist religious community in the North-West.<sup>8</sup>

Doukhobor and non-Doukhobor scholars have examined in detail the chronology of Doukhobor emigration to Canada, and I feel that there is little reason to provide a full account here.<sup>9</sup> What is essential in understanding this conflict is a basic overview of the concessions granted to the Doukhobor settlers and the subsequent flashpoints in the conflict. When the Doukhobors arrived in Canada in 1899, Sifton went out of his way to accommodate the new settlers. The agreement reached between the government and representatives for the Doukhobors<sup>10</sup> stated that, through an order in council, the

---

<sup>6</sup> It must be noted that Sifton's "open door" policy was still premised on dominant white supremacist ideology. His acceptance of pluralism did not extend to Japanese or Chinese immigrants. D.J. Hall, *Clifford Sifton, Volume 1: The Young Napoleon, 1861-1900* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1981), 263.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 253-262.

<sup>8</sup> Woodcock and Avakumovic, 131-134.

<sup>9</sup> The reason that I feel this investigation is unnecessary is that in my research I examined many of the primary sources cited in these historical accounts and found that for the most part these authors accurately present a detailed account of the events leading up to and the eventual arrival of the Doukhobors in Canada. These accounts detail the political persecution in Russia; the different trajectories of various Doukhobor groups, such as the Doukhobors that arrived in Canada via Cyprus; the co-ordinated effort of Quaker, Tolstoyan, and other Doukhobor sympathizers in orchestrating the migration; and finally, the agreements reached with the Department of the Interior regarding specific concessions made for the Doukhobor settlers. This literature, and the accurate chronology and narrative that it provides, is essential for a complete understanding of the Doukhobor land conflict, but it cannot be adequately addressed in my research that is focused on the Doukhobors as settler-subjects. See Kathlyn Rose Marie Szalasznyj, "The Doukhobor Homestead Crisis 1898-1907" (master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1977); Woodcock and Avakumovic, *Doukhobors.*; Koozma Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors* (Grand Forks, BC: Mir Publication Society, 1982).

<sup>10</sup> It is important to note that negotiations did not include Doukhobors. This was arguably a central reason for later conflicts over what was initially agreed to.

Doukhobors would be exempted from military service just as Mennonite conscientious objection had been accommodated previously. Further, the Doukhobors would be allowed to settle communally, *en bloc*, according to the “Hamlet Clause” of the *Dominion Lands Act*, but there emerged ambiguity about whether this meant that the cultivation requirement of the Dominion Lands Act could be satisfied by cultivating the equivalent of 15 acres per homestead entrant around the immediate vicinity of the communal village sites, or whether the Act required this 15 acres of cultivation on each individual quarter section.<sup>11</sup> Importantly, the initial agreement did not mention the homestead requirement of taking an oath of allegiance to obtain citizenship. The rejection of the oath of allegiance was central in the conflict with Russian authorities that led to the persecution of Doukhobors and their fleeing to Canada. The fact that it was not mentioned during negotiations proved to be a significant oversight on both the part of the government and the negotiators for the Doukhobors, leading to future conflict.

With these concessions in mind, the government, through Sifton, also facilitated the Doukhobor migration by providing the \$5 per head finder’s fee (that would normally be paid to a colonization company or steamship company) directly to a fund that would help the Doukhobors in their first year in Canada. The assistance above and beyond standard policy, as well as the accommodations provided by the government for Doukhobor settlement, is evidence that Sifton and the Laurier Liberals were seeking agriculturalist settlers and that the Doukhobors fit this vision of the settler.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Szalasznyj, *Homestead Crisis*. 40, 180.

<sup>12</sup> Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*, 36.

The story of the persecution of the Doukhobors in Russia and the subsequent campaign by sympathizers for their emigration to Canada is fascinating in its own right,<sup>13</sup> but certain aspects of this prelude are also essential to understand the community form that developed on the Prairies and the distrust many Doukhobors had for government. The first important aspect of the Russian Doukhobors is the communal landholding system that would be the basis for the new community in Canada. This system developed in the early 1800s, under the leadership of Savely Kapustin, while the Doukhobors lived on the Crimean frontier of Molochnaya Voda (Milky Waters).<sup>14</sup> Under this village system—a system practiced in very similar form by other Russian peasants—pasture land and livestock, grain, and granaries were held in common,<sup>15</sup> and decisions about the governing of the community were made through the religious gathering of the entire village known as the *sobranie*.<sup>16</sup> By 1816, the most ambitious aspects of the communal economy were abandoned and private land ownership and individualism became the

---

<sup>13</sup> Several influential and well connected figures were central to the international effort to aid Doukhobor migration, including: the literary giant and Christian anarchist Leo Tolstoy (who donated the royalties from his 1899 novel *Resurrection* to the Doukhobor migration); the aristocrat-turned-anarchist Peter Kropotkin; another Russian noble who turned to Tolstoyism and who got Society of Friends (Quakers) involved in the campaign, Vladimir Chertkov; and importantly, James Mavor, the political economist who acted as the Canadian liaison with the Department of the Interior.

<sup>14</sup> The origin of the communal economy in the widespread peasant village system, or *mir*, means that arguably the Doukhobor communal system has much older roots. However, it is during this period, under the leadership of Kapustin, that the Doukhobor community takes on its own unique form of governing the communal purse through the institution of the Orphan's House. See Woodcock and Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*, 29, for an account of early forms of communism based on the mir. Before the settlement at Milky Waters, the Doukhobors consisted of smaller, isolated communities spread across the Russian Empire. See Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*, 5.

<sup>15</sup> These common holdings were controlled through the Orphan's House, which was composed of the spiritual leader Kapustin and the council of elders appointed by him. Woodcock and Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*, 43.

<sup>16</sup> See Woodcock and Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*, 43-44, for the political structure of the *sobranie*.

norm.<sup>17</sup> A return to the communist system would not occur until the leadership of Peter Vasilevich Verigin towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The history of forced dislocation is a second aspect of the Doukhobor history in Russia that was consequential for the Canadian Doukhobors. From 1841 to 1845 the vast majority of Doukhobors from the Milky Waters settlement were exiled to the Caucasus by Tsar Nicholas I after accusations of mass murder in the Doukhobor colony.<sup>18</sup> The Doukhobors were once again a displaced people a half-century later when the religious revivalism of leader Peter V. Verigin—specifically his militant pacifism<sup>19</sup>—brought the wrath of the Russian authorities upon the Doukhobors. This history of displacement had two primary effects on the Doukhobors: first, it created a deep sense of distrust of all earthly government;<sup>20</sup> second, it reinforced a certain religious detachment from place through adherence to an identity as divinely chosen exiles.<sup>21</sup>

The history of the Doukhobor settlements at Milky Waters and in the Caucasus demonstrate the complexity of Doukhobor identity and practice that was imported to Canada. The shift from communism, to individual property holding, and back to the ideal of communism suggests that Doukhobor landholding was a lived religious experiment.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 60-61.

<sup>19</sup> During this period Verigin was exiled in Siberia because he was perceived as a threat by the Russian authorities. It was during this exile that Verigin became highly influenced by Tolstoy's writings on pacifism and Christian anarchism. Through letters to his followers, Verigin instituted a program of religious revival based on a return to village communism; abstinence from alcohol, tobacco, and meat; and strict pacifism. In 1895, under Verigin's leadership, the Doukhobors collected all of their firearms and ceremonially burned them in defiance of mandatory military service. This specific action led to violent repression of the Doukhobors and their dispersal. Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*, 25.

<sup>20</sup> Woodcock and Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*, 217.

<sup>21</sup> John McLaren, "The Failed Experiments: The Demise of Doukhobor Systems of Communal Property Landholding in Saskatchewan and British Columbia, 1899-1999," in *Despotic Dominion: Property Rights in British Settler Societies*, eds. John McLaren et al. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005), 223-224.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

It can be argued that the Doukhobor experiment, facing repression in Russia, required Canadian settler colonialism and its opportunities of “empty” land to continue as an experiment. Further, the emergence of hereditary leadership had created divisions between powerful Doukhobor families, and demonstrates that the Doukhobors had a history of internal factionalism prior to their arrival in Canada.<sup>23</sup> These pre-existing divisions help to explain the emergence of divisions between various elements of the Doukhobors in their attempt to create a new community in Canada. And so, it is in the context of displacement, religious revival, fierce opposition to earthly government, and experimentation in landholding that approximately 7,500 Doukhobors arrived in Canada at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The basic chronology of the Doukhobor homestead crisis is as follows. First, as mentioned earlier, the Doukhobors arrived as ideal settlers, being given fairly generous concessions by the Ministry of the Interior. In late 1899, nearly 750,000 acres of land in the territory of Saskatchewan and Assiniboia were reserved for Doukhobor settlement in three major blocks.<sup>24</sup> The Doukhobors first came into conflict with the government when Community Doukhobors resisted the legal requirement to make individual homestead entries on the land reserved for the Doukhobors. While the more individualist Doukhobors, later to be named the Independents, had no problem making individual entries, those who were strictly following Verigin’s vision of communal villages rejected the idea of signing for land in an individual’s name as contrary to their religio-political project. This initial conflict was resolved when Verigin arrived in Canada from exile in

---

<sup>23</sup> Indeed, it was the Large Party, one faction of the Doukhobors, who followed Verigin’s leadership and came to Canada.

<sup>24</sup> Woodcock and Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*, 136.

Siberia in 1902. At this stage, Verigin signed the homestead entries as a proxy for individual community members. The next conflict over homestead land revolved around the cultivation requirement of the *Dominion Lands Act*. In 1902, Clifford Sifton managed to appease the communal Doukhobors by allowing the minimum cultivation of 15 acres per homestead to be carried out on the land surrounding village sites, rather than on each individual homestead quarter section. It is this aspect of the land crisis that will be the focus of this chapter, as it is the aspect that received the greatest emphasis in government reports and popular discourse about land's relationship to making settler-subjects. The third aspect of the crisis arose when Community Doukhobors refused to take an oath of allegiance, which was required under the homestead policy in order to become British subjects of Canada. Ultimately, this refusal led to the cancellation of Doukhobor homestead entries and the migration of the majority of Community Doukhobors to British Columbia, where the conflict over land would take on new dimensions.

### **Between exclusion and assimilation: late 19<sup>th</sup> Century Indian Affairs land policy**

Indian Affairs land policy gains full meaning as an attempt to destroy sovereign Indigenous nations when one accepts that these Indigenous nations had complex systems of land governance prior to European colonization. In the context of Plains Indigenous peoples, disputes between Indigenous nations—and importantly, resolutions through inter-Indigenous treaty—over resources and territory pre-date the numbered treaties between First Nations and the Crown.<sup>25</sup> These early disputes and their resolution are

---

<sup>25</sup> Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Council with Walter Hildebrandt, Dorothy First Rider and Sarah Carter, *The True Spirit and Original intent of Treaty 7* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 108-110; Harold Cardinal and Walter Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders of Saskatchewan* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2000), 39.

evidence for the existence of Indigenous legal conceptions of land that would later come to be the basis upon which negotiations and disputes with the Crown occurred.<sup>26</sup> A comprehensive history that centres on Indigenous perspectives would begin with creation stories,<sup>27</sup> while a comprehensive state-centric history would have to at least examine the Crown “purchase” of Rupert’s Land from the Hudson’s Bay Company, the Red River Resistance 1869 and subsequent conflict over Métis scrip, the signing of and resistance to the Numbered Treaties, and the North-West Resistance 1885. This chapter brackets this history and focuses on reserve land policy at the time of the Doukhobors’ arrival. This policy reveals the importance colonial officials placed on dispossession as a colonial practice meant to sever relations with the land that are at the foundation of Indigenous political communities. Land policy was not only a material dispossession, but also a tool to destroy Indigenous subjectivities tied to the land and re-make them to conform to the new political order.

Indian Affairs reserve land policy in the decades leading up to the Doukhobor arrival can best be described as ambivalent in its commitment to assimilation. On the one hand, some officials promoted an ideology of civilizational progress and assimilation through individual land ownership and agricultural labour, while on the other hand, impossible barriers to agricultural success were intentionally imposed by Indian Affairs.<sup>28</sup> Sarah Carter provides a detailed historical analysis of this dual process of

---

<sup>26</sup> See Cardinal and Hildebrandt.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>28</sup> Some of these obstacles included: inadequate provision of training and equipment, restrictions on selling produce, restrictions on the purchase of farm equipment, and the imposition of the “peasant farming policy” that encouraged the use of rudimentary equipment over modern technology. See Sarah Carter, *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1990).

exclusion/assimilation in her study of Treaty 4 Plains Cree reserve farming.<sup>29</sup> Treaty 4—first signed in 1874—was preceded by a series of devastating events for the Plains Cree; there was a smallpox epidemic in 1869-70, a rapid decline in bison population, and military defeat at the hands of the Blackfoot Confederacy.<sup>30</sup> In this context, agriculture became the obvious alternative to the bison economy, and thus Cree negotiators demanded agricultural training, equipment, seeds, and livestock as part of the treaty provisions.<sup>31</sup>

While agricultural assistance was part of the Numbered Treaties on the Prairies, a clear consensus emerges from the oral history of treaty elders that, despite the inclusion of territorial surrender in written versions of the treaties, the Plains Indigenous peoples never intended agricultural development to extinguish their existing title to the land or the foundation of their communal identity. This consensus appears to span all the nations that made up the territory that would become Saskatchewan and Alberta—the Cree, Saulteaux, Dene, Assiniboine, Bloods (Kainai), Peigan, Siksika, Stoney Nakoda, and Tsuu T'ina nations.<sup>32</sup> The treaty ideal of *wîtaskêwin*—Cree for “living together on the land”<sup>33</sup>—was completely absent from the agricultural land policy of Indian Affairs.

Instead of providing a means of existence as distinct peoples, the European vision of productive agricultural land use held by Indian Affairs was used as a tool of

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 36.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 37, 49.

<sup>32</sup> Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Council, *The True Spirit*, vii-viii; Cardinal and Hildebrand, *Treaty Elders*, 62; John Leonard, “Two Views on the Meaning of Treaties Six and Seven,” in *The Spirit of the Alberta Indian Treaties*, Richard Price ed., 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1999), 40.

<sup>33</sup> Cardinal and Hildebrand, *Treaty Elders*, 39.

dispossession and assimilation.<sup>34</sup> The policy of promoting individual land ownership—a policy pursued most vigorously by Hayter Reed—had the stated goal of abolishing “tribal communism” and instilling an individualist ethos.<sup>35</sup> Carter argues that the goal of the farming policy was not really to make Indigenous peoples into farmers, but rather to destroy reserve-based communities and acquire land.<sup>36</sup> The obstacles imposed by Indian Affairs led, unsurprisingly, to poor agricultural outcomes; the perception of unproductive use of the land would later be used as a justification for the acquisition of reserve land through surrenders.<sup>37</sup> The reserve land surrenders were pursued under Minister of the Interior Clifford Sifton (1896-1905), but were most aggressively pursued by Frank Oliver who replaced Sifton in that role (1905-1911).<sup>38</sup>

The ambivalence regarding agricultural assimilation in Indian Affairs is evidence of two different approaches to settlement that both relied on a shared colonial ideology of land. The peasant farming policy—a policy that required Indigenous farmers to use only rudimentary tools and denied access to necessary machinery—was clearly at odds with a rational attempt to make Indigenous peoples into agriculturalists by imposing an enormous barrier to success, but it was nonetheless part of the colonial ideology of land. Land, and labour on land, was the key ingredient in the improvement of people, and

---

<sup>34</sup> Carter, *Lost Harvests*, 201. Carter demonstrates that the policy of reserve severalty, or individual agricultural landholding, put forward by Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs Hayter Reed had the dual goal of assimilation and defining “surplus” reserve land that could be opened to non-Indigenous settlement. This position is supported by J.R. Miller, who argues that severalty was seen as a way of destroying “tribal communism”; PM MacDonald’s support for the program (in the 1880s) lay largely in the ability to identify, and open to settlement, “surplus” land. J.R. Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 256.

<sup>35</sup> Carter, *Lost Harvests*, 146.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 193.

<sup>38</sup> Richard Spaulding, “Executive Summary,” In *First Nation Land Surrenders on the Prairies: 1896-1911*, Peggy Martin-McGuire ed., (Ottawa: Indian Claims Commission, 1998): xiii-xlvi.

Indigenous peoples would have to progress through each stage of civilizational development before they could make use of modern technology.<sup>39</sup> Even reserve land surrenders, a policy that appeared to be almost entirely based on material expropriation and greed, was couched in an ideation of this land as “surplus” or “waste” land. The land policy of the time was steeped in a conceptualization of land where agricultural labour on the land would improve the character of the individual and of races by instilling notions of private property, individual self-dependence, respect for rule of law, a sense of dominance of man over nature, and respect for the patriarchal family. When settlers and government perceived that Indigenous land use was antithetical to the goal of making ideal settler-subjects, this served as a justification for expropriation. In these cases, expropriation only served the negative goal of destroying Indigenous subjectivities—these subjectivities being ungovernable because of their inherent tie with Indigenous territory and political community—without the corresponding re-making in the image of the settler ideal.

It is in the context of vacillation between a policy of simple material dispossession and agricultural subject formation that the federal government created, in 1893, the Pelly Haylands as a grazing reserve for the Cote, Keeseekoose, and Key bands.<sup>40</sup> In 1898, the Department of the Interior accidentally reserved the northern half of the Haylands as part of the future Doukhobor settlement; this “accident” was then given official blessing through an 1899 Order in Council that opened the Haylands to

---

<sup>39</sup> Peggy Martin-McGuire, *First Nation Land Surrenders on the Prairies: 1896-1911* (Ottawa: Indian Claims Commission, 1998), 10.

<sup>40</sup> Renée Dupuis, *Report on the Mediation of the Fort Pelly Agency, Pelly Haylands Claim Negotiations* (Ottawa : Indian Claims Commission, 2008).

Doukhobor settlers.<sup>41</sup> The significance of this event is twofold: first, it reveals what was and still is obvious to the Indigenous peoples of the plains, namely that settlers were not settling unoccupied land; second, this event locates the arrival of the Doukhobors in a state-directed system of land distribution that was founded on colonial ideas about ideal land use, the power of land to change group character, and which people were worthy of possessing land. The same colonial ideology of land that allowed the Doukhobors to take priority over the title of Cote, Keeseekoose and Key First Nations,<sup>42</sup> would ironically serve as one of the primary justifications for cancelling Doukhobor homestead entries several years later.

### **Colonial Ideology of Land: Two Variants**

The colonial ideology of land is an example of relational overlap between projects of dispossession and settler making. The ideas about land that Indian Affairs officials used to justify land policy were also the ideological basis for Canada's homestead policy. Settler society widely held the idea that there was a duty to subdue nature and improve land, and that this would also improve one's "character" (a broad early 20<sup>th</sup> century concept that roughly maps onto my definition of subjectivity). This belief was the basis for making the small-holder family farm the preferred unit of settlement.<sup>43</sup> It also motivated the policy of dividing reserve land into small holdings for individual Indigenous families.<sup>44</sup> The ideological baggage of these policies meant that critics of Doukhobor non-compliance with homestead regulations would interpret this non-

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> In 2004 the federal government agreed in principle to pay the three First Nations \$73.5 million in compensation for the Doukhobor land. Ibid., vi.

<sup>43</sup> Carter, *Lost Harvests*, 18-19.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 194.

compliance as much more than a minor infraction; this was a symbolic assault on the very core of the settler colonial project. The following section provides a detailed account of the ideological context in which the Doukhobor land crisis played out.

The idea of improvement, tied to character and land, was ubiquitous across British settler colonial contexts at the time of the Doukhobor arrival in Canada.<sup>45</sup> One of the central aspects of this ideology, the duty to subdue nature, is deeply embedded in Western Christian culture through the Biblical injunction in Genesis 1:28.<sup>46</sup> Other aspects of the improvement ideology were popularized through Lockean liberalism and were spread across the British Empire, where they were assimilated into settler culture and drawn on by settlers who had no knowledge of their Lockean origin.<sup>47</sup> There are six aspects of this liberal ideology (in addition to the command to subdue nature) that were repeatedly drawn upon in debates, analyzed in detail in the next chapter, about Doukhobor and Indigenous land use. First, the origin of private property is in labour, specifically agrarian labour.<sup>48</sup> All land is property held in common until the labour of cultivation and enclosure transform it into private property.<sup>49</sup> Second, there is a clear distinction between land that is productively used for agriculture and “waste land”; this distinction provides a justification for the appropriation of occupied land that is not being

---

<sup>45</sup> John Weaver, *The Great Land Rush and the Making of the Modern World, 1650-1900* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2003), 5, 12, 81-82.; John McLaren, A.R. Buck, and Nancy E. Wright, “Property Rights in the Colonial Imagination and Experience,” in *Despotic Dominion: Property Rights in British Settler Societies*, John McLaren et al., eds. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005), 2.; Carter, *Lost Harvests*, 14-20.; J.R. Miller, *Skyscrapers hide the heavens*, rev. ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989).; Renisa Mawani, *Colonial Proximities: Crossracial encounters and juridical truths in British Columbia, 1871-1921* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009), 136.

<sup>46</sup> Miller, *Skyscrapers*, 18.

<sup>47</sup> Weaver, *Land Rush*, 81.

<sup>48</sup> Barbara Arneil, *John Locke and America: The Defence of English Colonialism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 136.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 138.

exploited to its fullest.<sup>50</sup> Third, there is a clear distinction between industriousness and idleness as traits of peoples, and this justifies projects aimed at improving these peoples.<sup>51</sup> Fourth, and related to the last point, there is a developmental approach to race, which means that over time, backwards and “idle” races can be improved through colonial tutelage<sup>52</sup> (specifically by means of colonial imposition of private property and agriculture). Fifth, in the “unsettled” territory of colonies the land is so vast that settler appropriation could not harm Indigenous peoples, while conversely, Indigenous non-agricultural use of land could harm settlers by infringing on their private property rights.<sup>53</sup> Finally, despite the natural foundation of private property in labour, when it comes to the reality of promoting economic development and trade in the colonies, land-as-property must be regulated by government rather than natural law.<sup>54</sup> Efficient colonial administration requires laws that seek optimal development by fine-tuning the number of settlers on a given amount of land.<sup>55</sup>

The liberal colonial ideology of land, as presented above, was, in reality, never singular. Cole Harris argues that “[t]he reserve system in British Columbia grew rather more out of the mindset of a settler society and mid-nineteenth-century British colonial policy than out of formal philosophy or legal theory.”<sup>56</sup> Likewise, the archival evidence regarding the Doukhobor homestead crisis on the Prairies lends support to the view that

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 149.

<sup>52</sup> Mawani, *Proximities*, 56.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 150-151.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>56</sup> Cole Harris, *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002), xxiii.

government officials and settlers were drawing upon a popular colonial imaginary without engaging in any deep analysis of the origin of these ideas. It is reasonable, then, that different actors pursuing the project of settler colonialism would hold different ideas about land, downplaying some aspects of the ideology and emphasizing others. This chapter locates two variants of dominant colonial conceptualizations of land (material colonial and culturalist colonial) that are prominent in the debates about Doukhobor homesteads detailed in the following chapter. While both variants are part of a liberal-colonial ideology, the materialist colonial perspective put relatively more emphasis on the economic project of colonialism, while the culturalist perspective was relatively more concerned with the cultural and racial character of settlers and their contribution to the overall character of the body politic. These two variants are the products of the political “messiness” of colonialism on the ground and developed as responses to the challenges that Doukhobor and Indigenous communities posed to the colonial project. The next chapter demonstrates that the culturalist perspective developed in opposition to Sifton’s more materialist approach, with the materialists then defending their perspective against this opposition. As such, these variants, despite being presented by political actors as distinct approaches to land and settlement, often overlap with one another as they developed in a shared political context. They are presented here as ideal types, and thus distinctions between the two are emphasized for analytic clarity in making sense of what are in reality less clear cut differences.

#### **Variant One: Materialist Colonial**

The material colonial conceptualization of land—as articulated by Minister of the Interior Clifford Sifton and his expert advisor James Mavor—shared with the culturalist

colonial perspective the ideas of idleness, unproductive (waste) land, and the importance of full exploitation of resources. In the material view God is absent from the picture, yet a teleological vision of economic history still creates a duty to subdue nature; the capitalist development of the North-West is destined by market forces rather than God. Settlers were valued as industrious agricultural “labourers” that would bring the land into production, rather than as settler “citizens.” This conceptualization of land put relatively more emphasis on the vastness of the North-West as a reason to downplay the importance of extraneous character traits of settler groups. This emphasis on vastness, and the material practicalities of building a settler economy, meant that Sifton and Mavor were more amenable to large capitalist ventures than those culturalists who viewed large land holdings as counterproductive to the building up of citizens’ character. In a similar vein, since the North-West was such a vast territory, lacking in European population, the taking up of land by the Doukhobors could harm nobody and coercive state intervention was unnecessary for the creation of settler-subjects. When culturalists attacked Sifton’s Eastern European immigrants, Sifton simply stated that “[i]n Canada if you get the immigrant on the land he becomes at once naturalized and nationalized.”<sup>57</sup> In the materialist perspective, prosperity led almost automatically to loyalty to Canadian political institutions. The material colonial approach to land emphasized that the role of colonial administration in settlement should be to determine and implement a policy to maintain optimum settler population for a given territory to maximize production. This approach to land was focused on the material practicalities of population and production, and despite the mundaneness of population and agricultural production statistics

---

<sup>57</sup> Hall, *Clifford Sifton*, 268.

(mundane in comparison to a culturalist mission from God to eradicate “tribal communism” through private property), the very framing of settlement in these terms, and the creation of specialized knowledge about settlement, reified the material colonial vision of land as exploitable resource and settlers as producing subjects. This approach relied on a minimalist ideal of the settler-subject, but still relied on the idea that land policy could shape settler-subjectivity.

### **Variant Two: Culturalist Colonial**

This variant of colonial land ideology begins with the premise that there is a duty to subdue nature and improve land by bringing it into full production. The culturalist colonial conceptualization of land draws heavily on the connection between land and (racial) character.<sup>58</sup> During the Doukhobor homestead crisis Minister of the Interior Frank Oliver and his partner in the field Reverend John McDougall espoused this conceptualization of land. In keeping with his profession, McDougall, the self-professed “John the Baptist” of the new regime,<sup>59</sup> wrote about the exploitation of the North-West in terms of divine will. Oliver and McDougall placed emphasis on strict compliance with homestead provisions meant to foster individual private ownership; a re-ordering of Indigenous and Doukhobor relations with the land toward a relation of individual exploitation was meant to have a civilizing effect and undermine “communism” and its negative effect on these backwards peoples. This vision of land saw the settler colonial project as primarily about using land and immigration policy to construct settler-subjects as “citizens” rather than as “labourers.” This variant, while calling for the heavy hand of

---

<sup>58</sup> As will be demonstrated in the following chapter, the use of racial difference by political actors at this time does not necessarily relate to a biological characteristic. It is often used as a broad difference between peoples that encompasses linguistic, national, and cultural traits. Sometimes this type of race is characterized as malleable, but at other times it is seen as innate and unassimilable.

<sup>59</sup> John McDougall, *On Western Trails in the Early Seventies* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1911), 174.

government in imposing land-based civilizing projects, was simultaneously critical of government distribution of land rights that did not benefit homesteaders. Land held by speculators and the railroad was seen as wasteland and an impediment to the ideal use of land in building the cultural character of the ideal settler.

Counterintuitively, Oliver and McDougall, who place a great deal of importance on improvement of character through land use, had less faith (than Sifton and Mavor) in the power of land to shape subjectivity; they saw improvement not as inevitable, but rather as requiring strong state intervention. For culturalists like Oliver, the profound differences between peoples (whether characterized as races or cultures) were primary and thus sometimes seen as insurmountable.<sup>60</sup> This emphasis on innate racial difference meant that Oliver favoured an exclusionary immigration policy,<sup>61</sup> but for those like the Doukhobors who had already settled, a concerted effort at assimilation was required.

### **Plains Indigenous Conceptualization of Land**

Debates about the best way to think about ideal land use and the ideal settler were not the product of government officials working in a vacuum. They were, in many respects, hashed out in the face of resistance from Indigenous peoples. While the characteristics of the colonial “other”—that is, idleness, enslavement to nature/desire, irrationality, backwardness, communistic despotism—were clearly part of a colonial myth, the Canadian government was also facing the reality of resistant Indigenous nations with very different conceptualizations of land and sovereignty. This section focuses on Plains Indigenous conceptualizations for the simple reason that these are the peoples on whose

---

<sup>60</sup> Ninette Kelley and Michael J. Trebilcock. *The Making of the Mosaic: A History of Canadian Immigration Policy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 132.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.

territory the Doukhobor story initially plays out. The problematization of Indigenous relations with land and property by Indian Affairs, however, also developed through government attempts to dismantle Indigenous governance and economies that were significantly less “communistic” than Plains nations. For example, coastal First Nations in British Columbia are characterized by Paul Tennant as relying on historical private property regimes, “at least as detailed and sophisticated,” as European systems.<sup>62</sup> Even in this significantly different context, however, colonial officials regarded practices associated with the potlatch as contrary to the development of a subjectivity tied to productive material accumulation through labour.<sup>63</sup> The development of colonial ideas about Indigenous relations with land was the result of attempts to govern diverse Indigenous peoples with equally diverse conceptualizations of land and property. With this in mind, the analysis now turns to Plains Indigenous conceptualizations of land.

While the next chapter focuses on the dominant voices of state actors, knowledge of the Indigenous and Doukhobor conceptualization of land is necessary for three reasons. First, it helps the analysis avoid reinforcing the colonial idea that Indigenous peoples lack/lacked the legal and political systems that allow legitimate holding of land as territory. Secondly, without at least a basic understanding of the differences between Plains Indigenous and Doukhobor conceptualizations of land there is the danger of equating very different experiences of colonialism.<sup>64</sup> This would be problematic both politically and analytically; despite the fact that land policy targeted Doukhobors with the aim of undermining their religio-political governance, the transient Doukhobor relation to

---

<sup>62</sup> Paul Tennant, *Aboriginal Peoples and Politics* (Vancouver, UBC Press, 1990), 7.

<sup>63</sup> Christopher Bracken, *The Potlatch Papers: A colonial case history* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 59.

<sup>64</sup> See introduction, p. 6, for discussion of relational overlap compared to colonial equation.

place means that cancelling Doukhobor homestead entries—while perhaps unjust—did not amount to cultural genocide as it arguably did in the case of dispossession of Indigenous land.<sup>65</sup> Third, focusing only on dominant colonial conceptualizations of land might naturalize this conceptualization of land, defeating the political impetus for this research (that is, the denaturalization of settler-subjectivity). The ideational context of the Doukhobor land crisis included Indigenous conceptualizations of land that provided alternative subjectivities, even if they were marginalized.

Unlike the dominant colonial ideology of land, which is relatively transparent to someone trained in Western political thought, Indigenous conceptualizations of land present a methodological hazard. A settler scholar, such as myself, can easily misrepresent a concept that has been translated across languages and across cultural worldviews<sup>66</sup> (this problem also occurs when presenting Doukhobor conceptualizations of land). This misrepresentation could, in the context of ongoing struggles over land, further reinforce colonial power. Additionally, according to Cardinal and Hildebrandt, unlike dominant settler notions of land that can be abstracted from their lived context,<sup>67</sup> the concepts of Plains First Nations are rooted in lived spiritual laws.<sup>68</sup> Elder Norman Sunchild of the Thunderchild First Nation states:

---

<sup>65</sup> See pg. 74-76, for discussion of the differential impact of Reverend John McDougall's actions on the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples.

<sup>66</sup> Treaty 7 Elders, *True Spirit*, 200.

<sup>67</sup> As the introduction to this dissertation argues, however, all political thought (including European thought) should be interpreted in its context. The difference that Cardinal and Hildebrandt are pointing to between Indigenous and European concepts of land is one of degree, not type. One reason why European concepts of land are more easily interpreted by outsiders is because of a long history of abstract political and legal theorizing that is recorded in print. While context is essential for understanding this type of text, it is a different type of context than systems of ethics and law that are premised on living interactions that over time allow subjective access to a system of thought.

<sup>68</sup> Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 1.

Our ancestors spent their lifetime studying, meditating, and living the way of life required to understand those traditions, teachings, and laws in which the treaties are rooted. In their study, they rooted their physical and spiritual beings directly on Mother Earth as a way of establishing a connectedness to the Creator and His Creation. Through that connectedness, they received the conceptual knowledge they required and the capacity to verbalize and describe the many blessings bestowed on them by the Creator. They were meticulous in following the disciplines, processes, and procedures required for such endeavour.<sup>69</sup>

The problem of cross-cultural translation is further compounded by the fact that some of the lived practices that give conceptual meaning, such as Sundance ceremonies, are meant to be kept secret from outsiders.<sup>70</sup> Despite these challenges, and precisely because of settler misunderstandings of treaties, many Treaty Elders from various nations have shared their understandings of land.<sup>71</sup> The following analysis draws heavily from projects, such as Cardinal and Hildebrandt's,<sup>72</sup> that were designed to inform non-Indigenous people about Indigenous perspectives on land by relying on elders' own words.

While caution is required in making generalizations about conceptualizations of land across Indigenous nations, in the context of Plains First Nations, Cardinal and Hildebrandt argue that Treaty Elders have identified significant commonalities across Cree, Assiniboine, and Saulteaux conceptualizations.<sup>73</sup> Across these national contexts, histories and concepts (including land) begin with creation stories and the relationship between the Indigenous peoples and the Creator.<sup>74</sup> Accordingly, Saulteaux Elder Dolly

---

<sup>69</sup> As quoted in Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 1.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>71</sup> See Treaty 7 Elders, *The True Spirit*; Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*; Richard Price ed., *The Spirit of the Alberta Indian Treaties*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1999).

<sup>72</sup> Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*.

<sup>73</sup> Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 9.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

Neapetung states that “[t]he Creator gave us a way of life and a language by which we could speak to one another and speak to Him and give meaning to everything that was around us, to help us understand the world and other people, our relatives.... God gave us this land. We own it as people, as a nation.”<sup>75</sup> Cree Elder Peter Waskahat of the Frog Lake First Nation explains that this relationship with the Creator and the laws that flow from that relationship are played out by living on the land:

On this land, in the past and even today we were very careful about what we were given—what we were given through the uses of everything on the land, Creation. We were very careful, we had our own teachings, our own education system—teaching children that way of life was taught [by] the grandparents and extended families; they were taught how to view and respect the land and everything in Creation. Through that the young people were taught how to live, what the Creator’s laws were, what were the natural laws, what were these First Nations’ laws ... the teachings revolved around a way of life that was based on their values.<sup>76</sup>

As the above quotations suggest, a holistic belief framework that combines political and spiritual elements of national identity provides a central place for *land*. Cardinal and Hildebrandt explain the Cree concept of *iyiniw sawêyihâtâkosiwin* (“the peoples’ sacred gifts”) as a term “used to describe gifts deriving from the peoples’ special relationship with the Creator, whether those gifts are material in nature (land) or metaphysical (as in the case of laws, values, principles, and mores that guide or regulate the peoples’ conduct in all their many and varied relationships).”<sup>77</sup>

In this holistic outlook, *askiy* (Cree for earth/land) is necessary to develop conduct that promotes *pimâcihisowin* (“making one’s own living”).<sup>78</sup> The desirable character

---

<sup>75</sup> As quoted in Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 5.

<sup>76</sup> As quoted in Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 6.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 10-11.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

traits to be self-sufficient include the trait of *kakayiwâtisiwin*, which means in Cree “the ability to develop an inner sense of industriousness or inner ability or desire to be hardworking.”<sup>79</sup> This is only one of many characteristics required to make one’s own living, but it is telling that as in colonial conceptualizations of land, the land is central in forming subjectivity. The importance of land in shaping subjectivity is also present in Stoney Nakoda conceptualizations of land. Late Chief John Snow, while criticizing a 19<sup>th</sup> century Indian Affairs statement about civilizational improvement through individual ownership and cultivation of land, argues that they were “trying to teach us something that we knew more about than he and his staff did. He was trying to teach the Indian how ‘to attach to his possessions a respect which it [sic] had not previously’.”<sup>80</sup>

Another essential aspect of Plains First Nations conceptualization of land is the idea of land as territory. This is reflected in the Cree concept of *wîtaskêwin*, meaning “living together on the land.”<sup>81</sup> When this concept is applied to other nations it is the basis for delineation and sharing of territory.<sup>82</sup> Elder Danny Musqua states:

All of the agreements they have had between one another as peoples as nations were always based on [land] use—on how they were going to use that land. And ... when I say that the use of that land, we had agreements between one another, hunting territories that we shared, trapping lands that we shared, gathering lands that we shared, medicinal lands that we shared [sacred lands], peace territorial lands that we designated for the shelter and safety of all people. And [the boundaries of] those lands were always laid out before these peoples....<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> John Snow, *These Mountains Are Our Sacred Places* (Calgary: Fifth House Ltd., 2005), 36-37.

<sup>81</sup> Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 39.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> As quoted in Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 39.

Cardinal and Hildebrandt interpret treaty making as part of living together on the land; the spiritual ceremonies required for treaty making reaffirm the sovereignty of the treaty parties.<sup>84</sup>

According to Cardinal and Hildebrandt, Plains Treaty Elders believe that it is impossible to cede territory without doing harm to the foundational relationships that provide their identities because sovereignty is rooted in the Creator and in relations with the Creator's gifts.<sup>85</sup> Likewise, in the context of Blackfoot concepts, Wilton Goodstriker claims that there is no Blackfoot word for "surrender" because, "We are one with the land. Is it possible to give or relinquish part of one's self?"<sup>86</sup> Since holding land as property, in fee simple title, is incompatible with Plains Indigenous concepts of land, the Treaties with the Crown were and continue to be seen as limited territorial sharing relationships—limited to settler agricultural use that should not interfere with Indigenous relations with the Creator.<sup>87</sup> This is not to say that Plains peoples did not, at the time of treaty with the Crown, see the land as *theirs*, but simply that it was inalienable.

### **Doukhobor Conceptualization of Land**

At the time of their arrival in Canada, relative to colonial and Indigenous conceptualizations of land, the Doukhobor conceptualization of land was less established and more in flux.<sup>88</sup> John McLaren argues that the Doukhobors viewed land as belonging

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 41.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 62.

<sup>86</sup> As quoted in Treaty 7 Elders, *The True Spirit*, 24.

<sup>87</sup> Cardinal and Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders*, 66; Price, *The Spirit of Alberta*, 43.

<sup>88</sup> This argument is made by John McLaren in "The Failed Experiments," in *Despotic Dominion: Property Rights in British Settler Societies*, 223-224. The historical evidence, including Verigin's correspondence with Tolstoy and the written version of the *Doukhobor Book of Life* (the collection of oral psalms and teaching that make up the Doukhobor "Bible") support this interpretation. However, the experimental nature of the Doukhobor relation to land during this period should not be interpreted as disinterest in the question of land; clearly, the split between Independents, who accepted individual land ownership, and

to God, with the Doukhobors acting as stewards of the land.<sup>89</sup> The Doukhobors who arrived in Canada had a history of both individual and communal landholding, as well as a history of displacement from their land. This led to a paradoxical fundamental religious attachment to land at the same time as a detachment from it. As McLaren writes:

Although at one level analogous to Aboriginal perceptions of landholding, the Doukhobor perception differed in that the relationship was not tied to particular territory or time-honoured use of that land. The connection was more abstract because the association with discrete territory was seen as transitory in the sense that the community seemed fated to be moved on by external authority.<sup>90</sup>

To elaborate, the Doukhobor concept of land may not have been as clearly articulated as other traditions, but land was an essential part of their worldview and was linked to their religio-political identity.

Like colonial and Indigenous conceptualizations of land, the Doukhobors viewed land as importantly linked to industriousness. The motto “toil and peaceful” is central to the Doukhobor ethos,<sup>91</sup> and explains why as late as 1960 John Stoochnoff could state: “[A]nything to do with the soil, and there you will find the Doukhobors.”<sup>92</sup> The emphasis on worldly labour is in keeping with the Doukhobor belief in the perfectibility of earthly life and the belief that the divine resides in each person; God and heaven are not separate from the earth, but are rather manifest through the perfection of the Doukhobor community. It is worth quoting at length the Doukhobor psalm *Lord Give Us Thy Blessing* as it contains these various themes:

---

Community Doukhobors, who were willing to leave their prairie homesteads for British Columbia, indicates that one’s relation to land was an essential part of Doukhobor identity.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> John Stoochnoff, *Toil and Peaceful Life: Doukhobors As They Are* (Vancouver: Liberty Press, 1961), 4.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 23.

A Doukhobor is one whose body Christ has chosen for the continued manifestation of God's spirit that was within Him. The Spirit of God dwells on earth within a physical body, and it is the source of eternal wisdom. It was necessary for Jesus Christ to have a body and be a physical being, for it is through the lips of man that God speaks. The apostolic church and the Mount of Zion are embodied in the Doukhobor Commune. Within this mount there dwells God's Spirit. Wisdom and the power of God are exemplified in man. Present within this mount is a source of living water that brings forth the glad tidings of life eternal. The commune's virtues, its exemplary life, shall overcome the world, the kingdom of this world whose end is nearing. Then, the Doukhobors shall become known to all mankind, and Christ Himself shall be the worthy King. Around Him shall gather all nations. Only this honor to the Doukhobors shall come after a time of great sufferings and tribulations. There shall be a great struggle in the world, but Truth shall conquer all, and the Kingdom of God shall be brought into being on earth.<sup>93</sup>

Thus, it is in the context of divine equality of all Doukhobors and earthly perfectibility—through human relations—that Doukhobor conceptualizations of communal landholding gain meaning.

While these basic tenets of the Doukhobor faith were broadly held at the time of arrival in Canada,<sup>94</sup> it was Verigin who explicitly linked communal landholding as key to the creation of the Kingdom of God on Earth. One of the influential psalms penned by Verigin, *Some General Opinions of the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood*, expressed that not only was all of existence (including rocks, animals, and plants) observable in “transitional degrees of perfection,” but also that the foundation for communal life was in the divine equality of all people, leading to the moral law stating “what I do not wish to be done to me, I should not wish for another.”<sup>95</sup> One can see that within this worldview, lived relations on the land are the foundation of ethical behaviour.

---

<sup>93</sup> Eli Popoff, *An Historical Exposition on the Origin and Evolvement of the Basic Tenets of the Doukhobor Life-Conception* (Publisher unknown, 1964), 39-40.

<sup>94</sup> The same themes recur throughout the psalms recorded by Vladimir Bonch-Bruevick in Canada in 1900. Vladimir Bonch-Bruevick ed., *The Book of Life of Doukhobors*, translated (1978).

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

In 1899, Verigin wrote to Tolstoy and clearly outlined this vision of communalism in Canada, yet this vision did not include any definitive declaration about the exact form of landholding.<sup>96</sup> In late 1902, while on his way to Canada, Verigin addressed a group of Tolstoyans in London outlining his views on land:

We desire that we should be allowed to live freely, not harming our neighbours ... Every person should have as much land as it is within his strength and ability to work. We desire that this land be communal (not belonging to any individual) and that no one should force us to act contrary to our conscience.<sup>97</sup>

While there appears to be a degree of experimentation and material, rather than spiritual, motivation in Verigin's thought,<sup>98</sup> by 1905 McDougall reported that the "invariable" response of Community Doukhobors to his commission was: "We do not want to own the land, all we want is to be permitted to make a living thereon."<sup>99</sup>

An important commonality between all four conceptualizations of land is the ability of one's relation to land to shape and improve individual and collective character. Interestingly, the belief in the divine spark in each individual is both compatible with the rejection of hereditary communal leadership—as is the case with the Independents who took up individual ownership and rejected Verigin's leadership—as well as being compatible with a communal relation to the land based on the moral law as articulated by Verigin above. The communal relation to land can be read as a collective endeavour to progress toward the perfection of God's sovereignty through loving human relationships

---

<sup>96</sup> "Verigin to Tolstoy, 1 Feb. 1899" in *Leo Tolstoy-Peter Verigin Correspondence*, Andrew Donskov, ed., trans. John Woodsworth (New York: Legas, 1995), 42.

<sup>97</sup> Szalasznyj, "Doukhobor Homestead Crisis," 131.

<sup>98</sup> For an example of characterization of communal landholding as a practical necessity see "Verigin to Tolstoy, 1 Dec. 1903" in *Leo Tolstoy-Peter Verigin Correspondence*, Andrew Donskov, ed., trans. John Woodsworth (New York: Legas, 1995), 58.

<sup>99</sup> General report of the Doukhobor Commission sent from McDougall to the Minister of the Interior. 11/25/1906. Mavor Fonds.

of equality. Evidence for this interpretation can be found in the Tolstoy inspired psalm *My Beloved Brother In Our Lord, Jesus Christ*, which reads, “It is not possible to serve two masters . . . A Christian is released from the authority of man, in that he acknowledges over himself the one Authority of God, and the Law which is revealed to him by our Lord, Jesus Christ.”<sup>100</sup> Sole adherence to God’s sovereignty, coupled with a belief in worldly perfectionism, created not only a religious identity, but a *religio-political* identity that was deeply connected to land.

Unlike Indigenous conceptualizations that link historical uses and spiritual-political ceremonies to specific territorial locations, and also unlike settler conceptualizations that see the regime of land ownership as requiring exclusive state dominion over territory, the Doukhobor conceptualization of land is much more mobile. A story told by Doug Cuthand about Reverend John McDougall’s lack of respect for the Indigenous landscape helps to clarify this important difference. Cuthand generalizes that for Plains First Nations “[t]he land was their mother, so there were important places that were regarded as sacred and special.”<sup>101</sup> He tells his readers that the site of the Iron Creek meteorite was one such place, and was seen as a sign of protection from God.<sup>102</sup> McDougall, however, seeing this location as a source of evil paganism, removed the meteorite in 1866 in an attempt to undermine traditional spiritual beliefs and identity.<sup>103</sup> Elders predicted that this alteration in the sacred landscape would lead to “plague, the loss of the buffalo herds and resulting famine, and war.”<sup>104</sup> McDougall’s attempt to

---

<sup>100</sup> Popoff, *An Historical Exposition*, 42.

<sup>101</sup> Doug Cuthand, *Askiwina: A Cree World* (Regina: Coteau Books, 2007), 12.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*

undermine Indigenous identity struck a serious blow by targeting a specific location that gave a sense of God-given relation to the land and its resources. In contrast, when McDougall urged the government to cancel Doukhobor homesteads, the idea that he was doing them a favour by “[conceding] to their desire and reliev[ing] them at present from the necessity of citizenship by cancelling all their entries to homesteads,”<sup>105</sup> is only partly disingenuous. McDougall was clearly trying to undermine the collective political identity of the Doukhobors by undermining their communal relationship to the land, but the sense of inevitable displacement, fostered in their Russian history, meant that this displacement also strengthened this aspect of their collective identity. The fact that the Doukhobors did not have a place-based Indigenous identity is precisely why, even with relational overlap, the Doukhobors experienced this displacement differently.

### **Existing literature on the land crisis**

The most detailed historical account of the Doukhobor land crisis can be found in the unpublished MA thesis of Kathlyn Szalasznyj.<sup>106</sup> Comprehensive works on the history of the Doukhobors in Canada provide more concise interpretations of the events from 1899-1907.<sup>107</sup> Carl Tracy provides a book-length, detailed account of the formation and internal workings of the Doukhobor prairie colonies.<sup>108</sup> John McLaren, building on these works, provides a legal history of the Doukhobor land conflicts that briefly compares government response to Doukhobor communal landholding to the

---

<sup>105</sup> General report of the Doukhobor Commission sent from McDougall to the Minister of the Interior. 11/25/1906. Mavor Fonds.

<sup>106</sup> Szalasznyj, *Doukhobor Homestead Crisis*.

<sup>107</sup> Woodcock, *Doukhobors*; Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*.

<sup>108</sup> Carl J. Tracie, *Toil and peaceful life: Doukhobor village settlement in Saskatchewan, 1899-1918* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1996).

government's less intrusive response to the Mennonites.<sup>109</sup> These works, taken together, provide a richly nuanced history of this conflict.

Several commonalities exist amongst the various historical accounts of the land crisis. The first is the thesis that the government used homestead policy as a way of making diverse immigrant groups conform to a pattern of individualist, capitalist, property relations. Second, these accounts tend to agree that the origin of the conflict is to be found partly in government action and partly in Community Doukhobor belligerence. A third commonality is that there is a sharp turn away from Sifton's conciliatory approach to the Doukhobors with the appointment of his replacement, Minister Oliver. It is common for these accounts to characterize Oliver as hostile to the Doukhobors, and Slavs in general.<sup>110</sup> The change in minister, coupled with a rapid growth in settler population and the related increase in demand for agricultural land, serve as the explanatory factors in the shift from accommodation to repression of the Doukhobors.

The archival research and analysis in the following chapter supports these main theses, but also points to some shortcomings in the existing research. All of the shortcomings stem from the fact that the authors pay insufficient attention to the importance of the colonial context in which the Doukhobors arrive. First, the existing accounts erase from the historical narrative the prior occupancy of Indigenous Plains nations. This is problematic not only in that it replicates the tiresome colonial imagining of the Prairies as empty, but more importantly in that it is analytically dubious when trying to understand what the "Doukhobor problem" was. As much as settlement was a material process, it was also equally a cultural and ideological process of making settler-

---

<sup>109</sup> McLaren, "Experiments."

<sup>110</sup> Woodcock, *Doukhobors*; Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*.

subjects. Other scholars are correct that the government used homestead policy to make Doukhobors conform to individualist property relations. But what exactly does that mean? What were these property relations? What was the meaning behind them? The answers to these questions are in the colonial context presented throughout this chapter. Doukhobor non-conformity with homestead regulations was not a simple matter of breaking the law (indeed, as will be seen in the next chapter, settler squatters were also breaking homestead regulations, but with impunity). The “Doukhobor problem” was not just non-conformity with the law, but that the Doukhobor relationship with the land was the basis of creating a law unto themselves: a distinct political community that appeared to government officials to be incompatible with the colonial project. The fact that the “Doukhobor problem” began as a struggle to dismantle an entire community meant that future conflicts over public education, which might otherwise have been minor, were seen by radical Doukhobors as existential struggles.

Colonial ideologies included ideas about land and its ability to shape subjects, both Indigenous and settler, and these ideas were central in motivations of anti-Doukhobor actors like McDougall and Oliver. Despite mentioning that McDougall had a history of working for the government regarding treaty negotiation, none of the Doukhobor literature examines how his ideas of land and settler colonialism may have impacted his approach to the Doukhobor land crisis. In fact, John McLaren, in an anthology dedicated to the development of settler colonial property law, treats Doukhobor settlement history separately from the history of dispossession of plains First Nations.<sup>111</sup> The existing literature, because of its lack of attention to colonial conditions,

---

<sup>111</sup> In the introductory chapter of *Despotic Dominion* the authors, including McLaren, argue that conflict over land and property law in settler colonies was not only between Indigenous peoples and settlers, but also

misses the important insight into both continuity and disjuncture that occurs with the change in Minister of the Interior from Sifton to Oliver. The ideological difference between the two Ministers of the Interior was the result of two different colonial visions that originated in two different experiences of the colonial project. Furthermore, while this shift between competing colonial visions is significant in explaining the change in land policy toward the Doukhobors, this was not a complete change in ideology. While Sifton was more sympathetic to the Doukhobors, his material colonial vision was a variant of the same colonial land ideology held by Oliver.

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of the preceding contextual analysis has been to set the stage for the historical analysis of the Doukhobor land crisis with a certain backdrop. That backdrop consists of Doukhobor history prior to arrival in Canada, Indian Affairs land policy, homestead land policy, and the multiple conceptualizations of land that informed these policies. This chapter has demonstrated that there were other conceptualizations of land besides dominant colonial ideology at the time. Even within a liberal colonial ideology of land, there were competing variants. The following chapter will detail the political conflict between competing visions of land and how land was used by the state to make settler-subjects during the Doukhobor land crisis.

---

between various groups of settlers—especially religious communalists like the Mennonites, Hutterites, and Doukhobors. McLaren et al., *Despotic Dominion*, 13. However, in McLaren's chapter on Doukhobor communal landholding, despite operating within this overarching thesis, he does not examine how homestead and reserve land policy were interactive with one another.

## **Chapter 2: Land and Settler-subjects: Overlap between Indian Affairs and Homestead policy, 1898-1907**

At this stage, the dissertation has provided the reader with the necessary background for understanding the colonial context in which the Doukhobor land crisis played out. The Doukhobors arrived in Canada with preconceived ideas of land, tied to a religio-political identity, and a distrust of all man-made government instilled through persecution in Russia. Government officials, and settler society, also entered this episode with a preconceived colonial ideology of land and land policies that emerged during attempts to undermine Indigenous land-based subjectivities.

The previous chapter provided a macro analysis of the colonial conditions, while this chapter zooms in to provide a microanalysis of four key colonial actors in the Doukhobor land crisis. This chapter examines two key political partnerships in the making of settler-subjects during this period: the first between Minister of the Interior Clifford Sifton and political economist James Mavor, and the second between Minister of the Interior Frank Oliver and the Reverend John McDougall. An analysis of these two pairings shows strong ideological affinities between each minister and his chosen expert on land and settlement as well as contrasting visions of settlement between each pairing. Clifford Sifton and James Mavor tended to promote a vision of settlement and settlers based on the materialist imperative of populating the West with agriculturalists, rather than focusing on issues of immigrant national and racial character and their potential as future citizens. Frank Oliver and John McDougall, in contrast, attacked this materially driven vision of settlement and tended to prioritize obtaining ideal—that is, those most closely resembling British—settlers rather than quickly populating the West with

agriculturalists. Within this debate, publicized through politician-controlled newspapers,<sup>1</sup> the Doukhobors and the Doukhobor land problem became a theme that politicians took up in debates about the best policy for creating ideal settlers.<sup>2</sup>

This chapter traces the transition from a relatively materialist vision of the ideal settler, championed by Sifton and Mavor, to a more stringent culturalist ideal, championed by Oliver and McDougall. In keeping with the contextualist history of political thought method, this transition is explained as a form of constrained agency within macro processes, material conditions, and ideological confines. In short, the shift from the Siftonian vision to the culturalist vision can neither be wholly explained by shifting material and practical political conditions nor by the individual ideological interventions of Sifton or Oliver. Both must be taken into account.

As discussed in the previous contextualizing chapter, Sifton's immigration policy and his ideas about the ideal agriculturalist settler were developed initially in a period of depression and emigration from Canada and the perceived need to quickly replace and build up the settler population on the Prairies. At that time the Doukhobors were the largest mass migration in Canadian history.<sup>3</sup> By the time Oliver replaced Sifton in 1905, the massive push for immigrants had succeeded at making homestead land a commodity in high demand and with this came a changed political landscape with increased pressure

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time of the debate Sifton owned the *Winnipeg Free Press* and Oliver owned the *Edmonton Bulletin*. Both used the editorial pages of their papers to argue for their vision of settlement.

<sup>2</sup> The Doukhobors were not alone in being targeted as problematic settlers. The Galicians (Ukrainians), Mennonites, and Hutterites were similarly targeted in this debate. Of these various groups, the Doukhobors' communal landholding system seems to have been more vigorously attacked. John McLaren argues that this was likely because Mennonite communalism was more regulated and stable, leading to less concern about its deleterious effects on the project of settling the West with European immigrants. John McLaren, "The Failed Experiments: The Demise of Doukhobor Systems of Communal Property Landholding in Saskatchewan and British Columbia, 1899-1999," in *Despotic Dominion: Property Rights in British Settler Societies*, eds. John McLaren et al. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005), 242.

<sup>3</sup> Julie Rak and George Woodcock, "Doukhobors" *Historica Canada*, <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/doukhobors/>

from voters for access to the dwindling resource.<sup>4</sup> This changing material and political landscape created a positive opportunity structure in which Oliver's ideas could take hold. At any given time the intertwined ideological, material, and practical political context limit the range of possible speech acts and ways of problematizing and proposing solutions to political problems.

Changes in the material and political context, however, cannot fully explain the shift in vision of the ideal settler. As will be seen in the textual materials that follow, Oliver had developed his vision of the ideal settler well before these contextual conditions existed. Also, Sifton, although retreating to some extent in his defence of groups like the Doukhobors, continued to defend his vision of the settler even as the context made his approach less resonant with the settler population. Within these macro changes we can see political thinkers putting forward different perspectives on colonial ideology and demonstrating a constrained agency within structure.

Ultimately, the Oliver-McDougall vision of the ideal settler, and relatedly the emphasis on the use of land policy to shape non-ideal settlers, played an important role in the reversal of earlier concessions to the Doukhobors made by Sifton regarding landholding. The eventual cancellation of Doukhobor homestead entries reinforced Doukhobor mistrust of the government and set the stage for future conflicts between provincial and federal governments and the Doukhobors. The use of land policy to shape Doukhobor subjectivity did not result in assimilation, but it did work to contain a community seen as posing a threat to colonial sovereignty. McDougall and Oliver wanted to see the Doukhobor political community fully assimilated, but in the face of strong

---

<sup>4</sup> George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), 218-221.

Community Doukhobor resistance the government instituted a land policy that would make them subject to Canadian law and undermine the land base of the community, even if it failed to fully change their subjectivity in the process. The loss of homestead land in 1907 would inflame a sense of martyrdom in the radical Sons of Freedom faction throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century as politicians and experts attempted to understand and put an end to what would come to be called the “Doukhobor problem.”

This chapter, drawing on newsprint, government correspondence, government reports, and Hansard transcripts, provides empirical evidence to help answer the central research question of this dissertation: how do we understand the place of a problematic settler group like the Doukhobors in settler colonialism? At the time, it was undecided whether they were settlers or not. This ambivalent positioning is productive in that it provides support for the contention that settlers are politically constructed. The political debate that erupted around these problematic settlers demonstrates that colonial actors disagreed on competing ideals of the settler, different minimum requirements for inclusion, and different strategies to mould subjectivity in line with these ideals. During this debate, politicians and settlers use various terms such as “good settlers,” “bona-fide settlers,” and “old timers,” to elaborate the ideal settler-subject and his relationship to the land.

These debates also demonstrate that the land-based project of settler-subject making was related to the project of colonial dispossession. The institutional fusion of Indian Affairs, immigration, and settlement under a single Minister of the Interior facilitated the overlap of ideologies and land policies. For example, Reverend John McDougall was well known to the Department of the Interior as an expert on the North-

West and land issues because of his work with Indigenous peoples. This expertise made him a likely candidate to conduct a commission on Doukhobor land for the same department.

The political debates about Doukhobor land use and the ideal settler further reveal the importance of specialized knowledge in the production of settler-subjects. Mavor's knowledge as a political economist of colonial settlement made him a welcome expert in the Sifton administration of the homesteading program. This knowledge gave an empirical and scientific basis for the materialist colonial vision of land and the settler. Similarly, McDougall's expertise on land as an assimilatory force made him a valuable contribution to the Oliver administration and the production of the Doukhobor Land Commission report. This report reinforced the culturalist colonial vision of land in the form of official knowledge. The views held by all four of the actors examined in this chapter were not solely personal opinions translated into specialized government knowledge; they relied on established colonial ideologies of land, which were then disseminated to civil society through partisan newspapers, reinforcing these same ideologies. All of these actors had privileged access to the tools of ideological dissemination.

Land was the crux of the "Doukhobor problem," and this was path defining for later conflicts over education. This chapter ends with the political defeat of the "material colonial" vision (of land and settlers) and the rise of the "culturalist colonial" vision championed by Oliver and McDougall. This vision, with its focus on race and character, would be influential on J. T. M. Anderson's views on education as a solution to the Doukhobor problem. When education became a flashpoint in British Columbia in the

1950s, this vision declined and was eclipsed by an integrationist ideology with similarities to the earlier “materialist colonial” vision. This story of disjuncture and continuity in settler colonialism points to both the agency of colonial actors within prevailing colonial contexts as well as the political contingency of the settler-colonial project. This chapter denaturalizes the settler-subject’s individualistic and exploitative relationship with land by demonstrating that this relationship was the product of government intervention and political contestation.

### **James Mavor: Colonial Economic Experiments**

At this stage, the analysis turns to what various political actors thought about land, and how these ideas were tied to shaping settler-subjects. The previous chapter provides an idea of the religio-political subjectivities that the settler colonial project aimed to transform by supporting—or imposing—an exploitative, individualistic relation to land. Yet James Mavor was sympathetic to the Canadian Doukhobors, fiercely opposing any attempt by the Canadian government “to destroy what, when all is said, is by far the most interesting and extensive example of community life in modern times.”<sup>5</sup> Mavor’s economic vision—characterized as materialist colonial—had its own commitments to a progressive view of economic history and resource exploitation. This approach to land imposed an exploitative economic relation to land on Doukhobor and Indigenous conceptualizations of land. Mavor took as foundational that economic exploitation was a social good to be brought to a land “scantly inhabited by bands of

---

<sup>5</sup> “Communism in Being” Jan. 1, 1906, James Mavor Fonds.

Indian hunters and trappers” who had made no “amelioration [to its] physical conditions.”<sup>6</sup>

Mavor had a clearly articulated view of the criteria for a good settler, and while his writings show that material economic concerns were not the sole criteria, they were primary. For Mavor, the “value of an immigrant” as “living capital,” as he put it, could be determined through a calculation based on average life expectancy in a given occupation, expected earning and productivity, and the cost of maintenance of this life.<sup>7</sup> Mavor was historically aware of debates about what made a good settler and whether racial character should be a primary concern. In a 1900 report to the federal government he wrote:

[T]here are two positions either of which may reasonably be taken and on both of which much may be said.

- (a) That there is no necessary advantage in mere magnitude of population and that the general standard of comfort is highest where the population increases slowly rather than quickly.
- (b) The contrary view held in an exaggerated form by the mercantilist writers of last century that the principal object of national policy should be the increase of population is still held in a vague way, especially in cities where an increase of population is customarily looked upon as a sign of prosperity, the immediate and obvious results being a demand for houses and an increase in retail trade.<sup>8</sup>

Mavor insisted on the importance of specific national context in developing immigration policy and argued that given the vast amount of land in the North-West, “It is difficult to see any valid objection to the peopling of these areas and to the cultivation of them, the only questions are, the rate at which they should be occupied and the persons by whom they should be occupied.”<sup>9</sup> This was the central question that occupied both the culturalist

---

<sup>6</sup> James Mavor, “Emigration and Immigration” 1900. Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor, 31.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 30

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 25

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

and materialist visions of land, and the question around which the debate about the ideal settler would take place.

James Mavor was a political economist who left Scotland to become the Chair of Political Economy at the University of Toronto in 1892.<sup>10</sup> His memoirs paint a picture of an intellectual with many international scholarly, political, and business connections and friendships.<sup>11</sup> Mavor was an astute observer of economic phenomena, but also well aware of how this outlook framed what he saw in the world. He wrote that we “look upon the world through the window afforded by a science or an art, fully mastered or otherwise; and whether we travel or not, we see only what is revealed to us through this window.”<sup>12</sup> Mavor then explained that his “window” has primarily been “the study of economics and especially the comparison of the economical development of different peoples....”<sup>13</sup> This self-assessment was confirmed by Mavor’s friend Peter Kropotkin, who wrote that “[t]o every question which I would ask him the reply appeared at once in the shape of statistical tables and economical works.”<sup>14</sup> As much as Mavor may have sympathized with the Doukhobors, he held a different, more materialistic, worldview.

His economic viewpoint was not dogmatic; in 1884 Mavor joined the Glasgow branch of the Marxist organization Social Democratic Federation, and later in life he praised private railway ownership and the management skills of the Canadian Pacific Railway’s William Van Horne.<sup>15</sup> He was not wedded to any one school of economic

---

<sup>10</sup> James Mavor, *My Windows on the Street of the World, Vol. 1* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons Limited, 1923), 309.

<sup>11</sup> Mavor, *My Windows on the Street of the World, Vol. 1*.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, ix.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> Peter Kropotkin, “Some Resources of Canada,” *The Nineteenth Century* 43 (1898), 495.

<sup>15</sup> Mavor, *My Windows on the Street of the World, Vol. 1*, 177, 315.

thought, but rather he was concerned with the practical study of the intersection of politics and economics as they affected different peoples. This outlook proved central in his sympathy for the Canadian Doukhobors, as he was willing to look upon their communalism as an experiment, albeit one with consequences if it failed. Mavor characterized the scholarly problem of collectivism as an empirical question: “[D]oes it result in a larger product and in such a distribution of the products as to ensure the continuance of increased production?”<sup>16</sup> However, Mavor also saw economic systems as shaping subjectivity at the risk of loss of individuality and initiative in systems of collectivism.<sup>17</sup>

Mavor played a central role in the immigration of the Doukhobors to Canada by liaising between government officials and Doukhobor supporters,<sup>18</sup> and this role would serve as the starting point for Mavor’s relationship with the government as an expert on the economics of colonization and immigration. However, the question of land’s importance to colonial immigration was hinted at in Mavor’s work prior to his contact with the Doukhobors. In 1893, writing about labour colonies in Britain, Mavor argued that the industrialization and development of capitalism in Britain, while part of universal progressive history, had also left victims in its wake.<sup>19</sup> The root cause of an unemployed class was that Britain had “abandoned the solid basis of the land for the fluctuating basis of trade.”<sup>20</sup> The transition from self-contained villages living on the land to industrial relations could be made more humane if there was a “hospital for those who are wounded

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 247.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Kathlyn Rose Marie Szalasznyj, “The Doukhobor Homestead Crisis 1898-1907” (master’s thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1977), 34.

<sup>19</sup> James Mavor, “Setting the Poor on Work,” *Nineteenth Century* 34 (1893): 523-532.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 523.

by our industrial system.”<sup>21</sup> Mavor’s later writing reveals that the Doukhobors fit easily into this progressive view of economic history, and that Canada’s North-West could serve, like labour colonies, as a research hospital for the economic development of different agricultural peoples displaced by industrialization.

Mavor first visited western Canada in 1896 and observed that the key economic problem was a lack of exploitation of natural resources due to a lack of population. Mavor saw Western Canada as a “huge undeveloped country,” and thought that the nearly free land offered through homesteading did not always attract the best agricultural labour.<sup>22</sup> However, he saw a huge potential for productivity if skilled agriculturalists could be attracted to settle in large numbers.<sup>23</sup> Of central importance in his early views on western Canada is the question of what type of settler would be ideal. It is telling that upon visiting British Columbia, Mavor found the anti-Asian racism of the West Coast petty and simplistic.<sup>24</sup> While Mavor was not immune to the dominant white supremacist ideology of the day,<sup>25</sup> he was able to conceptualize racial diversity and immigration in dispassionate economic terms. He argues that British Columbia should not be seen as a sporting ground for British gentlemen, but rather as an area rich in natural resources that must be exploited for the “service of mankind.”<sup>26</sup> He states matter-of-factly that if there is insufficient European migration, “either the economical prosperity of the province must

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Mavor, *Windows*, Vol. 1, 362-3.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 350.

<sup>25</sup> Mavor clearly views the world through early 20<sup>th</sup> century racial categories and views certain groups—such as “the Jews, the Chinese, or the Negroes”—as less amenable to assimilation than most European races. Mavor, *Windows*. Vol. 2. 34-5.

<sup>26</sup> Mavor, *Windows*, Vol. 1., 350.

be compromised, as well as the prosperity of other countries, or non-European labourers must be admitted to share in the exploitation.”<sup>27</sup> Mavor’s interest in communal experiments, coupled with his tendency to see the non-exploitation of resources as a problem, explains why, upon visiting Mennonite colonies in Manitoba during the same 1896 trip, he was able to describe them with only minor criticism as *imperium in imperio* (state within a state).<sup>28</sup> The ideal settler, for Mavor, was the experienced agriculturalist, especially the peasant agriculturalist whose self-sufficient village could withstand the isolation of the far edges of European settlement.<sup>29</sup>

Within Mavor’s conceptualization of the North-West as “an unoccupied region” waiting for exploitation, Indigenous peoples are conspicuous by their absence. This is likely due to the fact that Mavor had little contact with Indigenous people or with Indian Affairs administration—his interest in colonialism focused on European settlement. On the other hand, within a year of arriving in Canada he visited the prominent Kanien’kehá:ka (Mohawk) scholar, physician, and businessman Oronhyatekha on the Desoronto reserve.<sup>30</sup> If this exceptional case was Mavor’s primary exposure to reserve life, then one might conjecture that Mavor thought that inevitable industrial growth would bring prosperity and economic integration to Indigenous peoples across the country. Despite—or perhaps because of—Mavor’s lack of familiarity with Indigenous peoples, his imagining of the land of the North-West in exploitative economic terms constructed the land as settler space.

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 351.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 339.

<sup>29</sup> James Mavor, “Emigration and Immigration” 1900. Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 315.

In 1897 Mavor convinced his friend Peter Kropotkin to come to Canada during the meeting of the British Association in Toronto.<sup>31</sup> This visit was consequential for the Doukhobors because an article written by Kropotkin about Canada's North-West was central in convincing the Doukhobors' Tolstoyan sympathizers that Canada was an ideal country for relocation.<sup>32</sup> The article, which was written at Mavor's house and published in the British periodical *The Nineteenth Century*, also mirrors Mavor's exploitative view of land coupled with sympathy for experimental communal projects in the North-West. During his trip to Canada's North-West, co-ordinated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, Kropotkin was accompanied by George Dawson, the Director of the Geological Survey of Canada, and a Professor Coleman, an expert on mining.<sup>33</sup> Dawson played an important role in constructing Canada's West as settler space by providing practical scientific knowledge essential for settlement, and also by symbolically conceptualizing exploitative settlement as inevitable; his mapping asserted symbolic territorial control.<sup>34</sup> This symbolic construction of settler space is also evident in Kropotkin's article. Kropotkin unwittingly provides a poetic depiction of settler colonialism through an analogy that represents each region of Canada's West as a corresponding region of Europe.<sup>35</sup> Drawing on Dawson's ideas, Kropotkin argues that Canada's North-West is composed of "three distinct regions, which must be strictly separated in the *very interests of colonization*."<sup>36</sup> These divisions are based on physical geography, but also on the land's agricultural

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 317.

<sup>32</sup> Koozma Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors* (Grand Forks, BC: Mir Publication Society, 1982), 32.

<sup>33</sup> Kropotkin, "Some of the Resources of Canada," 494.

<sup>34</sup> Jason William Crek, "Making Settler Space: George Dawson, the Geological Survey of Canada and the Colonization of the Canadian West in the Late 19<sup>th</sup> Century" (PhD diss., Queen's University, 2009).

<sup>35</sup> Kropotkin, "Some of the Resources of Canada," 496.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 499. Emphasis mine.

potential.<sup>37</sup> Kropotkin is referring to the type of practical scientific information that is required for settlement, but one can also read the conceptualization of land in terms of its potential to be exploited as a symbolic imposition of one conceptualization of land that would, through land policy, gain dominance in Canada and “bring wilderness into a semi-civilized state.”<sup>38</sup>

The conceptualization of the land of the North-West as vast, empty, and having almost limitless resource potential is the background against which Kropotkin evaluated the Mennonite colonies that he came across. Kropotkin’s description of the liberty provided to the Mennonite colonies on the “free soil”<sup>39</sup> of the North-West must have been a convincing element in the Tolstoyans’ acceptance of Canada as an ideal land for the Doukhobors, who had faced so much persecution in Russia. Kropotkin described the Mennonite colonies as being “left entirely to themselves” and granted land in a block, rather than individual homesteads.<sup>40</sup> He also described them, not as a religious minority granted accommodation by the Canadian state, but rather as community “holding their own, surrounded as they are by a very different civilization.”<sup>41</sup> The question of land policy as a tool of assimilation—especially the idea of scattering settlers across individual homesteads to hasten the process—was clearly part of popular discourse during Kropotkin’s visit, but the vastness of the North-West was reason enough for Kropotkin to dismiss this idea as detrimental to development.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 513.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 498.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 503.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 504.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 506.

Kropotkin, sharing with Mavor many beliefs about the proper settlement of Canada, would initiate Mavor's relationship with the Department of the Interior by asking Mavor in 1898 about the prospects of the Doukhobors settling in Canada.<sup>43</sup> Mavor proposed the scheme to Minister of the Interior Clifford Sifton by writing, "I venture to bring before you a matter which might involve an important project of immigration, not as I believe out of line with what I conceive to be the very wise policy which you have already been carrying out."<sup>44</sup> This initial correspondence demonstrates that Mavor shared with Sifton the opinion that the best way of exploiting the North-West was with the mass immigration of the "stalwart peasant in a sheep-skin coat, born on the soil, whose forefathers have been farmers for ten generations...."<sup>45</sup> Indeed, another letter from Mavor proposing the scheme to Sir William Mulock, Postmaster General, demonstrates Mavor's view of the Doukhobors as "good material"<sup>46</sup> for the economic project of agricultural settlement. Like Sifton's views on the ideal settler, it mattered less where the settlers came from than what value they brought to Canada as "living capital"<sup>47</sup> that would aid in bringing agricultural land into production.

From this initial contact with the Department of the Interior, Mavor developed a relationship with key figures such as James Smart (Deputy Minister) and Minister Sifton based on his expertise in the political economy of colonial settlement.<sup>48</sup> Mavor's 1900

---

<sup>43</sup> "Kropotkin to Mavor," July 10, 1898. Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>44</sup> "Mavor to Sifton," July 26, 1898. Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>45</sup> Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*, 34.

<sup>46</sup> "Mavor to Mulock," July 26, 1898. Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>47</sup> James Mavor, "Emigration and Immigration," 1900. Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>48</sup> By late 1898 Mavor was asked by Sifton for insights into the emigration of various European agriculturalists. He suggested to Smart the possibility of bringing to Canada groups of expelled Danes and Dutchmen. "Mavor to Smart," December 16, 1898, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor. This relationship would lead to Mavor travelling to Europe to research the potential of various sources of

report on Emigration and Immigration, commissioned by the Department of the Interior, provides important insights into Mavor's colonial economic theory as presented to the government. Importantly, he draws attention to the reasons for "voluntary emigration"; for most the prospect of better economic fortunes is the main driver, but for many others political and religious persecution combined with the industrial displacement of self-contained village life drive emigration.<sup>49</sup> As one of Mavor's contemporaries Clare V. Fitz-Gibbon wrote, "Colonization has much for which to thank persecution."<sup>50</sup>

Despite the potential for jealousy on the part of established settlers,<sup>51</sup> Mavor believed that an overall increase in settler population, regardless of race, was economically beneficial to all.<sup>52</sup> He argued that race mixing is not a new phenomenon and that the term "Anglo-Saxon race" is a misnomer because it is, in actual fact, a mixture of many European races.<sup>53</sup> Racial assimilation, for Mavor, was an inevitable process<sup>54</sup> caused by flows of populations and this process was "an important factor in general progress."<sup>55</sup> Despite his enthusiastic support for racial assimilation, not all

---

immigrants and the writing of a report on "Emigration and Immigration." James Mavor. "Emigration and Immigration," 1900. Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor. Mavor's expertise on the history of the Doukhobors and their character is heavily drawn upon in the 1898 Report of the Department of Interior, *Sessional Papers of the Dominion of Canada*, Vol. 11, Fourth Session, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 1899. Mavor was also seen as an expert on the Doukhobors and colonial settlement beyond Canada, as is evidenced by Lord Strathcona's invitation for Mavor to represent Canada regarding "Colonization and Immigration" at the World Fair in Paris. "Strathcona to Mavor," August 3, 1900, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>49</sup> James Mavor, "Emigration and Immigration," 1900, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>50</sup> Mary Agnes Fitzgibbon (Lally Bernard), *The Canadian Doukhobor Settlements: A Series of Letters* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1899), 2, 10.

<sup>51</sup> Mavor was aware, even before the arrival of the Doukhobors, of the popular preference for "native" eastern Canadians, and the view that foreigners should not be allowed to settle in blocks as this would slow assimilation. Patrick to Mavor, December 26, 1898, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>52</sup> Mavor, "Emigration and Immigration," 25.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

colonies can “absorb” peoples of different racial groups equally.<sup>56</sup> A colony with an underdeveloped industrial capacity could only absorb a limited number of labourers, but in a country like Canada with its vast “unoccupied cultivable lands” the number of agricultural settlers was limited only by the amount of available land.<sup>57</sup> From this perspective, the political question of the racial character of the ideal settler is addressed through the resource potential of the land; the land, as exploitable resource, does the work of subject making by engaging the settler in the economic exploitation of the land. Once settlers were engaged in economic activity, assimilation was a “question of time and fertility.”<sup>58</sup> The fact that Mavor speaks of fertility has a poetic double sense in his report. On the one hand the fertility of the land is the key to engaging settlers in economic activity that will lead to assimilation. On the other hand, the reference to fertility reminds the reader that Mavor, while putting forward a largely economic theory is still constrained by the racial ideologies of his day and the idea of innate differences between peoples that are not so easily assimilated.

Within this ideology, the Doukhobors were considered the ideal settlers in part *because* of their self-contained community. Unlike the British settler, whose specialized skills require merchants and infrastructure, the self-sufficient Doukhobor community, holding the land in block, could bring the far edges of settlement into agricultural production.<sup>59</sup> However, the settlement of those displaced Europeans “who are swept into a side eddy by the stream of industry”<sup>60</sup> is not an end in itself, but rather “the germ from

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 31.

<sup>60</sup> Mavor, “Setting the Poor on Work,” 523.

which development may come.”<sup>61</sup> It is here, through the lens of inevitable economic progress, that Mavor imposes his vision of land on the Community Doukhobors. Despite

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 33.



**Figure 1 Map of the North West of Canada** *This map, produced by Mavor, is typical of the materialist conceptualization of colonization that placed greater emphasis on population and production statistics than on the “character” of settlers. The map shows the tapestry of various ethno-racial group settlements on the Prairies. The map can be read as a representation of the problematization of colonization as a question of population distribution and production, as it appears in a report specifically focused on wheat production statistics (James Mavor, Report of the Board of Trade on the North West of Canada, with special reference to wheat production for export. (London: HMO, 1904)).*

describing the community as a “polity,”<sup>62</sup> for Mavor the economic advantage to agricultural production, rather than the maintenance of the Doukhobor commune as a religio-political entity, is the proper measure of the worth of the Doukhobor relation to the land.<sup>63</sup> By 1904, having witnessed several years of Community Doukhobor conflict with the government over land issues, Mavor would concede some ground to critics of group settlement. While a communal holding of land might be beneficial at the fringes of settlement, “[f]rom the point of view of the advisability of speedy assimilation, a matter which some attach considerable importance, it would appear that the group colony system is less favourable to assimilation than the system of isolated settlement.”<sup>64</sup>

#### **Clifford Sifton: “The War on Our Settlers”<sup>65</sup>**

Similarities in worldviews made Mavor a natural fit as a trusted expert during Sifton’s tenure as Minister of the Interior—a position he held from 1896 until 1905. Sifton’s position gave him substantial political power, with one popular account of his role as Minister of the Interior describing him as “the political monarch of the West,” in charge of all major aspects of the Liberal party in Manitoba and the North-West including

---

<sup>62</sup> James Mavor, *Report of the Board of Trade on the North West of Canada, with special reference to wheat production for export*, (London: HMO, 1904), 16.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> This quote is the title of an article from Sifton’s *Manitoba Free Press* that aptly captures the public relations battle between nativist critics and Sifton over who is an ideal settler. “The War on Our Settlers,” *Manitoba Free Press*, August 25, 1899.

immigration, patronage appointments, and election strategy—especially the use of Liberal controlled newspapers to influence the immigrant vote.<sup>66</sup> Like Mavor, Sifton was interested in “practical studies”<sup>67</sup> and saw the problem of settlement as largely one of absolute increase in population. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed in 1886 there was an initial economic boom around real estate speculation in the West, followed by a depression in the early 1890s and the exodus of over one million Canadians to the United States.<sup>68</sup> To address this problem, and fulfill the Western settlement aspect of the National Policy, Sifton would develop a policy of attracting agriculturalist immigrants from continental Europe in addition to British immigrants. In the face of early opposition to his government’s immigration policy, Sifton defended the Doukhobors, saying:

The only solution of our problem there, is to get people on the land who will till it. And I am prepared to say this: that I do not care what language a man speaks, or what religion he professes, if he is honest and law-abiding, if he will go on the land and make a living for himself and family, he is a desirable settler for the Dominion of Canada...<sup>69</sup>

The above quote shows that while Sifton had other concerns besides materialist ones in identifying the ideal settler, language and religion (two defining features of racial and cultural difference at the time) were not of primary concern. The measure of a settler for Sifton was the ability to bring the North-West into production and create a market for eastern merchants and industrialists; therefore, in seeking settlers, Sifton believed that

---

<sup>66</sup> Pierre Berton, *The Promised Land: Settling the West 1896-1914* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1984), 25.

<sup>67</sup> D.J. Hall, *Clifford Sifton, Volume 1: The Young Napoleon, 1861-1900* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1981).

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 253.

<sup>69</sup> *House of Commons Debates*, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4<sup>th</sup> Session, Vol. 3 (July 7, 1899). 6859.

“[a]ll other faults may be forgiven, but laziness is a vice for which there is no compensation.”<sup>70</sup>

A brief reflection on the institutional structure of the Department of the Interior will demonstrate the unified project of European settlement and dispossession of Indigenous peoples. When Sifton came to power, he maintained political leadership of both the Department of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior. Further, Sifton put one Deputy Minister, James Smart, in charge of both files until it became clear in 1902 that this integration was too burdensome for one person.<sup>71</sup> This institutional structure created conditions for relational overlap to occur between the projects of Indian Affairs and immigrant settlement since Indian Affairs land policy was seen as “inextricably bound up with settlement.”<sup>72</sup>

Sifton, like Mavor, believed that the practicalities of settlement sometimes required landholding that did not conform to the ideal of the single-family homestead. Sifton’s personal stake in the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company shows that he had no qualms about land speculation. Furthermore, despite his initial belief that reserves for First Nations should be moved away from towns because he saw them as detrimental to rapid development,<sup>73</sup> he came to resist calls for unilateral expropriation of reserve land. In 1902 Sifton’s brother, along with Frank Oliver and the Calgary Board of Trade, pressured Clifford Sifton for the surrender of the “unoccupied and unproductive” land of

---

<sup>70</sup> Sifton to Mavor, March 22, 1899, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor, SFU.

<sup>71</sup> D.J. Hall, “Clifford Sifton and the Canadian Indian Administration 1896-1905,” *Prairie Forum* 2, no. 2 (1977), 128.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 123.

<sup>73</sup> Hall, *Clifford Sifton*, 271.

the Tsuu T'ina reserve, but he refused to go ahead without the consent of the band.<sup>74</sup> However, this should not be taken as a principled stand on Indian Affairs land policy. In a separate call by Frank Oliver to open the Stoney reserve for settlement in 1897, Sifton agreed that while it would be in everyone's best interest, the letter of the law must be followed.<sup>75</sup> Indeed, Sifton had attempted to expropriate reserve land upon taking office, only to be informed of the legal hurdles—including consent of the band—in doing so.<sup>76</sup> Further evidence of this instrumental approach to Indian Affairs land policy can be seen in Sifton's claim that the inclusion of Métis scrip in Treaty 8 was not to benefit the Métis, but to "pacify and keep pacified the North-West territories."<sup>77</sup> Nonetheless, Sifton appears to have accepted that the economic imperative of settling the North-West required flexibility in patterns of landholding.

This flexibility can be clearly seen in the concessions that Sifton made for the Doukhobors—especially the 1902 concession that allowed the Doukhobors to meet homestead requirements by cultivating land communally around village sites, rather than on each quarter section.<sup>78</sup> In his letter informing the Doukhobors of this concession, Sifton rhetorically asks, "Of what use is land anywhere in the world unless it is occupied and cultivated?"<sup>79</sup> If uniform application of homestead policy was causing problems for settlement—as it was with the communal Doukhobors—then a strategic concession was required. For Sifton the question of assimilation was secondary to concerns over

---

<sup>74</sup> Patricia Wood, "Pressured from all sides: the February 1913 surrender of the Northeast corner of the Tsuu T'ina Nation," *Journal of Historical Geography* 30, no. 1 (2004), 117-118.

<sup>75</sup> Hall, "Sifton and Canadian Indian Administration," 142.

<sup>76</sup> Hall, *Sifton*, 270.

<sup>77</sup> Hall, *Sifton*, 273.

<sup>78</sup> Sifton to Ivan and Feodor Suchorukoff, February 15, 1902, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

departmental spending and the economic development of the North-West. In the House of Commons Sifton defended the Doukhobors on the grounds that not only were they ideal agriculturalists, but their emigration required no spending on recruitment propaganda.<sup>80</sup> Furthermore, Sifton defended the group colony settlements of the Mennonites, even if they did not assimilate, because they had been economically essential for early settlement. Near the time of the Doukhobors arrival in 1899, Sifton argued in the House:

The Mennonites are exclusive, the Mennonites are opposed, and always have been to some extent by the mental attitude, to becoming Canadians. And yet, Mr. Speaker, although the Mennonites were not looked upon so favourably as the Galicians and the Doukhobors, they have been among the most valuable citizens we have had in Manitoba and the North-West. Why, Sir, there is no more prosperous portion of the province today than the Mennonite reserve. I venture to think that if the hon. Gentleman will ask the leading merchants of the city of Winnipeg where, in the last ten years, they have made the most money, where they have had the fewest bad debts, and therefore have lost the least money, they will say that it has been upon the Mennonite reserve; and that of all the population of the province of Manitoba there is no portion that contributes more to its commercial prosperity than does the Mennonite reserve.<sup>81</sup>

The lack of a strong ideological commitment to a policy of state interventionist assimilation, articulated in the above intervention in the House, can also be seen in Sifton's overall approach to Indian Affairs. The overriding concern for Sifton was almost always the bottom line. Upon taking over Indian Affairs Sifton immediately started to make cuts to the department. Addressing concerns about costs, Sifton stated that the department should "see that we either had more Indians to look after or less officials, for at present there were nearly as many officials as Indians."<sup>82</sup> His approach to the Indian

---

<sup>80</sup> *House of Commons Debates*, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4<sup>th</sup> Session, Vol. 3 (July 7, 1899), 6852.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 6863.

<sup>82</sup> Sifton quoted in Hall, *Clifford Sifton*, 127.

Residential School program, while drawing on a racial ideology of Indigenous inferiority,<sup>83</sup> gave up on the earlier goal of education for integration in the wage economy and instead focused on basic agricultural training for self-sufficiency on reserve.<sup>84</sup> This policy was consistent with Sifton's preference for settler peasant agriculturalists over specialized labourers; one can speculate that Sifton's ambivalence about projects of rapid assimilation was founded on his progressive economic view that the vast land resources of the North-West would eventually eliminate any deep differences between various Indigenous and settler groups, or that the "Indian problem" would simply disappear with the dominance of settler economy.

Unlike James Mavor, who left behind various reports that provided a relatively coherent economic colonial theory of land and the ideal settler, Sifton's views were most thoroughly developed indirectly through the editorials of his newspaper, *The Manitoba Free Press*.<sup>85</sup> Through the pages of the *Free Press*, a certain vision of settlement was constructed. On March 20<sup>th</sup>, 1899, this vision was laid out vividly in an article titled "Home for Millions."<sup>86</sup> In the article, the imagery of a wall-sized map of the North-West with two small red dots representing the Doukhobor reserves demonstrates that the

---

<sup>83</sup> J.R. Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 135.

<sup>84</sup> Hall, *Sifton*, 270.

<sup>85</sup> Sifton acquired the *Manitoba Free Press* in early 1898 and set out to use its pages for political advantage. Hall, *Sifton*, 216. Although one should not assume that politically controlled newspapers were a direct reflection of their owner's views, it is telling that many of the editorials are nearly identical to the ideas expressed by related politicians in the House of Commons. For example, Sifton's *Manitoba Free Press*, published an editorial titled "Our Immigration Policy"—"our" referring to Sifton and the Liberals—that is nearly identical to Sifton's defence of his immigration policy in the House three months later. See "Our Immigration Policy," *Manitoba Free Press*, April 4<sup>th</sup>, 1899; *House of Commons Debates*, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4<sup>th</sup> Session, Vol. 3 (July 7, 1899), 6859. Furthermore, debates in the House about who was the best type of settler drew on direct quotes from politically controlled newspapers, suggesting that there was little distinction between the discourse of "civil society" and politicians. See *House of Commons Debates*, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4<sup>th</sup> Session, Vol. 3 (July 7, 1899) 6886.

<sup>86</sup> "Home for Millions," *Manitoba Free Press*, March 20<sup>th</sup>, 1899.

vastness and the emptiness of the North-West are the foundation for immigration policy.<sup>87</sup> A quote from an anonymous visitor to the immigration hall reflected the Siftonian vision:

There should be two or three million people growing wheat and raising cattle on those thousands of square miles of land now growing prairie grass to be burned by the fires in the fall. There should be black lines representing railroads on that map until it looked like a well cracked window pane, and towns so thick that ‘Saskatchewan’ and ‘Assiniboia’ would have to be printed in open faced letters to keep them from covering up a couple of dozen. ... Let the Doukhobors come. We want fifty shiploads if we can get them and we will run a railroad to carry out the millions of bushels of wheat they will raise and extend our city a few miles down the river with industrial concerns manufacturing supplies for them.<sup>88</sup>

The idea that the vastness of the land made the Doukhobors the ideal settlers did not go unchallenged. Conservative papers argued that bringing in Doukhobors was “as sensible as deliberately bringing vermin into a new house.”<sup>89</sup> The *Free Press* conceded that the ideal settler was not only an agriculturalist but a *British* agriculturalist; however, the Sifton vision saw the assimilation of non-British settlers as an inevitability.<sup>90</sup> Of course, the tool of public education would be a Canadianizing force, but importantly the land—the “free soil” of Canada—would give the opportunity for servile people,<sup>91</sup> like the Doukhobors, to develop an independent character.<sup>92</sup> In this vision, land takes on an almost magical quality in its ability to transform the subjectivity of settlers. Sifton’s paper

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> See “Our Immigration Policy,” *Manitoba Free Press*, April 4<sup>th</sup>, 1899.

<sup>90</sup> “The Doukhobors: Some Facts About an Interesting People Who Are Coming to Western Canada to Escape Russian Persecution,” *Manitoba Free Press*, January 21<sup>st</sup>, 1899.

<sup>91</sup> At the turn of the century, anti-Slavic sentiment that extended beyond the Doukhobors often characterized these people as “serfs and slaves.” Hall, *Sifton*, 264.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

argued that “[i]n Canada, if you get the immigrant on the land he becomes at once naturalized and nationalized.”<sup>93</sup> Furthermore, even “primitive sects” like the Doukhobors would eventually progress beyond their religious “idiosyncrasies” over the course of generations.<sup>94</sup> This was because there had never been “a *land* and a people better fitted to assimilate and absorb such desirable immigrants as the Doukhobors” as there was in Canada’s west.<sup>95</sup> This progressive view of history aligned neatly with Mavor’s view that, “It is the universal experience of every European people that the basis of a prosperous peasant population has been the self-contained village, at least until it has established itself as a special producer.”<sup>96</sup> While Mavor and Sifton’s primarily materialist view of settler-subject making rely mostly on a positive assessment of time and economic activity to make good settlers, there is also some evidence that Sifton saw strong coercive assimilation as counterproductive. When the political opposition called for the disenfranchisement of Doukhobors who maintained strict pacifism, the *Free Press* argued that religious persecution would only further entrench a distinct religious identity.<sup>97</sup>

There is an important political element to this discourse; it is not just that Doukhobors and others may have undesirable “characteristics,” but that these characteristics are tied to governance, which in turn is tied to a system of relating to the land. Sifton’s views on land and settlement were being developed in opposition to those of his critics who argued that brute agricultural strength was no replacement for “settler

---

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 268.

<sup>94</sup> “A Narrow Policy,” *Manitoba Free Press*, August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1899.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid. Emphasis mine.

<sup>96</sup> Mavor, “Emigration and Immigration,” 33.

<sup>97</sup> “A Narrow Policy,” *Manitoba Free Press*, August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1899.

citizens”<sup>98</sup> with, in the words of Conservative MP Edward Prior, “the courage and the wish to build up the British Empire and perpetuate British institutions.”<sup>99</sup> For Sifton, settlement on the land was the solution to problematic settlers, and thus the question of citizenship could be solved through the economic management of populations. Sifton reasoned that the Doukhobors’ pacifism, for example, should not be seen as a marker of their foreignness, but rather should be seen as a question of occupation and division of labour; if the Doukhobors would not fight for Canada, the taxes raised by their agricultural work would allow the government to hire others to fight for them.<sup>100</sup> This faith in the exploitative potential of the land to eventually and automatically assimilate settlers into good British-Canadian subjects did not withstand the criticisms of those calling for a more interventionist approach to land policy in the interest of the “native” or real settler in the context of homestead scarcity. The appeal to keep out the “alien and servile Slav serfs” in the interest of Anglo-Saxon settlers was hyperbolically termed “The War on Our Settlers” by the *Free Press*.<sup>101</sup> It was not the Conservatives, but a fellow Liberal, Frank Oliver, that would champion this war on Sifton’s settlers.

### **Frank Oliver: The Production of Settler-Citizens**

If Mavor and Sifton were primarily concerned with the colonial exploitation of material resources, then Frank Oliver can be seen as primarily concerned with harnessing the human ability to reproduce a British political community on Indigenous territory. To this end, his culturalist vision of ideal land use was developed in contrast with Indigenous

---

<sup>98</sup> *House of Commons Debates*, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4<sup>th</sup> Session, Vol. 3 (July 7, 1899), 6839.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 6837. It is significant that this MP quotes from Frank Oliver’s *Edmonton Bulletin* to make the case for the “settler citizen.” This demonstrates some of the influence of Oliver’s conceptualization of the “settler citizen.”

<sup>100</sup> *House of Commons Debates*, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4<sup>th</sup> Session, Vol. 3 (July 7, 1899), 6862.

<sup>101</sup> “The War on Our Settlers,” *Manitoba Free Press*, August 25<sup>th</sup>, 1899.

land use that he saw as an impediment to this project. In his mind, immigrants like the Doukhobors should have been excluded from settlement, but given that they were already in Canada, strong state intervention would be required to make them into settler-subjects. This vision of land constructed some settlers as “native,” justifying their use of the land, while excluding newcomers. In contrast to Sifton, Oliver was hostile to large capitalist interest in the land.<sup>102</sup> The very fact that these two visions played out so publicly and with such vitriol in response to a shared ideological, material, and political context is evidence of the politically contingent nature of the settler colonial project. The same political situation can, and was, problematized in different ways.

In the Spring of 1901 Frank Oliver’s *Edmonton Bulletin* published his thoughts on Sifton’s immigration policy in general, and the Doukhobors in particular:

It is not enough to produce wheat out of the ground. We do not live to produce wheat. *We live to produce people, to produce social conditions, and to build up a country,* and if you give us only those who can produce wheat, and who cannot take their places as citizens, you do us an injury, and you place an obstacle in the way of our progress, instead of conferring an advantage upon us.<sup>103</sup>

Oliver’s vision of the ideal settler, however, predates the arrival of the Doukhobors in Canada, as well as Sifton’s immigration policy. During the 1880s in the early settler culture of Edmonton, Oliver used *The Edmonton Bulletin* to publicise his views. Unsurprisingly, the question of the ideal settler revolved around the issue of land use.

---

<sup>102</sup> One commonality between Clifford Sifton and Frank Oliver as Ministers of the Interior is that both used the office to personally profit from settlement. Sifton profited through his investment in the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, a speculation company, while Oliver acquired surrendered reserve land through his son-in-law. Richard Spaulding, “Executive Summary,” in Peggy Martin-McGuire, *First Nation Land Surrenders on the Prairies: 1896-1911*. Prepared for the Indian Claims Commission. Ottawa: 1998. p. xviii. This should not, however, be taken to mean that the two shared a common view on the best form of settlement and land policy.

<sup>103</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1901, 4. Emphasis mine.

Oliver called on the government to specify “settlers’ rights” in disputes that would surely arise in the settlement of the West.<sup>104</sup> His fear was that the labour of the original settler in improving the land might be wasted, and an injustice done to him, if newer settlers were able to take out a homestead on that squatter’s land.<sup>105</sup> Much worse than a new settler taking over already improved land was the danger of large scale land speculation, an act seen as “evil,” because of the retarding effect it had on real agricultural development.<sup>106</sup> Oliver also criticized CPR reserves as an unproductive use of land that prevented rapid development.<sup>107</sup>

While Oliver criticized these uses of land, he pursued an even stronger attack on the Papasschase Indian Reserve 136. Beginning in the early 1880s local settlers and Oliver’s *The Edmonton Bulletin* argued that the reserve was crowding out settlers and hemming in the town.<sup>108</sup> They petitioned the government, arguing, “Now is the time for the Government to declare the reserve open and show whether this country is to be run in the interests of the settlers or the Indians.”<sup>109</sup> The reasoning was predictable enough; the reserve was on good agricultural and timberland and the Indigenous residents were allegedly not productively using the land, slowing economic development.<sup>110</sup> The *Bulletin* argued that the exploitation of resources and the improvement of land required private ownership.<sup>111</sup> This early campaign for reserve surrender also dressed up settler

---

<sup>104</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, May 27<sup>th</sup>, 1882, 4.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>107</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1896, 2.

<sup>108</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 1881, 4.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>110</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1884, 2.

<sup>111</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 1894, 4.

expropriation as being in the interest of the reserve residents; a larger, more remote reserve would allow a farm instructor to provide a quicker transition to civilization, while those who desired to stay could be brought into the homestead regime and eventually enfranchised.<sup>112</sup> Within this ideology it was not enough to simply dispossess Indigenous peoples; the dispossession had to provide the political good of individuation through agricultural labour.

One fascinating aspect of the *Bulletin's* call to open the Papasschase reserve is the way that it attempted to de-Indigenize the members of the band. The paper described the land as a “supposed reserve” because the residents, it claimed, were not really from the area, but rather they were from Slave Lake.<sup>113</sup> Furthermore, the paper claimed that they were not really “Indians” because they were mixed blood and they wanted to enfranchise.<sup>114</sup> The flipside of this discourse of de-Indigenizing is the Indigenizing of old-time settlers. The idea of “nativism” reflects this process of de-Indigenizing/Indigenizing for the purpose of privileging certain settlers over others. This theme is also apparent in McDougall’s work on reserve surrenders, as discussed below. This form of nativism naturalizes the political process of settler making by disappearing the pre-existing Indigenous relations to the land. The conflict and violence of imposing new relations with the land is hidden behind the simplified logic that “old timers” have a rightful claim to the land.

Oliver’s ideas about proper land use were then put into service against Sifton’s eastern European settlers. In 1898 when the Doukhobor representatives were scouting

---

<sup>112</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1884, 2.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*

land in Canada, before Oliver was ever acquainted with the Doukhobors, Oliver spearheaded a campaign against Doukhobor settlement near Edmonton.<sup>115</sup> A letter to the editor, reprinted from the *Winnipeg Tribune*, made the case that one of the major problems with “foreign” settlers was communal settlement; if these people were to be admitted at all they should be territorially dispersed for quicker “Canadianization.”<sup>116</sup> More than one Member of Parliament took up this sentiment about territorial dispersal during debates about the Doukhobors, suggesting that the sentiment was widespread.<sup>117</sup> Land and assimilation were ideologically linked to one another in the problematization of settler groups. Like the materialist vision of land, state oversight was necessary to ensure an ideal settlement pattern that would lead to the improvement of subjects.

The Siftonian valuation of settlers based on agricultural potential—the measure that made communal settlement acceptable—came under direct attack by Oliver through *The Bulletin*. An editorial against the Doukhobors and Galicians, targeted specifically at Sifton’s newspaper, proclaimed:

[T]he doctrine preached by the *Free Press* that any man who will cultivate the ground is a good enough settler for the Canadian West, does not go when it comes to an electoral appeal to the men whose enterprise, sacrifices and endurance have made the country all that it is, and whose hope has always been not merely to raise wheat for the C.P.R. to haul, but to establish for themselves and their wives, their sons and their daughters, an intelligent and progressive civilization in this great West of Canada.<sup>118</sup>

This quote is telling in that it combines an appeal to old-time settlers, electoral advantage, and the linking of settler citizenship with “progressive civilization” based on the

---

<sup>115</sup> Szalasznyj, “Doukhobor Homestead Crisis,” 41.

<sup>116</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, February 27<sup>th</sup>, 1899, 2.

<sup>117</sup> *House of Commons Debates*, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4<sup>th</sup> Session, Vol. 3 (July 7, 1899), 6843; *House of Commons Debates*, 10<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, Vol. 4 (May 23, 1905), 6415.

<sup>118</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, September 11<sup>th</sup>, 1899, 3.

patriarchal family unit. This vision also attacked *The Globe* as an organ of the monopolistic railway for presenting a view of immigration as purely economic; the greatest fault of the materialist view was that it treated “citizens” as “beasts of burden.”<sup>119</sup> The problem of exploiting vacant lands was of utmost importance for Oliver, but it came second to the type of people settling the land.<sup>120</sup> On this matter Oliver and his *Edmonton Bulletin* were clear: “We want citizens as well as tillers of the soil.”<sup>121</sup> The best class of citizen-settler—or “citizen-producer”<sup>122</sup>—were Canadians and British subjects.

The reason why the Doukhobors were considered particularly bad settlers was their religio-political relation to the land, inextricably linked with Doukhobor racial character. Not only were they undesirable as settler-citizens, they were undesirable as “settlers *or* citizens.”<sup>123</sup> Oliver, in his capacity as a Liberal MP, criticized his colleague Sifton for putting all foreigners on the same level as the Doukhobors. Because the Doukhobors arrived en masse as exiles, they arrived with “special” privileges, giving them a group identity and making them undesirable settlers.<sup>124</sup> Oliver reasoned that the Doukhobors, and Slavic people in general, continued to be at the level of serfs.<sup>125</sup> Clearly, as evidenced by their communal landholding, the Doukhobors had not yet progressed beyond the developmental stage of the peasant, according to Oliver. This relation to land was then fused with a racial character to argue that even within the same country of

---

<sup>119</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1900, 4.

<sup>120</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 1896, 2.

<sup>121</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1900, 4.

<sup>122</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1901, 4.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.* Emphasis mine.

<sup>124</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 1900, 4.

<sup>125</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1901, 4.

origin different groups belonged to “radically different races. The foundation ideas in the minds of both people are radically different.”<sup>126</sup>

The racialization of “foundation ideas” and a group’s internal government meant that while assimilation might be possible, it would be a difficult process requiring concerted effort<sup>127</sup>—not the type of automatic and inevitable laissez-faire assimilation of materialists. The racial character of serfdom meant that the Doukhobors were predisposed to tyrannical government and could not take their place as fellow citizens under a representative democracy.<sup>128</sup> One can see how, following this line of thinking, the Doukhobors would not only be poor settlers, but would be inimical to settler colonialism, that is, the creation of a new political community on Indigenous territory. In fact, MP Sam Hughes opposed the granting of provincial status to the Territories in 1902 in part because the very presence of Doukhobors put the Territories in “a very unsettled state.”<sup>129</sup> If the Doukhobors’ racial character prevented the Doukhobors from becoming settler-citizens, then at the least land policy could be used to break up the territorial concentration of the community and make them subject to Canadian law in a form of political containment.

When Frank Oliver succeeded Clifford Sifton as Minister of the Interior in 1905, he already had a well-developed theory of ideal settlers and land use. His ideology had proven sufficient motivation in the past for preventing Doukhobor settlement near Edmonton and for pursuing reserve land surrenders, but upon taking office his ideas found fertile ground in a changed political context of growing calls from politicians and

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid.

<sup>129</sup> *Edmonton Bulletin*, March 14<sup>th</sup>, 1902, 4.

settlers alike to open up Doukhobor land and Indian Reserves for settlement. Sifton's immigration policy had been a success; the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw a five-fold increase in settler population, leading to a land rush.<sup>130</sup> The decrease in availability of homestead land led to popular protest against land speculation, especially the practice of homestead entry by proxy where a family member would make a homestead entry for another family member who never actually farmed the land.<sup>131</sup> Settlers also criticised the practice of "gopher farming" where minimal improvements were made to a homestead in order to later sell it at a profit.<sup>132</sup> Even if the motivation of later settlers was purely a material interest to acquire land for themselves, the ideological context meant that these demands for land would be justified by appeals to unproductive land use as a reason for expropriation. The land was neither exploited for material resources nor was it exploited for making settler-subjects.

Oliver's track record on amendments to legislation and policy provides ample evidence that he was on the side of those "true" settlers seeking private family ownership of agricultural land. Soon after becoming Minister of the Interior he ended the policy of allowing homestead entry by proxy.<sup>133</sup> This was a reversal of the conciliatory policy of Sifton that allowed Verigin to make entries for those Doukhobors that opposed individual entry on religious grounds. He also made an amendment to the Indian Act in 1906 to allow 50 per cent of the sale price of surrendered reserve land to be distributed to band members in order to encourage surrenders—this was an increase from the previously

---

<sup>130</sup> Spaulding, "Executive Summary," xx.

<sup>131</sup> Szalasnij, "Doukhobor Homestead Crisis," 163.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 164.

allowed maximum of 10 per cent of the sale price.<sup>134</sup> Finally, in 1911 Oliver worked to have the Indian Act amended so that in certain circumstances reserve land could be expropriated without the band's consent.<sup>135</sup>

The political climate of the land rush worked decisively against the communal Doukhobors. A May 1905 debate in the House of Commons brought the issue of communal landholding to the fore, putting Oliver on the defensive by suggesting that the government's treatment of Doukhobor land was enabling Verigin to coerce Doukhobors who were trying to leave the community.<sup>136</sup> The Conservative Member from Qu'Appelle, R.S. Lake, argued that the government must stand up to Verigin by recognizing the individual homestead entries of those Doukhobors breaking away from his leadership; the current positions tended "to keep in their minds the idea that the lands are being entered by the community as a body, and not for the individual."<sup>137</sup> Another MP echoed Lake's ideas and added that while communal settlement might have had some benefit in the "early days" of settlement, the "tyrannical" government of the community Doukhobors acted to "keep down and utterly make impossible this assertion of individuality."<sup>138</sup> Others like Liberal John Turriff agreed that the government should use land policy to encourage individuals exiting the communal experiment, but remarked that from an economic perspective Verigin was a good businessman and the Doukhobors' agricultural skill made them a "good class of settlers."<sup>139</sup> The position of Turriff demonstrates the

---

<sup>134</sup> Spaulding, "Executive Summary," xxi.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., xxiii.

<sup>136</sup> *House of Commons Debates*, 10<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, Vol. 4 (May 23, 1905), 6408.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., 6415.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 6418.

tension, at this time, between the material aspects of settler colonialism and the culturalist nation-building project. Given Oliver's views on land and settlement it was likely an easy decision to give in to this pressure and reassure the opposition that his department did not support religious polities, but rather "[o]ur business is with the individual settler and to protect his rights."<sup>140</sup>

Conservative Thomas Chrisholm eloquently summarized the ever-increasing hostility toward unproductive land use and aimed this hostility squarely at the earlier policies of Sifton. After touring the North-West in search of land for his sons he remarked:

I found Indian reserves, Doukhobor reserves, Gallician reserves, Mennonite reserves, school-land reserves, forest reserves, wood-lot reserves, ranching reserves, Canadian Pacific Railway Company reserves, Hudson's Bay Company reserves, Temperance Colonization Company reserves, and, last but not least, Saskatchewan Valley Land Company reserves, and so on, and so on. But there was one reserve that I looked for in vain, and that was a reserve of good land to provide homes and farms for our young and growing Canadian farmers' sons.<sup>141</sup>

All of these reserved lands might have been economically productive, but they were not producing the patriarchal family farm as the ideal foundational unit of the new nation. It was in this political climate that Oliver sought help on the land issue from an old-timer settler and expert on the North-West: Reverend John McDougall.

### **Reverend John McDougall: Tribal Communism and Doukhobor Subjectivity**

While Frank Oliver envisioned the private family ownership of homestead land as key to the improvement of that land, as well as the improvement of settler-subjects—and also the maintenance of democratic institutions—the historical records suggest that he

---

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., 6416.

<sup>141</sup> *House of Commons Debates*, 10<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Vol. 2 (May 11, 1906), 3186.

was somewhat ambivalent about the assimilability of both Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples. Reverend John McDougall, on the other hand, was fully committed to an assimilationist ideology that stressed the importance of one's relation to the land in improving character and furthering civilization. This ideological commitment, developed during his missionary work with Plains First Nations, helps to explain McDougall's anti-communal Doukhobor stance: a stance that would be taken up as government policy under Frank Oliver.

McDougall believed that settler colonialism was a much more noble project than simply exploiting resources. Like Oliver, his thought can be seen as culturalist in that it saw cultural difference as a primary concern in determining the settler ideal. Also, like Oliver, McDougall believed that a much more interventionist approach to assimilation was required than the laissez-faire Siftonian approach.<sup>142</sup> McDougall shared with the materialists the aspect of colonial ideology that conceptualized the exploitation of land as the unfolding of a progressive history. However, even though McDougall and someone like Mavor were drawing from the same ideological context and available concepts, they came to different conclusions about the implication of progressive history for the making of settler-subjects (and for McDougall the making of Indigenous peoples into settler-subjects as well).

McDougall is a challenging figure to come to terms with because his fierce commitment to assimilation of Indigenous peoples put him into conflict with some of the most paternalistic and materially exploitative policies of Indian Affairs. As an individual he is the embodiment of the argument that colonial ideology is contested even within

---

<sup>142</sup> *The Globe*, February 11<sup>th</sup>, 1904, 14.; "The Methodists School: Many interesting subjects discussed yesterday," *The Globe*, July 7<sup>th</sup>, 1903.; "The Great Northwest," *The Globe*, April 28<sup>th</sup>, 1902, 5.

settler society. Sarah Carter's work on popular missionary writing argues that for those contemporaries reading McDougall's accounts, "[i]t would have been difficult to escape the conclusion that the vast, rich lands occupied by the Indians should be settled by a stronger, more industrious race of men,"<sup>143</sup> and that these Indigenous peoples should be governed by "more capable hands."<sup>144</sup> This assessment, however, is complicated by the fact that McDougall railed against the paternalism and "despotic laws" of the Indian Act that left Indigenous people "robbed of their manhood."<sup>145</sup> Furthermore, he opposed the exploitation of Indigenous peoples by "barbarian" Europeans<sup>146</sup> and called the lack of treaties in BC a disinheritance of their birthright.<sup>147</sup> Nonetheless, alongside his missionary work, McDougall played a central role supporting Indian Affairs and the Canadian government by liaising with Indigenous leadership to prepare the way for the North-West Mounted Police,<sup>148</sup> by playing a pivotal role in advertising the good will of the Crown in pursuing Treaty 6 and Treaty 7,<sup>149</sup> and by working to secure dubious reserve surrenders during Oliver's time in office.<sup>150</sup> However, even though McDougall

---

<sup>143</sup> Sarah Carter, "The Missionaries' Indian: The Publications of John McDougall, John Maclean and Egerton Ryerson Young," *Prairie Forum* 9, no. 1 (1984), 27.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>145</sup> "CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING AN EXAMINATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA RESERVES, IN AND OUT OF THE RAILWAY BELT, BY REVEREND JOHN MACDOUGALL. (MAPS)" Mikan no. 2059343, McDougall to Frank Oliver, Ottawa, 22 September 1910, NAC, RG 10, vol. 4020, file 280470-2 (reel C-10173), The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development fonds, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Canada, 4.

<sup>146</sup> Rev. John McDougall and Elizabeth Boyd McDougall. *McDougall Reflections: The Future of the Indians of Canada* (Calgary: The McDougall Stoney Mission Society, 1996) (first published 1905), 6.

<sup>147</sup> McDougall to Frank Oliver, 22 September 1910, The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development fonds.

<sup>148</sup> John McDougall, *On Western Trails in the Early Seventies* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1911), 174.

<sup>149</sup> John McDougall, *Opening the Great West* (Calgary: Glenbow-Alberta Institute, 1970); Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Council with Walter Hildebrandt, Dorothy First Rider and Sarah Carter, *The True Spirit and Original intent of Treaty 7* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 122.

<sup>150</sup> Martin-McGuire, *First Nation Land Surrenders*.

called for “full liberty” for Indigenous people in Canada, this liberty did not extend to issues of land or liquor.<sup>151</sup> According to Mathew Hunter, who was born in 1907 on the Stoney reserve near McDougall’s mission, “McDougall told us to close our eyes and pray, but when we opened them our land was gone.”<sup>152</sup>

McDougall held a nearly universal colonial ideology of land as resource to be exploited as well as the progressive view of history that accompanied it. Sarah Carter quotes McDougall, in his typically grandiose style, as representative of the settler vision of progress and improvement to land and the individual:

Material, moral and spiritual wildernesses are to be reclaimed and resurrected and made to fill the purpose of their existence. . . . [T]hat God does call men this world is full of the proofs of. It is to till the soil, to hew and place the rock, to fashion the timber, to melt and fuse and mould and shape the metal. . . . [T]he bridging of oceans and spanning of continents and manipulation of lightnings, the multiplication and concentration of mechanical power in these days all go to show that God meant what He said to the first man when, pointing to the wonderful world He had made, He gave the command ‘Subdue it’.<sup>153</sup>

Writing retrospectively in 1917 about the need for treaties in the North-West and the inevitability of settlement, McDougall stated that he “foresaw the change coming—railroads, settlement, production, all in due time.”<sup>154</sup> Perhaps the best illustration of this vision of land can be seen in the epilogue to McDougall’s biography of his father, where he painted a vivid picture of the resource potential of the North-West. He imagined half the land occupied by 3.2 million people holding 100 acres each, and a future where “God’s cattle”—the bison herds—would become extinct by divine will, allowing

---

<sup>151</sup> McDougall, *Reflections*, 14.

<sup>152</sup> Mathew Hunter quoted in Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Council, *The True Spirit*, 157.

<sup>153</sup> McDougall quoted in Sarah Carter, “Missionaries’ Indian,” 33.

<sup>154</sup> McDougall, *Great West*, 23.

McDougall to speculate how many head of cattle the land could support.<sup>155</sup> McDougall actively spread this message about the North-West through his autobiographical works as well as through public speeches and newspaper articles.<sup>156</sup>

McDougall contrasted civilizational progress, marked by settler improvement of the land, with the perceived stagnation of Indigenous societies and the perceived lack of improvement of their land. According to McDougall, Indigenous peoples were present-minded, not progressive, and the evidence was that “[h]e built no cities, he cleared no farms, he tilled no plains, he hewed out no great highways, he made no hay, he fed not stock, he branded no cattle, nay the cattle upon a thousand hills were his and God’s.”<sup>157</sup> For McDougall Indigenous religion was a “dead faith” in comparison with the progressive “living faith” of Christianity.<sup>158</sup> Predictably, the “idle” land of the Prairies and its lack of exploitation provided not only a moral justification for settlement, but made it a Christian duty.

McDougall’s thinking on land was not a simple justification for a land-grab, however. His thought was nuanced, and deserves careful consideration. For McDougall, the lack of cultivation by Indigenous peoples did not support the popular settler view of the “lazy Indian”; he argued that anyone with the slightest experience of Indigenous life in the North-West would recognize the industriousness of these peoples.<sup>159</sup> Furthermore,

---

<sup>155</sup> John McDougall, *George Millward McDougall, the Pioneer, Patriot, and Missionary* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1888).

<sup>156</sup> *The Globe*, February 11<sup>th</sup>, 1904, p. 14. ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Globe and Mail (1844-2011); “The Methodists School: Many interesting subjects discussed yesterday,” *The Globe*, July 7<sup>th</sup>, 1903. ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Globe and Mail (1844-2011); “The Great Northwest,” *The Globe*, April 28<sup>th</sup>, 1902, p. 5. ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Globe and Mail (1844-2011).

<sup>157</sup> McDougall, *Reflections*, 6.

<sup>158</sup> John McDougall, *Pathfinding on Plain and Prairie* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1898), 71.

<sup>159</sup> McDougall, *Pathfinding*, 13.

the lack of cultivation was not the result of some racial flaw since missionaries and “Indians” were “made of the same clay.”<sup>160</sup> Given this relatively positive assessment of Indigenous peoples, McDougall condemned forms of greed-driven exploitation of Indigenous peoples that might prevent their participation in the great exploitative future that awaited all the people of the North-West.<sup>161</sup>

While McDougall did not locate the origin of unproductive use of land in racial inferiority, this does not mean that he did not focus on its source and seek to eliminate it. The source was a land-based subjectivity. McDougall characterized the landscape of the North-West as “a tremendous cathedral”<sup>162</sup> with the potential to either improve or degrade one’s “character.”<sup>163</sup> A “communist” relation to the land was seen as a major factor in retarded progress. McDougall explained:

[D]oubtless environment has a great deal to do with the formation of character and being... The great herds of buffalo as abused by man were hurtful to himself, and therefore in the fullness of time the Great Father, in the interests of His children, wiped them from the face of the earth. Tribal communism has always been hurtful to individuality, and without this no race of men can progress.<sup>164</sup>

According to McDougall, the vast potential of the tremendous cathedral of the North-West should have had a positive effect on Plains nations, but because of their “dead” faith and their dependence on bison, communism took hold and prevented progress. The continued reliance on bison and “tribal communism” meant that Plains peoples would not

---

<sup>160</sup> McDougall, *Reflections*, 14.

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>162</sup> McDougall, *Pathfinding*, 28.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*

take up homesteads as the “owners of the best wheat fields in the world.”<sup>165</sup> The key to progress was individual, private ownership of agricultural land, hence McDougall’s characterization of the Côté First Nation as a “progressive” band because of their embrace of agriculture and their work toward the subdivision of the reserve into 160 acre parcels of land.<sup>166</sup> This ideology was, of course, not unique to McDougall. As noted in the previous chapter, the Indian Affairs policy of severalty was meant to destroy “tribal” and “communist” identity and create a settled state where Plains First Nations would be tied to individual pieces of land leading to an attachment to settler law and order.<sup>167</sup> As with the Doukhobors, a perceived lack of individual attachment to land prevented the development of subjects governable by the Canadian state.

Where McDougall’s thought is especially relevant to the construction of settler-subjects is his recognition that the land-based projects of improving peoples applied to both Indigenous peoples and problematic settlers alike. McDougall, in a speech to a Methodist audience, said, “You ask me about the future of the Indian? Why not ask me about the future of all Canadians, about the future of this glorious Dominion? I say to you, the one is part of the other...”<sup>168</sup> The imposition of law and order, and its relation to land use, would also address the problem of the barbarous European exploiter, the “bad whites” who engaged in killing, stealing, and debauchery.<sup>169</sup> Before being engaged by the government to address the Doukhobor land crisis, McDougall argued that the character-

---

<sup>165</sup> John McDougall, *Saddle, Sled and Snowshoe* (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1896), 141.

<sup>166</sup> “CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING AN EXAMINATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA RESERVES, IN AND OUT OF THE RAILWAY BELT, BY REVEREND JOHN MACDOUGALL. (MAPS)”, The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development fonds, 4

<sup>167</sup> Sarah Carter, *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1990), 146-7.

<sup>168</sup> McDougall, *Reflections*, 15.

<sup>169</sup> McDougall, *Western Trails*, 145.

shaping power of land of the North-West could be seen in the transformation of the Doukhobors from a slave-like people to a free people.<sup>170</sup>

Similar to Frank Oliver's public distaste for Indian Reserves and land speculation, McDougall also drew on the distinction between "the speculator and ... the bonafide settler."<sup>171</sup> The bonafide settler was also the "early settler" in contrast to "The New Comer" who, like the bad whites, was driven by greed and land speculation.<sup>172</sup>

McDougall argued in a 1910 report on reserve land in British Columbia that the time had come to "open up ... British Columbia to developing processes of the movements of settlement and capital."<sup>173</sup> This opening should, he reasoned, be done for the benefit of bonafide settlers as well as Indigenous peoples. His solution was the creation of one law for all, which he articulates by taking on the voice of "progressive" Indigenous people:

They say: 'Come let us settle the title to these lands. Then give us title to land in fee simple family by family. Take away your Indian Act, take away your Indian Agent, take away your Indian reserve system, put us in to your citizenship and we will either rise or fall even as other men do'.<sup>174</sup>

Reminiscent of Oliver's de-Indigenizing of reserve residents near Edmonton, McDougall's vision constructs "progressive" Indigenous people as homesteading settlers, while constructing "early settlers" as Indigenous in contrast to newer problematic settlers.

---

<sup>170</sup> "The Methodist School," *The Globe*, July 7<sup>th</sup>, 1903, 12.

<sup>171</sup> "REPORT BY REVEREND JOHN MACDOUGALL INDICATING WHICH BRITISH COLUMBIA RESERVES COULD BE SURRENDERED BY THE INDIANS FOR SETTLEMENT AND WHICH SHOULD BE RETURNED. (SEVERAL MAPS)" Mikan no. 2059344, General Report, NAC, RG 10, vol. 4020, 1909-1910, file 280470-3 (reel C-10173), The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development fonds, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Canada, 7

<sup>172</sup> "CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING AN EXAMINATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA RESERVES, IN AND OUT OF THE RAILWAY BELT, BY REVEREND JOHN MACDOUGALL. (MAPS)," The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development fonds, 4.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

If it had not been for their communal landholding, McDougall might have characterized the Community Doukhobors as ideal settler-subjects. When McDougall was hired by Oliver as Doukhobor Commissioner in the summer of 1906, he came to the conclusion that while some Doukhobors (the Independents) had accepted citizenship and individual cultivation, the majority rejected citizenship and cultivated the land in common, leaving much land “without cultivation or improvement.”<sup>175</sup> The Doukhobor land commission was directed by McDougall, but also included homestead inspectors and Dr. Cash, MP for Mackenzie. According to the General Report of the Doukhobor Commission, it was created with the “purpose of securing data affecting these Doukhobour peoples in their relation to ... [the Department of the Interior] and to the country in general...”<sup>176</sup>

The data from the commission—which included general census (including the number of community and Independent Doukhobors in each area), cultivation acreage, number of livestock, and “experiences with and attitude towards this country”<sup>177</sup>—served to formally articulate and reinforce ideas about proper land use and the ideal settler already held by Oliver. For McDougall the Independent Doukhobors were perhaps evidence of the land’s ability to improve character, but the land was not able to improve all Doukhobors because Verigin, as a political and spiritual leader, was taking total control “for the purpose of securing an abject communism under and subject to an

---

<sup>175</sup> Copy of a notice to printed in English and Russian and signed by Rev. John McDougall as Commissioner, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>176</sup> General Report of the Doukhobor Commission sent from McDougall to the Minister of the Interior, 15 November 1906, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor. 1.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

absolute one man power...”<sup>178</sup> McDougall and the commissioners reasoned that under this system of communism “[i]ndividuality is forever at a big discount. The results strongly in evidence are extreme passivity and general lethargy.”<sup>179</sup> Indeed, one homestead inspector on the commission found evidence of Verigin’s negative impact inscribed in the aesthetics of Doukhobor gardens; before his arrival they were “neat and tidy” and afterward they were quite unsymmetrical.<sup>180</sup> For McDougall the cultivation statistics gave empirical evidence that the “general progress of these people has been slow.”<sup>181</sup> By comparing Independent and Community cultivation statistics the commissioners were able to argue that even under constant theft and coercion by Verigin, the Independents were much more productive agriculturalists.<sup>182</sup> Thus, the government should expedite the naturalization of the Independents and help them with their applications for land patent,<sup>183</sup> a suggestion not dissimilar to the recommendations of opposition MPs in the House.

The Community Doukhobors, on the other hand, were a more difficult problem for the government. The McDougall report was perhaps the first government use of the “Doukhobor problem” terminology; the report was meant to find solutions to “this problem re the Doukhobor peoples and their occupancy of lands in Canada.”<sup>184</sup> The problem was not only one of non-productive use of land; land use was necessarily tied to

---

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>180</sup> Letter from McCallum enclosed in Letter from Cash to Oliver, 19 December 1906, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>181</sup> General Report of the Doukhobor Commission sent from McDougall to the Minister of the Interior, 15 November 1906, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor. 8.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid., 14.

<sup>184</sup> Ibid., 13.

Doukhobor subjectivity. Similar to McDougall's conceptualization of the problem of Plains First Nations, the Doukhobor individual, "having no special interest in the land or its product becomes extremely unstable and is constantly moving about."<sup>185</sup> The "fanatical" pilgrimage of 1,700 radical Doukhobors in October 1902 was blamed on the lack of attachment to land and religious isolation.<sup>186</sup> The communal relation to the land was seen as responsible for the creation of a character or subjectivity that was antithetical to both law and order and to material progress. The solution was to "[c]oncede to their desire and relieve them at present from the necessity of citizenship by cancelling all their entries to homesteads." The idea that this policy of strictly applying one homestead law to all people, and reneging on Sifton's concessions, was a concession to Doukhobor desires is unbelievable when placed in the political context of this report. The cancellation of homestead entries was meant to destroy the territorial basis of the religio-political community and coerce communal Doukhobors into fee simple ownership. The idea that Doukhobor character, as it relates to land, had to be shaped by government action can be seen in the recommendation that upon cancellation of the homestead entries a reserve of Crown land should be set aside for "their agricultural development and livelihood..."<sup>187</sup>

Dr. E.L. Cash, also a member of the Doukhobor commission, made clear to Frank Oliver that the problem was not only communal landholding, but the consequence of this landholding: the creation of non-subjectable Doukhobors. He wrote to the Minister that "their manner of life and religious ideas are inimical to our form of Government; they

---

<sup>185</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid., 13.

will not in the least subject themselves to the laws and regulations of the Dominion.”<sup>188</sup>

The commissioners saw the dominant version of Canadian sovereignty—based on the intertwined dominion over land and peoples—as imperilled by the communal Doukhobor experiment.

McDougall was well aware of the growing land rush and demands by “good settlers”<sup>189</sup> for the Doukhobor land, which he saw as “a most serious block impediment to the natural and righteous growth of the country.”<sup>190</sup> For all of the concern over exerting control over Doukhobor governance and shaping their character—making them settler-subjects if not fully assimilated settler-citizens—there remained the practical political and economic problem of political opposition, railway, and settler calls to open up to settlement the land around the Doukhobor and Cote reserves. It is clear that this was the motivation for Oliver to hire McDougall to look into both the Doukhobor land question and First Nations’ reserve surrenders. In a letter to Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs Frank Pedley regarding the 1905 Cote reserve surrender Oliver stated matter-of-factly that the “Canadian Northern Railway station is on the reserve. The railway people want the Southern portion of the reserve open for sale.”<sup>191</sup> It is worth quoting at length Oliver’s candid account of the cancellation of Doukhobor homesteads in the House of Commons:

My hon. Friend will understand that when the Doukhobors were located on these lands, the lands were distant from railway communication and were not considered valuable to any degree. They were good enough for

---

<sup>188</sup> Letter from Cash to Oliver, 19 December 1906, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid. E.L. Cash wrote that the locals saw the illegal squatters on Doukhobor lands as “good settlers.”

<sup>190</sup> Letter from McDougall to Oliver, 12 December 1906, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor..

<sup>191</sup> “CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING AN EXAMINATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA RESERVES, IN AND OUT OF THE RAILWAY BELT, BY REVEREND JOHN MACDOUGALL. (MAPS),” The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development fonds.

the Doukhobors, but not good enough for anybody else. But when the railroad was run through these tracts, the condition was absolutely changed. Besides there had been seven years' residence of the Doukhobors, during which time the fertility of the soil and the suitability of the climate had been demonstrated. So when the road was constructed these lands acquired a very great value—not only an actual, but a speculative value. We had not only the difficulty of dealing with the Doukhobors, who thought they owned the land or ought to own it, but we had also the difficulty of dealing with the people who saw in that a very considerable cash value...<sup>192</sup>

McDougall characterized the land rush problem as caused by two distinct groups both breaking Canadian property law: the Doukhobors were not complying with homestead regulations while other “would be settlers” were illegally squatting on Doukhor land.<sup>193</sup> The answer to who was a real settler was once again provided through cultivation and improvement statistics produced by McDougall for the Minister.<sup>194</sup> The empirical data helped to reinforce the popular settler attitude against the Doukhobors and in favour of real settlers. McDougall explained to Oliver, “To summarily eject the trespasser in this case might be legal but would it be wise in as much as he has the strong sentiment of the people of the Northwest at his back.”<sup>195</sup>

In an act of sovereign decisionism, the government sided with the non-Doukhor settlers and instituted an official policy in line with McDougall's recommendations. All Community Doukhor homestead entries were to be cancelled, requiring that any Doukhor wishing to remain on the land would have to abide by regular cultivation, habitation, and naturalization requirements of the Dominion Land Act. A much smaller reserve, under Crown ownership, would be created to prevent the Doukhobors from

---

<sup>192</sup> *The Edmonton Bulletin*, 18 June 1908, 5.

<sup>193</sup> Letter from McDougall to Oliver, 12 December 1906, Doukhor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>194</sup> Letter from McDougall to Oliver, 23 November 1906, Doukhor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>195</sup> Letter from McDougall to Oliver, 12 December 1906, Doukhor Collection of James Mavor.

becoming destitute. On the first of June, 1907, more than half of the land entered for homestead by the Community Doukhobors—258,880 acres—was opened to public purchase.<sup>196</sup>



# DOUKHOBOR Reserve Lands

The available Lands in the Territory comprised in the former Doukhobor Reserves will be opened to Homestead Entry commencing on the **FIRST DAY OF JUNE, 1907**, as follows:

AT THE DOMINION LANDS OFFICE, YORKTON, SASK.			
TOWNSHIP	RANGE	ON JUNE	ON JUNE
27	31, W. 1	1	15
28	31	3	17
29	31	4	18
27	32	5	19
28	32	5	20
29	32	6	21
30	32	6	22
31	32	7	24
28	33	7	25
29	33	7	27
29	1, W. 2	8	29
30	1	10	ON JULY 2
31	1	11	3
32	1	12	4
29	2	13	5
30	2	14	6

AT THE DOMINION LANDS OFFICE, PRINCE ALBERT, SASK.			
TOWNSHIP	RANGE	ON JUNE	ON JUNE
39	7 W. 3,	1	8
39	8	3	10
39	9	4	11
39	10	5	12
40	8	5	12
42	7	6	12
43	6	7	13

AT THE DOMINION LANDS OFFICE, REGINA, SASK.			
TOWNSHIP	RANGE	ON JUNE	ON JUNE
38	9 W. 3,	1	1
38	10 W. 3,	1	1

Entry will be granted for each quarter section to the first eligible applicant applying therefor at the counter. Applications for cancellation which may have been filed against any of these lands will not be considered in any way or have any standing.

All entries must be made at the Land Agency for the District in which the land is situated, namely, at Yorkton, Prince Albert and Regina. Entries will not be taken at any of the Sub-Agencies.

No scrip will be accepted under any conditions.

Attention is particularly drawn to the fact that positively no entries will be granted in any Township before the date (advertised above) for the opening of that Township to entry.

Quarter sections affected by squatters' claims will be reserved from general entry for ten days from the date of the opening of the Township in which the land is situate, in order to give such squatters opportunity to appear at the proper Land Office and file satisfactory sworn evidence—verified by affidavits of disinterested witnesses—as to their improvement and occupation of the land. Only those claimants who are noted in the records of the Department as having residence and improvements on or before the 1st day of December, 1906, will receive consideration.

**P. G. KEYES,**  
Secretary.

Department of the Interior, Ottawa, 13th May, 1907.

**Figure 2** Poster advertising the opening of Doukhobor land to non-Doukhobor homesteaders. (Library and Archives Canada, reference e000009389)

<sup>196</sup> Woodcock and Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*, 222.



**Figure 3** 1907 Land rush for former Doukhobor reserve land. Yorkton, SK. (Library and Archives Canada, <http://data2.archives.ca/ap/a/a022236.jpg>)

The cancellation of Doukhobor homesteads was strongly criticized by James Mavor, who pointed to 1905 government reports that demonstrated sufficient cultivation.<sup>197</sup> In an aptly titled report—*The Doukhobors in Canada: A Ticklish Problem of Colonisation*—he provided his own interpretation of land cultivation statistics that undercut the government assertion that the Independents were far superior to the Community Doukhobors.<sup>198</sup> This debate about cultivation statistics, when taken out of the context of the colonial ideologies of land behind it, obscures the fact that the Doukhobor problem was part of a much larger debate about competing visions of colonialism. McDougall himself contradicted the under-cultivation claim.<sup>199</sup> The cultivation statistics

---

<sup>197</sup> Ibid.

<sup>198</sup> James Mavor, *The Doukhobors in Canada: A Ticklish Problem of Colonisation*, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>199</sup> Szalasznyj, “The Doukhobor Homestead Crisis,” 192.

were only one part of a larger colonial discourse around land and the ideal settler—the statistics were particularly powerful, however, because they gave a sense of empirical objectivity to the construction of productive/unproductive relations with the land. In creating statistical knowledge about land use, both Mavor and McDougall were publically framing the proper conceptualization of one's relation to land as a relation of exploitative productivity. Unlike Mavor, demonstrated exploitation of the land was not enough to make one an ideal settler in McDougall's eyes. The conception of political subjectivity tied to tribal communism that McDougall developed relationally between Indigenous and Doukhobor experiences, meant that the Doukhobor commune had to be dismantled.

At the time of the cancellations, the government was warned of the potential dangers of the course of action. E.L. Cash, while advising Oliver that there was really no better option, warned that upon cancellation some Doukhobors would quickly naturalize and follow homestead rules, while others would become even more entrenched in Verigin's communism.<sup>200</sup> Likewise, Mavor pleaded with the government not to cancel the homesteads as cancellation would only bring about terrible political repercussions.<sup>201</sup> Both of these warnings proved prescient, as the problematization of the Doukhobors and the chosen solution would only inflame a sense of martyrdom and the creation of a new communal experiment in British Columbia. With this in mind, one should not characterize the government's action as a total failure in meeting the goal of reshaping Doukhobor relations with land; the Doukhobors had not been assimilated, but the

---

<sup>200</sup> Letter from Cash to Oliver, 19 December 1906, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

<sup>201</sup> Letter from Mavor to Laurier, Cartwright, Fisher, Aylesworth and Fielding, 14 April 1907, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

cancellation of homesteads had undermined the economic and territorial integrity of the community. The communal project in BC relied on the dominant legal property regime, and arguably the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood (CCUB) would not have gone bankrupt in 1938 had the Community Doukhobors maintained the Saskatchewan homestead land. The government action between 1905 and 1907 was one step in the subjection and subjectification of Doukhobor settlers, but the project remained open-ended. Doukhobor land commissioner Michael White explained that the Doukhobors would require “constant watching until schools and contact with other settlers will transform them and make them think in the same way as an ordinary man does.”<sup>202</sup> And so it was the case that education became a central element of the “Doukhobor problem” that had developed around land on the Prairies.

### **Conclusion**

This chapter has argued that variants of colonial ideology regarding land developed in a specific settler colonial context in Canada. As such, it is impossible to disentangle the outside demographic and economic pressures for the opening of the Doukhobor homestead land from the ideas about land held by key political actors. The tracing of debates about the ideal settler and how land can shape settlers toward this ideal shows constrained agency on the part of all the political actors under study. In the same political context various colonial actors came up with different problematizations and solutions regarding how to make settler-subjects and how to envision settlement. As the Siftonian immigration project led to increasing demand for land, the context shifted allowing Oliver and McDougall’s variant of colonial ideology to gain uptake; however,

---

<sup>202</sup> Quoted in Szalasznyj, “The Doukhobor Homestead Crisis,” 236.

this should not be read as a materially deterministic account. Mavor continued to pressure the government, including Prime Minister Laurier, to be lenient with the Doukhobor community even as plans were underway to cancel homestead entries.<sup>203</sup> The preceding analysis of Mavor/Sifton and McDougall/Oliver provides ample evidence that these figures held distinct views on land that predisposed them to approach the Doukhobors in different ways even as all of the approaches were rooted in a settler-colonial context. All four saw the power of land to shape settler-subjectivity, with McDougall and Oliver emphasizing the need for a more interventionist approach to producing subjects for the new nation.

The role of ideas about land during the Doukhobor land crisis has significance beyond its role as a causal factor for government action. Tracing the genesis of the “Doukhobor problem” through these four key figures gives a much richer meaning to government action. The genesis of the problematization of the Doukhobors is in the project of settler colonialism. The problem amounted to a land-based project of dismantling the Doukhobor political community and their relationship with the land by imposing sovereign dominion over the North-West and a subjectivity compatible with this project. Even Mavor, as sympathetic to the Doukhobors as he was, recognized that the territorially based *imperium in imperio*—his description of the community—could be problematic for colonial development. The main difference between this material colonial vision and the culturalist view held by McDougall and Oliver was that Mavor and Sifton had faith that the gradual progress of economic development would take care of assimilation without resorting to the heavy hand of government intervention. For

---

<sup>203</sup> Letter from Mavor to Laurier, Cartwright, Fisher, Aylesworth and Fielding, 14 April 1907, Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor.

McDougall and Oliver, the central importance placed on culture as a defining feature of difference between peoples and their ability to be governed meant that stronger state intervention was needed to make settler-subjects. The early recognition of this aspect of the “Doukhobor problem” is important, although it tends to become obscured by the details of later episodes of conflict with the provinces and Ottawa. As can be seen in the Hawthorn reports of the 1950s, the challenging questions around land and sovereignty—the foundations of the “problem”—are contained and re-problematized as questions of economic integration and cultural adaptation.

The colonial ideas about land presented in this chapter are not, however, only significant in their role in causing a shift in government policy toward the Doukhobors. These ideas also demonstrate the contested and political nature of both colonial views of land. Neither side in the debate about who was a good settler was drawing on objective facts about land productivity. Rather, each was putting forward a vision of settler colonialism that drew on different aspects of land as a shaper of subjectivity. A conclusion to be drawn from this is that Mavor and Sifton were equally part of the project of making Doukhobors into settler-subjects. The ordering of the world through population and production statistics worked to construct the Doukhobor relation to land as a question of exploitation. Oliver and McDougall’s language regarding the stagnation inherent in communism and the requirement of private property for the civilizational development of different peoples is a much more obvious version of a state-based project to shape settler-subjectivity. However, this does not mean that seemingly more objective government-commissioned knowledge about the resource potential of the North-West and the Doukhobor role in the exploitation of these resources did not also impact

Doukhobor relations with the land. Indeed, upon arriving in Canada and achieving early success in the communal experiment, Verigin seems to have been swayed by this vision of land, constructed through production statistics. During his correspondence with Tolstoy, Verigin wrote of the material success of the community measured in terms of acres cultivated and farming machinery purchased,<sup>204</sup> only to be chastised by Tolstoy for forgetting that “religious feeling is the basic capital underlying even material well-being.”<sup>205</sup> The production of land use statistics not only created knowledge, but also shaped settlers’ relationships with the land, regardless of whether the specialized knowledge was marshalled to support a materialist or culturalist variant of colonial land ideology.

The fact that the materialist colonial view lost the political battle against the culturalist view in the debate about the ideal settler is further evidence of the contingent, political nature of these ideas. When, in the 1950s, the discourse of economic development and integration gained ascendancy over the discourse of racial assimilation—in debates about both the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples—this was not simply a shedding of past prejudice, but rather the continuation of a colonial ideology with strong affinity to the earlier materialist colonial vision. Before the rise of the integrationist iteration of the “Doukhobor problem,” the project of subject making initiated by Oliver and McDougall through land policy would be attempted through public education.

---

<sup>204</sup> “P.V. Verigin to L.N. Tolstoy, 1 December 1903,” in *Leo Tolstoy-Peter Verigin Correspondence*, Andrew Donskov, ed., trans. John Woodsworth (New York: Legas, 1995).

<sup>205</sup> “L.N. Tolstoy to P.V. Verigin, 2 January 1904,” in *Leo Tolstoy-Peter Verigin Correspondence*.

### Chapter 3: Education: From Racial Assimilation to Welfare Apprehension

The paramount factor in racial fusion is undoubtedly the education of the children of these non-English races...”<sup>1</sup>

“It requires very little observation and thought to come to the conclusion that the only real and permanent solution of the ‘Doukhobor problem’ lies in education and assimilation...”<sup>2</sup>

This chapter examines the use of public education to make Doukhobors into governable subjects. The assimilatory project did not impact all Doukhobors equally. The Independents, having broken away from Verigin’s leadership, readily accepted mandatory public education and became subject to Canada’s governance, all the while maintaining a distinct religious and cultural identity. The Community Doukhobors, who relocated to British Columbia after the loss of homestead land, experienced conflicts with the government of BC over mandatory public education that imposed foreign norms on Doukhobor students—of special concern was the view that the schools imposed a worldview that valorized militarism and nationalism. Under the leadership of Peter Petrovich Verigin (Peter V. Verigin’s successor) the Community Doukhobors officially accepted public education in 1925. Alongside the rapprochement of the Community Doukhobors and the Canadian state, the Sons of Freedom grew increasingly hostile to the state and to Doukhobors who were integrating into Canadian society. This conflict

---

<sup>1</sup> J.T.M. Anderson, *The Education of the New-Canadian* (Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1918), 89.

<sup>2</sup> British Columbia, *British Columbia Royal Commission on Doukhobor Affairs 1948: Interim Report* ([Victoria, BC]: [Province of British Columbia], 1948), 7.

culminated in the government of BC undertaking a project of forced education and confinement of Sons of Freedom children from 1953 to 1959 at New Denver.

The previous chapters demonstrated relational overlap in ideologies and policies related to land that were institutionalized in the federal government. With the move toward subject formation through education, a provincial responsibility, the connection to the settler colonial project remains an important factor in understanding the motivation of state actors. One of the central figures in this chapter, school inspector turned Premier of Saskatchewan J. T. M. Anderson, aptly demonstrates that the problem driving public education in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century was the problem of settlement. Education, in his view, was a central part of Canadian nation building tied to British imperialism. The tension between the material project of productively settling the West with immigrants and the assimilatory project of creating a homogeneous Canadian nation provided the impetus for the development of Anderson's assimilatory vision of education. The political debate between two variants of colonialism (materialist and culturalist) analyzed in the previous two chapters, continues with the figure of Anderson. His interest in pedagogy was specifically an interest in how to address the problem of non-British immigrants who had been allowed to settle in Canada under Sifton's immigration policy. From this starting point, Anderson developed a comprehensive colonial ideology of educational "racial assimilation" for the non-British settler. This ideology relied on the ideas of "racial assimilation" and civilizational improvement that were also central to the justification of Canada's Indian Residential School program. Anderson identified a subjectivity (in his words "character") in certain immigrant groups toward forms of government that were incompatible with Canadian sovereignty and the colonial project. The making of settler-

subjects and the attempted elimination of Indigenous peoples through education both relied on similar tactics such as segregation from the cultural influence of parents and the imposition of the English language as a way of undoing distinct political subjectivities.

The analysis covers a long time frame from the Doukhobor arrival in Canada until approximately 1960, and in doing so demonstrates a significant shift in thinking about assimilatory education. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the use of “race” and “character” is prominent in characterizing the question of assimilation through education. By mid-century, however, most political actors framed the problem of educating the Sons of Freedom children as a question of child welfare and children’s right to education. This transition marks a shift in colonial ideology away from overt coercive assimilation to a policy of integration of moderate Doukhobors and containment of those elements of the Sons of Freedom deemed unassimilable. This ideological shift is also present in Indian Affairs’ conceptualization of education; however, it did not put an end to the Indian Residential School program.

The simultaneous ideological shift in settler and Indigenous educational programs provides further evidence of relational overlap. If the overlap of settlement and dispossession had been confined to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, one might conclude that this was an historical accident owing to the institutional overlap at the Department of the Interior. The ideological overlap between provincial officials working on Doukhobor education and federal officials working on Indigenous education is reflective of a broader circulation of colonial ideology that does not necessarily require institutional overlap for dissemination. Beginning in the late 1940s both educational projects begin to take up an integrationist ideology, and in 1950 Indian Affairs was placed within the Department of

Citizenship and Immigration to more fully exploit the overlap of these projects. As with the land-based projects of colonialism, the ideological debates and shifts could be seen in civil society as well. This second era of institutionalized and societal overlap suggests that there was a perennial pre-occupation with settler and Indigenous subject making as intimately related projects.

The shift away from racial ideology, detailed in this chapter, also plays a prominent role in the final two chapters of this dissertation. Integrationism emerges in the colonial context of failed ideologies, policies, and techniques of racial assimilation. This chapter provides some of the context of the “Doukhorbor problem” and “Indian problem” that Harry Hawthorn inherits when he is commissioned to produce his two reports in the 1950s. This chapter continues the theme that the ideologies and the practices of settler colonialism are always contested and never singular, but they are always contested within the confines of the colonial context of the time. This chapter traces a change in the available ideological language after WWII, but it also demonstrates that in this new context there were competing ideas about how best to approach the making of Sons of Freedom Doukhorbor children into governable subjects.

Continuity and disjuncture in the colonial project can be seen in the mid-century debates about Doukhorbor education. Even when politicians and commentators framed this educational problem as an issue of child welfare, criminality, and non-compliance with regulations, it is analytically short sighted to see this as a clean break from previous projects of settler-subject making. The terminology of the “settler” is fully replaced with the “citizen,” but the educational project remains one of making subjects compatible with the new political order. The half-century of previous conflict over education and land

demonstrate the origin of the “Doukhobor problem” in non-compatibility of the Doukhobor community with Canadian sovereignty and the colonial project. This origin conditioned both the Sons of Freedom sense of martyrdom and their perception of public education as an existential threat, as well as the choice of politicians to use educational segregation as a solution to the “Doukhobor problem.”

This chapter begins with an analysis of the colonial ideology of racial assimilation through education. Specifically, it examines the Indian Residential School program and how this racial ideology was tied to undoing and remaking Indigenous subjectivities. The chapter then briefly analyses how Doukhobor conceptualization of education differed from Canadian public education in important respects. This is followed by J.T.M. Anderson’s writings on educational assimilation, in which he problematizes the Doukhobors and their education, as an example of the racial assimilationist ideology applied to settlers. The chapter then moves from the Prairies to British Columbia and traces the state tactics of Doukhobor subject making. While the focus remains on education, the analysis also examines how the government used several tactics to make the Sons of Freedom subject to Canadian law: legislation was crafted that targeted community assets, Canadian Doukhobors were disenfranchised and foreign Doukhobors barred from entry to Canada, a special island penal colony was built to reform the character of imprisoned Sons of Freedom, and J.T.M. Anderson worked with Prime Minister R.B. Bennett to attempt the deportation of Peter Petrovich Verigin. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the events surrounding the apprehension of Sons of Freedom children and their placement at the New Denver dormitory school. This period can be characterized as a political cacophony of competing visions for dealing with the

problematic Doukhobors. The material reality of the messiness of politics during a time of ideological transition meant that various actors were taking up old colonial tropes as well as new integrationist thought during this era of transition.

### **Settler Colonialism and the Indian Residential School Program**

The executive summary of Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) begins by saying:

Canada's residential school system for Aboriginal children was an education system in name only for much of its existence. These residential schools were created for the purpose of separating Aboriginal children from their families, in order to minimize and weaken family ties and cultural linkages, and to indoctrinate children into a new culture—the culture of the legally dominant Euro-Christian Canadian society, led by Canada's first prime minister, Sir John A. Macdonald.<sup>3</sup>

The church-run, state-funded schooling system existed for over 100 years, a time during which the Canadian state attempted cultural genocide: “the destruction of those structures and practices that allow the group to continue as a group.”<sup>4</sup> The TRC has developed an expansive historical account of the Indian Residential School program that places it in the context of a broader colonial project aimed at eliminating Indigenous peoples in order to access land and resources and to build a settler community. The Commission finds that there are still many aspects of Canadian law and society that maintain this colonial relationship.<sup>5</sup>

The ideology that justified the mobilization of state resources for this “educational” program, like ideologies that justified the use of land policy to shape

---

<sup>3</sup> Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, (Ottawa: Library and Archives Canada, 2015), v.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 1, 45, 187, 189.

subjectivity, was based on the concepts of racial inferiority and civilizational improvement. Shirley Flowers, a witness at the TRC, succinctly explains: “The whole part of the residential school was a bigger scheme of colonization. There was intent; the schools were there with the intent to change people, and to make them like others and to make them not fit.”<sup>6</sup> The TRC explains that the ideology of civilizational improvement was based on a progressive view of history in which less developed peoples could be gradually improved; in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century this idea was combined with “scientific” biological racism that created the idea of in-born obstacles to this improvement, requiring greater state intervention.<sup>7</sup> This racial ideology was also tied to nationality and to the global imperial goal of British improvement of less developed peoples. In 1883, the same year in which Canada began the state-led Indian Residential School program, Lord Rosebery explained that

[i]t is on the British race, whether in Great Britain, or the United States, or the Colonies, or wherever it may be, that rest the highest hopes of those who try to penetrate the dark future, or who seek to raise and better the patient masses of mankind.<sup>8</sup>

A brief examination of the ideology of civilizational development through residential schools shows a repeated use of racial language alongside the hope of assimilation. Various sources characterize the goal of the project as “the extinction of the Indians as *Indians*,”<sup>9</sup> the “euthanasia of savage communities,”<sup>10</sup> or the infamous goal put

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 43.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>9</sup> Allan G. Harper, US Bureau of Indian Affairs official reporting on the Canadian system quoted in J.R. Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 184.

<sup>10</sup> Herman Merrivale, quoted in Miller, *Shingwauk*, 74.

forward by Duncan Campbell Scott to “continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic and there is no Indian question.”<sup>11</sup> Complementary to this project of cultural destruction was the “positive” re-socialization toward the Anglo-Saxon ideal based on notions of cleanliness, lawfulness, industriousness, patriotism, and identification with British institutions.<sup>12</sup> The ideology of civilizational improvement simultaneously debased all things “Indian” while extolling whiteness, not simply as morphological, but as a civilizational and cultural ideal that was often explicitly Anglo-centric.

According to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, language played an important role in the radical reshaping of Indigenous subjectivity. Indigenous language was to be eradicated through English education, as it was not only the medium through which culture was transmitted, but was also a lived practice of a different way of being in the world.<sup>13</sup> In contrast to noun-centred European languages that compartmentalize and “reify” the world, Indigenous languages are verb-centred and are foundational to a fluid, relational worldview.<sup>14</sup> Sakej Youngblood-Henderson explains the centrality of language to subjectivity:

Everywhere we are born into language, everywhere it binds our consciousness. Its mystery and development reflect our particular habits, those of our linguistic heritage. Our language [or languages] contain the essential ways in which we experience and interact with our culture. Thus, our linguistic understanding [the world view in English] is our map that a

---

<sup>11</sup> Duncan Campbell Scott quoted in J. Leslie and R. Maguire, eds., *The Historical Development of the Indian Act*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Ottawa: Treaties and Historical Research Centre, Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1978), 115.

<sup>12</sup> Canada, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Volume 1: Looking Forward, Looking Back* (Ottawa: Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996), 430.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 431.

<sup>14</sup> Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Council with Walter Hildebrandt, Dorothy First Rider and Sarah Carter, *The True Spirit and Original intent of Treaty 7* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996), 200.

particular language creates in order to navigate the larger worldview. These understandings become, then, in some sense, most of the worldview.<sup>15</sup>

The destruction of Indigenous language and replacement with English was required to inculcate a subjectivity that was compatible with British-Canadian civilization and institutions.<sup>16</sup> The fluid, relational, and land-based Indigenous subjectivities would be disciplined out of the children through routine and rules that would create deference for hierarchical authority.<sup>17</sup> Not only the content of education, but the lived practice of it through the institution of the school, would shape subjectivity.

The colonial ideology of racial assimilation and civilizational improvement is the ground on which there is overlap with the provincial educational project of settler-subject making. This overlap is the reason why even the TRC, whose mandate excluded investigating provincial public education systems, makes the case that attention must be paid to the way provincial curriculum provided and continues to provide a distorted view of Canadian history that demeans Indigenous peoples and elevates Canadian settler history and makes citizens in this idealized image.<sup>18</sup> While the federal responsibility for “Indians” created a unique residential schooling program, provincial education often shared the assumptions of civilizational superiority and worked as another institutional technology in settler colonialism. Timothy Stanley argues that “[s]tate-controlled schooling was integral to the construction of supremacist hegemony in B.C. ... School textbooks were particularly important in transmitting a nexus of ideas about patriotism,

---

<sup>15</sup> Sakej Youngblood-Henderson as quoted in Treaty 7 Elders, *True Spirit*, 20.

<sup>16</sup> *Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples Volume 1*, 431.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 430.

<sup>18</sup> Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth*, 76, 239.

citizenship and ‘character’.”<sup>19</sup> As in the residential school project, the shaping of “character” as an “ethical subjectivity” turned public education into a settler nation-building project.<sup>20</sup> As Valverde explains, “the production of self [through] ... character-building was an inner subjective task. It involved learning to lead a morally and physically pure life, not only for the sake of individual health and salvation but for the sake of the nation.”<sup>21</sup> Much like the residential school program, provincial education constructed British imperialism and Canadian colonialism as a moral duty, but at the provincial level the education was directed at settlers—that is, until the post-WWII move toward integration of Indigenous students into the provincial system. The important connection between federal and provincial education is that in the context of settler colonialism, all state-education is used as a technique to shape the subjectivity of peoples.

The previous chapters have developed the idea that despite continuity in the settler colonial project, ideology is contested and politically contingent; while racial assimilation and improvement may appear as a unified, transnational British imperial ideology, the ideas are haphazardly and unevenly applied “on the ground.” That is why one can speak coherently of the Canadian Residential School Program as part of a systematic process of colonization despite the fact that those responsible for administering the program—including government officials and religious teachers—never reached consensus on the potential for racial improvement of “Indians.”<sup>22</sup> The

---

<sup>19</sup> Timothy J. Stanley, “White Supremacy and the Rhetoric of Educational Indoctrination: A Canadian Case Study,” in *Children, Teachers, and Schools in The History of British Columbia*, Jean Barman et al. eds. (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd., 1995): 39-56.

<sup>20</sup> Lisa Comeau, “Contemporary Productions of Colonial Identities through Liberal Discourses of Educational Reform,” *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies* 3, no. 2 (2005), 12.

<sup>21</sup> Valverde quoted in Lisa Comeau, “Contemporary Productions of Colonial Identities,” 12.

<sup>22</sup> Miller, *Shingwauk’s Vision*, 153-4.

conceptualization of settler colonialism as a process relying on sometimes-contradictory ideologies helps to understand ongoing patterns of colonialism even as theories of racial and cultural difference change. The post-WWII shift from “assimilation” to “integration” in “Indian” education policy, while catalyzed by a growing discourse of human rights and a distaste for *overtly* racist policy,<sup>23</sup> in no way changed the fundamentally colonial nature of the federal government’s education policy. Canada’s TRC agrees that, beginning with the 1949 *Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons Appointed to Examine and Consider the Indian Act*, the move toward integration in public schools and the emergence of a discourse of child “welfare” to justify residential schools should be seen as colonialism by a different name.<sup>24</sup> The failure of the Residential School Program to eliminate the “Indian problem,” as evidenced by the post-WWII rebound in Indigenous populations and the continued existence of distinct national communities, led to a critical reassessment of assimilatory techniques. “Integrated” education was one facet of this “gentler” approach to assimilation. The move toward integration of Indigenous students into provincial education ignored the demands of Indigenous peoples<sup>25</sup> and continued to aim at their elimination as distinct peoples. Even as the colonial ideologies of civilizational improvement fell out of fashion and were replaced with a discourse of citizenship integration, the project of subjectification continued.

Examining the history of Doukhobor education sheds light on how conflicts between government and Doukhobors regarding education were not free-floating, but

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 378.

<sup>24</sup> Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth*, 68.

<sup>25</sup> Helen Raptis and Samantha Bowker, “Maintaining the illusion of democracy: policy-making and aboriginal education in Canada, 1946-48,” *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy* 102 (2010), 18.

were part of a larger colonial project. The Doukhobors arrived *in medias res* to a political scene where policy and discourse around education had been shaped by colonial expansion and dispossession. The fact that the shift from racial discourse to child welfare and integration occurs simultaneously in Indian Affairs and provincial public education is strong evidence that these two systems were part of one political project.

### **Doukhobor Conceptualization of Education**

Just as with Doukhobor conceptualizations of land, ideas surrounding education varied amongst Doukhobor factions. Although the Independents did have concerns about their pacifism being undermined by militarism in the schools, the ready acceptance of public education by the Independents suggests little friction between their worldview and Canadian public schooling. The experiences of the Community Doukhobors and the Sons of Freedom, in contrast, demonstrate a deeper divide between their conceptualization of education and dominant Canadian visions of education. Doukhobors feared that the curriculum would reinforce nationalism, militarism, and materialism, but there was also a deeper disconnect between Doukhobor subjective ways of being in the world and the individualistic subjectivity taught by public education.

John Stoochnoff explains that misunderstandings between the government and Doukhobors are understandable because the Doukhobors arrived in Canada with an “entirely different concept of life.”<sup>26</sup> Doukhobor conceptualization of education was founded on this broader worldview in which the “divine spark” resides in each individual and, through the lived perfection of human relations, the kingdom of God could be realized on Earth. This worldview combines an individual relation to the divine with

---

<sup>26</sup> John Stoochnoff, *Toil and Peaceful Life: Doukhobors As They Are* (Vancouver: Liberty Press, 1961), 9.

collectivist mutual aid needed for the perfection of human relations. Accordingly, true wisdom was the result of a lived community experience where one sought knowledge of and implemented God's law on Earth.<sup>27</sup> Thus, "[t]hose who have discovered 'the truth,' the essence of 'God's law,' are in this life a living source of truth and justice."<sup>28</sup>

In practice this experiential, spiritual vision of education meant that Doukhobor children could learn through practical engagement in the community. An early sympathiser and advocate for education in the Doukhobor settlement, Aylmer Maude, positively assessed the results of this type of education:

With reference to their children, I think any one who has seen how obedient, considerate, and quick to be of use the Doukhobor children usually are, will be inclined to admit that most of us have much to learn from these people on the subject of education. Even regarding instruction (as apart from education proper), their knowledge of agriculture and of useful handicrafts, coupled with a serious attention to religion as a guide to daily life, are more likely to help them to live useful and happy lives than any knowledge of vulgar fractions or of the eccentricities of English orthography could do.<sup>29</sup>

Under this system Doukhobor parents taught their children the *Living Book*, a collection of orally transmitted psalms, and each adult in the community was expected to teach something of use to each child in the community.<sup>30</sup> This oral transmission made the Doukhobor dialect of Russian especially important to the formation of a collective identity. Education as modelled behaviour, according to Eli Popoff, was based on the fact that "members of the Community regard everything that exists with love and admiration,

---

<sup>27</sup> Vladimir Bonch-Bruevick ed., *The Book of Life of Doukhobors*, translated (1978), xix.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Aylmer Maude, *A peculiar people: the Doukhobors* (New York: AMS Press, 1970), 41.

<sup>30</sup> William Janzen, *Limits on liberty: the experience of Mennonite, Hutterite and Doukhobor communities in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 116-117.

and then they try to bring up their children in the same tendency.”<sup>31</sup> In 1912, responding to a Royal Commission investigating the non-attendance of Community Doukhobor children at school, those opposed to public education explained, “We adopt our children to learn at [the] wide school of Eternal Nature.”<sup>32</sup>

As is demonstrated in the following section, the Anglo-conformist vision of public education served ends that directly contradicted this Doukhobor conceptualization of education. Doukhobor education was meant to create a subjectivity that respected the authority of each individual, while breaking down nationalistic attachments that prevented universal community. Canadian education, however, was meant to foster competitive individualism as well as deference to hierarchical authority and to make subjects of British Empire and Canadian state sovereignty. The experiential aspect of education, and its role in reinforcing the communal identity, meant that public education, simply by removing children from active participation in community life, worked to undo this subjectivity. Similarly to state programs for Indigenous education, the English language was seen as essential in making Doukhobors think in English.

**“Let us pay more attention to the development of our human material!”:**

### **J.T.M. Anderson and Doukhobor education on the Prairies**

This section turns to the overlapping history of Doukhobor education, beginning with the Doukhobors’ educational experience in the early 20th century as context for the Sons of Freedom Doukhobor crisis in the 1950s. As discussed in the previous chapter, the lack of settler presence in the North-West that forced Sifton to seek settler population

---

<sup>31</sup> Eli Popoff, *An Historical Exposition on the Origin and Evolvement of the Basic Tenets of the Doukhobor Life-Conception* (Publisher unknown, 1964), 43.

<sup>32</sup> Government of British Columbia, *Report of the Royal Commission on matters relating to the sect of Doukhobors in the province of British Columbia, 1912* (Victoria, British Columbia: Legislative Assembly, 1913).

regardless of national origin, was quickly remedied with an influx of settlers. Doukhobor education on the Prairies coincides with this consolidation of settler economy and political institutions; this relative security of the colonial project helps to explain the shift toward greater emphasis on the importance of the “character” of the settler population rather than simply populating the West with bodies.

John Lyons’ study of Doukhobor schooling in Saskatchewan shows that Doukhobor acceptance of public schooling depended largely on which of the emerging three factions of Doukhobors one belonged to.<sup>33</sup> The Independents, who rejected communal living and were quickly integrating into settler society, were the first to embrace public education, with the majority of children attending by 1912.<sup>34</sup> The Community Doukhobors, who followed the spiritual leadership of Peter V. Verigin and lived communally, donated land in 1913 for the construction of a public school in Verigin, Saskatchewan, but remained fearful of forced attendance and wrote the deputy minister of education warning that compulsory education would cause trouble.<sup>35</sup> Lyons concludes that the institutional design of provincial education in Saskatchewan—that is, its decentralized control by local school boards—along with lax enforcement of the 1917 School Attendance Act led to a gradual building of trust and acceptance of schooling by Doukhobors in Saskatchewan.<sup>36</sup> Despite the mostly peaceful integration with public schooling, between 1929 and 1931 the radical faction known as the Sons of Freedom

---

<sup>33</sup> John Lyons, “The (Almost) Quiet Revolution: Doukhobor Schooling in Saskatchewan,” *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Etudes ethniques au Canada* 8, no. 1 (1976): 23-37.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 29.

Doukhobors or Freedomites burned 25 schools in response to coerced education.<sup>37</sup> This period is particularly telling as it coincides with the election of the former inspector of schools, J.T.M. Anderson, as premier and a shift toward an overtly assimilationist education policy. An important element of Anderson's thought that would be carried on by officials in British Columbia was the injunction to know the immigrant other. Anderson believed that it was the duty of every good Canadian citizen to study and know the "character" of immigrants in order to hasten assimilation through education.<sup>38</sup>

Anderson's treatise, *The Education of the New-Canadian*, published in 1918 while being the school inspector in Yorkton—in close proximity to Doukhobor communities—provided a blueprint for the Anglo-Saxon supremacist vision of education in Saskatchewan. This influential work, along with his thought developed in his Master's thesis on the problem of immigration, provide a rich insight into the political motivation behind Anderson's education policy: tough enforcement of attendance as well as amendments to the School Act requiring school trustees to read and write English and declare naturalization. Anderson argued against Sifton's policy of quickly populating the West and argued for more careful attention to the character of future immigrants and the role of education in re-socializing problematic peoples like the Doukhobors. He wrote, "Surely the right to become a living link in the great earth-girdling imperial chain of the greatest Empire on earth is too lightly regarded in the apparent anxiety to 'increase production' and develop 'material resources.'"<sup>39</sup> Anderson approvingly wrote about the improvement of settlers through recent immigration restrictions on those deemed

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>38</sup> J.T.M. Anderson, "Canadian Immigration and its Problems," (master's thesis, University of Manitoba, 1914), 46.

<sup>39</sup> Anderson, *The Education of the New-Canadian*, 8.

“physically, mentally and morally unfit.”<sup>40</sup> If Sifton’s policy was an example of the colonial need for labour trumping ethno-cultural reproduction, then Anderson’s account can be seen as a swinging of the pendulum in the opposite direction.

The problem of settlement was a question of race in Anderson’s worldview, but it is not always clear what the category *race* entailed. Throughout Anderson’s thought there is a lack of clarity regarding distinctions based on race, religion, language, nationality, and character. He argued that the question of settlement required careful attention to “national character” in order to determine an acceptable proportion of immigrants that the dominant Anglo-Canadian society could assimilate.<sup>41</sup> Anderson relied on a racial hierarchy of assimilable and unassimilable immigrants that included such diverse groups as Orientals, Hindus, and Russians.<sup>42</sup> For non-assimilable races, such as “Orientals,” exclusionary policy such as the Chinese head tax was called for.<sup>43</sup> Within this ideology, language and religion are tied to subjectivity and have important political implications for settlement. Anderson saw language and religion as an important indicator of a “present or past community of social and political life.”<sup>44</sup> Drawing on J.S. Woodsworth—an obvious intellectual influence on Anderson—Anderson states that the only undesirable immigrants from the U.S. are Mormons

... whose pernicious doctrines are obviously inconsistent with the teaching of Christianity, and are directly inimical to the welfare of the State. The practice of polygamy will subvert our most cherished institutions. But more dangerous even than polygamy is the utter surrender of personal liberty, and the acknowledgement of the absolute authority of the

---

<sup>40</sup> Anderson, “Canadian Immigration,” 3.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

priesthood. This means the end of all free Government, and is the confessed aim of the leaders of the Mormon Church.<sup>45</sup>

In this formulation, the threat from groups like Mormons is that their difference is embodied in a non-state sovereign authority, leading to a subjectivity that cannot be reconciled with Canadian governance. Likewise, the religious difference of Sikhs made them, for Anderson, incompatible with Canadian governance even if they were British subjects by law.<sup>46</sup> These two examples of religious exclusion make clear that settler nation building was not only a matter of legal subjecthood, but rather it was also about the character and “subjectivity” created by religious and linguistic differences.

The tension, present in the debates about land policy, between economic exploitation of resources through immigrant labour and the building of a settler nation is also apparent in Anderson’s thought. He argued that the problem of immigration is one of economic development and assimilation, and that at times these projects have been at odds. The problem lay in the creation of “a Canadian ideal sufficiently broad to incorporate the best which the immigrants bring with them and sufficiently high to save us from selfish commercialism which threatens to dominate our thought.”<sup>47</sup> Anderson appears to be taking a jab at Sifton’s immigration policy as “selfish commercialism,” as he states that recent restrictions on immigration have helped greatly in improving the quality of immigrants.<sup>48</sup> In Anderson’s mind the solution to this problem was to be found in education. He argued that this should be seen as the most important aspect of settler-

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 16.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 37.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 3.

subject making: “If the foundation of citizenship be imperfectly laid by our public schools the superstructure cannot but be frail and unstable.”<sup>49</sup>

While engaging in grandiose language praising Canada’s role in British imperialism, Anderson makes the case that adult foreigners are a lost cause and that their children are “the material upon which Canadians as nation-builders must work.”<sup>50</sup> Anderson singles out the Doukhobors as particularly problematic because their communal settlements make them resistant to “racial assimilation”;<sup>51</sup> he characterizes the Doukhobors as being in need of salvation from their autocratic leader through public education of their “bright, but mentally starved children...”<sup>52</sup> As with the Mormons, the Doukhobor problem was seen as a question of a competing political authority. The key to education was to break the link with the influence of the community. The adults of these communities were seen as a lost cause as they “will never become true Canadian citizens, imbued with the highest Anglo-Saxon ideals.”<sup>53</sup> The focus on children as the key site for assimilation and the characterization of Doukhobors in general as part of infantile civilization<sup>54</sup> has clear parallels with the educational ideology that develops around the education of Indigenous children. To focus on this ideology, however, neglects the fact that it is not simply a global British-imperialist consciousness that provides the impetus for Anderson’s work and later government policy; it is the historical process of

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 61.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 203.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>53</sup> Anderson, *The Education of the New-Canadian*, 8.

<sup>54</sup> J.S. Woodsworth characterized the Doukhobors as out of sync with the present when he wrote, “Their customs, their mode of thought, their whole spirit is that of the thirteenth century rather than the twentieth.” J.S. Woodsworth, *Strangers Within Our Gates* (Toronto: F.C. Stephenson, 1909), 116.

colonizing the West and Sifton's materially driven immigration policy that provide the immediate impetus for Anderson's Canadianization program.

The ideological fusion of racial character with governable subjectivity can be seen in Anderson's characterization of the Slavic race; in his hierarchy of European races, Icelanders are the ideal non-Anglo-Saxon with Slavs significantly inferior.<sup>55</sup> While quick to point to variations in the Slavic type based on differences of nationality and religion,<sup>56</sup> he nonetheless provides a sketch of the phenotypical<sup>57</sup> and moral<sup>58</sup> characteristics of the Slav. Anderson quotes a Professor Steiner who describes the Slavic character as having "a certain passivity of temper, a lack in sustained effort and enthusiasm, an unwillingness to take the consequences of telling the truth, a failure to confide in one another and in those who would do them good, a rather gross attitude towards sexual morality, and an undeniable tendency towards anarchy."<sup>59</sup> Anderson saw all of these characteristics, especially the tendency toward anarchy, as a danger that "must not be allowed to enter into our national character."<sup>60</sup> The most important feature of this racial ideology is that Anderson recognized that these peoples had been hastily let in to Canada, and were here to stay. However, he saw a solution: "The paramount factor in racial fusion is undoubtedly the education of the children of these non-English races..."<sup>61</sup> While not ideal, Doukhobors were salvageable settlers so long as their communal way of life, the element that created a subjectivity incompatible with Canadian ways, could be

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 39, 60.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 49.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 50.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 60.

<sup>59</sup> Anderson, *Education of the New-Canadian*, 60.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 89.

undermined. Unlike unassimilable, non-white races, intermarriage could play a part in the “racial assimilation” of the Doukhobors.<sup>62</sup> This demonstrates the complicated position of Doukhobors as problematic settlers, whose alternative communal economy and theocratic governance threatened dominant settler sovereignty. Unlike non-white races, and their wholesale exclusion from the category settler, the Doukhobors could be assimilated.

In an exchange, recounted by Koozma Tarasoff, between Anderson and recalcitrant Community Doukhobors, Anderson told the Doukhobors:

If you and your leader are prepared to acknowledge loyalty to our Sovereign and our Country—if you both are prepared to endorse our public school system; if you are prepared to give allegiance to what the Union Jack stands for, then there is no cause for further argument or discussion.<sup>63</sup>

The Community Doukhobors responded, “State patriotism affects our religious feelings and our contemplation of the world as a universal brother-hood and the equality of all men upon the face of the earth.”<sup>64</sup> This exchange shows the competing projects of subject making at play in education.

Anderson succeeded in clearly articulating a cultural supremacist vision of the colonization of the West; however, his educational policy as Premier was not strictly enforced. The perception of government persecution that would drive the Sons of Freedom faction in BC was limited by the lenient application of the mandatory attendance requirement of the new School Act at the local level; further, when Sons of Freedom protesters were charged with public nudity, judges tended to use discretion and

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>63</sup> Janzen, *Limits of Liberty*, 122.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

impose light sentences.<sup>65</sup> This demonstrates that while Anderson was drawing on British imperial ideology, local political conditions—specifically the decentralized administration of education—meant his policy was not evenly applied. Instead, a less coercive approach to education-based settler-subject making was pursued. The failure of Anderson’s ideology to be translated into coercive policy actually resulted in a faster process of Doukhobor integration into Canadian society in Saskatchewan, according to Lyons.<sup>66</sup> In spite of himself, Anderson’s vision was implemented in a more politically intelligent manner that avoided conflict. The British Columbia education system was ideologically similar to Anderson’s vision and mandatory public education was strictly enforced.

### **Early 20th Century Education in BC**

In response to the 1907 “Doukhobor land crisis” in Saskatchewan, Peter V. Verigin purchased land in the Kootenay/Boundary regions under the assumption that he would be able to move the Community Doukhobors to an area with less government interference than in Saskatchewan. At the time Verigin exclaimed, “No schools. No government interference. An ideal place to build a brotherhood.”<sup>67</sup> This idealism was quickly dashed by the reality of a province with centrally controlled compulsory provincial education and a political culture formed through the rapid building of a colonial white-supremacist society.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Lyons, “The (Almost) Quiet Revolution,” 33.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

<sup>67</sup> Koozma Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors* (Grand Forks, BC: Mir Publication Society, 1982), 102.

<sup>68</sup> Patricia Roy, *A White Man’s Province: British Columbia Politicians and Chinese and Japanese Immigrants, 1858-1914* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989); W. Peter Ward, *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Toward Orientals in British Columbia*, 2nd ed. (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1990).

The creation of the education system in BC has strong roots in BC's colonial history. The nature of the system as centralized and non-sectarian was established before BC entered confederation. The founder of this system was Amor de Cosmos, and his 1865 *Free School Act* was "perhaps the most highly centralized system of public education in North America."<sup>69</sup> This system, which would be preserved in essence in the new province of BC, was hostile to any accommodation of religious sectarian education. In fact, Amor de Cosmos even opposed missionary schools for Indigenous students, preferring their attendance at state-run schools.<sup>70</sup> From the beginning, education in BC was meant to be a way of uniting a dispersed and precarious settler society. Thomas Fleming has argued that the institutional position of the Superintendent of Education was created to "provide the vision and control necessary to establish a provincial school system in a vast territory with a diverse population and uncertain economic prospects."<sup>71</sup> Not only was the institutional design of the education system meant to provide cohesion in a precarious white settler-society, but the material being taught was also intended to inculcate an ideal British character.<sup>72</sup> In this setting it is not surprising that Community Doukhobors leaving Saskatchewan would face government interference in British Columbia as well.

Soon after arriving in BC, Verigin had two schools built for Doukhobor students, one at Grand Forks and one at Brilliant. In 1912, in what Tarasoff describes as an act of

---

<sup>69</sup> F. Henry Johnson, *A History of Public Education in British Columbia*. (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Publications Centre, 1964), 31.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>71</sup> Thomas Fleming, "In the Imperial Age and After: Patterns of British Columbia School Leadership and the Institution of the Superintendency, 1849-1988," *BC Studies* 81 (Spring 1989), 53.

<sup>72</sup> Stanley, "White Supremacy and the Rhetoric of Educational Indoctrination."

“unbelievable clumsiness,”<sup>73</sup> provincial authorities arrested four Doukhobor men for failing to register a death; this action led to the withdrawal of Doukhobor students from the schools<sup>74</sup> and non-compliance with registration laws. The resulting backlash against this “flaunting” of Canadian laws led Premier McBride to appoint William Blakemore as the head commissioner for the first Royal Commission on Doukhobors. While Blakemore’s report assumed assimilation of Doukhobors was beneficial and inevitable, his recommendations regarding education were conciliatory because in his words, “[p]ersecution is fuel to the flames of fanaticism. Withdraw the fuel, and the fire dies out.”<sup>75</sup> The report laid out the Doukhobors’ arguments against education, which included the belief that schools teach immorality, militarism, patriotism, and materialism.<sup>76</sup> While Blakemore called for enforcement of the Public Schools Act, he also recommended winning the Doukhobors’ “sympathy” through the hiring of Russian-speaking teachers and a modification of the school curriculum.<sup>77</sup>

Blakemore’s recommendations regarding education reflect an integrationist model of education, which gained prominence post-WWII. According to this model, assimilation is hastened by strategic accommodation of non-threatening religious or cultural difference. Even in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, people like Blakemore were using the Doukhobor conflict with the provinces and federal government to make the case that a smarter policy of assimilation, relying less on coercion, was required for the Doukhobors.

---

<sup>73</sup> Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*, 117.

<sup>74</sup> John McLaren, “Truancy and ‘child snatching’: law, social control and Doukhobor education in British Columbia, 1911-1935” (paper presented at BC Studies Conference 1994, Okanagan University College, Kelowna, BC, October 7-10, 1994), 12.

<sup>75</sup> Government of British Columbia, *Report of Royal Commission on Matters Relating to the Sect of Doukhobors*, 38.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

This approach, based on containment rather than overt assimilation, shared with the materialist colonial variant of land ideology a certain faith that Canadian society and the market would eventually eliminate any problematic difference inherent in the Doukhobors without excessive state interference.

In 1913, the same year the Blakemore Report was published, the federal government initiated a program of funding for provincial education in agriculture that coincided with popular calls for increased vocational training.<sup>78</sup> The alignment of government policy aimed at agricultural development of the province and the Doukhobor system of education may partially explain the conciliatory tone of the Blakemore report. The Doukhobor motto of “toil and peaceful life” happened to be compatible with training for entry into the BC economy, and so accommodation towards this aspect of Doukhobor education made sense. In this respect the Doukhobors met a minimum requirement of the settler ideal, that is, they would contribute to the settler economy. Any chance of Blakemore’s recommended policy of patient assimilation succeeding, however, was eliminated by his recommendation to cancel the Doukhobors’ exemption from military service, which was one of their primary reasons for immigrating to Canada.

An uneasy compromise existed between government and Community Doukhobors on the education question between 1915 and 1922, but the governments of the time maintained a posture of compulsory school attendance with the goal of breaking up the Doukhobor community. In 1914, Attorney General William Bowser had introduced the Community Regulation Act, which was aimed at levying fines against the entire Doukhobor community and seizing communal property for any number of

---

<sup>78</sup> Johnson, *A History of Public Education*, 67.

infractions such as truancy from school. Government correspondence from the time shows that the Community Regulation Act was meant to bring pressure on the entire communal organization and “directly affect the most cherished doctrine of their leader–economy.”<sup>79</sup> According to inspector of Schools, A.E. Miller, the Act, which applied to groups “under communal or tribal association,”<sup>80</sup> would “put Peter where he belongs and would also furnish an effective test of the real strength of the opposition to the schools without putting the Government to any unnecessary expense.”<sup>81</sup> The Act conceptualized the education problem as a conflict between Government and the Doukhobor collective. When the Act was put into full force in 1923, in response to declining school attendance, public schools became the targets of Sons of Freedom arson attacks.<sup>82</sup>

While the move of the Community Doukhobors to BC resulted in the successful growth of the Doukhobor communal economy,<sup>83</sup> their search for freedom from government would prove to be a failure. While Blakemore may have seen Doukhobors as settlers that could be assimilated with patience, it is clear that government officials would not tolerate certain aspects of the Doukhobor community. Although the Community Regulation Act was designed specifically for Doukhobors, and “Indians” were a federal responsibility, the legislation targeted “communal or tribal associations.” This language points to the government’s perception that the Community Doukhobors were a competing political community. Their presence, not as individual settlers but as a community, were

---

<sup>79</sup> A.V. Pineo, Memo to Attorney General Bowser, 1913, Doukhobor Research Collection, Rare Books and Special Collections, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, D.Ms. 13.

<sup>80</sup> Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*, 123.

<sup>81</sup> A.E. Miller, Letter to Dr. Alexander Robinson, March 31, 1915, Doukhobor Research Collection, D.Ms. 13.

<sup>82</sup> J.C. Yerbury, “The ‘Sons of Freedom’ Doukhobors and the Canadian State,” *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Etudes ethniques au Canada* 16, no. 2 (1984), 56.

<sup>83</sup> See Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*, Chapter 10, for a brief overview of the short-lived success of the Community Doukhobor experiment in British Columbia.

seen by non-Doukhor settlers and government officials as “retard[ing] the formation of school districts, churches and other local organizations so important to new settlements.”<sup>84</sup> The existence of a community unto themselves with theocratic authority and an alternative communal economy would not be allowed to co-exist with Canadian sovereignty.

Emerging in the context of conflict over education, the Sons of Freedom engaged in a number of public protests, burnings of their own homes, and nude demonstrations. In addition to this public protest a small minority engaged in secret “black work”, bombings and burnings of public buildings and infrastructure as well as attacks on Community Doukhor property.<sup>85</sup> In 1931 the federal government, under pressure from Saskatchewan Premier J.T.M. Anderson and BC Premier S.F. Tolmie, amended the Criminal Code to provide a three year sentence for public nudity; the three year sentence was meant to make Sons of Freedom protesters eligible for incarceration in federal penitentiaries and thus the burden of “the Doukhor problem” could be shared between levels of government.<sup>86</sup> According to John McLaren, the government record suggests that the motivation for this amendment was to target the entire Doukhor community and separate Sons of Freedom children from their parents in order to re-educate them.<sup>87</sup>

### **The Piers Island Experiment**

---

<sup>84</sup> A.V. Pineo, Memo to Attorney General Bowser, November 8 1913, Doukhor Research Collection.

<sup>85</sup> George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), 312.

<sup>86</sup> Harry B. Hawthorn, ed., *The Doukhobors of British Columbia* (Vancouver: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd. 1955), 214.

<sup>87</sup> John McLaren, “The Law and Public Nudity: Prairie and West Coast Reactions to the Sons of Freedom, 1929-32” in *Laws and Societies in the Canadian Prairie West, 1670-1940*, eds. Louis Knafla and Jonathan Swainger, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005), 310.

This legal development set the stage for the mass arrests of Sons of Freedom during a nude demonstration in Thrums, BC in 1932. The adults were placed in a specially constructed penal colony on Piers Island, while 365 children were dispersed between foster homes, orphanages and industrial schools for juvenile delinquents.<sup>88</sup> During this time children alleged abuse and officials tried to keep this information from parents by translating and censoring letters from the children; for a short time the children were forced to write in English despite many of them lacking basic English skills.<sup>89</sup> Another factor increasing Sons of Freedom sense of persecution was the fact that prior to the prisoners being transferred to Piers Island, three infants who were taken from their mothers at Oakalla prison died in hospital. The matron at Oakalla prison claimed that the breast-feeding infants were sickly upon arrival at the prison and were made worse when their mothers went on a hunger strike,<sup>90</sup> but the Sons of Freedom maintained that they were left to die by officials.<sup>91</sup>

According to Hooper's 1947 study on custodial care of Doukhobor children, "[t]he placement of three hundred and sixty-five children was an experiment that did not last long enough to test its possible value."<sup>92</sup> Hooper claimed that the government made no attempt to re-educate the children during their stay in foster homes, orphanages, or industrial schools, but this seems unlikely given that he also believed that the experiment would put them into contact with welcoming Canadians and socialize them to Canadian

---

<sup>88</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 280.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 282.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 283.

<sup>91</sup> Fraternal Council, Union of Christian Communities and Brotherhood of Reformed Doukhobors, An Open Letter to BC attorney-general Robert Bonner September, 1953, Doukhobor Collection, SFU.

<sup>92</sup> Hooper as quoted in Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 283.

citizenship.<sup>93</sup> Indeed, Hooper directly states the assimilatory goal of the experiment by quoting official correspondence:

It is where we have small groups that the children are more easily managed; the moment you get the older ones with the younger ones, their influence is detrimental to their behaviour and creates difficulties that do not exist when you have smaller groups. I cannot believe that the public could question seriously a plan which will effect the very thing we are attempting to do, namely, to change the point of view of the youth of the Doukhobors by breaking them up into groups so that they will assimilate more quickly Canadian ideas.<sup>94</sup>

Younger children, being less resistant to authority and more amenable to assimilation, would be placed with foster families, while older children, requiring more intervention, would be placed in provincially run industrial schools.<sup>95</sup>

When the government settled on this plan, there was an outpouring of support from Canadian families willing to foster Sons of Freedom children. The letters received by the Child Placement Department of the Children's Aid Society of Vancouver reveal how the separation from family and placement in new homes was not simply about protecting children. One letter reads, "This is a Christian home and we would bring them up under the word of God and the laws of the land...."<sup>96</sup> Another demonstrates the popularly imagined racial hierarchy of Canada: "It would be better still if you could send [me] some white children now in government homes if you wanted to make room for Doukhobors there."<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Ronald H.C. Hooper, "Custodial Care of Doukhobor Children in British Columbia, 1929-1935," (Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1947).

<sup>94</sup> Holland, Miss L., letter to Mr. W. Manson, 11 May, 1932, as quoted in Hooper, "Custodial Care," 40.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

The older Doukhobor children were housed at industrial schools: one for girls and one for boys. Both the boys and the girls displayed passive resistant protest to the institution that aimed to provide the basics of life while providing an education that “assisted in developing a more amenable attitude toward government authority and citizenship.”<sup>98</sup> The experience of the Sons of Freedom boys in the industrial school aptly demonstrates the teaching aimed at creating governable subjectivity. Upon arriving at the institution, the superintendent informed the children that he was an authority that must be respected; the children responded, “Jesus Christ [is] our boss!”<sup>99</sup> Later in their residence, when the boys refused to follow the instruction of their teacher, he physically pulled the offenders out of the classroom by their ears; this led to the other children seeing the punished Doukhobors as “the bad boys” for disrespecting authority.<sup>100</sup>

The Piers Island experiment was premised on the belief that separation from the influence of parents was essential in re-making Doukhobors in the image of the ideal settler-subject (by this time, simply the ideal Canadian). In addition to this negative project of group destruction, the government aimed to inculcate a subjectivity in line with Canadian sovereignty and authority. At its gentlest, the policy placed children under the influence of Canadian families, while at its most coercive the policy relied on the institution of the industrial school to discipline an acceptance of authority.

### **Sons of Freedom Doukhobor education crisis, 1948-1959**

Less than three years after the Piers Island experiment began, it was brought to an end by a government facing depression-era financial strain. The Sons of Freedom

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 63.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 69.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 74.

children were returned to their parents. There would be continuing conflicts with the government over schooling in the years that followed, but nothing on the scale of the Piers Island project until the 1950s. The period leading up to, and during, the confinement of Sons of Freedom children at New Denver demonstrates shifting colonial ideologies of education. Political debates around the Doukhobors were highly sensitive to “race” and prejudice owing to the recent defeat of Nazi Germany. Community Doukhobors fought against anti-Doukhobor prejudice by further distancing themselves from the Sons of Freedom, while Sons of Freedom invoked the language of racial genocide in their campaign against the removal of Sons of Freedom children and their placement at the New Denver school. As a result of this sensitivity to racism, the discourse and policy of “integration” and children’s welfare sought to achieve the earlier goals of “racial assimilation” by different means.

This shift in ideology regarding Doukhobor education can also be seen in Indian Affairs administration. During this era, the Indian Affairs Branch was moved into the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in order to combine the integrationist efforts aimed at new immigrants as well as Indigenous peoples.<sup>101</sup> This institutional fusion demonstrates the relational overlap between Indigenous dispossession and settlement, just as these two aspects of settler colonialism had been institutionally wedded under the Department of the Interior at the turn of the century. There is evidence that knowledge about educational integration developed in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration regarding “Indians” was being suggested as a solution to the “Doukhobor

---

<sup>101</sup> Heidi Bohaker and Franca Iacovetta, “Making Aboriginal People ‘Immigrants Too’: A Comparison of Citizenship Programs for Newcomers and Indigenous Peoples,” *The Canadian Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (2009), 428-9.

problem”; a provincial DCI liaison pointed to the success of integrating “Indians” at a Nanaimo school as a model for dealing with the Sons of Freedom.<sup>102</sup>

The duty to know the other in order to assimilate them, as formulated by J.T.M. Anderson, was actively taken up by both the BC and the federal governments. Just prior to the New Denver experiment, governments commissioned Harry Hawthorn to head two social science studies on integration: one regarding the Doukhobors and one regarding Indigenous peoples. This drive toward official knowledge was part of a larger post-war development where colonial governments increasingly relied on “scientific” knowledge to further the integration of Indigenous peoples.<sup>103</sup> The networks that transmitted this colonial knowledge from one location to another are examined in the following two chapters on Harry Hawthorn.

While Hawthorn’s integrationism was not fully endorsed by the Social Credit government of the time, the theoretical connections made between the education of Sons of Freedom Doukhobors and “Indians” continued to have discursive power. Francis Henry Johnson, a prominent professor of education history and the Director of Elementary Teacher Education at the University of British Columbia in 1956, wrote of “minority” issues of Doukhobor and “Indian” education as *the* minority issues, discounting the importance of Catholic schooling in BC.<sup>104</sup> Likewise, Mary Ashworth, a founder of English as a second language teaching, drew on the similarities between the

---

<sup>102</sup> “Doukhobors not a problem speaker tells women’s club,” *Vancouver Sun*, November 28, 1951.

<sup>103</sup> Byron King Plant, “‘A relationship and interchange of experience’: H.B. Hawthorn, Indian Affairs, and the 1955 BC Indian Research Project,” *BC Studies* 163 (Autumn 2009), 6. Plant draws on H.G. Barnett’s 1957 description of this shift as “postcolonial governments’ growing interest in state-sponsored investigations of Aboriginal customs and institutions for administrative purposes.”

<sup>104</sup> Johnson, *History of Public Education*.

education of Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples among other “minorities.”<sup>105</sup> The construction of Indigenous education as an issue of “minority” education replicates the 1950s framing of Indigenous peoples as “just another minority” by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

It is in this context of relational overlap that this chapter now turns to the events leading to the New Denver experiment. Up until this stage of the analysis, the reader has seen how the “Doukhobor problem” had its genesis in the settler colonial context of land and sovereignty. During this period political actors relied on competing variants of colonial land ideology that were applied first to Indigenous peoples and then to Doukhobors. An assimilationist ideology of racial improvement became dominant over the competing materialist conceptualization of colonialism. The problem of Doukhobor education flowed from this origin, and education, as a tool of racial assimilation, was applied as a technique of settler-subject formation. At this juncture two developments took place. First, unlike earlier forms of relational overlap, the direction of influence was reversed. Citizenship education and integration are initiated in settler-subject making projects and then applied to Indigenous peoples. Second, the materialist colonial vision of settler colonialism, marginalized by the likes of Oliver and Anderson, makes a resurgence in a new integrationist form.

The period between 1948 and 1959 should be placed in the context of the anti-Doukhobor rhetoric of the time, the impact of this rhetoric on electoral outcomes, and W.A.C. Bennett’s “get tough” Doukhobor policy. While the discourse about Doukhobors

---

<sup>105</sup> Mary Ashworth, *The Forces Which Shaped Them: A History of the Education of Minority Group Children in British Columbia* (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1979), 209.

during this period was not as straightforward as the racial-assimilationist ideology of J.T.M. Anderson, the use of racial language persisted in debates about the “Doukhobor problem.” Many academics, journalists, politicians and non-Doukhobor citizens saw clearly enough that only a minority faction engaged in the bombings, arsons, and nude protests, and many observers provided thoughtful insights about how best to deal with the situation. Many others, however, held fast to an anti-Doukhobor stance that racialized the entire group and had a significant impact on educational policy. Regardless of one’s position, it seems as if everyone had something to say about the “Doukhobor problem.”

Anti-Doukhobor sentiment was widespread enough that John Stoochnoff, a Community Doukhobor, went on a public relations tour in the 1950s in order to address the “not always complimentary” image of “Douks” in the news.<sup>106</sup> Koozma Tarasoff similarly tried to combat bias in print media through a 1958 study of newspaper representations of Doukhobors.<sup>107</sup> Tarasoff, in taking up a challenge by the *Vancouver Sun* to prove press bias, found significant variation between papers but nonetheless found widespread use of the derogatory term “Douk,” frequent conflation of “Doukhobors” and “Sons of Freedom Doukhobors,” and general bias and innuendo.<sup>108</sup> Pervasive anti-Doukhobor sentiment also inspired a 1952 study of high school student and adult attitudes towards Doukhobors.<sup>109</sup> Although Zubeck’s study would not stand up to today’s social science methods, it found increasing prejudice as students aged, as well as

---

<sup>106</sup> Stoochnoff, *Toil*, 1.

<sup>107</sup> Koozma Tarasoff, Report on the Press of British Columbia Regarding Doukhobor and “Sons of Freedom” News, August 30, 1958, Doukhobor Collection, SFU.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.

<sup>109</sup> John Zubeck, “The Doukhobors: A genetic study on attitudes,” *Journal of Social Psychology* 36, no. 2 (1952): 223-239.

evidence that economic competition drove prejudice in the adult sample.<sup>110</sup> This link between anti-Doukhor prejudice and occupation was not new; the Blakemore commission had to deal with angry retailers from Grand Forks who believed the Doukhobors unfairly purchased their consumer products from wholesalers.<sup>111</sup> The Hawthorn Research Committee, in a survey of 74 employers of Doukhor labour, found that while the majority of firms held “neutral views” toward Doukhor employees, 25 firms held “predominantly unfavourable” views compared to only five firms with “predominantly favourable” views.<sup>112</sup>

In hindsight, the results of the Piers Island experiment were increased isolation of the Sons of Freedom from moderate Doukhobors, a virulent sense of martyrdom amongst the Sons of Freedom, and a growing security crisis involving bombings and arsons. In response to a series of bombings and arsons the previous year, the *British Columbia Royal Commission on Doukhor Affairs 1948* was convened with Harry Sullivan as the head commissioner. In his interim report (the commission was never completed because of ongoing violence) Sullivan paints a picture of a small minority that shows “utter contempt” for the government because they have been allowed to “get away with it.”<sup>113</sup> While Sullivan differentiates between fanatics and “good Doukhobors” who have integrated into Canadian society, he nonetheless argues that “a state of emergency exists,”<sup>114</sup> and this means that “[i]f you have a cancer in your right hand, it may be necessary sometimes to amputate the whole arm. A lot of muscle and healthy tissue may

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 232-3.

<sup>111</sup> British Columbia, *Royal Commission Doukhobors 1912*, 57.

<sup>112</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 80.

<sup>113</sup> Sullivan, *British Columbia Royal Commission on Doukhor Affairs 1948: Interim Report*, 10.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 23.

be sacrificed, but that sacrifice has got to be made for the preservation of life in the whole body.”<sup>115</sup> Once again the assimilative force of childhood education is called upon:

It requires very little observation and thought to come to the conclusion that the only real and permanent solution of the ‘Doukhobor problem’ lies in education and assimilation; and with this thought in mind I feel that opportunity must be provided [to] the Doukhobor children to participate in all the educational, cultural and recreational activities which our larger schools afford.<sup>116</sup>

This report is particularly important because it shows that representatives from the Independent Doukhobors and the Community Doukhobors were willing to throw their support behind any program that would end Sons of Freedom attacks on their community. The details of internal factionalism, however, seemed to be lost on many non-Doukhobors observers who saw all Doukhobors as the same group.

---

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 24.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., 7.



**Figure 4** Men inspect tracks suspected of being damage by a Sons of Freedom bombing, 1952 (Photographer: Art Stevens, © Touchstones Nelson, Accession: 2008.023.209)

While Sullivan’s harsh words for the Sons of Freedom are suggestive of earlier attempts at forced assimilation, a closer reading shows that even Sullivan’s report reflects a turn toward integration instead of coercive assimilation. He defines good Doukhobors as those who “combine the best traits of their Doukhobor ancestors with the best features of our Canadian way of life”<sup>117</sup> Furthermore, his recommendations for childhood education are based on integration into larger public schools that “would [...] contribute to the social education of the Doukhobor child, enabling him to mingle and fit in with

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., 10.

Canadian children of different religious persuasion.”<sup>118</sup> What differentiates Sullivan from other integrationists is his insistence on “using every bit of force necessary” to gain compliance with Canadian law.<sup>119</sup>

What made the Sons of Freedom education crisis so repugnant to Sullivan was the refusal of the Sons of Freedom to recognize the sovereign power of the state. A telling exchange occurs between the school inspector C.E. Clay and Sullivan when Sullivan enquires about the inaction of state authorities on school attendance in the face of parental resistance. Sullivan asks the inspector, “It looks as though the tail is wagging the dog?” to which Clay answers, “It is.”<sup>120</sup> As a minority group, the effective Sons of Freedom resistance to the majority called into question the power of the elected government. The Sullivan commission set a minimum requirement of the settler-ideal that was significantly lower than in previous times. Doukhobors could maintain elements of their identity that were compatible with the current legal order. The “good Doukhobor,” in contrast with the fanatic, held on to their heritage while accepting that public school was necessary to foster integration with Canada’s religious mosaic. Sullivan saw the Doukhobor problem as a problem of integration into Canadian political and economic society; there was no need to completely assimilate the Doukhobors.

While most Doukhobors at this juncture had found a way of integrating into Canadian society while maintaining cultural distinctiveness, the Sons of Freedom refused what they saw as the corruption of the original Doukhobor ways. The brief submitted to

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 10.

Sullivan by the Sons of Freedom characterizes the movement as an antagonistic force to the state:

From the very earliest beginning of the Doukhobor movement, it especially stood apart from all other groups and had unending conflicts with the governmental system and other organizations and societies on the grounds that they have always disregarded God's commandment, 'Thou shall not kill', and it can be safely stated that these conflicts are not the result of any mistakes or misunderstandings but the unavoidable result of the meeting of two contradictory forces; light and darkness, and truth and falsehood.<sup>121</sup>

While Sons of Freedom may have been integrating more than they could ever admit, in word they rejected all government authority. Sullivan could accept accommodation and tolerance of cultural quirks, but never the existence of an independent political community.

Following the failed Sullivan Commission, the Liberal-Conservative coalition government of BC called for a study of the "Doukhobor problem," as it was by then obvious that previous government action had failed to assimilate all Doukhobors. Two committees were created: the Consultative Committee on Doukhobor Affairs, which was to deal with the immediate problem of an ever-expanding Sons of Freedom prisoner population, and the Doukhobor Research Committee, headed by Harry Hawthorn, which was to engage in a longer-term multi-disciplinary study of the "Doukhobor problem." One of the main focuses of the Consultative Committee—made up of representatives of all three Doukhobor factions, government representatives and police representatives—was the relocation of the Sons of Freedom either within BC or to another country. The theory behind the relocation was that it would help with the further integration of Community Doukhobors and limit the negative impact of this faction on the community

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., 25.

while potentially distracting the Sons of Freedom through the hard labour of reconstructing their own community.<sup>122</sup> The plan was essentially a last-ditch effort at a land-based solution to the Doukhobor problem.<sup>123</sup> The consequence of this proposed solution was another outbreak of anti-Doukhobor agitation.

The Consultative Committee initially tried to export the Sons of Freedom to a willing host country but, unsurprisingly, the answer from ten different countries was a resounding “no.”<sup>124</sup> A pamphlet published in 1950 for public consumption called for a different type of migration for the Sons of Freedom: forced displacement and dispersion of individual families to hasten assimilation.<sup>125</sup> It seems many would have preferred this dispersal, as the Consultative Committee’s new plan to relocate the Sons of Freedom to Adams Lake near Kamloops created an uproar from locals. At the third meeting of the committee in August 1951, the Kamloops Protest Committee made clear their objections to the relocation to Adams Lake based on the perceived security threat.<sup>126</sup> However, security was not the main reason for the protest, as a letter from a local board of trade stated that the “first reason presented for this opposition is that this Sect has given no indication of becoming good Canadian citizens.”<sup>127</sup> Soon after this initial opposition, the local MLA Sydney Smith, a member of the Coalition government, called for vigilante

---

<sup>122</sup> Hawthorn, *The Doukhobors*, 40. (1952 or 1955??)

<sup>123</sup> The idea of solving the problem through relocation was driven by the demands of the Sons of Freedom. Leading up to the 1950s the Sons of Freedom had gone through several leaders in quick succession; the most significant impact of these short-lived leaders was a growing emphasis on the Second Coming of Christ and the notion of catalyzing the emigration of the Sons of Freedom from Canada through confessions of crimes. Stephan Sorokin, a non-Doukhobor, briefly united the Sons of Freedom through a promise for migration and was active in pressing for migration through the Consultative Committee.

<sup>124</sup> “Doukhobors’ search for new home in other land fails,” *Herald*, December 18, 1950.

<sup>125</sup> Phillip J. Lipp, *Doukhobors*, 1950, Doukhobor Research Collection, file 351.

<sup>126</sup> Consultative Committee on Doukhobor Affairs, Minutes, August 3rd, 1951, Doukhobor Research Collection, D.Ms. 7.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*

action if the Sons of Freedom were allowed to relocate near Kamloops.<sup>128</sup> Smith was quoted as saying, “As a last resort I am suggesting we may have to defy the law to combat them.”<sup>129</sup>

The sense of political crisis only deepened the following year. With the break up of the Coalition government, a Progressive Conservative MLA, A.B. Ritchie, urged the Liberal government to “[l]eave the Doukhobors alone. ... You’ve seen what happens with foot-and-mouth disease. If you don’t leave them alone, you will get into more trouble.”<sup>130</sup> The next day the Farmer’s Institute called for a 200-mile buffer around Kamloops to keep the Sons of Freedom out.<sup>131</sup> In the legislature, discussion of the government’s estimates was dominated by more than a dozen MLAs discussing the “Doukhobor problem” and the proposed relocation.<sup>132</sup> A PC member argued that the government-funded research committees were a waste of money that had accomplished nothing, while a CCF member argued that the solution was to “drive a wedge” between the Doukhobor factions by giving the Community Doukhobors “all the rights we give other *racial* groups.”<sup>133</sup> The Attorney General’s response to those opposed to the relocation of Sons of Freedom Doukhobors drew on a developing post-WWII shift in attitudes toward race and racism; he characterized the Kamloops opposition as “race prejudice” and argued that MLA Maurice Finnerty’s call for the forced dispersal of Sons of Freedom risked repeating “the

---

<sup>128</sup> “MLA Urges Force to Keep Douks Out,” *The Province*, September 5, 1951.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid.

<sup>130</sup> “‘Hands off’ Doukhobors B.C. government told,” *The Province*, March 4, 1952.

<sup>131</sup> “Kamloops fears ‘Sons’ invasion” *Victoria Times*,” March 5, 1952.

<sup>132</sup> “Province in favor of relocating sect,” *Victoria Colonist*, March 18, 1952.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid. Emphasis mine.

appalling treatment of Japanese during the war.”<sup>134</sup> This political use of the Japanese internment, a mere three years after Japanese-Canadians were legally granted the franchise, shows the impact of WWII on the discourse of race and racism. Although racism hardly declined, it was clear that politicians could not as freely speak of Anglo-Saxon supremacy, nor could they easily propose forced assimilation without significant backlash. Resistance to coerced assimilation and spatial containment was far from universal, however. The *Vancouver Province* quoted an ex-police officer from the Kootenays who provided a justification for the removal of Sons of Freedom children based on earlier attempts at coercive assimilation.<sup>135</sup> Bob Kidd is quoted as saying, “Take every last child of the Sons of Freedom and keep them in provincial welfare until they come of age.”<sup>136</sup> The paper continues, “This ex-policeman insists that if all children had been taken permanently from their Freedomite parents after Piers Island ‘this situation just wouldn’t exist now’.”<sup>137</sup> Appeals to past attempts at coercive assimilation existed alongside appeals to anti-racism.

### **The Hawthorn Committee and Integration**

Several scholars have argued that the coercive education program of New Denver could have been avoided if cooler heads had prevailed and the more reasonable recommendations of the Doukhobor Research Committee had been followed.<sup>138</sup> The recommendations of the Committee would certainly have been less damaging to Sons of

---

<sup>134</sup> “Wismer hits Kamloops on Racial Intolerance,” *News-Herald*, March 18, 1952.

<sup>135</sup> Bruce Larsen, “Doukhobor Solution: ‘Take Away Their Children’,” *Vancouver Province*, September 25, 1953.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>138</sup> Margaret Hill, “The Detention of Freedomite Children, 1953-1959,” *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 18, no. 3 (1986), 50.; Janzen, *Limits*, 139.; McLaren, “The State,” 269; Yerbury, “Sons of Freedom,” 48.

Freedom children, but the end goal remained the integration of the Sons of Freedom so that they would accept Canadian authority. The Committee correctly assessed the danger of creating martyrs through coercive education and noted, “No school or other group should push for an assimilation policy framed in those terms, acceptable to immigrants of other backgrounds; such pressures will inevitably engender future Sons of Freedom.”<sup>139</sup> The Committee’s conciliatory approach to education based in proposals for Russian speaking teachers, cultural sensitivity, and a modified curriculum<sup>140</sup> was contrasted with the forced removal of children for education. It is worth quoting at length Claudia Lewis, one of the authors of the Doukhobor Research Committee’s report, on removal of children:

I believe it is generally recognized now that the removal of children from home during the time of imprisonment at Piers Island was a mistake, albeit one made with good intentions. In fact, the recognition that children need their homes is such an accepted consideration in social welfare work today that it is probably unnecessary for me to develop the point further here.<sup>141</sup>

The post-war concern for a “gentler” form of assimilation, while responding to a political culture newly averse to coercive assimilation, also grew out of failed experiments like Piers Island and the Indian Residential School program. It was not sheer benevolence that motivated the move toward integration—though benevolence seems to have motivated some progressive academics and bureaucrats—but rather the failure of other forms of assimilation. The spirit of assimilation can be seen in the fact that Lewis notes that the Piers Island experiment was done with “good intentions,” it was the method that was the mistake. Ruby McKay, the superintendent of Child Welfare at the time of

---

<sup>139</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 25.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

New Denver, also drew on the failed assimilation project attempted during the Piers Island period. She argued that the removal of Sons of Freedom children during the Piers Island experiment was damaging and urged the government not to repeat the same mistake.<sup>142</sup> Simultaneously, she was warning about the steep rise of Indigenous children in foster homes and the placement of foster children outside of their communities.<sup>143</sup> This is one of the few instances, during the period under study, in which relational overlap led to a policy recommendation that was not injurious to Indigenous people or Doukhobors.

The Doukhobor Research Committee made clear that despite Sons of Freedom violent opposition to education, school attendance would need to be enforced in order to end the isolation of the faction.<sup>144</sup> The key was to make education palatable to the parents through professional teachers who understood that “their function involve[d] more than classroom instruction.”<sup>145</sup> The something “more” was meant to be a sort of cross-cultural bridge building to support the end goal of reshaping of the Doukhobor culture and subjectivity.

Hawthorn stressed that this controlled development of a culture should not focus only on children, but other areas of the report could easily be interpreted to give support to later government policy that took education of children as the crux of assimilation. Claudia Lewis’ chapter, *Childhood and Family Life*, suggests that there is a Doukhobor “way to bring up children” based on “authoritarianism” that when pushed to the extreme

---

<sup>142</sup> John McLaren, “The State, Child Snatching, and the Law: The Seizure and Indoctrination of Sons of Freedom Children in British Columbia, 1950-60” in *Regulating Lives: historical essays on the state, society, the individual, and the law*, eds. Dorothy E. Chunn, John McLaren and Robert Menzies (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002), 265.

<sup>143</sup> Leslie Foster, “Trends in Child Welfare: What do the data show?” in *People, Politics, and Child Welfare in British Columbia*, Leslie Foster and Brian Wharf eds. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2007), 50.

<sup>144</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 184.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, 188.

creates “the kind of personality structure that may be strongly attracted to the Sons of Freedom.”<sup>146</sup> Lewis emphasizes factors internal to the Doukhobor community at the expense of examining the impact of government policy. For example, the impact of the Piers Island experiment on family life is given less coverage than a section detailing Doukhobor toilet training methods.<sup>147</sup> Alfred Shulman’s contribution, dealing with personality characteristics and psychological problems, likewise locates the source of the “Doukhobor problem” as internal to the group. He argued that “the majority of Doukhobors are partially sick and unhappy through causes that lie largely within themselves.”<sup>148</sup> Once again, the cause of Sons of Freedom hostility was to be found in overbearing parents who create a “basic personality type” of passivity and dependence; the burnings and bombings were simply a displaced hostility toward their parents.<sup>149</sup> As with the earlier ideology of “racial assimilation,” parents were seen as an obstacle to the development of a subjectivity compatible with Canadian governance because of their role in social reproduction of the group.

The Doukhobor Research Committee’s finding that much of the source of the “Doukhobor problem” lay in parental influence led logically to targeting the children with the goal of a generational solution. The experts from various fields involved in the Doukhobor Research Committee in a sense created “the Doukhobor” they were studying, but were careful to avoid the racial language of an earlier period. The integrationist approach to education can be interpreted as a shift in colonial ideology that replaced the

---

<sup>146</sup> Ibid., 102.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., 108.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 154.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 137.

earlier ideology of racial assimilation in an era of growing concern about racism. Like other colonial ideologies, local political contingencies led to an uneven and at times contradictory implementation in policy. During this era of transition away from racial assimilation toward integration, the political debate was characterized by a cacophony of competing views on Doukhobor education.

### **W.A.C. Bennett and the “no-nonsense” policy**

On April 10, 1952, at the height of the Adams Lake relocation fiasco, Social Credit (Socreds) won a surprise electoral victory due largely to the use of the Alternative Vote system that rewarded the Socreds with many second preference votes.<sup>150</sup> It is difficult to determine the impact of the “Doukhobor problem” on the 1952 and 1953 elections, but it did play a central role in political debates and was used to bolster W.A.C. Bennett and the Socreds’ populist appeal. If populist parties are able to come to gain influence during times of crisis,<sup>151</sup> the crisis in BC in the early 1950s was not solely one of big company capitalism and monopoly, but also the crisis of the Sons of Freedom. Bennett’s core support in the interior of the province, coupled with his party’s focus on small business free-enterprise aligned with those most likely to harbour anti-Doukhobor sentiment—that is, small-town shopkeepers in the interior of BC. Bennett’s “no-nonsense” approach to the Sons of Freedom was reflective of what David Elkins describes as a British Columbian populist “preference for ‘action’, getting down to work rather than wasting time talking, and preferably simple, concrete, common sense actions

---

<sup>150</sup> Gordon Hak, “Populism and the 1952 Social Credit Breakthrough in British Columbia,” *The Canadian Historical Review* 85, no. 2 (2004), 2.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

rather than the complicated schemes of experts or intellectuals.”<sup>152</sup> Critics of the previous government framed the Hawthorn Committee’s nuanced recommendations on educational accommodation and integration as the “complicated schemes of experts.”

The Sacred approach to the “Doukhobor problem” did not materialize immediately, but was rather the result of local demands from residents of the interior. In the run-up to the 1953 provincial election campaign, the CCF MLA from Grandforks-Greenwood called on the government to crack down on Sons of Freedom through increased policing, while defending the majority of Doukhobors.<sup>153</sup> Another CCF MLA from Cranbrook argued that if the Sacreds did not “get tough” on the Doukhobors, Kootenay residents would take the law into their own hands.<sup>154</sup> Bennett seemed to take the demands seriously as the government dispatched thirty extra RCMP officers to the area in preparation for the announcement of an election date and a “new plan” for the Sons of Freedom. Just days after the election was called, Attorney General Bonner revealed the government’s three point “get tough” policy for dealing with the Sons of Freedom: 1) relocation outside Canada of those willing; 2) “rehabilitation” of those remaining; 3) a “firm attitude” toward education and taxation enforcement.<sup>155</sup>

The “get tough” rhetoric struck a chord with those sympathetic to Bennett’s anti-intellectualism; Bennett was fond of saying, “An expert is only an ordinary person three miles from home and lost.”<sup>156</sup> A sympathetic editorial in the *Daily Colonist* said, “there is

---

<sup>152</sup> Hak, “Populism,” 9.

<sup>153</sup> “MLA for Doukhobor Riding Defends Majority of Sect,” *Victoria Daily Times*, February 12, 1953.

<sup>154</sup> “House told Douk problem ‘serious’,” *News-Herald*, February 13, 1953.

<sup>155</sup> Gregory Cran, *Negotiating buck naked: Doukhobors, public policy, and conflict resolution* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006), 14.

<sup>156</sup> David J. Mitchell, *W.A.C. Bennett and the Rise of British Columbia* (Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre, 1983), 185.

no more silly talk this time of appeasement, of the ‘psychological’ approach,”<sup>157</sup> while *The Province* summed up the frustration of interior residents:

When this radical minority of the Doukhobors begins to burn and bomb and undress it is easy for people in Vancouver and Victoria and Ottawa to be tolerant and academic about it. But if you live in Nelson or Slocan or Grand Forks, if you are a railway man on the much-bombed Kettle-Valley Railway, you find about 30 years of this nonsense makes you impatient. You reach for your gun.<sup>158</sup>

About mid-election, the Slocan Valley Citizens’ Committee called for a curfew to be placed on Doukhobors and a demand that employers hire only non-Doukhobors.<sup>159</sup> This same group intercepted Bennett on the campaign trail and forced him to send a telegraph to Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent demanding federal imposition of a curfew on *all* Doukhobors. While some saw this move by Bennett as problematic because it provided ammunition to eastern Canadians who were “all too eager to dismiss [BC’s] problems as racial or religious intolerance,”<sup>160</sup> Bennett was able to harness this turn of events and paint the federal government as the enemy because of its refusal to act on the crisis.<sup>161</sup>

In the days immediately before the election, with voters exposed to sensationalist headlines like “Kenya on Vancouver’s Doorstep: Man, Guns Lurk in Night in Fear-Ridden Doukland,” the Socreds used their “get tough” policy to consolidate support in the interior of the province and form a majority government in 1953. The allusion to the then ongoing anti-colonial Mau Mau Uprising in British Kenya suggests that it was not

---

<sup>157</sup> “Beyond provincial control,” *The Daily Colonist*, April 18, 1953.

<sup>158</sup> “A powder keg of trouble,” *Vancouver Province*, April 27, 1953.

<sup>159</sup> “Job Boycott of Doukhobors Urged,” *Vancouver Sun*, May 4, 1953.

<sup>160</sup> “Hurting B.C.’s Doukhor Case,” *Vancouver Sun*, May 8th, 1953.

<sup>161</sup> “‘Open Door’ Policy...Webster,” *Vancouver Province*, May 25, 1953.

only Sullivan, but also members of the public and press that saw the Sons of Freedom crisis as a threat to Canadian sovereignty. In a policy speech delivered soon after the election, Bennett reiterated the “get tough” policy, but was careful to distinguish between “good Doukhobors” and the Sons of Freedom.<sup>162</sup> The central pillar of this policy was the mass arrests of Sons of Freedom adults for public nudity and the removal and education of their children. If the government’s hand was forced by popular calls for action, debate about the forced confinement of children at New Denver shows that the chosen method was controversial.

### **The New Denver Experiment**

From 1953 to 1959 the government of British Columbia undertook a program of forced education and confinement of the children of Sons of Freedom Doukhobors. These children were placed in a former tuberculosis sanatorium at New Denver as wards of the province under sections of the Child Protection Act because their parents either engaged in nude protest or refused to send their children to public schools. Initially a school was set up at the New Denver institution, but soon after the children were taught at the local New Denver school. The issue of forced education of these children has been framed variously as “a long and painful process of accommodation to the Canadian ways,”<sup>163</sup> as an issue of state accommodation and religious minority rights,<sup>164</sup> as an example of poor public policy that could easily have been avoided,<sup>165</sup> as a severe infringement of

---

<sup>162</sup> Mitchell, *Bennett*, 264.

<sup>163</sup> Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*.

<sup>164</sup> Janzen, *Limits on Liberty*.

<sup>165</sup> Yerbury, “The ‘Sons of Freedom’ Doukhobors,” 48.

children's rights by both parents<sup>166</sup> and the state,<sup>167</sup> and finally as an internal factional conflict between moderate Community Doukhobors and radical Sons of Freedom Doukhobors.<sup>168</sup>

A group of former residents at the New Denver institution calling themselves the New Denver Survivors Collective have used the discourse of race, assimilation, and genocide in calls for government accountability. The group states on its website, "Abuse, forced assimilation, genocide and crimes against humanity committed on 7-15 year [old] children by a provincial government in a democratic society is extreme racism."<sup>169</sup> Further, a cursory reading of the 1999 BC Ombudsman's report into New Denver suggests parallels with the Indian Residential School program regarding physical and emotional abuse as a result of unqualified staff and understaffing.<sup>170</sup> These surface similarities, however, are complicated by the fact that some of the most damaging characteristics of the Indian Residential School program—the half-work day, the missionary aspect, lack of professional educators—were specific to that federal program. New Denver and Indian residential schools were not the same thing, but there was significant overlap across the institutions regarding the goal of assimilation through isolation from parents and community. The distinctness of the "Doukhobor problem" in the 1950s was not lost on Frank Calder when he urged premier W.A.C. Bennett to press the federal government for Indigenous representation in the Senate by saying,

---

<sup>166</sup> Simma Holt, *Terror in the name of God: The story of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited. 1964).

<sup>167</sup> Ombudsman Province of British Columbia, *Public Report No. 38: Righting the Wrong: The confinement of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobor Children* (Victoria, BC: Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, 1999).

<sup>168</sup> Cran, *Negotiating buck naked*.

<sup>169</sup> "New Denver Survivors Collective", accessed online September 16 2016, <http://www.newdenversurvivors.tk/>.

<sup>170</sup> Ombudsman, *Righting the Wrong*.

“Governments approach the Doukhobors with recommendations and solutions to their problems and the Doukhobors remain silent ... In our case, we approach the governments with recommendations and solutions to our own problems and the governments remain silent.”<sup>171</sup>

Some of the historical debate about New Denver closely resembles the earlier discourse of “racial assimilation” through education. For example, one commentator argued, “Until all Doukhobor children learn to speak English and think in English, the Doukhobor, like any other racial group similarly situated, will merely be an indigestible mass in the Canadian craw.”<sup>172</sup> For the most part, however, racial language was being used by *opponents* of the New Denver program; a concerned citizen wrote to the editor of the *Vancouver Sun* comparing the government’s action to the Nazi regime.<sup>173</sup> In an open letter to the Premier, the Sons of Freedom framed their grievances along similar lines. Connecting the New Denver program with previous government discrimination such as disenfranchisement, the letter stated: “And by the shades of Hitler, anyone with even a drop of Doukhobor blood (it was a drop of Jewish blood in Hitler’s day) in their veins is ‘verboden’ to vote in Dominion Affairs!”<sup>174</sup> The forced education program, in their view, was “aiming at the extermination of the entire Doukhobor community.”<sup>175</sup> The Sons of Freedom not only used post-WWII anti-Nazi discourse, but also tried to use the less than ten-year-old U.N. Genocide Convention. In a telegram to the U.N., the Sons argued that “these forcible abductions are an international offence under the U.N. Genocide

---

<sup>171</sup> “Representation in Senate For Indians Asked by MLA,” *The Daily Colonist*, October 1, 1953.

<sup>172</sup> Harold Weir, “Teach them English,” *Vancouver Sun*, May 10, 1954.

<sup>173</sup> “Wrong Handling,” *Vancouver Sun*, October 23, 1953.

<sup>174</sup> “Fraternal Council CCBRD, I accuse...: An Open letter to the B.C. Government”, 1957, Doukhobor Collection, SFU.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*

Convention ... It is a direct assault upon human rights and a final attempt to annihilate the identity of our group by assimilating our children into the common nationalistic pattern.”<sup>176</sup>

Despite the Sons of Freedom tendency toward dramatic rhetoric and extreme sense of martyrdom, there was an element of truth in these accusations. Government correspondence shows that the proposal for schools to be built in Sons of Freedom communities was rejected by officials because it would not foster assimilation:

The children will become good Canadians most rapidly if they associate with other Canadian children in regular schools. It is the belief of your Committees that the major hope of solving the Sons of Freedom problem is by a generation or two (25 to 50 years) of compulsory education of children.<sup>177</sup>

The goal of integration was central. It was not enough to have schooling, it would have to be schooling that put them in contact with other Canadians. While many government officials were enthusiastic about an educational solution, there was concern on the part of the Department of Welfare that the program was not really about education and welfare, but rather about forced assimilation.<sup>178</sup> The Kootenay and Boundary Citizens’ Committee on Doukhobor-Canadian Affairs seemed to understand clearly enough the purpose of the program. Minutes from their first meeting indicate support for a stiffening of the New Denver program with the goal of making “good Canadian citizens out of our minority groups.”<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> Fraternal Council CCBRD, Open letter to AA Gusskin, Sondalo, Italy, 1955, Doukhobor Collection, SFU.

<sup>177</sup> *Report of the Sons of Freedom Situation September 1953 to May 1954*, quoted in: Ombudsman, *Righting the Wrong*, 9.

<sup>178</sup> Ombudsman, *Righting the Wrong*, 10.

<sup>179</sup> Kootenay and Boundary Citizens’ Committee on Doukhobor Canadian Affairs, minutes, Doukhobor Research Collection, D.Ms. 25.

The invocation of race and genocide by opponents of New Denver had an impact on the way New Denver was framed by supporters of the program. The rhetoric of “getting tough” with the “Douks”—popular during the 1953 election campaign—was replaced with the language of children’s rights once the New Denver project was under way. Supporters of the program would now say such things as, “The children are not being imposed upon in being required to attend school; they are being granted a privilege, which their parents deny them...”<sup>180</sup> In 1957 W.A.C. Bennett explained, “The children have a right to a Canadian education ... We have nothing but goodwill for all the Doukhobors.”<sup>181</sup> The language no longer made reference to the moral duty to populate the West with Anglo-Saxons, but the logic of educational assimilation in order to inculcate a political subjectivity remained. The reason Bennett could claim goodwill towards the Doukhobors was because the communal project had almost completely disintegrated and the majority of Doukhobors were integrated into local economies. The removal of children from their homes, the element least in keeping with the integrationist approach to education, was reframed as a right and a privilege.

---

<sup>180</sup> “The ‘Sons’ Got the Right Answer,” *Vancouver Province*, January 8, 1954.

<sup>181</sup> “Bennett on Doukhobors,” *Colonist*, July 26, 1957.



**Figure 5** *Parents stand outside of perimeter fence at the New Denver dormitory where Sons of Freedom children were housed from 1953 to 1959 (Photo by Art Stevens and Alive Stevenson, © Touchstone Nelson, Accession: 2008.023.279)*

For the most part Bennett, and the closest members of his political team, framed Doukhobor education in terms of law enforcement and security. Unlike the carefully crafted Research Committee's assessment of the need to provide tools for the adaptation of a culture to the mainstream, Bennett and Attorney General Bonner—and arguably the angry constituents of the interior—simply wanted the Sons of Freedom out of the way. The decision to use childhood education and forced integration into public schools as a solution was likely influenced by the prevalence of integrationist thought, but the more immediate goal was to get rid of the Sons of Freedom as an obstacle to Bennett's vision for the province. The Sons of Freedom violent resistance to government intervention,

especially the bombings of railways, was a particularly troublesome obstacle to Bennett's comprehensive plan<sup>182</sup> to develop the hinterlands of BC.

This episode provides further evidence of the variability of colonial ideologies across time and amongst different political actors. W.A.C. Bennett's development of transportation infrastructure and large-scale hydro-electric projects was no less colonizing for lacking the use of integrationist language. Bennett was actively making the modern economy and society into which Indigenous peoples and the Sons of Freedom were supposed to integrate. Bennett's economic development policy was rooted in a view of the land and resources with parallels to the earlier material colonial vision of land. By not fully exploiting the resources of BC, previous governments had wasted them. He explained, "We have a great asset which is now being exported, unused, for which we do not receive a single nickel. It is exported to ocean; to the Arctic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, unused."<sup>183</sup> Like the colonization of the Prairies, economic development was a moral duty, though now it was highways and hydroelectric dams rather than homesteads that were required. Bennett's vision, which required the elimination of the Sons of Freedom, had an enormous impact on Indigenous peoples as well. In 1956 the Sinixt, displaced by the Doukhobor settlement in BC, were "extincted" by the federal government. Soon afterwards, their traditional territory was flooded by the construction of the Keenleyside Dam. The Ktunaxa, also claiming this traditional territory, were not recognized in this ideology of land use. Similarly, the Tsay Keh Dene's traditional

---

<sup>182</sup> Stephen Tomblin, "W.A.C. Bennett and Province-Building in British Columbia," *BC Studies* 85 (1990), 47.

<sup>183</sup> W.A.C. Bennett on BC's hydroelectricity future, July 16, 1961, CBC Digital Archives, CBC/Radio-Canada, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

territory along the Peace River would also be flooded by Bennett's drive to modernize the interior and north of the province.

### **Conclusion**

The preceding chapter on education has traced the development of the "Doukhobor problem" through the racial assimilationist program of J.T.M. Anderson, through various assimilationist provincial policies aimed at undermining the religio-political identity of the Doukhobors of BC (such as the Community Regulation Act), and finally through removal and re-education of Sons of Freedom children in the 1950s. All of these government programs used education as a tool to create a settler-subject who would accept Canadian authority. This was the goal of Indian Affairs and immigrant education alike. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the ideal settler-subject was a high bar to reach as it was explicitly based on imperialist Anglo-supremacy. The policy of breaking a community by removing children for re-education has strong colonial roots, and official statements support the view that the removal of Sons of Freedom children during Piers Island and New Denver were both based on assimilationist logic that grew out of this colonial past.

This chapter has also traced the decline of "racial assimilation" discourse and the rise of integrationism in education. During this transitional period, the settler-subject making project became less demanding on the Doukhobors by allowing the continued existence of Doukhobor culture as long as the Doukhobors accepted Canadian sovereignty. During this mid-century period of transition, commentators and government officials would still use earlier assimilationist language and methods of subject making, but they also faced increasing criticism for doing so. Settler-subject making during this

integrationist period began to resemble the earlier material colonial approach that expected market forces and economic integration to do the assimilatory work that the heavy hand of government intervention had failed to bring about.

If re-interpreting Doukhobor history through the lens of settler colonialism sheds light on the settler-subject formation inherent in government education policy toward Doukhobors, it also obscures certain details. Other historical accounts have focused on factionalism in the Doukhobor movement, the strengths and weaknesses of Doukhobor leadership, and details about the Doukhobor faith.<sup>184</sup> These accounts of *internal* factors affecting Doukhobor reactions to public education and the rise of the Sons of Freedom are essential in understanding the complexity of a history with several competing viewpoints. An excellent alternative interpretation focusing on sectarianism and the impact of Sons of Freedom “terrorism” on Community and Independent Doukhobor communities is Andrei Bondoreff’s study.<sup>185</sup> While noting the ineffectiveness of the New Denver experiment due to its reinforcing of a sense of martyrdom in Sons of Freedom,<sup>186</sup> Bondoreff also focuses on the violent pressure exerted by radical Sons of Freedom on fellow Doukhobor parents that considered sending their children to public schools.<sup>187</sup> Likewise, Koozma Tarasoff has argued that the source of the injustice at New Denver should be placed squarely on Sons of Freedom parents who owe their children and the

---

<sup>184</sup> Woodcock and Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*; Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava*; Janzen, *Limits on Liberty*; Cran, *Negotiating Buck Naked*.

<sup>185</sup> Andrei Bondoreff, “Spirited Differences: Doukhobor Sectarianism, Freedomite Terrorism and Government Policy” (master’s thesis, University of Victoria, 2008).

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*, 77-8.

broader Doukhobor community an apology.<sup>188</sup> This complicated history of victimizing and being victimized is perhaps one of the reasons that the BC Ombudsman's report into New Denver focuses on children's rights and intentionally glosses over the history leading to this government program. The report argues that the children at New Denver were caught in a political confrontation beyond their control and that, "[w]hile there may be an historical recounting of events leading up to the confinement, such a restatement may only stand in the way of healing for these individuals."<sup>189</sup> The danger here is that in these two radically different accounts of New Denver, one focusing on terrorism and the other on children's rights, there is a risk of making a normative judgement about New Denver based on one's sympathy or antipathy toward the Sons of Freedom. Instead, the analysis of this dissertation has sought to focus on the complex interplay of public pressure, electoral politics, academic policy advice, government-directed economic development, and the discursive environment of a settler-colony in the development of educational policy aimed at shaping settlers as governable subjects.

There is an important piece of evidence that suggests that the disputes between governments and the Doukhobors over education were about fundamentally different visions of subjectivity tied to different visions of governance. The 1957 Perepolkin case<sup>190</sup> was one of the few times that a member of the Sons of Freedom attempted to work through the courts. The Perepolkins attempted to get custody of their child, who was held at New Denver, by appealing to freedom of religion. Their version of "freedom

---

<sup>188</sup> Koozma Tarasoff, "Review of News Article about Residential School Apology," *Spirit-Wrestlers Blog*, May 24, 2012, <http://spirit-wrestlers.blogspot.ca/2012/05/review-of-news-article-about.html>.

<sup>189</sup> Ombudsman, *Righting the Wrong*, 3.

<sup>190</sup> *Perepolkin v. British Columbia* [1957], 23 W.W.R. 592, 27 C.R. 95 (B.C.C. A.).

of religion” was not recognized by the Judge, Sidney Smith, who saw religion as a narrow sphere of life compatible with state sovereignty:

I, for my part, cannot feel that in this case there is any religious element involved in the true legal sense. It seems to me that religion is one thing: a code of ethics, another, a code of manners, another. To seek the exact dividing line between them is perhaps perilous but I absolutely reject the contention that any group of tenets that some sect decides to proclaim form part of its religion thereby necessarily takes on a religious colour. ... This clearly to my mind involves the claim that a religious sect may make rules for the conduct of any part of human activities and that these rules thereby become ... part of that sect’s religion. This cannot be so.<sup>191</sup>

The reason why Smith could not see this as an issue of religious freedom is because it was much more than “religion” in the narrow sense offered by Smith. The Sons of Freedom rejection of public education was part of a religio-political worldview that demanded not simply accommodation, but the active living out of an alternative sovereignty to the state. As can be seen in early Community Doukhobor and Sons of Freedom conceptualizations of a lived relationship to land and experiential learning, this alternative form of governance, like Canadian colonial governance, created a certain form of subjectivity. In the 1950s, the majority of Doukhobors would have fit Smith’s definition of religion in that they accepted the legitimacy of the state, but earnestly sought to protect their religious and cultural distinctiveness. However, the Sons of Freedom, like the early Community Doukhobors, were a different matter altogether.

The Sons of Freedom education crisis in the years following WWII, revealed an emerging theory of integration shared between provincial and federal levels of government. This theory drew lessons from failed experiments in forced assimilation, and urged a thoughtful, scientific approach to state management of Indigenous peoples and

---

<sup>191</sup> As quoted in Janzen, *Limits on Liberty*.

immigrant minorities. This theory of integration will be further explored in the detailed analysis of the Hawthorn reports in the chapters that follow.

## Chapter 4: Harry Hawthorn and the Migration of Colonial Knowledge

“The production of knowledge, new knowledge and the validity of specific forms of knowledge, became as much commodities of colonial exploitation as other natural resources.”<sup>1</sup>

“A program for changing the culture should select new traits for reward, offer new constructive roles, ignore or punish undesired traits, and constrain destructive individuals. This would be only a specialized form of a universal process of history ... Successful results of this procedure could be documented from some instances of rapid cultural change among primitive peoples.”<sup>2</sup>

This chapter engages with the problem of how colonial ideologies are spread and how they come to be applied to problematic settlers and Indigenous peoples alike. The idea that the government techniques of subject making and the ideologies that support them migrate between government officials and diffuse throughout settler society is central to the argument about relational overlap, but this idea has been latent rather than explicit throughout the dissertation. This chapter provides both a theoretical interpretation of colonial knowledge and an empirical analysis of the way that colonial knowledge and government tactics move between contexts (national, subnational, government departments, and civil society) and create relational overlap. This analysis focuses on the figure of Harry Hawthorn.

Harry Bertram Hawthorn was born in Wellington, New Zealand in 1910 and ultimately became one of the most prominent anthropologists in 20<sup>th</sup> century Canada. The Great Depression caused a significant shift in his early career, forcing him and his first wife to take work as a teaching couple in the Maori Native School system. This fateful

---

<sup>1</sup> Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Zed Books, 2012), 119.

<sup>2</sup> Harry Hawthorn ed., *The Doukhobors of British Columbia* (Vancouver: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1955), 38.

turn ignited his interest in the Maori and thus began his career in anthropology. Several years after completing his PhD in anthropology at Yale, Hawthorn was invited in 1947 by the president of UBC, N.A.M. MacKenzie, to become the first anthropologist in the Department of Economics, Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology.

Hawthorn arrived in British Columbia with a self-awareness of his historical location at a juncture in colonial policy towards Indigenous peoples. He also arrived with the political ambition to make social science, specifically applied anthropology, central in the formulation of policy around integration and acculturation. Soon after arriving in BC, however, Hawthorn's attention was directed toward the Doukhobors rather than Indigenous peoples. Hawthorn chaired the *Doukhobor Research Committee* that had been commissioned by the Government of British Columbia to examine the source of conflicts between the government and this religious minority group. The Committee reported in 1952, and the *Report of the Doukhobor Research Committee* was published as *The Doukhobors of BC* in 1955. Then, in 1954 Hawthorn was asked by the Branch of Indian Affairs, then within the federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration, to chair another research project regarding the Indigenous peoples of BC. This 1955 report would also be published for the public in 1958 as *The Indians of British Columbia: A Study of Contemporary Social Adjustment*.

He immediately set about creating a network of key political actors in order to create and mobilize knowledge about the problems and opportunities facing Indigenous peoples and Doukhobors in BC. As the hub of this network, Hawthorn served as a political agent in framing both the circumstances of the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples as “problems” that arose as a result of cultural conflict and the need to adapt to

modern economy. The characterization of these “problems” in these new terms grew out of previous failed attempts by the government at forced assimilation. Although the reports reject earlier racial colonial ideologies, the integrationist solution continued to be premised on a state project of making governable subjects out of Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples. The reports provide an example of integrationist colonial ideology that justifies the economic and political basis of settler colonialism in non-assimilationist terms. To date no one has studied the political significance of the overlap found between Hawthorn’s reports on the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples.

This chapter and the next focus on the relational overlap in Hawthorn’s government commissioned reports. This chapter examines the colonial context and origin of Hawthorn’s integrationist ideology. It argues that by tracing Hawthorn’s training as an anthropologist and examining his early writing, one can see that Hawthorn’s integrationism was not a rejection of colonialism, but rather a new solution to the old problem of colonial rule and governance. This colonial knowledge was then transported to BC and further built upon and diffused by a network of scholars, public servants, and prominent members of the public that Hawthorn developed around his two 1950s reports. In addition to relational overlap in the content of the reports, the analysis of Hawthorn’s networks demonstrates overlap between the members of the Doukhobor and Indigenous research projects, suggesting a mechanism for the migration of knowledge. The analysis of the colonial conditions that made possible Hawthorn’s reports (and the problem framing and solutions contained in them) is necessary in order to understand the ideological overlap in the two reports as more than mere coincidence. While the current chapter engages with the colonial context of the two reports and the theoretical

importance of colonial knowledge, Chapter 5 engages in a close reading of the two reports. This close reading demonstrates a continued relational overlap between the projects of settler-subject formation and dispossession of Indigenous peoples even as integrationism replaces earlier coercive assimilation projects. Chapter 4 introduces the argument that Hawthorn's research represented a move towards colonial "containment" by framing the Doukhobor and Indigenous "problems" in such a way as to exclude foundational issues of land and sovereignty; however, this argument is more fully developed in Chapter 5 through a close reading of the two reports and their recommendations.

The current chapter begins by taking stock of the dissertation's argument to this stage, and how official colonial knowledge and colonial ideologies (and their migration) operated in the land and education projects of Doukhobor subject making. The analysis then turns to the theoretical significance of colonial knowledge and the significance of framing political "problems" as a form of colonial governance aimed at shaping subjectivity. The chapter then engages the question of what it means to describe Hawthorn's integrationism as colonial and whether this is a post-facto imposition of present day scholarly sensibilities on the past. With a theoretical basis for understanding Hawthorn's interventions in place, the chapter turns to analysis of archival sources to demonstrate the extent of the colonial network through which Hawthorn developed and dispersed his ideas. The chapter concludes by discussing the implications for understanding both the study of settler colonialism and existing Doukhobor historiography.

### **Doukhobor land and education conflicts and colonial knowledge**

At this stage, the analysis of Doukhobor conflicts with the state regarding land and education has shown that colonial ideologies matter in the project of settler-subject making and are key sites where overlap occurs between the twin projects of settlement and dispossession. While colonial actors drew on broadly circulating ideologies of land and educational assimilation, the particularities on the ground in Canadian settler colonialism meant that colonial actors applied these ideologies unevenly in response to different circumstances and these ideologies were often contested. This contestation gave political meaning to the material aspects of the colonial project. As much as settler colonialism is a material process, even the largely economic vision of settlement put forward by Mavor and Sifton (chapters 1,2) drew on colonial ideology that conceptualized land and labour as shapers of subjectivity.

The previous chapter demonstrated that the assimilatory education project aimed at Doukhobors followed as a consequence of the partial failure of the land project to fully assimilate and make the Doukhobors into settler-subjects. The educational projects aimed at Indigenous peoples and the Doukhobors also relied on the widely circulating colonial ideology of racial assimilation and improvement. This ideology was formalized in J.T.M. Anderson's publication *The Education of the New Canadian*.<sup>3</sup> This ideology saw racial assimilation as dependent on the removal of parental cultural knowledge transmission, the destruction of subjectivities tied to alternative non-state political communities, and the teaching of a subjectivity compatible with British Canadian institutions of government. Chapter three left the reader in the midst of the 1950s political crisis over

---

<sup>3</sup> J.T.M. Anderson, *The Education of the New-Canadian* (Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1918).

Doukhobor education, where politicians and citizens were increasingly challenging the racial assimilation ideology with integrationist and child welfare perspectives.

The ideational context of the settler colonial project presented in the previous chapters shaped how colonial actors conceptualized the “Doukhobor problem” and the political solutions they offered regarding the making of ideal settler-subjects. The previous chapters have drawn on various sources to illustrate the ideational context of the time: for example, newsprint, popular missionary adventure accounts (John McDougall), government correspondence, and Hansard transcripts. While colonial ideology is created and disseminated at multiple sites, including organic bottom up growth from settler society, a crucially important source for the uptake, modification, and dissemination of colonial ideology is official state supported knowledge. Mavor’s reports on immigration, John McDougall’s Doukhobor Land Commission, the Blakemore Royal Commission, the Sullivan Royal Commission, and even the 1999 BC ombudsman report on New Denver, are all examples of state-backed knowledge creation about the Doukhobor problem. They were particularly consequential in the conflicts between Doukhobors and the state because they engaged experts, were aimed at policy makers, and set the terms of debate even amongst civil society through news coverage of the reports. No hard line can be drawn between popular and official colonial knowledge as the previous chapters demonstrate that the two bleed together; sometimes official knowledge producers also contribute to popular forums (e.g. newspaper editorials, popular books, public speeches) and official knowledge is likewise taken up in civil society. However, conceptually, official knowledge is distinguished by the fact that it is a colonial technique available only to the state in shaping subjectivities.

Hawthorn's 1950s reports continue this tradition of official colonial knowledge creation. As the previous chapters have demonstrated, the desire to know the other in order to better assimilate and govern was a technique of colonial government that predated Hawthorn's reports.<sup>4</sup> The creation of agricultural production statistics and the mapping of racial distribution of settlers in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century was a government attempt to harness the knowledge of political economics to fine-tune the process of settlement and settler-subject making. Hawthorn was also not unique in being part of a large colonial network through which this knowledge could migrate. Mavor's network of scholars, prominent businessmen, politicians, and cultural elites meant that he was likewise well positioned to transfer colonial knowledge from Britain to Canada and back. The wealth of archival documentation surrounding the production of Hawthorn's reports, however, allows an in depth empirical analysis of the production and dissemination of official colonial knowledge. The story of the two Hawthorn reports of the 1950s is not a story of only one man; in a concrete way the reports are the product of whole teams of researchers, while more abstractly they are the product of broad post-WWII shift in Canadian society—a shift toward an ethical consciousness regarding coerced assimilation and the rise of integrationist ideology. By focusing on one actor, however, one can gain a detailed account of how colonial knowledge migrates between countries, between various political actors, between levels of government, and between targeted Indigenous and settler groups.

### **Colonial Knowledge as Colonial Governance**

---

<sup>4</sup> See for example, J.T.M. Anderson's injunction to know the other in chapter 3.

The theoretical insight that colonial knowledge and colonial governance are connected through colonial networks has been developed elsewhere. Edward Said has argued that institutions of colonial governance have historically supported scholarly research and cultural production and that these knowledges circulate from the colonies to the metropole through networks.<sup>5</sup> The theoretical basis of this chapter, however, is indebted to Linda Tuhiwai Smith's work on the scholarly production of colonial knowledge.<sup>6</sup> Similar to the conclusions of this dissertation, Smith argues that not all colonial knowledge is official, formal, or scholarly. In addition "oral discourse," travellers' tales and adventure stories, newspapers, and travel brochures are some examples of the informal migration of colonial knowledge throughout settler society and between Europe and the colonies.<sup>7</sup> However, the formalization of colonial knowledge, especially anthropological knowledge, allowed colonial governments (New Zealand in her account) to select certain experts as "intermediaries" between Indigenous peoples and colonial administration.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the formalization of colonial knowledge created authority and legitimacy for this knowledge and the development of "learned societies" and their networks allowed greater movement and influence of colonial ideas.<sup>9</sup>

One of the key insights into colonial knowledge relevant to interpreting Hawthorn's 1950s reports is Smith's finding that the way the "Indian problem" is framed by researchers is an extension of colonial power. She writes:

Framing 'the ... problem', mapping it, describing it in all its different manifestations, trying to get rid of it, laying blame for it, talking about it,

---

<sup>5</sup> Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993).

<sup>6</sup> Smith, *Decolonizing methodologies*.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 41-42.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 146-7.

writing newspaper columns about it, drawing cartoons about it, teaching about it, *researching* it, over and over ... how many occasions, polite dinner parties and academic conferences would be bereft of conversation if ‘the indigenous problem’ had not been so problematized?<sup>10</sup>

Problem framing or problematization has been colonial because it is settler scholars and colonial officials that are able to set the terms of the political debate, define the source of the problem, and define solutions without challenging the fundamental colonial relationship of oppression.<sup>11</sup> This formulation means that certain problematizations of both the “Indian problem” and the “Doukhobor problem” exclude certain anti-colonial solutions (e.g. fundamental changes to dominant conceptualizations of sovereignty and territory) because of the way the problem is conceptualized. Colonial problem framing also excludes the possibility that the positions of *author and object* in the problem-framing could be reversed (that is, that settlers are the problem). Specifically, both Hawthorn reports reproblemate questions around sovereignty and land by focussing on the solution of integration. An analysis of the shifting post-war colonial context in which Hawthorn produced his reports is necessary to understand why a specific problematization and solution was pursued regarding both Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples, and how it resulted in relational overlap.

The problematizations in the Hawthorn reports should not be read as merely a lack of engagement with questions of land and sovereignty. In fact, what is significant about Hawthorn’s ideological contribution is that he is aware of previous colonial problematizations around these themes and instead attempts to create a new problem framing that allows different forms of subjectification to emerge. His elisions serve a

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 165.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 167.

productive purpose in putting forward integrationism as a new solution to a new political problem. He gestured to this theoretical move when he wrote, “Most important, an over-awareness of the past can easily lead to a belief that a current situation has a massive inflexibility, and discourage initiative in seeking a solution to its problems.”<sup>12</sup>

### **Presentism and the Hawthorn Reports**

Describing both of the Hawthorn Reports of the 1950s as ‘colonial’ carries significant implications. The type of colonial knowledge created in the two reports is complex; it is not a clean break from previous attempts at assimilation, nor does it mirror the positions of the governments that commissioned the reports. The Hawthorn fonds at UBC contain some evidence that *The Indians of British Columbia* was well received by Indigenous people at the time. In 1957 a Wolastoqiyik (Maliseet) man named Andrew Nicholas Jr. wrote Hawthorn to express his “sincere gratitude,” saying, “I feel that my peoples’ sentiments have, finally, found expression in your report.”<sup>13</sup> There is no doubt that Hawthorn was genuinely concerned with the welfare of Indigenous peoples and Doukhobors (including the Sons of Freedom faction).

This chapter and the following chapter take issue with the assessment of one scholar that “[w]hile Hawthorn’s 1950s survey clearly endorsed integrationist measures and *can be read as colonialist when assessed by modern standards*, for its time, it was highly innovative.”<sup>14</sup> In fact, both Hawthorn reports were simultaneously innovative *and* colonial. The following analysis rejects the idea that “modern standards” are the sole

---

<sup>12</sup> Harry Hawthorn, Cyril Belshaw and Stuart Jamieson, *The Indians of British Columbia: A Study of Contemporary Social Adjustment* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 33.

<sup>13</sup> “Andrew Nicholas Jr. to Harry Hawthorn, 25 March 1957.”, box 6, file 27, Harry Hawthorn Fonds, University of British Columbia Archives, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

<sup>14</sup> Byron King Plant, “‘A relationship and interchange of experience’: H.B. Hawthorn, Indian Affairs, and the 1955 BC Indian Research Project,” *BC Studies* 163 (Autumn 2009), 30. Emphasis mine.

basis for judging Hawthorn's report as colonial. The approach of this dissertation to historical thought engages with historical material because of present day political questions, but it also attempts to be historically attentive and accurate. It is not only that present day theorists of settler colonialism have articulated the ways in which integration is colonial, but also that the existing colonial conditions of the 1950s (as exposed through archival evidence) make Hawthorn's work colonial on its own terms. In fact, an analysis of the colonial context is an essential condition for understanding the meaning and motivation behind his problematization and proposed solutions in the reports.

The remainder of this chapter takes up the colonial context in which the Hawthorn reports were produced. This context suggests that the innovativeness and goodwill demonstrated in the two reports should not be taken as a rejection of the colonial project. The previous chapters have demonstrated the contested and politically contingent nature of colonial ideologies that justified the shaping of settler-subjectivity. For example, Reverend John McDougall abhorred the paternalism of Indian Affairs toward Indigenous peoples, yet he was also heavily involved in land-based projects of dispossession and settler-subject making. Likewise, the previous chapter on education provides the reader with the background knowledge that the Sons of Freedom crisis in BC in the late 1940s and early 1950s was the ground for considerable ideological disagreement. While some commentators still appealed to racial difference and the need for coercive techniques of assimilation, welfare officials, members of the public, and officials at Indian Affairs were increasingly calling for a new integrationist approach to settler minorities and Indigenous peoples. Both Hawthorn reports were written with knowledge that previous attempts to shape subjectivity through imprisonment, removal of children, forced education, and land

dispossession were unsuccessful and ethically dubious. In contrast to these approaches to assimilation, and similar to early 20<sup>th</sup> century economic visions of colonialism, Hawthorn's integrationism assumed that a hands-off approach to integration would allow market and social forces to organically shape the character of Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples. Exposure to Canadian society and integration into the wage economy would do the work of subjectification that the heavy hand of state coercion had failed to accomplish.

### **Global Colonial Experiments in Cultural Change**

As mentioned in the introduction, Harry Hawthorn's interest in anthropology was born in his experience teaching Maori children. This interest sent him overseas to pursue his Master's in Anthropology from the University of Hawaii in 1938; he went on to complete his PhD at Yale under the supervision of Bronislaw Malinowski. While one should not overstate the influence of Malinowski on Hawthorn—after all, the student is rarely a carbon copy of his or her supervisor—Malinowski's thought about “primitive peoples” can be traced in many of the aspects of the two Hawthorn reports.

By the 1930s Malinowski's interest in “primitive” peoples had turned to an interest in the colonial administration of these peoples. In 1929, he wrote that the “gradual expansion of one form of civilization over the whole world was one of the greatest crises in human history.”<sup>15</sup> He noted, “When groups of people are rapidly developing new commercial and industrial ventures there is much room for abuse, for maladjustment, for the creation of conflicts and dangerous prerogatives.”<sup>16</sup> He was

---

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in Carlo Rossetti, “B. Malinowski, the Sociology of ‘Modern Problems’ in African and the ‘Colonial Situation’,” *Cahiers d'étude africaines* 25, no. 100 (1985), 483.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

perhaps one of the first anthropologists to critically reflect on the relationship between colonial state administration and the anthropologist. While Malinowski was sympathetic to Indigenous peoples and urged anthropologists to work for native rights, his approach was paternalistic.

Malinowski saw “direct” colonial rule in Africa as particularly destructive because of its overt exploitation, but also because of its attempt to make “the African into a caricature of the European.”<sup>17</sup> Because of this stance on colonial administration, he advocated for the continued existence of some Indigenous institutions alongside indirect rule by the colonial power<sup>18</sup> to transition “primitive” people into participants in a modern economy. The goal was to maintain some amount of Indigenous culture—in contrast to forced assimilation—while maintaining the power of the colonial state.<sup>19</sup> Malinowski believed that public policy could be seen as a type of anthropological experiment in cultural change;<sup>20</sup> forced assimilation and economic exploitation were a failed experiment. Hawthorn’s supervisor was not only a forerunner in “applied anthropology,” but also a theorist of the ethical basis for Hawthorn’s integrationism. This approach, with its focus on cultural contact and change, was an alternative to the evolutionary and developmental stages approach to Indigenous peoples, yet the central problem remained reconciling Indigenous peoples with the existence of colonial political power.

---

<sup>17</sup> Quoted in Thomas Weaver, “Malinowski as Applied Anthropologist,” In *The Dynamics of Applied Anthropology in the Twentieth Century: The Malinowski Award Papers*, Thomas Weaver ed. (Oklahoma City: SFAA, 2002).

<sup>18</sup> Ernst Gellner, “The Political Thought of Bronislaw Malinowski,” *Current Anthropology* 28, no. 4 (1987), 558.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> Weaver, “Malinowski,” 27.

The theme of a controlled, non-revolutionary political reform of colonial rule was apparent in Hawthorn's early work before his move to Canada. In 1944, Hawthorn returned to his interest in Maori adaptation to modern economy in a piece entitled, "Maori: A Study in Acculturation."<sup>21</sup> In this piece Hawthorn used New Zealand as a sort of best practice case study for other colonial nations. He argued that despite the Maori being racialized, they were not considered second class citizens; they served in government, inter-married with Whites, and "were one of the first native peoples of the Pacific to belie the myth of the 'vanishing primitive'."<sup>22</sup> The article went on to argue that New Zealand's "contented conquered" were the result of legal equality;<sup>23</sup> the real challenge facing New Zealand was the integration of the Maori into a modern economy through trades training and government-sponsored development programs aimed at making capital available to Maori.<sup>24</sup> While sympathetic to the co-operative culture of the Maori (he suggested harnessing this character trait for co-operative economic ventures) Hawthorn believed that the traditional political structures of Maori were unlikely to serve any important function in the future and suggested that Maori nationalism was a divisive force.<sup>25</sup> As in Malinowski's approach to applied anthropology, this suggests a policy of containment of Indigenous politics that were incompatible with colonial power rather than forced assimilation. In contrast to a perspective that seeks to understand Indigenous political forms as an inherently valuable foundation for a political community, Hawthorn saw Indigenous political organization in instrumental terms for the benefit of the settler

---

<sup>21</sup> Harry Hawthorn, "Maori: A Study in Acculturation," *American Anthropological Association Memoirs* 64 (1944), 44-48.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 46-8.

state. He argued for an inquiry into Indigenous political organizations in order to assess what forms “could be used for the democratic process.”<sup>26</sup>

Hawthorn also weighed in on shifting colonial policy by the Australian government. In 1945, the Australian government announced that it would dismantle the system of indentured labour in New Guinea and become a leader in “trusteeships respecting dependent peoples.”<sup>27</sup> Hawthorn argued that while those who initiated the indentured labour system believed it would introduce civilization, this experiment in human change had disastrous consequences; in fact, it destroyed Indigenous culture and left nothing but suffering as a substitute.<sup>28</sup> His solutions to this failed experiment were in keeping with his supervisor’s insights: expert anthropological advice to administrators, tutelage through indirect rule, and needs-based education.<sup>29</sup> On the issue of education, Hawthorn also had first-hand experience in the failure of forced assimilation methods in New Zealand; Hawthorn claimed to have advised the Church of England that their residential schools were harmful because of “segregation and inferiority of equipment,” and that the schools should be located in population centres where Maori youth could gain trades training.<sup>30</sup>

### **Hawthorn’s Arrival in British Columbia: A New Frontier in Experimentation**

By the time Hawthorn arrived in British Columbia his focus on providing expert advice to policy makers to ensure a more successful experiment in directed cultural change had been cemented. Hawthorn was part of a broad movement toward social

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 46.

<sup>27</sup> Harry Hawthorn, “Indentured labour in New Guinea,” *Far Eastern Survey* 15, no. 5 (1946), 74.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 78.

<sup>30</sup> “Harry Hawthorn to W.S. Arneil, Commissioner of Indian Affairs (BC),” box 14, file 6, 6 December 1951, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

science expertise in colonial administration; in an era of unravelling colonialism and empire, Canada was one of many countries seeking expert advice on reform to colonial policy.<sup>31</sup> Given Hawthorn's supervision by Malinowski—who was himself self-conscious of the anthropologist's role in colonial administration—and Hawthorn's early writings about major transformations in colonial policy, it is evident that Hawthorn displayed agency in his choice to pursue an integrationist solution to the problem of colonialism.

Soon after his arrival in BC, Hawthorn set about gathering information from bureaucrats, politicians, and anthropologists on the current situation of Indigenous peoples in BC. Although he had just begun his research in this part of the world, his own work and the work of other anthropologists already set the agenda. In September 1947 he wrote to Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources Hugh Keenleyside (responsible for Indian Affairs) detailing his project:

I have taken a new position in Social Anthropology at the University of British Columbia, and am looking forward to gaining a knowledge of the Indians of B.C. and their problems. I have observed or worked at guiding the change of tribal cultures in New Zealand, Hawaii, South America, and the United States, and hope that this experience is going to be of some value in the B.C. setting.<sup>32</sup>

Hawthorn's initial networking with non-governmental organizations in BC would have reinforced his belief that colonial policy toward Indigenous peoples was in flux. Anthony Walsh of the Indian Arts and Welfare Society wrote to Hawthorn that he had “arrived at a very opportune time in B.C. just at the dawn of a new age for our Indian people.”<sup>33</sup> With the knowledge that this was a global process, Hawthorn confirmed Walsh's statement in

---

<sup>31</sup> Plant, “A Relationship and Interchange,” 8.

<sup>32</sup> “H.B. Hawthorn to Dr. Hugh Keenleyside, 15 September 1947,” box 1, file 1, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>33</sup> “Anthony Walsh to Harry Hawthorn,” 7 February 1948, box 1, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

correspondence with the director of New Zealand's Education Department, saying that "The picture here is just in the process of changing, and if I ever wanted a place where I was needed, I have now found one."<sup>34</sup>

Hawthorn's interest in Indigenous policy as a form of experimentation in cultural change can be seen in his request to Major D.M. MacKay of the Indian Affairs Branch to address certain themes in a guest lecture in his course. He asked the official to address the questions: "Are there any new experiments in the government programs for the Canadian Indian?" and "Why have some tribes in BC progressed so much farther than others?"<sup>35</sup> Like other colonial administrators, Hawthorn considered himself a social scientist whose laboratory was the settler colony and who studied experiments on colonial populations using policy instruments (not unlike James Mavor who saw the North West as a laboratory in the economic development of ethnic communities). These new experiments were clearly the result of failed policies of forced assimilation. Walsh, a former Indian Residential School teacher, relayed to Hawthorn a growing sentiment that "We've made a mess of attempting to make them into whites."<sup>36</sup> At a 1948 conference on "Indian Welfare" organized by the Indian Arts and Welfare Society and Harry Hawthorn, ethnobotanist A.E. Pickford argued that the "disgraceful handling of Indian Affairs in the past" was the result of non-scientific "hit-and-miss" approach to Indigenous policy.<sup>37</sup>

The shepherding of Indigenous peoples into modernity was now considered to be a science and Harry Hawthorn had a prominent role in the development of this science in British Columbia. As (first name) Plant explains, building of strong relationships between

---

<sup>34</sup> "Harry Hawthorn to Dr. C.E. Beeby," 8 April 1948, box 1, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds,

<sup>35</sup> "Harry Hawthorn to D.M. MacKay," 5 December, 1947, box 1, file 1, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>36</sup> "Anthony Walsh to Harry Hawthorn," 29 December, 1947, box 1, file 1, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>37</sup> "Address by A.E. Pickford," 1948, box 2, file 4, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

public administration and social scientists was central to Hawthorn's vision of applied anthropology.<sup>38</sup> What Plant misses, however, is the extent of Hawthorn's network of knowledge mobilization that reached beyond established civil servants and included many others, such as Hawthorn's students. Hawthorn invited Indian Affairs Branch official Major D.M. MacKay to guest lecture in his class on topics including the required training for work on reserves.<sup>39</sup> Likewise, he suggested to Keenleyside that some of his students would likely find themselves in the new administrative order,<sup>40</sup> and requested help in expediting the hiring of his students in the Branch of Indian Affairs.<sup>41</sup> He also tapped into his contact, Anthony Walsh, the former Indian Residential School teacher and member of the Indian Arts and Welfare Society to give a talk to his students studying acculturation.<sup>42</sup> The minutes of the 1946-1948 *Special Joint Committee on the Indian Act* served as material for his course on "culture, contact, and change."<sup>43</sup>

The exchange of knowledge was not just between Hawthorn, civil servants, and his students, however. His network had many spokes and he was the hub. Hawthorn also built connections with journalists in the print media, especially at *The Vancouver Sun*.<sup>44</sup> He built relationships with prominent Indigenous figures like Andrew Paul of the North American Indian Brotherhood,<sup>45</sup> George Clutesi,<sup>46</sup> and John Sparrow.<sup>47</sup> Hawthorn also

---

<sup>38</sup> Plant, "Relationship and Interchange," 12.

<sup>39</sup> "Harry Hawthorn to D.M. MacKay," 5 December, 1947, box 1, file 1, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>40</sup> "H.B. Hawthorn to Dr. Hugh Keenleyside," 15 September 1947, box 1, file 1, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>41</sup> "Harry Hawthorn to Hugh Keenleyside," 30 April 1948, box 1, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>42</sup> "Harry Hawthorn to Anthony Walsh," 18 February 1948, box 1, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>43</sup> "Harry Hawthorn to T.F. McIlwraith," 15 September 1947, box 1, file 1, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>44</sup> "Harry Hawthorn to Anthony Walsh," 8 April 1948, box 1, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.; "Anthony Walsh to Harry Hawthorn," 12 March 1948, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.; "Harry Hawthorn to T.C. Hargrave of *Vancouver Sun*," 20 May 1948, box 1, file 3, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.; "Ralph Daly (*Vancouver Sun*) to Harry Hawthorn," nd, box 38, file 8, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>45</sup> "Andrew Paul to Harry Hawthorn," 24 February 1948, box 1, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

served as a liaison passing information between provincial and federal levels of government.<sup>48</sup> Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this information network was the international link that Hawthorn maintained with New Zealand. His birthplace served as a personal connection to anthropologist Diamond Jenness,<sup>49</sup> but more importantly it allowed the communication of Indigenous policy information between bureaucrats in Canada and New Zealand.<sup>50</sup> In 1948, Hawthorn wrote to the Minister of Native Affairs in New Zealand, stating, “The administrations concerned with the Indian of Canada and the United States rightly consider that much of the recent work with the Maori is an example of the best which can be done.”<sup>51</sup>

By the time the provincial government approached University of British Columbia president N.A.M. Mackenzie about the Doukhobor research committee in 1950, Hawthorn already had a conceptual framework for understanding the conflict. For Hawthorn, the problem was one of culture conflict and maladjustment to modern Canadian society and economy; the solution was in a social science-based program of integration. It would be wrong, however, to assume that Hawthorn’s orientation was solely the result of his analysis of failed attempts at assimilation of Indigenous peoples. His network also reveals that there was a broader post-WWII concern with civil rights

---

<sup>46</sup> “Harry Hawthorn to Douglas Leechman,” 4 November 1948, box 1, file 4, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>47</sup> “Chief John Sparrow to Harry Hawthorn,” 27 January 1953, box 2, file 3, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>48</sup> “Harry Hawthorn to Minister of Labour John Cates,” 27 April 1950, box 1, file 6, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.; “Harry Hawthorn to N.A.M. Mackenzie, President UBC,” 15 September 1954, box 12, file 10, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.; “Jean Boucher to Harry Hawthorn,” 15 September, 1955, box 12, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>49</sup> “Diamond Jenness to Harry Hawthorn,” 23 April, 1967, box 7, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>50</sup> “Harry Hawthorn to W.S. Arneil, Indian Commissioner (BC),” 22 October 1952, box 1, file 8, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.; “Harry Hawthorn to W.S. Arneil, Commissioner of Indian Affairs (BC),” 6 December 1951, box 14, file 6, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>51</sup> “Harry Hawthorn to Peter Fraser, Minister of Native Affairs,” 6 May 1948, box 1, file 3, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

and equality at play. Although he claimed to have insufficient knowledge of the situation to weigh in on the issue, Hawthorn was made aware of the wartime Japanese-Canadian expulsion from the West Coast and internment through Alice Ravenhill, the president of the BC Indian Arts and Welfare Society.<sup>52</sup> Ravenhill wrote to Hawthorn expressing concern that the return of Japanese-Canadians to the West Coast fisheries would “spell ruin to our Indians.”<sup>53</sup> Although Hawthorn would not take a stand on the issue at the time, it is clear from his participation in the Vancouver Civic Unity Council in subsequent years that Hawthorn saw “race” and cultural relations as important beyond his anthropological interest in Indigenous peoples. Hawthorn’s research network would also put him in contact with James Hirabayashi who would work on the Indian Research Project.<sup>54</sup> James’ older brother, Gordon Hirabayashi, a prominent activist against the internment of Japanese-Americans, would work on the Doukhobor Research Committee. All of this is to say that Hawthorn was well aware of West Coast racism and rights abuses, and this inclined him to a civic equality approach in both reports.

### **Knowledge migration and mobilization**

So far this chapter has traced how Hawthorn’s government-sponsored knowledge production about the Doukhobors and the Indigenous peoples of BC is embedded in a transnational and local network. This migration of knowledge can be traced from the birth of his interest in “primitive peoples” in New Zealand, to his training with Malinowski in the US, and finally to his position as a self-conscious crafter of colonial policy in BC. An analysis of this network demonstrates that Hawthorn was well

---

<sup>52</sup> “Harry Hawthorn to Alice Ravenhill,” 10 February 1948, box 1, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> “Immigration Branch to Harry Hawthorn,” 26 August 1948, box 1, file 3, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

connected and had developed a well thought out framing of the problem of cultural adaptation and labour market integration, but to this point the analysis has not given concrete examples of Hawthorn mobilizing knowledge across levels of government or between those working on Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples.

Hawthorn's network had the effect of gathering researchers together who would go on to make theoretical connections between the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples. Hawthorn included Stuart Jamieson and W.G. Dixon—the two researchers most in agreement with his theoretical orientation during the Doukhobor research—on the Indian Research Project. In fact, Dixon characterized the project as a second chance for “having our views implemented.”<sup>55</sup> W.A.C. Bennett's “get tough” policy on the Doukhobors ignored many of Dixon and Hawthorn's ideas, and so it was a great opportunity to further their integrationist approach applied to different peoples in transition. Claudia Lewis was also involved in both Hawthorn research projects and specifically articulated that it was her work on the Doukhobor project that inclined Hawthorn to include her in the project on Indigenous peoples.<sup>56</sup> Claudia Lewis would go on to complete her PhD dissertation *A Study of the Impact of a Modern Life on a Canadian Indian Band*, a fitting subject for someone interested in the adjustment of peoples to Canadian society and modernity. This small sampling is evidence for the movement of ideas within a scholarly network that, while initially applied to Doukhobors, then applied to Indigenous peoples.

The movement of knowledge between provincial and federal governments can be seen in the case of the 1948 Conference on Native Indian Affairs organized by Hawthorn. The proceedings of this conference were sent out to members of the federal Special Joint

---

<sup>55</sup> “W.G. Dixon to Harry Hawthorn, 29 July 1954.” box 12, file 13, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>56</sup> “Preface, Unpublished Manuscript,” n.d. ,box 7, file 19, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

Committee on the *Indian Act*.<sup>57</sup> This action led Ian Eisenhardt, the newly appointed supervisor of physical education in the Branch of Indian Affairs, to call on Hawthorn for help in developing the program.<sup>58</sup> The conference also put Hawthorn in touch with provincial labour minister John Cates who, like Eisenhardt, had heard of Hawthorn through the published conference proceedings.<sup>59</sup> Hawthorn mobilized social scientific knowledge about economic integration by passing along to Cates an article by Dr. Jamieson—researcher on both Hawthorn reports—that dealt with the fishing industry in BC and Indigenous peoples.<sup>60</sup> Cates indicated that he would make this information available to an upcoming Provincial Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs.<sup>61</sup> This relationship appears to have been mutually beneficial as in 1954, upon hearing about the commissioning of the Hawthorn Indian Research Project, the secretary of the Provincial Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs was happy to help Hawthorn with his research.<sup>62</sup> Hawthorn made civil society contacts with various experts and then passed this information along to both Provincial and Federal officials, acting as an informal intermediary.

Hawthorn was particularly adept at making influential connections, and this was in keeping with an ambitious policy-oriented social scientist. Tracing the movement of knowledge through this network reveals further connections between Hawthorn's work on the Doukhobors and Indians in BC. In the early 1950s Hawthorn began corresponding

---

<sup>57</sup> "Mailing list 1948 Conference" 1948, box 2, file 4, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>58</sup> "Letter from Ian Eisenhardt" n.d., box 1, file 6, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>59</sup> "Letter from Minister John Cates" 12 May 1950, box 1, file 6, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>60</sup> "Letter to Minister of Labour John Cates" 27 April 1950, box 1, file 6, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>61</sup> "Letter from Minister of Labour John Cates" 2 May 1950, box 1, file 6, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>62</sup> "Letter from TR Kelley" 29 April 1954, box 6, file 27, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

with W.G. Black, the BC Regional Liaison Officer for the Department of Citizenship and Immigration (DCI).<sup>63</sup> While Hawthorn was obviously not the sole influence on Black's thinking, the theory of integration, and its ability to be applied to both Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples, must have struck a chord with Black. Later, in 1951, he addressed a women's group in BC suggesting that the model of educational integration was working well for Indigenous people in Nanaimo and could serve as a model for dealing with the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors.<sup>64</sup> Several years later Hawthorn continued his contact with Black, sending him research on the Doukhobors.<sup>65</sup> One should remember, as was discussed in chapter 3, that the merging of Indian Affairs with DCI was meant to create one political project out of the integration of new immigrants and Indigenous peoples.<sup>66</sup> Thus, Hawthorn's work on acculturation of Doukhobors would have been particularly relevant to the department's mandate.

It is here that Hawthorn's network takes a fascinating turn that demonstrates the migration of Hawthorn's ideas between those working on settler and Indigenous subjectification. The impetus for Black's correspondence with Hawthorn in 1957 was a Doukhobor by the name of Koozma Tarasoff. The Saskatchewan regional liaison officer for DCI contacted Black because Tarasoff had been coming into the regional office "at infrequent intervals to discuss topics of mutual interest."<sup>67</sup> Although somewhat cryptic, the rest of the letter indicates that the topics of mutual interest centred around the

---

<sup>63</sup> "Letter from W.G. Black" 10 April 1951, box 1, file 6, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>64</sup> "Doukhobors not a problem speaker tells women's club," *Vancouver Sun*, November 28, 1951.

<sup>65</sup> "Letter to W.G. Black" 22 March 1957, box 5, file 14, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>66</sup> Heidi Bohaker and Franca Iacovetta, "Making Aboriginal People 'Immigrants Too': A Comparison of Citizenship Programs for Newcomers and Indigenous Peoples," *The Canadian Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (2009), 428-9.

<sup>67</sup> "Letter from F.H. Tyler to W.G. Black" 6 March 1957, box 5, file 14, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

question of ethnic group integration.<sup>68</sup> Specifically, Tarasoff was seeking funding for the Doukhobor publication *Inquirer*; when Black sought support from Hawthorn and UBC, Hawthorn argued that there was no way UBC could support this publication since it “[gives] space and editorial approval to Communist peace groups, although I am sure that it is not otherwise captured.”<sup>69</sup> While this anti-communist sentiment is in keeping with Hawthorn’s focus on economic individualism, it is somewhat surprising given Tarasoff’s position as a prominent moderate Doukhobor—just the type of cultural bridge-builder that both of Hawthorn’s reports recommended encouraging (see chapter 5).

The correspondence between the DCI liaison officers also gives insight into the type of on-the-ground integrationist methods the civil servants at DCI were encouraging at the time. Black and the Saskatchewan liaison officer obviously saw benefits in a moderate Doukhobor publication that promoted cultural distinctiveness alongside integration. To find funding for the publication, Black suggested that Tarasoff first approach prominent Doukhobors such as lawyer Pete Faminow who represented the “enlightened groups” of Doukhobors.<sup>70</sup> Second, he recommended that Tarasoff approach wealthy and influential individuals and organizations concerned with ethnic integration and citizenship education.<sup>71</sup> He named Mr. Dal Grauer, the president of the BC Electric Company, as one such person.<sup>72</sup> This exchange is evidence of widespread purchase of the idea of cultural integration as beneficial to economic development and modernization. In

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> “Letter from Harry Hawthorn to G.C. Andrew, Dean of UBC” 13 March 1957, box 5, file 14, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>70</sup> “Letter from F.H. Tyler to W.G. Black,” 6 March 1957, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

other words, Hawthorn's politics of organic economic and political integration resonated in both the public and private sectors.

Hawthorn's theory of culture conflict, adaptation, and integration also resonated with Koozma Tarasoff, who would later become a prominent Doukhobor historian. Despite Hawthorn's initial apprehensions about Tarasoff, it appears that the two came to see each other as allies. Tarasoff would go on to complete graduate studies in anthropology and use this training to work for the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada from 1964-1979, researching economic development and integration of Indigenous peoples.<sup>73</sup> In 1964 Tarasoff contacted Harry Hawthorn asking for any suggestions he might have regarding government research into Indigenous peoples in Canada.<sup>74</sup> Even today, Tarasoff draws parallels between the Doukhobor experience of integration and the problems facing Indigenous peoples in Canada and suggests that the solution is integration—that is, the process of “removing the boundary between ‘us’ and ‘them’.”<sup>75</sup> Tarasoff describes Hawthorn as a scholarly mentor who taught him the difference between assimilation and integration.<sup>76</sup> Interestingly, Tarasoff also names Gordon Hirabayashi, another member of the Doukhobor research team, as a mentor.<sup>77</sup> Tarasoff states that this framework was the spirit animating his work on the draft policy paper that would become the federal government's infamous 1969 White Paper.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Koozma Tarasoff, “Why are First Nations ‘Idle No More’?: Wisdom from the Past,” (unpublished manuscript, February 2013), [http://www.spirit-wrestlers.com/2013\\_Idle\\_No\\_More.pdf](http://www.spirit-wrestlers.com/2013_Idle_No_More.pdf)

<sup>74</sup> “Koozma Tarasoff to Harry Hawthorn, 28 February 1964,” box 33, file 15, Harry Hawthorn fonds.

<sup>75</sup> Tarasoff, “Why are First Nations ‘Idle No More’?”

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

The case of Hawthorn, the DCI liaison officers, and Tarasoff demonstrates the mobility of colonial knowledge on a national level. Anyone familiar with Hawthorn's much more widely known 1963 report *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada* will know that the report recommended seeing Indigenous peoples as "citizens plus," a framework taken up by Harold Cardinal and the Indian Association of Alberta in opposing the 1969 White Paper. How is it, then, that Hawthorn's ideas could be the inspiration for two seemingly opposite policy directions? The first explanation, and the one given by Tarasoff, is that his vision of integration was not reflected in the final version of the white paper.<sup>79</sup> Tarasoff continues to advocate for the dismantling of the Indian Act and full integration of Indigenous communities while maintaining treaty rights and cultural identity.<sup>80</sup>

A second and analytically more important reason for the seemingly contradictory use of integrationist ideology is that the problematization of the Doukhobor and "Indian problem" as a problem of integration was a refinement of failed experiments in assimilation not a rejection of colonialism. The analysis of Hawthorn's network demonstrates the shifting colonial conditions that led to the framing of both 'problems' in this way. Contrary to Patrick Wolfe's influential assertion that throughout all historical iterations of settler colonialism lies a structural logic of "elimination of the native,"<sup>81</sup> the case of Harry Hawthorn demonstrates a theory of cultural adaptation that challenges assimilative elimination in some respects and maintains it in others. While assimilation seeks to overcome the problem of land and competing sovereignty in a settler-colony by

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the elimination of the native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 387-409.

eliminating Indigenous peoples as Indigenous peoples, containment seeks to frame land and governance issues in a way that is non-threatening to Canada's economic and political order. As seen in Hawthorn's early writings and his 1950s reports, the continuation of Indigenous cultures and any form of self-government are not supported on their own terms, but rather are supported to the extent that they provide the tools needed for freely chosen integration. The difference between assimilation and integration is largely a difference in tactics.

Examining Hawthorn's Doukhobor research in this light helps to illuminate the tactical difference between assimilation and containment through integration. Hawthorn explained that many Doukhobors had accepted the authority of the state in welfare provision and policing and that increasing acceptance and integration "hinges largely on the *spirit and form* of administrative action."<sup>82</sup> The overarching spirit of non-coercion and the administrative tactics differ from assimilation, yet the problem of reconciling Doukhobor subjectivity with the settler state remains. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the dominant view in the literature on Hawthorn's Doukhobor work is that the W.A.C. Bennett government's "get tough" policy (especially the removal and re-education of Sons of Freedom children) was in direct opposition to Hawthorn's recommendations. However, when presented with this interpretation by Dr. Werner Cohn of UBC, Hawthorn responded with quite a different interpretation:

I do not think it is quite right to say now that the Provincial Government has done very little with our recommendations. In actual count it has done something positive about most of them. Unfortunately, it has done much

---

<sup>82</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 35. Emphasis mine.

of this without any warmth or understanding, and so has contributed much less than it might have.<sup>83</sup>

Even though he describes the government policy of removal and forced education of Sons of Freedom children as “not ... very intelligent,” he believes that the program is likely “going ahead with good results.”<sup>84</sup>

This analysis takes us far beyond the characterization of Hawthorn’s reports as an enlightened path not taken. Settler colonialism as a global phenomenon created the conditions necessary for the international migration of Hawthorn and his ideas. Once in Canada, a different type of knowledge migration spread his ideology of integrationism in unpredictable ways—for example, its use in the drafting of the White Paper. Tarasoff’s use of the Osoyoos Indian Band as a best-practice example of Hawthorn-inspired economic integration<sup>85</sup> in discussing the *Idle No More* movement suggests that the study of Hawthorn’s ideas is not the study of a forgotten past, but a history of the present.

### **Implications: Doukhobor Historiography and Settler Agency**

The framework of cultural adaptation and integration occupies a prominent position in the understanding of Doukhobor history in Canada primarily because Tarasoff was responsible for writing much of that history. Tarasoff had a prolific career writing about the Doukhobors, and his work *Plakun Trava* is arguably the most comprehensive and influential history of the Canadian Doukhobors written by a Doukhobor. Understanding the genesis of this specific framing of the “Doukhobor problem” in Hawthorn’s historically contextualized work problematizes a dominant historical narrative about the Doukhobors. When Tarasoff characterizes the confinement of Sons of

---

<sup>83</sup> “Letter from Harry Hawthorn to Dr. Werner Cohn” 22 May 1957, box 5, file 14, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>84</sup> “Harry Hawthorn to Claudia Lewis, 22 January 1954,” box 38, file 29, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>85</sup> Tarasoff, “Why Are First Nations ‘Idle No More’?”

Freedom children as “a long and painful process of accommodation to the Canadian ways,”<sup>86</sup> this is the product of a theoretical framework of integration and this framework has a genesis in settler colonial governance that can be traced through genealogical analysis.

Examining both Hawthorn reports together exposes the migration of colonial knowledge through Hawthorn, and it also tells us something about settler agency. Clearly Hawthorn is operating in a world of political forces beyond his control. The failed colonial experiments in forced assimilation, the post-WWII rise of human rights consciousness, the series of political events leading to his 1950s reports, and more specifically the terms of the government-commissioned reports are all constraining/productive factors in his knowledge creation and mobilization. The fact that Tarasoff and bureaucrats at DCI were simultaneously using the language of integration demonstrates that Hawthorn’s integrationism was part of a larger political ideology. Yet Hawthorn’s thought did represent a challenge to prevailing colonial tactics of administration. Hawthorn’s vision of dismantling paternalism in Indian Affairs, the replacement of residential school “education” with highly skilled teachers, and access to capital for Indigenous entrepreneurs would have been a much different direction than the inertia-driven response of Indian Affairs. Likewise, Hawthorn’s recommendations for the Doukhobors would have made an enormous difference in the lives of the Sons of Freedom children that were part of the New Denver experiment.

The Hawthorn reports of the 1950s can be seen as a continuation as well as an innovation in colonial thought, and this suggests a constrained settler agency. This

---

<sup>86</sup> Koozma Tarasoff, *Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors* (Grand Forks, BC: Mir Publication Society, 1982), 130.

provides some hope for current attempts by settlers to decolonize their ways of thinking; in spite of his immersion in a colonial world, Hawthorn was able to propose a new way forward. Unfortunately, despite being sympathetic to the plights of Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples in BC, he reinforced one of the most insidious forms of colonial ideology that encourages cultural distinctiveness, yet contains the foundational political problems of land and sovereignty.<sup>87</sup> This should serve as a warning that what appears as a break with colonial thought is always conditioned by the circumstances of the time.

### **Conclusion**

This chapter has traced the ways in which colonial knowledge in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century migrated internationally and domestically within Canada through the figure of Harry Hawthorn and his networks. It has also laid out the colonial context that gave birth to Hawthorn's problematizing the Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples in a specific way. This contextual analysis has laid the groundwork for a close reading of the two reports in the following chapter.

A further analytical benefit of tracing this knowledge migration through Hawthorn is that it clarifies the political and theoretical connections between the Hawthorn reports on Doukhobors and on Indigenous peoples of the 1950s. The analysis of these reports in a non-isolated manner leads to a rethinking of the dominant characterization of Hawthorn's work as a progressive path not taken. In tandem, the reports reveal a shared ideology of integrationism. Importantly, when Hawthorn applies this integrationism to various distinct groups he betrays the blind spots of integrationism, demonstrating that it entails a politics of containment.

---

<sup>87</sup> The present day form of this type of colonialism is explored in Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel, "Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism," *Government and Opposition* 40, no.4 (2005): 597-614. See especially pages 603-604.

Both of Hawthorn's reports were born of failed state attempts at subjectification through assimilation. This shared genesis, and the tracing of overlap between Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples in Hawthorn's networks, provides concrete evidence that settler-subjectivity is politically constructed in relation to Indigenous peoples. The following chapter examines the two reports to demonstrate specific examples of this overlap and how Hawthorn's politics of containment continued to be a project aimed at shaping the subjectivity of Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples.

## Chapter 5: The Doukhobors of British Columbia and The Indians of British Columbia: Two Reports, One Vision

Economic independence, new occupations, dual language, increased literacy, heightened standard and altered manner of living, are all indices of the amount of acculturation which has occurred in Canada. Indeed, the rapidity of this change, and the social and psychological disturbance it inevitably brings, has been a main cause of the reaction of the Sons of Freedom, whose most intense effort is directed toward opposing it.<sup>1</sup>

This failure to adapt to Western industrialization may occur not only because the modern industrial system lacks positive incentives for many non-industrialized peoples, but also because the values of their cultures may create barriers that prevent any large number of them permanently committing themselves to the new industrial system until new motivations come into play.<sup>2</sup>

This chapter puts forward three arguments. First, it argues that despite a shift away from the discourse of “racial assimilation” the new focus on cultural adaptation and integration continues to operate as a colonial technique in subject formation. Second, it builds on evidence of relational overlap from the previous chapter by demonstrating significant overlap in the content of the two Hawthorn reports. Specifically, both reports use an integrationist solution to a perceived problem of cultural adaptation to modern economy and Canadian political institutions. Third, the chapter argues that integrationism represents a shift from overtly coercive subject making to a politics of containment whereby fundamental challenges to the colonial order are marginalized or re-problematized as compatible with settler economy and governance.

Throughout this dissertation the central claim has been that the Doukhobors (and Sons of Freedom), as problematic settlers, have faced state attempts to remake their

---

<sup>1</sup> Harry Hawthorn ed., *The Doukhobors of British Columbia* (Vancouver: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1955), 11.

<sup>2</sup> Harry Hawthorn, Cyril Belshaw and Stuart Jamieson, *The Indians of British Columbia: A Study of Contemporary Social Adjustment* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 86-87.

subjectivity in line with a settler ideal and that these ideals are created in relation to the colonial project of Indigenous dispossession and re-subjectification. The early history of conflict over land and education provide transparent examples where political actors use the language of the “settler” and explicitly set standards for the ideal settler-subject. With integrationism in general and Hawthorn’s reports in particular it becomes more difficult to recognize this process as the language used increasingly sounds like that of the present day. To speak of equal Canadian citizenship, economic independence, or educational opportunities does not immediately make one think of colonialism in the same way that speaking of heathen tribal communism does. And yet a settler ideal persists in Hawthorn’s thought even as the language of the settler disappears. Hawthorn continues to conceptualize some Doukhobors as problematic through repeated references to the “Doukhobor problem.” The settler ideal to which problematic Sons of Freedom were expected to adhere can be seen in the division between those Doukhobors and Indigenous people who have integrated and those who problematically have not integrated into Canadian life. In *The Indians of British Columbia*, Hawthorn argues that Indigenous community attitudes towards Whites determine whether their relationship with state administration is “co-operative” or “obstructionist.”<sup>3</sup> This ideal was much less stringent than early 20<sup>th</sup> century assimilationist ideals, but continued to require acceptance of Canadian territorial sovereignty. In the words of Hawthorn, the reality of treating Indigenous peoples as citizens meant a “demand for conformity to the laws of Canada and the Province of British Columbia.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 61.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 15.

The purpose of this chapter is not to draw a straight line of analysis from early 20<sup>th</sup> century settler colonialism to the 1950s Hawthorn reports, but rather to take up the theme of continuity *and* disjuncture in colonial ideologies and policies. Hawthorn's integrationism represents a shift away from racial ideologies of subject formation towards a focus on culture as the site of intervention for subject making. This intervention is also conceptualized in a more *laissez-faire* manner where integrated participation in the wage economy and Canadian institutions will organically shape a sense of individualism that is compatible with the settler-colonial project of building a new political community on Indigenous territory. The significance of the shift away from racial ideology is that the core of the settler-colonial project continues even as ideological justification shifts significantly.

The previous chapter described the way in which problematization (or problem framing) can act as a colonial technique by precluding certain anti-colonial solutions to the perceived political problem. In this sense, what is excluded from the Hawthorn reports is equally as important as what is included. This chapter argues that the Hawthorn reports act as a form of containment by reproblematising questions about land and sovereignty as questions of cultural integration. It is not that earlier problematisations of land and sovereignty are absent from the Hawthorn reports, but rather that Hawthorn is making a novel ideological intervention that bypasses stalled or failed solutions based on earlier interpretations of the Doukhobor and "Indian problems." One should expect land and sovereignty to be central to the Hawthorn reports for several reasons. First, as seen in the previous chapters, political debates about land and education were explicit that the problem was about creating subjects compatible with the settler-state. The genesis of the

problems in land and sovereignty could be found in previous government reports and documentation. Second, as the previous chapter demonstrates, Hawthorn was self-reflective and knew that the integrationist project was an attempt to continue colonial governance through new and more humane means. Finally, one should expect land and sovereignty to occupy a central place in the reports because Hawthorn's own papers demonstrate knowledge of the Indigenous land question in BC. Hawthorn was in contact—in person and through correspondence<sup>5</sup>—with Skwxwú7mesh activist and leader of the North American Indian Brotherhood Andy Paull and would have been exposed to the fact that land and title were a central aspect of ongoing colonialism in BC. For instance, in Hawthorn's notes on the 1946-1948 *Special Joint Committee on the Indian Act*, he specifically takes note of Paull's statement about non-extinguishment of title. The implication, as noted previously, is that both reports reproblematicize central aspects of the political situation facing Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples in BC in the 1950s.

This chapter draws on the two published versions of the reports, secondary literature on the political impact of the reports, and material from the UBC Hawthorn Fonds in order to argue that the two reports are ideologically linked to one another. The analysis addresses the limited secondary literature on the political reception of the two reports, much of which mistakenly argues that the reports were reasonable and progressive alternatives to government policies of the day. This is followed by an examination of Hawthorn's framework of analysis. Finally, the analysis will compare and contrast Hawthorn's treatment of labour market integration and education in the two

---

<sup>5</sup> "Harry Hawthorn to Andrew Paull, 17 February 1948," box 1, file 2, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

reports to advance evidence of the relational overlap of the reports. The chapter ends with a discussion of how Hawthorn's reports represent a politics of colonial containment.

### **Assessments of the Hawthorn Reports' Receptions**

Whereas some early critiques of anthropology as colonialism<sup>6</sup> invite an indictment of Hawthorn based on his social location and use of anthropological categories, the secondary literature that assesses these reports is perhaps too quick in characterizing the reports as progressive alternatives to government policy. Byron King Plant points out that Hawthorn's *The Indians of British Columbia* has been largely ignored by academics;<sup>7</sup> as such, Plant's work on assessing the relationship between Hawthorn's social science research and government reception stands as the most thorough research in this area. Plant's research comes to similar conclusions reached by Sally Weaver's assessment<sup>8</sup> of the political impact of Hawthorn-Tremblay report of 1967; both Indian Affairs reports were relied upon only selectively to align with Indian Affairs Branch priorities and the broader priorities of government, with major recommendations being ignored.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See for example Diane Lewis, "Anthropology and Colonialism," *Current Anthropology* 14, no. 5 (1973): 581-602. Lewis' argument that the anthropologist is relied upon for expert knowledge in the administration of colonialism and studies "culture contact and culture conflict" without a self-critical analysis of his implication in this historical process of colonialism can easily be applied to Hawthorn. However, a more productive and nuanced approach to anthropology's complicity in colonialism avoids the universalism of an overarching colonial ideology and instead focuses on local specificity and the conditions of possibility that allow the creation of colonial anthropological knowledge and competing colonial *ideologies*. Examples of this turn in the anthropology of colonialism can be seen in Ann Laura Stoler, "Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31, no. 1 (1989), 134-161, and Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1994).

<sup>7</sup> Byron King Plant, "'A relationship and interchange of experience': H.B. Hawthorn, Indian Affairs, and the 1955 BC Indian Research Project," *BC Studies* 163 (Autumn 2009), 6-7.

<sup>8</sup> Sally Weaver, "The Hawthorn Report: Its Use in the Making of Canadian Indian Policy," in *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada*, Noel Dyck and James Waldram eds. (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993): 75-97.

<sup>9</sup> Plant, "A Relationship and Interchange," 7.

Plant argues that several aspects of the report were deeply critical of Indian Affairs policy and this accounts for its defensive rejection by Indian Affairs. Specifically, he argues that the recommendation to move away from forced assimilation and toward allowing Indigenous peoples to choose their own route to integration was a “fundamental critique” of paternalism in Indian policy.<sup>10</sup> Plant also interprets the report’s recommendation for the continued existence of reserves and Indian Affairs bureaucracy, its critique of the power of the agency superintendent, and some comments on land policy as alternatives to Indian Affairs visions.<sup>11</sup> Plant’s strong archival research provides much evidence to support his ultimate conclusion that while Hawthorn was implicated in colonial government he did not act as “a simple corollary to state power.”<sup>12</sup>

It is not the case that Hawthorn’s study of the Doukhobors was simply a “delay” to his work on Indigenous peoples as Plant contends.<sup>13</sup> In fact, the Doukhobor report allowed Hawthorn to assemble a network of researchers and apply a nascent theory of integration and cultural adaptation, already present in his early writings on “primitive” peoples, to a minority group in BC. Hawthorn cut his teeth on the Doukhobor report and carried over, not only his basic framework, but also some of the findings to his *Indians of British Columbia*. This chapter demonstrates that in studying Hawthorn’s first government commissioned report on the Doukhobors alongside his work on Indigenous peoples, colonial assumptions and misrecognitions become apparent in both reports, namely the marginalization of issues of sovereignty and land.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, 20-25.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 12.

The secondary literature dealing with the political reception of Hawthorn's Doukhobor research is more diverse, yet it is less richly researched than Plant's work. J.C. Yerbury wrote that the report's "constructive and humane recommendations" were interrupted by a change in government and increased violence by the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors.<sup>14</sup> Likewise, Margaret Hill has argued that the recommendations were reasonable and would have avoided the "tragedy inherent in seizing [Sons of Freedom] children."<sup>15</sup> While there is widespread support for this view in the literature,<sup>16</sup> there are also those like Gregory Cran who argue that Hawthorn's interpretation of the problems facing the Doukhobors was a complete misrecognition of the nature of factionalism amongst the Doukhobors.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> J.C. Yerbury, "The 'Sons of Freedom' Doukhobors and the Canadian State," *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Etudes ethniques au Canada* 16, no. 2 (1984), 61.

<sup>15</sup> Margaret Hill, "The Detention of Freedomite Children, 1953-1959," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 18, no. 3 (1986), 50. This "seizure of children" refers to the program of forced education and confinement of the children of Sons of Freedom Doukhobors at New Denver from 1953-1959.

<sup>16</sup> See also William Janzen, *Limits on liberty: the experience of Mennonite, Hutterite and Doukhobor communities in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 139; John McLaren, "The State, Child Snatching, and the Law: The Seizure and Indoctrination of Sons of Freedom Children in British Columbia, 1950-60" in *Regulating Lives: historical essays on the state, society, the individual, and the law*, eds. Dorothy E. Chunn, John McLaren and Robert Menzies (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002), 269.

<sup>17</sup> Gregory Cran, *Negotiating buck naked: Doukhobors, public policy, and conflict resolution* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006), 14.



**Figure 6** Sign posted on Sons of Freedom land that reads: “The land cannot be bought, or sold, or taxes collected thereof. The land is the gift of God by the birthright inheritance of man. Down With private ownership. Down with Boundries (sic). Let the world be a communal abode of all mankind, for the Kingdom of God is already with us on Earth.” The photo was taken during the 1950s, indicating the ongoing conflict regarding land and sovereignty with the state. (© Touchstone Nelson, Accession: 2003.023.844)

All of these accounts have in common a lack of analysis of the colonial context that gave rise to Hawthorn’s choice to examine the Doukhobors as a problem of adjustment to a rapidly modernizing economy. When examined in light of the colonial context in the previous chapter, it becomes clear that he employed an overarching ideology of integration in *The Doukhobors of British Columbia*, and that this ideology had arisen from failed colonial attempts at forced assimilation. Many carefully crafted recommendations in the report reflect detailed research on the specific problems facing

the Community Doukhobors in the early 1950s, but in many respects the report attempts to impose an integrationist framework that did not adequately capture the political challenge that the Sons of Freedom posed as a distinct political community that adhered to alternative conceptualizations of sovereign power and land.

### **The Doukhobor Research Committee in its Political Context**

The story of Doukhobor and Sons of Freedom conflict with the state is a long one involving land, education, the oath of allegiance, vital statistics, and other areas of government intervention. Though previous government action toward assimilation had targeted all Doukhobors, by the time Hawthorn had arrived in BC in 1947, conflict with the provincial government was essentially confined to the radical Sons of Freedom faction. This faction, having developed a strong sense of martyrdom following decades of conflict with the federal and provincial governments—and also having faced increasing integration of the Community Doukhobors into Canadian society—protested against assimilation. Some of this protest took the form of nude demonstrations, but a minority of Sons of Freedom burned and bombed public schools, power lines, and railroads. These attacks were also directed at the Community Doukhobors because of their perceived attachment to materialism. When Hawthorn entered the scene, the Sons of Freedom crisis had reached a fevered pitch. Following the failed Sullivan Commission, the Liberal-Conservative coalition government of BC called for a study of the “Doukhobor problem” as it was by then obvious that previous government action had failed to assimilate all Doukhobors.

### **Re-framing old Problems as Containment**

*The Indians of British Columbia* recommended changes to Indian Affairs policy that were opposed by the Indian Affairs Branch at the time and thus, in this sense, could be considered “progressive”;<sup>18</sup> however, upon closer inspection of Hawthorn’s other anthropological work, it becomes clear that Hawthorn’s project is also a refinement of colonial administration through political containment. This containment can be seen in the Doukhobor report when Hawthorn argues for the freedom of minorities to develop their own cultures “without harm to neighbour or nation.”<sup>19</sup> In both reports the prominence of “Canadian society” is unquestionably taken as the dominant society to which Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples will adapt. For Hawthorn, the continued existence of distinct Indigenous communities “can be integrated, socially, politically and economically as units into the wider Canadian society.”<sup>20</sup> Likewise, continued distinctiveness for the Doukhobors would be in the areas of religion and language, rather than socio-economic separation.<sup>21</sup>

The project of political containment is closely linked with an asymmetrical process of acculturation. Insofar as acculturation ideally involves a process of mutual adjustment of cultures to one another, the two government-commissioned studies into acculturation were looking at a different phenomenon. The reports recommended the adjustment of Canadian “culture” by eliminating overtly discriminatory legislation and by accommodating difference that is compatible with Canadian society. The legal, political and economic structure of “Canadian” culture—that is the elements of culture entwined

---

<sup>18</sup> See Plant’s discussion of Hawthorn’s critique of paternalism and land policy. Plant, “A Relationship and Interchange,” 24-5.

<sup>19</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 16.

<sup>20</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 13.

<sup>21</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 25.

with political power—were never considered as negotiable in the process of acculturation. There was never a justification given in either report for this continued dominance, except for the “fact” that it was inevitable. “Inevitably and universally,” Hawthorn argued, “Indians are taking up the standards of the dominant culture in clothing, technology, housing and furnishings.”<sup>22</sup> According to Hawthorn, there was not a single Indian community that has a “self-sufficient” economy today,<sup>23</sup> nor is there any aspect of Indian culture that had survived into the present without being profoundly changed by cultural adaptation.<sup>24</sup> The Doukhobors, similarly, had no functioning co-operative economies largely due to the inducements to integrate into Canadian society including: individual freedom, fairness of Canadian law, and material comfort.<sup>25</sup> Popular Canadian culture as reflected in comic books and movies acted on Doukhobor children as an “irresistible force.”<sup>26</sup> Throughout both reports there is a barely concealed contempt for those who might suggest that another world is possible. For example, Hawthorn wrote that the Doukhobors arrived in Canada with “fixed ideas of their goal, which included freedom from the control of any government, and they failed to consider its unattainability.”<sup>27</sup> Likewise, Hawthorn described “nostalgic” Indigenous elders that wanted to achieve the impossible: “working to turn back the clock.”<sup>28</sup>

Examining the two Hawthorn reports reveals several ideological innovations in Hawthorn’s thought. In both cases important elements of the fundamental political

---

<sup>22</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 43.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 94.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>25</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 24-25.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>28</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 13.

demands of Sons of Freedom and Indigenous peoples were de-emphasized in Hawthorn's framing of the "problems." For radical Sons of Freedom the report attempted to bypass the fundamental conflict between Canadian sovereignty and an anarchistic theology that demanded complete freedom from state intervention. For Indigenous nations in BC, the report characterized the land question not as an issue of sovereign political communities, or even a question of redistribution of resources, but rather as a question of Indigenous resentment and selective historical memory.

For many moderate Doukhobors, the proposals would likely have seemed quite reasonable. This is because they had already partially integrated into Canadian society and were seeking protection from Sons of Freedom attacks. For many of these Doukhobors, the Hawthorn reports' recommendations and theoretical framing would not only have been acceptable, but would have been an accurate reflection of their process of integration into Canadian society. Hawthorn states that one of the draws toward greater integration is the fact that economic and political integration do not necessitate giving up many Doukhobor beliefs.<sup>29</sup> However, integration can only be achieved if one central belief—or at least a specific interpretation of a central belief—is abandoned: the interpretation of the belief in the voice of God residing in each individual that leads to a rejection of earthly authority. For those moderate Doukhobors that had accepted, if not embraced, state authority, the framework of cultural conflict and the solution of integration did not represent a fundamental misrepresentation of the issues at hand. Hawthorn's insight that discriminatory legislation and anti-Doukhobor prejudice held by

---

<sup>29</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 25.

Canadians were obstacles to further “Canadianization”<sup>30</sup> was likely an apt assessment of the situation.

The political problem inherent in a group like the Sons of Freedom, however, had historically been conceptualized as a problem of competing sovereignty and the need to create a settler-subjectivity that undid this competition to state authority. Hawthorn, however, re-thought this problematic as a question of ethnic relations and integration. The continued adherence to a principle of anarcho-theological rejection of man-made laws by a number of Sons of Freedom adherents points to a radical challenge to the Canadian and provincial political order. During the period immediately before and after the Hawthorn report, documents from the Sons of Freedom demonstrate a characterization of their relationship with the Canadian state as a holy war.<sup>31</sup> In fairness, Hawthorn recognizes a certain segment of the Sons of Freedom as being incorrigible because of their radical opposition to government authority and public education.<sup>32</sup> Hawthorn’s framework, however, marginalizes this element of the “Doukhobor problem” because it does not easily fit with the report’s framework, which is built on integration as a solution. It is almost as if Hawthorn had resigned himself to the impossibility of the situation when he offered as a solution the relocation of radical Sons of Freedom and imprisonment of those that could not comply with Canadian law. The underlying problem of an anarchist rejection of Canadian sovereignty is never addressed, only deferred. Normative questions about the legitimacy of the dominant economic and political order are never addressed. It is as if Hawthorn thought that the problem of unassimilable Sons

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 14.

<sup>31</sup> British Columbia, *British Columbia Royal Commission on Doukhobor Affairs 1948: Interim Report*, 25.

<sup>32</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 19, 40.

of Freedom might disappear through attrition. If the pull of Canadianization was, in fact, an “irresistible force,” and if his recommendations were successful in making this force less coercive, then the fundamental question of sovereignty becomes simply a problem of a handful of criminals living on the margins of society. The historical genesis of Sons of Freedom conflict with the state in land and sovereignty suggests that the Hawthorn report partially re-characterized the political problem at hand. Hawthorn’s self-consciousness regarding integration as a refinement of colonial policy means that this theoretical move was at least partially intentional. Ultimately, no reform to government policy in the form of cultural accommodation could address what, through historical entrenchment, had become a problem of competing sovereignty.

Hawthorn’s myopia is perhaps less excusable, even if understandable, regarding the radical political implications of Indigenous land claims and self-governance. Hawthorn’s assessment of historical Indigenous political communities is rather blunt: they did not exist. As an anthropologist he is aware that one should not expect to find Western political institutions mirrored in these communities.<sup>33</sup> Yet he still writes, “[i]n most groups in British Columbia there was no governmental organization as such, separate from kin and other types of social structure, nor was there any merely political chieftainship even within the villages.”<sup>34</sup> It is important to note Hawthorn’s categorization that maintains a strict division between religion or spirituality and what can be properly understood as “political.” This division, and Hawthorn’s assessment that “unified action” around food acquisition and some religious gatherings were only intermittent, allows the report to maintain the framework of cultural integration without a

---

<sup>33</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 35.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

major threat to this project; various Indigenous communities can maintain their distinctiveness without fundamentally altering the economic or political order in BC. This form of containment does not, however, require the complete elimination of Indigenous government. The report recommends that some Indigenous communities institute a form of local government along the lines of the municipal system that would operate alongside non-Indigenous municipalities.<sup>35</sup> The point is that this political organization, while potentially “distinct,” has been defined in such a way that it no longer challenges provincial or federal authority. The overarching ideology of integration requires the marginalization of this potentially radical political threat, and a redefinition as a problem that can be solved through integration.

Similarly, the report reframes the question of land and resources as a question of cultural understanding. While Hawthorn argues that government denial of Indigenous rights to land is logically dubious<sup>36</sup>—a point that Plant uses to shore up the interpretation of Hawthorn as a progressive alternative to Indian Affairs<sup>37</sup>—he also argues against reopening debates that he sees as confined to the past. The report states:

Problems associated with land—the allocation of reserves, the extinguishment of aboriginal title, the reversionary interests of the Province, the granting of compensation—have been central in the development of administrative relations with the Indians. Although these problems still exist, they are not perhaps of paramount importance today, *and we do not wish to revive an interest in claims which, for all practical purposes, might be considered as finally settled.*<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 471-472.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 51.

<sup>37</sup> Plant, “A Relationship and Interchange,” 25.

<sup>38</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 49. Emphasis mine.

The report does not recommend any attempt to settle the issue of title, but rather recommends framing land policy in a way that is sensitive to Indigenous peoples' "selective" memory of history.<sup>39</sup> The problem, in the Hawthorn report, is not really about land, but about intercultural understanding brought about through "objective history" that is disseminated to Indian Affairs administrators and Indigenous peoples.<sup>40</sup> The accusation of selective historical memory is particularly rich given the report's treatment of the history of the land question in BC that neglects to mention the 1927 Indian Act prohibition on land claims activity.

### ***The Doukhobors of British Columbia and The Indians of British Columbia: Two Reports, One Vision***

The contention of this chapter is that the two reports written by Hawthorn in the 1950s are intimately linked through the framework of culture conflict and integration. Before delving into the similarities between the reports, one should consider the ways in which they are significantly different. The Doukhobor report is comparatively unsystematic as a representation of Hawthorn's integrationist ideology. The various chapters of the report bear the names of each individual author and the individual voices and theoretical commitments of each author show through in the final report. As chair of the research committee, however, Hawthorn provides the two introductory chapters and provides an overarching coherence to the project made up of disparate approaches. Despite being co-authored by Cyril Belshaw and Stuart Jamieson, *The Indians of British Columbia: A Study of Contemporary Social Adjustment* presents a more systematic exposition of Hawthorn's thought on cultural and economic adaptation.

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

The multiplicity of voices in *Doukhobors of British Columbia* results in far greater focus on the “character” type, psychology, and religio-political worldview of the Doukhobors. In the introduction, Hawthorn seems to have trouble reconciling this psychological approach with his “social science” approach to cultural and economic integration.<sup>41</sup> In *The Indians of British Columbia*, Hawthorn explains that given the immensity of the project and heterogeneity of Indigenous peoples there would be little focus on “Indian ‘philosophy’” and worldviews.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, the mandate of the Indian Research Project was driven by the Indian Affairs Branch desire for practical policy advice, which apparently meant the exclusion of “Indian thought.”<sup>43</sup> In contrast, it seems plausible that the lack of an institutionalized administrative branch for Doukhobors in the Government of British Columbia meant that there was less pressure to focus the report solely on policy advice.

Putting aside the focus on Doukhor psychology and religion and the proportionally stronger treatment of economic participation in the report on Indigenous peoples, the topics covered in the two reports are strikingly similar. Both reports begin with the theoretical framework and guiding principles of the reports followed by the background history of the various groups, ethnic relations with other Canadians, economic data and prospects for integration, family life (especially education), and finally law and administration. A scholar of Hawthorn’s prominence does not rise to that prominence through ignorance, and thus it is expected that Hawthorn would provide distinct and often nuanced recommendations for Indigenous peoples and Doukhobors—

---

<sup>41</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 36.

<sup>42</sup> Hawthorn et al., *Indians*, vi.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, vii.

peoples with very distinct histories. The congruence of the two reports on key elements, however, reveals that Hawthorn believed his framework of culture-conflict and the resulting ideology of integration could be applied to both settlers and Indigenous peoples.

The most significant area of overlap in the two reports can be found in the overall framework and guiding principles as elaborated in the reports. It is this framework of culture conflict and adaptation—a framework that Hawthorn shares with Malinowski and that is a response to failed experiments of forced assimilation—that helps to explain the rest of the similarities between the reports. While Hawthorn’s reports treat both the “Doukhobor problem” and the “Indian problem” as multifaceted (touching on criminal law, legislative prohibitions, internal political organization, front line administration, as well as ethnic and racial prejudices and, in the case of the Doukhobors, theology), the overarching framework is a universal anthropological process of culture contact and adaptation.

### **The Problem Framed: Culture Contact and Conflict**

In contrast to what Hawthorn sees as ill-founded ethnic prejudices against the Doukhobors, he argues that the Doukhobors exhibit “real distinctions” in their culture along the axes of “religion, language, economy, food, dress, social life, recreation and a number of intensely held beliefs.”<sup>44</sup> According to Hawthorn, this cultural distinctiveness has “contributed to their conflict with governments and to the difficulties of adjustment to the life of their neighbours.”<sup>45</sup> While most Doukhobors have rapidly adapted to “Canadian ways,” especially by shifting from a communal economy to economic individualism and wage labour, for others this adaptation to the dominant culture has

---

<sup>44</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 9.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

resulted in “social and psychological disturbance” and a reactionary opposition to both the government and integrated Doukhobors.<sup>46</sup> Similarly, a conflict between Indigenous cultures and Canadian culture “manifest[s] itself in individual confusion, aimlessness and mental ill-health.”<sup>47</sup> While there are proximate causes for specific aspects of the “Doukhobor problem,” the process of cultural contact, conflict, and adaptation serve as the background against which these more specific causes operate. The central problem for Hawthorn is that there are certain Doukhobors who have not, or refuse, to integrate. Those who have adapted to Canadian ways are held up as the desirable model against which problematic Doukhobors are contrasted.

Hawthorn’s treatment of Indigenous peoples in BC relies on the same theoretical framework. The subtitle of the published version of the report was, fittingly, “a study of contemporary social adjustment.” The study, like the Doukhobor study, was a continuation of Hawthorn’s interest in a universal process of acculturation. The question of why some groups have progressed more than others, which he asked D.M. MacKay of the Indian Affairs Branch soon after arriving in BC,<sup>48</sup> had become the driving question for which the Department of Citizenship and Immigration wanted answers.<sup>49</sup> The initial hypotheses of the Indian project researchers were drawn from “parallel instances of acculturation”<sup>50</sup> from around the world. It is worth quoting at length the way in which this process was characterized in the report:

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>47</sup> Hawthorn et al. *Indians*, 14-15.

<sup>48</sup> “Harry Hawthorn to D.M. MacKay,” 5 December, 1947, box 1, file 1, Harry Hawthorn Fonds.

<sup>49</sup> Hawthorn et al., *Indians*, v.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 11.

Our research takes as axiomatic that the acculturative change of the Indian is irreversible and is going to continue, no matter what is done or desired by anyone. If present trends are maintained, change will go on to a final point of nearly complete cultural assimilation and racial amalgamation. Further, if these processes of change continue, they will operate, as in the past, at variable rates in different places.<sup>51</sup>

The problem for Hawthorn, and also for Indian Affairs, was no longer one of military resistance, racial contamination, guidance toward the physical extinction of Indigenous peoples, or any number of historical iterations of the “Indian problem.”

For the Indian project researchers, profound economic changes brought about through the industrialization of British Columbia, coupled with the fact that “now the Indian isn’t vanishing at all,”<sup>52</sup> meant that social and economic integration was inevitable and irreversible. As with the recalcitrant Sons of Freedom, the problem of integration for Indigenous peoples was a problem of variable rates of integration and how to govern this variability. Some Indigenous peoples and individuals were more problematic than others. The problem was a lack of integration and this manifested itself in poor economic and health outcomes that created a feedback preventing further integration. These problematic communities were seen as “not moving with the economic and social forces around them and are in danger of acute crisis as a result.”<sup>53</sup> This formulation relies on a progressive economic history that viewed the development of capitalist industry as inevitable and characterized some “cultures” as incompatible with that reality and in need of change. Hawthorn defined culture as “the complex of beliefs, social organization, economic life, and other parts of [one’s] human environment.”<sup>54</sup> This expansive definition of culture

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid. 12.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 59.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 316.

<sup>54</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 35.

occupied a similar role as earlier non-biological understandings of race and character that were deployed in ideologies regarding settler-subject formation.

In the *Indians of British Columbia* Hawthorn similarly defined culture as “attitudes, ideas, relationships and norms of behaviour, and only externally as pageantry; works of art, massive buildings, and cities.”<sup>55</sup> The report specifically stated that previous theories of “race” were in fact a misrecognition of a much more complex process of cultural contact and change.<sup>56</sup> The strict division between “biological (i.e., racial) and cultural (i.e., what can be learned)”<sup>57</sup> meant that orientation towards authority, relationships with the land, industriousness, and other characteristics once considered racial were then seen as *cultural* and thus able to be learned and unlearned. Culture was seen as the site for policy intervention in subject formation, but this intervention was to be different than ineffective policies of assimilation.

### **The Solution: Integration**

Given that the guiding theoretical framework of the two reports was the same, it is understandable that the reports would rely on a shared ideology of integration as the solution to both problems. Integration, in both reports, was contrasted with forced assimilation. In the case of Doukhobors, Hawthorn draws on the failed experiments of coercing Doukhobor school attendance and comes to the conclusion that these policies will only further enflame a sense of martyrdom and work counter to the project of integration.<sup>58</sup> Instead, he argued:

---

<sup>55</sup> Hawthorn et al., *Indians*, 301.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 300.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 25.

Past experience in this situation and in *many parallel ones in and out of Canada* indicates that effective policy towards realizing an increased Doukhobor contribution to Canada will be in the nature of steps lessening prejudice, increasing opportunity, and perhaps discovering elements of Doukhobor thought and life which will contribute to the richness of Canadian culture.<sup>59</sup>

The policy of integration was explicitly a policy of addressing the root cause of the Doukhobor problem—a culture (including political subjectivity) that was conceptualized as problematic in modern Canada—through means that were more effective than assimilation. Accepting the “good” elements of Doukhobor culture and lessening Canadian prejudices was seen as a way of increasing opportunities for economic and political integration that would shape Doukhobor subjectivity in a positive way.

According to Hawthorn, policy should aim to provide the tools necessary to make a voluntary integration into Canadian economic and governance structures. He wrote:

The recommendations for rehabilitation, for economic support for development of leadership and greater effectiveness in community operation, for assistance to their own educational programmes and some special adaptation of the Provincial schools are in line with the belief that Doukhobor culture can and should be altered in some degree.<sup>60</sup>

Likewise, Hawthorn argued that the best method to reduce the pain and confusion that attend cultural adaptation was to provide Indigenous peoples, through Indian Affairs, with the tools necessary to address the problems that arise from culture conflict.<sup>61</sup> These tools included education and training to compete in the wage economy. Instead of counterproductive policies of forced assimilation, Indian policy should simply “not attempt to check” moves toward integration that were initiated by the free choice of

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 25-26. Emphasis mine.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 40.

<sup>61</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 14.

Indians themselves.<sup>62</sup> As with the Doukhobor project, the reason for a policy that at times would appear to be the opposite of assimilation,<sup>63</sup> was an attempt to reconcile Indigenous “culture” with the reality of modern Canadian economy and institutions. The reason for abandoning assimilationist policy was simply that it did not consistently work. Hawthorn provided the example of missionary William Duncan’s Christian community of Metlakatla as a successful example of rapid assimilation of Tsimshian culture.<sup>64</sup> He argued, however, that the successes were few and far between and that for the most part attempts at rapid assimilation have led to the “retarded state of many other communities.”<sup>65</sup> Integration as a colonial policy was a matter of efficiency and effectiveness.

As mentioned earlier, the Doukhobor project was conducted in the midst of a security crisis, and this explains why the report suggested using a slightly more interventionist tactic in approaching Doukhobor cultural adjustment. Hawthorn explained how cultural change could be directed:

A program for changing the culture should select new traits for reward, offer new constructive roles, ignore or punish undesired traits, and constrain destructive individuals. This would be only a specialized form of a universal process of history ... Successful results of this procedure could be documented from some instances of rapid cultural change among *primitive* peoples.<sup>66</sup>

The specifics of the Sons of Freedom belief system and structure of religious leadership led Hawthorn to make specific recommendations about how best to shepherd

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 38. Emphasis mine.

Sons of Freedom into Canadian society. The solution for the Sons of Freedom, in Hawthorn's view, was to remove government coercion that inflamed a sense of martyrdom, encourage acceptance and non-discrimination by other Canadians, and isolate those who were a physical threat to fellow Doukhobors.<sup>67</sup> This approach would allow inevitable economic integration to take its course, bringing Doukhobor subjectivity increasingly in line with a dominant settler-subjectivity based on individualism, materialism, and respect for state authority.<sup>68</sup> For example, Independent and Community Doukhobors had accepted many aspects of state authority and Hawthorn argued, "a more complete change of this nature hinges largely on the spirit and form of administrative action."<sup>69</sup> In the past, Hawthorn argued, it had been lenience on the part of the government combined with the material benefits of participation in the economy that had acted as a force of Canadianization.<sup>70</sup> A lack of economic participation, on the other hand, made moderate Doukhobors vulnerable to the appeals of the Sons of Freedom, and thus the solution was "a suitable programme to enable them to consolidate their position of growing economic individualism."<sup>71</sup>

The consequence of this integrationist solution was that for Doukhobors, and for Indigenous peoples, distinctiveness and separateness were to be maintained for some time to come. For Doukhobors, this might mean accommodations such as Russian language education and a specialized curriculum for Sons of Freedom children whose parents

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 25-26.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 35, 48-9, 89.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 35

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 48-49.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 89.

opposed public education.<sup>72</sup> At the extreme, Sons of Freedom could be relocated to good arable land, away from their more integrated Community neighbours; at a minimum this would take the terroristic pressure off of the Community Doukhobors and allow them to make the decision to further integrate into Canadian society.<sup>73</sup> The state would contain the most radical threat, allow integration to change the culture of moderate Doukhobors, and promote the celebration of cultural expression determined to be consistent with Canadian economic and political norms. For Indigenous peoples, the most significant implication of this policy would be the continued existence of distinct Indigenous reserve communities and the continued existence of Indian Affairs administration in its perpetual role of facilitating Indigenous-initiated integration.<sup>74</sup>

### **Educational Integration and Subject Making**

As mentioned earlier, the recommendations of the Hawthorn Doukhobor Research Committee were aimed at the modification of a “culture” in order to allow peaceful integration into Canadian society. It is likely that the source of Hawthorn’s interest in education as a tool of cultural adaptation to an “outside” culture and economy was his early career in the New Zealand Native School Service—work that drove his interest in anthropology. He was a believer in making anthropology practical,<sup>75</sup> and this fit perfectly with the post-war shift in thinking about integration as policy based on social science evidence. Education was no longer to be imposed on inferior peoples, but rather it was to be scientifically administered to allow Sons of Freedom and Indigenous peoples to

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 40.

<sup>74</sup> Hawthorn. *Indians*, 13, 15.

<sup>75</sup> Plant, “A Relationship and Interchange,” 11. He quotes Hawthorn as saying, “Perhaps above all I wanted to put anthropology to good use.”

choose their own path toward integrating into the Canadian economy and political system.

The similarities between the two reports' recommendations on education are striking. Like the Doukhobor research committee, *The Indians of BC* addresses the question of racial inferiority and argues forcefully that problems facing indigenous communities are an issue of *cultural* adaptation, not an issue of race.<sup>76</sup> Field researchers found that a minority of teachers blamed educational underachievement on innate biological ability; one such teacher was quoted as saying, "As much as I would like to think differently, I am forced to say that I believe that the natives of British Columbia are by nature slow in thought and listless in action. Invariably, those who have shown most progress are those who show evidence of White strain."<sup>77</sup> Despite the prevalence of this form of biological racism, the quoted teacher shows some hesitance in making an overtly racist assessment in saying that he or she would "like to think differently." This ambivalence in one individual provides anecdotal evidence of a societal shift away from racial colonial ideology.

Hawthorn's expansive definition of culture meant that education aimed at cultural adaptation needed to target the entire "culture" and community rather than a narrow education in the sense of childhood schooling.<sup>78</sup> With this in mind, both reports made similar integrationist recommendations for a shift away from forced educational assimilation; they argued that the removal of children from communities and the imposition of cultural norms was counter-productive because "[s]uch attempts stifle the

---

<sup>76</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 300.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 38; Hawthorn, *Indians*, 301.

possible results of education by drawing down on the child the hostility of all who oppose assimilation.”<sup>79</sup> As with the Doukhobors, the failure of past experiments in forced assimilation drove the search for a more scientific and humane integration. Besides the threat of fanaticism being driven by a sense of martyrdom amongst the Sons of Freedom, there remained the very real problem for Indigenous students that assimilatory programs risked creating children caught between “two worlds” without the skills to succeed in either.<sup>80</sup>

In place of imposition, the integrationist model conceptualized schooling in liberal terms as a tool that allowed *choice*. Hawthorn argued that the schools’ role was to “giv[e] the child the equipment so that he has a real possibility of choice, in jobs, in speech, in associates, and in community.”<sup>81</sup> In the integrationist ideology the economic pull towards adoption of dominant cultural norms was seen as inevitable and thus alternative ways of relating to land, economy, and authority (aspects of a political community and subjectivity) were not accepted as a real alternative. The “choice” offered to the educated child was limited to marginalization or integration into the dominant Canadian society including its political institutions. While both reports were concerned about a lack of educational opportunities leading to a lack of autonomy<sup>82</sup> (mostly regarding the choice to leave the community to enter wage labour) this conceptualization of autonomy was impoverished. For Sons of Freedom Doukhobors personal autonomy also meant a relentless questioning of the state and human government, a rejection of

---

<sup>79</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 303.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 315.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 302.

<sup>82</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 302.; Alfred Shulman, “Personality Characteristics and Psychological Problems,” in Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 127.

dominant property relations, and the building up of God's sovereignty through individual action. Hawthorn argued that the origin of problematic protest behaviour was to be partially found in the internal contradictions of leaderless anarchism. In this sense the solution was not really increased choice and autonomy, but making the choice that was consistent with colonial institutions. This is further evidenced by the fact that the report recommends a program of counselling for older students to prevent their participation in protest behaviour.<sup>83</sup>

To make the "equipment" for choice available, Indigenous communities needed to first be willing to accept the necessity of schooling. This, the report argued, can be difficult because when the student encountered a white teacher they encountered a "symbol of what has been learned as distasteful and frightening."<sup>84</sup> To make schooling palatable, the report suggested certain accommodations bearing remarkable similarity to the accommodations recommended for Sons of Freedom<sup>85</sup> that were resistant to schooling: education in the mother tongue,<sup>86</sup> extra pay to attract specialist teachers,<sup>87</sup> cultural sensitivity in curriculum,<sup>88</sup> and teachers who would become immersed in Indigenous cultures to act as cultural bridge builders.<sup>89</sup> This education was meant to shape Doukhobor and Indigenous perceptions of other Canadians as positive, in order to create the conditions necessary for economic integration that would radically change the subjectivity of these various groups. The exactness with which many of the educational

---

<sup>83</sup> William Dixon, "Public Administration and the Community," in Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 188.

<sup>84</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 306.

<sup>85</sup> Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 19; Dixon, "Public Administration and the Community," 188.

<sup>86</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 307.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 308.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 314.

recommendations for Doukhobors—Sons of Freedom especially—mirror recommendations for the education of Indigenous children is a strong indication of relational overlap.

### **Labour Market Integration**

In the introduction to this dissertation settler colonialism was defined primarily in terms of dispossession of land, rather than exploitation of Indigenous labour. This is not to deny, however, that labour is an important site of state intervention in colonialism. Glen Coulthard clarifies that even though exploitation of Indigenous labour—especially after industrialization—was secondary to the expropriation of land, this does not mean that “the long-term goal of indoctrinating the Indigenous population to the principles of private property, possessive individualism, and menial wage labour did not constitute an important feature of Canadian Indian policy.”<sup>90</sup> In fact, the characterization of Indigenous people as lazy, shiftless, and unproductive served, and continues to serve, as the foundational basis on which European settlers idealize their own identity and justify expropriation of Indigenous territory.<sup>91</sup> Chapters 1 and 2 demonstrated how the ideal of industriousness was central to colonial ideologies of land that justified the use of land policy to shape settlers as industrious subjects beholden to Canadian laws and institutions. It is in this sense that wage labour figures in both the Hawthorn reports not solely as a commodity and a way to materially improve peoples conditions, but as a marker of subjectivity and difference.

---

<sup>90</sup> Glen Coulthard, “Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the ‘Politics of Recognition’ in Canada,” *Contemporary Political Theory*, 6 (2007), 18-19.

<sup>91</sup> See John Lutz, *Makuk: A New History of Aboriginal-White Relations* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2008). Especially pages 31-37.

The Hawthorn reports both presented recommendations for increased labour market integration as a form of passive subject making. In *The Doukhobors of British Columbia*, the section on *Economic and Social Life* by Stuart Jamieson argued that increased labour force participation during WWII led to rapid acculturation of Doukhobors.<sup>92</sup> However, this acculturation was held back by anti-Doukhobor prejudice on the one hand, and a Doukhobor preference for mobile and temporary work on the other hand.<sup>93</sup> The report pointed to studies that suggested that casual work can lead to distinct cultural group formation around “attitudes and norms that diverge rather widely at some points from the accepted norm of other occupational groups.”<sup>94</sup> Limited engagement in the workforce paired with a reliance on subsistence work represented a barrier to acculturation.<sup>95</sup> Jamieson explains that this resulted in prejudice similar to that held against Indigenous workers: “Like many a logger on the Coast, as well as the native worker in many areas, the Doukhobor has a reputation in the West Kootenay for being ‘shiftless’ and ‘unreliable’.”<sup>96</sup> The solution was to provide a government program “to enable them to consolidate their position of economic individualism.”<sup>97</sup>

If a lack of education was seen as preventing participation in economic integration, a lack of economic integration was also seen as preventing education. Economic marginalization, the report contended, made moderate Doukhobors susceptible

---

<sup>92</sup> Stuart Jamieson, “Economic and Social Life,” in Hawthorn, *Doukhobors*, 61.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

to Sons of Freedom influence and their rejection of schooling.<sup>98</sup> Similarly, *The Indians of British Columbia* stated that a pattern of seasonal and mobile work led to poor school attendance and material progress.<sup>99</sup> The importance of steady wage labour for subject formation was not limited to its knock-on effect on education, however.

*The Indians of British Columbia* provided a much more in-depth discussion of the cultural impact of labour. Hawthorn was aware that labour was not only a material concern, but also an important cultural concern. The report suggested, for example, that Indigenous participation in coastal fisheries was not solely about money as it provided less tangible cultural benefits such as a sense of identity.<sup>100</sup> The fishing industry, the report continued, had been not only the single largest employer of Indigenous people, but it had also provided prestige to fishermen in their traditional cultures.<sup>101</sup> One might expect, then, that this occupation would have been a perfect match for economic integration and cultural maintenance as theorized in Hawthorn's integrationism. However, the logic of inevitable economic development meant that this option was seen as a near impossibility. The report claimed that technological innovation and capitalist consolidation had made Indigenous fishermen marginal and, "[to] provide them all with up-to-date and well-equipped boats would be an excessively costly and risky investment."<sup>102</sup> While the report recognized the subject making aspect of labour, it was unwilling to recommend maintenance of Indigenous economies that would require a significant re-distribution of resources and affect existing industrial use. This reluctance

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

<sup>99</sup> Hawthorn, *Indians*, 46.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 107.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 122.

to interfere in the industrial relations of the settler economy extended beyond fisheries. For example, Hawthorn noted that it was “interesting” (read unrealistic) that, “the people at the Nass still refer to their early and continuing applications for extensive timber reserves, at a time when large companies have been granted new Forest Management Licences to operate in these same areas.”<sup>103</sup> In contrast, the report recommended that Indigenous arts and crafts could be marketed as a way to teach the public about Indigenous cultures.<sup>104</sup> This contrast was not meant to downplay the importance of arts and crafts, but rather to demonstrate the type of safe and contained cultural production envisioned in integrationism.

Similar to the Doukhobors, *The Indians of British Columbia* identified Indigenous peoples as engaging problematically in the labour force. The report argued that the main barriers to full participation were: 1. Isolation; 2. Indigenous preference for seasonal work in the primary sector; and, 3. Racial prejudice that characterizes Indigenous labour as lazy, shiftless, and irresponsible.<sup>105</sup> The report examined major industries and the prospects for Indigenous employment in each one, recommending a general move toward urbanization and professionalization as well as a shift toward efficiency in the primary sector for isolated reserve communities.<sup>106</sup> The report recommended that Indian Affairs invest in a program to increase efficiency in the primary sector and to encourage professionalization in order to prevent an “incipient caste system,” that could develop if Indigenous peoples continued to rely on rural resource industries.<sup>107</sup> This incipient cast

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 54.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 265.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 73.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 84.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., 268-9

system that could develop if Indigenous peoples did not professionalize and enter the secondary and tertiary sectors of the economy would further hinder equal participation in Canadian society.<sup>108</sup>

The Hawthorn report on Indigenous peoples also provided an important insight into how the new labour market integrationism differed from failed attempts at assimilation through labour. Hawthorn singled out Indian Affairs agricultural policy as counter-productive and paternalistic. He recognized that this policy rested on a colonial ideology of civilizational development:

[T]he agricultural policy of the Indian Affairs Branch rests on an assumption widely held in economic history—that agriculture is the logical stepping-stone for a non-industrial people like the Indians, in their transition from hunting and fishing to a modern industrial economy.<sup>109</sup>

In an attempt to change Indigenous peoples through industrious agricultural labour, Indian Affairs actually retarded their integration into the industrial wage economy.<sup>110</sup>

Hawthorn recognized the flawed developmental stages anthropology that this ideology was based on, but he did not reject the premise that Indigenous peoples' land use would inevitably be superseded by modern (settler) industry, and that this could be beneficial.

The report argued that part of the problem was a lack of individual title to land on reserves. It stated, "If people had clear titles of ownership to their holdings, the most efficient sizes and shapes would tend to emerge as the more industrious or enterprising farmers bought or sold land as the needs for efficient production dictated."<sup>111</sup> This appeal to individual title and its relation to industriousness had clear ties to previous reserve land

---

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 152.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 153.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 154

policy such as severalty. The problem it was meant to address, however, was no longer tribal communism, but rather economic integration. The Hawthorn report did recognize the question of land, but it was re-problematized as a question of integration, rather than racial assimilation. Note the similarity to the materialist colonial perspective put forward in chapters 1 and 2 by Mavor and Sifton. In this perspective the state could take a minimal role in subject-making as market forces would encourage behaviour (industrious land use) which would aid in integration.

### **Conclusion**

This chapter has demonstrated the relational overlap between Doukhobors and Indigenous peoples in Hawthorn's ideology of integration. By examining Hawthorn's earlier writings and his vast network, the previous chapter demonstrated that Hawthorn's integrationist ideology was the descendent of failed attempts at assimilation. Unlike many previous ideologies that justified projects of settler-subject making, Hawthorn's vision explicitly rejected coercive state intervention in this project. However, like earlier materialist colonial ideologies, the economic progress of Canada was seen as a force stronger than government intervention in shaping peoples. The aim of new colonial projects would be to carefully direct underdeveloped peoples into the wage economy and contain any elements that threatened the foundation of the settler economic and political system.

Hawthorn's thought was located in the international context of an era where ideas about previous government projects of subject making were openly discussed as failures and new solutions and problematizations were proposed. The practical political context in British Columbia at the time was likewise a time of contestation over the best path

forward in making Doukhobors into settler-subjects. Chapter 3 describes some of the fierce political debate about what was seen by most as a crisis security situation with the Sons of Freedom. In this practical context some actors relied on earlier ideologies of racial difference, some called for coercive assimilation, and others called for novel approaches like integrationism. While Hawthorn's vision of integrationism would eventually become conventional, with elements similar to state multiculturalism, it should be remembered that many of the Doukhobor report's recommendations were rejected in favour of the New Denver experiment. Hawthorn's integrationism was only one of several possible problematizations and solutions to subject making.

This raises the theme of colonial context and historical thought that has run throughout the dissertation. The post- WWII period provided a different colonial ideological context than previous eras where a different range of political languages were available. The material conditions regarding industrial development had also changed from the earlier period of Prairie homesteading. This broad societal change over time does not, however, determine the uptake and diffusion of ideologies. That process requires political action, including public speech acts. Political agents, like Hawthorn, were making interventions in a contested political field. Hawthorn actively used his constrained agency to harness various tools of ideological dissemination (civil society organizations, universities, government agents, news media, and most of all commissioned government reports) to make his intervention have public uptake.

The analysis of the Hawthorn reports in their colonial context sheds further light on the workings of relational overlap. The shared colonial ideological context of a given period partially explains the overlap in Hawthorn's reports on Doukhobors and

Indigenous peoples. If ideological interventions were limited by this shared context, then it limited the available problematizations and solutions to political issues. It then makes sense that Hawthorn's reports would share a similar characterization of two distinct "problems." This overlap, however, was only part of the story. There was also the practical overlap in dissemination of ideas that reinforced this ideological overlap, and that was also partly responsible for the relational overlap in the first place. This type of practical overlap occurred when the same political agents moved between the two governmental aspects of settler colonialism: settlement and dispossession. Hawthorn was a clear example of this type of practical overlap when he was commissioned by both the federal and provincial governments to conduct two research reports on different groups. The earlier chapters on land also demonstrate this type of practical overlap in the appointment of John McDougall as land commissioner for Indian Affairs and for the Doukhobors. This practical, personal and personnel overlap appears to have been aided by broad ideological relational overlap, which was then reinforced by practical relational overlap in a positive feedback loop.

## Conclusion

The primary goal of this dissertation has been to contribute to theorizing settler colonialism through a grounded case study of settler-subject making in the context of an immigrant group that troubled settler society. The preceding chapters demonstrate that settler-subjectivity is constructed through state action and at times this construction relies on relational overlap with the colonial projects aimed at Indigenous peoples. During the period under study the Canadian state used land policy, imprisonment, removal and forced education of children, legislation targeting communal property, and problem framing through official knowledge in order to create governable subjects out of the Doukhobors. Colonial ideologies and government-directed knowledge creation were central to these endeavours; the creation of this colonial knowledge both framed and created the “problems” to be addressed by state action. In the process of creating this knowledge the state reached into civil society to harness settler expertise (e.g. Reverend John McDougall, James Mavor, Harry Hawthorn). Even within this state-centred analysis—an analysis prone to reinforcing a discourse of colonial inevitability<sup>1</sup>—I have demonstrated that projects of settler-subject making were politically contingent and contested.

I introduced this dissertation by arguing that current debates about who, and what, a settler is could be enriched through grounded historical study. One of the most important insights of this study is that the settler-subject is *political* and is thus contestable; it is not the automatic result of arrival of non-Indigenous peoples on

---

<sup>1</sup> As mentioned in the introduction, the reliance on the colonial archive has the potential to ignore the agency of non-dominant groups. When dominant voices are privileged it may appear that settler colonialism faced little resistance and thus was an inevitable march of progress.

Indigenous territory. The study of the Doukhobors makes the processes of political construction evident because they were assumed by the state to be settlers, and yet they did not embody what a settler was expected to be. Doukhobor subjectivity relied on different relations with the land and materialism, different understandings of education, different relations to authority, and a different conceptualization of the spiritual and the political. The ideologies and processes of settler-subject making would likely be less obvious if the Community Doukhobors and Sons of Freedom had not come into conflict with the state and instead followed the path of the Independents who maintained elements of the Doukhobor faith that were compatible with the requirements of settler-subjectivity. This research has worked to make conspicuous the inconspicuous nature of settler-subject making.

The fact that settler-subject making is presently inconspicuous does not mean that it is not an ongoing project. Changes to immigration policy, amongst many other developments in the last 50 years, have made the type of naked conflict that occurred between the Doukhobors and the state rare even as recent immigrants continue to be problematized in ways that are not discordant with earlier techniques of subject making. With the advent of a points-based immigration system that privileges individual human capital and an immigrant's potential contribution to the Canadian economy, it is unthinkable that Canada would today admit a cohesive group of immigrants with an alternative economic and political model to settle in a concentrated territory. The avoidance of conflict through immigrant selection helps to naturalize current forms of state subject making. For example, the legal dominance and broad acceptance of fee-simple title to land continues to shape settler relations to land, yet despite a growing

settler consciousness of environmental sustainability there is no mainstream political attempt by settler Canada to question this fundamental political and legal relationship with land.

The insight that settler-subjectivity is politically contingent can be applied to the study of other non-Indigenous groups, but it does not answer whether a certain immigrant group are settlers or not. Only detailed historical accounts can provide answers to the question. Doukhobor otherness was racialized and at times political actors debated whether they were unassimilable or not. But what of 20<sup>th</sup>-century anti-Asian racism that more often excluded Chinese, Japanese, and Indian immigrants from the category settler rather than forcibly attempting to make them conform to a settler ideal? The prevalence of relational overlap in the making of settlers suggests that an analysis of settlerhood may be productive in understanding state treatment of “others” not included in the category. In fact, parliamentary debate about the desirability of the Doukhobors as settlers overlapped with debate about the undesirability of Japanese and Chinese immigrants.<sup>2</sup> One might further investigate the way that anti-Chinese racism focused on “sojourning”<sup>3</sup> as the antithesis to settlement and glean insights into the construction of settler identity and its non-Indigenous others. As was discussed in the chapters on land, one aspect of settler identity relies on nativism in order to indigenize settlers and make their relationship to the land appear natural, regardless of how long they have actually resided on the land.

One of the premises of this dissertation is that differently located non-Indigenous groups will require the telling of different stories to understand their place in Canadian

---

<sup>2</sup> *House of Commons Debates*, 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4<sup>th</sup> Session, Vol. 3 (July 7, 1899), 6836-6843.

<sup>3</sup> Patricia Roy, *A White Man's Province: British Columbia Politicians and Chinese and Japanese Immigrants, 1858-1914* (Vancouver: UBC Press.,1989), 8-9.

settler colonialism. This is one aspect of decolonization that is beginning to take shape at the intersection of scholarship and activism. In 2011 Henry Yu, an historian at the University of British Columbia, was involved in a project in Vancouver that aimed to bring non-white immigrants into dialogue with local First Nations and urban Indigenous people.<sup>4</sup> The stated goal was to reimagine Canadian history in order to shed light on injustices faced by immigrants and Indigenous peoples alike in order to address the stereotypes about Indigenous peoples held by many new arrivals due to a lack of knowledge.<sup>5</sup> This reimagining of Canada through migrant stories requires a move beyond the colonial archive in order to see the rich worldviews of migrants rather than simply examining what was done to them by the Canadian state.<sup>6</sup> This intersection of scholarly work and migrant storytelling as a tool of decolonization is a promising development.

The call to move beyond state history suggests the need for future research to complement the current state-centric approach. Doukhobor women, gender roles, family forms, and marriage practices are topics largely ignored by the actors I have investigated even though they served as important sites for colonial intervention in the making of settler-subjectivity and the colonization of Indigenous peoples.<sup>7</sup> However, even when these stories are retrieved from dominant sources, they remain stories of what was done to the Doukhobors. One of the most politically productive aspects of this study is its

---

<sup>4</sup> Henry Yu, "Nurturing Dialogues between First Nations, Urban Aboriginal, and Immigrant Communities in Vancouver," in *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation Through the Lens of Cultural Diversity*, edited by Ashok Mathur et al. (Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2011), 301.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Henry Yu, "Refracting Pacific Canada: Seeing Our Uncommon Past," *BC Studies* 156, no. 7 (Winter 2007): 5-10.

<sup>7</sup> Sarah Carter, *The Importance of Being Monogamous: Marriage and Nation Building in Western Canada to 1915* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2008); Ashleigh Androssoff, "A Larger Frame: 'Redressing' the Image of Doukhobor-Canadian Women in the Twentieth Century," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 18, no. 1 (2007): 81-105.

ability to allow disputes between dominant political actors to reveal cracks in the façade of a unified settler colonial project and in doing so reveal the alternative subjectivities that are being targeted for manipulation. There is nothing inevitable about the political world we live in. Different relations with land, authority, law, family, community, education, and knowledge all provide the basis of a different way of being in a political community. These rich worldviews ought to be seen not solely as historical challenges to dominant settler-subjectivity, but rather as political forces of the present because of their disruptive power. This is a story, however, left to those with lived experience of these worldviews.

As various scholars, activists, and communities reimagine Canada's colonial history they should take care to avoid an historical narrative that excludes certain non-Indigenous groups from complicity in settler colonialism on the grounds that these groups were also oppressed by settler colonialism. It is relatively easy for a Scottish-Canadian scholar like myself to analyze the culpability of Scottish-Canadians in contributing to settler colonialism. One need only look at figures such as Reverend John McDougall or James Mavor to see the influence that this ethnic settler group had on the creation of Canada as a settler colony. Other stories are much more difficult to tell. The Doukhobors provide an example of how a group can be oppressed by the forces of settler colonialism, yet still contribute to the dispossession of Indigenous peoples. The complexity of these migrant stories requires specificity to understand the workings of settler colonialism rather than an overarching theory that assumes all settlers are equally complicit.

This study of the making of settler-subjects demonstrates that settler colonialism is flexible, resilient, and nuanced. Dominant settler voices do not all sound like the

infamous Duncan Campbell Scott who, as head of the Department of Indian Affairs from 1913-1932, openly stated the genocidal intentions of the Department. Sometimes colonial voices were progressive voices breaking with past colonial policy. Relatedly, not all settlers looked like Anglo-settlers. Some, like the Doukhobors, were oppressed by the Canadian state while still contributing to settlement. I believe these insights continue to be relevant today. The adaptability of settler colonialism is one of its most insidious characteristics.

The shift away from coercive assimilation documented in this study shows that containment can also be used as a colonial technique of government. Optimism about a renewed relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples should be encouraged, but tempered by caution if, as I believe, containment continues to be an aspect of current forms of settler colonialism. In 2014 the Supreme Court of Canada declared that the Tsilhqot'in Nation held title over more than 1,700 square kilometres of traditional territory.<sup>8</sup> Grand Chief Stewart Phillip, president of the Union of BC Indian Chiefs, stated, "This, without question, will establish a solid platform for genuine reconciliation to take place in British Columbia."<sup>9</sup> There is no doubt that this decision empowers Indigenous peoples in British Columbia, yet the decision still firmly asserts Canadian sovereignty through the ability of the government to justify incursion on Aboriginal title for any number of reasons, including the "settlement of foreign populations."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia, 2014 SCC 44, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 256.

<sup>9</sup> CBC, "Tsilhqot'in First Nation granted B.C. title claim in Supreme Court ruling," June 26, 2014. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/tsilhqot-in-first-nation-granted-b-c-title-claim-in-supreme-court-ruling-1.2688332>

<sup>10</sup> Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia, 2014 SCC 44, [2014] 2 S.C.R., 83.

In December of 2015, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, addressing a meeting of First Nations representatives, declared, “It is time for a renewed, nation-to-nation relationship with First Nations peoples, one that understands that the constitutionally guaranteed rights of First Nations in Canada are not an inconvenience but rather a sacred obligation.”<sup>11</sup> This statement, coupled with the far-reaching recommendations of Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission<sup>12</sup> have led to optimism about future decolonized relations between Canada and Indigenous peoples. Once again, caution should temper this optimism. The *Idle No More* movement in Canada<sup>13</sup> has demonstrated the power of grassroots Indigenous voices and suggests that many Indigenous people will continue to see the relationship as colonial if the new “nation-to-nation” relationship is solely between Indian Act-recognized Band governments and the state. Current forms of governance in Indigenous communities with institutional ties to the Canadian state cannot be assumed to be legitimate national representation for all Indigenous people. Colonial containment of the most radical elements of Indigenous communities is a real possibility if history is any guide. The containment of the most radical elements of the Doukhobors, and support for moderate Doukhobors to further integrate into the economic mainstream, is a colonial tactic that was not limited to the Doukhobors in application.<sup>14</sup>

My study demonstrates that the intention behind the project of making Doukhobors into settler-subjects was to safeguard Canadian sovereignty understood as

---

<sup>11</sup> CBC, “Trudeau lays out plan for a new relationship with indigenous people,” December 8, 2015. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/justin-trudeau-afn-indigenous-aboriginal-people-1.3354747>

<sup>12</sup> Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2015).

<sup>13</sup> For a sample of the thoughts and goals behind the Idle No More movement see The Kino-nda-niimi Collective, *The Winter We Danced* (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2014).

<sup>14</sup> Deposing Indigenous leadership that opposed Indian Affairs policy was common practice in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Richard Spaulding, “Executive Summary,” in Peggy Martin-McGuire, *First Nation Land Surrenders on the Prairies: 1896-1911* (Ottawa: Indian Claims Commission, 1998), xix.

exclusive territorial control of land and subjects. It was an attempt to make the Doukhobors governable. If Canada wishes to build decolonized relationships with Indigenous peoples there will have to be a radical rethinking of Canadian sovereignty that allows the co-existence of other sovereign political communities. As stated in the TRC's interim report, there is a fundamental disagreement on this point:

The Government of Canada appears to believe that reconciliation entails Aboriginal peoples' acceptance of the reality and validity of Crown sovereignty and parliamentary supremacy, in order to allow the government to get on with business. Aboriginal people, on the other hand, see reconciliation as an opportunity to affirm their own sovereignty and return to the 'partnership' ambitions they held after Confederation.<sup>15</sup>

Many Indigenous thinkers, writing on their own terms rather than in opposition to the colonial state, have provided relational political philosophies that provide the basis for the coexistence of sovereign communities even when these communities overlap territorially.<sup>16</sup> Canada has much to learn from these systems of thought.

There is also much to be learned from the history of government conflict with the Doukhobors. What if the government had taken the Doukhobor political community seriously rather than dismissing it as an impossibility? What lessons about embodied, relational sovereignty might Canada have learned? There is no reason that these lessons should not be learned from Indigenous traditions in the process of radically transforming Canadian law.<sup>17</sup> In addition, Canadians can recuperate marginal European traditions of

---

<sup>15</sup> Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, 187.

<sup>16</sup> See for example, Charles Menzies, "Standing on the Shore with Saaban: An Anthropological Rapprochement with Indigenous Intellectual Traditions," *Collaborative Anthropologies* 6 (2013): 171-199.; Leanne Simpson, *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence* (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2011); Harold Cardinal and Walter Hildebrandt, *Treaty Elders of Saskatchewan* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2000).

<sup>17</sup> Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Volume 6: The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015), 78.

political thought in this process of transformation. In a world where deep differences in fundamental orientations do not appear to be waning, the Doukhobor philosophy that sees the good life as manifest in peaceful, but often tumultuous, human relations should be taken seriously for its present relevance. Difference, then, might come to be seen as the necessary material for the building of the good life rather than as something to be contained, accommodated, or reconciled with Canadian sovereignty.

## Bibliography

### Books, Theses and Articles

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Alfred, Taiaiake. "Deconstructing the British Columbia treaty process [Paper in: Indigenous Peoples in the International Sphere.]" *Balayi: Culture, Law and Colonialism* 3 (2001): 37-65.

Alfred, Taiaiake and Jeff Corntassel. "Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism." *Government and Opposition* 40, no. 4 (2005): 597-614.

Alfred, Taiaiake. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2009.

Anderson, J.T.M. "Canadian Immigration and its Problems." Master's Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1914.

Anderson, J.T.M. *The Education of the New-Canadian*. Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1918.

Androsoff, Ashleigh. "A Larger Frame: 'Redressing' the Image of Doukhobor-Canadian Women in the Twentieth Century." *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 18, no. 1 (2007): 81-105.

Androsoff, Ashleigh. "Spirit Wrestling: Identity Conflict and the Canadian 'Doukhobor Problem,' 1899-1999." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2011.

Arneil, Barbara. *John Locke and America: The Defence of English Colonialism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Arneil, Barbara. "Liberal Colonialism, Domestic Colonies and Citizenship." *History of Political Thought* 33, no. 3 (2012): 491-523.

Ashworth, Mary. *The Forces Which Shaped Them: A History of the Education of Minority Group Children in British Columbia*. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1979.

Barker, Adam. "The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State." *The American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (2009): 325-351.

- Barrows, John. *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2002.
- Berton, Pierre. *The Promised Land: Settling the West 1896-1914*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1984.
- Bohaker, Heidi and Franca Iacovetta. "Making Aboriginal People 'Immigrants Too': A Comparison of Citizenship Programs for Newcomers and Indigenous Peoples." *The Canadian Historical Review* 90, no.3 (2009): 427-462.
- Bonch-Bruevick, Vladimir. *The Book of Life of Doukhobors*. Translated. 1978.
- Bondoreff, Andrei. "Spirited Differences: Doukhobor Sectarianism, Freedomite Terrorism and Government Policy." Master's thesis, University of Victoria, 2008.
- Bracken, Christopher. *The Potlach Papers: A Colonial Case History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Breton, Raymond. "From Ethnic to Civic Nationalism: English Canada and Quebec." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 11, no. 1 (1988): 85-102.
- Cairns, Alan. "The Past and Future of the Canadian Administrative State." *University of Toronto Law Journal* 40, no. 3 (1990): 319-361.
- Cardinal, Harold and Walter Hildebrandt. *Treaty Elders of Saskatchewan*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2000.
- Carter, Sarah. "The Missionaries' Indian: The Publications of John McDougall, John Maclean and Egerton Ryerson Young." *Prairie Forum* 9, no. 1 (1984): 27-44.
- Carter, Sarah. *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990.
- Carter, Sarah. *The Importance of Being Monogamous: Marriage and Nation Building in Western Canada to 1915*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2008.
- Carter, Sarah. "'Daughters of British Blood' or 'Hordes of men of Alien Race': The Homesteads-for-Women Campaign in Western Canada." *Great Plains Quarterly* 29, no. 4 (2009): 267-286.
- Carter, Sarah. "Erasing and Replacing: Property and Homestead Rights of First Nations of the Northwest, 1870s-1920s," in *Place and Replace: Essays on Western Canada*, edited by Esyllt W. Jones, Adele Perry, and Leah Morton. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2013.

Carter, Sarah. "‘They would not give up one inch of it’: The rise and demise of St. Peter’s Reserve, Manitoba," in *Indigenous Communities and Settler Colonialism: Land Holding, Loss and Survival in an Interconnected World*, edited by Zoë Laidlaw and Alan Lester. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Translated by Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.

Comeau, Lisa. "Contemporary Productions of Colonial Identities through Liberal Discourses of Educational Reform." *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies* 3, no. 2 (2005): 9-25.

Coulthard, Glen. "Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the ‘Politics of Recognition’ in Canada." *Contemporary Political Theory* 6 (2007): 437-460.

Coulthard, Glen. "Subjects of Empire?: Indigenous Peoples and the ‘Politics of Recognition’ in Canada." PhD diss., University of Victoria, 2009.

Coulthard, Glen. "Place Against Empire: Understanding Indigenous Anti-Colonialism." *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4, no. 2 (2010): 79-83.

Cran, Gregory. *Negotiating Buck Naked: Doukhobors, Public Policy, and Conflict Resolution*. Vancouver, UBC Press, 2006.

Cuthand, Doug. *Askiwina: A Cree World*. Regina: Coteau Books, 2007.

Dixon, William. "Public Administration and the Community." In *The Doukhobors of British Columbia*, edited by Harry B. Hawthorn. Vancouver: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1955.

Donskov, Andrew, ed. *Leo Tolstoy-Peter Verigin Correspondence*. Translated by John Woodsworth. New York: Legas, 1995.

Dupuis, Renée. *Report On the Mediation of the Fort Pelly Agency, Pelly Haylands Claim Negotiations*. [Ottawa]: Indian Claims Commission, 2008.

Evalenko, Alexander. *The Message of the Doukhobors*. New York: The International Publishing Co., 1913.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press, 2008.

Fitzgibbon, Mary Agnes [Lally Bernard]. *The Canadian Doukhobor Settlements a Series of Letters*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1899.

- Fleming, Thomas. "In the Imperial Age and After: Patterns of British Columbia School Leadership and the Institution of the Superintendency, 1849-1988." *BC Studies* 81 (1989): 50-76.
- Foster, Leslie. "Trends in Child Welfare: What do the data show?" In *People, Politics, and Child Welfare in British Columbia*, edited by Leslie Foster and Brian Wharf, 34-65. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2007.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: Histoire de la sexualité*. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- Foucault, Michel. *Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*. New York: Picador, 2003.
- Friesen, J.W. and M.M. Verigin. *The Community Doukhobors: A People in Transition*. Ottawa: Borealis Press, 1989.
- Gellner, Ernst. "The Political Thought of Bronislaw Malinowski." *Current Anthropology* 28, no. 4 (1987): 557-559.
- Hak, Gordon. "Populism and the 1952 Social Credit Breakthrough in British Columbia." *The Canadian Historical Review* 85, no. 2 (2004): 277-296.
- Hall, D.J. "Clifford Sifton and the Canadian Indian Administration 1896-1905." *Prairie Forum* 2, no. 2 (1977): 127-151.
- Hall, D.J. *Clifford Sifton, Volume 1: The Young Napoleon, 1861-1900*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1981.
- Harris, Cole. *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002.
- Hawthorn, Harry. "Indentured Labour in New Guinea." *Far Eastern Survey* 15, no. 5 (1946): 74-48.
- Hawthorn, Harry. "Maori: A Study in Acculturation." *American Anthropological Association Memoirs* 64 (1944): 44-48.
- Hawthorn, Harry B., ed. *The Doukhobors of British Columbia*. Vancouver: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1955.
- Hawthorn, Harry, Cyril Belshaw and Stuart Jamieson. *The Indians of British Columbia: A Study of Contemporary Social Adjustment*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.
- Hill, Margaret. "The Detention of Freedomite Children, 1953-1959." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 18, no. 3 (1986): 47-60.

- Holt, Simma. *Terror in the Name of God: The Story of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1964.
- Hooper, Ronald H.C. "Custodial Care of Doukhobor Children in British Columbia, 1929-1935." Master's thesis, University of British Columbia, 1947.
- Howe, Stephen. "Native America and the Study of Colonialism, Part 1: Contested Histories." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 1 (2013): 102-126.
- Jamieson, Stuart. "Economic and Social Life." In *The Doukhobors of British Columbia*, edited by Hawthorn, Harry B. Vancouver: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1955.
- Janzen, William. *Limits on Liberty: The Experience of Mennonite, Hutterite and Doukhobor Communities in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Johnson, F. Henry. *A History of Public Education in British Columbia*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1964.
- The Kino-nda-niimi Collective. *The Winter We Danced*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2014.
- Kropotkin, Peter. "Some Resources of Canada." *The Nineteenth Century* 43 (1898), 495.
- Lawrence, Bonita. *'Real' Indians and Others*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004.
- Lawrence, Bonita and Enakshi Dua. "Decolonizing Antiracism." *Social Justice* 32, no. 4 (2005): 120-143.
- Leonard, John. "Two Views on the Meaning of Treaties Six and Seven." In *The Spirit of the Alberta Indian Treaties*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., edited by Richard Price, 9-45.
- Leslie, J. and R. Maguire, eds. *The Historical Development of the Indian Act*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Ottawa: Treaties and Historical Research Centre, Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1978.
- Lewis, Diane. "Anthropology and Colonialism." *Current Anthropology* 14, no. 5 (1973): 581-602.
- Lutz, John. *Makuk: A New History of Aboriginal-White Relations*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2008.
- Lyons, John. "The (Almost) Quiet Revolution: Doukhobor Schooling in Saskatchewan." *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada* 8, no. 1 (1976): 23-37.

Macoun, Alissa and Elizabeth Strakosch. "The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3-4 (2013): 426-443.

Martin, Jason William Grek. "Making Settler Space: George Dawson, the Geological Survey of Canada and the Colonization of the Canadian West in the Late 19<sup>th</sup> Century." PhD dissertation, Queen's University, 2009.

Martin-McGuire, Peggy. *First Nation Land Surrenders on the Prairies: 1896-1911*. Ottawa: Indian Claims Commission, 1998.

Maude, Aylmer. *A Peculiar People: the Doukhobors*. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Mavor, James. "Setting the Poor on Work." *Nineteenth Century* 34 (1893): 523-532.

Mavor, James. *Report of the Board of Trade on the North West of Canada, with Special Reference to Wheat Production for Export*. London: HMO, 1904.

Mavor, James. *My Windows on the Street of the World*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Limited, 1923.

Mawani, Renisa. *Colonial Proximities: Crossracial encounters and juridical truths in British Columbia, 1871-1921*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009.

McDougall, John. *George Millward McDougall, the Pioneer, Patriot, and Missionary*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1888.

McDougall, John. *Saddle, Sled and Snowshoe*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1896.

McDougall, John. *Pathfinding on Plain and Prairie*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1898.

McDougall, John. *On Western Trails in the Early Seventies*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1911.

McDougall, John. *Opening the Great West*. Calgary: Glenbow-Alberta Institute, 1970.

McDougall, John and Elizabeth Boyd McDougall. *McDougall Reflections: The Future of the Indians of Canada*. Calgary: The McDougall Stoney Mission Society, 1996.

McLaren, John. "Truancy and 'child snatching': Law, Social Control and Doukhobor Education in British Columbia, 1911-1935." Paper presented at BC Studies Conference, Okanagan University College, Kelowna, BC, October 7-10, 1994.

McLaren, John. "The State, Child Snatching, and the Law: The Seizure and Indoctrination of Sons of Freedom Children in British Columbia, 1950-60." In *Regulating Lives: historical essays on the state, society, the individual, and the law*,

edited by Dorothy E. Chunn, John McLaren and Robert Menzies, 259-293. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002.

McLaren, John, A.R. Buck, and Nancy E. Wright. "Property Rights in the Colonial Imagination and Experience." In *Despotic Dominion: Property Rights in British Settler Societies*, edited by John McLaren et al., 1-21. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.

McLaren, John. "The Failed Experiments: The Demise of the Doukhobor Systems of Communal Property Landholding in Saskatchewan and British Columbia, 1899-1999." In *Despotic Dominion: Property Rights in British Settler Societies*, edited by John McLaren et al., 222-247. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.

McLaren, John. "The Law and Public Nudity: Prairie and West Coast Reactions to the Sons of Freedom, 1929-32." In *Laws and Societies in the Canadian Prairie West, 1670-1940*, edited by Louis Knafla and Jonathan Swainger, 309-322. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.

Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Translated by Howard Greenfeld. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991.

Menzies, Charles. "Standing on the Shore with Saaban: An Anthropological Rapprochement with Indigenous Intellectual Traditions." *Collaborative Anthropologies* 6 (2013): 171-199.

Miller, J.R. *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens*. Revised edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Miller, J.R. *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Miller, J.R. *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

Mitchell, David J. *W.A.C. Bennett and the Rise of British Columbia*. Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre, 1983.

Monture-Angus, Patricia. *Journeying Forward: Dreaming First Nations' Independence*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1999.

Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. *Sovereign Subjects: Indigenous Sovereignty Matters*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin, 2007.

Morgensen, Scott Lauria. "Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16, no. 1-2 (2010): 105-131.

Nichols, Robert. "Indigeneity and the Settler Contract Today." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 39, no. 2 (2013): 165-186.

Peacock, J.G.A. *Political Thought and History: Essays on Theory and Method*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Perry, Adele. *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Phung, Malissa. "Are People of Colour Settlers Too?" In *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity*, edited by Ashok Mathur, Jonathan Dewar and Mike DeGagné, 289-298. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2011.

Plant, Byron King. "'A Relationship and Interchange of Experience': H.B. Hawthorn, Indian Affairs, and the 1955 BC Indian Research Project." *BC Studies* 163 (Autumn 2009): 5-31.

Popoff, Eli. *An Historical Exposition on the Origin and Evolvement of the Basic Tenets of the Doukhobor Life-Conception*. Publisher unknown, 1964.

Price, Richard, ed. *The Spirit of Alberta Indian Treaties*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1999.

Rak, Julie. *Negotiated Memory: Doukhobor Autobiographical Discourse*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004.

Raptis, Helen and Samantha Bowker. "Maintaining the Illusion of Democracy: Policy-Making and Aboriginal Education in Canada, 1946-48." *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy* 102 (2010): 1-21.

Rosetti, Carlo. "B. Malinowski, the Sociology of 'Modern Problems' in African and the 'Colonial Situation'." *Cahiers d'études africaines* 25, no. 100 (1985): 477-503.

Roy, Patricia. *A White Man's Province: British Columbia Politicians and Chinese and Japanese Immigrants, 1858-1914*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.

Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. "Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and Indigenous difference." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3-4 (2013): 280-294.

Scott, David. "Colonial Governmentality." *Social Text* 43 (1995): 191-220.

Sharma, Nandita and Cynthia Wright. "Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States." *Social Justice* 35, no.3 (2008): 120-138.

- Shulman, Alfred. "Personality Characteristics and Psychological Problems." In *The Doukhobors of British Columbia*, edited by Hawthorn, Harry B., 122-160. Vancouver: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1955.
- Simpson, Audra. "Settlement's Secret." *Cultural Anthropology* 26, no. 2 (2011): 205-217.
- Simpson, Leanne. *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2011.
- Smith, Andrea. "Native Studies at the Horizon of Death." In *Theorizing Native Studies*, edited by Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith, 207-234. Durham: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Zed Books, 2012.
- Snow, John. *These Mountains are our Sacred Places*. Calgary: Fifth House Ltd., 2005.
- Spaulding, Richard. "Executive Summary." In *First Nation Land Surrenders on the Prairies: 1896-1911*, edited by Peggy Martin-McGuire, xiii-xlvi. Ottawa: Indian Claims Commission, 1998.
- Stanley, Timothy J. "White Supremacy and the Rhetoric of Educational Indoctrination: A Canadian Case Study." In *Children, Teachers, and Schools in the History of British Columbia*, edited by Jean Barman et al., 39-56. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd., 1995.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. "Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31, no. 1 (1989): 134-161.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance." *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 87-109.
- Stochnoff, John. *Toil and Peaceful Life: Doukhobors As They Are*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Vancouver: Liberty Press, 1961.
- Strauss, Leo. *Natural Right and History*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Sulerzhitsky, L.A. *To America with the Doukhobors*. Translated by Michale Kalmakoff. Regina, SK: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1982.
- Sunseri, Lina. "Moving Beyond the Feminism versus Nationalism Dichotomy." In *First Voices: An Aboriginal Women's Reader*, edited by Patricia Monture and Patricia McGuire, 253-263. Toronto: Inanna Publications and Education Inc., 2009.

- Szalasznj, Kathlyn Rose Marie. "The Doukhobor Homestead Crisis 1989-1907." Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1977.
- Tarasoff, Koozma. "An Interpretive Review of a Deceptive Book." *Mir: A Doukhobor Youth Publication* 2 (1974): 5-7.
- Tarasoff, Koozma. *Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors*. Grand Forks, BC: Mir Publication Society, 1982.
- Tarasoff, Koozma. "Multiculturalism and the Rise of a New Spirit." In *Spirit-Wrestlers' Voices: Honouring Doukhobors on the Centenary of their migration to Canada in 1899*, edited by Koozma Tarasoff, 329-345. Toronto: Legas, 1998.
- Tarasoff, Koozma. "Why are First Nations 'Idle No More'? : Wisdom From the Past." Unpublished manuscript, February 2013. [http://www.spirit-wrestlers.com/2013\\_Idle\\_No\\_More.pdf/](http://www.spirit-wrestlers.com/2013_Idle_No_More.pdf/).
- Taylor, Charles. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Tchertkoff, Vladamir, ed. *Christian Martyrdom in Russia*. London: The Brotherhood Publishing Co., 1897.
- Tennant, Paul. *Aboriginal Peoples and Politics*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1990.
- Thobani, Sunera. *Exalted Subjects: Studies in making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Thomas, Nicholas. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1994.
- Tomblin, Stephen. "W.A.C. Bennett and Province-Building in British Columbia." *BC Studies* 85 (1990): 45-61.
- Tracie, Carl J. *Toil and Peaceful Life: Doukhobor Village Settlement in Saskatchewan, 1899-1918*. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1996.
- Treaty 7 Elders and Tribal Council, Walter Hildebrandt, Dorothy First Rider and Sarah Carter. *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.
- Tuck, Eve and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization is not a metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1-40.

- Tully, James. "The Pen is a Mighty Sword: Quentin Skinner's Analysis of Politics." *British Journal of Political Science* 13, no. 4 (1983): 489-509.
- Tully, James. "Political Philosophy as a Critical Activity." *Political Theory* 30, no.4 (2002): 533-555.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Ward, W. Peter. *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Toward Orientals in British Columbia*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990.
- Weaver, John. *The Great Land Rush and the Making of the Modern World, 1650-1900*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2003.
- Weaver, Sally. "The Hawthorn Report: Its Use in the Making of Canadian Indian Policy." In *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada*, edited by Noel Dyck and James Waldram, 75-97. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.
- Weaver, Thomas. "Malinowski as Applied Anthropologist." In *The Dynamics of Applied Anthropology in the Twentieth Century: The Malinowski Award Papers*, edited by Thomas Weaver, 14-33. Oklahoma City: SFAA, 2002.
- Weber, Max. "The Profession and Vocation of Politics." In *Weber: Political Writings*, edited by Peter Lassman and Ronald Speirs, 309-369. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Wilkinson, Myler, and Duff Sutherland. "'From our side we will be good neighbour[s] to them': Doukhobor-Sinixt Relations at the Confluence of the Kootenay and Columbia Rivers in the Early Twentieth Century." *BC Studies* 174 (2012): 33-59.
- Wilson, Shawn. *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Blackpoint, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2008.
- Wolfe, Patrick. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*. London, Cassell, 1999.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 387-409.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Recuperating Binarism: a Heretical Introduction." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no.3-4 (2013): 257-279.
- Wood, Patricia. "Pressured from all sides: the February 1913 Surrender of the Northeast Corner of the Tsuu T'ina Nation." *Journal of Historical Geography* 30, no. 1 (2004): 112-129.

Woodcock, George and Ivan Avakumovic. *The Doukhobors*. London: Faber and Faber, 1968.

Woodsworth, J.S. *Strangers Within Our Gates*. Toronto: F.C. Stephenson, 1909.

Wright, J.F.C. *Slava Bohu: The Story of the Doukhobors*. Toronto: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1940.

Yerbury, J.C. "The 'Sons of Freedom' Doukhobors and the Canadian State." *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada* 16, no. 2 (1984): 47-70.

Yu, Henry. "Refracting Pacific Canada: Seeing our Uncommon Past." *BC Studies* 157, no. 7 (2007): 5-10.

Yu, Henry. "Nurturing Dialogues between First Nations, Urban Aboriginal, and Immigrant Communities in Vancouver." In *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation Through the Lens of Cultural Diversity*, edited by Ashok Mathur et al., 299-308. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2011.

Zubek, John. "The Doukhobors: A Genetic Study on Attitudes." *Journal of Social Psychology* 36, no. 2 (1952): 223-239.

Zubek, John P. and Patricia A. Solberg. *Doukhobors at War*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1952.

### Archival Collections

CBC Digital Archives. CBC/Radio-Canada, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development fonds. Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Doukhobor Collection of James Mavor. Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

The Doukhobor Collection. Special Collections and Rare Books, W.A.C. Bennett Library, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

Doukhobor Research Collection. Rare Books and Special Collections, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Harry Hawthorn Fonds. University of British Columbia Archives, Vancouver, British Columbia Canada.

Stevens Studio Collection. Touchstones Nelson, Museum of Art and History, Nelson, British Columbia, Canada.

### Websites and Blogs

Jafri, Beenash. *Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences* (Equity Matters Blog). <http://www.ideas-idees.ca/blog/>.

New Denver Survivors Collective. *The New Denver Survivors*. <http://www.newdenversurvivors.tk/>.

Tarasoff, Koozma. *Spirit-Wrestlers Blog*. <http://spirit-wrestlers.blogspot.ca/>.

Waziyatawin. *Unsettling America* (Blog). <http://unsettlingamerica.wordpress.com/>.

### Newspapers and Online News Sources

*CBC*

*The Daily Colonist*

*The Edmonton Bulletin*

*The Globe*

*Herald*

*Huffington Post*

*Manitoba Free Press*

*News-Herald*

*The Province*

*Vancouver Province*

*Vancouver Sun*

*Victoria Colonist*

*Victoria Daily Times*

*Victoria Times*

### Government Documents

Canada. Parliament. *House of Commons Debates*. 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4th Session, Vol. 3, 1899.

Canada. Parliament. "Report of the Department of the Interior." *Sessional Papers of the Dominion of Canada*. 8<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 4th Session, Vol. 11, 1899.

Canada. Parliament. *House of Commons Debates*. 10<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, Vol. 4, 1905.

Canada. Parliament. *House of Commons Debates*. 10<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Vol. 2, 1906.

Canada. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. *Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996.

Government of British Columbia. *Report of the Royal Commission on Matters Relating to the Sect of Doukhobors in the Province of British Columbia, 1912*. Victoria, British Columbia: Legislative Assembly, 1913.

Ombudsman Province of British Columbia. *Public Report No. 38: Righting the Wrong: The Confinement of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobor Children*. Victoria, BC: Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, 1999.

Sullivan, Harry J. *British Columbia Royal Commission on Doukhobor Affairs 1948: Interim Report*. [Victoria, BC]: [Province of British Columbia], 1948.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Ottawa, Ontario: Library and Archives Canada, 2015.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015.

### **Legal Cases**

Perepolkin v. British Columbia [1957], 23 W.W.R. 592, 27 C.R. 95 (B.C.C. A.).

Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia, 2014 SCC 44, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 256.