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ABSTRACT

The archaeological study of colonization has largely been conducted from an Anglo-Eurocentric perspective and until recently has failed to acknowledge the perspectives of indigenous peoples. Within the Okanagan region and the rest of British Columbia, people of indigenous ancestry have historically experienced dispossession, discrimination and colonial intervention. To give voice to these experiences, this study examines the experiences of the Okanagan’s historic McDougall family during the period of 1859-1905. This research examines the genealogy of the McDougalls, whose heritage can be considered to be Scottish, Syilx, Secwepemc and Métis, evaluating the extent to which their social and kin networks were shaped by current dominant ideologies that increasingly emphasized the racialization and depreciation of mixed indigenous peoples. Furthermore, following Glassie’s (1975) approach to studying vernacular architecture, five structures built by John and David McDougall are examined as symbolic expressions of ethnic identities. Structural and stylistic changes indicate a shift in indigenous identity and are also suggestive of a transforming external environment. Under the pressures of assimilation, the McDougalls were forced to depart from the liminal spaces of a mixed identity.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Prologue

From a post-structural perspective, it is necessary that those who produce knowledge are conscious of the biases in which it is produced (Haraway 1988). My own background as a person who self-identifies as Métis has had a significant impact on this study. I am a Métis woman who grew up in a small community in southwest Saskatchewan, later moving to the city of Saskatoon. Being Métis is a way of life that is difficult to define. As a child, I was aware of my indigenous heritage as my mother and grandfather were involved with various Métis organizations. Being exposed to cultural practices such as hunting, fishing and handcrafting clothing as a child has had a significant impact on my personal values. The stories that have been passed down through my grandfather and mother are of great importance to me and will be passed down to my own children. Understanding the history of my family and the places from which we come has been integral to my own identity as an indigenous person.

As an indigenous academic, I am aware of the pressures to write using my ‘native voice’. I understand why this is and has been an important technique within the field of indigenous studies. It helps to situate the writer, while also serving as a form of resistance to the colonialist mindsets that have permeated academia. If I were to write this thesis in my ‘native voice’, or the voice that best reflects my experiences growing up, it would be a nearly incomprehensible cacophony of the Fransaskois of my father’s family and the growly curse-laden mutterings of my grandfather. I would argue that this is my native voice. While the format and writing of my thesis subscribes to the demands of academia, I feel that the content is explicitly resistant to colonialism.
Prior to my Masters program, my academic background was archaeology. Throughout my current program, I have deconstructed my previous knowledge and reassembled it through a critical lens. This was challenging as I had initially conceptualized of indigeneity and indigenous knowledge as being outside of academia and scientific knowledge. Yet, my experience with being Métis - a person with a deep understanding of liminal space (being both colonized and colonizer) - has allowed me to accept the space between indigenous knowledge and humanistic-scientific thought. For me, this space exists within a post-colonial theoretical framework.

Although I understand colonization as a process that is still ongoing and would prefer to use the term neo-colonialism to describe the current state of affairs, positioning myself under the umbrella of post-colonialism allows for a critical reading of colonization that includes an examination of past power relations. Many of the theories used to understand past indigenous people within both archaeology and history have only further reinforced or naturalized colonization (Smith 1999). In this study, I aim to undermine these types of theories by providing an interpretation that is not drawn from a dominant non-indigenous position, but inclusive of an indigenous perspective; this approach is instrumental to providing for a more complex understanding of Métis archaeology. Having positioned myself as an indigenous researcher, I attempt to contest traditional colonial historical narratives, replacing them with a critical historical analysis that is inclusive of the experiences of indigenous peoples.

Throughout this study, I struggled with much of the literature that has been written concerning Métis identity. Following political and administrative perspectives, indigenous peoples are measured as belonging to one category of ethnicity, which often appears to have definite boundaries. The problems with these categories are significant, but it is not necessarily that indigenous peoples cannot see themselves existing within them, more that they see themselves existing also within other more complex categories. The current categories used to
measure indigenous peoples don't allow for multiple subjectivities and the overlapping fluidity of identities. Questioning the legitimacy of the ways in which indigeneity is (and has been) measured and expressed can assist in laying the groundwork for a decolonizing movement.

I strongly relate to the writings of Bonita Lawrence (2003), who self identifies as a “mixed-blood Mi’kmaw”, as she discusses the challenges that accompany any attempts at deciphering past identities, especially those of our indigenous ancestors. She writes:

Identity is understood as being neither neutral and passive, nor fixed. While identity is intrinsically an individual issue, it is also relational, juxtaposed with others’ identities, with how they see themselves and see others...In some respects, identity has been seen as something’s that a person does; in other respects, identity is seen as defining what a person is. Because identities are embedded in systems of power based on race, class, and gender, identity is a highly political issue, with ramifications for how contemporary and historical collective experience is understood. Identity, in a sense, is about ways of looking at people, about how history is interpreted and negotiated, and about who has the authority to determine a group’s identity or authenticity. For Native people, individual identity is always being negotiated in relation to collective identity, and in the face of an external, colonizing society. Bodies of law defining and controlling Indianness have for years distorted and disrupted older Indigenous ways of identifying the self in relation not only to collective identity but also to the land. [2003:4, emphasis in original]

I should be clear that I am using ethnicity as a heuristic device to understand past social behavior. Being a practical device for ordering social reality, much of the writing concerning ethnicity, especially within the field of archaeology, is an oversimplified version of the past. The complexity of ethnicity requires that it be tackled from a qualitative humanistic perspective, although I still use the problematic term of “ethnic groups”. It is crucial that ethnicity is understood as a non-fixed, fluid and situational aspect of identity. In the past, group boundaries have been understood to encapsulate a homogenous people, with all members sharing multiple qualities and belonging to only one group. This may not be the case as an individual can self-identify as belonging to multiple ethnic groups with boundaries that may or may not overlap.
As such, the archaeological remains of the houses built by the McDougall family do not easily fit into the commonly used ethnic categories of Euro-Canadian pioneer, Red River Métis or local Syilx peoples.¹ Nor do these structures mark a ‘transition period’ of disappearing fur trade societies, but much like contemporary buildings and objects, they are the material remains of a people in a time and space, both of which were in a perpetual state of change. The structures built by John McDougall and the identities of his family members are complex, hybrid and overlapping. The objective of my research is not to segment the history of the McDougall family by labeling John McDougall or his descendants as belonging to certain ethnic groups, but to discuss the intermingling and intermixing of multiple identities.

My own Métis identity has hugely influenced my reasons for studying the McDougalls and my gravitation towards understanding their position within the larger process of Métis ethnogenesis. Based upon oral histories, historic documents and material remains, it is evident that the ethnic categories to which the historic McDougalls subscribed cannot be circumscribed by simple bounded ethnic appellations. It is my goal to communicate that the identities of the McDougalls were variable and largely situational. It is of great importance to me that this study is not misunderstood as an attempt to label John McDougall’s family as Métis or to suggest that his descendants should in any way claim a Métis identity. How descendants identify today, after over a century’s time, is not the central interest of this study, but rather I focus in this work on how past peoples identified themselves and were identified by others.

¹ The term Syilx refers to the indigenous people who traditionally occupied the Okanagan region. Newcomers often referred to Syilx peoples as the Okanagan People or as Okanagans.
1.2 Making Sense of Métis Identities

Métis was a term used in the past, simply meaning “mixed” in French, but is a term used currently to describe a distinct and legally entitled indigenous population in Canada that descend from the intermarriage of Europeans and First Nations during the fur trade era (Barman and Evans 2009; Weinstein 2008). Peterson and Brown describe Métis as a “socio-cultural or political term for those originally of mixed ancestry who evolved into a distinct indigenous peoples during a certain historical period in a certain region of Canada” (1985:6). The role of the Métis in the North American fur trade cannot be understated, as it is impossible to conceptualize of one without the other. The Métis remain dependent on and thus connected to their traditional land and resource base, despite being dispossessed from them (Burley et al. 1992; MacDougall 2006; St. Onge 2004).

Although research has been conducted concerning 19th century mixed ancestry communities throughout British Columbia, considerably less research has been conducted surrounding Métis peoples living in the Okanagan Valley in particular. Furthermore, Métis archaeology as a field is practically non-existent, as there is little work published to even develop any type of discourse around the subject of Métis material culture. This may result from overlooking ethnicity in archaeological interpretations. Other aspects of past peoples' identities overshadow ethnicity, such as occupation or class. While there has been a substantial effort made in terms of developing a fur trade archaeology discourse, very little of this has included Métis as

---

2 The term material culture is used throughout this study in its most broad application, as the material dimensions of the social and cultural aspects of the lives of humans (Orser 2004:90).

3 In this study, the term ethnic group is understood as “any group of people who set themselves apart and/or are set apart by others with whom they interact or co-exist on the basis of their perceptions of cultural differentiation and/or common descent” (Jones 1997:xiii). As such, ethnicity is “all those social and psychological phenomena associated with a culturally constructed group identity” (1997:xiii).
a part of the interpretation. Many articles may mention Métis as an aside, or provide a brief mention of how many fur trade workers engaged with relations with Native women, but the distinctiveness of this community as Métis is rarely discussed.

While there is an emerging discourse concerning the history of the Métis (Brown 1983; Foster 1994; Peterson and Brown 1985; St.Onge 2004), bounded definitions trouble Métis communities and identities, as being Métis does not correspond with hegemonic understandings of ethnic groups as bounded entities. Attempts to recognize métissage using static indexes such as hunting bison, speaking michif or even dressing in particular ways fail to acknowledge the inconsistencies of varying geographies, suggesting the need for a wider focus (Brasser 1985:225). Local indigenous groups undeniably influenced regional Métis cultures. Consequently, expressions of culture such as art did “not remain an exclusive hallmark of métis culture” (1985:225). Métis peoples were constantly undergoing a process of ethnogenesis, transforming their identities to fit their circumstances. Being in both worlds, as colonizer and colonized, the identities of Métis peoples shifted dramatically with increasing European settlement.

1.3 Case Study: John McDougall’s Family

John McDougall and his descendants did not appear to self-identify simply as belonging to one ethnicity or another, but like other people in contemporary and historical societies held flexible identities that became more or less salient based on social circumstance. John McDougall was an instrumental member of the early settler community of Kelowna because of his role as a Hudson’s Bay Company employee, and as a specialized builder (Louis 1996). His

---

5 The term *ethnogenesis* is used to describe the transformation, development and evolution of ethnic identities.
children exhibited strong connections to the local Syilx peoples, with whom many of them had consanguineous relationships, lived with and worked with them as hunters, trappers, and guides (Louis 1996). While numerous historical records confirm John McDougall's mixed ancestry, the saliency of his identification with this ethnicity can only be inferred using history, genealogy and material culture. An intimate examination of the social networks in which the McDougalls participated is key to understanding their past identities. By observing the ways in which other members of the local community racialized the McDougalls, the transformation of their ethnic identities can be better understood.

1.4 Material Expressions of Ethnicity

Studying material culture in order to recognize underlying cognitive processes, dominant ideologies and power relations has been foundational in many studies within the field of historical archaeology (Deagan 2003; Deetz 1982; Leone 1984; McGuire 1982; Mullins and Paynter 2000). In doing this, archaeologists attempt to go beyond studying subsistence patterns and typological styles to understand the deep-seated mindsets of past peoples. It is these different worldviews that distinguish groups of people from one another. Categories of identity such as ethnicity are understood as socially constructed, fluid and intersecting with other categories of identity, such as gender, class and race.

This type of contextual approach is particularly relevant as it allows for an examination of past power relations in terms of the distribution of both material and symbolic resources. Moving beyond a simple one-to-one correlation of ethnicity and material culture (namely archaeological cultures and ethnic markers), ethnicity is examined as a product of the intersections of what Bourdieu terms ‘*habitus*’ and the conditions that constitute any given historical situation (Bourdieu 1977; Cohen 1989; Giddens 1982, 1984). Habitus, which is defined as “durable
dispositions towards certain perceptions and practices” (Bourdieu 1977:78), is employed to examine ethnicity, but also as a means for understanding vernacular architecture. Henry Glassie’s (1975) detailed study of domestic architectural forms throughout Middle Virginia set the precedent for understanding material culture to be an expression of values and perceptions that are structured by *habitus*. Material culture alone cannot provide information on the fluid qualities of ethnicities including language, conceptualization of space, spiritual beliefs and traditions, political relations, underlying ideologies, perceptions of gender, and familial relationships. Applying a mixed methods approach that contextualizes material culture within an appropriate theoretical framework allows for a more complete understanding of these qualities.

### 1.5 Methods

Despite the divisions that are often made between interpretative and critical research methods (Merriam 2009:34), this study attempts to understand the meaning of the material remains while examining the power dynamics that shaped the past. Due to the various humanistic approaches that this study demands, a qualitative research methodology has been employed throughout the duration of research and analysis. Using an approach that critically examines historic textual records, this study focuses on the period that begins with the building of the first Catholic Mission in the Okanagan in 1859 and ends in 1905 when the Okanagan’s principal community of Kelowna was incorporated as a city.⁷

This study contextualizes material remains by cross-referencing them with historical documents and oral histories in order to discern the dominant ideology that was being imposed

---

⁶ The term *vernacular architecture* is used to describe buildings that are constructed according to cultural norms (Orser 2004:184).

⁷ Although the historical material is not explicit as to when John McDougall and his family arrived in the Okanagan, the archaeological material suggests that it was at a similar time or perhaps shortly thereafter.
upon people in the past, including the structuring of power relations and their responses to it. Within a wider context, this process of a changing historical situation is viewed as being reciprocal and interactive and not simply a one-sided imposition. To provide an understanding of the context in which past identities were constructed and expressed, the settlement of Kelowna is examined with particular attention paid to the attitudes that may have influenced the extent to which the McDougalls expressed certain identities.

In addition to examining textual records concerning Kelowna’s early history, I conducted a historical survey that examined the McDougall family using a constant comparative method (Merriam 2009:30). This involved investigating primary sources such as birth records, baptismal records, marriage registration records, death registration records, census records, military enlistment and attestation papers, as well as first person accounts from historic diaries, journals and interviews. Secondary sources such as donated family genealogies as well as Shirley Louis’ 1996 and 2002 works concerning the McDougall family were cross-referenced with primary documents. Segments of historical data were compared with one another to determine differences and similarities, grouping data with similarities. Once named, each group became a tentative category, which was then used to identify patterns within the data.

A similar approach was used to conduct a selective architectural field survey of each of the five buildings being studied. The structures examined in this study include four houses built by John McDougall from 1861 to 1886 as well as a house built by his son David in 1890. Prior to intensive documentation surveys, reconnaissance surveys were conducted for each building. This included documenting the current state of each building as they have all been relocated and rebuilt by various organizations. Survey data include a detailed description of each structure’s

---

8 According to Merriam, the constant comparative method “involves comparing one segment of data with another to determine similarities and differences” (2009:30).
interior and exterior; including measurements, log construction techniques, treatments, repairs and replacements. In addition to taking photographs, the basic plan and form of each structure have been reconstructed to scale, using Google SketchUp so that building layouts can be visually compared. In addition to using a constant comparative method to compare each building, each structure was analyzed within the discourse of vernacular architecture during this time period (1859-1905).

1.6 A Cyclical Investigation Rendered Linear

This study is organized in a linear fashion, although the process has been cyclical, as topics, theory and data have overlapped and intersected throughout. The following chapter reviews literature that has been relevant to the current discourse to which this study will contribute, while explaining key concepts and theories. Chapter 3 includes a background summary of the history of Métis ethnogenesis in Canada including a discussion of the controversial topic of Métis identities. Chapter 4 explores the historical context in which the McDougalls lived by examining the history of colonialism and racism in the Okanagan between 1859 and 1905. Chapter 5 presents historical, genealogical and archaeological data pertaining to the McDougall family, examining their roles within various social networks in the Okanagan. Chapter 6 synthesizes the data within its historical context using the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2, thus taking the form of an analytical discussion. The final chapter of this study draws conclusions, while also making suggestions for moving forward.
CHAPTER 2 CURRENT THEORY AND DISCOURSE

2.1 Overview

The interdisciplinary nature and inherent complexity of this study has resulted in the need to consult a vast array of literature from multiple fields of study. The following literature has assisted in situating this work within more than one discourse, meanwhile informing the theoretical framework that was employed throughout the study. The final synchronization and analysis of the data collected were conducted through a lens structured by the theories, concepts, case studies and approaches that have been included in this review.

Employing a post-colonial perspective as a means for deconstructing past power relations is an essential tool for decolonization. This review examines the archaeology of colonization. While a post-colonial approach to the archaeology of colonization is a fairly recent development, there have been earlier contributions to the studies of creolization, ethnogenesis and resistance throughout colonization (Deagan 1983, 1985, 1998, 2003; Mullins and Paynter 2000). These topics are crucial aspects of my own study of people of mixed indigenous ancestry during an increasingly intense period of colonization within British Columbia’s southern interior region. To support my study of architectural forms as expressions of internalized structures, perceptions and practices, this review surveys early work by pioneers within the field of historical archaeology.

The theories of *habitus*, *practice* and *structuration* that were suggested by critics of structuralism Pierre Bourdieu (1977) and Anthony Giddens (1982, 1984; Cohen 1989) are included in this review as they have been crucial to my own analysis. This review moves beyond a simple one-to-one correlation of ethnicity and material culture (namely archaeological cultures
and ethnic markers) to an examination of ethnicity as a product of the intersections of *habitus* and the conditions that constitute any given historical situation. This type of contextual approach is particularly relevant to my own research as it allows for an examination of past power relations in terms of the distribution of both material and symbolic resources. Furthermore, I examine literature that elaborates on the need for an understanding of categories of identity such as ethnicity to be socially constructed, fluid and intersecting with other categories of identity, namely race.

Continuing the discussion concerning Bourdieu’s *habitus*, but as a means for understanding domestic architecture, the review considers Henry Glassie’s (1975) detailed study of domestic architectural forms throughout Middle Virginia as setting the precedent for understanding material culture to be an expression of values and perceptions that are structured by habitus. Also discussed is how Glassie’s approach was utilized within the field of fur trade archaeology. For instance, Gregory Monks’ interpretation of the spatial arrangement and building styles as forms of non-verbal communication suggested that the Hudson’s Bay Company was actively attempting to reinforce their power (1992). Mann’s examination of a fur trade fort has multiple parallels to my own research as he sees domestic architectural forms as a means for intentionally differentiation and resistance to the increasing ethnic segmentation that was occurring at the Zachariah Cicott trading post near the Great Lakes (2008). Although Mann’s approach examines building techniques employed predominantly by *canadiens* during a period that may considered to be prior to the crystallization of the Métis Nation, it is still significant in terms of his approach.

Finally, previous work within the field of Métis archaeology is highlighted, examining Burley’s work on Métis material culture including building styles and domestic assemblages, which has been the most recognized archaeological research concerning the Métis (Burley 1989;
Burley 2000; Burley and Horsfall 1989; Burley et al. 1992). I am using it is a point of reference in terms of the architectural forms that he recorded throughout Saskatchewan, but also because of his employment of what he terms a “pseudostructural” approach. Other archaeologists who have recently contributed to Métis archaeology, including Yvonne Marshall and Alexandra Maas (1997) and Beaudoin et al. (2010) are also examined for their individual contributions to the discourse of Métis archaeology.

2.2 The Archaeology of Colonization

The archaeological study of colonization has largely been conducted from an Anglo-Eurocentric perspective and until recently has failed to acknowledge the perspectives of indigenous peoples. The paradigmatic shift from a distinctly scientific archaeology (also known as processual archaeology) to one that argued that there were “no single truth of the past, only narratives of what the interpreter (the archaeologist) wanted to see” (Sutton and Yohe 2006:69), was termed post-processual archaeology. This postmodernist movement embraced issues that dealt with inequality and under representation, while suggesting that scientific archaeology was an “agent of colonialism” (2006:69). Some scholars have argued that the continued excavation of non-European once-colonized sites without the involvement or consultation of descendant communities further propagates European hegemony over marginalized peoples (McDavid and Babson 1997; Potter 1991).

More recent scholarship within historical archaeology concerning colonial sites has focused on providing insight into understanding past and present identities and their formation within the context of past power relations. Common themes within this field include the study of domination, resistance, status, ethnicity and gender (Lawrence and Shepherd 2006:73). Given’s (2004) work *The Archaeology of the Colonized*, extends these themes to examine topics such as
agency, landscape, taxation and settlement. He argues that the use of colonial documents to read colonized peoples continues to centre the colonizer. Additionally, he argues that people’s relationship to colonial rule becomes part of who they (the colonized) are.

Like much of the other work concerning colonialism and archaeology, Given applies the dichotomy of colonizer and colonized. Williamson (2004) points out that these types of dichotomies within proto- and post-colonial archaeology result from the division between the disciplines of archaeology and history, which is part of the more general philosophical dichotomies of history/science, particularism/generalization, event/process and agency/structure. To overcome these dichotomies, she suggests the application of heuristic models that are non-linear using both historical and archaeological data sets.

This is certainly a valuable suggestion since not all past peoples in North America were either European or indigenous, with many communities engaging in a process which some scholars term ‘creolization’. The work of Kathleen Deagan (1983, 1985, 1988, 1996) has influenced subsequent studies of creolization within the archaeology of colonization. Deagan’s critique of the traditional methodology of historical archaeology suggests that archaeologists are asking the wrong questions and employing inadequate techniques for retrieving data. Furthermore, she questions classic approaches that focus on assimilation to European norms, arguing that a relatively equal cross-cultural exchange transforms mono-cultural practices into creolized forms (1996).

More recent scholarship such as Mullins and Paynter’s (2000) study of post-contact Haida material culture examines local representations of European people as an active strategy to negotiate colonial power relations. Within this study, they apply the concept of ethnogenesis to Haida creolization in order to examine conflict between indigenous groups and various colonial powers. Mullins and Paynter emphasize the lack of analysis of power relations within
creolization scholarship, suggesting that it is most often framed as a “multicultural adjustment” (2000:73).

By applying the concept of continuous ethnogenesis, Mullins and Paynter attempt to situate creolization as a process that involves the construction of new cultural subjectivities within specific structural power relations. Furthermore, the study suggests that collective agency within the Haida community inevitably “mirrors both the structural domination of a colonizer and the local material organization and cultural identity of a colonized people” (2000:74). Mullins and Paynter’s application of an ethnogenesis-based creolization within archaeology is a useful way of examining how creolizing cultures both resisted multiple forms of European domination, while at the same time appropriating empowering advantages and resources. The traditional archaeological approach of applying a monolithic cultural change model is an impractical means for understanding the multiplicity of past experiences within the colonial world, as it reduces colonization to “a universal encounter between dominant Europeans and subordinate indigenous peoples” (2000:74).

2.3 Structuralism in Historical Archaeology

The archaeology of capitalism has sometimes been considered synonymous with North American historical archaeology, as much of the early work in historical archaeology was focused on the transition to capitalism in 18th century Annapolis, Maryland. The works of James Deetz, Mark Leone, Paul Shackel, Charles Orser and Stanley South have pervaded most theoretical dialogues in historical archaeology. Historical archaeology often extended beyond the discipline to the theories of Bourdieu, Giddens and Foucault to discuss themes such as critical theory, ideology and structure, structural Marxism and meaning (Hicks and Beaudry 2006:5).
Deriving from sociological foundations, the theory of structuralism was particularly influential to historical archaeologists James Deetz and Mark Leone. Both scholars employed structuralism to understand the built landscape as an expression of internalized ideological beliefs. Deetz’ approach was clearly influenced by structural linguistics as he suggested that similar to language, artifacts were the direct result of physical action and therefore should similarly demonstrate underlying meaning and a universal cognitive structure (Preucel 2008:101). In his work titled *In Small Things Forgotten* (1977), Deetz argued that during the 18th century, a shift in worldview occurred among both American colonies and British subjects. This shift involved a movement away from what Deetz terms a *Medieval* mindset that emphasized communalism and openness to a *Georgian Order* that was based on the values of individuality, privacy and capitalism.⁹ Deetz demonstrates that this shift was simultaneous across various forms of material culture including ceramics, cuts of meat, architecture and other artifacts. Although he has been criticized for the narrow dualism that is inherent to structuralism (Johnson 1999), Deetz’ insight that the *Georgian Order* was a set of social rules that reflected shifting social relations between classes pervaded many other studies within historical archaeology.

The approach of ideology as worldview continued in Leone’s examination of Mormon behaviour (1973, 1977), as well as his analysis of William Paca’s garden (1984). In his study of William Paca and his garden, Leone observed that Paca’s garden was a reflection of both his internal contradiction and the dominant ideology in 18th century Maryland. Both his Annapolis house and garden were built in the Georgian style, thus emphasizing order, segmentation and

---

⁹ The term *Georgian Order* describes not only a stylistic category, but is “a distinctive Anglo-American mind set, characterized by symmetrical cognitive structures, homogeneity in the material culture, a progressive and innovative world view, and an insistence on order and balance that permeates all aspects of life from the decorative arts to the organization of space by society” (Deetz and Bushman 1974:22).
symmetry (1984:31). While both Deetz and Leone’s structural approaches were influential, they were only partially successful, as there was limited attention paid to the social dialectic that continuously occurs between social structures and daily practice (Preucel 2006:121).

2.4 Bourdieu and Giddens’ Critique of Structuralism

Giddens’ and Bourdieu’s critique of structuralism and subsequent theoretical developments have permeated archaeological theory concerning both ethnicity and vernacular architecture. Jones (1997) suggests that archaeologists use Bourdieu’s theories of practice and habitus (1977) as a means for understanding ethnicity as it transcends the dialogues between objectivism and subjectivism as well as primordialism and instrumentalism. Bourdieu’s critique of structuralism was built on the concept that people are structured by cultural schemes of meaning, which mediate social relations and therefore social actions. These organizing structures, which were initially conceived of as being analogous to a language’s grammar, are often sub-conscious, but are nonetheless “durable dispositions towards certain perceptions and practices…which can be transposed from one context to another” (Bourdieu 1977:78). Learned at an early age, the needs and interests of a person are defined within a culturally structured space. This space is inherently dialectical as it both structures and is structured by social practice. Perceptions and practices are learned through processes of socialization during which structures of power become embodied. This embodiment of cognitive structures influences dispositions and practices at an unconscious level (Jones 1997:88-89).

Bourdieu attempted to transcend the dichotomy between functionalism and structuralism, but was initially critiqued as being both conservative and deterministic in his explanation of the relationship between human agency and social structure (Jones 1997:89). It appeared that Bourdieu was simply describing agency as operating within a social context that was structured
by power relations and contingent on historical ideologies (Last 1995:149). As a result, the actions of the agent are both constrained and enabled by the ideological and social networks in which the agent participates. These structuring social networks were known as *habitus* and any action mediated by *habitus* is considered to be both regulated and instinctive (Last 1995:150). A structural Marxist approach would suggest that *habitus* is generated by external conditions such as modes of production and access to resources.

Bourdieu’s *habitus* provides the necessary theoretical framework for understanding and analyzing various aspects within historical archaeology, but some scholars have critiqued Bourdieu’s approach as unable to explain social change and as being overly static (Last 1995:151). Anthony Giddens’ theory of *structuration* (1982, 1984; Cohen 1989) attempts to overcome this problem by conceptualizing of *habitus* in a different way. Giddens employs the term *structuration* to describe the “set of conditions that intervene between structure and practice to ensure the reproduction or transformation of that structure” (Last 1995:151). Furthermore, he argues for a duality between agency and structure, rather than a dual opposition. Structure and agency are inherently implicated in the production of the other, so when analyzing *structuration* it is necessary to study “the modes in which such systems, grounded in the knowledgeable activities of situated actors who draw upon rules and resources in the diversity of action contexts, are produced and reproduced in interaction” (Giddens 1984:25). Routinized practice is Giddens’ equivalent of Bourdieu’s *habitus*, but agents are seen to be actively transforming or maintaining structures. Both the access to power and the mobilization of resources can enable or constrain an agent’s ability to affect said structures. Meanwhile, “Power…is generated in and through the reproduction of structures of dominance” (Giddens 1984:258). The dialectical relationship between structure and agency that is described by Giddens advances Bourdieu’s critique of structuralism.
2.5 Habitus, Practice, and Ethnicity

Few archaeologists have employed (or even seriously discussed) the theories of Giddens and Bourdieu, yet Giddens’ structuration is a useful approach for interpreting past social reality, as it includes agency within the historical narrative, while explaining long-term change and stability.\(^{10}\) Jones supports the use of Bourdieu’s theory of practice to analyze the processes that shape ethnicity (1997:128), as commonalities in practice give “members of an ethnic cohort their sense of being both familiar and familial to each other” (Bentley 1987:32-33).\(^{11}\) Contrary to earlier approaches to ethnicity that recognized its formation as a passive process, this application of habitus allows people to recognize a shared identity and express it in multiple ways. The correlation between habitus and ethnicity is not direct. Much like the correlation between ethnicity and culture, the relationship is nuanced, as ethnicity is embedded in a shared habitus, which is both variable and situational and often results in a pattern of overlapping ethnic boundaries.

Material culture may be a product of a common habitus, but that doesn’t necessarily mean that it maps the boundaries of past ethnicity, as these boundaries are more often than not shifting and subject to transformation. The feeling of shared identity that results from a shared habitus are consciously appropriated and expressed using existing symbolic resources (Bentley 1987:173). These symbols are not arbitrary, but relate to shared cultural practices and meaningful cultural idioms. The signifiers, however, are subject to transformation, as their meaning is contextual (Eriksen 1992:45). There are often strong psychological attachments to symbols of ethnicity, as an individual’s social identity is shaped by a shared habitus (Bourdieu

\(^{10}\) Some exceptions include the work of Burley et al. (1992), Jones (1997), and Last (1995).

\(^{11}\) Bourdieu’s theory of practice can be explained as an individual’s bodily engagement with the world (1977). Bourdieu added the concept of field to his theoretical construct of practice (1991), which can be viewed as a the structured domain in which practice occurs.
1977:78-93). That being said, an individual may express multiple ethnic identities as these symbolic representations are not fixed.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{2.6 Archaeological Cultures and Ethnic Markers}

There has been limited attention focused on developing a theoretical framework to support a relationship between ethnic identity and material culture. With the exception of Dolukhanov (1994), Hodder (1982), Shennan (1994) and most recently, Jones (1997), historical archaeologists continue to employ vague definitions of ethnic identity, meanwhile ignoring the need for supporting theory. Ethnic groups and archaeological cultures are conflated, which is hugely problematic for a number of reasons. The use of archaeological cultures as a means for understanding ethnicity was initially employed as a form of taxonomic classification and is essentially the legacy of a colonialist perspective. Perceiving cultures as bounded, homogenous and normative, processual archaeologists replaced much of the interpretation concerning ethnicity with the analysis of archaeological cultures. The scientific approach to archaeological cultures assumed that members of a culture would inevitably conform to ideal prescriptive rules of behaviour. During the 1980s and 1990s, several new approaches to understanding ethnicity emerged, employing different theoretical approaches that disrupted the conflation of ethnic groups and archaeological cultures (Burley et al. 1992; McGuire 1982, 1983; Praetzellis et al. 1987). More recently, studies have emerged that examine ethnicity in terms of localized communities (Canuto and Yaeger 2000). Following Anderson (1983), this approach understands ethnicity as being the result of networks of relationships, but also being strongly connected to people’s ties to sets of meaningful cultural symbols.

\textsuperscript{12} For instance, if someone is of shared descent and identifies with more than one ethnicity.
Although historical archaeologists have devoted much time to identifying ethnicity in the archaeological record, this has been done by considering ethnicity as a discrete, objective unit, which falls into a preset criteria (having various visible characteristics). This search for ethnic markers has been critiqued by Burley as “limiting [historical archaeology’s] ability to contribute to a meaningful dialogue on ethnicity as a social phenomenon in concordance with sociological and anthropological studies” (1992:4). There are a number of reasons why ethnic markers are problematic, but the most significant flaw is that independent markers of identity, such as opium pipes, ceramic styles and house forms, are taken out of the context in which they were originally found (Burley 1992:4).

As an attempt to go beyond the classic approach of historical archaeologists to locate ethnic markers, there has been a recent emphasis on the study of style, as it has focused on how people use, manipulate, and negotiate material symbols strategically.13 Burley argues for “an iconographic theory of style” that “forces the archaeologist to examine artifacts, or artifact attributes, in light of social information they have been meant to convey” (1992:9). Based on Barth’s conception of ethnic boundaries (1969), earlier ethno-archaeological studies of style attempted to discern the relationship between shifting ethnic boundaries and degrees of inter-group interaction (Hodder 1982). These studies were somewhat problematic as the relationship between interaction and material culture was inconsistent, with some material culture distinctions being maintained and others crossing boundaries. Like all forms of material culture, items that expressed ethnicity were not a passive reflection of social organization, but active expressions of identities that in turn, structure people’s actions (Hodder 1986). Countering earlier diffusionist and assimilation models, Hodder concluded that cultural diversity and

13 Style and ethnic representations do not have a direct correlation, as style is a form of social marking that can communicate affiliation to various other types of groups including social classes and religion.
distinction persisted despite interaction and interdependence of different ethnic groups (Jones 1997:73). It has also been argued that during times of social, economic and environmental stress, the intensity of ethnic consciousness and therefore material culture differentiation dramatically increased (Hodder 1982).

2.7 A New Understanding of Ethnicity and Material Culture

Material culture can mediate and legitimate social relations, but is only part of the environment in which ethnicity is generated, so ethnicity may be entirely invisible in the archaeological record. That being said, archaeological interpretation can still be employed to analyze ethnicity within a given context if ethnicity is recognized and expressed as a result of “the historically constituted dispositions and orientations that inform people’s understandings and practices” (Jones 1997:125). Examining ethnicity as a product of the intersections of *habitus* and the conditions that constitute any given historical situation allows for an examination of past power relations in terms of the distribution of both material and symbolic resources. A historical approach is critical, as ethnicity is generated and expressed within a diachronic context. Jones suggests that by employing a historical theoretical framework, “it may be possible to pick up the transformation of habitual material variation into active self-conscious ethnic symbolism, and vice versa, on the basis of changes in the nature and distribution of the styles involved” (Jones 1997:126). Furthermore, this may contribute to our understanding of the processes that drive the transformation of structures such as ethnicity.

My approach to ethnicity directly follows that of Jones (1997:140), which centres on individual and communal consciousness of ethnicity and how expressions of ethnic identity are transformed and reproduced as a form of cultural differentiation within the context of particular historical structures. By understanding ethnicity using this approach, it is impossible to correlate
particular artifacts or architectural forms to a particular ethnic group in terms of a static one-to-one relationship. It is crucial that objects of ethnic representations are not labeled as such in isolation (as ‘ethnic markers’), but that entire assemblages are examined within larger contexts. If expressions of identity are considered as continuously reproduced and transformed by different people within a changing historical context, then archaeological assemblages need to be understood as existing within a social reality that included conflicting, heterogeneous constructions of cultural identity. As Jones articulates, “there is no single, unambiguous ethnic association, because no such single social reality has ever existed. Even within a self-identifying ethnic group, such an identity and the material forms that come to symbolize it are differently lived and articulated by different people” (Jones 1997:140).

2.8 Intersecting Categories of Identity

Expressions of ethnic identity tend to intersect with other categories of identity such as class, race and religion as they are often embedded within one another. A single artifact or structure may reflect multiple types of identities, including pan-geographical or localized expressions of identity. Any attempt to untangle single categories of identity from others is both challenging and problematic. In this study, various interlocking categories of identity are examined, including ethnicity and race. Unfortunately, historical archaeologists have failed to address race in terms of its archaeological remains, often conflating it with ethnicity (Orser 1998:661). Orser argues the following:

The failure of American historical archaeologists to address race and racism in any substantive way has served to maintain the field’s tacit political conservatism, a stance consistent with the traditional use of historical archaeology to examine sites associated with places and personages important in the dominant national ideology. [1998:662]
With the understanding that race is a social construct that has been used in the past to classify people and define power relations in a manner similar to other categories such as class and ethnicity, it should be at times visible in the archaeological record. Because there has been little precedence in this field of study within historical archaeology, there is a lack of theory to support the study of race and racism in the archaeological record. The most successful approach is that of Terrence Epperson (1990). He argued for a dual focused approach that would allow historical archaeologists to realize that racism was both a “means of oppression and a locus of resistance” as it “embodies contradictory tendencies of exclusion and incorporation” (341). This dual perspective was based on W. E. B. Du Bois’s (1961:16-17) concept of double-consciousness, with the goal of “denaturalizing essentialist racial categories”, while valorizing cultures of resistance (Epperson 1990:36). Victims of racism internalized racist attitudes, which affected the material expressions of their identity.

2.9 Vernacular Architecture as a Mode of Communication

The study of vernacular architecture as a means of understanding underlying cognitive structures was pioneered by folklorist Henry Glassie in his 1975 study of houses in Middle Virginia. In opposition to formal architecture, vernacular architecture is not planned or constructed by trained architects and builders, but instead, is constructed according to internalized cultural norms (Orser 2004:184). As Glassie articulates, “what makes vernacular architecture is not an occupant who builds but a cultural congruity among design, construction and use” (2000:46).

Early on, Glassie argued that the information produced by vernacular architecture can both supplement and challenge historical records that only represent an elite population. Influenced by structural linguistics, Glassie proposed that “a conception of the object is related
to internalized ideas of external objects while the object is being composed” (Glassie 1975:17).14 Glassie’s understanding of vernacular technologies, which was based on an extensive survey in Middle Virginia of 338 houses, differentiated from industrial modes of production that depended on “expansive political powers that maintain the costly infrastructure of transportation and communication, while supporting through law the right of a small minority to amass great reserves of capital” (1975: 31). Instead, vernacular technology emphasizes the direct connection to both the people who supply, produce, and shape consume raw materials and the materials themselves. Glassie employed rigorous methods of recording house structures, with the goal of creating a model to account for the design ability of the builder, which he termed an *artifactual grammar* (Glassie 1975:17). This set of rules guiding the construction of vernacular architecture is often unconscious, but as Preucel argues, it “can be brought into the conscious domain through questioning and contemplation” (Preucel 2006:106-107).

Like Deetz, Glassie employs the concept of the Georgian Order to explain the shift from openness to enclosed spaces in Middle Virginia. He describes the architectural changes as a result of the American Revolution, stating the following:

> As ownership of the land solidified, so did the house. It was rebuilt in permanent materials. Then, as though at last awakening to its aloneness, the house drew a cloak of symmetry over itself and, in hiding, commenced to subdivide its interior, transferring the class structures of the larger society into the little community of the family. [1975:149]

Glassie suggests that to compensate for the socio-political disorder that was associated with the American Revolution, houses were increasingly ordered, structuring the activities of those who lived within and amongst them. For instance, hallways were used to stop and channel people,

14 Glassie adopted Chomsky’s (1968:64) approach, distinguishing between “competence” and “performance”. Competence is described as the ability to compose and “to relate to the composition to things external to it in context” (Preucel 2006:106-107). Performance is the observable outcome of the result of interrelations of these two abilities.
becoming a “transitional place where people, perhaps opposed in political orientation, can negotiate their differences politely” (1975:118,135).

Since Glassie’s 1975 study, architectural studies in archaeology have been examined from several different perspectives, which for the most part, have included varying degrees of semiotic analysis. Despite critique from other scholars (Barrett 1994; Buchli 1995; Parker Pearson 1995), Ian Hodder’s artifact-as-text approach has been the focus of much of the discourse concerning symbolic meanings and subsequent interpretations of artifacts. Following the post-processual perspective, he argues that “material cultural meanings are continually generated through practice” and that symbolic meaning is generated for power and social strategy, as “not everyone in a particular society is authorized to write a text or to give it a particular meaning” (Preucel 2006:139-140).

Recognizing how the study of architecture has been fragmented between the fields of symbolic archaeology, historical archaeology and social archaeology, Ayan Vila et al. proposed an inter-disciplinary and multi-dimensional approach that views architecture as an active, living entity. This new vision for the archaeology of architecture has been termed archaeotecture (Ayan Vila et al. 2003). Using a social archaeology of landscape that follows Bourdieu (1977) and Giddens (1979), this approach emphasizes architecture as being both an instrument for social action and a technology of coercion.

---

15 Note that “architectonic space is essentially a social space which is constructed culturally, a cultural landscape which fully participates in the construction of symbolic apparatus, of the collective imagination and the ritual practices of the community which builds it and inhabits it” (Ayan Vila et al. 2003:4).

2.10 Fur Trade Architecture as “vital terrains of colonization”

According to Klimko (2004), fur trade archaeology was initiated as a focus set by the Canadian Federal Historic Sites and Monuments Board, which “viewed itself as an educated elite whose duty lay in imparting proper values of patriotism, duty, self-sacrifice and spiritual devotion to young and new Canadians and members of lower orders of society” (170). Fur trade archaeology peaked dramatically in the 1970s, as federally funded projects were initiated, with a “focus on historic and architectural information for reconstruction and display” (2004:166). The resulting reports from these projects were “highly descriptive accounts of fieldwork, architectural features and site layout, with limited artefact analysis” (2004:165). Most of this work conducted in the 1970s was and still remains unpublished, evidence for the current knowledge gap that exists within fur trade archaeology in Canada. It was only in the 1980s that archaeologists finally approached fur trade sites in a manner that went beyond materialism and included critical approaches, but by this time, many fur trade posts had already been excavated (2004:169).

Perhaps the most well-known fur trade site excavation in Canada is Gregory Monks’ work at Upper Fort Garry. Although Monks’ analysis had an underlying processual tone, he emphasized architectural symbols, arguing that the Hudson’s Bay Company used non-verbal communication to establish and maintain a dominant socio-economic position amongst settlers and its employees (Monks 1992:37). A similar approach by Rob Mann examined vernacular architecture at the Zachariah Cicott trading post on the central Wabash River. Here he argued that the vernacular architecture of canadiens during the Great Lakes fur trade became a “locus of

17 Quoted from Comaroff and Comaroff 1992:274.
struggle”, as material expressions of identities were reproduced within a context of an ethnically segmented labour market and subsequent racialized discourses involving housing (2008:320).

Mann’s argument is similar to my own study, with a few exceptions. His emphasis on canadiens would have likely included what may be termed proto- or early Métis populations, but this is at no point made explicit.\(^{18}\) Also, I am critical of his use of language pertaining to ethnicity and focus on ethnic segmentation. Although he does briefly mention the role of race in allocation of labour market positions (2008:321), racism is largely ignored. It is likely that racial segmentation occurred simultaneously to ethnic segmentation, with the former taking precedence.

Employing a structuralist approach, Mann argues that “through daily practice Canadien vertical and horizontal log folk housing became invested with the meanings that both produced and naturalized Canadien fur trade identity” (2008:326).\(^{19}\) His emphasis on daily practice is key, as many studies of identity and architecture tend to essentialize identities and material symbols as static and without context. As Comaroff and Comaroff suggest, “bodies, houses and everyday routines” were as much the site of colonial practices “as formal confrontations with Anglo colonial elites” (1992:42-3).

Another valuable argument put forth by Mann is his caution against attaching essentialized notions of social identity to material culture, as ethnic groups may or may not have attached cultural significance to material items (2008:332). He argues that rather than regarding fur trade sites that are replete with imported British artifacts as evidence of the “Anglo-Americaness” of the inhabitants of these sites, this should instead be viewed as merely the

\(^{18}\) This may be influenced by the lack of recognition of Métis peoples in the United States (see Basson 2008).
\(^{19}\) Mann focuses on French vernacular piece-sur-piece construction, a prefabricated house that was cut to fit like a jigsaw puzzle, using a tenon-and-groove adhesive system (2008:325).
homogenizing effects of a globalized distribution of capitalist commodities (2008:332). Taking Epperson’s dual focused approach (1990), Mann suggests that architecture is a means of marginalization of non-Anglo Americans and a locus of resistance as it was both a method of exclusion and inclusion. Mann’s work is one of the few studies that have examined fur trade period vernacular architecture from a critical semiotic perspective.

2.11 An Archaeology of the Métis

David Burley’s work concerns the time period following the decline of the fur trade and is the most well-known research concerning Métis archaeology (Burley 1989; Burley and Horsfall 1989; Burley et al. 1992; Burley 2000). Other archaeologists have recently contributed to Métis archaeology, including Yvonne Marshall and Alexandra Maas (1997) and Beaudoin et al. (2010).

In his approach to Métis archaeology, David Burley critiques earlier methods of studying Métis society which characterized it as a hybrid culture composed of both European and indigenous characteristics.20 This approach categorized Métis as having a set of traits and styles that only transform with changes in Métis ethnic identity. Burley suggests that this becomes increasingly problematic as attempts are made to identify distinct patterns when observing Métis material remains in conjunction with conducting oral history interviews with descendants of Métis communities. Burley suggests that the theoretical framework upon which archaeologists discuss ethnicity be reappraised to include a pseudostructuralist theoretical position that accepts Bourdieu’s habitus. Arguing that the unconscious rules that structure Métis behaviour are

20 Instead, Burley argues that “Métis ethnicity involves a host of intangibles including a sense of common identity founded on and strengthened by historical events of the 19th century. More importantly, Métis ethnicity envelopes a shared way of doing things that is regulated by unconscious rules and principles. To understand the Métis as an ethnic group, one must come to grips with this underlying phenomenon” (1992:2).
manifested in daily activities and thus the built environment, Burley describes the dispositions demonstrated by Métis peoples as “a way of doing things” (1992:6).21 These dispositions include a lack of division between culture and nature, overriding concerns with equality in terms of social organization and consensus and finally, what Burley terms “an unbounded and asymmetrical perception of space” (1992:2). Vernacular architecture, in particular, reproduces cultural values in a manner that serves to enculturate younger generations.

Burley’s 1992 conclusions concerning Métis perceptions and symbolic expressions of identity resulted from his 1986 study of four Métis wintering sites: Petite Ville (located on the South Saskatchewan River), Kis-sis-away Tanner’s Camp (in Dirt Hills), Four Mile Coulee and Chimney Coulee (both located in Cypress Hills). He compared these archaeological sites with the Kajewski and Buffalo Lake sites (in Alberta), as all sites had similar spatial distribution and material culture content, and were all occupied during the same time period (1870-1880). By examining the sites together and by examining assemblages as a whole, Burley attempted to determine the basis upon which Métis ethnicity could begin to be defined. The goal of his study was to provide insight into the underlying governing principles such as Métis use of space, settlement patterning, use of materials and other aspects of Métis lifeways that reflect a Métis habitus (1992:95).

Burley and Horsfall’s (1989) publication followed a similar approach, but was based on farmsteads studied by the Canadian Parks Service in the mid 1970s and Burley’s own survey in the St. Laurent area in 1986, which was heavily dependent on data gathered from interviews with local community members, some of whom were Métis. This work emphasizes the vernacular architecture of Métis farmsteads built between 1882 and 1940. None of the houses that were

21 He also notes that individuals may recognize variations from what is considered to be the norm (1992:6).
studied fit the model of the traditional Métis Red River frame or that of early hivernant Métis houses, but instead had “dovetail corner notching, gable roofs, symmetrical window placements on the front facade, lean to additions and wattle and daub exterior plaster” (1992:125).\footnote{Prior to 1870, predominant technology at the Red River Settlement was tenon and groove construction, imported from francophone communities (Burley 2000:30-31). Early hivernant Métis houses were two room structures, built using saddle notched construction and sod roofs (Burley and Horsfall 1989:25).}

Countering the archaeological data of the McDougalls, Burley and Horsfall suggest that dovetail log construction only moved westward with the Red River Métis in the late 1870s (1989:25).

Despite the problematic chronology in terms of dovetail technology and the explicit recognition of Métis as persisting as a distinct group in only Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the interpretation of vernacular housing using a pseudostructuralist approach provides the first in depth analysis of the symbolic expression of Métis ideology. Burley and Horsfall interpret Métis space as being consistently fluid, flexible and open from place to place (1989:28). This, he suggests, correlates with a greater emphasis on communalism and consensus, which is consistent with descriptions of Métis social organization (1989:28-29, 1992:148).

In addition, the authors argue that similar to a spatial arrangement that emphasizes openness, an asymmetrical use of space has been associated with communalistic social organization (1989:29). The asymmetry that is found in the rear façade of Métis houses and in the spatial arrangement of Métis farmsteads is in correlation with this principle; however, the symmetrical front façade, seems contradictory. Burley and Horsfall argue that adopting a Georgian-style front façade from Euro-Canadian elite was a means for the Métis to mask their cultural values (1989:30).

Burley followed up with a detailed analysis of ceramics from a 1986 survey, which attempted to discern the role of women in Métis hivernant societies. According to Burley, “many
Métis found it necessary to abandon the annual return to the Red River colony and the practice of "wintering over" on the western Canadian plains and parklands became established" (1989:98). These wintering Métis were communal bison hunters and became known as the hivernant (1989:98).

Burley also published an article examining fragile, transfer printed earthenware ceramics found in excavations at five hivernant wintering sites (1989). In this study, Burley asserts that these ceramics had a significant symbolic role that went beyond the initial adoption of ceramics by Métis peoples out of concern for female status and etiquette in Red River fur trade society (1989:97). He suggests that the action of tea drinking provided a forum for structured interaction between multiple groups, which was “integral to Métis ethnic integration” (1989:104). This locus of interaction provided Métis peoples with an opportunity to share information, further reinforcing his earlier assertion of a communal Métis worldview. Yvonne Marshall and Alexandra Maas developed Burley’s observations further, comparing Métis ceramic use to other non-agricultural groups that adopted European ceramics (1997). Their study articulated that Métis women were responsible for maintaining identities, as they were more socially mobile and that this was accomplished through an etiquette of hospitality (1997:287). The ceramics resulting from Burley’s excavations were therefore the material remains of ceremonial social interaction.

In Burley’s most recent publication (2000), he likened Métis vernacular architecture to the Métis language, Michif, arguing that structural features like words can only be understood though the grammar that was used to construct them. In this work, Burley reiterates the same analyses that were used in his earlier discussions of architecture as a symbolic expression of Métis worldview, but instead emphasizes the creolization process. Using his earlier data, Burley asserts, “a distinctive and homogeneous vernacular style for the South Saskatchewan River Métis was defined” (2000:29). Burley continues by describing four features of the South
Saskatchewan River House that are decidedly creolized forms. These features include the following: the tenon and groove construction used by Métis in Saskatchewan to construct window and door frames, which is interpreted as a creolized version of the Red River Frame; house additions that are influenced by either English and Scottish or French vernacular traditions; Ukrainian influenced willow lathing and wattle and daub plastering; and finally dovetail notching that Burley claims was imported from Eastern Canada to the Red River Settlement in 1870 with displaced united empire loyalists (2000:31). Burley’s linguistic analogy seems obvious considering that it is the same general analogy used by Glassie since 1975, but his focus on creolization is redundant as Métis structures were, like other architectural developments throughout North America, constantly undergoing processes of transformation. Métis architecture may have been innovative to suit their cultural norms and needs, but it was not particularly inventive.

Beaudoin et al.’s (2010) study of a Labrador Métis sod structure appeared to develop several of Burley’s ideas more thoroughly. For instance, Beaudoin et al.’s study directly compares a 19th century Labrador Métis site (FkBg-24) with contemporaneous Inuit and European sites, with the purpose of locating archaeologically observable differences in order to “justify a separate definition for the Labrador Métis” (2010:150). Although I don’t feel that archaeologically observable differences are needed to justify the existence of Métis populations, it is helpful to use a comparative approach when trying to understand an archaeological assemblage that is specific to a certain ethnic group. Developing Burley’s focus on creolization, Beaudoin et al.’s study emphasizes the process of hybridization as being associated with the daily practices of the inhabitants of the structure. Beaudoin’s argument appears analogous to the Michif language as the archaeological assemblage is interpreted as being equally divided between European and Inuit practices. For instance, “practices that were traditionally male, such
as the design and construction of the home, were more likely to represent European influences whereas practices that were traditionally female, such as the preparation of food and clothing, were more likely to represent Inuit influences” (2010:167).

2.12 Summary

The literature detailed above has impacted my research tremendously. Bourdieu’s concepts of *habitus* and *practice*, as well as Giddens’ *structuration*, have been employed in different ways as a means for understanding both ethnicity and vernacular architecture. Earlier archaeological research concerning Métis peoples contributes to my analysis as it provides comparative data, highlighting earlier approaches to understanding historic mixed indigenous peoples. Each contribution to Métis archaeology have been valuable for my own interpretation of the McDougall houses, although it is problematic to decontextualize the results of these studies and apply them to other Métis sites across time and space. As this study exists within the wider discourse of the archaeology of colonization, I will examine relevant intersecting power relations including those related to capitalism, ethnicism, classism, sexism, and racism.
CHAPTER 3 UNDERSTANDING MÉTIS POLITICS, HISTORY, AND IDENTITY

3.1 Overview

The process of colonization that has been occurring across the vast landscape of North America since 1492 can be understood as a multi-dimensional process, during which various categories of identification such as gender, religious affiliation, race, ethnicity and class are used to delineate the ‘other’. The intersections of these social dimensions have been crucial to the process of ethnogenesis that resulted in the ethnic identity of the Métis. The Métis have been referred to by various names, be it “halfbreed”, “mixed-blood”, “Indian”, “interracial”, “Native”, or “Aboriginal” (Peterson and Brown 1985:4), each term having its own subtle and not so subtle connotations. These types of complexities permeate the entire history of Métis identity politics, contributing to the problematic predicament of defining this pluralistic cultural group. Bounded definitions trouble Métis communities and identities, as being Métis does not fit easily into taxonomic notions of ethnic groups as discrete entities (Chartrand 1991; Jones 1997:49).

Over time, a sense of solidarity appears to have developed into a distinct entity known as the Métis Nation. While the Métis Nation and Métis peoples tend to overlap, it is apparent that not all people that belong to the Métis Nation are Métis peoples and not all Métis peoples subscribe to being part of the Métis Nation (Weinstein 2008). The academic use of the word nation suggests a group committed to collective action, whereas within indigenous communities, the word “usually implies a specific combination of kinship, government, world view, and

---

23 For the purpose of this study, I have used the terms Métis and “halfbreed” interchangeably when referring to the past, as these appear to have been used interchangeably throughout historical materials.

24 The term ‘Métis Nation’ is used to describe a politically organized group, opposed to an ethnic category of identification.
cosmic community” (Champagne 2007:358). By adopting this definition of nation, it is evident the Métis nation and the Métis peoples overlap considerably.

Métis identity and its various components have been largely affected by the political actions that have contributed to the development of the Métis Nation (Peterson and Brown 1985:6). Beginning in the 1800s and continuing to the present day, political organizations motivated to support the Métis have attempted to develop definitions for the term Métis that are inherently exclusive, using subtle methods to differentiate between certain groups (Peterson and Brown 1985:6). Various definitions of métissage have resulted in low-level conflict amongst federal, provincial, and regional organizations (Kennedy 1997). Judicial courts have also developed their own methods for determining who is Métis (Weinstein 2007:157). These definitions are often in conflict with each other, suggesting that the question of ‘who are the Métis?’ remains in process of being answered.

The typical and most commonly expressed understanding of historic Métis society is that which Peterson presents in her 1985 work, as follows:

[a] sudden florescence of a distinctive métis population and culture radiating outwards from the junction of the Assiniboine and Red Rivers, present-day Winnipeg…the “new people” of Red River- not merely biracial, multilingual and bicultural, but the proud owners of a new language; of syncretic cosmology and religious repertoire; or distinctive modes of dress, cuisine, architecture, vehicles of transport, music and dance; and after 1815 of a quasi-military political organization, a flag, a bardic tradition, a rich folklore and a national history. [Peterson 1985:64]

This understanding, though perhaps historically accurate, is particularly problematic as “a definition of Métis peoples in contemporary society has yet to emerge” (Sawchuk 1996:69). It is problematic to suggest that a cohesive singular Métis identity exists, but there appears to be an emphasis on collective memory within most definitions of métissage.
Through the repetition of stories of injustice, oppression, resistance and conflict, a sense of solidarity has developed amongst Métis peoples. This chapter explores the common historical narrative associated with the Métis, as it is an integral component in the construction of Métis identity. The coalescence of Métis peoples at the confluence of the Assinaboine and Red Rivers was an instrumental stage of the ethnogenesis of the Métis, yet prior to this rich cultural period, the Métis were “a people in the process of becoming” as “their distinctiveness was fully apparent to outsiders, if not to themselves” (Peterson 1985:39). As early scholastic writings of Métis boundaries have excluded most of British Columbia, this chapter includes a comprehensive examination of métissage west of the Rocky Mountains. The objective of this chapter is review the scholastic, political and historical discourse concerning Métis peoples, the Métis nation and the formation of Métis identities across space and time.

3.2 Identity Politics

To better understand what it means to be Métis, scholars have dissected the word itself, but it is apparent that the diversity of naming practices reflects the confusion over the identity of the group (Chartrand 1991:12). While the racial categories used to describe people of mixed heritage are fictive and fluid, they have had a profound impact on understandings of Métis identity. Terms that have been used to describe the Métis, such as half-castes, half-breeds, half-bloods and half-whites, emphasize their identity as a derivative of two cultures, as “the sum of their diverse parts rather than an original creation” (Brown 1993:24; Perry 2001:5). Despite being recognized as a distinct socio-cultural entity, their origin as the offspring of their European fathers and indigenous mothers remains a crucial component Métis identity (Brown 1993:20).

Dominant scholarship suggests that the term métis, as in the French word meaning mixed, when used historically by French speakers “applied broadly to the offspring of Indian and
white parentage, but more specifically to the French- and Cree-speaking descendants of the Red River métis” and as such, “was rarely used by English speakers before the 1960s” (Chartrand 1991:12; Peterson and Brown 1985:5). Since the 1960s, its usage has been enlarged to signify “any person of mixed Indian-white ancestry who identified him- or herself and was identified by others as neither Indian nor white, even though he or she might have no provable link to the historic Red River métis” (Peterson and Brown 1985:5). For instance, in Slobodin’s (1966) publication concerning the Métis of the Mackenzie district, he supported the enlarged usage of the term Métis, as he applied it to both “those with Red River roots and to the more northerly first- and second-generation subarctic mixed-bloods with part-British, Hawaiian and other ancestries who shared a collective identity” (Peterson and Brown 1985:6).

As scholars seek to define and understand what it means to be Métis, simultaneous political and legal proceedings for determining Métis rights are in process. In 1984, the Métis National Council, a political organization, responsible for representing the interests of the Métis Nation (but not all Métis peoples), took it upon themselves to define the semantic differences between Métis and métis in their opening statement to the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations in Geneva. According to the MNC, when “written with a small ‘m’, métis is a racial term for anyone of mixed Indian and European ancestry”, but when “written with a capital ‘M,’ Métis is a socio-cultural or political term for those of mixed ancestry who evolved into a distinct indigenous people during a certain historical period in a certain region in Canada” (Métis National Council 1984). In contrast, other political organizations, such as the Native Council of Canada, have intentionally used the term Métis more inclusively, as they feel that those “who base their claims on national rights rather than aboriginal rights…undermine the aboriginal rights of Métis people” (Gaffney et al. 1984; Lussier 1984).
In 1982 the Canadian government included the Métis as being among Aboriginal peoples in Section 35.2 of the Constitution Act. The inclusion of the Métis in this act “did little to spur the federal government into action”, as they preferred “to continue to limit their activity to status Indians as defined in the Indian Act” (Barman 2006:19). The definition of the term Métis was never established within the constitution, but appears to have been left to political processes and the courts (Sawchuk 1992). In 2003, *R. v. Powley*, decided by the Supreme of Canada, described three attributes that were necessary for Métis peoples to gain access to Aboriginal rights. These included self-identification as Métis, having “an ancestral connection to a historical Métis community” and community acceptance (Barman 2006:20). Furthermore, the term Métis was defined as “distinctive peoples who, in addition to their mixed ancestry, developed their own customs, way of life, and recognizable group identity separate from their Indian or Inuit and European forebears” (para 10, quoted in Barman and Evans 2009:68). Not only did the *Powley Decision* create the opportunity for a more fluid definition of métissage that was not limited to the fur trade, but it also disturbed the previous “Red River myopia” (Nicks and Morgan 1985:173), as it extended the definition potentially to include communities tracing their ancestry beyond the historic Métis centre of the Red River Settlement. The extension of the definition of Métis countered earlier statements by the Métis National Council, demonstrating that the Métis, as a socio-political category remains subject to evolution and thus re-definition (Peterson and Brown 1985:6).

### 3.4 Academic Understandings

The academic discourse concerning the Métis has had a tendency to place emphasis on the centrality of the historic Red River Settlement. Recent historiographic work suggests that there has been a distinct focus on the paternal descent of Métis peoples from French Canadian
voyageurs, and that the maternal descent of Métis peoples from a diversity of indigenous groups has largely been ignored (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992; Chartrand 1991; Foster 1994; Tanner 1994; Payne 2001). Following the realization that “women and families in the fur trade had been a non-topic among scholars” (Brown 2005:26), which was in part, the result of the majority of historical material being produced by adult males (Foster 1985), there was a shift within Métis and fur trade studies to examine the role of women and relationships within the fur trade as a central aspect of the ethnogenesis of the Métis (Brown 1983, 2001, 2005; Murphy 2003; Rollason Driscoll 2001; Scott 1991; Sleeper-Smith 2000).

The shift from examining solely the Red River Métis and their descendents as homogenous groups, centralized in Canada’s prairie provinces, to an exploration of localized peoples with distinct characteristics and traditions was introduced in 1985 with Peterson and Brown’s volume The New Peoples. This volume made a significant contribution to the growing body of literature pertaining to the Métis as it explored not only the historical components of Métis identity (Dickason 1985; Dusenberry 1985; Foster 1985; Nicks and Morgan 1985; Peterson 1985), but also other cultural facets such as language and material culture (Brasser 1985). Following Peterson and Brown’s volume, multiple studies have emerged that use micro-historical and genealogical approaches to study specific communities of Métis peoples (Burley et al. 1989; Devine, 2004; Lischke and McNab 2007; Macdougall 2006; Pannekoek 1991; St-Onge 2004).

Peterson stated that “intraregional mobility seems to have fostered, by the early decades of the nineteenth century, a personal and group identity which was less place-specific than regionally and occupationally defined”, yet few studies have examined the continuous movement of Métis peoples throughout Canada and the Northern United States (1985:63). Reconstructions of familial and social networks may be the first step in mapping the ethnogenesis of the Métis
across time and space. Métis peoples have had a tendency to identify themselves and understand the identity of other Métis families and individuals on the basis of patronyms or family relations. Rather than identifying according to government imposed categories, Métis naturally self-organized as belonging to categories such as Chartrands, Beaulieus or Desjarlais'.

Geographically bounded definitions of Métis identity suggest that an historical Métis presence in British Columbia does not exist (Dickason 1985:31). This understanding of Métis ethnogenesis is grounded in a false notion that Métis fur traders (and other European men who were engaged with indigenous women) did not settle collectively west of the Rockies. Definitions that seek to understand the Métis as a single entity are ultimately restricting as the Métis are both a sociological and cultural group. Of all the differences among various localized Métis communities, there are certainly sociological commonalities between these groups. Experiences within British Columbia are similar to those of other regions outside of the Red River Settlement, in that “ethnic differentiation was not a matter of blood but a social process reinforced by government policy”, and even in cases where there was an absence of external intervention, it appears that “social forces [determined] patterns of association and identification (Coates and Morrison 1986:262, 270).

The process of the ethnogenesis of the Métis in British Columbia can be understood as being autochthonous, yet continuing the social processes of ethnic formation that once flourished at the confluence of the Assinaboine and Red Rivers. As such, Barman and Evans (2009) argue for a broader understanding of the historical process of métissage, as tracing ancestry to the Historic Métis Homeland of the Red River can be problematic for many self-identified Métis living in British Columbia. Tracing ancestry to a community that is heavily linked to traditionally accepted Métis communities would allow the definition to be more inclusive to those who currently self-identify as being Métis (Barman and Evans 2009:83).
Evans et al. (in press) provide evidence of a historic Métis presence in the central interior region of B.C., comprising of a network of families with ties to both local indigenous communities as well the Historic Red River community, and are thus part of the Historic Métis Nation (Barman and Evans 2009; Evans et al. in press). The processes of both being and becoming part of the Métis community are documented using sources such as vital statistic records, census records as well as first person narratives. Linkages between families appear to result from close geographic proximity, working relationships within Hudson Bay Company fur trade posts, intermarriage and witnessing religious events such as marriages and baptisms. Tangible historical evidence of large interconnected networks of mixed-indigenous and Métis communities supports Brown’s understanding of Métis identity:

Mixed parentage or “blood” itself was not a predictor of identity; everything depended on where these offspring went, who brought them up, which parental kinship networks drew them in, what marital mates and livelihoods were available, and what larger events...scattered their families and communities or fostered the founding of new ones in new (or old) places, as for example, in mission settings. [Brown 2005:26]

By examining the history of mixed indigenous peoples (deemed historically as either “halfbreeds” or Métis) in British Columbia since the fur trade, it is evident that the ongoing process of being and becoming Métis that was happening simultaneously throughout the prairies was also occurring in B.C.. Although there were no specific events in B.C. that crystallized a singular image of Métis identity within the Canadian psyche, the overall experience within British Columbia was similar to that of the Métis living east of the Rockies.

3.5 The Métis Historical Narrative

The recollection of social memories is an active way for groups to define a cohesive identity using specific historical narratives (Said 2000). A sense of a collective Métis identity throughout the prairies and the historic Northwest was established prior to 1869, but it was
during this time, and the events that would transpire over the following two decades, that the Métis Nation was acknowledged by outsiders. The repetition of stories about contact and the beginning of the ethnogenesis of the Métis as well as stories of historical events have been an important part of the Métis cultural tradition, as they persist within the collective memory of Métis peoples.

The following sections describe significant components in the formation of the Métis peoples, the Métis Nation and, thus, Métis identities. As in the rest of the Western world during the 19th century, the resource industries upon which British Columbia was built were gendered male (Perry 2001:16). During the fur trade (and the gold rush), the demographic dominance of men disrupted customary gender relations resulting in a “rough homosocial culture that existed side-by-side and occasionally overlapped with the mixed-race community” (Perry 2001:20). New policies successfully reproduced British class relations, using steep land prices to encourage wealthy settlers, meanwhile forcing poorer immigrants to become low-wage laborers (Perry 2001:125). As a result of settlement, increasing racism, pressures to engage in livestock farming or intensive agriculture and government policies, mixed indigenous communities were stripped of their indigenous rights and forced to assimilate, disowning their heritage whilst denying their culture.

3.5.1 The fur trade as “a protocolonial presence”25

The fur trade required a large-scale management of its own employees, as well as the local indigenous peoples amongst whom the traders lived and exchanged goods. This occurred within a territory that was not their own, was unstructured by the state, and was peopled by ________________________________

25 Perry suggests that, “the fur trade established a ‘protocolonial’ presence in the interests of profit” (2001:10).
indigenous peoples that were often characterized through a European lens as being uncivilized and savage (Harris 1997:34). Early traders attempted to create safe spaces by establishing forts along important trade routes. A European system of power operated within these forts and along trade routes, introducing a new geography into the area. Unlike later forms of colonial power, traders were not interested in ‘civilizing’ local indigenous peoples, but rather, were seeking a means to their own security through the establishment of profitable trade relationships (Harris 1997:65). Traders moved within the narrow corridors that they established and indigenous peoples responded to their presence and the goods they brought with them. From an instrumentalist perspective, interracial sexual relationships operated as tools to further the fur trade, as “they calmed the men, provided links to and allies in Native societies and channels of information about them, and took place quickly whenever a new fort was established” (Harris 1997:49).

The Métis Nation as a political entity did not “spring from the soil” at the confluence of the Assinaboine and Red Rivers, but rather can be understood as a form of social cohesion “rooted in a historic past and a wider geographical frame” as it had grown out of networks of relationships that were established during the fur trade in the Great Lakes region of North America (Peterson and Brown 1985:5; Peterson 1985:38). Similarly, this process of ethnic formation would continue outside of the Red River settlement, beyond the period of cultural florescence.

3.5.2 Gold rush relationships

In 1846, Britain agreed to take charge of the area that would soon become British Columbia, as the Treaty of Washington established the American border along the 49th parallel (with the exception of Vancouver Island). In 1849, under administration of the Hudson’s Bay
Company, Vancouver Island was deemed a colony, in hopes of encouraging further settlement. As there were only a few hundred newcomers, the majority of who were HBC men with indigenous wives, it seems that the colony only existed in name (Barman 2006:6). Although the colony may have only been a title for a small population, the ground had been prepared by “a large body of experience - the evolving, now two-hundred-year-old discourse of the fur trade - on which colonial administrators could draw” (Harris 1997:64).

In 1858, Britain proclaimed the mainland a second colony of British Columbia, binding the new transient gold rush economy to the remaining fur trade society (Barman 2006; Perry 2001). Relationships with indigenous women continued into the 1860s, as the 1858 gold rush brought an influx of non-indigenous men to the area west of the Rocky Mountains. A male dominated environment that emphasized the sexualization of indigenous women became prevalent throughout the mainland area adjacent to the new colony of Vancouver Island.

The uneven ratio of non-indigenous men to women resulted in a considerable number of relationships that crossed the racial divide, including not only fur traders and miners, but also colonial officials.26 In fact, the formation of mixed descent communities among gold miners was not that different than that of fur traders, with descendants often intermarrying due to geographical concentrations and similar ways of life (Barman 2006:18-19). By the early 1860s, a social hierarchy had been established amongst settler society west of the Rockies in which people were ranked according to their race, the “appropriateness” of their marriage, and their...

26 Barman describes the prevalence of inter-racial relationships in the following excerpt: “Port Douglas, a typical way station on the way to the gold fields with a population of several thousand at its peak, was, according to the visiting Anglican bishop in 1862, rife with ‘immorality.’ He lamented how ‘almost every man in Douglas lives with an Indian woman,’ and counted among their number both the magistrate and the constable” (quoted in Barman 2006:7).
religious affiliation (Philips 2008:27). As Barman explains, the prejudice and discrimination with which descendants of interracial relationships were treated was similar to that of other groups that were racialized by dominant Anglo-European white society:

‘Halfbreed,’ the English-language equivalent of Métis, became wholly derogatory in its usage. Sons and daughters need not do anything wrong in order to be disparaged, as indicated by the Anglican bishop’s comment in his private journal in 1863 that interracial children ‘usually sink into a degraded state, combining the force of the white race with the viciousness & lowness of the savage’. [Barman 2006:7]

In On the Edge of an Empire, scholar Adele Perry describes how colonial politics re-enforced negative attitudes towards mixed-race relationships in British Columbia. Functioning as “a symbol of imperialism gone awry” (Perry 2001:73), mixed-race relationships were the target of anti-indigenous discourse. Directing racism at Governor Douglas and his “halfbreed” wife Amelia Connolly was common practice, as his assimilationist policies that encouraged the possibility of a biracial society were often cited as the cause for what critics saw as his poor ability to govern the new colony (Perry 2001:69). Douglas’ policies were overruled when Arthur Kennedy replaced Douglas as Vancouver Island Governor in 1864. Kennedy supported segregation, endorsing campaigns to prevent sexual and social contact between settlers and local indigenous peoples (Perry 2001:119). Governor Kennedy reported to the Colonial office “I think a great mistake has been made in permitting an Indian settlement to grow up and continue in juxta-position with a city like Victoria,’ he continues, ‘thus mixing the two Races together to the greatest degradation of the one, and the demoralization of both” (quoted in Perry 2001:120).

East of the Rockies, at the Red River settlement, anthropologist Louis Henry Morgan observed the following on his travels through the area in the 1860s:

An exceedingly interesting experiment is now in progress at Selkirk, or Red River Settlement, near Lake Winnipeg. Along the banks of this river, from the mouth of the Asiniboine [sic] River for some twelve miles down towards the lake, there is a straggling village containing near ten
thousand people, made chiefly of half-blood Crees, but showing all shades of color, from the pure white Orkney Islander, through all the intermediate degrees of intermixture, to the full-blooded Cree. [1871:207]

Morgan’s observations are more telling of the typical racial assumptions of the time than of the actual population living at the settlement. He suggests that although “the effects produced by intermixture of European and Indian blood, although a delicate subject, is one of scientific interest” (1871:207). In addition, Morgan describes the mixed indigenous population living at the Red River settlement in pseudo-scientific terms that are more commonly applied to livestock:

This population is still drawing fresh blood both from native and European sources; hence the main condition of the experiment- namely, their isolation from both stocks- has not yet been reached. But there is a permanently established half blood class, intermediate between the two; and the problem to be solved is, whether a new stock can be thus formed, able to perpetuate itself. [1871:207]

It is evident that those who self-identified or were identified by others as being Métis or “halfbreeds” were treated with prejudice by non-indigenous peoples living and traveling amongst them. Supported by political and media propaganda, this racism continued to intensify alongside Métis political uprisings.

3.5.3 Métis rights and the Manitoba Act

Beginning in 1869 with the sale of Rupert’s Land by the Hudson’s Bay Company to the Dominion of Canada, the Métis of the prairies became politically organized. This massive transaction of land was conducted with no provisions made for the Métis majority that were living in the Red River settlement, as it was expected that they would be governed directly by Ottawa (Weinstein 2008:8). With the desire to secure their place in Canada both geographically and politically, a provisional government was established at the Red River Settlement (Stanley 1985:77). The provisional government petitioned the Federal government for land deeds for the
territories that they already occupied, as well as political representation in Ottawa (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:122). Receiving no response from the Federal government, the provisional government’s leader, Louis Riel, prevented a party of surveyors from mapping land at St. Norbert in October 1869. In response, Lieutenant-Governor William McDougall attempted to enter Fort Pembina and was forced by Métis to retreat to the American side of the border. By November, Fort Garry was seized by the provisional government and in January 1870, Riel was elected president of the Métis Council. The provisional government drafted a list of rights, which were sent with delegates to Ottawa with the hopes of settling Métis land claims (Stanley 1985:74).

With the rationale that this would extinguish Indian title to the land, the Federal government acknowledged the Métis list of rights, drafting the Manitoba Act (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:122). As per the request of the provisional government, this admitted the territory that was predominantly occupied by Métis peoples into confederation as the Province of Manitoba. In addition, the Métis won several other rights such as the right to vote, bilingual courts and government, additional transportation access, provincial control of public land, representation at Canadian parliament, a legislature of elected Métis peoples, as well as confirmation of Métis traditions and privileges (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:122).

Sections 31 and 32 of the Manitoba Act conferred land rights not only to all settlers within the province who already had interests in land (the majority of which were Métis), but explicitly granted 1.4-million-acres of land to the “children of the half-breed heads of families” (quoted in Weinstein 2008:11). These sections were given constitutional force and were believed to be immune from alteration, but nevertheless, over the following decade, “parliament enacted a number of statures, which… either repealed portions of Section 31 and 32 or set up qualifications and procedures which were so stringent or complicated that they robbed both
sections of their original meaning” (Weinstein 2008:12-13). Consistent with the pro-assimilation policies of the time, the Métis were encouraged to assimilate into the throngs of new settlers or to disappear into the bush, disowning their indigenous roots and identities.

The failure to acknowledge Métis land claims resulted in the dispossession and dispersal of Métis peoples out of Manitoba. Between 1870 and 1886, the Métis population in Manitoba dropped from 83 percent to 7 percent, with roughly two thirds of Métis peoples moving westwards (Weinstein 2008:13). Not only did the Manitoba Act fail to settle Métis grievances, but events led to over 1200 troops being dispatched in May 1870 to the Red River settlement. It was during this time that leader Louis Riel was expelled from Canada for five years for leading the initial resistance. Despite being exiled to the United States and not allowed in Ottawa, Riel was shown support from the Métis peoples as he was repeatedly elected to parliament (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:127). The Manitoba Act’s acknowledgement of the Métis peoples as one of Canada’s founding peoples contributes to the conscious evolution of the Métis into a “new nation” (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:112).

3.5.4 Regulating indigenous rights

To avoid future uprisings and to extinguish Aboriginal title, the Canadian Federal Street Commission was authorized to distribute Halfbreed Grants to resolve Métis grievances, allowing land in the Northwest to be opened for large-scale settlement (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:123; Hatt 1983:118). This attempt to appease the restless Métis peoples and their supporters took the form of scrip. Under the Dominion Lands Act, grants took the form of both land and money scrip; essentially a coupon granting land or actual dollars that could be used to buy land (but were often not used for this purpose) (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:125). To be eligible for receiving scrip, one had to be a descendant of a union between European and Indian peoples. As
Nicks and Morgan illustrate, “the biological criterion was a convenient way of identifying those eligible, but it was not an all-encompassing rule”, as many mixed indigenous peoples entered into treaty (1985:176).

The regulation of indigenous identities that began with the Indian Act of 1876, as the Federal government took responsibility to oversee those persons defined as Indians, perpetuated the racial assumptions that indigenous peoples required protection and should be wards of the state (Barman 2006:10). This racist perspective was widely accepted as a scientific principle, as the notion of the time was that “non-Europeans think somewhat like children, and will be led toward adulthood by Europeans” (Blaut 1993:96). Gendered attitudes determined descent to be patrilineal, resulting in the loss of Indian status for indigenous women who married non-indigenous men, as well as that of their children (Barman 2006:13).

The criteria that are and have been used for determining indigenous rights and Aboriginal title have a tendency to bear “little resemblance to the on-the-ground reality of who is recognized as an Indian person in terms of family ties, lifestyles, social and cultural orientations, and participation in community life” (Sawchuk 1996:68). Regulating indigenous identity was a responsibility taken on by the colonial Canadian government. This process did not simply require that individuals conform to racial blood quantum or even self-identify as a “halfbreed”, but also included factors such as language, lifestyle, and place of residence. As Lawrence explains, “Once ascribed, an individual became, irrevocably, Indian or halfbreed (as did their descendants)...”[2003:10]. White officials and Indian Agents were responsible for differentiating between Indians and “halfbreeds” to determine whether individuals would be allowed to receive treaty status or Halfbreed scrip.

There were several other problems with the issuing of scrip to Métis peoples living in the historic Northwest Territory. For instance, if land had not yet been surveyed, it couldn’t be
obtained through a scrip application. This disrupted traditional land use activities for many Métis peoples, as they were displaced from their traditionally territories (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:125). Furthermore, many Métis peoples lacked the capital that was necessary for agricultural endeavors, as their main sources for subsistence, such as the bison hunting and freighting industries, had since disappeared with the fur trade (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:133). Another problematic aspect of the scrip application process was that dominion land offices were distant and often difficult for Métis peoples to access in person. According to Sawchuk, on account of the “exigencies of a nomadic hunting, trapping and fishing economy and lifestyle, many people were unable to be contacted…still others feared involvement with such activities” as they were unfamiliar with the language and government that they represented (1996:58). The British colonial government and later the Provincial government of British Columbia failed to recognize the Aboriginal rights of mixed indigenous populations, leaving a distinct void in the historical documentation of Métis in B.C. (Barman and Evans 2009:67). Scrip did not fully extend into British Columbia, thereby excluding populations living west of the Rockies; however, scrip applications asked claimants for their places of residence and birth, which indicated that many Métis peoples were living in B.C. in areas beyond the north eastern regions which were part of prairie treaties and thereby eligible for scrip (Weinstein 2008). Many people took money scrip, later selling it to land speculators for a fraction of its value on account of the dire conditions that the Métis of the historic Northwest faced (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:128).

Indisputably, the long-term implications of policy development concerning Indian status, on behalf of the Federal government, on indigenous populations throughout Canada are extensive and unimaginable (Sawchuk 1996:57). The question of indigenous rights and Aboriginal title is particularly problematic for the Métis, as they do not fit easily into legal definitions, as determined by the Indian Act. Measuring Métis peoples in comparison to other
indigenous peoples within a legal framework has presented and still presents several challenges, as “Métis peoples were not here since time immemorial and they did not occupy exclusive territories because their origins are linked to White contact” (Sawchuk 1996:69). Continuous attempts to apply hegemonic ideas of nationhood, based on geographic landedness, to indigenous groups has further complicated and delegitimized Métis claims, on account of their displacement from traditional territories (Lawrence 2003). Despite the Federal government’s attempt to compensate the Métis for the land that had once been promised to them, the issuance of scrip to the Métis ultimately failed, further disconnecting and disenfranchising Canada’s mixed indigenous population.

3.5.5 The North-West Resistance

As Métis peoples moved westwards out of Manitoba, life continued to change as decreasing bison populations halted traditional hunting practices. Beginning in 1884, Métis peoples living in the historic Northwest became restless and frustrated as their traditional river lot system of land ownership was overridden by the township system being imposed by incoming surveyors. Furthermore, steamships, and the newly built railroad, encouraged immigrants to occupy the Northwest. The Métis Council of Saskatchewan, led by Gabriel Dumont, sent petitions and letters to Ottawa to resolve land claims, which were supported by white settlers who were also at risk for losing land (Hatt 1983:122).

Although the Dominion Land Act was established in 1879 and was to provide land to the Métis of the Northwest in order to extinguish Indian title, it wasn’t until 1885 that the government established a commission to review and settle claims (Hatt 1983:122-123). By this time, the Métis were again restless and were seeking the help of Louis Riel, imploring him to return from exile to help them to voice their concerns (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:127). Riel
sent a message to Ottawa stating that the Métis of Saskatchewan would prevent, by armed force if necessary, the surveying of claimed land. In late March, he seized hostages at Batoche, proclaiming a new Provisional government (Hatt 1983:123).

The height of the resistance began at Duck Lake, where Gabriel Dumont and a few other Métis clashed with North West Mounted Police (Stanley 1985:315). In response, Ottawa sent out a volunteer army led by General-Major Frederick Middleton (1985:343). The violence continued as Dumont ambushed Middleton’s army at Fish Creek on 24 April 1885, but after a three day stand at Batoche, the Métis were defeated on 12 May 1885 (Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:127-8).

There were clear divides throughout the political uprisings of the Métis, as such acts of resistance only represented a certain section of the mixed indigenous population living in Canada. Not everyone agreed with Riel and his cause, as some people belonging to the Anglophone mixed-blood community were “ready to secure the promise of their British Protestant heritage through union with Canada” (Van Kirk 1985:213). Many English “halfbreeds” were cautious of Riel’s aggressive approach to the political crises, yet “experienced a real sense of disillusionment as a result of the violent excesses perpetrated by the Canadian troops, being apprehensive that they too would fall victim to racist attacks” (Van Kirk 1985:214).

On 16 November 1885, Louis Riel was tried and executed for treason, initiating a national divide between English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians. French Canadians, who were supportive of statements from religious leaders, thought Riel to be sane, whereas many English Canadians “wondered why the jury should have gone as far as to recommend the accused man to the mercy of the court” (Stanley 1985:361). As a result of such diverse perspectives, Riel continues to be viewed under various opposing guises; a crazed madman, a leader, a prophet, a rebel, or a folk hero (Reid 2008:183; Stanley 1985:iii).
3.5.6 Resisting racism

Policy consistent with that which “structured the setting in which Native people lived, worked, and gained their subsistence” during Canada’s fur trade (Hatt 1983:121), extinguished the rights of the Métis peoples via scrip, dispossessing them from the land. With the rapid decline of the fur trade and bison hunting economy, as well as a tide of immigration, the Métis were pushed to the edges, occupying marginal spaces.

As the fur trade declined, so did opinions of Métis people. The sons of the Hudson’s Bay Company’s most faithful officers were demoted in terms of rank, pay and allowances, resulting in resistance against the company’s stratified labour system in the form of desertion and mutinies (Judd 1980:312). Governor George Simpson of the Hudson’s Bay Company, arguably the most powerful fur trader at the time, was particularly prejudiced against “the half breed population”, as demonstrated by the following:

…their notions of pride and independence are such that they will not enter the service and moreover they are not the class of people that would be desirable on any terms as they are indolent and unsteady merely fit for voyaging, under those circumstances it is necessary to watch and manage them with great care otherways [sic] they may become the most formidable Enemy to which the Settlement is exposed. [HBCA D.4/87, fo. 8-9f]

Desertion became a common practice, as Métis peoples were familiar with the land and had extensive familial networks. Many Métis people moved to the northern forests of the Prairies, joining established Métis communities or forming their own (Judd 1980:311; Boisvert and Turnbull 1992:125-6). Sacrificing their Métis identity, some people adopted a Euro-Canadian facade to become more upwardly mobile, but for the visibly indigenous, this was not an option.

Similarly, in regions west of the Rocky Mountains, many mixed indigenous families were pushed to the margins of both white communities and Indian reserves. The completion of the transcontinental railway in 1886 brought immigrants to B.C. from central Canada and
Europe. With them, the new settlers brought a colonialist mindset replete with racist and classist attitudes. The immigration campaign was proving to be successful, as non-indigenous populations rose dramatically (Barman 2006:14), causing the rift between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples to grow even further.

A hardening racist attitude towards “halfbreeds” forcibly caused mixed indigenous peoples to change their lifestyles, including type of employment, residence, language and outwards appearance. Despite attempts to tame indigenous sexuality using policies that discouraged unions between indigenous women and non-indigenous men, many mixed relationships continued into the 1880s, “in some cases by the partners legally marrying or retreating outward into the frontier, or by simply standing their ground” (Barman 1998:264). As a result of the shifting demographic and increasingly racist attitudes, children of these unions who were once regarded as “neatly dressed” scholars (Dawson 1877, quoted in Barman 1998:86), became “dangerous members of the community” (Barman 1998:252). Hierarchical notions that stemmed from Social Darwinism resulted in a particular disdain for “halfbreeds”, as they were deemed inferior to both white and indigenous peoples, and thought to inherit the vices of both groups.²⁷ For instance, early Anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan argued that varying degrees of blood heritage result in specific characteristics:

> “the half-blood is inferior, both physically and mentally, to the pure Indian; but the second cross, giving three-quarters Indian, is an advance upon the native; and giving three-fourths white is still greater advance, approximating to equality with the white ancestor. With the white still carried further, full equality is reached, tending to show that Indian blood can be taken up without physical or intellectual detriment. [1871:207]

Some Métis were able to keep their lands, working as farmers or farm labourers, whereas

²⁷ Social Darwinism is the notion that applied the principles of Darwinian theory to racial categories.
others were forced to live along public roads, becoming known as “road allowance people” (Campbell 1973:13). The results for non-status Indians and Métis were similar, both groups being pushed to the shadows of white settler communities and Indian reserves. For the most part, the Métis became a landless population and to avoid the stigmas that were attached to being “road allowance people” as well as increasing racism towards “halfbreeds”, many Métis peoples chose to assimilate. As Van Kirk suggests, “the degree of psychological dislocation which they suffered appears to have been proportional to the degree to which they attempted to assimilate, accompanied as this was by the hazards of personal ambivalence and the threat of rejection” (Van Kirk 1985:215).

The degradation caused by displacement had a profound effect, as communities became geographically dispersed, disrupting kinship ties, intergenerational transfer of knowledge between youth and elders, community cohesion, cultural continuity, and traditional identities (Brown and Perkins 1992; Gieryn 2000; White et al. 2003). While some retained a consciousness of their roots, others would keep their ancestry hidden. As Weinstein explains, “for those Métis stuck in limbo between white and Indian societies, identity shifting became a means of meeting the needs of the situation” (2008:22). A “halfbreed” born in 1904 explains the conundrum faced by mixed indigenous peoples during the early half of the 20th century: “not white and not Indian but we look Indian and everybody but Indians takes us for Indian…It has been a complicated world” (Barman 1991:171). “Halfbreeds” or Métis were forced to “go underground”, which depended largely on one’s personal circumstance. As Barman explains: “half-breeds tended to ‘go white’ or ‘go Indian’ depending on the marital decisions of the second and third generations. As a rule, it seems that male offspring were more likely to be absorbed into native society, female siblings sometimes marrying Europeans” (1991:171).
3.6 Summary

By taking into account the history of mixed indigenous relationships in British Columbia and the history of identity politics surrounding métissage throughout Canada, the complexity of expressing Métis identities becomes apparent. The scholastic, political and historical discourses concerning Métis peoples have each been significant components of the formation of Métis identities over time and space. The process of the ethnogenesis of the Métis living west of the Rocky Mountains can be understood as a continuation of the social processes of ethnic formation that once flourished at the confluence of the Assinaboine and Red Rivers. While independent of the Red River settlement, the process of becoming Métis in British Columbia results in communities that are linked to widely accepted historic Métis communities that are situated east of the Rocky Mountains.

Furthermore, a “common experience of racism” contributed to the processes that transformed mixed indigenous British Columbians into a group with a shared identity centered around distinct customs (Barman and Evans 2009:77). It is clear that various axes of power were in operation throughout B.C. from the fur trade and beyond, all of which point to an intense discrimination against the other (in this case indigenous, and especially mixed-indigenous peoples). For the McDougalls, external pressures affected their choice of marital partner, occupation and community, as well as the identities that they chose to represent. As the newcomer population in the Okanagan grew with the arrival of the transcontinental rail line in 1886, so did racism against anyone who was not white.
CHAPTER 4 WELCOME TO “THE LAND OF FRUIT AND SUNSHINE”

4.1 Overview

The history of Kelowna that is commonly shared and accepted by the general public reflects a colonial narrative that represses other perspectives, including any negative commentary. The ‘settler story’ is often a romanticized and “white-washed” - it does not generally account for all of the past community members and fails to acknowledge the devastation of colonialism and racism. This approach is particularly problematic as it both “suggests that nobody was there” while “subtly depoliticiz[ing] the process whereby white people came to dominate First Nations territory” (Perry 2001:7). Furthermore, this approach fails to acknowledge the sexual, marital, and consequently familial relationships between incoming white (or sometimes Métis) settlers and local indigenous women.

This study attempts to represent multiple perspectives, meanwhile explaining the economic, ecological and sociological effects of a colonial government’s interventionist policies. This critical reading of local history allows for various intersecting axes of power to be examined including colonialism, racism, ethnicism, classism, sexism and capitalism. Moreover, this section provides a background for understanding the shifting ethnic identities of John McDougall and his children and the ways in which expressions of these identities changed over time.

4.2 Syilx Peoples Before, During, and After the Fur Trade

It is crucial that the story of the Syilx peoples be told alongside the classic “pioneer” historical narrative. Prior to the fur trade, Syilx peoples were living within the Okanagan and 28

28 In his analysis of past Okanagan landscape aesthetic, Wagner points out that the Okanagan was being sold to settlers as “the land of fruit and sunshine” (2008:26).
29 For an example of an alternative history of Kelowna, see Salloum’s (2003) film.
Similkameen watersheds, both in Canada and across the border in the United States (Wagner 2008:23). The Syilx economy included a complex system of hunting, fishing, gathering, food processing and trading that was organized by kin-group. Semi-permanent winter village sites were established as centres for storage, with less permanent sites established nearer to important resources (Thomson 1994:96). In the 1700s, horses were introduced into the Okanagan region and became key to the Syilx economy as an important means of transport and trade.

From initial contact until 1905 and beyond, the effects of increasing colonization and an increasingly racist attitude towards indigenous peoples devastated Syilx communities. The formation of reserves and of a capitalist economy, alongside restriction to access to key resources, prevented Syilx peoples from maintaining their traditional harvesting practices. Once promised by James Douglas that they would be treated fairly under the law, Syilx peoples were often treated as second class citizens, being denied basic rights (such as the right to vote and to purchase Crown land). In the early years of Euro-Canadian land development in the Okanagan, Syilx and settler communities often overlapped, as the majority of mission settlers engaged in relationships with indigenous women (Barman 1996).

4.3 Father Pandosy’s Mission

The Okanagan region was not highly productive in terms of fur bearing animals, so interaction with the North West Company and later the Hudson’s Bay Company was limited. Traders attempted to maintain friendly terms with local Syilx peoples as the pack-horse brigade that ran from the rich fur trade area of New Caledonia, now central British Columbia, to the west coast passed through Syilx territory (Thomson 1994). In the Okanagan, freighters traversed the fur trade brigade trail, linking the Hudson’s Bay Company at Fort Alexandria to regions south of the American border (Harris 1989).
In 1859, Oblate priests Fathers Charles Pandosy and Pierre Richard, accompanied by a handful of other settlers, arrived in the area that would come to be known as Kelowna’s Mission. The Oblates were granted permission by a Syilx chief to occupy and cultivate the land only through the intercession of Theresa, the Salish wife of French Canadian settler Cyprian Laurence (Thomson 1985:113). In 1860, alongside Mission Creek (then called l’Anse au Sable), a permanent site was located for the mission and 160 acres of land were pre-empted near the shore on the east side of Okanagan Lake (1985:39). Land was surveyed, seeds were sowed, and the construction of a chapel and a dwelling house began (1985:40). By 1861, around 15 more settlers arrived to the Mission with the hopes of gold mining or pre-empting land for farming.

During this period, the priests took on several responsibilities including Christianizing, ‘civilizing’, disciplining and “teaching Indian and métis youth” (Thomson 1985:46), encouraging settlement and agriculture, serving the settler community, conducting diocesan activities and managing their own farm operations (1985:39, 47). Most of all, the priests remained a part of the governing body, ensuring that both incoming settlers and local Syilx peoples were under constant surveillance. Although they officially had no status, missionaries were unofficially “the government’s foot soldiers, and its eyes and ears” (Barman 1998:249).

As Thomson explains, the establishment of the mission in the Okanagan was only the beginning of an attempt to regulate and control the lives of Syilx peoples:

In the settlement era, Oblate priests were even more intrusive than the Hudson’s Bay Company had been. Encouraged and buttressed by the priests, chiefs assumed civil, judicial, religious, and economic power. This indirect rule masked, but did not diminish, the extent of the priests’ authority. Village officers were part of the church hierarchy and village regulations were based on European Catholic, not traditional precepts. At the turn of the century the DIA replaced the church as the controlling agent, and thereafter the management of village life by a Euro-Canadian institution became increasingly apparent. [Thomson 1994:108]
By 1865, some Oblate priests such as Father Paul Durieu, moved to Syilx settlements, whereas others established residential schools for both Secwepemc and Syilx children. Additionally, in 1863 Constable W.C. Young notes a school, where “Father Richard was reportedly teaching five or six white and métis children of local settlers in the French language” (1994:96). Until 1885, this was the only school in the Okanagan Valley that served “local white and métis children and those from the South and North Okanagan who could arrange to board their children with a family at the Mission” (Thomson 1985:99). Formal education began at a young age, and Catholic values were enforced. Legitimate church sanctified marriages were encouraged both among indigenous communities and between settlers and indigenous women.

For the Oblate priests, the emphasis on the sexualization and commodification of indigenous women that pervaded gold rush communities needed to be constrained. Barman suggests that in gold rush communities, indigenous women had been wholly sexualized and that in British Columbia, “gender, power, and race came together in a manner that made it possible for men in power to condemn Aboriginal sexuality and at the same time, if they so chose, to use for their own gratification the very women they had turned into sexual objects” (Barman 1998:240).

To address the sexualization of indigenous women, the Oblate priests felt that it was crucial that the sexual autonomy of indigenous women be subdued and that they be subservient and docile. Key aspects of the paternalistic missionary rhetoric emphasized that mixed-race relationships degraded both parties. For instance “Aboriginal women were ‘used as slaves, and turned off at will’” and “white men ‘pursued a system of debauchery and vice, in their keeping Indian women, and exchanging or abandoning them at their pleasure’” (Perry 2001:62). While

30 The term Secwepemc refers to the indigenous people who traditionally occupied the Thompson, Shuswap and Upper Columbia regions. Newcomers often referred to Secwepemc peoples as the Shuswap People.
there was truth to some of this discourse, regional histories throughout British Columbia describe many long and successful marriages that crossed racial lines (Barman 2006).

Not only did the missionaries bring a colonialist and sexist attitude to the Okanagan, but also their hierarchical view of society was apparent. These priests did not come from humble or impoverished backgrounds, but were formally educated gentlemen, drawn from the upper-middle classes of France (Thomson 1985:49). According to Thomson, “their conservative vision of the proper structure of society, shaped their attitudes toward their white and Indian parishioners” (1985:49). This attitude was inherently racist, as they turned a blind eye to drinking, gambling and lapses in church attendance among white residents, but were quick to demand obedience from the indigenous residents (1985:50).

4.4 Cowboys and Cattle Ranching

While horticultural practices were already present in the Okanagan prior to the establishment of Father Pandosy’s mission, local conditions were ideal for cattle ranching, as there was easy access to water and a grassland environment in the open areas at lower elevations (Mather 2002; Thomson 1985, 1990). Growing hay for feeding cattle was also relatively easy, as no irrigation was required (Cohen 1998; Thomson 1985; Wagner 2008:25-6). Hay production along with cattle ranching became a key source of income for Syilx peoples, requiring larger expanses of land. Incoming settlers had a distinct advantage over Syilx peoples as a result of restricted access to land and resources. Despite James Douglas’ 1858 promise to the indigenous peoples of British Columbia that everyone would be treated equally as British subjects under the law, it seems clear that as a foreign legal regime was being imposed: “Indian people were progressively denied equitable use of the country’s resources to the detriment of their competitive position” (Thomson 1985:111).
In the same year, reserves were laid out by agreement between Syilx peoples and representatives of the British government (Thomson 1985:111). Government agents repeatedly broke this agreement, as reserves were dramatically reduced over time. When asked to stipulate the boundaries of their new reserves at Head of the Lake and Penticton in 1861, Syilx communities chose most of the good bottom land, retaining their fisheries, gardens, winter livestock ranges and village sites. As Thomson explains, in 1865 both reserves were reduced from 200 to 25 acres of land per household, of which only 10 acres was arable. The local Justice of the Peace, J.C. Haynes, argued that “the reserve awards were excessive and beyond the requirements of semi-nomadic Indians” (Thomson 1994:99). Reducing reserves allowed white stockholders to acquire bottom land, which became central to their livestock operations. A policy of denial of Aboriginal title on behalf of the newly formed Colony of British Columbia as well as the perception that settlers had the “exclusive right to use land” caused reserves to be “regarded as an area to which Indians were restricted or confined” (Thomson 1985:122).

Early settler populations followed Syilx cattle ranching strategies that depended on resources at higher elevations during drier summer conditions, then brought cattle to the valley bottom for winter feeding. By 1870, Syilx cattle ranchers were pushed out of the market, as most of the bottom land with access to water was owned by settlers with cattle-ranching operations (Thomson 1985).

4.5 A Wave of Immigration

Since the beginning of Euro-Canadian land development in the Okanagan, many of the incoming settlers had engaged in relationships with indigenous women (Barman 1996), forming a distinct network of mixed indigenous families. Canada’s 1901 Census is a particularly valuable source for understanding the ethnic identity (or at least the perceived ethnic identity) of such
families living in the Okanagan as the census form required the Census enumerator to record the “Racial or Tribal Origin” of all persons. For people of mixed indigenous ancestry, the enumerators used conventions such as noting their European ancestry, then the term breed or simply using abbreviations. For instance, Indian Scotch Breed becomes Indian SB or when a person’s European ancestry was unknown, but they were clearly of mixed indigenous ancestry, they are simply recorded as OB or Other Breed.

The 1901 Census recorded several families that are recorded as being of mixed indigenous ancestry living throughout the Okanagan, including the Berard, Bouvette, Brent, Dickson, Garcia, Houghton, Kruger, Lawrence, McDougall, McIntosh, McIntyre, McLean, Richter, Shuckey, Shuttleworth, Steele and Tronson families. R.S. Hanna, a teacher at the Okanagan Mission describes the predominant usage of the Chinook, a language used for trade that was often commonly used amongst mixed indigenous peoples, in a letter:

> With one exception the pupils are halfbreeds, & speak better Chinook & Indian than English, & those who have a French father speak French, Indian & Chinook at home, & English only when at school, consequently their written English is very inferior. [R.S. Hanna 1883, quoted in Barman 1998:89]

During this period, “halfbreeds” were also drawing negative attention from colonial authorities (and consequently, media), for providing liquor to their “status Indian” friends and family members (Barman 2006:17). Thomson states that “alcohol usage was not significant before 1900 at Nkamip, Penticton, Spallumcheen or Nkamaplxic, although the Mission (later Westbank)
Indians, historically situated near a white and Métis community had a record of usage” (Thomson 1994:107).

Mixed indigenous peoples worked and lived amongst each other, as mixed indigenous sons engaged in the same types of employment. Common occupations included packing, trapping, logging and working as farm labour, since in these fields one’s physical strength and willingness to work mattered more than skin colour (Barman and Evans 2009:78). Similar to Barman and Evans’ (2009) case study of B.C.’s Central Interior, there appeared to be a tendency among mixed indigenous offspring living in the Okanagan to intermarry with other mixed indigenous peoples (2009:78). According to census manuscripts, some mixed indigenous sons stayed single, living on the margins of white settler society. Others married indigenous women with “Indian status”, moved illegally onto reserves (Barman 2006:17). Unlike the many white settlers who simply “turned off” their indigenous wives and families as more suitable white women became available, relationships between “halfbreeds” and local indigenous people seemed to be stable. (Barman 1996; Coates and Morrison 1986). Other white settlers denied their indigenous families in public, but kept them in private, as the mixed children they had in previous relationships intermingled with their new white families (Barman 1996:13).

4.6 Selling Off “the land of fruit and sunshine”

In the 1880s, J.M. Robinson, a land developer from Manitoba, acquired large parcels of land, all of which were adjacent to either Okanagan Lake or local creeks. He began to subdivide this land, constructing irrigation systems, furthering his vision of the Okanagan as an oasis of orchards. Initially, Robinson circulated promotional material throughout Manitoba, with the hopes of attracting newcomers who were tired of cold prairie winters with the promise of sunshine (Wagner 2008:26).
Robinson quickly re-directed his promotional efforts to higher echelons of society—British gentlemen. Robinson’s efforts were fully supported by the Federal government, as they launched an immigration campaign with the intention of attracting British settlers of a certain status (Barman 2003:137). Until 1890, cattle ranching had been the dominant activity in the Okanagan, but with the completion of the CPR spur line that ran from Sicamous to Okanagan Landing (Vernon) in 1892, orcharding became prominent throughout the Okanagan Valley (Craib 2009:27-28). A successful attempt to redefine the cultural landscape of the Okanagan Valley resulted in the alteration of the physical landscape. The transformation of the Okanagan from a relatively small cattle ranching region to “a really high-class little community” happened in several stages.33

The first stage, as explained by Wagner, “was facilitated by the commoditization of a landscape aesthetic built around the lush, oasis-like qualities of orchards and lakes set among a dramatic, arid and mountainous backdrop” (2008:23). This vision of the Okanagan contradicted with Syilx values pertaining to land-use and landscape aesthetic. Boosters created promotional material to attract British gentlemen that was based on a familiar rurality, equated with wealthy southern England, an area that was fundamentally associated with class divisions (Barman 2003). Upon arrival, many British immigrants refused to adapt to their new environments, becoming “rootless to their adopted landscape” (Craib 2009:29). They sought to recreate British culture within a landscape defined by their own imaginations, staying “firmly entrenched within a cultural diasporic bubble” (Barman 2003). In the 1890’s, a new upper class was created in the Okanagan, altering the landscape and the population, while creating a power imbalance that favored those who were wealthy and, more importantly, white.

33 As, quoted from Lady Aberdeen’s 1894 Journal, see entry below.
J.M. Robinson’s success at developing land formed the centres of Peachland, Summerland and Naramata, but others, like Scottish-born Booster George McKay, quickly followed suit (Orchard and McAllister 1978). McKay acquired properties in the valley in the early 1890s, backed by the Okanagan Land and Development Company. His first sales in 1890 and 1891 to Lord Aberdeen only further attracted the attention of the British elite. Robinson and McKay’s advertising schemes targeted England and northeastern North America, where pamphlets and brochures boasted about the fine climate and decreasing (and non-threatening) indigenous populations, meanwhile emphasizing a nostalgic familiarity (Perry 2001:136; Wagner 2008:23-26). Land developers intentionally constructed fruit farming as separate from agricultural labour, allowing it “the same immunity as gardening from that of the wheat farming of the plodding peasant” (Craib 2009:29). When choosing locations to emigrate to, the Okanagan was a natural solution, as “fruit growing was considered to be a suitable occupation for gentlemen” (Barman 2003:138). The lives of British emigrants were mostly social and recreational, as they often hired others to do any work that required physical labour.

British gentlemen sought to recreate their British homes in the Okanagan, never adapting themselves to their surroundings. Having disdain or disregard for the ‘British Columbians’ who already occupied the area, the new emigrants “had no interest in converting others to their perspective, but rather sought out the company of their own kind” (Barman 2003:139). Recreation was formalized, in the same manner as in England with leisure activities that were typically limited to the wealthy such as cricket, tennis, croquet and polo (2003:147). Class distinctions played a significant role in the manner in which the local landscape aesthetic was constructed (Wagner 2008:23). Land prices remained steep, ensuring that participation in Okanagan society was exclusively available to the wealthy (Craib 2009:30).
As Wagner explains, the European landscape aesthetic “had been created as a marketing tool well before most settlers arrived in the valley. It provided settlers with a ready-made European perspective but also with a charter for colonization and ecological transformation” (2008:30). Syilx perceptions of Okanagan landscapes differed from that of land developers and the supporting Provincial government. For instance, the Syilx aesthetic was “rooted in a diverse appreciation of landscape features with a high value placed on grassland environments, forest and forest edge habitat where game and berries were abundant, as well as wetland and riparian zones” (Wagner 2008:29). In contrast, the European landscape aesthetic valued capitalism, recreation activities and a “fruit bearing Eden of Arcadian fancy” (Craib 2009:34). In 1892, provincial legislature was enacted that sought to expand water licensing to private corporations so that land development could be maximized in the Okanagan (Wagner 2008:30). Meanwhile, Syilx access to water supply became further limited. Relationships to the physical landscape were an obvious reflection of the social hierarchy being put in place by the new settler community (Craib 2009:31).

In her journal written while living in the Okanagan, Lady Aberdeen, wife of the Canadian Governor General, described the settler population in 1894 illustrating what would have likely been the typical values of British emigrants:

> These settlers are of a very good class. Mr. Abbott, his mother & two sisters, the son of an English clergyman… very superior people…These ought to make a good nucleus for the future… But we ought to get in time a really high-class little community here. [1986:55]

White women like Lady Aberdeen played an important role in the development of the new class of settlers in the Okanagan. Prior to confederation, an effort was made to attract white women to British Columbia, as an attempt to remedy the problem of white-indigenous relationships (Perry 2001:139). Early colonial promoters “envisioned a particular role for white
women in the process of transforming British Columbia from a rough, racially plural resource settlement into an orderly settler colony” (Perry 2001:145). Fulfilling the hegemonic ideal meant that “European men were complete only when living in heterosexual, same-race, hierarchical unions” (Perry 2001:21). In the early development of the colony, this would have been difficult to achieve, but by the 1890s, it was fully possible. As white women became more “available” in the Okanagan, many white men cast away their indigenous wives and families, pushing mixed indigenous peoples further into the shadowy margins of settler society.

4.7 Increasing Racism in the Okanagan

As a result of Mendelian genetic research at the end of the 19th century, racism acquired what Blaut terms “a pseudoscientific aura of apparent truth” (1993:62). Racism was not only acceptable, but also expected. Multiple ethnic groups in the Okanagan Valley experienced racist treatment as a direct result of the recently immigrated and still increasing white upper-middle class Anglo-European population. The newly dominant industry, orcharding, was exclusively restricted to wealthy land-owners, all of which were white. Chinese, Syilx and mixed indigenous populations were denied access to resources and were forced to become orchard labourers.

Syilx peoples were restricted from participating in fruit farming, as applications for water licenses, which were necessary for irrigating orchards, were consistently denied by the Provincial government (Thomson 1994:104). Also, as Thomson explains, “intensive agriculture required capital investment, and capital was scarce in the Indian community, especially after the collapse of the wheat and livestock markets” (Thomson 1994:104). Thomson suggests that separate legislation discriminated against Syilx peoples, as they were unable to participate in the Euro-Canadian socio-economic system.
4.8 Summary

Kelowna’s mainstream historical narrative includes a glorification of the roles of the British gentlemen who settled in the Okanagan near the turn of the century. This version of the past tends to exclude the experiences of marginalized populations living in the area. The common thread that ties together their peripheral histories is a shared experience of dispossession, discrimination and colonial intervention. Despite engaging in sexual and consequently familial relationships with Syilx peoples, the growing settler community was complicit with such interventions, as they accepted policies that were developed for the purpose of controlling, assimilating and exploiting indigenous populations. People who once fluidly occupied the spaces between these two distinct cultures were forced to distinguish themselves as belonging to one or the other. For one of John McDougall’s sons, the choice was made to evade identification as a “halfbreed” as, when asked if he was a “halfbreed” he responded, “No sir, I am a McDougall” (Holliday 1948:29). This response highlights some of the complexity of being just that – a McDougall of mixed ancestry, living in the Okanagan.
CHAPTER 5 HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE MCDougalls

5.1 Overview

Identity is a fluid and situational phenomenon. For those who don’t belong to dominant categories of identity, identity shifting is more than an attempt to belong. It is a survival strategy. Exploring the McDougalls’ history, genealogy and archaeological remains provides insight into the ways in which they navigated Kelowna’s early settler society. The current history of the McDougall family has been created to a great extent by those who have interpreted their presence in the Okanagan Valley, be it historical societies, museums, descendants or historical first person accounts. It is no coincidence that certain perspectives make up the majority of historic documents. This is certainly the case for the McDougall family, as many references to John McDougall and his sons come from first person accounts written by local non-indigenous people.

As the most prominent contributors to written historic materials have been men, it should be noted that there is a lack of documentation that describes the experiences of the women of the McDougall family. Because of the oral nature of Syilx and Secwepemc culture, historical records typically describe only half of the story, which is largely from a Euro-Canadian perspective. A survey of the McDougall family historical documents, including local histories and first person accounts written by both indigenous and non-indigenous authors, unearthed a number of key resources. For instance, Shirley Louis’ (1996) We Heard it in the Bushes includes data from primary sources such as census and vital statistic documents, post journals and first person accounts. Most importantly, Louis records oral histories told by descendants of John McDougall that are rich in details of past activities and social relationships in the Okanagan.Louis’ (2002) Q’Sapi is also valuable, as she includes several oral histories concerning past
women told by Syilx elders and McDougall descendants. According to Louis, John McDougall was literate and likely schooled by Jesuit priests, yet little documentation of his literacy remains (Louis 1996:2-3). Therefore, his personal history and genealogy is re-constructed through the few documents in which he was mentioned, the stories told about him, and in the buildings that he constructed.

It is also problematic that women are not key components of the archaeological aspect of this study. Women play an important role in the ethnogenesis of the Métis and are crucial mediators within indigenous communities (Murphy 2003). Unfortunately, the cultural space occupied by women is often not represented by architectural remains, as much of the materials left behind by women (or that have been altered by women) either do not survive in the archaeological record or are kept as family heirlooms and are not available for interpretation (Beaudoin et al. 2010). Materials such as textiles, clothing, and baskets, much of which was kept in the home, have had limited study and are thus of increasing significance. Because of the relocation of the houses, the original artifacts that once filled the houses have not been recovered for study. The buildings being interpreted are essentially just a shell of the house, built by the men of the McDougall family. Nonetheless, the archaeological data that remains available for interpretation provides important insight into past construction techniques and traditions.

While historical records confirm John McDougall's Métis ancestry, the saliency of his identification with this ethnicity can also be inferred through archaeological remains. One objective of this study is to discuss John McDougall’s Métis ancestry as exhibited through his use of traditional Métis construction techniques. The archaeology of the McDougall family involves the examination of four buildings built by John McDougall and one house built by his son David McDougall. While several buildings throughout the Okanagan Valley region have been attributed to the McDougalls, these five buildings have been selected for study because
they are confirmed by historical documentation to have been built by and inhabited by the McDougalls, are easily accessible, and are remain in good condition. The following buildings will be discussed: 1) a trading post, built in 1861, and moved to the Kelowna Heritage Museum; 2) a house built in the 1860s at Guisachan, moved to its current location at the Father Pandosy Mission in 1968; 3) a house built on the west side of Lake Okanagan in 1873 for the Allison family; 4) a house built in 1886, which was moved to the Guisachan Heritage Park in 1984, and is now under the care of the Central Okanagan Heritage Society; 5) a house built by David McDougall in 1890, which was immediately sold to Joseph Christien, and as a result, is hereafter referred to as the Christien House. These buildings are of archaeological significance as they are some of the earliest European influenced permanent structures in the Okanagan.

5.2 A History of the McDougalls

Jean Baptiste McDougall, known locally as Johnny, was born in 1827 at Fort Garry to a Scottish father and Métis mother (Louis 1996:2). His father and mother's father were both employed in the fur trade by the Hudson's Bay Company. John came west to British Columbia at a young age while working as a guide for Donald Smith (Louis 1996:3). Until 1854, he worked as a labourer and canoe man, traversing the Okanagan with pack trains. In the early 1860s, John McDougall preempted 160 acres in the Okanagan Mission, building a small trading post (Louis 1996:1). While working in the fur trade at Fort Kamloops, John engaged in a country marriage to an indigenous woman of Secwepemc and Syilx ancestry named Emelie Topa, with whom he had a long lasting relationship (Barman 1996:10, Louis 1996:11). John McDougall was instrumental to the early pioneer community of Kelowna and held considerable status on account of his role

34 Note that the directional orientation of the buildings has been omitted as they have been moved from their original locations and are not relevant to this study.
as an Hudson’s Bay Company store owner, but also because of his role as a builder. John McDougall was relatively wealthy due to his discoveries of gold in the Similkameen Forks River, which he attributed to a prophetic dream from God (Gellatly 1983:27). He was known as a devoutly religious man who was dedicated to the local church (Louis 1996:7). John was particularly knowledgeable of the local landscape as a result of his many years working in the area and reportedly “mixed well with his neighbours” (Louis 1996:9). He and his family started off living near the Mission, but sold his land at Guisachan to the Aberdeens around 1891 and later moved to the west side of Lake Okanagan (Louis 1996:10). His children exhibited strong connections to the local Syilx community, as many of them had consanguineous relationships, lived on Indian Reserves and worked with the local population as hunters, trappers and guides.

5.3 A Genealogy of the McDougall Children

Together, John and Emelie had ten sons and, with another Syilx woman named Julie, John had two daughters with whom he had limited to no contact (Louis 1996:2). The following section describes a limited genealogy of John McDougall’s children. This information has been predominantly garnered from primary sources such as birth records, baptismal records, marriage records, military enlistment records, census records, death records; but also includes information from secondary sources such as first person accounts and personal genealogies. Providing a detailed description of the subsequent linkages of such an extensive family demonstrates the extent to which the McDougall family was present in the Okanagan, while illustrating the complexity of their social and familial networks. For a visual representation of these relationships, see Appendix A.

John McDougall’s eldest son, Alexander, appears to have been born in Victoria, but after being raised in the Okanagan, he pre-empted land in both the Benvoulin and Ellison regions.
Alexander married Marguerite (or Margaret) De Chiquette, the daughter of Similkameen HBC clerk Francois De Chiquette and an indigenous woman named Marie (Louis 1996:25). He lived in the Okanagan with his wife and their two children, Angelique and Jean. Alexander McDougall died a few years after his father in 1908, after he too, moved across the lake to Westbank. 

David and Emilie’s second son, Ernest, was born in 1853, but it is likely that he passed away at a young age, as there is little documentation of his life (Hutchinson and Hutchinson 2007:1). John McDougall’s third son, Eneas, was born in Washington, later marrying a local Syilx woman named Idal and in 1901, he lived with her, their 15 year old son August, and Eneas’ younger brother Lezime on the west side of Lake Okanagan. In addition to being a talented hunter and guide, Eneas engineered the first ferry across the width of Okanagan Lake (Louis 1996:24-25).

David Joseph McDougall appears to have been born around the same time as Eneas, as his death registration suggests that he was also born in 1854. His baptismal registration notes that he was baptized in Victoria in 1855 and that his mother, Emilie, was an ‘Okinagan Métis’. He married Therese Couture (sometimes listed as Christina), the daughter of a French Canadian man and an “Indian woman, Louise” (Louis 1996:26). David built the Christien house, now located at the Father Pandosy Mission site. It was originally located on his property at Ellison, British Columbia.

---

36 Death Registration Record for Alexander McDougall, Sep 26 1908, RG 09-062386, Vital Events Collection. Victoria: British Columbia Archives.
but David sold his land to pioneers Joseph Christien and John Conroy in 1890, relocating to the Duck Lake Indian Reserve (1996:27). David and Therese’s home was known to be a lively place, where the “local townspeople at Winfield and native people” would stop by to play music, dance and hear stories of the past (1996:28). David McDougall, like his father John Baptiste, was well known for his storytelling abilities, and is noted by his descendant’s as carrying oral traditions through the telling of detailed coyote stories (1996:28).

David and Therese McDougall’s family are noted as being fluent speakers of French, English and the Syilx language, Syilxcen (Louis 1996:27), which likely resulted from their social and familial relationships with speakers of each language. David and Therese had eight children: David Samuel, Virginia, Elizabeth, Isadore, Angus, Oliver, Julie and Emily Louisa (1996:27). Daughter Virginia’s first husband was Alphonse Chartrend, a French Canadian or possibly Métis man from Manitoba (1996:27). Her second husband was Peter Bessette, who was a registered member of the Okanagan Indian Band, but was perhaps a French Canadian who gained his status from his earlier marriage to Syilx Mary Helene. Virginia and Peter had one son who died at infancy, and were later divorced (Louis 2002:81).

David and Therese’s daughter Elizabeth married James Steele, who was perhaps the mixed indigenous son of Colonel Samuel Steele of Fort Steele (Louis 2002:211) Together, they had four children: John, William, Mary and Martina. Oral histories told by Syilx descendants of Elizabeth McDougall and James Steele describe Elizabeth McDougall as having ran the family farm at the Duck Lake Indian Reserve, while James Steele stayed in Vernon. Their son William Steele is described as having worked on a trap line (Louis 2002:211).

---

David and Therese’s daughter Julie married Edward Derickson at the Okanagan Mission, who is listed as a member of the Tsinstikeptum Indian Band.\textsuperscript{42} He may have been Syilx or of mixed European and Syilx background as he is listed as being born in Syilx territory south of the U.S. border; however, his residence on the Tsinstikeptum reserve could have also been a result of his marriage to Julie McDougall. David’s daughter Emily Louisa married a Scottish American farmer, born in Oregon, named James Alvernia Bailley, with whom she had 12 children (1996:27).\textsuperscript{43} David McDougall’s son David married a Syilx chief’s grand-daughter named Nancy and later fathered a daughter with a woman of unknown origin named Rosie Sanford (1996:27). Angus married local Irish Canadian Molly McKinley and had one child.\textsuperscript{44} John McDougall’s son Joseph Norbett was born in 1860, but died almost four years later and was buried in the same location as Father Pandosy at the Immaculate Conception Cemetery (Louis 1996:30).

John McDougall’s son Henry, born in 1861, is listed in the 1901 census as living near brothers Urban, Amable and Eneas with his Syilx wife Mary and their seven year-old adopted Syilx daughter, Lizzie James (Louis 1996:31).\textsuperscript{45} Similar to his father, Henry is noted as being an avid hunter, trapper and guide, as well as having a talent for finding gold (1996:31). Little else is known about Henry McDougall, but he is mentioned as having a farm in the Westbank region, as Frank Bouvette, a Métis man from Pembina, is mentioned as having moved near Henry McDougall’s farm, after having married a “halfbreed” relation of the McDougall’s, Rose Smithson (Gellatly 1983:88).

\begin{footnotes}
\item[43] Marriage Registration Record for James Alvernia Bailey and Emily Louisa McDougall, Feb 10 1919, RG 09-203067, Vital Events Collection.
\item[45] 1901 Census, British Columbia, 5-J9-5. Ottawa: Library and Archives Canada.
\end{footnotes}

---

Garcia, the daughter of Mexican ‘half-breed’ Frank Joseph Garcia and Celina Letinic. Edward McDougall’s fourth son Thomas was single and lived in Westbank for the majority of his life. On his death registration, he is listed as an “Indian.” Both sons James and Frederick died young, as did his daughter Fay (1996:33). His fifth son James appears to have also been single and have lived in the Merritt region. Edward’s eldest daughter Emily married Syilx Willie Tomat of Westbank, but had no children (1996:33). Edward’s daughter Grace was born in Westbank, lived in Merritt and married Joseph O’Brien, a farmer from Saskatchewan, in 1917.


---


John McDougall’s son Lazeen, or Lezime, is also recorded in the 1901 census as single and living with his brother Eneas at Westbank. He is remembered for being honoured by members of the Okanagan Indian Band and having been offered land in exchange for his employment as a carpenter, but he never accepted the land, as he “had a bit of the McDougall wandering spirit (Louis 1996:36).”

Finally, John McDougall’s youngest son, Urban McDougall, appeared to also have lived most of his life with his brother John Amable at Westbank. Urban McDougall appeared to have had two female partners, Syilx wife Madeline Jack and an unknown Angelique. He had four children: John Urban, William, Susan, and Joseph (Louis 1996: 37). His eldest son John Urban, like his cousin Daniel John McDougall, married into the Syilx Eli family, as he married Rosie Eli in 1932 at a church on the Westbank Indian reserve.

---

61 During this time, he built houses for Syilx Ethel Jack, chief Pierre Louis and Willie Marchand (Louis 1996:36).
63 Marriage Registration Record for Urbain McDougall and Madeline Jack, April 7 1902, RG 09-026740, Vital Events Collection. Victoria: British Columbia Archives.
John McDougall had no contact with his two daughters, Martha and Agnes, as upon their mother Julie’s death, John wanted his daughters to be educated at boarding school, which their grandparents outright refused (Louis 1996:39). Martha married Syilx San Pierre and had six children, whereas Agnes married Syilx Casimier Pierre and had three children. Their children also married into Syilx families (1996:39).

5.4 The Archaeology of the McDougalls

Within the context of historic settler houses in the Okanagan, the McDougall houses are distinct in construction style and technique. The majority of houses in the settlement area prior to the 1905 founding of the town of Kelowna were either Dutch-revival or Victorian cottage, farm house, or bungalow style (Hobson et. al. 1983:xxiv). The Kelowna heritage resource inventory notes, “both John and David McDougall were skilled axe-men and did much of the early logs building in the area” (1983:12). John McDougall and his sons appeared to be well known for their construction abilities, as they specialized in building hewn log houses (1983:14), using a complex dovetail corner-notching technique. Other log houses were built in the area during the 1800s, including the structures built by Brother Surel at Father Pandosy’s mission in the 1860s, Frederick Brent’s house built in 1879 and the Casorso house built in 1884/1885 (1983:xxiii).

5.5 Building Materials

Each of the houses studied were built of hewn cedar logs. Western Red Cedar (*Thuja plicata*) is abundant along North America’s western coastal region, extending south to California. A second parallel population of *Thuja plicata* is located in British Columbia’s southeastern interior region (O’Connell et al. 2008:194-195). As an extension of this secondary

---

65 As most of the remaining buildings at the Father Pandosy Mission heritage site fell to disuse and were destroyed, it is problematic to assume that the 1958 reconstructions are absolutely accurate (Hobson et. al. 1983:12).
population, pockets of cedar exist throughout the Okanagan Valley (Hobson et al. 1983:42). Western Red Cedar is not a dense wood, but is relatively light, making it useful for thermal insulation in both hot and cold climates (Kumaran 2006:495). It is easy to transport and work with, a characteristic that would have likely had significant appeal to builders. Western Red Cedar is valued for its overall workability, as its uniform texture and straight grain cause it to be easily sawn and prevent unpredictable splitting (Stewart 1995:40). Furthermore, it is relatively rot resistant in humid climates and lasts in dry climates, making it possible for old buildings such as the houses being studied to remain in relatively good condition (Kumaran 2006:495).

5.6 The McDougall Houses

The cedar logs used to build the McDougall houses were all squared using an axe, the marks of which can be found among each log. Constructed using dovetail corner-notching (Figure 5.1), each house required considerable time and labour. The buildings being examined are observed in their current reconstructed state, as there is minimal evidence of their original construction. Although there may be the occasional discrepancy, the measurements, descriptions and models used throughout this study argue that the reconstructions are accurate representations of original construction. The following sections provide a description, a plan that is to scale, and a photo of each of the reconstructed houses.

Figure 5.1 Photo of dovetail corner notches (by G. Legault).
1) The first building built by John McDougall in 1861 is a simple 15’ x 12’ structure with a door centered on the short wall and a single small window on the long wall (Figure 5.2). There are the three equally distributed supportive beams and a gabled roof. The structure is built of hewn cedar logs that are dovetailed on both ends so that they can be assembled, much like a puzzle, at each of the house corners (Figure 5.3).

![Figure 5.2  Photo of McDougall house 1 (Surtees 1977)](image1)

![Figure 5.3  SketchUp of McDougall house 1 (by G. Legault).](image2)
2) The second house built by John McDougall sometime during the 1860s is now located at the Father Pandosy Mission site, where it has been incorporated into the interpretation of early buildings in the Okanagan (Figure 5.4). This house is slightly larger, at 22’ x 16’ and would be considered a 1.5 storey building (Figure 5.5). The walls of the top level are entirely gabled, creating a low ceiling. There is also a wide staircase leading to the second floor and both front and side entrances. In addition, there is a balanced front façade on the long wall consisting of the main door and two 3’ x 2’ windows.

![Photo of McDougall house 2 (by G. Legault).](image)

*Figure 5.4* Photo of McDougall house 2 (by G. Legault).

![SketchUp of McDougall house 2 (by G. Legault).](image)

*Figure 5.5* SketchUp of McDougall house 2 (by G. Legault).
3) The third house constructed by John McDougall is located on the west side of Lake Okanagan and is currently being used as a gift shop for the Quail’s Gate Winery, so has been modified with an addition to the east wall (Figure 5.6). Originally, the house was built for early settler J.F. Allison. Allison became a prominent member of the Okanagan community upon his arrival to the area. His second wife was one of the first white women to arrive in the Okanagan and his son, the first white child born in the region. Most narratives about J.F. Allison fail to mention that his first wife was a “half-breed” and that he had a mixed indigenous family living with him prior to the arrival of his new white wife, Susan (Barman 1996:7-8).

Allison reportedly hired John McDougall in 1873 to build him and his new family a log house on the west side of Lake Okanagan, then termed “Sunnyside” (Gellatly 1983:7). A balanced front façade is located on the long wall (facing south) and includes a wide (4’) main entrance and two 3’ x 2.5’ windows. Vertical supportive logs have been added to the sides of both the front windows and doors, but it is difficult to discern if these are original or later additions (Figure 5.7). Another window and door are located on the back wall (facing north) of the house, as well as an area that appears to have been previously cut out and may be the possible location of a past fireplace and/or chimney.
Figure 5.6  Photo of McDougall house 3 facing north (by G. Legault).

Figure 5.7  SketchUp of McDougall house 3 facing south (by G. Legault).
4) The fourth house examined for this study was built by John McDougall, and is now located at the Guisachan Heritage Park, as it was moved and rebuilt to clear the way for Gordon Drive. Figure 5.8 illustrates the original location (written as the Men’s Quarters) as well as the new location (written as New House). The Kelowna Heritage Resource Inventory notes that this house was “built of squared logs between 1879 and 1880” (Hobson et. al. 1983:14), having a similar appearance to John McDougall’s other houses (Figure 5.9). The bottom floor includes two separate rooms separated by a central hallway and a staircase that leads to a full second storey (Figure 5.9, Figure 5.10, Figure 5.11, and Figure 5.12). Written on one of the logs that partitions the house are the words “My name is Amabile McDougall and don’t you forget it”.

![Map of old and new locations of McDougall house 4](Figure 5.8)

*Figure 5.8  Map of old and new locations of McDougall house 4 (courtesy of Central Okanagan Heritage Society).*
Figure 5.9  Photo of McDougall house 4 (by G. Legault).

Figure 5.10  SketchUp of McDougall house 4 (by G. Legault).
Figure 5.11  Blueprint of McDougall house 4- main floor (courtesy of C.O.H.S.).

Figure 5.12  Blueprint of McDougall house 4- second floor (courtesy of C.O.H.S.).
5) The final house being examined for this study, known as the Christien House, was not built by John McDougall, but by his son David McDougall in 1890. The building acquired its name as it was sold to Joseph Christien and was used as both a boarding house and a schoolhouse. This house, despite having the same dovetail corner-notching and horizontal, squared cedar logs as all of John McDougall’s houses, appears to be built in a distinctly different style (Figure 5.13). When compared to House 4, the basic layout of the house is similar, with a central hallway and staircase (Figure 5.14), but has an addition on the front façade, creating an L-shaped house (Figure 5.15).

Figure 5.13  Photo of McDougall house 5 (by G. Legault).
Figure 5.14 SketchUp of McDougall house 5 (by G. Legault).

Figure 5.15 SketchUp of McDougall house 5- main level (by G. Legault).
5.7 Summary

John McDougall and his descendants did not appear to self-identify as belonging to one ethnic group, but like people in contemporary societies held flexible identities that became more or less salient based on social circumstance. An examination of the social networks in which the McDougalls participated, through the lens of their ethnic background and the ways in which they were racialized by other members of the local community, is key to understanding their identities. Like many early settlers in the Okanagan, John McDougall married a woman indigenous to British Columbia and had mixed indigenous children. Similar to other mixed indigenous peoples, the historical and genealogical data suggests that there is a distinct cultural preference among the McDougalls to select marriage partners that were Syilx or of mixed indigenous descent. It is also clear that John and David McDougall made certain choices during times of construction, as the archaeological data demonstrates a distinct increase in size and complexity over time. Influenced by external factors, these choices demonstrate the agency of McDougall family members and the intentional expression of certain ethnic identities.
CHAPTER 6  DISCUSSION

6.1 Overview

The fluid boundaries of ethnicity tend to overlap, varying depending on circumstance. Expressions of identity produced within a changing historical context can be understood as existing within a social reality that included conflicting, heterogeneous constructions of cultural identities. Thus, there is no single ethnic identity as the symbolic expressions that accompany such an identity are inevitably experienced and articulated in various ways by different people (Jones 1997:140). The manipulation and negotiation of such material symbols, or style, can be understood as a means for discerning the relationship between shifting ethnic boundaries as well as the extent of inter-group interaction (Barth 1969; Burley 1992:9; Hodder 1982).

Material culture can mediate and legitimize social relations, but it is only part of the environment in which ethnicity is generated. Ethnicity is recognized as being the consequence of “the historically constituted dispositions and orientations that inform people’s understandings and practices” (Jones 1997:125). By examining ethnicity as a product of the intersections of the conditions that modify historical situations and the habitus, past power relations become an integral component for understanding the distribution of symbolic resources. By looking at the ethnogenesis of the McDougalls using the same creolization approach as Mullins and Paynter (2000), the processes that transformed their ethnic identity can be perceived as ongoing. As agents are actively transforming or maintaining structures, one’s ability to affect such structures can be constrained or enabled by access to power, often through mobilization of resources (Giddens 1984).

Upon reflection on the history and genealogy of John McDougall and his descendants, it is clear that the McDougalls had ties to the local Syilx population and the new settler population.
It can be assumed that they engaged in some sort of coping strategy to negotiate outside pressures to self-identify as belonging to one group, which likely affected their geographic, kin and employment relationships. Nonetheless, there is a distinct pattern among the McDougalls to select marriage partners that are either indigenous or of mixed indigenous descent. Similar to other Métis peoples living in B.C.’s central interior, the marital choices of the McDougall sons “echo those of parents and grandparents”, as they “partnered with others of similar background and understandings where they were most likely to find social acceptance” (Evans et al. in press). Their similar cultural preferences support the argument that the Métis culture is not necessarily defined by geographically boundaries, but can be understood as a collection of shared dispositions.

This chapter discusses how the McDougall’s ethnic and familial identity intersects with their house construction, meanwhile considering external modifying factors. Comparing the form of Burley’s South Saskatchewan River House to the McDougall houses suggests that the Métis builders at St. Laurent had a *habitus* that was shared with John McDougall, as the spatial layouts are nearly identical and therefore reflect similar cultural values. Additionally, by examining how the transformation of the McDougall houses coincides with the changing attitudes towards mixed indigenous peoples, it becomes clear that the expression of ethnicity on behalf of the McDougalls was shaped by such external factors.

### 6.2 Geographic Comparisons

Comparing the features of the South Saskatchewan River House (Figure 6.1) to those of the McDougall houses (Figure 6.2) sheds light on past social constructs and ideology. By examining the South Saskatchewan River House as “the consequence of a society in transition” and, as an indicator of “the nature of that transition” (Burley 1992:123), it can be viewed as
existing within a similar context as the McDougall houses. Despite Burley and Horsfall’s suggestion that dovetail log construction only moved westward with the Red River Métis in the late 1870s (1989:25), the archaeological data of the McDougalls suggests otherwise.

![Figure 6.1 1884 Robert Chenier house (Burley 2000:30)](image1)

Figure 6.1 1884 Robert Chenier house (Burley 2000:30)

![Figure 6.2 Photo of McDougall house 2 (by G. Legault).](image2)

Figure 6.2 Photo of McDougall house 2 (by G. Legault).

David Burley's work examined construction traditions found near Batoche, Saskatchewan, was based on houses studied by the Canadian Parks Service in the mid 1970s and his own survey in the St. Laurent area in 1986. His South Saskatchewan River House had “dovetail corner notching, gable roofs [and] symmetrical window placements on the front facade” (1992:125). The McDougall structures also feature dovetail corner-notching, gabled
roofs, and window placement that is somewhat symmetrical. Burley suggests that these features may be the result of a more stable settlement willing to devote “greater energy and resources to house construction” (1992:126). According to Burley, the appearance of multiple storied log houses resulted from the use of dovetail corner notching “as the corners bear the entire weight of the structure, and the notches control lateral movement” allowing the use of heavier logs (1992:134).

The unconscious rules that structure Métis behaviour are manifested in daily activities and thus the built environment. David Burley’s description of Métis dispositions as “a way of doing things” includes “an unbounded and asymmetrical perception of space” (1992:2-6). He also asserts that there is a distinct lack of division between culture and nature as well as overriding concerns with equality in terms of social organization and consensus. As such, an asymmetrical use of space has been associated with communalistic or egalitarian values (Burley and Horsfall 1989:29). Furthermore, Burley and Horsfall’s interpretation of Métis space as being fluid, flexible, and open is consistent with descriptions of Métis social organization as being adaptable, and inclusive (Burley and Horsfall 1989:28-29; Burley et al. 1992:148). If the McDougall structures are to be considered within the context of Métis vernacular construction traditions, then it is likely that the McDougalls exhibited similar dispositions to those described by Burley. This includes having overriding concerns with equality in terms of social organization and consensus, as well as a lack of division between culture and nature (Burley and Horsfall 1989:28-29; Burley et al. 1992:148). Accepting Bourdieu’s habitus, the built environment of the McDougalls appears to reflect a continuously changing system of values, including those defined by their evolving ethnic identity.
6.3 Temporal Comparisons

Vernacular architecture reproduces cultural values in a manner that serves to enculturate younger generations, and as such familial identities can also be viewed as being embedded within a shared *habitus*. As an intergenerational activity, house construction can be considered as abiding by certain cultural traditions, which tend to overlap with the individual’s *artifactual grammar*. As the rules that guide the builder or their *artifactual grammar* is often subconscious (Glassie 1975:17). Nabokov and Easton describe house-building among indigenous peoples as “a ritualized means of cementing relations among tribes, or between clans, moieties, and important families” (1989:33). As such, the *artifactual grammar* that guides builders may be reproduced amongst kin, resulting in a shared style among family members. The consistencies between John and David McDougall’s houses act as evidence that techniques and construction traditions were passed down from father to son. Additionally, constructing dovetail corner-notched structures requires the physical labour of more than one person as a result of the weight of the massive logs, meaning that it was possible that John’s sons were helping him. As an intergenerational and communal activity, it is also possible that John McDougall learned to build dovetail corner-notched structures from his father, who learned from his father, and so on.

As a mode of communication that gives physical form to ideas and perceptions, vernacular architecture tends to be a non-planned, intuitive construction approach (Glassie 2000:22). For indigenous peoples, “their traditions were their blueprints; social rules, their building code” (Nabokov and Easton 1989:15). According to oral histories, dovetail corner-notching was a skill that was well known among Métis, but was difficult and required specialized builders (Burley 1992:126). Oral and written histories suggest that John McDougall was the local specialist in the Okanagan and construction quality acts as confirmation (Hobson et al. 1983:xxiv). These houses appear to have been somewhat designed prior to construction, as
dovetail corner-notched houses are assembled much like a complex jigsaw puzzle. David McDougall’s house, in contrast to those of his father, appears to have been built according to predetermined architectural plans, whereas John McDougall’s appear to be more intuitive; however, both types of houses can be viewed as reflecting the changing habitus of the builder.

Over time, the houses begin to stray from their original construction form, exhibiting features associated with upper class Euro-Canadian or Euro-American architecture. When comparing the McDougall houses to each other, it is evident that the construction style becomes increasingly complex and focuses increasingly on spatial divisions. The shift to more divided rooms and an increasingly bounded space may be the result of several factors.

The earlier four houses built by John McDougall appear to have been constructed in accordance to the builder’s vernacular, reflecting a particular way of life. These four houses developed from being a basic one room, single storey form to a multi-room, two-storey form. In the first house, there is only one spatial division, a permeable division created by the three supportive beams that separate the main room from the triangular space created by the gabled roof. The second house is larger at 22’ x 16’ and is a 1.5 storey building as there is a separation between each level; however, the walls of the top level are gabled, creating a low ceiling. The third house is similar in size and form to the second and was built in nearly the same style, but it is larger and more square at 26’ x 26.5’. In addition, the second storey is more complete, as it has a higher ceiling than the earlier houses. On the main floor of the fourth house, space is divided with a hallway separating two large rooms. This house demonstrates the peak of John McDougall’s construction abilities, as it is the largest and most complex house that he built.66

66 As John McDougall’s family size increased, it is possible that more living space was required.
The increased separation of space suggests a change in the way that indoor space is used. As a “way of being”, use of space is often the result of cultural dispositions and behaviours. While it is possible that this temporal change results from a transformation of John McDougall’s *habitus*, it seems unlikely, as the dispositions and practices shaped by the *habitus* tend to occur at a young age. It is more likely that the first, single-room, single storey house built by John McDougall is the most authentic expression of his values and way of living, meaning that the other three houses were modified by external factors, such as the changing historical context in which he and his family were living.

The Christien house, built by David McDougall supports Burley’s statement that a “change in style reflects a change in values, as vernacular architecture serves as a visible expression of ethnicity and ethnic values” (Burley 1992:123). This structure is distinctly different from John McDougall’s houses, as it involves more symmetry and follows the basic layout of a colonial Georgian house (having a central hall with rooms on either side). The style of the Christien house clearly reflects a colonial influence, as there are increasingly divided spaces throughout the building and evidence of a colonial aesthetic. For instance, the use of symmetrically balanced windows throughout the house façade reflects a colonial preference for cleanliness and order. Another colonial trend that was also incorporated into the house was the addition of a veranda, a common practice throughout colonial settlements in Canada and the United States in the 1890s.

The construction style of the Christien house is unique, as it may be considered to be a merging of two colonial house forms, the *gabled ell* house and the *plains cottage* house. The *gabled ell* house, also known as the *village residence style* was found in rural areas in Canada and the United States beginning in the 1870s and was distinguished as having “a wing projected at a right angle to the main block” (Jennings and Gottfried 1988:276). Most *gabled ell* houses
were large and spacious and were advertised as requiring minimum construction and upkeep costs, as well as being “easily adapted for group construction” (Jennings and Gottfried 1988:277). Both of these qualities would have been advantageous for the builder, David McDougall, and the owner, Joseph Christien.

The plains cottage house style wasn’t restricted to an L-shape, but often included a front room that projected from either side or from the middle of the building. The entry of the plains cottage house was typically located on the front, as a part of “a modestly trimmed porch” (Jennings and Gottfried 1988:280). The Christien House was also designed using one of the common roof plans of the plains cottage style, which included two intersecting gables (Jennings and Gottfried 1988:280). The original plans for this style, also known as the western cottage style or workingman’s cottage style, included little ornamentation and no bathroom, and the exterior “fairly [expressed] its domestic purpose” (Jennings and Gottfried 1988:281). The adoption of a new architectural style might articulate changes in aesthetic preference, an improved class status, a willingness to adapt to the changing socio-economic context, but it could also be viewed as an attempt at masking ethnic identity (Burley and Horsfall 1989:30).

6.4 A Changing Historical Context

When one considers the context in which the McDougalls were building houses, and compares this to the physical remains, it is evident that the family was being influenced by external factors such as racism and the newly transformed socio-economic context. As newcomers arrived to the Okanagan with the completion of the transcontinental railway in 1886, mixed indigenous peoples separated themselves even further from the white settler community. Non-indigenous populations rose dramatically resulting in marginalized populations being denied access to resources, dispossessed from their lands, and discriminated against (Barman
As new Provincial government policies discouraged unions between white and indigenous populations, a distinct effort was made to attract non-indigenous peoples to Kelowna (Perry 2001:139). Delegitimizing children of white-indigenous unions, while regulating indigenous identities, were only some of the ways in which many mixed-indigenous families were geographically and socially pushed to the margins of both white communities and Indian reserves (Barman 1998:248; Barman 2006:10,17). Essentially, racism towards anyone with indigenous ancestry was an acceptable everyday occurrence that came to be expected.

People who once fluidly occupied the spaces between multiple cultures were forced to distinguish themselves as being either white or indigenous. Despite the policies that discouraged unions between indigenous women and non-indigenous men, many mixed relationships continued on, as some married legally while others retreated from urban areas (Barman 1998:264). Many mixed offspring had a tendency to intermarry with other mixed indigenous peoples whereas other mixed indigenous sons stayed single, living on the margins of white settler society. Others married indigenous women, moved onto reserves, denying their mixed ancestry (Barman 2006:17). Revealing their true identities was dangerous and not beneficial for “halfbreeds” in the period following the influx of immigrants to British Columbia. Mixed indigenous peoples living throughout Canada went underground, disappearing into the singular fictive categories, which they were forced to occupy.

For the McDougalls, it appears that the increasing immigration of white settlers into the Okanagan pressured them to leave the recently urbanized areas of the Mission, Guisachan and Benvoulin, moving to designated spaces such as the Duck Lake Indian Reserve and the Westbank Indian Reserve. Here, the sons of John McDougall could continue the activities with which they were most familiar, mainly hunting, guiding and trapping. Social and familial networks were formed out of kin connections, work and school relationships, geographic
proximity and religious affiliation. Moving closer to their Syilx families ensured security during a time of economic insecurity, meanwhile providing a sense of belonging (Evans et al. in press). Perhaps familial support lessened the effects of the intense racism that was being directed towards the McDougalls.

It is crucial that the historical experience of the McDougall family isn’t analyzed as being simply a depoliticized “multi-cultural adjustment” (Mullins and Paynter 2000:73). Instead, their ethnic identities should be understood as situated within the framework of creolization and as continually transforming. As a process that involves the construction of new cultural subjectivities within specific structural power relations, the ethnogenesis of the McDougalls began before 1859 and continued after the scope of this study. It is clear that the ethnic identity of the McDougalls was in a state of transition, as they were caught in between the cultures from which they were born. They were entwined into multiple and often overlapping social networks consisting of European settlers, “half-breeds”, and both Syilx and Secwepemc peoples.

Yet, there still exists a collective agency among the members of the McDougall family, which results in a historical and archaeological assemblage that, like the Haida in Mullins and Paynter’s study, “mirrors both the structural domination of a colonizer and the local material organization and cultural identity of a colonized people” (2000:74). The archaeological evidence of the McDougall family suggests that, following the intentions of assimilationist policies, they had attempted to adapt to European standards. The reproduction of structures of dominance, such as David McDougall’s reproduction of Euro-Canadian architectural features, can be considered as attempts to generate power (Giddens 1984:258).

The historical evidence appears somewhat contradictory, as it indicates that the family became increasingly tied to the local Syilx communities. It appears that the McDougalls identified with both Syilx and Euro-Canadian identities, but did not continue to represent a
mixed indigenous identity. These processes of identification happened simultaneously over time, as the descendants of the McDougalls self-identified as belonging to multiple different and sometimes overlapping ethnic groups. This illustrates not only the complexity of indigenous and ethnic categories of identity, but also the need to establish a means for negotiating external pressures.

6.5 Summary

By applying Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus as a means for understanding both ethnicity and vernacular architecture, the mindset and dispositions of the McDougall builders can be explored. Like people, material culture is not static, but is constantly transforming. As Brasser suggests, when studying Métis material culture a wide focus is necessary, as material expressions such as art “did not remain an exclusive hallmark of métis culture” (1985:225). The similarities of the artifactual grammar of the McDougalls to that described by Burley et al. (1992) suggests that the habitus of John McDougall upon settlement bore similarities to that of the Métis peoples living at St. Laurent, Saskatchewan. While there are clear similarities in construction style between John McDougall’s houses and David Burley’s South Saskatchewan River House, this does not necessarily equate to an indicator of métissage.

The historical, genealogical and archaeological data concerning the McDougall family suggests that they were directly connected to the Syilx community through kinship, geographic and working relationships, but were also tied to the settler community through kinship, through their employment as specialized builders and through other economic endeavours. The ethnogenesis of the McDougall family over time appears to have involved an autochthonous development. While still linked to traditional Métis territories, the McDougall sons form distinct social and familial relationships with the local Syilx community. The structural and stylistic
shifts that occur between the generations of father John McDougall and son David were indicative of a shift in indigenous identity and the need to deal with the gradually transforming social environment. External modifying factors such as a changing historical context that increasingly emphasizes the racialization and depreciation of mixed indigenous peoples clearly impacted the symbolic representations of the ethnic identity of the McDougalls.
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

7.1 Overview

Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* has been employed in different ways throughout this study as a means for understanding both ethnicity and vernacular architecture. Within this space, power structures and cognitive structures become embodied through processes of socialization, which subconsciously impacts individual dispositions and practices, meanwhile mediating social actions and relations (Jones 1997:88-89). As such, culturally determined values are learned at a young age within a dialectical space that was itself structured by ongoing social practices (Bourdieu 1977:78). While material culture can act as an expression of shared dispositions, this does not correlate directly to ethnicity. Expressions of ethnic identity are transformed and reproduced as a form of cultural differentiation, implying both individual and communal consciousness of ethnicity (Jones 1997:140). As ethnicity is embedded in a shared *habitus*, the feelings of shared identity are deliberately embraced and are symbolically represented (Bentley 1987:173; Bourdieu 1977:78-93). The unconscious rules that structure the behaviours of mixed indigenous peoples are manifested in daily activities and the built environment.

As ethnicity is understood as a product of the intersections of a shared *habitus* and the conditions that constitute any given historical situation, socially constructed categories of identity are inherently subject to the effects of external factors. The struggle to identify who and what can be considered to be Métis confirms that past and present identities are fluid and often situational. While the Red River Settlement may be the location of the most public expressions of Métis ethnicity, it does not mark the beginning or the end of the ethnogenesis of the Métis. Becoming Métis in British Columbia results in communities that are autochthonous in that they are connected through kinship and geographic relationships to local indigenous populations, yet
they remain linked to Métis communities located east of the Rocky Mountains. These links are demonstrable in the built environment and extensive social and familial networks.

While Métis identities may have roots in specific geographical and historical contexts, external factors such as displacement due to increased settlement have continued to affect the material culture. Although many early Okanagan settlers engaged in relationships with Syilx peoples, the growing settler community directly or indirectly supported oppressive government policies targeted at indigenous populations, pressuring biracial families to distinguish themselves as being either white or “Indians”.

Although the McDougalls were identified by others as “halfbreeds”, the saliency of their outward identification as Mètis is deciphered through the symbolic expressions of their material remains. There appears to be clear similarities in construction style between John McDougall’s houses and David Burley’s South Saskatchewan River House, possibly reflecting a shared *habitus*. While their heritage could be considered to be Scottish, Syilx, Secwepemc and Mètis, historical and genealogical documentation suggests that the historical McDougall family exhibited direct connections to the Syilx community through kinship, geographic and working relationships. It appears that familial identity held equal, or possibly more importance than the constructed categories that were increasingly imposed upon people as the dominant ideology transformed, as illustrated by John McDougall’s son’s response to the question of being a halfbreed “No sir, I am a McDougall” (Holliday 1948:29).

The transformation of John McDougall’s construction style can be viewed as reflecting an evolving ethnicity, a shifting external ideology and perhaps even the adoption of new technology and resources. Burley attributes the disappearance of a distinctly Mètis construction style in the early 20th century to diminishing resources, due to increased socio-economic marginalization (Burley 1992:129), but the end of a style should not be equated to the end of a
culture. Métis culture continues, and like each stage of ethnogenesis, the *habitus* transforms, as it is constantly in the process of negotiating external pressures. For many people, their identification with the Métis culture faded over time, never to be recovered. For some, it persisted, despite discrimination, and for others it remained hidden, only to be discovered and re-explored generations later.

### 7.2 Contributions: Giving Back

It is my intention that in return for the privilege of being able to study an historical indigenous family that is not my own, I am able to contribute to the progress of indigenous studies at both a wider academic level and also to local historical studies. This study is significant to academic disciplines such as historical archaeology as it contributes to the discourses of symbolic representation, vernacular architecture, the archaeology of ethnicity, and the archaeology of racism. More specifically, this study contributes to the understudied topic of Métis material culture, thus contributing to the growing literature within Métis Studies. This study will contribute specifically to understanding Métis material remains within British Columbia’s southern interior, but also to the current body of research concerning Métis ethnogenesis in British Columbia (Barman and Evans 2009; Evans et al. in press). Breaking down the barriers between disciplines is key to the growth of archaeology, history and anthropology and perhaps the only way to understand certain cultural groups, such as the Métis.

In addition to benefitting the academic community, the intention of this study is that it will benefit the organizations that interpret these types of historic structures so that future interpretations will include the indigenous identities of the people who built and inhabited these buildings. Contesting the traditional historical narrative that continues to be perpetuated by historical texts pertaining to the City of Kelowna, this study provides substantial documentation.
of the historical evidence of racism in Kelowna, contributing to the emerging body of literature concerning racism in the Okanagan (Aguiar et al. 2005). In addition, this study illustrates that the McDougalls did not allow racism to render them inert, but instead, they remained alert to the changing attitudes and adapted in terms of the outward representation of their indigenous identity. This study is intended to be of benefit indigenous communities by disrupting current heritage interpretations that act to further reinforce colonialism. The intent is that the indigenous voices of the past to be heard alongside the written history of the dominant non-indigenous community.

7.3 Study Limitations and Future Recommendations

As a result of limited time and resources, there are some limitations that have influenced this study. For a more detailed study of the past McDougall family, it would be ideal to have included more oral histories. Because of the time depth of approximately 110-150 years ago, it is impossible to interview anyone who was living during this time. As a result, documented oral histories and contributions from descendants Shirley Louis and Lottie Kozak are of significant value, and for this I thank them.

Moving forward, it is crucial that archaeologists begin to understand indigenous communities as heterogeneous and not homogeneous and unchanging, a myth that has limited the progress of, and unfairly categorized living indigenous peoples. Only by understanding the theoretical foundations of an indigenous archaeology and by taking cues from previous archaeological projects involving indigenous communities (Anyon et al. 2000; Hollowell and Nicholas 2009; Nicholas 2000; Warner and Baldwin 2004; Whitridge 2004; Zimmerman 2005), can Métis archaeology begin to develop as a distinct sub-field. As seen in cases of other indigenous groups, a well-developed Métis archaeology could be used to benefit Métis peoples.
in several ways, including law related purposes such as land-use claims (Jackson and Smith 2005; Klimko and Wright 2000; Leclair 2005). Additionally, by engaging in the collection of oral histories, archaeologists will be able to preserve knowledge that is quickly disappearing. A positive result of a decolonized Métis archaeology could be the empowering of a historically marginalized community. This field will only grow as more interdisciplinary research is conducted with the Métis and more Métis archaeologists embrace the past of our peoples.

7.4 Epilogue

Throughout this study, I have been struggling with the notion of relevance, wondering how my analysis of a historical family contributes not just to academic discourse, but also to a larger discussion. The theoretical aspects of this research have challenged me, as they seemed, at times, to be disconnected from my personal understandings of ethnicity, indigeneity and material culture. For me, in practice, ethnicity involves a sense of belonging and a shared way of being, but indigeneity takes these ideas even further. In essence, this belongingness goes beyond a connection to family and to community, but includes an intimate connection to the land and to our past (often through the land).

For those who descend from both European and indigenous backgrounds, it is often difficult to feel welcome in either world. A Métis colleague of mine once stated that his Métis identity left him feeling like he was a burden to society, that he was a being part of a population that needs to be “dealt with”. This internalization of the attitudes that have persisted for centuries towards Métis peoples is comprehensible. My experience has demonstrated that immediately upon revealing my Métis identity, I am often greeted with subtle (or not so subtle) disapproval from both non-indigenous and indigenous peoples.

This discrimination towards mixed indigenous peoples has been the driving force in my
research. For those belonging to the dominant white population, or even those who can “pass” and do not have to carry their indigenous identity with them at all times (myself included), it can be easy to think of racism as something that only occurred in the past, and that rarely occurs in the present. This understanding is only a result of our privileged perspective, as we do not face racism daily. People who are visibly indigenous face discrimination daily, not only through their human interactions, but also in terms of structural violence.

The historical context in which the McDougall family lived undeniably impacted the choices that they made in terms of who they married, where they lived and what identities they chose to represent. Vernacular architecture is one means for understanding these symbolic representations of identity, but my interpretation of the archaeological material is just that, an interpretation. My intention was to open up a discussion on a subject that has yet to be discussed in a public manner in the Okanagan. There is meaning in physical remains. Perhaps the process of building, as an intergenerational activity focused on passing cultural traditions, is of more importance than the actual building forms. Or perhaps, material culture such as the McDougall buildings can be viewed as a representation of the resistance of dominant society to accept that which is fluid and does not fit clearly into one box or another. From this I gain inspiration, as it is a reminder that such understandings of identity need to be challenged.
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APPENDIX A  MCDOUGALL FAMILY GENOGRAMS

Figure A.1  Ancestry legend

Figure A.2  John McDougall and children
Figure A.3 McDougall children and spouses

Figure A.4 Alexander McDougall family
Figure A.5  Eneas McDougall family

Figure A.6  David Joseph McDougall family
Figure A.7  Henry McDougall family

Figure A.8  Edward McDougall family
Figure A.9  John Amable McDougall family

Figure A.10  Urban McDougall family