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Abstract

Before contact First Nations in what is now British Columbia were not mapmakers. Territory was demarcated experientially, by genealogy, oral narrative, ceremony, and the social arts. Since contact, however, and especially since the beginning of the comprehensive claims process in the early 1970s, First Nations have become mapmakers — not because they especially wanted to but because they had to. They have recognized that cartography — whether in court, at the treaty table, or for pedagogical purposes — is a way of validating Aboriginal title and rights. They have also recognized, however, that committing their geographies to maps is a risky endeavour. Much of what distinguishes First Nations' geographical space does not translate well in a cartographic register and Euro-Canadians generally lack the cultural equipment to interpret and evaluate what does. This dissertation tries to open a space where translation can occur. Drawing on both Native and ethnographic sources and guided by my experience and some of the postcolonial literature, I show that First Nations' maps are both a record of an encounter that has always turned on the ability of one side to dominate the representation-al terrain of the other and a window on a world that most non-Natives have hitherto apprehended only in the faintest outline. The questions raised by this dissertation, then, are of a theoretical sort, but the answers are matters of fact and future practice. Land claims, if they are about anything at all, are about the struggle over geography — both the terrestrial object, and the perspective through which that object is territorialized — for Aboriginal title and rights, if recognized by law, mean nothing without the territories to which they refer. At issue is not whether the 'map of First Nations' is more true than the 'map of British Columbia' — though I will defend such a claim — but whether or not, in mirroring one against the other, a space of mutual understanding can be reached.
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QQ[a]) Clearcut logging on Native Sovereign Lands, Shaman Trying to Fix, Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun, 1993 (in Morris and Helen Belkin [eds] *Yuxweluptun* [Morris and Helen Belkin Fine Arts Library, University of British Columbia, Vancouver])
[b]) Red Man Watching White Man Trying to Fix Hole in Sky, ibid.

RR) protest camp at Cheam, Bert Crowfoot, 2000 (in *Wind-speaker* 18[1], May)
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Preface

My encounter with British Columbia was, I now know, typical. Like so many who have made this province their home, I came from elsewhere. I first learned about British Columbia on the map of Canada that hung on the blackboard in elementary school social studies, while growing up as a child in Ottawa during the 1950s. In 1966, the federal civil service sent my family to Victoria and that abstract space on the map sprung suddenly to life. I finished high school and entered university. For some inexplicable reason, I majored in chemistry, ended up hating it, and withdrew before I'd finished second year. By 1972, I'd had enough of hanging around Victoria and left for Prince Rupert, where I knew jobs could be had. I hired on the railway, and, a couple of years later, became president of the local union. Since then, I've travelled on steel and asphalt through, by boat around the perimeter of, and by air over British Columbia more times than I can remember. It was easy enough; all I had to do was follow that map. Along the way, I've resettled in Vancouver, terminated a 24 year career on the railway, and in the union, and in 1985 returned to university, this time majoring in geography. It seemed a logical choice; I had always liked social studies and maps, and it seemed a lot less stressful than fooling around in laboratories with dangerous chemicals. I have also encountered, if rather more circuitously, something else — a world that did not appear on those maps, that was not taught in elementary or secondary school, but one which, the more I travelled, kept coming persistently into view.

At first it was by chance. I knew, of course, that 'Indians' lived here, and I'd seen the totem poles at the Royal British Columbia Museum (RBCM), Museum of Anthropology, and in Stanley Park. I'd seen the reserves in Saanich and Esquimalt, although I'd never actually set foot in one. There were place names on the map of British Columbia that were apparently of non-European derivation. I spent six years in Prince Rupert, where there were still more poles and where many of my friends were 'Indians' — but it was clear (at least as I then perceived it) that they lived in a rather more atomistic world.
than the one I was used to. I was there when the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) handed down its decision in *Calder v. A.G.*, although I confess I knew very little of it at the time. So far as I can recall, I don't think many of my Indian friends did either.

But as I travelled around the province, I could not help but notice more of this other world. There were these road signs — like 'Nisga'a Highway turn right', 'Dakelh Keyoh is our homeland', or 'Welcome to Tl'etinqox' — pointing to parts unknown. There were these other museums and historical sites — like Xá:ytem and Xatsu'll — with even more unpronounceable names starting with X. And there were those reserves — hundreds of them, flashing by the car or train window, a kind of subliminal advertising but for what I did not then know. I still had not contemplated the links between what I saw through the window, what the SCC had ruled, or my own experiences in Prince Rupert. I was still stuck, it seemed, on that map — where none of these places could yet be found.

By the mid 1980s, about the time I returned to university, this encounter changed, as it did for other British Columbians, from chance to circumstance. In 1982, Aboriginal rights and title were recognized and affirmed in Section 35 of the *Constitution Act*, and Native issues were being raised more regularly in the mainstream media. In 1985, Native people were blockading logging roads on Meares, and the Queen Charlotte Islands, stopping military convoys at McLeod Lake, and halting my employer's efforts to double-track the Thompson River canyon. Comprehensive claims were being filed and the words 'First Nation' had become part of daily speech. Hitherto, books on Indians had been limited to a handful of academic texts by Euro-Canadian anthropologists, lawyers and historians. Now, though, the shelves were stuffed with academic and coffee-table books on Native art, history, politics and culture, and many were written by Native people. Canadian universities were admitting First Nations students, and a few were establishing faculties of First Nations studies. In 1990, by which time I was considering graduate school, armed Mohawks faced off the Canadian military at Oka and Kanesetahke,
and a new round of blockades of roads, railways and government buildings had put a stranglehold on the provincial business. All that was cartographically solid, it seemed, was starting to melt into the air...

In 1991, the year I entered graduate school, the British Columbia Supreme Court (BCSC) delivered its now (in)famous decision in Delgamuukw v. the Queen. I recall my dismay at what the presiding judge had said about the plaintiffs' cultures from a legal perspective, but it was the way in which he had evaluated cartographic evidence from the visual that really excited my geographic sensibilities, and — with visions of the police forcibly tearing down the blockades at Gitwangak, Toosey, and Mount Currie dancing in my head — I knew I was hooked. An encounter that had started by chance, and then was dictated by circumstance, had now become, for me, by design. That the map of British Columbia had silenced the Native presence on this landscape was no mere accident, a 'cartographer's mistake'; it was part of the machinery by which that landscape had been constructed. By not examining that silence, existing histories of cartography in British Columbia had simply repeated it. And so, over the next four years, I submerged myself in the archives and map vaults of Victoria, Vancouver and Winnipeg and a masters thesis on the means by which Euro-Canadian cartography had serviced, and continues to serve, the imperial and colonial projects in British Columbia eventually emerged.

But hovering in the background, tugging insistently on my own geographical imagination, was a far more intriguing story. Sprinkled throughout the affidavits and transcripts of Delgamuukw were other maps, maps of the plaintiffs, fantastic maps with unfamiliar boundaries, and even more unfamiliar names — hundreds of them (and lots of them starting with X) — the first glimpses of another, far older, but no less gargantuan world. Another geography. Now I wanted to know more about this other geography. More to the point, I wanted to 'see it', but I wanted others to 'see it' too. Too many British Columbians, rejoicing in the Delgamuukw judgment, had thought about this world,
if they had thought about it at all, in the abstract — as if Aboriginal land claims could be somehow disconnected from the land itself. I concluded that it might be possible to gather up some other First Nations' maps, if such maps existed, and make that geography visible. Doing so might not only be a way of reconnecting the claims and the land, but perhaps bring the non-Native and Native worlds in British Columbia into closer alignment.

Looking back, I still wonder about my motives. As a union representative, I had always been interested in issues of social justice, but by the end of the 1980s, a now deregulated railway cutting jobs, victories were few and far between. I had felt for some time that the labour movement had long since capitulated to capital anyway. At the same time, my returning to university was already moving me, intellectually and politically, in a different direction. On the one hand, academic geography had acquainted me with new ways of thinking about, and acting upon, the world. On the other, I came to realize that Native people had not simply been disfranchised by capital to a much greater extent than labour (or any other segment of provincial society) but had also been de-territorialized by it. Their loss had been, in short, every other British Columbian's gain, including my own. And yet geographers, who supposedly have expertise in matters as these, had added almost nothing that helped explain how we arrived at this fork in the road, even less about where we might go from there.

I did, and still do, struggle with the most anxious rhetorical question of our time — by what right or authority can one cultural voice propose to speak for (or map) another? Is this not to reinscribe the same arrogance, to commit the same epistemic violence that brought us to this fork in the road in the first place? Perhaps. We are recent arrivals in this place and if *Delgamuukw* demonstrated anything it was that such a study would necessarily require travelling across a contentious political terrain. Indeed, if there is an academic discipline that has been more thoroughly imbricated in the imperial and colonial imaginations than geography then I don't know what it is. But it also seemed to me
that it would be a far greater violence if those of us who may have something important to say about the most pressing geographical question of our time were to remain silent — and so let colonialism off the hook. The voices speaking against a fair and workable settlement of Native land claims were as loud, and as widespread, as they were a century and a half ago. There needed to be a spirited rejoinder. I also envisioned this dissertation as but the opening salvo in a decidedly geographic reorientation of the 'Indian land question' in British Columbia. While it would obviously advocate a political position, it was not intended as a manifesto. What did matter was the extent to which the work was able to create the space for dialogue, and to speak with and to, rather than for, the other. Finally, preliminary enquiries confirmed that most Native people shared my fascination with maps and felt that my project might provide a service that most of them — already so preoccupied with the day-to-day struggles of decolonization and cultural survival — could not afford to engage on their own. If there were maps out there of a sensitive political nature, then they simply would not be made available.

In the event, I decided that the benefits outweighed the risks, and that one did not need to be Native to reflect Native values. And so, convinced that it was better to act than not, and armed with my quiver of esoteric theoretical arrows, I set out on the road once again. This time, though, I said goodbye to the railway and the union for the last time, left that now useless map of British Columbia at home, and followed those signs pointing to wonders yet unseen. I returned to those museums and historical sites that started with X, and then went on further, to band or tribal council offices and archives ranging from the Kootenays to the Nass River, and from Vancouver Island to the Northern Rockies. I met people living on the remotest of reserves and encountered some of the most beautiful country I had ever seen. I devoured all the ethnographies and ethnohistories I could get my hands on. I travelled through space and back in time, and then, changed, came home again. This dissertation is the record of what I found.
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Introduction

I was wondering how many of your listeners have seen this new map put out by the Indians downtown? Geez, it covers the whole damned province!¹

The Map of British Columbia — by which I mean not any particular map of British Columbia, but the aggregate cartography of all the journals, charts, surveys and maps that have ever been made by Europeans and their descendants in what has become British Columbia — is getting frayed at the edges. This Map has always had a rather tenuous existence. As durable and timeless as it seems to us, it is, for a start, just 'too new'; if it were the foundation of a building — and the metaphor is appropriate — the cement has barely had time to dry. Its 'at-a-glance' authority resides in vision — or more properly in the mechanisms by which it makes British Columbia visible to us — but a vision through rose-coloured glasses. It was first inscribed along the tracks of those who were here before Europeans arrived, and yet it has managed, as the poststructuralist Michel de Certeau would put it, to disentangle itself from those tracks, and eliminate, little by little, through time and across space, almost all the itineraries and practices of imperialism and colonialism that went into its production.² This Map is a simulacrum — a palimpsest of spatial representations and descriptions that, far from being a neutral reflection of some underlying geographical reality, has come to constitute, for non-Natives, geographical reality itself.³ This Map has always been a contingent one, always anticipating, as it must, but never quite achieving, as it cannot, complete visual enclosure over the territory it names. And so British Columbians have always lived "somewhat perched...in a place that is not quite their own."⁴

¹ Unidentified caller to the *Rafe Mair Show*, CKNW radio, Vancouver, September 16 1995; he was referring to the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs (UBCIC) 1993 *Map showing Sovereign Indigenous Nations Territorial Boundaries* (Map 36 in this study).
³ For Ecclesiastes, the simulacrum was "never that which conceals the truth [but the] truth which conceals that there is none" (cited in Jean Baudrillard, *Simulations* [New York: Semiotext(e), 1983], 1). This does not mean, though (as Baudrillard implies), that there is nothing outside the simulacrum; some things, as I hope to show, are 'more true' than others.
It is only in our own time, the last couple of generations at most, that this Map is being 'dis-simulated', peeled away from the territory, so to speak, by other maps — de-colonizing maps, the maps of the First Nations of British Columbia. Like some strange cartographic solvent dissolving the glue of a grand terrestrial decal these maps implode the simulacrum at its seams, shattering our rose-coloured glasses, causing the ground to move, literally and figuratively, beneath our feet. They are even newer than the Map of British Columbia, but the geographies they reference are far older than we can scarcely fathom. Here are but three of them — the Gitxsan Hereditary Chiefs (GHC) 1998; the Carrier Sekani Tribal Council's (CSTC) 1996; and the Stó:lō Nation’s 1996 Statement(s) of Intent (Maps 1 to 3) to the British Columbia Treaty Commission (BCTC). From our vantage point of course they are not Gitxsan, Carrier Sekani or Stó:lō maps at all. They did not make them and they are only three of forty eight others quite like them (one for each First Nation now sitting at the BCTC table). Their base map is the Map of British Columbia, and they conceal from us all the traces and practices of anti-imperialism, decolonization, and cultural (re)construction that generated them. And yet, from another vantage point, they are, or rather have become, the Gitxsan, Carrier Sekani, and Stó:lō maps, the Gitxsan, Carrier Sekani and Stó:lō territories — the aggregate cartography of all the stories that have ever been related by the Gitxsan, Carrier Sekani and Stó:lō peoples. What follows is one geographer's account — a traveller's tale perhaps — of some of those stories, both on and off the Map.

A short history of the Map of British Columbia

My motivation is that the comprehensive (hi)story of Aboriginal cartography in British Columbia — if this be the right way to describe it — has scarcely to be broached at all. This is a striking omission in a province where contemporary land claims are arguably the pre-eminent social, political and justiciable question of our time. Indeed, land
Map 1
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs' *Statement of Intent for the Gitxsan Hereditary Chiefs*, Victoria, 1996, 21 x 28 cm; coloured lithograph map delineating extent of Gitxsan territorial claim to the BCTC (copied from original at Gitxsan Treaty Office, Hazelton).
Map 2
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs' *Statement of Intent for the Carrier Sekani Tribal Council*, Victoria 1998, 21 x 28 cm; coloured lithograph map delineating extent of Carrier Sekani Tribal Council (CSTC) territorial claim to the BCTC (copied from original at CSTC, Prince George).
Map 3
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs' *Statement of Intent for the Sto:lo Nation*, Victoria 1996, 21 x 28 cm; coloured lithograph map delineating extent of Stó:lō territorial claim to the BCTC (copied from original at Stó:lō Nation Aboriginal Rights and Title Department, Sardis).
The lines on this map represent the approximate boundaries of traditional territories described in the First Nations Statements of Intent to negotiate treaties which have been submitted to, and accepted by, the B.C. Treaty Commission. They are illustrative only.

Publication of this map does not imply that First Nations, the Province of British Columbia or the Government of Canada have agreed to the boundaries shown.
claims are, as the cultural critic Edward Said puts it, about the struggle over "overlapping and intertwined territories and discrepant histories" — a struggle that appears irresolvable without recourse to maps. The problem is not a paucity of First Nations' maps. During the early contact process in British Columbia, Native people used them to facilitate dialogue with explorers and fur traders. Later, they were used in the context of political resistance to colonization. Today, they are used extensively in court, at the treaty table, and in support of issue-specific claims. Some are found in Native and non-Native schools, museums and cultural centers, while others are scattered through books on Native culture. A few are sold to the public. The problem is that an immigrant society has had no compelling reason to seek them out.

It's pointless to assign blame for this. Most non-Native British Columbians have lived and still do live the 'frontier myth' — a foundational historical tradition that relies on abstract symbols, imperial rhetoric and pioneer narrative to sustain a romanticized, Eurocentric view of the past, silencing alternative histories, and alternate ways of doing history at the same time. This is History as Hubert Bancroft first wrote it — a packaged history in which historical change is mainly the result of Euro-Canadian initiatives and agency, and in which Native people have been mere foils. It abides in our museums; our legal and justice systems; our explorers' journals; our ethnographies and anthropologies; and in those thoroughly imperialist texts that still stock the shelves of many elementary or high school libraries. There is a discrepant historical tradition going back to at least Lewis Saum and Robin Fisher, and, more recently, an emergent First Nations'

---

5 In Culture and Imperialism (New York: Vintage, 1993), 78.
6 See the discussion by Elizabeth Fumiss, 'Pioneers, progress and the myth of the frontier: the landscape of public history in rural British Columbia', BC Studies 115/116, 1997/98, 7-44.
8 These are The Fur Trader and the Indian (Seattle: University of Washington, 1965) and Contact and Conflict (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1978) respectively.
autohistorical literature also. But much of it has not been read by the non-Native public, and there is no comparable discrepant geographical analysis to go along with it.

Indeed, the frontier myth is even more pervasive in space than it is in time. I have argued elsewhere that in British Columbia, Euro-Canadian mapmaking helped to delineate, organize, and then sanctify the geographies of empire and colonialism. It did so not by simply effacing alternative geographies. It did so by constructing networks: systems of territorial surveillance constituted by 'lines of sight' that reached across vast distances, flattening space, compartmentalizing it, renaming it and assimilating these alternatives into the geometry of the Cartesian grid. These are the lines of sight of what the cultural historian Simon Ryan has called the cartographic eye/I, a detached orthogonal perspective that views space as a plan, as a tabula rasa. The cartographic eye/I does not so much eliminate spatial heterogeneity; as the philosopher Henri Lefebvre has noted, alternative cultural spaces do survive in the interstices of the grid. What it does is render heterogeneity transparent by overlooking it. Thirty-five years ago, the historical cartographer Albert Farley was of the opinion that the geographical construction of the Map of British Columbia reflected nothing more than a self-evident transition from "unknown Indian territory to a province with precisely surveyed boundaries, accurately measured altitudes and carefully mapped planimetry." This optic — the spatial corollary of Bancroftian History — prevails today. Most not-Native British Columbians still

---

9 George Sioui (in For An Amerindian Autohistory [Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992]) defines autohistory as history "written in accordance with Amerindian values" (x). He does not, however, rule out the possibility that such history may be written by non-Natives.


see British Columbia either from ground zero, as a surveyor might — which means about as far as the horizon allows — or from an infinite distance, as an aerial photographer might — in which case there is no horizon to speak of. Rarely do they perceive the provincial landscape from somewhere in between. Non-Native British Columbians are not "geographically ignorant." They are too much prisoners of the plan view of space to be able to conceive of a world that exists outside of it. But if the mechanisms of the myth are different, the effect is the same — Euro-British Columbian cartography has vanquished Native geographical reality just as surely as Paul Kane's art suggested that Native people were a vanishing race or Duncan Campbell Scott's poetry romanticized the 'imaginary Indian'. The simulacrum is the frontier myth — spatialized.

The result is that while there appears to be broad public support for the settlement of land claims in the abstract, this support is soft. In liberal democratic societies it tends to be based on a collective sense of guilt, on a grudging acknowledgement that an immigrant society has done wrong by Native people. It is not based on the understanding that land claims are about territory and resources — the two items without which no culture can survive. Because framed in the malleable language of rights discourse, support can deteriorate rapidly, especially in wake of highly mediated events like Oka or Gustafsen Lake. So while there is a general consensus that existing treaties should be honoured, there is far less confidence that comprehensive claims are the solution to the social, po-litical or economic marginalization of Native people in untreatied territory. The intense debate that surrounded the 1999 Nisga’a Treaty— in my view, a most moderate agreement — confirms that the constitutional recognition of Aboriginal title

---

14 Keith Tinkler accuses all Canadians of this (in 'Drawing earth: Or representing region Niagara' in Phillip Simpson-Housley [ed], A Few Acres of Snow [Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1992]), 202-16, quote is 207.

15 From the title to Daniel Francis, The Imaginary Indian (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1992), 59.

or rights is one thing. It's entirely another, however, to put it into spatial practice. Now Maps 1, 2 and 3 may be extreme examples; few Native territorial statements are quite so visceral, or leave as much unsaid as these do. But for most non-Native British Columbians they remain the only Native maps they have ever seen. And so the immediate reaction to them is at best surprise, at worst complete disbelief. Oozing across the image field like giant uni-cellular organisms they seem foreign, invasive. There seems to be no recognizable territory to which they refer and no mutually agreed-upon boundaries where some kind of cross-cultural dialogue, some common territorial reference, can be established. And when all 51 are mapped on the same page, as they are on the BCTC's 1994 composite (Map 4), things are still more confusing.

Looking at First Nations maps

What follows, then, is my contribution to the process of changing the public geography of British Columbia. It is intended as a contribution to the de-colonization of geographic thought. If it is true that Euro-Canadian cartography was one of the means by which an immigrant society was able to materially and conceptually grab hold of territories that did not belong to it, then First Nations' cartography may be a way for Native people to get some of those territories back. This, though, is easier said than done, because cartography alone is not enough.

Before contact, Native people in British Columbia did not, so far as we know, make maps (as we normally define the term). They did not need to. They have become map-makers because they have had to — because maps have proved to be one of the more effective means of showing that they have lived, worked, and played where they are, for a very long time indeed. As to how they organized space, I need only suggest here

---

Map 4
G.M. Johnson and Associates Ltd.'s *Traditional Territories of British Columbia First Nations*, Vancouver, 1994, 21 x 28 cm; coloured lithograph map showing external boundaries of all territorial claims submitted to the BCTC as of 1994. As noted bottom left some of them were filed with written 'metes and bounds' descriptions only. While eight more claims were filed after 1994, First Nations already signed on had become increasingly exasperated at trying to explain to a non-Native public why their boundaries overlapped, and, on their request, no more editions were printed. The map also shows that there are some First Nations who had not submitted claims to the BCTC. I will come back to this point in Chapter 1 (copied from original at BCTC Vancouver).
that it was not, or at best only partially, through visual means. They had graphic arts, like pictography, crests or totem poles, but most geographical information was recorded and transmitted orally in story and song, and performatively in ceremony and in the course of the daily rounds. This means that for contemporary First Nations, western cartography must be, by definition, a reductive activity. There is inevitably this 'loss of signal' as geographical information, sourced and organized through multiple senses in a multi-dimensional world is collapsed onto the two-dimensional surface. For non-Native British Columbians, however, understanding First Nations' maps must be augmentative because it requires that this world be reconstructed. But these two operations are not mirror images of each other. The problem is not only that the instructions for a reconstruction are missing, but that even if they are not, there is little pressure on colonial institutions or people to read them. The BCSC's nearly categorical rejection of the cartographies presented by the plaintiffs in Delgamuukw — yes, they're nice looking maps, but so what? — is evidence.  

That said, no one presumably makes any map that they do not believe represents, in whole or in part, some underlying geographic reality, and there is a difference between the representation that is the map, and what it contains. As the ethnohistorian Benjamin Orlove says, there is a difference between the analysis of form — how one draws or makes maps — and the analysis of practice — how one draws on or uses them. The first deals with the map itself, the second with the viewers and their culturally specific ways of 'looking at' maps. First Nations' maps are thus invested with dual visual readings, one driven by the seeing of them, the other by the images proper. First Nations' maps do not translate themselves — they are already translations of something else — but the clues for their evaluation and interpretation are already contained within them.  

18 I have discussed this at length in my Euro-Canadian Cartography, op. cit.  
By First Nations' cartography I do not then mean maps that are of purely autochthonous derivation, or that they are 'authentic' forms of geographical imaging. Maps 1 to 4 are proof enough of that. I mean, rather, that they are representations in part complicit with the representational apparatus of the Map of British Columbia. They are not maps that show the territories of the colonized as the colonized would perceive them — even though they often come to be used for this purpose. They are maps that show First Nations' territories in the form that the colonized expects they may be seen and understood by an immigrant society. First Nations maps are maps of what the postcolonial theorist Mary Louise Pratt has called the 'contact zone', a place where two or more territories, and two or more ways of organizing and managing those territories, overlap.20

This also means, of course, that we will have to redefine what we mean by 'the map' altogether and as the geographer Derek Gregory has suggested, "envisage other more open forms of cartographic discourse."21 We will need to agree that anything that territorializes serves a map-like function, and that the map is only a specific, and sometimes unnecessary, choice within a range of possibilities that achieve this aim. Put alternatively, what qualifies as a map depends on the media or means any given culture uses to territorialize itself. This means that any comprehensive (hi)story of Aboriginal cartography in British Columbia has to contain both graphic and oral components, and include some kind of primer or legend that allows readers to navigate between them.

Where the (hi)story of Native cartography has been

In my view, these demands make most of the models in the existing ethnohistorical, ethnogeographical or cartographic history literature unsatisfactory. As a rule, this literature either appears in the guise of the historical atlas — the constituent plates of which

are typically Native maps that have survived the dislocations of contact and are collected from geographically scattered archives or museums — or it focuses on specific mapping projects — either case studies of post-contact Native maps or some sort of contemporary land use and occupancy study (LUOS) conducted jointly by a Native group and one or more non-Native professional or academic institutions (like a geographical information systems [GIS] consultant or a university). In the former there is too much context; in the latter there isn't enough.

By their very nature, historical atlases tend to be heavy on text, taking viewers away from the maps. Indeed, the context for most such atlases comes from the editor, not the raw cultural materials in which indigenous maps are partially situated. As the cultural critic José Rabasa points out, they become 'tissues of fiction', in which "global histories and geographies regardless of the introduction of other regions into the world...always retain a Eurocentric perspective." The result as the geographer Denis Wood alerts, is "a lively polemic about a self-perpetuating system of states," that so often runs dangerously close to what Harris calls the national or international 'morality play'. In short, historical atlases ostensibly intended as vehicles for hemispheric surveys of indigenous cartographies tend to work like conventional atlases, the quintessential expressions of what the geographer James Blaut calls the 'colonizer's model of the world'.

Some case studies focussing on one or two Native maps are situated in pre-contact cultural material. Those that work with immediate post-contact maps often show how

---


24 In 'Pleasure in the idea/the atlas as narrative form' Cartographica 24(1), 22-45, quote is 35.

25 In 'Maps as morality play' in Joan Winearls (ed) Editing Early and Historical Atlases (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 163-80.

oral societies moved to graphic forms of representation but they rarely extend this into the modern era. There are a few more comprehensive studies examining specific elements of indigenous wayfinding systems, but they do not deal with cartography at all. Those concentrating on contemporary mapping projects show how they are mobilized as acts of resistance to neo-colonial authority, but they are generally not linked to more traditional forms of geographical representation. In most instances, moreover, colonization simultaneously compromised many distinct indigenous groups within a colonized territory. The result is that an uninitiated reader is left without a clear sense of how two or more autonomous Native groups might have territorialized themselves with respect to each other. Overall, there has been a tendency to privilege maps produced during, or soon after, contact — as if they somehow bring one closer to a 'more pure' Native geographic reality — and to disregard maps made with contemporary cartographic


technologies — as though they are 'too scientific' to be of more than utilitarian interest. Intellectually, the result is to enforce an arbitrary binarism between the traditional map on the one side, and the modern map on the other, and so let the imperial imagination sneak back in through the rear door. The consequence is that Native maps have rarely been squarely situated in public policy debates in liberal democratic societies constituted, in the main, on the avails of the colonial intervention, and now find themselves trying to reconcile the aspirations of multiple decolonizing projects.

Where, in British Columbia, it must go

This is, admittedly, a young literature, as literatures go. It reaches to all corners of the compass. It is fragmented across a wide disciplinary spectrum and so lacks a consistent theoretical framework. While there are exceptions most of it is exploratory or plainly procedural in nature. Almost none of it deals with First Nations in British Columbia.\(^{30}\) I do not want to dismiss this literature out of court; it is the launchpad for everything that follows in this study and I have learned much from it. If I focus on a large cross-section of Native maps collected from many different First Nations in British Columbia, I privilege an understanding of how they were (and are) arranged in space with respect to each other. By allowing me to display a greater variety of maps I may be able to show how Native territories cover(ed) 'the whole damned province'. Such an approach would not, however, provide much insight into how pre-contact indigenous territorialities differed, and thus leave the question of overlap raised by Map 4 without a satisfactory explanation.\(^{31}\) It would also require the study to display one or two maps

---

\(^{30}\) The exceptions are Brody, H. Maps, op. cit., Sterritt, N. et al. Tribal Boundaries, op. cit., and Sparke, M. 'The map that roared', op. cit. First Nations' cartography is not, however, the focus of Sterritt et al.'s study, and Sparke's uses but two maps from one First Nation (one of which is Map 53 in this study) to make a theoretical argument. Brody's does address both oral and graphic maps (two of which are Map 17 in this study), and to this extent probably comes closest to what I have in mind. Again, however, it deals with only one First Nation, and is now somewhat dated.

\(^{31}\) This has been one of the most contentious, and misunderstood, points of the entire land claims process. By the end of this study I hope to have sent this bogeyman back to where it belongs.
from every First Nation in the province, which might not be possible. More seriously, it would not require the reader to extricate him or herself from the orthogonal grid, and I would end up with, at best, the type of historical atlas that I criticized above, or worse, a thoroughly decontextualized 'book of maps'.

If I focus on a more limited set of maps made by a select few First Nations, by contrast, I open up enough space to more thoroughly engage pre-contact systems of territorial organization and representation that did not rely on maps. By gaining a greater understanding of the differences between, and across Native territories, such an approach would allow me to explain the source of overlap. The tradeoff is that I lose sight of the wider geography of claims in British Columbia, and have to get by with a narrower collection of maps. In the former option, my points of entry would be through what Lefebvre calls the representation of space, the abstract, uniform space of plan and map. In the latter it would be through what Lefebvre calls representational spaces, the concrete spaces of practice and lived experience.

In my view, however, any comprehensive analysis of First Nations' cartography in British Columbia has to do both and then some. First, it must show something of the great diversity of Native maps made at different times, in different places, and by different Native groups. It could not be a historical atlas, much less a book of maps. But I wanted a visual study, and it would likely have to have at least the look or feel of an atlas or book of maps, but without the imperial baggage that either implies.

Second, it needs to work with these maps to show that the way in which an immigrant society understands them depends entirely on the perspective through which they are interpreted and evaluated. Perspective is one of the two key concepts in this study.

---

32 The difference between the 'book of maps' and the atlas has been discussed by James Akerman, in 'From books with maps to books as maps: the editor in the creation of the atlas idea' in Winearls, J. (ed) Editing Early, op. cit., 3-48.

33 This is a key conceptual construct for Lefebvre's history of space (see, in this connection, the Introduction to The Production, op. cit.)
It is also one of the more ambiguous terms in the English language, and my use of it needs to be particularly clear. On the one hand, there is the 'mathematical concept' of perspective where it refers to any of several techniques for representing three-dimensional objects or depth relationships, as perceived by binocular vision, on a two-dimensional surface. On the other, there is the 'cultural concept' in which it serves as a metaphor for the general relationship of aspects of phenomena in a milieu to each other, and may or may not be visual. In the former, it is so particular that it excludes anything that is not describable in optical terms (such as by lines, points or visual rays), and so borders on the meaningless. In the latter, it is so general that it means almost anything. In this study, however, I will understand perspective as occupying the one place where these two definitions intersect. I use it to refer to the relationship between subject and object that is arranged by sensing — the way in which corporeal bodies use one or more of the six senses to position themselves in a milieu. It shall refer to an orientation towards, or particular stance in the world having subjective and objective components. This orientation can be mainly visual, but it can also be dialogical, sonorous, olfactory, tactile, or intuitive. It might be a combination of some or all of them. The whole debate surrounding the relationship, if any, between maps and the mathematical or cultural concept of perspective is, then, besides the point. Let us accept here and now that maps are sensed and interpreted through visualization. The important point is that it is still possible to make maps whose contents are sourced in a different perspective — that is, to make maps that come out of an orientation towards, or a stance in the milieu that is not, or is only partially, constituted by vision.


Third, it has to use this analysis of perspective to show that the *spatial typologies* abstracted by these maps are as different from each other as they are, collectively, from that represented on the Map of British Columbia. By spatial typology, I mean the concrete configuration of places, ways and boundaries in a given territory. It is what a specific kind of territorialization produces. The space of the cartographic eye/I is one such spatial typology, but there are many others. Clearly, not all First Nations in British Columbia deployed narratives, poles, songs or pictography in the same combinations, and in some groups, one or more of these elements may be missing altogether. They are also inserted in linguistic and physiographic contexts that vary widely. I cannot begin to investigate all of them — there are too many in this place — but I can unpack some and certainly enough to bring the question of overlap into clear view.

Fourth, and finally, such understanding of how different forms of territorialization create different spatial typologies must then be used to demonstrate *continuity*, the most important concept in this study. By continuity I do not mean that territories now being mapped by First Nations in British Columbia are geographically 'the same' as the territories that existed at some distant time in a pre-contact past — before British Columbia was, in effect, brought into existence by the Map. They are not. The dislocations of contact — the fur posts and the land-based fur trade; the re-arrangement (or even elimination) of indigenous borders; the reserve system and registered traplines; and the legal apparatus of the *Indian Act* — have ensured otherwise. Nor do I mean the way in which pre-contact territories were exploited to provide the necessities of life are 'the same' as those used in the post-contact period. They are not, for similar reasons. To a point, in fact, it does not matter just where those territories were or exactly how they were used. What is meant by continuity, rather, is that there is a substantial degree of consistency or fluidity between older (or 'traditional') and newer (or 'modern') forms of geographical self-identification and representation. Not only do elements and traces of old forms persist within the new but forms within the new have always existed as unexploited po-
tentialities within the old. Ownership, jurisdiction, and sovereignty: these are not abstractions that fill in some pre-determined space. They are the exertions that turn space into territory in the first place. As territories change in a material way, the representational machinery has to change with them. Conversely, if the representational machinery changes, so also are the territories effectively reconfigured. But the essential unity between a territory and the perspective through which it is defined, delimited and controlled persists. To assume otherwise is not to minimize the consequences of an encounter in which the colonizer held the balance of power. It is to deny that there ever was one.

If we accept that British Columbia is a contact zone, and that maps are ultimately defined less by what 'they are' than by what 'they do', then it follows that trying to delineate the line between the map and the non-map is a wasted exercise. The leap from oral and performative, to graphic or static forms of territorial representation is, while conceptually huge, technically small — something First Nations have understood far more readily than most non-Native British Columbians. We can delineate with some precision, however, specific historical junctures that motivate the choices First Nations make (or their ancestors made) with respect to their transition from the one to the other. We can isolate, in other words, the contact events that introduce, or dispense with the need for maps. It is from this view then, that I attach no theoretical weight to the terms 'first' and 'First National' space. While I will defend the claim that there is only one First National space in British Columbia — Map 4 or some derivative thereof — there are many first spaces — Maps 1, 2 or 3 being abstractions of three of them. I will use these terms heuristically, however — that is, as a kind of 'shorthand' that maintains a conceptual distance between 'original mappings' (in first space) and 'Aboriginal remappings' (in First National) but without losing sight of the fact that the two are intimately interconnected.

Structure and method

This brings me to the structure and method of this study. They are based on the assumption that for First Nations in the contact zone it is less important to show how they share a contiguous space across all British Columbia than to show how continuity has persisted within the discontinuities occasioned by contact and colonization. Put alternatively, it is less important to show the great variety of spatial typologies proper than how different representational strategies 'hang onto' them. The problem is that I have no unmediated access to a pre-contact past in British Columbia. Because there were no written records or maps, there are no privileged historical or geographical reference points for baselining continuity. But continuity can be traced backwards as well as forwards, and I do have this collection of post-contact maps, the contents of which chart an itinerary across space, back in time, and into a pre-contact world. The solution, then, is to use the former option to preface the latter. By focusing on a handful of cartographic case studies with both graphic and oral elements I can demonstrate continuity and I can show how indigenous spatial typologies in British Columbia were different. But by also including a selection of First Nations' maps in an introductory capacity I can show, as clearly and unequivocally as possible, that the way in which one interprets or evaluates First Nations' maps ultimately depends not on what they contain. It depends, instead, on the perspective through which interpretation and evaluation is effected.

The choice of which First Nations cartographies to emphasize, however, was influenced by the context in which I was operating and by the research methodology itself. As noted in the Preface the main contextual consideration was political. Because they penetrate more directly into genealogies, sacred sites and increasingly scarce resource gathering areas, First Nations' maps tend to be more intimate, and consequently more private than Euro-Canadian. Indeed, modern traditional use studies (TUS) are among the most carefully guarded of all Native cultural property because they provide access to
arguably the last archives of traditional knowledge that have not already been picked over by non-Natives. First Nations are wary of supplying maps which they fear may be used for ulterior purposes, and there are often serious political and territorial differences between (and sometimes within) Aboriginal communities. Map 4, which raises the bogeyman of overlap, is a case in point. This meant that I would likely have to work the majority of the study around cartographies that were, in good measure, already in the public domain, or at least circulating around its edges.

As to the question of my research method, the trite answer is that there really wasn't one. I knew it would be of the 'hunt-and-peck' variety, and involve some sort of interpretive program once I had the maps in hand, but beyond that I really had little idea of where I was going. I began by outlining to as many bands, tribal councils, or umbrella Native political organizations as possible a brief biography of who I was, how I first got interested in such a project, and why I thought it was important for First Nations to participate. Most responded right away. In some cases, I was invited up to the territory to give a presentation to the tribal council or band (with approval given or denied at some later date); in others I was just handed the maps that (they imagined) I was looking for. Many liked the concept, and liked to talk about their maps, but were reluctant to participate. A few wanted nothing to do with it and plainly, but politely, said so.

In the field, I spoke to band chiefs, treaty negotiators, and band or tribal council cartographers or GIS technicians. I tried to follow protocol even though it often was not at all clear what that protocol was. Decision making authority usually rested in the individual bands, but finding the right people to talk to was often difficult. I spoke to few elders, and then only on their own invitation. Elders are the repositories — the 'memory banks' perhaps — of traditional knowledge, but I respected the wishes of band administrations, many of whom discourage outside researchers soliciting elders directly.  

37 This is a problem especially germane to contemporary research. Prior to that, and especially up until 1951 (when the law prohibiting claims related activity was removed), most Native people freely told their stories to non-Native researchers because it was just about the only way they could get their voice heard.
Regardless, at no time did I use a formal interview process (either taped or questionnaire). Native discourse is based on consensus and dialogue, and is distrustful of an interview process based on hierarchy, structure and written authority. In all instances I committed our conversations approximately to memory and then later wrote down my impressions of them. The only direct quotes from Native people in this thesis are those that I excerpted from academic or Native publications, or band or tribal council newspapers or newsletters. Always, I relied on my intuition, my instincts, and a general feeling for the situation at hand. I was more interested in how Native people perceived, or collectively thought about, their maps than I was in how they went about making them.

I spent very little time in the field — primarily because time was the luxury I did not have, but also because time itself marches to different drummers in Native and non-Native societies.\(^{38}\) Still, there is a sense in which the maps themselves were 'my field' — even when I could not always be out 'in it', I could yet 'bring it home' with me. While I learned a fair number of words, a few phrases, and some of the linguistic categories, I made no attempt at mastering any indigenous language. I agree that language is a primary vehicle of cross-cultural understanding, and that one cannot fully grasp the mentalities of cultures or cultural behaviour without it.\(^{39}\) It's not just that the inflections and nuances of linguistic delivery are different, but that "different languages have different worlds [and that] what constitutes the objective world... is largely the result of the way language renders things material and valid."\(^{40}\) Indeed, words that we take for granted (like 'map', 'landscape', 'ownership', or 'sovereignty') and for which there is little amb-

---

38 Mostly, it was the logistics of researching in rural British Columbia while studying in Vancouver. As to how time was (or is) experienced by Native people, I will leave aside until Chapter 3.

39 This point has been made by, among others, Robert Levine, in 'Native languages and culture' in his and William Langlois, Janet Cauthers, and Derek Reimer (eds), *Sound Heritage* 4(3/4) (Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum, 1976), 1-5; and Bruce Trigger, in 'The historian's Indian: Native Americans in Canadian historical writing from Charlevoix to the present' in Fisher, R. and Kenneth Coates (eds), *Out of the Background* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1988), 19-43.

guity as to their common meaning have, so far as I know, few equivalents in any Abor­
ginal language (in British Columbia). Likewise, many indigenous words, phrases and
linguistic categories have no direct translation or applicability in English. On the other
hand, this was never a linguistic study, and cartographic studies, it seems to me, are of a
rather different order than linguistic.41

Finally, there was the question of sources. Obviously, the maps themselves, supple­
mented by my field reconnaissances, were the most important, but it was clear I would
have to grapple directly with the ethnohistorical record, the quality of which varies.42
Along with their usual preoccupation with modes of social or material reproduction, an­
thropologists and ethnographers recorded myths, stories, and songs, and some of them
clearly tried to preserve the inflections that would have accompanied the oral delivery.
Others, however, did not and while it seems clear that many narratives were specific to
who told them, and where, many did not identify the informant, where they were recor­
ded, or record the spatial references in them. Beyond that, they were all motivated by
'salvage ethnography'. Most thought it was possible to extrapolate a more pure indige­
nous reality by working back from contemporary contact conditions.43 They eschewed
anything that smacked of technological sophistication since doing otherwise would
break down the boundaries between 'the modern' and 'the traditional', and so run coun­
ter to the culture of the museum in which they operated.44 The art historian, Ruth Phil­

41 The degree to which maps and language may or may not be considered analogous to one another has
been a matter of some debate. See, for example, Michael Blakemore and Harley, J.B., 'Concepts in the
history of cartography' Cartographica 17(4), 1980; Arthur Robinson and Barbara Petchenik, The Nature
of Maps (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 43; and Denis Wood, The Power of Maps (New
York: Guilford Press, 1992), 122-3. My own view is that they are not.
42 See Ralph Maud, A Guide to British Columbia Indian Myths and Legends (Vancouver: Talonbooks,
1982). With one or two exceptions, I am in general agreement with Maud's assessment.
43 There is a wide literature on this. Two accessible hemispheric studies are James Clifford, Predica­
ment of Culture (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988); and, with George Marcus (eds), Writing
Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986). For a
critique of ethnographic writing in British Columbia, see Charlotte Townsend-Gault, 'Kinds of knowing',
in her, with Diana Nemiroff and Robert Houle (eds), Land, Spirit, Power (Ottawa: National Gallery of
Canada, 1992), 75-102.
44 The technologist bias was a central theme of colonial discourse more generally. See, especially,
Michael Adas, Machines as the Measure of Men (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989). For the cul­
lips, has made this point with respect to articles produced for sale in the contact economy, but it may also have extended to maps. We might never know if the ethnographers' Native informants made their own maps to animate their interview process, or, if they did, what happened to them.

The thornier challenge is what to do with maps made by the ethnographers themselves. Most drew their own maps of Native territories and a few located some villages, trails, sacred sites and the like, but the majority were generalized outline maps of tribal boundaries determined according to an ethnographic classificatory logic. They may or may not have reflected indigenous realities, and were deployed largely as introductions to, or as reference grids for, the written texts. Indeed, for many ethnographers, geography seems not to have generated much interest at all. That said, this record is better than no record at all, and a lot of it is now being used in support of specific and comprehensive claims, and to background contemporary autohistorical writing.

This raises, however, the parallel question of authorship. There are maps in this study that, while clearly trying to reflect indigenous values, were produced in collaboration with ethnographers or anthropologists (or those who imagined themselves as such) or were parachuted, in part, out of information recorded by them. This clearly has a direct bearing on the degree of authenticity that one might ascribe to any given map. In

---


47 Two exceptions are George Dawson, *Notes and Observations on the Qwakiul People of the Northern Part of Vancouver Island and Adjacent Coasts* (Fairfield: Ye Galleon Press, 1887); and Franz Boas's gazetteer of Kwak'waka'wakw toponyms and outline maps in *Geographical Names of the Kwakiutl Indians* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934). Dawson's had one map, but with extensive textual support. Boas's consisted of 22 fold-out plates, four of which are detailed maps of fishing grounds, gardens, villages, and other sites on Hope Island and at the head of Knight Inlet (Map 8 in this study). The other 18 are sections of the larger territory with mapped sites keyed numerically to toponyms listed in a separate index.
some respects it is similar to a debate that surrounds the determination of the authenticity of Native art. My own view is that the authenticity of a Native map cannot automatically be ascribed to the ethnic purity of the cartographer. Rather, it should be the overall quality of the map — that is the 'Indianness' that is embodied in it — and its traditionality — that is the degree of 'otherness' — that determine the authenticity of a given Native map.\(^48\) In the event, my engagement with the ethnographic and ethnohistorical records (textual or graphic) is based partly on its overall consistency, partly on what others have written about it, and partly on instinct. Mostly, though, it is based on what Native people have themselves told me about it. If they seemed generally favourable to it, I used it liberally; if they did not, I dealt with it cautiously or not at all.

In the end, then, my method was really a hodgepodge of archival, participant-observation, and unstructured interview techniques. I chose the Gitxsan, Carrier Sekani, and Stö:lo for four reasons: a) because I wanted to sample at least three of the four major linguistic groupings in the province, and so preserve some sense of the geographical and cultural diversity of First Nations before, during and after contact; b) because there was, for the most part, a substantial, if sometimes suspect, ethnographic record; c) because they did not immediately raise (or only incidentally raised) the issue of overlap; and d) because there were, in each case, a considerable number of maps already in circulation, and two of them had already published many of them in an atlas format.\(^49\) What I have, then, amounts to three 'historical atlases' — consisting of cartographic and non-cartographic components — prefaced by a 'book of maps' — consisting of only the cartographic. Maps 1, 2 and 3, and all the stories that have ever been told about them are the end (and substance) of this dissertation, but it is a collection of maps produced

---

\(^{48}\) See, again, Phillips, R. 'Why not tourist art?', op. cit.

\(^{49}\) This needs clarification. When I started this study, there were only two — one by the Gitxsan and one by the Nisga'a. The first, to which I shall return in detail in Chapter 4, was part of the cartographic evidence adduced in *Delgamuukw*. The second has not been made public. During this study, the Stö:lo produced a third, and some of it is reproduced in Chapter 6.
by other First Na-tions in the province that provide its beginning. Perhaps we can have our cake and eat it. I will start and finish on the familiar ground of the orthogonal grid, but the journey from one end to the other will take us about as far off that grid as we could possibly im-age. The plan of the work unfolds as follows.

**Map of the study**

The study is broken into two parts, three chapters each. In Chapter 1, I start where we already are — on the Map of British Columbia. Beginning with the first recorded instances of Native maps during the age of discovery and exploration, and through to the profusion of Native maps associated with the emergence of the modern land claims movement, I arrange them in chronological order. They are presented in gallery format and with minimal text. The Chapter thus presupposes a working familiarity with the important historical junctures in the evolution of the Indian land question in British Columbia. Even so, my concern here is less with the context of these maps' production than with what they show (or don't show) us, and accessible references for background reading are supplied in the footnotes. At any rate I advance a preliminary interpretation of these maps through the perspective of the orthogonal grid. I then use this interpretation to think about the limits to understanding implied by such a perspective, and to orient my investigation of pre-contact forms of territorial representation and organization in Chapter 2.

Having concluded that the most important geographical information in Native societies is transmitted orally, Chapter 2 opens with a selection of narratives that explain how Native groups in British Columbia came to occupy, and then maintain jurisdiction over their traditional territories. By deliberately choosing examples that relate to the maps in Chapter 1, I can begin to bring this question of continuity into clearer view. I then consider a wide variety of other territorializing devices. These include song, verse, and es-
pecially place names in the oral register; and 'picture writing', crests and totem poles in the graphic. I also consider the importance of trails, architecture and features in the natural landscape. By choosing examples that relate to the narratives previously excerpted I can then begin to appreciate how and why different Native groups constructed different spatial typologies. A consideration of boundaries leads me to some claims respecting the general character of territoriality in first space.

If this study were likened to a folding frame holding two pictures, then Chapter 3 is the hinge between them. In this section I briefly consider some of the existing ways in which various commentators have tried to classify Native maps. I suggest instead that it is best to consider indigenous forms of geographical self-identification and representation as mappings having cognitive, corporeal, graphic, and spoken elements. I then compare and contrast mappings in first space with Native maps in First National according to three criteria: territoriality, temporality, and knowledge. Initially, I do so from the perspective of the orthogonal grid, confirming the limits to understanding that this perspective implies. I then offer a simple theoretical framework that will ask, and then allow readers to interpret and evaluate First Nations' maps through a different perspective — as perceived, understood and mobilized by Native people. This allows me to expand on the modern definition of cartography to include means of territorialization in multi-cultural societies that go well beyond maps proper.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 make up Part II and constitute the core of the study. Having established with a reasonable degree of certainty the appropriate reference points for the construction of a historical atlas containing both cartographic and non-cartographic elements, I show how the Gitxsan, the Carrier-Sekani, and the Stó:lō have maintained continuity in British Columbia. In each chapter, I begin with narratives that explain their origins, the ancillary devices that they have used to sustain jurisdiction over their territories, and the various spatial typologies associated with them. I then turn to a discussion of the contact process and how its dislocations and disruptions differentially affec-
ted the geographies of each. In each, I pay special attention to the reserve system. Re­serve allocation was sometimes a protracted, and when described narratively occasion­ally tedious process. But it is the main reason why contemporary First Nations' political geographies often seem discontinuous with those that existed before contact. Categori­zed according to the same historical junctures as sketched out in Chapter 1, the balance of each chapter deals with post-contact cartography. The key difference is that I do so not from the perspective of the cartographic eye/I, but through that suggested at the end of Chapter 3.

Overall, the reader will note that each of the case studies in Part II is entered, so to speak, through different doors. For the Gitxsan it is the land tenure system, for the Car­rier Sekani the language, and for the Stó:lô the spiritual landscape. While I would still argue that there is, outside of the narrative format in the broad sense, no privileged fixed point of entry in first space, my choices were not arbitrary. They were based on the nature of the evidence; that is, on those aspects of Native cultural geography that these three First Nations have themselves emphasized in their own autohistories, cultural pro­grams, or contemporary negotiations or litigations. The same thinking extends to the names of people, places and things. In Part I all of them are recorded in their English equivalents. In Part II, however, I use those in the Gitxsan, Carrier Sekani and Stó:lô languages. This is a small gesture but it permits me to preserve, as much as is possible, the various shades of meaning that accrue to them, and so helps support the change in perspective that I am asking readers to make in Chapter 3. It is also a technique that First Nations authors now deploy in their own work. I recognize this forces readers to do more work, and so have bracketed the English derivation of some terms more than once. Not counting place, tribal or proper names I have also placed all of them in a se­parate glossary at the back of the study.

I offer two more general caveats. The first is that while the narratives in both parts of the study are faithful to the source document, they have been subjected to a process
of selective edition. This allows me to highlight sections containing geographical information, without having to transcribe the entire narrative, many of which are quite long. Unless otherwise noted in the footnotes I have used standard editing procedures — ellipses for excised words or phrases, square brackets to paraphrase longer passages. The second has to do with the map and figure captions, some of which are a bit longer than would usually be deemed 'normal'. What I have done is use the captions for empirical details relating to the maps — who produced them, where and when they were published, the technologies used to prepare them, their size, and particulars on select features on them — and save the text for analysis. While captioned information is clearly germane, I have structured the study so that it can be reviewed without it, but without seriously detracting the points I am trying to make.

The Conclusion is wrapped around two seminal events that took place during the research and writing of this study: a) the 1997 SCC decision in *Delgamuukw*; and b) the 1999 *Nisga'a Treaty*. The first was important because it reset the constitutional table of contemporary land claims in Canada, and because much of it vindicated my preoccupation with continuity. The second was important because it is the first modern land claims settlement in British Columbia, and so represents arguably the first substantial reconfiguration of the Map of British Columbia since Confederation. Wrapped around both of these events are some general thoughts on the politics of First Nations' cartography post-contact; the production, perils and promises of First Nations' maps in the post-Calder era; and what these maps suggest about nationalism, modernism and postcolonialism. I conclude by considering ways in which an immigrant society can move to the fair and just settlement of the Indian land question in British Columbia more quickly than it has.

---

50 I will elaborate on this point at the start of Chapter 2.
Finally, some more general thoughts. This work is not a procedural manual on the applications of conventional or digital cartographic technologies to First Nations' concerns; readers seeking same should look elsewhere.\textsuperscript{51} Although it is informed by theoretical ideas, and makes some theoretical claims, it is not a theoretical argument. It is about perspective, territory and continuity in British Columbia. It does not pretend to be 'complete'; there are gaps and discontinuities. Much of it is tentative. A lot is inferred. Some of these maps have not been published elsewhere, and none of them (save the last) should be taken to indicate that any First Nation has agreed with the federal or provincial governments on the boundaries delineated on them. This study should be viewed as part of a process, a 'work-in-progress'. As much as its voyeuristic overtones may discomfort the postcolonial critic, I make no apologies for my use of the metaphor of travel. For myself, it was an exploration in the truest sense of that word, and I have treated, and written it as such. That said, there ought to be enough in here to provide something of value to First Nations as a whole, and to provide a model for First Nations that may not have travelled as far down the cartographic highway as others. As for the rest of us, it should be enough to show that the 'First' in First Nation is not just historical — it is \textit{geographical} too. If I may paraphrase the lawyer, Thomas Berger, it might be by exploring these maps that an immigrant society can acknowledge that this is "still the age of discovery, a discovery of the true meaning of [British Columbia] and

of Native peoples rightful place [in it]. [It] is a discovery to be made in our own time should we choose it — the second discovery of [British Columbia]."\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{52} In \textit{A Long and Terrible Shadow} (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1991), 162. The original citation used the word 'history' in place of 'geography', and 'America' in place of 'British Columbia, but I've not seen the point made quite so eloquently (or quite so applicably) anywhere else.
As suggested in the Introduction, the best place to begin any study in any history of cartography is with the maps themselves and through the perspective of the cartographic eye. In this chapter, I exhibit a cross-section of Native maps as they have appeared on the Map of British Columbia. They are arranged in chronological order, but categorized by the relevant historical junctures in the evolution of the Indian land question. I start with the earliest references to Native maps during the 'age of exploration', the land-based fur trade, and the early colonial period. I then consider a handful of maps made by anthropologists and ethnographers around the turn of the century. This leads me to some of the maps produced by Native people for the 1913-16 Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia (hereafter referred to as the McKenna-McBride Royal Commission [MMRC]). The following section samples maps prepared by the (so-called) 'amateur ethnographic' school from the 1920s, and through to about the late 1960s. The bulk of the chapter deals with the profusion of Native maps associated with the emergence and development of the modern land claims movement in British Columbia over the latter three decades of the 20th century. It concludes with some thoughts on how to appreciate these maps as a mode of geographic argument, and how they guide my investigation of non-cartographic forms of geographical representation in Chapter 2.

**Cartographic encounters in the age of exploration**

The earliest Native maps that we know of date to first contact. In the summer of 1793, somewhere south of where the West Road (Blackwater) River empties into the Fra-

---

ser (near the present site of Soda Creek), Alexander Mackenzie met with some Secwe-pemc or Southern Carrier (who, exactly, is not specified), whereupon he:

proceeded to request [a] native, whom [the local chief] had particularly selected, to commence his information, by drawing a sketch of the country upon a large piece of bark, and he immediately entered on the work, frequently appealing to, and sometimes asking the advice of, those around him. He described the river as running to the East of South, receiving many rivers every six to eight leagues, encumbered with falls and rapids, some of which were very dangerous, and six of them impracticable. The carrying places he represented as of great length and passing over hills and mountains. He depicted the lands of three other tribes, in succession, who spoke different languages. Beyond them he knew nothing...²

Heeding this advice, Mackenzie struck west instead. Fifteen years later, and almost at the same spot, Simon Fraser, having determined to navigate the 'impracticable and dangerous' river that Mackenzie chose to avoid, reported how, having asked:

several times for the Slave that knows the Country below, [he] at last was introduced to us by the Chief....I immediately got the two oil cloths spread out to get a chart of the River drawn by the Slave, which he undertook, but seemingly knew but little of its situation, as he delineated nothing but what an elderly man...a relation of the Chief, ensign'd.³

Evidently, this map was of sufficient accuracy to get his party safely downriver at least as far as the confluence with the Chilcotin River. There Fraser solicited from either the Tsilhqot'in or Secwe-pemc (again, exactly, who is not clear):

several charts of the River...[and the next day]...another chart of the River, which, Mr. Stuart got explained, and took them down in writing, by which the road appears more practicable than by the information they gave us before.⁴

These maps have not survived. They were produced 'on the spot', with bio-degradable materials, and then only at the request of European explorers. They would have

⁴ Ibid., 140.
been of no practical use to those who made them. For those who requested them, by contrast, these maps were only a means to an end. Schemers of empire, their only purpose was to extract from them the information they deemed essential for the successful prosecution of their missions and, having consigned it to formal survey, discard them.5

At any rate, both Mackenzie and Fraser did make salt water and the rest, as they say, is history. The point, of course, is that they did not do it by themselves — indeed from the Native perspective they hadn't 'discovered' a thing. How frequently Europeans turned to Native cartographers as British power crept along the filaments of the land-based fur trade and across (what was for them) the terra incognitae of the cordillera can only be surmised, but it must have been often. North West and Hudson's Bay Company (H-BC) archival records are fairly clear that surveyors and traders often solicited geographical information from Native people.6 How often such information was transmitted in a cartographic register is more uncertain, because few of those maps have survived either.7 Like Mackenzie and Fraser before them, the traders were also 'men of commerce'. They would have had little sense of these maps' archaeological or ethnographic significance, much less an understanding of the perspective in which they were partially drafted. That they should have acknowledged their contribution to their own surveys would have been dismissed as ludicrous. Whether or not these maps assisted in the expansion of empire was what mattered most. Of this much we can be certain: the ancestors of today's First Nations were capable of making, and did make, maps.

---

5 For an account of British trade and navigation in the cordillera during this period, see Barry Gough, *The Northwest Coast* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1992)


7 The only way to dispute this claim is to peruse every scrap of archival record on both sides of the Atlantic over a period of some 60 years which I admittedly have not done. Nevertheless, in his exhaustive survey of the cartographic record of the HBC — whose agents would probably have intercepted most of them — Ruggles, R. (in *A Country*, op. cit.) did not identify a single surviving map that was both clearly of indigenous authorship and produced by a Native cartographer west of the Rocky Mountains and between the 49th and 60th parallels.
Some clues as to what these maps might have looked like are provided by a handful of surviving late 18th or early 19th century Native maps made elsewhere in North America.\textsuperscript{8} Stylistically they probably looked like Roman itinerary maps (like the \textit{Peutinger Table}) or \textit{portolanos} (like the \textit{Carte Pisane}). They charted routes and lines of sight according to the powers of direct observation. Native maps generally did not, though, distinguish fluvial paths from terrestrial (that is, for example, a 'river' from a 'trail') or primary streams from secondary or tertiary.\textsuperscript{9} They likely would not have delineated tribal boundaries. They would not have maintained a consistent cardinal orientation (such as 'north on top') or subscribed to the rules of a projective geometry.\textsuperscript{10} This hypothesis is lent additional credence by one of the oldest maps authored by a Native cartographer in British Columbia that has survived and that does chart a \textit{topological} space having some, if not all, of the above mentioned characteristics (Map 5).\textsuperscript{11}

\textbf{Colonization and counter-maps}

Drawn in 1864, Map 5 is also, so far as I am aware, the last Native map to have been solicited by Europeans and to which the mapmaker himself attached no political significance. Up to this time, Natives made maps as a matter of courtesy. They were part of an evolving cross-cultural \textit{dialogue} in which Native people used the graphic arts to help guide the newcomers through (what was for the latter) an unfamiliar world. Over the next few years, however, there are almost no references in the literature to Native maps. In 1875, the surveyor John Morley reported receiving "a sketch map [drawn by an Indian Charley] show[ing] where his land [on Mayne Island was] situated...[and

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{8} Several examples are reproduced in Warhus, M. \textit{Another America}, op. cit., and Lewis, G.M. (ed) \textit{Cartographic Encounters}, op. cit. For prototypes from western North America only, see either of Lewis, G.M. 'Indian maps' op. cit.; Ronda, J. 'A chart', op. cit.; or Helm, J. 'Matonabbee's map', op. cit.
\item \textsuperscript{9} Lewis, G.M. 'Indian maps' op. cit., 77. Matonabbee's map is an excellent example.
\item \textsuperscript{10} Lewis, G.M. (in his 'Metrics, geometries, signs and language' Monograph 44 \textit{Cartographica} 30[1], 1993, 98-106) has made this point, but I will reconsider it myself in Chapter 3.
\item \textsuperscript{11} So far as I am aware, only Map 74 predates it. For reasons which will become apparent, I have reserved consideration of this map for Chapter 6.
\end{itemize}
Map 5
Tomo's and Robert Brown's *Cowichan Lake and River from sketch by Tomo an Indian*, Cowichan Lake (?), 1864, 21 x 65 cm; as far as I know, the earliest Native authored map in the colony of Vancouver Island. Showing Hul'qumi'num villages, camping or fishing sites and select physical features, it may also be the first map of the Cowichan River drainage between Cowichan Lake (*Kaatza*) and Cowichan Bay. Solicited by Robert Brown on his Vancouver Island Exploring Expedition (see John Hayman [ed] *Robert Brown and the Vancouver Island Exploring Expedition* [Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989]) the sketch, proper, is the work of the one-armed Iroquois trapper Tomo, but the calligraphy is probably Brown's. Of interest is how Tomo's drawing seems to 'compress' Cowichan Lake and River on an east-west axis while exaggerating the bends of the river on the north-south, and how it simplifies into a single channel the braided delta by which the river actually empties into the bay (copied from reproduction at Kaatza Station Museum and Archives, map 995-35, Lake Cowichan).
Cowchien Island

River
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1864
made] in my presence."  

This map has not survived either but Morley's proviso that he was "not sure if [Superintendent of Indian Affairs Israel W. Powell] can understand it" suggests that it was drawn in a similar style as Map 5. The important point, though, is that Charley's map might well be the first Native map to make a territorial statement to colonial authority, and so signalled the point at which Natives were no longer making maps for only dialogical purposes. Charley's map was also an assertion of ownership.

If, subsequently, Native people made few maps, it was partly because Europeans no longer required them, but also because the socio-political environment, from the Native perspective, had become even less benign. The late 19th century was the period during which the full arsenal of the European state machinery and the late Victorian 'civilizing mission' was deployed.  

It included the missionary assault on traditional religions, the assimilationist agenda of the residential schools, and the legal architecture of the Indian Act and the Indian band as the operative political unit. Its *sina qua non* was the allotment of reserves by various Indian reserve commissions between 1875 and 1908, and the failures of the provincial and federal governments to engage in a formal treaty process. It also included, though, the museological enterprise. And beginning over the


14 For a discussion of the residential school system, and 'Christianity on the Pacific', see Jim Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), Chapters 6 and 8 respectively.

15 The definitive account of the implementation of the reserve system during this period is Harris, C., *Making Native Space* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002), Chapters 5 to 7. A shorter, more theoretical study is my 'Travels', op. cit.

16 James Douglas had negotiated 14 territorially small treaties with some Vancouver Island tribes during the 1850s, and in 1899 all of the Peace River district was adhered to Numbered Treaty 8, but the rest of British Columbia remained untreated territory. As to why most of the province was not subjected to treaty, see either of Paul Tennant, *Aboriginal Peoples and Politics* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1990), Chapters 2 and 3; or Hamar Foster, 'Letting go the bone: the idea of Indian title in British Columbia, 1849-1927 in *Essays in the History of Canadian Law*, Vol. 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995).

17 For a discussion of the culture of the museum in *fin de siècle* British Columbia, and its effects on Native lifeways, see Douglas Cole, *Captured Heritage* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985).
last years of the 19th century, professional ethnographers, most of whom were academically schooled in Boasian anthropology, did make maps of Native territories and settlements (Maps 6-8).

**The ethnographic intervention I**

As a rule, ethnographers and anthropologists were not cartographers, and not all of them made maps. Those that did tended to use them in a perfunctory manner, as preface for the written texts. Depicting only external tribal boundaries, they reflected that sense of scientific objectivity that these men brought into the field. The few maps that ventured more detail (like 6 and 7) had (in my view) a nasty habit of alphanumerically keying toponyms and tribal names to a separate index.\(^{18}\) That said, the ethnographers' maps were usually rendered true to scale, conventionally oriented, and shared the same style. The examples shown here reflect considerable input from Native informants. Indeed, that so many have been recycled by contemporary First Nations as base maps for land claims submissions, traditional use studies (TUS) or autohistorical publications is a *post facto* testimony to their accuracy. A few, if all too rare gems, drawn at a much larger scale (like Map 8), also provide some very privileged glimpses into the geographic, environmental, or land tenure characteristics of past Native landscapes.

**Native mapmaking at the MMRC**

Meanwhile, Native culture bent under the time-space compressions of administrative colonialism, but it didn't break. Native people did resist the allocation of reserves, even to the point of physically obstructing surveyors.\(^{19}\) Signalling their rejection of the band form of governance they also often organized *ad hoc* tribal alliances to press their de-

\(^{18}\) This practice of detaching the toponyms from the base map was not invented by the ethnographers but it had, in the context of colonialism, serious ideological repercussions. I will come back to this point below and again in Chapter 3.

\(^{19}\) See, for example, 'Travels', op. cit., footnote 101.
Map 6
James Teit's *Map showing the Habitat of the Lillooet Tribe*, Spences Bridge, 1906, 12 x 13 cm; showing the external 'tribal' and internal 'sub-tribal' boundaries of the Stl'atl'imx, this map is typical of those made by ethnographers like Teit, Edward Sapir, and Diamond Jenness to preface their texts. While not, *sensu strictu*, of Native authorship, it does map the territory as explained to Teit by the Stl'atl'imx, and in an orthogonal perspective familiar to non-Natives (copied from original in Teit's *The Lillooet Indians*, Franz Boas [ed] *The Jesup North Pacific Expedition: Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History*, Vol 2, Pt 7 [New York: Brill, Leiden and Stechert, 1906], 201).
Fig. 61. Map showing the Habitat of the Lillooet Tribe.

1. Lillooet River Band.
2. Pemberton Band.
3. Lake Band.
4. Fraser River Band.
Map 7
James Teit's *Map showing the Shuswap Territory*, Spences Bridge, 1909, 12 x 13 cm; a rather more detailed ethnocartography than most of its ilk, this map shows not only the external and internal boundaries of the various Secwepemc 'tribes' but the locations of the most important villages. By highlighting areas occupied by Sekani and Tsilhqot'in peoples during the post-contact period, it may also be one of the first maps of Native territories in British Columbia to show overlap (copied from original in Teit's *The Shuswap*, Franz Boas [ed] *The Jesup North Pacific Expedition: Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History*, Vol 2, Pt 7 [New York: Brill, Leiden and Stechert, 1909], 450).
Fig. 199. Map showing the Shuswap Territory.

A, Fraser River Division.  
B, Canon Division, territory now largely occupied by the Chilcotin.  
C, Lake Division.  
D, North Thompson Division.  

D', Kinlasket.  
D'', Former territory of the Iroquois Band.  
D', Shuswap, Cree, and Iroquois mixed.  
E, Bonaparte Division.  
F, Kamloops Division.  
G, Shuswap Lake Division.  
G', Arrow Lake Band.  
●, Villages.  
+, Former villages.

Dotted area, territory recently occupied by the Chilcotin. Area at head of Fraser River, enclosed by broken double lines, temporarily occupied by the Sekanai.
Map 8(a-b)
Franz Boas's *Head of Dzā'wadē*, Knight Inlet, 1934, 46 x 22 cm; map of the estuary and Kwakwaka'wakw village at the head of Knight Inlet. It shows the main dwellings (designated by letters), family-owned weirs or canoe launches (numbers 1-27), dipnets (28-45), viburnum patches (46-63), and mountains harvested for berries and goats, and other important place names (64-152). Of the 22 plates in Boas's *Geographical Names*, op. cit., gazetting over 2000 individual toponyms, this one is by far the most detailed. Its 'figure-ground' contrast is poor and the alphanumeric legend makes interpretation difficult, but by reconstructing Boas's original in (a) as (b), the sophistication of Kwakwaka'wakw land tenure and resource use, and the intensely personal and intimate nature of Kwakwaka'wakw environmental knowledge become clear ([a] copied from original in Boas's ibid.; [b], with permission, from Eric Leinberger's original, in Robert Galois, *Kwakwaka'wakw Settlements, 1775-1920: A Geographical Analysis and Gazetteer* [Vancouver: UBC Press, 1994], 137).
Skinner's survey of 1887 locates the Awaelalal/Tenaktak village between sites F and G. (see Figure 2.1)

Numbers refer to tribal ownership of fishing sites

2. Tlawitsis     7. Tenaktak    11. Tenaktak

- Viburnum (and clover) patches
- Hunting territory and berry patches
- Dip net sites
- Weirs, (see Boas, 1900, p. 468 for description)
- Village sites, ownership in brackets ( )
- House sites, ownership in brackets ( )

A - J Sites mapped but not identified by Boas- perhaps shelters used during the Oolachan fishery

Approximate boundary of Indian Reservation #1 Tsaw-watti

After Boas, 1934, Map 22
mands for treaties and a recognition of Aboriginal title. By the first decade of the 20th century more formal political coalitions based on a European organizational model were submitting declarations evoking the language of the 1763 Royal Proclamation to the federal and British governments. It was only, however, in the years immediately preceding, and then during the hearings of, the MMRC, that Native people started supporting their claims with maps of their own making (Maps 9-11).

To a point, these examples evoke the same stylistic characteristics shown on Map 5. They chart what amounts to a topological as opposed to planimetric space, anastomose fluvial and terrestrial routes, and there is still no attempt at maintaining a uniform cardinal orientation. There is, however, a greater preoccupation with displaying relief (as on 9) and with providing (on all three) a scale reference. For Europeans, this latter development is the one that typically earns a map the seal of scientific approval, but it is achieved here in an unorthodox way. Partly, it is implied in the depiction of a built infrastructure of trails and structures (on 9 and 10), partly in the thematic overlay of English toponyms (on 9 and 11). The most unusual, however, is the innovative 'temporal distance vector' superinscribed on Map 6.

These maps reflected the hybrid character of the early 20th century contact zone in British Columbia. So far as I know, they are the earliest Native maps in British Columbia that emphasize how parsimonious the reserves are with respect to the larger territor-

---

20 In 1879, in a meeting at Lytton, Nlha7kâpmx chiefs proposed a self-government arrangement they thought acceptable to the provincial government (see Douglas Harris, The Nlha7kâpmx meeting at Lytton, 1879 and the rule of law BC Studies 108, 1995/6, 5-28). In 1881 Nisga’a and Tsimshian chiefs travelled by canoe to Victoria to present their demands for the recognition of title, and in 1887 met with provincial officials on the Nass River (see, in this connection, Papers Relating to the Commission to enquire into the state and condition of the Indians of the North-West Coast of British Columbia [Victoria: Government Printer, 1888]). There were also a number of petitions and declarations, some by individual bands or tribes, others by regional alliances.

21 The most thorough account of the activities of the Indian Rights Association (IRA) and the Interior Tribes during this period, and, in particular, the political geography they created, is Robert Galois, The Indian Rights Association, Native protest activity and the "land question" in British Columbia, 1903-16 Native Studies Review 8(2), 1992, 1-33. An abridged, but aspatial account is in Tennant, P. Aboriginal Peoples, op. cit., Chapter 7. For the formation and work of the MMRC, see Harris, C. Making Native Space, op. cit., Chapter 8.
Map 9
Jacob Russ's (Hadagim Lakha) **untitled** map of Aiyansh hunting ground, Aiyansh, 1902, 28 x 41 cm; oriented southeast on top, and using hachuring to display relief, coloured manuscript map of a portion of the lower Nass River. Whether by natural features (on a south-north alignment) or superinscribed double lines (on an east-west), it distinguishes boundaries between the chiefly 'hunting grounds' (Russ's is shown as Chief Nisgēt's). The map also shows the location of Gitlakdamiks (Russ's village), the boundaries of the reserve allotted at Aiyansh in 1881 (across the Nass from the present site of New Aiyansh); the Aiyansh sawmill; the lava plain created by the circa 1720 eruption of Mount Tseax (not shown); and (in red), the main trails from the Nass to Lava Lake (*Si Dak*), and from there into Tsimshian territory (shown as 'country of the Gitzimgēluin [Kitsumkalum] Tribe') beyond the 'water divide' separating Sand Lake (*Gwil Alal*) from the headwaters of the Kitsumkalum River (*Hkit*). Although the initials 'J B McC' (at center bottom) suggest that the local Anglican missionary, Reverend J.B. McCullagh, participated in its production, I suspect most of the map is properly credited to Russ. Like Map 5, it appears to 'warp' planimetric space, exaggerating the straight-line distance between the Nass and the 'water divide' while 'compressing' area away from the main drainage of the Tseax River (*Si aks*). Unlike Map 5, however, this rendition is annotated with a line (A to B) that specifies temporal distance, and it is, overall, much more detailed. Not only are the toponyms rendered in the orthographic spellings used by the Nisga'a at that time, but a small table at the bottom shows where Nisga'a traps and hunting lodges had recently been destroyed or stolen; it also highlights two places where Nisga'a chiefs met their unfortunate demise (copied from reproduction of original at University of British Columbia Library Special Collections cat. no. G3512.N37 1902 R8, Vancouver).
Map 10

unidentified author's and Reverend J.M. McDougall's *un-titled* map of the Bulkley River valley, Moricetown, 1910, 46 x 25 cm; oriented north-on-top, black and white manuscript map of Wet'suwet'en traditional territory reaching from the confluence of the Bulkley and Skeena Rivers at Hazelton to Burns and François Lakes, and from the valley of the Bulkley to Ootsa and Morice Lakes. The map shows the locations of trappers' cabins, graveyards, the reserves allotted in 1891, and the main trails. As on Map 9, there is some doubt over who added the textual elements (the bracketed names have been superscripted by Robert Galois) but the topographical base appears to be the work of a Wet'suwet'en cartographer. Again, the linear distance along the Bulkley River is 'stretched' while the areal expanse between the river and the lakes at the foot of the Coast Mountains is highly 'compressed' (copied from original in National Archives of Canada [NAC] RG10, vol. 4052, file 371968).
Map 11
Peter Niisyok's *untitled* map of the middle Nass, Aiyansh (?), 1915, 38 x 16 cm; oriented north on top, a black and white draft map delineating the main river and tributaries between the confluence of the Nass and Kinskuch River (*Kinshgoik*) and to below the confluence of the Nass and Tseax River (*Sheaks*). Prepared for the MMRC, the map includes a number of Nisga'a place names and the areas of land requested as timber leases. The map does not reflect the topological distortion typified on Maps 5 or 9, but its connection to the latter is clear; the bottom third of this map covers approximately the same territory as Map 9; as shown by the boundaries of the Aiyansh reserve (on each) and the references to the 'hunting ground of Chief *Nisyoq'* (the Nisga'a spelling for Niisyok) on Map 9, only the scale has changed (copied from original in MMRC, field minutes from the Nass River Agency, June 4, 1914, British Columbia Archives reel T-3963).
This area described by Peter Nisyok in hearings in Atqasuk pp. 4-6
7 [illegible] 1918
T3963
ies (on all three) on the one hand, and to show internal sub-tribal boundaries (on 9) and Native place names (on 9 and 11) on the other. The missionaries' annotations on Maps 9 and 10 also hint how a geopolitical struggle has already been partially overdetermined by the denominational. These maps are not only examples of a newer genre of Native maps made by choice, and as assertions of ownership (that is, no longer at the behest of Europeans). Because they mark the point at which a topological construction of space is starting to yield to the planimetric, they more deliberately enlist, and to a point coopt the representational machinery of the colonizing power. They are, in other words, acts of cartographic resistance.

The MMRC did effect some change in the existing reserve geography of British Columbia, but its failure to address the underlying question of treaties and Aboriginal title prompted a new round of Native political activism. In 1927, however, the federal government added Section 141 to the Indian Act, outlawing all claims-related activity. The band became the only recognized political entity, and over the next few years most un-treated territory still ostensibly available outside the reserves for hunting and fishing as formerly was further fragmented by the registered trapline system and the consolidation of the mid-20th century resource economy. Native political practice, now unable to solicit outside legal assistance, reconfigured itself around non-titular concerns. Tribal politics collapsed and the raison d'être for Native mapmaking disappeared. Maps of Native territories were made, however, during this period. Anthropologists and professional ethnographers continued to produce some, but many were the work of a handful of self-styled amateur ethnographers (Maps 12 to 14).

---

22 Missionary meddling in the politics of Native resistance was so widespread that it even extended to cartography. I will consider additional examples in Chapters 5 and 6.

23 A most accessible summary of the shifting alliances that led to the collapse of the IRA, the formation and collapse of the Allied Tribes, and the intense political fallout surrounding the recommendations of the MMRC between 1916 and 26 is either of Brian Titley, A Narrow Vision (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1986), Chapter 8; or Tennant, P. Aboriginal Peoples, op. cit., Chapter 7.

24 For the formation of the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia (NBBC) in 1931 and the North American Indian Brotherhood (NAIB) in 1944, see ibid., Chapter 9.
Map 12(a-b)

J.S. Matthews's *untitled* sketch of the area on and around Howe Sound (a) and *Sko-Mish-Oath the Territory of the Squamish Indian Peoples* (b), Vancouver, 1937, 26 x 41 cm, and 19 x 22 cm respectively; the rough, and then finished, versions of a black and white map of Squamish traditional territory. Working on information supplied by Squamish Chief August Jack Haatsalano (Xáts’lánexw, which is the source of the English name Kitsilano) the draft (a) was "started in 1929 or 30 [and] finished about 1937 [and redrawn] seven times to get...right." Showing the Howe Sound portion of the territory in the north-on-top orientation, and the Indian Arm portion (top left) east-west, the map shows Squamish place names in the PPS orthography, the main reserves, and, in English, the main drainages and a handful of non-Native settlements. It does not show, though, any external territorial or internal 'sub-tribal' boundaries. On (b) the two portions are restored to their proper alignment and Matthews acknowledges (center) the contributions of August Jack, "who cannot read or write...and other Squamish or Musqueam Indians." Although, as Chief Mathias Joe cautioned, "one or two of the names may have been missed," most of the toponyms are reproduced as on the rough draft. The most striking additions, though, are the pictures of animals, birds, fishes and plants found in the area; of Squamish or Musqueam canoes (lower left) and dwellings (top or bottom center); and a form of topographical shading that is neither hachuring or contouring, but a blend of both. While it is fairly clear that the pictorial embellishment was Matthews' design, it seems to have pleased August Jack, who signed his name, in English, under the comment "as read to me-correct" (both copied from originals at Vancouver City Archives [VCA] Map Collection, map 351, sheets 1 and 2, Vancouver).
Map 13(a-b)
J.S. Matthews's *Before the Pale-Face Came* (a) and Oliver Wells's *Indian Villages and Landmarks Burrard Inlet and English Bay* (b), Vancouver, 1932 and 1966 respectively, each 19 x 25 cm; black and white draft maps of the area around Burrard Inlet. One of them (a) was clearly Matthews's attempt to show a portion of Map 12(b) at a larger scale, while the other (b) prefaced Wells's (ed) *Squamish Legends by Chief August Jack Khahtsahlano and Dominic Charlie* (Vancouver: Charles Chamberlain, 1966). According to Matthews, (a) was, again, "compiled from information given by aged Indians of the Squamish and Musqueam Tribes...and designed after exhaustive investigation, 1932 and 1933." It includes toponyms not found on 12(b) and a more elaborate pictorial thematic. On this one, Matthews took more liberty with aesthetic license — most traditional Coast Salish longhouses were flat-roofed structures, and neither the totem pole nor the crests on it are of Coast Salish design — but the robed figure that seems to be 'welcoming pale-faces' into the area seems to have pleased the Squamish Indian Council (in the credits bottom center). On (b) the most important changes are the elimination of most of the pictorialization, some of the toponyms, and the greater use of English names. Note too the simulated cedar background. In 1937 Matthews produced a larger scale version showing only the area around Stanley Park ([a] copied from original at VCA, Add.MSS 54, vol. 517-B-6, file 3, map photo 10, Vancouver; [b] from original in Wells (ed) *Squamish Legends*, op. cit., inside cover).
Map 14(a-c)  
Dan Paul's, Basil Joe's and Lester Peterson's *Indian Villages and Landmarks Jervis and Sechelt Inlet* (a); and Peterson's *Homesites of the Sechelt Band* (b) and *Traditional Homesite and Pictograph Locations of the Sechelt Nation* (c), Vancouver (?), 1962, 63 and 90 respectively, 46 x 27, 24 x 19, and 21 x 14 cm respectively; also in the pictorial tradition used by J.S. Matthews in Maps 12 (b) and 13(a), the rough, and then two finished, versions of black and white maps showing the Se'shalt traditional territory around Jervis and Sechelt Inlets. According to Peterson (in his *The Story of the Sechelt Nation* [Madeira Park: Harbour Publishing, 1990], ix-x), (a) is the product of over fifteen separate expeditions stretched over a two year period in the early 1960s during which he recorded 200 Se'shalt toponyms, past and present villages, and other sacred sites. Place names are in the PPS orthography, and village sites are embellished by images of dwellings in the more appropriate Coast Salish 'shanty style'. On the edited version in (b), Peterson acknowledged the "place names dictated by members of the band" (credit, upper right) and added pictures of animals or fish (which he claimed, in a letter to Matthews, were 'meaningfully placed'). The dwellings are now rendered in the ethnographically less accurate, but aesthetically more pleasing 'gabled roof style'. His more panoramic treatment of sacred peaks reflects his growing awareness that "from almost any viewpoint...[either looking up]...from sea level...[or looking down]...on their territories from high up...the Sechelt saw themselves surrounded by mountains...some...recognized as boundaries that separated their traditional homeland from...the Squamish [Maps 12 and 27], the Lillooet [Maps 6 and 28], and the Klahuse peoples" (ibid., 46). In (c), the version that prefaced the 1990 book, Peterson dispensed with most of the pictorialization and toponyms, instead emphasizing important pictograph sites ([a-b] copied from originals at VCA, Add.MSS 54, vol. 517-B-6, file 5, map photos 114 and 105 respectively, Vancouver; [c], with permission, from original in Peterson, L. *The Story*, op. cit., v).
Place names dictated by Members of the Band.

By Lester R. Peterson
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The ethnographic intervention II

Operating more or less from the 1920s and through to the 1960s, these men had no formal academic training. They approached the Native world more intuitively than the professional ethnographers, and their maps reflected it. In most cases, they offered no accompanying ethnographic text. Using a hyphenated 'practical phonetics system' (PPS), they employed toponyms dictated to them by their informants and put them directly on their maps. Notably, they did not record tribal or sub-tribal boundaries. Their most striking innovation, though, is their use of pictorial thematization, the overall effect of which was to blur the lines between a two-dimensional plan view and a three-dimensional panorama. To a point, iconicity like this is reminiscent of the stylized cartouches of the 'noble savage' first used by the Dutch Renaissance cartographers three centuries earlier, and so smacked of an imperial imagination more generally. Still, these amateurs inserted themselves into Native lifeways as much as (and often more than) their professional counterparts and they prepared rough drafts of their maps that were circulated to band or council members for correction. As August Jack states (on 12[b]), even when embellished almost to a fault the finished versions seem to have been greeted favourably by those who oversaw their production. As to which of the two ethnocartographic traditions (amateur or professional) was the more (if at all) faithful rendition of the way in which Native peoples perceived (or would have chosen to represent) their territories, I'll leave to Chapter 3. The important point is that these maps did help to keep alive in the visual register what could not be advanced in the political.

25 There is an extensive literature on this, but see Brian Harley, 'Maps, knowledge and power' in Denis Cosgrove and Steven Daniels (eds), The Iconography of Landscape (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988). I have summarized the main themes in Euro-Canadian Cartography, op. cit., 21-6.
Land claims and Native maps

From first contact through to the early 1960s, the Native cartographic record in British Columbia was sparse at best. Chronologically, it was characterized by isolated flurries of Native mapmaking, separated by long stretches during which no maps were made. Aside from a few by professional ethnographers working in the interior, it was geographically limited to tribal groups on the northwest or southwest coasts. With the emergence of the modern land claims movement in the late 1960s, however, there was an unprecedented explosion in the number, type, and geographical scope of Native maps. In 1951 the federal government removed Section 141 from the Indian Act, and in 1963 established the Indian Claims Commission (ICC). On the Native side, the extant pan-Indian organizations were re-energized, but the most important political developments were the formation of the first tribal councils. In 1969 the federal government issued the Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (otherwise known as the White Paper), only to have it categorically rejected by Native people. The result was twofold. One was a major reconfiguration of the pan-Indian political voice, but the more important was the Nisga’a Tribal Council’s (NTC) decision to take the question of Aboriginal title directly to court (Map 15).

26 It was during this period that the developed countries, euphoric over the defeat of the Axis powers, were swept by a series of counter-cultural movements and an increasingly humanitarian ethic. While most visibly expressed in Canada with the official adoption of a policy of multiculturalism, these initiatives reflected a growing sensitivity to the plight of Native peoples as well. For a working summary see Tennant, P. Aboriginal Peoples, op. cit., Chapter 11.

27 They were the Nisga’a Tribal Council (NTC) in 1955, the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council (NNTC) in 1958, and the South Vancouver Island Tribal Federation in 1964. The NAIB and NBBC continued, but were increasingly ineffective. See, in this connection, ibid., Chapters 9 and 10.

28 Derived from a consultation process initiated under the auspices of the ICC in 1968, the White Paper was supposed to incorporate Native suggestions on how to improve the Indian Act. Instead, it recommended the abolishment of the Act and, by extension, special status for Native people. This is discussed in ibid., but for more on the Native reaction, see Harold Cardinal, Unjust Society (Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig Ltd., 1969).

29 Divided more along philosophical than geographical lines, the formation of the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs (UBCIC) and the British Columbia Association of Non-Status Indians (BCANSI) is discussed by Tennant, P., op. cit., Chapter 12.
Map 15(a-b)
Wilson Duff's *Nisga'a Land Claim Area*, Vancouver (?), 1969, 27 x 19 cm; arguably the map that started the modern comprehensive claims process, a coloured topographic (a) of the Nass valley. There are no 'sub-tribal' boundaries or place names (as on Maps 9 and 11); only a black line bounding the territory over which the Nisga'a sought a judicial affirmation of unextinguished Aboriginal title in *Calder v. A.G.* While the boundary was based on Duff's interpretation of the metes and bounds description in the 1913 *Nisga'a Petition*, and was accepted by the Nisga'a at trial, the Nisga Tribal Council (NTC), in 1986, reinterpreted the petition to encompass the area mapped in (b) (for an explanation of this inconsistency, see Sterritt, N. et. al. *Tribal Boundaries*, op. cit., Chapter 6; the consequences will be addressed below and in Chapter 4) ([a] copied from original in *Calder v. A.G.* [1973] S.C.R. 313, Ex. 2); [b], with permission, from reproduction in Sterritt, N. *Tribal Boundaries*, op. cit., 271).
The 1973 SCC decision in *Calder v. A.G.* was the watershed historical juncture for the Indian land question in British Columbia. The court split evenly on the question of whether or not Aboriginal title continued to exist in the province, but it was unanimous that such title had existed prior to contact.\(^3^0\) In 1974, the federal government replaced the failed ICC with a Native Claims Commission (NCC) mandated to receive two types of submissions: a) specific claims, concerning unfulfilled treaty obligations, breaches of *Indian Act* regulations and statutes, or the illegal surrender or disposal of reserve lands; and b) comprehensive claims designed to more widely clarify Aboriginal rights to land and resources in untreatied territories.\(^3^1\)

Because federal guidelines stipulated that a comprehensive claim had only to supply basic information about the claimant group, describe the approximate boundaries of the claimed territory, and provide preliminary evidence for its continuing use and occupancy, there was no immediate demand for maps. In principle, comprehensive submissions could be in the form of metes and bounds descriptions.\(^3^2\) That allowed, most claimants did file maps, three of which are shown here (Maps 16 to 18). Like Map 15, many of these maps (like 18) defined an external boundary. Some (like 16) did not, preferring to submit written boundary information. Yet others (like 17) displayed the boundaries internally, as constituted by land use practices over time. Some displayed the reserves and their English names (on 16 and 17); others used toponyms in the appropriate orthographies and avoided any reference to the geographies of colonialism (on 18). Often, the maps included additional detail on historic trails or portages, campsites, or resource procurement areas (on all three).

---

\(^3^0\) Although a complex case, this was the essential thrust of *Calder*. For the complete synopsis, and its effects on federal Native policy generally, see Peter Kulchyski, *Unjust Relations: Aboriginal Rights in Canadian Courts* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1994), Chapter 4.

\(^3^1\) Since then, two other categories of claims have been added: a) treaty land entitlements, having to do with lands promised, but not allocated, under existing treaties (which means, in British Columbia, territories subject to the Douglas Treaties or Numbered Treaty 8); and b) claims having to do with compensation for lands flooded by the Nelson River hydroelectric project (which apply in Manitoba only).

\(^3^2\) The original guidelines are summarized by Tennant, P. *Aboriginal Peoples*, op. cit., 204.
Map 16(a-c)
Nazko Indian Band's *Indian Land (a), Establishment of Reserves 1892-1943 (b) and Non-Natives Continue To Move In 1974 (c)* Quesnel (?), 1974, each 25 x 18 cm; black and white sketch maps prepared in support of the band's comprehensive claim. Like those made by the a-mateur ethnographers, they eschew fixed external boundaries, instead using pictures that are 'meaningfully placed'. On (a) images of the lodgepole pine (upper left) and fir (lower right) designate biogeoclimatic boundaries; the willow tree a swampy area along the Blackwater; the dotted lines the main trails; and the campfires (left and right) the best caribou hunting grounds and/or camping spots. While the animals shown are found throughout the territory, the deer (center bottom), trout (adjacent to Kluskus Lake) and the salmon (on the Fraser) are placed where they are because that's where the biggest and healthiest of the species are usually found. On (b) the band has used more abstract symbols to show not only the reserves allocated by reserve commissioners Peter O'Reilly and A.W. Vowell, and the MMRC, but also those requested and rejected by the MMRC, and lands purchased for the band by the Department of Indian Affairs (DIA) after 1925. Perhaps the most visceral of all three plates, however, is (c). The images of hunting licenses, a fishing rod, plane, D-8 tractors and chainsaws show how the Nazko are by now perceiving their ghettoization by the mid-20th century resource and recreational economy. The irony is that it is an economy that has forced its way into Nazko territory, in part, by converting ancient Nazko trails centered on the Nazko village into a network of logging roads emanating from Prince George (all copied, with permission, from originals at Nazko Indian Band Office, Quesnel).

ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVES 1892-1943
Map 17(a-b)

Doig River Band's *Doig River Reserve: Hunting (a)* and *Doig River Reserve: Camping Sites (b)*, Fort St. John, 1979, each about 60 x 85 cm; two maps from a Dunne Za (Beaver) LUOS conducted in northeast British Columbia in the late 1970s. Strictly speaking these maps have nothing to do with a comprehensive claim; the Dunne Za were part of Treaty 8 and thus excluded from that process. This did not mean, however, that they could not pursue same by other means, and when a natural gas pipeline across their territory was proposed in the early 1970s they decided to act. Sponsored by the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs (UBCIC) and funded in part by the federal government, the study was based on the model first used by the Inuit in 1973. Individual band members were asked to prepare their 'map biographies'; drawn in coloured ink on 1:250,000 topographic base maps, they were intended to show all the areas used for hunting, fishing or gathering in 'living memory'. The biographies of each band were then aggregated to produce composites like those shown here. The concentric lines in (a) should therefore be seen as representing the 'outer limits' of all the expeditions made by Doig River hunters over time. However, because they are based on trips directed at big game, and because smaller game was typically taken while going after larger animals, the lines summarize only the range, and not the intensity, of land use. While these concentric lines are the classic visual signature of most LUOS maps, a few were sometimes of a more site-specific nature. The camping sites in (b) are not just overnight campsites but all the places that Doig River people regularly used as hunting camps, trapping cabins, and even former village sites. (The pipeline was never built but seismic activity in the area has intensified in recent years and the plans have been reactivated; for more on the Dunne Za LUOS, see Brody, H. *Maps*, op. cit. I will consider another LUOS, and how the LUOS differs from the TUS, in Chapter 5) (copied, with permission, from originals in ibid.).
Map 18
Mahkum Space Design's **Nuxalk**, Bella Coola, 1984, 90 x 82 cm; partially coloured manuscript map of Nuxalk traditional territory on the central coast. It shows the main rivers, an external boundary (thick black line), the approximate geographical range of the 'sub-tribes' (large capitals), the primary (large dots) and secondary (small dots) villages (each of which are labelled in their proper phonetic spellings), and select grease trails (light dashed lines). "All worked out on the map," the inset shows more clearly the exact locations of the "thirty four villages [that existed when Mackenzie arrived] from the mouth of the river to the precipice" (Chief Edward Moody, quoted in Ruth Kirk, *Tradition and Change on the Northwest Coast* [Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1986], 237) but there is no attempt at defining the internal 'sub-tribal' boundaries. Note also that while the external boundary was originally defined with considerable precision, its western portion was later extended seaward to include all of King Island. Whether this was a response to the Heiltsuk's assertion of their eastern boundary (shown by the thin dashed blue line) the same year the map was made, or because the Nuxalk just got it wrong the first time around is unclear. A similar map locating pretty much the same villages (except by means of a numerical key referencing the etymologies of the toponyms in a separate index, and without any boundaries) may be found in Harvey Thommasen (ed) *Bella Coola Man* (Madeira Park: Harbour Publishing, 1994) (photographed, with permission, from original at the House of Smayusta, Bella Coola).
In good part these maps were variations on themes that had been worked out on earlier prototypes. The annotations of sub-tribal boundaries, toponyms in their proper orthographies, and references to the built environment were already evident in maps prepared for the MMRC. The pictorial imagery in Map 16 might have been inspired by the work of the amateur ethnographers, while the fixed external boundary on Map 18 is as much a throwback to the professional ethnographic perspective as it is a response to the demands of the NCC. Overall, the technology has not changed; they are still being prepared manually and as cheaply as possible. There are, though, some differences.

Where internal detail is included, it either tends to be more selective (as on 18) or spread across more than one map (as on 16 and 17). Where external boundaries are shown, they are more precise and superimposed on a topographic base map, but even then (as on 18) with a fair degree of uncertainty. Taken as a group, the maps suggest that while Native cartographers are now more concerned that their maps are planimetrically accurate, they are also becoming more careful about what is displayed on them.

Indeed, these maps reflected the increasingly unstable political climate in British Columbia as the 1970s wore on. So long as *Calder* was still winding its way through the courts, Native political power continued to reside in the bands and the pan-Indian organizations. Both received government funding and some control over schooling, health care, and other social services was devolved to the bands.33 There was, though, no progress on the larger title question, and when the *Calder* decision came down the immediate effect, from a Native perspective, was to discredit the pan-Indian organizations and lend credence to tribalist politics. In this sense, these maps not only reflected a return to the tribalism that had characterized the pre-MMRC period, but actually served to enhance it.34 The result was to further reinforce tribal authority on the one hand, and to

---

33 The rapid growth of the UBCIC and BCANSI during this period is discussed in Tennant, P. *Aboriginal Peoples*, op. cit., Chapter 13.
34 By definition, tribalism is a political philosophy based on an identification with unique, historically defined cultural or linguistic groups, and more or less distinct collective memories. It does not require
provoke acts of civil disobedience by Native people on the other. Like those prepared for the MMRC, Maps 15 through 18 were maps of resistance. The difference is that these maps were becoming active agents in a growing culture of resistance spreading to all corners of British Columbia.

First Nations maps in the post-Section 35 environment

Even so these claims languished. The problem was that NCC policy in British Columbia allowed only one comprehensive claim negotiation at a time, and so long as the province continued to disavow the existence of Aboriginal title, not even the Nisga'a's could be dealt with. At the same time, comprehensive claims were being resolved in the territorial north and by the middle of the decade Native people in British Columbia were getting impatient. In 1982, moreover, "the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada [we]re hereby recognized and affirmed" in Section 35 of the Constitution Act, and, quite suddenly, claimants found themselves with other options. One was to borrow a page from the NTC's playbook and take claims directly to court, where a handful of rulings were already creating a more accommodating judicial landscape. While these litigations were mainly of the specific kind, they did provide a way of achieving more short-term objectives while the broader title claims simmered on

that tribal councils necessarily consist of traditional or hereditary chiefs. It does require a perspective that is decidedly territorial in character.

35 In 1973, UBCIC and BCANSI staff occupied DIA offices in Vancouver, and the Quwutsun caught salmon in defiance of Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) regulations on Vancouver Island. In 1974, several tribal councils and bands rallied on the lawn of the provincial legislature. The Nisga'a interfered with Canadian National Railways (CNR) surveyors on the Nass River and the Bonaparte Secwepemc blockaded traffic on Highway 97 north of Cache Creek for several days. Later that year, several hundred British Columbia Natives travelled in a 'Native Caravan' to Ottawa, only to be met on Parliament Hill by RCMP in full riot gear. These actions are summarized in ibid., 174-6.

36 These were the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement in 1977, and the Cree-Naskapi Act and Inuvialuit Agreement in 1984.

37 One of the most important was the 1984 SCC decision Guerin v. the Queen, which ruled that Aboriginal interest in untreatied territory was a preexisting legal right derived from Native peoples' historic occupation of their tribal lands (see Chapter 6, but for the complete synopsis, see Kulchyski, P. Unjust Relations, op. cit., Chapter 6).
the back burner. The other was to capitalize on the powers of 'symbolic politics' by engaging in newer acts of civil disobedience. These were more carefully orchestrated, received more intense media scrutiny, and were a good deal more effective than those of the previous decade. As it turned out, in fact, both options usually played off one another, and the maps made during this period reflected it (Maps 19 and 20).

These two maps represented a qualitative leap over anything that Native cartographers had hitherto produced, but they did so in quite different ways. By showing in great detail the toponyms, and types of resources and where they were traditionally harvested, Map 19 is clearly an attempt to meet the more stringent rules of evidence demanded by the courts. By doing so in a site-specific format, it also prefigured a move away from the more generalized LUOS that characterized Map 17 and comprehensive claims in the territorial north, and towards (what would come to be called) a TUS. By taking its audience directly to the heart of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), it showed that, for Native claimants, 'Aboriginal rights' was not some aspatial liberal democratic concept. It was about preserving access to territory and the resources in it. Map 20, by contrast, was clearly an attempt to influence the court of public opinion. It was, so far as I know, the first Native map to be lithographed for commercial sale, and one of

---

38 Clearly inspired by Guerin, most of these actions — the Kaska Dene on the Kechika River in 1983, the Nuu-chah-nulth on Meares Island in 1984, the Haida on Lyell Island in 1985, the Kwakwak’wakw on Deer Island in 1986, and the Tsilhqot’in in the Nemiah valley in 1988 — were efforts at preventing, or slowing down, logging activity in traditional territories. Others included the Niha7k̓apmx and Stl’atl’imx campaign against CNR plans to double-track the Thompson River canyon and the Wsa:nec struggle to protect traditional fishing grounds from commercial development. (Most of these are summarized in Tennant, P. Aboriginal Peoples, op. cit., 207-9; but for a more geographically attuned account, see Nicholas Blomley, "Shut the province down": First Nations blockades in British Columbia 1984-1995 BC Studies 111, 1996, 5-36). Whether by securing injunctions against the resource company or by forcing the government to negotiate a resolution, most of them must be considered an unqualified success. (A general discussion of Native 'symbolic politics' in Canada is C. Radha Jhappan, 'Indian symbolic politics: the double-edged sword of publicity' Canadian Ethnic Studies 22[3], 19-39.)

39 In general, the LUOS was based on a quantitative assessment of past or present resource use in the form of generalized population surveys. The TUS, by contrast, tends to rely on a site-specific approach and is rather more qualitative in nature. I will pin this down from a conceptual standpoint in Chapter 3, and from a procedural in Chapter 5.

40 While the term is contentious, I understand TEK as referring to a body of knowledge transmitted by oral means and first hand experience, and within which the ecological aspects of the milieu are closely linked to the social and spiritual. I will come back to this very important point in Chapter 3.
Map 19(a-c)
Earl Claxton's (Yelkátte) and John Elliott's (Stolcel) untitled map (a) of, and Saanich Indian territorial declaration (b) to, the southeastern portion of Vancouver Island, Brentwood Bay, 1988, each 101 x 64 cm, approximately; and Kevin Paul's Wsá, nec (c), Brentwood Bay, 1994, 23 x 28 cm; the first two prepared as support for the 1985 Pauquachin, Tsawout, Tsartlip, and Tseycum Indian Bands court challenge to a proposed destination marina in Cordova Bay; the third for use in elementary school curricula. The black and white thematic original (a) shows, in great detail, the locations of marine, terrestrial and intertidal resource procurement sites, while (b) is the declaration of Saanich title that accompanied it. The map also locates, in the accepted contemporary orthography, the main islands (or portions thereof) and villages, but there are no external or internal boundaries. (A simpler en quarto variant, but without the toponyms, is found in Dave Elliott's Saltwater People [Saanich: School District 63] 1983, 40-1). Although (c) also avoids delineating territorial boundaries, it uses digital colour shading to highlight the terrestrial and submarine relief, and expands the longitudinal limits to include places used at some time in the past but which are now on the American side of the Gulf Islands. Keyed to etymologies of the toponyms in a separate gazetteer in Claxton's and Elliott's Reef Net Technology of the Saltwater People (Brentwood Bay: Saanich Indian School Board, 1994) "the traditional hunting, fishing, food, and medicine gathering territory is clearly laid out [in] the Sen-coten language;" the result being that viewers may find their way around "the territory of the Wsanec through the interpretations of the ancient names" (42). A third variant of this map, combining features of (a) and (c), is mounted on the stairwell wall of the Láuweñew Tribal School in Brentwood Bay. It is an enormous composite of 1:50,000 topographic base maps, and thematically superscripted with Saanich toponyms and student illustrations of the resources typically found in the area. (In 1995, the Saanich won their case and the marina was never built.) ([a-b] copied, with permission, from originals donated to author; [c], with permission, from original in ibid, 44).
Map 20
Nemiah Valley Indian Band's (Xeni Gwet'in) and Western Canada Wilderness Committee's (WCWC) *Nenduwh Jid Guzit'in*, Vancouver, 1989, 62 x 46 cm; coloured 'poster-map' showing the band's traditional territory around Tatlayoko (Telhiqox), Chilko (Tsilhqox Biny) and Taseko Lakes (Taziqox). Derived from a composite of registered trap-lines, the external boundary (the red line) delineates the area over which the Nemiah Band assert title (the conditions of which are spelled out in both the English and Tsilhqot'in languages; and in English only on the sign in Figure E[b]). The area in green was (at that time) being proposed as a wilderness preserve. The proposal was prompted by increased clearcut logging of the band's territory during the late 1980s, and against which a series of blockades was mounted. The map also locates two of the band's sacred mountains, one of which, Mount Tatlow (Ts'il?os), is pictured at center. Because the band occupies a remote portion of the Chilcotin Plateau, selling the map to the public was facilitated by an *ad hoc* marketing alliance between the band and the WCWC (which shared the band's interests in wilderness protection). (The blockades did lead to negotiations with the province, and, in 1996, the designation of a class A provincial park [see Map 25.]) (photographed, with permission, from original purchased by author).
the first to be produced in colour. By subordinating the cartographic component to the pictorial, it allowed the mapmaker to be more selective about what it revealed of TEK, but without compromising its visual impact. Although reduced, as the cultural historian Benedict Anderson would have it, to "pure sign", such a logo-map was still "instantly recognizable, everywhere visible...penetrating deep into the popular imagination, forming a powerful emblem for anticolonial national[isms] being born."41

Overall, these two maps clearly show that Native claimants were becoming more familiar with contemporary cartographic technologies, and were learning how to exploit them for specific purposes. As the term 'first nation' started to circulate more freely in public discourse, they also reflected the increasingly militant posture of Native people in British Columbia in the 1980s. Excepting the registered traplines on Map 20, there are no references to the landscapes of colonialism. The toponyms are in the appropriate orthographies and there is no fixed boundary on Map 19. Both are accompanied with a declaration of sovereignty. Each recycles language similar to that used in the pre-MMRC petitions and one does so in both languages. Finally, the two iterations of Map 19 show that Native research for purposes of land claims was already being adapted for use in local autohistorical publications. These maps were still about resistance, but they were now serving extra duty as educational primers within Native communities.42

Meanwhile, the province continued to deny the existence of Aboriginal title in British Columbia, and in 1987 the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en initiated legal proceedings in Delgamuukw v. B.C., a second major land title litigation that had a potential to go much further than Calder.43 That same year, now aware that the winds of judicial and public

41 In Imagined Communities 2nd Edition (London: Verso, 1991), 175.
42 I shall return to this very important point below.
43 Coming well before Section 35, Calder sought only a judicial affirmation that Nisga'a title continued to exist in the province. Delgamuukw was seeking a declaration that the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en not only owned their traditional territory, but that such ownership was an Aboriginal right under Section 35. For reasons which will become apparent, I will come back to this litigation in Chapter 4, but most substantively in the Conclusion.
opinion had started to blow in the Natives' direction, the federal government revised its 1974 NCC policy to allow more than one comprehensive claim negotiation at a time. At the same time, and taking direction from the courts, it set down a more stringent set of conditions that Native claimants would have to satisfy. These would include "a documented statement...that [the group] has traditionally used and occupied the territory in question...a description of the extent and location of such land use and occupancy...together with a map outlining the approximate boundaries...the names of the bands, tribes or communities...the claimants linguistic and cultural affiliation, and approximate population figures for the claimant group."45

The British Columbia Treaty Commission

As the 1980s drew to a close, there was still no prospect of provincial participation in comprehensive negotiations, but in 1990 the Mohawks and the Canadian Forces faced off at Oka and Kanesetake. This spawned a new round of blockades in British Columbia that were even more substantial than those of the 1980s, and they seriously compromised the resource economy. By 1991, it was clear that the province had had enough. It continued to state that Aboriginal title in British Columbia had not yet been

44 See, in this connection, Tennant, P. Aboriginal Peoples, op. cit., Chapters 15 and 17.
46 By 1989, the federal government had accepted 22 comprehensive claims (sixteen of which were from tribal groups and six from individual bands) with seven more in preparation. Only the Nisga'a's was in actual negotiation, however.
47 Ranging from the Nuu-chah-nulth hindering public access to Pacific Rim National Park; to the Lil'wat blockading highways, railways and logging roads at Mount Currie, Pemberton, Fountain and Lillooet; to the Okanagan preventing access to a ski resort and airport at Penticton; to the Secwepemc closure of a road to recreational cottages near Adams Lake; to the Tsilhqot'in stopping loggers and vacationers near Alexis Creek and interfering with military manoeuvres at Riske Creek; to the Gitxsan seizing logging equipment and obstructing railway and highway traffic at Kispiox, Kitwanga and Hazelton; to the Squamish slowing down traffic on the Burrard Inlet bridges in Vancouver: these direct actions were geographically far more wide-ranging and temporally much more long-lasting than those of the mid-1980s. See, again, Blomley, N. "Shut the province down!", op. cit.
proven, but it agreed to enter into negotiations with the Nisga’a, and, with Canada and the other First Nations in the province, to set up the British Columbia Treaty Commission (BCTC). The BCTC was not intended as a substitute for negotiations; it had no effect on specific claims and did not rule out litigation. Its purpose was to oversee the negotiation process, provide funding, and educate the public.\textsuperscript{48} To the extent that it changed the framework for negotiations, however, it superseded the 1987 comprehensive claims policy that still held elsewhere in Canada.\textsuperscript{49}

On the Native side, reaction was mixed. For some, the BCTC represented a breath of fresh air. It expanded the definition of 'first nation' for treaty purposes to include any group that envisioned, and could reasonably justify itself as a "self-determining and distinct nation with [its] own spiritual values, histories, languages, territories, political institutions and ways of life."\textsuperscript{50} This allowed submissions by groups that probably would not have qualified under the 1987 policy.\textsuperscript{51} Taking direction from the courts the BCTC also provided for interim measures agreements (IMAs), subsidiary compacts design to protect Native interest in resources in contested territories while the broader claims proceeded. For others, it meant more of the same at best, or a regression at worst. Some claimants, mostly in the interior, thought that the BCTC was unconstitutional because it allowed the province and third-party intervenors a voice in what they saw as a matter that could only be negotiated between themselves and the Queen in right of Canada.\textsuperscript{52} They also accused the BCTC's 'land selection model' — a model which implied the extinguishment of title over the larger traditional territory in exchange for a more limited set of rights over a smaller parcel of land and resources — as being nothing more than

\textsuperscript{49} Only the Nisga’a continued to negotiate under the old comprehensive claim process.
\textsuperscript{50} Cited in the BCTC 1997 \textit{Annual Report} (Vancouver: British Columbia Treaty Commission), 16.
\textsuperscript{51} Conceivably, many individual bands could satisfy these conditions.
\textsuperscript{52} This argument was based on the 1763 \textit{Royal Proclamation}. In their view, provincial participation was bad enough. Letting resource companies, municipalities, and non-governmental organizations into the process was simply unacceptable.
the reserve system dressed up in new clothes. These groups could still seek redress in the courts or by private arrangement with third party interests. In practical terms, however, it meant their exclusion from the treaty process and that any claims that may have been filed under the old NCC policy went to the back of the queue.

At any rate, the result was yet another realignment of the pan-Indian political voice, and with it a more accommodating and yet at the same time more contentious geography of claims in British Columbia (Maps 21 to 27). Early on, maps of groups that had previously filed claims, but which had since been in limbo (like 23 and 24), were very much a throwback to those made by the professional ethnographers. While perhaps adjusted to watershed contours, they displayed the external boundary and the names and locations of the main reserves. Submissions from first-time claimants (like 21) tended to be more tentative. A couple (21 and 24) included a tribal logo and one of those was accompanied by a declaration of sovereignty. Although in more guarded fashion, later editions (like 22, 25 and 27) ventured more in the way of toponyms or important physiographic features.

There were however, at least two new wrinkles. One was that Native cartographers were now deploying maps to dialogue with each other. As already hinted on Map 18 and now here in Map 22 the delimitation of an external boundary by one or more First Nations seems to have caused a neighbouring group to revise their original submission. As suggested by Map 26 and the declaration accompanying Map 24, basic philosophical differences over the best way to resolve claims prompted maps of a decidedly more propagandistic character. Read collectively, the other development was the emergence of a technological gap. As already hinted in Map 19(c) and now here in Map 27, some

53 In essence, the comprehensive claims process placed the burden of proof of Aboriginal title on Native claimants. For these groups, it was up to the province to prove that such title did not exist.
54 Groups opting into the BCTC constituted themselves under the umbrella of the First Nations Summit (FNS). Most of those opposed accepted de facto representation by the UBCIC; those in the southern interior, specifically, organized themselves as the Six Nations Alliance, which was later renamed the Interior Alliance.
Map 21
Cheslatta Band's *Cheslatta t'en*, Cheslatta, 1993, 26 x 16 cm; prepared immediately after the band's decision to separate itself from the CSTC (see Chapter 5) and file an independent submission to the BCTC. Like Map 15(a), except this time in 'plain vanilla', and referenced with an inset, it shows only the external boundary. It contrasts markedly with the maps of the Nazko Band (Map 16), whose border they share to the south and east of Natalkuz Lake (copied, with permission, from original donated to author).
Map 22
NTC's *Land Question Boundary Map*, New Aiyansh (?) 1995, 19 x 15 cm; prepared as cartographic support for 'Lock, stock and barrel: Nisga'a ownership statement' Nisga'a Tribal Council, New Aiyansh 1995, black and white map showing the Nisga'a land claim. It defines a fixed external boundary, main villages, and select mountains and rivers, all named in the preferred Nisga'a phonetics. While printed at a scale forbidding greater detail (say, for example, the internal boundaries of the 'chieflly hunting grounds') it's clear that it includes areas previously charted on Maps 9 and 11. Of more immediate interest, however, is that the northeastern portion of the external boundary reaches further up the Nass River (*Lisims*) than it did on either of Maps 15(a or b). By contrast, another version of this map (see the NTC, *Nisga'a: People of the Nass River* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1993) shows no boundary at all. I will return to this point below, and in Chapter 4 and the Conclusion (copied, with permission, from reproduction in Sterritt, N. et. al. *Tribal Boundaries*, op. cit., 264).
TRADITIONAL NISGA'A TERRITORY

LAND QUESTION BOUNDARY MAP

*All Nisga'a names, common spelling at the time • Nisga'a villages • Sacred mountains • Lava beds

Note: Map is representational, not to scale.
Map 23
Nicola Tribal Association’s (NTA) *Nlaka’pamux Nation’s Bands* (a) and *untitled* map of the south interior plateau (b), Merritt, 1996 (?), each 22 x 28 cm; black and white draft maps showing the Nlha7kápmx traditional territory. On (a) the NTA has shown, in English, the main bands; an approximated external boundary (dashed black line); and, in the appropriate Salish orthography, the nations on their borders (shown elsewhere on Maps 6, 7, 24, 29 and 33). On (b) the NTA highlighted the boundary defined by Teit in 1900 (in *The Thompson Indians*, op. cit., 166) and re-submitted that as their boundary for TUS purposes. Note, too, that the eastern portion of this boundary is a composite of those which Teit believed described the geographic limits of the Nlha7kápmx on the one hand, and an Athapaskan offshoot absorbed by either the Nlha7kápmx or Okanagan sometime during the protohistoric period on the other (copied, with permission, from originals donated to author).
Submitted for the Nicola Valley Tribal Council - Traditional Use Study (1990)
Description of study area

MAP SHOWING
LOCATION OF THE THOMPSON IN
AND
NEIGHBORING TRIBES.

The area formerly inhabited by the Aenina of Nicola Valley is indicated by shading.
Map 24
Sofor Consultant Ltd.'s *Stl'atl'imx Nation Territory*, Mount Currie, 1996 (?), 21 x 31 cm; black and white outline map of Lillooet traditional territory. It shows the main reserves in both English and Stl'atl'imx phonetics and the external boundary (dashed line) defined by Teit (on Map 6) in 1906 (but adjusted to correspond to water-sheds). The band council stated that the map is "a record of our traditional territory as told to us through our traditional and oral history" (letter from Chief Allen Stager and the Mount Currie Band Council to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and Premier Glen Clark, in 'Lil'wat Nation' *Kahtou* 6[5] 1997, 12). In a clear swipe at the BCTC, the council added that it would "not accept any treaty having an impact on the lands and resources within [their] traditional territory" or any treaty process that had, as its intent, the extinguishment of Aboriginal title and rights." In closing it noted that the nation "remain[s] committed and loyal to the Declaration of the Lillooet Tribe, made and signed by all Chiefs at Spences Bridge, B.C. on May 10th 1911" (ibid.) (copied, with permission, from original donated to author).
Map 25
Xeni Gwet'in's and the British Columbia Ministry of Environment Lands and Parks' Ts'ilhqot'in Features, Williams Lake, 1996, 27 x 19 cm; produced for inclusion in Parks' Draft Master Plan for Ts'il?os Provincial Park, it shows the area set aside the following year as a Class A park. Note, however, that the external boundary (dashed black line) is not coterminous with that anticipated by the Nemiah on Map 20. (Note, also, that the legend has the road and boundary backwards.) The map highlights, in the correct Tsilhqot'in orthography, a number of places but no etymologies are supplied. (The facing page in the Master Plan has the same base map in English but the features mapped are not the same.) Some evidence of the slow pace of contemporary geographic research by the Tsilhqot'in Nation is indicated by the fact that when it decided to conduct its own TUS in 1998 (long after most other First Nations in British Columbia had so decided), they did not start in the field (where a TUS typically begins); they started with the names on this map (copied, with permission, from original in ibid., 13).
Map 26(a-b)
House of Smayusta's *untitled* maps of Nuxalk territory on the central coast, Bella Coola, 1996 (?), each about 50 x 65 cm; both prepared to express the Nuxalk’s opposition to both the BCTC (a), and the geographical terms of reference for the (then) 1996 Nisga’a Agreement in Principle (AIP) (b). In (a), the Bella Coola Band manually coloured the area in Map 4 where the Nuxalk claim would have been shown had they elected to participate in the BCTC, to highlight their overlap with the claims of the Heiltsuk (who are in the BCTC, and whose eastern claimed boundary is shown on Map 18), and the Oweekeno and Kitasoo (who are not, and who had always been considered 'sub-tribes' of the Nuxalk). With the help of some figures, scribbled lower left, (b) shows what the Nuxalk stood to lose (areas shaded yellow) or end up with (areas shaded pink) if the Nisga’a AIP was ever used as a template to determine an appropriate percentage of traditional territory for claims settlement purposes; for the Nuxalk, this would mean an area roughly equivalent in size to King Island. (The areas in black designate provincial parks.) (both photographed, with permission, from originals at the House of Smayusta, Bella Coola).
Map 27
Squamish Nation's *Xay Temixw - Sacred Lands*, Vancouver, 2001, 27 x 42 cm; a coloured GIS map of Squamish traditional territory designed to "show how [the Squamish] want the traditional forests and wilderness treated," and to preempt "government, industry and other stakeholder groups [that had] been deciding," without any input by the Squamish people, "how [their] traditional lands will be used." It displays roughly the same area shown 64 years earlier on Map 12, except this time with the fixed external boundary (the red line) and logo, and without the pictorial elaboration. Now more concerned with scientific accuracy, it shows instead the various land use categories proposed by the Squamish Nation, labelling them in the appropriate orthography. The range of Squamish traditional territories contrasts vividly with the tiny reserves (in red). At the time of this writing the land use plan proposed on this map had been accepted by the WCWC and other environmental groups; government and resource companies had not responded (copied, with permission, from original lithograph donated to author).
claimants had started to exploit the representational capabilities of a GIS. Over the late 1980s and early 1990s, digital technologies had been successfully adapted by First Nations in the territorial north, where they slowly replaced the analog techniques that characterized the LUOS of the late 1970s and early 1980s. They were, though, expensive and until the BCTC provided the necessary resources few claimants in British Columbia had the finances or expertise to run them. But as more of the bugs that accompany new technical applications were worked out, and the costs dropped, GIS became a more attractive alternative. More importantly, a handful of upper court rulings had by now added more substance to Section 35, and the province was demanding more comprehensive TUS in contested territories. As suggested on Map 19(a), analog cartography could provide some of this data, but for the multi-level taskings the government had in mind only a GIS would do. The problem was that GIS were not made available to First Nations on a non-partisan basis. Because both governments devoted their energies to the BCTC, groups opting out of that process found themselves with more limited resources and had to make do with analog maps well after most BCTC affiliates had already converted to digital techniques. The net effect was to further entrench the 'first-past-the-post' mentality implied by the BCTC and the land selection model.


56 Two of the most important included the 1990 SCC decision in R. v. Sparrow and the 1993 British Columbia Court of Appeal ruling in Delgamuukw v. A.G. By insisting that laws which regulate an Aboriginal right do not constitute extinguishment, and that such rights must be interpreted in a liberal and purposive manner, Sparrow clarified what is meant by the terms 'existing' and 'recognized and affirmed' in Section 35. (For the complete synopsis, see, again, Kulchyski, P. Unjust Relations, op. cit., Chapter 8.) While it left the determination of those rights to specific cases, Delgamuukw was the first to acknowledge that non-exclusive Aboriginal rights did still exist in British Columbia.

57 With the Appeal Court ruling in Delgamuukw, the province could no longer arbitrarily determine whether or not Aboriginal rights in any given area could be constitutionally violated by provincially licensed activities such as forest tenures or mining claims. It was this decision, in short, that forced the province to be more accommodating of IMAs, and to start coughing up funds for TUS capacity building purposes in First Nations communities. For details on how a GIS does so, see either of Weiler, M. 'GIS applications', op. cit.; or Duerden, F. and Keller, P. 'GIS and land selection', op. cit. I will return to some concrete examples in Part II.
Overall, the most striking feature of these maps is how sparse they are, especially in light of some of the maps produced in the 1980s. Most were in a manuscript style and very few were in colour. Those that included pictorial images or declarations did so in a far more reserved manner. Part of the explanation is that for some groups, especially those submitting for the first time, land claims research was still in its infancy — the data were not yet in hand. As hinted by Map 23(b), however, the more likely reason is that most groups had the data, but were treating them with far greater caution. If more detail was included on these maps, it was either because the information had already been made public on earlier maps (as on Map 22), or because public policy initiatives required it (as on Maps 25 and 27). Indeed, if the maps prepared in this period were more spartan than those earlier, it was not because the technology was lacking or because the information was not available. As suggested by the labyrinthine geography shown on Map 4, it was because the Map of British Columbia had become more like a chessboard — a place where every move was potentially dangerous, and where Native cartographers were increasingly reluctant to display on their maps anything more than was absolutely necessary at any given time.

**First Nations maps and community empowerment**

Throughout the modern claims period there had developed, however, a parallel tradition of Native mapmaking that did provide more intimate glimpses of a Native geography. Whether for the general public or for use in First Nations communities these were maps made for pedagogical purposes. Indeed, it was inevitable that as First Nations acquired more control over education, and became more familiar with cartographic techniques, Native maps would begin to find uses in other areas. As already hinted on Map 19(c), these maps did not have anything to do with land claims *per se*. But they came
out of that same process, and so reflected some of the same stylistic currents and crossed the same historical junctures I have previously identified (Maps 28 through 34).

Through to the 1980s, most were very much in the same black and white manuscript tradition outlined above. Prepared mainly in support of (quasi)academic textual works (as with 28 through 30) or band-based educational programs (as with 31) they could be produced cheaply and by people with little or no formal training in cartography. In the 1990s, they started to exploit the latest in analog or computer mapping, and the mass-production capabilities of colour lithography (32 to 34). In part, this reflected more financial or technical resources, but also the desire to satisfy the aesthetic tastes of an increasingly public audience. In either case, however, the pervasive influence of an ethnographic imagination is evident. While they all show a willingness to approximately position tribes or sub-tribal groups (as on 29, 31 or 32), there is a general reluctance to venture, with any precision, fixed external or internal boundaries. Where there are fixed boundaries (as on 28, 33 or 34) they are often prefaced with disclaimers to the effect that these boundaries are not to be attributed any legal weight for land claims purposes. The photographic legend on Map 33 is a new technical wrinkle, but its thematic function is not intrinsically different than the iconic panoramas that characterized the work of the amateur ethnographers. And while the digital treatment of the volumetric landscape on Map 34(b) is rather more colorful than it would be on an analog version, we have seen it in simpler form elsewhere.

There are, however, at least two striking developments in these maps, both of which are related. The first is that they all lure map readers more deeply into the geographies of TEK. In some (like 31, 32[a] and 33[b]) they do so by highlighting various resources and where they were traditionally harvested. Others (like 30 and 32[b and d]) use diffusion flowlines to show the ancestral migrations of founding ancestors or lineages. In still others (like 28, 29, 32[c], 33[a] and 34) they emphasize the toponyms, and often with their etymologies placed directly on the map beside them. At the same time, there
Map 28
Chief William Matthews’s and Kathleen Dalzell’s *Some of the Ancient Haida Villages and Camping Sites*, Queen Charlotte City (?), 1968, 9 x 12 cm; prepared as cartographic support for Dalzell’s *The Queen Charlotte Islands 1774-1966* (Terrace: C.M. Adam, 1968) it remains, so far as I know, the most detailed map of Haida territory available to the public. Along with their etymologies, it locates and names the main Haida villages and camping sites, and (in the circled letters) the clans that lived there. Where more than one clan is shown, it is because of movements and amalgamations induced by contact; this explains why some of the villages have more than one name. The areas bounded by dotted lines (numbered 1-14) are those used for hunting or gathering purposes by the leading lineages in the villages, but the lack of boundaries elsewhere does not mean the territory was not owned; as Dalzell acknowledged, "the map is far from complete...owing to the lack of accurate records" (ibid., 50) (copied, with permission, from original in ibid., 332-3).
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Map 29(a-b)
Dorothy Kennedy's and Randy Bouchard's *Map of Upper Lillooet Place-names (a)*, and *Map of Lower Lillooet Place-names (b)*; Victoria, 1977, each 8 x 10 cm; prepared as cartographic support for their *Lillooet Stories*, William Langlois, Janet Cauthers and Derek Reimer (eds) *Sound Heritage* 6(1) (Victoria: RBCM, 1977), black and white maps of Stl'atl'ímx traditional territory. To a degree, these add little to either Maps 6 or 24; they use the same generalized boundary defined by Teit in the former, and situate, in English instead of Stl'atl'ímx, the same settlements that Sofor Consultant Ltd. would later show in the latter. What these maps do add, however, are a number of important transformer sites; these are labelled in the P-PS in use at that time and are keyed to references in the narratives in the accompanying text (copied, with permission, from originals in ibid., 6-7).
Map 30(a-c)
Hilary Stewart's *untitled* maps of Kwakwaka'wakw territory around Johnstone and Georgia Straits and Discovery Passage, Quadra Island (?), 1985, each roughly 19 x 15 cm; three (of five) hand drawn 'route maps' illustrating the migrations of the Lekwiltok tribes. The protohistoric movement of the Weewiakay (*We-Wai-Kai*) 'sub-tribe' from an ancestral landing place at Topaze Harbour (*Teka*) to sites at White Rock Passage (*Tatapa?ulis*), Drew Harbour (*Calcexisa*), Gowlland Harbour (*Gwigwikulis*), Campbell River (*Gamatexw*) and, finally, to Cape Mudge (*Cakwaloten*) is highlighted in (a). The post-contact odyssey of the Walitsma and Weewiakum (*We-Wai-Kum*) 'sub-tribes' from Salmon River to Cape Mudge, and then to Campbell River, where they took up residence with the Weewiakay is shown in (b). The pre-contact migration that brought the Walitsma (*Walitsma*) 'sub-tribe' from an (unspecified) northern cultural hearth to the mouth of the Nimpkish River (*Geldedzulis*), and then to Salmon River, where they intermingled with a Coast Salish speaking group (probably the Comox [*Komenox*]), is shown in (c). These journeys are all recalled in narrative format by Chief Harry Assu in his and Joy Inglis, *Assu of Cape Mudge* (Vancouver: UBC Press), 3-15) (all copied, with permission, from originals in ibid., 7, 8, and 11 respectively).
Map 31
Hartley Bay Curriculum Committee's (HBCC) *Sites in the Territory of Gitga'ata*, Hartley Bay (?), 1985, 28 x 21 cm; prepared for use in District 52 (Prince Rupert) elementary schools, a black and white thematic map of the area around Douglas Channel. It shows the reserves allotted in 1882 (the small circles), the main fisheries (the fish symbols), and the clan (or, in the language of Maps 9 and 11, the 'chiefly hunting grounds') territories of the Gitga'ata (one of the contemporary constituent villages of the Coast Tsimshian people). As noted in the legend, information on the traditional fishing stations was taken from a map made by the local Anglican missionary in 1913, but the clan territories are depicted as described by elder Heber Clifton in 1939. So far as I am aware, it is one of a very few northwest coast nation maps to show clan boundaries in a format readily accessible by a non-Native audience. As to why these nations (which include the Gitxsan [Chapter 4] and Nisga'a) had been (and are still) reluctant to map clan territories is hinted in the accompanying primer, which notes that "the map [must] be studied in its historical context as modern changes, traplines, and land claims issues have all had an effect on the concept of clan ownership of the land" (in the HBCC, *Hartley Bay Clans* [Prince Rupert: School District 52, 1985], 21). A primer prepared by the Kitkatla Band (a sister community to Gitga'ata) contains a resource map of the area around Dolphin Island, along with guidelines on how to read, interpret, and make maps. One of the more interesting lessons includes instructions on how to use natural or artificial materials, like rocks, plastiglum and popsicle sticks, to construct a three-dimensional topographic (see the Kitkatla Band Council Education Committee, *Kitkatla: A Northwest Coast Village* [Prince Rupert: School District 52, 1994], 164) (copied with permission from *Hartley Bay*, op. cit., 22).
SITES IN THE TERRITORY OF GITGA'AATA

TRADITIONAL CLAN LAND OWNERSHIP
(From information by H.L. Clifton, 1939)

Key
E = Eagle Territory
B = Blackfish Territory
R = Raven Territory
Map 32(a-d)
Susan Marsden's and the Tsimshian Chiefs' *untitled* maps of the northwest coast, Prince Rupert, 1992 (?) each 17 x 21 cm, more or less; four (of six) coloured lithographs used to help illustrate a series of elementary school primers on Tsimshian culture and history. Select place names in (a) are given in the accepted contemporary *Sm'algyax* (Tsimshian language) orthography and keyed to a gazetteer in the text. A record of the ancient migration of some of the ancestral clan lineages from the cultural hearth at Temlaxam (*Temlaxam*) to Gitga'ata (*Gitk'aa'ta* [Map 31] and Kitkathla (*Gitxaxaata*) is in (b), and recounted in narrative format in the text. A textual thematic, using English names but without fixed boundaries (c) shows the general location of neighbouring nations and resources traded during the pre-contact period. The route of a Nisga'a trading expedition during the contact period is mapped in (d), and related in narrative format in the text ([a-c] copied, with permission, from originals in Susan Marsden, Viola Hutchingson and Anita Haas [eds] *Na Amwaaltga Ts'miseen* [Prince Rupert: School District 52, 1992], 8, 29 and 34 respectively; [d], with permission, from original in *Conflict at Gits'ilaasù*, ibid., 1).
Map 33(a-c)
Secwepemc Cultural Education Society's (SCES) *Traditional Place Names of the Shuswap Nation* (a), *Shuswap Fishing Methods Traps and Weirs* (b) and *Shuswap Nation Residential Schools* (c), Kamloops, 1994, each 62 x 46 cm; three (of six) coloured lithographs prepared for educational purposes. On (a) the SCES labelled each of the current 17 Shuswap bands in English, but keyed them to a 'photo-legend' consisting of pictures of people, structures or occasions characterizing the band, and captioned with their Secwepemc names and their etymologies. Additional information is supplied in the short text. On (b) artistic renditions of traditional resource-gathering technologies and a short text support a map of the main salmon spawning runs. Relating a more depressing tale, again with a photo-legend and short text, (c) situates the four main residential schools (two of which were extra-territorial) to which, starting in the 1890s, Secwepemc children were sent. As suggested, all six plates were standardized on the same base map and used similar combinations of cartographic, illustrative and textual elements. (The other three plates were resource maps mainly dealing with fisheries issues.) Notably, they all highlight that portion of Secwepemc territory occupied by the Tsilhqot'in after 1880; the area around the Arrow Lakes considered to be shared territory with the Ktunaxa Kinbasket; and the external boundary defined by Teit at the turn of the century in Map 7. While all six plates can stand alone (separately or as a set) they were meant to be used in conjunction with other SCES publications, including an elementary school social studies manual containing exercises on the interpretation and design of thematic or topographic maps (all copied, with permission, from originals at Simon Fraser University Library Map Division cat. no. G3511 E10, Burnaby).
Aldona Jonaitis's Map of Kwakiutl Region (a) and Brian Compton's and Eric Leinberger's Kwakwaka'wakw Territories (b), each Vancouver, 1991 and 1998 respectively, each 19 x 26 cm; both generalized maps of Kwakwaka'wakw traditional territory on the Queen Charlotte and Johnstone Straits. Both show selected settlements, the external boundary, and the internal 'tribal' and 'sub-tribal' boundaries (including those of the Lekwiltok [Ligwiltdaxw] Walitsma [Walitsmakw], Weewiakum (Wewekam), and Weewiakay [Wiweka'yi] whose ancestral migrations are illustrated on Map 30[a-c]). Beyond these points of connection, however, there are marked differences. The visual emphasis in (a) lies in the 'three-dimensionalization' of the topography, and the way in which the named groups are 'draped over' specific fjords and associated drainages. In (b) the emphasis lies on the dialectical divisions into which the named groups are organized. In addition, (a) locates past and presently occupied Kwakwaka'wakw villages in both English and Kwak'wala (Kwakwaka'wakw language) and names the neighbouring First Nations; (b) labels only the presently occupied communities in English and no external neighbours ([a] copied, with permission, from original in Jonaitis, Chiefly Feasts [Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991], 18; [b], with permission, from Juanita Pasco, Compton and Lorraine Hunt, The Living World: Plants and Animals of the Kwakwaka'wakw (Alert Bay: Umista Cultural Society, 1998), 3).
seems to be no special correlation between the intended readership, and whether or not the names are in English or the appropriate orthographies. If anything, English seems to dominate the intra-tribal maps (as on 31), while Native orthographies are more common on those directed to a non-Native readership (as on 30, 33 and 34). On maps appealing to both audiences (28, 29 and 32), there are both. The second is the distinctly narrative form in which this display of TEK is cast. In some cases, and especially when used to define a migration, a single map is sufficient. More often than not, though, Native cartographers are making more use of a model first experimented with on Map 16. They are using a series of maps, in a common format, to add a time dimension or to relate several tales simultaneously. As already shown on Map 16(b-c), and now here on Map 33(c), these may even extend to contact narratives. As the number of maps multiplies, moreover, more initiated viewers can begin to infer relationships between maps made at different times, in different places, and for different reasons — the dialogues set up across Maps 31 and 32, or 30 and 34 cases in point. Insofar as all these maps were inspired, in whole or in part, by the land claims process, they are still maps of resistance. The difference is that they are no longer merely artefacts, detached from context and from each other. They are becoming more like pages, perhaps even chapters, in a book of TEK. In short, these are Native maps that have begun to tell stories.\[58\]

From an infinite distance

What permeates all the maps that we have hitherto examined is the pervasive influence of the tribal perspective on the land. Aside from acknowledging their immediate neighbours, on none of them is there any concerted attempt to map beyond the boundaries of the groups that produced them. This said, the modern land claims movement

---

58 While cartographic theorists have long debated the utility of linguistic metaphors in cartography (see, again, Blakemore, M. and Harley, B. 'Concepts', op. cit.), this has generally not been extended to the narratival. I will come back to this point in Chapters 2 and 3.
has spawned a handful of maps that reflect a pan-Indian voice, and which provide a useful coda for this chapter. Part of a discrepant historical tradition that was emerging at that time, one of the earliest, and most unusual, is reproduced here as Map 35. It was designed to show that the reserve allocation process was by no means an innocent by-product of the cartographic eye/I in British Columbia. On the contrary, it was for Native people a classic 'death by a thousand cuts'. In all likelihood, it was also the model that inspired Map 17 three years later, and some of the time-series maps just discussed.

In the 1990s, pan-Indian cartography has been more preoccupied with showing how a Native geography did, and still does extend over 'the whole damned province' (Maps 36 to 38). Displaying fixed solid boundaries, and thematized in multiple colours, Map 36 demonstrates the continuing influence of the ethnographic imagination. On Map 37, by comparison, the whole effect is to de-emphasize tribal difference. Boundaries are in thinner dashed lines and the same base colour is used throughout. At the same time, the map is adorned with pictorial imagery. In part, such treatment is clearly reminiscent of ornately decorated Dutch Renaissance maps. The difference is that while Dutch map-makers surrounded their maps with romanticized representations of Natives 'looking in' on territories by then being reconstituted in the European image, this one uses formline drawings of supernatural beings 'looking in' on territories now being reconfigured in a Native perspective. Finally, Map 38 draws on the best of each. Itself a representation made possible by digital colour enhancement, it shows boundaries not as fixed frontal edges in the ethnographic or political sense, but as blended transitional frontiers in the ecosystemic. To paraphrase the geographer Yi-Fu Tuan, Maps 36 to 38 are pictures of First National space from an infinite distance.\(^5^9\) But as the unidentified caller at the beginning of the study suggests, they are about as real as maps can get.

\(^5^9\) In 'Realism and fantasy in art, history and geography' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 80(3), 1990, 435-46.
Ron Hamilton's *Our Land* (a), *Douglas Reserves 1860's* (b), *Trutch Reserves 1860's-1870's* (c), *Indian Reserve Commission 1876-1910* (d), *D.I.A. Land Administration Policy 1870's-1920's* (e), *McKenna-McBride Commission 1913-1924* (f) and *D.I.A. Administration Since 19-20s* (g), Victoria, 1975, each 20 x 25 cm; set of chronologically ordered coloured lithographs recording the (de)volution of the reserve system in British Columbia, as perceived and experienced by Native people. Because it was a protracted, and areally variable affair, Hamilton chose not to illustrate the allocation and subsequent fragmentation of specific reserves in any one or more portions of the province. Instead he created a kind of generalized 'cartographic novella' summarizing a process that had (and still has) wide purchase everywhere (copied, with permission, from originals in Ruben Ware, *Our Homes Are Blee-ding: A Short History of Indian Reserves* [Victoria: UBCIC Land Claims Center, 1975], 5, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18 and 20 respectively).
OUR LAND

This is the land before the whites came. There were no reserves. There was no white regulation of Indian ways. There was Indian law and Indian ways. Indians owned and managed and used all of its resources. This map shows the aboriginal claim for land, for fishing, hunting, and trapping rights, for Indian use of timber, grasses, water, minerals, and many other things.

None of these things have ever been surrendered or ceded to the whites. These things make up our claim for aboriginal rights and Native Title.

DOUGLAS RESERVES 1860's

The first Indian reserves in British Columbia were set up by James Douglas, the first Governor of the Colony of British Columbia. His policy was to recognize aboriginal rights and to make reserves as big as the Bands desired. Some of these early reserves were quite large. They were set up in the South Island, Fraser Valley, Fraser Canyon, and the Thompson River areas.
TRUTCH RESERVES 1860's - 1870's

Joseph Trutch was Commissioner of Lands and Works and later Lieutenant-Governor. He made big changes in Douglas' policy. He refused to recognize Native Title. He made large reductions in the size of reserves by "re-alloting" them. Small reserves and non-recognition of Native Title has been the policy of the Province ever since. Trutch's policy led to disputes with Ottawa. There were great protests by Indian leaders and nearly an Indian war.

INDIAN RESERVE COMMISSION 1876 - 1910

The Indian Reserve Commission was set up by both the Province and Ottawa. Its job was to review the size of Trutch's reserves and to set up reserves in areas that had none. Over 35 years it alloted, or "re-allotted" most of the reserves in British Columbia. Sometimes it made reserves smaller by resurveys. The Province also refused to approve some of the reserves that were set up by the Indian Reserve Commission. Sometimes the reserves were set up without meaningful consultations with the Bands.
D.I.A. LAND ADMINISTRATION POLICY 1870's - 1920's

In 1871 British Columbia became part of the rest of Canada. The Federal government was given responsibility for Indians. The department of Indian Affairs started its administration in British Columbia shortly after. Reserves have lost much land in many different ways due to Department of Indian Affairs land policies. There have also been losses because Dep of Indian Affairs failed to protect Indian rights. Ways such as land sales, rights-of-way, re-surveys, and lands taken for "public purposes" are examples.

McKENNA-McBRIDE COMMISSION 1913 - 1924

The McKenna - McBride Royal Commission was set up by both the Province and Ottawa. Its job was to review the work of the Indian Reserve Commission and to settle the dispute between the two governments over the size and location of the reserves. The Royal Commission took away reserve lands by "correcting" the acreage allotted by the Indian Reserve Commission. It also took rights-of-way, as well as the "cut-off lands."
Most of the ways that reserves have lost land in the past are going on today. There are still land sales and surrenders. There are still rights-of-way takings and Provincial Order-in-Council No. 1036 has recently been used in this regard. Since 1940 land has been lost by the War Measures Act and by transferral to other Federal departments. There have been cancellations of reserves set up by the McKenna-McBride Commission and at least one reversion to the Province because it was claimed the Band was extinct. These are only some examples, there are many others.
Map 36(a-b)
UBCIC's *Map of the Sovereign Indigenous Nations* (a) and UBCIC's and Multi Mapping Ltd.'s *Map Showing Sovereign Indigenous Nations Territorial Boundaries* (b), Vancouver, 1992, and 1993 respectively, each 92 x 70 cm; so far as I know, the first attempt, by a Native political umbrella group, to map all First Nations in British Columbia. Note that both maps were designed to show the traditional, ethnographically defined nations that existed before contact and not the more fragmented polities negotiating under the auspices of the BCTC (Map 4); indeed, many of the boundaries appear to be taken from 'metes and bounds' descriptions provided (in an April 1 1910 letter to British Columbia Provincial Museum [BCPM] curator J.F. Newcombe) by James Teit in his critique of the boundaries defined on George Dawson's and William Tolmie's 1884 *Map shewing the Distribution of Indian Tribes of British Columbia* (reproduced in my *Euro-Canadian Cartography*, op. cit., 116). Even so, the map was always intended for public sale, and a manually drawn black and white rough draft (a) was circulated to each representative tribal council with a request for comments or criticisms on its overall accuracy. According to past UBCIC president Saul Terry, not all councils (such as the Heiltsuk’s) responded — the result being that they were either left off, or treated as belonging to the nearest nation in the same language family. At any rate, the finished coloured lithograph (b) with fixed solid boundaries and a mix of English and Native orthographies reflects the changes made. (Note that the Wet'suwet'en and Gitxsan were incorrectly cross-labeled.) That this final print uses a topographic base map of British Columbia does not, in my view, compromise its visual effectivity — if anything, it enhances it (photographed, with permission, from original purchased by author).
Map 37
Lyle Wilson's *First Nations of British Columbia*, Duncan (?), 1997 (?), 57 x 46 cm; another coloured lithograph map of First Nations territories in British Columbia. (The original is about twice this size, and painted in acrylics.) The names are given in the accepted orthographies, but this time with the boundaries depicted by dashed lines. Beyond that the aesthetic emphasis is no longer on the territories proper; instead, it lies in the formline images of animals, birds, or aquatic mammals that frame the map (photographed, with permission, from original purchased by author).
First Nations of British Columbia

The intent is to provide a more accurate representation of First Nations in British Columbia. Boundaries shown are approximate and not an authoritative depiction of tribal territories. The names listed are the ones First peoples prefer to call themselves. Terms and spellings do not reflect all varieties present and by First Nations living within the illustrated regions.

First Nations of the Georgia Straits Region:
1) Heiltsuk 11) Semiahmoo
2) Haida 12) Aleutian
3) Tsimshian 13) Musgamox
4) Comox 14) Haysan
5) Qualicum 15) T'Sou-ke
6) Secwepemc 16) Squamish
7) Nuu-chah-nulth 17) Kwakwaka’wakw
8) Kootenay 18) Cowichan
9) Kwakiutl 19) Cowichan
10) Squamish 20) Colville

First Nations of the Georgia Straits Region:
1) Heiltsuk 11) Semiahmoo
2) Haida 12) Aleutian
3) Tsimshian 13) Musgamox
4) Comox 14) Haysan
5) Qualicum 15) T'Sou-ke
6) Secwepemc 16) Squamish
7) Nuu-chah-nulth 17) Kwakwaka’wakw
8) Kootenay 18) Cowichan
9) Kwakiutl 19) Cowichan
10) Squamish 20) Colville
Map 38
British Columbia Ministry of Education's *First Nations Peoples of British Columbia*, Victoria, 1994 (?) 56 x 43 cm; coloured lithograph map of First Nations' territories in British Columbia. Like Map 37, all nations are again given in the accepted orthographies, except the boundaries are shown not with fixed or dashed lines, but as 'fuzzy', transitional zones. Citing von Clausewitz's famous dictum that "the map is not the territory" (cited in Wood, D., 'Maps are territories: Science is an atlas: A portfolio of exhibits', *Cartographica* 28 [2] 1991, 73-80), the caption cautions that "in recognition of the complex territorial relationships involved...the boundaries are deliberately shown as blending into one another." It also notes that the map is a compromise between its two main sources: Map 4 (showing overlapping boundaries) and Map 36 (which shows discrete, coterminous ones). Intended as an instructional aid for elementary or secondary schools, a written preamble, verso, suggests how the map may be used in history or geography classes, or art and language lessons (photographed, with permission, from original donated to author).
Towards an understanding of First Nations' maps

These first tentative forays into First National space have been of the most superficial, voyeuristic kind. Partly, this has been deliberate. I have attempted to broach these maps much as an explorer like Mackenzie or Fraser, or a casual visitor to an art gallery or museum might — with as few preconceptions as possible and with a view to appreciating these maps in an 'at-a-glance' manner. I admit that I intentionally sought some of them out, and that this gallery has been situated in a social and political history that is unfamiliar to non-Native British Columbians. That said, the majority of these maps are in the public domain, and I have provided no more context for them than I deemed absolutely necessary. If each of these maps was in its own glass case in a museum, or its own frame in a gallery then I have supplied the 'captions' at best. On balance, I tried to enter this space armed only with what most non-Native British Columbians could reasonably be expected to know about maps, and could be evaluated by ordinary experience on the Map of British Columbia.

It is also in the nature of this gallery itself. Its contents come from various points of the compass; are contingent on different political, socio-cultural and environmental circumstances; and appear intermittently over a long historical period. With one or two exceptions, there are few visible points of connection between them. While I classified these maps according to some functional, aesthetic or temporal criteria, that classification has been mostly a convenient way of avoiding the tedious 'map-by-map' historical atlas. On balance, these maps are what they seem to be. They are glimpses of territories that have, for the most part, remained invisible to non-Native British Columbians.

There is, however, one aspect of these maps about which one can be fairly certain. To greater or lesser degree they are all counter-mappings. They are maps of resistance, their prime objective having been to facilitate a dialogue with the agents of empire and colonialism. They are not, of course, only about resistance. At contact, most of them
were about the exchange of useful information. Most recently, many are designed as instructional aids within First Nations' communities. Their proliferation after contact is, though, directly proportional to the degree to which First Nations have fought for a geographical 're-presencing' on the Map of British Columbia. As the anthropologist Peter Nabokov has noted, these maps are all variants within a more hemispheric tradition of indigenous maps that have variously served as a mode of cross-cultural argument; as a mirror for collective self-representation in a changing environment; as a rhetorical device for staking out a social, political or diplomatic position; or as a technique of visualization used in conjunction with storytelling.\textsuperscript{60} If I were to borrow Edward Said's musical metaphor, they may be conceived as \textit{contrapuntal} cartographies. They are contact zone cartographies that are 'in tune' with the harmonies that resonate across the Map of British Columbia, even as they set up 'oppositional melodies' within it.\textsuperscript{61}

To the degree that they are in tune with this Map, they present no special cognitive challenges for those who live in the simulacrum. Most are faithful to the Cartesian geometry of the orthogonal grid and the perspective of the cartographic eye/I in British Columbia. Many of them display coastlines, rivers, lakes, mountains and place names familiar to most non-Native British Columbians. Like all abstractions they are of course selective. They generalize. Some display toponyms; some do not. Some mark out fixed boundaries; those that don't at least hint that they are there (somewhere). Some emphasize the physiography; others don't bother. Some are thematized iconically, others symbolically, still others only textually. They all employ visual techniques used by European cartographers for hundreds of years, even though they all use them in dramatically different ways, and in accordance with available technologies of production. On balance, though, they all look like maps. Perhaps not maps one might expect to find in

\textsuperscript{60} From 'Orientations from their side' \textit{Cartographic Encounters}, op. cit., 241-69.

\textsuperscript{61} In \textit{Culture}, op. cit., 62-79, Said defines contrapuntal reading as that which recognizes the counterpoint between the imperial and anti-imperial subtexts permeating occidental discourses. While he develops this concept in the context of literature and opera, it is equally germane to maps.
a newspaper, textbook, coffee table atlas, outdoor recreation supply store, or gas station — but maps nonetheless.

That said, these maps are disquieting. There are boundaries, toponyms, and icons that are clearly not of the Map of British Columbia. In contrapuntal terms there are melodies that an immigrant society has not heard before. It is quite true that all maps authorize themselves on what the literary critic Graham Huggan has called the mimetic fallacy — the illusion that they are somehow a neutral and faithful representation of some essentialized 'geographic reality'.62 But there is this nagging sense that these maps are grounded, in whole or in part, in some 'other reality' in which maps were not the primary medium for geographical self-representation and identification. One intuitively suspects that these maps are all trying to translate fragments of one geography into the representational idioms of (an)other. The question is exactly what is it being translated? And is what is being made visible in the the translation, in the eye of the beholder, anywhere near to what was envisioned in the mind's eye of the map-maker?

Given that there are no maps of pre-contact Native space in what is now British Columbia there would seem only two avenues open to us. Either we jump into the ethnohistorical record without much sense of where to focus our attention or we begin with the gallery we have in front of us but without any real fix on the historical or geographical depth of field in which that record is partially constituted. As the geographer Michael Blakemore suggested a generation ago, "it is necessary either to use the exceedingly limited amount of historical evidence of past societies and so enter the realm of conjecture or to study present-day societies in an attempt to seek analogies in surviving aboriginal cultures which can be projected back into the past as indicators of the earliest formative styles of map making."63 This suggests that while my second stop on this ex-

---

ploration must be the extant ethnohistorical record, the maps discussed in this chapter provide some clues as to where, in that record, to look. My preliminary thoughts are these.

To begin with we will have to get some sense of how the ancestors of today's First Nations came to identify themselves with certain territories, and specific tribes or communities with particular places or sites. Some of these identifications seem to be associated with ancestral migrations reaching back into the mythological age; others might be the result of protohistoric or immediate pre-contact diasporas. Perhaps still others can source no such record, suggesting either that the origins are shrouded in some now forgotten past or are described along the lines of Genesis accounts. These would not be written accounts in the same sense as the explorer's journal or the captain's log, but, rather, oral narratives that performed a similar function. Indeed, if we assume that maps made by Native cartographers, and as learning aids within Native communities, tend to emphasize stories — and that such maps would reflect what Native peoples considered most germane — it seems logical that narratives (or at least some particular category of narratives) are the most important vehicle for the transmission of geographical information generally. If so, then we may also have to entertain the possibility that such information can be relayed in a musical, as opposed to the merely spoken, register. At any rate, these maps do suggest that this mosaic of peoples that occupied British Columbia before Europeans arrived was by no means static.

We most certainly will have to consider the toponyms, which, at all points, seem to be important territorial signifiers in their own right. Indeed, a quick scan of the etymologies on (or in the gazetteers accompanying) many of these maps suggests that Native toponyms are laden with geographical meaning. They seem to refer to anything from

---

64 As suggested, for example, in Maps 30(a-b) and 32(b).
65 Maps 30(c) and 32(d).
66 Maps 8, 19(a and c), 28, 32(a), 33(a), 15, 19, 24(a), 25(a-c) and 28(a-c).
how a site looks from some other vantage point, to its biophysical or environmental situatedness, to the resources that are commonly found there, or to some event that might have happened at the site at some time in the past. This also suggests, to go back to my previous point, that we will have to watch for important connections between the names and any origin stories that purport to explain how those places came into existence, or with any other narratives of a site-specific nature. The same consideration probably applies to the relationship between the narratives and tribal or clan names, the implication being that these latter may function in a like manner.67

None of this is to preclude the possibility, of course, that Native peoples convey(ed) some territorial information in the graphic register. While there is nothing in the Native graphic arts that equates to what Europeans would call portrait or landscape painting, or topographical art, there are formline, or more conventional pictorial representations that try to capture, visually, the essence of real, mythical, or anthropomorphic entities. Such entities might well be associated with certain locations, or, more specifically, mark the identification of tribal groups in specific territories.68 If so, then it is quite possible that 'totem poles', which are sequentially adorned with multiple graphic elements are, if not maps in an artefactual sense, at least map-like in their functional. Does 'totemism' embody, in other words, a geographical/terrestrial as well as a cosmological/spiritual component? If it does, then the same considerations might also have to be extended to pictographs, pictograms or dendroglyphs — not only in terms of what they depict, but also of where they are.69 Could it be that images scratched, painted or etched on rocks or in tree bark are the indigenous equivalent of the highway road sign, or billboard, on the Map of British Columbia?

---
67 Maps 7, 9, 18, 31 and 34(a-b).
68 Maps 12(b), 13(a-b), 14(b), 16(a) and 38.
69 Map 14(c).
Taking this line of thought a step further, we might also have to watch for landmarks in the natural, or built, landscapes. There are suggestions that physical features, especially prominent bodies of water or mountains that are visible from some distance away ‘center’ geographical and cosmological space. The same considerations would likely apply to important resource-gathering sites or areas, most of which appear to be identified by descriptive toponyms. In terms of the built landscape, one would intuitively suspect that trail systems are to first space as are railroads, highways or pipelines to the Map of British Columbia. The assumption, though, is that in indigenous territories, trails would not be driven through a pre-existing cultural space in the same way as a new freeway. They would be the arteries along which narratives unfolded, and so integral to the way in which such territories were constructed. That some of these maps highlight specific buildings is also instructive. There is, of course, a broad literature on the ways in which architecture — whether in the form of domestic dwellings, places of worship, or markets — structure and objectify both cosmological and terrestrial space in western and non-western societies and we have no reason to suppose that such was not the case in pre-contact British Columbia too.

Finally, this gallery suggests that we are going to have to pay particular attention to boundaries — not only in those instances where they seem to raise the question of overlap but in those where they are not shown at all. These boundaries may, of course, be wrong; they may even be fabrications. It does appear, however, that we cannot make that judgment without acknowledging the fragmented character of the contact zone in which these boundaries are being delineated. So long as comprehensive claims are being shaped by the terms of the land selection model upon which the BCTC is premised

---

70 Maps 14(b) and 20.
71 Maps 9, 12(b), 13(b), 16, 17, 19, 31, 32(c) and 33(b).
72 Maps 9, 10, 16(a-b), 18 and 32(d).
73 Maps 12(b) and 13(a-b).
74 One way or another, across the entire gallery.
it has been in the best interests of each First Nation to begin 'in the periphery', and through negotiation work 'towards the center' from there.\textsuperscript{75} Equally plausible, however, is that Native boundaries in first space may be beyond the representational capabilities of the map. Stirred in a territorial mould that was likely dynamic and fluid, and where territorial boundaries are not determined by maps, it makes intuitive sense that such boundaries are best imagined not as fixed lines partitioning a grid, but as blended frontiers defined along natural or social criteria. In those instances where boundaries are just not shown, it is probably not because they are unknown, but because "when viewed retrospectively," as the cartographic historian G. M. Lewis states, "what appear to [be] inexplicable omissions from Native maps may [be] negative expressions of truth, the silent equivalents of dotted lines in the terrae semi-cognitae"\textsuperscript{76} on the Map of British Columbia. Is it, in other words, that boundaries in oral cultures simply actualize themselves in a different perspective?

Indeed, aside from all the empirical questions we have just considered, it does seem as though we will not be able to travel very far in first space at all until we learn to understand perspective in non-visual ways. For confirmation of this, we need look no further than the maps that Native people made during and for a time after first contact. Although they map bounded areas they are "akin to an iconic representation of a familiar object done on an elastic surface and then differentially stretched...thereby preserving connectivity...but distorting distance, angles and...shape."\textsuperscript{77} Indeed, most everywhere we look in the literature on the history of cartography in non-Western societies we find that these early Native maps are stylistically consistent with other indigenous maps that inevitably chart a topological, as opposed to geometric space. In cultures in which other senses than the visual participate in territorialization, space is not surveyed and navi-

\textsuperscript{75} This is, after all, how the province approaches negotiations — with the premise it's 'all theirs'.
\textsuperscript{76} In (ed) \textit{Cartographic Encounters}, op. cit., 99.
gated according to abstract plan, but according to the inherent properties of multi-sensory space itself.

This all means is that if we are to attempt an exploration of first space we need to remove our rose-coloured glasses, dispense with the idea that perspective is only a matter of looking and seeing, and start drawing on our other senses. We must try to recapture that heightened sense of awareness and situatedness that multi-sensory perspective implies, and in so doing learn to discriminate between and then "give meaning to disparate and disconnected bits of shadow and substance."\textsuperscript{78} We have to be willing to work our way beyond the horizonal encounter of an explorer or the casual visitor to the museum or the art gallery and train ourselves, as the geographer Robert Sack has put it, to "see through to the real."\textsuperscript{79} This does not mean that we abandon the familiar territory of the orthogonal grid altogether. It does mean that we understand Native maps less as end products on the Map of British Columbia, than as constructions situated in a process. Along that azimuth, then, we now bear.

\textsuperscript{78} Ronda, J. 'A chart in his way', op. cit., 87.
\textsuperscript{79} In 'A sketch of a geographic theory of morality' \textit{Annals of the Association of American Geographers} 89(1), 1999, 26-44. Sack was not talking about maps, but it is a metaphor that has considerable purchase with them.
Oh yes. Indians made maps. You would not take any notice of them. You might say such maps are crazy. But maybe the Indians would say that is what [western] maps are, the same thing. Different maps — from different people — different ways.  

While the ancestors of today's First Nations in British Columbia were capable of making maps, they were not the preferred medium for geographical self-identification and representation. Indeed, there is no concrete evidence, prior to Mackenzie and Fraser, that they made any maps. Apparently, they made no more than a handful up to the mid-19th century, by which time the aggressions of European colonialism seem to have encouraged (or compelled) them to produce a few more. There is a brief flurry of Native maps in the years leading up to, and just after the MMRC, but only in the latter half of the 20th century do Native people voluntarily make maps on a more consistent basis. The question as to why they had not made maps before contact has a very simple answer — they did not need to. The more interesting question is how, without maps, did Native people manage to find their way around the crumpled cordilleran geography in which they lived. Answers to this question are the subject of this chapter.

Using examples that refer to the gallery of maps in the previous chapter I begin with a survey of foundational accounts that explain how Native people came to occupy their territories. I then consider a variety of wayfinding devices used to negotiate and maintain jurisdiction over them. These ranged from crests, totem poles, built landmarks and pictography in the visual arts; to historical narratives, verse or song, and, especially, toponyms in the oral. This leads me to a consideration of the network of trails, streams, portages, and marine channels — the terrestrial infrastructure signposted by wayfinding devices and along which foundational and historical accounts unfold. I conclude with some preliminary thoughts on the nature of indigenous boundaries.

---

Narrations of nations

On the eve of contact what would become British Columbia was inhabited by some 34 independent tribal groups stretched across seven language families. These families were the Koluschan, Tsimshian, and Haidan speakers occupying the Alaskan panhandle, the northwest coast, and the Queen Charlotte Islands; the Wakashan speakers along the central mainland coast and on Vancouver Island; the Salishan speakers on the lower mainland coast and through the south central interior; the Kootenaian speakers through the Kootenays; and the Athapaskan across much of the north and east central interior. The constituent tribal groups were distinct political societies occupying specific ecological niches and distinguished from each other by cultural preferences and attributes that had been worked out over thousands of years. They had developed subsistence and barter economies, and traded regularly with each other along defined routes that sometimes extended over hundreds of miles.

Accounts of the coming of these peoples have been passed down the generations in narrative form. Many of them may be usefully grouped under the designation 'origin (or creation) stories'. They are generally set in a distant past and typically explain how the physical environment was created (or transformed) and then populated by animals, plants and humans. Their contents are as varied as the cultures that have related them but the plotlines tend to follow patterns that correspond, in a general way, to their linguistic context. Using the language families as a convenient point of entry, a few examples should be sufficient to suggest these narratives' 'cartographic function'.

---

3 There is debate on not only what constitutes a 'language family', but how to assign dialects within it. My classification is more or less reflective of that shown on Maps 36 to 38, and is consistent with Wilson Duff, in The Indian History of British Columbia, Anthropology in British Columbia Memoir No. 5 (Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum [BCPM], 1965), 12-7.

4 My positioning of these narratives is not altogether satisfactory, but under the circumstances probably unavoidable. As hinted in the Introduction, ethnographers solicited them from Native informants whose situatedness, background, social status, and identities varied widely. Ethnographers also tended to seek particular categories of narratives. Not only were they all recorded after contact, but at different times, and the more recently they were recorded, the greater the chance they use idioms, terms or inflections...
Many of the Koluschan, Tsimshian and Haidan speakers seem to track their origins to one or more anthropomorphic beings sent to earth at the beginning of time by a 'great chief' living in a cosmological realm generally thought to be 'somewhere above' and yet 'parallel with' the terrestrial. The Nisga'a, for example, trace their primordial identity to the peregrinations of Txemsem, a 'trickster' who was sent to earth long ago by K'amligi-hahlhaahl ('Chief of the Heavens'). One of the best known accounts explains how the Nisga'a came to occupy the Nass River valley (Maps 9, 11, 15 and 22):

There was a Gispaxloats chief who was married to a very beautiful [but to his chagrin unfaithful] princess. At this time the world had no daylight as we know it...[and]...the dusk made it very difficult for the people to do their work or go hunting. [After the chief confronted his wife on her unfaithfulness] she was so ashamed that she pretended to be dying. Finally she apparently died [and the aggrieved chief] placed [her] in a box which he put on a burial pole... [and] selected men from his tribe to watch over [the box]. Every night [the box's watchers] would see a very beautiful woodpecker...sit on the box and then would suddenly disappear...[while] sounds of laughter and happiness... [hinted that] the woman was not really dead [and still secretly meeting with her lover]...This went on for a long time...[until] finally the woman became pregnant and one...morning those watching the burial box saw the lid raise up and a child climb down the pole...Soon [after] the people saw the very beautiful woodpecker come from the box and fly away in the direction of the north wind...[and] realized that this was a supernatural being that had been cohabiting with [the chief's] wife [all along]. [A woman whom the chief subsequently chose to look after this child] had a son of her own...[and]...as they grew they thought they were brothers. They had heard of a very distant land which was very bright where there was a great chief who had a light ball [containing] daylight. It was told that this country...at the head of the Nass River...was a difficult country to get to, as they would have to go through a very narrow opening in the mountain...[and so the boys put on wild duck cloaks] and flew up the Nass River and after many days of flying came to a huge mountain...They just got through the passage...[and] landed on the lake [in a] very beautiful country. There were many houses at the edge of the lake, and a very large one had a sun as a house front painting which was very bright and shining. [While in duck form, two sisters from this painted house took the boys] to their sleeping

that come out of a different conceptual system. The Christian influence is a particularly thorny problem. My having to selectively edit what have already been edited one or more times by the ethnographer only complicates things further. That said, I have no access to the unmediated oral versions, and therefore must work with those we have. As I hope to demonstrate, moreover, it is the basic agency and event structure of these narratives that I am most interested in — and I do think there are patterns and motifs that are consistent or frequent enough to make some educated claims about how they participate in the construction of different spatial typologies. I will come back to this point below.

Indeed, whether this reference is purely autocthonous or is an adaptation of the Christian deity is uncertain.
places, and when [they] slept with their mistresses they took human form. When it was daylight they became birds again.... [Anon, the two sisters gave birth to two sons]. The great chief named the son of the eldest daughter Txamsem, the Clever One, and the son of the younger daughter...Lugabula, the Lazy One. [These boys returned to the now aged Gispaxlo'ats chief who realized they were] supernatural beings and [had to be cared for carefully]. As they [became] fully grown...[Txamsem] saw the difficulty the people were under in constant semi-darkness...so he [decided] to get the ball of light from [the] chief of the skies who had it in his possession...[Changing into raven form] he flew many days and finally came to a very bright country he knew [was] the right place. [He changed himself into a pine needle which was swallowed by a woman, who subsequently begat a son who grew rapidly]....Everyday, whenever [this son] began to cry, the chief of the skies took down the light ball and gave it to him to pacify him. One day while he was playing with this ball, he rolled it to the entrance of the house and rolled it out. Immediately he jumped after it and changed into human form and ran with [it] to where he had hid his [raven] garment [which he donned], and flew away with the light ball. He had been flying a long while and looking down into the Nass River where he saw the ghost people were gathering eulachons by torchlights, and he [called down for some. When] these ghost people, who hated light and relished darkness, laughed at Txamsem...[he] became very angry and [burst] the daylight ball. Immediately, it became daylight, and very bright...on the Nass River, and it spread to all the world...and the sun appeared. The people no longer had any fear of the ghost people, who disappeared.6

Other narratives explain how Txemsem steals a 'moon ball', which he bursts to create the moon and stars; or buckets of water, which he spills as he flees, creating the Lisims (the name he gives to the Nass River) and numerous lakes. He then travelled up and down the river, reshaping the channels to enhance salmon-spawning capabilities, and making it fit for the spring eulachon.7 In yet others he created four sacred mountains to guard Nisga'a territory from enemies, and then flattened the valley between them to open up space for homes.8 He taught the first families ayuukhl Nisga'a, the ancient code which would eventually grow to embrace a set of laws, institutions and behavioural rules treating everything from the limits of chiefly authority, to regulations on marriage and in-

7 At least four other versions, each from a different informant, in a different Nisga'a village, but emphasizing the same accomplishments, are found in ibid., 16-24 and 27-30.
8 These four mountains are shown on Map 22 as Wil Baxt'aahl Ganaaw (Mount Hinkley on government maps), K'ipmats'iskw (Mount Fowler), Xhlaawit (Vetter Peak) and Xk'aat'aapgwit (unnamed).
heritance of property, to how to relate to animals and fish. As to how the first families spread over the land, the following tale relates that:

[When the Chief of Heavens sent people to earth they were grouped in four clans. The Eagle clan was one of them, then there was the Wolf clan, the Raven clan and the Killer Whale. These were the specified clans. The crests used were for identification of each family, and were recognized as such. He gave our people these crests when they were placed on the Lisims, the Nass River. He gathered together throngs of people and placed them in various locations other than the Nass River. They were informed that they would not speak the same dialect. There would be a distinct difference according to where these people were placed. There shall be one tongue spoken on the Nass River, from the headwaters right down to the estuary. Fluent speaking, and understanding would be prevalent among them, but not so with the others. The other dialects will not clearly understand what the Chief of Heavens said when he placed them here on earth. Their destination was unknown and uncertain. Our forefathers did not bring anything with them. It was dark on earth then. There were bodies of land, but barely visible. There was no light or water then. The land was like mountains where they were. Our ancestors made preparations to make it their homeland. The first location...for their new community was at Gwinks'eexkw, 'village in darkness'. These peoples were the first occupants...and this was their first village. Soon buildings were erected. There were four different Houses. The people intermarried with other families placed here with them. Four females were with the other representatives of the clans. One woman was Ksim Laxgigik [Eagle]. Another was Ksim Laxgibuu [Wolf]. Another was Ksim Ganada [Raven]. The other was...Ksim Gisk'ahaast [Killer Whale]. When children were born their family ties were with their mother. So that if the woman was an Eagle, the child was an Eagle. The same applied to the Wolf clan, the Raven clan, and the Killer Whale. They erected their village at Lax Gwins'eeexkw, on an island near Gitlaxt'aamiks....Upon completion each House started raising families. The village population began to increase.]

These narratives weave elements of the geographical/genealogical, and of the cosmological/terrestrial into one seamless packet. The references to the earthly princess and supernatural woodpecker cohabiting the burial box on the pole, and the painted

---

10 As told by Rod Robinson, New Aiyansh, ibid., 34. The bracketed English clan names are mine. In another version, recorded in Barbeau, M. and Beynon, W. Tsimshian Narratives I, op. cit., 19-24, the crests that became the insignia of the four clans Txemsem discovers on the backs of blankets bestowed by the 'chief of the skies'.
11 While it still needs to be demonstrated, it's important, in what follows, to accept that there is, in oral societies, no clearly defined line between the material and phenomenal worlds, or between the world of 'things as they really are' and the 'world of things as they appear to be'. To the extent that what follows occasionally seems to suggest otherwise, it is a function of the 'univocality' of the written analysis itself. I will come back to this point below, but most substantively in Chapter 3.
house fronts are not only an allusion to the totem pole and the house crest but also to their dual character as spiritual and genealogical identifiers. Robinson's story further suggests, in a general way, how the Nisga'a population increased; how distinct exogamous clans acquired crests as clan totems; and how the clans were further subdivided into 'houses' living in specific villages. It adds the important rider, already suggested in the nativity sequences in Price's account, that crests and totems were inherited through the matriline. The story also notes how other cohorts were situated elsewhere, and, in being given distinct languages, became distinct nations in their own right.

The Coast Tsimshian (Maps 31 and 32) also trace their primordial identity in the adventures of Txemsem but the story-lines work themselves out differently. In some variants he is Ganada (Raven) and the landscape he travels is the valley of the Xsan (Skeena River) and not the Lisims. In addition, the division of the clans into houses owning 'chiefly hunting grounds' is typically accomplished through ancestral odysseys out of a primeval 'landing place' and often as a result of some catastrophe visited upon the first families. In some, the dispersals are the result of a feud between ancient villages on either bank of a river. In many, they are prompted by a (super)natural event, such as a flood or a storm, and are generally thought to have originated at Temlaxam, a great trading complex on the middle Xsan. One well known story, which underwrites the itinerary shown in Map 32(b), describes the migration of the Gispewudwada (Killer Whale [Blackfish] clan) to Gitkxaatla (Kitkathla) and Kitk'a'ata (Hartley Bay, Map 31):

Temlaxam on the upper Skeena River...was a great place. It was so rich that many of the young people became restless and disregarded the wise counsels of their elders...lost[ing] respect for themselves [and killing] animals for no need, but just for the sport of killing...[and] though the wise men begged them to be careful as they would bring down disaster...these pleas were

---

12 In most variants — two of which are recorded in Barbeau, M. and Beynon, W. Tsimshian Narratives I, op. cit., 103-6 and 262-5 — the two villages, each occupied by different clans, are generally believed to have been somewhere on the upper Lisims.

13 For more on the origins of Temlaxam, which is in Gitxan territory (and which we shall visit again in Chapter 4), see Ken Harris and Frances Robinson (eds), Visitors Who Never Left: The Origin of the People of Damelahamid (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1974).
The season of the spring salmon arrived and...people...were catching and cooking them...over the fire...[but] it was then that snow began to fall. A...thoughtless young man stood up with some roasted spring salmon in his hand, and rebuked [the Chief of the Skies for] trying to make another winter. The squirrels were now running away, as were all other animals seeking shelter. "That is a grave warning" said the wise men but the thoughtless folk kept on their insulting remarks to the Chief of the Skies. It began to snow...heavily and...soon all the houses were snowed under and a severe cold set in, making it impossible for the people to leave their houses. Soon the people were on the verge of famine....One morning [after a long time] a blue jay appeared and sat on the smokehole of one of the Temlaxam chiefs. In its bill was a bunch of elderberries. [The people realized it] "must be only upon this snow has fallen and all other places enjoy the summer. Let us leave this place and go elsewhere before we all perish." At once the chief, who was Ts'ibasa, and all his brothers got ready to depart...Before parting Temlaxam they sang their limx'oy together...[then] they stepped out of their houses and went down the Skeena River to Kitsegukla [Gitsegukla]. Here they found everything was as in the summer. So they stopped. Ts'ibasa and his brothers said "We must not stay here. Let us go down the river to some other locality and we may have a chance to escape the anger of the Chief of the Skies". [Some of] Ts'ibasa's brothers and families...elected to remain where they were....Ts'ibasa, who was accompanied by his brothers 'Wiiseeks, Nisweexs, Gunax'nuutk and many of his nephews, nieces and headmen [chose to go] down...river. They first stopped at Gits'ilaasu [Kitse] where nephews T'muunax and Nistaxo'ok stayed behind. [They] others kept on travelling down the river...until the reached the mouth of the Skeena [where] more...separated. Agwilaxha went northwards with his family until they came upon the Gispaxlo'ots [while] Gyetuk went with his group to the Gitando [becoming] the original chiefs of these two tribes before the Laxsgiik came. Ts'ibasa and his brothers travelled south until they came upon what is now the Gitkxaata section, each with a small household. Then Ts'ibasa, seeing that it was a land of plenty established himself at Kts'm'anlakan [Curtis Inlet], a country with plenty of salmon, animals, seafood and mountain berries. This country was subdivided among the others....One of the lesser chiefs among them was Nta'wiiwalp...an older nephew of Ts'ibasa, who had a large group of his own. Now that they were in new country they set off to find a territory of their own...came upon the Laxgibuu at Kitk'a'ata at the mouth of the river of the same name [and with whom] they allied themselves....Since this House of Nta'wiiwalp became the leading House, many other headmen went farther south and to adjoining islands. This is how Ts'ibasa and his group came down from Temlaxam.14

On the one hand, this is a much more explicitly geographical narrative than those cited above. It seems to record events in chronological as opposed to mythical time, and in terrestrial as opposed to cosmological space. It draws more direct links between the

---

14 'An adawx of Temlaxam', Wa'moodmxl (Heber Clifton), Kitk'a'ata, recorded by Beynon, W. c. 1948, in Marsden, S. et. al. (eds) Na Amwaaltga, op. cit., 23-5. Kitk'a'ata is the current accepted orthography for Gitga'ata, and is shown upper center Map 31, and, along with Gitxaala, bottom left Map 32(b).
names of the chiefs, the hunting territories they claimed, and the villages they established. It also introduces a new element, the *limx'o'y* ('dirge songs'), which were composed to commemorate important events in the history of the clan or a house and, in this case, sung of Medeek, the supernatural grizzly bear said to inhabit the slopes above Temlax'am. On the other, there is no reference to crests or totem poles and the suggestion of prior occupancy of the Laxgibuu at Kitk'a'ata seems at odds with the regime of clan ownership shown on Map 31. If so however, it is not because *Wa'moodmxl*'s narrative is 'wrong', but because it is but one of several other versions of the same narrative. In another variant *Wa'moodmxl*, himself, becomes the active agent, the narrative describing how he travelled with Ts'ibasaa, and his brothers and nephews, as far as Ksanga'at (at the confluence of the Xsan and Ecstall River) where he alone stayed and where he 'planted his cane' to claim the territory for himself. Finding life difficult there, he then veered south and along the Ecstall and Quail Rivers (as opposed to the outer coast), arriving on what is now Gil Island, where his people intermarried with the Laxgibuu. Soon, however, political squabbles caused a bifurcation — *Wa'moodmxl* led his followers up the channel to Lax Galts'ap ('Old Town') where he planted his cane for a second time, rebuilt his house *Biyaalsm wilp* ('star house'), and adorned it with the crest of the white grizzly, all of which he subsequently validated in a big potlatch. The remaining Laxgibuu, now weakened by *Wa'moodmxl*'s departure, were soon absorbed by the Laxsgiik. In yet another version, but without a reference to the planting of the cane, *Nta'wiiwalp* is the principle protagonist and travels to Lax Galts'ap via Klaxgyels (Lakelse Lake). In all versions, the move to the present site of Kitk'a'ata occurs in 1878, after contact.

---

15 For more on Medeek, see, again, Harris, K. and Robinson, F. *Visitors*, op. cit., 56-60. This *limx'o'y*, one of the few translated into English, is in Marsden, S. et. al. (eds) *Na Amwaaltga*, op. cit., 27.
16 This is old Kitk'a'ata, and shown top center of Map 31.
17 This place is shown upper right Map 32(b). These other variants may be found, albeit in condensed form, in the HBBC *Hartley Bay Clans*, op. cit. Four other full-length versions — two Tsimshian, one Nisga'a and one Gitxsan, but all recycling the same motifs — are found in Barbeau, M. and Beynon, W. *Tsimshian Narratives I*, op. cit., 257-61 and 266-70l.
Taken together, then, these tales allow us to envision a little more clearly how crests, songs and totem poles are all constituent elements that compose the larger narrative account that not only establishes identities, but also parleys the clans and houses into specific territories. *Wa'moodmxl's 'planting of the cane' is not only the means of claiming chiefly hunting grounds but seems to be the symbolic gesture that anticipates the 'planting of a totem pole' in a subsequently established village.* The totem pole (or, alternatively, a painted house front) doubles, in turn, as the medium upon which the crests can be carved (or painted) in rather the same way that *K'amligihahlhaahl*, in Price's narrative, had his cosmic abode adorned with an image of the sun. *Wa'moodmxl's migration stories also distinguish at least three categories of crest. One is the aforementioned clan crest which could be displayed by everyone in the clan by virtue of their shared patrimony as (in this example) Gispewudwada. There are also commemorative, or legendary crests, which would include (in this example) the crest of Medeek, the subject of the limx'oy sung on departure from Temlaxam and has since belonged to those who had the right to sing it in the potlatch. The third would be the heraldic, or 'event', crest. These would be the property of individual houses or lineages in houses, and would include (in this example) *Wa'moodmxl's 'white grizzly' because acquired through his own personal encounter with that being.* This all suggests, then, that crests are not merely 'coats of arms' (or 'insignia') that denoted genealogical or anthropomorphic relationships. To the degree that they captured events when carved on a totem pole, or painted on the house front, and insofar as houses came to be localized in specific villages while claiming ownership of associated territories, they also apparently functioned as *geographical markers*. And when placed alongside Price's account, the suggestion is that a totem pole, as

---

18 According to Gitanyow Laxgibuu Chief Weekha (in Wilson Duff [ed], *Histories, Territories and Laws of the Kitwancool*, Anthropology in British Columbia Memoir No. 4 [Victoria: BCPM, 1959]) migrating lineages "took along duplicates of their totem-poles and erected them in their new permanent villages" (18). If he meant miniature versions of same, as seems likely, then perhaps the cane served a similar purpose.

19 Obviously, this is a reference to the Kermode bear on Princess Royal Island (which is directly across the channel from *Wa'moodmxl's temporary habitation on Gil Island*).
it is planted in the ground (in front of the house) and reaches upward, is a metaphor for the indivisibility of the cosmological and terrestrial realms.

Such an interpretation is lent additional credence in Nuxalk territory (Maps 18 and 26). Subscribing to a most complex cosmology, these Salishan speakers saw their terrestrial world as flat and circular, held steady by the ropes of Sninia, a supernatural being living in a northern region of perpetual ice and snow. The sky was seen as the underside of 'the land above' which was also flat and warmed by the sun, while below the Bella Coola valley was still a third realm, where ghost people, anthropomorphic fishes, and supernatural ocean dwellers of one kind or another all lived together. The animals, birds, mountains, trees and everything else on terra firma were created by the Carpenters, those who were 'sent down' from the land above by Alquntâm, the Nuxalk equivalent of K'amligihahlhaahl. Alquntâm resided in Nusmâta (meaning 'place of myths'), a magnificent cosmic dwelling that could alter its size and go by different names depending on whichever supernatural guests happened to be there at any given time. In some variants the Carpenters descended to earth by climbing down totem poles, while in others they flew. Depending on the village, they could go by different names, or arrive in different forms. Regardless, each received a set of names and a cloak (whale, eagle, bear, raven, or some other entity), and these became the ancestral crests of the first families as they took up residence in specific villages.20 One such tale explains the origins of the village of Stwic (Stuie):

In the beginning, when there was still no sun in this world, Alquntâm erected a post which reached from its base, near [Stwic] to the land above, and prevented the sky from falling. On the top sat Tsiwalaks, an eagle. Down it came Nusmalexwai, Wakitmai, Walakitmai, Wiaqaii, Tlisla, Qeit, and several women whose names have been forgotten...all were supernatural [except] Qeit. The newcomers looked around them for a suitable spot...Tcawat, on the mainland opposite Vancouver Island, appealed to them but they did not

like...the Kwakiutl...[so they chose]...the Bella Coola valley....There was then no river, but Wiaqaii scratched in the earth with his foot and the water that filled the depression became [the] river....After due consideration, Nusmalexwai and his comrades travelled some distance down the river valley; then returned to Nustilsta not far from [Stwic] where they built their house. It was of the normal size, but when many guests assembled, it enlarged [accordingly]. The post, the benches, the boxes, the beams, and the totem pole were all carved with the design of Raven....In one corner sat Echo [a famous mask]. With the completion of this house, Nusmalexwai and his companions became mortal. In course of time, as they grew wealthy, they were able to summon people from far and near for potlatches...[which] enabled them to validate several names, which they had brought from above.... All the names mentioned in this myth have been preserved. That of Nusmalexwai is held in special esteem by the people of [Stwic]. It means 'head of the river', referring to the point where he came to this earth.21

While this narrative also describes a migration, it is clearly a migration of a different sort. For the most part it takes place back in mythic, as opposed to chronological, time; does not hint of a catastrophe spawning a diaspora in concrete geographical space; and makes no reference to clans, songs or heraldic crests. Although larger tribal affiliations anchored around adjacent villages were recognized Nuxalk families were not organized into clans or corporate houses.22 There are, however, clear parallels between the Tsimshian clan crest and the Nuxalk family crest and the Carpenters do Alguntam's biddings in rather the same manner that Txemsem did for K'amligihahlhaahl. The potlatch is the means of validating ownership of legendary or material property, and the dual roles of the totem pole — as metaphor for the continuities between the cosmic and terrestrial realms, and as physical artefact associating a named ancestor with a primal settlement

---

21 As told by an identified informant c. 1923 to McIlwraith, T., in ibid., 309-10. Doubtless because of the complex cosmology, Nuxalk origin tales are as polyvocal as any on the entire northwest coast. McIlwraith recorded at least four variants of this narrative (the others are on 307-9 and 310-2) and Boas, F. (in The Mythology, op. cit., 65) one. While all of them share similar geographical details in terms of where they 'came down' and 'where they went', the names of the Carpenters are not consistent (because they beget different genealogies), and there is a greater variety in terms of the various feats attributed to them. This is the only one, moreover, that refers to a dwelling which changes in size. What they all share, however, is Stwic itself; it is shown just above the word 'Nuxalk' on Map 18.

22 The Nuxalk do have a rich corpus of songs and verses, but these are mostly associated with the sisaok and kusiut dances (the two most important rituals in the 'winter ceremonial' complex), not the private clan dirges of the northwest coast (see ibid., Volume 2, Chapters 1 and 2) And while there are numerous references to totem poles in these narratives, they seem to be more metaphorical than real — indeed, actual carved renditions were quite rare, and true heraldic poles virtually non-existent.
— are unmistakable. That each extended Nuxalk family/village assemblage henceforth distinguished itself from its neighbours by the names or crests acquired from the Carpenters is further illustrated in the origin story of Nusq'alst:

In the beginning of time there came down from Nusmāta to Nusq'alst a man whose name was Kamalsonxw. As a present from Alquntam he had brought with him a model of Nusmāta, which he set up on this earth and to which he gave the same name. This was after the first sonxw [Nuxalk designation for the 'upper sky'] had fallen; it was from this catastrophe that Kamalsonxw derived his name. Kamalsonxw had seen at the zenith of Nusmāta the face of a grizzly bear...[and his property was]...adorned with grizzly bear designs....the door of his house Nusmāta was the mouth of one which opened to admit a guest, and closed when he had entered. The dwelling, which lengthened of its own accord whenever Kamalsonxw gave a potlatch, endured for generations....These first Nusq'alst people made a number of special objects for their potlatches. As a representation of the five-peaked mountain beneath which they lived they erected five peaks over the front of their house, a custom which has been carried out to the present day. Projecting from one of them was a figure of a mountain goat; since that animal was brought to earth to serve as food by their first ancestors.23

Once again, the account highlights the ways in which crests, names and potlatches serve as the scaffolding around which the larger narrative is constructed. In this case, there is no direct reference to totem poles as geographical markers, but there is the explanation of how architecture, more generally, could serve a similar function. Not only does the painted house front, like the totem pole, constitute an interface between a cosmic imaginary and a terrestrial reality, but the structural outlines of the dwelling would sometimes mimic the form of natural features (themselves, of course, also the work of the Carpenters).24 Even more striking is the way in which buildings were perceived as zoomorphic entities in their own right.25 And, finally, this particular story also re-en-

---

23 As told by an unidentified informant c. 1923 to McLlwraith, T., in ibid., I, 304-5. Excepting the name of the Carpenter and his dwelling, a second variant (305-6) differs in almost every other detail. At the same time, however, it recycles a number of motifs that we saw in the origin narrative of Stwic — including the reference to Tcawat in Kwakwaka'wakw territory, the Echo mask, and the house that could change its size. Nusq'alst is not shown on Map 18 but is at the confluence of the Bella Coola and Numst Rivers. The mountain above it (Mount Nusatsum) is a landmark of great spiritual significance; the village proper is the one Alexander Mackenzie named 'friendly village'.

24 For a sneak preview, refer to Figure A(b), below.

25 I will return to this point in Chapter 3.
gages the motif of the calamity — the difference here is that it prompts the adoption of a chiefly title as opposed to a larger geographic dispersal of one or more chiefs.

If socio-political, as opposed to linguistic, criteria be our only guide, travelling from Nuxalk into Kwakwaka'wakw country (Maps 8, 30 and 34) would have been virtually undetectable. Like the Nuxalk, these Wakashan speakers were organized into ranked extended families that traced their identity to a named ancestor associated with a place of descent and a defined tribal territory.\(^{26}\) The difference is that in many Kwakwaka'wakw tales, the ancestors in adopting human form remove a mask, and not a cloak, and the agents who modified a myth-age environment were the Transformers. These were anthropomorphic beings like Mink or Raven, but, unlike the Carpenters, were denizens of the woods, sky and sea, and operated more or less independently from a supreme being.\(^{27}\) There are, however, a number of narratives that describe how a great catastrophe caused some tribal groups to abandon — geographically if not spiritually or genealogically — their original place of descent. As in many Tsimshian tales, the migration of the Wiweka'yi tribe, abstracted in Map 30(b), was the result of a great flood:

> When I was six...my father...took me to see our old village Tekya...he told me that's where our people used to live. There [was a] village...there, right beside the river. There [were] two big long totem poles standing up about two hundred feet apart and fifty feet high....I can only remember that on one [pole] there was a whale with a man carved below....The mountain behind the village is where our people were saved at the time of the flood. Wega'i was the chief...[from whom we] take our name. [Wega'i] wove cedar ropes from the anchor rock on top of the mountain down to the village and told the

---


\(^{27}\) Strictly speaking, agents like the Carpenters (or the Nisga'a's Tsxemsem) were those 'sent down' by a supreme being to 'bring the world into existence' at the dawn of the myth age. While it is often more a matter of emphasis than kind, Transformers are best seen as 'tricksters' whose relationship (if any) to a supreme entity is not theorized, and who must, whether through force, stratagem or supplicance, draw on more constrained powers to effect change in an 'already partly formed' myth-age world. An excellent summary of the various Kwakwaka'wakw Transformer figures is found in Judith Berman, 'Red salmon and cedar bark', BC Studies 125/6, 2000, 33-52.
Like the Tsimshian's this migration seems to have occurred mainly in chronological time (perhaps quite recently), and details the abandonment of less suitable villages for more favourable ones. Unlike the Tsimshian or Nuxalk accounts, there is no evidence of events being captured in song, or on heraldic crests. As in both, however, it makes clear reference to totem poles, and to family or legendary crests which, whether acquired from a named ancestor, or through an engagement with a supernatural entity, have been passed down through the generations. As McKay's account does for the Nisga'a, it explains how other nations speaking different languages came to occupy specific territories, but in this case following a diaspora caused by a catastrophe and not by deign
of a creator. This narrative is assembled out of many of the same constituent elements that we have already encountered in the Tsimshian, Nisga’a and Nuxalk origin legends, but they are composed in different configurations.

Travelling east and south, however, and back into Salishan territory, origin narratives tend to be formatted in a qualitatively different way. Some of them make reference to a supreme being who brought form and function to a shapeless world, and then seeded it with a foundational first human. One such account explains the origins of the Squamish country (Maps 12, 13 and 37):

In the beginning there was water everywhere and no land at all....the Great Spirit determined to make land appear. Soon the mountains showed above the water...Then he made the lakes and rivers, and after that the trees and animals. Soon after this had been done, Kala’na, the first man, was made. The Great Chief bestowed upon him the three things an Indian cannot do without, viz, a wife, a chisel...and a salmon trap...and, in course of time his wife bore him many sons and daughters who spread out over the land and peopled it. When the land was full of people and Kala’na had grown very old, the Great Spirit took him away...[and] the people had become very wicked...[and so] the Great Spirit made the waters rise up over the land above the tops of the highest mountains and all the people were drowned except one man named Cheatmuh, the first-born of Kala’na, and his wife. These two escaped in their canoe, which floated above the water for a long time, and at last...settled on top of a high mountain. Cheatmuh and his wife descended from the mountain and built themselves a house, and in course of time repeopled the land....But the Great Spirit became angry with them a second time after Cheatmuh’s death and this time punished them by sending a great snowstorm over the land....Starvation and cold assailed on every side...[until after a very difficult interval] the snow at last stopped falling and the sun appeared, and a rapid thaw set in....The man now took his daughter to wed and from those two the land was, in course of time, once more repeopled. Times of plenty came back, and the people learned to forget the terrible punishment the Great Spirit had sent upon their forefathers.30

In this narrative there are a number of motifs that we have already encountered further north, including the first dwellings, and diasporas prompted by calamitous events. The difference is that the Great Spirit accomplished this without the assistance of inter-

30 As told by Muhl'ks, c. 1898, to Charles Hill-Tout, in 'Notes on the cosmogony and history of the Squamish Indians of British Columbia' Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada Second Series 3(2), 1897/8. This one is so close to Christian accounts of Noah and the flood that it must be treated with considerable caution; indeed, Hill-Tout tended to rely on converted informants. At any rate, note that Cheatmuh is the source of the English name, Cheakamus.
venors like the Nisga'a's *Txemsem* or the Nuxalk's Carpenters. The first families had to
survive not one, but two catastrophes: the originary myth age event being, as it was for
the Kwakwaka'wakw, the great flood; with the snowstorm, which was the originary
event in *Wa'moodmxl*'s narrative, surfacing here as secondary, and of more recent, even
chronological vintage. Another is that while there is a testimonial to a named ancestor,
there are no references to specific geographic locations, or to totem poles or crests asso-
ciated with them. Partly this is because there were, in Squamish society, no clans, line-
ages or corporate houses. Families owned important resource sites, but the larger hunt-
ing territory was not divided along tribal lines. Partly, however, this narrative needs
to be situated alongside other accounts with which it intersects. One of them explains
the beginnings of the Se'shalt (Map 14) and the Pentlatch/Quwutsun (on the east coast
of Vancouver Island):

The first man came to s'CHUNK [Gibson's Landing, where] he had a house
— he was alone when somebody hit the roof...[it was] another man...[with] a
mask and...a rattle...and nobody [knew] where he came from. This fellow...
that had started to dance up there...told the first man "you are my brother...
you are below me." The fellow down below said "No I'm the oldest...you
come after me," and he said "*Mayohastenlam*, come into my house." This
fellow started to come in and dance...and that's the family we come from, I
belong to that family....The first man's name was Whuhl-ahl-tun and the se-
cond man's name was Day-muhk, that's the name of my brother Chief Hawts-
lah-no....Whuhl-ahl-tun [was] a powerful man...[and] got tired of his brother
[for dancing all the time]...and told [him] "you better move." Day-muhk told
his brother "Alright I'll go." He moved...[and] built a house...[no one knows]
how he got a wife, but this man got a woman and the family grew and
became lots of them....Day-muhk would not give his brother a chance, he's
always greedy for everything. There was a reef out there at that point where
there is a nice beach. That is where the sea lion comes on and goes to sleep
on the rock. *Day-muhk* gives his brother Whuhl-ahl-tuhn a chance to
get...the sea lion. Because *Day-muhk* goes there to spear them... *Whuhl-ahl-
tuhn*...he carved a thing just like a sea lion....There [is] a lake there and
*Whuhl-ahl-tuhn* goes there...and rubbed [kelp on it]...and it got alive....And
*Whuhl-ahl-tuhn* told that sea lion "you go around that bay and all those men
spear you — when you have got all their spears in you, you go right straight

31 As hinted in Map 13(a) Squamish extended families did carve or paint relatively spartan images of
named ancestors on mortuary boxes and house posts, and individuals could acquire and display 'personal
totems' ('guardian spirits') acquired through vision quests — but the long migrations in search of territori-
al niches (and which seem to be precondition for an overt display of commemorative or heraldic crests
common to the *Tsimshian* and *Wakashan* speakers) were just not there.
across the gulf to *Tuhk-kwu-hm-suhn*, that's Gabriola Pass." When the sea lion swam around the bay, all the others got their spears into [him...and] the sea lion went straight out across to Gabriola Pass. When the people reached there, some of them cut their lines [and settled on either side of Cowichan Pass]. Some of them cut their lines loose at *Pihn-awulth*, that's Kuper Island...And that thing kept going until they came into Cowichan Bay and they all cut loose there, those that were left. We don't know what happened to...the sea lion, but that's why we are all friends of these people — because they are all Squamish, and we are all friends of them.\textsuperscript{32}

In this story, then, the migration is neither mainly terrestrial (as it was in *Wa'moodmxl*'s account) nor mostly cosmological (as it was for the Carpenters) but rather a kind of hybrid having elements of both. Like the Kwakwaka'wakw narrative, much of it occurs on water. It makes no mention of a great spirit but is more specific about the identity of a named ancestor, a place of descent, and a geographic dispersal of the first families. (It also explains why the Pentlatch were the only Coast Salish people to have hunted sea lions.) It is still, however, a Squamish account of the origins of the Se'shalt and Pentlatch. The Se'shalt themselves source their identity in the first people that survived the great flood by mooring their canoes to the summit of *Kulse* (Mount Victoria).\textsuperscript{33} The Pentlatch record speaks of a named ancestor, *Seahlatsa*, who dropped from the sky and then, with his brother and one-horned dog, *S'wukus*, founded the first Pentlatch and Quwutsun villages. *S'wukus* became the name of the mountain (Mount Prevost) where the lone survivor of the flood took refuge.\textsuperscript{34}

Other Squamish, Se'shalt or Pentlatch stories introduce more consistently the adventures of the Transformers, save that they are of a somewhat different character than in the *Wakashan* narratives. They are still anthropomorphic beings — typically Mink, Raven or Coyote — that go on earth by different names but a single name may refer to as few as one, or as many as five individual agents. They are not responsible for crea-

\textsuperscript{32} 'The creation of the Squamish People, the s'CHUNK people of Gibson's Landing', Dominic Charlie, Capilano Reserve, recorded in 1965 by Wells, O., in *Squamish Legends*, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{33} This place is shown top, just left of center, on Map 14(b); for more on *Kulse* and the other spiritually significant mountains on this map, see Peterson, L. *The Story*, op. cit., Chapters 1 and 2.

tion events but were charged with finishing the work that 'great chiefs' (or their equivalent) had started. The way in which the Transformer stories 'fill in the gaps' left in more generic, or fragmentary creation myths is illustrated in two accounts from Stl'atl'imx territory (Maps 6, 24 and 29). The Sk'a'tin (Skookumchuck) band traces its identity to ancestors who took refuge from the deluge by securing their canoes to the peak of In-SHUCK'ch (Snowcap Peak). 35 Once again, one or two canoes broke loose, floating away to a distant land, their occupants begetting the founders of other tribes speaking different languages. Others waited for the water to recede, finding themselves surrounded by a devastated landscape. 36 It was then that:

[The Transformers came through Harrison Lake into the land of the Lillooet people...in a canoe [which was their transformed sister]. On their way, they met Mink, whom...they invited...to accompany them on their journey. Mink knew that the Transformers were using their sister as a canoe [so he ran it] aground and smashed into a rock; the imprint...can still be seen today. They came to a place called Sta-thli-lick where a man named Tsoop was standing at the edge of the lake...[After teaching him how to catch fish the Transformers] turned [him] into a rock [which] can still be seen today. Mink and the Transformers continued travelling until they reached the mouth of the Lillooet River....they came to a place...called Shi-la-posh, where the shore is very rocky....[there] they removed part of [Mink's] body, and threw it onto the shore, where they transformed it into a rock...[which] can still be seen today at Shi-la-posh. They went up to Lillooet Lake....When they arrived at Mount Currie, they stopped at a place that is called Thla-lak and examined the marks which were left on the mountain face when the flood waters receded. They made each of the stripes a different colour, so this mountain is known as Shmi-mich, which means 'marked mountain'. Further along, Mink and the Transformers came to a place named Zee-hal-im, which is about halfway up the high mountain called Ta-zeel, near Mount Currie...the Transformer changed [two hunters] into two rocks which can still be seen there today. They travelled up the Birkenhead River, until they reached a fishing place called Yi-whi-lah [where] they transformed [a man] into a kingfisher. Today, there are a lot of kingfishers at Yi-whi-lah....When they reached Birken they sat down for a rest...[where] their sister...put her foot on the rock and managed to cause a creek to appear....This creek, as well as the imprint left by her foot in the rock...can still be seen today....The Transformers and Mink...reached Anderson Lake [where their sister] was again transformed into a canoe....They reached Seton Portage and then Seton Lake. A

35 Albeit in the older PPS orthography of Shuck-CHEEN the mountain is shown right of center Map 29. Sk'a'tin is shown just below and right of center on Map 24.
36 In one variant, told by Tsawwassen Chief Harry Joe at the MMRC, the destination is said to have been 'Yalis (Alert Bay) in Kwakwaka'wakw territory. Another more detailed version, but without reference to the escaped canoe, is in Bouchard, R. and Kennedy, D. Lillooet Stories, op. cit., 10-1.
chief who lived at the lower end of the lake was very pleased to see the Transformers [until turned]...into a rock....the Transformers and Mink continued on their way...[arriving] at a camp at the eastern end of Seton Lake, where an unfriendly woman [with an ice-baby, and whose husband was the glacier] was staying....[The Transformers] placed the ice-baby at the foot of a large rockslide at Seton Lake, where it can still be seen today.

[After visiting Lillooet] the Transformers turned around and returned back through the Mount Currie area, heading towards the Coast, but they followed a different route....They stopped at Stsats-kwim, which is near Six-Mile Creek...where some Squamish people were camped. "You are camping very close to the Leel-wat [Lil'wat or lower Stl'atl'imx today] people, yet you speak a different language. That is not right" the Transformers told [them] "we are going to transform you into rock"....A large pile of rocks can still be seen at Stsats'kwim, where [they] were camped. The Transformers continued travelling until they came to a place called Skeech-ik-thl-tin near Alta Lake....Near Cheakamus Station, which is the territory of the Squamish people, the Transformers came upon a chief and transformed him into a rock....They kept travelling until they reached the Coast.37

As may be apparent the Transformers accomplish many of the same feats that Txem-sem and the Carpenters do on behalf of the Nisga'a and Nuxalk. The differences are that while a supreme being is often loosely credited with having some role in the Transformers' first appearance on terra firma, there is no explanation in Coast or Interior Salish foundational narratives on why, when, or where they do. Nor do they, or the encounters they experience, appear on crests, totem poles or house fronts.38 These narratives make reference, however, to the painting or marking of natural features. Indeed, there is the suggestion that paintings or etchings on natural surfaces may comprise the scaffolding of Transformer narratives in roughly the same manner that limx'oy or crests compose the ancestral migration stories of the Tsimshian or Wakashan.39 The more relevant point is that Coast and Interior Salish Transformer figures tend to be 'geographically active' in a way that those of the Kwakwaka'wakw rarely are. These latter interact with beings that are sometimes mortal, sometimes supernatural, and they 'make things

38 Partly, of course, it is because we are now more firmly ensconced in a socio-political space in which bilineal families are not stratified beyond some loosely recognized tribal affiliations, where true chiefly authority crystallizes only in times of crisis, and that lacks 'built settlements' in the broad sense.
39 For reasons which will become apparent, I have chosen to defer a consideration of this particular form of the graphic arts until the latter part of the Chapter.
right' in an otherwise chaotic myth-age world, but their legacy is evoked ceremonially. Their Salishan counterparts, however, describe trajectories in an identifiable terrestrial space, changing the landscape and applying toponyms as they go, and are rarely invoked ritually. As with the Wakashans, Salishan Transformers are geographical intervenors also, but intervenors of a more decidedly 'cartographic' kind.

Not surprisingly this also holds true in Nlha7káp.mx country (Map 23) where tales of supreme beings, foundational supernatural agents, and transformers operating in mythic time, and terrestrial migrations in chronological time, all weave in and out of each other in myriad ways. Again recycling many now familiar motifs the origins of the world are explained as follows:

Formerly the earth we live on did not exist, in its place was a great lake. Old one, who lives in the upper world or in that part of it where now the highest snowcapped mountains reached the sky, got tired of looking below him at the endless waste of water. He thought "I will make an island in the middle of the lake, which will be nice to look at." Taking some clear earth he formed it into a round ball, hollow in the center, and threw it down in the middle of the lake. Here it formed a large island — the earth upon which we live. The ball burst when it hit the water [and] remained in the water as a broken mass of flats, hollows, hills and islets, much as we see it now. This is the reason that the edge of the earth is surrounded by great lakes at the present day.

For the Nlha7káp.mx, the terrestrial world that Old One created is a kind of rounded square, the four corners corresponding to the cardinal points of the compass. There is no heavenly realm per se but there is a 'country of souls' that lies somewhere 'beneath',

---

40 This is again a slippery, but notable distinction. It is not that Kwakwa'wakw Transformers do not perform geographical work; they do effect changes in the resource base, intervene in the weather, and many are often associated with, if not identifiable places, at least generalized biophysical milieux (refer again to Berman, J. 'Red salmon', op. cit.). But they do not appear to have as much to do with the modification of the existing terrestrial landscape, and they rarely seem to be travelling along a recognizable geographical tangent. In the Salish world, moreover, the Transformers disappear after their work on earth is finished; in the Kwakwa'wakw, by comparison, they persevere well into the temporal epoch, their powers annually re-energized in the winter ceremonials.

41 'The creation of the world by Old One', from an unidentified informant c. 1897, in Teit, J., Mythology of the Thompson Indians, Boas, F. (ed) The Jesup North Pacific Expedition Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History Vol. 8, Pt. 2 (New York: Leiden, Brill and Stechert, 1912), 320. In most of the other nine variants (321-8) Old One interacts with 'first people' (who are sometimes in animal form, sometimes human) already 'in the world' (although how they got there is not explained); this one is probably the exception. Again, moreover, Old One may be an adaptation of the Christian deity.
and yet 'parallel to' the terrestrial.\textsuperscript{42} While Old One is responsible for the weather — he makes rain or snow by scratching his backside — and water and land 'mysteries' that inhabit lakes, waterfalls or mountains, most of the earth was made by \textit{Senk'iýáp} (Coyote). He lived with Old One before coming to earth and rejoined him after his earth time was finished; in other narratives he is said to have repaired, like the Nuxalk's \textit{Sninia}, to the north, where the \textit{aurora borealis} is the light of his fire shining through the ice.\textsuperscript{43} In some versions he survived the great flood on an unnamed mountain at \textit{Nk'awmn} (Ncomen) whereupon he turned his canoe into a stone outcrop; the high watermarks are still visible today. In this story, however, the flood was caused not by a rebuked or angered creator, but by Beaver.\textsuperscript{44} In other versions, \textit{Senk'iýáp}'s children beget all the Interior Salish tribes, each of them speaking a like language but having different character:

There was once a monster [whom Coyote killed]. Then he cut up his body, and threw the several parts to the neighbouring tribes. He scalped him and threw the scalp to the Crees; therefore they have very long hair and scalp their enemies. He beheaded him and threw the head to the lower Fraser tribe; therefore they have large heads. He cut off his legs and threw them to the Ktunaxa; therefore they are fleet of foot. His arms he threw to the Shuswap; therefore they are a powerful people. His privates he threw to the Nlha7-kápmx; therefore they are noted for their thick penis. His heart he threw to the Okanagan; therefore they are a brave and stouthearted people. After he had finished cutting up the body, he threw the knife, covered with blood, to the Upper Thompasons; therefore they became known as the Knife people and were celebrated for quarrelling and stabbing one another. Now he plucked some grass, wiped his hands with it, and threw the wiper to the Lillooet; therefore they are a poor people, behind all others.\textsuperscript{45}

While among men, Coyote lived in his underground lodge in the Nicola valley, but spent most of his time roaming far to the south and east, clear to the edges of the world. He taught the arts to all the Nlha7kápmx people, and he created, or modified, and then

\textsuperscript{42} The standard ethnography on these matters is Teit, J. \textit{The Thompson Indians}, op. cit., Chapter 12.
\textsuperscript{43} 'The coyote', from an unidentified informant c. 1897, in Teit, J. \textit{The Mythology}, op. cit., 295-6.
\textsuperscript{44} 'Coyote and the flood', from an unidentified informant, c. 1897, in Teit, J., 'Folk-tales of the Salishan tribes' \textit{Memoirs of the American Folk-lore Society} 11, 1917, 1-64, variant is 13. Three other versions, but without the geographical specificities, are in Teit, J. \textit{Mythology}, op. cit., 230 and 332-3.
\textsuperscript{45} 'Coyote and the monster', from an unidentified informant to Teit, J., ibid., 314. In another variant (255-7), this was accomplished by a man who defeated a cannibal, which was then cut into pieces and tossed to the four corners of the territory.
named geographic features rather as did Txemsem for the Nisga'a, or the Transformers for the Stl'atl''imx — indeed, in a few variants, Senk'i'yáp and the Transformers are one and the same. In most versions, though, the Transformers appear, as elsewhere in the Salish world, as separate agents, performing their own miracles in a landscape already named and prefigured by Senk'i'yáp. In some they get the 'upper hand' — one account explains how they visit the Nicola, turning Senk'i'yáp's lodge into stone and him and his wife into the gravel bars and islets that now braid the Nicola River. In most, such as in the following account, Senk'i'yáp succeeds in preventing the Transformers from becoming too active by confining them to the coast:

The Qwo'qtqwal were transformers who came from the lower Fraser River or the sea. They were four brothers....The name of the eldest was Sésali'd'n. It is said that they performed many wonderful feats in the lower country, but the Upper [Nlha7kápmx] only know of those feats...performed while [they were] passing through the country above Lytton. They came up the canyon of the Fraser River until they came to Spences Bridge. When they arrived at Mud Slide [about four miles below Spences Bridge] they saw a cannibal who lived there fishing in the river...they kicked down a mountain on him...Since that time this mountain has continued to slide into the river. When they arrived at Xexlxox'xemex [the spring two miles below Spences Bridge] the youngest brother felt thirsty. [The eldest brother found the spring, saying] henceforth this spot will be a training place for girls. Then they arrived just below Ca'ñexenenamax Mountain [a mountain below Spences Bridge]...they camped on the river [making] a high rocky mountain [on which to escape the rising water]. When the Qwo'qtqwal reached Cook's Ferry they turned up the Nicola River and travelled until they came to Kwenc'd'nt [22 miles from Spences Bridge] where they met Coyote [who let them proceed on the understanding they would not interfere with his work]. The Qwo'qtqwal went on until the came to the place called Coyote's House near Teze'la [and made Coyote two wifes out of a branch]....Now the brothers came to Zuxt [the foot of Nicola Lake], above which place there was at that time no lake, only a creek. Here on the mountain called Sqom'lst [Gilmore's Mountain] lived the cannibal of that name. [They transformed him] into the 'mystery' of that place and made a dam across the creek at Zuxt. The waters rose and formed a lake. Now the transformers jumped over the bones of the people [the cannibal had killed] and they came to life again [settling down] at Zuxt which was then a desert place and became quite numerous...The Qwo'qtqwal swerved to the south...and travelled down the Similkameen River to the Forks. Here at Zu'tsamen [Vermilion Bluff] they met again Coyote, who objected to their invasion of the country....[and so] they decided to leave the interior...travelled up the Tulameen River, and cross[ed] the Cascade Range to the lower Fraser River. Henceforth, they confined their operations to the

---

46 On this view, Senk'i'yáp would still be the most senior and most talented of any other Transformers.
coast and...they travelled all around the edges of the world. Having finished
their work they went to the sky, where they chose to be transformed into
stars.

In still other accounts, *Senk’iyáp* is neither Old One’s assistant nor a Transformer, but
a mortal chief who, at the close of the myth age, leads his people from a far off place
into Nlha7kápmx country where they mingle with those already there. In one version
these people lived somewhere to the southeast under the sun, where they were hemmed
in by enemies on three sides, and a large lake on another. Eventually they were
attacked and forced out, having to cross the lake, a great plain (likely the prairies), a
mountain range (probably the Rockies) and a wide river (allegedly the Columbia).
They stayed on its west bank for a while but then broke up, one group going south, the
other north, and an offshoot of this latter eventually arrived on the Thompson River:

> We know about our origin and our ancestors and we have inhabited this
country for a long time. The earth is full of the bones of our ancestors. Our
traditions tell us that even in mythological times our ancestors lived here.
Four of them lived at Lytton, from whom we believe we are descended —
*Nicemi’ken...* a man of very large stature and a great hunter and warrior;
*Kwona’e’ka*, who made canoes; *Skwáł:tenemux*, who could move around like
a bird, and was a hunter and warrior; and *Kweskapi’nek*, who was like a
queen and mother of the people. These were Indians...not animals. Some
people claim that the Lytton people sprang from these original inhabitants.
At the close of the mythological period there were four lodges at Lytton,
each representing a family, or family group. These families intermarried and
from them have sprung all the Thompson people. *Cexpéntlem, Tsé’sieten,*

---

47 The *Qwo’qtqwal* were four brothers in human form, and is one of six Nlha7kápmx Transformer nar-
ratives recorded c. 1897 by Teit, J. *Mythology*, op. cit., 315-9. Of the other five, one was also recorded in
the Nicola valley area (319-20) but is less explicit geographically and refers to only three brothers (one of
whom travelled alone). The other four were related by lower Thompson River informants (218-28): in
two of them, geographical references are few and the Transformer is one man; in yet another he is also
one man, except this time works mostly below Lytton and has more consistent geographical references;
in the fourth, they are again *Qwo’qtqwal*, and while they describe a trajectory virtually the same as that
cited above, they now appear as four black bears. The variant describing the transformation of Coyote’s
wife and lodge is recorded as ‘Sesulia’n and Seku’lia’in Teit, J. *Folk-tales*, op. cit., 13-4. Two other
variants, but again shorn of most of the geographical referents, are related by contemporary Nlha7kápmx
elders in Darwin Hanna and Mamie Henry (eds), *Our Tellings* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1996), 76-80. The bracketed *spatial* references in the narrative cited here are taken from Teit’s footnotes.
48 From an unidentified informant c. 1897 in Teit, J. *Folk-tales*, op. cit., 48-9. In some variants, the
migration is said to have gone the other direction (see, in this connection, Teit, J. *Mythology*, op. cit.,
178) while in still others it is said that the reference is not to other indigenous groups, but to the coming
of the whites (in ‘Folk-tales’, op. cit., 50-1). These references, although vague, are suggestive historical
accounts, appearing in a handful of Secwepemc and Okanagan narratives also.
and other leading chiefs, all claim descent from one or more of these families. In course of time these four lodges increased, and some families broke away and settled in other places where there were good hunting and fishing. Thus from Lytton the people spread up and down the Fraser River and up the Thompson River. Some families migrated from Lytton, and settled at [Nkawm], which was a great salmon-fishing place, and was annually visited by the Okanagan. The people of many of these places sent forth offshoots, a family or two breaking away and making their headquarters at a certain place, which, in time, became the center of a band. Thus, our country was settled, until...our people spread down the Fraser to Spuzzum and up the Fraser to La Fontaine [Fountain], also up the Thompson River to Spences Bridge, and over to Nicola and Similkameen. At these points they came in contact with other tribes, with whom they intermarried. They were called the 'real [Nlha7kápmx]'. Other [Nlha7kápmx] were considered their offspring or children....This is why Lytton was considered the chief and central place of the tribe and our head chief was there...[and] why the Lytton people had the right to hunt anywhere in the country of the tribe ....Stories used to be told of a migration of Thompson people from the Columbia River to Lytton and also later from Lytton to the Columbia River... There are still some Thompson-speaking Indians on the Columbia....I have never seen any of them, but have often heard of them, and seen men who have seen them.49

Containing references to mythic ancestors, lodges that multiply into extended families living in different villages and more recent immigrations in chronological time, the narrative contains many of the same motifs noted previously.

It is when travelling west, into Kootenaian, and especially further north, into Athapaskan country, however, that one enters a qualitatively different world. Partly it is sociopolitical. Stretching across a vast, mainly intermontane plateau, Athapaskan extended families were also organized into regional bands, but they were more nomadic, and permanent settlements were somewhat smaller and more dispersed than in Salishan country. Partly, it is in the nature of Athapaskan oral tradition. A few narratives refer, if in passing, to ancient odysseys from some distant land to the north or west (the Berin-gia connection, perhaps?). Most Athapaskan origin stories, however, seem to be almost exclusively along the lines of geographically ambiguous Genesis accounts.50 Some re-

49 'Migration narrative', from unidentified informant c. 1897, in Teit, J. 'Folk-tales', op. cit., 49-51. The bracketed spatial references are mine. A shorter version, this time attributed to Chief Tetlonitsa, is found in ibid., 51-2.

50 Once again, I am on slippery turf. Ethnographers generally spent less time in the Athapaskan world, and those that did (such as Diamond Jenness and Father Adrien Gabriel Morice) tended to use informants
call how 'cultural heroes' of one kind or another are responsible for the creation of the world and the animals in it. The Dunne Za (Map 17), for example, speak of Yagatunne ('Heaven Sitter'), who drew a cross on the water and then sent down various animals—one of which, Muskrat, placed some dirt at the center of the cross, and caused the earth to grow. Their ancestor figure is Saya (Swan), who follows a 'trail from Heaven', turning monsters into animals along the way. However, Yagatunne's or Saya's connection with today's families, their influence on a terrestrial geography, or their relationship to each other is not theorized.51 The Kaska Dene oral tradition, by comparison, speaks of a great flood, but in this case Crow is the trickster who persuades the supernatural Sea Woman to dive beneath the water and bring up a clump of mud. After she flattens it to make the world, it is seeded with animals by Game Mother.52 Again, however, no recognizable terrestrial connections are provided.

It is only along the lee side of the coastal mountain ranges, where Athapaskan culture was heavily influenced by those of the Koluschan Tsimshian, Wakashan and Interior Salish to their immediate west and south, that Athapaskan origin narratives appear to contain more geographical references. Adopting motifs from the Tlingit, some Tahltan narratives speak of a supreme being, Yanaxa, while others recall how the first families survived a great flood by mooring their canoes on the highest peaks. When the waters ebbed, many journeyed far to the north, west or south but others stayed where they were, establishing Titcaxhan, their great gathering and trading complex on the Stikine River near the present site of Telegraph Creek.53 Typical of the Athapaskan speakers, they had no crests or totem poles, but, like the Koluschans, were organized into

51 The definitive contemporary ethnography on these matters is Ridington, R. Trail to Heaven, op. cit. Thanks to him and Brody, Dunne Za spatial referencing systems are as well documented as any.
52 See, in this connection, the brief summary in Coull, C. A Traveller's Guide, op. cit., 228.
53 See, for a summary, ibid., 221-3. Also a kind of great city-state, Titcaxhan was to the Tahltans as was Temlaxam to the Tsimshian.
matrilineal clans living in planked winter villages. The origin stories of *Athapaskan* groups flanked by two or more language families reflect more complex borrowings, two Southern Carrier accounts cases in point. The first comes from the west Chilcotin:

At Salmon House, the story says...[three brothers: Kwakwosat, Yus and Nowakila] had a house which was dug underground....There they fixed the salmon and made a place for them to jump. At another place nearby they made a flat place where the salmon could be dried. When they finished that place Kwakwosat went down the Salmon River. Yus came to Ulkatcho. He fixed lots of places where man would come. He put trout and suckers in the lakes. Nowakila went down to Anahim Lake and Chilcotin country. Then he went to Bella Coola. At that time there were no men but these three. Only Nowakila was really a man. As Kwakwosat down to Salmon River, Nowakila...told him to fix that river all the way down. That time it was a bad river full of high waterfalls so that salmon could not swim. Kwakwosat swam down but sometimes he got too anxious and would fly. Where he swam the water was good, but where he flew the water was bad.54

That this story contains motifs similar to those of the Nuxalk, with whom the Southern Carrier shared their western border, is not surprising. Like the Nuxalk, extended Southern Carrier families were not grouped into clans but owned specific resource sites and passed legendary crests down the generations in potlatches.55 Unlike the Nuxalk, however, there were no totem poles or planked villages, and nothing was attributed to the design of a creator. Further inland are a handful of stories explaining how the landscape was the result of competition between, as opposed to the intervention of, cultural heroes. A narrative from the Blackwater country (Map 16) goes as follows:

Long ago there were no people at Nazko. People stayed at Kluskus and Bazeeko. Nazko valley was all flooded from Gilles Crossing, all up the Nazko River, through to the Clisbako River and even halfway along the Blackwater River to Kluskus. It was all one big lake. This was because a giant beaver had built a dam all along the river. The beaver's house can still be seen today — it is the big mountain to the east of the Nazko River near Trout Lake. There is a mountain covered with birch trees near Kluskoil Lake — that is where the beaver left his food. A man named Kebets'ih came along and broke the dam, and from that time on the Nazko valley was made free for people to live in. Kebets'ih was like a giant and he had many adventures.

55 The standard ethnography on these matters is Goldman, I., 'The Alkatcho Carrier: Historical background of crest prerogatives' *American Anthropologist* 43, 396-418.
[He] stayed on the Blackwater River [and] often hunted beaver up near Kluskus. He had a bear for a dog....There was another man named Nahoolt'en. [He] came and was fishing at Squirrel Lake near Kluskus. In the middle of the lake is a big island. Nahoolt'en says he looks in the water and that [was] how he fishes. Kebets'ih came and drowned Nahoolt'en in that lake. Now, if you travel up to Kluskus, especially if you go in a plane, you can see Nahoolt'en's body...in the shape of an island...Kebets'ih threw Nahoolt'en's tools...far away and they landed in Tatelkuz Lake. People even today see it — it look's like cement for a house foundation. These are Nahoolt'en's tools, all cemented together.\(^56\)

That this account smacks more of the Transformer narratives characteristic of the Interior Salish, with whom the Southern Carrier share their southern frontiers, should not surprise us either. As in the Stl'atl'imx and Nlha7kâpmx stories, these heroes are not directly linked to a creator, and how, why, or when they appear is not explained. The tale only confirms that they could assume either human, animal, or inanimate form, and that they are responsible for the creation or modification of terrestrial features, or the resources associated with them. Unlike their Salishan counterparts, however, these heroes do not trace a specified itinerary between named places in the landscape.\(^57\)

Not all narratives are, of course, of the foundational sort. While it is often a matter of convenience, many Native groups did (and still do) distinguish 'primary stories' constituted during the myth age to explain basic geography from 'secondary stories' focussing on more recent events in a temporal world. Just as Interior Salish Transformer narratives seem to pick up where creation narratives leave off one might claim that secondary narratives are 'situated in' the primary — that is, they devolve in a landscape already made ready by creation accounts.\(^58\) They might explain things like the establish-

---

\(^56\) 'Kebets'ih and Nahoolt'en', Eulalie Patrick, Nazko Reserve, recorded in 1992 by Furniss, E., Dakelh, op. cit., 12-3.

\(^57\) Once again, the distinction between Transformers and cultural heroes is more a matter of 'degree' than it is of 'type'. There are Interior Salish and Wakashan Transformer narratives that are geographically more vague than many cultural hero tales. The fact that Athapaskan narratives do not use the term Transformer does imply, however, that they are not the same.

\(^58\) This terminology is consistent with that used by the anthropologist John Cove, *Shattered Images: Dialogues and Meditations on Tsimshian Narratives* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1986), 45-6. I shall come back to this distinction from a theoretical standpoint in Chapter 3, and from the empirical in Chapters 4 and 6.
ment of newer villages, bifurcations or amalgamations of clans, tribes, houses and families, and, especially, important wars. The following story is but one of many Nlha7-kápemx accounts of events in living memory, long after agents like Senk'i'yáp or the Transformers had disappeared:

Formerly there lived two Tcawa'xamux brothers by name Nhlkwe'ixen and Slemi't'sa....Although they lived in Nicola, where they ranged the country hunting and fishing as far east as Douglas Lake, they were of pure Nlha7-kápemx blood...Once the Ut'à'mqt [the name by which people below Lytton were known to those at Nicola] came down the Coldwater River, and arrived in Nicola to hunt and fish. The brothers went to Nsi'qet, where the Ut'à'mqt were camped and killed a man called Tà'uta, whereupon the others at once struck camp and went home. Shortly after this a noted Ut'à'mqt named Nò'ea raised a large war party and went to Nicola to search for the murderers. They surrounded and attacked the house of Stëw'i'xamux...[who] asked them why they attacked him...[and they answered that] they wished to catch the two brothers who had murdered Tà'uta...Stëw'i'xamux told them they were fishing up at Pena'asket's camp, near Douglas Lake, whereupon [they went]....Stëw'i'xamux sent a boy...to warn Kauli's and Kenuxé'sket, with whom the brothers were staying...[and] when they received the news...they made ready to shift down to Nicola Lake....They drove along boldly, not expecting the Ut'à'mqt to molest them...[but] the Ut'à'mqt...attacked them from ambush...they shot Kauli's and Kenuxé'sket...When Nhlkwe'ixen and Slemi't'sa saw what had happened...they made a detour....Not long after this the brothers murdered a Tcawa'xamux near Spences Bridge. The chief relatives of this man were Gisti'mt and Nxeu'eks, who presently caught Slemi't'sa in a lodge at Spences Bridge and killed him. The other brother, Nhlkwe'ixen...joined a war expedition against the Lil'ooet and was killed in battle.59

Consider, as a second example, this quite famous tale of the Nisga'a chief Litux dating from the immediate pre-contact period. Abstracted in Map 32(d), it describes how his attempt to circumvent a rival chief by establishing a trading alliance along the Nisga'a-Gitanyow grease trail nearly resulted in a wholesale territorial realignment of the Tsimshian speaking world:

This had been going on for some time, as the [grease] trail from Gitlaxdamks to Gitwiniguul [Kitwancool] as not very distant....Knowing the trail existed

59 From an unidentified informant c. 1897, in Teit, J., Mythology, op. cit., 405-6. Of the four other war stories recorded by Teit, the two from the lower Thompson River region refer to conflicts with the Sa'ál-cínko (as will be clear in Chapter 6, probably the Ts'elxwéyexw [Chilliwacks] but perhaps the Skagit), while the two from the upper Thompson area (406-10) involve skirmishes with the Secwépemc and Stl'atl'imx.
and being married to a Gitksan woman Litux...planned to trade by going over this trail. [His party] gathered all their trading goods of seacoast foods... which were in great demand by the upper Skeena people. Knowing...they had to stay clear of the [Coast] Tsimshian and Gits'ilaasii [Kitselas] Litux...set out...[and] after many days travelling...arrived at Gitwiniguul, where they traded many of their things...[including] a huge copper shield...[they] kept on...until they came to Kispiox [Kispiox] and Gitpanmaax [Hazelton] and Hagwilget [across the river from New Hazelton]...and traded some more.... Litux had planned to return the same way he had come...but had [too] much to carry...over the trail. So Litux wintered at Gitpanmaax...and when the river was clear, he purchased...several large canoes and set off downstream. [Ligeex (the Gispaxlo 'ots chief) heard of this and told his nephew Gwütxex to watch for Litux, promising that] "they shall be punished for stealing our food box on the upper Skeena." [When Litux arrived at Gits'ilaasii his party] was captured without a chance to protect themselves. The Gits'ilaasii took them to the house of Gwütxex and...destroyed [the canoes] and took all the contents. There was nothing the Nisga'a could do....[But on the other side of the canyon was another Gits'ilaasii village led by Gitxoon who had many Nisga'a relatives] and when he heard of the treatment the Nisga'a were getting, he [invited Litux across the river, calling to his tribesmen] "come bring in my brother's canoe that he may see it." Much feasting and dancing followed. Soon Litux was ready to continue his journey to the Nass, and the canoe which Gitxoon had given him was filled with provisions and gifts....[Litux thanked his host, telling him] "it will be well for you not to come to the Nass next oolichan season. But should you come you and your own group must stay in a separate village, not together with Gwütxex." This was [his] way of warning Gitxoon to stay away from the [revenge the Nisga'a would surely exact upon Gwütxex]....[Sure enough, when spring came everyone moved to the mouth of the Nass for the oolichan fishery....The other Gits'ilaasii [came] in small numbers...[but] the Gitlaan Tribe of the Tsimshian came together as a group and camped, as they always did, just below the Nisga'a and Litux, seeing them, remembered [his humiliation]. One day, two young men from the Gitlaan camp went into the forest...[meeting] a party of Litux's relatives [who] saw their chance for revenge [killing one while wounding another]. A group of Tsimshian at once got together a raiding party and went directly to the Nisga'a village of Gwunwok [killing a Nisga'a chief on the way there]. When the relatives had heard what happened they immediately called the Nisga'a warriors together and gave a great feast [and...made preparations] for war...what had happened was that [a] struggle between Litux... and the Gitlaan and the Gits'ilaasii...was beginning to involve other villages and was becoming a very serious conflict....It was just as [it] was about to break out [however] that Litux...saw a large canoe approaching...and recognized Gitxoon. They were all singing a peace song, and had gifts. Then Gitxoon [acted] as peacemaker [suggesting they all] settle their troubles in a peaceful manner....[After compensation and feasting and gifts, then] so it was that the Tsimshian chief Ligeex, and the Gits'ilaasii continued to share control of all upriver trade.60

As noted above, these narratives all come from different informants, in different situations, at different times, and are filtered, to greater or less degree, through an ethnographic classificatory logic. Even so, there appears to be enough evidence that one of the 'prime directives' of all these narratives is to capture, transmit and preserve for posterity geographical information. They do not do so in the same way as journal, survey or map — these are spoken, not written, accounts — but to the extent that they provide a kind of spatial legislation that partitions territories they serve much the same purpose.\(^61\) This does not mean that where origin narratives become geographically ambiguous that such legislation is absent. My preliminary investigation suggests that the less hierarchical the socio-political context, the less territorial partitioning there tends to be.\(^62\) Hence, there is less demand for detailed origin narratives. It is also quite possible that in cultural spaces based on greater territorial flexibility, such as in the Athapaskan world, that the bulk of the geographical record is carried in narratives of a more recent, secondary, vintage. Beyond that, however, narratives are not the only means by which Native people came to associate themselves with certain territories and, by extension, with each other. Indeed, it seems clear so far that no narrative has an existence outside of the elements, events, or itineraries that compose it. Some of these we have touched on already.

**Landmarking**

Crests, totem poles and house fronts are obviously extremely important (Figure A). That clan or legendary crests, painted on house fronts, or engraved on totem poles con-

\(^61\) In *Practice*, op. cit., de Certeau suggested that "primary stories...have the function of spatial legislation since they determine rights and divide up lands by 'acts' or 'discourses about actions" (122, emphasis in original). He was talking about evidence being adduced in court, but it seems even more appropriate as a way of thinking about the function of narrative in oral societies.

\(^62\) de Certeau's related point was, of course, that narratives spatially legislate by "marking out boundaries" (ibid.); this suggests that the more generic the stories become, the more approximate the boundaries must be. I will come back to this point below, in Chapter 3, and throughout Part II.
Figure A(a-c)
Highlighting some of the different variants of totem poles, crests, and dwellings, portions of three of the largest coastal villages (all of which have been partially reconstructed for the Grand Hall of the Canadian Museum of Civilization [CMC] in Ottawa [see, in this connection, Nancy Ruddell, *Raven's Village* (Hull: CMC, 1995)]. While these are all of post-contact vintage (which means that they may not be accurate replications of pre-contact designs) they are probably typical enough. Characteristic of the northwest coast cultural complex was the Haida village at Skidegate (*Hlgaagilda*) (on Map 28), as it looked in 1878 (a). Note the timbered gabled houses and the wide variety of free-standing mortuary, memorial, heraldic and house frontal columns. Along the central coast, poles were more squat and dwellings, if often of much flimsier construction, were usually gabled and decorated with formline art. Pictured in 1920 the boardwalk at Bella Coola (*Q'umk'wts* on Map 18) (b) was typical, even if the unusual peaked 'false front' (which represented the five summits of *Nusq'alst*) was not. Still further south, in Kwakwaka'wakw territory, more substantial framed houses, also with painted fronts and lining a boardwalk, were the norm. As shown in this 1910 view of Alert Bay ('*Yalis*') (c), however, house frontal columns were taller and more slender and there were usually a few free-standing heraldics also ([a] by George Dawson [RBCM, neg. no. PN1020, Victoria]; [b] by Harlan Smith [American Museum of Natural History (AMNH), photo 330864, New York]; and [c] by Tom Davis [RBCM, neg. no. PN2588-C, Victoria]).
veyed messages about the ordering of social relations in a village has long been recognized. As Haida Chief Matthews put it:

If I want my children to be recognized among the high class people, I raise a totem pole, and their crest is on that...my children's. And then from that day on other tribes will recognize my children. Even when I pass away, my children are part, and that's the guarantee of the totem pole. The totem pole represents a memorial....Since [we] couldn't record language in writing, that's the nearest thing, the carving of totem poles.63

What my small selection of origin narratives suggests, however, is that clan crests were about more than this. Clan formation came out of a need to clarify difference, a difference that likely would have been reflected spatially when clans migrated. In this sense, then, clan crests had some bearing on which lineages came to be associated with which chiefly hunting grounds.64 The heraldic crest was of a different order. By itself, it refers to nothing beyond the event or encounter that prompted its acquisition. But these events or encounters, which add to the 'plotline' of the lineage that owns them, happened somewhere. Heraldic crests are event recorders and thus geographically significant. They summarize, in the visual register, what their public witnessing and validation in a potlatch conveyed in the oral or ceremonial. Graven sequentially with clan, legendary and heraldic crests, totem poles thus related a "history of interpersonal and interlineage relationships [and] symboliz[ed] the success of the crest owners in accumulating material and symbolic capital."65 Totem poles embodied, simultaneously, one or more chief-
ly names; the partitioning of the clan, tribe or house group into constituent lineages, the relationship of lineages to particular villages; and corporate ownership of hunting territories. Totem poles are not 'maps' in the normal sense of the term; they cannot be interpreted if abstracted from the narratives they help compose. But insofar as they are like "documents [that] display a people's origins and lineages, their...experiences, their exploits and achievements, and their successions, acquisitions and territories" some of their functions seem to be 'map-like'.

The same line of thought extends to the clan or dirge song. That songs such as 'Wa'-moomdxl's limx'oy on Medeek were integral to territorialization has since been confirmed by the Wet'suwet'en elder, Mikh Lilch Legh (Chief Johnny David):

Each clan have their own song. Each house chief has a song. And those songs are composed out on the territory. You can try for years to compose a song and all of a sudden something hits and you compose a song. [It] might come to you during a hunt or while stalking animals, and the incidents that happened about how they became [a] chief, all that is recorded through the song. So each song tells a story...[I]n the feast hall...[b]efore any transaction takes place, house chiefs identify themselves with a song: where their territory is situated, and they sing a song about that territory. Every piece of territory has a song.

Like the heraldic crest, the dirge song refers to something that happened, somewhere. It is only in the context of the larger narrative in which it is ensconced, and the system of feasting in which the link between the ownership of the song and ownership of the territory is validated, that its geographical function emerges. It is in this sense that the dirge song can be understood as the aural analogue of the visual crest.

Crossing the coast ranges into Interior Salish and then Athapaskan country, references to crests and totem poles disappear. Origin narratives are still scaffolded around events and itineraries. But it is increasingly Transformers, rather than named ancestors, who are the active agents, and other geographical identifiers become germane. One of

---

66 Hilary Stewart, in Totem Poles (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1990), 27.
them, introduced in Mack's story of the Transformers' travels in Stl'atl'imx country, is 'picture writing'. While something of a misnomer, this term usually refers to the painting or etching of graphic designs on or into natural surfaces (Figure B). Whether or not the pictures in pictograms, petroglyphs or dendroglyphs carry out some kind of 'cartographic function' remains debatable (Figures C and D). To begin with there is often no way of knowing whether all the designs at any one site were created at once, and even where some seem to represent geographic features, they cannot be identified. Some panels were intended to be seen by others — and supports the contention that they may be 'maps' — but many more were known to only to a few individuals or were made by shamans in obscure places. And while it might simply be a matter of documentation, it seems that the nearer one gets to the coast, the more they are representations of animate or supernatural beings, than they are images of a quasi-cartographic kind.

That said, there is every reason to suppose that it is where they were made, and not necessarily what they depicted, that is significant, and that they are, in fact, landmarks. Indeed, and given the frequency (at least in the Salish world) with which they are attributed to the activities of the Transformers, it would be difficult to conclude otherwise. They do denote sites where supernatural beings 'came to earth', and entered into relations with corporeal agents. Like so many Stl'atl'imx and Nlha7kápmx pictograms re-

---

68 The term is frequently used in the ethnographic literature, but as Wendy Wickwire and Mike M'Gonigle (in "Reading" rock art: One sense/many senses BC Studies 108, 75-93) have pointed out, 'writing' is a term that implies a reading that is essentially syntactical, as opposed to interpretive, and thus must be used cautiously. The term 'rock art', to the extent that it implies an attempt by a 'painter' to capture experience, may be closer to the mark, but we should not, as Jack Goody cautions (in The Interface Between the Written and the Oral [Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1987], 8) rule out the possibility that such representations, which are communicative, may still contain 'linguistic' elements.

69 In Sacred Scrolls, op. cit., Dewdney S. concluded that because they displayed water courses and lakes between Sault Ste. Marie and northern Minnesota (the direction of the post-contact Saulteaux migration) with a remarkable degree of topographical precision (and did so with design elements strikingly similar to those documented by Teit), certain bark parchments of the Mide (an Ojibway shaman cult) were, if not 'maps', at least what amounted to the same thing (see, again, Goody, J. Interface, op. cit. 16). The difference is that they were a post-contact development, and were 'portable' in a way that 'rock art' could never be.

70 The authoritative empirical survey is Hill, B. and R. Indian Petroglyphs, op. cit.

71 I shall come back to this very important point in Chapter 3.
Figure B
James Teit's *Some interpretations of pictographs in the Thompson and Lillooet Region*, Spences Bridge (?) 1896; whether as pictograms (painting, typically on rocks), petroglyphs (etching, usually into rocks) or dendroglyphs (carving or burning of debarked trees) 'rock art' or 'picture writing' was arguably the one graphic device common to all Aboriginal cultures. These Interior Salish designs are among the most thoroughly documented anywhere in the cordillera. Graphic designs like these were not unique to the Salish, or even, for that matter, to transformer stories; they are found all over British Columbia and most are not directly referenced in narratives. At any rate, many of them seem to require little or no 'translation' by Native informants and some of them are almost certainly symbols representing geographical features (copied from original in Teit's 'Notes on rock paintings in general' *Bulletin of the Museum of Natural History* 8[12], 1896, 227-30).
## SOME INTERPRETATIONS OF PICTOGRAPHS IN THE THOMPSON AND LILLOOET REGIONS

by James Tait

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sh</th>
<th>Unfinished basketry</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>An animal near a trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Crossing of trails</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Lake with trees, island with trees in the middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Fir branches</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Unfinished matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Snakes</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Stream running out of a lake with an island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>A guardian spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Ruffed grouse</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Range of mountains with valley in between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Grizzly bear tracks</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Fir branch with needles plucked from one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Lakes and river</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Bow and arrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Ditch with piles of earth</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Black bear tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Human with stripped fir branches</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th†</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Arrowheads or cedar branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th†</td>
<td>Four mountains and lake between</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th†</td>
<td>Mountain with trees and gulches</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Probably grizzly bear in den surrounded by forest or timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Lightning</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Perhaps a spider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Perhaps a lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Canoe with people</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>The sun and rainbow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Probably an otter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Eagles</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Bighorn sheep showing horns, heart and ribs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Hunter with two dogs</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>a. Mountains and glacier in valleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Water mystery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Beavers</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Dog or horse struck by arrow</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Probably a bear issuing from or connected with something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Trench with poles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Frog</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Crossing of track, sacrifices of food and pole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th*</td>
<td>Paddle</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Face with tears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th*</td>
<td>Bark canoe</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Coyote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Rising sun and earth line</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Cap with fringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th*</td>
<td>River and its bank</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Animal showing backbone and ribs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Insect Kilaxwa'us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Four quarters</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Lakes and river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Man with apron &amp; feather headdress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following abbreviations indicate the language group area from which the pictographic designs are taken.

- Sh = Shuswap
- L = Lillooet
- Th = Thompson
- Ok = Okanagan
- * = Tattoo design
- † = Pictograph designs on clothing and artifacts.
It is when pictorial symbols are combined into panels that 'translation' then becomes very much a matter of educated guesswork, even for contemporary First Nations interpreters. According to Annie York, an Nlha7kâpmx elder, the etching at Ts'etx'êkw ('markings') on the lower Stein River (a) depicted the creator (the large figure) directing hunters to goats climbing the ridge but along a route that demanded indirect and difficult access (the jagged lines); while (b) represented two guardian spirits (the ghost-like figures) and the two-headed serpent, all of which are being envisioned by the dreamer (as indicated by the hand) after a nine-day fast (the cross-hatchings). The design in (c), located at Nzikzak'wxn ('a place where boys and girls come to wash with boughs during puberty') is rather more obscure. According to York, the four apparent 'sections' were supposed to represent, left to right: a) the earth line (the thick line broken into three parts), with owl (the hooded figure) anchored to the 'foundation of the earth' (the jagged vertical line), and the dreamer (the stick figures); b) the surface of the earth (the short horizontal line), sun and moon (the starry figure and small crescent) 'above' the surface (although shown 'below' on the drawing) and again, a nine-day fast (the hash marks); c) a grave box (the cross), two large and one small ponds and a goat; and d) a ridge (the vertical hatched line), 'deer man' and again, earth lines (the full account is in York, Richard Daly and Chris Arnett, They Write Their Dreams On the Rock Forever [Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1993], 81-7 and 154-9). How (or even if) these sections are related to each other, however, is unclear, and York's interpretations are not consistent with earlier explanations. According to James Teit's and Harlan Smith's informants, York's 'earth lines' were really trails, the 'lakes' camp sites, and the vertical hatched line the watershed boundary separating Stl'atl'imx and Nlha7kâpmx territories. This suggests that the entire display might be viewed as a kind of map. Such a reading does not, however, answer the question of whether it is a map of terrestrial or cosmological space (or both) (see, in this connection, Wickwire, W. and M'Gonigle, M. ""Reading" rock art', op. cit.) (all copied, with permission, from original tracings in York, A. et. al. They Write, op. cit.)
Figure D
Less well documented are northwest coastal cultural complex designs such as this enigmatic Tsimshian pictograph, one of many like patterns found on rock faces on islands in Venn Passage (in Prince Rupert harbour). Although it would be easy to conclude that it was some sort of map, contemporary Tsimshian informants suggest that the dots actually served some (now forgotten) calendrical function, while the face-like images were scratched by girls leaving their village for marriage, and who wanted to commemorate their domestic residency. Indeed, the solid lines have since proved to be natural fissures, and all known panels are located at old village sites. Most were also carved intertidally, suggesting that they were supposed to be seen by supernatural underwater spirits (copied, with permission, from original tracing in Beth and Ray Hill, *Indian Petroglyphs of the Pacific Northwest* [Saanichton: Hancock House, 1974], 199).
corded by Teit, most Se'shalt pictograms (Map 14[c]) were painted on cliff faces, overlooking bodies of water or grottos known to be inhabited by mythical beings. Kwakwaka'wakw petroglyphs at Dogfish Bay on Quadra Island and on the eastern shore of Malcolm Island marked sacred springs. The Nuxalk told McIlwraith that the oft-visited petroglyphs along the cataracts of Squamalh (Thorsen Creek) were gathering places for the Tastquam (Nuxalk secret societies), and were etched into the rocks 'in time' with the musical intonations invoked in their ceremonies. There is a pictographic panel at Hisnit in Nuu-chah-nulth country marking the 'place of descent' of Umiq, the founding ancestor of the group that lives there. Some displays, such as a number of Tsimshian petroglyphs in Venn Passage, are either permanently underwater — suggesting they were surface designs etched when sea level was lower — or only appear at low tide — suggesting they were deliberately sited where they could be seen by subsurface supernatural beings.

There are also pictograms, petroglyphs and dendroglyphs that demarcate the boundaries between nations, or between tribes, clans or houses within the nation. Pictograms near Spuzzum are said to confirm the border between the Nlha7kapmx and the Stó:lō.

A Nisga'a petroglyph excavated from a site on Observatory Inlet, and displayed outside the Museum of Northern British Columbia in Prince Rupert, defined the boundary of a chiefly hunting ground, and a Tsimshian narrative explains how Laxgibuu Chief Neas-laws once used a pictogram to stake a new village site. Others appear to have signed important resource harvesting areas. Tlingit elders told Cheryl Coull that a petroglyph

---

72 A detailed discussion of many of these is found in Peterson, L. The Story, op. cit., Chapter 13.
73 Hill, B. and R. Indian Petroglyphs, op. cit., 144-5 and 152. Dogfish Bay is just around the point from Cakwaloten on Map 21(c).
74 McIlwraith, T. The Bella Coola I, op. cit., 177-9. The creek is shown just below Q'umk'wts on Map 18 (inset).
75 Alan McMillan, in Since Kwatyat Lived On Earth, unpublished PhD dissertation, Simon Fraser University, 1996.
76 York, A. et. al. They Write Their Dreams, op. cit., 210.
77 Hill, B. and R. Indian Petroglyphs, op. cit., 77.
near Atlin Lake defined one end of a caribou hunting run. Like crests or totem poles then, pictograms, petroglyphs and dendroglyphs are also if not maps at least 'map like'. The difference is that crests or poles were always carved and erected in villages. They were often some distance away from the territories they referenced and could not be abstracted from the narratives they helped compose. Picture writing, by contrast, was, as often as not, created in the frontiers, beyond the reaches of domesticated space where more dangerous and unpredictable forces held sway. Many designs were acknowledged in narratives but most were not. In a few instances, designs seem to have generated narrative accounts having nothing to do with the context in which they were originally made.

Cosmological and terrestrial frontiers could also be identified by unmarked natural features. Often these would be the most sacred mountains. In some cases, they are already in the world, their origins unexplained; *Kulse*, in Se'shalt country, or *In-SHUCK'-ch*, in Stl'atl'imx are two examples. Others are created by the origin narratives, but only in passing; the four peaks of the Nisga'a cases in point. Still others are seen to be sufficiently important that they have their own detailed creation narratives. Consider for example the following excerpt from Tsilhqot'in territory (Maps 20 and 25) which explains the origin and character of *Ts'il?os* (Mount Tatlow):

> Long ago, before white settlers moved in, *Ts'il?os* was once a man. *Ts'il?os* had a wife named *?Enuyid*. They lived in the mountains south of Konni Lake. Even though they had six children together, they had trouble getting along....One day *Ts'il?os* and *?Enuyud* got into an argument. *?Enuyud* threw her baby on *Ts'il?os* lap. She left two children with him and took the other three away. *Ts'il?os* turned into a rock along with the two children above Xeni Lake. You can still see the baby in his lap today. *?Enuyud* and her three children headed toward the Tatlayoko Valley. On her way, she planted wild potatoes. When she arrived on the other side of Tatlayoko Valley,

---

79 Partly, of course, this was because shamans conjuring spirits, or individuals engaged in vision quests generally chose, or were expected, to do so in isolation, as far away from secular influences as possible. 80 This appears to be the case with the 'man who fell from the sky', a Tsimshian petroglyph near Metlakatla. According to the archaeologist David Archer (personal conversation), the original purpose of this carving has been forgotten, the stories explaining it having been constructed post facto.
?Eniyud also turned into a rock. Wherever you find wild potatoes growing, she planted them. The Elders of Xeni Gwet'in say that if you point at Ts’i-l’os, he will make it rain or snow. He will change the weather, usually when you are on foot or horseback, far from home.\textsuperscript{81}

Elsewhere, natural features might seem relatively mundane, and may not be associated with primary or secondary accounts. The Secwepemc say their boundaries have always been known to outsiders as the four Coyote Rocks — located at Yexyex (near Yellowhead Pass), Three Valley Lake (in Eagle Pass west of Revelstoke), Tececoysten (Chapperon Lake) and Q’wyucenk (Ball Mountain).\textsuperscript{82} In some instances natural objects would be rearranged, or altered, in order to commemorate events. Consider, for example, this short narrative from Southern Carrier country (Map 16):

A long time ago the old timers went to war at Kitimat. A whole bunch of Kluskus and Ulkatcho people. Each person who went to war dropped a rock in a line. The rocks are still there yet. There's a line of rocks at Qualcho Lake and another one near Kluskus. That's how they counted each other. Not too many guys were missing they said.\textsuperscript{83}

Culturally modified trees (CMT) may also be viewed in a similar light.\textsuperscript{84} Though most CMTs are the consequence of resource gathering activity they are still, as the Ahousaht elder Stanley Sam has stated, "a living testament to the sustainable use of the forests by First Nations" and to this extent a record of "[their] history of continuous use and occupation of [their] lands."\textsuperscript{85} When debarked surfaces have been turned into dendrographics by graphic designs, moreover, many CMTs double as boundary markers too.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{81} As told by the Xeni Gwet’in chiefs, c. 1994, in British Columbia Parks 'Draft', op. cit., v. This mountain is located in plan view just above center Map 25, and pictorially, in panorama, at the center of Map 20. It is to the Tsilhqot’in as is Nusq’alst to the Nuxalk.
\textsuperscript{82} Coull, C. A Traveller's Guide, op. cit, 137. If there are references to these rocks in the Secwepemc narrative record, I haven't found them.
\textsuperscript{84} Generally speaking, the term CMT refers to trees that have been partially debarked for cambium, or 'cored' in order to test their soundness for conversion into a canoe, but can mean any tree that has, in any way, been altered by Native people for subsistence purposes.
\textsuperscript{85} in Ahousaht Wild Side Heritage Trail Guidebook (Vancouver: WCWC, 1997).
\textsuperscript{86} For much more on this, see Mike Blackstock, Faces in the Forest (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001). I will address this point more substantively in Chapters 4 and 5.
Naming the land

But of all the ways by which Native people maintained, over time, their connection with the land the most important was naming. There were two general types of names. One was tribal names, which often preserved, etymologically, the association between the social or political group and their territory, or place of origin. In the interior (sub-)tribal names were typically agglutinations consisting of a suffix having a generic translation of 'people of', and a stem that described some general quality of the local territory. Hence the Nlha7kapmx name *Teawa'xámux* (in the war story cited above) is a contraction of the suffix *'ámux*, meaning 'people of', and the stem *Teawa'x*, the Nlha7kapmx's name for the Nicola River, and means 'people of the creek'. Similarly, the name *K'kêmtsi'námux* is a contraction of the suffix and *K'kêmtsin* (Spences Bridge) and translates as 'people of the entrance' (because where the *Teawa'x* 'enters into' the Thompson River). Sometimes, the original etymology of a tribal name has been lost, such that the name of a tribal group and the name of its main residence are the same. An example is *Tl'kêmtsinemux*, which translates as 'people of the village of Tl'kêmtsin (Lytton)'. At a more generic level, a Nlha7kapmx distinction between sub-tribes living below *Tl'kêmtsin* and those above was carried in the names *Uiămqtámux*, the 'people below', and the *Nku'kûmámux*, the 'people above'.

Similar constructions are the norm in Secwepemc territory. Among several examples we have the *Stie'támux*, the 'people of the interior' (those that lived on the wide plateau between the North Thompson and Fraser Rivers); the *Sktamlu'lepsámux*, the 'people of the confluence' (of the North and South Thompson Rivers); and the *Zaxtecî'nâmux*, the 'people of the low valley' (because it is lower in elevation than valleys occupied by the other Secwepemc tribes). In other instances, the tribal name is adapted from the

---

87 These (and other tribal) etymologies are recorded in Teit, J. *The Thompson Indians*, op. cit., 168-71. The approximate boundaries of the *Uiămqtámux* are shown on Map 23(a). These were the appellations used at contact; how frequently they are used today is unclear.
name of the main village, or area of occupancy, for which the original etymology has been forgotten. One example is *Slemxu'lamux*, the ‘people of Slemxuláx’ (a district along the Fraser between what are now High Bar and Soda Creek).  

Among the *Wakashan* speakers, sub-tribal names may again identify nothing more than an association with an area or some resource that lends special character to it. Unlike the *Salishan* systems, however, these names often do not subscribe to a regular rule of phonemic contraction. In the Kwakwaka'wakw world, for example, are the *Gwa'salala*, meaning 'northern people' (because they are so with respect to the other Kwakwaka'wakw tribes); the *Dzawada'eduxw*, 'people of the oolichan place' (because abundant in the Kingcome River); and the *Dg'nxada'xw*, 'the sandstone ones' (referring to the rock shelves of the Knight Inlet area). Sub-tribal names may mark a geographical association even more circuitously — as through the name of the foundational ancestor who may or may not have come down where the tribe now lives. The *Wiweka'yi* is one example; another is *Mamalilikala*, named after their ancestor figure *Málelikillú*.  

These *Wakashan* examples confirm that while tribal names sometimes adduce a geographical reference with little or no inference outside the etymological derivation of the name itself, others reveal a territorial association more tangentially. Sometimes, in fact, tribal groups reference themselves not by 'where they are', but by 'where they are not'. Among the Kwakwaka'wakw, for example, are the *Kwikwasut'inuxw*, 'people of the opposite shore' (that is as across a body of water from some other tribe). Nor are the tribal names used by a collective necessarily the same as those applied by its neighbours. To the Secwepemc, for example, the Nlha7kápmx *K'kémtsi'námux* are known as *Nkuó'támux* (from *Kuo't*, a deserted village below *K'kémtsin*) and the *Tcawa'xámux* as the *Lo-  

---

88 These (and other) tribal etymologies are recorded by Teit, J. *The Shuswap*, op. cit., 452-7. They are mapped, in English, on Map 7. Note that *Stkamlu'lepsámux* is the source of the name Kamloops.  
89 A summary of the Kwakwaka'wakw tribal etymologies (some accompanied with origin narratives) is in Galois, R. *Kwakwaka'wakw Settlements*, op. cit.; these five are on 321, 124, 147, 154 and 266 respectively. These names are in use today, and their boundaries are shown on Map 34.  
90 Ibid., 113.
lowakámux (from Lololówq, an old site on the Tcawa’x above K’kémtsin).91 The Stl’atl’imx, in turn, call only the Secwepemc Stie’támuł by that name — all other Secwepemc tribes are generalized as the Zuxwa’pámux (etymology unknown). The name Tcawa’xámux they apply to both the Nicola River Nlha7kápmx and the Okanagan.92 That such differences would show themselves between different nations should perhaps be expected. But similar 'double-codings' are often found within nations too. The Nlha7kápmx tribes living along the Fraser above Tl’kémtsin call themselves Slaxa’yux (etymology unknown). This is the name that the Secwepemc use for them, but the K’kémtsis’námux call them Skwoti’kinámux, 'people of the opposite side of the mountains'.93

For all practical purposes, though, it arguably does not matter whether or not tribal names are self-designated, applied by or referenced against others, or whether there is more than one name.94 Nor does the degree to which tribal names might or might not be agglutinated out of a set of phonemic constants; this is a function of how polysynthetic the language is, and has nothing to do with cross-cultural translation per se. All that matters is that the enunciation, in oral discourse, of a tribal name conveys, to those who enunciate it, an othering and, by extension, an awareness of geographical relatedness.95

The second, and in so many ways more important, category of names are the toponyms. It is not just that place names were usually bestowed by those who claimed, and have since sustained jurisdiction over, the territory so named, and so are culturally specific in a way that tribal names are not. It is that there are so many of them. Franz Bo-

---

92 These (and other Stl’atl’imx) tribal etymologies are recorded by Teit, J., The Lillooet, op. cit., 195-6. Again, it is unclear how frequently they are used today. They are shown, in English, on Map 6.
93 In Teit, J. The Thompson Indians, op. cit., 170-1. They are shown, in English, on Map 7.
94 Such a system is intrinsically no different, and need be no more precise, than, say, a Chinese map of North America labelling the countries of the continent in Cantonese, while a National Geographic map shows the countries of Asia in English.
95 Etymologically, to enunciate means to pronounce, or articulate, in a speech act. My use of the term is from Homi Bhabha (in Location of Culture [London: Routledge, 1995]) — that is, as referring to that (unspoken) 'discourse of difference' that articulates itself at the borderlines of cultural translation (35-9).
as catalogued over 2,000 individual toponyms in Kwak’waka’wakw territory alone (and
150 of those in an estuary not much larger than a few city blocks).96 Most are also ex-
tremely old. Some etymologies, the work of Transformers or other supernatural agents,
are so ancient they have been forgotten. It is in this sense that place names have a per-
manence that cannot be ascribed to material landmarks — like crests, poles, dendro-
glyphs and pictograms — which are constantly being reclaimed by natural processes.97
Indeed, one cannot help but note, after perusing the ethnohistorical record, that indige-
nous place names have generally not received the attention they so properly deserve.98

On balance the vast majority of toponyms are contractions of longer periphrases de-
scribing the physiographic characteristics of the site. In Nuxalk territory consider, for
example, Snut’lalh (at the mouth of the Squmalh), which means ‘place near half-dry ri-
ver’; Nukits, ‘place where the river is crooked’; Asanani, ‘where water splashes you’ (re-
fering to the waterfall at that place); and Nutl’hiiixw, ‘place by dry valley creek’ (Burnt
Bridge Creek, which often dries up in late summer).99 In Tsimshian country are Naga’-
aks, ‘toward water’ (describing water crashing against the cliffs); Kts’mtgut’iin, ‘place in-
to small valley’; and K’wii’ts’m’aax, ‘place large mouth’ (meaning the large waterfall
across from Kitk’a’ata).100 In Wsá, nec territory are Heleniken (Colquitz Creek), ‘stream

96 In Geographical Names, op. cit. Refer, again, to Map 8.
97 As paradoxical as this may sound, it has as much to do with the polyvocality of the narrative format as
its does with the biochemistry of natural decay. I will come back to this point in Chapter 3.
98 Of the classical anthropologies, Boas, F., ibid. is again the notable exception, but even here, as Galois,
R. (in Kwak’waka’wakw Settlements, op. cit.) points out, his text does not do justice to the names listed.
Of the numerous contemporary ethnographies, Basso, K., Wisdom, op. cit., on Apache toponyms is a
standout, but on balance the amateur ethnographers have shown far more interest in indigenous place
naming systems than their professional counterparts.
east, they are all shown along the Bella Coola River on Map 18. It’s worth noting Mack’s etymologies are
occasionally inconsistent with those recorded a half century earlier by McIlwraith, T. in The Bella Coola
I, op. cit., 5-13. As but one example, the latter’s informants claimed that Asanani translated as ‘concave
town’ (reflecting how it was ‘wrapped around’ the outer bank of the river). The ambiguity that sometimes
characterizes the etymologies of indigenous place names is again, however, a function of the polyvocal
nature of the narrative format in which they are ensconced, and not because any one etymology is ‘right’
while the other is ‘wrong’. I will come back to this point in Chapter 3.
100 As told by Tsimshian elders to Marsden, S. et. al. (eds) Na Amwaaltga, op. cit., 10-2. They are all
shown on Map 32(a). Kts’mtgut’iin is the source of the English name, Kutzemayteen; the valley is now
a grizzly bear sanctuary administered as a Class A provincial park.
tumbling down'; *Pkáyelwel* (Mitchell Bay, San Juan Island), 'place of ancient wood';
and *Xeolxelek* (Elk Lake), 'small islands that form along the edges and break off and
drift out'.

Several Secwepemc examples include *Xats'ull* (Soda Creek), 'at the edge of
the steep bank' (because perched on the canyon's rim); *Xegttem* (now *Xatl'tem* [Dog
Creek]) 'deep valley'; *Tsk'weleylxw* (Pavilion) 'burnt brown rocks' (referring to the
marble out-croppings in that valley); *Splatsin* (Spallumcheen) 'riverbank at the edge of
the water'; and *Tseqwtsqweqwéltqw* (North Thompson); 'by the water's edge'.

The practice of naming sites according to their physical qualities often extended to
the marine environment as well. In *Wsá, nec* territory, for example, are *Xemyác* (a mar-
ine area between Campbell Bay and Anniversary Point), which warns of 'the swift tide
that runs there'; *Xíxyes* (Boat Pass), 'narrow caution' (because of the tidal flows in that
passage); *Qeneniw* (southeast point of Pender Island), 'watching the slack tide'; and *Sy-
ownt* (Ganges Harbour), 'make it cautious' (because exposed to southeasterlies). Often,
toponyms are composed of nested phonemes, so that they refer to both the topograp-
hic feature and the course that must be followed to negotiate it. Consider, for exam-
ple, the Tsimshian site *Kts'mkwtnuun*; it means 'place into around the bend' (noting how
the various rivers and channels flow into *Kwtnuun* [Work Inlet] but also reminding can-
oeists that they must paddle 'around the point' north of *Laxlqu'alaams* [Port Simpson],
'place of wild roses', to get there. Other names allude to how a place looks when seen
from offshore; an example is *Laxkait*, 'on lizard' (because the large fort there looked like
a big lizard when approached by canoe).

A utilitarian approach to place naming was especially useful when identifying im-
portant resource gathering areas and usually did so in a straightforward way. Hence,
Tsimshian country are Knaxgaax, meaning 'trapping territory for mink and otter'; Klappatoon, 'place of sea otter' (except in this case because they slept on the rocks near here); Wilsgaluwi, 'where in the way alder' (referring to an unusually dense growth of that species); Txalmusoo, 'coming together sockeye' (because the salmon 'squeezed together' as they enter the spawning channel); and Laxkwilwat, 'place of yellow cedar'. In Wså-nec territory are Smonéc (east point, Pender Island), 'place to gather pitch'; and Sxássem (Mitchell Bay, San Juan Island), 'soap berries'. In Nuxalk country we have Alhq'lax-lhh, 'fence all around' (but a 'fence of stinging nettles'); Snut'li, 'a place of dog salmon'; and Nutsqwalst, 'a place of many spawning salmon'. As before such names could also be phonemically nested. The Tsimshian name Lpuunmgaits'ap agglutinates the suffix gaits'ap, meaning 'village', and the stem Lpuun, 'whale', but when spliced together translates as 'plenty of food place'. (This likely explains why it later became Maxlak-xaatla (Metlakatla), the largest and most important post-contact Tsimshian community on the entire coast.) In some cases the toponym does not refer to the resource nominally, but inferentially, by way of some artifice that might be required to secure it. Some Tsimshian examples include Laxki'i, a contraction of the prefix 'lax', meaning 'place of, and the phoneme 'ki'i', which is the call made when approaching a seal, and so together means 'place where the seals are called'; and Willikibaawan, 'where down run deer', (referring to the place where deer were run over the cliff). In Wså-nec country we have Am,mecen (Taylor Point, Saturna Island), which means 'to wade for crabs'; and Cak,sen (Stanley Point, Pender Island), 'seal call point' (alluding, in this case, not to a call made to attract a seal, but to where Wså-nec hunters were drawn by the seal's call). A few

105 From ibid. These places are also all shown on Map 32(a).
106 As provided by Claxton, E. and Elliott, J. Reef Net Technology, op. cit., 44.
107 As recorded by McLlwraith, T. The Bella Coola I, op. cit., 6, 9 and 15. The first two places are on the Bella Coola River on Map 18; the third is at the head of Dean Channel and shown in the inset.
108 As told by Tsimshian elders to Marsden, S. et. al. (eds) Na Amwaaltga, op. cit., 9. These places are all shown on Map 32(a).
109 As provided by Claxton, E. and Elliott, J. Reef Net Technology, op. cit., 44. These places are shown on Map 19(a and c).
were far more generic. Consider, for example, *Telec* (now *T'exelc* [Williams Lake]), a Secwepemc term meaning only 'to go after fish';\(^{110}\) or *Sulhmaak*, a Nuxalk name for a 'place where there is a fishtrap'.\(^{111}\)

Where the most desired places were permanently settled, such toponyms inevitably supplied a convenient reference for the occupants, enunciating a local relationship between a people and its place of residence in the same way that tribal names did at the regional scale. The degree to which the association was foreshortened by phonemic constants varied accordingly. All the Secwepemc place names cited above were not only descriptive of the biotic or physical characteristics of the site proper, but were, in their unmodified form, the names of the bands that took up residence at them. On the northwest coast, by contrast, the names of the winter villages and the house groups that inhabited them were derived (in this case) from the prefix *'git'* or *'kit'* (meaning 'people of') and a stem describing some quality of the site. Two examples already visited (in *Ts'ibasad*’s migration narrative) are *Gitkxaatla* and *Gits'ilaasü*, 'people of the salt water' and 'people of the narrow canyon' respectively. Two others are *Gitandoiks*, 'people of the swift water' (referring to the fast flowing river that spills into the Xsan at that place); or *Ginaxangiik*, 'people of the mosquitos'.\(^{112}\) The same rules applied to the Nisga’a house groups at *Gitlaxdamks*, which is an agglutination of the stem *damks*, 'ponds' and two nested prefixes, and so together translated as 'people of the place of ponds'.\(^{113}\) Unlike the Secwepemc examples, however, these associations were seasonal. When house groups vacated their village, and headed into their chiefly hunting grounds in the summer, they dropped the toponymic reference, instead going by the names of the chiefs.\(^{114}\)

---

\(^{110}\) *In Teit, J.* *The Shuswap*, op. cit., 451-2. This place is shown on Map 33(a).

\(^{111}\) As translated by Mack, C. in Thommasen, H. (ed) *Bella Coola*, op. cit., 112. This place is not shown, but is on the Hotnarko River just above its confluence with the Atnarko on Map 19.

\(^{112}\) From Coull, C. *A Traveller’s Guide*, op. cit., 193-7. These tribes are shown on Map 32(b).

\(^{113}\) From ibid., 218. This very important place is shown on Maps 9 and 11.

\(^{114}\) It was the actual physical location of the group that determined which name was active at any given time. In this example, the residents of *Gitlaxdamks* would, when out on their hunting grounds, be identified by the name of the chief of the house group that owned it.
Elsewhere, the place name might be taken directly from the name of a foundational ancestor; in Nuxalk territory, consider, for example, *Nusxiq*, which is the name of the Carpenter who descended there.\(^{115}\)

Toponyms might also refer to important events in a group's history. These could be occurrences associated with the work of the Transformers, foundational ancestors, anthropomorphic beings, and various other supernatural agents or events. In Wsa,nec territory, for example, are *Lauwelnew* (Mount Newton), meaning 'place of refuge' (referring to where the Wsá, nec rode out the flood); *Xixneseten*, (Helen Point, Mayne Island), 'sacred track' (said to be the footprint of the Transformer); *Welkiem* (Satellite Island), 'serpent waters' (referring to the two-headed serpents in that area); *Xoxdel* (Mandarte Island), the name of the Wsá, nec woman changed into that island; *E,ho* (the beach at Bedwell on Pender Island), 'did you hear?' (because one could hear the spirits in the graveyard at that place); and *Teuen* (a large boulder at Land's End, Saanich Peninsula), 'howling wolf', *Citnew*, (Gull Rock, Rosario Strait), 'big horned owl', or *Spået* (Mackenzie Bight, Saanich Inlet), 'bear' (all three of which were supernatural beings turned into stone by the Transformers).\(^{116}\) Other toponyms recall more recent events, often of a cyclical nature. Some were utterly serious; consider, for example, the Nisga'a village *Gingolx* (Kincolith), meaning 'place of skulls' (referring to their habit of mounting skulls on sticks to scare away intruders).\(^{117}\) Others might imply behavioural mores; consider, for example, the Nuxalk's *N'skeet*, 'the place where you screw a woman'.\(^{118}\) Still others

---


\(^{116}\) As provided by Claxton, E. and Elliott, J. *Reef Net Technology*, op. cit., 43-4. These places are all shown on Map 19(a and c). Perhaps appropriately, *Lauwelnew* is now also the name of the local school in Brentwood Bay.

\(^{117}\) From Coull, C. *A Traveller's Guide*, op. cit., 218. The place is shown on Map 22.

\(^{118}\) As translated, if apparently with some embarrassment, by Mack, C., in Thommassen, H., (ed), *Bella Coola*, op. cit., 114. Many indigenous toponyms are loaded with sexual connotations. Given the morality of the day, it is perhaps not surprising that most professional ethnographers took pains to remove such references from their publications.
were completely generic, as at Skeetchestn (Deadman's Creek) in Secwepemc country, 'gathering place'.

And then there is that special category of toponyms demarcating place, person, and thing all at the same time, and so freighted with even more complex layers of geographical or cultural meaning. In Nuxalk territory consider, for example, Sinxl, which means 'fallen sun'; it refers, if circuitously, to the origin narrative of Stältimx, the first ancestor of that place who carved the crest of the sun on his totem pole only to see it fall down a few years later. Another is Anutsqwaxstl, meaning 'labretted'; it recalls the adventure of Taiakwala, the Carpenter who descended there, but later travelled to the Xsan where he saw a woman wearing labrets, and so, on his return and to commemorate his journey, carved her image on a pole. A very important place, already visited (in the origin narrative cited above), was Nusq'alst. Etymologically it is the 'place of sqa'lstutl' (a greenstone used for axes or chisels) and thus refers, directly, to the mountain south of the village where the mineral was mined. It was also, however, the place of residence for the Weathermen, shamans who were able to forecast the weather in the Bella Coola River valley by watching the clouds that formed at its summit. It was the landing place where a number of extended Nuxalk families temporarily stayed before they established other villages. And as the place where a canoe that had drifted away from its moorings somewhere on the lower Fraser eventually came to rest, it is also where the Salish language was diffused to the Nuxalk. In Nisga'a territory, similarly, consider Gitwinsihlkw. It means 'people of the lizards', and so identifies the winter collection of house

---

119 As shown and translated on Map 33(a).
120 As translated by Mack, C. in Thommasen, H. (ed) Bella Coola, op. cit., 106. Neither of these places is shown on Map 18, but were 'suburbs' of Alhq'lauxth. As suggested in Map 8, it was common for proximal settlements to osmose into each other, and especially so on the outer coast, where resource rich estuaries were often squeezed into narrow confines. Such an arrangement was like a collection of 'neighbour-hoods', each having its own name and associated with one or more founding ancestors, extended families or tribes.
121 See, in this connection, footnote 14, Chapter 6. For much more on Nusq'alst, see McIlwraith, T. The Bella Coola I, op. cit. Small wonder, then, that this mountain was commemorated architecturally too (recall Figure A[b]).
groups at that place, but by invoking remembrances of the supernatural 'three foot long lizards' that lived there before the eruption of Tseax, it also describes something of the past environment of the site.\textsuperscript{122} Having figured out the agglutinative system are places like \textit{Lax Galtsáp} (Greenville). It translates as 'place of villages' (literally, 'the dwelling place of all dwelling places'), and so refers not to any one cluster of Nisga'a houses but to the fact that it is the nearest settlement to Fishery Bay, the great oolichan fishing station on the \textit{Lisims} (Nass River) to which all the Tsimshian speaking nations repaired in the spring.\textsuperscript{123} In Tsimshian territory proper, finally, is \textit{Kitk'a'ata}; in translating as 'people of the cane', it refers not to any special biophysical (or even supernatural) characteristic of the place but (as narrated above) to how 'Wa'moodmxl planted his cane to assert his claim to that place and, in turn, came to be a ranking chief of the house groups that subsequently resided there. So also is it with \textit{Klaxgyels}; not only is it (as noted above) the stopover in 'Wa'moodmxl's migration, but in meaning 'place of mussels' links it to another story describing how the valley was temporarily filled with sea water during the Wisconsinan glaciation.\textsuperscript{124}

Place-names are a basic tool in the spatial imaginations of all cultures, but in oral societies they are, as often as not, the most basic tool of all. They can reference anything and everything from the biophysical characteristics of a place, its past or present usage, people who came and went there, or important events and encounters that happened at some time in the past. What does seem certain is that few, if any, indigenous toponyms are ever arbitrary; they are never proper names commemorating individuals or condensed out of abstract identifiers that have nothing to do with some quality of the place it-

\textsuperscript{122} The eruption of \textit{Tseax}, which, according to oral tradition, wiped out about 30\% of the Nisga'a, has been dated to about 1740, just prior to contact. The lava plain is today the scenic centerpiece of \textit{Ahnluut'ukswim Laxmahl Angwing'asanskwhl} (Nisga'a Lava Bed Memorial Provincial Park), a protected area managed jointly with BC Parks.

\textsuperscript{123} From Coull, \textit{A Traveller's Guide}, op. cit., 218. Although not identified by name, this is also the fishing station referred to at the end of \textit{Litux}'s narrative quoted earlier.

\textsuperscript{124} This story, recorded in sonnet form, was sung by the Tsimshian chiefs for Marsden, S. et.al. (eds) \textit{Na Amwaaltga}, op. cit., 14-6.
self. Not only are toponyms reference points appearing in almost all narratives but they are a kind of 'spoken shorthand' that "can be made to represent the narratives themselves...condensing into a compact form their essential moral truths." At the same time, it appears equally plain that place naming is a form of narrative art in its own right. It supplies a 'terrestrial vocabulary' that can 'make geography', even without a corpus of spatially precise creation narratives hovering in the background. It is true, of course, that toponyms in writing cultures also perform geographical work. But it does seem that in oral societies, where they remain enmeshed in the geographies they make, toponyms not only do more work, but do so in a qualitatively different way.

**Wayfinding in action space**

If all these landmark(ing)s, artefactual and non-artefactual, functioned as the nodes of a geographical referencing system in oral societies then it is the dendritic network of trails and streams that constituted its arteries. After all, the existence of landmark(ings) presupposed some method of navigating between them. The importance of long inter-tribal trails, like the Nisga'a-Gitanyow grease trail in Litux's narrative, we have already

---

127 The geographer John Keates's claim that western "place names are unsystematic, arbitrary and frequently ambiguous" (in *Nature of Maps* [London: Longman, 1982], 83) is too broad. Many European toponyms, like those bestowed by explorers or commemorating important battles, do radiate into wider constellations of geographical and cultural meaning. (See, in this connection, Paul Carter, *The Road to Botany Bay* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987], Chapter 1); or Saul Cohen and Nurit Kliot, 'Place names in Israel's ideological struggle over the administered territories' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 82(4), 1992, 653-80). When consigned to a map, however, supplementary layers of meaning do tend to fade away over time, the toponyms surviving in common usage only as locational markers.
128 Some evidence of the importance Native people attach to place names is provided by Thomassen, H., who wrote (in [ed] *Bella Coola*, op. cit.) "that in the last year of his life [the Nuxalk elder] Clayton [Mack] had an urgency about telling me the names of the old Nuxalk villages [but]...I wasn't too interested at first....So I ignored Clayton's initial requests, but the theme kept coming up, and I began to listen. The more I listened the more I became interested, and the more interested I became the more it became clear Clayton was sharing unique and valuable information" (9-10).
noted, but more lightly trafficked, intra-tribal trails were no less significant. Consider, for example, the following narrative by the Nuxalk elder, Clayton Mack:

Rivers Inlet Indians almost same as South Bentinck people. Bella Coola Indians in South Bentinck mix with Rivers Inlet People. They walk between South Bentinck and Owikeno Lake. Good trail. I did [it] in one day. From Owikeno Lake to South Bentinck. There's a cave, like there, about halfway between South Bentinck and Owikeno Lake, along the Tzeo River. Pretty big cave. There's paintings inside that cave. That's where the [South Bentinck and Owikeno] Indians used to make potlatch in the olden days.... And they paint on the rocks. Lots of pictures of coppers in there. Them Indians pack all their stuff to that spot...at the divide where one river goes down to Owikeno Lake and the other goes to South Bentinck. But I don't like that divide much. Too many frogs.... One time I see millions and millions of frogs in there.... I don't like frogs.... I got logging boots with spikes on the bottom. Step holes is where grizzly bears step in the same spot for hundreds of years. They fill with water. Them step holes were full of frogs. You step in a hole and squish twenty frogs. Step in another hole and squish another twenty frogs! Frogs. I think there's a logging road through there now.129

Mack's account of the South Bentinck trail not only hints at the way in which trails and portages linked important landmark(ing)s together, but also shows how in oral cultures they acted as memory traces. To even speak of a trail was to remember the things that happened along it.130 At the same time, the purpose of memory recall and accumulated experience in oral societies is to provide a guide for the present. This was especially so when it came down to the basic goals of securing access to resources, to neighbours (or enemies), or to other villages. According to the 'Ulkatchot'en elder, Henry Jack:

Them old people had trails all over the place. There used to be a trail all the way from Ulkatcho to Big Ootsa Lake where Frank Sill used to live. At Ootsa Lake they used a boat. There were two trails to Johnny Lake. People lived all over. Every five or six miles there would be another lake, and a family would live there. Every little pothole lake had muskrat houses in it. We used a .22 to shoot them in the head. We'd get lots of muskrat. About a hundred and fifty in a season. Now... hardly any muskrats around. When we lived at Squinas Lake we went to Ulkatcho Village every Sunday. We had to go to the store. Sunday was the only time the storekeeper was home. Me and Old

129 Recorded in ibid., 126-7. The trail is shown on Map 18.
130 The conceptual difference between 'memory' and 'history' — and how each treats with experience — is fundamental. I will come back to this point in Chapter 3.
Stillas, we used to go around all the time and go trapping. One time when I went with him, we followed the Dean River almost to Salmon House. It was four days down the river than up the mountain by Tanya Lakes. We came out by Squinas Lake. When we got to the Dean River I wondered how we were going to get across. My grampa cut some dry logs and took some dry sticks and tied them all together with a rope. Old Stillas behind, and me up front, we paddled across the river....At Tanya Lakes, everybody used the smokehouse down below the waterfall on the way to Salmon House. People from Kluskus, Ootsa Lake, Ulkatcho and the Chilcotin, they all used it. You can still see part of that old smokehouse yet. That way if you caught some big spring salmon you didn't have to pack them all the way back. There were three smokehouses up at the main campsite at Tanya Lakes....There was another smokehouse behind a little ways that belonged to the Alexie family. Up on the hill there was a little smokehouse that belonged to Cahoose....People from the Chilcotin used to come to Tanya Lakes as well.\(^\text{131}\)

Jack's story also suggests that navigating a network of trails, portages and streams was much more than a matter of memory. As suggested by the declination diagram in Map 19(c), there was a general awareness of cardinal directions. But surface travel obviously required more, which meant that the network still had to be signposted with navigational aids of one kind or another. Artefactual devices, such as dendroglyphs, pictograms or pictographs, were obviously among them. So too were important structures, like smokehouses, food caches and cabins. When viewed or approached from a distance, or from a certain direction, natural features like mountains, canyons or springs were also important.

Travellers also used, however, a variety of mnemonic devices infrastructural to the network itself. There was, for example, a separate category of toponyms concerned almost exclusively with designating important junctions — places where travellers could expect, in advance, that their direction, or mode of conveyence, might have to change. Hence, in Secwepemc territory, *Llenlleheyten* (High Bar), meant 'place where the trail goes down' (referring to how it 'dropped down' to the Fraser River).\(^\text{132}\) In Nuxalk country *Asiixw* meant 'place at the head of the inlet'; *Siwalusim*, 'place where canoes are left';

\(^{131}\) As recorded in Birchwater, S. *Ulkatcho Stories*, op. cit., 23-5.
\(^{132}\) As recorded by Teit, J. *The Shuswap*, op. cit., 458. The place is shown on Map 33(a).
and Sulkelta, 'a winter trail'. In Kwakwaka'wakw territory were places like Tlgenxla, 'trail behind' or Tlaxála, 'trail leading along'. Other toponyms denoted places where travellers might pause or rest. The Nuxalk's Stwic translated as 'resting place' (because where the trail to Anahim Lake began its steep climb over Heckman Pass); while the Kwakwaka'wakw's Quinsam, meant 'tranquil place' (reflecting the serenity of the estuary where Wiweka'yi's migration ended). There were even names that marked boundaries; the Wsá, nec's Si'cenen (Gordon Head), meant 'becoming Saanich'.

Like references were just as crucial along the outer coast, where treacherous shoals, tides or winds demanded undivided attention. There was again a general awareness of cardinal directions, but the relevant references were more of the 'up' or 'down', 'inland' or 'away from land', or 'seaward' or 'away from sea' variety. Navigators had to be able to interpret oceanic swells and tides, and how to relate the passage of time to the direction of currents or the number of shoals or points they passed. Either by how they looked from offshore, or by how they aligned with others, they were guided by known landmarks, such as coastal villages or prominent headlands or beaches. The Kwakwaka'wakw, for example, had names for areas out in the middle of channels or estuaries where certain landmarks came into view. Consider, for example, Dôxtsaelas, 'a place of looking inside' (a fishing ground in the north reaches of Queen Charlotte Strait where canoeists could just make out the east tip of Nigel Island behind the west tip of Hope Island); Dógúnegwis, 'seeing corner of beach' (because when coming out of the strait it was there that the beach on the northeast tip of Hope Island became visible); or Hâmaelt-
"samgo," 'two round ones meeting' (referring to a line of sight running southeast from the Halford Island fishing grounds, through the passage between Sedge Island and a small adjacent island, and to the south of another small island in Spring Passage). In this realm of waterways, as the ethnohistorian Ruth Kirk stated, it was by such references that "relationships and interconnections easily overlooked on a map...suddenly make sense...[and you could] see the feasibility of paddling a canoe almost anywhere..." Native people also relied on verse and song to help find their way on both land and water. Indeed, these were just as integral to everyday activity as were clan dirges to ceremonial life. In both Secwepemc and Nlha7kapmx territory, James Teit classified, and made wax cylinder recordings of several types of 'public' songs. Many were composed to accompany ceremonies like birthing and puberty rites, medicinal practices, or eulogies and cremations, while others were for 'less serious' pastimes like games and drinking. There were love songs and war songs. But others, like the Secwepemc's hwistcimain ('travelling songs') were composed to accompany movement. These were typically sung by men, sometimes individually but mainly in groups, and often when 'feeling good' (such as when coming home from a successful hunt). Others served a more pure cartographic function — the melodies supplying the musical score that could be adjusted to the pace of walking or rowing; the lyrics relating the passage of familiar landmarks. Some songs were used to get ready for movement, usually along known trails. McLlwraith recorded a verse that went, "Where are you going old woman?/I am going to seek food/at the bottom house [furthest downstream]/Be careful, lest you fall

138 As recorded by Boas, F. Geographical Names, op. cit., 47 and 54-5.
139 In Tradition and Change, op. cit., 16.
140 See, for example, Teit, J. The Thompson Indians, op. cit., 383-5; or The Shuswap, op. cit., 603-5; a number of Nuxalk songs are recorded in McLlwraith, T. The Bella Coola II, op. cit., Chapter 2.
141 See, in this connection, Teit, J. 'Information re songs sung by Tetlonitsa', unpublished manuscript, NMC, Ottawa, 1916.
142 Because of the nature of my own evidence a theoretical explication of music and verse as territorializing agents is deferred to Chapter 3; an empirical to our travels through Carrier Sekani and Stó:lō country in Chapters 5 and 6.
down as you go/towards Rivers Inlet."143 Others prepared for movement along 'roads less travelled'. Teit recorded a Tahltan rhyme that went, "Yanaxa/the trail is this way/this is the way it goes/do not miss it/the trail goes right east where the sun goes up."144

What all this suggests, then, is that indigenous wayfinding, though memorized and transmitted in narrative form, could never be reduced to some kind of abstracted 'cognitive map'. Constructed by and through multiple senses, it constructed an action space in the truest sense of that term. To be sure, journeying was in some measure pre-oriented. People inhabited recognizable territories and knew where they could and could not go. Daily and seasonal rounds tended to repeat the same trajectories. Movement was rarely haphazard or unplanned. Nevertheless, it was often an iterative endeavour. Unfolding, as it did, in a milieu pulsing with unpredictable forces, it was a matter of constantly reading the cultural or natural landscape, (re)evaluating options, making decisions, and choosing directions — but while always staying open to the possibility that itineraries might have to change if, and when, the unexpected arose. When it came to movement through action space, as the anthropologist Hugh Brody has phrased it, "there was no step or pause between theory and practice...The decision [was] taken in the doing."145 Indigenous spatial referencing systems were, always and everywhere, dynamic and kinetic. Wrought with action and reaction, engagement and disengagement, movement and counter-movement, they were systems in which the accumulated experience of past events was constantly being re-enacted in the present — just as subsequent movements were constantly adding new events to the narratives, extending their plotlines, awaiting their own recall by generations of travellers yet to come.146 Incessantly and unavoidably energized by 'bodies-in-motion' they were, in a word, corporealized.

143 In The Bella Coola II, op. cit., 555.
144 In 'Information re songs', op. cit.
145 In Maps, op. cit., 37.
146 Just as there is, in oral societies, no clear separation between the phenomenal and material worlds (recall footnote 10), so too, then, must the distinction between 'things that happen now' and 'things that happened in the past' be more heuristic than factual. I will come back to this point in Chapter 3.
Bounding it all together

We are now in a position to make some more substantive claims about the nature of pre-contact Native spatial referencing systems and then, from that, to critically compare or contrast them with the post-contact Native maps in Chapter 1. Before doing so, however, some preliminary thoughts on the nature of indigenous boundaries are in order. Strictly speaking, boundaries are not a part of the cultural equipment by which cultures territorialize themselves; they are the things that territorialization creates. In writing or graphic societies, surveys and maps do accomplish this, but in oral societies, operating in action space, the idea of solid, fixed or measured boundaries is less tenable. Rather, boundaries are better understood as a series of frontiers, or 'transitional zones', where there was always some ambiguity as to where one territory ended and another began. Some have suggested that this ambiguity is a reflection of the indeterminate nature of ecological boundaries, and to a point they are right. But ecological boundaries were themselves created in the origin accounts, which means that the source of this ambiguity goes back to the beginning of the world itself. As foundational ancestors, transformers, tricksters, and cultural heroes moved over the landscape, creating ecological pockets as they went, they inevitably crossed into pockets created by other myth-age agents engaged in similar projects. Operating in an unstable, atemporal environment, they all experienced the same events, encountered the same mythic creatures, and suffered the same calamities — and these occurrences constructed the basic plotlines of their origin narratives.

Diasporas caused by the flood are a case in point. We have noted how a number of Nuxalk narratives recorded how a stray canoe from the lower Fraser alit on Nusq''alst, bringing the Salishan language with it. Likewise did the Stl'atl'imx canoe that escaped

from In-SHUCK-ch, although in this case it landed at 'Yalis (Figure A[c]), giving rise to Kwak'wala, a Wakashan tongue. In Kwakw̱a'kw̱a'kw̱ origin narratives, it was Weqa'î's lost canoe that drifted north into Haisla country. Small wonder, then, that we find references in a number of Kwakw̱a'kw̱a'kw̱ accounts to Tsáxînâ (their name for the X̱san), Stâkîn (Stikine River), Wawîs (Bella Bella) and Ts'âmas (Victoria!), all of which are now firmly within the territories of other nations. Although the evidence is thinner, the homonymies in some of the names are also compelling. Consider, for example, the similarity between the name of the Kwakw̱a'kw̱a'kw̱ tribe Wiweka'yi and the ancestor name of Wiaqâi, the Carpenter who founded Stwîc. Wiaqâi's story even infers how he considered, for a time, Tcawat, which is now in Kwakw̱a'kw̱a'kw̱ territory, as a Nuxalk village site. So too is it with Nowakîla. In Southern Carrier narratives he is the cultural hero who created Salmon House, and seeded the Dean River with suckers and salmon, but he surfaces in Nuxalk narratives as Raven, the most powerful trickster ever to come out of Nusmatâ. Consider, also, the Athapaskan world, where the great sky chief in Tahltnn narratives is Yanaxa, in Dunne Za, Yagatunne, and in Sekani, Yagasta. More generally, we have encountered several instances in which foundational ancestors (like Txemsem) supernatural beings (like Sea Lion), or Transformers (like Mink or Coyote), seemed as adept at transgressing territorial boundaries as they are at crossing the boundaries between people, animals and inanimate objects. It is in this sense that narratives reach across boundaries even as they legislate them spatially.

Eventually, of course, the progeny of these ancestors, or of those who survived catastrophic events, settled down. Time became more linear and as the narratives were passed on down across the generations they were 'edited'. Whether in a ceremonial or ped-

\[148\] As recorded by Boas, F. *Geographical Names*, op. cit., 58, 43 and 61.
\[149\] Although the place is cited in a number of Nuxalk narratives (recall footnote 22), its location, usually Rivers Inlet but sometimes Bute, varies. The former designate seems roughly consistent with Tsâq̓̓ó, listed by Boas, F. only as 'place near Rivers Inlet' (in ibid., 56).
\[150\] See McLlwraith, T. *The Bella Coola I*, op. cit., 82, 106 and 392-3.
agogical context, oral transmission would likely not preserve the plotlines in their original form. Cultural and linguistic adaptations or preferences would tend to encourage the retention of certain motifs at the expense of others. Details seen to be less important would be jettisoned, while other, more important, ones would be (re)emphasized. This tendency to selectivity explains why the same motifs, the same places, and the same names, keep reappearing, albeit in different configurations, over and over again in situated oral archives now separated by considerable geographical distances.

By the protohistoric period, a correlation between linguistic, tribal and ecological boundaries is more sustainable, but even then boundary information was still carried in a narrative form. Unless subsequently compromised by important wars, extinctions or natural disasters, the patterns of geographic interrelatedness established in primary myth age accounts would tend to persevere. But these would be overlain by marriage or trade relationships, themselves recorded in secondary accounts. Sub-tribal, tribal, or chiefly names would continue to enunciate a general cartography of boundaries across all of space. But because the rights of access to certain resources in specific areas were now being determined by kin relations (and less so by where one was) it was inevitable that Native spaces would be characterized by a considerable degree of interpenetration and flux. This explains why the Gispaxlo'ots tribe yet has nearly as strong a presence in Nisga'a territory as as it does in Tsimshian, or why Ts'ibasaa owns hunting grounds.

---

151 Some Native elders insist that certain narratives have been memorized. This may be true in certain rituals based on a strict adherence to the ordering of words, phrases or gestures, but I suspect it is an exception in most primary or secondary narratives, many of which are quite lengthy. The claim also appears inconsistent with the ethnological record, where many narratives have been recorded in multiple versions and from different narrators. I will come back to this point in Chapter 3.

152 This, of course, is exactly the source of the problem of contextualization that I raised at the start of this chapter. As will be made clear in Chapter 3, narratives would continue the process of selective edition after contact just as much as before, if not moreso. It is in this sense that it likely would not have mattered how careful the ethnographers were when the narratives were first recorded — their very presence would have immediately rendered the oral versions inaccessible.

153 The tendency for ecoregional and linguistic boundaries to be roughly coterminous is clearly no accident. I will engage these points in Part II and the Conclusion.

154 If only because this takes us to the source of overlap, this point is as basic to what follows as any. At the risk of sounding like a stuck record, I shall defer the fuller explication for the next chapter.
on the *Lisims* (in Nisga'a country) and at *Gitkxaatla* or *Kitka'a'ta* (in Tsimshian). It explains why the progeny of Chief *Haw-ts-lah-no*, although traced to *Cheatmuh*, have as many rights of access in Se'shalt, Tsleil-Waututh, and Musqueam territories as they do in Squamish. It explains why both Secwepemc and Ktunaxa could hunt and fish in the Rocky Mountain Trench near what is now the Kinbasket Lake Reservoir, and why the Nlha7kapmx and Okanagan both frequented the valley of the *Tcawa'x*, even though in other areas any such attempt at shared usage would have led to conflict. And it explains why *Tsk'weylexw* is, today, as much Stl'atl'imx as it is Secwepemc blood, to the point that it appears on the maps of both.

The fact that boundaries are dynamic or fluid would not, however, preclude their being enforced. As the anthropologist Wilson Duff has noted, "it is not correct to say that the Indians did not 'own' the land, but only roamed over the face of it and 'used' it. The patterns of ownership...they imposed upon the lands and waters were different from those recognized by [the/white man's ] system of law, but were, nonetheless, clearly defined and mutually respected....Except for barren and inaccessible areas...every part of the province was formerly within the owned and recognized territory of one or the other of the Indian tribes." Nor am I claiming that boundaries were not sometimes expressed visually. We have already determined that 'picture writing' on natural surfaces was occasionally used to identify frontiers, just as totem poles or painted house fronts communicated border dialogues of their own.

It is to suggest, however, that Native boundaries were never defined by reference to externally surveyed limits. They were never abstracted onto an arbitrary datum (like a map) where a 'representation of the territory' was detached from 'the territory represent-

---

156 This place is shown on Maps 24 and 33(a).
157 In *The Indian History*, op. cit., 8.
158 The term is from the title to Ian Chambers, *Border Dialogues* (London: Routledge, 1990). He was talking about the undecidability that characterizes boundaries in the postmodern world, but its conceptual purchase in understanding boundary construction in oral societies seems self-evident.
Crests and poles were always erected in the village, away from territorial frontiers and could not be interpreted without a working familiarity with the narratives in which they were ensconced. Some 'picture writing' was out on the frontiers, but there was no guarantee that a traveller would see it. The important point is that in first space travellers could not negotiate boundaries by seeing alone. They had to rely on the other senses, and on navigational aids of a non-visual sort. In societies where primary spatial legislation is transmitted in a narrative, as opposed to a graphic or written, format, boundaries are not demarcated by the visual logic of the cartographic eye/I. Rather, boundaries in first space are immanent to the geographical limits of the narratives proper. They exist not on the visual plane of the orthogonal (or any other) grid. They reside at those horizons where narratives fade, where genealogies can no longer be traced, where toponyms are not recognizable, or where languages become unintelligible. As Wigetimistol (Dan Michell), a Wet'suwet'en chief from Tse Kya (Hagilgwet) put it, "God created us as we are and our boundary. Otherwise we would all speak the same language. These are not man-made boundaries. This is the way it was created by our boundaries." Native boundaries show themselves, in short, through a different perspective, and they construct an entirely different kind of territoriality. And it is only from this perspective that we can properly interpret and evaluate what we are looking at in the gallery of Native maps in Chapter 1. It is to such an understanding that I now turn.

---

Between First and First National Space

The differences in...perspectives...are reflected in the maps [the] two traditions produced....Native...oral maps are fluid pictures of a dynamic landscape, a geography in which experience shapes the past and present on the land....Western maps describe land as an object...[and] use conventions like scale and the coordinate system to 'accurately' picture the land and establish the boundaries of ownership that define it.¹

There is, in first space, no such thing as a 'Native map', even though some commentators have tried to understand indigenous spatial referencing systems in such terms. In emphasizing the linguistic construction of territory, Huggan has used the dreams of the Dunne Za and the songlines of the Australian Aborigines to distinguish the 'graphemic map' — a map advanced as a form of spoken expression — from the 'graphic map' — an artefactual representation that abstracts space in the visual register.² Exploring the lack of separation between conceptions of art and representations of landscape in the dhulan (the Aborigines' bark paintings), the anthropologist Veronica Crang suggests that the concatenation of rituals, songs, corroborees and stories associated with them constitute what amounts to a 'performative map'.³ By showing how the Ongee people of the Andaman Islands mark and maintain terrestrial and cosmological space through movement, the ethnohistorian Vishvajit Pandya has argued that the indigenous map is better thought of as a 'cartography of kinesics'.⁴ Working along a similar tangent, the geographer Robert Rundstrom has looked at how the Inuit find their way around an apparently featureless landscape by reading the smallest of environmental clues, suggesting that it might be better to conceive Native maps not as artefacts, but as acts situated in a process.⁵

Other commentators have suggested that 'Native maps' may be more usefully slotted into either of two general categories, leaving any direct comparison with 'western maps'

¹ Warhus, M. Another America, op. cit, 139.
² In 'Maps, dreams and the presentation of ethnographic narrative' Ariel 22(1), 1991, 57-69.
⁴ In 'Movement and space in Andamese cartography' American Ethnologist 17, 775-97.
⁵ In 'A cultural interpretation', op. cit.
aside. Nabakov has defended a distinction between the indigenous 'mental map' and the 'spoken landscape' accented by Huggan. On this view, the former concerns the spatial components of imagined encompassing cosmologies; the latter the terrestrial geography constructed by narrative, toponym and song.\(^6\) Similarly, the cartographic historian L. A. Vaselkov, has discriminated between the indigenous 'sociogram' (his term for mental map) from the 'event transcription' (his term for the spoken landscape).\(^7\) In trying to retain equal emphases on the linguistic and kinetic aspects, the cultural historian Paul Carter has suggested that Native maps are at once 'corporeal maps' — because "to read them is to read the body of the territory itself" — and spoken landscapes — because "the country itself is the product of their journeying coming into being like a familiar text read aloud."\(^8\)

Some of these definitions can be useful. Given the importance of narrative and toponym, the notion of the spoken landscape has considerable purchase. As Skeetchestn Chief Ron Ignace has pointed out, "if you don't know your language, you don't know your land...the history of how [y]our people went to that place [or] what they did at that place...[L]anguage marks out the boundaries of [y]our nation...states that [you] are a people...in a country of [y]our own."\(^9\) Working with the complex of potlatch, dirge song, and the displaying of crests on poles or regalia is certainly a cartography of a performative kind. I am less enthusiastic about mental maps. Too often in the literature do they refer not to cosmologies, or world views, but to individuals' spatial perceptions of their local environments.\(^10\) On the other hand, emphasizing the performative, spoken or kin-

---

\(^6\) In 'Orientations', op. cit.
\(^7\) In 'Indian maps of the colonial southeast: Archaeological implications and prospects', in ibid., 205-21.
\(^8\) In Road, op. cit., 337.
\(^9\) In 'Our language, our land', Tl'azt'en Free Press, Mar/Apr 1995, 1 and 12-15, quote is 12.
etic character of 'Native maps' may not tell us much about the relationship between ter­restrial and cosmological space.

From maps to mappings

In the end, summarily bracketing the elements or practices immanent to indigenous spatial referencing systems off from each other, much less detach them, like a graphic map, from their cultural or physiographic milieux, is a risky endeavour. In first space, as argued in Chapter 2, orality, graphicity, performativity, movement and knowing all interpenetrate in myriad and complex ways. Narrative and crest, pictography and pot­latch: they all percolate together along a continuum that is not dissected in theoretical terms — and maps, as the geographer David Turnbull notes, are theories.11 This allowed, neither is it much of an improvement to suggest, following Nabokov, that 'Native maps' are better understood as 'messy discourses'.12 It is not that we cannot conceive them as a kind of (spatial) discourse, or not, as Turnbull puts it, seamless with respect to other discourses.13 The fact that indigenous spatial referencing systems recycle and re­combine similar motifs, are constituted through multiple senses, and are of intelligent design, confirms that they are more systematic than the term 'messy' lets on.

In the event, then, I suggest that we conceive these systems as mappings that have cognitive, corporeal, spoken and graphic components. It is a simple term, but one that captures the processual and open-ended character of first space without losing sight of the fact that such systems are deliberate, organized and programmed. In short the term retains that sense of objectivity implied by its phonemic stem, but while yet understanding territorialization in a more subjective manner. In what follows, I shall occasionally draw on some of these conventional definitions of 'Native maps'; they are useful as heu-

11 In Maps, op. cit., Exhibit 1.
12 In 'Orientations', op. cit., 242.
13 In Maps, op. cit., 28-36.
ristic devices. My emphasis, however, will instead be to compare and contrast maps and mappings according to three general conceptual categories: territoriality, temporality, and knowledge. Having done so, I will then revisit the questions of translation and interpretation first raised in the Introduction because it is clear from Chapter 1 that there are, in First National space, 'Native maps'. It is how we should think about the translation and/or interpretation of maps and mappings — and the crucial difference that perspective makes — that is the subject of this Chapter.

Maps, mappings and territory

Robert Sack has defined territoriality as "the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area [which becomes] the territory."14 As such, all territoriality is a function of three interdependent exertions: one that classifies an area with respect other areas; one involving some form of shared communication within it; and one concerned with enforcing control over it. While he accepts that there are potentially many possible forms of territoriality and that each must be analyzed on its own terms, he suggests that modern capitalist societies, pre-modern civilizations, and classless-primitive societies constitute the three most basic. On this view, maps would be to modernity as mappings would be to classless primitive, with premodern civilizations relying on both. That said, the 'theoretical matrix' of some two dozen 'territorial effects' that Sack develops to analyze forms is cumbersome15 and his terminology too slippery. He does not adequately distinguish territoriality — which is the experience of being territorial — from territorialization — the acts by which people territorialize — from territorialism — the sets of (often unacknowledged) doctrines, rules and codes that con-

15 For the full account, see ibid., Chapter 2.
stitute territorial discourses. The result is that he says a lot about what territoriality is, but not enough about how it is actually produced.

In what follows, then, I want to provisionally accept Sack's basic thesis of what territoriality is. Understanding the differences between maps and mappings, however, requires an engagement with how territory is produced, and may be approached along three conceptual axes. Corresponding roughly to my distinction between territorialism, territorialization and territoriality, these are directionality, corporeality, and experientiality respectively. Directionality refers to the way in which a particular geography (or geographical world view) is aligned or oriented. Insofar as maps are the quintessential expression of the cartographic eye/I, they have no directionality. Maps do subscribe to basic conventions of north, south, east and west, and most maps are nominally faithful to the 'north-on-top' orientation. By fiddling with projections, or because published by different institutions or states, maps also emphasize some territorial jurisdictions at the expense of others. Beyond that, however, it does not matter where on the orthogonal grid you are; all territories on that grid are coded through a common language (lines of latitude and longitude, coordinate points, azimuths, etc.) and in every direction equally. Maps thus describe an equivalent space, a mathematical space that has no need for an external reference, and the existence of which does not depend on divine intervention. It is a space in which directions can be measured and followed, to be sure, but the totality of mapped space is, in effect, directionless.

Mappings, though, are directional, and are never independent of the cosmologies in which they are ensconced. Many anthropologists, ethnohistorians and human geographers have commented on how cosmologies expressed in indigenous narratives seem to be structured around binary pairs: light versus dark (as in the struggle to bring light to a dark myth age world); good against evil (as manifested in a conflict between supernatural monsters and human or anthropomorphic agents); energetic versus indolent (as in a contest between individuals or villages having a different character or disposition). It is
the function of narrative to resolve these binaries, but they are never resolved absolutely. In the struggle between light and dark, neither wins out — rather, a compromise is reached so that the world is dark part of the time and light another. So also do human agents never completely subdue the supernatural forces that lurk in the woods, sea and sky; in some contexts, humans gain the upper hand, in others they do not. And in the contest between villages or ancestor figures, the distinction between one that is energetic and one that is sluggish may or may not be reducible to that between good or beneficent, and evil or duplicitous. Rather than thinking in terms of binaries, then, it may be better to think of indigenous cosmologies as concerned with preserving, or always tending towards, symmetry.

It should not suprise us, then, that symmetrical forces show themselves in a spatial context too. Indeed, no matter where we look in first space we find this preoccupation with centrality, axiality, cardinal directionality, and horizontality/verticality. Consider, for example, the architectural accoutrements of the large planked winter villages characteristic of the northwest and central coast cultures (recall Figure A). As already noted, totem poles, by reaching vertically upwards, metaphor and maintain symmetry between the heavenly and terrestrial realms. The crests themselves were painted or carved in symmetrical formline style, and, by summarizing a plotline, bespoke of the inexorable struggle to secure equilibrium between the human and non-human realms. Horizontally, the spatial layout of the houses constructed their own symmetries. Aside from anomalies that might arise from the addition of families to established settlements

---

16 There is an extensive literature on this. In Tsimshian country, see Cove, J. Shattered, op. cit.; in Kwakwaka'wakw, Berman, J. 'Red salmon', op. cit. A more theoretically informed discussion (again dealing with the northwest coast) may be found in either of Lévi-Strauss, C., Myth and Meaning (New York: Schocken Books, 1979), or The Way of the Masks, Sylvia Models (trans) (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982).

17 Some cosmologies, such as the Nuxalk's, add a third, or subterranean, realm. In such cases, symmetry is expressed in triadic, as opposed to binary, terms.

18 As noted in Chapter 2, I will come back to this point most empirically on our travels through Gitxsan country in Chapter 4.
(especially during the contact period), the houses were aligned parallel with, and facing the beach (or, in inland areas, to a main stream), the leading houses at the center of the line, the lower ranking at the extremities. This arrangement preserved the perpendicularities of the two most important *axis mundi*: one that runs through the dwellings, lengthwise front to back, and thus metaphorical to the indissolubility of the land/sea interface; the other crosswise to it, running laterally through all the houses, and 'around the territory', and so metaphorical to the way in which corporate lineages are dispersed across many villages.\(^{19}\)

At the larger scale, the ethnographer Louis Allaire has suggested that Coast Tsimshian villages could be imagined as situated at either end of two terrestrially defined axes. One was the axis linking the 'contained' interior villages (like *Gitsilaasii* and *Gispaxlo'ots*) to the 'containing' outer coast villages (like *Kitk'a'ata* and *Gitxkaata*). Symbolic also of the relationship between a plenitude of different foods (the contents), and the vessels in which foods were served (the containers), it was an *axis mundi* understood in organic terms. The second axis was temporal, and referred to the relative antiquity of the various houses as they parlayed themselves into their ancestral territories and which thus bespoke the relationship between 'mature' and 'immature' villages.\(^{20}\) On this view, then, it was one of the main functions of the potlatch to bring both axes into temporary alignment. While I remain uncomfortable with Allaire's understanding of symmetrical

---

\(^{19}\) For a schematic representation, see Ruddell, N. *Raven's Village*, op. cit., 25. For an overview of the layout of a typical Haida village see either of John and Carolyn Smyley, *Those Born at Koona* (Surrey: Hancock House Publishers, 1973), 19; or George F. MacDonald, *Ninstints: Haida World Heritage Site* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1983), 10-2. Gitxsan village layouts may be previewed pictorially in Figure J, and in plan view in Map 41.

\(^{20}\) In 'A Native mental map of Coast Tsimshian villages' in Margaret Seguin (ed), *The Tsimshian* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1984), 82-98. Although anchored by territories as opposed to villages, the Aborigines of West Kimberly, Australia seem to 'cognitively map' their world in a similar manner. According to the ethnohistorian, Val Blundell, clans belonged to either of two moieties, which are nested, like two clasped hands, in cosmological space, and comprise what they call the *wunan*. Symmetry is maintained by exogamous marriage rules and the insistence that goods be traded only between clans whose real terrestrial alignment happens to reflect, at any time, the ideal type specified in the *wunan* (in 'Hunter gatherer territoriality: Ideology and behaviour in northwest Australia' *Ethnohistory* 27[2], 1980, 103-7.)
territorialism in such terms, there is evidence that this kind of 'mental mapping' characterized other coastal nations like the Nuu-chah-nulth and Kwakwaka'wakw.\footnote{For the Nuu-chah-nulth, see either of McMillan, A. \textit{Since Kwatya\l Lived}, op. cit., Chapter 1; or Daniel Clayton, \textit{Islands of Truth} (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998), Part II; for the Kwakwaka'wakw, see either of Helen Codere, \textit{Fighting With Property: A Study of Kwakiutl Potlatching and Warfare}, 1792-1930, Monograph 18 (Washington: American Ethnological Society, 1950); or Galois, R. \textit{Kwakwaka'wakw Settlements}, op. cit., 25-6.}

In the interior, where the contrast between land and sea was not present, and where seasonal resource cycles were less dualistic, villages were located in river valleys, protected from the winds by ridges, and could be oriented with respect to their neighbours any number of ways. There was still, however, a concern with preserving symmetry across the terrestrial realm, and between the terrestrial and spiritual. As indicated in one of the more unusual Native maps ever made (Map 39) the Nlha7kapmx conceived their territory as a huge circular lodge, its four 'compartments' associated with the four cardinal directions, and which, in turn, anchored one end of an axis leading to and from the 'country of souls'.\footnote{As noted in Chapter 2, this representation may have incorporated ideas from Christian theology. The point, however, is that there are still similarities between the symmetries expressed in both cosmological systems.} In rather the same way that the Secwepemc marked the corners of their territory with the 'Coyote Rocks', so also did the Nlha7kapmx, except in this case in terms of a number of 'entrances' associated with the narrower canyons. In the following excerpt of the migration narrative cited in Chapter 2, the narrator notes that when Fraser asked one of the Tl'kemtsin chiefs "where his house was," he answered "You are in it. The center of my house is here at Lytton. The fireplace is right here, and you are sitting by it. The doors of my house are at Spuzzum, at Laha'hoa [Fountain], at St'le'z [Ashcroft], at Stce'kus [Quilchena Creek], and at Tcutcuwi'xa [Hedley]. Between these places is our tribal territory from which we gather our food."\footnote{From an unidentified informant c. 1897, in Teit, J. 'Folk-tales', op. cit., 51.}

There was also a concern with structural symmetry, and was reflected in the orientation, and quadrilateral design, of the pithouses, which were set into the excavation, and
Map 39
Unknown author's *untitled* sketch of the (Nlha7kåpmx) world', Lytton (?), 1900, 4 x 10 cm; so far as I am aware (and not counting pictographs or pictograms [Chapter 2]), the only known example of a northwest coast indigenous cosmology abstracted onto the two-dimensional grid. According to James Teit, the map is supposed to represent the route taken by deceased Nlha7kåpmx when they depart the earthly realm for a 'land of ghosts' believed to be under the earth towards the west. The (a) represents the trail between the two worlds (which is monitored at points by 'guardians' inhabiting sweathouses); (b) the river that had to be crossed on a log bridge; (c) the land of ghosts (a fecund world populated by the souls of people and animals); d) a lake surrounding the earth (the sea maybe?); and e) the earthly world with its rivers and villages. If occasionally with minor variations, this conception of the cosmos was apparently held by all Teit's informants, and confirmed by shamans who had visited and then successfully returned from the land of ghosts (copied from original sketch in Teit, J. *The Thompson Indians*, op. cit., 343).
Fig. 290. Sketch of World.  

a, Trail leading from the earth to the land of the ghosts, with tracks of the souls;  
b, River and log on which the souls cross;  
c, Land of the ghosts, and dancing souls;  
d, Lake surrounding the earth;  
e, Earth, with rivers and villages;  
N, S, E, W, Points of the compass.
centered by two crosswise ropes, the ends of which were aligned semi-cardinally. Indeed, in Interior and Coast Salish cultures the number 4 seems to have been especially symbolic — standing simultaneously for the four seasons, the four corners, the four cardinal directions, and the four elements (earth, air, water, fire). The same logic extended to the pithouse ladder. Like a totem pole, it was often carved or painted with the image of the bird or animal that represented the household’s guardian spirit, but instead of the vertical orientation was customarily tilted towards the eastern edge of the smokehole. This reflected the importance of the rising sun, the giver of life (and helps explain why the country of souls was imagined as lying to the west). Brody has observed how Dunne Za hunters would even sleep with their heads oriented to the east so that they could properly dream where the trails to the animals and the trails to Heaven met.

As Sack notes, equivalent space, the space of the cartographic eye/I, is a conceptually emptiable and fillable space. Reduced to a set of lines and coordinates, it is like a container that can exist independently of any entities — persons, things, buildings, phenomena, stories, etc. — that we put in it. Symmetrical space, though, is always a full space, because it has no existence outside of the entities that compose it. Clearly, this means that symmetrical territorialism does not necessarily create symmetrical terrestrial geographies. There are physiographic constraints, and the entities that comprise them are not distributed equally. Not all indigenous territories, or familial or house groups within a territory, are the same size. Only in the space of the grid can one say that the discourses of equivalent territorialism always and everywhere create equivalent spaces.

---

24 As a rule, Nlha7kâpmx pithouses were four-posted and pyramidal. The Stl'atl'imx, however, dug a more rectangular pit, giving the structure a wedge-like look, while the Secwepemc sometimes used a six-post frame, a hexagonal structure being the result (for schematics, see Nabokov, P. and Easton, R. Native American Architecture, op. cit. 176-8).
25 For the Nlha7kâpmx, it was proper protocol to descend the latter facing northeast, gripping the latter by the right hand. The northern Secwepemc reversed that protocol, keeping the left hand on the ladder and facing southeast (ibid.).
26 See Maps, op. cit., Chapter 3.
27 In Human Territoriality, op. cit., 64. While couched in his theory of the history of space, Lefebvre understands abstract space in the same way. See Production, op. cit., Chapter 4.
Symmetry, by contrast, is a matter of degree, and makes no sense except in relation to asymmetry. One can have symmetrical territorialism without perfectly symmetrical terrestrial geographies to go along with it.

The second axis of difference between maps and mappings has to do with their corporeality, or the role of the body in territorialization. This is an issue that is simply not raised by Sack but Lefebvre has pointed out that all spaces are originally bodily spaces. By generating its own concepts of form and symmetry — right and left, backwards and forwards, up and down, etc. — and of contours and boundaries — interiority and exteriority, object and subject, etc. — the body 'secretes' its own spatial field. This field constitutes a biomorphic space, a space of gestures, inclinations, and immediate sensory input and output.\(^{28}\) This means that all territorialization is ultimately sourced in the body itself, but the relationship between the body and the territory is of an entirely different order in mapped space than it is in mapping. In my view the nature of this relationship can be explored in three different registers, which I call the \textit{body-as-metaphor}, the \textit{body-as-energizer}, and the \textit{body-as-author}.

By body-as-metaphor, I mean the degree to which territories, or the entities in them, are conceived in corporeal terms. In mapped space, the space of the cartographic eye/I, such conceptions are rare. Whether as a generic reference, or as part of a proper place name, we do occasionally speak of a 'neck of land', the 'foot of the mountain', or a 'body of water', and architectural historians have shown how the symmetries in (neo)classical buildings metaphored the symmetries of the human body. Overall, however, such metaphors are based only on resemblances, and physical features and buildings are never attributed with anthropomorphic or zoomorphic qualities.

Mapping space, by contrast, is infused with metaphors that understand territories and the objects in them as organic entities having animate or spiritual powers. Sometimes it

\(^{28}\) For elaboration, see \textit{Production}, op. cit., 169-76.
is carried in the names. Consider, for example, a handful of Wsá, nec toponyms, including Wsánec (Saanich), which means 'back raised up' (referring to the 'spine' of the Saanich Peninsula); Setines (Sidney), 'chest sticking out' (referring to the peninsula at that place); Tekteksen (East Point, Saturna Island), 'long nose' (because that is the shape of the island at that point); Pkols (Mount Douglas), 'white head' (because it was said to be one of three large stones cast across Georgia Strait by a Transformer standing at [what is now] White Rock); S,kektines (Pender Bluff), 'chest out of water' (as if the island was the breast of a partially submerged supernatural being); and Pexoles (point on east mid-section of Stuart Island), 'big eyes' (referring to a supernatural being or Transformer).29

Other times, it was embodied in resource gathering technologies or dwellings. The Wsá, nec's sxole (reef net) was a rectangular construction consisting of a horseshoe shaped net oriented to the direction of tidal flow, and anchored to the inshore seabed at four corners with stones of a specific size and shape. Not only were the four stones lined up with known terrestrial landmarks, but the entire structure, seen through the shimmering surface of the water, looked like a person clinging to the sandy bottom with their hands and feet.30 As evident in Figure A, houses were perceived in corporeal terms, not only as living beings that had 'mouths' (the doors) and 'eyes' (the windows), but as 'containers' in which the body of the collective resided.31 This is consistent with the belief that to permanently abandon a house meant, in effect, a loss of genealogical and territorial identity.32 It is in this sense that the postcolonial theorist Tim Mitchell has suggested it might be better to conceive of the indigenous house not as simply the structural solution to a particular design problem, but as a housing characterized by an interplay of

29 As supplied by Claxton, E. and Elliott, J. Reef Net Technology, op. cit., 44.
30 See the full discussion in ibid., 29-30.
31 See, in this connection, either of Nabokov, P. and Easton, R. Native American Architecture, op. cit., 38-9; Cove, J. Shattered, op. cit., 106; or Ruddell, N. Raven's Village, op. cit., 24-5.
differential forces. Sometimes, metaphors are expressed in the graphic arts. Just as the Aborigines' *dhulan* represented the body of the territory as the body of a crocodile, so too is the crest intended to capture the essential symmetry of the being represented. Images of engagements with non-human species, crests are like souls, requiring bodies to give them life.

This suggests that any theory claiming to explain the nature of territoriality and perspective that fails to open up space for non-human animals is inadequate. As the geographer, Wilma George, has pointed out, the use of animal iconography on maps produced by European schools of cartography during the 'age of exploration' was not simply a matter of decoration or rude fancy. It was a way of diagnosing, in fact of thematizing the *terrae incognitae* of newly discovered lands in the visual logic of the cartographic eye/I. But it was also because Europeans viewed themselves as separate from animals even as they saw no difference between animals and the savage other. Both were symbolic of a profane space, hovering at the outer perimeters of an anthropocentric, Eurocentric, and technocentric view of the cosmos, benchmarks against which ideas of the civilizing mission arose.

In mapping space, however, there is no clearcut distinction between human beings and the rest of creation. As our travels in first space have already shown, a successful transformation of a chaotic, myth age world to an ordered, temporal one, and of securing the necessities of life, was predicated not on human beings being able to secure an asymmetrical dominion over (supernatural or corporeal) animals but on sustaining sym-

---

36 This issue has received almost no attention in the social science, much less geographical, literature, but see, for starters, Jennifer Wolch and Jacque Emel, 'Bringing the animals back in' *Environment and Planning D* 13, 1995, 632-6.
37 In *Animals in Maps* (Berkeley: University of California, 1969).
metry with them. So it was that the Dunne Za could dream of those places where the trails to Heaven and the trails of the animals met. Or why the Wsā nec and Stó:lō ceremonial complex had separate rituals designed to solicit the arrival of the first spring salmon, the setting of the sxole, the catch of the first salmon in spring, and the closure of the fishing stations in the fall. Or why a successful seal hunt in the Arctic depended on the Inuit's mastery of 'environmental mimicry' — specifically, their ability to supplicate the animal by lying on the ice, and gyrating their own bodies in a similar way. This is not to say that indigenous peoples perceived themselves as animals, but, rather, that "the very existence and behaviour of animals confirm[ed] humanity," and that it is "human interaction with animals" that not only "map the outer dimensions of [the] moral universe," but the inner dimensions of the geographical.

By body-as-energizer, I mean the degree to which the body draws on all its ambulatory and sensory faculties to territorialize, but a distinction needs to be drawn between the way in which bodies-in-motion convert space into place through physical presence and the way in which the physical substance of the body, and the body of the territory, inform each other at a deeper level. The first I have already skirted in the Introduction and Chapter 2. In mapped space, an equivalent space sensed or measured exclusively by sight, the body is conceptually detached from space. This does not mean that the whole of mapped space does not always proceed from the body, but that equivalent or abstract space, the space of the cartographic eye, "metamorphoses the body that it may forget it altogether." The result is that the body, the cartographic I, is simultaneously privileged — in the sense that it can view and scan space from above or outside of it —

39 See, again, Brody, H. Maps, op. cit., Chapter 3.
41 Rundstrom, R. 'A cultural interpretation', op. cit.
42 Wolch, J. and Emel, J. 'Bringing the animals', op. cit., 635.
43 There is an extensive literature on this. In this study I have relied most on Ryan, S. The Cartographic Eye, op. cit.; Chapters 1 and 2; and Lefebvre, H. Production, op. cit., Chapter 4; but see also Gregory, D. Geographical, op. cit., Chapter 6; and Hillis, K. 'The power', op. cit.
44 Lefebvre, H. Production, op. cit., 405.
and non-existent — in the sense that it functions as a passive or transparent translator of that which is being viewed or scanned within it. But in being effectively "transported outside itself and into the ideal visual realm," it does not matter where on the grid the body is. In mapping space, a symmetrical space where all the senses contribute to territorialization, and where location does matter, body and space remain tethered. Belonging to a collectivity, at no time does the body "envisage [itself] as one point among others in an abstract milieu." Just as in mapped spaces, territories are claimed by processes of story-telling, naming and landmarking. But in mapping space, it is the dynamic of movement, rest and repeated use, and not the detached inscriptions of the cartographic eye/I, that maintains them.

In the second case, I want to turn to the question of rhythms, because it seems clear that mapping space is rhythmic in a way that mapped is not. Some of these rhythms are induced by nature itself. As Jack's narrative in Chapter 2 suggests, there is a kind of cadence to the seasonal or daily rounds, cohorts of people oscillating between winter and summer villages, and revisiting the same resource gathering areas over and over again. Some of them are captured in narrative form, the stories sort of 'bouncing' from one experience, place or time to another; rare is the narrative that unfolds in situ. Mostly, however, the rhythmic character of mapping space is a function of the bio-mechanics of movement. As Lefebvre, and the poststructuralists Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari have noted, bodies not only create their own symmetries, contours or boundaries, but their own rhythms. On this view, it is less assemblages of matter — molecules, cells, etc. — than composites of energies, flows and forces — circulation, breathing, muscula-

---

45 Ryan, S. *Cartographic Eye/I*, op. cit., 6-8.
46 Lefebvre, H. *Production*, op. cit., 309.
47 Ibid., 194.
48 My understanding of rhythms owes most to Lefebvre, H.*Production*, op. cit., 205-7. Although couched in a dense theoretical architecture of intensities, desires, and BwOs (bodies without organs), I find Deleuze, G.s and Guattari, F.'s argument (in *A Thousand Plateaus* [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1987], especially Chapters 6, 10 and 11) roughly similar.
ture, synaptic impulses, etc. — which, "in all their multiplicity interpenetrate one another," to create corporeal bodies. Indeed, "what we live are rhythms." This was certainly true off the coast where the harmonic oscillations of waves, and of tidal ebbs and flows, were overcoded by the metronomic strokes of oars hitting the water. But terrestrial travel was rhythmic too. Partly, it was tactile. As the terrain was constantly changing, and whether by canoe (on stream), or by foot or on horseback (on trail), the body was always moving up or down, side to side, forward and backward, faster and slower. More than that, however, it was also sonorous. The gush of wind through the trees, the drumming of rain or the clap of thunder and lightning, the gurgling or pounding of water spilling over rocks and deadfalls — the indigenous body was always and everywhere immersed in the sounds of nature. Indeed, because it is 'felt' as much as heard, sound is the most physical and, with the possible exception of smell, most emotive of all the senses. This is certainly the case with music. Its elementary notes are the sounds pre-given in nature, but when assembled into melodies and harmonies tap into bodily rhythms, compelling movement. This explains why song and dance are basic to the constitution of mapping space. They are not only means of capturing and memorizing events, or of facilitating travel. They are gestural systems that combine three rhythmic codes — that of nature; that of the musician, dancer or singer; and that of the spectators keeping time by clapping or other physical movements. Forms of sensory expression in which the rhythms of nature and the rhythms of the body most thoroughly overlap, they are themselves, as Deleuze and Guattari have it, territorialized refrains.

---

49 Lefebvre, H. Production, op. cit., 205.
50 Ibid., 206, emphasis in original.
51 See, in this connection, Tuan, Y.F. Topophilia, op. cit., Chapter 2; or Reginald Byron (ed), Music, Culture and Experience (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), Chapter 2.
52 Lefebvre, H. Production, op. cit., 206.
53 As I understand it, the refrain is a territorial assemblage consisting of cosmic and terrestrial rhythms, flows and energies "that carries the earth with it." While operative in all cultures, and in all spatial typologies, the refrain "has an essential relation to [the] Native." (in A Thousand, op. cit., Chapter 11, quote is 312).
If rhythm is the first answer to chaos, then all territorialization is, at base, a rhythmic art. But vision is the one sense that is not rhythmic, and equivalent or abstract space has the effect of "diminishing living rhythms by defining them in terms of the rationalized and localized gestures of divided labour." This does not mean that the space of the grid is completely arhythmic. Individuals are no more immune to seasonal cycles, or less moved by music, dance and song. But technologies of mechanical transportation have convinced us that we can master nature in the same way that the cartographic eye/I masters space; we drive through, or shield ourselves from the vicissitudes of, nature, rather than work around or through them. The result is that music, dance and song have been largely consigned to the realm of aesthetics and leisure; people engage them to restore the rhythms linearized or flattened out by the speed of modern life. They are still territorialized refrains — but they are contingent to territorialization, not essential. It is in this sense, as Deleuze and Guattari imply, that mapped space might best be conceived as a resonant space. It is more like a single note (or chord) that, once struck, "separate[s] itself so radically from the body as to kill it," while it vibrates or echoes, ad infinitum, across the whole of space.

Clearly, the body-as-metaphor and the body-as-energizer play a much more important role in mapping space than in mapped. With the body-as-author, however, it is the reverse. Maps have authors; they are called cartographers. But in oral societies, where the narratives themselves "represent the autobiography of the tribe," it is meaningless to suggest that mappings have an author. The idea of author does not emerge because "the individual could not...be imagined to stand outside or against society...and where

54 Ibid., 312.
55 Lefebvre, H. Production, op. cit., 408.
56 Indeed, I don't think it coincidental that the great proliferation of musical styles during the post-Renaissance period in Europe emerges precisely at the time that the magico-mythical and literary explanation of the ecumene is giving way to the rational scientific.
57 In A Thousand, op. cit., 212-3.
58 Lefebvre, H. Production, op. cit., 405.
there [is] no writing...[there can be]...no authors.\[^{60}\] This is why narratives are so often told in the first person — it ensures that the narrator remains but one character in a larger cast, while leaving interpretation up to the listeners.\[^{61}\] As the anthropologist Jack Goody has said, it is not that there is an absence of sanction against deviations from an original, "but rather that the whole concept of an original is out of place."\[^{62}\] We can ascribe authorship to a written transcription of a narrative, but even then must realize that it is the Transformer, trickster, Carpenter or cultural hero that interfaces between the oral and written version.\[^{63}\] As Nisga'a elder, Bert McKay, has said, for example, "Txeemsim is the touchstone of our identity [and] history....Txeemsim and Nisga'a are one in [sic] the same".\[^{64}\] Like mappings, the 'indigenous cartographer' is polyvocal.\[^{65}\]

Experientiality, finally, refers to the ways in which maps and mappings engage with experience, the phenomenal material that is manifested as events. In equivalent space, experiences and events do occur in particular places but they are again, like bodies, entirely conditional. Hyperextended across the whole of space, the grid has a conceptual existence independent of any concrete experiences or events that might take place in it. Indeed, positivist social planning and theory is based precisely on this notion of space as an endlessly emptiable container.\[^{66}\] It is in such sense that mapped space is a priori, the events and experiences that fill it, a posteriori. In mapping space, it is the reverse. As shown in Chapter 2, and whether recorded in songs, narrative, toponyms or the graphic arts, experiences and events are the raw material, or the 'cultural stuff', from which

\[^{61}\] This point has been elaborated in Harris, K. and Robinson, F. (eds) Visitors, op. cit., xv.
\[^{62}\] In The Interface, op. cit., 70.
\[^{64}\] Cited in the NTC Nisga'a, op. cit., 16.
\[^{65}\] As to whether or not this implies that an indigenous person is a mere vessel for myth and narrative in the same way that Althusser suggested people in capitalist societies are 'interpellated' by ideology, the answer is clearly no. As the political theorist Ira Gellner has put it, "it is pointless to include preliterate, tribal religions with the class of ideologies...Ideology involves doctrine; ideological conflict arises when doctrines, not men and shrines, are in opposition" (cited in Goody, J. The Interface, op. cit., 164).
\[^{66}\] Sack, R. Human Territoriality, op. cit., 64.
geographies are made. Distances, directions and locations are the product of a series of inter-connected occurrences, happenings, or engagements — not atomistic instances or bearings on the orthogonal grid. Where there are no occurrences, happenings or engagements, space ceases to exist as such.67

For Sack, the principal difference between (what he calls) pre-modern and modern territoriality is not then the degree to which a particular experience or event relates to a particular place, but the degree to which those associations are understood by all members of the collective.68 In modern societies, experiences are individualistic and conditional. In pre-modern, experiences and events are shared and public so that their association with places is essential.69 As shown in Chapter 2 this helps explain why experiences and events appear in narratives belonging to different groups. It also helps explain why a chief, having claimed ownership of a specific crest, could yet loan it to someone else in their lineage, or even to a related house. Indeed, if 'Wa'moodmxl's white grizzly was subsequently engraved on poles of both Ts'ibasaa and Gunax'nuutk at Gitkxaata it was because 'Wa'moodmxl allowed (or requested) it.70 In Nuxalk mythology, by comparison, identical crests were spread between families from different villages because the Carpenters had only a limited number of prototypes to work with. After being used to establish a given village they had to return the cloaks to Nusmatā, where they could be reused somewhere else.71 Crests thus tracked changes in prerogatives in the same way that multiple variants of the same narrative could tell the same story even as their empirical contents differed.72

In sum, the difference between maps and mappings reflects the difference between two territorialisms. Whether we call it abstract (as in Lefebvre), sedentary or stratified

67 Ibid., 63.
68 Ibid.
69 See, again, Basso, K. Wisdom, op. cit.
70 As pointed out in the HBBC Hartley Bay, op. cit.
71 Refer, again, to McLlwraith, T. The Bella Coola I, op. cit., Chapter 2.
72 This point has also been made by Boeschler, M. The Curtain, op. cit., 150.
(as in Deleuze and Guattari), or cartographic (as in Ryan), mapped space is a conceptually emptiable space of vision and measurement. Equivalent and transparent, it is a resonant space that has no outside reference except to itself. Whether we call it anthropological (as in Lefebvre), nomad or smooth (as in Deleuze and Guattari), or fluctuate (as in Sack), mapping space is a full space of multiple senses, narrative and TEK. Opaque and symmetrical, it is a rhythmic space that has no dimensions higher than that which flows through or happens in it. Clearly, the fact that Native people did not "possess a map-like representation of their collective domains"\textsuperscript{73} did not mean that they were less territorial than westerners. If anything, it is the reverse. In first space, this complexity of spiritual and corporeal experiences of place constitute an intensive, intimate relationship between body, territory, and identity. On the Map of British Columbia, the three are conceptually distinct. Native people could certainly territorialize in an abstract way (recall Map 39), but it was not for them the dominant form of spatial appropriation and understanding.\textsuperscript{74} Indeed, my earlier point can now be reformulated. Mappings always and everywhere territorialize, because the enunciation of territory only arises in relation to other territorializations. Maps reterritorialize, but only by first deterritorializing that which came before.\textsuperscript{75} There is only one equivalent space, and only one spatial typology associated with it. There are, however, many possible configurations of symmetrical space, and therefore many possible spatial typologies associated with them.

**Time mapped and mapping time**

The same argument must be extended to time. If we accept that time is essentially a function of events and how they are structured, the relationship between maps and time

\textsuperscript{73} Sack, R. *Human Territoriality*, op. cit., 7.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 63-5.
\textsuperscript{75} For Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (in *A Thousand*, op. cit.), this point is fundamental. Although he speaks of space, as opposed to territory, Lefebvre H.'s argument (in *Production*, op. cit.) amounts to the same thing.
is as straightforward as between maps and the grid. Maps are *atemporal*. They are artefacts that picture space at a particular time on a chronological continuum. Spatial objects are always the result of events, but by reducing them to locational identifiers maps detach objects from the events that created them. By obscuring their event record maps substitute themselves *as* events in their own right. They are meta-events. As the geographer Denis Wood has suggested, there is a sense in which maps "make the past and future present"\(^76\) — indeed, the structure of this study is based, in part, on this assumption — but as artefacts they are but snapshots. Whether in terms of their style, contents or technology, this is why maps are so readily categorized as 'representative' of the era or epoch in which they were made. This is, in short, why we can speak of a history of cartography in the first place.

Mappings, by contrast, *are* temporal because they never detach themselves from the events that compose them, and because the events themselves are conveyed in a narrative form. The question is what kind of temporality do narratives imply? Painting with a broad brush, some commentators have been able to distinguish 'myth' and/or 'legend' on the one hand from the 'story' on the other. According to this logic, myth and legend are family, house or tribe property, and very old, while stories are newer, and can be related by anyone.\(^77\) Others suggest that myths and legends are the two main categories of stories in general, the difference being that myth refers to a time when the world was in a chaotic and unpredictable state, while legend deals with historic agents and is more local in nature.\(^78\) Consistent with my earlier categorization of primary versus secondary narratives, still others argue that legends, although often having supernatural overtones, are structured around natural events, while myths are explanations passed down from an irretrievable past to explain why the world appears as it does.\(^79\) Stories, in contrast, are

\(^76\) In *The Power*, op. cit., 7.
\(^77\) For example, McIlwraith, T. *The Bella Coola I*, op. cit., 292-5.
\(^78\) As suggested by McMillan A. *Since Kwatyai Lived*, op. cit., 50.
\(^79\) As suggested by Peterson, L. *The Story*, op. cit., 10.
all the other narratives explaining relatively unembellished occurrences, or the ethics of community and individual behaviour.\textsuperscript{80}

Even so, our travels in Chapter 2 suggest that myths, legends or stories all tend to telescope into each other. Partly, this is a function of the event structure of the narratives. All narratives refer to events alleged to have 'taken place in time', but it is still where, as opposed to when, the events occurred that is most important. Written down, narratives do seem to unfold chronologically, but in their oral form, it is possible for events to be narrated out of sequence or as if they are collapsed on top of one another.\textsuperscript{81} Partly, it is a function of the polyvocality of the narrative form. As noted in Chapter 2, different families have their own versions of myths, legends, or stories, as often as not inconsistent with other families' variants, even as regards to epitomizing events concerning the origins of the group.\textsuperscript{82} They have plots, themes and motifs that mingle in dissimilar, but interwoven stories, and they temporalize originary events in different configurations.

None of this is to argue that there was not a recognition of sequentiality. Whether by monitoring changes in the weather, the changing angle of the sun, lunar phases, or the positioning of constellations, mappings had to accommodate seasonal change. Indeed, knowing when and where certain resources would be available — the arrival of spring oolichan, the ripening of berries and plants in early summer, the mad dash of salmon in late summer, goats descending from the high country in fall — depended on it. The difference is that this cycle was not envisaged in chronological terms, but as a kind of \textit{returning}. The Nlha7kapmx, for example, divided the seasonal round into eleven moons and while sequenced by number, they are designated by name, each of which refers to whichever resource gathering activities occupied the collective at that time.\textsuperscript{83} The idea of the return is even more explicit in the Wsá,nec oral tradition, which emphasizes four

\textsuperscript{80} As in Mcllwraith, T. \textit{The Bella Coola I}, op. cit. 292-5; and Peterson, L. \textit{The Story}, op. cit., 8.
\textsuperscript{81} As explained by Harris, K. and Robinson, F. (ed) \textit{Visitors}, op. cit., xiv.
\textsuperscript{82} This point has been made in Maud, R. \textit{Guide}, op. cit., 87.
moons: Centeki (means 'sockeye returns to earth'), Cenhenen ('hump-back salmon returns to earth'), Centa,wen ('coho salmon returns to earth'), and Cengolew ('dog salmon returns to earth').

At the more local level, people were born and people died. But here also, it was the names, and not the people that bore them that returned from one generation to the next. The migration narratives outlined in Chapter 2 certainly unfold chronologically, but the vast majority of narratives are not of this type and it is still the geography of events and not their chronology, that is most important. As narrative art, place names would likely have been applied sequentially. In his analysis of Apache toponyms, the ethnographer Keith Basso has argued that because bestowed by tricksters, transformers and other cultural heroes during the mythical age to make the world ready for human occupancy, descriptive names have to be the most ancient. Names commemorating important events came later, because it was only when people were installed in terrestrial space and engaged in the search for territories that experiences would start to accumulate. Names of clans, families, and villages came last, because it was only when people became associated with locales and territories that the preconditions for the enunciation of geographical relatedness emerged. That said, toponyms are, in the broad scheme of things, all of great antiquity. Like the narratives they shorthand, their purpose is not to chronologize space. They are to supply the permanent terrestrial vocabulary necessary for the engagement with experience.

The essential point is that mappings are not events — they are a bundling of many events, some chronological, some not. The more recent the narrative, the more likely it is that events are structured sequentially. But the further back one travels in mapping time, the more time seems to compress, taking on an appearance of circularity. The older epitomizing events tend to be, the more they become analogous to 'states of being',

85 In Wisdom, op. cit., 23-30. A similar point has been made by Peterson, L. The Story, op. cit., 24.
or to 'phase changes' in the life of the collective, than they are identifiable points along a chronological continuum. 86 In some contexts, then, mapping time is like a river, flowing through a diachronically ordered landscape; in others, it is more like a lake, a kind of suspension where past, present and future osmose.

This thesis suggests another reason why music is more important in mapping space than it is in mapped. Like myth, music conveys meaning not by a sequential bundling of events, but as a totality of bundles of organized sound. 87 In responding to, and reopening structures that already exist at a mythic level, the "essential quality of music is," as the musicologist John Blacking suggests, "its power to create another world of virtual time." 88 While conducting fieldwork among the Dunne Za, the ethnographer, Robin Ridington, remembered how "some of the older Indians [would] sing in a form of expression that I knew was literally out of a world other than the one I was familiar with. Their songs were without words. In my altered state of consciousness the melodic line seemed to rise and fall like the wind. It was a wind that dissolved history." 89 The recitation of clan dirges, like the limx'oy of Medeek in Chapter 2, would have had much the same effect. Like language "music is a primary adaptation to environment." The difference is that "with music mankind may feel across boundaries," while in language, "decisions are made about boundaries." 90

The difference between mapping and mapped time does not then reduce to the difference between cyclical or chronological time. It is the difference between orality and literacy or, in what amounts to the same thing, between memory and history. The mental faculty by which one retains or recalls past experiences, memory is recursive and retrospective, and is a universal human trait. History, by contrast, is discursive and specula-

86 For a more detailed, but similar argument, see Michael Harkin, The Heiltsuk (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press), Chapter 3.
87 See, in this connection, Lévi-Strauss, C. Myth, op. cit., Chapter 5.
89 In Trail to Heaven, op. cit., 12.
tive, a record of occurrences in the life of a people, country or institution as perceived by an authorial figure who privileges certain occurrences at the expense of others. In this sense, the difference is not dissimilar to that between the individual, short-term memory on the one hand, and the social, collective or long-term memory on the other. In oral and literate societies, the prime function of a collective memory is the conferral of identity requisite for a confrontation with experience. But it is only in literate, where history has arrogated to itself the preservation of selected long-term memories that the distinction between individual and collective memory emerges. In oral societies, these two memories remain coterminous. This is why elders are able to rediscover the paths of their ancestors in the course of their own (real or recollected) movement along those same paths each time they tell the narratives associated with them. Or why revisiting a spiritual or sacred site is to reestablish the primary connection between a supernatural being and human actor that caused it to become a spiritual or sacred site. The basis of historical recall is chronological; the basis of memory recall is geographical.

This is not to suggest that memory is not selective. Like history, memory filters out, or sloughs off, remembrances — in societies organized polyvocally, it must. The more past the past becomes, the more it tends to fade from memory, opening up space for newer remembrances. Epitomizing events, bundled in cyclical time, are retained, but less

91 According to Peterson, L. (in The Story, op. cit.) "history is speculation based on record...[but] record alone is not history. History emerges only when records have been subjected to the art of speculation" (1).
93 This point has been emphasized by Goody, J. (in The Interface, op. cit., 150), and is supported by my analysis of Clayton Mack's and Henry Jack's narratives in Chapter 2. Likewise has the ethnohistorian, Tamara Giles Vernick (in 'Na lege ti guiriri' [On the road of history]: Mapping out the past and present in M'Bres region, Central African Republic' Ethnohistory 43[2] 1996, 245-75) shown how the Banda people of the Central African Republic pass on TEK by imag(in)ing the terrestrial network of trails and sites that constituted their world. The network functioned like a memory trace along which elders were able to maintain continuity with past events.
94 Goody, J. (in The Interface, op. cit., 220) has also made this point. Blundell, V. (in 'Hunter gatherer territoriality', op. cit.) has noted how Aboriginal leaders reaffirmed their clan's spiritual attachment to territory by annually touching the totemic images of animals and plants painted on local cave walls by their ancestors. I will illustrate this empirically on my travels through Stó:lō territory in Chapter 6.
important ones, of a more chronological nature, may not be. It is to suggest, as the anthropologist, Claude Lévi-Strauss, has it, that memory is where "we find the same...elements combined, over and over again, but they are in a closed system...in contradistinction with history, which is...an open system."95 This helps to explain why totem poles were not re-erected in situ when they collapsed, as they inevitably did. Certainly, there were practical concerns associated with the expense of carving and the need to convene a potlatch in order to properly witness and validate the crests displayed. But it was also because to have prevented collapse would be, in effect, to ascribe a permanence to the event structure recorded by the crests — to historicize it — and so preclude the addition of newer crests when events required it. It is wrong, then, to conceive of memories as 'alternative histories'; indeed, the term 'oral history' is an oxymoron. What does seem plain is that the collective memory of a community can be preserved in all its intimacy only so long as it is not disassociated from speakers (as, for example, by writing or making maps); once this happens (as, say, under contact conditions), a collective memory loses its personal qualities, becoming externalized96 — and thence turned into history.

Maps, mappings, knowledge and knowing

Finally, maps and mappings differ in how they acquire, store and transmit an archive of cultural knowledge. On this view, mappings are to TEK as maps are to the scientific paradigm of resource management.97 Writ large, TEK consists of a system of categor-

---

95 In Myth, op. cit., 40.
97 To the degree that TEK has become a buzzword for a body of knowledge that can be appropriated by western science, the term is contentious (see, for example, Martin Weinstein, 'Traditional knowledge, impact assessment and environmental planning', unpublished paper presented at the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's BHP Diamond Mine Environmental Assessment Panel, Ottawa, January, 1996.). However, the term is still frequently used by Native people, and I do find it a convenient shorthand for distinguishing what Lefebvre (in Production, op. cit.) would call connaissance — less formal, or more localized forms of knowing — from savoir — more abstract or synthetic knowledges created by apparatuses of institutionalized power.
ization, a set of empirical observations and lessons about the local environment, and a regime of self-management concerning the acquisition and distribution of scarcer resources.\textsuperscript{98} As such, it is antithetical to the western paradigm based on the anthropocentric view of the natural world, a quantitative assessment of use or exchange values in an ideal market, and the division of the knowledge field into disciplines, each with its own specialized discourse and Lakatosian hard core.\textsuperscript{99} The former is experiential and works with memory — the latter is experimental and based on historical record. Grounded in past practice, TEK is cumulative and dynamic, but flexible, open to technological innovation and socioeconomic change in the present by adopting what works even while it sloughs off that which does not. In the scientific paradigm, it is hypothesis testing and verification that makes that call. The quantity and quality of TEK varies between community members depending on their age, gender, intellectual capabilities, social status, and profession (hunter, chief, shaman, etc.) but it is still the collective knowledge held by the whole community. The scientific paradigm professes applicability to the entire community irrespective of difference even as its contents are determined by a group of specialists. The scientific paradigm of environmental knowledge is classificatory, topical, and abstracted from space. TEK is categorical, geographical and infrastructural to it. The important point is that the cognitive framework in which TEK resides lies not at the surface, in the events or experiences proper, nor at the deep levels, where memory lurks. Conceived as an event structure in its own right, it lies in the mapping itself.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{98} For more on TEK, see Freeman, M.M.R., 'The nature of traditional ecological knowledge' \textit{Northern Perspectives} 20(1), 1992, 9-12; Mark Johnson, \textit{Lore: Capturing Traditional Environmental Knowledge} (Hay River: Dene Cultural Institute, 1992); or Kuhn, R. and Duerden, F. 'A review of traditional environmental knowledge: An interdisciplinary Canadian perspective' \textit{Culture} 16(1), 1996.


\textsuperscript{100} Although with reference to narratives specifically, this point has been made by Goody, J. \textit{The Interface}, op. cit., 172.
More generally, mappings do not constitute the rational world in the same way that maps do. For the mapmakers, the rational is that which can be surveyed, mapped and measured by mathematics, the result of which is to dismiss information gathered or organized through non-visual senses as anecdotal and subjective. For mappers, though, mathematics is irrational because it cannot assimilate knowledge acquired through other senses. Both mapping and mapmaking cultures deploy semiological systems to construct the world. The difference is that mapmakers deploy symbols abstractly, to create bounded realities. Mappers, however, situate their symbols in the world, to cross boundaries between realities.\textsuperscript{101} There is a huge difference, for example, between geometric shapes that function as formal abstractions of visual facts and the same shapes in form-line art. In the former, they are generalized representations, in the latter, metaphysical symbols.\textsuperscript{102} As the ethnographer Frances Robinson notes, "what appears as psychic phenomena in one culture may be understood as logical truth in another."\textsuperscript{103} To argue otherwise is to be guilty of what the anthropologist Marshall Sahlins calls 'pidgin ethnography', and so negate indigenous realities.\textsuperscript{104}

**Transmission interrupted**

This, then, brings me to the turning point of this study, because it now appears that the gulf between maps and mappings is even wider than I first feared. Participating in the Cartesian perspective, and using western technologies of production, maps are abstractions. They substitute equivalence for symmetry, resonance for rhythm, and history for memory. As de Certeau has put it, they cut up what stories cut across, 'freezing', so to speak, the mappings that preceded them.\textsuperscript{105} They often source ethnographic (or even

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Basso, K. *Wisdom*, op. cit.}
\footnote{As pointed out by Robert Houle, in 'The spiritual legacy of the ancient ones' in Nemiroff, D. et al. (eds) *Land, Spirit, Power*, op. cit., 42-73.}
\footnote{In her and Harris, K. (ed) *Visitors*, op. cit., xv.}
\footnote{In *How "Natives" Think* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).}
\footnote{In *Practice*, op. cit., 129.}
\end{footnotes}
governmental) as much as autochthonous data, further confusing the idea of authorship. They are typically produced on reserve, the very signature of colonization. They all use paper, the medium indigenous peoples often equated with the white man's ability to tell lies. Analyzed chronologically, they show the same progression from the earliest symbolic, to pictorial, to topographic and thematic, and finally to digital maps that some argue, if inaccurately, has constituted the history of western cartography dating back over two millennia.¹⁰⁶ In short, these maps all reflect, as Edward Said so eloquently put it, the partial tragedy of resistance — they must, to a certain extent, "recycle and mimic forms already established or at least influenced by the culture of empire and colonization."¹⁰⁷

All counter-mapping is guilty of this but First Nations' maps are the worst offenders. For Euro-British Columbians, making maps is mainly a technical challenge because the objects mapped have already been brought into existence, additively, by earlier generations of maps. No translation is needed or expected. For First Nations, however, making maps is an exercise in translation because the objects to be mapped either cannot be found on other maps, or are of the non-mappable sort. It is true that First Nations have today reached the point where maps are increasingly based on earlier maps, but the timing is not the same; Native maps have had to accomplish in a few decades what western maps have worked out over centuries. The result is that Native maps don't just confuse the question of authorship; they introduce authorship where it previously did not exist. For First Nations in the contact zone this is, to paraphrase the ethnographer, James Clifford, the predicament of Native maps.¹⁰⁸ They must subscribe to a machinery of truth

¹⁰⁶ Until very recently, the history of cartography was decidedly Eurocentric, and understood in developmentalist terms. See, for example, Norman Thrower, Maps and Man (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972); Gerald Crone, Maps and Their Makers 5th Edition (Kent: William Dawson and Son, 1978); P.D. A. Harvey, The History of Topographical Mapping (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); or Arthur Robinson, Early Thematic Mapping in the History of Cartography (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
¹⁰⁷ In Culture, op. cit., 210.
¹⁰⁸ From the title to Predicament of Culture (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).
that is predicated on the construction of in-visibility, on mis-translation, and on the appearance of dis-continuity with their own cultural spaces.

Indeed, some have argued that because it is impossible to ever totally know the other, it is pointless to attempt translation, and that to do so is to reify the worst arrogance of the imperial imagination. The literary critic Barbara Belyea says we need to "resist the temptation to translate" Native maps in western conventions because we "can never understand more than partially a cartographic convention that conceptualizes and organizes the world so differently from the way ours does."  

For Carter, to even speak of "the historical space of the [Native] in terms of tracks, journeys, and regions is already to appropriate it to the symbolic language of white history." More seriously, to translate anything in the present is to shatter the social memories embodied in it. At the borderlines of cultural translation, peoples necessarily participate in each others' collective memories whether they want to or not. In a contact situation, however, participation is not symmetrical, and the dominant culture "take[s] over the memory of the other...detach[ing it] from the other's historical experience."

These views have been shared, and are still shared, by Native people. Speaking to the provincial commission of enquiry at Nass Harbour in 1887, Chief Charles Russ stated that "in the first place, we did not like the name 'reserve'. We have no word in our language for 'reserve'. We have the words 'land', 'our land', 'our property'. Your name for our land is 'reserve', but every mountain, every stream, and all that we see, we call our forefathers' land and streams. It is just lately...white people are changing the name. Now it is called the Indian reserve instead of the Nass people's land." More recently, Ian Campbell, a Squamish Nation teacher, pointed out how the Native "language is very sacred [and] has to be spoken just right, from the heart" but it "is tied to the land and

---

109 In 'Inland journeys, native maps' Cartographica 33(2), 1996, 1-16, quotes on 6 and 12 respectively.
110 In Road, op. cit., 337.
111 Motzkin, G. 'Memory and cultural translation', op. cit., 265-81, quote is 276.
112 Ibid., 18.
also...to the longhouses and the ceremonies...[and t]here is no way that we can translate our ceremonies in English."\(^{113}\) For others, any attempt at translation was theft. When Peterson first asked Basil Joe about Se'shalt toponyms (Map 14) Joe countered, "Why do you want our names white man? You stole our land. You stole our fish. You stole our timber. Now you want our names. What do you want with our names?"\(^{114}\) More recently, the 'Ulkatcho elder Henry Jack took issue with the renaming of the Nuxalk-Carrier grease trail as the Mackenzie Heritage Trail. "[T]his has always been our trail," he stated, "I used to climb that tree across the trail from my father's cabin...I still trap along the trail today. My grandfather used [it] all his life. You can still see the stumps... he cut to build his barn. Now they want to give this trail to Mackenzie."\(^{115}\) Such cautions also extend to contemporary First Nations' maps, especially as regards boundaries. Canim Lake treaty coordinator Elizabeth Pete "has trouble with solid straight lines on a map"\(^{116}\) while NTA chair Harold Aljam is concerned that "the provincial government wants us to draw solid lines, solid boundaries, for the treaty process. But the reality is we overlap."\(^{117}\)

**Transmission restored**

With all due respect to either position, though, these views only hold so long as we remain stuck on the orthogonal grid. As I suggested in the Introduction, First Nations' maps are double-voiced. There is a difference between the form of an image and what it contains, and maps can take back what other maps take away. There is an alternative reading possible, but one that obligates us to adopt a different vantage point, to embrace a different *perspective* — to move from an analysis of form to an analysis of content.

\(^{113}\) Cited in Ignace, R. 'Our language, our land', op. cit.
\(^{114}\) Cited in Peterson, L. *The Story*, op. cit., ix.
\(^{115}\) Cited in Furniss, E. *Ulkatcho*, op. cit., 1.
\(^{116}\) Cited in Alan McRae, 'Canim lake and North Thompson bands sort out their shared areas cooperatively', *Secwepemc News* Nov/Dec 1997, 10.
and in doing so blur the lines between orality and graphicity, and between memory and history, and redefine what we mean by 'the map' altogether. Let us try, in short, to see First Nations' maps not as erasures, or freezings of, but as extensions of, as elaborations on, or as addenda to the oral mappings of the cultures that produced them.

Here, I find the social theorist Paul Connerton's distinction between what he calls inscribing and incorporating social practices most illuminating. Inscribing practices are those that trap and hold information with abstracting or reproductive media like writing, photography and, of course, cartography. Incorporating practices, by contrast, are those based on conversation, commemorative ceremonies and bodily activity. This thesis can be extended to the practices of perspective too. On this view, maps inscribe. They imply a chronological history, use a nominal language, and order the world by seeing. Sharing the visual logic of the cartographic eye/I, they extend an equivalent space infinitely in all directions. Mappings, by contrast, incorporate. They are derived from memory, use a verbal language, and organize the world through multiple senses. Immanent to the spatial typologies they construct, they fold space back in on itself. The relation between viewer and viewed in inscribing culture is spatial; in incorporating it is dialogical and corporeal. The important point is that there is no clearcut distinction between either genre — Connerton notes that there is an element of incorporation in every inscription just as there are elements of inscription in every incorporation. This is, in short, the reference point for starting to think about First Nations' maps as First Nations perceive them.

In some sense, the change in perspective that we need to make has already been anticipated in the quite different sensibilities that professional and amateur ethnographers brought into the field with them. Point men of the ethnographic imaginary, the profes-

---

118 The full thesis is worked out in How Societies Remember (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
119 As pointed out by Elkins, D. The Poetics, op. cit., 37.
120 Connerton, P. How Societies, op. cit., Chapter 3.
sional school had a predilection for the most spartan of maps. Most defined only an external tribal or, where applicable, internal sub-tribal boundaries. Those few exceptions that located places typically did so by means of an alphanumeric key, the net effect of which was to at once detach the contents from the space they created.\textsuperscript{121} These maps evoked the idea that the ethnographic objects (the territories) had already been discovered, and now only needed to be explained and analyzed. By comparison, maps prepared by the mid-20th century amateur school tried to approached the Native world with a more balanced perspective. Their maps avoided defining external or internal boundaries, and preserved the toponyms in a pictorial panorama, the net effect of which was to (partially) repair the separation between form and content.\textsuperscript{122} Like the ornamental cartographies of the Dutch Renaissance, their maps reflected the perceptions of a traveller who has just stumbled across hitherto undiscovered wonders, and has only just started to bring them into the realm of immediate understanding.

\textbf{Incorporation in action}

Since first contact, and even before in fact, this is exactly what Native people in British Columbia have been doing. Around the turn of the 20th century, ethnographers often heard stories of Native prophets. They were not shamans or medicine men, but 'Indian doctors' who, through dreams or trances induced by sickness, were supposed to be able to forecast future events. James Teit recorded the story of \textit{Pê' lak}, an Nlha7kápmx prophet who predicted the coming of white settlers and the havoc they would wreak on his people.\textsuperscript{123} Another Nlha7kápmx prophet, \textit{Kwálos}, claimed to have travelled by the clouds to a far off land east of a great lake (the Atlantic Ocean). There he met strange

\textsuperscript{121} Recall Maps 6 and 7.
\textsuperscript{122} Recall Maps 12 through 14.
\textsuperscript{123} From an unidentified informant c. 1897, in \textit{The Thompson Indians}, op. cit., 365-6. Once again, Teit recognized that such stories may have been incorporations of Christian motifs; he attributed this one to information supplied by HBC traders. Still, and as Teit implies, it is the degree to which these stories were accepted as truthful by Native listeners that mattered.
people speaking an unfamiliar language (which, when mimicked, Teit was convinced sounded like French). They lived in stone houses with mouths and eyes (the doors and windows), had fires inside (the stoves), and deer (probably horses) frolicking in fields of grasses and flowers. Kwálos danced and prayed that these people would come and teach his people about the great things he had seen.\textsuperscript{124}

When Europeans finally arrived, Native people incorporated them into the narrative form through which they made sense of their world. Consider, for example, the following Tsimshian tale explaining the arrival of traders James Colnett and Charles Duncan on \textit{H.M.S. Prince of Wales} and \textit{Princess Royal} at Gitkxaata in 1787:

\textit{Laxgibaaw} was on the extreme southern end of Banks Island and was a village used by the entire Gitkxaata group...as a halibut drying location....It was here that the Gitkxaata people saw the first coming of the white man in a huge ship. [One day the fishermen were on the outer banks fishing halibut when] there was a fog on the waters which soon cleared up and, all of a sudden, a huge monster appeared very close....It had very large wings and traveled very fast. The Gitkxaata, seeing this, became alarmed and, without making any noise, pulled up their anchors and paddled to shore. Only Sabaan and his slave [who were farthest out] never saw this monster and, when [they suddenly did it was almost on top of them]. The chief Sabaan, seeing that this strange being was so close and seeing many people whom he thought were ghost people, as they were so white, running about on the ship, immediately began pulling up his stone anchor, while the slave man pulled in the halibut hooks. The ship began lowering one of its small boats, and this Sabaan saw and he said to his slave "Hurry, the monster is letting down one of its children. See, it has many arms and is going to head towards us. That is a ghost monster filled with ghost people. The small boat with many oars was now following [and gaining on] them....[w]hen Sabaan and his slave man landed, they both jumped out and ran towards the woods.\textsuperscript{125}

Again using their own terms of reference, the Nlha7kapmx explained Simon Fraser's arrival at \textit{Tl'kémtsin} (Lytton), and a subsequent mishap involving one of Fraser's crew falling into the river, in 1808 the following way:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{124} From an unidentified informant c. 1897, in Teit, J. 'Information re songs', op. cit.
\item \textsuperscript{125} 'The ghost people', James Lewis, \textit{Gitksaatla}, recorded by Beynon, W. c. 1948, in Marsden, S. et. al. (eds) \textit{Na Amwaaltga}, op. cit., 91-4. A similar incorporation, this time telling about George Vancouver's arrival in Heiltsuk territory in 1793, is recorded as 'The First Schooner', in Harkin, M. \textit{The Heiltsuk}, op. cit., Chapter 4.
\end{itemize}
Many years ago, but at a time long after Coyote had finished arranging things on earth, he appeared on the Fraser River in company with Sun, Moon, Morning Star, Kokw'ela, Nmu'ipem ('diver'), and Skwia'xemux ('arrow-armed person')... These seven came in a bark canoe, and came down from the Shuswap country above. They landed at Lytton where many people saw them. Continuing on their journey, and when in the middle of the river, a short distance below Lytton, the Moon, who was steersman of the canoe, disappeared with it underwater. The others came out of the water and sat down on a rock close above the river. Then Skwia'xemux fired many lightning arrows, and Nmu'ipem dived many times into the river. The Sun sat still and smoked; while Coyote, Kokw'ela, and Morning Star danced. Coyote said, "Moon will never come up again with the canoe," but Sun said "yes, in the evening he will appear." Just after sunset, Moon appeared holding the canoe and came ashore. All of them embarked and, going down the river, were never seen again. This is about the only time Coyote appeared since the end of the mythological age. About ten years ago he was reported to have been seen travelling in the Shuswap country, but some Kamloops Indians who took much interest in the matter ascertained it to be a false report.126

In some cases, changed conditions required that existing narratives be modified. Consider, for example, the following creation story told by Haida Chief Matthews:

After God created the world, he wanted some people to live in it. So he looked around and he took the brown earth and make a body, and he breathed into the body and it became a living body. That is the Indian. We are made out of the brown earth. That is why we are brown. That's what they say. Now the Devil saw what God did, and the Devil said to himself 'I can do that too'. So the Devil looked around... and came to the seashore and he saw the waves breaking along the beach creating a white foam and he took that white foam and make a body, the Devil did. But he couldn't make it live; didn't have the power. But when God saw that beautiful body made by the Devil, he took the body and then breathed into it. That's white man. That's the story of the Interior Indians.127

Part of the Nlha7kápmx migration narrative in Chapter 2, the following excerpt seems to have vindicated Pë'lak's prediction of the dire consequences of the coming of the whites:

We are as in prison, and our lands and nearly everything we had have been spoiled or stolen from us. The great chief led us to this country, placed us in it to occupy it, multiply in it, and be happy. He gave us a rich country, with plenty in it for us to eat. He did not give this country to the whites, or anyone else. The chief gave us this part of our mother's body to live on and rest on.... This is why our chief Cexpé'ntlem, in talking to the whites... told them they had entered his house and were now his guests. He asked them to

126 From an unidentified informant c. 1897, in Teit, J. Mythology, op. cit., 416.
treat his children as brothers, and they would share the same fire. He did not
know that they would afterwards treat his people as strangers and inferiors,
and steal their land and food from them. Had he known it, there would
probably have been war, and the land would have been red with blood.128

Confirming Connerton’s thesis that the line between inscription and incorporation is
not fixed, the ability to incorporate extended to the plastic arts too. Dressed in his tunic
and seaman's trousers, a Kwakwaka'wakw totem pole at Kelsey Bay included the figure
of Boston trader Captain William McNeill, who arrived on the coast in 1825.129 A pole
at Bella Coola once bore the image of George Vancouver, and a Tlingit pole at Ketchikan of Abraham Lincoln. Although more permanent, 'picture writing' was also used to
incorporate foreign elements or events into a familiar conceptual framework. A Tlingit
pictogram near Atlin Lake shows a canoe coming up from the coast, while Nuu-chah-nulth petroglyphs near Clooose depict European vessels arriving from a more distant
place.130

This analysis supports the ethnographer Michael Harkin's contention that contact ev-

tents involved the interpenetration of two distinct chronotopes, or space-time configura-
tions: the synchronous one of the Natives, "that describ[ed] the everyday world...mount-
tains, forest, sea and foreign territory...[beyond which] lay uncontrollable and super-hu-
man forces"; and the diachronic one of the Europeans, "open to the outside and driven
by the notion of progress."131 For Europeans, contact required an inscription; journals,
surveys, photographs and censuses comprising a complete makeover of that which was

129 See Kirk, R. Tradition and Change, op. cit., 53.
130 Surveys of Clooose pictography are found in Hill, B. and R. Indian Petroglyphs, op. cit., 72-7; and
Peter Johnson, Glyphs and Gallows (Surrey: Heritage House, 1999). One of the images is clearly the
HBC’s Beaver. Three others are of three-masted schooners. Because these latter are surrounded by im-
ages of people, the Hills and Johnson have concluded from colonial records that one of them is John
Bright’s vessel that capsized off Hesquiat in 1869 (but see, also, Arnett, J.’s critique of this claim in
131 In The Heiltsuk, op. cit., Chapter 3. A chronotope, following the philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, refers
to those "points in the geography of a community where time and space intersect and fuse" (62).
already there. For Native people, however, contact events marked, but did not completely rupture, previous states of being and modes of understanding.132

Towards a more open form of cartographic discourse

There are three lessons to take from this. The first is to qualify Turnbull's claim that "western maps are more powerful than Aboriginal maps because they enable forms of association that make possible the building of empires...and a concept of land ownership that can be subject to juridical processes."133 If empire building is your aim, then he's probably right. But if it is a more nuanced way of engaging experience and knowing and understanding your local environment, then mappings are the more powerful.134 Western maps handle discrepant cultural spaces by overlooking them. They are accessible to the relatively uninitiated, but are not the territory they claim to represent. Mappings, by contrast, are infrastructural to the worlds they construct, so that only those initiated in them can travel beyond surface experience.135 But they are able to flex, in order to admit, and then incorporate alien bodies, events, or spaces into their own orbit.136 Although not theorized in this way, this capacity was not lost on Native peoples in British Columbia. As Okanagan Chief John Chillihitza stated it in 1877, "while you white chiefs have your paper writing to speak from afar we, too, have our writing, but it is the tongue that writes, and our intelligence travels fast."137

The second is that if foreign events could be incorporated with domestic technologies, the reverse was also true. In most instances, it was artefactual — the adoption of

133 In Maps, op. cit., 95.
134 Ryan (in Cartographic Eye/I, op. cit., Chapter 6) has made a similar point.
135 Turnbull, D. Maps, op. cit., Exhibit 5. A similar point has been made by Crang, V. Uncommon Ground, op. cit., Chapter 9.
136 Although from the standpoint of narratives specifically, Cauthers, J. (in 'Some reflections', op. cit.) has made a similar point.
European tools and utensils a case in point. But it also extended to technologies of representation. As hinted in Chapter 1, cartography is certainly one of them. Photography was another. Early on, Native people were suspicious of photographs because they were perceived as 'copying people'; appropriating their image was the same as appropriating their essence. Later on, though, they solicited it, posing themselves in front of the camera as they wished to be seen. Some Haida engravers are known to have based crest designs on photographic imagery, and by the middle of the 20th century, some chiefs were making their own family albums.138

The third, and most important, point is that the incorporation of foreign events, artefacts and technologies under contact conditions does not require the abandonment of what obtained before. On the contrary, it preserves it. There are two consequences of this, both fundamental to what follows. The first is that incorporating practices used in first space have continued in First National — the fact that First Nations are still here is proof. The second is that it forces us to dramatically expand our definition of First Nations' maps beyond the gallery in Chapter 1, to include territorializing media of the non-cartographic kind. If we agree, for example, that 'picture writing' is a form of mapping, then the same consideration must be extended to signs on the Map of British Columbia (Figure E). This includes an appreciation of what the signs say, and of where they are located. Like picture writing, signs are landmarkings. They convey geographical information, and they designate borders. If so, then we might have to include, where appropriate, art and other forms of two-dimensional picturing.

The same goes for landmarkings in three dimensions. If we agree that the tepee, longhouse, or sweathouse were places of cultural cohesion and social incorporation, then the museum or heritage park must serve a similar function in the modern era (Figure F). The role of the museum in the imperial imagination is doubtless indisputable.

138 The Haida thought that the camera functioned like a mask, transformatively; indeed, their word for the camera, when translated, meant 'copy'. See, in this connection, Margaret Blackman, "Copying people": Northwest coast Native response to early photography' BC Studies 52, 1981, 86-112.
Figure E(a-d)
It is getting increasingly difficult to physically travel across the Map of British Columbia without coming across 'signs pointing to wonders' like these. Not too long ago, before the modern land claims process was front and center on the public agenda, non-Natives would likely have dismissed such postings as curiosities at best, perhaps wishful thinking at worst. No longer. In these examples, (a) signposts the turnoff to the Nass valley (Maps 9, 11, 15 and 22) on Yellowhead Highway 16 outside Terrace while (b) announces that point on the logging road leading southwest from Hanceville (on Highway 20 west of Williams Lake) at which one crosses into Xeni Gwet'in territory (Maps 20 and 25). Other signs are more authoritative; "public testimony that the land has always been used or occupied by Tsilhqot'ins" (Miriam Machuca Wise, in her 'Tsilhqot'in Title', *Wolf Howls* 4[10], 1998, 13) (c) was posted to slow speeding logging trucks disturbing the Nagwentled (Farwell Canyon) fishery, while (d) lets drivers know that they are entering Gwetsilh (Siwash Flats), a sacred gathering area on a secondary road off Highway 20 between Redstone and Alexis Creek ([a-b] author's photos, 1995 and 1996 respectively; [c-d] copied, with permission, from reproductions in ibid.).
More substantial than 'signs pointing to wonders' are the 'landmarkings containing wonders'. The two shown here are the Xatsu'll Heritage Park at Soda Creek (a) and the Kwagiulth Museum and Cultural Center at Cape Mudge (b). There are marked differences between them. The heritage park is an open-air display, and a generalized representation of northern Secwepemc material culture. Visitors may overnight in the tepees, while site hosts tell stories and prepare traditional foods. Packaged for the tourist gaze, the overall aesthetic is one of traditionality. The museum is an enclosed structure, shaped to represent a sea snail to emphasize the Kwakwaka'wakw connection to the sea. Two poles and four (relocated) petroglyphs (the white stones along the walk) characterize the grounds, but inside the standard museological architecture rules. Contained in bright, hermetically sealed glass cases, the artefacts are mostly those confiscated by the Indian agent in 1922, but returned to the village in 1979. The captions provide a contextual history of the objects, but almost nothing on the families that owned them. The property exhibited here is private, not cultural or tribal, and the overall aesthetic is one of modernity. What both sites do share is that unified field of representation in which the perceptual apparatus of the colonizer is effectively turned against itself (a author's photo, 1998; b with permission, from postcard donated by museum, n.d.).
The cultural historian Tony Bennett, has shown how the birth of the public museum in Europe circa the turn of the 19th century could not be disassociated from the then-emergent social scientific disciplines like anthropology and ethnography, the increasingly governmental aspect of culture, and more disciplinary forms of social regulation.\(^{139}\)

The museum was a space of representation in which articles of indigenous manufacture could be detached from context and consigned to gallery cases according to a European classificatory logic. By directing visitors along paths, and through period or theme rooms in a pre-ordained way, museums "constructed man in a specific relation of both subject and object to the knowledge it organiz[ed]."\(^{140}\)

Museums were thus players in a unified exhibitionary complex in which a racialized and deterritorialized other could be inserted into a visual narrative of modernity and progress.\(^{141}\)

The Kwagiulth Museum and Cultural Center and the Xatsu'll Heritage Park are, however, something quite different. To the extent that they reorganize the domain of the visible and the invisible, and mythologize "a specially authentic, intense or direct contact with [a] sacred subject,"\(^{142}\) both qualify as museums. The difference is that their locations are not incidental to their contents, and the objects displayed are of autochthonous manufacture. They also tend to have live actors, Native people in traditional dress, and engaged in traditional activities (dancing, carving, or the preparation of traditional foods, etc.). On this view, these places are cultural centers, because they are "continuations of indigenous traditions of storytelling, collection and display."\(^{143}\)

\(^{139}\) In The Birth, op. cit. In my view, this is the most comprehensive account of the ways in which museums influence cultural politics, perception and behaviour by regulating seeing, historicizing time and representing otherness. A shorter, more accessible discussion is Stephen Bann, 'Views from the past', in Gordon Fyfe and John Law (eds), Picturing Power (London: Routledge, 1988), 39-64.

\(^{140}\) Bennett, T. The Birth, op. cit., 7. The use of the term 'man' was deliberate.

\(^{141}\) See, also, Mitchell, T. Colonizing, op. cit.; and Gregory, D. Geographical, op. cit., Chapter 1.


\(^{143}\) Clifford, J., in 'Four northwest coast museums', in Ivan Karp and Shirley Lavine (eds), Exhibiting Cultures (Washington: Smithsonian Institute Press, 1991), 212-54; quote is 215.
tive perspective, in other words, cultural centers are part of a more unified field of cartographic practice concerned with the reassertion of identity and the staking of place.

If we accept that bodily practices were basic to territorialization in first space, then we may have to include blockades and occupancies in First National (Figure G). While blockades and occupancies almost always garner front-page headlines — where they are typically dismissed as the work of malcontents at best, or terrorists at worst — they have received little attention in the academic literature. The exception is the geographer Nicholas Blomley, who, in a wide ranging empirical survey of First Nations' blockades in British Columbia between 1984 and 1995, has suggested that they are deployed either to curtail the movement of others (to protest an unrelated grievance), or to obstruct the circulation of capital through, into, or out of a traditional territory. In the first instance, they are designed to attract media or governmental attention and are therefore primarily symbolic; in the second, with the movement of primary commodities out of the territory at issue, they are more overtly political.144

While I agree with Blomley that it is the immediacy of blockades and occupancies that is strategic, they are clearly a lot more than this. Like signs, they construct boundaries, but boundaries that can be policed. In this sense, they are a throwback to the inherently corporeal character of marking, claiming and defending territory. Grouped together, and viewed from the perspective of the orthogonal grid they 'punch holes' in the Map of British Columbia, destabilizing its mimetic authority (Map 40). From a Native perspective they are the nodal points of a system of terrestrial cartography, the object of which is to physically reterritorialize a landscape deterritorialized by the lines of sight of the cartographic eye/I.

Clearly, I am not trying to diminish the overriding importance of Native cartography. Cartography remains the dominant territorializing medium in the simulacrum, and

---

144 See, again, "Shut the province down", op. cit.
Figure G(a-b)
To a point, blockades serve exactly the same purpose as signs (Figure E). As shown here in two photographs from the confrontation at Gustafsen Lake in 1995 (a-b) they demarcate sites where boundaries suddenly and dramatically 'presence themselves'. The difference is that blockade boundaries, because they rely on 'bio-power' are active, and defensible, in ways that signed boundaries are not. The tradeoff, though, is that the presencing of bio-power tends to destabilize signs, with the result that boundaries are turned into frontiers — spaces of engagement where bodies constitute new (or reconstitute previously taken for granted) signs, and where identities become increasingly ambiguous ([a] by Mark van Manen, with permission, Vancouver Province Aug 27; [b] by Rick Loughran, with permission, Vancouver Sun Aug 27).
Map 40
Paul de Grace's *British Columbia Native Blockades 1984 - 1995*, Vancouver, 1996, 21 x 27 cm; generalized coloured map showing the approximate locations of Native blockades, occupancies and other forms of direct action in British Columbia over the stated period. As such it does not show the numerous actions before 1985; because of uncertainties over documentation, it might not even show all those struck during the stated period. At any rate, the map shows that some Native groups have used this form of spatial strategy more consistently than others (adapted, with permission, from original in Blomley, N. ""Shut the province down"", op. cit., 13).
BRITISH COLUMBIA
Native Blockades 1984 - 1995

Type of Blockade
- Full (all non-native traffic)
- Partial (selected non-native traffic)
- Information (picketing, leafletting etc.)
- Other (occupancy, sabotage, etc.)
- Threatened (intended only)
it is the incorporation of this technology that is the focus of the study. Nor am I saying that western society does not also territorialize with signs, museums and bodily movement. But understanding how incorporation works, and expanding our definition of cartography are the two essential components of the shift in perspective that an immigrant society must make if it is sincere about a fair and workable settlement of the Indian land question in British Columbia. So far, I have fulfilled two of the four criteria of comprehensiveness that I set out in the Introduction. I have displayed a wide cross-section of First Nations’ maps. I have also shown that while these maps point a trajectory back in time, and across space, the manner in which we interpret and evaluate them ultimately depends less on what they contain than on the perspective through which they are perceived. And I have done both without recourse to more than we have in front of us — the maps themselves. My other two criteria of comprehensiveness remain, however, elusive. I have not yet shown how spaces with different degrees of symmetry are associated with different territorial typologies, and I have not squarely addressed the issue of continuity. By comparing and contrasting the mappings in Chapter 2 with the maps in Chapter 1, and by expanding my definition of cartography, I have skirted the edges of both, but I have not yet demonstrated either. I now have the conceptual and methodological tools to do so. With these in hand, I can now put away that Map, and start travelling again. It is time to leave the orthogonal grid.
Adaawk Gitxsan

The maps can change, you see, you can draw a map here and they say cut it in half and then — but Spookw's territory has its own boundaries from the time that they were here. You see, this is what I mean, I'm going to explain it to you...maps can change, but the territory itself stays, and we know.¹

My first traveller's tale begins in Gitxsan country. The Gitxsan would earn this distinction simply on the basis of the map evidence they adduced in Delgamuukw v. A.G., but their cartography goes much deeper. Dating at least to the turn of the 20th century, they possess one of the oldest independent mapmaking traditions of any First Nation in British Columbia. Their external and internal boundaries, and their main villages, have remained remarkably stable over time. Due in part to the nature of their oral traditions, I have access to ethnohistoric records that are geographically thorough and temporally consistent. Their space was by far one of the most visual of all first spaces in the province and to this extent most like the Euro-Canadian. Indeed, if making visible First National space is our aim, and tracking continuity from first space is our game, we would be hardpressed to justify starting anywhere else. Our main challenge on this exploration, then, is neither one of sources nor of trying to fill in the gaps — it is deciding what to leave out. Where to begin, by contrast, is relatively easy.

Situating the Gitxsan

The Gitxsan are Tsimshian-speaking peoples occupying a large territory of heavily forested mountains, fast flowing rivers and creeks, and alpine lakes approximately bordered by the headwaters of the Xsan (Skeena River) and Txemsem (Nass River) in the north, the Xsi Tsa Muutsax (Zymoetz River) and Wedzen Kwah (Bulkley River) to the south, and from the Xsu Wìi Akxs (Sustut River) and Xsan Togasxw (Driftwood River) in the east, to the Dam Suu Tsìi Ada (Bowser Lake) and Xsi Ans'pa yaxw (Kispiox Riv-

er) and Tsihl Gwellii (Cedar River) in the west. Their neighbours to the north are the Tahltn, to the east the Babine (Carrier) and Sekani, to the southeast the Wet'suwet'en (Carrier), to the southwest the Coast Tsimshian, and to the west the Gitanyow and Nisga'a. Their name for themselves comes from the prefix 'git' or 'kit' (meaning 'people of') and Xsan, and so translates as 'people of the Skeena River'.

Occupying a topographically differentiated region where three distinct biogeoclimatic zones converge, theirs was a land of natural abundance. Like all the Tsimshian-speaking peoples, the Gitxsan were mostly sedentary, living in large permanent dahk (timbered houses) clustered in salmon-fishing galts'ap (villages) through most of the year. The people dispersed into hunting and/or gathering territories (especially in winter), or to satellite fishing stations on lakes or tributary streams (usually in the spring or fall) according to the relative availability of resources. Residence in, and identification with any one galts'ap was identified by the prefix 'git' or 'kit' and a stem describing the physical or experiential attributes of the site. So, for example, Gitanmaax (now Hazelton), was a composite of the prefix 'git' and the stem meaning 'fishing by torchlight', and so translated as 'people where they fish by torchlights'; likewise Kitseguelca (near Skeena Crossing) was a contraction of the prefix and a stem meaning 'sharp pointed mountain' and so translated as 'people of the sharp pointed mountain'. While ethnographers and colonial agents frequently generalized people as residents of galts'ap, settlements were actually composites of constituent and distinct sociopolitical groups.

The principal corporate unit was the wilp (house), a matrilineal descent group of closely related families living (at least in older times) in the same dahk (timber house), and in which there were no ambiguities as to who belonged to it and shared in the priv-

---

2 Sociopolitically the Gitanyow, who occupy that narrow stretch of land between the Gitxsan's western border and the Nisga'a, have always seen themselves as independent, but they are linguistically Gitxsan and they share the same oral traditions, particularly as regards their origins. As we shall see, it is well nigh impossible to find our way around Gitxsan country without also having to spend some time in Gitanyow.
ileges and prerogatives attached thereto. Each wilp bore the name of the simo‘ogyet (hereditary chief) who owned, and regulated access to the fishing stations and gathering/hunting territories associated with it. The huwilp (plural of wilp) belonged, in turn, to larger assemblages called wilnat’ahl (house groups). These were headed by the highest-ranking simo‘ogyet and included anyone who could track genealogical relationships across closely related huwilp (generally, all known relatives) and who shared a common ancestry. The broadest, most diffuse, and most ancient groups were the exogamous pdeek (clans), each consisting of a number of wilnat’ahl and huwilp, but within and between which members may or may not be aware of the exact nature of their relation to them or to each other.

The origins of the pdeek (clans), their ancestral migrations out and away from their 'landing places' (cultural hearths), their bifurcations into wilnat’ahl (house groups) and huwilp (houses), and the subsequent establishment of the gait’s’ap (villages) have been handed down from time immemorial in the adaawk. Roughly speaking a protean, multi-themed oral constitution of stories, genealogies, and laws, adaawk are narratives that "describe what the house stands for, what the chief stands for, what the territory stands for." They are perpetuated in memory training and publicly witnessed and validated in the yukw (potlatch or feast), the main political and ceremonial institution of the northwest coast cultural complex.

Many of these adaawk are very old, reaching back to a time 'when the land was like spring', or 'when there were no trees'. Almost all of the Laxseel/Lax Ganeda (Frog-Ra-

---

3 The wilp is the house as a social unit; the dahk is the built structure in which the house lives.
4 Ethnographers used slightly different terminologies. Viola Garfield (in 'Tsimshian clan and society' University of Washington Publications in Anthropology 7[3], 1939, 167-340) called the pdeek clans, and wilnat'ahl sub-clans, while Barbeau, M. (in Totem Poles of the Gitksan, op. cit.), and Sapir, E. (in A Sketch, op. cit.) called them phratries, reserving the designation clan for the wilnat'ahl. The terms used here are those preferred by Gitxsan today.
6 There is a wide literature on the yukw. A most accessible discussion, especially of the rules governing witnessing, may be found in Mills, A. Eagle Down, op. cit.
ven clan) and *Lax Gibuu* (Wolf clan) *pdeek*, for example, trace their origins to the ancient landing places of *Ts'imianluuskeexs* (near *Dam Suu Tsiis Ada* [Bowser Lake]), *Git-winhlt'uutsxwhl'aks* (on *T'amuutsxwhl'aks* [Blackwater Lake]), or *Gitangasx* (the confluence of the *Xsasn* [Skeena River] and *Xsu Wix Aks* [Sustut River]). On the edges of a still sub-Arctic world, the earliest families huddled together in subterranean pit-houses. As they multiplied, however, they sorted themselves into *pdeek*, *wilnat'ahl* and *huwilp*, built the first *dahk*, and started moving over the land. Many went south to found more permanent *galts'ap* at *Kisgega'as* ('people of the place of seagulls', near the confluence of the *Xsasn* and *Xsu Gwin Liginxw* [Babine River]) or *Galdo'o* ('wild area' on the *Xsasn* 30 miles above *Kisgega'as*); and later to *Ans'pa yaxw* ('people of the hiding place', on the river of the same name at its confluence with the *Xsasn*). Others went southwest to establish *Kitwinkuhl* ('people of the narrow passage', on the *Xsi Tax* [Kitwanga River] twelve miles above its confluence with the *Xsasn*) and then west into what is now Tsimshian and Nisga'a country. There they came into contact with coastal peoples, some of the *Lax Gibuu* reconstituting themselves as the *Lax Skiik* (Eagle clan). Most of the *Lax Skiik* remained on the coast, becoming a dominant *pdeek* in the Tsimshian and Nisga'a, but a few moved back up the *Xsasn*, met up with the *Lax Gibuu* or *Laxseel/Lax Ganeda* already there, and established *Gitwangak* ('people of place of rabbits').

At a somewhat later date, in one of the most famous, best known *adaawk*, the *Gis-kaast* (Fireweed clan) landed at *Laxwiiyip* (the name of a general area on the headwaters of the *Txemsem* [Nass River] in the vicinity of the border with the Tahltans), where they planted the *gilhast* (the first totem pole) and built their first *dahk*. Later, they came into conflict with *Lax Ganeda* already there, migrating further south to establish *Temlaxam* (one mile below and opposite the present site of Hazelton), where they mixed with

---

7 Many of these *adaawk* were transcribed by Barbeau, M. and Beynon, W. in 'Raven clan outlaws of the North Pacific coast', Folklore Division, CMC, Ottawa, 1950; and 'Wolf clan invaders From the northern plateaux among the Tsimsyan', ibid. For Gitanyow only, see Duff, W. (ed) *Histories*, op. cit. Demographically, the *Lax Gibuu* and *Laxseel/Lax Ganeda* (hereafter abbreviated *Lax Ganeda*) were the largest *pdeek* among the Gitxsan; the *Lax Skiik*, by contrast, the smallest.
other peoples moving through the interior. Although destroyed many times — once by Medeek, the supernatural grizzly that rampaged up and down the 'Street of Chiefs' and once by the one-horned matx (mountain goat) who led the people to a feast on Stekyaw-din (Rocher Déboulé) where they were punished for abusing the animals — it rebuilt itself into a metropolis so populous its citizens could shout loud enough to startle geese passing overhead, so broad that when the disoriented birds fell they were still in Temlaxam, but so old that archaeologists have as yet found no trace of it. From there, some wilnat'ahl (house groups) went north into regions not already peopled by the Lax Ganeda or Lax Gibuu. Others established Gitanmaax (a mile above Temlaxam) and Kitseguccla (on the Xsan, 25 miles below Gitanmaax). As already noted in Chapter 1, still others followed the Lax Ganeda or Lax Gibuu to the coast, becoming the Gispudedwada (Killer Whale clan) amongst the Tsimshian and Nisga'a.

As the people travelled, things happened — and it was these events that supplied the contents of adaawk. Some of them involved conflicts with other peoples who were already at a given place, encounters with naxnox (spirit powers) and other memorable experiences. Many involved the acquisition of, and the assertion of ownership over, wilp (house) territories and are geographically precise. Consider, for example, this adaawk describing the ancestral migration of the Lax Ganeda wilnat'ahl of Gamlaxyeltxw and Sindihl from Ts'imanalwiskeeks to Kitwinkuhl. It took place after Gamlaxyeltxw had built his first dahk (timbered dwelling) and had taken as his clan crest the image of a Raven and its offspring, which he had seen carved on a stone figure emerging mysteriously from Dam Suu Tsii Ada (Bowser Lake):

---

8 Coull, C. A Traveller's Guide, op. cit., 179. Temlaxam is at least 3,000, perhaps as much as 8,000 years old. Gitangasx, and Ts'imanalwiskeeks, two of the earliest landing places, may be closer to 10,000.

9 If this migration sounds familiar it should; it is the same described by Wa'moodmxl from a Tsimshian perspective in Chapter 1. The Gitxsan variants are detailed in Harris K. and Robinson F. (eds) Visitors, op. cit. The Giskaast are relative latecomers on the Xsan, but because of the importance of Temlaxam, which anchored a great trans-regional diaspora reaching from the central interior through to the coast, they are generally thought to be the 'real Gitxsan'. They are currently the third largest pdeek.
[Sindih] was the name of the chief, and [Ts'imanluuskeexs], meaning 'wading in water', was the name of the place they came from. In their travels they reached a grassy mountain named [Sga'nisimhabasxw] ('mountain of grass'). They went along the top of the mountain to the other end, which had timber, and gave it the name Laxwiiyip. When they left the mountain, they came to a river flowing south, named [Anxts'imilixnagets] or Wolverine River. Looking back they could see the grass mountain and they felt a great deal of sorrow in their hearts as they sang their first funeral song, *Gamlugaldalgood*, referring to the heaviness of their hearts. They sang it because they were leaving that country and felt very sad. They came to another river [Aksnagyalga], meaning 'river of poor water'. They asked Chief Galga if he drank this water and he said 'yes' and that is why they gave the river that name 'waters of Galga'. They had a ceremony and put their power on that river and land, which meant that it belonged to them as they had found it first. Again they travelled on and reached [Winsgahigu'l Ts'ilaaxs]xw], a long, narrow valley. When Chief [Sindih] had taken the land there and had left their power there, they travelled on again. They reached another river which they named [Xsigigyeenit] meaning 'river above'. It was a good salmon-fishing river in a good country; they built a permanent village here and put their mark on the river, thus claiming ownership of it. Then they thought they would move on and see more country, so they fastened up their homes and left. They found another place and built another village, at [Gitxits'uutx'xwt] meaning place of the seagull hunter. The name of the seagull hunter was [Singewin]; his mother's name was Akslakamsks, meaning 'clear waters at a nice prairie-like place'. The chief built a house, and on the door...was carved a frog, the crest of the people. The name of the door is *Ganawomlakpioor* ('frog on the door'). Once more they moved, leaving their power and mark which made this country theirs, and returned to their former village [Xsigigyeenit]. The reason they were travelling so much was that they were making their map, and on each piece of land when they stopped they had left their mark and power, making it theirs. Still travelling, they arrived at Gitanyow...by following... the...[Xsiyagasgiit] (Cranberry River)] (river that descends gradually). When they arrived the [wilnat'ahl] of the [Lax Gibuu] was already here. The [Lax Ganeda] decided to build a [dahk] close to that of [Gwaas Hlaam]; it was built in the same style as they had built at [Ts'imanluuskeexs]...and was given that name as a house name. The chief was [Sindih], whose name refers to the frayed clothing of those who had travelled so long and far....The chiefs established themselves at [Gitanyow] and raised their poles. The poles gave them their power or coat of arms and gave them the right of ownership of all the lands, mountains, lakes and streams they had passed through or over and camped or built [gals'ap] in. The power of these poles goes unto the lands they had discovered and taken as their own. The power from the house of this chief and his council goes as far as [Gitxits'uutx'xw], the place of the seagull hunter, and includes [Xsigigyeenit], the 'upper fishing station'. The power of the pole still goes on and belongs to [Sindih].

Other adaawk tell of more recent events in a territorialized landscape, and might not be quite so geographically specific. The following is one of many variants describing the adventures of Nekt ('tongue-licked'), a warrior sim'o'gyet who roamed throughout the northwest culture area during the protohistoric period:

A party of Haida...raided a fishing camp at the mouth of the Nass, massacred many of the occupants, and captured a beautiful young woman of high rank, whose name was Lutraisuh. She became the wife of [Qawq], a Haida chief, and gave birth to two sons, whom the father smothered to death after their birth for fear that some day they might avenge the death of their uncles. Lutraisuh deceived her husband as to the sex of her third child...[and] with the help of some relatives of the Raven crest...murdered [Qawq], cut off his head and escaped by night in a dug-out...[This child] is supposed to have sucked the protruding tongue of his father's head [from which he took the name Nekt]....Lutraisuh was rescued at the mouth of the Nass and was adopted there....Nekt grew into a strong, reckless boy...[and the Nisga'a] finally dismissed both mother and son, who then began a life of wanderings and solitude in the forest. Nekt grew up with but one ambition, that of punishing the wrongs which he and his mother had to suffer. He became a bold and powerful warrior and made friends with some families on the Skeena.... He fashioned for his use an armour out of a grizzly-bear skin reinforced inside with a coat of pitch and flakes of slate, and began his career as a mysterious raider of coast and Nass River settlements. [The Haisla mistook him] for a mythic Grizzly-bear, whose attacks could not be resisted, on account of a magical war-club in his front paw, the Strike-only-once-club. [At Kitimat, Nekt came upon a] chief's house....Outside the door there was a large totem pole. [Nekt asked one of his prisoners] the name of the figure at the top. It was a remarkable carving: as soon as anybody walked near the pole, the bird waved its wings and moved its head. He inquired "How does your uncle call this bird on the end of the totem pole?" She replied "He calls it Live-eagle"....Nekt took [it] as his own [and then fled up the Xsan] ...But his identity was ultimately discovered....[and] several tribes, from Kitimat and the Nass organized together to defeat him and his confederates and curb his as-cent to power. [Nekt] then established his tribal headquarters on Ta'awdzep ('fortress'), a pyramid-like hill 2 miles north of the present village of [Git-wangak]....To protect his stronghold against a surprise attack he made a fence of logs around the five houses of his tribe, and a trap door covered with deer hoofs, which would rattle at the least contact. When the enemies one night tried to climb [the hill], they were crushed to death by logs that rattled down as they were released by the besieged warriors above. Nekt was later wounded, some say by...the first gun in the country...and then clubbed to death.11

Although many adaawk take days to recite and many more have never been translated into English, Sindih'ls and Nekt's demonstrate as well as any how they are the spatial legislation that divides up territories and determines who has what prerogatives and where. Sindih'ls, especially, does so in a distinctly cartographic register. As hinted by the reference to Laxwiiyip (the landing place of the Giskaast) adaawk intersect at many points, but each is still private property — to tell another's adaawk is considered an act of trespass no less than if one is physically in a territory they do not own — but it is better to think of adaawk as owning the wilnat'ahl, huwilp and simo'o'gyet. As Gyolugyet (Mary Mackenzie), a Lax Gibuu from Galdo'o, has it, "[w]ithout the adaawk you can't very well say you are a chief or you own a territory...it has to come first...names come after, songs come after, crests come after...and the territory that's held, fishing places, all those came into one: that's the adaawk"12

On this view, adaawk must be distinguished from the andamahlasxw, a much older corpus of creation narratives that convey the philosophical foundation of society, provide reason or order on land, or teach ethical values13. Some describe how tricksters like Weegyet spilled buckets of water thieves from 'an old man', creating the rivers and lakes; burst 'balls of light' in order to bring sunshine to the world; or levelled mountains in order to make passage over the land easier.14 Others are concerned with the ways in which people learn moral lessons through their interaction with the environment and the animals in it. Unlike adaawk, then, andamahlasxw appear in many variants and belong to everybody. The point at which andamahlasxw yields to adaawk is not fixed — elements of each are frequently embedded in the other — but we could say that the former operates primarily in mythic time, while the latter takes over as the first families begin to move over the land and sequential time begins. Essentially, the cosmology of Git-

12 Cited in Monet, D. and Skanu'u, Colonialism, op. cit., 28.
13 Sterritt et. al. Tribal Boundaries, op. cit., 1.
14 As may be recalled, these roles were performed by Tjemsem in Nisga'a country; and by Raven in Tsimshian. The point, again, is that they are one and the same agent by a different name.
xsan society is transmitted in *andamahlasxw* and the concrete temporal and geographic experiences in *adaawk*.

**A cartography of crests**

A more engaged reading of these *adaawk* confirms my Chapter 1 hypothesis on the cartographic function of songs and totem poles. As noted in 'Wa'moodmxl's, and now here in Sindihl's narrative, many of these events were recorded sonorously, in the *limx'oy* (dirge songs). They were private property and performed in the *yukw* (feast) by the *simo'ogyet* (hereditary chief) that owned them.\(^\text{15}\) As shown in both these *adaawk*, however, most were recorded visually in the *ayuuks* (Gitxsan crests). A few were reproduced on regalia and *dahk* walls, but the majority were carved on the *xwtsaan* (Gitxsan totem poles) (Figure H). They "ha[d] two major colours...black, which represent[ed] the people that went before...and the red, which show[ed] the bloodshed that went into the land as" the territories were acquired and defended.\(^\text{16}\) Although they were also private property they could be jointly owned. Because *pdeek* (clan) or legendary *ayuuks* were bestowed down the matriline, in the *yukw*, they would tend to repeat themselves across many *xwtsaan* belong to a *wilnat'ahl*. Heraldic *ayuuks*, however, could wind up on almost any *xwtsaan*. Indeed, over half of the *xwtsaan* at Gitwangak displayed *ayuuks* of *Nekt*.\(^\text{17}\) They could be acquired by conquest, as compensation for a crime, or to cover a debt, and were typically exchanged in a *xsiisxw* (treaty or peace pact). A few were honorific. Classifying any one *xwtsaan* as mainly memorial, legendary or heraldic depended, then, on what category of *ayuuks* was most dominant, but interpretation was not for the uninitiated. One had to have a working familiarity with the *adaawk* in which they

---

\(^{15}\) These songs are among the most private of all Gitxsan cultural property. Unlike the *adaawk*, which are often written in different languages, *limx'oy* are only recited in the ancient tongues in which they were first composed.

\(^{16}\) Alice Jeffrey, in 'Remove not the landmark', in Frank Cassidy (ed), *Aboriginal Title and British Columbia: Delgamuukw vs. the Queen* in (Montreal: Oolichan, 1992), 51-61, quote is 59.

\(^{17}\) See, in this connection, MacDonald, G.F. *The Totem Poles*, op. cit.
Figure H(a-b)

Sindihl's xwtsaan Hanelalgag ('where the raven sleeps with its young') at Gitanyow (a); and Nekt's xwtsaan Kanuget ('man crushing log') at Gitwangak (b). One of three xwtsaan in front of dahk G1 on Map 41(b), (a) is primarily memorial in character and one of the tallest known. According to Beynon's informants, on top is Sindihl's pdeek ayuuk, raven with two offspring; followed by an unidentified figure holding Gamlayeltxw's copper, denoting his wealth; and a three-faced family ayuuk. The three 'people of the ladder' ayuukks, and Ranaxs itself, recall the time when Sindihl's ancestors still lived in pit-houses at Ts'imanlanluuskeexs; the Mawdzek ayuuk represents the pictures of eagles painted on Ranaxs. Ganawomlakptoor is the ayuuk on the dahk at Gitxits'uxtx'xwt, while the 'headdress of the upper river' refers to the time spent at Xsigiyeenit. Semgyaks is a large kingfisher that rescued one of Gamlayeltxw's brothers who got lost in the woods at Ts'imanlanluuskeexs. Shown as pole 19 on Map 41(a), (b) is one of four xwtsaan raised by Nekt's family, and is purely heraldic. From top to bottom are the ayuukks of the ptaw at the Ta'awdzep; Giludal, which Nekt took from the Haisla; and, shown in grizzly form and holding Gelaxt, Nekt himself. Below is Kanuget and the ayuuk of two crushed Haisla warriors. (Other Gitwangak xwtsaan display the ayuukks 'half-way-out' and 'man-cut-in-half'; the former was a Haisla warrior who ran into Klaxgyels [Lakelse Lake] before expiring, the other one whom Nekt severed in half with his knife.) Described in another Lax Ganeda adaawk, Maxkyawl is a supernatural being found on a snag surfacing from an unnamed lake by one of Nekt's relatives. In still another version of Nekt's adaawk, Gepigamganao is a flying frog Nekt retrieved from Dam Kitwinkuhl (Kitwancool Lake). (For more on Nekt, Ta'awdzep, and the Gitwangak xwtsaan, see George F. MacDonald, Totem Poles and Monuments of Gitwangak Village (Ottawa: Environment Canada, 1984) ([a] by Harlan Smith, 1915 [RBCM neg. no. PN1228, Victoria]; [b] by G.T. Emmons, 1926 [NAC neg. no. PA95505, Ottawa]).
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were ensconced. If a wilp wanted to display many crests, it would spread them across more than one xwtsaan. Ayuuks commemorating epitomizing events (such as the 'people of the ladder' on xwtsaan Hanelalgag) were often repeated. Interpretation was further complicated by the finite range of available images. The ayuuk of the eagle, for example, could be a Lax Skiiik (Eagle clan crest) in one context, a legendary crest in another (as it is on xwtsaan Hanelalgag), or a heraldic crest in yet another (as it is on xwtsaan Kanuget). At any rate, each ayuuk was clearly much more than merely a piece of heraldry or coat-of-arms. It was an event recorder that referred to a place. That there were few rules governing the sequencing of ayuuks on xwtsaan confirms that it was the geography of events, and not their chronology, that was most important.18

This thesis calls into question Levi-Strauss's claim that the mere existence of totemism is more important than its substantive content.19 On the contrary, Gitxsan totemism is as much a territorializing, as it is a classificatory, system. These xwtsaan are named things — transactional artefacts that identify, and record for posterity, the accumulation of material, propretiary and symbolic capital. When planted in the ground, just like the gilhast (first totem pole) of the Giskaast, they become markers of daxgyet (power and identity). As Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw have put it, "the pole...recreates, by reaching upwards, the link with the spirit forces that give the people their power...at the same time it is planted in the ground where its roots spread out into the land".20 As such, xwtsaan could only be erected in the yukw (feast), where the witnessing and validation of daxgyet took place. In brief, then, adaawk are not reducible to myths, songs, or folk tales on the one hand, much less to images or representations on the other. An adaawk

20 In Spirit in the Land (Gabriola: Reflections, 1989), 27.
is all of these things, but none of them. But if it is mostly anything, it is mostly geography. As Gyolugyet has it, "it's not a story, it's just how people travelled, is adaawk."\(^{21}\)

**Gitxsan spatial typology**

The question, however, is what kind of spatial typology was this? There was not, in a strict sense, a map of *adaawk*, but if we were inserted into the early Gitxsan world we would find that much, on the face of it, was not that different than our own. Like Westerners the Gitxsan selected their *galt's'ap* (village) sites carefully. All were aesthetically pleasing, near resource gathering sites, and defensible. *Ta'awdzep* was only one of a several similar fortifications throughout the northwest coast culture complex (other Gitxsan forts were at *Kisgega'as* and *Ans'pa yaxw*). Reaching over canyons on a series of spectacular cantilever bridges built according to engineering standards usually attributed to European designers, dozens of trails linked the *galt's'ap*, fishing stations, and *wilp* territories together, and into the outside world.\(^{22}\) The Nisga'a-Gitanyow grease trail was so heavily trafficked, it was cut a meter deep by the time Charles Horetzky used it while surveying for the Canadian Pacific.\(^{23}\) The trail system was signposted too. The Gitxsan used *anlii'iusxw* (corner posts, usually blazed tree stumps) to notify travellers they were crossing from one *wilp* territory to another. They also carved *gyet'im gan* ('faces in the forest') on trees to record their passing through a territory (Figure I). Indeed, territories were even claimed by the same symbolic acts later used by Europeans — the difference is that early explorers planted Christian crosses, while the Gitxsan planted canes or *xwtsaan*. Every place had a name describing the physical, biotic or experiential attributes of the site. Like Euro-Canadian space, then, Gitxsan space was also visual, hierarchical, and configured to provide a place for everyone, and everyone in their proper place.

---

\(^{21}\) Cited in Monet, D. and Skanu'u *Colonialism*, op. cit., 28.


While most anliit'iisxw marked house boundaries, not all gyet'im gan necessarily did. Found near the Xsi Ans'pa yaxw (Kispiox River) during a Xsi Gwin Liginsxw (Babine River) roadblock in 1989, some blockaders thought that this one "may have been a boundary marker for the wilp of Geel (standing by it), since it was in the vicinity of the frontier of several house territories, and boundary markers were a common practice among the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en house chiefs" (Glavin, T. Death Feast, op. cit., 153). Elders were less sure, suggesting that many 'faces in the forest' were the result of artistic impulse, and that any proximity to a house boundary was coincidental (by Dan Muldoe, with permission, from Monet, D. and Skanu'u, Colonialism, op. cit., 210).
Unlike the Euro-Canadian, however, this was decidedly not grid space. The boundaries that partitioned it were not generated by reference to externally measured limits. They were generated from inside the territory — in the galts'ap (village), in the limx'oy (songs) and yukw (feast), and on the xwtsaan (totem poles). Although migrating wilnat'ahl (house groups) and huwilp (houses) often carried miniature carved xwstaan, the full size versions were always raised in whichever galts'ap the wilnat'ahl or huwilp took permanent residence (Figure J). They were arranged in a linear fashion (Map 41), fronting the dahk (dwellings), with the ayuuk facing the river. Indeed one could almost argue that they 'gazed towards' the territories they referenced, or, alternatively, that it was 'through' the ayuuk that adaawk maintained surveillance over them. These territories were certainly real property. As Kispiox Chief Charles Wesley later averred, "all these hunting grounds [are] just the same as a bank where we have our money; and all these little lakes where we...get our fish the same as a kitchen box where we put our food." But they were not real estate. As Txemsim (Alfred Mitchell), a Giskaast from Galdo'o has phrased it, the Gitxsan "didn't go by square miles, they go by their boundaries, and that's what they had it in, their head, and that's what they are using." From a Gitxsan perspective, the xwtsaan were not preoccupied with looking or speaking out. It was in being looked after and spoken of that they confirmed a wilp "did exist, does exist, and will continue to exist" and did so in a defined space. The xwtsaan did not map house boundaries directly; they summarized the cultural material that authorized them. It is in this sense that each territory was "like an animal, and [the] village, which [was] situated in it...its heart." That the xwtsaan were, as often as not, some distance from the territories they referenced is, from this perspective, irrelevant.

---

24 As noted in Chapter 2, footnote 15, this helped travelling simo'ogyet remember certain images.
25 Field minutes from the Babine Agency, MMRC, April 16, 1915, 34.
26 Cited in Monet, D. and Skanu'u Colonialism, op. cit., 69.
27 From an address by Gitwangak simo'ogyet to miners on Lorne Creek in 1884, cited in Monet, D. and Skanu'u Colonialism, op. cit., 85.
28 Hanamuxw (Joan Ryan), a Giskaast from Kitsegual, in ibid., 85.
Figure J(a-b)
Panoramic views of the galts'ap of Gitwangak (a) and Gitanyow (b) as they looked around the turn of the century. Reading south to north (left to right) in (a), and coded numerically to the plan in Map 41(a) are the xwtsaan of the Lax Skii'k's Qawq (12), Te'walasxw (11 and 10 [having the dog salmon fin ayuuk on top]), and Gwis Gyen (8 [with the ayuuk of the eagle on top]). (Xwtsaan 9, also a Lax Skii'k, has fallen down and is barely visible between 10 and 8.) Beyond 8 are xwtsaan of the Lax Gibuu's Axtee (7 and 6 [with the ayuuk of the wolf on top]) and Hlawts (5 [with the ayuuk of the mountain lion pointing out behind 7]). (Difficult to see in this view, the two xtwtsaan in the background are probably [2] and [3], and belong to the Lax Ganeda's Wii Hlengwax). Working south to north (left to right) in (b), and coded by name to the plan in Map 41(b) are the xwtsaan and dahk of the Lax Gibuu's Haits'imasxw, Malii, Wiiitsxw, and Gwaas Hlaam; and the Lax Ganeda's Gamlax-yeltxw, Sindihl, Luuxhon and Gwinuu ([a] by Harlan Smith, 1915 [CMC, image no. 34596, Hull]; [b] by G.T. Emmons, 1910 [RBCM, neg. nos. P4054/55, Victoria]).
Map 41(a-b)
Donald Kappler’s *untitled* map of Gitwangak (a), Ottawa, 1984; and Gitanyow Chiefs’ *untitled* map of Kitwancool (b), Gitanyow, 1984, each about 15 x 13 cm; generalized *galts’ap* plans showing the arrangement of *dahk* and *xwtsaan* in the early 20th century. Few Gitxsan *xwtsaan* were of the house-frontal kind (recall Figure A) but they were aligned symmetrically, and positioned so that the side displaying the *ayuuks* faced the river. The *dahk* formed a second row behind. Reflecting the seating arrangements in the *yukw*, the leading lineages in the *galts’ap* generally occupied the center of the alignment. (Exceptions to this basic pattern, such as at *Gitwangak*, were the result of post-contact migration) ([a] copied, with permission, from MacDonald, G. *The Totem Poles and Monuments*, op. cit., 33; [b], with permission, from Gitanyow Hereditary Chiefs’ *Adaawhi Gitanyaaw*, op. cit., 31).
Lefebvre would call this space monumental space — the space that embodies the potentialities of all possible forms of spatiality but in which representation has not detached itself from the represented and from which true iconicity has not emerged — but I find this too general. To call it 'totemic space' is to freight it with too much structuralist baggage and not to distinguish it from purely totemic (animistic) spaces. This space was, rather, what I shall call a mosaicked space. It was a space in which each piece of the mosaic was an irregularly shaped wilp territory, and which, fitted together like a jigsaw, constituted the basic architecture of the Gitxsan land tenure system. Some of the 'contents' of the various pieces — the xwtsaan, the ayuks, the dahks — were of the material kind. Clustered in or near the galt'sap they gave each piece of the mosaic its 'center of gravity'. But because there were many wilp territories and only a handful of galt'sap, the centers were shared spaces. Other contents — the limx'oy, the adaawk, and the genealogies — reached across wilp boundaries, maintaining symmetry between centers and between the centers and the outlying wilp territories. The configuration of this mosaic at any point in time is formatted by adaawk, and it has changed over time (most recently following the Tsetsaut wars in the late protohistoric period). But its basic form — in essence, a clustered mosaic, each segment bounded by natural and genealogical criteria — has remained constant all the way back to 'when the land was like spring'.

Reserves and resistance on the Xsan

Sometime during the late 18th or early 19th century, however, the Gitxsan discovered Europe. At first it was vicarious, Europe's presence betrayed only by unfamiliar artefacts circulating through the territory along the grease trails, and broken accounts of

29 In Production, op. cit., 224.
30 Now extinct, but quite likely the 'people of the ladder' in Sindih'i's adaawk, the Tsetsaut were the Athapaskan group that cohabited the area around Laxwiiyip and Ts'imantlaweex back when the land was like spring. The adaawk describing these conflicts have been recorded in both Duff, W. (ed) Histories, op. cit., and Sterritt, N. et. al. Tribal Boundaries, op. cit.
strangers who came from far away. Already, though, adaawk were adjusting to changed conditions. As hinted at the end of Nekt's saga, some of this presence was incorporated narratively. Elsewhere, it was expressed in the graphical arts. Because they were split and so represented a transformation, Barbeau was convinced that the ayuuk of the eagle on Qawq's xwtsaan at Gitwangak were not his pdeek ayuuk but incorporations of the Russian imperial eagle, acquired from the Tlingit.\footnote{Although the angle prohibits the full view, this xwtsaan is foreground in Figure J(a) and numbered (12) on Map 41(a). For more on this pole, see MacDonald, G.F. The Totem Poles, op. cit., 93.} First contact with the am sii wa ('white driftwood on the beach') was extra-territorial. The HBC built Fort Kilmaurs on D'am Gwin Liginsxw (Babine Lake) in 1822, and Fort Connolly on D'am Smax (Bear Lake) near the ancient site of Gitangax in 1826, but the company found the Gitxsan reluctant continental traders and rarely ventured along the Xsan itself.\footnote{Maureen Cassidy, From Mountain to Mountain (Hazelton: Ans'pa yaxw School Society, 1984), 16. The Gitxsan preferred to trade with the coast, and neither fort sustained more than intermittent traffic. Kilmaurs was abandoned a few years later, and replaced by Fort Babine at the head of the lake, but by then the trade's best years were already behind it.} By the middle of the century, sorties were more frequent but traders were after fur, not land, and were incorporated nicely into northwest coast modes of production. As more wealth circulated through the contact zone, the Gitxsan's sense of daxgyet (identity and power) would have been intensified but not threatened, and it was in this period that some of the most elaborate xwtsaan that would later so impress Barbeau, were erected.\footnote{For Barbeau, Gitxsan carvers were less skillfull than their Nisga'a or Haida kinsmen; what impressed him was that the Gitxsan's xwtsaan were generally taller, older, and had survived, relatively intact, in greater numbers, than on the outer coast (see Totem Poles of the Gitksan, op. cit., 1-6).}

In 1862, however, a smallpox epidemic spread north, by all accounts killing some 30% of the Gitxsan.\footnote{This was not the first epidemic to strike the Gitxsan; it was one of the more serious.} Three years later, the Collins Overland Telegraph (COT) — destination Europe, via New Westminster, central British Columbia, and the Bering Strait — reached the south bank of the Wedzen Kwah (Bulkley River) at Tse Kya (the Wet'suwet'en galts'ap across and just upriver from Gitsanmaax). The Gitxsan feared this 'talking wire' — a new naxnox (spirit power) — because of the realization that now anyone
could potentially hear the contents of adaawk, and they threatened to kill the first lineman crossing the river. Eventually, however, a compromise was reached, the company constructing Fort Stager on the east bank of the Xsan, and by late 1866 the 'talking wire' had linked the galts'ap of Ans'pa yaxw and Gitanmaax to the outside world. The line was extended another 60 kilometers beyond Ans'pa yaxw but when the trans-Atlantic cable was completed construction stopped, and in 1869 Fort Stager was abandoned. The Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en promptly burned the fort and telegraph poles, salvaging the wire for fencing and bridge repair at Tse Kya and Ans'pa yaxw.

At first life in the galts'ap continued pretty much as before, the simo'ogyet and yukw holding the balance of territorial power, but with the telegraph trail in place Euro-Canadian infiltration increased. In 1870 the HBC set up a trading post at Gitanmaax and by 1871 the newly incorporated town of Hazelton had started to mushroom up around it, attracting independent traders, doctors, miners, and wage labour for those Gitxsan that wanted it. A new government pack road was built across the bridge at Tse Kya, and up the Xsa'an Tsam Lan (Suskwa River) grease trail to D'am Gwin Liginsxw, connecting to the trail to the Omenica goldfields. In 1872 careless prospectors torched the galts'ap of Kitsegucla, destroying twelve dahk and and a half dozen xwtsaan. A mere footnote in Euro-Canadian historical accounts, it was devastating to the Gitxsan, not only because of the loss of symbolic capital — Giskaast Chief Guxsan, who owned many of the xwtsaan, was "so much affected that [he] stayed a month [in Hazelton] for want of courage to visit the scene of [his home]" — but because of "the labour in rebuilding and expense of calling together many tribes" — without which, under adaawk Gitxsan, re-

39 Cited in ibid. Viewing the incident from both the Gitxsan and Euro-Canadian perspectives, this paper is the definitive account of the events leading up to, during, and after the conflagration.
construction could not take place. The villagers immediately blockaded the Xsan to all traffic, ceasing only after meeting with government agents and a promise of compensation. Over the next few years, the galts'ap was rebuilt just upriver from the old site.\textsuperscript{40}

Where there was colonization, there was also religion. As missions were established at Ans'pa yaxw (Anglican, in 1879) and Kitseguala (Methodist, 1885), some Gitxsan began converting to Christianity and, almost imperceptibly, the carving of ayuuk and xw-tsaaan declined. Both churches frowned, however, on any display of (what they saw as) heathenism, and campaigned for their outright destruction, a task that received tacit legal sanction with the 1884 law banning the yukw.\textsuperscript{41} Whether over dogma, or because of visions of personal aggrandization, conflict between the missionaries inevitably played itself out genealogically within the Gitxsan community, splitting the galts'ap along denominational lines. At Kitseguala, the Methodist faction moved to a new upriver site at Siits'eet'ixs (Carnaby) while followers of the Salvation Army went down to Taxh'loaulitxw' (Andimaul), leaving the original site to the unconverted.\textsuperscript{42} At Ans'pa yaxw Anglican converts moved a few kilometers up the Xsi Ans'pa yaxw, building a mission and a hospital at An'kitlaas. After abandonment in 1883, the Methodists set up shop in Ans'pa yaxw and, over the next fifteen years, built their own churches, a number of single family frame dwellings in the European style, and a sawmill, the first in the valley. An experiment in venture capital, it was financed by the villagers and operated up until 1914, when completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway (GTP) and the town of Hazelton left it without a market. Methodist converts then came into conflict with Salvation Army faithful, who moved to Glen Vowell, halfway downriver towards Gitanmaax.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{40} The present village layout can be previewed in Map 45.

\textsuperscript{41} See, in this connection, Douglas Cole and Ira Chaikin, An Iron Hand Upon the People: The Law Against the Potlatch on the Northwest Coast (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1990). Generally speaking, the Gitxsan managed, as did many First Nations in the province, to resist such overtures.

\textsuperscript{42} For details, see Charlotte Sampare (ed), Adawkhl Gitsegukla (Kitseguala: Gitsegukla History and Development Project, 1979), 2-5.

\textsuperscript{43} For details see, again, Cassidy, M. From Mountain, op. cit., 19-30.
But the most intense assault on the authority of ayuuk and yukw began in 1889 when the 'visitors who would never leave' established the Babine Indian Agency at Hazelton. In 1891 the Indian reserve commissioner, Peter O'Reilly, on a three-week blitz through the territory, and bearing transits instead of xwtsaan, strung fifteen small reserves along the banks of the Xsan and Xsi Ans'pa yaxw: three at Kitseguela (and identified, inexplicably, as the Babine Nation); eight at Gitwangak; three at Ans'pa yaxw (named the Kispiox tribe, and one of which was hived off to the separate Glen Vowell Band); and one at Gitanmaax (and renamed as the Getanmax Band, Hazelton Tribe). He allotted no reserves at Gitanyow. When "a few of the Indians [at Ans'pa yaxw] objected to reserves being assigned at all, O'Reilly "explained the meaning of the agreement made [with the village] and what would be the result if they failed to do their duty" (even though it was clear that no such agreement had ever been reached), and that, in any event, "a reserve when made protects the land from trespass by others [and] the Indian still has the right to hunt, fish, or gather berries outside."44 In his annual report, he acknowledged the resistance of some of the chiefs had made it impossible to complete all his anticipated allotments but he concluded, regardless, that "the greater number appeared glad that the land question was about to be finally settled and expressed themselves well satisfied with the extent of the reserves I defined for them."45

The Gitxsan at the MMRC

In 1898, A.W. Vowell made a second pass through Gitxsan country, allotting three reserves at Gitanmaax and one each at Galdo'o and Kisgega'as. In 1910, the Indian agent subdivided the reserves at Gitanmaax and Kispiox, and in this way did "[s]mall, white-style strips of land replace house and crest ownership of the whole valley."46

44 To the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Annual Report, 1891, 77.
45 Ibid.; for Gitxsan recollections of the allotments at Ans'pa yaxw, see Cassidy, M. From Mountain, op. cit., 24-33; for the Wet'suwet'en's at Tse Kya, see Cassidy, M. 'The Gathering Place', op. cit., 30-3.
46 Cassidy, M. From Mountain, op. cit., 27.
Resistance intensified. In 1908 Squamish Chief Joe Capilano toured the valley, and a Gitxsan delegation led by Chief Wesley went to Ottawa to press their claims with Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier. In 1909, Gitxsan chiefs stopped road building crews at Kispiox (where seven of them were arrested) and obstructed GTP surveyors at Gitwangak. And in 1910, Gitwangak and Gitanyow chiefs pinned notices of their claims invoking the 1763 Royal Proclamation along trails throughout the Hazelton District.47

That the Gitxsan had by now become familiar with the representational apparatus of the cartographic eye—I, what it meant in practical terms, and how to use it to press their claims, is confirmed by the transcripts of the hearings of the MMRC, which visited the Babine Agency in 1915. As elsewhere in British Columbia, the commissioners tried to solicit information about agricultural prospects, fishing practices, demography, schooling, who was going to what church, and so on, but at every point, the Gitxsan made it clear that any discussion of the land question would take place on their terms or not at all.

At Gitwangak Chief Jim refused to tell the commissioners about "the number of people [on the reserve without] an answer from the government about the land question."48 At Gitanyow, Albert Williams admitted recognizing his village on the government plan, but then produced his own map (Map 42) showing the "little red spots...[where] all different families live...[and claiming] the whole country within th[e] black line."49 When the commissioners asked him if the cartographer was a surveyor Williams advised them that "he was [Kitwancool] and [knew] all about the land there."50 At Andima, an (unidentified) chief again deflected the census question, stating that his people were "not a stranger to this place [and] we know all this belongs to us..."51 Refusing to answer any

47 Monet, D. and Skanu'u, Colonialism, op. cit., 11.
48 Field minutes from the Babine Agency, April 17, 14.
49 Ibid., 17 and 20.
50 Ibid., 19.
51 Ibid., April 20, 28.
Map 42(a-b)

*Biyoosxw's (Sam Douse) (?) untitled* map of the south-ern portion of Gitanyow territory, Gitanyow, 1910 (?), 30 x 18 cm (?); oriented northeast on top, it covers an area between the confluence of the *Anxts'ímiliixnagets* and *Lisims* (upper left) and *Gitwangak* (lower right). It maps the main rivers, the external boundary (the thick black line) and the *galt's'ap* (the spots). As illustrated more clearly in the reconstruction in (b) the original in (a) used the Gitxsan orthography in use at that time, and while only one of the *galt's'ap* (*Gitwangak*) was named, each was identified with a different size of spot (perhaps to reflect their relative size or importance?). Stylistically, it is consistent with the sort of linearized 'route maps' that were being produced by Native people in the latter half of the 19th century (recall Maps 5 and 10), but it confirms that the Gitanyow were becoming more familiar with the planimetry of areal space. Even so, there is some confusion surrounding this map. The map that Williams had at the MMRC was made by *Biyoosxw* in 1910, but it might not be the one pictured here; the original has been lost and has 'survived' only because the ethnographer Louis Shotridge photographed it in 1918. (*That Gitanyow had already recognized 'the power of maps' is evidenced by the fact that when Shotridge asked for the original, he was politely denied. We are indeed fortunate that he was allowed to commit it to film.*) At any rate contemporary Gitanyow simo'ogyet think that even if it is not *Biyoosxw's* original, it is very similar to (or even a copy of) it ([a] copied from original at University of Pennsylvania Museum, photo 14952, Philadelphia; the reproduction in [b] copied, with permission, from Sterritt, N. et. al. *Tribal Boundaries*, op. cit., 68).
more questions until they "go[ ]t their territory back," he produced another map showing "all the camping places on the different creeks" and their claim to all the land "enclosed within [the] red line." At Kitseguacla, Jacob Milton was willing to answer the commissioners' questions, but only if wrapped around his own "map of the territory that [they] claim[ed]," while Chief Molaxan, pointing to the same map, stating "here is our foundation...that God put us on and he stops there." At Kispiox, Charles Wesley "most strenuously objected to...the reserve," while at Gitanmaax, Edward Spouk dismissed O'Reilly's plan, insisting only that he wanted "all the land back" and that's all there was to it. At Galdo'o and Kisgega'as the chiefs refused to answer the commissioners' queries altogether. Not surprisingly, most of these meetings came to a quick and abrupt end. The commissioners added one reserve at Taxh'loaulitxw', three at Gitanyow, and of the thirty four additional fishing stations sought by Ans'pa yaxw alone, but seven.

Tourist trap

The reserve system accomplished at least two things. Along with an accompanying arsenal of regulations (such as fisheries) and legislative instruments (such as the Indian Act), the first was that it compromised the traditional resource economy, and restricted Gitxsan mobility on the ground. Out of their traditional territory of some 30,668 km$^2$ (as now claimed in Map 1), the Gitxsan wound up with a string of 30 reserves totalling 71 km$^2$. To Europeans it was simply a matter of drawing lines. To the Gitxsan, it was like "cutting off...the animal's feet." The second was that customary government

---

52 Ibid. This map, if still it exists, has not been located.
53 Ibid., 32. Nor this one. My own suspicion, however, is that it was the same map. If so, it demonstrates, in conjunction with Map 42, that cartography was, even then, already a collaborative exercise among different Gitxsan huwilp. The significance of this I will come back to below.
54 Ibid., 28.
55 Ibid., 39.
56 Ibid., July 13, 1915, 75.
58 From the same address referenced in footnote 27.
based on the *pdeek, simo'ogyet* and the *yukw* was supplanted by an imposed band council system (which meant the Gitxsan could still have their *simo'ogyet*; they just would not be recognized as such by DIA). This made it easier for DIA to repartition or amalgamate existing bands or reserves at any time, for whatever reason, and without consultation with the Gitxsan. In conjunction with missionization, the overall effect was to remove the last vestiges of Gitxsan self-government, at least for official purposes.

Perhaps of less immediate impact was the government's imposition of the registered trapline system in the 1920s. Ostensibly designed as a solution to the challenge of wildlife management, Indian agents encouraged Aboriginal people throughout the province to register their traplines so that their hunting territories would not be taken up by Euro-Canadians. Unlike the reserves, however, the issue was not, for the Gitxsan, one of perspective.\(^5^9\) Certainly traplines had to be registered by a single person (or a company of persons) and to this extent they did not square with a land tenure system in which a *wilp* could hold more than one territory. But because the government considered traplines to be defined areas, and because *wilp* and watershed boundaries were generally coterminous, Gitxsan *simo'ogyet* were able to register their traplines as individuals, but in such a way as to sustain the "high(est) degree of correspondence between areas registered and hereditary House territories."\(^6^0\) (The Gitanyow solved this problem by registering a single block trapline over the entire territory under the name of a single *simo'ogyet*). The thornier issue concerned the generational duration of traplines. In the registered system traplines had to pass to the holder's son — which was inconsistent with matrilineal descent — so that if one had to trace Gitxsan ownership at a later date he or she would have to establish which matriline held it at the time it was registered. Failure to do so could (and did) lead to the alienation of some traplines by non-Gitxsan.\(^6^1\)

\(^5^9\) As we shall see when we visit Carrier country next outing, the same cannot be said of other spatial typologies in the province; indeed the northwest coast cultural complex was probably the exception.

\(^6^0\) Gisdai Wa and Delgam Uukw *The Spirit*, op. cit., 60.

\(^6^1\) Sterritt, N. et. al. *Tribal Boundaries*, op. cit., 279.
There was more. After World War I the GTP discovered the tourist potential of the remaining xwtsaan (totem poles) and for a time an advertising blitz made the Gitwangan-gak xwtsaan the most photographed subject in North America after Niagara Falls. In 1925, GTP successor CNR, the federal government and the National Museum of Canada (NMC) began a restoration project on the remaining xwtsaan, leading some Gitxsan to wonder why a culture previously so intent on their eradication was now so interested in their salvation. In 1926, A.Y. Jackson and Edwin Holgate visited the Xsan, and their canvasses soon adorned the 'Totem Pole Room' in the Château Laurier in Ottawa. This signalled the appropriation of the totem pole as an unofficial emblem for the province, and was the perfect corollary for Barbeau's contention, two years later, that "the poles have fallen and decayed, and others lean precariously in the wind, soon to come down with a crash....This art now belongs to the past."  

So it must have seemed. From miners to missionaries, and from reserves to registered traplines, wilp (house) territories had been effectively dismembered, and the people confined, as one man from *Ans'pa yaxw* sardonically put it, to "a nice little nest." The population was declining and the galt'sap (villages) of Galdo'o and Kissega'as were deserted. There were more roads, more automobiles, more tourists. Most Gitxsan continued the yukw, but underground — out of sight, as it were, of the surveillant gaze of the cartographic eye — and the carving of ayuuk and xwtsaan waned. Meantime, ethnographers, missionaries, and freelance collectors pirated whatever Gitxsan artefacts they could get their hands on and sent them off to museums in Europe and eastern North America. The majesty and scope of his ethnographic work notwithstanding, Barbeau was one of the worst offenders. As the oldest carvers passed on so also did the

---

63 In *Totem Poles of the Gitksan*, op. cit., 1-3.
64 Cited in Cassidy, M. *From Mountain*, op. cit., 40.
memory of how to carve ayuuk and xwtsaan. At one time, there were no less than 33 xwtsaan standing in Ans'pa yaxw alone, but by 1925 only 22 were in good enough condition to be catalogued, and by 1951 only fourteen — one of them, in a bitter irony, still topped by the ayuuk commemorating the one-horned matx that drew the sinners of Temlaxam to their last supper on Stkwyadin.

**Contesting the gaze**

But it was exactly here that this adaawk of continuity and change on the great bend of the Xsan took an unexpected turn. With the repeal in 1951 of the 1884 law banning the yukw, Wilson Duff and the art historian Bill Holm encouraged a revival of Gitxsan handicraft, and by the late 1960s a new generation of artists was going back into adaawk for information on ayuuks, and to carve xwtsaan. The difference was that while there was a resurgence in ayuuk design, their ordering on a xwtsaan was often driven more by aesthetic than genealogical or territorial considerations. If we were to accept Barbeau's simplistic classification of xwtsaan into welcome, house post, house frontal, memorial, shame and mortuary types as valid, we could say that these carvers added a new type — the commercial, the first xwtsaan commissioned by global forces. Indeed, many of the xwtsaan erected at that time were extra-territorial, located at museums, ferry terminals, shopping malls, hotels, schools, etc. In those days, as the carver Norman Tait later suggested, "many carvers use[d] a general story, a public story, because the poles they [we]re doing [we]re carved for everybody."

However, no cultural revival — even one admittedly commissioned in part by extra-indigenous forces — can take place without some territorial rediscovery, and by the la-

---

65 As may be apparent, Barbeau is an ambiguous figure. Judging from some of his terminology, he appears to have shared all the primitivist biases of Jennessian ethnography. His empirical work on the Gitxsan ayuuk, xwtsaan, and wilp territories is, however, unparalleled, and remains a major source for contemporary Gitxsan researches.

66 Cassidy, M. *From Mountain*, op. cit., 42.

ter 1960s, Gitxsan artisans were fashioning new xwtsaan "of a quality equal to the best of the old ones." As wil litxwhl gyadim gan ('totem pole places') got more crowded, Gitxsan simo'ogyet who had never abandoned their interest in land claims after Section 141, travelled into the back-country, recording toponyms, wilp boundaries and the ancestral migrations that brought them into being. Some, like Luus (Chris Harris) from the wilp of same, Wii Muugwiluxsxw (Jonathan Johnson) from Xhliimlaxha, and Gla'ee-yu (Richard Benson) from Gyolugyet, all from Galdo'o, spent the better part of the 19-50s and 60s sorting out toponyms and boundaries in the upper Txemsem and Xsan watersheds, annotating information on government topographic maps.

Others made their own maps from scratch. In 1958, the Gitanyow allowed the British Columbia Provincial Museum (BCPM) to move three of the most valuable xwtsaan in the gals'ap to Victoria for restoration. The conditions were, among others, that the museum undertake to have exact replicas carved and raised at the original site, to "borrow the map of Kitwancool territory (Map 43) prepared by Mr. Fred Good [Lax Gibuu Chief Niishlaganoos], to copy it, and to return the original...to Kitwancool...[and] to issue a publication which will embody the information and map referred to...[and] provide the University of British Columbia with copies of all the above...for the use of professors and students."

Although separated by 43 years and addressed to different audiences, a comparison between Maps 42 and 43 is instructive. Both encompass the same general area, and delineate the same external boundary and named rivers, but the surface topologies are different. In the earlier version, the distances and angles between the features were cartographed temporally, as they would have been experienced during surface travel. In this

---

68 Cassidy, M. From Mountain, op. cit., 42-3.
69 For more detail on these projects, including a reproduction of Wii Muugwiluxsxw's 1965 map, see Sterritt, N. et al. Tribal Boundaries, op. cit., 108-13.
Map 43

Niishlaganoos's (Fred Good) *untitled* map of Gitanyow territory, Gitanyow, 1959, 14 x 20 cm; showing principle rivers (in italics), *galts'ap*, the Nisga'a-Gitanyow grease trail (the dotted line) and a generalized external boundary. Toponyms are in both English and Gitxsan (although English seems to have been used only just enough to permit 'professors and students' to orient themselves to the area depicted). The *xwtsaan* and *dahk* associated with these *ad-aawk* are shown in Figures H(a) and J(b) (copied, with permission, from original in Duff, W. [ed] *Histories*, op. cit., inside front cover).
version they were mapped to scale, as seen through the perspective of the cartographic eye. If planimetric accuracy be our judge then Map 43 is clearly the 'more true'. But if it be faithfulness to to the rhythms of landscape, then it is Map 42. What this suggests is that for Gitanyow, distortion arises not because of a lack of scale, but when the surface is reduced to it. What rescues Map 43, and makes it the more effective cross-cultural geographic statement, is that it substitutes the designations 'Indian village' with the Gitxsan names and so links it directly to the adaawk transcribed in narrative form in the accompanying text. As its authors intended, 'professors and students' could now trace out the ancestral migrations of the simo'ogyet (hereditary chiefs) with their fingers, but without losing sight of the places where adaawk 'touched down' and the Gitanyow 'put their mark and power'.

By the late 1960s the Gitxsan were making power places of a more earthly sort. In 1970 they reconstructed a typical galts'ap on the site of the ancient village of Gitanmaax (Figure K). It consisted of a half dozen dahk and a set of xwtsaan of the Lax Gibuu, Giskaast and Lax Ganeda — the three pdeek (clans) that historically occupied the original site — surveying, as they had in earlier times, the confluence of the Xsan and Wedzen Kwah. Containing a school of artistic design, gift shop, and offering up live performances by Gitxsan dancers, K'san was designed as a place where artefacts could be arranged, and bodies could be mobilized so as to presence continuity in Gitxsan culture, and between Gitxsan and Euro-Canadian. By foreshortening the distance between the past and the present, and by making visible ways of life rather than scientific taxonomies, K'san is a place enmeshed in local memories and practices. It is a place where cultural product is repatriated and where daxgyet (identity and power) is mapped anew.

This time in concert with Parks Canada, much the same thing took place a year later at Ta'awdzep, where Nekt had successfully defended the western cornerpost of Gitxsan territory against Haida, Nisga'a, and Haisla invaders two centuries earlier. Now called the Kitwanga Fort National Historic Site it consisted of display panels describing Nekt's
Figure K
Panoramic view of the reconstructed galts'ap at K'san (on the old site of Gitanmaax) as it appears today. In keeping with its public function visitors may wander the site free-of-charge, but are encouraged to pay the small fee and take the guided tour. The three undecorated dahk foreground are usually locked: the Lax Ganeda (right) features articles common to traditional life; the Lax Gibuu (second from right) highlights changes wrought by contact; the Giskaast (third from right) holds masks and regalia belonging to the K'san Performing Arts Group. The other four dahk, three of which are decorated, are open to anyone, and house (left to right) a gift shop/museum, workshop, studio, and traditional foods restaurant respectively. A maintained campground, nestled at the confluence of the Xsan and Wedzen Kwah, is just off picture to the left. One would be hard-pressed to find a more utilitarian, never mind picturesque spot upon which to build a galts'ap — then or now (author's photo, 1998).
adventures in Gitxsan, English and French, a reconstructed sweat house, and archaeological evidence of the fort's appurtenances, such as ancillary structures and food caches. Like K'san, it too re-discovers place as past events are re-enacted in the present. It is almost impossible, having read these displays, to stand atop this windswept hillock without visualizing, just as Nekt must have, invaders approaching the fortress, unaware they were about to be killed by 'man crushing logs' rolling down the bluff.

There were also signs (Figure L). Erected at highway rest areas, points of interest or entrances to provincial parks, they serve, conceptually, the same purpose as the dendro-glyphs wilp simo'ogyet once used as boundary markers for their territories (recall Figure I). In terms of perspective, however, these signs have more in common with those posted along the trails of the Hazelton District in 1910; they demarcate boundaries not between huwilp or even between the Gitxsan and their neighbours, but those 'pinch points' where the Gitxsan and Euro-Canadian worlds abruptly interface. Cultural centers, historical sites, and signs are not maps. But taken together, and positioned in the contact zone, they amount to the same thing. The difference is that these are mappings in three dimensions, not two. Like the Kwakwaka'wakw's Kwagiulth Museum and the Secwépemc's Xatsu'l, or the Nisga'a's sign 'Nisga'a Highway, turn right' — and quite unlike the museum, historical site or roadside billboard — K'san, Ta'awdzep, and the signs at Stek'yawden and D'am Stekyoodenlh are cultural center(ing)s, places where the exhibitionary machinery of the colonizing power is turned against itself.71

As Gitxsan territorial space reenergized itself, on the ground and on the map, so too did the Gitxsan's politics of resistance. In 1968, following federal overtures of consultation with Native people on amendments to the Indian Act, the Gitxsan, Gitanyow and Wet'suwet'en bands formed the Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council (GCTC). At first glance such a coalition seems anomalous; linguistically, the Wet'suwet'en are a division of the

Figure L(a-b)
Two examples of signs pointing to wonders in Gitxsan territory, both found in rest areas along Yellowhead Highway 16 near Gitwangak. Showing the five main species of salmon, and informing travellers this is Giskaast territory, the upper figure (a) is a simplified oblique perspective view of Wii Sa Nist ('big mountain', Seven Sisters on government topos). The lower figure (b) is one of a number of similarly engraved plaques bearing the contemporary logogram of the Gitxsan Nation and a short text describing the significance of the site. This one speaks of the time that Med- eek uprooted trees on the slopes of Stekyawdin, causing a huge landslide at D'am Stekyoodenlh (Seeley Lake) (author's photos, 1998).
Indian histories tell of ancient adventures that occurred on these shores. One myth is of the huge water-grizzly Medeek, whose wrath was awakened by foolish Indian children who were wasting nature's bounty. The monster was killed only after a heroic battle. With Medeek slain new tribal laws governing the training of children were followed, including the most important: Respect the Animal World.
Athapaskan (Carrier) speaking peoples. During the protohistoric period, however, the Wet'suwet'en had incorporated aspects of the yukw-rank complex, and by contact had more in common with the Gitxsan than with the rest of the Carrier. The Wet'suwet'en explained their origins in a somewhat different manner, erected less elaborate xwtsaan and were organized into five (instead of four) pdeek. Beyond that, their land tenure system was the same. The wilp was the main corporate unit, chiefly prerogatives were inherited matrilineally, and their oral record, which they call kungax, shared many of the same motifs, and often detailed the same historical events, as adaawk.72

The Gitxsan and the comprehensive claims process

As noted in Chapter 1, the consultation process collapsed with the White Paper, but in 1972 the province completed the first leg of the Dease Cassiar Highway between Gitwangak and Stewart and was contemplating a railroad along a similar route. As lumber companies increased demand on wilp resources and the Nisga'a and Gitanyow confronted CNR surveyors, a new round of protests seemed imminent. The following year the SCC handed down its landmark decision in Calder and the GCTC immediately convened at Gitwangak, the simo'ogyet appointing Madeegam Gyamk (Neil Sterritt), a Kispiox Giskaast from the wilp of Gitluudahl, as Director of Land Claims. His mandate was to carry out detailed and coordinated research in all the huwilp in preparation for negotiations and at Ans'pa yaxw in 1977, the GCTC submitted their comprehensive claim to Ottawa (Map 44).73 The Gitanyow, however, filed their own claim independently.

72 The kungax are, though, somewhat different than adaawk. The kungax are conceived as "trails of song that offer maps of the spiritual journeys that Wet'suwet'en continue to make" (Mills, A. Eagle Down, op. cit., 75), but they do not record terrestrial dispersals of every wilp or simo'ogyet. Rather, they source all the lineages in a single simo'ogyet, Goolaht. In ancient times, he lived at Dizkle — a great city-state astride the Wedzen Kwah just above Temlaxam (but which may have been, according to some, coterminal with it). At any rate, there ensued a number of internal conflicts, causing Goolaht to divide the territory in order to restore peace to the pdeek. More historical allegory than historical story, and relating moral lessons, kungax thus have as much in common with the Gitxsan's andamahlasxw as they do adaawk.

73 Cassidy, M. From Mountain, op. cit., 45.
Map 44(a-b)
GCTC's *Territories of the Gitksan and Carrier Indians (a)* and *Gitksan-Carrier Declaration (b)*, Kispiox, 1977, each 27 x 21 cm; map and declaration showing external boundary, and 'contents', of the GCTC's comprehensive claim. The submission includes the territories of the Wet'suwet'en Carrier, the Gitanyow, and the Gitxsan proper but does not locate any galts'ap, wilp boundaries or toponyms. Like Map 15(a), it is a *tabula rasa* (because that's all it needs to be in 1977). Like all *tabula rasa*, though, it is one that anticipates being 'filled in' at some later date (both copied, with permission, from originals at Gitxsan Treaty Office, Hazelton).
Territories of the Gitskan and Carrier Indians

Presentation to the Government of Canada

The Honourable Hugh Faulkner
Minister of Indian Affairs

Hispiox, B.C., Nov. 7, 1917
Since time immemorial, we, the Gitksan and Carrier People of Kitwanga, Kitseguecla, Gitanmaax, Sikadoak, Kispiox, Hagwilget and Moricetown, have exercised Sovereignty over our land. We have used and conserved the resources of our land with care and respect. We have governed ourselves. We have governed the land, the waters, the fish, and the animals. This is written on our totem poles. It is recounted in our songs and dances. It is present in our language and in our spiritual beliefs. Our Sovereignty is our Culture.

Our Aboriginal Rights and Title to this Land have never been extinguished by treaty or by any agreement with the Crown. Gitksan and Carrier Sovereignty continue within these tribal areas.

We have suffered many injustices. In the past, the development schemes of public and private enterprise have seriously altered Indian life and culture. These developments have not included, in any meaningful way, our hopes, aspirations and needs.

The future must be different. The way of life of our people must be recognized, protected and fostered by the Governments of Canada and the Laws of Canada. Only then will we be able to participate fully in Canadian society.

We, the Gitksan and Carrier People, will continue to exercise our Sovereignty in the areas of Education, Social and Economic Development, Land Use and Conservation, Local and Regional Government.

We have waited one hundred years. We have been patient. Through serious negotiation, the basis for a meaningful and dignified relationship between the Gitksan and Carrier People and the Governments of Canada and of British Columbia will be determined. These negotiations require mutual and positive participation by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government.

Today, the Governments of Canada and British Columbia undertake a bold new journey to negotiate with the Gitksan and Carrier People. During this journey, we will fulfill the hopes and aspirations of our ancestors and the needs of future generations.

Let us begin negotiations.

Recognize our Sovereignty, recognize our rights, so that we may fully recognize yours.

KISPIOX, B.C.
NOVEMBER 7, 1977
Initially, this submission, like all the others submitted during the 1970s, languished in files at DIA. The research process continued, but so long as the province refused to budge on the possible existence of Aboriginal title, there was nothing to negotiate. But if the door was not quite open politically, there was an educational window. During the latter half of the 1970s and early 1980s, Gitxsan teachers, elders, and band councillors collaborated on a number of educational texts and primers designed to instruct Gitxsan students on their 'histories, territories and laws'. By itself, this was perhaps unremarkable. During this period, provincial school boards, especially in districts where the majority of students were Aboriginal, began devolving curriculum to local bands, some of which were building their own schools. What distinguished the Gitxsan's was that maps were seen as an integral part of the learning process.

The galts’ap maps of Kitseguala and Ans’pa yaxw (Maps 45 and 46) are early examples. Used to accompany local autohistories, the immediate impression is that they are 'mental maps', not unlike those drawn by subjects of environmental perception studies. To the extent that they reflect individuals' profoundly personal and intense engagement with locality, they are. Indeed, for many young Gitxsan living in their galts’ap at that time, these maps would have delineated the only world they had ever known. What is of interest here, though, is less any insights they might provide on spatial behaviour or cognitive processes than the ways in which their authors deliberately played with an alternative spatial perspective in order to tell village stories. From a Gitxsan perspective, then, they are not 'maps of mind' at all — as suggested by the Gitwangak simo’ogyet in 1884, they are, rather, 'maps of the heart'.

That not all Gitxsan mapping can be summarily explained as a response to the solicitations of neocolonial agents is further confirmed by a set of maps that appeared a few years later in Birds of the Ksan, three of which are reproduced here (Map 47). If Maps 42 and 43 denoted power places where adaawk 'touched down', then we might say that these maps delineated adaawk's 'terrestrial trace' between them. Together, they suggest
Map 45
Gitsegukla History and Development Project's *untitled* map of Gitsegukla village, Kitseguela 1979, 23 x 19 cm; showing selected buildings, burial sites, a street plan and generalized local topography. It shows the location of the original village (which was burnt by careless prospectors in 1872), Gitseguela Reserve No. 1 (established in 1891 and flooded out in 1936), and the new upper hillside site. Ten different *simo'ogyet* contributed stories relating to the features shown in the accompanying text. In addition to the fire and flood they tell readers about the missionaries, the built environment (including the *xwtsaan* and *ayuuk*), material and cultural practices (including the *yukw*), and sociopolitical organization (copied, with permission, from original in Sampare, C. [ed] *Adawkhl Gitseguela*, op. cit., 1).
Map 46(a-b)
Kispiox Band's *untitled* map(s) of *Ans’pa yaxw*, Kispiox, 1977, each 20 x 28 cm; (b) shows the street layout and main buildings as they existed in 1977, (a) as they existed 1951. Like *Gitanmaax*, *Ans’pa yaxw* was strategically tucked into the confluence of two rivers, the *xwtsaan* occupying the most crucial location. Whether (a) was drafted from memory or an old DIA street plan is not clear but viewed with (b) they highlight the changes in the *galts’ap* landscape over the intervening period. Used to ground Gitxsan geographic names and to help teach children *Gitxsanimx* (Gitxsan language), streets and important places in (b) are given in the Gitxsan orthography in use at that time. The accompanying primer includes a song about the *galts’ap*; examples of how the names may be used in sentences; and asks students to draw their own *wilp* (meaning the *dahk* itself). Note that the only feature rendered in oblique perspective is the *wil litxwhl gyadium gan*; some things just look better in three dimensions than two (copied, with permission, from originals in Vickie Jensen and Edith Gawa, *Gitxsanimx For Kids* [Kispiox: Kispiox Band Council, 1977], 10).
Map 47(a-c)
Susan Marsden’s and Gitxsan Chiefs’ *The Origins of Gitwingax (a), Wars of Long Ago (b) and Trade Routes (c)*, Terrace, 1980, each 21 x 27 cm; three of a series of black and white sketch maps in a Grades 8 and 10 geography primer. They all use the same base map showing the main rivers and the approximate boundaries (the dashed lines) with the Tahltan and Tlingit (to the north and northwest), and the Carrier and Haisla (to the south and southeast) but each is thematized in a different way. Of the two plates excerpting adaawk (a) maps migrations of Axtee and Qawq (who erected three of the xwtsaan in Figure H[a]), Nekt (in the wilp of Wii Hlengwax, who erected the xwtsaan in Figure J[b]), and the Lax Ganeda’s Lelt (in the wilp of same) to Gitwangak (Map 41[a]). Students are encouraged to differentiate these routes in colour or, on a blank base map, trace the adaawk of their own wilp. (The ayuuks associated with these migrations are discussed in Barbeau, M., *Totem Poles of the Gitksan*, op. cit., 129-31, 41-4, 48-54, and 133-8; and MacDonald, G., *The Totem Poles*, op. cit.) On (b) a textual thematic highlights historic conflicts between the Tsimshian speakers and their neighbours, and disputes between Tsimshian huwilp. The boxes marked 'R' denote raids, the 'W' wars. (Many of these are recorded in Barbeau, M. and Beynon, W., *Tsimshian Narratives II*, op. cit.; and Duff, W. [ed] *Histories*, op. cit.) On (c) pictorial symbols differentiate fluvial trade routes from terrestrial and are alphabetically indexed to a table showing which goods were typically transported along a given route. The map shows the importance of the Nisga’a-Gitanyow grease trail and the Xsan. It was accompanied by a blank flowchart asking students to convert thematic data into text, and to think critically about the links between trade and war, and the ways in which contact affected contemporary trading relationships (all copied, with permission, from originals in Marsden, S. and Barbara Bingham, *Birds of the Ksan: Harvesting the Ksan* Teachers Guide and Supplementary Materials [Terrace: School District 88, 1980], 36-8).
The Origins of Gitwengax

* Kitwanga
TRADE GOODS

Legend

(a) copper caribou hides hide clothing moccasins
(b) Chilkat blankets yellow cedar yew wood for bows
(c) seal skins sea otter skins

(d) dried berries large cedar logs canoes dried salmon oolichan grease
(e) oolichan grease dried berries dried salmon furs
(f) canoes large cedar carvings bent wood bows sea otter skins seafood

(g) dried berries dried salmon furs mountain goat horns and wool
(h) dried seafood seaweed herring eggs seashell jewellery
(l) rabbit skin and blanket mountain goat horns and fur barks dried berries groundhog skins and blanket other furs

(j) dried seafood canoes seaweed herring eggs seashell jewellery
(k) furs skins hide clothing moccasins
(l) (from the Nootka oolichan grease dried oolichan dried seafood craft and art

(m) groundhog skins (n) (to the Tse-tsaht) dried salmon dried berries (o) (to the Nootka smoked meat furs and hide
other furs and skins red ochre
(o) (to the Nootka smoked meat furs and hide arts and crafts items

(p) (from the Tse-tsaht) furs and skins

(a)-(p) - see legend below
a thematic atlas in every sense of the term. They are, to be sure, drawn freehand, achromatic, and not all the symbols have been abstracted to the point at which the shapes of the depicted objects gives way to conventionalized signs. Still, they do subscribe to all the rules normally prerequisite for a visually effective thematic atlas — the standardized base map, uncluttered thematic overlays, and at most one, or perhaps two, themes mapped on each plate. What separates this 'atlas' from most others, however, is that by including several blank base maps, it is a participatory atlas. With little more than a pencil, or coloured highlighter, students contribute to, and share in its production.

By the early 1980s the Gitxsan had acquainted themselves fully with the concepts, techniques, and potentialities of modern cartography. They were using maps for geopolitical arguments (Map 42 and 44), recording stories (Map 47), the museological enterprise (Map 43), and for local education (Maps 45 and 46). They had their cultural centers (Figure K), historical sites, and signs pointing to wonders (Figure L). A set of spatial strategies that took hundreds of years to work themselves out in the Anglo-Saxon world, on the Xsan took under a century. It would be wrong, however, to castigate this process as evolutionist. These map(ping)s were conditional and contingent, designed to reflect certain interests and to achieve specific goals. There were few (deliberate) points of connection between them. The maps were made by people who did not view themselves as cartographers and had little or no professional or academic training in geography. Everything was derived from memory and direct experience, and constructed with local resources.

Nor would it be fair to argue (as some soon would) that by visually abstracting pieces of the oral record in this manner the essential seamlessness of adaawk Gitxsan had been compromised. Admittedly, Gitxsan who cut their geographical teeth on primers like Birds of the Ksan might no longer recall the ancestral migrations to Gitwangak or

---

74 See, in this connection, Borden Dent, Principles of Thematic Map Design (New York: Addison-Wesley, 1985)
Gitanyow in a wholly traditional manner. But these map(ping) were never intended to replace traditional Gitxsan forms of geographical self-definition and self-representation. These continued as before, in the yukw and the limx’oy, and on the ayuuks and xwtsaan. Rather, the adaawk have, in effect, incorporated some part of a hitherto foreign system of representation into their own, and reformatted it to exploit a potential that had always resided, but had previously not been required, within it. In principle, it is the same process that occurred when ayuuks depicting Euro-Canadian interlopers were mounted on xwtsaan. Indeed, if adaawk is to preserve itself under contact conditions it must do no less. Far from introducing discontinuity into adaawk, in other words, incorporation has actually served to prevent it.

**Gitxsan maps and Delgamuukw**

In 1977, the GCTC reconstituted itself the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en Tribal Council (GWTC) to better distinguish the latter from the rest of the Carrier, and in 1981 elected Madeegam Gyamk president — the net effect of which was to bring the research and political agendas into closer alignment. In 1982, existing Aboriginal title and rights were recognized and affirmed in Section 35 of the Constitution Act but the various constitutional conferences designed to spell out the content of those rights went nowhere. In 1983 the GWTC, fed up with the inertia built into the comprehensive claims process, decided to test the am sii wa's system of justice on its own terms and the following year initiated legal proceedings against Canada and the province in Delgamuukw vs. A.G.

Its premise was that 'Aboriginal title and rights' was an empty phrase if it did not extend to ownership of, and jurisdiction over, the land itself. In other words, the GWTC was not about to waste time only "asserting aboriginal rights" in the abstract; it was going to court "to discuss territory and authority." To do so the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet-

---

75 Cited in Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw The Spirit, op. cit., 9.
wet'en would have to demonstrate not only firsthand knowledge of their territories, past and present, but present it in a form consistent with the rules of evidence demanded by the courts. The plaintiffs would have to be the individual *huwilp* (houses), and the *sim-o'ogyet* (hereditary chiefs) their voice. They would have to open up their archives of T-EK, and retell the *adaawk* and *kungax* that validated their ownership of their traditional territories. Most importantly, they would have to accurately delineate their contemporary internal *wilp* boundaries, which, "for the benefit of the Court [would have to be] set out in maps." This meant far more than simply adding Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en toponyms to government topographical maps, and it immediately ruled out the more orthodox LUOS that had characterized earlier comprehensive claims negotiations in the territorial north.

There were doubters, of course. Partly, it was the sheer magnitude of the exercise. There were 54 *sim'o'ogyet* holding 133 individual *wilp* territories spread across nine different *pdeek*. Many potential interviewees would be quite unfamiliar with the planimetry of the orthogonal grid. Just as, a century earlier, their forefathers had feared the penetration of their territories by the 'talking wire', many elders were reluctant to 'open up their boxes' in such detail, and so expose to foreign scrutiny one of the last archives of traditional knowledge that had not yet been prised apart by a colonizing power. As the Wet'suwet'en elder, *Mikh Lilch Legh* (Johnny David), would later recall, "why we went to court is something that I am mystified by. Telling somebody that we own this land, like, we're trying to prove we own this land, I'm not sure about that." Other concerns were more general. Many First Nations in the province remembered how narrow a victory *Calder* had been, and were afraid that if the GWTC lost this challenge, it could wipe out, once and for all, the gains that had already been made.

76 Ibid., 59.
77 Proving rights and title in court required a site-specific approach, something the LUOS is ill equipped to handle. This will be made more clear on our travels in Carrier Sekani country in Chapter 5.
78 Cited in 'Feature interview', op. cit.
At any rate, the SCC ruling in Guerin in 1984 apparently brought most of the doubters onside, and the research process intensified. Like that newer generation of carvers that had preceded them simo'ogyet and elders reached back once more into adaawk and kungax, and "went out into their territories, and from the mountain tops pointed out to the researchers and map makers the[ir] metes and bounds." Data from each wilp was roughed up in sketch maps (Map 48), and then checked and rechecked for consistency against neighbouring huwilp. Although most simo'ogyet were of the opinion they were "all Indians," and that "each [of them knew the] boundar[ies] and...all underst[ood] that [they] shouldn't fight about [them]," potential overlaps with adjacent nations had to be sorted out too. Drawing on earlier efforts by Luus, Wii Muugwiluxsxw, Gla'eeyu and Madeegam Gyamk the GWTC met with Nisga'a and Tahltan leaders to sort out the western and northern boundaries. At the 1986 All Clans Feast at Kyah Wiget (Moricetown), the Wet'suwet'en simo'ogyet rose up "one by one...and talked about their territory, its location and boundaries, and how it [was] associated with the title and the robes, songs and crests," and in this way "clarifie[d]...and validat[ed] the outer boundary of the[ir] territory" with the Carrier Sekani to the south and east. The significant point is that they did so not with maps, but as they had always done, orally and performatively.

Once the boundaries and toponyms were confirmed past and present resource usage was thematized on draft maps of each of the 133 different huwilp (Map 49). Although Madeegam Gyamk continued to provide the overall direction and much of the resource mapping was contracted to outside agencies, wilp mapping devolved to a Wet'suwet'en

79 Cited in Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw Spirit, op. cit., 59. This research methodology was not unlike that used by the Paêz in the Peruvian Andes in the early 1980s. Like the Gitxsan simo'ogyet, Paêz elders "st[ood] atop [their] sacred mountains...look[ed] into valleys and trac[ed] boundaries with their eyes, much as the mythical caciques [ancestors] were said to have done from the same heights" (see Joanne Rappaport, 'History, myth and the dynamics of territorial maintenance in Tierradentro, Colombia', American Ethnologist 12[1], 27-46, quote is 30).
80 Chief Noostel (Warner Williams), of pدهek Gilserhyu, cited in Mills, A. Eagle Down, op. cit., 50.
81 Chief Dyee Kyo (Edward John), of the Tl'azt'en Nation (Carrier Sekani), cited in ibid., 54.
82 Mills, A. (in ibid.) discusses this feast in detail, 44-55; quotes are 44 and 47 respectively.
Map 48
Madeegam Gyamk's *untitled* sketch map of Delgamuu-kw's *wilp* territory on the upper Txemsem watershed, Kispiox, 1983, 12 x 12 cm; oriented north on top, it denotes main physical features identified by their Gitxsan names, and the dashed line defining the height of land that forms the *wilp*’s western border with the Gitanyow and the eastern with the *wilp* of Gyolugyet. It is not drawn to scale. Like Map 42 it occupies that place where an attached multisensory perspective on space has just begun to yield to the detached planimetric perspective of the cartographic eye/l (copied, with permission, from original in Sterritt, N. et. al. *Tribal Boundaries*, op. cit., 123).
Map 49
Wah Tah Keg'ht's (Basil Michell) Land Claim (Wah Tah Keg'ht...), Moricetown (?), 1988, 50 x 50 cm; prepared as Exhibit X-164 of the plaintiffs' evidence, one of a series of similarly formatted TEK maps showing the resource base and how logging cutblocks have interfered with it. Also locating the main settlements, trails, and physical features in the relevant orthography, it is typical of the kind of map one gets when a rough sketch map (like Map 48) is adjusted to the orthogonal grid (copied, with permission, from original at Wet'suwet'en Treaty Office, Moricetown).
cartographer, Marvin George, a Laksamshu from the wilp of Smogelgem at Kyah Wiget. In consultation with field researchers, simo'ogyet and interpreters, his task was to work through, and update the draft maps by "color coding the different areas to differentiate between the different clans," and to categorize "the different geographical features under lakes, rivers, creeks, mountain areas and [to identify] the Indian name that [they] already had plus the English name that was associated with that particular feature." All of this was then combined on maps showing, in as much detail as possible, the external and internal boundaries of the 133 huwilp that constituted GWTC territory. On May 11 1987, in a crowded Smithers courtroom, the 'mother of all trials' began.

Delgamuukw was, by any measure, an unprecedented litigation, not only in terms of the sheer volume of evidence, but also the performativities with which it was presented. All told, 76 witnesses including 24 simo'ogyet and 21 expert witnesses for the plaintiffs testified. In deference to the age of many of the elders and simo'ogyet, some evidence was adduced or cross-examined out of court. Against the advice of those who thought that they ran a risk of bringing shame upon their huwilp should they lose the litigation, some elders wore their regalia in court. Draped on the walls were "charts upon charts for all of [the] Houses...[s]ome days you [could] walk in there and see all these genealogies just pasted on the wall". Adaawk and kungax were narrated, and limx'oy were sung. But when it became clear that everyone might be there well into the next millennium — Gyolugyet took eight days to tell the adaawk of her wilp — much was resubmitted in the form of 53 territorial affidavits. Even so, the drama lasted 318 days; in the

---

83 Cited in Monet and Skanu'u Colonialism, op. cit., 134.
84 The term is constitutional advisor, Mel Smith's (in Our Home Or Native Land? [Victoria, Crown Western, 1995]). Opposed to the very idea of land claims, he used it in a derogatory sense. While I have no sympathy with his argument, the phrase does capture the importance of the litigation.
86 These were unmapped, but detailed metes and bounds descriptions of the internal wilp boundaries; for an example, see Delgamuukw, op. cit., 331-40.
end, over 50,000 pages of transcripts, arguments and cross-examinations filled over 50 huge binders of material.

Although maps were wielded tenaciously and consistently by both sides, two pieces of cartographic evidence adduced by the plaintiffs stand out. The first was Map 50, in my view one of the best examples of Native cartography anywhere. Oriented east on top, labelled in the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en orthography, and partitioned by irregular boundaries, the chief justice called it "the map that roared,"\(^{87}\) and from his perspective, it did. Indeed, for untutored viewers used to the more conventional north-south alignment, English names and geometric boundaries, the map seemed unnavigable at best, fantasy at worst. But if time is taken to figure out the courses of the Xsan (Skeena River), Txemsem (Nass River), and Wedzen Kwah (Bulkley River); to identify the galts'ap of Gitwangak, Kitsegucia, Hazelton, Hagwilget and Kispiox; to know something of the place-naming system; and to understand how adaawk and kungax format territory, the map takes us to the heart of the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en land tenure system.

To begin with, the internal huwilp boundaries are irregular because that is the nature of the watershed boundaries to which they generally conform. The clustering of huwilp belonging to any given pdeek at the larger scale reflects the clustering of xwtsaan in the galts'ap at the smaller. As might be expected, wilp clusters tend to be near to the galts'ap where most of their respective xwtsaan were erected. The map also confirms how a few clusters were the centers of gravity for many wilp territories belonging to more than one pdeek, and how some simo'ogyet could come to hold discontiguous wilp territories. It is in this sense that the galts'ap were common areas; they were always inside a given wilp, but they were the places of winter residence for other huwilp. More generally, the map immediately negates Barbeau's contention that Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en territories were nothing more than "casual geographical units."\(^{88}\)

\(^{87}\) Cited in Monet and Skanu'u Colonialism, op. cit., 108.
\(^{88}\) In Totem Poles of the Gitksan, op. cit., 9.
Map 50

GWTC’s *Territories of the Gitksan - Wet’suwet’en*, Hazelton, 1988, 176 x 85 cm; a monochromatic topographic map of Gitxsan and Wet’suwet’en territories. It shows the main physical features, internal wilp boundaries (including the wilp of Wah Tah Keg’ht [center right] in Map 49), galt-s’ap; and an external boundary that is, not counting the Gitanyow (off the map below), remarkably consistent with the one delineated on Map 44. By insetting the big picture in the full view, this gargantuan geography comes into even clearer view. What we see is that the distribution of huwilp is reflected not only in the adaawk that detail how they were established, but in the relative dominance of any given pdeek and their xwtsaan within the galt-s’ap. At the time of Barbeau’s researches, for example, there were sixteen Lax Ganeda, six Lax Skiik and four Lax Gibuu xwtsaan in Gitwangak (inset, lower left). As shown in Figure J(a) and Map 41(a), this is consistent with the fact that the huwilp of Wii Hlengwax, Haaksw, Haalus, Luulak, Tenimgyet, Haakasxw and Lelt are all Lax Ganeda or Lax Gibuu and Sakxum Higookx is Lax Skiik. Similarly, there were fourteen Giskaast but only five Lax Ganeda xwtsaan in Kitseguala (near center). This reflects the fact that Kitseguala looms largest in the adaawk of the Giskaast, and that the huwilp of Spookw, Hanamuxw, Guxsan, Haxbagwootxw and Gwis Gyen are all Giskaast, while Gaxbgabaxs and Wiis Dis are Lax Ganeda. Finally, almost all the huwilp in the more northern portion of the territory (which is not insetted here) are almost all Lax Ganeda or Lax Gibuu, those who set out, long ago, from Gitangasx, Lax-wiiyip or Ts’im’lanluuskeexs (photographed, with permission, from original purchased by author).
On the face of it, it appears that the representation of mosaicked space on the orthogonal grid was a straightforward exercise. Indeed, Map 50 satisfies the two conditions typically assumed prerequisite for scientifically accurate maps — scale and fixed boundaries. So much so, that it seems to contradict the claim that spatial legislation resided in adaawk. From the Gitxsan perspective, however, this just happens to be what a clustered mosaic looks like when abstracted in two dimensions. These watershed boundaries were themselves created in the andamahlasxw. It was still adaawk that formatted them. As the ancestral simo'ogyet ventured away from Gitangasx, Laxwiiyiip, Temlaxam, and points in between, 'putting their mark and power' at important places as they went, they would have claimed ownership from river level — and the highest ridges they could gaze on, speak of, sing about, or walk over from there would tend to define wilp boundaries. This meant that in the higher country, where use and occupancy would be most infrequent, the more elastic wilp boundaries would tend to be. Whether because of a calamity that befell a wilp, or the loss or acquisition of a territory in a xsiisxw (peace pact) boundaries might change from time to time. But the basic form of the mosaic would have remained fairly constant.

Nor does Map 50 require the abandonment of a traditional perspective on space. Although many simo'ogyet had obviously become more familiar with the representational machinery of the cartographic eye/I, most continued to understand their territories with the multiple senses that adaawk demanded. As Mikh Lilch Legh stated it in court, "if you know your territory well it is like your own skin. Sometimes you can even feel the animals moving on your body as they are on the land, the fish swimming in your bloodstream." The sonorous and tactile character of Gitxsan territoriality was further elab-

---

89 As it turned out, there were simo'ogyet who did experience difficulty orienting themselves to Map 50, but it was not because they were unfamiliar with the cartographic perspective per se — surprisingly enough, it was because they had become accustomed to a north-south orientation during the registration of traplines in the 1920s.
90 Cited in ibid., 89.
orated by Gitanyow Lax Gibuu, Taxwok (James Morrison), who told the court "I can still feel it today while I am sitting here, I can hear the brook, I can hear the river run.... You can feel the air of the mountain. This is what the memorial song is, to bring your memory back into that territory."91 The main point is that while the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en land tenure system visibly exhibits many points of connection with the Euro-Canadian, it cannot be reduced to it. The Gitxsan world was created in andamahlasxw and formatted in adaawk, but maintaining jurisdiction over it still demanded regular, if seasonal use. As Gwis Gyen (Stanley Williams), a Giskaast from Kitsegukla testified, "every time our people use our [territory] they make it stronger....It's still the same today...[don't] tell me about a territory that you haven't been on. You have to have the dirt of that territory under the soles of your feet before you tell me [its] boundaries."92

For the contents of the footprint, though, we need to turn to the second major piece of cartographic evidence adduced at trial. Entitled, appropriately enough, Cartographic Support for the Plaintiffs Evidence, it was submitted as a thematic atlas, at that time one of only two published by any First Nation in British Columbia.93 Consisting of 27 full colour plates, a gazetteer of Wet'suwet'en and Gitxsan toponyms, and published on heavy glossed paper with a thick leatherette cover, it would have covered the chief justice's entire bench. Of the 27 plates, seventeen dealt with animal and plant distributions (two of which are in Map 51), three with provincial land tenure arrangements (one of which is Map 52), and four with fisheries (one of which is Map 53). One was a Landsat photogram of GWTC territory, another biogeoclimatic zones, and yet another dealt with the protohistoric period (Map 54). The gazetteer indexed 1,114 Gitxsan and 540 Wet'suwet'en place names (Figure M). While much of the baseline biogeoclimatic information was taken from government sources, and while the production of the atlas was con-

---

91 Ibid.
92 Cited in Monet and Skanúu, Colonialism, op. cit., 100.
93 The other belonged to the Nisga'a; it has never been made public. The Stó:lō (Chapter 6) have since published a third.
Map 51(a-b)
GWTC and Canadian Cartographics’ *Mountain Goat (a)* and *Soapberry (b)*, Vancouver 1987, 76 x 48 cm; orientated east on top, two of 17 plates dealing with plant or animal distributions in the claim territory (the external boundary of which is defined by the dark line). The darker the colour tint the more prevalent is the species in that area. The data comes from both provincial ministries and Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en draft maps (like Map 49). Each of the 17 plates is prefaced by a photograph of the species, and a text describing the current health of the population (photographed, with permission, from originals donated to author).
Map 52
GWTC and Canadian Cartographics' *Traplines, Outfitters and Wildlife Management Units*, Vancouver, 1987, 76 x 48 cm; coloured map showing registered traplines, provincial outfitters and wildlife management units, with an index of the names of the current holders. If we were to overlay this map on Map 50, it would show a very close correspondence between the boundaries of the registered traplines and the *wilp* boundaries, and especially so in the most northern Gitxsan territories. As a rule, of course, government trapline maps do not show *wilp* boundaries. Indeed, their apparent invisibility on such maps was used by the Crown in an attempt to invalidate the plaintiffs' case. Some guide outfitters, like Dr. Igor Steciw (who has the trapline just below and left of center) were subpoenaed as 'expert witnesses' for the defence (photographed, with permission, from original donated to author).
Map 53
GWTC and Canadian Cartographics' Fishing sites, Vancouver, 1987, 76 x 48 cm; one of four plates dealing with fisheries issues. This one shows the fishing stations, the names of the site (in black), and the name of the simo'o-ogyet that holds it (in red), all in the contemporary Gitxsan orthography. Some sites are not named; whether they have been forgotten over time, or just were not recorded, is unclear. As with all the plates in the atlas, the map is prefaced by a short text describing how the sites are situated in the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en land tenure systems, and photographs of the two at Gwin'oop and Ant'kil'ls (the latter capturing an exchange with DFO field officers). As expected, fishing stations are grouped according to, and in most cases as near as possible to the simo'o'ogyet or wilp that holds them. They are most agglomerated immediately up- and down-stream from the principle gals't'ap — so much so that even at this large scale they must be insetted in dialogue boxes for clarity. Monet, D. and Skanu'u would later remember how Gwaans (Olive Ryan), a Giskaast from Kitsegukla, sat "in the witness box for two days...her eyes half closed...[reciting]...all of the House and clan fishing sites downriver from Gitsegukla [as] the lawyers and judge frantically turn[ed] pages and tr[ied] to locate them on [their] maps and documents" (Colonialism, op. cit., 45). The problem, of course, was that they never could locate them; they have never had a presence on the Map of British Columbia (photographed, with permission, from original donated to author).
Map 54
GWTC and Canadian Cartographics, *Ancient times - the arrival about 10000 years BP*, Vancouver 1987, 76 x 48 cm; map thematizing the main dispersals of the four Gitxsan *pdeek* as they migrated away from their landing places, establishing territorial jurisdictions, and mingling with other interior or coastal people who were doing a little migrating of their own. It highlights the migrations of the *Lax Gibuu*, *Lax Ganeda* and *Lax Skiik* from *Ts'ilm'anluuskeexs, Laxwiiyip* or *Gitangasx* in the upper *Xsan* and *Txemsem* watersheds (some of which were shown at a larger scale in Map 47, and whose *xwtsaan* were pictured in Figures H and J). In the vicinity of *Kisgega'as* and *Galdo'o*, they interacted with the *Giskaast*. They too trace their origins to *Laxwiiyip*, but at a much later date, and established *Temlaxam*. Later, many moved into *Nisga'a* and *Coast Tsimshian* territory, becoming the *Gispewudwada* (recall Map 32[b]) The map also shows *Dizkle* which, if not the same place as *Temlaxam*, is close to it. Overall the map shows, visually, the reasons behind the very close cultural, genealogical and linguistic connections between the Tsimshian speaking peoples, and why the geographically dispersed *pdeek* and *wilnat'ahl* share *ayuukts* or 'themes of *adaawk* to the degree that they do (photographed, with permission, from original donated to author).
Figure M
One of several pages in the gazetteer listing GWTC toponyms in the appropriate Gitxsan orthography. Some are supplied with etymologies and/or their English equivalent but there are many for which the etymology has been forgotten, and even more that have no English equivalent. Because of the limits of scale, the majority are not cross-labelled to the plates by name but they are all indexed by latitude and longitude, and the main physiographic features on each plate are labelled in the appropriate Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en names (photographed, with permission, from original donated to author).
| Gazetteer - Gitksan names |
tracted out because of technical limitations at the GWTC, core data was taken from ad-aawk and kungax, and Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en field research. Three of these plates deserve separate consideration here.

Map 52 shows us the registered traplines, overlain with the boundaries of provincial wildlife management units and guide outfitters' tenures, all cross-referenced in a legend to the current holder. It is fairly clear that the registered trapline boundaries correspond in general to the wilp boundaries on Map 50, especially in the northernmost Gitxsan territories. Where they do not, it is partly because government surveyors were careless in recording wilp boundaries as described by the simo'ogyet, and partly because the registered lines legalized patrilineal inheritance. The subsequent awarding of guide outfitters' licenses and wildlife management tenures over the post-registration period only confused things more. The result was that some registered traplines, whether because of lack of use or because of bureaucratic machinations, passed into non-Native hands. Like all Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en maps Map 52 tells a story. But it is not, as the Indian agents had unctuously promised, one of protecting Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en land tenure. It is the story of how the registered system commodified space, weakened GWTC jurisdiction, and made it easier to transfer trapping tenures to Euro-Canadian interests.94

In exquisite detail, Map 53 shows us the literally hundreds of individual fishing stations strung along the rivers and creeks spilled from Weegyet's buckets and immediately highlights the extent to which O'Reilly short-changed the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en in the 1890s. Each site is identified by the toponym describing the physical characteristics of the place or an event that once happened there, and the name of the wilp that holds it. In general, and like the huwilp themselves, the map shows that owned sites were also clustered along the watercourses fronted by, or as near as possible to, their respective wilp holders. Some of the more remote huwilp, though, did not have direct access to

---

94 I will come back to this point again as we journey through Carrier Sekani country next Chapter.
viable fish runs, so some of their sites are located near galts'ap or in canyons where the stock was sufficiently abundant. This means that while conceptually wilp territories reached to the waterline, in practice there was typically a cultural riparian zone where some huwilp would locate their fishing stations (or smokehouses, and, later, gardens) interspersed with those of others. A few were considered communal stations, where any wilp member could fish at any time.

For those few authors that have bothered to look at Gitxsan maps at all, Map 53 has usually been the plate of choice, and deservedly so.\textsuperscript{95} Whether in the context of layout, detail, the aesthetics of colour, or the way in which photography, cartography and text are hitched together to make a comprehensive territorial statement, this is (r)evolutionary thematic mapping in every sense of the term. But for me the most important plate in the atlas is Map 54 because it is this plate that not only prefaces every other plate in the atlas, but Map 50 as well. It is a generalized schematic that synthesizes a whole set of adaawk explaining where the Gitxsan planted their gigilhasts (first totem poles), built the first dahks (dwellings) and then, as they organized themselves into pdeek (clans), wilnaat'ahl (house groups) and huwilp (houses), migrated away, marking daxgyet (identity and power) as they went. In short, it is the adaawk thematized on this map that formatted the huwilp shown in Map 50. That this map shows us multiple migrations in a generalized way does not, however, compromise adaawk at all. Like the more spartan antecedents (recall Map 46) it makes them even more authoritative. The main achievement of this map, however, is that it anchors two historical geographies (or, in Bakhtinian terms, two chronotopes) in a common territorial referent. By confirming that the 'time when it was like spring' or 'when their were no trees' corresponds to the retreat of the Winsconsinan glaciation, Map 54 is the point of connection between adaawk and

\textsuperscript{95} See, for example, Sparke, M. 'The map that roared', op. cit.
the Euro-Canadian geological record. Where both records part company is in the way in which everything that follows that referent is explained, validated and memorized.

With Delgamuukw, the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en took Native cartography into previously uncharted territory. Certainly, from the perspective of adaawk, none of it (with the possible exceptions of Map 50, and some of the biogeoclimatic data) was new. As already noted, the Gitxsan had worked out the basic elements of topographical or thematic mapping, if in a different context, elsewhere. This cartography was more sophisticated technologically, but the most important maps were still cantilevered (directly or indirectly) out of adaawk. No one map was based on earlier maps. What had changed was that the plaintiffs adduced the evidence to show the points of translation between them, and between the maps and the adaawk record. It was not only that these maps were composed, like a musical score, to play off one another. Nor was it that the maps were used, in effect, to witness and validate adaawk. It was that oral and graphic evidence was adduced to witness and validate each other. And it was through this hybrid perspective that the plaintiffs had hoped, as Skanu'u (Ardythe Wilson) would later say, to "prove [their] continued existence and jurisdiction on the land," and to prove that "[their] societies and cultures [we]re viable and thriving."96

Delgamuukw and Gitxsan mappings

This, though, was only the half of it — the drama being played out in court was but one act in a larger performance outside of it. In 1987, as Delgamuukw was going to trial, the GWTC elected Mas Gaak (Don Ryan), a Giskaast in the wilp of Hanamuxw, and a former social worker and community activist, as president. While Madeegam Gyamk pioneered the comprehensive claims process and coordinated the research that made litigation possible, it was Mas Gaak who steered it through to its conclusion and consoli-

96 Cited in Monet, D. and Skanu'u Colonialism, op. cit., 171.
dated the longer term vision that he thought necessary regardless of the court's decision. For *Mas Gaak*, the litigation could only be one component of a more global set of territorial tactics involving direct action on the land itself.

One of his first acts was to start Radio Free Gitanmaax, a 'pirate' two-watt radio station, featuring young and old Gitxsan disc jockeys, traditional and contemporary music programs, community announcements and local news. A century and a quarter earlier, the Gitxsan had feared the 'talking wire' because they viewed it as a tool of the colonizing power. This time, however — much as their forefathers had recycled that wire into bridge repair at *Tse Kya* and *Ans'pa yaxw* — the 'talking wireless' would bring the colonizer under the surveillance of the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en and so carry out a decolonizing function. *Mas Gaak's* second initiative was to abolish the GWTC, reconstituting it as the Office of the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en Hereditary Chiefs (GWHC). In practical terms, it was of little consequence — most of the DIA chiefs were already *simo'ogyet* anyway — but symbolically it was significant. It reconfirmed the authority of those who would have to 'open their boxes' in court, and it marked the turn towards genuine self-government, DIA and the *Indian Act* be damned. Nor did *Mas Gaak* lose sight of the importance of healthy communities, without which self-government would be an empty shell. In 1988, for example, he oversaw the opening of the *wilp si'satxw* (House of Purification) in *Gitwangak*, where Gitxsan could draw on European and traditional healing techniques to help them deal with drug and alcohol abuse problems.

But if, as *Gwis Gyen* would later claim, the demonstration of ownership and jurisdiction was about getting the 'dirt of that territory under one's feet', *Mas Gaak's* most important move was to reinvent the power of the blockade. It was not a new strategy. As noted in Chapter 1, physical resistance on the northwest coast goes back at least to the mid-19th century. Nor was *Mas Gaak* the first to use such tactics in a post-*Calder* era. As I have already alluded (recall Map 40), First Nations across the province had been erecting blockades since at least the early 1970s. *Kitsegucla simo'ogyet* blocked access
to their reserve in 1975 and *Gitwangak simo’ogyet* mounted at least three blockades in 1985. But *Mas Gaak* took hold of what had typically been a one-shot, last resort, and issue-specific spatial tactic, and honed it into a comprehensive territorial strategy.

Beginning in the late 1980s and into the early 1990s, the Gitxsan set up a series of blockades of logging roads, provincial highways, mill sites, and even the CNR mainline (Map 55). Most were mounted to protest what the Gitxsan perceived to be a rampant and illegal extraction of resources from untreatied territory. But many were obviously designed to demonstrate ownership and jurisdiction on the land as the litigation played out. They were especially frequent in 1990 during the faceoff between the Mohawks and Canadian Forces at Oka. Temporally, they lasted from a few hours to several days. Geographically, they appeared at, or close to, all the *galts’ap*, but were most prevalent at *Ans’pa yaxw* and *Gitwangak*. Organizationally, some were mostly information pickets, others stopped logging trucks (Figure N), others any non-Gitxsan traffic. A few occupancies were ignored by non-Gitxsan, but most blockades — like those on provincial highways or the CNR mainline — were met with force — usually the RCMP armed with injunctions, but occasionally disgruntled loggers or travellers.

Now viewed at a much larger scale than was possible in Chapter 3, the cartographic function of blockades and occupancies is made clear. From the perspective of the orthogonal grid, blockades and occupancies do 'punch holes' in the Map of British Columbia. They are strategic counter-manouevres that work with the geographical residue of the colonial project. Creeping along the *Xsan* from the *galts’ap*, Gitxsan blockades do seem to 'look outward' in the same way that *xwtsaan* seem to 'gaze upon' the territories to which they refer. But viewed from *Hawaaw’s* perspective, that is as acts, blockades are not an outward offensive; they are about 'defending an inside' from the colonizing power. Like the *wil litxwhl gyadim gan* (totem pole places), in the *galts’ap*, 'looking in', as it were, on the *huwilp* to which they refer, so also does the blockade, erected in the
Map 55
Paul de Grace’s *untitled* map of the middle Xsan watershed, Vancouver, 1996, 22 x 28 cm; mapping the locations and circumstances of Gitxsan direct action between 1984 and 1995, shows how blockades and occupancies can be a very effective spatial strategy. In British Columbia the main transportation corridors are topographically confined to river valleys, and just happen to run through the reserves (recall Map 35), where most blockades are mounted and the RCMP are often reluctant to intervene. The CNR claimed that the numerous Gitwangak blockades of their main line (lower left) ran into the millions of dollars per day. While I agree that it is the immediacy of the blockade that is tactically important, this map also shows how blockades can collectively constitute a kind of mapping in their own right (copied, with permission, from Blomley, N. "Shut the province down", op. cit., 13).
Kitwancool 1990 (?)-7/30
On Route 37
Blockade at junction with reserve access road to show solidarity with Mohawk at Oka.

Klitwanga 1985 12/3
On CNR main line
Chief stands in front of trains to protest 1910 land preemption.

1985 11/29 - 12/8
On CNR main line
Natives block access to yard and bunkhouse station torched.

1985 (?)
On CNR main line
Chiefs block train traffic to protest pesticide spraying on the right-of-way through reserve.

1985 11/29 - 12/8
On CNR main line
Chief blocks logging equipment to protest closure of Westar mill.

1990 5/18 - 5/28
On CNR main line
Natives block train traffic to protest inaction on land claim.

1990 7/23 - 8/8
On CNR main line
Natives block train traffic to protest inaction on land claim.

1990 7/23 - 8/8
On Route 37
Blockade of highway through reserve to show sympathy with Mohawk at Oka.

1990 12/3 - (?)
On CNR main line
Natives block train traffic to protest transfer of timber licence.
In full regalia, a rather determined looking Hawaaw (Alice Wilson) putting the brakes on the clear-cutters at Ans'pa yaxw in 1988. Although a few blockades have bordered on the comical — in one, Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) field officers were pelted with marshmallows as they tried to dismantle what they considered an illegal fishing station — they are serious business indeed. Many Gitxsan blockaders have found themselves recipients of contempt of court orders, or worse, spending the night in the local jail. Others, however, have achieved their stated objective — either a stop-work injunction served to the resource company, or a commitment by government or industry to negotiate a resolution to the grievance (by Steve Bosch, with permission, from Monet, D. and Skanu'u, Colonialism, op. cit., 197]).
reserve, 'look in' on the territories it is designed to protect. It is in this sense that surveillance can cut both ways, if often in asymmetrical fashion.

Like those cultural sites at K'san and Ta'awdzep (Figure K), or the signs pointing to wonders yet unseen (Figure L), blockades create boundaries. They demarcate the crucial pinch points where borders harden, and the Gitxsan and Euro-Canadian worlds abruptly interface. The key difference, though, is that the blockade is corporeal. It constructs a boundary that is *mobile* — a boundary that can be erected, (re)moved or dismantled on a moment's notice, and across which the degree of *porosity* can be manipulated with a certain amount of precision. The 1988 blockades at Glen Vowell, Xsan Si Mitsitxw (Pinenut Creek), Xi Matsu Ho'ot (Sterritt Creek) and Kisgega'as, for example, were all part of a broad strategic manoeuvering in which each blockade event was moved upriver as soon as the RCMP were about to serve their injunction against the blockade immediately downstream and antecedent to it. None of this is to suggest that the blockade is a panacea, or that it does not often construct unwanted boundaries within or between Gitxsan *huwilp*. As Mas Gaak admitted on the Xsa'an Tsam Lan (Suskwa River) road in 1989, "the roadblock is a test. You have husband against wife, brother against brother and father against son, the whole thing with Indian-white relations, and all that plays itself out. But it's the kind of discussion we have to have."

There is more. If blockades are seen as maps, the continuities to which I have referred throughout start coming into focus. Stripped to the barest outlines, blockades are a throwback to (or a reconstitution of) traditional ways of acquiring, naming, and defending territory. Like the *yukw* or *xsiixsw*, they are enacted by bodily gesture, perform-
tively, constructing places of concrete lived experience and memory (Figure O). Blockades do often create unwanted boundaries within and between Gitxsan families. But they are also places where families come together and transform the abstract spaces of the map and the court into the tangible spaces of daily life.\textsuperscript{100} It is in this sense that the ceremonial is translatable into something else after all — the strategic. Maps, conversely, are elaborations of traditional graphic ways of witnessing and validating jurisdiction over territory. Like ayuuxs and xwtsaan, they construct a conceptual space, a space of imagination and possibility (Figure P). To this end, I agree with Said’s observation that "the slow and often bitterly disputed recovery of geographical territory...at the heart of decolonization is preceded...by the charting of a cultural territory."\textsuperscript{101} There is a point, however, at which a geographical imagination feeds back into, and reinforces cultural practices (Figure Q). And it is in this sense that "the act of viewing from afar, of contemplating what has been torn apart, of arranging 'viewpoints' and 'perspectives' can change the effects of a strategy [back] into aesthetic objects."\textsuperscript{102}

In sum, it is by travelling between experiential and conceptual space and by way of multiple spatial practices, that continuity on the great bend of the Xsan finally shows itself. Gitxsan maps are two-dimensional inscriptions of the cartographic eye/I. But they are still derived (directly or indirectly) out of the adaawk. Gitxsan blockades, by comparison, are erected within the boundaries of the reserves, the signatures of the cartographic eye/I on the Map of British Columbia. Viewed simultaneously, through two different but complementary perspectives, there is a double movement. In the maps, the oral becomes the graphic. There is a loss of signal as a multi-sensory space is collapsed onto a dimensional surface and the event record disappears. We temporarily lose track of the adaawk that holds a mosaicked space together. On the blockade, by contrast, the

\textsuperscript{100} For Lefebvre (in his Production, op. cit.) it was the local fair, protest, or street festival that did this. While the element of risk for the participants is not the same, the blockade can be a festive affair.

\textsuperscript{101} In Culture, op. cit., 209.

\textsuperscript{102} As suggested by Lefebvre, H. Production. op. cit., 318.
Ron George and Antgulilibix (Mary Johnson) blockading with gusto at Ans'pa yaxw in 1989. While blockades are indeed serious business, they can also be places of celebration and cultural revival. This reflects, of course, the eternal paradox of the cross-cultural frontier: its points of distinction, across boundaries, are also its points of connection (by Bev Anderson, with permission, from Monet, D. and Skanu'u, Colonialism, op. cit., 208).
Figure P
One of the most striking photographs I've ever seen, Gitxsan blockaders studying Map 50 at Xsan Si Mitsitxw (Pine Nut Creek) in 1988. It is sometimes in the most fleeting of moments that we are able to see that the divide between the concrete space of daily life and the conceptual space of plan and map is by no means 'clear cut'. I will return to this point in Map 63 (by Bev Anderson, with permission, from Monet, D. and Skanu'u, Colonialism, op. cit., 208).
At the start of the Delgamuukw litigation the Lax Gibuu simo'ogyet 'Wii Muk'willixw (Art Wilson), son of Hawaaaw (Figure N), felt that "stories of injustice and resistance needed to be recorded in art form because people have short term or selective memories [and] painting [can] stand out as a constant reminder of the atrocities that have taken place" (in his Heartbeat of the Earth [Gabriola: New Society Publishers, 1996], 14). Figure (a) depicts his displeasure at the local forest company's refusal to change the name of the road leading to their mill; while (b) reflects the way in which the machinery of the corporate state, 'surveying' the blockades at Ansp'a yaxw (Figure O), is like a virus invading a living body. Like traditional ayuks, both use only red and black and in this sense are paintings less of 'landscape' or 'land claims' than they are 'landmarkings' (copied, with permission, from originals in ibid., 37 and 41 respectively).
graphic becomes the oral. Events reassert their primacy, are incorporated into adaawk, and the signal is restored.

In this view, then, the evidence is that from maps, to cultural centers, to signs pointing to wonders, to blockades, to formline art, and to a 'talking wireless' — the exertions of jurisdiction and ownership that the Gitxsan have used in the post-Calder period are essentially the same as those deployed in the interregnum between Section 141 and the White Paper; the same as those used in the years leading up to and during the MMRC; and the same as those used prior to that. Not only have older forms of geographical representation and self-identification persisted within the new but the new had always existed as untapped potential inside the old. These exertions are hitched together in different ways, at different times, and in different places. Depending on the wider political context, and the purpose for which map(ping)s are made, the emphasis shifts. But the affective bond between people and place remains. As Spookw's epigram suggested at the start of this journey, what changes is not the territory. What changes is the perspective through which that territory is understood by its occupants, and how it is represented to others. As to the question, then, of where one looks for continuity in Gitxsan country, the answer must clearly be...all over the place.

Aftermath

Throughout all of this, of course, it was still the court that would have the last word. The problem for the plaintiffs was that this was an institution which, on its own admission, could only perceive Gitxsan and West'suwet'en geography through judicial (read cartographic) eyes. The chief justice took issue with the differences in the external boundaries on Maps 44 and 50, and because they were not geometric doubted the accuracy of the internal wilp boundaries. He did admit boundary information in the form of

103 The following paragraph has been summarized from a more detailed discussion in Euro-Canadian Cartography, op. cit., 172-90. See, also, Sparke, M. 'The map that roared', op. cit.
territorial affidavits but if he found inconsistencies in the metes and bounds descriptions of any one wilp boundary — as he often did in the more remote corners of watersheds — he took this to cast doubt on the validity of all other wilp boundaries coterminous with it. He also concluded that because Marvin George sometimes based his maps on other maps, and often in advance of his interviews, they could not be objective. In his view, this suggested that the boundaries were gerrymandered from the registered trap-lines and not the other way around. He even argued that before the fur trade there was no reason for the Gitxsan to have any internal boundaries at all. The chief justice did accept adaawk and kungax as viva voce evidence — the first time in Canadian jurisprudence this had happened — and he allowed some elders to testify out of court. But because they lacked details about specific territories, and because the oral testimony often appeared to conflict with the territorial affidavits, he dismissed adaawk and kungax as anecdotal and heresay. This was a crucial move because it effectively dissolved the oral cement that holds mosaicked space together. This made it impossible to see how simo'ogyet could own discontiguous wilp territories, or how 133 different wilp territories could be owned and used by multiple lineages living in a half dozen villages. Perhaps the most damaging blow had nothing to do with the case per se. In moving the trial from Smithers to Vancouver after the first few weeks of evidence, the plaintiffs were detached from place and the support structures of kin and family upon which oral societies depend. In the end, the court accepted that the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en had limited rights to use Crown land, but it concluded that Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en title had been extinguished by colonial and provincial legislation, and with it their claim of ownership and jurisdiction.

To be sure, the judgment did not rely solely on the nature of cartographic evidence. From legal science, to anthropology, to History, it drew on every discursive thread in the fabric of the frontier myth, and it is in this sense that the court was but the voice of
an immigrant society. But stripped to essentials, the judgment was a carefully crafted denial of Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en daxgyet (identity and power) by way of, to borrow from Robin Fisher, a 'scissors-and-paste' approach to Gitxsan geography. The province, and the third party interests it represented, were, understandably, relieved. For the plaintiffs, it was a stinging indictment. As Yaga'lahl (Dora Wilson-Kenni), a Lax Gibuu from Gitanmaax stated at trial, "I'm right here in front of you. Look at me, listen to me talk. How can you deny that I exist if I am right here?" And later, after the ruling, "we were told we didn't exist. Didn't exist. [I]f we didn't own the land, what were we doing there? How did we get to be there? And if you don't want us on the land why don't you send us back where we came from?"

Her point, of course, was that the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en were already where they came from, and it is from this perspective that they could view the judgment as a victory. Not only in the sense that for the first time their geographies were "written in black and white...for anyone to see in [the] transcripts," but also that in being written some portion of the Map of British Columbia was incorporated into adaawk and kungax, becoming pages in the territorial atlas of the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en. As far as Miluu-lak (Alice Jeffrey), a Lax Ganeda from Glen Vowell was concerned, "we won because we've got it in our minds that we've won. What our families have now decided is we're going back into our territories. We're going to occupy those lands and we're going back to look at the overall resources."

104 This ruling spawned an extensive literature, much of it critical, and far more than can be footnoted here. For comprehensive accounts (and in which both Native and non-Native voices are heard), I recommend either of Cassidy, F. (ed) Aboriginal Title, op. cit.; or Miller, B. (ed) Anthropology and History, op. cit..
105 In 'Judging history: Reflections on the Reasons for Judgment in Delgamuukw v. B.C., in ibid, 43-54.
106 According to the Gitxsan, clearcutting in their traditional territories tripled almost to the day the decision came down.
107 Cited in Monet, D. and Skanu'u, Colonialism, op. cit. 77.
108 In 'It will always be the truth' in Cassidy, F. (ed) Aboriginal Title op. cit., 199-205, quote is 202.
110 In 'Remove not the landmark', op. cit., 60.
Reclaiming the Xsan with GIS

In 1993, the Appeal Court of British Columbia partially overturned *Delgamuukw v. A.G.*, dismissing the lower court's extinguishment argument, and affirming that the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en continue to have non-exclusive Aboriginal rights and that those rights were protected under Section 35. The court did not grant rights of ownership or self-government but it was still enough, as FNS Chief Edward John put it, to show that "the wicked witch of extinguishment [was] dead!"\(^{111}\) In the wake of the Appeal Court decision, the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en parted company, filing separate submissions to the BCTC.\(^{112}\) Having served its purpose through the tumultuous years of the late 1980s and early 90s, blockade activity subsided. At the same time, third party intervention in the territories, although slowed by blockades, did not stop. The provincial government was stalling on IMAs, and the Gitxsan were not prepared to wait for the BCTC process to run its course. As far as *Wii Seeks* (Ralph Michell), a Lax Skiik from the wilp of Sakxum Higookx was concerned, it was time to "take our direct action policies one step further [by] initiating plans to use, and benefit economically from our lands.... [t]he land is ours and we must act accordingly"\(^{113}\) In early 1996, *Mas Gaak* suspended negotiations at the BCTC, sought leave to appeal *Delgamuukw* to the SCC, and shifted the emphasis to another major policy initiative. He hived off cartography and resource management concerns (which had been primarily a service branch within the GWHC) to the newly constituted Strategic Watershed and Analysis Team (SWAT).

Established to help the provincial government meet its obligations to the Gitxsan as required by the Appeal Court ruling; to provide the Ministries of Forests (MOF) or Environment, Lands and Parks (MELP) with alternate models of forest or other resources

---


\(^{112}\) This did not mean that there were substantive differences between them (there were not), but, as noted in Chapter 1, that the terms of the BCTC process were favourable to a more independent approach.

\(^{113}\) Cited in Monet and Skanu'u *Colonialism*, op. cit., 205.
management; and to empower local communities, SWAT's mandate was "to fulfill the territorial and resource mapping needs of...House groups, government and industry." In so doing, the Gitxsan signalled their intention to create the infrastructure that would train and capacitate their simo'ogyet and pdeek as they exercised their jurisdiction over wilp resources. Provided they were ready to accept "a strategy of land use that [would] not harm [the] ecosystem," and do so according to Gitxsan values, they also wanted to tender these services to non-Gitxsan interests. Their governing philosophy was that the watersheds (read wilp territories) would be the fundamental political, economic and biological units of landscape analysis. It was hoped that when it came down to how (or even if) those watersheds were to be exploited, MOF and MELP would seek Gitxsan expertise, and not, as had hitherto been the case, the other way around.

Arguably the central strategic move in this new agenda was the acquisition, in 1996, of a PAMAP GIS. By providing the means by which multiple categories of land tenure and resource use data could be stored and retrieved as digitized overlays, GIS expanded exponentially on the possibilities of Gitxsan cartography (Figure R). Near three decades of in-depth field research on the land could now be assembled in a common data base, recalled and combined in any way desired, and, with a 256-colour palette, made visible at the press of a key (Map 56). Whether in a context of negotiations, or to reconstruct past geographies — or to address both at the same time (Maps 57 and 58) — overlaps with adjacent First Nations could also be brought into clear view. In Gitxsan communities, huwilp could now create, at whatever scale desired, maps or 'mini-atlases' of their traditional territories (Map 59). Perhaps most important, GIS allowed the Gitxsan to display territories in three dimensions (Maps 60 and 61). Now, arguably for the first time in the grand narratives of adaawk Gitxsan, simo'ogyet could 'point out the metes and bounds of their territories' in the visual register. This did not mean they would no

115 Ibid., 3.
Figure R
A generalized schematic of the way in which GIS permits one to break down land use inventory and analysis into a series of steps, or overlays. These overlays can then be combined in a variety of ways to highlight spatial relationships that might not be made visible on analog maps (or so made only with great difficulty) (copied, with permission, from original in Duerden, F. and Keller, P. 'GIS and land selection', op. cit.).
Overlays depicting various aspects of traditional use. Each overlay may itself consist of several different types of information.

Location of cabins/camps.

Very simplified harvest map. This may consist of a series of overlays depicting where various species are harvested and the season.

Routeways. This includes trails, water routes and routes used historically.

Location of culturally important sites. Includes meeting place burial sites, archaeological sites etc.

Cabins/Camps

Important harvest areas

Routeways

Heritage sites

Building a simple traditional use map from a series of overlays.
Map 56
SWAT's *The Gitksan*, Hazelton, 1996, 94 x 68 cm; coloured PAMAP GIS topographical map digitized directly from Map 50 and superimposing, in this case, huwilp with Timber Supply Area boundaries. Now without the Wet'suwet'en huwilp to the south and east, the external boundary is, as expected, exactly coterminous with that shown on Map 1. One of the unwritten axioms on the aesthetics of thematic mapping has always been to avoid the use of more colours than are absolutely needed to categorize what is being thematized. In my view, this map proves otherwise (photographed, with permission, from original purchased by author).
Map 57(a-b)
Neil Sterritt's *Nass River*, Hazelton, 1995, 21 x 33 cm; PAMAP GIS map of the upper *Txemsem* watershed. Labelled in the proper Gitxsan spellings, the map, shown in (a), differentiates Nisga’a sites (in blue) from Gitanyow (in red) and in this way marks the boundaries between them. It is actually, however, the reconstruction of an older map (b), prepared by the Gitanyow *simo'ogyet*, *Ts'imgwanks* (Michael Bright); it surfaced in Barbeau’s files in 1926, but was apparently made in 1915 for the MMRC. As hinted in my earlier comparison of Maps 42 and 43, *Ts'imgwanks*’s manually drawn original charts a topological space, and to this extent is a better rendition of the territory as the Gitanyow would have experienced it on the ground. Sterritt’s reconstruction, by contrast, is adjusted to scale in order to satisfy a Euro-Canadian audience used to planimetric accuracy. Beyond this, they are the ‘same map’ and map the ‘same names’. Taken together, they show how GIS is used to reconstruct, and clarify, older maps. For an analysis of these two maps (and their importance for understanding the source of overlap in Map 58, below), see Sterritt, N. et. al.’s *Tribal Boundaries*, op. cit., 69-76 ([a], copied, with permission, from original at Gitanyow Treaty Office, Gitanyow; [b], with permission, from ibid., 72).
Map 58
Neil Sterritt's *Gitxsan - Nisga'a Overlaps*, Hazelton, 19-95, 94 x 68 cm; essentially an areal summary of Map 57, a coloured outline map showing the area of overlap between the Gitxsan, Gitanyow and Nisga'a on the upper *Txemsem* and middle *Xsan* watersheds. It was produced to show that if the boundaries contemplated in the Nisga'a AIP (recall Maps 15[b] and 22) were accepted as the official boundaries for treaty purposes, the result would be a constitutionally entrenched transfer of Gitanyow and Gitxsan territory to the Nisga'a. Unfortunately for the former, this is exactly what happened (preview Map 97[b]) (copied, with permission, from original at Gitxsan Treaty Office, Hazelton).
GITXSAN - NISGA'A OVERLAPS

NIISGA' OVERLAP THE GITXSAN BY 805,937.5 HECTARES (3,173.98 SQ. MILES)
TOTAL DRAINAGE OF THE TXEMSEM IS 2,060,262.4 HECTARES (795.47 SQ. MILES)
TOTAL GITXSAN TERRITORY IS 3,027,906.0 HECTARES (1,169.041.5 SQ. MILES)
Map 59
Art Loring's *Grizzly Bear Habitat*, Hazelton, 1997, 29 x 33 cm; one of a series of exquisitely detailed PAMAP GIS maps of the *Lax Skiik wilp* of *Sakxum Higookx* (lower left Map 56, and just visible bottom Map 50 inset). Oriented east on top, it shows the areas of prime grizzly habitat (in green) and the 'grizzly trails' (the pink lines). A one time faller, Loring's conversion to political activist and blockader during the late 1980s was prompted by his realization that he had been participating in the destruction of his home territory. (See, in this connection, Nettie Wild's National Film Board production *Blockade*.) Most of the early 1990s he has spent coordinating field research in the western Gitxsan territories and making maps. Combined with the other plates in this series, Loring has created what amounts to an 'atlas of TEK' in the *Xsugwin Gaat* (Dorreen Creek) watershed. The atlas has provided important baseline data for a *Lax Skiik* community forest/ecotourism initiative now under development in the watershed. It has also provided a model that other *huwilp* cartographers are now following (photographed, with permission, from original donated to author).
Map 60(a-b)

SWAT's *untitled* sectoral map of the area around the confluence of the Xsan and Ans'pa yaxw, Hazelton, 1997 (?), 21 x 23 cm; oriented northwest on top (and covering approximately the same area shown lower left Map 56 and upper left Map 50 inset), oblique-view digital elevation models (DEM) of *wilp* territories (a), and generalized land use regimes (b). Baseline boundaries are again digitized from Map 50 and contour elevations from government topographies. As suggested on Map 56, the ability to visually correlate categories of land and resource use and tenure data is one of the key features of a GIS. Another is the ability to display that data in three dimensions, and so make it more accessible to those who may not be familiar with the orthogonal perspective. Before *Delgamuukw*, no Gitxsan *simo'ogyet* had ever seen their *huwilp* from the air; maps like these have since made that possible (photographed, with permission, from originals at SWAT, Hazelton).
Map 61
SWAT's *Stekyawdenhi*, Hazelton, 1997 (?), 21 x 23 cm; in terms of perspective, about as far removed from the way it was traditionally perceived, DEM of the mountain on which the sinners of *Temlaxam* met their fate. As playful as they might be, maps like this still serve a pedagogical purpose. In the same way that Maps 45 and 46 experimented with the translation of the sensory perspective on space into the cartographic, then so does this map experiment with the translation of the cartographic into the digital (photographed, with permission, from original at SWAT, Hazelton).
longer have to walk them physically — they would still have to periodically get 'the dirt of that territory under their feet' — but it did allow them to survey those territories from the comfort of their own homes.

There were, of course, neo-colonial interests who argued (as did counsel for the defence in Delgamuukw) that by adopting GIS, and by creating a separate class of cartographers while so doing, the Gitxsan had moved so far away from the spaces of adaawk that they had effectively relinquished any claims to 'tradition'. Although the 1990 SCC decision in Sparrow had already dismissed this argument it is true that by adopting GIS technology the Gitxsan seemed to have to reached the point where maps were being derived, at least in part, from other maps and where visualization per se played an increasingly dominant role. They appeared, in other words, to have become fully complicit with a technology that some have criticized as being the quintessential embodiment of the simulacrum and the bureaucratic state.116

Viewed from the Gitxsan perspective, however, there is no necessary distinction between mapmaking by GIS, by stereoplotter, or by pencil and paper. All are only tools, which are used in specific contexts, with existing resources, and in pursuit of specific goals. While SWAT, for example, is currently developing a 'point-and-click' GIS for use in galt'sap schools,117 in principle this is no different than handing out to students pencils and blank hand-sketched base maps from Birds of the Xsan. Nor has the adoption of GIS stopped simo'ogyet and elders from making (or updating) their own maps in a more time-honoured fashion (Map 62). In short, these digital representations are still really only elaborations on pre-existing paper or stereoplotted maps, which were themselves drawn out of the adaawk record, and the spaces of lived experience. This does

116 There is a wide literature on this, and I will engage it more substantively in the Conclusion. In the interim, as good a survey as any may be found in John Pickles (ed) Ground Truth: The Social Implications of Geographic Information Systems (New York: Guilford Press, 1995).
117 One of the first was developed by the Ditidaht, a Nuu-chah-nulth band. It is inaccessible to the general public, however.
Map 62
Sindihl's (Robert Good) Kitwancool Map, Gitanyow, n.d., 28 x 39 cm; the incorporation of GIS technology has not stopped Gitxsan simo'ogyet from making (or updating) their own maps in a more time honoured fashion. In this example, Sindihl has taken Niishlaganoos's original 1959 map (Map 43), scaled it up on a photocopier, and then added in the appropriate areas the names of the simo'ogyet that own them (copied, with permission, from Sindihl's original, Gitanyow).
not mean that GIS is not important. It can do things that analog maps and LUOS cannot. In a contact zone where one culture has basically deified technology as an arbiter of truth, GIS carries a legal weight that other kinds of maps do not. But it does not follow that Map 56 is a better map than Map 50, or that Map 57(b) is an improvement over Map 57(a). As I noted in my comparison between Maps 42 and 43, it is likely the reverse.

SWAT cartographers are trained in digital production, and to this extent might constitute a new technocracy within the Gitxsan community. But they are the same people who rediscovered geography on primers like *Birds of the Ksan* a generation ago. Like many GIS applicators they are not preoccupied with the nuances of database design, or with debating the perils and promises of the digital imagination. They understand that parts of adaawk cannot be properly translated in three dimensions anymore than in two. They are only interested in what a GIS can do — the degree to which it 'hangs onto' the territories; the extent to which it empowers their communities and their management of local resources; and whether it helps create a space for dialogue between their communities and the Euro-Canadian. In the event, the database that matters to Gitxsan is still that which has been transmitted across space and through time in adaawk Gitxsan. Indeed, you will not see a map in the yukw, where territories are witnessed and validated in the traditional manner. On this view, then, it seems plain that the authorities of adaawk Gitxsan have not been compromised by adventures in cyberspace at all. On the contrary, and as I have argued previously, adaawk has, once again, incorporated the representational machinery of the cartographic eye/I and brought it within the orbit of its own event structure. By bringing GIS into the community, and using it to map TEK, the Gitxsan have, in fact, democratized it.

Because the SCC decision in *Delgamuukw* had broad policy implications for all First Nations in British Columbia, I have chosen to consider its contents in the Conclusion of this study. As far as the specifics of the plaintiffs' case were concerned, the SCC had no
comment, except to suggest that if they wanted to seek a judicial resolution, a new trial was warranted. As of this writing, the Gitxsan have neither sought a new trial (but it is being considered), nor resumed negotiations at the BCTC, preferring instead to give bipartite negotiations with the province a chance. From their perspective, however, it does not matter. They have already exerted their ownership and jurisdiction out on the land. They have inventoried their resources to a level of detail that few other agencies can match. New xwtsaan are going up, limx'oy are being sung, yukw are ongoing, and the daily rhythms of life continue. An immigrant society might not agree that anything has changed on the great bend of the Xsan — and in some respects it has not. But perception is nine tenths reality and there are many Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en who think otherwise. According to Mikh Lilch Legh:

> When someone takes something from you, like they just take it away from you, sometimes later you take it back. And...if it's taken in our feast system in front of witnesses, it is valid. But if someone takes something without witnesses, then it's not valid. We are the caretakers of this land. We have always been. We own this land and whether it's in the court, or in negotiations, the only thing that we know is that we own the land. If there are any doubters, come and see me, Johnny David, Chief Mikh Lilch Legh.  

Let us now depart Gitxsan country by way of a detour through Map 63, which hints that the distance between the space of the cartographic eye/I and the space of xwtsaan, ayuuk and yukw is perhaps not as great as we might otherwise think. To be sure the visual emphasis rests on the former, but would this still be the case if Map 63 was scaled up like a banner, and suspended like bunting, between a pair of xwtsaan as they looked skyward to Laxwiiyip, Gitangasx, Temlaxam and points between? An absurd proposition perhaps but is not that, in essence, what Map 63 is? The fact that the wil litxwhl

---

118 The decision completely reset the table upon which equal and competing titles would henceforth have to be reconciled but the court did not adjudicate the specifics of the litigation itself. This was partly because there had been a change in the pleadings between the original claim and the argument presented at the SCC, and so prejudiced the defense and other potential intervenors; and partly because the trial judge had not adduced the plaintiffs evidence in a manner consistent with the principles established by the SCC ruling.

119 Cited in 'Feature interview', op. cit., 1.
Map 63
Neil Sterritt’s and Gitanyow Hereditary Chiefs’ *Gitanyow Territory*, Hazelton, 1998, 94 x 60 cm; prepared as cartographic support for the Gitanyow’s BCSC challenge to the terms of the Nisga’a AIP (recall Map 58) in *Luuxhon v. A.G.*, a PAMAP GIS map of Gitanyow wilp territories. It shows the locations of pre- and post-contact gals’tap (boxed V’s), smokehouses and fishing stations (boxed H’s) and other named sites (the small circles), all alphanumerically keyed to a separate gazetteer. Not surprisingly, the most detail is provided in the area bordering the Nisga’a. What sets this map apart from other huwilp maps (such as Maps 50 or 56), however, is the way in which the mapped space is enframed with photographs of the most important xwtsaan in the *adaawk* describing how the ownership of each territory was established. Generally speaking, the images of the xwtsaan are arranged around the perimeter of the map so as to preserve visual adjacency between the xwtsaan and the wilp to which they refer. (On an earlier version, the links were highlighted by arrows.) It is in this sense that the map authorizes itself from two perspectives at the same time. On the one hand, what is implied in the photographic overlay serves as the ‘legend’ for what is shown cartographically. On the other, the cartographic overlay ‘witnesses’ and ‘validates’ that which is represented in the photographic! (Although the Gitanyow won their treaty challenge in the narrow legal sense, they lost it in the practical. Thanks to the passage of the *Nisga’a Treaty*, the Nisga’a have received a constitutionally entrenched right to harvest wildlife resources in Gitanyow territory on the upper Nass watershed [see, again, Map 97[b])] (photographed, with permission, from original purchased by author).
*gyadim gan* (totem pole place) has been abstracted onto a photographic overlay does not, it seems to me, alter anything. Rather like the moiré pattern paintings that instantly generate three-dimensional pictures as soon as we focus our vision on some vanishing point behind the two-dimensional surface, so too does the cartographic rendition of *adaawk Gitanyow* adsorb itself into the latter the moment we plant ourselves in the *wil litxwhl gyadim gan*. Again, what has changed is not the territorial object itself but, depending upon the positionality of the viewing subject, the perspective through which the object is perceived.

Perhaps better than any other in this dissertation, Map 63 closes a circle. It is a place where two potential perspectives on territory — one inscribed in the cartographic eye/I; the other incorporated in *adaawk* — cohabit. As shown on Map 54, these perspectives share a common ancestry, but they separated early, consolidating themselves on continents on opposite sides of the globe. On Map 63, there is a sense in which they have finally joined together. In taking us directly to the heart of the contact zone — where territories overlap and histories intertwine, and where two perspectives discourse with each other — Map 63 shows continuity between the past and the present, between the map and the non-map, between tradition and modernity, and between first and First National space. On this map, we can dip our toes in the shores of the cross-cultural ocean, and the water seems inviting. Those that have always been where they are have dove right in. It seems only right that the visitors who never left now do the same.
Dakelh Yunk'eguz

The fight to bring our land claims forward has taken up months and years of my life, but I know this is necessary – there is nothing more important to my people than a territorial settlement."  

Compared to the Gitxsan, tracking continuity in Carrier Sekani cartography is a rather more difficult undertaking. Geographically, their pre-contact domains were the most expansive in all of what is now British Columbia; their internal and external boundaries among the most diffuse. Under contact conditions Carrier Sekani bands have been marked by movement, bifurcation, amalgamation, regrouping and intermarriage with other indigenous groups, and have been further confused by the various labels given to them in an uneven ethnohistoric record. Although it has gradually acquired some ground in historical and geographical fact, the name Carrier Sekani is really a post-Calder designation created to deal with the land question. Overall, Carrier Sekani territorialization presents a unique set of conceptual and logistical challenges to making, and for making sense of, Carrier Sekani maps. Indeed, while they are arguably the first Native groups to have been positioned on the Map of British Columbia by the cartographic eye, they are among the last to have made maps of their own. Still, by oscillating between fragments of the ethnohistoric literature, contemporary Carrier Sekani maps, CSTC archival sources, and my own journey through Carrier Sekani country, I should have enough to show that while the processes of incorporation are similar, Carrier Sekani geography was, and remains, as different from the Gitxsan's as from the Euro-Canadian.

Situating the Carrier Sekani

The Carrier and Sekani were both independent Athapaskan speaking peoples occupying a vast territory of lakes, mountains and intermontane forest approximately bound-

---

2 See, in this connection, my Euro-Canadian Cartography, op. cit., 43-6.
ed by the Dzulhti (Rocky Mountains) in the east, Chudadee (Thutade Lake) and the upper drainage of the Tsutsikoh (Finlay River) to the north, Khelh Bun and Utsa Benghen (Takla and Ootsa Lakes) in the west and the Tsalakhoh, Baezeko (Chilako and Bazaeko Rivers) and the upper Lhtakoh (Fraser River) in the south. Their neighbours to the east were the Dunne Za, to the south the Tsilhqot'in and Secwepemc, to the west the Gitxsan and to the north the Kaska Dene and Tahltan. The Carrier, occupying roughly the western two thirds of this territory, called themselves the Dakelh (contraction of uda'dakelh, meaning 'they who travel on water in the morning') and the Sekani the Tsekhene (meaning 'people on the rocks'). These were not the names applied to each other, however, and in modern usage, dakelh and tsekhene are also generic designations for all Native people, and to distinguish them from the nedo ('white people'). The 'sub-tribes', by contrast, were named and localized socio-territorial units, or regional bands, the organization of which varied according to dialectical, sociopolitical or geographical particularities, but was generally consistent with those of other Athapaskan speaking groups.

Inhabiting the salmon-rich watersheds west of the Dzulhti, Carrier 'sub-tribes' were semi-sedentary associations of constituent extended families, each of which controlled access to specific 'ndi (fishing weirs) at salmon fishing villages in the summer, satellite freshwater fishing stations in fall or spring, and keyohs (trapping territories) in winter. They were neither corporate kinship groups nor unified political chiefdoms, but assemblages of constituent settlements, identifying and locating themselves in space by a de-

---

3 The Sekani called the Carrier the Agili (meaning 'people who are tied up', and refers to the way that the Carrier carried packs on their backs), while the Carrier called the Sekani Tlat'ten (meaning 'people of the beaver dams', but which the Sekani applied, in turn, to the Dunne Za). For more specific appellations according to regional band, see Diamond Jenness, The Sekani Indians of British Columbia, Bulletin No. 84, Anthropological Series No. 20 (Ottawa: NMC, 1937), 17-8.


scriptive toponym appended with the suffix (whu)t'en(ne) (meaning 'people of'). *T*l'az-t'enne, for example, was a contraction of the suffix and the stem *tl'az* ('head of the bay') and thus translated as 'people at the head of the bay' (in this instance, a bay on the north shore of Nak'al Bun [Stuart Lake]); likewise, *Nadleh whut'en* is a contraction of the suffix and stem *nadleh* ('annual run') and so translated as 'people of the annual run' (in this case, referring to the annual run of salmon in the Nautley River). These bands were represented by names which denoted bodies of water because it was at, and by means of such bodies that the bands were enunciated as distinct collectives. An individual from a *T*l'az't'enne family would be, then, firstly a *dakelh* speaker, then a *T*l'az't'enne proper. In addition, the longer suffix, *whut'en(ne)*, was often used to associate individuals with specific villages within a band so that, for example, a person could be a *Tache whut'en* (meaning 'a resident of the *T*l'az't'enne village of *Tache*').

Sekani sub-tribes, however, were much more diffuse, and appear not to have identified themselves in the same way. Historically occupying the watersheds east of, or the ridges and valleys astride the *Dzulhti* where the climate was much harsher, and lacking access to salmon-bearing streams, they were more nomadic, relying to a greater extent on small and large game and freshwater fish. They also were organized into extended families but they were sociopolitically even more acephalous than the Carrier. The size of the bands varying widely depending on the relative availability of terrestrial resources, and there were no permanent villages. Like the Carrier, however, residence was generally patrilocal and bilateral inheritance rules maximized individual choice in a difficult environment. In both linguistic groups sharing was expected, and given, in times of

---


scarcity. And while there were exceptions, the Carrier and Sekani were usually on friendly terms with each other.  

Unlike the coastal nations, oral tradition offers few clues on how the Carrier or Sekani came to occupy their territories. Both groups seem to have believed in a 'being-on-high' — for the Sekani, Yagasta; for the Carrier, Utakke — who was responsible in a general way for the origins of the world, the weather, and moral guidance. There is no evidence that they created or modified specific topographical features, and no record of either the kind of ancestral migration narratives that characterized the Tsimshian or Wakashan speakers or of transformer stories like those of the Salishan. There are a few tales describing a diaspora of Carrier and Sekani from Dizkle, but they are strictly Wet'suwet'en and have clearly been incorporated from the Gitxsan. As with most Athapaskans, the Carrier or Sekani seem to accept that they have always been where they are, and have never felt compelled to theorize about their origins.

Some oral traditions do make reference to the uda'dune ('ancestors' or 'long ago people'), or to tricksters who created features of the physical landscape. They are often named, but rarely linked to specific villages or band territories. In the Carrier oral trad-

---

8 Conflict occasionally arose with the southeasternmost Carrier, who were wedged between the Sekani and Secwepemc, who were not on good terms. See Jenness, D. *The Sekani*, op. cit., 18–9.  
9 As noted in footnote 49, Chapter 2, ethnographers spent comparatively little time in the Carrier Sekani world. The handful recorded by Morice, A.G. had incorporated Christian motifs, and while Jenness, D. collected a number of creation myths (see below), none of them deal with territorial occupancy.  
10 Recall from Chapter 2 that these are similar responsibilities attributed to creator beings in a number of Athapaskan and Interior Salish oral traditions. Once again, however, the degree to which these figures may be personifications of Christian entities is unclear.  
11 The Carrier Sekani do not seem to have drawn any distinction between primary, myth age accounts, and secondary narratives of a more temporal nature. Indeed, in the entire dakelh-English dictionary (draft copy on file at the Tl'azt'en Treaty Office), I can find no dakelh word that translates as 'story'.  
12 A well known story describes how the people of Gitwangak, Gitsegukla, and 'Kyah Wiget (Moricetown) all used to live together at Dizkle, where each clan had its own fish weir and dam across the Wedzen Kwah. Reconfiguring some of the motifs already seen in the migration adaawk of the Tsimshian chief Ts'tbasaa (in Chapter 2), the dispersal was triggered by a supernatural squirrel running across one of the weirs, foretelling disaster for anyone who stayed. (Two variants are transcribed by Jenness, D., in 'Myths of the Carrier Indians of British Columbia' *Journal of American Folk-lore* 47[184-5], 1934, 240-6; and by Skokum Mah Sash [Little Tommy Michell] in Carol and Rose Naziel [eds], *Stories of the Moricetown Carrier Indians of Northwestern British Columbia* [Moricetown: Moricetown Indian Band Council, 1978], 20).
ition, for example, there are a handful of tales describing the adventures of 'Usdas, a cultural hero who stole buckets of water from 'the old man', spilling out some of the lakes and rivers while he ran, but they vary depending upon who told them and where. In some versions the water created Nak'al Bun or Neda Bun (Stuart or François Lakes); in others 'salt water'.\(^\text{13}\) There is a rock above waterline in the west end of Nadleh Bun-k'ut (Fraser Lake) said to bear the imprint of 'Usdas after he was 'dropped from the sky' by swans,\(^\text{14}\) and he is supposed to have made a large trench, a smoothed rock cliff, and other features near 'Kyah Wiget.\(^\text{15}\) A Nadleh story speaks of Galbażnelye, a culture hero who raced between 'Ulkatcho (Ulkatcho) and Nak'azdli (Fort St. James) at superhuman speed but in the Tache\(k\) whut'en (Stony Creek) version — a longer narrative which has not been translated into English — he is a real historical agent charged with dividing up the land into the original keyohs and generally making them ready for human occupation.\(^\text{16}\)

As argued in Chapter 2, though, it is the agency, and not the agents proper, that is of concern. 'Usdas is actually a name identifying 'legendary men', in general — uda'dune (long ago people) who were intelligent and accomplished many interesting things, not the least of which was to bring the moral imperatives and values of Yagasta or Utakke down to earth. This would explain why so many Carrier 'myths' recorded by Diamond Jenness in 1934 are devoid of site-specific references.\(^\text{17}\)

\(^\text{13}\) Jenness D. recorded two Carrier variants in 'Myths', op. cit., 204-14; Morice, A.G. one in 'Are the Carrier sociology and mythology indigenous or exotic?' *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 2, 1892, 126. A Wet'suwet'en kungax describes how an unidentified boy wanted two balloons belonging to an unnamed chief and Indian doctor whose people lived in a dark and dry world. The boy broke both balloons, one of them emitting the sun, and the other the water that formed the lakes and streams (told by Kush Gea Bah [Pat Namox] in Naziel, C. and R. *Stories of the Moricetown*, op. cit., 24.). Recall that in the northwest coast adaawk, these feats were accomplished by Weegyet or Txemsem.

\(^\text{14}\) Mrs. Ralph Hall, cited in Cauthers, J. 'Some reflections', op. cit., quote is 15.

\(^\text{15}\) In Jenness, D. 'Myths', op. cit., 204. Recall from Chapter 2 that similar motifs surface in a couple of Southern Carrier narratives concerning the workings of Yus, Kwakwasat and Nowakila on the Dean River, and of the giant Kebets'ih near Nazko.

\(^\text{16}\) The former in ibid., 203-4; the latter from a personal conversation with Leonard Thomas, former chief and treaty coordinator for the Saik'ug (Stony Creek) First Nation.

\(^\text{17}\) Hall, L. *The Carrier*, op. cit., 7-10.
be that the purpose of these tales is not to spatially legislate people in place, but, rather, to delineate the outer limits of a generic moral geography that has wide applicability everywhere. Indeed, in the majority of these stories the uda'dune are typically unnamed young adults or children, often orphans who learned moral truths through their interactions with animals. Certain things tended to happen depending on whether or not they were at a lake, on salt water, in a cave, or up on a mountain but they are reconfigured, in the variants, to fit local requirements.18

A contoured cartography

Carrier Sekani territorialization depended, rather, on an intense experiential knowledge of the land itself. They were, after all, mobile people, characterized by a low level of social stratification and living in territories that often yielded their resources grudgingly. Settlements were small, dispersed and seasonal. At the same time, this was a less topographically variegated landscape than, say, that of the Gitxsan or Stó:lō, and there were more options for travel through, or in it. This suggests that the Carrier and Sekani would have had to develop mappings consisting of at least two basic components: a discriminating spatial referencing system by which individuals, as if equipped with a familiar text, could read the landscape; and a terrestrial infrastructure of routes and landmarks by which to organize and find their way through it.

Reading the landscape depended on the toponyms. Functioning as a form of narrative art in their own right, their structure reflected the grammatical and syntactical rules of the dakelh or tsekhene languages. Like all Athapaskan languages, these are ungend-

18 Mills, A. (in Eagle Down, op. cit., 98), has accused Jenness of indiscriminately jettisoning toponyms from tales recorded in the 'Myths', op. cit., but she is referring specifically to the Wet'suwet'en's kungax and I am now rather less sure that this accusation can be extended, as she implies to (non-Wet'suwet'en) Carrier narratives. (Although from the standpoint of the listener, Furniss, E. has made a similar point in Dakelh Keyoh, op. cit.) That aside, this should not be taken to exonerate Jenness; on balance, he was careless in not identifying his informants and many of his transcriptions seem rather too perfunctory, lacking the lilting and uneven tone of, say, Teit, J.'s or Wells, O.'s.
ered verbal languages, oriented to action and to conveying the experience of events as they unfolded in space and time; indeed out of of every ten words in the dakelh dictionary, nine are either verbs, verbal forms, or verb-modifying morphemes. They are the most polysynthetic of all North American indigenous languages, meaning that phrases and morphemes can be strung together in different combinations, and then contracted or abbreviated so that complex references can be expressed as economically as possible.

Like the names of the regional bands, each toponym is a contraction of a suffix describing the type of site and a stem narrating the physical, biotic, spiritual or other characteristics associated with it. Lakes are called bung hun (usually shortened to either bun or ghun), islands are noo, mountains are dzulh (above the treeline) or yus (below it) and rivers, koh (or ka). Several examples of names describing the biotic character of sites are T'ughus Noo (in Nak'al Bun [Stuart Lake]), meaning 'trembling aspen island'; Chun-si Noo (also in Nak'al Bun), 'fir island'; Duzdli Koh (Taché River), a 'river where driftwood flows'; and Chunlac, a contraction of duchun nidulak meaning 'wood floats to a terminus' (and thus describes how driftwood accumulates on the sandbars).

Other places are named according to the way they were perceived or used by Carrier or Sekani people. Neither category should be considered discrete, but examples of the first include Betsen Dzulh (Pinchi Mountain), 'warrior mountain' (because when viewed from the ground it looks like a warrior lying down); Neyilasts'ah (Mouse Mountain), 'cannibal's pinkie' (because it looks like a crooked little finger, and was the lair of the cannibal Neyi); Dzilh Ghiz Bin (Burns Lake), 'the lake between the mountains'; and

19 See Morice, A.G., 'The Déné languages considered in themselves and incidentally in their relations to non-American Indians', Stuart's Lake Mission, 1891, Canadian Institute of Historical Microforms (CIHM) 15671; and 'Abstraction in the Carrier Language', in Minor Essays, Mostly Anthropological (Quesnel: Stuart's Lake Mission, 1902), 55-64.

20 This contrasts with the Tsimshian languages, which are among the least polysynthetic. Indeed, there is a sense in which the dominant geographical references in the Tsimshian world are the adaawk, the toponyms secondary to, or flowing from them; while in the Athapaskan, it is the toponyms doing the most substantive geographical work, the narratives directed towards other purposes (cf. Basso, K. Wisdom, op. cit.)

21 Except as noted below, these etymologies are taken from the dakelh-English dictionary, op. cit.
Bilhka Bun (Whitefish Lake), lake of 'snares and arrows' (and so reflected the excellent hunting and fishing at that place). In the second we have Tsintelehnoola (also in Nak'al Bun) 'the island where there are ling cod underwater' (and so captured its importance as a satellite fishing station); and Ts'alk'et, a boggy area between Saik'uz (Stony Creek) and Nadleh (Nautley), 'diaper moss place' (because of the ts'al [diaper moss] that grows there; knowing this also conveyed that 'uyak'unulh'a [Labrador tea], a drink and medicine, is also probably found there since they typically grow in the same environment). A few names appear to acknowledge that past environmental conditions may have been quite different; Utsa Benghen, a variant on Etayauyootsoo, meaning a 'lake that is way down toward the water', suggests that Ootsa Lake may have once drained into the Pacific.

In other cases, toponyms shorthand stories connected with anthropomorphic beings or uda'dune who brought the sites into existence and gave them their special character long ago. One example is Chuzghun (Tezzeron Lake): it translates as 'snowflake lake', but actually refers to a huge storm that separated two ancestral Carrier lovers; the tears they shed created the lake, their cries the sounds of the loons that mate there. Nak'azdli (Fort St. James) is a contraction of the sentence, Ut nak'a bulh tizdli. It means 'the outlet flows with the arrows of foreigners', and refers to a historic battle between the residents of that village and the Etnanyez (or 'little people') who lived in caves on Nak'al (Mount Pope). The arrows flew so thickly during the contest that they broke the natural dam at the outlet of Nak'al Bun, forming the islands Nooyiz and Nootsul. Dakelh toponyms never refer to persons arbitrarily (as they often do in English), but a few do link specific sites with the individual that used them. Jenicho Noo (in Nak'al Bun); for ex-

---

22 I am indebted to the linguist, William Poser, for supplying the author with these etymologies.
23 I will come back to the significance of this particular etymology in footnote 66.
25 This is one of the best known of all Carrier narratives. See Morice, A.G. 'British Columbia maps and place names' in Minor Essays, op. cit., 44-54; another tale involving the Etnanyez is found in Hall, L. The Carrier, op. cit., 59-60.
ample, is named after Jinni Cho, a Täché whut'en whose family once owned a fishing camp at that place.  

The most important component in the terrestrial infrastructure linking named sites together was the system of *ti* (trails) and *koh* (streams), and portages between them. To a point, this system was similar to that developed by the Gitxsan. At the sub-continen- 
tal scale, the Carrier and Sekani anchored the eastern termini of both the Nisga'a-Gitan- 
yow and Nuxalk-Carrier grease trails, as well as a handful of less frequented trails lead­
ing through mountain passes to the east, south and north. Regionally, however, these 
would have been secondary to the more dense and dendritic network of *ti* and *koh* that 
served local commerce, and went, as Henry Jack suggested in Chapter 2, 'all over the 
place'. The Carrier and Sekani classified at least six types of *ti*. In addition to the gen­
eric term *ti* (which could mean a 'trail', a 'path', or a 'road'), one could also travel, de­
dpending on the morphemes to which it was agglutinated, a *lhatus*ti, meaning 'trail to the 
other side of the lake'; *lhatuswheti*, 'intersection'; *nati*, 'crossroad'; *'awhnaduti*, 'circum­
erential road or trail'; *ts'ahati*, 'road from'; or *khunai ti*, 'animal trail'. The important 
point is that the distinction between these different categories of *ti* was not (as is typic­
ally the case in English) based on surface characteristics, or heaviness of use. It was 
based on their *directionality* with respect to something or each other, and upon who or 
what used them. The same classificatory logic applied to the waterways, which were 
not defined by their size or length, but by the nature of their flow regime or current. 
Thus, in addition to the *kohs* proper, one could distinguish between a *tigdl*, meaning 
'outlet of a lake'; *hukw'einli*, 'tributary of a (specified) stream'; *'aghchininli*, 'meandering 
stream'; or *'aghcheininli*, 'end of current' (or the point at which the current of a stream 
emptying into a lake is no longer visible). Indeed, while in modern use the name Lhta-

---

26 Recall, also, from Chapter 2, *Nahool’ten*, a *noo* in the Euchinikoh (Euchiniko River) which is named after the *uda'dune* who drowned there.
"koh" means Fraser River, it originally referred only to the point where the distinct currents of the Lhtakoh and Nechakoh (Nechako River) merged.

This network of tis, kohs and portages was embellished by both artefactual and graphic wayfinding devices. The most important artefactual elements were the countless family-owned 'ndis (fish weirs), tsachuns (above ground food stores) and chuntohyohs (cabins). Although of less elaborate design than the Gitxsan dahk (timbered houses), there were more of them; distributed evenly throughout the territory, they were the permanent built structures that marked out the resource component of TEK. The spiritual component was primarily evoked in pictographs, pictograms and dendroglyphs (Figure S). Though most contemporary Carrier Sekani are not able to translate the meaning of the larger representations — if they are composites, there would not be any larger meaning — and have no idea about who drew them or how old they are, many can still decipher the meaning of the individual elements. While most are a consequence of vision quests, some seem to depict various types of ti (trails) and to this extent carry out a cartographic and, possibly, even astronomical function. Beyond that it was where they were drawn as much as what was represented by them, that was equally relevant to Carrier and Sekani wayfinding. Surely, it is not coincidental that these examples are all on the north shore of Nak'al Bun (Stuart Lake), because this is where the salmon thalweg runs, and thus where they would be most visible to others. On Khelh Bun (Takla Lake) they are found on the south shore for the same reasons.27

Some wayfinding devices, especially those designed to facilitate travel, were more temporary. For example, it was common practice to break stakes into different shapes, and then mount them trailside where they could be seen by others (Figure T). In this way, travellers could decide on a course of action outside of the constraints normally implied by oral communication. The Carrier and Sekani also located themselves with

---

Figure S

Not unexpectedly, Athapaskan pictography was stylistically consistent with Salishan (recall Figures B and C). According to Father Adrien Gabriel Morice's informants, the simpler designs (Morice's figure 194) were thenkoh (personal crests or guardian spirits acquired in vision quests), and typically sketched in charcoal on trees in pictorial (left) or symbolic (center and right) form. In older times they were often tattooed on the owner's breast or face. More complex pictures (Morice's 190) were usually painted onto cliff faces or cave walls, but uncertainly over which elements were painted when makes interpretation difficult. Morice's informants thought that this panel, halfway between Tachë and Nak'azdli on the north shore of Nak'al Bun, represented a stream (bottom of panel), from which a fish was emerging (middle), some birds (at the left end of the stream), a bear (center) and tracks (center right), a toad (upper left), and the constellation Yihta ('great bear', the spidery figure, center left). Other symbols they could not identify. Some may depict various types of ti, or maybe more fish; others could be figures of people or animals. The designs at bottom (Morice's 191-3) were supposed to be a deer in a cave on a dzulh (left), a crane or large insect (right), and beavers circling a dam in a lake (center). Most contemporary Carrier agree with the first two interpretations, but state that the latter is actually a generalized representation of the four clans circumnavigating Carrier territory (copied from original drawings in Morice's 'Notes, archaeological, industrial and sociological on the western Déné with an ethnographical sketch of the same' Transactions of the Canadian Institute 4, 1893, 207-8).
Figure T
According to Morice's informants, the pointing of the stick in (a) marked the direction of the previous party; (b) that it was camped not far up the ti, (c) that it was camped at some greater distance away (encouraging the following party to expedite itself); (d) that the first party had backtracked before resuming its original course; (e) that it was distressed (in which case burnt rags were hung and the stick pointed in that direction), or needed someone to help dispose of a kill (in which case the appropriate animal hairs were hung); (f) that someone had been shot; and (g) that a person in the preceding party had died from natural causes (copied from original drawing in Morice, A.G. 'Notes', op. cit., 211).
music or verse, except in this case by reference to the place names as opposed to each other. While there were a few places where musical recitation appears to have been integral to a spirit quest — for example, *Tsekoo Shunk'et* (a cave west of *Nadleh Bunk'ut* [Fraser Lake] where 'women gained spiritual power through music') — and individuals often had their own *duneyun* ('personal songs'), there is no evidence of the sort of commemorative dirge song used by the northwest coastal cultures or of the type of migration poems characteristic of the Stó:lō. Rather, Carrier and Sekani used music mnemonically, as preparation for, or as a guide to movement itself. Three examples included their *'uka' tist'elh* ('hunting songs'), *chus shun* ('paddling songs'), and *nekuzdude shun* ('travelling songs') (Figure U). Like the Secwepemc's *hwistcimain*, these were recited atonally, often with a drum accompaniment or in cadence with the pace of walking or paddling. And in the same way that generic moral lessons could be adapted to where they were told, or by the audience to whom directed, so these songs could be sung anywhere and on any excursion — all one needed to do was substitute different toponyms. This, it seems to me, supports the argument in Chapters 3 and 4 — that a territorial perspective can operationalize itself in the sonorous and tactile, as well as the visual registers.

Wayfinding devices were not only infrastructural to the system of *tis* and *koohs*, but further classified according to the way they were sensed. Structures (like *'ndis, chunto-hyohs* or *tsachuns*), prominent physical features (like *Neyilasts'ah* and *Nak'al*), and pictographs and petroglyphs are all examples of what the Carrier call *beyunuhoodal'en*. In modern usage the term translates roughly as 'landmark', but etymologically is a contraction of a longer phrase meaning any location 'where the ground is marked for the eyes'. At the same time *beyunuhoodal'en* were coded with layers of meaning acquired through other senses — they also refer to the trajectories, the vision quests, and the stories that created them. They could also be temporary. According to this logic, ordinary *tis* and *koohs*, relatively unremarkable physical features, *shun* (songs), and CMTs likely did not
Music was basic to Carrier Sekani territorialization. These are three of several categories of *shun* used to get ready for, or during, movement. (Two others were meeting and departure songs.) That geographical information was carried lyrically seems self-evident. That it was also transmitted rhythmically, in time with the undulations of landscape, would only become evident in their performance (all copied, with permission, from original transcriptions by Ileen Heer in the Carrier Linguistic Committee's [CLC] *Carrier Teachers Manual for Oral Instruction* [Fort St. James, CLC, 1977], 215-221).
TRAVELLING SONG

1. Come on, come with me.
Let me show you 'round.
This is my dear homeland.
We call it Necoslie.
It sits on the Stuart Lake.
Yes, it's pretty.

2. Let us go by boat
To Indian land
Where there are villages.
First of all is Pinchi.
These live native people.
There, too, it's nice.

3. In Tache village
Live more native friends.
Further west is Portage
Where they feed us so well
While we rest for awhile.
It's beautiful.

4. On Tache river
We go up by boat.
We lunch at Grand Rapids.
We resume the trip, then
Arrive on Trembleur Lake.
There, too, it's nice.

Nukczudude Shun

1. 'Anih, nulhun'ay.
Dulcho sih not'as.
Njan skeyoh 'uhoont'oh.
Nak'zizdi ts'uwhutini.
Nak'al bun ba whuz'ai.
'Alha hoonzoo,

2. Ts'i be noo' toke'.
Dakelh yun hooni
Whuz keyoh wheoodilya.
'Udechoo 'et Binche
'Et dakelhne ihilah.
'Et cha hoonzoo,

3. Doocha Tache 'et
Dakelhne huulhai.
'Oono' 'et Yekooche.
Nzo'o neghahu'ayh.
Natsulyih cha' ts'uwh'ih.
Tube hoonzoo,

4. Tache koh k'ut 'et
Ndo utsuku ihoh.
K'uzche 'et na'tsuwh'ih.
Doocha whenazzdikih.
Dzinghubun k'ets'ikih.
'Et cha hoonzoo,

THE PADDLE SONG

1. Wind, you are very strong.
Days are getting long.
The nomad's eager to row.
So take yourself elsewhere.
The waters are very still.
So I can paddle downstream,
Down the river that
I love so.

2. Ah, the waters have calmed.
The journey begins.
How good's the oar in my hand
As once again I row.
And down the river I row
Near the eddies, slowly as
Past them I do float,
I do float.

3. I drift in the canoe as
Though waiting in awe.
Suddenly the current's strong
While I was floating by.
To the midst went my canoe.
Into the boiling rapids
We so bravely bounced.
Yes, we bounced.

4. Soon my canoe and I,
To waters so calm
Arrived and there we drifted.
Dream well, my dearest friend.
You and I, we are alone.
The sky above, the still waters
And the world around
You and me.

Chus Shun

1. Nikol'si, tube ilhus.
'Awet dzin dihdza'.
Nukedude-un t'ito.
Nyuun 'uts'un nilbi't.
Buntoo 'awet soo dizghel
'Inka 'ukoh 'et tist'o.
'Et le bha hoonzoo,
Sha hoonzoo,

2. 'Awet too dizghel
'Et huwa tiskelh.'
Chus nudustun hoonzus't'.
'Et doocha za ust'o.
N'ats 'ukoh ts'e ust'o.
'Inka 'ok'et zih naitsha
'Owhuya whets'ukw,
Soo whets'ukw.

3. Ts'i be whes'kih 'et le
Whubaili k'un'a
Chus ulitfn ulitfn lhah
Nyo ts'i be mustat whe.
'Et s'isi whusus wheo.
'Awet dumohol dos'en
'Et soo huk'we'ski,
'Et huk'we'ski.

4. Si 'et 'ink'ez s'isi bulh
Soo dizghel-un 'et
Huk'we'ski.
'So otsat.
Soo ninte, sk'eyezy.
Whenich'o za 'uts'it'oh,
Yat 'ondo, 'et too dizghel
Za. Yun unzuoo
Za hooni.

'I'M OFF TO HUNT

1. I'm off to hunt, I'm off to hunt
In the forest, in the forest.
For animals I'm off to hunt.
There are many in the forest.

2. I'm off to hunt, I'm off to hunt,
Down the river, down the river.
For animals I'm off to hunt.
There are many down the river.

3. I'm off to hunt, I'm off to hunt,
Out by the lake, out by the lake.
For animals I'm off to hunt.
There are many out by the lake.

4. I'm off to hunt, I'm off to hunt,
In the mountains, in the mountains.
For animals I'm off to hunt.
There are many in the mountains.

'Uka' Tist'elh

1. 'Uka' tist'elh, 'uks' tist'elh,
Chuntoh ts'e, chuntoh ts'e.
Khumai ha 'uks' tist'elh.
Khumai'i hlah chuntoh ts'e.

2. 'Uka' tist'elh, 'uks' tist'elh,
'Ukoh ts'e, 'ukoh ts'e.
Khumai ha 'uks' tist'elh.
Khumai'i hlah 'ukoh ts'e.

3. 'Uka' tist'elh, 'uks' tist'elh,
Bonghun ts'e, bonghun ts'e.
Khumai ha 'uks' tist'elh.
Khumai'i hlah 'ukoh ts'e.

4. 'Uka' tist'elh, 'uks' tist'elh,
Dzhul k'ut ts'e, dzhul k'ut ts'e.
Khumai ha 'uks' tist'elh.
Khumai'i hlah dzhul k'ut ts'e.
qualify. But *lhatuswheti* (intersections), *nati* (crossroads), dendroglyphs and broken stakes most certainly would. This suggests that the idea of the site also has a broader connotation in *dakelh* than it does in English. For Carrier and Sekani a site is not just a location, but a kind of conceptual envelope containing everything that ever happened, or could be expected to happen at it. The site included that which was narrated by its toponym, the *tis* or the *kohs* that connected it with other sites in the network, the activities of anthropomorphic beings that frequent(ed) it, and the *uda'dune* who brought it into existence. It is in this sense that it may be better to think of the Carrier Sekani site as a kind of smudge, a locale of indefinite limits and constituted by an interplay of differential forces.28

**Carrier Sekani spatial typology**

Carrier Sekani space was obviously not, then, anything like the Euro-Canadian grid. But neither was it like the Gitxsan's, which is akin to a clustered mosaic. This geography of regional bands, dispersed small settlements, *keyohs*, *tis* and *beyunuhoodal'en* was more diffuse, and less ordered by vision, than that of *adaawk*, corporate house territories, nuclear villages, arterial trails, and monumental architecture. Carrier Sekani space was much closer to what Lefebvre called natural space, that space in which "ways and tracks were pores which, without colliding, gradually widened and lengthened, leading to the establishment of places and boundaries [along which] flowed increasingly dense human streams." It was a space in which "indicators remained purely qualitative in character, like those of animals [and where] different directions appeared as either benevolent or ill-omened...[I]nhabited...by real and fictitious, dangerous or lucky 'creatures', it "bore along the myths and stories attached to it."29

---

28 For a similar understanding of Athapaskan sites, see Basso, K. *Wisdom*, op. cit.
29 In *Production*, op. cit., 193.
While Lefebvre's account captures the essentially linear and symmetrical character of natural space, it is still a positioned and socialized space. Depending on the cultural and physiographic contexts, ways and tracks, and places and boundaries, can appear in different densities and configurations. In my view, it is better to think of Carrier Sekani space as a striated space — a term which captures its linear quality, but at a fairly coarse grain of analysis. To the degree that they linked sites together, such striations could be storylines (as in the narratives), songlines (as in the nekuzduke shun), lifelines (as in the genealogical connections) or sightlines (as in the beyunuhoodal'en). On the ground, however, striations were dimensional, varying in length and lateral extent. Along defined travel corridors and in settlements, they were at their narrowest. At some sites they bulged, like knots on a string. Where they were at their widest, as in the wetlands and shallow valleys, keyohs (trapping countries) formed. It is in this sense that keyohs, villages and sites were always mutually co-extensive; they were phase changes along a striation. This explains why the term keyoh was (and is today) used as a shorthand for resource rights in general, and can be equally translated as 'my home', 'my trapline', 'my country', or 'the place that I get my living from'.30 Depending on the spoken context, it can also refer to a route through a trapping territory, a specific camp within it, or even a city or town (including the towns of the nedo) outside of it.

Carrier Sekani territory was not then composed of bounded units separated by fixed borders but was, rather, a protean and dynamic action space in which frontiers were immanent to the striations themselves. Boundaries did occasionally harden at what I have called pinch points. They might be important sites where interaction with other groups was concentrated — like 'Ulgatcho or Tse Kya at the ends of the grease trails; or Chunlac, where the Carrier and Tsilhqot'in fought a decisive battle years ago.31 They could

30 As spelled out in some detail in the dakhelh-English dictionary, op. cit.
31 This decisive pre-contact battle, which effectively ended a series of Tsilhqot'in raids into Carrier territory, is described in Morice, A.G., The History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia (Smithers:
also be toponyms — sites where stories were grounded — or beyunuhoodal'en — where graphic designs marked frontiers between the terrestrial and cosmological realms. For the most part, however, boundaries were defined by the limits of directed activity, and directional movement, and by where the edge, or end of one striation osmosed into the edge, or beginning of another. As Lefebvre noted, it was in this way that "the network of paths and roads made up a space just as concrete as that of the body...of which they were in fact an extension." And it is from this perspective that a degree of ambiguity between striations did not imply that portions of the territory were unowned.

**Incorporating the northwest coast**

During protohistoric times, and apparently triggered by surplus wealth filtering in along the grease trails, the Carrier and Sekani incorporated elements of the clan, crest and feast complex from the Tsimshian and Wakashan speakers on a diminishing west-east gradient. The most important (or successful) hunters translated increased control and trade of specific animal species into the custodianship of associated nutsi (the Carrier term for crest) and started the balhats (the Carrier Sekani potlatch). The keyohs fell under the jurisdiction of deneza (clan chiefs or noblemen) or tsekeza (noble-women), and matrilineal descent prerogatives were superimposed onto the existing bilateral system.

Sociopolitically, the incorporation of clans and nutsi served the same purpose as among the northwest coast groups — to further clarify kin relations across or between extended family groups, and to which keyohs emergent clans had access. The

---

Interior Stationery, 1978 [1904]), Chapter 1. The site, at the confluence of the Nakalkoh (Stuart River) and Nechakoh, is now uninhabited.

32 In The Production, op. cit., 193.

33 An excellent procedural discussion of the Carrier balhats is found in Hall, L. The Carrier, op. cit., 16-9.

34 Kobrinsky, V. 'On thinking about', op. cit.
difference was that the system was less constraining among the Carrier and Sekani than it was on the coast — in particular, sons were still expected to trap in their father's keyoh.\textsuperscript{35} Nor was there much consistency in the number of clans — some regional bands had as many as five, others only two — and so long as exogamous marriage rules were not infringed individuals had some choice to which clan they belonged.\textsuperscript{36} In addition, the nutsi were restricted to animal species only (i.e. no fish, insects, plants or mythical ancestors) and they were never committed to masks or carved sequentially on totem poles.

In any event, the territorial effect was to fill in previously ambiguous interspaces between keyohs, and between outlying keyohs and extended families in the villages. The result was that the hunting territory of each clan was not a single strip of country, but a number of discontinuous districts controlled by a deneza/isekeza.\textsuperscript{37} The incorporation of nutsi did not subvert the basic architecture of Carrier Sekani mappings but it did introduce the didoshun ('clan song') into the Carrier Sekani playbook and a new stock of narratives that described the acquisition of the nutsi.\textsuperscript{38} Most importantly, it made Carrier and Sekani space a rather more mosaicked, and hence more visual space than previously. After all, nutsi could not be exploited until displayed for others (Figure V).

While the incorporation of the balhats rank complex was uneven, at the end of this process Carrier Sekani regional bands could be roughly grouped into four main divisions.\textsuperscript{39} To the west and north, and living along the Wedzen Kwah (Bulkley River), and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{35} Hudson, D. Traplines, op. cit.
\item \textsuperscript{36} The most concise account of the way in which clans and nutsi were differentially incorporated is Goldman, I. 'The Alkatcho Carrier', op. cit.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 488-9.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Jenness, D. recorded several narratives detailing these acquisitions in 'Myths', op. cit., 214-42. As already noted, however, they generally lack the geographical specificities of the adaawk.
\item \textsuperscript{39} The classification of Carrier Sekani 'sub-tribes' is an exceedingly hazardous undertaking; for a summary of the different criteria that have been used by past authorities, see Tobey, M. 'Carrier', op. cit. Generally speaking, Morice, A.G. 'Notes', op. cit., 222-31 was based on linguistic considerations, with Jenness, D. 'The Carrier Indians of the Bulkley River: Their social and religious life' Bureau of American Ethnology 133(25), 475-587, and The Sekani, op. cit.; and Goldman, I. 'The Alkatcho Carrier', op. cit., on sociopolitical. My categorization is post-MMRC territorial (and most faithful to Morice).
\end{itemize}
Figure V
Carrier Sekani *nutsi* were occasionally mounted on *tsac-huns* but most were reserved for high-ranking *deneza* or *tsekeza*, and erected upon mortuary columns or burial mounds. These were located at Fort Babine (Morice’s figure 185, *Tse kya* (Morice’s 186) and somewhere in the vicinity of *Dzingha Bun* (Morice’s 187). The first two identified the deceased as a member of the *Tsayu* (beaver) clan, while the third, showing a raven sitting on top of some kind of marine animal is rather more ambiguous. In any event, *nutsi* were of much simpler design than those of the *Tsimshian, Haidan* or *Koluschan* speakers (copied from original drawings in Morice, A.G., 'Notes, op. cit., 201-2').
around Nado Bun (Babine Lake), the Wet'suwet'en and Nanoot'en, or 'northern Carrier' spoke one of three distinct dakelh dialects. Like their Tsimshian speaking neighbours, to whom they were the closest, they were completely partitioned into clans and houses, each headed by one or more deneza/tsekeza controlling trapping territories and holding nutsi and titles validated at the balhats and passed on down the matriline. To the south, and residing, west to east, along the valleys of the Baezaeko (Bazeko River), Dadinko (Quesnel River) and Nazko (Blackwater/Nazko Rivers) the 'Ulkachot'en, Lhoosk'uzt'en, Lhtakot'en and Nazkot'en, or 'southern Carrier', spoke a different dakelh dialect. More influenced by the Nuxalk and Tsilhqot'in, they had no clans or houses, retaining bilateral descent prerogatives, patrilocal residence, and the extended family as the main corporate unit. In 'the middle', and living around Dzingha Bun, Nak'al Bun, Nadleh Bunk'ut, Niit Aagh Bin (Trembleur, Stuart, Fraser and François Lakes), and along the Nechako were, east to west, the Tano'tenne, Tachek whut'en, Noolkhkiiwhut'en, Nak'azdli, Nadleh whut'en, Tl'az'tenne, and Cheslatta t'en, or 'central Carrier', who spoke dakelh in its original sense (although there were a few dialectical differences between groups residing north of the Nechako, those living along it, and those to the south of it). Like the northern Carrier, they incorporated clans, nutsi and matrilineal descent prerogatives, but like the southern Carrier did not have houses and, in practice, allowed certain privileges (especially access to keyohs) to pass down the patriline. In general, villages were more permanent among the central and northern Carrier than they were in the southern. To the north and the east, and living along the west slopes of the Dzulhti, were, from south to north, the Tsekhene, Yutuwichan, Sasuchan and Tseloni who spoke tsehkene. Further removed from coastal influence, they retained bilateral descent rules, but experimented with clans and nutsi as they were pushed west and north by the Dunne Za, and into closer contact with the northern Carrier and Gitxsan, during the land-based fur

---

40 For consistency, and because they are the most thoroughly documented, all the orthographies used in this Chapter have been given in central Carrier dakelh.
trade. Unless otherwise noted, these last two divisions — the central Carrier and the Sekani — will be the focus of attention for the rest of this chapter.

**The bible and the plough in the central interior**

The incorporation of clans and *nuski* constituted the first reconfiguration of the Carrier and Sekani space economy; it made the acquisition and distribution of resources rather more hierarchical, and it embellished upon, but did not seriously modify, the existing ground-truthing system. The same cannot be said, though, of the second reconfiguration — that associated with the arrival of the *nedo* ('white people'). While more sudden than in Gitxsan country it was, at first, relatively unobtrusive. Alexander Mackenzie (1793), Simon Fraser (1806-8) and Daniel Harmon (1811) payed extended visits to Carrier Sekani territory, but they were seeking a route through it, not its rearrangement. The land-based fur trade, established by 1811, involved a more direct expropriation of Carrier Sekani *tis* and *kohs*, but it was after commodities, not territory; and the forts that anchored the fur trade infrastructure — Forts McLeod (1805) in Tsekhene territory; St. James (1806) at Nak'azdli; Fraser (1806) at Nadleh; and George (1807) at Lhtakoh — were all built at or near the largest existing Carrier Sekani settlements. These forts did not then centripetalize Carrier Sekani lifeways as immediately as, say, among the Tsimshian, but they appear to have fuelled a number of 'prophet movements' forecasting the deleterious consequences of contact. The most famous was *Bini*, a Carrier 'Indian doctor' who travelled widely throughout the central interior at this time, and is said to have predicted that the Indians would be devastated by a great pestilence, before becoming like white men speaking a new language; that great dogs (likely horses) would descend from the sky and run amok on earth; and that the rich (the Carrier Sekani) would become poor and the poor (the *nedo*) rich.41

---

41 See Jenness, D. *The Carrier Indians*, op. cit., 553-9. Again, however, the degree to which these movements were autochthonous, or adaptations of Christian teachings, is unclear.
After the 1858 gold rush and the decline of the land-based fur trade, cultural and territorial dislocations became more pronounced. In 1862, as *Bini* had forecast, a smallpox epidemic swept in from the south. While it generally spared the central Carrier, it devastated the northern and southern, killing about 30% of the former and as much as 75% of the latter. How much oral knowledge was lost can only be guessed at, but it must have been significant. In 1865, the COT was cut between *Nazkot'en* and *Wet'suwet'en* territory through *Saik'uz, Nadleh* and 'Kyah Wiget. The Carrier called the wire *tl'oolhbeядuk*, meaning 'the string wherewith one speaks' (and now translates, not surprisingly, as 'telephone'). As with the Gitxsan it facilitated the flow of information back to Victoria, bringing the Carrier more directly into the gaze of the cartographic eye.

As the *Wet'suwet'en* elder, John Brown, recollected, "[m]any of the people were troubled; when they heard of the approach of this new monster...the very thought that everybody could hear what was said in public was...enough to worry the people...[A]ny man wanting to know all about another man would find it easy; all he had to do was to touch the wire, and the wire would leave nothing concealed." The trail added another stratum to the existing Carrier *ti*-system, making overland travel or trade between the *Lhtakoh* and *Nechakoh* much easier. But its orientation was also south, and so provided a conduit for less welcome visitors like miners, magistrates, independent traders, and, eventually, the Indian reserve commissioners.

However, the most influential figure to find his way into central Carrier country via the COT during this period was the Oblate Father, Adrien Gabriel Morice. Stationed at Fort St. James during the 1880s and 90s, his working relationship with the Carrier was more involved than, say, Barbeau's with the Gitxsan, but no less ambiguous. He was a prolific writer, and well educated, dabbling in natural history, geography, cartography, linguistics and ethnography. He was also vain and egotistical, often subordinating his

---

religious duties to his thirst for the exploration and mapping of what was (for most Euro-British Columbians at least) still mostly *terra incognita*. On the one hand, he campaigned vigorously for the nuclear family, rather than the clans or *deneza/tsekeza*, to control local resources, and tried to stamp out the *balhats* and the erection of mortuary columns because he thought them inseparable from matrilineal descent, which he also opposed. He wrote extensively on Sekani, Tsilhqot'in and *Athapaskan* cultures, but he tended to generalize from his experiences with the central Carrier at *Nak'al Bun*. He recorded only eleven Carrier narratives, all of which had incorporated Christian motifs. On the other hand, his Carrier ethnographies are the earliest and most detailed we have, and he was arguably the first (and until Saum and Fisher, the last) author to 'write the Native' into Euro-Canadian historical accounts. A good sixth of his 1904 *History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia* was devoted to the pre-contact history of the Carrier.

The same ambiguities permeated his cartography. Although, as noted above, there are few toponymic systems as nuanced or expressive of landscape as the Carrier's, and while Morice granted that they were "born topographers [with] a wonderful capacity" for geographical knowledge — most of the field reconnaissance was carried out by his Carrier guides — he rejected Carrier place names on the grounds that in their untranslated form they were nothing more than "a confusing homonymy", and that even when translated were still "a source of endless errors." As far as the Surveyor General G. S. Andrews was concerned, Morice's 1907 *Map of the Northern Interior of British Columbia* was a "catechismic cartographic peregrination," but he identified the many Carrier

---

44 For the definitive account of the life, times and work of Father Morice, see David Mulhall, *Will to Power* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1984).
45 Maud, R. *A Guide*, op. cit. Morice was, however, the first to not only recognize the continuities between the origin stories of the Carrier and the northwest coastal cultures, but to argue, contra Boas and Dawson, that they were transmitted from the latter to the former. See 'Are the Carrier', op. cit., 122-6.
46 Cited in Mulhall, D. *Will to Power*, op. cit., 104.
47 In *Minor Essays*, op. cit., 52.
48 Cited in Morice, A.G. *History*, op. cit., v.
settlements only as I.V. (for 'Indian village') and applied English or French names to the mapped features. The significance of this was not lost on the Carrier. Years later, Mikh Lilch Legh would recall how the Carrier already:

had the names in our language. Everywhere we went the hills, the mountains, creeks, lakes, all had the names of our chief and people that passed on or events that took place. It had names, historical names that relates to the territory. When he came here, Father Morris [sic]...he put [the white man's] names on our lakes and rivers...[he] began [the process of] writing their histories on that land and total silence about our history and our names and how we came to that land and to wipe out every ounce of memory that we have of that land so that they could claim it....Today all the names of the creeks, rivers, different territories are all in English.49

This said, Morice did point out the inaccuracies in existing ethnographical maps (such as George Dawson's and William F. Tolmie's 1884 Ethnological Map of the Province)50 and while his own categorization of Carrier regional bands was based on linguistic criteria, his ethnogeographical work remains a major source for contemporary Carrier Sekani mapmaking.

Morice's singular contribution, however, was to develop the dulkw'ahke — a system of syllabic writing worked out for the Cree during the 1840s, but elaborated with extra characters to handle the particularities of the dakelh language. Morice obviously saw it as a way of maintaining intellectual dominance over the Carrier. Indeed, his most ambitious publication was Test'les Nahivelnek (meaning 'the paper that relates'), an eight-page monthly written in dulkw'ahke and containing local, regional, and even international news about 'what's happening amongst the Indians' (such as births, deaths and marriages) and 'what's happening outside' (which ranged from the latest doings of bishops

49 'Feature interview', op. cit. For numerous examples of where Morice substituted Carrier toponyms with English names, see John Munro, Legends, Language and Lore of the Carrier Indians, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Ottawa, 1944. Munro subscribed to all the biases of Jennessian ethnography, and much of what he wrote was taken uncritically from Morice, but he did note that it "seems a pity that the early explorers were not more careful in recording the place names of Aboriginal tribes....it would appear that explorers were more interested in giving names to geographical features than they were in perpetuating the Aboriginal name." (xx).
50 'Notes', op. cit., 26. This map is reproduced as Figure 24 in my Euro-Canadian Cartography, op. cit.
in Europe to information about other Native groups in British Columbia). It included a 'good to know' column (again mostly concerned with religious facts and figures), and a 'telling about wonderful things' (such as the latest discoveries in natural history or geography). It even included 'letters to the editor' and 'question-and-answer' columns, although both were again used for clearly acculturative purposes. In one edition, Louis Cho, a Pinche whut'en, asked "who found this country?" and Morice's answer was "Alexander Mackenzie, the Superintendent of the Hudson Bay [sic], found this country 98 years ago."51 When Thomas, a Nak'azdli whuten asked "why God made the first man?", Morice's response was to "remember the first words of catechism and learn it."52

Still, dulkw'ahke provided the Carrier a means of communication and translation available to few other indigenous nations in British Columbia.53 On the one hand, it facilitated the transmission of prophetic information of direct interest to the Carrier Sekani. Surely one of the most cryptic and ominous comments appeared in the December 1891 issue, where Morice wrote that "the man who gives Indian reserves works his way to a place called Kispiox [but] the people from there wanted too big a land so he didn't give it to them."54 On the other, it added a new wayfinding device to the existing Carrier Sekani ground truthing system. For example, by being inscribed with specific territorial instructions, ordinary CMTs could be converted into beyunuhool'an (landmarks) (Figure W), thus doing away with the older, and more cumbersome practice of constructing staked markers (recall Figure T).

The earliest central Carrier reserves were allotted in 1871 to the Nanoot'en and Tla'z't'enne (four each) along the shores of Dzingha Bun and Nak'al Bun (Babine and Stuart Lakes) by magistrate Peter O'Reilly during the Omenica gold rush but they were never

52 Ibid.
53 It is still used today by a handful of elders who have never learned English.
54 Ibid. The reference is obviously O'Reilly (recall Chapter 4).
Figure W(a-b)
The CMT on the left (a) was discovered just off the Holy Cross Forest Service Road south of Nadleh Bunk'ut by a Nadleh whut'en trail restoration crew in 1997. Partly obliterated by the elements, the dulkw'ahke inscriptions have not been translated but the date appears to be December 1926. The CMT on the right (b) was found at Klez Lake, on the trail between Nadleh Bunk'ut and Utsa Benghen by a Ministry of Forests (MOF) crew in 1993. Several different interpretations have been offered, but, in general, the superscript reads '1877, hello Antoine, there is game near here, this is Pierre saying this'. (Given that Morice did not introduce the dulkw'ahke until 1885, there is some confusion over the date. One Carrier translator thought it meant 'Monday the 18th' except that the hooked symbols are unknown in dulkw'ahke; another suggested that it might actually be '1899' and just written carelessly). Although tsachuns, 'ndis, kohs and tis did comprise a 'terrestrial map' in their own right, it was beyunuhoodal'en like these that supplied its 'legend' (by Craig Hooper [MOF, Vanderhoof], 1997 and 1993 respectively, with permission; William Poser assisted with the translation).
formally surveyed or gazetted. But in 1892, and as foretold in the *Test'les Nahivelnek* ('the paper that relates'), O'Reilly was back, this time as the Indian reserve commissioner. Entering *Dakelh* country along the COT, he allotted four reserves to the *Tano'tenne* (renaming them the Fort George Band); five to the *Nadleh what'en* (renamed the Fraser Lake Band); seven to the *Nak'azdli* (renamed the Necoslie Band); six to the *Noohlkhih what'en* and *Tachek what'en* (which were merged as the Stony Creek Band); added six to the existing four of the *Tl'az'tenne* (all of which were then subdivided into the Taché [five] and Trembleur Lake [five] Bands); and one for the *Tsekhene* and *Yutuwichan* (renamed the McLeod Lake Band.) According to O'Reilly, the Carrier and Sekani offered no resistance. At any rate, all were surveyed and gazetted without incident by the turn of the century.

The Carrier Sekani at the MMRC

When the MMRC passed through Carrier Sekani territory in 1913-16, it found most of the bands in very bad condition. The GTP right-of-way, bisecting (deliberately?) the already miniscule reserves, the general shortage of arable land, and indiscriminate trespassing by the *nedo* were persistent themes throughout. As noted elsewhere, cartographic evidence was used during the Commission's travels through the province, and it is fairly clear that Carrier or Sekani people were at least familiar with maps. In 1793, Alexander Mackenzie, while bearing down the *Lhtakoh*, reported pausing somewhere in *Tano'tenne* or *Nazkot'en* territory (exactly where is not clear) and acquiring "from [either a southern or central Carrier] such a plan of the river as he [was] enabled to give me; and [to which] he complied with a degree of readiness and intelligence that evidently

---

55 See *Papers*, op. cit., 95-6. These were the last reserves allotted in British Columbia before Confederation. Because they were not gazetted, they were not included in Trutch's schedule of reserves submitted to Ottawa later that year.
56 I have discussed and mapped these allotments from the perspective of the cartographic eye/I in my 'Travels from Point Ellice', op. cit., 229-32.
proved it was by no means a new business to him."\textsuperscript{57} Thirteen years later, Simon Fraser, near what is now Arctic Lake (the height of land between the headwaters of the Parsnip and McGregor Rivers) wrote that a Carrier or Sekani from McLeod Lake (it is not clear who), "who seem[ed] very intelligent and communicative...gave [Fraser] a great deal of information concerning this part of the country, and drew [him] a chart of it, at which he seemed very expert."\textsuperscript{58} And while we have no recorded evidence to that effect, it seems likely that Carrier or Sekani ti-blazers might have made some charts as they guided Morice around their country during the 1890s.

Still, these would probably have been consistent with the type of route map already identified in Chapter 1 as typical of Athapaskan maps made for European explorers or traders, and we have no evidence of either the Carrier or Sekani making any more graphic maps after that. In short, it is not at all clear how well they understood the kind of geometric blueprints that would have been deployed at the MMRC hearings. At Neco-slie, the transcripts suggest that the commissioners thought Chief Jimmy to be the most eloquent presenter they had met, noting that he could identify "all reserves of his band, a map of which he produced."\textsuperscript{59} At Cheslatta, another Chief Jimmy apparently took the commission's "blueprint as a guide" in asking for an extension to Reserve No. 1, and requested "additional hayland for the No. 3 location [already] marked on the map...[and which] had been gone over by Agent McMillan in company with [him] and contained approximately 37 acres."\textsuperscript{60} At the same place White Eyed Jack "identified his location on the pre-emptors map, Nechaco sheet."\textsuperscript{61} However, the Stuart Lake Agency minutes were not transcribed \textit{verbatim}. Instead, the commissioners summarized the gist of the hearings in their own words, and then, back in Victoria, took more information from the

\textsuperscript{57} Cited in W. Kaye Lamb (ed) \textit{The Journals and Letters}, op. cit., 315.
\textsuperscript{58} Cited in W. Kaye Lamb (ed) \textit{The Letters and Journals}, op. cit., 211.
\textsuperscript{59} Field minutes from the Stuart Lake Agency, June 15, 1913, 101.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., June 7, 1913, 65-6.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 67.
Indian Agent. Certainly, Carrier and Sekani spokespersons knew exactly what was happening to them on the ground. When Michael, of the Burns Lake Band, noted that they had tilled every square foot of available land but still did not have enough to eat, the commissioners only replied that they "should confine their operations within these lines, as all the land outside had been sold to white people." But without a clear and consistent Carrier Sekani voice coming through, one can only guess how much of this discourse was really understood, and by whom. My sense is that the terms of this exchange came out of a perspective that would have been quite foreign to all but a few Carrier or Sekani people.

In the end, the MMRC confirmed all of O'Reilly's allotments, and added a few more: seventeen to the Cheslatta t'en (renamed the Cheslatta Band); twenty two for the Nadleh whuten (nineteen of which were hived off to a separate François Lake Tribe, and divided among the Decker Lake [one], Maxim Lake [two], Uncha Lake [two], Skins Tyee [two], François Lake [nine] and Burns Lake [three] Bands); two to the Stony Creek Band; nine to the Necoslie Band; and twenty one to the Tl'az't'enne (fourteen of them hived off to separate North Takla Lake [seven] and Bear Lake [seven] Bands, the other seven divided among the Taché [one], Trembleur Lake [one], Yacutcee [one] and Pinchi [four] Bands). In Sekani country, the MMRC allocated four additional reserves at McLeod Lake and two for the Sasuchan and Tseloni at Fort Grahame. None of them were surveyed until 1925 and 26, at which time the Fraser Lake Band was partitioned into the Nautley (at the east end of Nadleh Bunk'ut) and Stellaquo (at the west) Bands, and the Yecutcee, Pinchi and Taché Bands were reamalgamated into the Stuart Lake Band.

---


63 This, again, is a major point of departure from the Gitxsan experience and relates directly to the difference between striated and mosaicked space. I will come back to this below and in the Conclusion.
Traplines and waterlines

In any event, the geographical result was the same as for the Gitxsan; out of a traditional territory of 75,595 km² (as now claimed in Map 2), Carrier Sekani people ended up with a 104 dispersed reserves comprising, in total, 120 km². The registered trapline system was another matter. As we have seen, this system tended to reinforce patrilocal residence or inheritance at the expense of clan and deneza/tsekeza. Whether disposing of goods acquired in the wage economy, or parcelling out existing property in times of scarcity, clans continued to operate at the level of reciprocity, redistributing any surplus through the balhats along matrilineal lines while territorial ownership devolved, at least for official purposes, to the registered holders. But because under the Carrier or Sekani land tenure system keyohs already passed from father to son, registered traplines did not engender the genealogical confusion that they did among the matrilineal northwest coastal cultures.64

In terms of perspective, however, registered traplines had rather more profound consequences.65 On the one hand, Euro-Canadian society saw traplines as 'spaces', having fixed geometric borders with no ambiguous interspaces between them. Carrier Sekani, however, always saw traplines as striations, the fluidity of which allowed for some ambiguity between them. While there was sometimes a close correspondence between the keyoh and the registered trapline boundaries, they were never an exact match. Juxtaposed in the same space they tended to be out of synch and so produced, cartographically, the appearance of discontinuity between them (Map 64).66 In addition, the govern-

64 For a thorough discussion of this process and its economic consequences in Tl'azt'enne territory, see Hudson, D. Traplines, op. cit.
65 This, too, was very much the reverse of the Gitxsan experience, and related directly to both the chronologies of, and the localized geographies created in, the contact zone. For the Gitxsan, it was arguably the reserve system that most seriously compromised traditional lifeways; for Carrier and Sekani, the registered traplines.
66 When it came to deciding which maps to include in this dissertation, this was one of a handful that I most struggled with. It is clearly Steward's, but it remains the only published map showing how the registered trapline system was laminated onto the keyohs.
Map 64
Julian Steward's untitled map of Tl'azt'enne territory, 1960, 14 x 15 cm; black and white outline map showing how the government's registered traplines (dashed lines) were superimposed on top of the traditional keyohs (solid lines). The keyohs are identified by the names of the tsekeza or deneza who owned them. Clan affiliations are shown with Roman numerals: I for Lusilyoo [beaver]; II, Lhtsumusyoo [frog]; and III, Tsayu [owl]. (That Tsayu is supposed to be beaver in Figure V is not a mistake; the association of any animal with a given nutsi depended on the regional band that adopted it). The map clearly shows how registered lines were not coterminous with the keyohs, and served to facilitate the alienation of keyohs outside the reserves by Euro-Canadian trappers (copied, with permission, from original in Steward, 'Carrier acculturation: The direct historical approach', in Stanley Diamond [ed] Culture in History: Essays in Honour of Paul Rabin [New York: Columbia University Press, 1961], 732-44).
ment understood the term tralpine literally — that is as a defined area in which indigene-
ous people were to trap animals, and nothing more or less than that. From the Carrier
Sekani perspective, however, the keyoh implied a more diffusive entity containing ma-
terial, social and symbolic resources, and where boundaries fluctuated according to sea-
son and to where the animals were at any given moment.

As already hinted in Map 16(c), and just as Bini had prophesied, the province's post-
World War II developmental agenda in the central interior was especially devastating to
the Carrier Sekani. Their traditional territory pulverized by tote roads, ranching leases,
guide outfitters' tenures and timber licences, "it [now] seem[ed] impossible", wrote Jen-
ness, "to map the original hunting areas of the various clans."

The coup de grace, how-
ever, was still to come. In the early 1950s, Alcan's Kemano I project dammed the Ne-
chakoh just above the tizdli (outlet) of Tsistlatha Bun (Cheslatta Lake). Below the dam
the flow regime declined precipitously and salmon stocks dropped. As the reservoir fil-
led behind it, Utsa Benghen (Ootsa Lake) rose and spread, submerging Cheslatta villag-
es, graveyards, 'ndis and keyohs. In the late 1960s, the huge W.A.C. Bennett dam be-
low Mackenzie backed up the Unjigah (Peace River) and created Williston Lake, flood-
ing Sekani keyohs, camping spots, tis and washing away the reserves at Fort Grahame.

For the Carrier and Sekani, reserves, registered tralpine and timber leases were bad
enough, but flooding was another matter entirely. The first three severely curtailed sea-
sonal mobility and range on the land but flooding removed the land entirely, destroying
the terrestrial infrastructure of TEK. Rose Peters, a Cheslatta whut'en, recalled how "at
Cheslatta we had everything [and we] hunted whenever we wanted...[now] we can't do
what we used to do," while Thomas Morris remembered how he used to "trap around

67 In The Carrier Indians, op. cit., 488.
68 And so, by a bitter twist of fate — the colonial intervention itself — Utsa Benghen (recall footnote 21)
once again drained to the Pacific, just as its dakelh name has always implied.
69 Cited in the CSTC, Kemano II Final Report, unpublished document (Prince George: CSTC, 1983-84),
Appendix D, 10.
an area called Long Lake. Now it's flooded...[w]hen I looked for it there was no cabin where it used to be....I've only been up once since [now] too many submerged trees."\textsuperscript{70}

Willie Pierre, a Fort Grahame Sekani noted how his band used to "travel and hunt together...but not anymore...[now] we just stay in one place...we hunt but not as much as before,"\textsuperscript{71} while Maggie Pierre must have been in tears as she "saw [their] house at Finlay Forks float down the Peace River."\textsuperscript{72} Flooding wiped out not only uncounted beyunu- hoodal'en (landmarks), but the tis and kohs (trails and streams), severing the striations that wove Carrier Sekani territories together. As Christine Jack, a Cheslatta whu'ten remarked, "it kind of looks real funny now they put the water up...[a] long time ago, we go to Anahim Lake and Bella Coola...now we [can't] go across."\textsuperscript{73} Suzanne Tomah, a Fort Grahame Sekani recalled how they used to "travel on the river [and always knew] just where [they were],"\textsuperscript{74} but after the flooding, as Maggie Pierre regretted, "we didn't know how to get home."\textsuperscript{75} Nobody has captured this sense of lost horizons better than Jean Isaac, who recalled getting "lost at the Ospika....[i]magine getting lost in your own country...[w]e could hardly recognize our own country....[W]hen we talk about the old village...young people...have difficulty visualizing how it [was]...We should go home but how can we get there?"\textsuperscript{76}

Without any consultation with the Tl'azt'enne, in 1959 DIA amalgamated the Stuart Lake and Trembleur Lake Bands as the Stuart-Trembleur Lake Band. In 1963 the Uncha Lake Band joined the Cheslatta t'en as they moved north to escape the flooding; the Decker Lake, Maxim Lake, Skins Tyee, and François Lake Bands merged into the Omenica Band. Further north, the Sekani diaspora, which reached back to the land-based

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 11.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., Appendix E, 2.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., Appendix D, 10.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., Appendix E, 1.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., 6.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., 3, emphasis added.
fur trade, was further dispersed. Through the 1940s, some Sekani that the MMRC had assigned to the Fort Grahame Band either moved north to Fort Ware (which had been allotted in 1938 to the Kaska Dene) or to the area northwest of Khelh Bun, where they lived with the Tahltan and Bear Lake people at Fort Connolly. In 1959, however, Fort Connolly split. Many Tahltan returned to Iskut; those who stayed merged with the Sekani and Bear Lake peoples in the North Takla Lake Band, reconstituting it as the Takla Lake Band. After Fort Grahame was flooded in 1969, many Sekani migrated south to McLeod Lake, but most found insufficient large game, and moved to the north end of Williston Lake at the tidzli (outlet) of the Tsutsikoh, becoming the Ingenika Band.

Such developments were resisted. The Tl'azt'enne fought the 1959 amalgamation of the Stuart Lake and the Trembleur Lake Bands while the Tanot'enne continued to press Ottawa for compensation for the loss of Fort George Reserve No. 1 to the GTP, and the city of Prince George, in 1914. Neither succeeded. The Cheslatta t'en demanded compensation from Alcan but got nothing. Indeed, the story of how this band came home one day to find their houses torched, and the remains of the uda'dune floating away on Utsa Benghen is not only one of the most flagrant abuses of basic human rights ever perpetrated in this province, but illustrated just how dispowered they were.

Staking claim to the central interior

As we have seen, though, culture is persistent. For the Gitxsan, a generation earlier, the road back began with those who reached back into adaawk, and started carving totem poles. For the Carrier Sekani, it began with the 'rediscovery' of what reserves, registered traplines, residential schools, and rising waters could never completely wipe out — the dakelh language. In 1972, central Carrier bands established the Carrier Linguistic Committee (CLC) in Fort St. James. Its mandate was to record, preserve and expand the use of dakelh through linguistic research, the publication of dictionaries of
the various dakelh dialects, and curriculum development for local schools. It also made maps, one of which is shown here (Map 65).

Framing roughly the same territory shown on Map 64, although with the emphasis on named sites rather than registered traplines, Map 65 is one quadrant of a four-plate 'mini-atlas' showing the basic terrestrial infrastructure of striated space. To untutored Euro-Canadian eyes, it is deceptively spartan, maybe nonsensical. There are no reference graticules, borders or English place names (on the map itself, or in the index that prefaces it). Indeed, unless one were familiar with a planimetric representation of Stuart or Trembleur Lakes, it would be virtually impossible to establish any kind of territorial referent. The point, however, is that it does not matter, because it was not intended for a non-Carrier audience; it was designed as an instructional aid for Carrier children. To the best of my knowledge, it is the first effort by any contemporary Carrier teacher to voluntarily show the connection between place, space and the dakelh language on a map, and demonstrates again that not all post-contact Native cartography can be reduced to (only) an act of resistance. For the Carrier, this map is a tracing, delineating that liminal frontier where the storylines and lifelines that constitute a Carrier Sekani world touch down, ever so lightly, ever so gently, on the orthogonal grid of the cartographic eye/I. To have included a reference grid, English names, or fixed borders would have plainly affixed it more firmly on the grid and so compromised the purpose for which it was made.

But it is precisely along this frontier that continuity shows itself. Now we can visualize where to expect success with 'snares and arrows' (Bihlka); where to find fir (Chunsi Noo) or aspen (T'ughus Noo); where to gather salvageable timber (Duzdli Koh); and to differentiate mountains above the treeline (the dzulh) from those below (the yus). Now we can see 'Usdas' 'waterscape'; where the lovers' tears and cries remodelled the 'terrascape' around Chuzgun; and where the Etnanye (from Nak'al) fought the people of Nak'azdli and created the islands of Nooyiz and Nootsul. Now we know where Jini Cho's
Map 65
CLC's *untitled* map of central Carrier territory, 1974, 20 x 24 cm; prepared in conjunction with the Summer Institute of Linguistics language program, black and white topographical map of (more or less) *Tl'azt'enne* territory. It shows the main *dzulh, yus, kohs* and *tis*, and selected toponyms in *dakelh* orthographies. The other three plates that make up this 'mini-atlas' are less detailed than this one; that covering the quadrant to the northeast contains only one toponym. If so, however, it is not because there are none; it is likely because much of the toponymic knowledge in more remote areas had not yet been confirmed by the elders who held it (copied, with permission, from original in CLC, *Central Carrier Country* [Fort St. James: CLC]).
family fished and camped, and we can understand why Chief Jimmy asked the MMRC in 1913 that all the noo in Nak'al Bun be turned into reserves, and why he would have been so disappointed when but three of them were.\textsuperscript{77} Far from eliminating, then, bit by bit, the stories, the encounters and the experiences that produced it, this map leads us to them; all we need is the right language to help us find them.

That maps were still seen as peripheral to Carrier Sekani interests is partially confirmed by the fact that the CLC made no more of them (at least none that I am aware of). But a crucial leap had been made and the cartographic hiatus that followed did not last long. In 1975, and clearly inspired by federal initiatives in the wake of Calder, the Ta-ché whut'en stopped construction of the Dease Lake extension of the British Columbia Railway through Reserve No. 1, while the McLeod Lake Sekani blockaded a military convoy moving through their village two years later.\textsuperscript{78} To the extent that these actions also created a place 'where the ground was marked for the eyes', they qualified as beyunuhoodal'ên. The difference is that these beyunuhoodal'ên were no longer merely infrastructural to Carrier Sekani mappings. Like those of the Gitxsan, they marked those pinch points at which the boundaries between the Euro-British Columbian and Carrier Sekani worlds temporarily hardened. More importantly, these blockades "forced the people to make public their culture and present their relationship to land and resources, and, through continuous use of the same region, to each other,"\textsuperscript{79} and in so doing marked the consolidation of a new political culture in Carrier Sekani society. In 1978, the Omenica Band split into the Broman Lake and Nee-Tahi Buhn Bands, and in 1979, almost all the Sekani, and central and northern Carrier bands constituted the CSTC, submitting their comprehensive claim to Ottawa four years later (Map 66).\textsuperscript{80} The holdouts

\textsuperscript{77} Field minutes from the Stuart Lake Agency June 13, 1915, 105.
\textsuperscript{78} For details of the Tl'azt'enne blockades, see Philip Morris, Negotiating the Production of Space in Tl'azt'en Territory, 1969-1984, unpublished MA thesis, University of Northern British Columbia, 1999.
\textsuperscript{79} Hudson, D. Traplines, op. cit., 153, emphasis added.
\textsuperscript{80} The southern Carrier bands formed the Chilcotin Cariboo Tribal Council (CCTC) in Williams Lake at the same time. Now part of the Interior Alliance, the CCTC remains opposed to the BCTC process.
Map 66
CSTC's *Carrier Sekani Territory*, Prince George, 1983 (?), 12 x 18 cm; black and white map showing (the then) external boundary of the 1983 comprehensive claim. Although this one approximates the location of the constituent bands, it is still typical of the genre of basic boundary map that First Nations used to start comprehensive claims in the late 1970s and early 80s (compare with Maps 15[a] and 44[a]) (copied, with permission, from original at CSTC, Prince George).
were McLeod Lake (which because legally considered part of a potential Treaty 8 land entitlement filed its own claim) and the Wet'suwet'en (who had cast in with the Gitxsan in 1968).

Kemano II and the Carrier Sekani LUOS

For the first few years little happened; as noted in Chapter 1, the inertia built into the comprehensive claims process effectively put the Carrier Sekani well back in the queue. This also meant that there was as yet no real demand for maps, the production of which required a technical competence that few bands then had. But in 1983, when Alcan announced its intention to proceed with Kemano II, the CSTC bands agreed that mapmaking was an undertaking that could be avoided no longer.  

Using techniques developed by the Inuit in the early 1970s, and a few years later by the Dunne Za (recall Map 17), the CSTC conducted LUOS in all the traditional band territories. Researchers met with elders, deneza and trappers to document their past and present activity on the land, and to plot, on acetates, all the hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering territories used in living memory. Because most are annotated with private information, none of the literally hundreds of individual map biographies have been made public. Some of the transcripts, however, have been; consider, for example, the following excerpt recorded in Tl'azt'enne territory:

Long ago, there was no salmon at Tachie. Used to hunt salmon in Grand Rapids with 'us [fish traps] — no nets. Lately, the government gave them nets. The 'us were set up at the mouth of Kuzkoh. I lived in Trembleur Lake then, before marriage...Most Stuart Lake people went to Babine Lake for salmon. After the salmon runs, in September we fished for bit (char) in Trembleur Lake and Stuart Lake in the reefs off the island. Most of the islands belonged to the Indians, and families go to own islands. Jennie Chow

---

81 Designed to increase hydroelectric capacity, Kemano II called for the interception of 60% of all waters draining into the Nechako (which had already lost 80% of the original flow to Kemano I). It meant, in short, more flooding, and a virtual death sentence for (what was left of) the Nechako salmon fishery.
82 See, in this connection, DIA, Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Project (Ottawa: DIAND, 1976); and Kemp, W.B. and Brooke, L.F. 'Towards information self-sufficiency', op. cit.
83 CSTC Kemano II op. cit., 12.
[sic] Island belonged to Malicoulu [Old Mary's mother]. Denoc'ay belonged to EJ Uba, and the island off Caesor Point is Kaesiaroon (Cassiar's Island). After bit fishing, we set traps and snares for bear. Each person went to his own trapline — go in families. We went to Ts'ace [Whitefish Lake, but not the same island as Bihk'a]. Go up to Trembleur Lake from Tachie by boat, then families walk in. Sometimes two or three families together, plus wives and children. Have smokehouses. All have different lines. We would stay there until Christmas; sometimes quit earlier if cold. Christmas was spent in Tachie; big balhats. Before I was married I lived in Trembleur Lake; after marriage, I moved to Tachie. People from Portage [Yekooche], Fort St. James, Pinchi, Trembleur Lake and Grand Rapids used to gather in Tachie at Christmas and potlatch for one month. [We] dance every night... no fights. If people fight, put up another balhats. That's why afraid to fight... that's the job of deneza. After Christmas, by [early] February, back out on the traplines. The men would go out until Easter, but the women stayed home. Then gather at Tachie for Easter ceremonies. In April, hunt ducks; in May, fish for trout around Tachie, and start planting, fixing fences, barns, putting in crops. In June, stay home, work around house, make canoes. After planting, troll for fish. An us... was built across the Tachie River, on Tache Noo [Tachie Is-land] to catch gusbay [suckers] and tsintel [ling cod]. July and August was hay time. Everyone had horses and cows in Tachie, Pinchi, and Fort St. James.

To the extent that interviewees were asked to retrace their lifelines; to reacquaint places they might not have been to in a long while; to think back to what it was like before Keman I; and to recall events, activities and sites consigned to the recesses of memory, it was the act, or the process, of making these biographies, and not the cartographic product that mattered most. But it is wrong, as at least one author has argued, to dismiss the finished composites, which have been published; consider, for example, the two entries in Map 67, each of which confirms three important points raised by Brody in his analysis of Map 17.

The first is the range and intensity of Carrier Sekani land use and occupancy over time, and how bodies-in-motion cause boundaries to pulse depending upon the season, the availability of game, or which genealogical relationships obtain at a given moment. As we should expect, land use is concentrated around axial water bodies (like Dzingha

---

84 Cited in Hudson, D., Traplines, op. cit., 141.
85 This point has been emphasized by, among others, Brody, H. Maps, op. cit., Lewis, G.M. (ed) Cartographic Encounters, op. cit., and Rundstrom, R. 'A cultural interpretation', op. cit.
Map 67(a-b)
CSTC's Fort George Land Use Map (a) and Stuart-Trembleur Band Land Use Map (b) Prince George 1984, each 20 x 21 cm; two of a series of LUOS composites prepared as cartographic support for the CSTC's Kemano II study (place names superscripted by author for clarity).
Derived from the same methodologies that produced Map 17, they show "the widest sweeps made by...members of [the band], indicat[ing] the territory within which the band used land, but not necessarily where each activity was practiced most heavily (Kemano II, op. cit., 29). Unlike Map 17, these composites do not show which sweeps were the result of which land use practices, and make "no mention...of cabin or campsite locations [of which] there are literally hundreds throughout the territory" (ibid). Like those of the Dunne Za, however, comparisons between them are suggestive. These show, for example, that Tan-ot'enne fishing and gathering activities (in [a]) were more geographically concentrated than hunting and trapping (which reflects the dominance of the Lhtakoh); while Tl'azt'enne (in [b]) were more evenly balanced. And insofar as men and women participated equally in the LUOS, and would have traditionally been responsible for different resource gathering or processing activities, the maps also hint that the sweeps were gendered. It is also clear, as it was in the Dunne Za case, that when all the bands' LUOS are spliced together, they show a high degree of overlap. Partly, this is because in the early 1980s, "the precise boundaries of traditional territorial regions ha[d] not yet been clearly defined [since not] all data [was] yet available" (ibid., 14). The more important point, however, is that, traditionally, they would have (overlapped). It is in this sense that "the maps [still have] a valuable role as a first step in defining the territories owned by each band and the territory covered by the Carrier Sekani bands as a whole" (ibid., emphasis added) (both copied, with permission, from originals in ibid., 51 and 47).
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Bun and Nak'al Bun in the case of the Tl'az't'enne, and the valleys of the Nechakoh and Lthakoh in the Tanot'enne case), and less so out on the keyohs, but even there these traces underestimate land use intensity. This is because these composites summarize only those map biographies concerned with fishing or the trapping of large ungulates at fairly small scales (i.e. over large areas). Trappers and harvesters would gather smaller animals, plants and other more local resources while in search of keystone species, but obviously at much larger scales (i.e. over smaller areas), and so would not necessarily be accounted for by the surveys shown here.87

The second is that while the composites collectively delineate areas, the Carrier Sek-kani world is still experienced and navigated linearly — as a set of striations that radiate outward and in all directions from villages or camping places. The composites are generalizations, because in a visual register that is all they can be. But if we extricate from them the individual map biographies — each of which displays chuntohyohs, tsachuns, 'ndis, tis, keyohs and countless other beyunuhoodal'en (CMTs, pictographs, food caches, quarries etc.) — that is exactly what they look like. They are pieces of striations that connect a set of points, but almost never do they close ranks, like polygons, upon one another and none of them are externally delimited by boundaries that hover, like horizons, beyond the itineraries themselves.88

The third is that overlap and duplication — the perspectival dissonance that dismays judges and treaty commissioners alike — is part of what makes a Carrier Sekani geography distinct from — and to a point incommensurable with — our own. Because activities are performed communally, and information is transmitted through the dense web of consanguinal relationships structured along family or clan lines, we should not be at all surprised that there is in some cases wide divergences between the itineraries, whilst in others a very close correspondence between them. But that the relatively ordered,

87 CSTC Kemano II, op. cit., 29.
88 I will come back to this very important point below.
and systematic pattern that emerges in these composites is a reflection of Carrier Sekani reality — and a reflection, therefore, of the truthfulness and the accuracy of the women and men who recorded their biographies — is confirmed by the fact that at no time were interviewees and/or mappers in the constituent bands collaborating with each other.89

For most of the 1980s, the Carrier Sekani had few allies in the struggle against Kemano II. By the early 1990s, however, many other interests — sport and commercial fishers, guide outfitters, ranchers or loggers, lawyers, environmentalists, radio hotliners and people opposed to corporatism — had jumped onto the anti-Kemano bandwagon, and it was the crescendo of that collective voice that in 1994 ultimately forced the province to cancel the project for the foreseeable future.90 But it was the Carrier Sekani — who had never forgotten the havoc wreaked by Kemano I — that started it, and it was the Carrier Sekani — who had the most to lose should II have gone forward — that finished it. Perhaps more importantly, the victory showed the Carrier Sekani that maps are about power; that maps were a means of cultural reterritorialization; and that maps could be mobilized as acts of resistance. In short, it was the Kemano LUOS that got the Carrier Sekani more interested in making other maps, three examples of which are reproduced here (Maps 68 and 69, and Figure X).

Most were produced by individual band councils. Map 68 may be considered typical, and covers roughly the same area, and many of the same features, as displayed by the CLC on Map 65. A few were made by the CSTC in preparation for land claims negotiations. Showing the four main dialectical boundaries of all the dakelh and tsekhene speaking peoples, Map 69 covers a territory that, while culturally and linguistically similar, was by then under the jurisdiction of three separate tribal councils.91 It also shows not only the linear character of the Carrier Sekani world, but how the reserves were al-

89 Ibid., 14. The point has also been made by Brody, H. Maps, op. cit., 176.
90 Unlike the Cheslatta t'en, Alcan was compensated handsomely.
91 To reiterate, these were the CSTC (the areas tinted red and mauve), the CCTC (green) and the GWHC (blue).
Map 68
Nick Prince’s *untitled* map of *Tl'azt'enne* territory, Taché 1984, 75 x 95 cm; black and white draft topographic map of central Carrier country. Like Map 65, this map shows no reference grid or fixed boundaries, but highlights relief and gives the toponyms in *dakelh* orthography. The difference is that Prince’s map came out of the politics of land claims; it was a map of resistance. Map 65 was almost a spinoff from linguistic research; its purpose was pedagogical (photographed, with permission, from original at Tl'azt'en Treaty Office, Taché).
Map 69
Nicolette Prince's *untitled* map of Carrier and Sekani traditional territories, Prince George, 1990 (?) 25 x 42 cm; based on Morice's ethnolinguistic classifications (in his 'Notes', op., cit., 24-30), coloured draft map showing the dialectical divisions of the *dakelh* and *tsehkene* speaking peoples. By showing the main waterways and reserves (the red dots), it also captures the coarsely striated nature of Carrier Sekani territory. As noted earlier, contemporary hand drawn maps like this have usually rated little attention in the cartographic literature, an oversight that needs to be corrected (copied, with permission, from original donated to author).
Figure X
YDLI's *Athapaskan Languages of British Columbia*, Vanderhoof, 1989, 60 x 40 cm; like all board games, this one was designed for play, but even games can serve a pedagogical purpose. This one helped teach children about the location and distribution of the *Athapaskan* speaking nations in British Columbia (photographed, with permission, from original at CSTC, Prince George).
located, like square knots on a string, along the most important striations. While most maps made during this period were manually drawn and coloured topographic maps, and so reflected the still largely experimental character of Carrier Sekani cartography, there were exceptions. In 1988, the CSTC, the College of New Caledonia in Prince George, and three local provincial school districts constituted the Yinka Dene Language Institute (YDLI) in Vanderhoof. Although better funded, and more cross-cultural in focus, its mandate was similar to the CLC’s and, as had the CLC, made maps. One of the more unusual was Figure X, which continued in the same pedagogical tradition launched by Map 65, except this time at a much larger geographic scale, and in 'game format'. Players travel through Athapaskan territories on the roll of the dice, and each time they land on a community or some other numbered site they have to select a card which either conveys something — a moral tale, the resource base, a description of the area, etc. — or contains instructions for the next move. And while we cannot be absolutely sure, it may be significant that the direction of play metaphors a kind of rediscovery (a homecoming perhaps?). Indeed, the action unfolds south to north — in the opposite direction of the uda’dune that a handful of scattered Athapaskan narratives suggest migrated from north to south following the retreat of the ice sheet.

The BCTC and the Carrier Sekani TUS

The late 1980s and early 90s was, as we have already noted, a period of rapid cultural change, and growing political empowerment of indigenous people all across British Columbia, and to which the Carrier and Sekani were not immune. In 1988, the Stuart Lake, Stellaquo, Nautley, and Ingenika Bands reconstituted themselves as the Tl’azt’en

---

92 As noted in Chapter 1, this was the period in which a technological gap was starting to develop between First Nations at different stages in the comprehensive claims process. Indeed, the Carrier Sekani were still relying on hand drawn general reference maps well after their Tsimshian speaking neighbours had turned, as suggested in Chapter 4, to stereoplotted (or even digital) thematic maps.

93 They were 28 (Quesnel), 55 (Burns Lake), and 56 (Nechako).
Nation, Stellat'ën, Nadleh Whut'ën, and Tsay Kay Dene respectively. In 1987 and 8 the McLeod Lake Band obstructed logging trucks moving through their community; and in 1990, during the Oka crisis, the Nak'azdli and Nadleh Whut'ën set up information pickets on the main streets through Forts St. James and Fraser while the Tl'azt'en obstructed rail traffic on the Dease Lake extension. These name changes, and this new round of beyunuhoodal'en, were more than merely symbolic — they reflected the fact that the CSTC affiliates were starting to conceive themselves not as bands, but as imagined communities, as nations, and in so doing were making a conscious effort to reestablish the authority of clan, deneza/isekeza and balhats. The trade-off, however, was a growing sense of band independence and to which the 1984 LUOS surely contributed. In 1988 the Nee-Tahi-Bun separated from the CSTC, and in 1991 the Fort George and Lake Babine Bands followed suit, reconstituting themselves as the Lheit-Lit'en and Nat'oot'en Nations respectively.94

These changes, then, constituted the revised Carrier-Sekani comprehensive claim submitted to the BCTC in 1993.95 In the preamble to their 1991 discussion paper, the CSTC stated that they "ha[d] occupied and managed [the land and] resources of...a vast area encompassing the Rocky Mountains in the east, the Babine River in the west, Thutade Lake, Tatlatui Lake and the Finlay River in the north and the Blackwater, Ootsa and Tahtsa lakes in the south...for over 5000 years," and that it was their intent to "reaffirm traditional title over all crown lands and Indian reserves within Carrier Sekani territory, and to obtain fair compensation for aboriginal lands and resources that have been ali-enated."96 It noted that each constituent nation had its own system of land

---

94 The reasons behind the Lheit-Lit'en's disassociation from the CSTC (which, with variations, are typical of the sorts of considerations that have motivated others to do the same) are discussed by Boyce Richardson, in People of Terra Nullius (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1993), Chapter 8.  
95 To summarize, these were the Tl'azt'en Nation, Nadleh Whut'ën, Nak'azdli, Cheslatta t'en, Tse Kay Dene, Stellat'ën, Saik'uz, Broman Lake, Takla Lake, and Burns Lake.  
tenure, depending on whether the principle corporate unit was the extended family or clan and deneza/tsekeza. It cautioned that it was not their intent to infringe on the rights of non-Native homeowners, farmers or businesses, and it indicated a desire to negotiate IMAs en route to a treaty. But it also asserted that the CSTC did "not regard these negotiations as a real estate transaction [and had no intent of] extinguishing their aboriginal rights and title."  

Because of geographical and political complexities, the submission demanded some organizational changes (Figure Y). Administrative and political authority would henceforth be fragmented between the Government of Chiefs (elected DIA chiefs), the Tribal Chief of the CSTC (a joint selection of the constituents), and the Uza' (deneza and tsek-eza) and Elders' Council responsible for establishing the Land Claims and Self-Government Commission (LCSGC). While there would be some overlap (since many elected chiefs are also 'Uza), the first two entities would oversee policy and administration, the third the interests of the clans and extended families (i.e. the traditional leadership). In effect, the LCSGC was seen as the political action arm of the Uza' and Elders' Council. It was this group that would be responsible for establishing a treaty negotiation process acceptable to the member nations or bands; monitoring and resolving issues of overlap (between the constituents, and between the CSTC and other First Nations); making sure funding went to where it was needed; and providing technical support, including cartographic.

So while there was obviously a concern that all the constituent nations of the CSTC spoke a unified voice, there was also the recognition that research would have to flow through the constituents themselves. In late 1993, the LCSGC held meetings in all the CSTC communities to "discuss collectively the strategy [needed] to accelerate[e] the negotiation and resolution of [keyohs] and wildlife and other natural resources."  

97 Ibid., 5.  
Figure Y
Generalized schematic of organizational changes required by participation in the BCTC process. Unlike so many Euro-Canadian organizational hierarchies, this one is designed to ensure that the pointed end of the pyramid is at 'the bottom' (copied, with permission, from CSTC 'CSTC discussion paper', op. cit., 9-11)
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meetings were communal; anyone, young or old, male or female, educated or not, was invited to participate. In particular "the elders attended [the] meetings and...talked together about [their] early history...[and] used their knowledge of the past and its traditions to establish boundaries in the Tribal Council."\textsuperscript{99} While there was considerable debate over how much information would have to be divulged in order to achieve resolution of their claim, it was clear that they were going to need detailed maps — and lots of them. The centerpiece of the research process would have to be a GIS-supported TUS.

Clarifying the difference between an LUOS and a TUS is not helped by the terms themselves. The geographer Peter Usher argues that use refers to activities involving the harvesting of traditional resources (hunting, trapping, fishing, gathering plants, and the travelling required to engage in them). Occupancy refers to the area that "a particular group regards as its own by virtue of continuing use, habitation, naming, knowledge and control."\textsuperscript{100} This means that although the geographic area of use tends to be larger than the extent of occupancy, mapping use generally reveals more overlap and less discrete boundaries than mapping occupancy. While some LUOS do record occupancy (Map 17[b], for example), most tend to emphasize use (as shown on Maps 17[a] and 67). A TUS, however, is more comprehensive, because it gives more equal weight to occupancy, in both its physical and conceptual senses.

Funding for these studies was provided by both governments, and allocated through the BCTC. Each CSTC nation appointed, or advertised for, the most qualified people it could find to act as treaty coordinators, treaty negotiators, land claims researchers, field workers, and, of course, cartographers. The majority (and all the fieldworkers) were of Carrier Sekani ancestry and usually those who had worked on the Kemano II LUOS.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{99} Moran, B. \textit{Justa}, op. cit., 166.
\textsuperscript{100} Cited in Terry Tobias (ed), \textit{Chief Kerry's Moose} (Vancouver: UBCIC and Ecotrust Canada, 2000), 3.
\textsuperscript{101} Indeed, while the CSTC nations were among the last indigenous groups in British Columbia to have started making maps of their own they were arguably more well prepared for their TUS than most, because much of the data base was already in hand from Kemano II.
Some of them purchased their own digital workstations; others preferred to carry out their own fieldwork, and contract the technical work to CSTC cartographers in Prince George.

Because most First Nations view the TUS as the key to depicting their real geographies, they are among the most valuable of all their cultural property and so are generally inaccessible to outside researchers. A few, though, have been rather more public than others, and I have been able to see the Tl'azt'en Nation's version, which may be considered typical of all the CSTC studies.\(^\text{102}\) A brief outline of this TUS not only provides a more intimate look at striated space than is possible with an LUOS but further specifies the differences between the two types of study. Morris Joseph, then treaty coordinator for the Tl'azt'enne, summarized both the governing philosophy and first years' progress of their TUS in this way:

> Tl'azt'en Councillors, and Band and Tribal Council personnel...have identified eight very sensitive areas in various parts of our traditional territory. We drew our boundaries...with neighbouring First Nations...as best we could.... We also wrote the proper Tl'azt'en names of mountains, lakes, rivers, creeks, village sites and sacred areas along with areas which have special medicinal plants growing. We also are identifying and documenting the Tl'azt'en family and clan 'keyohs' so that we do not confuse this system with the government imposed 'Registered Trapline' system as this system also accommodates non-Native users...[and] conflicts with our inherent right and title to these lands and resources...this is [why the] elders...are taking the leading role...by providing good knowledgeable direction to the leaders, staff and young people and also their wisdom on our past values in our 'balhats' and justice systems and how we should...protect them for future generations."\(^\text{103}\)

Procedurally, the TUS is field work. As with an LUOS, it involves going out on the land and interviewing elders, trappers and deneza/tsekeza about the ways in which they used and occupied it. Recording some of this information, especially that already docu-

---

\(^\text{102}\) I am especially grateful to Umit Kiziltan, treaty coordinator, Beverly Bird, TUS director, and the councillors, elders and people of the Tl'azt'en Nation for trusting me with the information that follows. Thanks also to Geraldine Thomas, treaty coordinator with the Saik'uz First Nation, for giving me a more complete picture of just what the TUS is all about.

mented in earlier studies (e.g. place names, genealogies, etc.) is relatively straightforward. Much of it, especially that compromised by years of third party activity, or lost along with the passing of those who held that knowledge (e.g. keyoh boundaries, some beyunuhoodal’en, etc.) is less so, and often of the 'hunt-and-peck' variety. Finding extant tsachuns, chuntoyohs or CMTs, to take three examples, is an iterative process in every sense of the word — fieldworkers simply strike off a known ti every few meters or so and wander into the bush until they come across one. Its position is fixed by a handheld global positioning system (GPS), and then used to suggest a possible route to the next. Often, in fact, it is the striation established by a sequence of such sightings that helps reconstruct the tributary ti or khunai ti that once linked them together, but has since been overgrown or obliterated. The process obviously demands a sharp eye (not to mention a good deal of patience). Everything is recorded in notebooks or logs, and as many of the finds as possible are photographed for future reference (Figure Z).

Once all the data are in hand, the fieldworkers turn them over to the cartographers, whose task it is — in consultation with the treaty coordinators, keyoh holders, and the local wings of the Uza’ and Elders’ Council — to put it into a GIS. This move constitutes a major point of departure between the two types of studies. The TUS also records all use and occupancy within living memory but it rejects the composite map biographies characteristic of the LUOS (recall again, Maps 17[a] and 67) as too abstract and inflexible, concentrating instead on transforming the data into the site-specific format required by the BCTC (Figure AA). This is also very much an iterative process. One set of maps is used to rough in these data (Maps 70 and 71) but they are then circulated to the community where they can be checked against, and if necessary modified to agree with, the oral record. In this way, the whole process is based on direct experience, but

104 It occurs far more frequently than one might expect. I remember one day in Saik’uz territory in September 1997 when one of their TUS teams stumbled across not only more CMTs, but a long-forgotten quarry, and an old tsachun; the team figured the cache had not been touched for almost fifty years and yet the meat inside was still edible.
Figure Z(a-c)
Neither rain, nor sleet, nor snow... *Tl'azt'enne ti-blazers* at work near *Yeeko Bun* (Cunningham Lake) (a). On the ground, the work is surveying as the Carrier Sekani have always done it, by direct experience. In that backpack, however, are altimeter, camera, journal and GPS, the tools of the cartographic eye/I. This blending of traditional and modern methods is one of the defining characteristics of the TUS. The *tsachun* in (b) was located at the east end of *Yeeko Bun* (P1002 on Map 70). It is one of many such structures built at gathering places, trapping camps or *lhatuswheti* (trail junctions). The CMT in (c) was located at *Yekuz* (Yekootchee Reserve) (P2018 on Map 70). While there were once thousands of CMTs throughout the territory, many have been destroyed by industrial logging. Finding the survivors is one of the more difficult, but rewarding aspects of the TUS (with permission, 1995 photos filed at Tl'azt'en Treaty Office, Táché).
Figure AA
Legend to Map 71. The conversion of field data into a site-specific format is one of the major points of distinction between a TUS and LUOS (compare with Maps 17 and 67) (copied, with permission, from original at Tl'az't'en Treaty Office, Taché).
### Traditional Land Uses

#### Hunting Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Game</th>
<th>Small Game</th>
<th>Waterfowl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moose</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Owl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>Muskrat</td>
<td>Ducks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Groundhog</td>
<td>Grease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk</td>
<td>Porcupine</td>
<td>Swans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Goat</td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>Cranes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Horn Sheep</td>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>Cranes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Bear</td>
<td>Bird Eggs</td>
<td>Herons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grizzly Bear</td>
<td>Blue Grouse</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fishing/Spawning Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salmon</th>
<th>Char</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coho Salmon</td>
<td>Sockeye Salmon</td>
<td>Huckleberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Salmon</td>
<td>Spring Salmon</td>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chum Salmon</td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td>Soapberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokanee</td>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>Cranberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>Other Berries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Trout</td>
<td>Steelpants</td>
<td>Raspberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Trout</td>
<td>Grayling</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ling Cod</td>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Mineral Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sacred/Spiritual Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial Sites</th>
<th>Cremation Site</th>
<th>Nordic Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth Site</td>
<td>Death Site</td>
<td>Ceremonial Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Site</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gathering Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine Plants</th>
<th>Special Plants</th>
<th>Specialty Woods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Plants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Plants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Plants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Plants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Plants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Settlers/Other Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlers</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Historical Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gathering Places</th>
<th>Assembly Sites</th>
<th>Celebration Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Berry Picking Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Huckleberry</th>
<th>Saskatoon</th>
<th>Soapberry</th>
<th>Cranberry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Health Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine Plants</th>
<th>Special Plants</th>
<th>Specialty Woods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mineral Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicine Plants</th>
<th>Special Plants</th>
<th>Specialty Woods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 70
Inset from Tl'atz'en Nation's *untitled* working draft map of Tl'atz'enne territory, Taché 1998, 88 x 96 cm; a coloured CAD base map showing the main fluvial features, and (in the red numbers) the locations of photographs (like those in Figure Z[b-c]) taken by TUS researchers (such as those in Figure Z[a]). Place names have been tentatively pencilled in the *dakelh* orthography. Nothing is mapped in stone until everything has been perused by elders and checked against the oral record (photographed, with permission, from original at Tl'atz'en Treaty Office, Taché).
Map 71
Inset from Tl'azt'en Nation’s *untitled* working draft map of 
*Tl'azt'enne* territory, Taché 1998, 88 x 96 cm; unlike Map 
70, this coloured draft map was produced on a Microsta-
tion GIS and focusses on the traplines, as opposed to the 
toponyms. The red lines demarcate the registered lines; 
the green, guide outfitters' tenures (such as those already 
mapped by the Gitxsan in Map 52). It does not delineate 
the traditional *keyohs* (although it eventually will), but as 
the 'post-its' suggest, it is still exceedingly important that 
the registered ownership is accurate. As one *keyoh* hol-
der said, "my trapline is like money in the bank...[w]hen I 
need something I just go out and get it" (cited in Hudson, 
D. *Traplines*, op. cit., 176) (photographed, with permissi-
on, from original at Tl'azt'en Treaty Office, Taché).
breaking it into a series of steps — into a series of overlays actually — ensures close attention to accuracy.

Because much of the data was already in hand from the Kemano II study, the *Tl'azt'enne* TUS proceeded quickly. By 1995 they had identified and mapped over 220 toponyms and uncounted but numerous *beyunuhoodal'en*, sacred sites and CMTs. Mounted on the walls of the new treaty office were "maps of all...the different *keyohs*, natural, and medicinal resources that [could be] viewed and [to which any band member] could give input on on an even better and more serious basis."\(^{105}\) Some of it was summarized in pictorial displays (Figure BB). While the TUS teams were meeting on a weekly basis, the *Tl'azt'enne* recognized that those living on more peripheral reserves might not be able to attend, and so started the *Tl'az't'en Free Press*, a monthly newsletter containing, among other things, regular TUS updates. They also inaugurated a Literacy Mobilization Project designed to "promote local literacy based activities through the use of print and video technology,"\(^{106}\) and, with additional funding from the province's Ministry of Skills, Training and Labour, established an Elders' Empowerment Project. Both were designed to ensure the elders' full involvement...[in] identifying and mapping [the territory] and educating the youth of our communities, as they w[ould] be the beneficiaries of any positive settlements of [the nation's] long standing requests to receive back what was once truly and even to date [its] rightful *keyoh* and all its beautiful resources."\(^{107}\)

The differences between an LUOS and TUS can now be brought into clearer focus. An LUOS typically involves a quantitative assessment of past and present resource use, and is contracted out to external agencies in the form of generalized population surveys. They almost never use technologies like GPS and GIS, making do with a manual thematization of topographic maps. In part, this is because such technologies were generally

---

106 Kiziltan, U. 'Tl'az't'en Nation Literacy Mobilization Project' in ibid., 4-7.
Figure BB

*Tl'azt'en Nation Traditional Land Use Study*, Taché, 1995, 300 x 160 cm; immediately accessible to both young and old, this billboard on the wall of the Tl'azt'en Treaty Office shows the public character of the TUS. Note again not only the importance of photography to the TUS process, but also that none of the photographs are static landscape panoramas (as often the case in Euro-Canadian photography used for similar purposes). Like many of those on Map 33(a), these are pictures of *Tl'azt'enne* actually engaged in traditional use activities (photographed, with permission, from original at Tl'azt'en Treaty Office, Taché).
Tl'azt'en Nation Traditional Land Use Study

Mapping Our Cultural History & How We Use the Land

Hunting & Trapping
- areas where we hunt land animals

Plant Gathering
- places where berries, medicine, or other plants are gathered

Fishing Sites
- places where we harvest our most valuable food

Sacred Sites
- places that are sacred for any reason to the community or to our family

Cabins
- our summer and winter homes

Social Sites
- places where we come together to do business and to have fun
unavailable (or too expensive) in the 1970s or early 80s when most LUOS were conducted, but also because the composite cartographic product is not the most important aspect of the study. A TUS, by contrast, relies on a key informant approach and is directed by First Nations researchers. They are site-specific, use digital techniques, and the maps are the most important elements of the study because they must bear the burden of proof when it comes to demonstrating continuity.

At the same time, the TUS is more than maps, circulating, as it does, through 'more open forms of cartographic discourse'. Much of it entails action on the land itself, the restoration and marking of old tis (Figure CC) a case in point. Like the Gitxsan a few years earlier (recall Figures E and L), so are the Carrier Sekani now erecting their own signs pointing to wonders hitherto unseen. The map on this sign is more detailed, but the concatenation of ti, sign and trail markers helps travellers negotiate this striation in exactly the same way that ti, broken stakes and messaged CMTs once did. A beyunuhoodal'en of a different kind, consider also the memorial pole of Galbaznelye (Figure DD) — the culture hero who divided up Saik'uz territories — recently raised in front of the Saik'uz community hall (Figure DD). On top and gazing, appropriately enough, in all cardinal directions, is the image of Galbaznelye himself; below are images of owl and frog, the nutsi of the Lhts'umusyoo (from Noohlkih whut'en) and Luksilyoo (from Tachek whut'en), the two traditional communities that make up most of the current population of Saik'uz. And it also shows continuity along three axes. Temporally, it extends from, and elaborates on, the unembellished sort of mortuary column, or chuntoh-yoh nutsi (cabin crest), reproduced by Morice (recall Figure V). Geographically, the use of formline art links it directly to the clans of the Tsimshian-speaking nations, the original source of the nutsi. Sociopolitically, it contains traces of the colonial intervention. Indeed, it was reserve commissioner O'Reilly who merged the Noohlkih whut'en and the Tachek whut'en as the Stony Creek Band (now Saik'uz) in the first place.
A collaborative effort by Nadleh Whut'en, Nak'azdli and M-OF trail restoration crews, this trailhead sign (a) marks the south end of Nyan Wheti ('trail across') from Nak'al Bun to Nadleh Bunk'ut. It includes a map of the ti (and its tributaries), and an undated Morice photograph of three Carrier using it. An important striation in the Carrier ti-system, it was most heavily used after 1806, when it became the North West Company's favored brigade route between Forts St. James and Fraser. After 1906 the trail fell into disuse, and by the 1970s much of it had either been overgrown or destroyed by logging. Restoration began in the early 1990s and was finished in 1998. Labelled in English, dakelh and dulkw'ahke, the colourful trail markers (b) are mounted on trees every 100 meters or so (author's photos, 2000).
Figure DD
As noted in Chapter 4, the vast majority of formline totem poles outside the central or northwest coast cultural complex are generics. This is one of three raised at the Stony Creek reserve in the early 1990s, and designed to show the crests of local *uda'dune* (author’s photo, 1997).
Continuing in the same pedagogical tradition outlined above, some territorial practices take place in a linguistic register. Consider, for example, one of a set of anagrams that regularly appeared in the Tl'azt'en Free Press (Figure EE). Readers are challenged to locate familiar toponyms in English, and then translate them into their dakelh equivalents. Here is another (Figure FF), the nukezdude shun that I considered above (recall Figure U), except this time set to a score so that it could be performed by Carrier children at the 1997 BCTC Area Workshop in Prince George (while the instructor hand-sketched a map of Nak' al Bun on the blackboard behind). So too does it show exactly what I mean by continuity. Indeed, it shows not only how the old perseveres within the new, but also how the traces of the new always existed as unexploited potentiality within the old — although this time sonorously, rather than visually. (I cannot imagine any better place at which to show so than a BCTC workshop.) As with the Gitxsan, songs, games, memorial poles and signs pointing to wonders are not maps. But taken together and placed in their proper perspective they serve what amounts to the same purpose.

From this vantage point, then, the difference between an LUOS and TUS is more a matter of degree and scope, than of kind or method. An LUOS is mainly reactive, concerned with recording past use. It tends to be consigned to the shelves of band and tribal council archives soon after the purpose for which it was conducted has passed. The TUS, however, is proactive, concerned with the conceptual and material (re)occupancy of the territory itself. It is in this sense that a TUS works with, but reconstitutes TEK in a way that an LUOS rarely does. To put this alternatively, one might argue that a TUS is to TEK as the LUOS is to the scientific paradigm of resource management. And it is in this sense that the TUS is a living thing; by constantly turning maps back into mappings it is infrastructural to the life of the collective. Indeed, just as the elders had been

---

108 I am indebted to the consultant, Martin Weinstein, whose ideas and hands-on consultation work in this area were instrumental in helping me to work through the distinctions between these two types of study. (See, also, his 'Aboriginal land use and occupancy studies in Canada' unpublished paper presented at Workshop on Spatial Aspects of Social Forestry Systems, June, 1993, Chang Mai.)
Figure EE
Like the board game in Figure X, these brain-teasers were designed for play, but one should not dismiss their pedagogical function either. They serve the same purpose as the *dakelh*-English dictionary, albeit in a graphic, as opposed to textual, register (copied, with permission, from *Tl'azt'en Free Press* 5(5), June/July 1996).
Test Your Knowledge of Tl'azt'en Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct Answers</th>
<th>Congratulations! You can be proud of your knowledge of Tl'azt'en Territory.</th>
<th>You are good, but you can do better. Talk to a few elders or stop by the R&amp;D trailer.</th>
<th>Thanks for trying, but you need to do a lot of studying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-9 correct answers</td>
<td>1 Amy lake</td>
<td>Hawhuza Koh</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mt. Pope</td>
<td>Dzint'at</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Tezzeron lake</td>
<td>Sas Ti'oh Yenun</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 North Arm</td>
<td>Muchoo Enchoot</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 McKelvey Lake</td>
<td>Nak'al Dzuhi</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 correct answers</td>
<td>6 Grand Rapids</td>
<td>Binkadli Dzuhi</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Flemming lake</td>
<td>Nakwun'at</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Van Decar Creek</td>
<td>K'uzche</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 White Crater</td>
<td>Tse Banghnun</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Steamboat Bay</td>
<td>Tatl'oh</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 correct answers</td>
<td>11 Purvis Lake</td>
<td>Chuegun Ban</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Words to find

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amy lake</th>
<th>Mount Pope</th>
<th>Tezzeron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Arm</td>
<td>McKelvey</td>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemming lake</td>
<td>Van Decar Creek</td>
<td>White Crater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steamboat Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purvis Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure FF
Lyrically, harmonization does not change the shun’s territorializing function. What has changed are the 'rhythms' (and the perspective) with which it is performed. Indeed, the score was footnoted with the comment that it ought to be taught in conjunction with 'local map work' (emphasis added) (copied, with permission, from original transcription by Ileen Heer in CLC Carrier Teachers Manual, op. cit., 215-6).
Nukezdude Shun

Arrangement by Kay Wilkinson

1. Come on, come with me.
Let me show you 'round.
This is my dear homeland.
We call it Necoqli.
It sits on the Stuart Lake.
Yes, it's pretty.

2. Let us go by boat
To Indian land
Where there are villages.
First of all is Pinchi.
There live native people.
There, too, it's nice.

3. In Tache village
Live more native friends.
Further west is Portage
Where they feed us so well
While we rest for awhile.
It's beautiful.

4. On Tache river
We go up by boat.
We lunch at Grand Rapids.
We resume the trip, then
Arrive on Tremblor Lake,
There, too, it's nice.

TRAVELLING SONG

'D-anih su-lhin'-us Dul-cho siih no-t'as N-jaa ske-yoh

2.  'Na-kaz-dli ts'u-whut-ni Na-k'ul bun ba whuz'ah A-li hoonzoo.

3.  Doocha Tache 'et
Dakelhe buldus.
'Onoo' 'et Yekoche.
Nzoo-i negha'uh.
Natsuliyah 'et ts'uruih.
Tube hoonzoo.

4.  Tache koh k'ut 'et
Ndo uzuukah ih.
K'uzche 'et ma'wut'ul.
Doocha whenazdikoh.
Dzinghubun k'ets'ikih.
Et cha hoonzoo.
traditionally responsible for passing on their stories and knowledge to their grandchildren, so also does the TUS now help preserve that chain of command, only this time as much through the visual, as opposed to the narratival, register.

This is not to suggest that the transition has been smooth; even allowing for literacy promotion and elders' empowerment projects, the technical demands of a TUS can exacerbate the generation gap that is already dividing many indigenous communities. At Saik'uz, in 1997, one treaty coordinator told me how his uncle was enthralled with the maps his nephew was making because he could finally, for the first time, visualize, on paper, what actually lay over the ridge behind his keyoh. Another Saik'uz elder, however, had great difficulty orienting himself to a map of tis and archaeological sites that I had naively shown him in the expectation that he could. It was only later, over coffee at his house at Noolkhiil Bun (Nulki Lake), that he and his wife could tell me, verbally, where their keyoh was, where their neighbours' keyohs were, a couple of stories explaining how keyoh ownership was established and maintained, and how the flooding had compromised the local bush economy.109

As already noted in Chapter 4, this points to the larger challenges of representation, which are well illustrated in what is presently the most widely circulated version of the Tl'azt'en TUS (Map 72). It shows us the main kohs and tis, the external national boundary and the internal trapline boundaries, but they are in English, and the external boundary seems to be out of synch not only with the outermost internal boundaries, but the widest sweeps shown on Map 67(b). In addition, the traplines are not the traditional keyohs but the registered system imposed by the government. Partly this is to ensure that non-Tl'azt'en viewers are not completely unfamiliar with what they see; partly it is because there is as yet no need to make the original keyohs public. Mostly, however, it is because striated space is incommensurable with planimetric space in a way that mosaic-

109 This experience is not atypical, and supports my earlier contention that Carrier Sekani spokespersons at the MMRC probably did have considerable difficulty interpreting government blueprints and surveys.
Map 72
Tl'azt'en Nation's *Tl'azt'en Nation Traditional Territory*, Taché, 1999 75 x 75 cm; coloured Microstation GIS map of Tl'azt'en traditional territory. In both full view, and insetted for more clarity, it shows an external boundary, the registered traplines in the names of the current holders, and the main *kohs, bunghuns* and *tis*. While they are the registered lines, they are still viewed by most First Nations people as a sign of security in an uncertain world. But even 'in there', as Hugh Brody has so eloquently phrased it, "in a circle drawn on maps in some white game official's office, and in circles that are drawn on maps in the people's minds there is still room for the Indian way of life." (in *Maps*, op. cit., 99) (photographed, with permission, from original at Tl'azt'en Treaty Office, Taché).
Tl'azt'en Nation
Traditional Territory
ked is not. As already noted, elders, deneza/tsekeza, and trappers experience and think of their keyohs as lines, as itineraries. When abstracted onto a two-dimensional surface they either overlap with other lines, or fail to close off as polygons. The result is to create the appearance of discontinuity — which is, of course, exactly what the Carrier Sekani do not want untutored viewers to see. The same logic explains the external boundary, which is the composite boundary defined by the keyohs, but which is still actually an average worked out with other CSTC constituents through the LCSGC. Once we allow this, it is clear that this boundary is as coterminous as possible with the most concentrated bundle of sweeps generalized on Map 67(b).

As noted in Chapter 4, there are those who continue to argue that by employing Euro-Canadian representational technologies, and by mapping registered traplines and English names, the Tl'azt'enne have effectively abandoned any claim they might have otherwise had to tradition(al use). Again, though, this is a primitivist argument because it presumes that culture is static, and ignores the dislocations of contact and colonization. On the contrary, it is the particular way in which the Tl'azt'enne have incorporated this technology that, far from destroying continuity, actually preserves it. Ground truthing for the Tl'azt'enne continues to consist of two components: a spatial referencing system carried in linguistic (narratives, songs, memory training) and performative (balhats and games) discourses; and a terrestrial infrastructure of routes and landmarks navigated experientially (hunting, fishing, gathering or camping) and using graphic support (artefactual, pictorial and cartographic). What's changed is the emphasis accorded to each. Indeed, the Tl'azt'enne have acknowledged that "the social significance of the 'text', written in English or Carrier in Tl'azt'en communities, has a very short history [and reflects] the very cultural change that the broader Western society is going through....[w]ith the coming of the information age, the computers, the internet, and the omnipresence of video images in our lives also came the 'end of the book' or the 'text' as we knew it. Tl'az-
t'en communities are not immune to these changes."\(^{110}\) As in Gitxsan country, what's changed is less the territory than the perspective through which the territory is sensed.

**Remapping the central interior**

So is it with the CSTC more generally. While the constituents have "supported th[e] process from day one,"\(^{111}\) some of them have since decided it was in their best interests to negotiate out from under the CSTC umbrella. In 1992, the Cheslatta t'en broke away, the Tse Kay Dene followed suit in 1993, and in 1994 the Yecutcee Band separated from the Tl'az'tenne, becoming the Yekooche Nation. In some cases, fragmentation has been due to policy disagreements with the larger body, but mostly it is because the BCTC definition of nation was so broad that almost any CSTC constituent qualified. It is important to remember that when the CSTC was first created the political context was different. Because comprehensive claims were then so abstract, and because there was as yet no Section 35, nor any judicial ruling on the extent and scope of Aboriginal title and rights, it was important that First Nations demonstrate solidarity in the broad sense. But this never changed the fact that neither the Carrier or Sekani ever conceived themselves as cohesive linguistic or sociopolitical entities. They were composites of more localized groups, each with different governmental systems, different trading alliances, and different dialects. It is in this sense that the recent splits within the CSTC, far from discrediting the CSTC itself, or being indicative of a lack of support for the BCTC process, are really a reflection, and reaffirmation, of much older 'sub-tribal' autonomies.

And so now, as we approach the end of our travels in Carrier Sekani territory, let us marry up the Tl'az't'en TUS with those of the other seven constituent nations still under the CSTC umbrella and in so doing make visible all the stories that have ever been told by the central Carrier and Sekani people (Map 73). From the perspective of the carto-


\(^{111}\) Monk, J. in 'Carrier Sekani council support new treaty' Kahtou 2(9) June 93, 8.
CSTC's Carrier Sekani Tribal Council Areas of Traditional Territories, Prince George, 1999, 123 x 91 cm; coloured CAD topographical map of Carrier Sekani traditional territory. The full view shows an external (black line) and the internal band (coloured lines) boundaries, the reserves (in red), and the toponyms in dakelh. The way that boundaries in striated space overlap in confusing ways when committed to an orthogonal grid is illustrated more clearly in the inset. In 1998, the Broman Lake Band renamed itself the Wet'suwet'en First Nation to reflect the reality that it was "the only Wet'suwet'en Nation registered as a member of the [CSTC] and...wanted to distinguish [it] as such" (Maureen Luggi, 'Broman Lake Band changes its name' Kahtou 7[9], September 98, 14). The apparently unbounded space between their eastern boundary, and the western boundary of Stellat'en territory is not unclaimed; it is the territory of the Nee-Tahi-Bun which, as noted earlier, separated from the CSTC in 1988 (copied, with permission, from original donated to author).
graphic eye/I Map 73 can only be but one stratum — a cross-section perhaps — of a volumetric, striated space, the substantive contents of which remain out of sight, beyond the two-dimensional frame. But once we know something about the perspectives that produced it, there is clearly more here than meets the eye. Superscripted in dakelh or tsekhene orthographies, it shows the external CSTC boundary, the internal band boundaries, the reserves, and many of the toponyms and beyunuhooal‘en that we have already encountered. As we might expect from a people whose very name meant to 'travel on water', its visual emphasis is decidedly on the kohs and bunghuns, with barely a nod to the terrestrial arteries of commerce and movement that dominate the Euro-Canadian perspective on the same space. But by also emphasizing the reserves, the map makes it clear exactly what that perspective meant in real terms for Carrier and Sekani people.

As expected, the external boundary is that depicted on the Statement of Intent (Map 2) — perhaps unexpectedly, but no less remarkably, this boundary matches up closely with the ethnogeographic boundaries that Father Morice proposed for the Carrier and Sekani speaking peoples at the dawn of the second configuration, and which were mapped out by Nicolette Prince in Map 69. It is in this sense, then, that the CSTC has closed a circle, and it demonstrates once again how the old perseveres within the new even as the potentialities of the new have always resided within the old. These internal national boundaries are not coterminous but again it is important to recognize that they are compromises worked out in the balhats and in the LCSGC. These boundaries overlap not because they are wrong, but because that is the reality of the many movements, bifurcations, amalgamations, regroupings and intermarriages that produced them. As the CSTC's Patrick Michell has put it, "things are blended....[t]he fine lines you see on maps today are political boundaries, formed to deal with the land question."

The same logic must also be extended to the toponyms, beyunuhoodal'en and other mapped sites because there does seem to be, at first glance, a lot of white space in Map 73. Partly, this is a matter of scale — there just is not room for the literally hundreds of sites and names that have been catalogued since Kemano II. Partly, it is because many of them have been flooded or logged out and can no longer be located. Partly, it is because of the differences between use and occupancy noted above. And partly, it is because Map 73 remains a work in progress — because of the inertia built into the BCTC, some constituents have simply mapped more than others. But mostly it is because non-Native British Columbians typically interpret maps at first glance. From the Carrier Sekani perspective, however, sites, toponyms and beyunuhoodal'en are more than merely points on a Cartesian grid. When we view them as smudges — as locales where sightlines, songlines, storylines and lifelines converge — space becomes much fuller.

Let me now depart Carrier Sekani country the way I first entered it a few years ago (Figure GG). Mounted on a billboard at Cluculz Lake Rest Area, east of Vanderhoof on Yellowhead Highway 16, it is one of four panels, the other three containing an explanatory text, photographs of Carrier Sekani people engaged in traditional subsistence activities, and reproductions of some of the pictograms and other important beyunuhoodal'en in the territory. Containing both Euro-Canadian and Carrier Sekani references, but emphasizing neither, it is a map of a hybrid space that lies somewhere between the world of 'those who travel by water' and 'those who travel by land'. It shows that these two worlds are continuous with each other, and have been thus ever since Alexander Mackenzie first situated the northwest coast in the geographical imagination of the cartographic eye/I, and ever since the Carrier Sekani first encountered hitherto unfamiliar tools, and then unfamiliar faces, coming into their homeland on the tis and kohs of the uda'dune.

It is in this sense that there is a huge difference between this map and the Statement of Intent (Map 2) with which we began, both in terms of the perspective in which they
Figure GG
CSTC's and Ministry of Highways' *Dakelh Keyoh is Our Homeland*, Vanderhoof (?), 1985 (?) 225 x 188 cm; coloured rest area billboard showing select *dakelh* and Euro-Canadian sites, arteries of communication and travel, and names in the appropriate *dakelh* or English orthographies. It is part of a much larger four-panel display describing (in text and picture) aspects of Carrier history and culture (including the current interpretation of the pictogram bottom center Figure S) (author's photograph, 1997).
Dakeln Keyoh is Our Homeland
were drawn and the audience for whom they were intended. The Statement is directed to non-Native British Columbians. If it rocks their world, it is because its 'in-your-face' character is completely at odds with a frontier geographical imagination. I can remember the remarks of one government treaty facilitator at the 1997 Area Workshop who, when first shown Map 2, asked rather incredulously, "does this mean that [the Carrier Sekani] are claiming this great big spot on the map?" Of course it doesn't because as far as Carrier Sekani are concerned there is no need to claim what already belongs to them. The Carrier Sekani do not, in any event, expect that all of the territory will be returned. All Map 2 is saying is that if Euro-Canadians insist on beginning with the Map of British Columbia and the premise that it is sovereign over the the territory it frames, then so too do the Carrier Sekani begin with Map 2 with the premise that "the CSTC is sovereign and has the right to govern itself." At the end of the day, Map 2 is only a starting point, a means to an end.

The billboard, however, is addressed to whoever happens to pull off the highway at Cluculz Lake. Many of these travellers would be from outside the province, but even for those resident, I suspect the reaction would be rather less visceral. This map invites people into the Carrier Sekani world because it contains just enough information (and just enough translation in the other panels) to allow the traveller to orient themselves to what they know, but without being displaced by what they don't. Indeed, is it any wonder that the term yunk'eguz, a recent addition to dakelh that means 'map' (or 'drawn on the earth'), is etymologically a contraction of the stem yunka, meaning 'world' or 'surface of the ground', and eguz, meaning 'between'? Whether on or off the map, we are all, in the central interior as on the northwest coast, still travellers between two worlds; it is just that most of us have not yet acknowledged it. There can be no longer any excuse not to.

Sólh Téméxw

Archaeologists [say] we have been here for at least 9,000 years. Our Elders [say] we have been here since time immemorial....We don't...think that our ancestors came over the Bering Land Bridge. We have always been here.¹

For a number of reasons, my last traveller's tale takes place in Stó:lō country. It was not the first part of the northwest coast subjected to the desiring gaze of the cartographic eye/I, but it was arguably the first to bear the full onslaught of its effects. The result is a relatively thorough ethnohistorical record, and, if out of necessity, a greater willingness by the Stó:lō to 'open their boxes' to an immigrant society. Going back at least to the mid-19th century, they are the authors, so far as I am aware, of the oldest surviving maps of any First Nation in what is now British Columbia. That said, tracking continuity in Stó:lō cartography raises several challenges. Unlike those of the Gitxsan, there are marked temporal gaps in Stó:lō maps, and where there are not, usually ethnographers have filled them. Stó:lō polities have been divided, recombined, and reshuffled in space by contact even more than the Carrier Sekani, and the designation 'Stó:lō Nation' has even less purchase in historical or geographical fact. Moreover, these changes have been imposed on a spatial typology that is neither mosaicked nor striated, and reveals its inner workings more tangentially than either. Partially compensating for these difficulties, and providing a justification for concluding my journey in Stó:lō territory, is that it is here that we do come back, like travellers on a parabolic curve, as near to the Map of British Columbia as possible without being completely reassimilated by it. But of all three tales, this one is arguably my most speculative.

Situating the Stó:lō

The Stó:lō are Coast Salish speaking peoples who occupy a moderate sized territory of alpine peaks, U-shaped valleys, and deltaic floodplain reaching from the headwaters

¹ Yewal Siyá:m Ohamil (Ohamil Chief Sonny McHalsie) cited in 'A legacy of broken promises' in Keith Carlson (ed) You Are Asked To Witness (Chilliwack: Stó:lō Heritage Trust, 1997), 55.
of streams emptying into Q'ëyts'í Xó:tsa, Sxa'yeqs Xó:tsa and Peqwpa:qotel (Pitt, Stave and Harrison Lakes) to the north; the Ts'elxwéyeqw and Kw'ikw'iya:la (Chilliwack and Coquihalla Rivers) to the east; the Nootsákt (Nooksack River) to the south, and tl'álhem qó ('salt water') at Stsewòthen and Xwmèthkwiym (Tsawwassen and Musqueam) in the west. More specifically, they speak two of three variants of Halq'éméylem, designated as 'downriver' (Hun'qumyi'num') and 'upriver' (Halq'éméylem proper). This distinguishes them from Coast Salish tongues south of what is now the 49th parallel (Clallam and Nooksack), and on Vancouver Island (Hul'qumi'num, the third 'island' variant, and Northern Straits, including the Sencoten). Their neighbours to the north are the Stl'at'imx, to the east the Nlha7kapmx, to the south the Nooksack, Semiahmoo and Skagit, and in the east, the Squamish on the mainland, and, across tl'álhem qó (Georgia Strait), from south to north, the Wsá:nec, Quwutsun and Sne-nay-muxw (Nanaimo). Their current self-designation is mainly a political adaptation worked out after contact, but is taken from the name the Coast Salish applied to the great river bisecting their territory: the Stó:lo (Fraser River), the 'river of rivers' proper.

These peoples gathered plants and hunted land and marine mammals, but they were primarily salmon fishers. Along the most landlocked stretches of rivers in the shadows of the coast ranges, families dispersed into nuclear groups of Plateau-style sqémél (subterranean pit, or 'keekwillie' houses) but elsewhere cohabited in large compartmentalized iltexwáttxw (planked, shed-style longhouses), various combinations of which comprised the villages (Figure HH). How many pre-contact villages there were is not clear,
Like those of the Gitxsan, Halq'eméylem villages (a) also reflected a symmetry. The *iltexwáwtxw* were aligned with the long side parallel to the river, the *smelá:lh* (b) occupying the most preferable spots. Unlike the *galts'ap*, however, there were no parallel rows of *xwtsaan*, and while their sizes varied, *iltexwáwtxw* were much larger than *dahk* — Simon Fraser saw one at *Máthekwi* (Matsqui) equivalent to two football fields, while one at *Malé*, a Xwmèthkwiym village, had 76 compartments. Although a few were gable- or mansard-roofed structures most were of shed or shanty style. On average, most villages would contain from three to six *iltexwáwtxw*, but there were a few that had only one (copied, with permission, from original diagrams in Carlson, K. (ed) *You Are Asked*, op. cit., 89).
Status was reflected in the physical space Siélo people occupied within villages and longhouses.
but it was considerably more than the handful attributed to either the Gitxsan or Carrier Sekani. Duff identified some 52 in upriver *Halq'eméylem* territory alone.\(^4\) While there appears to have been an awareness that they were all *xwélmexw* (people who speak the same language) — and thus distinct from the *lats'umexw* (different people) — and sufficient solidarity across closely spaced villages to justify what amounted to 'tribal names', the important sociopolitical units were extended families.\(^5\) The *smelá:lh* ('worthy people' who 'know their history') constituted the majority, the highest ranking headed by a *siyá:m* (a title meaning 'unblemished ancestry', 'good manners', and 'wealth'). At bottom, and in the minority, were the *stéxem* ('worthless people' who have 'forgotten their history') and *skwiyéth* (slaves). While they passed down rights to ancestral names and ceremonial prerogatives in the *stl'éleq* (the Stó:ló potlatch), and owned fishing stations, berry or wapato patches, the *siyá:m* were neither chiefs (like the Gitxsan *simo'ogyet*), nor clan leaders (like the Carrier Sekani *deneza* or *tsekeza*). They controlled the resolution of disputes, access to 'tribal watersheds', and often the affairs of entire villages, but by consensus, custom, and 'an ability to provide for'. Beyond that, Stó:ló territory was common property, and not partitioned into corporate houses (like *huwilp*) or trapping territories (like *keyohs*). Kinship was never fictitious (in the imagined or mythic sense) and was reckoned bilaterally.\(^6\)

More than with the Gitxsan or Carrier Sekani, any account of Stó:ló mappings has to address the complexities of Stó:ló cosmology, the essential themes of which are carried in the *sxwóxwiyám* — an oral archive explaining the emergence and growth of primary

---


\(^5\) Ethnographic classifications tend to confuse more than they elucidate. Boas, F. called the extended family 'clan' or 'gens' while Hill-Tout, C. referred to it as the 'sept'. Wayne Suttles called it the 'household', with a set of ranked households in one or more villages comprising the 'local group'. Duff, W. referred to it as simply 'family', designating the local group as the 'tribe'. For details, see either of ibid., 19-20; or Suttles, W., 'Central Coast Salish', in *Handbook of North American Indians* Vol. 7, *The Northwest Coast*, Suttles, W. (ed) (Washington: Smithsonian Institute, 1981), 463-65. My terminology is that preferred by contemporary Stó:ló, and is outlined in Carlson, K. *You Are Asked*, op. cit., 88-9.

\(^6\) For more detail, see either of Suttles, W., *Coast Salish Essays* (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1987), Chapter 2; or Carlson, K. (ed) *You Are Asked*, op. cit., 90-4.
communities; the character of, and the relations between, people, animals and resources; fundamental moral codes; and the circumstantial or physical characteristics of geographic features. As such, they are distinguished from the *sqwélqwel* — true stories or news recording and explaining actual, temporal events.  

While there is debate, many Stó:lō seem to have believed in the existence of *Chich-елh Siyā:m* ('He who dwells above'), but his role as creator is more pronounced in some *sxwoxwiyám* than others. Most of the downriver *Halq’eméylem* source their identity in the *Tel Swayel* ('sky born people'), foundational ancestors who arrived during the myth age, when the world was a chaotic place and full of dangerous forces. Not unexpectedly, many of these descents share motifs found in the 'first men' narratives of *Whuh-lahl-tun* and *Kala’na* in Chapter 2. *Stsewdthen* Chief Harry Joe recalled how his ancestor figure, *Stát’sen*, came:

> floating among the clouds in a "Squa-am". None of the Chewassin [*sic*] Indians know what this squa-am is, but anyway...he landed in one of the mountains in Agassiz...[and] began looking around...in search of a place to go. So then he gazed down towards the sea and saw an Island [the peninsula of Point Roberts]...he again floated himself among the clouds in his squa-am;...when he reached the island and got off...[he] uttered a Prayer in thanks to the one who sent him down. The Island where he landed was this Reserve of Chewassin....But although...Stetson [*sic*] named it Chewassin....There is another...word that Stetson sayed when he first dismounted and this word is "Steilup" which means "I want from now and everlasting." He gave this name Chewassin just as a nickname...When Stetson first landed he dismounted up around about this hill...and there is an Indian monument there...There were a lot of stories about the monument. And when [Stetson] landed there he came down to survey a place for him to build his home...the place where many generations from him have owned.

---

7 While this is similar to the distinction that the Gitxsan draw between *andamahlaswx* and *adaawk*, the difference could not be more basic. For the Gitxsan, it is *adaawk* that carries out the substantive geographical work; for the Stó:lō, it is *sxwoxwiyám*.

8 Almost all of the earliest Stó:lō informants insisted that such a belief was autochthonous; ethnographers were less convinced, suggesting it may have been a result of an early borrowing (see, in this connection, Duff, W. *The Upper Stalo*, op. cit., 119-20).

9 As recorded at Tsawwassen Reserve in 1925 (by whom not specified) and reprinted in Arcas Consulting Services, *Archaeological Investigations at Tsawwassen, B.C*. Vol. 1, unpublished document (Vancouver: Arcas, 1996), 109-110. The hill with the monument is now the bluff above the ferry terminal.
A far more detailed account was told by the Q'eyts'i (Katzie) elder Th'álecten ('Old Pierre'). He recalled how Chichêlh Siyá:n installed his ancestor, along with Swaneset, Xwethpecten, Smákwec and C'simlenexw, at the south end of Q'eyts'i Xô:tsa (Pitt Lake), on Sam’ê:ént (Sheridan Hill), at Ts’i:xwt (Port Hammond), at Stsewôthen (Tsawwassen) and at Xwmêthkwiyem (Musqueam) respectively. At this time there were shellfish in tl’-álhem qô (salt water), but no salmon, oolichan, sturgeon, or marine mammals, and no wind, deciduous trees or birds on land. Each ancestor received powers. Smákwec was given dominion over a series of subterranean channels linking Q'eyts'i Xô:tsa, to Stsewôthen, Se'shalt (Sechelt), and other locations in the xwelmexw world,\(^{10}\) while his spouse's tears were dispersed by his son as the south and west winds. C'simlenexw received the sxwó:ygxwey mask, a ceremonial 'cleansing device' used in weddings, funerals, and naming ceremonies. Th’álecten acquired power over the seasons and rainbow and his wife gave birth to the sturgeon (the first fish in Q'eyts'i Xô:tsa) and a mythical bird visible only to their descendants. It was his people that begat the smêlâ:lh of the Q'eyts'i (Katzie) and Q’ó:leq’ (sometimes Xwêwenaqw [Whonnock]). Xwethpecten received no special powers, but, with Th’álecten, seems to have founded some of the Qiqâ:yt (New Westminster), Mathekwi (Matsqui), and Qw’ô:ntl’an (Kwantlen) smêlâ:lh. Swaneset was the most gifted, acquiring the sun and moon, and smashing Sam’ê:ént (Sheridan Hill) into pieces that formed the many hills of the lower delta. He introduced seagulls and oolichan and seeded the ground with berries and wapatos. He created and named the sloughs and tributaries of the lower Stó:lo — including the Sa’nisalh (Alouette River) — and, with his second wife (the daughter of the chief of the 'sockeye people'), brought the sockeye salmon that have spawned in these waters ever since.\(^{11}\)

\(^{10}\) This belief in the existence of underground channels permeates Stó:lo sxwó:wxwiyám.

\(^{11}\) The full account, running 24 pages, recorded at Katzie c. 1936, may be found in Jenness, D., 'The faith of a Coast Salish Indian', reprinted in Suttles, W., Katzie Ethnographic Notes (Victoria: BCPM, 1955), 10-34. Whether Smákwec is Stá’tsen by a different name (since both are claimed to have descended at Stsewôthen) or they are two different Tel Swayel founding distinct 'tribal groups' is unclear. Note, once again also, that Th’álecten was a Christian convert.
These powers were not crests, but as important elements in a larger ceremonial complex of syúwél (roughly 'guardian spirit') that embellished smela:lh identity, served a similar purpose. Most, like Swaneset's sun and moon or Thálecten's rainbow, were bestowed directly by Chichelh Siyá:m; inheritable and passed on in the st'l'éleg (potlatch), they functioned like the Gitxsan's pdeek ayuukš (clan crests) or the Carrier Sekani's nusí. Others were acquired by (often unsuspecting) initiates in the smilha (winter dance), the most widely practiced of all Stó:lō rituals, and thus were more like the Carrier Sekani's thenkoh (personal crests). Some had to be invoked by a shxwlá:m (shaman) in a vision quest; they were not inheritable, although some of the talents associated with them might be.

Of all the downriver 'tribes', only the Xát'seq (Hatzic), Sxa'yeqs (Skayaks), Kwikwet-l'em (Coquitlam) do not trace ancestry to the Tel Swayel. In upriver territory, by comparison, almost none of them do. Descent is typically traced from those who survived the great flood by anchoring canoes to the tops of the higher peaks, but the mountains vary, and the ancestors are not Tel Swayel. The Semá:th (Sumas) and Leq'amél (Nicomem), for example, claim descent from:

a boy from Kilgard. In them days they used to call that place [Semá:th].
Well, that one boy was left by himself. All his people died. So he went home. And the next morning he made up his mind to come over there and see who was living in Yarrow, where he saw that smoke coming out of a big house where there was a lot of Indians living. When he come there...there was just that one girl left, after she had all the bodies put away....So he got real ac-quainted with her...and they married...stay[ing] together. And that's where the language that the Indians are using started from. They went over

12 I cannot do justice to the guardian spirit complex in the space available here. Excellent and accessible accounts are found, however, in either of Suttles, W. Coast Salish Essays, op. cit., Chapter 10; or Duff, W. The Upper Stalo, op. cit., 98-122.
13 While the evidence is sketchy, this is likely because they were either split off from other smela:lh, or primarily s'lexem (worthless people) or skw'iyeth (slave) families.
14 Some Teit (Tait) villages claim their ancestors moored themselves on Popelehó:ys (Yale Mountain), 'rising up'; others named Mómet'es (Spider Peak), 'pointing' (as with the finger). The Ss't'a':les (Chehalis) took refuge on an unidentified peak near Peqwpa:gotel while the Ts'elxwéyeqw claim Kw'ekw'i:qw (Sumas Mountain), 'head sticking up'. I will come back to this point shortly.
to Nicomen, where there was a lot of Indians... That was the only people that used the language that the Indians are using now...  

Subsequently, a handful of their descendants survived the flood atop Kw'ekwi:qw (Sumas Mountain).  

This means that feats and powers elsewhere attributed to the Tel Swayel must be accomplished by different agents. For example, upriver sxwôxwiyám trace the distribution of salmon to Beaver. They also describe the acquisition of the sxwô:yxwey mask, except that it is fished out of a xô:tsa (lake) somewhere near Ts'qó:ls (Hope) by a boy seeking a cure for his afflictions. They explain how certain smelá:lh came to possess syúwél, but they are less frequent and involve contact with a real animal. Upriver sxwôxwiyám also speak more frequently of encounters with various types of supernatural beings. Some of these — like the sasq'ets (sasquatch), shxwexwó:s (thunderbird), or Xeylxelemós ('River monster chief') — are thought to be just as real as bears or squirrels. Others — such as the si:lhqey (two-headed serpent) or t'liteqo spá:th (large

As told by Lhô:kw'elâlêgw (Dan Milo), Scowkale Reserve, in 1962, to Wells, O., in The Chilliwacks and Their Neighbours (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1987), 40. As in many Carrier narratives, the agent is again an orphaned boy. (For more on the importance of this agency in upriver Halq'emeylem country, see Norman Lerman, An Analysis of Folktales of Lower Fraser Indians, British Columbia, unpublished MA thesis, University of Washington, 1952, 45 and 171.) Etymologically, Halq'emeylem is a derivation of Leq 'amel.  

This story goes on to describe how two of the vessels floated away to Lummi — which explains why the Lummi dialect is basically upriver Halq'emeylem — and Bella Coola — which helps clarify why the Nuxalk speak Salish. This latter is the same canoe Nuxalk narratives record landing on Nusq'alst (as discussed in Chapter 2). Two different versions are found in Wells, O., Myths and Legends of the Stawloh Indians (Sardis: Frank Coan, 1970), 14-23; four others are in Lerman, N. An Analysis, op. cit., 14-21 and 151-62. It's worth noting that Secwepemc and Nlha7kapmx stories explain this distribution in roughly the same way, but it is Coyote, not Beaver, who does so (see, in this connection, Teit, J. The Shuswap, op. cit. 627-31, and Mythology, op. cit., 301-3).  

That this is the only mask that figures in the sxwôxwiyám belies its spiritual importance throughout Coast Salish territory. Most upriver tribes ascribe its origin to a xô:tsa nearest the village of the smelá:lh that have come to own the prerogatives associated with it, but the best known account describes how it was retrieved from an eddy that appears only at low water in the middle of the Sto:lô at Iwôwes, (just north of Ts'qó:ls), 'something that does not want to show itself', after being brought through an underground channel from Q'owqéwem (Kawkawa Lake) by Beaver (for the full story see, Duff, W. The Upper Stalo, op. cit., 123-6).  

The adoption, for example, of the bear by the Ts'elxwéyeqw smelá:lh of Wili:leq is detailed in Wells, O. The Chilliwacks, op. cit., 165.
underwater bear) — belong to a special class of beings called *st'áleqem*. These would bewitch those who unwittingly came into contact with them but could be invoked and managed by a *shxwlá:m* (shaman), and to this extent carried out a similar function as a *syúwél* acquired in a *smilha*. More importantly, these creatures inhabited and lent special character to named geographic features called *xá:xa* (spiritually potent or taboo places). For example, most of the sloughs perforating the middle *Stó:lō*, especially around the confluence with the *Ts'elxwéyeqw* (Chilliwack River), are the work of the *si:lhqey* winding sinuously through its channels. *Swilhcha* (Cultus Lake), 'unclear liquid that warns', is known for its sudden and violent storms caused by a most powerful *t'liteqo spá:th* that occupies its depths.

The main distinction, then, is that in upriver *sxwóxwiyám*, only the *Sts'a:iles* (Chehalis) and *Sq'éwlets* (Scowlitz) trace their ancestry to the *Tel Swayel*. Neither the *Teit* (Tait), *Pelólhxw* (Pilalt), or *St'qw'omlh* (a northern hybrid of *Sts'a:iles* and *Stl'atl'imx*) know of any such traditions, while the *Ts'elxwéyeqw* (Chilliwack) seem even more anomalous — their arrival in *Halq'eméylem* territory being so recent that it is recounted in the *sqwélgwel*. What links the two genres together, however, are the activities of the *Xexá:ls* (variously 'changers' or 'magicians', but usually the Transformers). In some

---

20 Vulgarly, 'monsters', but the term has no direct translation in English.
21 The two-headed serpent surfaces throughout the entire southwest coast culture area. The Kwakwa̱k̓a̱'wakw call it *sisiu*t; the Squamish *sinulkay*. Several accounts of its activities in *Halq'eméylem* country may be found in Wells, O. *Myths and Legends*, op. cit., 26-31.
22 *T'liteqo spá:th* (often known by the Chinook term *slalhahkum* [slollicum]) were said to inhabit a number of upriver *xó:tsa*. The tale associated with the one in *Swilhcha* is the best known, and is recorded in prose form in Eloise Street, *Sepass Tales* (Chilliwack: Sepass Trust, 1962), 49-55.
24 Some *Ts'elxwéyeqw* do recall how their ancestors survived a great conflagration (a reference to a time when their world was riven by volcanism?), while others hint of the arrival of the 'moundbuilders' during the Cordilleran phase circa 7,000 years B.P. (see Street, E. *Sepass Tales*, op. cit., 9-10). For all intents and purposes, however, *Ts'elxwéyeqw smelá:th* do not track lineages before they were living at *SgósSaqel* (Chilliwack Lake), 'lake at the head', where they spoke a different language and had ties with the Nooksack (see Marian Smith, 'The Nooksack, the Chilliwack and the middle Fraser' *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 41[4], 1950, 330-41). Their dispersal down the *Ts'elxwéyeqw* to its confluence with the *Stó:lō*, where they adopted *Halq'éméylem*, occurred during the immediate pre-contact era (see Wells O.'s interview with *Xwelxwéyleq* [Bob Joe] in *The Chilliwacks*, op. cit., 53-8).
sxwōxwiyám, their appearance is attributed to Chichelh Siyá:m, others not, but in either case they close the mythical age by rearranging the world and making it fit for human occupation. In some settings, then, Xexá:ls enter a realm not visited by prior agents; in others, they complete the work left unfinished by the Tel Swayne. Some of these latter are left alone to establish other villages or smelá:lh, but others are transformed into animals or inanimate objects in such a way that they would continue to embody their shxweli ('life force'). In still others Xexá:ls alter, or add new capabilities to existing syúwél (guardian spirits) or stl’áleqem (supernatural 'monsters').

In many upriver variants, Xexá:ls arrive via Spiyem (Spuzzum), moving downriver from there, marking or affecting changes in a physiographical environment filled with supernatural beings. At Th’exelis (near Yale), 'gritting his teeth', one of them was challenged by Kwiyaxtel who was sitting on the opposite side of the Stó:lō at Xelhálh, 'injured person'. Xá:ls defeated him by scratching the rock with his thumbnail, each scratch (still visible today) weakening Kwiyaxtel until he could be turned into stone. Below there, (t)he(y) outstare Xéylxelemòs ('River monster chief'), 'marked many times on the face', turning him into the rock of the same name (now Lady Franklin Rock); while at Alhqá:yem (just north of Hope), (t)he(y) they do the same to the hunter, Tewit, his dog and spear, and an elk they were tracking. Continuing down (t)he(y) meet a woman who had married a Nooksack man, her daughter and three sons. Deciding it should be their

---

25 In some accounts Xexá:ls are four figures, three brothers and a sister, the offspring of a marriage between Black Bear and Woodpecker, who sometimes appear in animal form, at other times in human. In others, they are only one being, shortened as Xá:ls. It is in this light that I will, in the following section, oscillate between the plural and the singular. It's worth recalling (footnote 45, Chapter 2) that in the Nlha7kapmx sptákwelh, the transformers are four named brothers, the eldest being Coyote. In Stl'atlimx country, they are two brothers and a sister, all of whom appear in human form but are assisted by Mink (recall footnote 36, Chapter 2; but see too either of Teit, J. The Lilooet, op. cit., 274-5; or Langlois, W. et. al. [eds] Lilooet Stories, op. cit., 13-7). In Nuxalk mythology, by contrast, the brothers are not transformers, but foundational ancestors sent to earth by Alquntam.

26 Two other variants told by Xwelxwéyleq — including one in which Kwiyaxtel and Xexá:ls travel via underground channels — were recorded by Lerman, N. An Analysis, op. cit., 75-90. In the Nlha7kapmx version, the transformers sympathize with some Indians on the opposite side of the river who are using small boys as fishing poles but without much success. With each scratch, however, they acquire better ideas on how to properly catch, and then cure, the salmon (see Teit, J. The Mythology, op. cit., 226-8).
duty to henceforth watch over the lower Stó:lō, Xexá:ls transformed her into Lhilheqey (Mount Cheam), 'mother'; her sons the small peaks to the east, her daughter the small peak to the west and facing downriver, and her husband into Kulshan (Mount Baker).27

Still further on down (near the present site of Chilliwack), (t)he(y) answer the solicitations of some women doing the laundry of their wayward husbands by turning the latter into birds (which explains why that place is now named Kw'ogwáltih'a [Coqualeetza], 'beating the blankets').28

In some variants, Xexá:ls eventually turn around, exiting upriver Halq'eméylem territory the way they came.29 In others, they depart for Stl'at'imx territory via Pegwpa:qotel (Harrison Lake).30 En route, at Chitimexw, (t)he(y) transform a Sts'a'í:les (Chehalis) man into a stone ledge resembling a great horned owl, and at Lhxé:ylex, further up the west side, defeat Sh'ai, a powerful shxwł:m (shaman) by having him smoke a specially doped pipe and then, when he succumbs, tearing his body apart and turning the pieces into stone. In still other variants, though, (t)he(y) continue downriver, arriving at Stsewòthen where they depart across tl'álhem qó (Georgia Strait), but not before tossing three huge rocks; one of them lands almost at the point it is flung (the large boulder from which the town of White Rock took its name), the second on the Wsá, nec (Saanich) Peninsula, creating Pkols (Mount Douglas),31 the third somewhere in Kwakwa'kawakw country.

27 In a Nooksack version, Kulshan's sister is Pekosia (Red Mountain), his wife an unnamed peak near the Columbia River. In another, they are Twin Sisters and Kw'emí:ic (Chilliwack Mountain), the latter of which looks like a woman with a child on her back.

28 Wells, O. (in Myths and Legends, op. cit., 10) recorded one variant; Lerman, N. (in An Analysis, op. cit. 144-62) four. Of these latter, three are the same narratives that explain the distribution of salmon (footnote 17, above); the fourth also states that these husbands were up to no good in 'Chinatown' (shown lower left Map 76).

29 This is consistent with the several Nlha7kapmx variants that record Coyote arriving in their country from the lower Stó:lō at Spiyem (see Teit, J. The Mythology, op. cit., 218-28).

30 This is consistent with Stl'at'imx variants, which assert that the transformers arrive from Pegwpa:qotel (recall footnote 36, Chapter 2), circumnavigate their territory performing feats, and then exit via Squamish country (see also Langlois, W.L. et. al. [eds] Lillooet Stories, op. cit., 5-8).

31 Two versions are recorded in Lerman, N. An Analysis, 91-2, and are consistent with a number of Wsá, nec accounts (see Elliott, D. The Saltwater People, op. cit.). Pkols is identified on Map 19.
In downriver sxwōxwiyám, by contrast, it is at Stsewdthem, after coming across tl'ál-hem qó (salt water), that Xexá:ls' adventures begin. In Th’álecticen's narrative, (t)he(y) proceed to the mouth of Qéyts'i Stó:lô (Pitt River), where they spare all the first people save an arrogant hunter turned to stone. On the Sa’nisalh (Alouette River), (t)he(y) do the same to a one-legged man fishing steelhead, telling him to monitor the fish ascending the river to ensure they are taken only by Qéyts'i people; his likeness is still visible at Páléxel (Davis Pool). From there, Xexá:ls return to Sam’è:ènt (Sheridan Hill) where some of Swaneset's people are transformed into suckerfish. (T)he(y) visit Th’álecticen's landing place and, finding him still siyá:m, instruct him on how to properly harvest the fish or animals he created. At Sqwa’nm’qwam’exw (Grant Narrows) people are changed into seals, and at Áthlets (opposite Goose Island), after being told to paint warnings on the cliff that the water was drinkable only by the locals, into underwater people. After again meeting Swaneset, (t)he(y) leave for Xá:ytem (in Xat’seq territory) where (t)he(y) transform three siyá:m to stone for not preserving the Halq’emeylem language. Xexá:ls then disappear upriver, entering the sxwōxwiyám summarized previously.

A cosmological cartography

As I read it then, Stó:lô mappings are a hybrid of two genres of sxwōxwiyám whose event structures overlap but are handled by different agents and in different geographic settings. Downriver smela:lh tend to trace identity through the Tel Swayel owning specific powers, but only secondarily to where they came down. The result is a looser association between foundational smela:lh and 'tribal watersheds' with diffuse boundar-

---

32 This is again consistent with both Wsá:nec and Stl’atl’imx narratives.
33 From the same narrative summarized earlier. For more on X(ex)á:ls, see either of Teresa Calson, Keith Carlson, Brian Thom and Sonny McHalsie, 'Spoken literature Stó:lô oral narratives' in Carlson, K. (ed) You Are Asked, op. cit., 182-96; or Gordon Mohs, 'Stó:lô sacred ground' in Donald Carmichael, Jay Hubert, Bryant Reeves and Alan Schande (eds), Sacred Sites Sacred Places (London: Routledge, 1994), 184-207.
ies. This seems consistent with a physiographic milieu itself constructed by *Tel Swa-yel* as relatively undifferentiated floodplain. Indeed, both the ethnographic and oral records confirm that the lower *Stó:lō* was a fluid contact zone in its own right; as *Th'alec-ten* (Old Pierre) put it, "an enormous dish that stored up food for all mankind [to which] Indians flocked...from every quarter to catch the fish that abounded in its waters." By contrast, upriver identity was more closely sourced in location, and only secondarily to who one was. The results are more definite 'tribal boundaries', and greater privatization of resource gathering sites, especially the canyon fisheries. This is consistent with the more constrained physiography created by *Xexe:ls*, and into which *smel:lth* were installed. It also explains why upriver territory was more populated by *stl'áleqem*. This was, after all, a more forbidding landscape, the sort of topography that provided all manner of murky and hidden canyons, caves and pools preferred by such beings.

These differences were understood; while all *xwelmexw* (people speaking the same language) were aligned along a linguistic gradient, those speaking *Halq'emeylem* were barely intelligible to *Hun'qumyi'num* living by *tl'álem qó* (or vice versa). They were also reflected in the 'tribal names'; while downriver names have a less obvious association with physiographic features than upriver, they did enunciate an awareness of geographical identity. They were reinforced in the plastic arts. Although there was again overlap, the subject matter carved, etched or painted on *sxwithi* (external house posts), *skwetxwóweltht'ó:mél* (internal) of downriver *iltexwáwtxw* (longhouses) or *smókw'e'álá*

---

34 Indeed, there seems to be no obvious etymological correspondence between the name of the *Tel Swa-yel*, the name of the 'tribe', or the area or location with they have since been associated. Most 'tribal names' are from some resource commonly found in the area, the names of physical features (such as *Q'éy-ts'i croft*) then inferred from the 'tribal name'.


36 As downriver, many upriver 'tribes' also take their name from a local resource. At least half of them, however, derive their names from those applied to local geographic features.

37 It is surely not coincidental that both the *sptákWelh* of the Nilha7kápmx and the oral tradition of the Stl'at'imx — the two groups with which the upriver tribes had close relations — were also preoccupied with 'land and water mysteries', and other entities associated with named geographical locations. See, again, Teit, J. *The Thompson*, op. cit., 337-44; or *The Lillooet*, op. cit., 274-6.
(mortuary boxes), almost always concerned Tel Swayel and syúwél, and only rarely stl'-álegem ('monsters') (Figure II). Upriver imagery, by comparison, not only emphasized stl'álegem, but was usually displayed on xwelmesxwátxw (smokehouses), a special type of dwelling used expressly for the smilha and other ceremonies (Figure JJ).

At the same time, these differences were homogenized by countervailing tendencies. In the cosmological realm these were the Xexá:ls and syúwél (guardian spirit) complex. As they travel around the Coast Salish world, interacting, here and there, with the Tel Swayel or stl'álegem, Xexá:ls are the cosmological cement that weave event structures together. In so doing, they ensure that sxwótxwiyám are open-ended, circular, and non-chronological. They are no longer short, independent accounts, but parts of a long and complex rhizomatic narrative, "a never-ending story in which the ancestors of the past interact with people of the present in shaping the future."38 The syúwél described a like dynamic. Consider, for example, Siyémches (Richard's son, Ts'elxweyeqw Chief Frank) recalling his father telling him how:

the power of syúwél...is in the mountains, and in the fall when the snow has come syúwél comes down to the warmer climate and it starts hitting the people. Syúwél hits people and then they wake up and start singing; and syúwél goes around the world. And I used to often wonder, 'what do you mean it goes around the world? Goes right around to China and comes back?' And then I was looking at a map of the Coast Salish territory and it sort of goes in a circle...Sechelt, Nanaimo down to Victoria, across to Neah Bay, you know, and up to Nooksack and it comes back, and it's almost like that's the only world the Coast Salish knew. And I was thinking that's how the elders described their territory, the Coast Salish territory, around the world.39

This world reflected the absolute physical dominance of the Stó:lō. Over time, the bidirectionality of the river encouraged ever greater dialogue, intermarriage and trade, and the downriver and upriver sxwótxwiyám and sqwélqwel increasingly fused together. As the smelá:lh established themselves in villages, they would naturally tend to arrange

Figure II(a-c)
Like most associated with the northwest coast dahk, Hal-
g'eméylem sxwithi or skwetxwówelht'ó:mél were decorative (and not structural) in nature, but they were of far less elaborate design. As shown on this engraving of Xáts'lá-
nexw at Xwmèthkwiyem (a), they usually commemorated named ancestors. Occasionally, they would include car­vings of their owners' syúwél. According to Harlan Smith, this Xwmèthkwiyem sxwithi (b) includes representations of the stars, sun and moon (three small circles, top) and two figures. One of them (Swaneset, maybe) may have been whoever was taught about, or acquired the powers of the astronomical bodies — according to (August Jack) Xáts'-
lánexw, the Stó:lō "[had] names for pretty near every star" (quoted in Wells, O. The Chilliwacks, op. cit., 145) — the other an ancestor figure (C'simlenexw, perhaps) holding two birds (likely shxwexwó:s). As with some of the Car­rier nutsi (recall Figure V), finally, ancestor or syúwél fig­ures were often carved on smòkw'e'álá; in this example (c) they are shxwémetsel (fishers) (all by Harlan Smith, 1898 [a-b] and 1928 [c] [AMNH, neg. nos. 42937 and 42936, and CMC, image no. 71406 respectively]).
Figure JJ(a-d)
Representations carved or painted on xwelmexwáwtxw, by contrast, almost always concerned stlí'áleqem or other unclassified supernatural entities, and never ancestor figures or syúwél; indeed the type of design would immediately determine for the visitor both the type and purpose of the building. While the evidence is sketchy, these seem to have been more common among the upriver Halq'eméylem (because most of the creatures they represent are thought to have inhabited upriver places). If so, however, very few seem to have survived. These three Oliver Wells renditions were based on information from Tixwelatsa (Albert Louie) and Siyémches (Richard Malloway); (a) and (b) were paintings of sì:lhqey on the xwelmexwáwtxw sxwithi at Yeqweqweqwi:ws (Yakweakioose) and Qweqwe'ópelhp (Kwawkawapilt), while (c) was a set of paintings of t'líteqo spá:th on the skwetxwówelht'o:mél of another xwelmexwáwtxw at Qweqwe'ópelhp. One of the few surviving carved variants was at Xwméthkwiym (d); top to bottom, it displayed a pair of shxwémetsel, face and protruding eyes (according to Harlan Smith the sxwóy:yxwey mask), and two sì:lhqey and a disk (perhaps the temexw [moon]) ([a-c] copied, with permission, from original drawings in Wells, O. Myths and Legends, op. cit., 28-9 and 32; [d] by Harlan Smith, 1898 [AMNH neg. no. 42942, New York]).
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themselves along the banks of the river and most accessible tributaries. These then became the conduits for a system of well-used trails (or subterranean channels) that helped maintain unity within the *xwélmxw* world, and with the Nooksack, Skagit and Semiahmoo to the south, the Nlha7kápmx, Stl'atl'imx and Squamish to the east and north.

**Stó:lō spatial typology**

This spatial typology was not like the Gitxsan's. It was a visual space, but without situated migration narratives, heraldic poles, and *wilp* (house) territories, it lacked the monumentality of mosaicked space. The 'tribal boundaries' were too diffuse and there were more villages than 'tribal territories'. To the extent that it had a linear character, it had more in common with the Carrier Sekani's. But there were no trapping territories, and a select few striations dominated. This space is better conceived as *vectored* space, and it had two basic characteristics. On the one hand, vectors want to elongate. To the degree that they do, they create a spatial typology in which a concept of ownership of, or identification with, a specific area is one of indefinite *extension* along a select few axes, and in which the end of each axis is, like a link in a chain, hooked to the end of another. On the other, vectors want to constrict, or thicken. Like a jet stream that creates a low pressure trough, vectors tend to *intensify*, drawing everything that comes within range towards the center of the trough.

This then explains why different *smélä:lh* would claim different mountains as their refuge from the flood. The flood was an epitomizing event throughout the *xwélmxw* world, but *smélä:lh* would trace sanctuary to peaks as near as possible to their ancient villages in order to preserve the sense of place from which local identity partially arose. It also explains why *Xexá:l* appear in different form or numbers depending on location. As they circumnavigate the territory, creating the event structure of the 'never ending story', they pick up vectors that lead them through the *Halq'eméylem* world and into
other countries. Because it is what they accomplish and how they accomplish it, and not what or how many they are, that matters, their composition can still be tailored to suit local requirements.

The same logic governed the various signs or powers in the syúwél. As Siyémches suggests, the beings variously invoked as syúwél were not conceived as singular entities, but as members of a species that travelled 'around the Coast Salish world'. However, smelá:lh would obviously derive their own syúwél from different (re)sources, those closest to where they lived. The ceremonial form (as in the smilha [winter dance]) was the same, but the contents were different. The net effect was to describe a circular vector that stayed within the xwelmexw world, but which could still be personalized by local circumstances. As Yewal Siyá:m Ohamil has stated it, "our resources are more than just resources, they are our extended family. They are our ancestors, our shxwelí [life-force]."  

The assigning of the sxwó:yxwey mask to different locations followed a like dynamic but with a twist. By situating originary points as near as possible to their own villages, smelá:lh (leaders) were able to privatize the mask's powers. As geographical sources multiply, genealogical vectors are shortened, enhancing the identities of those who use it. From the perspective of groups outside the xwelmexw world, though, this dynamic worked in reverse. As the mask was diffused through trade, intermarriage, or stl'éleg (potlatching) to the lats'umexw (different people) both the plastic features of the

---

40 In 'A legacy of broken promises', op. cit., 55. On balance, this method of adapting a generalized form to local circumstances is not that different than, say, the Carrier Sekani formfitting parts of a generic moral geography to address site-specific ethical or behavioural questions.

41 Sxwó:yxwey masks came to be owned not only by smelá:lh in almost all the constituent Coast Salish 'tribes' but by a number of high ranking Kwakwágwakw, Nuu-chah-nulth, Squamish and Interior Salish families also. Although a few, like the Xwmethkwiyem, attribute its source to foundational ancestors, the majority recognize an external origin, and accept that it was acquired from somewhere in upriver Halq'émeylem territory in more recent times (and only got confused with first men myths once it had been diffused to the lower delta). See, in this connection, Duff, W. The Upper Stalo, op. cit., 123-26; and footnote 18.

42 Although not couched in the language of vectors, I owe this line of thinking to Lévi-Strauss, C., whose analysis of the origin, function, and distribution of the sxwó:yxwey mask (in The Way of the Masks, op. cit.) may well represent the best of structuralist geography.
mask, and the narratives explaining its acquisition, change. As geography is 'stretched', genealogical vectors are so attenuated that what is enhanced are 'national', and not local, identities. The territory still generates the mask but its specific geography is eliminated as the sxwōxwiyám (or equivalent) take root in different cosmological contexts.43

We then have a set of vectors that tend to extend themselves indefinitely while compressing themselves laterally. On the ground, they configured a 'tree-like' geography. The trunk was the Stó:lō; the branches the stó:lō (smaller rivers) that empty into it at regular intervals. Because they were where Xexá:lS travelled, the Stó:lō and Peqwpa:qotel (Harrison Lake) were common passageways accessible to all xweḻmexw. Access to the branches was regulated by the smela:lh associated with them, but ownership was defined by the leaves of the branches — the settlements, fishing sites, berry or wapato patches, and spiritually important places, where the vector was the thickest — and not by the branch itself. One did not have to travel far from the branches before that sense of 'proprietorship' faded away completely. Between the branches, Stó:lō territory was more like the moss that dangles from old growth trees, a fluid common property space pierced by secondary trails that crossed watershed boundaries and which anyone could access.

This suggests a spatial typology that was not only internally balanced but displayed near perfect symmetry between its concrete terrestrial expression and the ideal type described in the sxwōxwiyám. In my view, this explains why the Stó:lō did not require a system of landmarks like those of the Carrier Sekani or Gitxsan and why they could get by with a toponymic system that was, at best, morphemically inconsistent. This geo-

43 By comparing the sxwō:ygwey with the Kwakwaka'wakw's dzonokwa, Lévi-Strauss has shown that both the mask and the myths explaining its acquisition only make sense as part of a transformative set, in which changes in the event structure of the narrative are symmetrically juxtaposed by changes in the mask's plas-tic features. In mainland narratives, the sxwō:ygwey is retrieved from underwater; in island versions from the sky. Likewise, its function among the Coast and Interior Salish is benevolent, among the Kwakwaka'wakw maleficent. For the latter, beneficence comes from the dzonokwa mask, which is sourced in the woods or mountains as opposed to the sky or water, and sports plastic features the exact inverse of the sxwō:ygwey (e.g. sunken eyes and mouth as opposed to protruding).
graphy was constituted by a public system of closely spaced villages, well used trails and *stó:lō* (streams) and transformer sites (Figure KK) in a select few corridors. It was not without accessory devices. As noted in Chapter 2, the boundaries between 'tribes' and between the *xwelmexw* (people of the same language) and *lats'umexw* (different peoples) were occasionally signed by pictography. In upriver territory, especially, boundaries were monitored by fortifications. In the canyon, stone ramparts guarding owned fishing sites were aligned so that the next rampart upstream could be sighted from the one downstream. Further downriver, forts could be made of wood. One of the largest was the watchtower at *Tita’s*, which guarded the entrance to the *Ts'elxwéyeqw* (Chilliwack River) in the same way that the Gitxsan's *Ta'awdzep* guarded the entrance to the upper *Xsan*. A series of *xá:xa* ('spiritually potent places') reminded people where they should or should not go. In downriver territory, especially, the plastic arts marked genealogical niches. Throughout, travellers occasionally temporalized movement in the *st'i:lém* (travelling songs) (Figure LL). Overall, however, daily life unfolded in local contexts, where the vectors were at their thickest. If you knew the *sgwóxwiyám*, navigating this system boiled down to one basic directive — *follow the river*. Built villages, transformer sites, fluvial confluences and trail junctions were encountered so frequently — a canoe could easily pass a dozen or more of either in a single day — that getting lost would have been next to impossible.

**The enormous food dish and the hungry people**

Sometime in the not-too-distant past, however, the *xwelmexw* received "news...[of] a great sickness...travelling over the land...a sickness that no medicine could cure, and no person escape." In a few years, smallpox had "killed...half the Indians all around the

---

44 *Th'álecten*, cited in Jenness, D. 'The faith', op. cit., 34.
Of the nearly 200 documented transformer sites that marked the *xwélmexw* world, here are three we have already encountered: (a) *Chitmexw* (the 'great horned owl'); (b) *Xá:ytem* ('the speaking ones'); and (c) *Tewit* (the 'hunter' is the larger rock; his 'spear' the small spike to its left; his 'dog', *Sqémay*, the small rock a few meters upriver) ([b] by Ann Mohs; [a] and [c] by Gary Fiegehen, nos. 98-P3-783 and 98-P3-696, all with permission [Stó:lō Nation Archives, Chilliwack]).
Figure LL
Like the Carrier's *nekuzdude shun*, some Stó:lō *st’i:lém* were used to both rhythmatize movement, and to assist with memory recall. As public property, this one was untitled and could be sung by anyone; according to Margaret Jim and Oywót (Amy Cooper) "it's just a travelling song. As you went past the place before and you seen [where you used to be], then you sang the song" (cited in Wells, O. *The Chilliwacks*, op. cit., 68) (copied, with permission, from ibid.)
Translation

Oh, where I used to walk
Oh, where I used to walk
I see where I used to walk and I cry
The place where I used to walk was beautiful
Oh, where I used to walk
Oh, where I used to walk
The place where I used to walk was good, anyway
Where I used to walk was beautiful and I cry
Fraser River." Some 'tribes', such as the Sxa'yeqs, Xat'seq, and Q'ō:leq' were almost completely wiped out. Fragments of others, like the Q'éyts'i, Sne'kwōmes (Snokomish), and Ts'elxwéyeqw, relocated. Coming into Georgia Strait in 1792, both Alcalá Galia-no and George Vancouver reported frequently on abandoned or destitute villages, and local inhabitants in poor health — a condition that had improved only marginally when Simon Fraser came down the Stó:lō from Nlha7kapmx country in 1808. So devastating was this affliction that even today, an array of toponyms — like Sxwoxwyelmelh (in Teit territory, just west of Ts'qó:ls), 'a lot of people died at once'; Smimidíyexwálə (in Sts'a'-i:les territory at the foot of Peqwpa:qotəl), 'people container' or 'mass grave where bodies were put'; and Sxwoyehd.id (in Ts'elxwéyeqw territory), 'container of dead people' — "creates a cultural geography that keeps the story of [the] smallpox alive."

Within a few years, populations had started to recover, but in 1827 the HBC established Fort Langley on the lower Stó:lō. Some Qw'ō:ntl'an, Q'éyts'i and Máthekwi abandoned their original settlements, reoccupying older Q'ō:leq', Xat'seq and Sxa'yeqs sites nearer the fort, but otherwise the main effects appear to have been socioeconomic and not territorial. In 1858, however, some 30,000 hardscrabble gold miners poured up the Stó:lō, overrunning upriver Halq'eméylem fishing stations and villages; and the Canada-United States Boundary Commission began surveying the 49th parallel. As

45 Tixwelatsa, cited in Carlson, K. You Are Asked, op. cit., 36. This probably understates the severity of the epidemic; recent scholarship suggests that it was closer to 65%, if not more (see, in this connection, Harris, C. The Resettlement, op. cit., 3-30).
46 In general, people moved out of tributary watersheds to live with relatives closer to the Stó:lō. The epidemic also opened up space for lats'umexw (different people). Some of the Semyō:me (Semiahmoo) shifted north, Quwutsun and Sne-nay-muxw established camps on the delta, and Leqwiltok (Kwakwa'kawak) raids became more frequent (see ibid., 23-6).
47 Carlson, K. 'First contact: Smallpox' in his (ed) You Are Asked, op. cit., 35. That the prefix to many of these toponyms is the same as that of the sxwó:ygwey mask is no coincidence. Indeed, in many variants describing the acquisition of the mask, the disease for which a cure was being sought was not an ancient malady, but smallpox. This explains why many tales claim the mask to be of fairly recent vintage, and why some smelát:lə trace the end of the myth age to the epidemic.
48 The fort was of marginal importance to the fur trade but it soon developed a brisk business in salted salmon. As such, it provided wage labour opportunities and many fort employees took Halq'eméylem wives — but it never centripetalized Native lifeways as did, say, Forts Simpson or McLoughlin on the coast, or Alexandria in the interior. The British presence did, however, put a stop to Leqwiltok raiding parties.
these events unravelled Halq'emeylem spatial integrity, so also did they catalyze a change in its representation (Map 74).

So far as I know, the oldest surviving Native maps in British Columbia, both cover roughly the same portion of the Skagit River country and use the same PPS orthography, but are stylistically different. Using star-shaped figures for mountains, and cross-hatchings for watersheds, Thiusoloc's version shows elevation not by contours or hachuring, but something in between. It anastomoses the stó:lō (streams) to show routes and angles of connectivity, and there is no relation between the size of the stream and its relative emphasis. His father's version breaks the routes into geomorphologically distinct segments and shows a greater concern with areal accuracy. Taken together, they mark a progression in which a topological and experiential perspective on Halq'emeylem space is starting to yield to the topographical and detached.

Better than Maps 5 or 42 do alone, this transformation seems to support the cartographic historian G. Malcom Lewis's insistence that we "reexamine early white maps ... in order to recognize the seams where the terra semi-cognitae, as communicated by the Indians, are welded to the terrae cognitae of the Europeans."49 Indeed, the father's map retains only those names or features deemed necessary for fixing the international boundary itself. Hindsight, however, is always 20/20; from Thiusoloc's and his father's perspective, these surveyors were basically lost. Custer admitted that these maps gave his men their "first knowledge of the country, as also many of the names of its mountains, streams and lakes."50 Thiusoloc and his father prepared these maps mainly as a matter of courtesy but also, perhaps, to acquire a technology that could represent a traditional understanding of Halq'emeylem geography. At that time, they would have had no inkling that they were unwittingly contributing to their own deterritorialization.

---

49 In 'Indian maps', op. cit., 77.
50 In letter to Archibald Campbell, op. cit.
Map 74(a-b)

Thiusoloc's *untitled (a)* and Thiusoloc's father's *untitled (b)* maps of the North Cascade area astride the 49th parallel, Skagit River (?), 1859, each 32 x 22 cm; according to U.S. Boundary Commissioner Henry Custer, Thiusoloc was a Somena chief having "the most extended...minute and reliable...geographical knowledge of any Indian I ever had to deal with," and his map *(a)* "although in the most primitive style [sic] remarkable for its correctness and completeness" (letter to Archibald Campbell, U.S. National Archives and Records Service [NARS], Series 69, File RG-76, May 1866). It covers roughly the area between the Nootsák and Tsuk-ék-num (Nooksack and Baker Rivers) in the west, to the (unlabelled) Skagit River in the east; and from S'háh-cha-ka (Chilliwack Lake) in the north, to the Skagit River rapids (now the Diablo Canyon Dam) in the south. Using a PPS, it identifies rivers, watershed divides (the cross-hatchings) and the main mountains (the star-shaped figures). Sháh-wath-um and Hoz-o-méen are Mounts Shawatum and Hozameen, Tuk-we-sállio and Tchús-kan, Baker and Shuksan, Skóme-han probably Jack Mountain or Devil's Dome. The small circles might be campsites. While it displays fewer toponyms or features, especially east of the Skagit, his father's *(b)* shows more area between S'háh-cha-ka and the Stó:ô — including, ever so faintly, the 49th parallel itself. Indeed, this latter feature, coupled with the fact that little is known of the father, makes me somewhat skeptical about the official accreditation. The PPS on each are Halq'éméylem, and Thiusoloc is still a living Stó:ô family name, but the fact that the largest river on each map has no name suggests that the cartographers may have been Skagit. I would have also thought that the more planimetric would be the work of the younger man. If not *(b)* may still be the revised edition of *(a)*, perhaps drawn by the father, but in consultation with the draughtsman to ensure the toponyms were correctly reapplied. At any rate, Thiusoloc and his father were arguably the first father/son team of Native cartographers in British Columbia history (both copied from originals in Northwest Boundary Records, NARS RG76 ser. 69, Maps 26 and 27 respectively, Washington).
If the boundary survey seemed innocent, the same could not be said for what followed — a series of reserves that would earn these newcomers the designation *xwelitem* ('hungry people'). The earliest were allotted for the *Xwmèthkwiyem* (one), *Kwikweltem* (two), *Qw’ō:ntl’ən* (one) and *Q’eyts’i* (two) by the Royal Engineers in 1861. In 1864, the stipendiary magistrate William McColl laid out reserves for the *Q’ô:leq’* (two), *Máthekwi* (one), *Leq’ámél* (two), *Semáth* (two), and *Ts’elxwéyeqw* (seven). As Douglas had instructed, these latter were allotted as pointed out by the *Halq’eméylem* themselves and totalled 39,900 acres. In 1867, however, Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works Joseph Trutch stated that because "these Indians [had] really no right to the lands they claim [and were of no] actual value or utility to them...the reserves should in almost every case be very materially reduced." With this directive, and the added proviso that "maps of same [be] given to each Chief so that the boundaries thereof should be clearly understood," surveyor J.B. Launders returned in 1868. He allotted more reserves for the *Ts’elxwéyeqw* (four), and new ones for the *Pelólhxw* (four), *Sts’a:i:les* (two) and *Sq’ewlets* (one), but these were small; and he reduced McColl's earlier allotments (canceling two of them outright) to a total land base of 8,143 acres — a reduction of 80%.

While I have found no evidence that the *Halq’eméylem* made any maps during this period, it is fairly clear they had come to understand the authority ascribed to maps by the *xwelitem*. In late 1867, the Protestant Minister A. Browning and two *Ts’elxwéyeqw siyá:m*, 'Indians Jim and Captain John', complained to the colonial secretary that under pressure from a Catholic priest, the stipendiary magistrate Henry Ball had seized the maps given them the year previous by Launders and "inserted the names of the Priest's.

---

51 Maps of the *Q’eyts’i* reserves, and McColl's allotments, including a discussion of same, may be found in *my Euro-Canadian Cartography*, op. cit., 76-83. Note that during the colonial period, reserves were allotted 'by tribe'; the legal category of 'band' does not yet exist.

52 Enclosure to the Colonial Secretary, August 28 1867, *Papers*, op. cit., 41-2.

53 Letter to the Colonial Secretary, November 19, 1867, ibid., 45-6.

54 Maps and a discussion of these surveys may also be found in *my Euro-Canadian Cartography*, op. cit., 90-7. The acres reduced in each have been tabulated by Carlson, K. in his (ed) *You Are Asked*, op. cit., 74.
nominees in the duly authorized map of the District as the real Chiefs, thus at once de-facing the map and placing the first named Chiefs in the position of being, in the eyes of the Government, no Chiefs at all." 55 Ball argued he had been advised that "the two Indians mentioned [were] both very good Indians but not the hereditary Chiefs of their tribes...to whom the majority...wish[ed] the maps to be given." 56 As things turned out, Indians Jim and Captain John were vindicated, but the exchange suggests that maps introduced carelessly into lifeways accustomed to a different perspective could confuse more than they clarify. Some evidence of just how disruptive these interventions were is provided by Tixwelatsa, who recalled, almost a century later, how:

After James Douglas, the first Governor, and Governor Seymour — Seymour’s the one that give out the map. You know I give Ritchie [Richard Malloway, father of Siyémches] that map. Ritchie was here the other day with his map, but this was way different. And I just showed him my map, and I told him "You can keep this map." I told him he was chief now. It's a better map. That was a map after they spoke for that Bishop Durieu, you know Father Paquette [Fouquet], another French fellow, they spoke to the Governor as how they got this. I think it must be about 1887....But they stopped marking that map what date it was. That fellow that first surveyed that, his name was on there. So we got a good chance on that. But that new map he got from the Government it's way different. 57

By Confederation, settlement spreading throughout the valley, the colonial agenda was clear. Between 1864 and 75, Stó:lō siyá:m coauthored some 14 separate petitions to the colonial, provincial and federal governments demanding action on the land question. In an 1874 letter to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, for example, 110 Coast Salish siyá:m said they were "fully aware that the Government of Canada ha[d] always taken good care of the Indians [east of the Rockies]...allowing them more than 100 ac-

55 Letter to the Officer Administering the Government, July 6 1869, Papers, op. cit., 71.
56 Letter to the Colonial Secretary, December 15 1869, ibid., 74.
57 Cited in Wells, O. The Chilliwacks, op. cit., 164. Although I have absolutely no evidence that Tixwelatsa is referring to the same events, his references to the two maps, to Governors Seymour and Douglas, and the two Catholic priests, are exceedingly suggestive. When Wells interviewed him in July 1965, he was 82 years old and it would be unfair to expect him to recall these events, passed on to him by his father, with precision. The date cited, 1887, seems completely out of sync, but could he have meant 1867? And, if so, are the two maps McColl’s and Launders’s, or some tracings thereof, and does the reference to the priests refer to the dispute over whose names ought to be applied?
res per family," and that their "hearts [were] wounded by the arbitrary way the local government ha[d]...locat[ed] and divid[ed their] reserves." They cited the number of smelá:lh and the exact acreage of each reserve allotted during the 1860s, pointing out how they varied from a low of five acres per family at Yeqwyeqwi:ws (Yakweakwoose), 13 at Chiyò:m (Cheam), 90 at Pòpkw'em (Popkum), and a high of 108 at Q'eyts'i. No land had been reserved for the Qw'ò:ntl'an at Fort Langley or the Teit at Ts'qó:ls (Hope). Overall, they had not enough resources to make a living, suggesting that 80 acres per family was the minimum for them to avoid "ill feelings [and] irritation."58

In 1876 the Joint Indian Reserve Commission (JIRC) added two reserves at Xwmèth-kwiyem (renaming them the Musqueam Tribe), but the majority of the post-Confederation reserves were allocated by reserve commissioner Gilbert Sproat in 1879. Working upstream from tl'álhem qó (Georgia Strait), he staked a new reserve for the Stsewòthen (named the Tsawwaassen Tribe); confirmed the pair at Kwikwetl'em (named the Coquitlam Tribe); surveyed two new reserves for the Qiqá:yt (assigning one to the New Westminster Band, the other, on Poplar Island, as joint use for all the 'tribes'); confirmed the surviving reserves at Q'ò:leq' (one) and Qw'ò:ntl'an (both), but added five more (four of which were for those Qw'ò:ntl'an that had moved to the fort, and all eight of which were classified as the Langley Tribe); confirmed the two at Q'ëys't'i (renaming them the Katzie Tribe); confirmed the surviving reserves at Semá:th (both) and Leq'ámél (one), but added eight more (and reclassified all eleven for the Sumas Tribe while hiving off four of those to the Lakahahmen [Leq'ámél Band]; and confirmed the two reserves at Máthekwi but added two more (renaming them the Matsqui Tribe).

Upriver, Sproat added nine reserves to the Ts'elxwéyeqw's seven (renaming them the Chilliwack Tribe, while partitioning all 16 across the Skwah [Sqwá, four], Skway [Shxwhá:y, one], Squiala [Sxwoyehá:lá, two], Kwawkwawapilt [one], Soowahlie [Th'ewá:li,

58 Petition from Chief Peter Ayessik and 109 others to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs July 14, 1874, Papers, op. cit., 136-8.
one], Skulkayn [Sq'ewqéyl, two], Atchelitz [Áthelets, one], and Yakweakwoose Bands; the remainder in common [one for the Skulkayn and Yakweakwoose jointly; one for the Skwah, Squiala, Skway, Kwawkwawapilt, and Atchelitz jointly; one for all sixteen]). To the four of the Pelólhxw he added ten (partitioning all 14 among the Omahil [Skxw'ów-kámel, two], Cheam [two], Popkum [one], Skawahlook [Sq'ewá:lxw, two], Hope [five], and Skwatits [Skw'átets, two] Tribes. For the Teit above Ts'q6:ls, Sproat alloted 15 reserves (renaming them the Yale [Xwoxwelá:lhp] Tribe, but hiving off seven as the Union Bar Band). Seabird Island, 4,500 acres of the best land on the lower Stó:lō, was assigned as a joint agricultural reserve for the Hope, Popkum, Skwatits, Ohamil, Skawahlook, and Yale Tribes. Finally, Sproat provisionally surrounded all the Pelólhxw and Teit reserves with two huge commonages: the first along the north bank between Sq'éllets (Scowlitz) and Ts'q6:Ts (Hope), the second along the east bank from Xéylxelemós (Lady Franklin Rock) to Xwoxwelá:lhp (Yale).

Sproat shared Douglas's sympathies towards Native people but these reserves were far in excess of what the province had in mind and by 1880 he was gone. None of his reserves were gazetted and the Halq'emeylem position became even more precarious. In 1878, the province legislated the Sumas Dyking Act and xwelitem engineering works were built across the floodplain without any regard to existing Halq'emeylem land use regimes. By the mid 1880s, the Canadian Pacific Railway had bisected many of the already twice-reduced reserves along the north bank of the Stó:lō. In 1911, the Canadian Northern Pacific (CNP) did the same on the south, and by the end of the decade, interurban and power utility lines filled the valley. There were a few more reserves. In 1881, Sproat's successor, Peter O'Reilly, assigned four more fishing stations to the Yale

59 Given the confusion arising from some careless record keeping during the colonial period, all these numbers must be treated with some caution. Mine are calculated from the 'Schedule of Indian Reserves' in the 1900 Annual Report, op. cit., 66-132.
60 See, in this connection, my 'Travels', op. cit.
Tribe, and one more for the Sq'ewlets. In 1884, he allotted three more to the Sts'á:l:lews (amalgamating them with the Sq'ewlets as the Harrison River Tribe). In 1887, he allotted one to the Semyó:me who had drifted across the 49th parallel after the epidemic (renaming them the Semiahmoo Tribe) and three more for the Q'éyts'i. Allotted over three successive visits in 1881, 84 and 97 were 13 reserves at the top end of Peqwpa:qotel for the Stqw'omlh (renamed the Douglas Tribe). He confirmed most of Sproat's reserves, but the large commonages intended for the Teit and Pelólhxw never materialized.

**The Stó:lō at the MMRC**

When the MMRC arrived in 1913, dykes, danger posed by railways, and the lack of social services were subjects of persistent complaint. The Trutch legacy was relived as if it were yesterday. At Xwmèthkwiyem, Chief Johnnie noted that since Douglas "[had] put [the posts] down...the land ha[d] been lessened twice. The Indians were not consulted or notified...and three persons [the JIRC] came here to Musqueam and told some of the Indians that the posts meant nothing at all."62 At Q'éyts'i (Katzie), Chief Isaacs stated how the Engineers' reserves had been reduced once by Trutch and then again by the JIRC.63 At Yeqwyeqwi:ws (Yakweakwioose), Chief Harry Stewart recalled that "in the early days [they] used to hold more land than [they were] holding today....this bargain which ha[d] been made by the first Chief, and the first Governor Sir James Douglas, and this land in Chilliwack...surveyed by [Douglas] and surveyed a second time, and now it has been surveyed over for the third time, and...left us with very little land."64 According to Xwoxwelá:lhp (Yale) Chief James, Douglas had "said that white men would not take land away from the Indians....I remember it in my heart!"65

---

62 Field minutes from the New Westminster Agency, June 24, 1913, 61.
63 Ibid., April 29 1914, 92.
64 Ibid., January 13 1915. Given that Tixwelátsa (recall footnote 62) is a Yeqwyeqwi:ws smelá:lhp name, this might refer to the same exchange between the colonial secretary and the Indians Jim and Captain John discussed above.
65 Field minutes from the Lytton Agency, November 19, 1914, 311.
As with the Gitxsan (and unlike the Carrier Sekani), these statements were couched in broader assertions of title. Speaking through his interpreter, Qw’ó:níl’án (Langley) Chief Kasslmer remarked how "the Indian act is very much different than it is with the Saskatchewan, and other Indians in the Eastern part of Canada...those Indians need the country...given to them by God. Today I am telling you that I own the land, and it don't belong to anyone else...I own the land and I own the water."66 At Sts’a’i:les (Chehalis), through his interpreter, Chief Johnnie argued that "first of all...God created us Indians in this territory in a good many tribes. So are the white man, brown man and coloured people in their own territories in Europe and Africa, and therefore we claim that we are the real owners of this territory, that our title and rights is sacred, which is called aboriginal title. From time immemorial various tribes of Indians exclusively possessed, occupied and exercised sovereignty over the territory now forming the province."67

Like the Carrier Sekani (and unlike the Gitxsan), however, these claims do not seem to have had cartographic support.68 It cannot be because Halq’eméylem were not familiar with the graphic arts. Their carved and painted sxwithi or skwetxwówelht’ó:mél (external or internal house posts) are proof. Likewise, and as shown in these remarkable drawings (Figure MM), it cannot be because of any limitations of the two-dimensional medium. Drawing on both the autochthonous/pictographic and European/pictorial traditions, these drawings evoke the interface of the cosmological and terrestrial realms just as surely as does Map 39 for the Nlha7kápmx.69 Whether Kwa’ielets drew these from scratch or learned the style from some other artist is probably irrelevant. If the former, it only suggests that the technical transition from the oral to the graphic was relatively

---

66 Field minutes from the New Westminster Agency January 9, 1915, 118.
67 Ibid., January 10, 1915, 231.
68 The one reference to this effect is ambiguous. At Q'éy't'si the commissioners were apparently presented with a map by Chief Isaacs; when they asked him "did you make this map" (in ibid., April 12, 1914, 92), he answered in the affirmative. If he did, it has not survived.
69 That these drawings seem to support Jenness, D.'s and Teit, J.'s conclusions that 'prophet movements' were hybridizations of Native beliefs and Christian teachings is another issue. It has nothing to do with what they might still tell us about the processes of cultural incorporation per se.
Some of the prophets (discussed in Chapter 3) made pictures of their visions. These renditions are two of several drawings by a Stó:lō syōwe (prophet), Kwa'ielets, who travelled up the Stó:lō at least as far as Lytton between 1880 and 82 prophesying and performing miracles. On the one hand, the stylistic similarities with some of the pictography summarized (in Figures B or C) by Teit (like the sun, trees and figure in [a] and the salmon in [b]) seem evident enough. On the other, however, the depictions of apse, tent, and congregation, all illuminated by the deity (as suggested in [a]) or the roof of the church (as implied in [b]), remind one of the paintings of Nicolas Point, who accompanied the Jesuit Father Pierre-Jean de Smet on his mission to the western Montana Flatheads, an eastern wing of the Salishan speakers (see, in this connection, Jacqueline Peterson and Suzanne Kotz [eds], Sacred Encounters [Norman: University of Oklahoma Press], 1993) (both copied from originals in Teit's 'Dreambook of a Stalo Chief', unpublished manuscript, 1882 [CMC, ms. VII-G-19M, box 121, fol. 8, Ottawa]).
smooth; if the latter, the alacrity with which such techniques, once acquired, could be transmitted.

Nor can it be an unfamiliarity with the basic techniques of route mapping, Map 74 a case in point. Cadastral maps require a different perspective, but testimony to the MMRC suggests they were also well within range of Stó:lō understanding. When Xwmèthkwiyem Chief Johnnie was asked about the acreages defined by the Douglas posts, he said he didn't know but that "it [was] on the map," and that "this stuff [had been] first given [to an earlier chief] and it has come up from all the chiefs to me. I also had a paper but I lost it [in the fire]...it was a map, it was not written or in print. It showed the whole of the Fraser River, and it came with the stuff." At Kw'ekw'i:qw (Sumas) Chief Ned was able to identify all their reserves on the government map, with Chief Johnnie Lewis noting the acreages of each. At Yeqwyegwi:ws, Chief Harry also knew exactly how many acres were contained in the reserves "which show[ed] on the map," and how many people lived on them.

And finally, it cannot be because the Stó:lō thought that xwelitem maps provided an adequate base for meaningful dialogue. At Yeqwyegwi:ws for example, it soon became clear that because of the frequency with which the Ts'elxwéyeqw (Chilliwack River) altered course during the reserve allotment period, the MMRC maps had little in common with those given earlier to Chief Stewart; between the 1881 survey (that the chief held) and the revised edition (which the commissioners had), 90 acres had been lost to floods, and by 1915, when the commissioners arrived, another 30.

70 Ibid., June 24, 1913, 62.
71 Ibid., January 12, 1915, 163.
72 Ibid., January 13, 1915, 171.
73 Ibid., January 13, 1915, 171. This was a persistent problem throughout the valley, especially since under provincial law any reserve land lost to freshet was considered as reverting to provincial jurisdiction. At the same time, any lands that might accrue to reserves through sandbar accretion did not go to the band.
spired. Consider, for example, Tixwelatsa recalling, 50 years after the fact, how the MMRC had advised them that:

"Wherever the mountain runs like that...that's your line; don't imagine it."
But these fellows had been straightening out the line right along from the Army Camp down to Bowman's Sawmill....And their making that line — well, it's a lot of people that's living in that place, five or six acres there, Vedder Road. It's White people, you see. But the old map what the Commissioner gives — "Follow the mountain," he says. "That's your lines," he says, "except when you straighten it out, so straighten it out like that, you might have a big piece like that, you know." Of course the mountains are...crooked from Vedder, this way, that way, and this way. There's quite a few...living right along that mountain on account of they straightened it out. But the Indians talked about it and knew it was their map. The young fellows like my dad, Sepass...never said anything about that.74

In the end I can think of only two reasons why the 'tribes' did not make maps for the MMRC. The first is that it was more trouble than it was worth because there was simply nothing left to claim. Indeed, when the MMRC quit in 1915, it could do next to nothing. Geographically it allotted one extra reserve for the Semá:th (Sumas) one fishing station at Ts'qó:ls (Hope), alienated several acres from the south bank reserves for the CNP right-of-way, and cut the Seabird Island reserve in half.75 Administratively, it divided the Harrison River Tribe into the Scowlitz and Chehalis Bands. Overall, the frontier had closed in fast on the Halq'eméylem — out of their traditional territory of 13,324 km² (as now claimed on Map 3), they wound up with about 170 km², more than for the Gitxsan or Carrier Sekani, but scattered across 106 reserves and shoehorned into a carceral colonial geography of levees, fences and property lines.

The second reason is more speculative, but I suspect that the 'tribes' had by now realized that meaningful dialogue would have to take place on xwelitem terms or probably not at all. This is a potentially dangerous claim but may be supported by my reading of two maps that were made three years after the MMRC had left (Maps 75 and 76). On

---

74 Cited in Wells, O. The Chilliwacks, op. cit., 164. This passage follows that in footnote 68. At this time, Tixwelatsa would have been 32 years old.
75 The Seabird Island cut-off was restored — 18 years later.
Map 75
Xeláh'ten's (Chief William Sepass) *untitled* map of Ts'elxwéyeqw country, Skowkale, 1918, 33 x 24 cm; black and white draft map showing the river and lake from which the chief's people took their name, the tributaries, and important peaks or ridges; all named in both English and a kind of 'pidgin Halq'eméylem'. The map also locates, and provides the owners' names of, some of the earlier xwelitem farms (the small squares along the north bank); the trail to Hope away from, and the surveyor's camp at the southern end of, Sxôtsaqel; and a couple of xwelitem mining operations in American territory (lower right). Perhaps the most interesting feature, however, is Sumatz Haatza (Semá:th Xó:tsa), which disappeared soon after the map was made (copied from original at Chilliwack Museum and Archives, Edenbank Farm Collection, Chilliwack).
Map 76
Xelàhten's *untitled* map of the area around the present site of Chilliwack, Skowkale, 1918, 33 x 24 cm; oriented south on top a large scale rendition of the area depicted as 'Chilliwack Valley' on Map 75. A privileged glimpse of the contact zone at the confluence of the Ts'elxwéyeqw and Stó:lō, it shows, on the one hand, Stó:lō places like 'Lochchamaquim Indian Village 3-400 years ago' (Láxe-wey, far right), 'the oldest Chilliwack Indian homes' (Th'e-wá:li, upper left), 'Whywella' and 'Yackuckwarse' (Sxwoyehá:lá and Yeqwyeqwí:ws, both center left); and, on the other, xwelitem sites like the 'Atchlitz store' (right of center), 'First Methodist Church about 30 years ago' (below and center right), 'Sweetman's Bridge' (below and center left), 'Chinatown' (lower left), Bowman's Mill (upper left) and several homes named for their owners. Showing the different configurations of the confluence in the past, the map is also a record of environmental change. At one time, and as hinted on Map 75, the Ts'elxwéyeqw flowed directly into Semá:th Xó:tsa. By the time the first xwelitem arrived, the river had veered north, inundating Sxwoyehá:lá and passing through Scowkale (Sq'ewqeyl) before arcing past 'Chinatown' to the Stó:lō; this explains why the old channel, which became Vedder Creek, is here shown as 'Cluelman' (Lhewá:lmeł), meaning 'river that changed its course'. In 1872 log jams caused the river to jump its banks near the 'Lawootomelum watch house' (the fortification at Tita's), most of the current redirected into '3-400 year old' creeks like the Suckacuck (should read 'Luckacuck') and Atchlitz, 'place where two rivers meet'. High water in 1874 caused some of the river to reenter the old channel (which explains the notation from Vedder's diary), and in 1882 an enormous spring freshet restored the rest of it; this affirms why those temporary channels across the floodplain are now short creeks or sloughs, and why, on contemporary topographic series maps, the Chilliwack River, now draining through the area once covered by Semá:th Xó:tsa, is renamed the Vedder at the confluence of the Świhchá (copied from original at Chilliwack Museum and Archives, Edenbank Farm Collection, Chilliwack).
the small scale version, Xelàlhten mapped an unbounded Ts'elxwéyeqw 'tribal territory', tracing a vector his ancestors took from Sxôtsaqel (Chilliwack Lake) to Swilhcha (Cultus Lake) and Semáth Xô:tsa (Sumas Lake) in pre-contact times. On the large, he mapped that area where this vector was at its thickest, and within which Ts'elxwéyeqw life-ways subsequently unfolded. While both maps capture the relative widths of the different stó:lō (streams) neither is true to scale. Like Thiusoloc's map 59 years earlier, Xelàlhten was still partially conceptualizing a rhythmic topological space in which distance was reckoned by landmarks and the time it took to get from one to the other. But these are mainly xwelitem landmarks, not Ts'elxwéyeqw. He shows no reserves but one still wonders why these maps refer to surveyor camps on Sxôtsaqel but not the t'iliteqo spá:th (underwater bear) of Swilhcha; the stótelō (sloughs) of the lower Ts'elxwéyeqw but not the si:lhqey (two-headed serpent) that created them; and to Christian churches but not the Halq'eméylem xwelmxwawtxw (smokehouses).

As the amateur ethnographer, Eloise Street, has shown, Xelàlhten, perhaps more than any other siyá:m (leader) of his generation, knew his sxwdxwiyám, and he presided over some of the largest ceremonial gatherings ever held in upriver country. He knew about the stars, moon and sun, the seasonal rounds, and the local flora and fauna. He spent a lot of time around Swilhcha, or on Lhilheqey (Mount Cheam), which he made his hunting ground. He made these maps because he wanted to offer a Ts'elxwéyeqw perspective on cultural and environmental change, and saw that maps were a way of doing so. That he was a capable cartographer certainly helped. But he also knew his world had changed. Xelàlhten understood in 1918 what many non-Native British Columbians do

---

76 In Sepass Tales, op. cit., 11-18.
77 Indeed, these are the only two survivors of a larger set. His second wife was a Nooksack from Everson, Washington, and shortly after his death in 1943, her house, to where the siyá:m had moved his belongings, was robbed. When the family returned a few days later, they found an old steamer trunk removed from the premises, and prised open, its contents exposed to the elements. Included inside were Xelàlhten's other maps — all so waterlogged as to be unsalvageable. One can only guess at the travellers' tales those maps may have told. I am indebted to his grandson, present Sq'ewqéyl (Scowkale) Chief David Sepass, for this information.
not understand today; some things cannot (or perhaps should not) be mapped. This provides at least a partial explanation as to why, a few years later, and in the face of severe opposition from his fellow siyä:m, he asked Street to transcribe his legends of Swilhcha, and the sacred ancestral poems, the Songs of Y-Ail-Mihth, and publish them. Despite appearances, then, Xelàhten's maps are not an admission of assimilation. They are but part of a larger package of mappings that acknowledge, even accept, the discontinuities induced by xwelitem landmark(ing)s. But they also restore continuity by incorporating those landmark(ing)s, graphically, into the sqwelqwel (current events).

**Engineered space and ethnographic imagineering**

Even so, Xelàhten's maps no more initiated a Halq'eméylem map-making tradition than had Thiusoloc's. Partly this was due to the outlawing of claims-related activity by Section 141 in 1927, but also because of even more intensive development. Spearheading it, and punctuating a process of environmental engineering that began with the 1878 Sumas Dyking Act, was the early 1920s draining of Semáth Xò:tsa (Sumas Lake). A lake that varied in size and depth depending on whether the Stó:lō was in freshet or not, it was rich in fowl and fish, and at low water opened up grass ranges for cattle. Upriver Halq'eméylem also used it as a sanctuary — to escape the summer mosquito infestations, they would frequently repair by canoe to Snanith, a village built on stilts in the middle of the lake. Draining the lake opened up arable land and helped reduce the flood hazard, but settler farms benefitted the most. The Stó:lō not only lost access to important wetlands, but, I think, would have suspected, as an immigrant society pro-

---

78 See, again, Street, E. Sepass Tales, op. cit., 13-4. The poems, which were considered private property and usually performed only in the smilha or st'l'éleg, were recorded in the early 1910s and are faithful to the rhythmic format in which Xelàhten told them. Some of them concern the t'ítego spá:th of Swilhcha, while others discuss the sywél or events in the sxwágwiyam, such as the flood or the creation of salmon. Still others make reference to the moundbuilders and a few, reflecting the fact that Xelàhten's grandmother was Nhá7kápmx, deal with the adventures of Coyote.

79 Thom, B. and Cameron, L. 'Changing land use', op. cit., 172-6. The debarkation point for Snanith is shown upper right on Map 76 as 'Saneats Indian Encampment'.
bably didn't, that this might be one of the greatest ecological disasters ever inflicted upon the lower Stó:lo. 80

The registered trapline system had comparatively little effect on Halq'éméylem seasonal rounds. A few lines were registered by high-ranking Ts'elxwéyeqw, Teit and St'qw'omlh smelá:lh around Peqwp'a:gotel and Szótsaqel (Harrison and Chilliwack Lakes), but these areas had always been common property and trapping was not a primary economic pursuit. Other lines were less benign. In the 1920s, a trans-provincial highway was pushed into the interior, further compromising the canyon fisheries; and in the 1930s, 40s and 50s a system of roads, many paving over older Halq'éméylem trails, filled the valley. 81 With the automobile came still more xwelitem, eventually turning once relatively isolated communities like Langley, Mission, Abbotsford, Chilliwack, and Agassiz into a sprawling suburban belt, and littering once pristine xó:tsa like Peqwp'a:gotel and Swilhcha with cottages and marinas. 82 Indeed, the surrender in 1954 of the four reserves on either side of the Stó:lo at New Westminster — one Qwó:ntl'an, one Xwmethkwiym, one of them belonging to the band of the same name, and the joint use reserve on Poplar Island — while officially voluntary, was clearly a reflection of the enormous pressures of mid-20th century modernization. 83

This said, these pressures did result in the production of several maps of Halq'éméylem territories during this period. But it was ethnographers, and not Halq'éméylem cartographers that made them. 84 Many were the work of amateurs, and very much in the pictorial tradition. J.S. Matthews's Maps 12(b) and 13(a) are two classic examples that

---

80 Since the arrival of the Xwelitem, 80% of the wetlands on the lower Stó:lo have disappeared.
81 See ibid., 168-70.
82 On this point, see, once again, Wells, O.'s interview with Tixwelâisa in The Chilliwacks, op. cit., 163.
83 As strange as it sounds, this resulted in the New Westminster Band having no reserve at all. To this date, it is the only such band in Canada.
84 Indeed, there seems to have been a dawning recognition that 19th century ethnographers had tended to overlook the Coast Salish, and that whatever might be left of this world had to be salvaged now — or not at all. We are indeed fortunate that some, amateur as well as professional, rose to the challenge.
we have already seen. Others were not so ornate, but as this Percival Jeffcott representation of Halq'eméylem territories south of the line suggests (Map 77), still reflected the sensibilities that the amateurs brought into the field. Emphasizing the fluvial corridors along which Nooksack lifeways unfolded, Jeffcott's map reflects the axial nature of vectored space. As had Xelálhten on Map 75, except here with trails as opposed to stó:lō (streams), it hints of the striations that crossed watershed boundaries between branches of the xwelmexw tree. By contrast, maps made by professionals reflected that sense of scholarly detachment reflected by James Teit on Maps 6 and 7. Consider, for example, Wayne Suttles's interpretation of Q'éyts'i country, a world created by Swaneset and Th'alecten back in the myth age (Map 78). Indeed, and as suggested in Chapter 3, to move between these cartographies is to move simultaneously through a space that has from one perspective already been 'discovered' and now is only in need of scientific explanation and classification (as in 78); and a space that is from another only being encountered and categorized for the first time (as in 77).

Both perspectives are reflected in a remarkable series of maps of upriver Halq'eméylem territory made late in the period by Oliver Wells (Maps 79 and 80). A lifelong valley resident — his grandfather's Edenbank Farm was preempted in 1867 — Wells was a self-taught linguist, anthropologist, historian and artist, and his association with the upriver Halq'eméylem as close as that of any settler family of his time. He researched Native art for the British Museum, and was instrumental in reviving Coast Salish weaving and canoe carving. As Tixwelatsa's accounts suggest, he recorded narratives and

85 I struggled over where, in this study, these two maps properly belonged; one could easily justify either of Chapters 1 or 6. In the end I decided that they covered more Squamish, than Xwmèthkwiyem, territory. This has probably been the case, in practice, since at least the mid-19th century, and certainly, in law, since Sproat confirmed the Burrard Inlet reserves for the Squamish in 1879.

86 Like Jeffcott, Wells became interested in Native issues at a young age, and remained so until his death in 1970 at the age of 63. He knew most of the local elders and was welcome to smilha and other ceremonies closed to most xwélitem. He was a close friend of Xelálhten and collaborated with Eloise Street, J.S. Matthews and Lester Peterson. Conducting his interviews in as traditional a setting as possible, his ethno-graphic work is, in my view, among the best ever produced in this province. For more on Wells, see the testimonials by Marie Weeden, Alan Fotheringham and Siyémches (Richard) in The Chilliwacks, op. cit. 5-10; and Maud, R. A Guide op. cit., 152-4.
Map 77

Percival Jeffcott's *Nooksack Geography*, Ferndale, 19-45, 34 x 23 cm; although obviously not, *sensu strictu*, of Nooksack authorship, black and white outline map of the traditional territories of the Nooksack (the right half of the map, more or less), Lummi (lower left quadrant) and Semiahmoo (upper left quadrant) peoples. It charts in a PPS the main Euro-American and Nooksack settlements, and the rivers, *Nuc-qua-lum, Nut-ak-um* and *Nec-qua-um* (all labelled on Map 74[a] as the *Nootsá:k, Noohts-hák-tsum*, and *Noo-whái-yam*, respectively). Whether the designation of *Lhilheqey’s* spouse as *Kulshan* means that *Tuk-wesállo* on Map 74(a) is not Mount Baker (which seems unlikely) or because it had two different names (more likely) is not clear. At any rate, this map also conveys the close social or economic ties between *Halq’eméylem* speakers astride the 49th parallel. The difference is that Map 74(a-b) did so with the named rivers while this one does so by the numerous trails. Grouped together they all show that there were more border crossings in the pre-contact period than there are now. (Incidentally, it was along one of the trails between Everson and *Swilchta* that Xeláhten’s vandalized chest of water-logged maps was found (copied, with permission, from reproduction in Wells, O. *The Chilliwacks*, op. cit., 149).
Map 78
Wayne Suttles's *Places in Katzie Territory*, Victoria, 1955, 21 x 13 cm; based partly on Suttles's interviews with Simon Pierre, and partly on Jenness's 1936 ethnographic work with Simon's father Old Pierre, black and white map of the traditional territory of the Q'eyts'í. It uses a numerical key to show the villages where individual extended families occupied planked villages (the circled numbers), and other named physical features or resource procurement sites. Each is cross-referenced to a table containing the toponyms in the Boasian orthography in use at that time with their English etymologies. Of the 92 sites named some 20 — including Qélamey (38), Sqwa'm'qwam'exw (54), Sam'é:ent (72), Sa'nisalh (74), Páléxel (77), and Ts'ixwt (88) — are geographical features created or modified by either Swaneset or Xa:ls. Taken together, they show the intense and personal nature of Stó:lō systems of land tenure and TEK (copied, with permission, from original in Suttles's *Katzie Ethnographic Notes*, op. cit., 16).
Map II. Places in Katzie territory.
Map 79(a-c)
Oliver Wells's *untitled* maps of the middle Stó:lō, Chilliwack, 1962 (?), each 55 x 43 cm, more or less; black and white draft maps of *Pelólhxw* (a), *Teit* (b), and *Ts'elxwéyeqw* (c) tribal territories. Though they are not strictly of Stó:lō authorship, they are all based on information supplied to Wells by Stó:lō elders. They all use hachuring to display the relief, but the thematizations are handled differently, and only the first two denote 'tribal' boundaries. On (a) the emphasis is on the sloughs as they existed during the mid-19th century and the known pre- and post-contact villages, each of which are named in Wells's own PPS and numerically indexed to etymologies in his *The Chilliwacks*, op. cit., 221-22). The black spots locate *sqémel*, the solid black rectangles *iltexwáwtxw*, the three hollow black rectangles the most important *xwelmxewáwtxw* at *Skwahlah*, *Skuhl-ahl-kw* and *Koh-Kwah-puhl* (*Sqwá:la*, *Sxela:wtwx*, and *Qweqwe'ópelhp*, respectively). (The second of these names means 'painted house', and it was the front of the third that displayed the image of *sílthqey* reproduced by Wells in Figure JJ[b]). On (b) there is no differentiation between the different types of structures (all marked by hollow black circles) and the toponyms are not, so far as I know, anywhere indexed to their etymologies. However, many of them — including, working downriver, *Kuth-laht*, *Ketl-eht*, *Ee-waw-wuh*, Kawkawa Lake, *Skaw-ehl-kw* and *Theeth-ulh-kay* (*Xwoxewlá:lhp*, *Xehálh*, *lwówes*, *Q'owqé-wem*, *Sq'ewá:lxw* and *Lhilheqey* respectively) — we have already visited. On (c) the emphasis is on the main fluvial features as they existed in the mid-19th century — including *Semáth Xó:tsa*, and the many channels of the *Ts'elxwéyeqw* (shown, from south to north, on Map 76) — and the many trails — including those leading into Nooksack country (Map 77) and the 1868 Sumas to Chilliwack Road (shown crossing Sweetman’s Bridge and by the ‘Luckac-kuck picnic site’ on Map 76) (all copied from originals at Chilliwack Museum and Archives, map 386, Chilliwack).
Map 80

Oliver Wells’s *Indian Territory 1858*, Chilliwack, 1966, 76 x 42 cm; in my view one of the most provocative maps ever made by a non-Native cartographer of a Native geography, black and white pictorial map of *Ts’elxwéyexw* ‘tribal’ territory. It is derived, in part, from information mapped by *Xələlhtən* on Maps 75 and 76, and by Percival Jeffcott on Map 77; and, in part, from Wells’s own interviews of Stó:lō elders Oyewóʔ, *Tixweláltsa*, Harry Edwards, Edmund Joe Peters, and, especially, *Xwelxwéyleq* and *Lhó:kweləléxw* (transcripts of which may be found in his *The Chilliwacks*, op. cit.) This information was roughed in on Map 79(a-c) before being reassembled here. Shown in both full view, and insetted for greater clarity, it shows the main peaks, ridges, and rivers or lakes (including *Semáth Xó:tsa*, and the various channels of the *Ts’elxwéyexw*); trails and villages as they existed during the mid-19th century; and the most important structures on trails or in villages (with the symbols indicating what kind of structures they were). The toponyms are shown on the map in Wells’s PPS and numerically indexed to the etymologies in ibid., 218-22. As suggested by the grizzly, swans and sturgeon on *Lhi-lheqey*, *Semáth Xó:tsa* and in the sloughs at *Sxelá:wtwx*, images of animals, fishes and birds are all positioned on the map so as to correspond with where they were most typically found. As hinted by the *sthiqey* swimming in the slough at *Qweqwe’opelhp*, images of supernatural beings are positioned on the map in the same way. There are a few references to the *xwelitem*; these include HBC cairns and the present location of the Trans-Canada Highway 1 Lickman Road overpass (copied from original at Chilliwack Museum and Archives, map 381, Chilliwack).
toponyms as they were given to him; and then, with Lester Peterson, developed a PPS mixing upper and lower case morphemes that allowed him to preserve the inflections of oral delivery. He was also a committed conservationist, turning part of Edenbank into a bird sanctuary and nature preserve years before ecological science made such things fashionable.

In short, Wells had a foot in both perspectives and his maps reflected it. On the one hand, they are certainly his authorship and exploit the pictorial tradition used by Matthews on Maps 12(b) or 13(a), and by Peterson on 14(b). Between the hachuring of the physical features (on all four maps), the numerical indexing of the place names (on all but 79[c]), the cartouches of animals and stl'álegem ('supernatural monsters') (on 80), they use nearly every visual trick of an imperial imagination. And with the possible exceptions of the Highway 401 cloverleaf, or the odd HBC cairn, they perhaps romanticize the late 19th century Halq'eméylem world in a way that Xelát'ñten's maps did not. There is, in short, a sense of detachment generated by the numerical referencing system, a painterly perspective, and an enframing by the desiring gaze of the cartographic eye/I. On the other, however, there is a sense of reattachment, evoked by a phonetically tuned toponymic overlay, a scale that is just shy of planimetrically true, and depictions of real and mythical beings located on the map as they would have been on the ground. Overall, Wells strove to convey to an immigrant audience some sense not so much of what an upriver Halq'eméylem geography looked like, as what it 'felt like'. The mapped objects are mainly those located on Xelát'ñten's maps, or extracted from the sxwósxwiyám by elders. But even detached from the mappings from which they spring, rhythm, syúwél, and Xexá:ls ripple through them. Far from effacing all traces of the sxwósxwiyám that produced them, these maps direct us along them. These names and images draw viewers into wider constellations of cosmo-geographical knowledge. And yet we still travel there respectfully. That Wells's maps have withstood the test of time from a Hal-

q'eméylem perspective, I will only note that it is still, today, Map 80 that hangs over the reception desk of the Stó:lō Nation offices in Sardis.

**Consolidating a Stó:lō geographical imagination**

That said, these maps, like Xelálhten's, are all of 'tribal territories'. As late as the early 1970s, there is still no comprehensive cartographic representation of the xwélmxw world. In short, if there was a pan-Halq'eméylem geographical imagination out there, it had yet to show itself. But two things happened during this crucial period. One was that the role of the siyá:m shifted. According to Stó:lō historian Keith Carlson, siyá:m who had become 'church chiefs', or who had graduated from the residential schools and were appointed as DIA band chiefs, supplemented their traditional privileges and obligations as social leaders with more overtly political responsibilities.\(^{87}\) The other was that the canyon fisheries were abandoned and many upriver siyá:m, whose sense of identity had been associated with defined watersheds, and had understood ownership in a more proprietary way, moved downstream, to take up residence on reserves with arable land and to enter into alliances with downriver siyá:m. This was, to be sure, a gradual process, elements of which can be traced as far back as the mid-1880s, perhaps even earlier. But it was mainly during the middle decades of the 20th century that these two senses of 'being of the river' and of a common xwélmxw destiny consolidated a pan-Halq'eméylem identity that came to be known as Stó:lō, and, with it, an emergent geographical imagination that would prove to be something other than the sum of its parts.\(^{88}\)

In 1958, the six upriver 'tribes' to which Seabird Island had been jointly assigned in 1879 transferred jurisdiction to the resident smelå:lh, acquiring legal status as the Seabird Island Band. In 1964, smelå:lh occupying Sproat's joint Skulkayn and Yakweak-

\(^{87}\) See, in this connection, *You Are Asked*, op. cit., 104-5.

\(^{88}\) So far as I know, Duff, W. was the first ethnographer to use the name Stó:lō (in *The Upper Stalo*, op. cit.); at that time, however, it was spelled differently, and only applied to upriver Halq'eméylem.
wioose Band reserve became the Tzeachten Band. In 1971 most of the upriver bands formed the Chilliwack Area Indian Council (CAIC), and in 1975, two years after Calder, issued the Stó:lō Declaration. So far as I know, this was the first official document to assert title under the name Stó:lō, but there was no accompanying map and no comprehensive claim to go with it. In fact, the only such claim submitted by any Native group on the Stó:lō during this period was the Xwmèthkwiyem’s (Musqueam) in 1977, and it was set aside by Ottawa on the grounds that all their traditional land had been preempted.89

In 1973, however, the CAIC established the Coqualeetza Education Training Center (CETC) in the old residential school at Kw’oqwáltlih’ a.90 Like the Carrier’s CLC (recall Chapter 5) its mandate was linguistic and genealogical research but it soon extended to archaeological and claims-related too. It produced no maps of its own, but did commission others, four examples of which are shown here (Maps 81 to 83, and Figure NN). The two made by the linguist, Brent Galloway (81 and 82), marked an important historical juncture on the lower Stó:lō not because of their stylistic treatment — if anything, they are a step backwards from Wells91 — but because as far as I know they are the earliest maps to extol a Stó:lō geographical imagination. Situated seamlessly into the larger Coast Salish world, Map 81 displays the east-west alignment of the Halq’eméylem 'tribes', strung along a linguistic gradient on both sides of the Stó:lō. The 'tribal boundaries' are tentative, but the tree-like structure of vectored space is starting to come into focus. Map 82 is a close-up view of upriver Halq’eméylem territory, but in this case us-

89 Tennant, P. Aboriginal Peoples, op. cit., 206.
90 The history of the school is summarized in Carlson, K. (ed) You Are Asked, op. cit., 101-5.
91 This is not a criticism. Many of the etymologies and phonetic spellings used in this chapter can be traced to Galloway, and his lexicologies have been key to the rehabilitation of the Halq’eméylem language generally. My only point is that Galloway was not the cartogapher that Wells was. The etymologies to the tribal names on 81, and the toponyms on 82, are in an unpublished manuscript at the Coqualeetza Library. For the dictionary, see his (ed) Tó:lméls Ye Siyelyólexwa (Wisdom of the Elders) (Sardis: CETC, 1980).
Map 81
Brent Galloway's *Halkomelem Language Area*, Chilliwack, 1981, 56 x 42 cm; prepared as cartographic support to commissioned linguistic research being conducted at that time, black and white outline map of *Halq'ëmëylem* language area. It shows the distribution of the different dialects, with the etymologies of the tribal names listed on a separate index (copied from original at Chilliwack Museum and Archives, map 379, Chilliwack).
Map 82
Brent Galloway’s *Upriver Halkomelem Dialect Area*, Chilliwack, 1981, 49 x 34 cm; black and white outline map of Ts’elxwéyeqw, Pelólhxw, Teit, Sts’a’í:les, Sqéwlets and Leq’ámél dialect areas. It shows the reserves, the principal peaks, and the rivers and creeks. As on Suttles’s map (Map 78), the reserves are numerically coded to a separate index listing the toponyms with their etymologies, but the physical features have been treated more inconsistently. Some of the mountains are in Halq’eméylem, while others are in English. All the creeks and rivers are in English only (copied from original at Chilliwack Museum and Archives, map 379, Chilliwack).
Map 83
Stó:lō Sitel Curriculum's *Stó:lō Lands Map*, Sardis, 1982, 71 x 56 cm; coloured lithograph map highlighting the reserves, the principal highways, and the topography of the lower Stó:lō watershed (including, yet again, the convoluted channels of the lower Ts'elxwéyeqw). In 1986, the British Columbia Teachers Federation (BCTF) suggested instructors experiment with visual aids that could help show what the allotment of reserves meant for Native people on the ground, and to encourage more nuanced ways of thinking about ownership and boundaries (see 'To have what is one's own: A history of Indian reserves' *BCTC Lesson Aids Service Program Against Racism*, unpublished manual [Vancouver: BCTF, 1986]). As shown here, Stó:lō educators had already figured this out (copied, with permission, from original purchased by author).
Figure NN
Stó:lō Nation's and Ministry of Highways' Sohl Temexw: Stó:lō Territories, Vancouver (?) 1985 (?), 225 x 158 cm; as far as I know the only other highways rest area display panel mapping that hybrid space where territories overlap and histories intertwine (the other being Figure GG). With both English and Halq'emeylem referents, this one shows the main roads, rivers and lakes, Canadian and Stó:lō settlements, three of the peaks where Stó:lō ancestors took refuge from the deluge (Kw'ekwi:qw, Lhilheqey and Pop-elehó:ys) and select transformer sites (including Xa:ytem [Figures KK(b) and OO], Alhqá:yem, Lhxé:ylex and Iwów-es). As in Figure GG, this one is accompanied by panels describing aspects of Stó:lō history and culture. What is not noted, however, is that this place, which in English is only the Wahleach Safety Rest Area (by inference, a place of sanctuary) is virtually on top of the old site of Sxwó-wxwiyxmelh (which was, for Stó:lō, anything but) (author's photo, 1996).
Solh Temexw: Stó:lō Territories
es an array of toponyms and physical features to show what amounts to a cross-section of Halq'eméylem TEK.

Prepared as cartographic support for Grade 7 social studies lessons in band schools, Map 83 is significant for at least three reasons. It is the first map that I know of to use the name Stó:lō, the first to be lithographed in colour, and the first to highlight the carceral character of Halq'eméylem life in the post-contact period. Like Map 81, it shows a gradient, but in this case it is established by the reserves, which are treated in such a way as to completely transpose the figure-ground relationship typically found on Euro-Canadian thematic maps of the same area. On this map, the reserves are no longer the residual trace of the colonial intervention, shoehorned here and there into the interstices of the simulacrum. Almost jumping off the map, it is the reserves that here become the ground, vantage points for an alternative, contesting gaze on the valley.

A more subtle approach to educating cross-cultural travellers is well illustrated by Figure NN, a sign pointing to wonders at the Wahleach Safety Rest Area on Highway 7 east of Agassiz. Funded as compensation for the (allegedly) accidental destruction of pictographs during a highway widening project at Sq'éw:lxw (Skawahlook) in the late 1970s, it is a record of contact on the lower Stó:lō much as Xelálhten's was on the Ts'elxwéyeqw a half century earlier. Indeed, by displaying a select few transformer or historic sites, the main highways, and the reserves as regular communities, the map invites people to conceptually navigate the frontier between the xwelitem and Halq'éméylem worlds in the same way that the Carrier Sekani's Cluculz Lake panels (recall Figure GG) did between the nedo and dakelh.

**Comprehensive and specific claims on the Stó:lō**

The entrenchment of Section 35 in 1982 further solidified a Stó:lō geographical imagination. In 1985, the Hope, Ohamil, Seabird Island, Popkum, Scowlitz, Cheam, Lang-
ley, Sumas, Yakweakwoose, Squiala and Soowahlie Bands amalgamated as the Stó:lō Tribal Council. The Union Bar, Skwatsits, Skawahlook, Skulkayn, Atchlit, Tzeachten, Skway, Kwawkwawapilt, Lakahahmen and Matsqui joined as the Stó:lō Nation Canada. Both established their head offices at Kw'oqwalith'a. Three years later the Hope, Skulkayn and Skwatsits Bands renamed themselves as the Chawathil, Scowkale and Peters Bands respectively. In upriver country the Yale, Skwah and Chehalis Bands remained independent, while the Douglas Band aligned with the Stl'atl'imx. Downriver, the Musqueam, Semiahmoo and Coquitlam stayed out, while the Tsawwassen and Katzie Bands joined the Sliammon, Squamish and Klahoose in the Alliance Tribal Council (ATC).

The important point is that these alliances were not based on linguistic or ethnographic criteria; they reflected the persistence of old identities established in the sxwōxwiyam. While there were exceptions, bands that traced ancestry to the Tel Swayel tended to stay out of councils; those who did not were generally in. As suggested here (Map 84), this created a complex overlap of potentially competing claims which could not be reconciled under the existing 1974 NCC policy. The result was a lack of movement on the land question. There were, though, two significant litigations, both initiated by the Xwmethkwiyem, that had a huge impact on the land claims process in British Columbia overall. The first was the 1984 SCC decision in Guerin v. the Queen, which confirmed in law what the split decision in Calder had stopped short of — that Aboriginal title was "a pre-existing legal right not created by the Royal Proclamation, by...the Indian Act, or by any other executive order,"92 and that such title held force on traditional tribal lands outside, and not just on, the reserves.93 Dickson, C.J. also stated that the government's fiduciary obligation to Native people extended beyond narrow legal interpretations and

92 Cited in Tennant, P. Aboriginal People, op. cit., 221-3.
93 The decision was the final chapter of a 1970 litigation in which the band sued the federal government for breach of trust over the latter's handling of a lease of a portion of their main reserve to a golf club. The ultimately successful blockades of Meares, Lyell, and Deer Islands, and in the Thompson and Stein River canyons (recall footnote 38, Chapter 1), not to mention a number of Gitxsan actions (Chapter 4), were a direct result of the legal precedents established in Guerin.
Map 84
BCTC's Lower Mainland Negotiation Region, Vancouver, 1993, Vancouver, 20 x 25 cm; a black and white draft map showing the 1993 political geography of what is arguably the most challenging of the six negotiating regions established under the BCTC. Not all of the organizations shown here had submitted claims when the map was made but it is clear that if and when they did the potential for overlap was enormous. (There is also a typo; at no time was there a separate Langley Band existing side by side with a Kwantlen.) (copied from original on file at BCTC).
into the realm of moral trust where the 'honour of the Crown' was at stake. The second was the 1986 British Columbia Appeal Court decision in *Regina v. Sparrow*, upheld on appeal by the SCC in 1990. It concluded that the Aboriginal right to fish (for subsistence purposes) was an unextinguished right that continued in untreatied areas and that the technologies used in the exercise of such rights are not frozen at the time the right first arose in law. In short, it was the first high court ruling that started to fill in the 'empty box' of Aboriginal rights Section 35 had anticipated, but had left undefined.94

**The BCTC and Stó:lô mappings**

Even following the establishment of the BCTC in 1992, no comprehensive Stó:lô claim was forthcoming, but restructuring of the administrative geography on the lower Stó:lô helped pave the way towards one. In keeping with the looser terms of reference permitted by the BCTC, the Musqueam, Tsawwassen, New Westminster, Semiahmoo, Coquitlam and Yale Bands redesignated themselves as First Nations of the same names, and the Langley Band became the Kwantlen. The Tsawwassen and Katzie Bands separated from the ATC (for treaty purposes) and then, with the Yale, Musqueam and Semiahmoo, submitted independent claims to the BCTC (refer to Map 84). On the educational front, the constituent bands in the Nation and Tribal Council joined with six Fraser valley school districts in the Stó:lô Curriculum Consortium. Mandated with developing a cross-cultural education and awareness program, the most tangible result was the 1996 publication, *You Are Asked to Witness*, an anthology that blended political, autohistorical and ethnographic research to offer a more balanced account of "the history and culture of the Stó:lô people, as well as the history of Stó:lô-Xwelitem relations."95 It included several maps, two of which are reproduced here (Maps 85 and 86).

94 In this judgment, the Appeal Court overturned a lower court ruling that had upheld the conviction of a Xwmēthkwiyem fisherman for using a 'restricted technology' (in this case, a drift net that exceeded DFO length limits) and doing so outside the reserve.

95 In the Preface to Carlson, K. (ed) *You Are Asked*, op. cit., i.
Map 85
Keith Carlson et. al.'s *untitled* map of the southwest coast, Chilliwack, 1996, 19 x 26 cm; one of several maps in *You Are Asked*, op. cit., a black and white thematization of important trading relationships both within and beyond the *Halq’eméylem* world. The arteries of such trade would have been primarily the Stó:lō and tributaries proper but also those trails that we have already seen in Maps 75 through 77. It is precisely these pre-contact linkages that the Stó:lō have always claimed, if so far unsuccessfully, as proof that they should be allowed to exchange goods, duty free, across the international boundary in the post-contact era (copied, with permission, from original in ibid., 50).
Map 86
Keith Carlson et al.'s *Stó:lō Reserves Past and Present*, Chilliwack, 1996, 19 x 26 cm; oriented west on top, another black and white thematic map from *You Are Asked*, op. cit. Inspired by the UBCIC's Map 35, this one condenses that same story onto a single image and then applies it to the allocation(s) and subsequent reduction(s) of reserves along the lower *Stó:lō*. Thanks to the *Tel Swayel* and *Xe-xáls*, the Stó:lō found themselves living along one of the most productive fluvial corridors in British Columbia; it was their great misfortune to have suffered the full onslaught of the *xwelitem* because of it (copied, with permission, from original in ibid., 65).
Stó:lo Reserves
Past & Present

- Present Day Reserves
- Douglas Reserves
- Sproat Reserves (recommended)
As Maps 32(a) and 47(c) do for the Tsimshian and Gitxsan, Map 85 combines typographical and flowline thematizations to describe a pre-contact Coast Salish space economy. The map also suggests that the concept of Cascadia is but the latest iteration of a much older idea. That trans-boundary, economically defined perceptual region including the North Cascades ecosystem, and the waters of Georgia Strait, Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the close correspondence between Cascadian boundaries and those of the HBC's pre-1846 Columbia Department has been noted elsewhere. But it looks as though there was something similar even earlier. Perhaps we could call it Salishia, and the waters that wash it, the Salish Sea. Map 86, by contrast, is a picture of geographical change after contact. Hitherto buried in reams of field notes, letters, reports and surveys, the convoluted process of spatial engineering that created the reserve geography in Map 83 is conveniently collapsed on Map 86 into a single image. The result is a short but accessible cartographic narrative — one as basic to the Stó:lo's sense of place now, as it has been incidental to Euro-Canadians' in the past.

On National Aboriginal Day, 1993, the Stó:lo and the provincial and federal governments officially dedicated the new iltexwáwtwxw (longhouse), gift shop and interpretive walk at Xá:ytem (Figure KK[b]) as a National Historic Site (Figure OO). The first (and so far only) Native spiritual site recognized by both governments, it received no attention in the mainstream press, but the dedication marked the culmination of a long struggle to preserve the site from development and marked a small change in Xwelitem attitudes towards it. As elder Evangeline Pete put it, "places [such as this] are very important for us...those that know about them. They are something that is proof of our past.... They were put here for a reason. Xá:ls meant for these places to last for all time. They were not meant to be destroyed." Three years later, the Stó:lo opened the Shxwt'a:sel-

---

96 See, for example, Sparke, M., 'Excavating the future in Cascadia: Geoeconomics and the imagined geographies of the cross-border region' BC Studies 127, 2000, 5-46.
Figure O0
For years, it was virtually impossible to miss 'the rock' at Xá:yetem (recall Figure KK[b]) perched, so it seemed, alone and 'out of place' in an empty grass field along the Lougheed Highway 7 east of Mission. Few, however, could have guessed at the spiritual significance of a landmarking that, while archaeologically dated to at least 9,000 years BP, had only been protected as a provincial heritage site since 1974 (and then only because it was about to be destroyed by a highway widening program). When the interpretive center was finally built, the Stó:lō decided that every detail be historically accurate, even if it meant having to live with a less inviting structural design that some thought would actually discourage visitation. According to Siyémtches (Frank Malloway), many of the first visitors, unaware that most lower Halq'eméylem Iltxwáwtwxw were of this style, complained about the shanty roof because "it just look[ed] like a lean-to" (in 'Through the eyes', op. cit., 15) (author's photo, 1999).
hawtxw ('House of Long Ago and Today') a 'hands-on' cultural center at Kw'oqwá̱lith'a. Xá:ytem and Shxwt'a:selhawtxw were to the Stó:lō as K'san and the Ta'awdzep were to the Gitxsan. They define new pinch points at which the boundaries between the Map of British Columbia and the mappings of sxwúxwiyám become visible.98

Later in 1996, following a DFO seizure of 22 nets, the Chiyo:m blockaded the CNR mainline where it entered the reserve at Rosedale (Figure PP).99 This was not the first time such tactics had been used in Halq'eméylem country. In 1976, some Stó:lō occupied the old military barracks at Coqualeetza; and in 1990, to show support for the Mohawks at Oka, the Burrard and Squamish Nations slowed traffic with information pickets on the Lions Gate and Second Narrows Bridges. But it was arguably the first to exploit the symbolic powers of direct action to secure a political objective. Like the Gitxsan (recall Figures N through P), the Stó:lō blockade created a redemptive site, a pinch point at which the rhythms of the body-as-energizer were channelled into a concrete geographical statement.

These mappings reached into the artistic arena too (Figure QQ). Claiming that "land [was] far more important [than money]," that he was "tired of usufructuary rights...fed up with being a usufruct person...and of being fruct around by [the Xwelitem],"100 Yuxweluptun's paintings are stylistically typical of a whole corpus of revolutionary, contact zone art offering a devastating ecological and colonial critique. To the degree that the "natural world is animate, that it generates powers to which humans can have access and that the human use of the land is sanctioned by the appearance of spirits,"101 this art constitutes an aesthetic rendering that blurs the boundaries between the spiritual and the

---

98 From a practical standpoint, both sites also provided a desperately needed source of seasonal employment and income.
99 The railway got an injunction but as the RCMP made ready to serve it the band brought in a couple of front end loaders, threatening to dislodge the roadbed. The railway backed off, the blockade lasting nearly a week before a DFO commitment to negotiate the band's grievance secured its removal.
100 Cited in Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery Yuxweluptun (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Fine Arts Library, 1995), 1-2.
On balance, the Stó:lō have employed the blockade infrequently but because such tactics are especially disruptive in any corridor as heavily populated and developed as the lower Stó:lō, the handful they have struck have been very effective. Borrowing a page from the Gitxsan procedures manual, the Chiyó:m blockade of the CNR at Rosedale in 1993 seemed, at times, more like a Sunday school picnic than what it really was — the effective closure of a national railroad (by Mark van Manen, with permission Vancouver Sun Aug 6).
Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun's *Scorched Earth, Clear-Cut Logging on Native Sovereign Lands, Shaman Coming to Fix* (a) and *Red Man Watching White Man Trying to Fix Hole in Sky* (b), Vancouver 1993, 76 x 57 cm; convinced that 'Indian gift shop' art is an art that has forgotten how to "watch, observe and participate in what's going on" (quoted in Townsend Gault, C., 'The salvation art of Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun' in Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery's *Yuxweluptun* [Vancouver: University of British Columbia Fine Arts Library, 1995], 12), Yuxweluptun calls his blend of three-dimensional formline and surrealist motifs 'salvation art' because of the way it politicizes, in the visual register, the toxic legacies of the colonial intervention. Indeed, while of Okanagan ancestry, and schooled in the same Coast Salish aesthetic tradition that produced the *sxwóy:yxwey*, his message is not different than that conveyed by *'Wii Muk'wilixw* in Figure Q. In the same way that older forms of picture writing (recall Figures B, C, D and S) mark places where the natural and cosmological worlds interface, or that 'signs pointing to wonders' (recall Figures E and L) define a boundary between the Native and Euro-Canadian worlds, so also does Yuxweluptun's art remind us not only that the latter's claims to British Columbia remain highly contested ones, but, as Robert Linsley has said it, that both "are [ultimately] as nothing in the face of the stronger claim that the land makes on us" (in his 'Yuxweluptun and the West Coast landscape' in ibid., 25) (copied, with permission, from originals in ibid., 57-8).
profane, and between a natural object and Aboriginal subject. It is a representation of space that simultaneously draws on the Coast Salish pictographic tradition first committed to canvas by Kwa'ielets in the early 1880s and the animate mysticism evoked in the plastic features of the sxwó:yxwey mask. But it is also a representation of space that "adapts Western art styles, [is infused] with synthetic colours, uses the Renaissance perspective,"\textsuperscript{102} and where sxwóxwiyám is circumscribed in a chronotope of world-historical time. Using schematic patterns similar to those on multi-coloured land use and resource maps, such art enters geography by destabilizing it.\textsuperscript{103} This suggests again that the task of a strategic aesthetic practice is not so much to circumvent a colonial perspective, but, as Clifford would say, to steer a pathway through it.\textsuperscript{104}

\textbf{Stó:lō maps and the BCTC}

Many siyám took a dim view of the Chiyo:m action, and Yuxweluptun's art generated considerable controversy within the Stó:lō community. Many, however, were equally tired of 'being fructed around' by federal and provincial stalling on the land question. In 1994, the Stó:lō Tribal Council and the Stó:lō Nation bands formally merged under the name of the latter, and in 1995 submitted their claim to the BCTC (Map 87). Of the two basic issues to be sorted out, that dealing with Stó:lō self-governance and administration was relatively straightforward. Essentially, the 21 bands agreed to a division of powers between a political arm consisting of three branches — the Lâlém Te Stó:lō Si:yám ('House of Respected Stó:lō Leaders', the law and policy making body seating at least one but, depending on demography, up to three elected representatives); the Lâlém Te Si:yelyó:lexwa ('House of Elders', overseeing the preservation of tradition and TEK, and seating one elder from each band); and a House of Justice (dealing with rehabilita-

\textsuperscript{102} Loretta Todd, in 'Yuxweluptun: A philosophy of history' in ibid., 47. It's worth noting that Surrealism itself was inspired by motifs in indigenous art.

\textsuperscript{103} Robert Linsley, in 'Yuxweluptun and the West Coast landscape' in ibid., 24.

\textsuperscript{104} In \textit{The Predicament}, op. cit., 25.
Map 87
Stó:lō Nation's *Stó:lō Territory*, Sardis, 1995, 21 x 34 cm; as we have already seen in a number of maps concerned only to make an opening statement for negotiations, black and white draft map of the Stó:lō submission to the BCTC; like Maps 15(a) and 44(a), this one uses a topographic base map (copied, with permission, from original at the CETC, Sardis).
tive or restorative justice) — and a bureaucratic wing consisting of five departments — Community Development and Education; Health and Social Services; Xolhmi:lh (Child Welfare); Finances; and Aboriginal Rights and Title (ART), each seating their 'portfolio chief' in a special cabinet in the Lālēm Te Stó:lō Sḵ:y̓á:m.105

Responsible for heritage management, archaeological and linguistic research, education, treaty negotiations and cartography, ART was then charged with the second, more difficult task of articulating the geographical dimensions of the claim. As may be gathered from this early submission (Map 88) — which instantly raises the spectre of overlap — this would be easier said than done. Indeed, to an unseeing public, it is perhaps small wonder that BCTC negotiations were already foundering on the shoals of '110% of the province' — and maps like this, variations of which were appearing regularly in the mainstream press, did not help.106 How could the province, so the argument went, ever hope to settle the land question if First Nations could not agree among themselves where their boundaries were?

But this is what happens when the administrative geography in Map 84 is detached from the sxwoxwiyam and collapsed onto the depthless screen of the cartographic eye/I. Although for different reasons, fixing Stó:lō 'tribal boundaries' runs into the same problems raised by Carrier Sekani keyohs. These are the boundaries of bodies-in-space, genealogy and TEK over time; not of spaced bodies, censuses and positivist statecraft at a point in time. And it is only from this vantage point that we can see how this more recent ART depiction of Stó:lō 'tribal territories' (Map 89) is at once discontinuous from, yet continuous with that shown on Map 88. Displaying bright, solid colours and fixed boundaries, it extols the self-assuredness and 'at-a-glance' authority of the ethnographic imagination. As the geographer, David Harvey, would put it, this map admits of a 'tri-

106 See, for example, the map of the lower mainland, and accompanying discussion in Stewart Bell, 'Staking claim' Vancouver Sun, April 1, 1995, A1-4.
Map 88
Q'eyts'i Indian Band's *untitled* map of southwest British Columbia, Katzie, 1995, 31 x 18 cm; prepared as cartographic support for the band's submission to the BCTC, a coloured ARCINFO GIS map showing the boundaries of the *Halq'eméylem* speaking 'tribes' and the reserves. The challenge of any graphic map of this part of the province — and one it can never meet — is to satisfy the BCTC's preoccupation with fixed boundaries without compromising the essential seamlessness of Coast Salish systems of land tenure and customary law (copied, with permission, from original donated to author).
Map 89
ART's Stó:lō 'Tribes', Chilliwack, 1998, 26 x 43 cm; like Map 81, an attempt at showing Halq'eméylem dialectical divisions but one which takes the representation in a different direction. Prepared on an ARCINFO GIS, this one is in colour and adjusts the internal boundaries to match up with watersheds; uses the external boundary shown on Maps 3 and 85; and thematizes the whole works on a topographic base map showing the reserves. Excepting the elimination of the Qiq̓á:ỵ, and the inclusion of the Temtemexwten (Burrard) the lower Halq'eméylem 'tribes' correspond with the dialectical frontiers approximated by Galloway on Map 81. In the northwest, however, changes are more substantive. Territory claimed by the In-SHUCK-ch/N'Quat'qua on Map 88, and shown as Sts'aːl̓es on Map 81, is now St'q̓w̓oml̓h, and the upper Q'eyts'i Stó:lō (Pitt River) watershed is designated as 'undetermined ownership'. In the upper Halq'eméylem area, the Teit 'tribe' on Maps 81 and 79(b) has been tentatively divided into five 'sub-tribal', but unnamed, groups, with the area east of the headwaters of the Ts'eilxwéyexw shown as a 'shared hunting zone' with the Nḻha7kâpmx and Skagit (copied, with permission, from original donated to author).
bal reality' only on the condition of an assumed and "secure knowledge that its place in the [Euro-Canadian] spatial order [is] unambiguously known."¹⁰⁷ Map 88, by contrast, accepts that fuzzy boundaries were the reality on the lower Stó:lō before Euro-Canadians arrived. As the postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha might state, it suggests that the Stó:lō do live "between the old and the new...in the tensions, irresolutions and overlapping territories" on the Map of the lower Fraser valley.¹⁰⁸ If Map 89 looks 'more right', it is only because it coheres with the visual culture of the museum in which a settler society unconsciously operates. If Map 88 seems 'more wrong', it is only because that is the reality of the 'enormous food dish' that most Euro-Canadians consciously took over. It is not whether one or the other is 'more truthful' but simply that it is not easy from either perspective to make maps of where fishers, hunters and gatherers go.

Taken together, both maps show that terms like 'tribe' are even more unstable in the geographic context than they are in the linguistic or ethnographic.¹⁰⁹ They also emphasize that which earlier maps (such as 81 and 85) tend to downplay — the divisive agency, even authorship, of the international boundary. Indeed, the 49th parallel — a parallel that Halq’eméylem helped secure — has been as instrumental in defining a Stó:lō national identity in the post-contact period, just as surely as its absence was for the awareness of pre-contact xwélmexw (people who speak the same language) identity. In this sense, Maps 88 and 89 reflect contemporary 'tribal identities' based as much on exclusion and where you are not (or cannot easily go), as on inclusion and where you are (or can go).

A similar narrative of inclusion and exclusion on the lower Stó:lō is told by the two versions of Map 90. The first (a) shows the reserves and their English names, the exter-

¹⁰⁸ From The Location, op. cit., 332.
Map 90(a-b)
ART's Stó:lō Traditional Territory (a) and Solh Téméxw (b) Chilliwack, 1997 and 1999 respectively, each 92 x 56 cm; prepared as support for the Stó:lō submission to the BCTC, coloured ARCINFO GIS maps of Stó:lō traditional territory. Both display the principal fluvial features, the reserves, and the ensign of the Stó:lō Nation, but the similarities end there. On (a) the emphasis lies on the built-up areas of the xwelitem (in pink) and the reserves (in red, for those in the Stó:lō Nation for treaty purposes, and yellow, for those that are not) are identified in English. On (b), the infrastructure of the xwelitem has been removed, and the names are in Halq'emeylem. The result is a completely different map. Taken together, they show how the reserves are simultaneously "monuments of [a Native] victory against extinction and symbols of the continuing struggle against oppression by the white man," and "the basis of independence" (unidentified commentator in B-CTF, 'To have what is one's own', op. cit.) (both photographed, with permission, from originals purchased by the author).
nal boundary on Maps 3, 87 or 89, and the Stó:lō Nation's newly minted logogram; the other (b) conveys much the same thing, except this time in Halq'eméylem and without the landmarks of the xwelitem. To a point, neither map shows us anything new. Like Map 83, the visual emphasis is on the reserves, with the larger territory surrounding them being mostly empty space. Like Maps 84 and 88, both show that some Stó:lō political imaginaries are out of synch with the political geography implied by the larger Stó:lō claim.

The continuing emphasis on the reserves is curious. It is not evident in Gitxsan or Carrier Sekani maps, and seems at odds with a cartography designed to enhance a Stó:lō geographical imagination. But how could it be otherwise for peoples as buffeted by the winds of change as the Stó:lō? As suggested in Map 86, they have had to live, and still do live, the reserve like no other First Nation in this province. There is some unoccupied Crown land outside the reserves, and there are a few registered traplines in peripheral areas. But there are scores of timber and mining leases, and much of it is alienated as protected areas. What makes the Stó:lō's position more tenuous than most other First Nations is that their resources are less the flora and fauna of the 'enormous food dish' than they are the railways, buildings, farms and power lines of an immigrant society (Map 91).

The same caveats raised in my comparison between Maps 88 and 89 apply to the apparent overlap between Stó:lō and non-Stó:lō communities. This is what happens when colonization cuts up what sxwoxwiyám cuts across. The communities that appear to be administratively outside, but cartographically inside, the 21 band alliance that comprises the Stó:lō Nation are still all xwel'mexw (people of the same language). They sing the same st'lém, dance the same smilha, invoke the same sxwó:gxwey, and attend the same stl'éleg. But old ancestral identities and nationalist aspirations cannot simply be wished away. Rather, it is the frustrations and anxieties associated with the lack of progress on the land question that promises to exacerbate them (Figure RR). In short, overlap is a
Map 91(a-b)
ART's *Tzeachten & Soowahlie* (a) and *Kwantlen* (b), Sardis, 1999, each 19 x 27 cm; two of series of ARCINFO GIS cadasters "provid[ing] an overview of [Stó:lō] communities." Although made at various scales, they are all based on a similar design and standard legend. Each, however, tells a different story. The plan in (a) shows how the creation of reserve boundaries sometimes served, however unintentionally, to preserve Stó:lō access to a mineral resource. At the same time, it shows how the *xwelitem*’s 'lines of power' helped to further weaken an already dispowered Stó:lō community. The plan in (b) shows how the creation of reserve boundaries usually, and deliberately, worked to prohibit Stó:lō access to a mineral resource. It also shows how 'lines of steel' further bifurcated the already miniscule reserves (copied, with permission, from originals donated to author).
Unlike its 1993 precedent (Figure PP), the Chiyó:m's closure of Ferry Island Road at Rosedale in 2000 smacked of a far more militaristic nature than the location — a little-used drive that dead-ends in a park on the banks of the Stó:lō — would seem to justify. It reflected, however, a then growing frustration with the general lack of progress at the BCTC. Indeed, the band became the first to break ranks, withdrawing itself from the larger Stó:lō action at the same time (by Bert Crowfoot, with permission, Wind-speaker 18 [1], May).
challenge the Stó:lō have to overcome, but it is still a consequence of the representa-
tional machinery the contact zone has forced upon them.

Reading *between* these versions, however, prefaces what may be the most important
lesson of this study. While the form of the representation is the same, the contents are
not. Bidirectionally aligned along the lower Stó:lō, these reserves are not just the figur-
ations of colonization. They are figurations that trace the vectors of sxwówxwiýám that
were already in place. It is as if version (a), with its English toponyms and urbanized
xwelitem landscape, no sooner takes viewers away from the xwelmexw world than ver-
sion (b), with its Halq'éméylem names and landscape emptied of the xwelitem presence,
brings them back. In (a) is created the appearance of discontinuity between the old and
the new; in (b), continuity is partially restored. By emphasizing the reserves, the Stó:lō
are not then mapping place and identity into a geographical matrix inscribed by the carto-
graphic eye/I. By incorporating cartography into the sqwelqwel they are mapping the
presumptuous character of a xwelitem geographical imagination mounted against them.

**Morality play on the lower Stó:lō**

It is more difficult to explain why more of the xwelmexw landscape is not shown on
either map, but perhaps because both versions were only opening salvos to the BCTC,
and the Stó:lō had already decided to fill that space in a different register. In 2001, the
Stó:lō published *A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, the first (and so far only) histo-
rical atlas by any First Nation in the province.110 Mandated to telling a Native and non-
atlas continued the tradition worked out in *You Are Asked to Witness*. It included 115

---

110 The GWTC's *Cartographic Support*, op. cit. (Chapter 4) was, by definition, a legal factum, not an
historical atlas. I cannot speak of the Nisga'a's because it has not been made public.
111 Chief Lester Ned, cited in the Preface to Carlson, K., McHalsie, S. and Jan Perrier (eds), *A Stó:lō-
Coast Salish Historical Atlas* (Sardis and Vancouver: Stó:lō HeritageTrust and Douglas and Mcintyre,
2001), xv.
(mostly colour) illustrations, 183 (colour and black and white) photographs, a 15,000 year historical timeline, transcriptions of all the petitions filed by the Stó:lō people, and a gazetteer of over 720 Halq'eméylem place names. This was all supported by substantial explanatory text, and some 100 (mostly colour) maps. Topographic and thematic, the maps range from graphic reconstructions of the pre-contact Halq'eméylem world; to the geomorphological and environmental history of the lower Stó:lō; and to the shifting identities, demographics, and geographies of contact up to the present. The atlas also included reproductions of Thiusoloc's and Xelâlhten's maps, select colonial maps, and all of Kwa'ielets's Dreambook of a Stalo Chief (recall Figure MM). The result was "a powerful educational tool with application to ongoing Stó:lō Nation treaty negotiations," and "an invitation for non-Natives to come and share with [the Stó:lō their] land and resources."

Three plates warrant attention here. The first is Plate 10 (Map 92), which shows the post-contact diaspora of a single smelå:lh family. It suggests how a dense web of consanguinal relations constructed the xwélmexw (people speaking the same language) world, even as they constituted the genealogical vectors that reached into those of the lats'umexw (different people). More importantly, it illustrates how inclusionary movements, aided and abetted by the exclusionary authorship of the international boundary, were critical to the formation of a post-contact Stó:lō national identity. Indeed, most of the action takes place at the interface of the upriver and downriver worlds, the contemporary cultural and political heart of the Stó:lō. The map takes direct aim at the persistent colonial notion of status Indians identified by affiliation to a specific reserve. As Seabird Island Councillor Clem Seymour has said, "we can't just say we are from a

112 Carlson, K., in ibid.
113 Will:leg (Ken Malloway), in ibid., back cover.
114 When this atlas was published, this study had effectively been completed and I had not intended to reference it at all. But there were three plates that in my view so validated some of my more tentative conclusions, particularly as regards the nature of a Stó:lō spatial typology, that I decided I should.
Map 92

ART's *untitled* map of Stó:lō territory, Sardis, 2001, 37 x 33 cm; while genealogical charts have long been a major focus of First Nations' cultural research, very few have ever been mapped. Covering the period from about the mid-19th century through to the present, this remarkable thematization shows the complex web of inter-generational ties and movements that constitute the historical geography of the McHalsies, one of the leading Stó:lō *smelə:lth* families. Male and female ancestors are identified by triangles and circles, and cross-hatched as required to indicate the now deceased; marriages and divorces/separations, in particular places, are shown with equal and unequal signs. The movement of married people is shown by solid lines, single by dashed; the arrowheads show the direction (copied, with permission, from original in Carlson, K. et. al. [eds] *A Stó:lō - Coast Salish*, op. cit., 32-3).
single Indian Act band. Look at where our grandparents lived and moved to. We are all connected. We are Stó:lō. 115

The second is Plate 8a (Map 93), which summarizes the precontact settlement geography of the lower Stó:lō, and is the pot in which the genealogical diaspora in Map 92 was stirred. In so doing, it shows the tree-like structure of vectored space — not by trying to figure where the extremities of the branches should be drawn (as on Maps 88 or 89), but by showing where the branches were at their thickest (as on Maps 75 and 78). The branches of the tree were the various 'tribal watersheds', with access regulated by smelə:lḥ living in the largest towns. These towns then anchored a dense array of settlements, maybe even neighbourhoods, that functioned as a wayfinding system in its own right. The roots were in tl’álhem qó (salt water). The Stó:lō and Peqwpa:qotel comprised the trunk. Because the two main corridors of travel for Xexá:ls, the trunk was seen as an extension of tl’álhem qó, and therefore was negotiable by all xwelmexw. The important point is that while the 'tribes' came to be associated with watersheds, tribal boundaries were no more 'determined' by watershed boundaries than were the Gitxsan's wilp boundaries. This is the way they were created in the sxwoxwiyám.

Finally, Plate 1 (Map 94) shows exactly how the Tel Swayel and Xexá:ls did it. As recorded in the sxwoxwiyám, the Tel Swayel were most active around tl’álhem qó (Georgia Strait) and where Peqwpa:qotel empties into the Stó:lō through Leqémel (Harrison Bay). The Xexá:ls travelled the breadth of the Coast Salish world, and into other countries. In this way did Xexá:ls create 'one big vector', its thickness varying in accordance with the cultural and physiographic environment. In downriver country, intensification comes from the Tel Swayel, but the vector has more space in which to operate, and is shown at its widest. In upriver, it comes from the higher density of transformer sites but in a more constrained landscape, and so is shown at its narrowest. The map also shows

115 Ibid., 32.
Map 93
ART's The Xwelmexw World, Sardis, 2001, 37 x 24 cm; more or less consistent with Maps 81 and 89, a coloured map showing and naming the main 'tribal watersheds' of the Halq'eméylem speaking peoples, except this time without boundaries and the emphasis on the core settlement clusters in the two mainland divisions. The map also distinguishes those portions of the marine and fluvial environment considered open or free access (in blue) from those recognized as being under 'tribal jurisdiction' (in orange). For some reason the Stsewòthen and St'qw'omih are not labelled, but the five Teit 'sub-tribes' that were not named on Map 89 — the Lwets'ó:kw'em, Sq'ewá:lxw, Pop'kw'em, Skw'átets, Shxw'ôhámél — now are. The settlements are subclassified according to whether they are large 'towns', consisting mainly of the leading smelá:lh families in each 'tribe' (the red squares); satellite, mostly smelá:lh villages associated with important spiritual or resource gathering areas (the green circles); or small hamlets, often predominately stéxem and skwyéth families, or associated with resource sites typically owned by women (the black dots). Other important resource gathering locations (the purple spots) were acknowledged as 'tribal property' but in practice could be used by almost any Stó:lô (copied, with permission, from original in Carlson, K. et. al. [eds] A Stó:lô - Coast Salish, op. cit., 24-5).
Map 94
**Transformer Features in Sohl Téméxw**, Sardis, 2001, 39 x 25 cm; coloured map showing how the Xexá:ls and Tel Swayel collaborated in the construction of vector-ed space. Consistent with the sxwōxwiyám excerpted at the start, the wide brown bandlines generalize the movement of the Xexá:ls from tl'álhem qó, up the Stó:lō, and into Nlha7kápmx and Stl'atl'imx countries. The lack of arrows on the bandline along Pegwpa:qotel reflects how in Stó:lō narratives they travelled north to south, in Stl'atl'imx south to north. The dashed yellow line, circumnavigating Q'éyts'i Xó:tsa, traces the more detailed variant told by Th'álecten. The red dots, the names of many of which we have already encountered, are known transformer sites, the tan lines transformed rivers. The vertical black arrows show where the Tel Swayel came to earth, interacted with Xexá:ls, and begat the first families of those tribes. Of these, the five arrows farthest left represent the descents of Th'álecten, Swaneset, Xwethpecten, Smákwe and C'simlenexw (copied, with permission, from Carlson, K. et. al. [eds] A Stó:lō - Coast Salish, op. cit., 6-7).
that stó:lō (such as the Ts'elxwéyeqw and Sa'nisalh), and x̣o:tsa (such as Sxótsaqel and Peqwpa:qotel) with their own unique names are typically those transformed by Xexá:l. The names of untransformed bodies of water (like Q'éyts'i or Semá:th Xo:tsa) were derived from the resource, locality or 'tribe' with which they were most closely associated. The result is a terrestrial geography in Map 93 in near perfect symmetry with the ideal type specified in the sxwoxwiyam thematized in Map 94. Indeed, it seems clear that of the three spatial typologies analyzed in Part II of this study, vectored space is the most symmetrical.

Map 94 raises two additional points. The first is that in making visible one of the last archives of Halq'eméylem TEK, it might have been the most contentious within the Stó:lō community. On the one hand, as Evangeline Pete warned, to show such places on any map is to entice visitors (or vandals) who do not know (or care) how "to speak to these places, to let them know that you're not a stranger...[and where] the power in the places may make strange upon you."116 On the other, to not introduce Euro-Canadians to them is to invite more tragedies such as the destruction of Mómet'es, accidently blasted out of existence by CNR engineering crews in 1999.117 Indeed, insofar as such "places are an affirmation of our spirituality before the white man came," elder Xwiyl-emot (Tilly Guitierrez) "[does not] mind [white people] going...to see them because it's proof that Xá:ls was here."118 In short, the map reflects a basic concern of all First Nations in British Columbia — should they map, and if so, how much?

The second is that Map 94 shows how this 'never ending story', transmitted orally across the generations actually can be mapped, in so doing punctuates the lesson introduced in Map 90. It is not that colonization worked with the raw cultural material car-

---

116 Cited in Mohs, G. 'Stó:lō sacred ground', op. cit., 185. I suspect that Plate 2, which mapped several upriver ga:ga (spiritually taboo places), would have been equally controversial; Plate 3, which used flowlines to show the distribution of the sxwó:wgwey mask, perhaps less so.
117 Yewal Siyə:m Ohamil, 'Mómet'es blasted, a cultural landmark gone forever' in Sqwe'lqwels ye Stó:lō 2(6), 1999, 11. On Map 94, it is shown just east of the Stó:lō, about halfway up the canyon.
118 Cited in Mohs, G. 'Stó:lō sacred ground', op. cit., 185.
ried in the sxwoxwiyám. It is that even with good ethnographic information being supplied to them, the xwelitem still got it wrong. Indeed, when the reserves were first allocated and then named by surveyors according to what they were told about those locations, many of them — like I:yem and Iwówes in upriver territory, or Qélósłhep downriver — were not in the exact places to which their Halq’eméylem names actually referred.119 The result was an officially sanctioned Indian Act geography of reserves that is continuous with a real geography of sxwoxwiyám, while being out of alignment with it. From a Halq’eméylem perspective any subsequent realignment that strengthens continuity can come from only one source — the satisfactory resolution of the Indian land question on the lower Stó:lō.

Once again, there are those who will argue that by putting their historical geography into an atlas format, the Stó:lō have moved so far away from the sxwoxwiyám that they have abandoned any claims to 'traditionality'. To a point, this atlas is a 'morality play' on the lower Stó:lō, and much of it deals with the landmark(ing)s of an immigrant society. At the same time, it is not a lively polemic about states, it is not a tissue of fictions, and it is not a colonizer's model of the lower Fraser valley. What the Stó:lō have done is take the basic structural shell of an atlas, incorporate it into the sqwelqwel and, in so doing, ground it firmly in the sxwoxwiyám. It is from this perspective that the idea that western cartographic practice is the means by which the "implicit geography of the nat-ives is made explicit by geographers; the local knowledge of the savages becomes the universal knowledge of the cartographers; the fuzzy, approximate and un-grounded beliefs of the locals are turned into a precise, certain and justified knowledge,"120 is exposed as the worst Eurocentrism. If there is, as the cultural critic Robert Young would say, the quintessential white mythology, surely this is it.121

119 While the scale is prohibitive, compare, for example, the location of the Qélósłhep transformer site on this map (lower left) with the Barnston Island reserve of the same name on Map 90(b) (left).
121 From the title to White Mythologies: Writing History and the West (London: Routledge, 1990).
British Columbia is, of course, no myth. The Stó:lo know this better than most. My point is simply that most xwelítem have perched themselves on the edges of an enormous food dish, or scripted themselves, if rudely, into the pages of a never ending story as followers. And to a certain extent, followers they will always be.

Let me now depart Stó:lo country through two maps (Maps 95 and 96), both quite different, but which, taken together, show that First Nations are just as capable of thinking globally while acting locally as anyone else. The first thing that strikes me about Map 95, with its oblique perspective, is this sense of a 'view from nowhere'. As the astronomer Carl Sagan might have said, it suggests that the Stó:lo are like the rest of us nothing but 'star stuff', clinging to a spinning orb of rock and air and water, and vectoring through the cosmos to an uncertain future. But it also suggests that while the Stó:lo have acknowledged they are territorially a small nation, as nations go, they are a member of the international community. Regardless of what happens at the BCTC, the Stó:lo will have their part to play, for better or worse, in the evolving global village.

On Map 96, by contrast, the whole effect is of a 'view from somewhere'; namely that the only world that always counts is the one in your own back yard. Utterly tactile, this is symbolic mapping in its most pure form. Using and manipulating artificial materials in the same way that more ancient forms of landmarking used and manipulated natural materials, it was the act and experiences of making this map, and not the finished product, that would have been its most lasting legacy. Indeed, while such maps have typically earned almost no attention in the cartographic literature — or are wrapped up in a psycho-geographical jargon that confuses more than it clarifies — they are the most telling, most fascinating, of all maps. As these young Stó:lo cartographers were taught, we are all ultimately of the earth, never outside of it. And that, it seems to me, is what way-finding and finding our way — along the lower Stó:lo or anywhere else — must always be about.
Map 95
ART's *British Columbia with Stó:lō Traditional Territory*, Sardis, 1999, 27 x 19 cm; like Map 20, a coloured 'logo-map' in which the logo carries more visual weight than the map proper. This one was produced on an ARCINFO GIS. As noted in Chapter 1, it is rare to find maps authored by individual First Nations that show any concern with mapping whatever it is that exists beyond the nation's borders; this one is clearly an exception. (Another variant extends the southern boundary of the Stó:lō Nation across the 49th parallel) (copied, with permission, from original donated to author).
Map 96
(unknown) student-authored *untitled* cloth map of the upper Stó:lô, Coqualeetza, n.d.; 90 x 140 cm approximately; yet another genre of maps typically ignored in the literature on Native maps. This one was made by applying pieces of cloth shaped to represent buildings (churches, residences, schools, etc.) or playgrounds, arenas and parks (baseball diamonds, hockey sticks and the campfire, etc.), and of course, the Stó:lô itself, to a felt backdrop. Each is placed so as to correspond to their actual locations in the real world. Similar procedures applied the title, the names of the reserves, the American and Canadian flags denoting the 49th parallel, and the rainbow and sun — the latter shining brightly over the only world many Stó:lô children have ever known. Tactile, manipulative and cantilevered out of direct experience in a three-dimensional world, however, this is surely map-*making* in its most primordial, most elemental, and yet, at the same time, most substantive form (photographed, with permission, from original mounted on wall at the Coqualeetza Museum and Gift Shop, Sardis).
Conclusion

You must understand how useless a map is. You must also study them with great care.1

Having now arrived back home, here in my own small corner of the Map of British Columbia, I almost feel like that stereotypical *Twilight Zone* protagonist who wakes up one day to find himself the same but everything around him different. The orthogonal grid is not quite as stable, as familiar, or as comfortable as when I left. But I have been changed, and the spatial typologies investigated *en route* are no dreams. By no means do they disclose their inner workings easily. As I have shown in Part I, they cannot be explored on the terrain of equivalency, where the cartographic eye/I disengages maps from mappings, turns them into pictures at an exhibition, and then forces them through a complex political geography of claims that is itself in flux. As I have shown in Part II, these typologies need to be *travelled*. Constituted by cognitive, corporeal, graphic, and spoken elements put together in different assemblages and in diverse geographical settings, they have to be worked into, on their own terms, and with the spatial referencing systems immanent to them.

It is on this note that any talk of 'a conclusion' seems misplaced. Conclusions usually imply some kind of a summary statement, a closing argument, a last word. But this adventure was more like the middle of a long sentence whose period is not yet in clear view. Conclusions also tend to be meta-narratival, offering (often grandiose) theoretical claims. If anything, and while I still think these mappings do much of the work for us, I have had to ricochet my travels off theoretical arrows shot from different perspectives, at different times, and from all points of the compass. That so, all theorization is a performative act, and to this extent a mapping in its own right. It ought to be judged not by whether it is right or wrong — but by whether the ideas in a body of theory help

---

1 Jiles, S. *North Spirit*, op. cit., 192.
us make sense of the unfamiliar.² It is with these caveats in mind, then, that I offer the following coda. Some of it empirical, some theoretical, some political, it is scaffolded around the same historical junctures highlighted in this study with two important additions: the 1997 SCC decision in *Delgamuukw* and the 1999 *Nisga'a Treaty*. In the first part, I revisit the cartography proper, in the second, its implications for matters of fact and future practice.

**The difference that space makes**

Symmetrical territorialism creates different spatial typologies. These differences are partly a function of agency. Ancestor figures, cultural heroes or transformers occupy specific positions in a cosmological order, are attributed with different powers (or limitations), and when on earth make geography in different ways. Partly, they are a consequence of the socio-political structure. The more hierarchical the indigenous body politic, the more it tends to construct an arealized typology with fixed boundaries. Less hierarchical societies tend to construct more linear spaces with more ambiguous boundaries. Partly, they are related to how polysynthetic the language is. While my own evidence is only suggestive, it does seem as if the more verbal languages develop in settings characterized by nomadic lifeways, the more nominal languages in more sedentary.³ Mostly, though, they have to be a function of the physiographic settings into which agents are inserted, where hierarchies develop, and inside which languages elaborate.

As to which is the most causal, it is arguably the latter — there is a reason why First Nations have always advanced the notion that they are Nature's sons and daughters — but it is important to avoid turning this into a crude form of environmental determinism. Indeed, from a Native perspective, the question as to why these typologies are

---

³ I have discussed this possibility with the linguist, William Poser. Ultimately, of course, this claim can only be validated (or refuted) through an in-depth linguistic analysis, which I clearly have not done. Nevertheless, it does make some intuitive sense.
different is not only unanswerable, but non-sensical. From the indigenous perspective, agency, structure, language and setting were all created, more or less simultaneously, in the origin narratives. Primordial cultures learned to recognize difference, and then developed the means of enunciating it. But there was never any need to explain it. Difference simply was.

On the northwest coast, where there is a high degree of topographic variability, a relatively complex cosmology, long migrations in search of territories, linguistic continuity, and enough resources to allow the development of distributive proprietary systems, mosaicked space is the result. We find this in Coast Tsimshian and Nisga'a country as well as Gitxsan. We also find something like it in Haida, Kwakwaka'wakw, and Nuu-chah-nulth country, but a somewhat different mosaic because the mythical agency, sociopolitical structures, and linguistic contexts are not the same. In the central or northern interior, where there is less physiographic differentiation and less complex mythologies, and where people must be mobile enough to get at scarce resources, striated space is the result. We find it in Dunne Za and Southern Carrier country, as well as in Carrier Sekani. While we would still have to go there to confirm it, I suspect Tsilhqot'in, Secwepemc or Tahltan territories would be similarly configured. On the southwest coast, with very complex cosmologies, where mythical agents and not historical actors travel, and there is a high degree of topographic variation marked by a near total dominance of one or two corridors, vectored space is the result. The surplus-generating resource base does not yield mosaicked space because the sociopolitical structure and proprietary system will not allow it. In this respect, the Stó:lō may be unique in British Columbia, but because they are linguistically related, and because the cosmological agency, physio-

4 For the Tsimshian, as suggested in Map 31; for the Nisga'a, as suggested in Map 9 (but see also Sterritt, N. et. al. Tribal Boundaries, op. cit., 188).
5 For the Kwakwaka'wakw, as suggested in Map 34; for the Haida, as suggested in Map 28.
6 For the Dunne Za, as suggested in Map 17; for the Southern Carrier as suggested in Map 16(a or c) (but see also Birchwater, S. Ulkatcho Stories, op. cit., 3).
7 For the Tsilhqot'in, as suggested in Map 25; for the Secwepemc, as suggested in Map 7.
graphy, and socio-political structure are approximately alike, I suspect we would find a similar typology in Nuxalk, Quwutsun, Squamish and Se'shalt countries also. In the southern interior, in Stl'atl'imx and Nlha7kapmx country, where there are more corridors, but where the sociopolitical structure is closer to the Athapaskan model, spatial typologies may have both vectored and striated characteristics, or perhaps be something else altogether.

It is meaningless to think of these typologies in developmentalist terms. Although I think Lefebvre is right that natural space is the one spatial typology that all territorialisms must pass through, it is wrong to conceive of vectored space as the ideal type to which striated spaces evolve, or that either will necessarily elaborate into mosaicked. There is no necessary relationship between geography, cosmology and socio-cultural organization. Nor are these typologies mutually exclusive. Just as traces of alternative spatial typologies survive at the interstices of equivalency, so can we find vectors and striations inside mosaicked space — as with the grease trails and principal rivers on the northwest coast — and arealized portions in striated and vectored — as we do in the Carrier Sekani keyohs and at the hearts of Stó:lō 'tribal territories'. As in equivalent space, scale matters. What we can say is that while different spatial typologies display certain defining characteristics, they are never absolutely distinct. As we have seen, this is a world characterized by a high degree of interpenetration and flux.

It is true that once symmetrical spatial typologies are subjected to the surveillant optics of the cartographic eye/I, which always and everywhere distills points from smudges and boundaries from frontiers, their differences are, to some extent, 'papered over'. But they are never completely elided. Indeed contemporary Gitxsan maps do 'look different' from Carrier Sekani maps, which, in turn, do 'look different' from Stó:lō maps.

---

8 As suggested in Map 18, the Nuxalk along the Bella Coola River; as suggested in Map 5, the Quwutsun along the Cowichan River; as suggested in Maps 12 and 27, the Squamish on Howe Sound; and as suggested in Map 14, the Se'shalt on Princess Louisa Inlet.
9 For the Stl'atl'imx, as suggested in Maps 24 and 29; for the Nlha7kapmx, as suggested in Map 23.
This difference is hard to detect as long as we stay on the familiar ground of the orthogonal grid. It is only when we work our way through these typologies, where maps and mappings are reconciled, that difference is finally, and quite dramatically, revealed. It is also reflected in the overall geography of First Nations' cartography in the post-contact period.

A generalized historical geography of First Nations maps

The gallery in Part I is not exhaustive. But it is representative — and when we scan back through the immediate post-contact world, it is clear that the southwest coast First Nations made the oldest surviving Native maps in British Columbia. But there are significant temporal gaps in that record, and some groups have mapped more than others. Northwest and central coast First Nations cannot track quite so far back. But they have been by far the most consistent mapmakers, and have used maps for more purposes than any of their neighbours. Central or northern interior First Nations were the first to have made maps. But this was through historical circumstance, and they have pursued this form of geographical representation only recently, and rather reluctantly.

In my view, there are two explanations. As I have shown in Part II, these patterns are partially the aftershocks of fundamental differences between spatial typologies having different degrees of symmetry, and whose capacity to incorporate the representational machinery of the cartographic eye/I varies widely. It is simply a more straightforward exercise to represent mosaicked space on a map, somewhat less so with vectored space, much more difficult with striated space. This explains why, at least initially, the reserve system was more damaging to the integrity of mosaicked space than striated or vectored space, while the registered trapline system was a greater compromise for striated space than it was mosaicked, and almost inconsequential for vectored. In short, the more arealized the spatial typology, the more readily it can be reduced to a
two-dimensional cross-section that can be accessed through the visual register. There is less loss of signal, less opportunity for the appearance of overlap, and it is easier for untutored viewers to trace continuity between the old and the new.

The second has to do with 'tribal alliances' formed to deal with the land question in the post-contact era. Central and northwest coastal groups have tended to advance claims through what might be called the 'ownership and jurisdiction' approach. These groups arguably suffered less from 19th century epidemics, experienced more belated settlement of their traditional territories, and had developed proprietary systems. They were proselytized near exclusively by Anglicans or Methodists, who taught them English, encouraged the incorporation of European enterprises and ways of life, and intervened on the land question at several points. Their philosophical and organizational affiliations have remained consistent with those worked out in coastal alliances, whose political rhetoric drew little distinction between Aboriginal title and Aboriginal rights. The result is that they have often preferred litigation over negotiation, have been more willing to engage in direct action, and have been most disposed not only to make maps, but make them public.

The central and some of the northern interior nations subscribe, by contrast, to what may be called the 'sovereignist position'. They take issue not only with the land selection model implied by the treaty process, but also with the very notion that the province has any constitutional authority to participate. They suffered gravely from 19th century epidemics, experienced settlement of their traditional territories at a relatively later date, and had more flexible proprietary systems. They were proselytized almost exclusively

---

10 This line of thinking I owe to conversations with the political scientist Paul Tennant, and the historical geographer Robert Galois. Tennant (in Aboriginal Peoples, op. cit.) and Galois (in 'The Indian Rights', op. cit.) address some of it, but largely in terms of a generalized political geography. In my view, it also bears directly on how that geography has been represented.

11 The Anglican missionary at Metlakatla, William Duncan, is the best known example, but recall also the authorship of Maps 9 and 10.

12 As noted in Chapter 1, the IRA, NBBC and NLC.
by Roman Catholics, who tried to protect them from the worst excesses of colonization by minimizing secular influences, and by intervening less frequently in the land question. Their philosophical and organizational linkages have remained consistent with those of the interior alliances, which emphasized title over rights. This helps explain why these groups have been militant blockaders but little disposed to seek redress in the courts. It also suggests why they have been the most reluctant cartographers, and the least willing to make their maps public.

Southwest coast groups, finally, have tended to seek resolution through what might be called the 'incrementalist approach' based on specific as opposed to comprehensive claims. They arguably suffered the worst effects of late 18th century pestilences, rapid settlement of their traditional territories through the early colonial period, and bore the brunt of denominational contests between different religious orders. Philosophically and organizationally, geopolitical alliances frequently shifted, lying sometimes with the interior groups, at others with the coastal. Knowing there is little crown land left in the region, and that future settlements will be tilted towards cash rather than land, they have emphasized rights over title. This helps explain why they have been more disposed to seek redress in the courts, the least prepared to engage in direct action, and why they appear more haphazardly in the cartographic record.

First Nations and the ungendering of cartographic practice

In the post-Section 35 environment First Nations' cartography has spread more evenly across the Map of British Columbia, and here I am immediately struck by two developments. The first is how many contemporary counter-mapping projects in First Nations' communities are being directed by women, something that is notably absent in the

---

13 The Oblate missionary, Adrien Gabriel Morice (Chapter 5) is a classic case in point.
14 As noted in Chapter 1, the NAIB, Interior Tribes and UBCIC.
15 Recall, for example, the dispute between the Catholic and Protestant missionaries over which chiefs' names ought to be applied to Launders's 1868 surveys on the lower Stó:lo (in Chapter 6).
pre-Section 35 period (and, for that matter, throughout the entire history of western cartography). Indeed, while I made no statistical assessment, I probably spoke to more female cartographers, treaty coordinators, and even blockaders than I did male. This is important because as the quintessential expression of the cartographic eye/I, maps have often been accused of reifying the phallocentric gaze on space. To the extent that Native women blockaders use territorial strategies developed or perfected by Native men, they may also unwittingly enforce what the geographer Gillian Rose calls hegemonic masculinism. As often as not Native womens' spaces are nested in lands controlled or claimed by men and there are too many land reform movements elsewhere in the world that have already transferred what little remaining power colonized women had left into mens' hands.

At the same time, the fact that Native women are mapmakers, treaty negotiators and blockaders casts doubt on the claim that they must be doubly marginalized: marginalized as women (in terms of gender); and marginalized as Native (in terms of ethnicity). For these are not the acts of the marginalized. Indeed I cannot imagine anything that is more centered, or more empowering, than women (and children) blockading railroads, highways or military bases — and doing so with a certain degree of success. No less than for men, a geographical imagination lies at the center of who and where these women are. It is, in fact, often local resources traditionally gathered or processed by women — especially plants having special medicinal, culinary or utilitarian properties —

---

16 There is an extensive literature on this. See, for example, any of Ryan, S. The Cartographic Eye/I, op. cit.; Lefebvre, H. Production, op. cit.; Gillian Rose, 'Distance, surface, elsewhere: a feminist critique of the space of phallocentric self-knowledge' Environment and Planning D 13, 1993, 761-78; or Anne McClintock, Imperial Leather (New York: Routledge, 1995).
17 In Feminist and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).
18 See, for example, Dianne Rocheleau, Barbara Thomas-Slayter, and David Edmunds, 'Gendered resource mapping' Cultural Survival Quarterly 18(4), 1995, 62-68.
19 See, for example, Gayatri Spivak, 'Can the subaltern speak' in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds), Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1988), 271-313.
20 Recall figures N, O and PP.
that are in immediate danger of extirpation and most in need of mapping. The difference is not that this imagination is circumscribed by an ethic of care and nurturing designed to protect 'the inside' (as opposed to exerting a detached gaze on 'the outside'); this is also true of many western feminist agendas. It is, rather, that in indigenous societies, where the notion of 'mother earth' is not corrupted by discourses of domination and where matrilineal inheritance is common, the division of labour, and the archive of knowledge in which it sits, flow from gender, not the other way around.

**First Nations and the digitization of cartographic production**

The second is an almost universal incorporation of GIS, a technology that, while lauded for its capacity to assimilate huge quantities of geographical information, has been criticized by some geographers for encouraging the technicalization of geographical knowledge. John Pickles accuses GIS of reifying the surveillant machinery of capitalism, and the ideologies of developmentalism and the bureaucratic state that support it.\(^{21}\) For Patrick McHaffie, GIS transforms local knowledge into homogenous general knowledge.\(^{22}\) At best, the result is a devaluation of alternative knowledges, at worst, a dismissal of TEK as valid knowledge altogether. For Michael Curry, digital technology represents an 'ethical unmooring' because it further detaches cartographers from the milieux in which they operate.\(^{23}\)

There are also technical questions. Michael Goodchild suggests that because GIS overlays are basically two-dimensional, the technology is good for positioning things, but weaker at capturing relations between them.\(^{24}\) It has difficulty handling fluid boundaries, and, as noted in Chapter 5, does not always close off polygons, showing blank

---


\(^{22}\) In 'Manufacturing metaphors' in Pickles, J. (ed) *Ground Truth*, op. cit., 113-29.

\(^{23}\) In 'Geographical information systems and the inevitability of ethical inconsistency' in ibid., 68-87.

\(^{24}\) In 'Geographic information systems and geographic research' in ibid., 31-50.
space on the map where none existed in practice. It is in this light that Howard Veregin wonders how mythical geographies, or 'geographies of the mind', can be translated in a spatial database, and if they cannot, then what is to become of them? Some First Nations with little cartographic expertise have had to contract digital production to 'hired experts'. At best, the result is maps that do not reflect a Native perspective; at worst, alien institutions, bureaucracies and governments end up influencing what is mapped, and how. Moreover, those with the expertise and hardware still find GIS expensive.

To a point, I agree with much of this. GIS was largely developed for, and is still devoted to military applications and the interests of states. As I have argued in Part II, however, GIS looks different from a First Nations' perspective. As shown in Chapters 4 and 5, GIS overlays are especially adept at portraying archaeological and wildlife data, both of huge interest to Native people. By three-dimensionalizing the milieu, and providing a means to extrapolate future scenarios of environmental change, GIS can "be a management tool to have the data on the archaeological sites and fisheries, forestry and see how they interrelate and impact on [tribal watersheds]." GIS cannot represent 'geographies of the mind', but as shown in Chapters 4 and 6, it can map narratives, and the activities and travels of mythical agents.

This means that GIS has become virtually indispensable to specific and comprehensive claims. In court, it can visualize "Aboriginal land use patterns [for] a panel of judges otherwise more or less unfamiliar with the subject." In treaty talks, it functions as a "credible, recognized expert witness...enter[ing] evidence backing Aboriginal land use rights." In a few instances, First Nations' expertise in GIS has allowed them to secure

---

25 In 'Computer innovation and adoption in geography' in ibid., 88-112.
27 In the early 1990s, when most of these systems were brought on line in British Columbia, a basic GIS workstation, with GPS support, averaged about $10,000CAN. Training of GIS operators added about another $1,000 per capita. I will come back to this very important point shortly.
29 Weiler, M. 'GIS applications', op. cit.
mapping projects that would normally have been contracted out to non-Native agencies, and thus help preserve a Native perspective on what is being mapped. In 1997, for example, the North Thompson Band successfully bid on an MOF tender for an Archaeological Overview Assessment (AOA) in the Kamloops and Clearwater Forest Districts. In Gitxsan territory, SWAT has worked with environmental organizations like Ecotrust to achieve similar goals. The geographer, Joseph Mensah, suggests that it is therefore less a question of whether or not GIS legitimizes claims, but whether it can help manage lands acquired. And it is this sense that GIS is but "one of these new complexes of discourse, practice and institutional ensemble...effecting changes in the modalities of power." 

Perhaps most importantly, as noted in Chapter 5, GIS can help reconnect children with the teachings of their elders, many of whom have passed away. By mediating the transformation of maps back into mappings, GIS is not only an important pedagogical tool but "a way of socializing" within Native communities. Like the Gitxsan, the Diddleth Band has reported great success with a 'point-and-click' GIS in the local school. When first introduced to the technology in 1993, Kwakwaka'wakw students acknowledged that "even turning the programs on and off was a challenge for the first few days." But as teacher Lucille Hill noted, they soon discovered that expertise in GIS led to expertise in researching, surveying or word processing — all skills they could use for employment outside their communities as well as in. According to Kitsumkalum Tribal Claims Office cartographer Alan Bolton, their GIS lab, established in 1994, soon be-

31 In 'Treaty negotiations', op. cit.
33 Norman LaRue, in 'Elders pass on traditional knowledge to the children' Secwepemc News Sept/Oct 97, 9.
34 The Diddleth system is film and sound-enhanced; when selecting a site, users may call up videos of elders walking the site, or hear them sing a song or tell a story about the place.
36 Ibid., 10.
came the place "where members of the community [came] to see maps of their traditional territory and learn more about the treaty process." By committing information to data bases that can 'talk' with each other, GIS can also mitigate the very technological gap it helps create. While "the personal maps and taped interviews by individual TUS participants will remain confidential to all except TUS staff," the Secwepemc's North Thompson and Canim Lake Bands can review each other's data base. Similar protocols govern, among others, the Neskonlith and Adams Lake Bands, and the Tsimshian's Kitselas and Kitsumkalum Bands. As Canim Lake treaty negotiator, Dodie Eustache, has put it "we're [using GIS] for government, but also for ourselves." In short, the proliferation of First Nations' maps in the post-Section 35 environment cannot be detached from the rapid expansion of GIS, the degenderizing of cartographic production, and the cultural enrichment of First Nations communities.

The many challenges of First Nations cartography

This said, the satisfactory resolution of the Indian land question is at stake, and it remains to be asked just how effective this cartography is? Maps often work their magic in unexpected ways and it quickly became clear that they could retard the very process they were supposed to expedite. Maps like solid boundaries and they immediately roused the bogeyman of overlap. For most First Nations, this issue was always of marginal concern. As Canim Lake treaty coordinator Elizabeth Pete suggested, First Nations "realiz[ed] there are a lot of overlaps, but [since they] walked the same trails and shared the same wildlife [they could] sort those overlaps out [them]selves." For Toosey

---

37 In 'Kitsumkalum GIS' Tsimshian National Voice 11, June/July/Aug 97, 16.
38 McRae, A. 'Canim Lake', op. cit.
39 McRae, A., in 'Adams Lake/Neskonlith TUS project will be used to safeguard Aboriginal rights' Secwepemc News Jan/Feb 98, 4.
40 Bolton, A. 'Kitsumkalum', op. cit.
41 In 'Mapping traditional sites' Secwepemc News, Apr/May 97, 15.
Band Chief Frank Boucher, "boundaries need not be fixed between our nations, we have always shared some of the use of each others lands." Of the complex boundary weaves in Kwakwaka'wakw territory, Quatsino elder Mary Charlie stated simply that "we are really one big family." The BCTC admitted that overlap was an inherent condition of pre-contact life, and that post-treaty jurisdictions could be negotiated on a resource-specific (as opposed to a territorial) basis. But its prime directive remained one of achieving certainty within the limits of a land selection model, and it continued to insist that boundaries be distinct for treaty purposes. First Nations have responded by negotiating inter-tribal treaties, but the less arealized the spatial typologies involved, the greater is the injustice to their claims.

If and when overlaps were satisfactorily resolved, there remained differences of opinion on what constituted mappable evidence of traditional use or occupancy. As far as the provincial Ministry of Heritage was concerned, the only sites that constituted proof of either were those of a physically identifiable kind (CMTs, cabins, food caches, etc.). The problem was that until the Forest Practices Code in 1994, third-party interests were not obligated to work around such sites, and First Nations generally lacked the resources to document them on their own. The result was that much of the evidence had already vanished. Since 1994 areas slated for development have had to submit to AOAs, and some First Nations have used the results to negotiate IMAs. But there are still no provisions governing sacred sites (landing places, spiritually important natural features, etc.)

43 In 'Toosey hosts 3 nations forum' Carrier Chilcotin News 3(6), Nov 96, 8.
44 Cited in von Specht, F., 'Quatsino signs treaty with Kyuquot' Awa'k'wis 6(1), Jan 95, 4.
45 Here is another case where typology matters. Indeed, most are in coastal areas, where relatively fixed watershed boundaries provide a convenient reference. Examples include the 1991 Northwest Tribal Treaty between the Tsimshian, Haida, Nisga'a, Haisla, Lake Babine, Wet'suwet'en, Gitanyow, Gitxsan, Carrier Sekani and Tahltan; a 1997 treaty between the Te'Mexw Treaty Association, Se'shalt and Sliammon; and the 1999 agreement between the Heiltsuk, Kitasoo/XaiXais and Haisla.
46 Following the mass demonstration against, and the publicity surrounding, clearcut logging in Clayoquot Sound in 1993, the incumbent New Democratic Party government promised a new direction in forest practices. In addition to protecting archaeological sites, the code established guidelines designed to, among other things, prevent logging in sensitive riparian or slide zones, protect endangered species habitat, and govern the building and deactivation of logging roads.
The Heritage Act allows a concept 'cultural landscape', defined as either a relatively discrete aggregation of distinct cultural processes in an area, or a series of culturally derived landscape features. But they must still be mapped site-specifically, which does not accord with a Native perspective in which the whole of a traditional territory is 'one big archaeological site'.

Meanwhile, resource activity in untreatied territory has not appreciably slowed — in some areas it has accelerated dramatically — and the clock ticks. On the one hand time is short. Data collection must be completed now, before the elders who carry much of this information have passed on. As Sugar Cane Chief Nancy Sandy has noted, elders who can still engage in fieldwork often find it personally "devastating to go out and try and identify a place when there has been so much destruction." On the other, time is money. Tsimshian Chief Negotiator Gerald Wesley has commented how First Nations "have always felt the requirements in order to substantiate our positions will involve a lot of technical work, historical documentation, development of position papers, statistical facts in regards to what may or may not have taken place." But the longer it takes, the more the bills pile up. Under BCTC legislation, First Nations Summit (FNS) affiliates receive only 20% of their funding as grants; the other 80% comes as loans, which must be paid back out of treaty settlements. In addition, most financing for TUS and TUS-related programs has come out of Forest Renewal British Columbia (FRBC), not the BCTC. But First Nations were never allowed more than 10% of total monies allocated by FRBC, and when disbursements were cut across the board by 40% in 1997,
First Nations cartography was hit hard. Many FNS affiliates had to lay off staff, idle digital workstations, or cancel ancillary projects like trail reconstruction or newsletters. For First Nations outside the BCTC process, it was worse. Until the cutbacks they were eligible for FRBC monies for TUS purposes. The tradeoff was not only that they had to turn all the results over to MOF, but squeeze the studies into timelines that could not be met. The Tsilhqot'in, for example, were expected to complete site-specific inventories in all their traditional territory, but were given only 15 months in which to do so.

In court, First Nations' maps face different challenges. As I have argued elsewhere, and as was illustrated in Chapter 4, the courts still function as a detached, fixed observer on the Map of British Columbia, much legal jurisprudence remaining as Eurocentric and canonistic as the frontier geographies of the cartographic eye/I. Until very recently, judges had relatively free reign to define what counted as 'relevant facts'. Oral testimony, obviously crucial to Aboriginal rights litigations, was dismissed as "referring to 'myths', 'legends' and 'superstitions'." Whether across the hierarchies of judicial reasoning (as between lower and upper courts), or in different jurisdictions (as between provincial and federal), rulings effectively charged with filling in the 'empty box' of Aboriginal rights were not consistent. In addition, most judges, schooled in corporate law, have held a limited view of Aboriginal rights to land and resources. Since Section 35, the courts have interpreted Aboriginal rights to both in an increasingly accommodating manner but they also become more demanding in terms of proof — which brings First Nations right back to the problem of mappable evidence noted above.

52 For example, the Tl'azt'en Free Press, the Tsimshian National Voice, and a number of trail reconstruction projects in CSTC territory (recall Figure CC).
53 See my Euro-Canadian Cartography, op. cit. Sparke, M. (in 'The map that roared', op. cit.) has made a similar point.
55 Carter, P. The Road, op. cit., 335.
56 See James O'Reilly, in 'The courts and community values' Alternatives 15(2), 1988, 41-7.
58 Elias, P. 'Aboriginal rights', op. cit.
The same considerations apply to symbolic politics, the public response to which inevitably influences the decisions courts make. As shown in Part II, First Nations mappings (like blockades) create visually significant events that (try to) capitalize on Canadians' basic senses of fair play and justice.\(^{59}\) In many instances it works.\(^{60}\) But terms like sovereignty, self government and self-determination are malleable and emotional, and just where 'legitimate protest' turns into 'terrorism' is not clear. At Gustafsen Lake, for example, many non-Native British Columbians would have agreed with Lekwiltok Chief Captain George Quocksister's claim that "the blockaders were correct...righteous people...try[ing] and get the attention of Government [on the] question of theft of Native national lands."\(^{61}\) Many more, however, reacted viscerally to media images of people manning barricades in camouflage gear.\(^{62}\) FNS president Bill Wilson thought that while the RCMP "did a fabulous job [because] nobody got killed...I was up in Williams Lake, and all it did was raise animosity....I almost got my ass kicked about half a dozen times because I happen to be an Indian, and I had nothing to do with [the standoff]."\(^{63}\) It is in this sense that mappings on the ground may actually negate the very claims that maps are trying to substantiate in court or at the treaty table.

Finally, these map(ping)s must be situated squarely at the interface of two philosophical systems with divergent views on the meaning and scope of Aboriginal self-government in a post-treaty environment.\(^{64}\) As Wet'suwet'en speaker, Satsan (Herb George), has phrased it, "several hours of debate on the issue of maps and associated costs" was

\(^{59}\) Jhappan, C.R., 'Indian symbolic politics', op. cit.
\(^{60}\) Recall the actions summarized footnote 38, Chapter 1, and the Gitxsan blockades in Chapter 4.
\(^{62}\) Recall Figures G and RR.
\(^{63}\) Cited in ibid.
\(^{64}\) The federal government was still relying on its 1987 comprehensive claims policy which insisted that First Nations' self-government would only be entertained in matters internal to their communities; that is, delegated governance based on reserve residency and not identification with the traditional territory. First Nations counter that the whole purpose of the treaty process was never to subordinate one form of govern-ance to another but to establish two systems of sovereign law that were parallel and complementary. For a good summary from a First Nations' perspective, see the CSTC, 'Proposal for Carrier Sekani governance negotiations', unpublished paper, CSTC, 1997.
not just "a first hand illustration of negotiations at its most frustrating" but about "someone's notion of power....a kind of holdover from a time when Indian agents and missionaries ruled." In short, First Nations' maps, detached as they generally were from the mappings in which they sat, seem to have caused as many problems as they solved. Indeed, I talked with at least one interior treaty coordinator who was frankly fed up with the entire mapping process.

The overall result is that while First Nations' cartography has spread to all points on the Map of British Columbia, First Nations have become more cautious with the maps they do make. The vast majority are never circulated out of court or beyond the treaty table. Those that have been are carefully scrutinized for content. The reality of overlap makes First Nations reluctant to bound their claims within the solid lines on the Map of British Columbia. But not drawing solid boundaries in a 'first-past-the-post' negotiating environment may be a more dangerous game if someone else draws theirs first. First Nations remain concerned that maps open up TEK to public scrutiny. But they are also well aware that non-disclosure may not be optional in an environment in which the presumption of right is based, in part, on the blank spaces of the Map of British Columbia. It is in all these senses that First Nations' maps remain partially, in some contexts essentially, acts of resistance.

But because they also participate in mappings in which a "rich potential of oral histories" continues to inform "the subjective popular experiences of social change wrought within living memory," they cannot be reduced only to this. Indeed by bringing together young and old, male and female, dominating and dominated, and allowing them to actively communicate about their territories and how they are to be used, making maps encourages group solidarities. As the bioregional cartographer Doug Aberley states it,

---

65 In 'Will O the Wisp into the Future', Wet'suwet'en Treaty Chronicle 1(1), 1997, 1.
66 Maps 26, 58 and 88 cases in point.
all maps are basically "shorthand for perceptions that each of us create with senses evolved as hunters and gatherers, as explorers, as animals that must navigate to survive. A map becomes more than a series of lines; it becomes an agenda for action, a turf to defend, a series of memories that remind of action and pleasure and history."68 The attitude cultivated through counter-mapping projects, more than the map(ping)s themselves, may be the more lasting legacy.

First Nations maps and Delgamuukw

The rapid resolution of treaties is not the only yardstick by which to measure the effectiveness of First Nations' maps. In late 1997, the SCC handed down its decision in the 'mother of all trials', sending the lower court's 'scissors-and-paste' adjudication of Gitxsan geography to the dustbin of legal history.69 The court ruled unanimously that "aboriginal title is a right to the land itself;"70 that title lands "may be used for a variety of activities...none of which need be individually protected as Aboriginal rights under Section 35;"71 and that they are held communally.72 In short, "Aboriginal title is sui generis...[and although] distinguished from other title [namely Crown] interests,"73 is still equivalent to a proprietary interest in land and in surface and subsurface resources. The only limitation is that because Aboriginal title is held by virtue of the "special bond between the group and the land...[having]...an inherent and unique value in itself,"74 it is inalienable. Other than sale, transfer, or surrender to the Crown, Aboriginal title lands may not be put "to uses which would destroy the value [of that bond]."75 Understandably, First Nations were as jubilant with the SCC ruling as the province had been relieving.

68 In (ed) Boundaries, op. cit., quote is 73.
69 Here, then, I return to the litigation started, but left hanging, in Chapter 4.
71 Ibid., 3.
72 Ibid., 35.
73 Ibid., 3.
74 Ibid., 4.
75 Ibid.
ed following the lower court ruling eight years before. Tsilhqot'in National Chief Ray Hance stated, "all my life I've been fighting for recognition of Aboriginal title. Now I don't have to. Now I have to fight for proper implementation of [title]." Just as importantly, and in vindication of the arguments presented in this study, the court addressed the question of continuity. In order to prove title, a First Nation has to show that its ancestors had 'exclusive occupation' of claimed territories when the Crown first asserted sovereignty (determined to be the 1846 Oregon Treaty). Such proof may include evidence of Aboriginal laws governing a peoples' relationship to the land (such as those concerning land tenure), occupation of their territory before 1846, or physical occupancy and use today. At the same time, the court held that exclusive occupation could still be shown even if other First Nations were present in, or frequented a territory being claimed. The court did caution that "if present occupation is relied on as proof of same, pre-sovereignty, there must be continuity between present and pre-sovereignty occupation," but added the crucial rider that "there is no need to establish an unbroken chain of continuity between present and prior occupation," because occupancy and use "may have been disrupted...[because of] the unwillingness of European colonizers to recognize [title]." In addition, the court recognized that "it may be impossible to identify geographical limits with scientific precision," and reiterated its earlier ruling in the 1996 Regina v. Van der Peet that courts have to "adapt the laws of evidence so that the aboriginal perspective...[is] given due weight...[which in] practical terms require[s] the courts to come to terms with the oral histories."

Like McEachern, C.J.'s lower court ruling, the SCC decision, if cloaked in jurisprudential language, was a determination of geographical identity. The difference was that

---

76 Cited in Paul Barnsley, 'Delgamuukw: Nobody seems to get it' Raven's Eye 16(6), Oct 98, 2.
77 Delgamuukw v. B.C., op. cit., 5.
78 Ibid., 43, emphasis added.
79 Ibid., 55, emphasis added.
80 Ibid., 28, emphasis added.
Lamer, C.J. et. al. were able (and willing) to see the map(ping)s of (in this instance Gitxsan) identity through cultured eyes. By holding that a First Nation must only demonstrate a "substantial connection"\textsuperscript{81} between past and present occupation; by recognizing that overlap is a consequence of conditions of "shared exclusivity;"\textsuperscript{82} by noting that genealogical linkages only construct generalized boundaries; and by committing the legal system to "adapt the laws of evidence so that the aboriginal perspective on their practices, customs and traditions...are given due weight;"\textsuperscript{83} their decision not only acknowledged the gaps and discontinuities induced by the colonial intervention, but the quantum of untranslatability that must inhere in its \textit{representation}.

It is true that the maps themselves were not adduced in the high court. Lower court factums rarely are. Nor did the court decide on the substantive geographical content of the litigation itself.\textsuperscript{84} But without those Gitxsan maps (recall Maps 50 through 54), the case would never have got to court in the first place. And without an understanding of how the Gitxsan used oral and cartographic evidence to, in effect, witness and validate each other, the court could not have tendered the ruling on continuity that it did. To be sure, the federal government has not revised its standing 1987 policy based on the land selection model and the presumption of extinguishment outside parcels so selected. To the extent that the decision has widened the gap between what First Nations expect and what either government is prepared to give, one could also argue that Gitxsan cartography opened one Pandora's box as it closed another.\textsuperscript{85} On balance, however, \textit{Delgamuu}...

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 45.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., 28.
\textsuperscript{84} Recall footnote 118, Chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{85} Sensing that litigation may now be preferable to negotiations that seem to be going nowhere fast, some FNS affiliates — like the Cheslatta (Map 21) and Oweekeno (Map 26) — have suspended talks at the BC-TC, concentrating on IMAs. Others — like the In-SHUCK'ch/N'Quatqua, Ts'kw'aylaxw (Pavilion) and Xaxli'p (Fountain) — have withdrawn. Five agreements-in-principle that might have been acceptable pre-\textit{Delgamuu}k — the Se'shalte and Dididaht/Pacheedaht (both 1999), the Lheit Li'cen (Map 67[a]) and NNTC (both 2000), and Sliammon (2001) — were rejected by their communities as inadequate.
ukw reset the lands claim table in First Nations' favour, and those Gitxsan map(ping)s were directly responsible.

**Mapping the Nisga'a Treaty**

On this note, then, I turn to the resolution of one comprehensive claim that, if never quite front and center in my own adventure, has provided one of its most basic subtexts — the 1999 *Nisga'a Treaty*. Although negotiated outside the BCTC (because started before the BCTC was brought into existence), it not only again confirms that First Nations' cartography is, and always will be, fundamental to the satisfactory resolution of the Indian land question, but shows how, at the point of resolution, the function, purpose and context of First Nations' maps changes once more.

In broad outline, the terms of the treaty are roughly consistent with those applied to the 'north of 60' treaties of the late 1980s and early 1990s. It provides for communal Nisga'a governance over 1,992 km² of land along the lower Nass (about 8% of the original claim on Map 15[a]), including surface and sub-surface resources; a wildlife co-management zone over a much larger area encompassing the upper Nass watershed; 18% of the after-conservation Nass River catch; the elimination of Indian Act tax exemption by 2011; and $190 million for capacity building purposes. For the sovereignists, opposed to the land selection model, it wasn't enough; for an immigrant society, much of it opposed to land selection *tout court*, it was too much. It also reopened old wounds between the Nisga'a and Gitanyow, and between Nisga'a houses supporting it and those (such as at Gingolx [Kincolith]) that did not. Most importantly, though, it

---

86 Recall the discussion in Chapter 1.

87 Recall the border dialogues evoked across Maps 15, 22, 57, 58 and 63. This overlap, the source of the differences in interpretation of the 1913 *Nisga'a Petition* (see, again, the discussion in Sterritt N. et. al. *Tribal Boundaries*, op. cit.), was a product of extensive intermarriage in the upper Nass watershed in the protohistoric period. It only became an issue when government negotiators, operating in a 'first-past-the-post' environment, failed to properly disentangle rights of *use* from rights of *ownership*.

88 The Kincolith argued that Nisga'a negotiators were mostly from the other three villages, and traded off lands desired by the Kincolith in order to secure larger apportionments upriver (see, in this connection,
creates two categories of land that had not hitherto existed in this province — fee simple Nisga'a Lands (Map 97a) and Nisga'a wildlife comanagement lands (97b) — even as it eliminates one that had been one of its most basic features — the reserves. And it is by punctuating my travels with these two maps that I want to raise three final points.

The first is that while the Nisga'a Treaty confirms that First Nations have every right to call themselves 'nations', it may evoke a new kind of 'nationalism'. The cultural historian Benedict Anderson has argued that all nations are essentially 'imagined communities', constituted in the main through an awareness of linguistic unity. Real nationalism, however, only emerges when language is inscribed in various forms of 'print technology', because it is only then that ideas of popular sovereignty required for the formation of nation-states can be disseminated across vast distances. For Anderson, this is accomplished in three registers: the map, because it classifies territories; the census, because it categorizes bodies; and the museum, because it inserts cultures in an evolutionary schematic. Indeed, he claims that the modern concept of the nation-state as a sociological organism looming out of an immemorial past and gliding calendrically into a limitless future first emerged not in Europe, but at the edges of empire, in the colonies. For it was there that the re-arrangement of indigenous frontiers by exported administrative cartels created both the fixed territorial boundaries required by independent states, and the historical 'depth-of-field' prerequisite to the preservation of imagined communities and the birth of nationalism as an ideological force. In this manner, nation-states came to appear as transcendent, absolute and truthful, and so long as they did so, it was "the magic of nationalism to turn chance into destiny."

Matthew Stewart, 'Nisga'a treaty faces obstacles as agreement nears' Raven's Eye 1[11], Mar 98, 3). The problem, of course, is that much traditional Kincolith land is now on the west side of Observatory Inlet, in American territory.  

89 This section owes most to a series of arguments worked out in Imagined Communities, op. cit.  

90 Ibid., Chapter 10.  

91 Zygmunt Baumann (in 'Soil, blood and identity' Sociological Review 40[4], 675-701) has made a similar point.  

92 Anderson, B. Imagined Communities, op. cit., 12.
Map 97(a-b)
Nisga'a Lisims Government's (NLG), Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs' (MAA), and Ministry of Indian Affairs and Northern Development's (DIAND) Map of Nisga'a Lands (a) and Nass Wildlife Area (b), Ottawa, 1999, each 26 x 43 cm; show two categories of land created under the terms of the first (and so far only) modern comprehensive claims agreement concluded in British Columbia. With all the finality that a Cartesian perspective on territory allows, (a) highlights the smaller portion of the Nass watershed (in green) now owned 'lock, stock and barrel' by the Nisga'a Nation; the main villages and physical features are in the contemporary Nisga'a orthography. The small scale map (b) shows the larger area (in tan) over which Nisga'a have wildlife co-management rights. (It is the northeast portion of this area that Gitanyow argue is theirs [recall Maps 57, 58 and 63]). Each also shows pockets excluded from the treaty because of their prior inclusion in either the Gingietl Creek Ecological Reserve 115 or the Ahlhuut'ukwsim Laxmihl Angwinga'asanskwhl Nisga'a. Over a century in the making, the area depicted in (a) comprises but 8% of the original claim but what I wonder will be the non-Native reaction when it is first carved out, live and in colour, on the Map of British Columbia? When the template suggested is applied, as it may be, to 50 other treaties under the auspices of the BCTC? And given the question of constitutionally entrenched jurisdiction that is embodied by (b), what does it suggest about the safeguards allegedly built into a 'first-past-the-post' negotiating process? Indeed what is to become of the Gitanyow, who have seen the transfer of a goodly portion of their traditional territory to Nisga'a or provincial government co-management boards? (both copied from originals in NLG, MAA and DIAND, Nisga'a Final Agreement [Ottawa: Federal Treaty Negotiation Office], 253-4 and 405-6 Appendix respectively).
But as these Nisga'a maps suggest, other destinies are at play here. As the geographer David Kaplan has stated, "spatial identity reflects not only different nationalisms, but different conceptions of nationalism."\(^9^3\) From a First Nations perspective, imagined communities have also been constituted in three registers: narratives, because they spatially legislate indigenous territories; genealogies, because they insert bodies in a dense web of kin relations; and ceremonial practices, because it was mainly through these that archives of cultural knowledge were sustained. It is in these registers that Native people also imagine themselves as 'looming out of an immemorial past and gliding into a limitless future'. The difference is that this historical depth-of-field is already profound; they have no need for a putative reconstruction of 'pre-indigenous' sovereignties. Post-contact, narratives have been embellished by maps, genealogies by censuses, and ceremonial practices by cultural centers, but they have been incorporated, not inscribed. It is on this view that while Map 97 is not the map of a nation-state, it is the map of a nationalism in its most pure form. And it is in this sense that Anderson's argument that all nationalisms spring from the examination of the most final of finalities — namely, death — is only a roundabout way of saying that all nationalisms arise in continuity — the one and only condition that consigns death to a future that will never arrive.

Second, if the cultural theorist Marshall Berman is right that modernity is characterized by the fleeting and contingent present on the one hand, and the immutable and traditional past on the other,\(^9^4\) then First Nations people may well be the true moderns in British Columbia today. Only they can remember what it was like to live in the province's pre-modern antecedent. For several generations, Native ideas, values and traditions were unable to create their own space; "in order to sustain themselves they [had to appeal] to an obsolete historicity, or assume folkloric or quaint aspects."\(^9^5\) No longer.

\(^{93}\) In 'Two nations in search of a state: Canada's ambivalent spatial identities' Annals of the Association of American Geographers 84(4), 1994, 585-606, quote is 586, emphasis in original.
\(^{94}\) In All That Is Solid Melts Into Air (New York: Penguin, 1982).
\(^{95}\) Lefebvre, H. Production, op. cit., 417.
That eternal and immutable past is being reinvented, and made continuous with a contingent and fleeting present. All the map(ping)s in this study confirm that tradition "deserves to be considered in the modernization process, since it is not essential that it be discarded in order to modernize." As the philosopher Hans-George Gadamer has put it, "even the most genuine and pure tradition does not persist because of the inertia that once existed. It needs to be affirmed, embraced, cultivated." But it may be Map 97 that provides a concrete geographical confirmation of the Haida artist Robert Davidson's argument that, "the only way tradition can be carried on is to keep inventing new things." As Berman said, real moderns do not insist that one sacrifices the past in order to be modern. It is when modernism succeeds in sloughing off its past that it ceases to be modern at all.

Third, Map 97 further confuses the issue of whether or not British Columbia can be considered a 'postcolonial state'. Objectively, as the cultural critic Anne McClintock argues, the term implies the temporal crossing of a historical divide, a supersession of generalized western History by the local histories of indigenous groups. Geographically, it implies the transcendence of the neo-colonial state through the concrete valorization of alternative cultural spaces. Subjectively, as Bhabha insists, it might be better to conceive post-coloniality as a condition that is still being 'worked through', a fracturing and reassembling of authenticities and identities at the borderlines of cultural translation. Still others, like the literary critic Aijiz Ahmad state that the real world does

---

96 Lance Roberts, in 'Becoming modern: Some reflections on Inuit social change' in Ian Getty and Antoine Lussier (eds), As Long as the Sun Shines and Water Flows (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1983), 299-316, quote is 311.
98 On a painting caption at the exhibition, Northwest Innovations, Evergreen Cultural Center, Coquitlam, July 8 to Sept 1, 2001.
99 In All That is Solid, op. cit., 333-46.
101 In The Location, op. cit.
not consist of perpetual undecidability and that to endorse hybridity as Bhabha does is to certify transnational capital and the *status quo*. In arguing that no anti-colonial agenda can reference itself from outside the imperial trace, the feminist theorist Gayatri Spivak, effectively dismisses the postcolonial as a useful conceptual category altogether.

As I have argued in this study, however, it ultimately depends on perspective. For immigrant intellectuals, a condition of postcoloniality implies some modicum of cultural empowerment, and the slow decline of colonial discourse. For indigenous peoples, it means the elision of anti-colonial discourse, and the satisfactory resolution of territorial claims. For most First Nations in British Columbia, neither of these conditions hold. They are engaged in postcolonial projects, but any experience of "postcoloniality necessarily follows and is highly engaged with colonialism," and their claims continue to operate out of what is at best "indigenized colonized space." To a point, the Nisga'a are in the same boat. The Nisga'a have pursued claims to territory through an argument that the geographer Alexander Murphy calls an 'historical justification' and to this extent have been operating on the equivalent terrain of the cartographic eye/I. Their form of self-government does not allow them to draft laws or policy inconsistent with the Canadian constitution. For the foreseeable future, their post-treaty identity will be inflected with the sensibilities of the colonial intervention, and a set of anti-colonial discourses involving resistance to them. But on Map 97 the Nisga'a *have* crossed a historical

102 In 'The politics of literary postcoloniality' *Race and Class* 36(3), 1995, 12-17; See, also, Arif Dirlik, 'The postcolonial aura: Third World criticism in the age of global capitalism' *Critical Inquiry* 20, 1994, 328-56.


106 Yousef Gotlieb, in 'Retrieving life space from colonized space' *Political Geography* 11(5) 1992, 461-4, quote is 461.

watershed and constituted an alternate cultural space in which they can determine their own destiny. On Map 97, as Bhabha would have it, 'newness has entered the world'.

Indeed, the most telling visual statement on Map 97 is the faint outline of the reserves. Until 1999, these lines were hard, a visceral reminder of the colonial intervention, and the figurations of the cartographic eye/I on the Map of British Columbia. But on Map 97, now hanging by their fingernails off the edges of this brand new space that is the Nisga'a Nation, they are but phantoms. I am reminded of the philosopher Jean Baudrillard's claim that in this postmodern world, "the territory no longer precedes the map, nor survives it....it is the map that...engenders the territory." From the Nisga'a perspective, however, it is exactly the opposite. From their viewpoint, their territories have always preceded the map. From this perspective the Nisga'a are the one First Nation in British province that has achieved, for themselves, a condition of genuine post-coloniality.

This takes us to the real paradox of First Nations' cartography. As important as it is for filling in the blank spaces on the Map of British Columbia; as important as it is as a form of cross-cultural conversation (between First Nations, and between colonizer and colonized); as important as it is in allowing incorporating cultures to sustain continuity in the face of changed conditions: it is precisely at the point that it actualizes territorial claims that it is finally revealed as the most fleeting, the most ephemeral, the most superficial cartography of all. First Nations people display maps in band or tribal council offices and use them in educational curricula. A few, like Sindihl, paste them on their kitchen wall. But you will still never find a map in the feast, at the winter ceremonial, or at the pole-raising — where territories, genealogies, stories and laws continue to be witnessed and validated in the traditional manner.

108 In Simulations, op. cit., 2.
True, these mappings are no longer those employed before two-dimensional maps were added to Native culture. To the degree that much First Nations' cartography, and especially that worked through a GIS, has become "a semiotic practice temporally embedded and transformative of previous maps,"\textsuperscript{109} generations to come will find it more difficult to form geographical imaginaries in a wholly non-cartographic manner. But this is precisely the point of continuity. Pictographs, petroglyphs, dendroglyphs, masks or crests — these are all evidence that graphicity has always been part of the cultural apparatus by which oral cultures position themselves in a milieu. These representations have also changed over time as new ideas, imaginations and technologies were incorporated. The difference is that such graphicity has never been allowed to substitute for experience as it has on the Map of British Columbia. Clearly this does not mean that if and when a First Nation secures its own treaty there will no longer be a need for maps. The Nisga'a will need maps for self-government, educational curricula, and resource management just the same as anyone else. But they will be made on their terms, not at the behest of an immigrant society.

**Completing the Map of First National space**

As other First Nations seek to plant their flags on this freshly minted map of First National space, the outcome, as they say, is up to the settler society. Some of it can be accomplished right now, and with little or no cost. Non-Native British Columbians can learn to respect, and tread more softly on Native sites. Forestry and CMTs are a classic case in point. As the Ahousaht elder Stanley Sam has stated, CMTs "are the histories for our people. If you destroy [them], these histories will be destroyed. It is as if we went into a library, and ripped up the one and only existing copy of a history book."\textsuperscript{110} As Basil Joe and Henry Jack cautioned in Chapter 3, we can name sites more sensitive-\textsuperscript{109} Ryan, S. *The Cartographic Eye*, op. cit., 103.  
\textsuperscript{110} In *Ahousaht Wild Side*, op. cit., 91-2.
ly. As the anthropologist Ann Forbes puts it, "maps and boundaries...[and] traces on the land are ways of knowing....Naming the objects of our places is a way of entering into relationships with those places, of making them our own, of creating a home." It is when people are forced to "live in places according to boundaries, maps and names created elsewhere [that they] become alienated from those places." The mainstream media can present Native concerns in a more balanced manner. It should not show maps like Map 4 without some attempt to contextualize them. Headlines like 'Indian rebels plan to leave in body bags' and 'Natives put chokehold on CN' — which accompanied the images in Figures G(b) and PP respectively — fan more flames than they douse.

In my view, however, the invigoration of a treaty process presently stuck in neutral demands three things, all costly. The first and most obvious is to implement Delgamuukw in the spirit in which it was intended. The second is for the federal government to discharge its fiduciary responsibility by clearing up the backlog of specific claims (because in many cases, this is all that some First Nations are seeking). The third is to ask if Section 35 provides enough for a satisfactory resolution of the Indian land question outside the lower Nass. What Section 35 has effectively done is turn what had historically been a 'discourse of needs and obligations' — in which Native people asked settler governments to honour their need for land and resources — into a 'discourse of rights' — which is about freeing individuals from the excesses of government.

---

111 In 'Heirs to the land: Mapping the future of the Malaku-Barun' Cultural Survival Quarterly 18(4), 1995, 69-71, quote is 71. For accounts of the ways in which renamed indigenous places continue to empower neo-colonial discourse in other parts of the world (or how the re-application of indigenous names serves to destabilize it) see any of Rundstrom, R. 'Postmodernism', op. cit.; Basso, K. Wisdom, op. cit.; Jane Jacobs, "Shake 'im this country": the mapping of the Aboriginal sacred in Australia – the case of Coronation Hill' in Peter Jackson and Jan Penrose (eds), Constructions of Race, Place and Nation (London: UCL Press, 1993), 100-18; or RDK Herman, The Aloha State: Place names and the anti-conquest of Hawai'i Annals of the Association of American Geographers 89(1), 1999, 76-102.

112 As of this writing, there are approximately 450 specific claims awaiting resolution in Canada. Of these, over half are in British Columbia, and of those a third go back to the mid-1970s.

113 Because rights discourse allows First Nations to make legal arguments consistent with notions of rights immanent to constitutional, liberal democracies, some commentators have defended this turn (see, for example, Alan Hunt, 'Rights and social movements: Counter-hegemonic strategies' Journal of Law and Society 17[3], 1990, 307-28.). Skeptics argue that by discounting ways in which cohorts have historically been treated unequally, there is little understanding that equality now only arises through a
problem is that Aboriginal rights are being determined in court — which brings First Nations right back to the problem of judicial unpredictability noted above. I am not arguing that rights discourse be abandoned. As Berger has noted, "[t]o recognize Aboriginal rights is to understand the truth of our own history while, for the Native people, such recognition is the means by which they may achieve a distinct and contemporary place in Canadian life." Nor am I suggesting that rights discourse has not advanced First Nations' claims. Indeed, the Nisga'a negotiated their treaty largely within this framework. But it took 118 years and we cannot expect other First Nations to wait that long. I am suggesting that First Nations' land claims cannot be taken to that level until and unless we exhume the discourse of needs and obligations, yoke to it the discourse of rights, and, in so doing, create what amounts to a discourse of space. Delgamuukw has shown where to look. But we still must go there. It is only by grappling directly with the multivalent geographical structures in these map(ping)s that unique and distinct First Nations' needs for land and resources can be respected for what they are. And it is only when respected that they can be properly obligated.

But if an immigrant society is going to insist that First Nations make maps to prove that they have lived, worked and played, where they are, for a very long time, it has to understand that they do so because they have to—not because they especially want to. It has to acknowledge that geographies constituted through multiple senses might not represent very well in a two-dimensional register. It has to understand that overlap is part of what makes indigenous territorialities unique, distinct and to a point incommen-

recognition of difference in the past, or that the dogmatic insistence on formal equality might lead to unequal outcomes (see, for example, Joel Bakan, 'Constitutional interpretation and social change: You can't always get what you want [nor what you need]' Canadian Bar Review 70, 1991, 307-28).


115 In The Long, op. cit., 219.

urable with our own. It has to accept that just as "stories have no meaning unless one accepts the rules of the story-telling game," so also do maps, when approached through the map(ping)s from which they spring, "become their own cultural interpreters." In a word, an immigrant society has to expand its perspective. In moving from inscription to incorporation, it has to learn to journey against the grain, to reach across frontiers, to sense beneath surfaces. It has to 'see beyond seeing' to cross that horizon where the very language, terms or definitions that it uses must either be changed into something different, or suspended altogether. It cannot be imposed from outside. It can only come from within the mappings themselves. It is a huge challenge, but one that everyone of us — judges, treaty negotiators, academics, the public — must take up. The lives of peoples hang in the balance.

117 Sylvia Tomasch, in 'Mappae Mundi and "the Knight's Tale": The geography of power, the technology of control' in Mark Greenberg and Lance Schachterle (eds) Literature and Technology, Research in Technology Studies Vol. 5 (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 1992), 66-98, quote is 89.
Postscript

In the end, this dissertation is both less and more than what I anticipated when I began. While it has the look and feel of one, it is, on the one hand, no atlas, either in the conventional or historical sense. At best it has but skimmed the surface of worlds that are more gargantuan and impenetrable than our own. There are many missing plates, and some of them are not yet available anyway. Beyond that, atlases are inevitably about roads already travelled, and there is too much of the traveller in this study for it to qualify. On the other, by expanding our definition of cartography, and by learning how to interpret the mappings in which maps sit, the study has allowed us to journey through some of these worlds more deeply, and I hope less voyeuristically, than any atlas could possibly allow. The result is more like three travelogues whose points of departure and arrival are laid out in a book of maps, but between which maps proper are of increasingly marginal utility.

This, it seems to me, is what it all comes down to. If only because they have had to, Native people have already learned how — the question is whether or not an immigrant society is prepared to be like a traveller also. To move between perspectives as readily as it moves between points on the Map of British Columbia? What I did not fully comprehend at the start is that we often discover more of the world obliquely, by inference and intuition, than by confronting it directly, with eyes so wide open that we overlook what really matters. Yes, maps are about power. First Nations knew this long before western academics figured it out. What this traveller found, however, was that it was never really about maps at all. It was always about land and resources, and a form of self-government that preserves the values that peoples ascribe to them.

What I remember most is not the long hours on the trail, the countless presentations, the emotional rollercoaster of stumbling across a piece of cartographic exotica one day only to wander down a dead end the next, or the trials and tribulations of trying to force into a procrustean bed something that has always resided beyond theory. It was the ex-
periences — standing on the bluff at Xats’ull, as a warm September breeze blew and the Fraser roiled in the gorge below...reading Tsilhqot’in narratives while tenting alone in a pitch-dark campsite at Telhiqox, and getting so spooked I had to sleep in the car...driving the Nisga'a Highway to the lava plains of Tseax, over the new totem bridge to Gitlaxdamks, and then by boat to the oolichan camp at Fishery Bay...sitting with the Lax Ganeda in a yukw at Gitwangak, and witnessing a Lax Gibuu wilp pass on their names, pdeek and territories as they had done for centuries...pondering the lichen-covered Nu-xalk petroglyphs around the crystal pools of Squmalh as it tumbled towards the Bella Coola River...the potholed landscape of Keatley Creek, all that was left of the pithouses that were the architecture of a place where nations met...sitting in Alec Johnny's house over coffee at Noolkhil Bun, listening to his stories about keyohs, tsachuns and ancient quarries — it was these experiences that left the most lasting impressions on me. I will never be able to think about or look at British Columbia in quite the same way again. I still take maps with me when I travel this place, but they are not the Maps that I used to take. If this study has conveyed even the smallest sense of that experience to others — even though it has had to do so, on the face of it, through experience's very antithesis — then its purpose will have been served.

We should not, of course, romanticize this world, even though I personally found it difficult not to. The political differences across and between, and often right down the middle of First Nations' families and clans are real. So is the alienation, the lack of opportunity, and the dysfunctional social fabric that still suffuses too many First Nations' communities. I still find it hard to get my head around the dissonance between the impoverishment that seemed so visible on so many reserves, and the phantasmal images that were being evoked on the maps produced within them. But I also found a generosity, a pragmatism, and an indefatigable spirit that we seem to have lost sight of in the non-Native world. And isn't it precisely this lack that underlines the malaise and anxst of late modernity on the northwestern edge of Turtle Island?
As I write these last words, a new, plainly neo-liberal government has made it fairly clear that it is not that interested in a fair and just settlement of the Indian land question. While still in opposition it tried to have the Nisga'a Treaty declared unconstitutional. It lost. Now in power it has instead launched a public referendum, ostensibly designed to clarify the limits of Aboriginal rights and self-government and to secure a mandate for a re-invigoration of a treaty process that has so far failed to generate a single agreement. But land claims are not about rights, and the few offers that have been made to Native claimants are so parsimonious that guaranteed jurisdiction over sufficient land and resources is not possible, now or in the future. Native people have responded with a new round of court challenges, and the rhetoric of civil disobedience, more or less dormant through much of the 1990s, is back. Meanwhile, the government, defending itself as the 'landlord of the province', is rushing to open up every last corner to third party interests. My own view is that a settler society has always been a tenant whose rent is in arrears, but even if one were to accept this argument the evidence is that it has not done a very good job. A geographical habitus that was tethered together, and sustained, for a very long time indeed, in some equitable, if often precarious, balance between fulfilling immediate needs and meeting future obligations has, in the space of a few generations, been brought to the point where such a balance no longer seems possible. We need to learn more, not less, about alternatives, and one well-tested model, it seems to me, is already out there in front of us. It is there, in these map(ping)s — if we are willing to take a look at them. That is what is required for all of us to begin taking a more considered look at ours, and, at the end of the day, start building a future that has room for both.
Glossary

Gitxsanimx (Gitxsan language) Chapter 4

*adaawk*  
roughly, an oral archive of laws, stories, songs and imagery comprising real historical geographies and explaining Gitxsan land tenure system

*amsiiwa*  
white people

*andamahlasxw*  
roughly, an oral archive of codes, rules and moral imperatives comprising creation narratives and explaining Gitxsan cosmology

*anliit'iiisxw*  
cornerpost, blazed tree or stump marking boundary

*a ammoos*  
crest

*daxgyet*  
gabled timber dwelling

*gali't'ul*  
roughly, identity and power

*gilhast*  
village, settlement

*gyet'im gan*  
first totem pole

*huwilp*  
dendroglyph, territorial marker

*kungax*  
plural of *wilp*

*limx'oy*  
roughly, the Wet'suwet'en oral archive having elements of both *adaawk* and *andamahlasxw* dirge, funeral or clan song

*matx*  
mountain goat

*naxnox*  
roughly, spirit power, vision, or supernatural entity

*pdeoek*  
exogamous clan or phratry

*simo'oget*  
corporate house chief

*wilt'ul*  
totem pole place

*wilnat'ahl*  
related corporate house groups

*wilp*  
corporate house group

*xsiiisxw*  
peace treaty, pact

*xwtsaan*  
totem pole

*yukw*  
feast, potlatch

Dakelh (Carrier language) Chapter 5

*'awhnaduti*  
circumferential road or trail

*balhats*  
feast, potlatch

*beyunwoodal'en*  
roughly, landmark(ing)

*bungun*  
lake

*chunthooyoh*  
cabin

*chus shun*  
paddling song

*deneza*  
male clan chief

*duk'w'ahke*  
system of syllabic writing

*duneyun*  
personal song

*dzulh*  
mountain, reaching above treeline
hukw'einli  tributary stream
keyoh  Roughly, trapline, but also home, country, residence, place of livelihood, etc.
khunai ti  animal trail
koh  river, stream
lhatusti  trail to the other side
lhatuswheti  trail across, intersection
lhghaneinilni  end of visible current in a stream
lhghaninli  meandering stream
nati  crossroad
nede  white people
nekuzduke shun  travelling song
'ndi  fish weir
noo  island
nutsi  clan crest
thenkoh  personal crest
ti  trail, path, road, etc.
tizdli  outlet of a lake
tl'oohlbeayaduk  telegraph wire, telephone, etc.
tsachun  above ground food cache
tsekeza  female clan chief
tsekhene  Sekani language
ts'al  diaper moss
uda'dune  culture hero, long ago people
'uka' tist'elh  hunting song
'uyak'unulh'a  Labrador tea
(whu)t'en(ne)  residents, people of a named place
yunk'eguz  roughly, map, drawing of the earth
yus  hill, mountain below treeline

Halq'eméylem (Stó:lō language) Chapter 6

iltexwáwtxw  shed style longhouse
lats'umexw  different people, people of a different language
sasq'ets  sasquatch
shxwémetsel  fisher, marten
shxwexwó:s  thunderbird
shxwlá:m  shaman, Indian doctor
si:lhqey  two headed serpent
siyá:m  smelá:lh extended family leader
skwetxwówelht'o:mél  carved or painted internal house post
skw'iyéth  slave families
smelá:lh  worthy families who know their history
smilka  winter dance
smilka  smilka
smókw'e'álá  mortuary box
sqémél
sqwelqwel

sóhl téméxw
sqwelqwel

roughly, an oral archive consisting of true stories, real temporal events

sohl temexw

the Stó:lō universe, cosmological and corporeal

st'láleqem

supernatural entities, spirits, monsters

stl'éléq

feast, potlatch

s't'ëxem

worthless families who don't know their history

st'i:lém

travelling song

stó:lō

river, stream

stotelō

slough, backwater

sxwó:xwiyám

carved or painted external house post

sówl:mexw

roughly, an oral archive of stories, laws, moral directives, and imagery that explain origins and the cultural, physical and spiritual composition of the world

sxwó:yxwey

special kind of mask used as cleansing instrument

syówe

seer, prophet

syuwel

roughly, guardian spirit or spirit power

tel swayel

foundational ancestors, first men, sky-born people

temexw

moon

t'láhehm qó

salt water

t'liteqo spá:th

or slahtlahkum, large underwater bear

xá:xa

spiritually potent or taboo places

xexá:ls

transformers, but variously changers, tricksters, magicians, etc.

xó:tsa

lake

xwelmextem

white people, starving or hungry people

xwelmexw

same people, people who speak the same language

xwelmxawtxw

ceremonial longhouse
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