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Abstract

In the updated and restored 2019 edition of *Halfbreed*, Métis writer Maria Campbell introduces the Cree word, kwaskastahsowin, to describe what it means to seek conciliation or to “put things to right.” By focusing on what it means to “put things to right” in the context of twentieth-century publishing in Canada, this dissertation considers the ways that Indigenous women writers working within the Canadian publishing industry have been negatively impacted by intersecting issues of colonialism, race, and gender. My project explores Campbell’s definition of *kwaskastahsowin* in relation to two key twentieth-century works of Indigenous women’s writing in Canada: E. Pauline Johnson’s *Legends of Vancouver* (1911) and Maria Campbell’s *Halfbreed* (1973). Using a decolonial case-study approach that combines archival/digital methods with Indigenous editorial principles and protocols, my project focuses on the literary and storytelling contributions of three Indigenous women authors – E. Pauline Johnson (Mohawk), Mary Agnes Capilano (Sḵwx̱wú7mesh), and Maria Campbell (Métis) – and situates their authorial contributions and publishing experiences within the larger context of twentieth-century Canadian publishing. My project uses archival research to interrogate the publishing contexts and histories of these texts, and reveals the extent to which colonial issues of voice and editorial intervention have shaped the published works. Furthermore, by approaching the various editions of these two texts with a focus on their shifting “paratexts” (Genette) or critical frameworks over time, I draw attention to the lasting impacts of such editorial interventions (as evidenced by the two excised and recently-recovered pages from Campbell’s *Halfbreed*, detailing her sexual assault by members of the RCMP, and through evidence of Johnson’s preferred title for the *Legends of Vancouver* collection). My examination of the publishing histories of these two key Indigenous texts reveals the urgency with which other works of twentieth-century Indigenous literature must be re-examined, and simultaneously calls for a necessary reenvisioning of the Indigenous literary paratext – one that takes into account Indigenous editorial principles and protocols.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

In the afterword to Métis writer Maria Campbell’s new edition of her autobiographical work *Halfbreed* (2019), she introduces the Cree concept of *kwaskastahsowin* to describe the processes and actions associated with “conciliation.” That Campbell uses this word to describe her relationship with McClelland and Stewart today is extraordinarily significant, as it gestures towards the weight of Campbell’s decision to republish with the same publisher who silenced her 45 years prior; it is an example of what reconciliation, of working towards repairing relationships, looks like within a contemporary publishing system. This was not the first time that I had encountered this term, as Campbell also spoke about the role of *kwaskastahsowin* at the 2019 Indigenous Literary Studies Association (ILSA) conference held on the unceded, traditional, and ancestral territories of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam) Nation. In this context, she explained that there is no word for “reconciliation” in the Cree, Michif, and Salteaux languages – instead, Campbell prefers to use the Cree term,

---

1 As a research assistant for Deanna Reder’s *The People and the Text: Indigenous Writing in Northern North America up to 1992* project since 2016, my approach to Indigenous research ethics has been informed and shaped by my experiences working directly with Indigenous literatures, traditional knowledge, and Indigenous peoples; as such, my ethics clearance for this dissertation (in which my RA work has been closely linked) falls under Reder’s project. Throughout my dissertation, I have prioritized ethical research practices and have maintained the highest possible standards of “continuous consent,” while being mindful of the longstanding mistrust of academics/researchers within Indigenous communities. To resist conventional research paradigms, I have not required Indigenous collaborators to provide official written consent for any quoted materials in this dissertation, but rather have worked to develop relationships of trust (with Campbell, the Mathias family) throughout this process. To understand the proper ways of thanking my collaborators according to Coast Salish protocols of gift-giving, I also learned from an Indigenous mentor, Deanna Reder (Cree-Métis), how to prepare tobacco ties – I presented these to both Campbell and the Mathias family when asking for permission to work on the materials included in this dissertation. In addition to these protocols for working with Indigenous collaborators, I have consulted with all quoted contributors and received approval to cite from our personal correspondences/interviews.
kwaskastahsowin, which she defined as “to put things to right.” I consider this concept of “conciliation” to be one that encapsulates the work of this dissertation, in its aim to understand decisions made within Canada’s publishing industry throughout the twentieth-century and to, in a small way, “put things to right.”

We can consider the concept of kwaskastahsowin in relation to two key twentieth-century works of Indigenous women’s writing in Canada: Legends of Vancouver (1911) and Halfbreed (1973). In the 1911 publication for which she is best known, Legends of Vancouver, Kanien’kehá:ka writer E. Pauline Johnson (Tekahionwake\(^5\)) presents a series of Coast Salish legends, based on the oral narratives of her esteemed friends and storytellers, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Chief Joe Capilano (Sahp-luk\(^6\))

---


\(^3\) I would like my readers to know that this dissertation addresses Maria Campbell’s sexual assault as a 14-year-old girl by an RCMP officer. Part of the urgency and importance of kwaskastahsowin for Campbell is a recognition of and sense of closure from this experience. Please note that while I discuss this event in greater detail in Chapter 4, I have done my best to not replicate this violence; instead, I aim to show its repercussions through an analysis of the inappropriate silencing of this violence that occurred on an editorial level.

\(^4\) Throughout this dissertation, I employ a range of terms when referring to members of Indigenous Nations, reflecting specific contexts of use. For example, I use the terms “Mohawk” and “Iroquois” when referring to E. Pauline Johnson and her writing, using the terms that she would have used to describe herself. Today, the term “Kanien’ke-há:ka” is being used instead of “Mohawk” to describe the Mohawk people, or People of the Flint (see Alfred xxv), and the term “Haudenosaunee” is used to refer to the Iroquois or Six Nations (see Monture, We Share Our Matters xi) – and I use these terms when referring to these communities at present time. I use the term “Indigenous” to refer to the original peoples of North America and their descendants, and employ nation-specific names (i.e. xʷməθkʷəy̓əm, Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, Métis) whenever possible. When using the term “Indian,” a term now considered outdated and offensive outside of legal contexts, I am either quoting this term directly or referring to its political use (i.e. the Indian Act).

\(^5\) Tekahionwake, meaning double wampum, was Johnson’s adopted Mohawk name — a name that belonged first to her great-grandfather, Jacob Johnson. She began using this name shortly after the death of her grandfather, John Smoke Johnson, in 1886, and began signing all her poems “E. Pauline Johnson” and “Tekahionwake” (Keller 7, 47). Of her use of both names, Strong-Boag & Gerson suggest that Tekahionwake was “adopted largely to enhance Johnson’s professional status” (Paddling Her Own Canoe, pp. 116-7), as in her personal life she was known as “Pauline” to her friends and “Paul” to her siblings.

\(^6\) Sahp-luk was Chief Joe Capilano’s ancestral Sḵwx̱wú7mesh name. Though Sahp-luk is the modern spelling (see Fee and Nason, Tekahionwake: E. Pauline Johnson’s Writings on Native North America), this name has also previously been written as Su-á-pu-luck (see Strong-Boag and Gerson, Paddling Her Own Canoe).
and Mary Agnes Capilano (Lixwelut⁷). However, due to Johnson’s ill health during the
time of publication, the published collection ultimately reflected a series of editorial
interventions – through the selection of stories to include, and the titling of the collection
– that were beyond Johnson’s authorial control. Over 60 years after the publication of
Legends of Vancouver, Métis author Maria Campbell would face similar challenges as
she endeavoured to publish an account of her life’s story with prominent Canadian
publisher McClelland and Stewart. In Campbell’s Halfbreed (1973), she describes a
childhood spent in extreme poverty in northern Saskatchewan during the 1940s and 50s,
and the struggles with domestic violence, addiction, and survival that defined Campbell’s
adulthood as a Métis woman. Campbell’s book also importantly recollected many shared
family stories and histories, and gave voice both to the “road allowance people” and an
emerging Métis consciousness. Though initially around 700 handwritten pages, this text
was revised to less than 200 typed pages – with two key pages removed without her
permission – as a necessary condition of publication.

By considering what it means to “put things to right” in the context of twentieth-
century Canadian publishing, this dissertation aims to highlight the ways that Indigenous
women working within the Canadian publishing industry have been negatively impacted
by intersecting issues of colonialism, race, and gender. To do this, my dissertation
reassesses the publication history of three Indigenous writers and storytellers – E.
Pauline Johnson (Tekahionwake), Mary Agnes Capilano (Lixwelut), and Maria Campbell
– using a decolonial case-study approach that combines archival methods and
Indigenous editorial methodologies. Though Mary Capilano did not “write” anything as

⁷ Lixwelut, also spelled Lay-hu-lette (see Morton, Capilano: The Story of a River, 1970) or Lay-Kho-
Lote (see “Princess Mary Capilano: Birth a Century Ago Sealed Peace Between Warring Tribes” in
The New York Times, 17 Dec. 1940, p. 25), meaning “the beginning of the world,” was Mary Agnes
Capilano’s ancestral Skwxwú7mesh name.
far we know (defined narrowly as text on a page), I consider her an “author” because of her authority as a widely recognized storyteller and keeper of knowledge, and as the source of many of Johnson’s *Legends* stories in which she often appears as a narrator. Furthermore, if we consider acts of writing, storytelling, and passing on knowledge more broadly, Mary Capilano’s basketry can also be “read” and understood as an important material expression of Indigenous knowledge set within specific cultural and interpersonal relationships. Thus, in this dissertation I am extending the notion of “writer” to include Mary’s storytelling contributions as authorial; I also refer to her basketry as potentially providing a frame by which to understand and read her stories. My approach critically considers the ways in which the Canadian publishing industry has misedited, dismissed, or silenced the literary contributions of these twentieth-century Indigenous women authors; it draws on archival evidence, publishing histories, and literary representation to identify the impact of settler colonialism on select cases of twentieth-century Indigenous women’s literary production and publishing in Canada. Most importantly, my dissertation uses archival research to engage in *kwaskastahsowin*, to “put things to right” by those Indigenous writers whose authorial intentions were misrepresented due to colonial power imbalances in publishing, and to make a case for the necessity of returning to other twentieth-century works of Indigenous literature and examining their contexts of publication.

My dissertation is theoretically grounded in the concept of the shifting “paratext,” or the ways in which these works of Indigenous literature have historically been framed across versions and throughout different historical and political contexts. In French literary theorist Gerard Genette’s *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (1997), Genette defines the “paratext” as “those liminal devices and conventions, both within and outside the book, that form part of the complex mediation between book, author, publisher, and
reader” (i). These devices include framing elements such as titles, forewords, prefaces, and afterwords, that effectively form the critical framework that often mediates our readings of literary texts. For example, in the 2015 edition of Mini Freeman’s *Life Among the Qallunaat*, additions to paratext include an interview with the author, and an afterword – both of these elements were not present in the original 1978 edition, but are included now to supplement an updated and critical reconsideration of the text as part of the University of Manitoba Press’s First Voices, First Texts series (an important publishing initiative in recovering neglected or out of print Indigenous texts).

Furthermore, by extending this notion of what exists “outside the book” to include archival materials, I am also arguing for the consideration of the archive as a form of paratext; the recovery of such materials and unpublished authorial contributions can fundamentally impact the ways in which we read these texts. Examining the shifting function of this critical framework in a selection of Indigenous literary works shows how the paratext becomes a means of locating each text within a specific historical context of Indigenous literary nationalism in Canada, and of tracing the presentation of these texts over time.

While arguing for a need to consider the margins of the text – its paratexts – I am also arguing for consideration of those Indigenous writers who are marginalized through the colonial processes of book production. To illustrate the relationship between Indigenous literatures and the paratext, I turn to settler scholar Sophie McCall’s definition of “told-to” narratives, which she describes as those collaboratively produced texts that involve multiple authorial figures – the oral storyteller, the field reporter, and the author, among others (5). Historically, issues with told-to narratives have been evident

---

throughout the paratext, as editors tend to “[claim] sole authorship on the title page” while acknowledging the important contributions of Indigenous authors as a kind of postscript. In recent years, however, McCall suggests that “new forms of the genre have emerged that emphasize process, debate, and exchange” (4); these important characteristics often become part of the paratext, accompanying the text in the form of a critical introduction or apparatus. Despite significant methodological differences between a “told-to” narrative (Johnson's *Legends of Vancouver*) and singly-authored autobiographical text (Campbell's *Halfbreed*), these two categories of Indigenous literature can both be examined through a consideration of their relationships to the paratext.

Though Genette’s concept of the paratext is useful in understanding the editorial changes to Indigenous texts over time, it is limited in that his European focus neglects to address colonial issues of voice, intervention, and authorship that are often representative of collaboratively-authored or “told-to” texts. In *Paratexts*, Genette acknowledges the limitations of his approach, stating, “Some elements (for example, the practices of non-European cultures) simply eluded me because I didn’t pay much attention to them or have enough information about them” (404). As a means of addressing and countering such theoretical limitations, my approach to the paratext is informed by a series of principles central to Indigenous editing and research methods as articulated by scholars including Gregory Younging (Cree), Kateri Akiwenzie-Damm (Anishinaabe), and Sophie McCall. My approach takes into account the importance of acknowledging Indigenous collaborators (McCall 2), of positioning oneself in relation to one’s work (Akiwenzie-Damm 32 and McKegney 84), of building relationships and trust (Younging, *Elements of Indigenous Style* 44-5 and Akiwenzie-Damm 33-4), and asking
for permission (Younging, *Elements of Indigenous Style* 92). I argue in my dissertation that these kinds of editorial principles must also be considered when interpreting the paratext in the context of Indigenous literatures.

Furthermore, I will also admit to struggling in justifying the use of Genette’s theories of the paratext so centrally in this project – of privileging a theoretical approach articulated by a settler scholar, who seemingly had no awareness of or concern for the impacts of colonialism on an Indigenous literary paratext. An ideal theoretical approach would have encapsulated all of these aforementioned paratextual concerns, but would also be informed by Indigenous editorial principles and, most importantly, be conceived and articulated by an Indigenous scholar. To my knowledge, such an approach did not exist. Moreover, as a non-Indigenous scholar, I understand part of my responsibility is to contest Eurocentrism that continues to shape academic inquiries, and my critique of Genette’s Eurocentrism in a small way advances that ongoing project. Instead, in pairing Genette’s theories of the “paratext” with Indigenous editorial principles, and putting this concept into dialogue with the works of Indigenous scholars, my approach in this dissertation aims to strengthen the concept of the “paratext” so that it might become relevant to Indigenous literary analyses.

I have already seen evidence of the value of this kind of approach, from Indigenous scholars who have referenced my “remix” of paratextual theory and its application to Indigenous literatures. For instance, UBC’s recent digital publishing initiative, *Ravenspace*, now hosts a digital edition of Elsie Paul’s 2014 text, *As I

---

9 Thank you to Iñupiaq scholar Rachel Taylor, whose Introduction in her Master of Publishing project provided a helpful example of how to articulate one’s interactions with Indigenous principles/protocols within a humanities research context. See Taylor, *Gathering Knowledges to Inform Best Practices in Indigenous Publishing* (2019).
Remember It: Teachings from the Life of a Sliammon Elder. In a corresponding web article titled “Our Process: Digital Remediation,” Paul’s grandson, Davis Mackenzie, discusses what it has meant for the book to take on a new, digital life. Mackenzie cites my work on the paratext (referring to my 2018 BC Studies article titled “Rethinking the Paratext”) in this article and explains: “Put simply, paratext in this digital book is meant to help the reader respectfully and intentionally engage with our teachings.” This concept of intentional engagement is key in understanding how a “remixed” approach to the paratext can be useful for Indigenous literatures and traditional knowledge – in print or in digital forms. In fact, we might also consider how Indigenous ways of “reading the land” – such as those articulated by Skwxwú7mesh scholar and archaeologist Rudy Reimer – can provide additional context and/or layers of meaning that exist beyond the boundaries of the Western archive. Through Reimer’s insights on the relationship between place and story, we can thus also recognize the land as a form of Indigenous paratext.10

With the release of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)’s 94 Calls to Action in 2015, addressing these issues of voice and editorial intervention common to twentieth-century collaboratively-produced texts presents an opportunity for literary scholars to engage in transformative, meaningful work that counters settler-colonial narratives. In addressing the implications of the TRC’s recommendations, Métis scholar Aubrey Hanson explains:

The recognition inherent in the Calls to Action that learning is necessary to social change is an important reminder that scholars and educators in literary studies have an opportunity to formulate conceptions of learning through literature that facilitate significant change—change that respects

10 See Interview in Appendix B, pp. 198-99.
the resurgence of Indigenous communities that is represented in
Indigenous literary arts. (81)

While Hanson identifies this emphasis on education presented in the TRC\(^{11}\) as a key
opportunity for literary scholars and educators to mobilize change, she fundamentally
questions reconciliation as a framework, citing Lee Maracle’s observations that
“reconciliation requires making restitution, which ‘only Canada as a governing body can’
do; and that the reconciliation framework in Canada right now, as articulated through the
work of the TRC… is not, she emphasizes, a response to the wider issues of settler
colonialism in Canada” (73). As an alternative, Hanson proposes the concept of “reading
for resurgence,” as a framework that “concentrates on regeneration within Indigenous
communities” (74) rather than focusing on the settler responses to colonial actions.

This idea of “resurgence”\(^{12}\) is also used within the context of Indigenous
feminism, a theoretical approach defined as one that “brings together two critiques,
feminism and anti-colonialism, to show how Aboriginal peoples, and in particular
Aboriginal women, are affected by colonialism and by patriarchy” (Green 23). Gina
Starblanket’s (Cree/Salteaux) article, “Being Indigenous Feminists: Resurgences Against
Contemporary Patriarchy,” introduces the concept of “resurgence” as a means of
challenging the ways in which colonial conceptions of sovereignty and nationhood have
affected Indigenous women; practices of resurgence, Starblanket argues, “involve
centring that which has been marginalized, reconstructing that which has been

\(^{11}\) Hanson cites recommendations from pages 1, 3, 6, 7, and 10 from the TRC as relating directly
to educational imperatives; she also notes that “an educational mandate is implied within or
requisite to a wide number of other recommendations for implementing culturally appropriate
programming or services” (80).

\(^{12}\) On the topic of resurgence, see also: Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Dancing on Our Turtle’s
Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence* (2011); and Leanne
Ethnic Studies* 2.2 (2016).
fragmented and communicating that which has been silenced” (25). This statement provides a concise description of what this dissertation aspires towards, by revisiting the works of three twentieth-century Indigenous women writers. Inspired by the tenets of Indigenous feminism, my approach aims to analyze – through a decolonial lens – the ways these writings have historically been framed, and to amplify those voices that have been overlooked.

As Hanson’s article convincingly articulates, many scholars within the fields of Indigenous literary studies consider the state-imposed concept of reconciliation as fraught with contradictions. In fact, settler scholar Keavy Martin “has argued that the concept of reconciliation relies upon a form of amnesia” (Hanson 73), in that the settler’s “fixation upon resolution” often leads to “forgetting” the past (Martin 49). Returning to Campbell’s assertion that no term for “reconciliation” exists in her Indigenous languages, this dissertation considers instead the ways that “decolonization” as a conceptual framework can provide opportunities for the recovery and resurgence of Indigenous women’s writing, as a means to “put things to right” within the context of twentieth-century Indigenous literatures. In using this term “decolonization,” I am referring specifically to Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang’s “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor” (2012), where the authors warn against the “easy absorption, adoption, and transposing of decolonization [as] yet another form of settler appropriation” (3). Instead, Tuck and Yang articulate the necessity of “unsettling” oneself within a decolonial framework, of coming to terms with actions that may be uncertain or lack a sense of finite resolution; in other words, to accept the processes and conversations surrounding decolonization as necessarily ongoing.

Over the last century, Indigenous writers have articulated and repeated their concerns about appropriation of voice, and representations of Indigenous persons in
mainstream literature. In 1892, E. Pauline Johnson’s newspaper article, “A Strong Race Opinion: On the Indian Girl in Modern Fiction,” made a critical interjection into the field of Canadian literature, demanding more realistic literary representations of Indigenous women. As a Kanien’kehá:ka woman writer publishing at the turn of the nineteenth century and in the wake of the 1876 Indian Act, Johnson’s interjection – though largely ignored at the time\(^\text{13}\) – is significant in that she identified key issues relating to race, gender, and colonialism that would continue impacting Indigenous women writers into the twentieth-century and beyond. But even Johnson’s writing was not immune to the twentieth-century colonial movement of “salvage ethnography,” an anthropological trend that positioned Indigenous culture as something dying that needed to be saved (Clifford). In fact, while Johnson used her unique position as both author and Indigenous proto-feminist to rewrite the “Indian” heroine, her stories can nonetheless be seen to attract similar criticisms of stereotyped Indigenous women – through overly romanticized language, references to a melancholic past – that she so vehemently rejected. Forced to find the balance between the competing roles of Indigenous advocate and struggling freelance writer, the superficial tensions often palpable in her writing speak to the difficulty of this position. As a result of this colonial context of production, Johnson’s literary contributions, alongside many other twentieth-century Indigenous writers, have often been dismissed as “corrupted” or “inaccurate.”

The decades that followed Johnson’s interjection, referred to by Armand Garnet Ruffo as the “dark days” (“Out of Silence” 212) of Indigenous literary production, were

\(^{13}\) Johnson’s “A Strong Race Opinion” was first reprinted in 2000 in Misao Dean’s *Early Canadian Short Stories: Short Stories in English Before World War I* (Tecumseh Press) and in 2002 in Gerson and Strong-Boag’s *E. Pauline Johnson, Tekahionwake: Collected Poems and Selected Prose* (UTP); it has since been reissued in whole or in part in a number of anthologies, including Fee and Nason’s *Takahionwake: E. Pauline Johnson’s Writings on Native North America* (2016) and Reder and Morra’s *Learn, Teach, Challenge: Approaching Indigenous Literatures* (2016).
characterized instead by the federal government’s efforts at assimilating Indigenous children through legislation that proved genocidal. Ruffo explains, “whatever Johnson’s critical and creative work may have encouraged from the next generation it would wither in insolation, neglect, and hostility as epitomized by the residential school system” (Ruffo, *Introduction to Indigenous Literary Criticism in Canada* xv). Though Indigenous literary production continued through the mid-twentieth-century, such contributions were, as Ruffo suggests, largely silenced by the effects of destructive federal policies meant to eradicate and/or assimilate Indigenous populations. Deanna Reder similarly notes that the books written by Edward Ahenakew (Cree), Mike Mountain Horse (Blackfoot), and Joseph Dion (Cree-Métis) were all published posthumously, mainly due to a “lack of support” – in terms of both opportunity and publication venues – during their lifetimes (“Indigenous Autobiography in Canada” 176). This absence of resources for twentieth-century Indigenous writers is also addressed by Akiwenzie-Damm: “Of those few who were able to retain knowledge of traditional storytelling or who had the abilities and skills to tell their own stories, few found opportunities for getting published” (30). Akiwenzie-Damm points to both Johnson and Campbell as examples of the few pre-1980s Indigenous women writers that challenged this status quo.14

Over one hundred years later, Johnson’s criticisms of Indigenous literary representations and appropriation of voice would be echoed by a surge of Indigenous women writers coming forward and speaking out about their publishing experiences. Coinciding with the 1990 land dispute between Kanien’kehá:ka protestors and the town of Oka, Quebec (known as the “Oka Crisis”), this moment is considered “a watershed for Indigenous literature and literary criticism in Canada” (Ruffo, *Introduction* xv) – and one

14 Akiwenzie-Damm also identifies George Copway, Duke Redbird, Howard Adams, Sarain Stump, Basil Johnson, and Harold Cardinal as other Indigenous writers who were published prior to 1980 in Canada (30), but Johnson and Campbell are notably the only women on this list.
that reflects the interconnectedness of Indigenous literary nationalism and activism in Canada. In an article published in *The Globe and Mail* on 26 January 1990, Anishinaabe writer Lenore Keeshig-Tobias accused Canadians of “stealing native stories,” and engaging in a “theft of voice”\(^\text{15}\) by appropriating Indigenous intellectual and storytelling identities. Stó:lō writer Lee Maracle expressed similar concerns in the Prologue of the 1990 edition of *Bobbi Lee, Indian Rebel*: “There are two voices in the pages of this book, mine and Donald Barnett’s… In the end, the voice that reached the paper was Don’s, the information alone was mine” (19).\(^\text{16}\) Though *Bobbi Lee* was first published in 1975 by the Marxist publishing house LSM (Liberation Support Movement), and recorded/edited by Don Barnett and Rick Sterling, it wasn’t until fifteen years later that Maracle openly addressed the issues of editorial intervention that characterized this “as-told-to” project. Also released during this “watershed” moment was German scholar Hartmut Lutz’s informative text *Contemporary Challenges: Conversations with Canadian Native Authors* (1991) in which, through a series of interviews with Indigenous writers, Lutz exposed the first-hand experiences and difficulties of contemporary Indigenous writers working within a colonial, culturally-hostile publishing industry.\(^\text{17}\)

In response to a growing body of Indigenous literary production in the late twentieth-century, Canada’s first Indigenous publisher – First Nations owned and operated – was established in 1980 under the name Theytus Books. Prior to this, the trade publishing scene in Canada had been entirely dominated by non-Indigenous


\(^{16}\) The most recent edition of *Bobbi Lee*, published in 2017 by the Women’s Press, includes a new Preface where Maracle addresses the origins of this autobiographical writing and speaks frankly about her own naivety throughout the initial publishing process.

\(^{17}\) The significance of Lutz’s text, and particularly his 1989 interview with Campbell about *Halfbreed*, would become even more apparent with the discovery of the two missing pages from the archives.
publishing houses, reflecting how much of twentieth-century Indigenous literary production came out of “contexts shaped and controlled by the discursive and institutional power of the dominant white culture in Canada” (Hoy 47). Among the most notable of these publishers was the Toronto-based company, McClelland and Stewart, started by John McClelland and Frederick Goodchild in 1906 (known then as McClelland & Goodchild); it became McClelland & Stewart\textsuperscript{18} in 1919 (King 2-3). The company was eventually taken over by John McClelland’s son, Jack McClelland, who worked for the publishing house between 1946-1987 (King xx). Described as “Canada’s greatest publisher,” (MacSkimming 4), Jack McClelland largely oversaw the development of a post-World War II nationalistic literature and literary voice – one that was dominated by non-Indigenous writers.

In the decades following Keeshig-Tobias’ 1990 article, such concerns with literary representation and theft of voice have been addressed more rigorously by Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars, whose work underscores the necessity of adopting decolonial approaches within the fields of Indigenous literature, editing, and publishing. In fact, as early as 2001, Younging (known then as Young-Ing) argued for the necessary establishment of Indigenous editorial guidelines to address issues of cultural appropriation and misrepresentation of Indigenous authors; in “Aboriginal Text in Context,” he identifies these two issues “as significant problems in Canadian publishing” (235). These concerns are echoed by Anishinaabe scholar Kateri Akiwenzie-Damm, who has also argued for the creation and implementation of Indigenous-specific editorial principles for Indigenous literatures. In “‘We think differently. We have a different

\textsuperscript{18} George Stewart, “who had the reputation of being the best Bible salesman in Canada,” partnered with McClelland and Goodchild around 1914 to create McClelland, Goodchild & Stewart. Goodchild left the company in 1918 to start his own firm, and the company became McClelland & Stewart in 1919 (King 3).
understanding’: Editing Indigenous Texts as an Indigenous Editor” (2016), Akiwenzie-Damm urges us to consider the colonial processes that occur before Indigenous texts are even published– an issue that is relevant for many of the writers examined in this dissertation. These conversations about common Indigenous editorial issues eventually culminated in the 2018 book, *Elements of Indigenous Style: A Guide for Writing By and About Indigenous Peoples*, where Younging proposes, for the first time, a definitive set of Indigenous-centered editorial principles for publishers, editors, and writers to follow when working with Indigenous content.

In the fields of English and Indigenous Studies, Cree-Métis scholar Deanna Reder has written extensively on the importance of Indigenous autobiography in Canada, using her work to challenge the idea of Indigenous intellectual production as a response to colonization – and instead highlighting the contributions of overlooked Indigenous writers including Edward Ahenakew (Cree), George Copway (Anishinaabe), and Vera Manuel (Secwepemc-Ktunaxa) among others.19 Furthermore, on the topic of “told-to” narratives and collaborative authorship, settler scholar Sophie McCall’s 2011 book, *First Person Plural: Aboriginal Storytelling and the Ethics of Collaborative Authorship*, importantly drew attention to the power imbalances that often characterize such collaborations; her book urges readers to think critically about “the implications of the choices that editors, translators, narrators, and documentarians make in their textualizations” (2). Scholars in these fields have also contributed to robust scholarly collections that further address and contextualize these issues relating to Indigenous editorial practices for contemporary readers, including *Learn, Teach, Challenge: Approaching Indigenous Literatures* (2016; eds. Deanna Reder and Linda Morra), and

Since the founding of Theytus Books in 1980, Indigenous publishing has garnered increased attention in Canada, with the establishment of additional Indigenous-led book publishers including Pemmican Publications (Métis), Kegedonce Press (Chippewas of Nawash First Nation), and Gabriel Dumont Institute (Métis). And since 2014, the University of Manitoba Press’s First Voices, First Texts series has been breaking new ground in the field of Indigenous literary studies by republishing and re-editing forgotten Indigenous writings, using archival research to highlight the material and/or discursive constraints that often characterized collaborative publishing relationships. Established by Métis scholar Warren Cariou, the series aims to “strive to indigenize the editing process by involving communities, by respecting traditional protocols, and by providing critical introductions that give readers new insights into the cultural contexts of these unjustly neglected classics.” For example, the series’ 2015 republication of Inuk Mini Aodla Freeman’s 1978 autobiography, *Life Among the Qallunaat*, revealed how the first edition was heavily edited prior to publication, and subsequently stored in the basement of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs for nearly eight months – out of concerns, Julie Rak argues, that Freeman’s book might “reflect badly on the Department’s administrative practices” (Rak et al. 270-4). More recently, and generated by attendees of the 2017 Indigenous Editor’s Circle gathering (formerly the Aboriginal Editor’s Circle), the Indigenous Editors Association was created to offer a networking group for working Indigenous editors.²⁰

---

²⁰ The Indigenous Editors Association, an official not-for-profit association as recognized by the Canada Council as an association with a majority Indigenous governance, was established in 2019 by Iñupiaq editor Rachel Taylor.
As these initiatives and scholarly interventions in the fields of Indigenous literary studies, publishing, and editing reveal, we are now in a position to advocate for the critical reconsideration of works of Indigenous literature, particularly those produced within the colonial constraints of the twentieth-century Canadian publishing industry. And, given Younging’s newly established and necessary guidelines for the editing and publishing of Indigenous literatures, and the precedent set by the First Voices, First Texts series, we are better equipped to consider the ways in which the Canadian publishing industry has misedited, dismissed, or silenced the literary contributions of twentieth-century Indigenous women writers. Building on recent research that demonstrates how the Canadian publishing industry has historically marginalized Indigenous writers, my dissertation examines particular case studies of twentieth-century Indigenous women’s literary production. In doing so, this dissertation focuses on telling the stories behind the published works. Using a combination of archival research and digital humanities tools, my analysis aims to expose the realities of many twentieth-century cross-cultural Indigenous publishing experiences.

As a means of coming to understanding the context in which these texts were written, I rely on archival research methods. In their 2011 book Archival Narratives for Canada, Kathleen Garay and Christl Verduyn define Canadian archives as “memory institutions whose function is to ensure the acquisition, preservation and dissemination of the many narratives that constitute Canada” (7). Literary scholars, including Linda Morra and Carole Gerson, have contributed significantly to our understanding of the many unknown Canadian “narratives” through extensive work in the archives. In her

21 See Freeman, Life Among the Qallunaat (2015); Manuel, Honouring the Strength of Indian Women: Plays, Stories, Poetry (2019); Maracle, Bobbi Lee, Indian Rebel (2017); Anahareo, Devil in Deerskins: My Life with Grey Owl (2014); Kenny, Indians Don’t Cry (2014); Weetaltuk, From the Tundra to the Trenches (2017), among others.
book *Unarrested Archives: Case Studies in Twentieth-Century Canadian Women’s Authorship*, Morra examines the role of socio-political forces in creating the archives for women writers (such as Sheila Watson, Emily Carr, and E. Pauline Johnson) in Canada. Morra explains that her view of “the archive” encompasses “not the sum of all texts, but rather the literal establishments that hold material traces of an author’s contributions, the mediating spaces that showcase who was able to articulate publicly and what was articulable in a given period” (4). Morra points also to the important work of French literary theorist Michel Foucault, whose conceptions of the archives as containing “documents of exclusion” and as “monuments to particular configurations of power” (Antoinette Burton qtd. in Morra 4) are key to our understanding of the archives as a site representative and reflective of our colonial past. Literary scholar Carole Gerson has also contributed significantly to our knowledge surrounding the lives and unknown writings of underappreciated twentieth-century women writers, including E. Pauline Johnson. Through both *Paddling Her Own Canoe: The Times and Texts of E. Pauline Johnson* (2000) and *E. Pauline Johnson Tekahionwake: Collected Poems and Selected Prose* (2002), co-editors Gerson and Veronica Strong-Boag set an exhaustive foundation from which all Johnson scholarship has followed.

Through case-study approaches to archival research in Indigenous publishing, scholars such as Morra and Gerson have demonstrated the necessity of “uncover[ing] the] layers of context” (Hulan xii) that surround or mediate twentieth-century published works. In the context of publisher McClelland & Stewart, such notions of archival exclusion and power imbalances continue to impact scholarly engagement with what exists in the publisher’s archives; for example, of the two published accounts that drew heavily from the M&S archives while McClelland was still alive (the 1999 biography, *Jack: A Life with Writers*, and the 1998 collection of letters, *Imagining Canadian*...
Literature: The Selected Letters of Jack McClelland), neither addressed the in-house controversies surrounding Halfbreed, nor did they acknowledge Campbell as an M&S writer. Thus, both texts perpetuate the very power dynamics that characterized McClelland’s engagement with writers in the first place, extending this notion of “exclusion” through a selective representation of McClelland’s career with M&S – one that ironically reflects his own insistence that Campbell create a “selective autobiography,” omitting some unnecessary “events” from her manuscript.22

When considering the archive as a site with the potential to uncover stories yet untold,23 we can also consider the ways in which digital technologies can help to visualize or provide access to these recovered stories. Settler scholar David Gaertner, in his article “A Landless Territory? Augmented Reality, Land, and Indigenous Storytelling in Cyberspace” (2016), similarly suggests that the digital realm “opens up productive and challenging spaces to further investigate key principles in Critical Indigenous Studies and provide students with interactive ways to engage with Indigenous knowledges and methodologies” (494). In fact, through the use of digital technologies, Kate Hennessy asserts that we are experiencing a “paradigm shift” in the ways that institutions can create access to their material collections (“Virtual Repatriation” 5). With the transformative potential of the digital humanities in mind, my dissertation thus employs a range of computational tools as a form of additional analysis – focusing on what is revealed through archival inquiry, and using these digital tools to increase the impact


23 I credit Linda Morra’s 2017 conference, “Untold Stories of the Past 150 Years” (University College Dublin) for this term, and for organizing an event that was, in many ways, a catalyst for the research undertaken in this dissertation.
and accessibility of my findings. For example, I utilize the digital collation tool “Juxta” to compare multiple versions of a text, creating side-by-side visualizations that clearly illustrate instances of editorial intervention; these visualizations (accessible via web link) accompany the literary and archival analysis provided within the chapter itself, and emphasize the drastic editorial changes that occur across versions of a text. Other web-based digital humanities tools incorporated into this dissertation include Voyant (textual analysis), BatchGeo (data map-clustering) and TimelineJS (interactive, media-rich timelines)—all of which function to underscore the extent of editorial intervention or neglect enacted upon these literary works in a different, more visually-accessible way.

In choosing to conduct this research in a manner that is mindful of Indigenous editorial principles and protocols (Younging; Akiwenzie-Damm), my approach was necessarily grounded in three key principles: asking for permission, building relationships of trust, and understanding my own positionality in relation to this work. To address the first principle regarding permission, I draw on Younging’s explanation regarding “reusing cultural material in archives,” where he emphasizes the importance of “establish[ing] permission” (Elements of Indigenous Style 92) before (re)using Indigenous archival materials. This principle was addressed in my dissertation through my research into the publishing history of Halfbreed, which began with asking Campbell’s permission to search for the missing pages within the McClelland and Stewart fonds. Furthermore, I consider obtaining permission or consent as an ongoing conversation; for example, as Deanna Reder and I proceeded to write an article based on my archival findings, we regularly checked in with Campbell, by phone and over

24 Note: I have also included Images/Screenshots of all digital humanities visualizations in the Appendix.
email, to ensure that she continued to support our work as it evolved. In seeking permission to pursue this line of inquiry, I also took the first steps in building a relationship of trust with Campbell. This “essential” principle, Younging explains, addresses how it is necessary to establish that all collaborators have “built the relationships that allow them to share the knowledge or tell the story” (44). Likewise, in building a relationship over several years with descendants of the Capilanos, and obtaining their permission to republish *Legends of Vancouver* under its intended title (*Legends of the Capilano*), I have prioritized the impacts that my research may have on present and future generations of the Capilano/Mathias family.

On the topic of positioning, Akiwenzie-Damm explains that understanding one’s position shows an awareness “of the colonial history that may come to bear upon the process and upon their relationships with Indigenous writers” (32). As an English/Scottish-descended Canadian-born settler scholar working in the field of Indigenous literature, my position in relation to the work of this dissertation is one that has required a necessary “unsettling” and “unlearning” of colonial approaches to scholarship and research. When considering the intersectional fields of English and Indigenous literary studies, I consider issues of cross-cultural mediations, particularly those scenarios presented within the Canadian publishing industry and in this dissertation, as both a common thread and entry-point for inquiry as a settler scholar. However, as a cultural outsider to the literature presented in this dissertation, I must preface this work by acknowledging the inherent limitations of my own understanding and analysis of Indigenous knowledges, and the privilege with which I approach this


26 See Chapter 2, pp. 70-3.
research as a settler. In working through the ethical uncertainties of conducting this research, I refer to settler scholar Sam McKegney’s “Strategies for Ethical Engagement: An Open Letter Concerning Non-Native Scholars of Native Literatures,” where he expresses the importance of maintaining a “critical consciousness” when engaging with Indigenous knowledge and materials. McKegney encourages non-Indigenous scholars to keep focused on the work being done:

Furthermore, remaining cognizant of limitations must not prevent the outsider critic from saying anything of note, from making the interpretive claims that are the earmarks of engaged scholarship. Critical interventions, even when they are flawed, can forward others’ thinking by inciting reactions in which new avenues of investigation and new methods of inquiry might be developed. (84)

Though McKegney describes the importance of understanding one’s position in relation to the work, he simultaneously urges scholars to refrain from letting this awareness become an immobilizing factor in the pursuit of knowledge.27

As this dissertation aims to “unsettle” the stories we know, and tell other stories from the archives that haven’t yet been told, I consider this a small way that I can “put things to right” within the context of Indigenous publishing in Canada. To accomplish

27 Though I have at times throughout this research struggled with these same uncertainties regarding my own positioning (should I take up this space? am I the right person to do this work?), I was fortunate to meet Gregory Younging at the 2017 Indigenous Literary Studies Association gathering – and his support for the Legends of the Capilano project reassured me that I could be the right person, and that I was heading in the right direction. At this gathering, Younging expressed interest in my analysis of the publishing history of Legends, and subsequently invited me to present this research at the Indigenous Editor’s Circle (August 2017). Having Younging’s support – someone whose contributions to Indigenous editing and publishing are monumental and without comparison – was the affirmation I needed in order to “unstick” myself and move forward with this research. But despite this, I also believe that questioning my own intentions, and continually reflecting on the integrity of my actions as evidenced throughout this work, are helpful ways to remind myself that I will always be an outsider to these materials.
this, I have chosen three case studies in Indigenous editing and publishing to form the basis of my dissertation. In Chapter Two, I trace the publishing history of Johnson’s *Legends of Vancouver* (1911) across different publishing venues throughout the last century, focusing on the ways in which subsequent editions (and their paratexts) have perpetuated the erasure of Chief Joe and Mary Capilano from the text. Through my extended analysis of the paratext, I argue that this space in the text has historically been used in a way that compromises the contributions of Indigenous authors and storytellers. My analysis begins with the first edition, published privately in 1911, and moves chronologically throughout each republished edition to conclude with the most recent 2013 Midtown Press edition.

Though Johnson first met Chief Joe Capilano in London in 1906,²⁸ it wasn’t until Johnson’s retirement and relocation to Vancouver in 1909 that their friendship truly developed. It was during this time, and in a mixture of English and Chinook, that Joe and Mary shared their traditional Skw̓ ̓xwú7mesh stories with Johnson, which she later penned from memory for publication (and as a form of cultural safe-keeping). Different versions of the stories appeared in periodicals such as *The Boys’ World* and *The Mother’s Magazine* (1909-1911), as well the weekend edition of the Vancouver newspaper *The Daily Province* (1910-1911). When Johnson became ill with inoperable breast cancer in 1909, a selection of these stories was gathered from *The Daily Province* by a group who called themselves “the Pauline Johnson Trust,” and the book *Legends of Vancouver* was published – with all proceeds going towards Johnson’s medical bills.

²⁸ Johnson, in London at the time to perform her poetry, was asked by Sir Arthur Pearson to interview a visiting delegation of three B.C. Indigenous Chiefs (one of whom was Chief Joe Capilano); the Chiefs had traveled to London with hopes of meeting King Edward VII to discuss destructive changes to Indigenous land and fishing rights in British Columbia. Though Johnson did not speak any of the west coast Indigenous languages, she was able to welcome them using the Chinook greeting, “Klahowya, Tillicum?” (‘How do you do, friend?’).
However, letters held at McMaster University’s Special Collections Library reveal that the early working title of the book was *Indian Legends of the Coast*, and that Johnson ultimately wanted it to be called *Legends of the Capilano*, as a tribute to her friends and fellow storytellers. Additionally, my focus on the many different editions of *Legends* (and corresponding paratexts) published throughout the past century clearly reveals how the authorial contributions of the Capilanos have been gradually dismissed from editorial view.

This chapter also considers publishing ventures beyond the initial *Legends of Vancouver* text, focusing on relatively unknown periodical and pamphlet publications that repurposed the original *Legends* stories for alternative means and audiences. For example, a series of abbreviated stories – based on the *Legends of Vancouver* narratives – were published during the 1920s by Vancouver writer Lionel Haweis in a local periodical titled *British Columbia Magazine*. In addition, one of these abbreviated stories was made into a limited-print pamphlet, measuring only 16 x 12.5cm and 8 pages of text, and titled *The Legend of the Salt-Chuck Oluk*. These abbreviated stories call into question issues of permissions and copyright, as Johnson was no longer living and Lionel Makovski (weekend editor at *The Vancouver Daily Province*) had been left the copyright for these materials in Johnson’s final will. In addition to these abbreviated adaptations, Makovski also proposed a “children’s” edition of *Legends of Vancouver* to publishers McClelland and Stewart. My chapter explores these little-known adaptations and contextualizes them within the larger *Legends of Vancouver* publishing history. To conclude this chapter, I reflect on my experiences editing an updated edition of *Legends*, retitled *Legends of the Capilano*, forthcoming with the UMP’s First Voices, First Texts series and developed in collaboration with descendants of the Capilanos. This chapter, along with the forthcoming edition of *Legends*, are also informed by interviews
conducted with Indigenous scholars Rick Monture (Mohawk) and Rudy Reimer (Skwxwu7mesh). As a form of paratext, these interviews convey Monture and Reimer’s insights on the legacy and context of the *Legends* stories from within their respective academic experiences and home communities. Reimer’s extensive geographical and geological knowledge as an archaeologist, combined with his deep knowledge of Skwxwu7mesh stories and place names, provides crucial cultural contexts for understanding the relevance of stories that stretch both backwards and forwards in time. Similarly, Monture’s knowledge of Mohawk cultural contexts and protocols around storytelling helps us appreciate how Johnson cultivated relationships with Joe and Mary Capilano – both in-person as a listener, and later by relating their stories in print.

In Chapter Three, I focus specifically on the untold life and stories of Mary Capilano, through an examination of historical newspapers as well as Capilano’s periodical versions of the *Legends of Vancouver* stories that today remain relatively unknown.29 This chapter builds on my analysis of gradual erasure throughout the paratext as explained in Chapter Two, but looks prior to the publication of *Legends* to reconsider the *Mother’s Magazine* versions of Johnson’s “legends,” highlighting the important and underrecognized contributions of Skwxwú7mesh storyteller Mary Capilano. As a twentieth-century Skwxwú7mesh matriarch30 whose lifetime spanned close to a century, Capilano experienced firsthand the ongoing, devastating effects of the Indian Act on Indigenous communities throughout British Columbia. In protest

29 I am grateful to Carole Gerson for sharing her copies of *The Mother’s Magazine* stories with me in 2013, which she acquired from the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, and from which my comparisons to the *Province* stories are based.

30 My use of this term comes from many conversations about Mary’s strength and accomplishments with Mary Capilano’s descendants, the Mathias family of North Vancouver, BC.
against seasonal restrictions being enforced over Indigenous land and fishing rights, Mary’s husband, Chief Joe Capilano, along with Chief Charlie Silpaymilt (Cowichan) and Chief Basil Bonaparte (Kamloops), travelled to London, England, to speak with King Edward VII in 1906. Nearly twenty years later, Mary would continue as an activist for Indigenous rights herself, standing as witness during the City of Vancouver/Government of Canada’s 1923 dispossession cases against the families of Brockton Point, Stanley Park.

Though Mary narrated six of Johnson’s “legends” in the American women’s periodical The Mother’s Magazine, only one of Mary’s stories, “The Lost Salmon Run,” was selected for publication in Legends. The Mother’s versions of “The Legend of the Two Sisters” and “The Legend of the Squamish Twins” represent stories that were first narrated by Mary, but were changed to the male voice of Chief Capilano for publication in The Province. Other stories of Mary’s, such as “The Ice Babies,” “The Seven Swans,” and “Lillooet Falls” were included in the 1912 Thomson Stationery Illustrated edition of Legends but in no other edition. Over time, and as the Mother’s publication ceased to exist, Mary’s versions of the “legends” largely disappeared from scholarly view – and today are accessible only through the Library of Congress’s onsite archival holdings. Furthermore, despite Mary’s recurring role as narrator in Johnson’s stories, very little is known of her life and accomplishments; thus, my dissertation provides a comprehensive biography of her life, drawing from newspaper articles, archival records, and stories shared with me from her descendants. Through my analysis of the neglected stories narrated by Mary Capilano, I set up the concept of recovery and re-centering Indigenous women’s voices that is foundational to my third chapter. My analysis in this chapter is supplemented with digital technologies, including collation software (Juxta Commons) to visualize the shift in narrative voices between Mary and Joe Capilano, text analysis
software (Voyant) to emphasize the thematic shifts that occur between versions, and map-clustering (BatchGeo) to illustrate Mary’s recurring appearance in local newspapers – even beyond her lifetime.

Chapter Four builds on themes of editorial intervention and neglect within Canada’s publishing industry, focusing on the publishing context of Campbell’s *Halfbreed* as the final case study. In a 1989 interview with Hartmut Lutz, Métis writer Maria Campbell was asked if she would ever rewrite her ground-breaking autobiography, *Halfbreed* (1973). She responded: “Yes, some day. I don’t think I’d make changes. What I would do with the book is, I would only put in that piece that was taken out” (47). That “piece” that Campbell gestures towards, one that describes her experiences of being sexually assaulted at 14 years of age by members of the RCMP, was removed from her story by McClelland & Stewart without her knowledge or permission, and represents yet another example of the Canadian publishing industry’s history of editorial interference upon texts written by Indigenous authors. While the threat of injunction or legal action on behalf of the RCMP presented a serious concern for the press, evidence in the archives suggests that Campbell was deliberately excluded from editorial conversations and decisions.

On a research trip to McMaster University in 2017, I uncovered this missing “piece” in the McClelland & Stewart fonds – two excised manuscript pages, both crossed out with a red X. In 2018, with Campbell’s permission, Deanna Reder (Cree/Métis) and I published an article titled, “‘I write this for all of you’: Recovering the Unpublished RCMP ‘Incident’ in Maria Campbell’s *Halfbreed* (1973),”31 detailing these pages and related

publishing correspondence. As a direct result of this important archival discovery, Campbell – now 80 years old – released an updated and fully restored edition of *Halfbreed* in November 2019 with the two missing pages finally included. For this case study, I have consulted extensive archival materials from McMaster University’s McClelland & Stewart fonds, using letters and correspondence from M&S staff to trace the editorial interventions enacted upon Campbell’s *Halfbreed* manuscript. My analysis in this chapter is similarly supplemented with digital technologies; I utilize an interactive-mapping software, TimelineJS, to visualize *Halfbreed*’s publishing timeline (1973-2019), and, drawing on archival records, simultaneously illustrate the extent to which Campbell was not involved in editorial decisions. I also employ the collation tool, Juxta Commons, to highlight paratextual differences across each edition’s “synopsis,” or summary on the back cover and inner flaps, throughout the past 46 years.

When Reder and I visited with Campbell to share my archival findings, Campbell shared a story with us about her love for E. Pauline Johnson as a young girl. She explained that as a child, she had admired Johnson – and was particularly drawn to her poem, “The Cattle Thief” (because Campbell’s father, like the character in the poem, was also a poacher). Her family would pay 25 cents for a box of assorted books; and Campbell was happiest when she received a book by Johnson.32 This connection between Campbell and Johnson is not coincidental – both women have left their mark on Indigenous literature, and represent a continued legacy of resilience in the face of colonial oppression. Their connection is reinforced when their literary contributions, alongside the forgotten stories narrated by Sḵwx̱wú7mesh matriarch Mary Capilano, are revisited through a decolonial lens with the purpose of *kwaskastahsowin*.

32 Ibid.
“How did he get there? It’s written in the books that they don’t know. They have no knowledge. Nobody even came and talked to anybody, from what I understand from my Dad. And what had happened is that Sahp-luk walked all over B.C. and collected whatever he could from people, because he was going to go over and talk to the King about land claims in the province of British Columbia. That’s why he went there in 1906, to talk about land claims. He talked to King Edward VII, who also died in 1910 – they both died that year. But he got there because he went to all the people in B.C. and got pennies, dimes, and nickels, and they got him there and back.”

– Agi Mathias, great-granddaughter of Chief Joe and Mary Capilano, daughter of William Joseph Mathias Capilano Joe (son of Mathias Capilano Joe), Nov. 2017

When Johnson first met Chief Capilano in London in 1906, speaking the little Chinook that she knew at the time, she unknowingly provided a small comfort to the Skwxwú7mesh leader who suddenly found himself very far from home.33 It is unlikely, however, that following her introduction to Chief Capilano, Johnson had any sense of the complex backstory behind the mighty Capilano name. Known prior to his London trip as Hyas Joe or Sahp-luk Joe, he had embarked on a massive fundraising effort in order to make the trek to visit the King – collecting whatever he could, “pennies, dimes, and nickels” from anyone in B.C. that was willing to support their mission.34 Though Joe had already been an elected chief for the Capilano Reserve since 1895, it was decided that it was not quite proper to visit the King of England without a powerful, traditional name to.


accompany him. According to Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Elder Louis Miranda (1892-1990), a name was given to Chief Joe to borrow, but was kept even after his return to Vancouver:

So when Chief Sahp-luk – they were calling him Chief Joe at that time, so Kiapalano from Musqueam said ‘I don’t think it’s right for you to go down there as “Chief Joe.” Take an Indian name with you. The man who really was the Chief of that reserve – My father, he says. And I got that name, Kiapalano. I’ll loan you this name, with the understanding that you’ll use it over there, but when you come back, you’ll return that name to me. Because it’s my name, he says. I’m the direct descendant. So Chief Joe got the name Kiapalano when he went over, and when he came back, he never returned it.35

In this sense, Chief Joe was never really a “Kiapalano” or Capilano – not like his wife, Mary Agnes, who was a descendant of the Old Chief. But as elected chief of the Capilano Reserve, Joe adopted the name for himself – and would keep it in the family for several generations to come.

After a brief visit to Vancouver for a month in 1908 – where she was welcomed by Joe Capilano at the Hotel Vancouver – and a final year of touring between 1908-09, Johnson settled into Vancouver permanently. As to why Johnson chose to retire in Vancouver, rather than at her ancestral home of Six Nations, Martha L. Viehmann suggests:

She was seeking a place to retire from her stage career but would need to continue to write to support herself. Therefore, Vancouver may have been a more appealing choice than the Six Nations area because of its mild climate and beautiful landscape. In addition, the presence of friends, such as her former partner Walter McRaye, and acquaintances, such as Suápaluck, would have been a draw, and perhaps she foresaw that her friendship with the Squamish chief would provide her with new material, and the publishing opportunities in the northwest may have seemed better. (265)

35 See “Louis Miranda Interviews,” Item AAAB8169, Tape 0001, BC Archives. The name was eventually returned, according to Keith Thor Carlson, around thirty years later, “when the Musqueam community held a potlatch to strip the name away from Chief Joe’s son,” Mathias Joe (The Power of Place, the Problem of Time 340, footnote 2). See also Baker, Khot-La-Cha (1994, p. 11), and Morton, Capilano: The Story of a River (1970).
Beyond these very plausible reasons to choose Vancouver, including the city’s ideal climate and proximity to close friends, we must also consider that over the years of touring and traveling, Johnson’s relationship to her ancestral territories had become somewhat fractured. Once in Vancouver, Johnson settled into a modest apartment located at 1117 Howe Street, and this became the site for most of her last writing.

Johnson often spent her time with the Capilanos, either at her home in Downtown Vancouver, across the Inlet at the Capilano Reserve, or paddling a canoe around Stanley Park. In those days, the only way across the Narrows was by boat: “When the famous Indian poetess, Pauline Johnson, wished to visit the Indian reserve at Capilano, she would call Mrs. Harris and ask her to keep a boat close at hand.” During these visits, Johnson had the pleasure of listening to stories, spoken in a mixture of Chinook and English, by her Sḵwx̱wú7mesh friends. Not much is documented about her transcription methods – how, in other words, she recorded the stories being shared with her. However, from what little is known, we can assume that Johnson relied mainly on some combination of memory and literary imagination to produce the stories. In Linda Quirk’s extensive descriptive bibliography on Legends, she argues that “Johnson took few notes because she did not want to distract the storyteller” (Quirk 209). In fact, in Charlotte Gray’s Flint & Feather: The Life and Times of E. Pauline Johnson, Tekahionwake (2002), Gray points to Bertha Jean Thompson Stevinson, a close Vancouver friend of Johnson’s, for insight into Johnson’s methodology: “If she needed to make a note to assist her memory she went into the kitchen on the pretense of getting a drink of water and there jotted down the note. Never did she do this before her guest”

36 See Interview with Rick Monture (Appendix B, pp. 186-93), where he explains the complicated nature of Johnson’s relationship to her home community at Six Nations.

Though the majority of the “legends” are narrated by Chief Joe Capilano, descendants of the Capilanos believe that Mary Agnes was the actual source for the stories of the Coast – that she had learned these stories and then related them either to Joe, who then eventually shared them with Johnson, or sometimes directly to Johnson.\(^{39}\)

**“Periodicals First”: The Mother’s Magazine and The Vancouver Daily Province\(^{40}\)**

The “legends” were published mainly between 1909-1912, with most appearing in the weekend edition of *The Vancouver Daily Province*, and others in the American women’s periodical, *The Mother’s Magazine* (Elgin, IL). These two publication venues targeted very different readerships; and aside from illustrating Johnson’s far-reaching, international literary audience, these distinct venues also underscore her adaptability as a writer to ensure a steady income.\(^{41}\) *The Mother’s Magazine* (published by David C. Cook, who also published *The Boys’ World* magazine) held a readership of “predominantly white, middle-class readers” (Viehmann 269) and was considered a mass-circulation magazine for women. For this U.S. periodical, Johnson crafted stories that centered on themes of motherhood and femininity; in fact, the editor of *Mother’s,*

---

\(^{38}\) In the “Sources” section at the back of Charlotte Gray’s *Flint & Feather*, she lists her source for this quote as Bertha Jean Thompson Stevinson’s book of collected columns, titled *Up and Down the Pacific Coast* (1989, privately published). These columns first appeared around 1906 in Thorold, Ontario’s *Thorold Post* newspaper (https://digital.lib.sfu.ca/ceww-703/thompson-bertha-jane).

\(^{39}\) This was suggested by Bob Baker (who today carries the ancestral name Sahplek) to me in an email communication (2 Oct. 2017), and also in conversations with Agi Mathias and the Mathias family.

\(^{40}\) I credit Carole Gerson’s article, “Periodicals First: The Beginnings of Susanna Moodie’s *Roughing It in the Bush* and Pauline Johnson’s *Legends of Vancouver*” (2013) for part of this title.

\(^{41}\) Strong-Boag and Gerson draw on surviving financial documents in *Paddling* to suggest that Johnson was paid six dollars per thousand words at *The Mother’s Magazine* in 1907 (166).
Elizabeth Ansley, corresponded with Johnson about writing for their magazine, suggesting that “some humour and bright, happy stories” would be most suitable.\textsuperscript{42} Those of Johnson’s stories that appeared in \textit{Mother’s} were often narrated by Mary Capilano, and were written with a more “sentimental”\textsuperscript{43} tone than those that appeared in \textit{The Province}.  

The “urban” readers of the Vancouver newspaper, on the other hand, expected something with a bit more literariness and sophistication (Strong-Boag & Gerson, \textit{Paddling} 137); and in early twentieth-century Vancouver, this meant catering towards a presumed readership of mostly male, non-Indigenous readers. Though Johnson’s first “legend” was published in \textit{Mother’s} (“The Legend of the Two Sisters”), and is narrated by Mary Capilano, the version of this story that later appeared in \textit{The Province} would be slightly different. At Johnson’s initial meeting with Lionel Makovski, then editor of the \textit{Daily Province Magazine} (the weekend supplement of the \textit{Province} newspaper), he suggested that adjustments to the legends would be necessary: “Mr. Makovski took the manuscript of ‘The Two Sisters’ under consideration, and in a few days reported to Pauline that he would use the story with a few changes, and asked if she would undertake to provide a series” (Foster 135). The most notable of these “changes” involved switching the narrative voice from Mary’s to that of Chief Capilano, and trading

\textsuperscript{42} Ansley, Elizabeth. Letter to E. Pauline Johnson. 13 Aug. 1907. E. Pauline Johnson fonds, The William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 1.

\textsuperscript{43} See Viehmann’s “Speaking Chinook” (2012) for an interesting analysis of Johnson’s use of sentimentalism, particularly how Johnson’s phrases like “she is so very Indian” often function to essentialize Indigenous women (163). I also address this tension between Johnson’s advocacy on behalf of Indigenous women and her tendency to invoke such stereotypes in her writing in the Introduction to this dissertation (see p. 11).
Mary’s mild-mannered nature for something more authoritative – presumably to better appeal to male readers.

Though Johnson had initially “doubted her ability” (Buckley 23) to convey the Capilanos’ stories, Makovski played an instrumental role in convincing Johnson to continue. As Alfred Buckley notes in a 1913 article for the *Vancouver News-Advertiser*, Johnson had a special, unrivaled connection with the Capilanos, and Makovski recognized this: “Others of us had talked with Chief Joe and found him a benevolent old man, expressing himself in English with difficulty and retiring too suddenly and frequently behind the monosyllable… Only Pauline Johnson had the sympathetic key to his mind.”44 Furthermore, *The Province* may have recognized an opportunity to capitalize on the notoriety of Chief Capilano, who was already known to many newspapers in Vancouver and throughout British Columbia. In fact, shortly before the publication of their first “legend,” *The Province* published a three-page profile for their weekend magazine dedicated to Chief Capilano, who had recently passed. As Strong-Boag and Gerson note, we have reason to be suspicious of the editors’ motives, especially since *The Province* had, up until that point, been “distinctly hostile to the Aboriginal cause” (*Paddling* 177).

We can also look to the short passages that often preceded Johnson’s newspaper stories to get a sense of Makovski’s editorial motivations; how *The Province*’s readership informed the ways the legends were editorially framed. For example, in the preface to “The ‘Lure’ in Stanley Park” (20 August 1910), Makovski

44. But Johnson’s translations were not received without issue, as J.N.J. Brown, former superintendent of the Skwxwú7mesh Nation, noted: “Pauline simply did not fully understand the chief’s mixture of Chinook and English which had been thinly stretched to provide words to explain the symbolism and subtle meanings in the legends. The mistakes, he suggested, were in the passage from the teller to the recorder” (Keller 250). See Brown’s article, “Legends of Vancouver,” which appeared in *The Province* on 18 June 1929.
emphasizes Johnson’s Indigenous background and, by extension, her authority on the subject. He writes, “We may remind our readers that Miss Johnson, being herself an Indian, has a peculiar insight into the lives of the coast tribes and it is natural that they will tell her their legends, when to all others they remain silent.” That Makovski needed to “remind” readers of Johnson’s Indigenous background suggests that readers may have initially questioned the credibility of these “legends,” and also perhaps questioned Johnson’s “claim” to them as a person of mixed English-Mohawk heritage. By emphasizing Johnson’s authority as an Indigenous storyteller, and using titles with phrases like “the True Legend,” Makovski set the tone for these stories as being the most authoritative versions.

In the published legends, regardless of venue, we gain a clear sense of Johnson’s respect and admiration towards the Capilanos through her detailed descriptions of both the storytelling context and of Chief Joe and Mary Capilano themselves. According to Christine Marshall, “‘it is clear that Pauline’s handling of the legends includes contextual elements now considered essential to an oral storytelling’. Those elements include ‘her detailed descriptions of her relationship to the storyteller, of the occasion of the storytelling, [and] of the language and gestures used’” (qtd. in Strong-Boag & Gerson, Paddling 177). Such elements are crucial to positioning both Chief Joe Capilano and Mary Capilano as more than merely disembodied Indigenous voices. And it is here, in these framing elements at either end of the legend itself, that we truly get a sense of Johnson’s efforts at editorial transparency.45 In “The Lure in Stanley Park,” for example, Johnson acknowledges that although the word “lure” is not what

Chief Capilano used in telling this story, she chose the word based on his description: “There is no equivalent for the word in the Chinook tongue, but the gestures of his voiceful hands so expressed the quality of something between magnetism and charm that I have selected this word ‘lure’ as best fitting what he wished to convey.” A similar editorial admission occurs in many of the stories narrated by Mary Capilano, whereby Johnson acknowledges Mary’s “broken English, that, much as I love it, I must leave to the reader’s imagination” (“The Legend of Lillooet Falls”). We can consider Johnson’s efforts at transparency, rather than accuracy, as perhaps a better goal throughout the collaborative storytelling process, in that freeing herself from the distraction of writing things down (and instead focusing on expressing the spirit of their stories) allowed for a more natural, genuine encounter.

Through her passage in and out of the narrative margins, we also catch glimpses of Johnson’s complicated relationship with her Mohawk identity. For instance, in “The Grey Archway,” Johnson includes an affirmation of her Indigeneity from a stranger, as if to placate herself, and any readers who may have doubts: “He gave a swift glance at my dark skin, then nodded. ‘You are one of us... and you will understand.’” In her article “But the Shadow of Her Story: Narrative Unsettlement, Self-Inscription, and Translation in Pauline Johnson’s Legends of Vancouver (2001),” Deena Rymhs interestingly points to Johnson’s tendency to refer to the Iroquois peoples in quotation marks, “suggest[ing] the narrators detached stance from the people she here defines as her own” (58). Though part of this narrative uncertainty can be explained by Johnson’s position as cultural outsider to the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Nation, it also reflects the inconsistency of her relationship to her ancestral home at Six Nations. In an interview with Mohawk scholar Rick Monture, he notes that “her connection to the reserve was so minimal in the last few years of her life, there wasn’t much really to talk about. We’re pretty sure that she
never did a reading that we know of on the Reserve” (Appendix B: p. 187). And yet, when drawing from her own historical records – as is done in the story, “A Royal Mohawk Chief” – Johnson provides readers with a confident and patriotic retelling of the Duke of Connaught’s ceremonial visit to Six Nations.46 This story, selected as the concluding story for Legends of Vancouver volume, does not follow the “legend” pattern of the rest of the stories; instead, this story draws on Johnson’s own Mohawk history and experiences, and as such can be seen as an effort to preserve her family’s legacy. However, by placing it at the end of the Legends volume (despite being one of the first pieces to appear in The Province), following the Skwxwú7mesh stories that speak to irreparable cultural loss at the hands of the Canadian and British governments, this story’s message about everlasting brotherhood between the British and the Mohawk Nation rings somewhat false. These contradictory responses suggest that Johnson was more comfortable drawing from her own experiences and repertoire, rather than attempting to locate herself within another nation’s narrative.

The Publication of Legends (and Recovering Mary Capilano’s Narrative Voice)

About two years after Johnson’s breast cancer diagnosis, and with her health rapidly declining, friends and supporters endeavored to publish a collection of Johnson’s prose stories to raise funds for her medical treatments. This group, calling themselves the Pauline Johnson Trust Fund, formed in September of 1911 and included Vancouver journalist Isabel McLean (known as “Alexandra”), and The Vancouver Daily Province’s Lionel Makovski and Bernard McEvoy. This group of supporters initiated the publication

46 See Monture’s Interview (Appendix B, pp. 186-93).
of *Legends of Vancouver*, choosing stories from Johnson’s repertoire of “Indian Legends” and arranging them in the collection that would be titled *Legends of Vancouver.*

In the year prior to the advent of the Pauline Johnson Trust, Johnson was hospitalized briefly (during the summer of 1910) while still attempting to regularly publish her “legends” in *The Province* and *Mother’s*. As she was unable to write anything down herself, she relied instead on her editor from *The Daily Province Magazine*, Lionel Makovski, who transcribed her stories from her hospital bed. Makovski explains the process this way: “Over and over again during those times when her health was rapidly deteriorating, I sat with her over a cup of tea and she ‘translated’ some of Chief Joe’s legends for me to transcribe” (qtd. in Johnston 210). By using the word “translate,” Makovski gestures towards Johnson’s process of relaying the legends to him through a combination of memory (recalling the stories as told by the Capilanos in a mixture of English and Chinook) and her own imagination. Also constantly in Johnson’s presence during her final years were acquaintances including Isabel McLean and Miss A.M. Ross; as Foster notes, “Could Pauline express herself of those hard times she would probably liken the situation to landing an overloaded canoe in rough water. Everyone about the wharf lent a hand and the landing was made” (135). These examples illustrate the potential of direct intervention throughout the transmission process (the true extent of which is not known, nor have I found any documentation of such intervention in the archives), adding another layer of mediation between the Capilanos and the published stories.

Several local women’s groups became heavily involved in Johnson’s cause, including *The Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire* (I.O.D.E.), Women’s Canadian Club, and Canadian Women’s Press Club. Members of these groups facilitated nation-
wide fundraising efforts, selling copies of Johnson’s *Legends* in their respective cities and mailing all profits back to Johnson at her new address: the Bute Street Hospital. The I.O.D.E. even created a local “Pauline Johnson Chapter” in Vancouver, with the goal of focusing specifically on Johnson’s fundraising campaign. And yet despite the involvement of women’s groups from across the country, the first edition of *Legends of Vancouver* set a precedent in place that would ultimately marginalize the voice of Mary Capilano for the next century. As the stories selected for publication in *Legends* were chosen only from *The Province* versions, this meant that most stories in the volume were narrated by Chief Capilano – and Mary Capilano’s voice faded from view. According to Strong-Boag and Gerson, “While this tactic [of story selection] creates unity, it discredits the status originally granted to Lixwelut as a storyteller in her own right” (*Paddling* 173).

In *The Mother’s Magazine* versions, Johnson emphasizes themes of motherhood and femininity, often describing the unbreakable bonds between Indigenous women and their children. For instance, in the *Mother’s* version of “The Two Sisters” (titled “The Legend of the Two Sisters”), the female narrator grounds the story in a metaphoric association to the Indigenous woman: “Yes, the river holds many secrets,' she continued, 'secrets of strong men’s battles and many tragedies, but the mountains hold the secrets of an Indian mother's heart, and those are the greatest secrets of all things’” (Jan. 1909, pp.12).

Of the stories selected for publication in *Legends*, only one story narrated by Mary Capilano was chosen for the volume: “The Lost Salmon Run.” While Mary’s version of “The Legend of the Two Sisters” was published in *The Mother’s Magazine*, the

---

47 The E. Pauline Johnson fonds at McMaster University includes letters from I.O.D.E. chapters in Canadian cities including Brandon, MB; Calgary, AB; Hamilton, ON; Collingwood, ON; and Brant, ON among others. These letters, addressed to Johnson at the Bute St. Hospital, would request additional books to sell in their respective cities, and often included kind, sympathetic messages with hopes for Johnson’s speedy recovery.
version printed in *The Province* one year later was instead narrated by Chief Capilano
and retitled “The True Legend of Vancouver’s Lions.”

### Table 1.1 Narrative changes across *The Mother’s Magazine, The Province*, and *Legends of Vancouver*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Mother’s Magazine (Elgin, IL)</th>
<th>The Vancouver Daily Province Newspaper</th>
<th>Legends of Vancouver (1911)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“The Sea-Serpent of Brockton Point”, 8 Oct. 1910 – <strong>CC</strong></td>
<td>“The Sea-Serpent” – <strong>CC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“A Legend of the Squamish”, 9 Jul. 1910 – <strong>CC</strong></td>
<td>“The Lost Island” – <strong>CC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“A Legend of Point Grey”, 10 Dec. 1910 – <strong>MJ</strong></td>
<td>“Point Grey” – <strong>MJ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“The Great Heights above the Tulameen”, 17 Dec. 1910 – <strong>EPJ</strong></td>
<td>“The Tulameen Trail” – <strong>EPJ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“The True Legend of Deadman’s Island”, 22 Oct. 1910 – <strong>CC</strong></td>
<td>“Deadman’s Island” – <strong>CC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>“A Squamish Legend of Napoleon”, 29 Oct. 1910 – <strong>CC</strong></td>
<td>“A Squamish Legend of Napoleon” – <strong>CC</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As this diagram reveals, there are two stories (“The Two Sisters” and “The Recluse”) that were changed from Mary Capilano’s narrative voice to that of Chief Capilano prior to their publication in *The Vancouver Daily Province*. These changes are not simply the substitution of one name for the other, but result in a noticeable shift in each story’s tone and theme. For example, in *The Mother’s Magazine* version of “The Two Sisters,” Mary passionately explains the sense of reverence towards women and mothers in Coastal First Nations. She explains:

I say you may not know that when our daughters step from childhood into the great world of womanhood, when the fitness for motherhood crowns them, we coast Indians of the sunset country regard this occasion as one of extreme rejoicing, great honor and unspeakable gladness. The being who possesses the possibility of some day becoming a mother receives much honor in most nations, but to us, the Sunset Tribes of Redmen, she is almost sacred. (Jan. 1909, pp.13)

In *The Vancouver Daily Province* version, Chief Capilano instead describes the honour of motherhood as culminating in “the possibility of some day mothering a man-child, a
warrior, a brave,” as if the women are but a means for producing the next generation of men. While the “legend” told in the distant past remains unchanged, we can see from these two versions how each narrator frames the themes of the legend quite differently – with Chief Capilano’s celebration of brave warriors overshadowing Mary Capilano’s nod to the integral role of matriarchs in Sḵwx̱wú7mesh culture. As Sḵwx̱wú7mesh archaeologist Rudy Reimer explains, we can look at variables such as “who is telling the history, and what they are trying to convey” to the listener, as a means of comparing different versions of Indigenous stories. Though a comparison of these two stories reveals how Chief Capilano’s version might have been considered better suited to Makovski’s vision of The Province’s assumed, mostly male readership, we can also see how the “essence of the story” – the focus on peace and brotherhood – remains consistent across versions.48

As these narrative shifts affect the tone of Johnson’s stories, they also highlight the differences between Mary and Joe Capilano as storytellers. In the Mother’s version, Johnson provides readers with a glimpse of Mary’s gentle, kind persona: “I nodded. I could see she liked that wordless reply, for she placed her narrow brown hand on my arm, nor did she remove it during her entire recital” (Jan. 1909, pp.12). There is a sense of intimacy here, a bond shared only between women, that Johnson articulates. In the Province version, Johnson contrastingly describes Chief Capilano’s gestures as “strong” and “comprehensive,” portraying their encounter as being more formal in nature. Thus, it is through these aspects of the “framing” technique where Johnson has memorialized in writing the unique abilities and mannerisms of Joe and Mary as storytellers. While these narrative details may seem minor – marginal, even – they are indeed textual

48 See p. 196 of Interview with Rudy Reimer in Appendix B on the “multiple versions” of stories.
representations of those Indigenous voices silenced, over time, by the text’s critical framework (which I will expand on below). Thus, through the editorial decision to exclude many of Mary’s stories from the published volume, generations of readers have unknowingly engaged with *Legends* through a limited representation of those actually involved in the storytelling process.

**Legends of Vancouver, or Legends of the Capilano?**

Despite being published under the title *Legends of Vancouver* for the past 100 years, this is not the title that Johnson wanted for the collection; in fact, documents held in McMaster University’s E. Pauline Johnson fonds reveal that the early working title of the monograph was *Indian Legends of the Coast*, and that Johnson ultimately wanted the book to be called *Legends of the Capilano* – as a tribute to her friends and fellow storytellers. The title that was ultimately chosen by the Pauline Johnson Trust was, as Linda Quirk suggests, quite misleading: “The legends in this collection are not about George Vancouver’s explorations of the Pacific coast late in the eighteenth century, nor are they about the founding of the city of Vancouver in the late nineteenth century. They have nothing to do with the city of Vancouver at all” (“Labour of Love” 205).

---

49 As Gerson and Strong-Boag note in *Collected and Selected*, these printed receipts indicate “that the title was not finalized until after the manuscript had gone to the printer” (xii).
Also located in the Johnson fonds at McMaster are a series of five letters,\textsuperscript{50} sent from Pauline’s sister, Evelyn, to a Mr. James Goulet (of Kent County, ON), that reveal the Trust’s involvement in selecting the book’s colonial title.\textsuperscript{51} Though these letters only show one side of the correspondence – all are written by Evelyn, and addressed to Mr. Goulet – it becomes clear in the first letter that Mr. Goulet initiated the correspondence to express condolences for Pauline’s recent passing. The first letter, dated 8 June 1913,

\textsuperscript{50} Gray refers to one of these letters, dated 27 Aug. 1913, in her biography \textit{Flint & Feather} (2002), in which Evelyn responds to a recently published article by Charles Mair in \textit{The Canadian Magazine} (See Gray 256-7). In the corresponding notes to this chapter, Gray writes that “Evelyn Johnson’s 1913 letter to James Goulet came into the possession of Juanita Staples Brumpt in about 1942; a copy was kindly sent to me by Harry Brumpt of Windsor, Ontario” (412-13). These letters were eventually donated to McMaster University Archives, as noted in the “Recent Notable Gifts” section of the fall/winter 2002 \textit{McMaster Library News} Bulletin: “Harry O. Brumpt, letters and news clippings from Evelyn H.C. Johnson to James Goulet regarding her sister, poet E. Pauline Johnson.” In the Pauline Johnson fonds (Box 1, Folder 1) at Trent University Archives, a scrap of paper documents all of Evelyn Johnson’s correspondences for the year of 1913 (including those with Goulet); this paper is divided into columns for each month, with the date, name, and general subject matter of letters received – presumably as a way for Evelyn to keep track of her increased mail, incoming and outgoing, in the wake of her sister’s death.

\textsuperscript{51} James Goulet (1866-1952) of Raleigh, Kent County, Ontario, was the son of John Goulet and Sophie Clark (originally hailing from Quebec). His brother, Louis, was a local historian/writer who documented some of the Goulet family’s genealogy. See Goulet, \textit{Kent Historical Society: Papers and Addresses} Vol. 5 (1921) and the \textit{Commemorative Biographical Record of the County of Kent, Ontario} (1904).
begins with Evelyn stating that she has “received over one hundred letters since [her] sister’s death in March.” She goes on to thank Mr. Goulet for his kind letter, and for the many similar letters she has received – many from strangers: “I have received many letters of sympathy from friends of hers, or people who had seen and read her, and whom I myself have never met.” In this initial letter, Evelyn shares some information about Pauline’s most recent publications, and offers to send Mr. Goulet a copy of Legends of Vancouver if he would like one (the two remaining signed copies are selling for $6.00 apiece). In her next letter, dated 1 July 1913, Evelyn acknowledges receipt of $1.25 (for an unsigned copy of Legends plus postage), and hopes that he has received his copy of the book by now. She elaborates on the history of Legends of Vancouver, apologizing for the rather poor binding and explaining that the Pauline Johnson Trust Fund “got out the book very hurriedly” due to Johnson’s immediate need for financial support.

In this same letter, Evelyn goes on to explain that the title given to the volume was not what her sister had desired. She writes,

The name “Legends of Vancouver” was given the book by the Trustees of the Fund in the hope that it would prove a better seller. My sister was greatly disappointed as she had called it “Legends of the Capilano” – the tribe of Indians on the Coast.

In the next line, Evelyn reveals that she has not shied from sharing this injustice with other correspondents: “I may have written this to you before – I forget, I wrote it to someone.” Over the next three letters, dated 12 August, 27 August, and finally 16 December of that same year, Mr. Goulet and Evelyn exchanged various newspaper clippings about Pauline and a set of Vancouver postcards.

This is not the first time that Evelyn has been documented asserting the provenance of a different title; in the City of Vancouver Archives, a similar letter exists
that was likely published closer to Evelyn’s death in 1937. The letter states, “Thank you so much for the picture of the house where Pauline lived and thank you for the write up of the Legends of the Capilano, as she always called them.” The letter goes on to describe in detail Pauline’s dissatisfaction with the chosen title, *Legends of Vancouver*: “When I arrived from New York in Vancouver she was almost (sic) in tears and complained to me and I said ‘Why didn’t you fight them?’ She said ‘I was too ill.’ But they have gone by the latter name ever since.”

The existence of these surviving archival documents, both indicating Johnson’s desired title for the volume, therefore necessitate a retitling of the collection and a reconsideration of the important authorial roles of Chief Joe and Mary Capilano. With this desired title, *Legends of the Capilano*, we can assume that Pauline was describing the people of the Capilano Reserve – those members of the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Nation, like Chief Joe and Mary Capilano, who called that area of North Vancouver at “Homulcheson” (Capilano Creek) their home.

---

52 Johnson, Evelyn. Letter to F.G. Lees. c. 1935. City of Vancouver Archives, Box 504-E-02, fld. 44. This letter is typewritten, dated “March 18, 1906” but seems to be erroneously so; in her book *Pauline: A Biography* (1981), Keller estimates this letter to be dated around 1935 (see Keller 297); Evelyn (Eva) could not be referring to *Legends* in 1906 as the book had not been published and the stories not yet written. Keller importantly notes Evelyn’s blindness near the end of her life in *Pauline: A Biography*, stating that in 1936 Eva was “almost totally blind” (279). Thus, it could also be possible that Evelyn typed “0” instead of “3” (i.e. writing 1906 instead of 1936), and couldn’t see her error clearly. Keller refers to this letter in her chapter on “Vancouver” in *Pauline: A Biography* (1981), where she argues that Pauline and Evelyn’s reunion during her sickness was “ill-conceived” (261), as they had been estranged for several years beforehand. Keller depicts Evelyn as being very bitter about Pauline’s decisions, particularly those articulated in Pauline’s Last Will and Testament.

53 It should be noted that one edition of the text, published in 1913 by G.S. Forsyth under the imprint of The Thomson Stationery Company, had a different cover pasted on top of the existing cover, effectively retitling the book as *Legends of Capilano* (available at SFU’s Special Collections and Rare Books, PR 9220 O35 L4 1913h, and pictured on page 52).

54 Local newspapers in British Columbia employed similar language during this time, using phrases like “the Capilano village” or “the Capilano” to describe what is now known as Capilano Indian Reserve No. 5. See Cranbrook’s *The Prospector* (23 July 1910) or North Vancouver’s *The Express* (30 July 1909), both available through UBC’s “BC Historical Newspapers” Open Collections.
Legends of Vancouver: An Overview of Key Editions

First Edition (Privately Printed, 1911)

The first edition of Legends of Vancouver, published in 1911 privately by Johnson’s network of supporters, was an initial print run of 1000 copies – these sold out instantly.55 This first run, shoddily-bound with paper covers, was selling copies for $1.00 apiece. In a letter dated 8 December 1911, Pauline writes to her sister:

My book went out in the book stalls on Saturday at noon hour, & by Wednesday, not a copy was left in the publishing house. Spencers (who is like Eatons in Toronto) sold 100 of them last Friday. There never has been such a rush on a holiday book here. Brantford telegraphed for 100 to be sent them, but Mr. Makovski could not let them have one single copy. The entire edition is sold out, is it not glorious?56

Later, at her friend Walter McRaye’s suggestion, Pauline began autographing copies and doubling the price of sale to $2.00 each.57 While this edition mentions Chief Capilano in passing, it sets the precedent for recognizing only one author – E. Pauline Johnson – on both the cover and title page of the collection. The cover features an embossed image of a Plains Indian chief, identified by the distinct headdress and regalia; this image does not represent Chief Capilano (according to descendants, he only wore fur and cedar hats) nor the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Nation, and instead constructs a kind of stereotypical or generically “Indian” figure to represent the Legends stories. In fact, in the same important letter from Evelyn Johnson that reveals the intended title for the collection, Evelyn writes: “The pictured head on the cover is merely a conventional

57 See McRaye's Pauline Johnson and Her Friends (1947), pp. 130-1.
drawing of an Indian’s head. Many persons think it is a picture of Chief Joe Capilano who related the legends to my sister."58

![Image of Legends of Vancouver book cover]

**Figure 2.2  First edition, privately printed (1911)**
Image courtesy of SFU Special Collections and Rare Books (PR 9220 O35 L4 1911b).

The only reference to Joe Capilano appears in the brief “Author’s Foreword,” where Johnson writes of their initial meeting in London and importantly acknowledges her close relationship with the Chief. She writes, “These legends he told me from time to time, just as the mood possessed him, and he frequently remarked that they had never been revealed to any other English-speaking person save myself.” This foreword, however, lacks any reference to Mary Capilano, suggesting perhaps that Johnson was tasked with writing it based on the stories gathered by the Trust for the collection –

58 Johnson, Evelyn. Letter to Mr. James Goulet. 1 July 1913. E. Pauline Johnson fonds, The William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 11.
stories narrated mainly by Chief Capilano. The “Preface,” written by Pauline Johnson Trust member and *The Province* editor Bernard McEvoy, states that Pauline “has made a most estimable contribution to purely Canadian literature” (vii). While McEvoy’s language doesn’t reflect today’s understanding of Indigenous literature as its own category of artistic production, he nonetheless recognizes the timelessness of these stories.


![Image of Thomson Stationery Illustrated edition (1912)](image)

*Figure 2.3 Thomson Stationery Illustrated edition (1912)*
Image courtesy of SFU Special Collections and Rare Books (PR 9220 O35 L4 1912d).

The Thomson Stationery Illustrated edition, published in Vancouver in 1912, included three additional stories by Johnson that were published originally in *Mother’s*
Magazine; these stories were titled, “The Seven Swans,” “Lillooet Falls,”59 and “The Ice Babies” – and were all narrated by Mary Capilano, who is referred to in the stories as the “old klootchman,” meaning “old woman” in the Chinook jargon. Focusing on themes of love and motherhood, these stories gave Mary Capilano a voice that the previous edition (and all those to follow) had not allowed for. After the successful sale of the first printing of Legends, the Trust began promoting the book in earnest – and pamphlets were circulated widely to encourage new female subscribers: “It is to be hoped that the Canadian Clubs and Daughters of the Empire will take this opportunity of paying a slight tribute to one of Canada’s most patriotic writers.”60 This edition was also heavily advertised in a local labour newspaper, the British Columbia Federationist, between 1913-4 and with advertisements often appearing on the same pages as the “Woman Suffrage” column.61 This edition also incorporated eight photographs of relevant Vancouver landscapes including “The Lions,” “Capilano Canyon,” and “Entrance to the Narrows.”

Saturday Sunset Presses/Geo. S. Forsyth Editions (1913)

The content of the 1913 Saturday Sunset Presses edition/Geo. S. Forsyth sub-edition remained largely the same, with the addition of a posthumous note about Johnson’s death and an excerpt from a memorial published in the Vancouver Daily Province. In contrast, the only acknowledgement of Chief Capilano’s death (1910)

59 The story of “Lillooet Falls” also appears in Johnson’s The Moccasin Maker, which was first published in 1913 by William Briggs (Toronto).

60 E. Pauline Johnson fonds, The William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 1, File 41.

61 The British Columbia Federationist (9 Jan. 1914). See UBC’s “BC Historical Newspapers” Open Collections.
appeared vaguely in the stories themselves. For example, in the “The Two Sisters”
Johnson writes, “This is the Indian legend of ‘The Lions of Vancouver’ as I had it from
one who will tell me no more the traditions of his people” (8); a similar gesture appeared
again in “The Recluse,” where Johnson writes, “But I learned this legend from one
whose voice was as dulcet as the swirling rapids; but, unlike them, that voice is hushed
today, while the river, the river still sings on – sings on.” A copy of the Forsyth sub-
edition, held in Simon Fraser University’s Special Collections Library, is particularly
notable – it has had an additional, hand-painted board glued over top of the original
paper binding, giving the volume the new title of *Legends of Capilano*. This reveals an
important gesture towards the legacy of the Capilanos, and suggests that Johnson’s
wishes for an alternative title were known widely – beyond the personal
correspondences of her sister, Evelyn.

![Image of the Legends of Capilano book cover](https://example.com/legends_of_capilano_cover.jpg)

*Figure 2.4 Saturday Sunset Presses edition (1913)*
Image courtesy of SFU Special Collections and Rare Books (PR 9220 O35 L4 1913l).
McClelland and Stewart Editions (1926, 1961)

The McClelland and Stewart 1926 edition, illustrated by Group of Seven artist J.E.H. MacDonald, featured paraphrased content from Johnson’s “Author’s Foreword” on the cover of the book, drawing attention to the authorial role of Chief Joe Capilano: “These legends were told to me personally by my honoured friend, the late Chief Joe Capilano of Vancouver.” While this is not the same as formally acknowledging Chief Capilano as Johnson’s co-author, this edition does importantly place his name (but not Mary’s) on the cover for the first time. This edition also importantly recognizes Johnson
by her Mohawk name, Tekahionwake, on the cover. Like those editions that have preceded it, the McClelland and Stewart edition reprinted the original “Biographical Notice” for Pauline, but still makes no reference to the lives of Chief Joe or Mary Capilano. Other imprints of this edition, published between 1922 and 1949 by McClelland and Stewart, included additional photographs such as the “Monument to E. Pauline Johnson” in Stanley Park, Vancouver.

![Figure 2.6 McClelland and Stewart 1926 edition](Image courtesy of SFU Special Collections and Rare Books (PR 9220 O35 L4 1926).)

53
For the 1961 redesign of Legends, McClelland and Stewart would move Johnson's “Foreword” (and indirect acknowledgment of Chief Capilano's co-authorship) to the back cover, relegating her acknowledgment of Capilano as an afterthought and abridging it to a mere sentence. This move ultimately decontextualizes the stories, creating a tangible disconnection between the legends and their Sḵwx̱wú7mesh storytellers – a decision further exacerbated by the removal of Johnson's Mohawk name from the cover. This edition also brings about a significant change to the text's critical framework: the original “Preface,” “Author's Foreword,” and “Biographical Notice” have been removed, and replaced with an introduction written by Marcus Van Steen (author of Pauline Johnson: Her Life and Work, which would be published a few years later in 1965).
In the new introduction, Van Steen perpetuates a range of pervasive stereotypes of Indigenous people, using terms like “folklore” to describe the stories and suggesting they are more than just “the simple imaginings of a primitive people” (vii). To consider the differences between terms like “folklore” and “legends,” we can look to the Brian Deer Classification System (BDC) as a means of understanding and classifying works of Indigenous literary production. Designed by Kahnawake Mohawk librarian Brian Deer in the 1970s, the BDC has been implemented by several First Nations libraries in Canada including the Xwi7xwa Library at UBC. Though editors like Van Steen have employed non-Indigenous vocabularies (like “folklore”) to describe the Legends stories, the BDC provides a more accurate, Indigenous-specific approach for classifying Indigenous literary legends (which are classified under the subheading “YG”). In Hartmut Lutz’s “Canadian Native Literature and the Sixties” (1997), he similarly critiques Van Steen’s 1961 Introduction to Legends: “In their condescension, Van Steen’s words are symptomatic of the early 1960s. More than thirty years later, it seems superfluous to criticize Van Steen in detail, because phrases like ‘our first Canadians [emphasis mine],’ or ‘simple imaginings of a primitive people’ reveal themselves for what they are: as not only racist, but also factually wrong” (175).

Yet despite Van Steen’s unapologetically racist Introduction, he accomplishes something important for the text: he acknowledges that Legends of Vancouver, as a title for the collection, was not Johnson’s desired choice: “Pauline had wanted them called ‘Legends of the Capilano’ in tribute to her friend, but she was too ill to insist” (xv). Though others have acknowledged the existence of Johnson’s preferred title prior to this publication, no edition of Legends had yet to mention Johnson’s preference in context,

62 See “Xwi7xwa Classification and Names.”
within the text itself. Thus, by placing this information alongside the stories, the edition allows readers to both consider the intentions behind Johnson’s original title, and also reconsider their interpretations of the legends themselves.

With regards to both the 1926 and 1961 McClelland and Stewart editions, it is unclear from the archives who at M&S was making the editorial decisions noted above. This gap in the archival record can be partially explained by a note on the digital finding aid for the McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds in McMaster University’s Archives and Research Collections, which states as follows: “Practically all of the company records prior to 1950 were destroyed by John McClelland. Before this was done, however, George L. Parker examined the records of the company for his doctoral dissertation and made notes. These notes are available to researchers.” Unfortunately, the “Parker Notes” collection includes only minimal notations regarding the early sales records of *Legends of Vancouver*; similarly, the only other file for *Legends of Vancouver* in the M&S archival holdings is a printing invoice from October 1973 (addressed to UK printer Hazell, Watson and Viney) requesting 1,500 copies.

---

63 Parker notes that between July 1920 and May 1928, there were approximately 19,125 copies of *Legends of Vancouver* printed, and approx. 18,400 bound. “The last record of bindings of the 1928 printing is April 1934. These were prepared in cloth, paper, velvet calf, lambskin, Persian yapp.” See McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 122, George Parker Notes. I would like to thank Dr. Leslie Howsam for deciphering the word “yapp” (i.e. a form of limp binding) on this surviving document, and linking me to this definition: [https://www.biblio.com/book_collecting_terminology/yapp-binding-334.html](https://www.biblio.com/book_collecting_terminology/yapp-binding-334.html).

64 See McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2Ca88.
The next significant changes to the book came in 1991, with the redesigned edition published by Quarry Press (Kingston, ON). Interestingly, this edition was selected as the first book in the Canadian Children's Classics Series, which highlighted books of “exceptional literary and cultural value” written for children; as *Legends* was not explicitly written for this demographic, we might instead consider this adaptation as an attempt (like Makovski’s proposed “children’s” edition) at marketing the stories towards a newer, younger readership.\(^{65}\) However, as noted in a 1994 review published in *Canadian*

---

\(^{65}\) There was a children’s book version of “The Two Sisters” (titled *The Two Sisters*) published in 2016 by Waterlea Books, which contains an abbreviated version of the story and new illustrations by Sandra Butt. This edition is marketed in Chapters-Indigo stores for children ages 3-5, and is classified as part of the “Fairytales, Myths & Legends” section. A children’s book edition of “The Lost Island” (titled *The Lost Island*) was also published in 2010, with illustrations by Bulgarian artist Atanas Matsoureff.
Children’s Literature, this edition was not well-suited for a “children’s” reading demographic: “For young readers and listeners, however, Johnson’s language may have to be edited or explained” (62).66 Since the original text of Legends of Vancouver was not abbreviated or adapted in any way for this new readership, Johnson’s vocabulary (and the context of such “time-bound” word choices) was likely too complex for child readers; adding a Glossary for the mainly Chinook words was not sufficient to justify a new genre classification. Despite this decision, the Quarry Press edition, more than any other edition in print thus far, made an effort to reconnect the Legends stories with contemporary Coast Salish Indigenous communities. For instance, Johnson’s Mohawk name is returned to the cover of the text, and is presented alongside original cover art and drawings by Stó:lō artist Laura Wee Láy Láq. The Press’s association between the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh stories and Stó:lō culture, on the other hand, remains somewhat puzzling. Though both nations are part of the larger Coast Salish umbrella, whose region extends from northern Vancouver Island to western Washington State, there are many individual nations within this grouping – and substituting the Stó:lō Nation in place for the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh suggests a generalization of Coast Salish nations, rather than an effort to bring the stories back to their home community.

This edition also effectively expanded the text’s critical framework to include an Afterword, Glossary, and Further Reading List (all anonymously written). Johnson’s original “Foreword” is also reinserted at the beginning of the book, emphasizing the importance of framing the legends, and Johnson’s respect for the Capilanos, with her own words. The Glossary provides a resource for the Chinook jargon that has been missing from previous editions; while early editions did include several footnoted translations for one or two Chinook words, this new Glossary is more complete, and

66 See Shklanka, “Two Collections of Native Stories.”
attempts to contextualize Johnson’s use of language – that is, to emphasize the ways in which language is often “time bound” (135). It should also be noted that Quarry Press donated all royalties from this book towards the preservation of Chiefswood – Johnson’s ancestral home in Brantford, ON.


The 1997 edition, published by Douglas & McIntyre, also returns Johnson’s “Foreword” to its proper place at the start of the book, and includes a new introduction by Vancouver writer Robin Laurence that improves significantly upon Van Steen’s – both in its emphasis on Johnson’s ever-present legacy that remains in places like Stanley Park, and on the importance and relevance of Johnson’s relationship with Joe Capilano.
Laurence writes, “these stories are as much about the writer’s love of Vancouver’s natural setting as they are about her admiration for Chief Joe Capilano and the traditions and oral culture of his people” (xvii). Though this edition does not replicate the glossary or further reading resources of the Quarry Press edition, it does include an updated selection of archival images – five full-page portraits of Johnson, and none of the Capilanos – chosen from the Vancouver Public Library and City of Vancouver Archives. In her book chapter included in Janice Fiamengo’s *Home Ground and Foreign Territory: Essays on Early Canadian Literature* (2014), Carole Gerson describes the historical absence of photographs of the Capilanos in *Legends* as an “oversight” – one that “has been perpetuated by the current Douglas & McIntyre edition” (62).

**Midtown Press 100th Anniversary Edition (2013)**

The most recent edition of *Legends* was published in 2013 by Vancouver’s Midtown Press, and was issued as the 100th Anniversary edition – commemorating a century since Johnson’s 1913 death. This edition interestingly juxtaposes historical photographs of Vancouver with more modern scenes of the city’s changing landscape, contrasting the trees and rocks of Stanley Park with the concrete bike-paths and skyscrapers of today’s Vancouver.
Figure 2.10  Midtown Press edition (2013)
Image by A. Shield, scanned from personal collection.

Figure 2.11  Title page from Midtown Press 2013 edition
Image depicting Edward S. Curtis’ photograph titled “Canoeing on Clayquot Sound.” Image by A. Shield, scanned from personal collection.
Johnson’s original “Author’s Foreword” follows the updated preface, written by Sheila M.F. Johnston, and is accompanied by, for the first time, a full-page image of Chief Joe Capilano. However, this important gesture is undermined by the book’s title page, which features an image of two unidentified Indigenous people paddling a canoe. An average reader might assume that this is an image of Chief Capilano and Mary Capilano, but the “List of Photographs” at the book’s conclusion reveals otherwise. Instead, this image is attributed to twentieth-century ethnographer Edward S. Curtis, reproduced from the Library of Congress’s digital repository and titled, “Canoeing on Clayquot Sound.” While an image caption was not provided in this edition, a Library of Congress database search revealed it to be as follows: “Two Hesquiat women are homeward bound with the product of their day’s labor in gathering food, and cedar-bark to be used in making mats.”

This caption reveals that rather than selecting images of the Capilanos, or at least of people from the Skwxwú7mesh Nation, the Press opted for a photograph reminiscent of early twentieth-century coastal Indigenous peoples more generally – one that was easily accessible and of no cost to reproduce. By failing to acknowledge the importance of nation specificity, particularly given our current national focus on repairing relationships with Indigenous communities, this decision highlights how such seemingly well-intentioned gestures – like including the photograph of Chief Capilano – continue to fall short with regards to Indigenous editorial protocols.

---

67 This image appears as plate no. 373 in Volume 11 of Edward S. Curtis’s The North American Indian (on the Nootka and the Haida Nations), published in 1916.

68 This was revealed to me through email communications with Midtown Press’s editor and book designer in April 2017. It should also be noted that the cover to this edition features an image titled Haayiitlik (Sea-serpent), created by xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam) artist Raymond Sim. By choosing to highlight xʷməθkʷəy̓əm art rather than Skwxwú7mesh as the entry-point to the Legends text, this edition exhibits a similar non-nation specific generalization of Coast Salish nations as the Quarry Press edition.
The English edition of 2013 was actually preceded by a version in French in 2012, published by Québec publisher Presses de Bras-d’Apic (as part of their “Collection Rencontres inattendues” or Unexpected Encounters Collection), and translated from English by Chantal Ringuet. The design, cover images, and photographs are identical to the Midtown Press edition, with some slight variations in colour to the front/back covers. Unlike the 2013 Midtown Press edition, the French translation was not presented as an anniversary edition, and was released one year prior to the anniversary of Johnson’s death. Where the Midtown Press edition includes a Preface (written by Sheila M.F. Johnston) and Johnson’s original “Author’s Foreword,” the French translation instead includes a preface written by the translator (Ringuet), titled “Une dame victorienne et une princesse mohawk” (A Victorian lady and a Mohawk princess), and excludes Johnson’s “Foreword” – a necessary component, as I have previously argued, in framing Johnson’s relationship to Chief Joe Capilano in her own words.
Johnson’s Final Will & Other Adaptations of Legends

With knowledge of Legends’ complex publishing history and constant republication over the past 100 years, we might also consider: who profited from the sales of these books after Johnson’s death? Though Legends is now in the public domain, and has been since about 1963, we can look to Johnson’s final arrangements for some insights into its stewardship over the last century.

According to Johnson’s Last Will and Testament (authorized on the 26th of February, 1913 – nine days before her death), she bequeathed all profits from the sales of Legends of Vancouver to Walter McRae, “my books which he has been instrumental
in selling” (5). With regard to the copyright of *Legends* and any other published materials, Johnson left this all to Lionel Makovski – with the provision that he might, “from time to time,” share the profits from any publications with Johnson’s remaining siblings, Evelyn and Allen. In 1914, Makovski would transfer the copyright of *Legends* over to the Toronto-based publishing house, McClelland, Goodchild & Stewart Limited (Quirk 216), who would control publication until the 1991 edition by Quarry Press was produced (and the text had entered the public domain). Noticeably absent from Johnson’s final will is any reference to the Capilano family, barring them from being entitled to any future monetary profits or copyright to the stories. As to why she excluded the Capilanos from her final will, we can only speculate. Perhaps given her illness, and the related urgency of finalizing her Will and dispensing of all material items to her closest friends, she didn’t consider the possibility of *Legends* remaining in print indefinitely. Nor would she, in the early twentieth-century and at the height of salvage ethnography, have likely considered the long-term implications of “borrowing” traditional knowledge from the Capilano family. In fact, Johnson and the Capilanos may have considered the publication of these stories as a precautionary measure or form of safekeeping, amidst widespread fears of inevitable Indigenous cultural loss in the face of modernization. However, by leaving them out of the will entirely, Johnson effectively devalued her relationship with the Capilanos, and set the neglectful tone that all subsequent editions of *Legends of Vancouver* would follow. Johnson’s decision not to assign copyright to the Capilanos could also be a reflection of the misconception that, as

---

69 Last Will and Testament of Emily Pauline Johnson. 26 Feb. 1913. Retrieved from the British Columbia Archives. (Note – Johnson appointed Lionel Makovski and Isabel Mackay as her executors).

70 The “George Parker Notes” on the early McClelland and Stewart records indicate the following agreement between M&S and Makovski: “1st record in Sales Book: Jan 16 1914. Contract with Lionel W Makovski." The William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, McClelland & Stewart Fonds, Box 122, George Parker Notes.
Younging articulates in *Elements of Indigenous Style*, “oral stories” are not “owned” by any one individual and therefore do not require permission or copyright.\(^{71}\)

In the years following Pauline’s death, surviving documents suggest that Makovski was trying to come up with different ways of adapting Johnson’s *Legends* stories – perhaps as a form of tribute, or in an attempt to attract new reading audiences. For instance, Makovski sent a letter to McClelland & Stewart Ltd. on 15 August 1922, proposing the creation of an educational edition of “Pauline Johnson[‘s] book for boys and girls,” one that would include coloured illustrations:

> I can imagine an Arthur Rackham making an extraordinarily fine edition for children. I think that there might be something in this but instead of the legends being re-written their impression would be stamped by the illustrations… Perhaps for children between eight and twelve the personal touches between Miss Johnson and Chief Capilano and others of her tillicums might be omitted. It may be possible to re-write the stories without losing the poetry and atmosphere, but I am a little doubtful.\(^{72}\)

The proposed table of contents to this edition uses the same titles for each story, but adds to each a kind of thematic phrase or “moral” that emphasizes and simplifies the story’s main idea or takeaway. For example, “The Two Sisters” is subtitled “Peace,” and “Siwash Rock” becomes “The Rock of Fatherhood.” Also included in this letter to John McClelland was a prototype “Foreword” to the new children’s edition of *Legends*, which Makovski had retitled as *Indian Fairy Tales*. While this proposal for a children’s edition was never put into motion, one might draw similarities between Makovski’s articulations for the addition of fine illustrations to the text and the “New Edition – Illustrated” put

---

\(^{71}\) See Younging’s *Elements of Indigenous Style* (2018, pp. 38-41) for more on copyright as it applies to Traditional Knowledge and Oral Traditions.

forward by McClelland & Stewart that very same year, featuring illustrations by Group of Seven artist J.E.H. MacDonald.\textsuperscript{73}

Another example of adaptation can be traced to a mysterious and obscure pamphlet, measuring only 16 x 12.5cm and consisting of 8 pages of text, titled The Legend of the Salt-Chuck Oluk. This pamphlet was published in the 1920s (exact date unknown) by non-Indigenous poet Lionel Haweis (1870-1942), who was a former UBC Librarian and Vancouver writer/poet, and member of the Vancouver Handicrafts Guild. Based on Johnson's story of “The Sea-Serpent,” the pamphlet version condenses Johnson’s original introduction to concepts of greed or “avarice,” but the story is, for the most part, true to the original text.\textsuperscript{74} Each page of text is written in a beautiful calligraphy-style, with ornamental designs and decorations added around the borders of each page.\textsuperscript{75} The back page of the pamphlet reads “Published by Special Permission of L. W. Makovski, Copyright Holder,” which reaffirms Johnson’s designation of all copyright to Makovski as set out in her final will (but does not convey Johnson’s permission for such adaptation). Haweis also published a series of abbreviated (or appropriated) poems, based on the Legends of Vancouver stories, between 1913-1914 in a local periodical titled British Columbia Magazine.\textsuperscript{76} That he determined to...

\textsuperscript{73} See Jeff A. Menges' The Fantastic Line Art of Arthur Rackham (2017) for examples of Rackham’s line art; I would argue that visual similarities exist between the line work of Rackham and J.E.H. MacDonald.

\textsuperscript{74} To view a side-by-side comparison of “The Sea Serpent” and The Legend of the Salt-Chuck Oluk, see: http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/80h6Nm.

\textsuperscript{75} A unique copy of this pamphlet can be found in the E. Pauline Johnson fonds at The William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections (McMaster University Library), which appears to include hand-painted watercolours throughout. It was McMaster University’s Archives and Rare Books Librarian, Myron Groover, who suggested to me that this pamphlet was likely hand-painted, stating that “the colours appear too unnatural to have been done by a printer” (24 Oct. 2017).

\textsuperscript{76} The list of abbreviated poems include: “The Shaman’s Sacrifice,” based on Johnson’s “The Lost Island”; “The Lure of the West,” based on Johnson’s “The Lure in Stanley Park”; “The Legend of Siwash Rock,” based on Johnson’s “Siwash Rock”; “The Song of the Tulameen River,” based on Johnson’s “The Tulameen Trail”; and “The Haunted Island or Isle of Dead Men,” based on...
appropriate so brazenly Johnson’s stories shortly after her death, and without her permission, speaks in part to challenges of authority often experienced by Johnson and other Indigenous women writers during the early twentieth century. In fact, these are the very same gender and racial inequalities that shaped Johnson’s stories several years earlier for their publication in *The Province* newspaper.

The abbreviated poems follow the narrative of Johnson’s stories quite closely, but depart often to invoke stereotypical or inaccessible language. For example, in Haweis’ “The Legend of Siwash Rock,” he repeats Johnson’s key phrases like “clean fatherhood” but also invokes terms like “peace-pipe” (line 47) and “squaw” (line 9) – these are terms that have no relevance to the story as Johnson tells it, but are terms stereotypically “Indian” in their usage and/or employment. In “The Legend of Siwash Rock,” Haweis describes the moment when the young chief and his wife decide that they must swim:

“All’s one,” said he, and smiled…. Hand, then, in hand
They weave the giant woods, the twain in one,
Now through a mass of green investiture,
Now ’twixt the bones of naked forests burned,
Shoreward a path and seaward, questing purity –
The purity of all the world’s unborn.

By using sophisticated words like “twain” and “investiture” in his poem, Haweis obscures the original narrative and ensures that only members of the literary and social elite can read his work. This same moment is represented in Johnson’s “Siwash Rock” as follows:

He sprang from his couch of wolf-skins and looked out upon the coming day; the promise of what it would bring him seemed breathing through all his forest world. He took her very gently by the hand and led her through the tangle of wilderness down to the water’s edge, where the beauty spot

---

Johnson’s “Deadman’s Island” (all are available in UBC’s Rare Books and Special Collections, in the Lionel Haweis sous-fonds).
we moderns call Stanley Park bends about Prospect Point. “I must swim,” he told her.

In addition to rendering the stories inaccessible to most readers, Haweis also discards Johnson’s use of the frame narrative technique. Traditionally, Johnson utilized the space at the beginning and end of each story to describe for readers the characteristics and mannerisms of Chief Joe and Mary Capilano, her Sḵwx̱ wú7mesh storytellers. In the abbreviated poems, however, Haweis jumps right into the “legend” – effectively erasing the presence of multiple narrators and decontextualizing the voices of the Capilanos.

His abbreviated poems were often accompanied by the line, “Suggested by the prose of E. Pauline Johnson’s ‘Legends of Vancouver’”; this disclaimer, though importantly acknowledging Johnson’s Legends as the main source, also has the illusory effect of downplaying the problematic nature of Haweis’ appropriation under the guise of artistic license. The word “suggested” is also an interesting choice, as it implies that the words for this poetic rendition somehow came to be of their own volition (and not through Haweis’ deliberate, appropriative actions). In his long poem titled “The Lure of the West,” he similarly writes, “Suggested by the prose of E. Pauline Johnson[’s] “The Lure in Stanley Park” Vancouver, B.C. in the book of her Legends,” but adds to this statement, “and by courtesy of the copyright-holder of the original story.” As most of these abbreviated poems appear to have been published during 1914, it is likely that Haweis acquired permission to adapt and publish his poems from Lionel Makovski, who was designated the official copyright-holder of Legends until it would be transferred, later that year, to McClelland, Goodchild, & Stewart.77 It is not a coincidence that both of these

77 It is also possible that Makovski and Haweis were former classmates of Marlborough College (Wiltshire, England), as is suggested by archival documents found in the Haweis Family fonds at UBC. (See letter dated 7 April 1930, “Headmasters Tour,” in the Lionel Haweis sous-fonds, which describes a reunion meeting for the “Old Marlburians” to be held in Vancouver, of which both Makovski and Haweis are named as invited guests).
men, one an editor for a prominent Vancouver newspaper, another a respected writer and poet, and both non-Indigenous, have similarly leveraged their positions in society to pay tribute to Johnson by inadvertently appropriating her writing and legacy.

Figure 2.14 The Legend of the Salt-Chuck Oluk (c1920)
Image courtesy of SFU Special Collections and Rare Books (PR 9220 O35 L3 1902).

Today’s *Legends of Vancouver*: A Community-Centered Approach

Since *Legends* has been in publication for over a century now, there have been many different editions and imprints produced – each reflecting distinct contexts and sociopolitical views on behalf of the publishers and editors. When considering the legacy of this text, and paying particular attention to Johnson’s ill-health during the production of
the collection, we must consider that the book published in 1911 may not have reflected the final wishes of its named author – especially with regard to the treatment of Joe and Mary Capilano. By examining each edition of *Legends* as put forward over the past century, focusing specifically on those editorial decisions that have minimized the important literary contributions of the Capilano family, the publication of a new edition becomes essential to reconnect readers with these important Sḵwx̱wú7mesh storytellers.

Through recent publishing initiatives like the University of Manitoba Press’s First Voices, First Texts series, we are finally seeing this model for critically framed Indigenous literatures being put into practice. In this series, works of Indigenous writings are being republished with updated critical frameworks that prioritize ethical engagement and foster community partnerships. As the editor of the forthcoming updated edition of this text, retitled *Legends of the Capilano*, I’ve had the privilege of working alongside members of the Mathias family, who are descendants of Chief Joe and Mary Capilano and members of the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Nation. Our relationship began in 2017, when I reached out to Cody Mathias, great-grandson of the Capilanos and respected carver in the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh community; he invited me to their family’s performance of the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh “Daily Welcoming” at Vancouver’s “The Drum is Calling Festival.” For this first meeting, I came bearing a copy of *Legends of Vancouver* and several bundles of tea. I chose a black tea blend called “London Afternoon,” thinking specifically of that fortuitous 1906 meeting between Chief Capilano and E. Pauline Johnson. After their performance, I was invited backstage to meet the family, all dressed in ancestral regalia, where I presented them with gifts and told them about my work on *Legends of Vancouver.*
After the festival, I was invited by Cody’s sister, Rose, to attend a Saturday family gathering at her home on the Capilano Reserve. Much to my surprise, the family were enthusiastic about the “Legends of the Capilano” project, and welcomed me – a settler scholar and cultural outsider – into their lives; these Saturday visits soon became a regular occurrence. I consulted with a mentor of my own, Deanna Reder (Cree-Métis), on how to prepare tobacco ties, as I wanted to formally present an offering to each family member before we proceeded. In doing so, I explained that I was coming to this work with a good heart and good mind, and asked if they would accept the tobacco as a gesture of respect for our collaborative work to come. Since then, I’ve had the privilege of learning from this family, of sharing with them my archival research and findings, and of better understanding the important role that Sḵwx̱wú7mesh matriarchs – women like Mary Capilano – maintain within Sḵwx̱wú7mesh culture. Their involvement and support of my vision to return this text to the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh community and Capilano family made this project possible.

As part of the editorial process, I’ve also had the honour of consulting with two Indigenous scholars to better understand the legacy of Legends of Vancouver and its relationship to the Kanien’kehá:ka and Sḵwx̱wú7mesh communities. In my interviews with Rick Monture (of Six Nations of the Grand River) and Rudy Reimer (Sḵwx̱wú7mesh),78 these scholars unpack some of the issues that surround Johnson’s representations of Indigenous culture, and the storytelling inconsistencies that often shape the versions of stories we come to know. As both Monture and Reimer assert in their respective interviews, we must continue revisiting older works of Indigenous literature in order for these writers and their stories to remain relevant. In revisiting

78 See Appendix B, pp. 186-200.
Legends of Vancouver through the publication of an updated edition, Legends of the Capilano aims to reconcile over 100 years of editorial intervention, bringing forth the voices and contributions of Chief Joe and Mary Capilano and acknowledging a literary legacy that belongs to both the Kanien'kehá:ka and Sḵwx̱wú7mesh communities, of generations past, present, and future.79

79 As per the Mathias family’s wishes, all royalties from the sale of this updated edition of Legends will be donated to The Chief Joe Mathias BC Aboriginal Scholarship Fund.
Chapter 3. The Life and Forgotten Stories of Mary Capilano

“For one must voice his thoughts delicately if one hopes to extract a tradition from my good old ancient Klootchman” – “The Legend of the Ice Babies” (Nov. 1911)

“My Grandfather’s mother, Mary Agnes Capilano did a lot for the people that live on our land… Great-grandma worked hard – everyday she would go on her canoe with all the sea food. She brought to the Hotel Vancouver fresh seafood. And also she made cedar baskets, and other things she made and sold them in downtown Vancouver, then came back in her canoe. I think about how strong she was” – Katherine (Katie) Phyllis Mathias Joe August (Dec. 2017)

With the 1911 publication of Legends of Vancouver, the path of Mary Capilano’s authorial legacy was forever altered. Of the fifteen “Indian stories” authored by Johnson and selected for publication, only one would include Mary Capilano as narrator – despite her recurring role as narrator in six of Johnson's previously published prose pieces. As multiple versions of many of Johnson’s “legends” exist, we must consider why the Pauline Johnson Trust and editors at The Province were motivated to exclude Mary’s stories from the final volume; furthermore, we must also consider how this decision, in perpetuity, has contributed to the ongoing silencing of Mary Capilano’s narrative voice. To address these issues, this chapter engages in several forms of archival recovery: first, through extensive biographical research across many disparate sources to provide the fullest possible account of her life; second, through the acknowledgement and analysis of Mary's narrative contributions through Johnson's forgotten Mother's Magazine stories; and third, more peripherally, through an appreciation of her basketry as a form of writing, storytelling, and as a preservation of traditional knowledge.
Despite Mary’s peripheral involvement in the *Legends of Vancouver* collection, which has remained in print for over a century, very little has been written about her life; thus, this chapter aims to provide the first comprehensive record of Mary’s existence. Described by Vancouver journalist Noel Robinson as “the most remarkable Indian I’ve ever met,” Mary Capilano was considered a regular figure in Vancouver’s twentieth-century newspaper scene. An analysis of her newspaper appearances, in conjunction with a comprehensive biographical sketch of her life, will serve to introduce Mary Capilano as more than merely a character in one of Johnson’s stories – instead, as a Sḵwx̱wú7mesh matriarch in her own right. Furthermore, by looking to her contributions to the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh community as an Indigenous activist, particularly in standing as witness during the Stanley Park court cases in the 1920s, we can recognize her contributions in addition to those of Sḵwx̱wú7mesh storyteller. After establishing an account of Mary’s influential life and legacy, this chapter will then conduct a survey of her forgotten contributions: namely, her versions of the *Legends of Vancouver* stories that were not selected for publication in the 1911 volume. This analysis will focus on Johnson’s ability to move fluidly between publishing venues, imbuing her *Mother’s Magazine* stories with seemingly minor, marginal details about Mary Capilano that actively resist anthropological modes of storytelling. Throughout this section of my chapter, I also integrate modes of digital humanities textual analysis to highlight the key differences, where applicable, between versions of the *Legends* stories.

80 See Item AAAB1468, “Noel Robinson interview,” BC Provincial Archives.
Part I: A Biographical Sketch of Mary Capilano

Mary Agnes Capilano (Lixwelut, also spelled Lay-hu-lette\textsuperscript{81} or Lay-Kho-Lote,\textsuperscript{82} meaning “the beginning of the world”) was born around 1840 at Potlatch Creek, in Howe Sound off the eastern coast of Vancouver Island. Mary was the first-born daughter of a marriage that united two previously warring tribes, the Yaculta (now known as the Kwakwaka’wakw) and the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh. For this, she became known by many as “The Princess of Peace.”

Mary’s first husband, Chief Charlie,\textsuperscript{83} came from the Catholic Mission Reserve in New Westminster. After his death from smallpox, Mary met her second husband, Sahp-luk Joe (who would become Chief Joe Capilano). In 1872, Sahp-luk Joe married Mary Agnes (Lixwelut), and they started a family at the first Catholic Mission Reserve No. 1 (known in Sḵwx̱wú7mesh then as Ustlawn, now Eslhá7an) in North Vancouver. When Chief Lahwa (of the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Nation) died in 1895, Joe was selected as the next Chief because of Mary – as the grand-niece of “Old” Chief Ki-ap-a-la-no, she was the nearest blood relative to the former hereditary chief. Beyond these blood ties, however, it has been speculated that Catholic missionary Paul Durieu may have influenced the decision to choose Joe as chief. As a devout Catholic and respected orator, Sahp-luk Joe was considered the most acceptable leader by the church – and the best chance the missionaries had of converting the nearby Capilano Reserve to Catholicism. Chief Joe Capilano and Mary Agnes relocated near the Capilano River to Homulchesun (now

\textsuperscript{81} See Morton, Capilano: The Story of a River (1970); Ashwell, Coast Salish, Their Art, Culture and Legends (1978); Thornton, Potlatch People: Indian Lives & Legends of British Columbia (1966); and records at The City of Vancouver Archives for examples of this alternative spelling.


\textsuperscript{83} See “The Old Lady of the Siwashes” in the Vancouver Daily World newspaper (12 March 1910, p. 45).
known as Xwmelch’sten or Capilano Indian Reserve No. 5, where Joe built a church for the community. Together they had three surviving children – Mathias Joe, Emma, and Susan, and also raised two of their grandsons, Simon and Joe Baker.84

Mary could speak many languages, including Skwxwú7mesh, hən̓q̓əmin̓əm (Musqueam), Tsilhqot’in (Chilcotin), St’át’imcets (Lillooet), Chinook Jargon, and some English. Those who knew her often described her as good-natured and clever: “She has the keenest sense of humor and is often very witty, and I am convinced that, as a small child she must have been what we call precocious.”85 She was known widely for her talents as a basket weaver,86 and was often seen paddling her dugout canoe, even in her older years when her legs were “not quite skookum”87 anymore, to cross the First Narrows between the Capilano Reserve and downtown Vancouver. Mary made a living by selling her basketry and mats, along with fresh clams and berries, to residents of the

84 The exact number of children Mary and Joe had is not certain, but most sources suggest at least ten. In Robin Fisher’s entry for “SU-Á-PU-LUCK (Joseph Capilano)” in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Fisher states that Joe and Mary together had 12 children; it is likely that most of these children died at a young age, as they are not mentioned in other biographical resources. The 1910 Vancouver Daily World newspaper article, “The Old Lady of the Siwashes,” the author states that Mary “has mothered a brood of fifteen little ones, but of that number, only three are living today” (45). Similarly, in Mildred Valley Thornton’s article on Mary in The Vancouver Sun, she writes: “She must have been the mother of many children, for the little cemetery records their interment two by two” (“Mary Capilano, Daring, Venturous”). These numbers reflect the staggering rates of infant mortality amongst Indigenous peoples during the early twentieth century (see Moffat, “Infant Mortality in an Aboriginal Community” (1992); see also Fahimi and Jones (eds), Epidemic Encounters: Influenza, Society, and Culture in Canada, 1918-20 (2012); such numbers are similarly described in Emily Carr’s 1941 story, “Sophie” (published in Klee Wyck), where Carr writes of her Skwxwú7mesh friend Sophie Frank: “Every year Sophie had a new baby. Almost every year she buried one. Her little graves were dotted all over the cemetery. I never knew more than three of her twenty-one children to be alive at one time” (56).

85 See Noel Robinson’s “Letters to the Editor: Inability to Present Indians to their Majesties Regretted” (3 June 1939) in The Province.

86 See photos on pp. 94-5 for an example of Mary’s basketry; this basket belongs to the Mathias family, who are direct descendants of Mary Capilano.

87 See Noel Robinson’s article “Mrs. Capilano’s Deception” (4 September 1937) in The Province.
West End and guests at the Hotel Vancouver. According to Vancouver journalist Noel Robinson, Mary enjoyed smoking tobacco from a pipe – or “tobac,” as she called it.88

After the death of her husband in 1910, Mary held two memorial potlatches in his honour – one shortly afterwards, and another about fifteen years later. From the second potlatch, she was given money from local Indigenous communities to build a tomb for the late Chief Joe Capilano; this generosity highlights the extent of Joe’s influence on and respect from First Nations as an activist in his lifetime, but more importantly speaks to her role as a widely esteemed Sḵwx̱wú7mesh matriarch. Vancouver columnist Mamie Moloney wrote about Mary’s potlatch in *The Vancouver Sun*: “A chieftainess in her own right, Mary gave one of the last of the famous potlatches before they were outlawed by the white man. With the proceeds from her clam beds, her orchard and her berry-picking, she saved money to buy hundreds of blankets which she gave away, with all the cash she possessed, to her potlatch guests.”89

In October 1940, Mary had an unfortunate near-death experience that likely led to her passing several weeks later. After visiting Chief Joe’s mausoleum at the Capilano cemetery, she got lost on her return home, and decided to wade across the Capilano River at dusk. She ended up in shoulder-deep water and spent most of the night resting alongside the River, too exhausted to continue home. When she eventually made it home, it was nearly sunrise. Mary spent the next two days in bed, semi-conscious, before she was able to resume her normal activities. This incident was reported in *The Province* on 29 October 1940, in an article titled “Matriarch of Capilano Escapes Torrent.” It seems that after this traumatic event, she was unable to fully recover. Mary

89 See Mamie Moloney’s 22 May 1953 “In One Ear” column in *The Vancouver Sun* newspaper.
died on December 15, 1940, at the approximate age of 100.\textsuperscript{90} She was laid to rest in the Capilano mausoleum, beside her late husband, Chief Joe Capilano.\textsuperscript{91}

### The Dispossession Cases

After the death of Chief Capilano in 1910, Mary continued as an activist for Indigenous rights herself, standing as witness during the City of Vancouver and Government of Canada’s 1923 dispossession cases against the families of Brockton Point, Stanley Park. The “Dispossession Cases” were launched by the City of Vancouver and Canadian Government in April 1923, against the families of Brockton Point in an effort to dispossess those residing at Whoi Whoi, Kanaka Ranch, and Brockton Point of their land and dwellings. These legal cases followed the 1886 petition to the government by Vancouver’s city council to turn all of the Coal Harbour peninsula into a public park (Barman 89). Of the four court cases, commonly referred to in newspapers as the “Stanley Park Squatters,” Mary Capilano served as a defence witness for Agnes Cummings and Margaret West as they attempted to prove, through succession, their “squatter’s rights” to the land in Stanley Park. As Jean Barman notes, these cases relied on the concept of “adverse possession,” i.e. “whereby occupation that went unchallenged for a specified period of time overrode legal ownership” (186). Mary spoke to the court (in Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, translated in court to English by her son Chief

\textsuperscript{90} Though Mary’s exact age was unknown, Vancouver writer Noel Robinson estimated Mary to be over 100 years old. This caused a point of contention between Robinson and City of Vancouver archivist Major Matthews, who claimed Mary to be only 83 at her time of death. See letters in the City of Vancouver Archives, “Capilano Genealogy” file, for their correspondences back and forth (including a response from Matthews where he states, ‘THIS IS NONSENSE’).

\textsuperscript{91} In 1993, there was a memorial pole raised in her honour at the Capilano Suspension Bridge (located in North Vancouver, B.C), and a permanent exhibit remains open at the Suspension Bridge titled “Kia’palano” that includes (at times, erroneous) information on the Capilano family.
Mathias\textsuperscript{92}), testifying that she remembered previous residents of the Cummings’ house from her childhood: “She knows Dr. Johnson. She says she never visit him, but she sees the old Dr. Johnson when she used to dig clams near to the beach there” (Barman 196).

In an article published in *The Province* (16 November 1923) titled “Joe Capilano’s Widow Is Witness in Squatter Case,” Mary’s testimony is summarized as follows: “When a little girl Mrs. Joe used to drink out of a well on Doctor Johnson Hjachalachth’s place, which in later years passed into the hands of Agnes Cummings’ father.”\textsuperscript{93} Though the City of Vancouver deemed the “Indian testimony” (Barman 207) unsatisfactory and rejected all four claims to possession in the BC Supreme Court, the defendants then hired new lawyers and presented their cases to the BC Court of Appeal – where they were successful. After the appeal decisions were announced in favour of the “squatters” in 1924, the City of Vancouver quickly challenged the decision, forcing the cases to be heard by the Supreme Court of Canada. Here, judges determined that “Indian testimony” should not be credited in these cases, and that “the appeal decision should be dismissed out of hand by virtue of Aboriginal people’s supposed inability to grasp the concept of time and to differentiate between truth and imagination” (Barman 218). The Supreme Court of Canada announced its decision to restore the BC Supreme Court’s original

\textsuperscript{92} In Barman’s text, she erroneously lists Mary Capilano’s interpreter as Chief Joe Mathias (193), where it should have been Chief Mathias Joe. In my research, I have often come across instances of confusion regarding the male lineage of the Capilano family, and I list the correct names here for clarification: Chief Mathias Joe (born 1886, son of Joe and Mary Capilano); Chief William (Buffalo) Mathias (born 1920, son of Mathias Joe); Chief Joe Mathias (born 1943, son of Buffalo Mathias, namesake for Chief Joe Mathias Center in North Vancouver, BC).

\textsuperscript{93} Dr. Johnson Hjachalachth was an “Indian medicine man” who had lived on the Stanley Park property prior to James Cummings, who then passed the property onwards to his daughter, Agnes Cummings. See also “Medicine Man Referred To: Ancient Practitioner Quoted in Stanley Park Squatter’s Case” in *The Province* (15 Nov. 1923, p. 20).
decision on 20 October 1925, thereby officially dispossessing the families of Brockton Point.94

A “Remarkable Indian,”95 a “Remarkable Matriarch” 96: Mary Capilano in Canadian Newspapers

Despite a devastating loss at the Supreme Court – one that highlighted the prevalence of colonial attitudes and inequalities at the core of Canada’s justice system – life for Mary simply carried on, but with a newfound handful of journalistic admirers. In fact, based on newspaper records from the past century, it could be argued that Mary actually surpassed Chief Capilano in visibility; not because she made headlines traveling to visit the King, as Capilano did, but because in outliving her husband by another three decades, she became a respected and adored personality in Vancouver’s downtown harbour. Chief Capilano on the other hand, though also no stranger to Vancouver’s newspaper scene, was mentioned less consistently; he gained popularity around the time of his 1906 trip to visit King Edward VII, and again with news of his death in 1910, and then once more around the time of Mary Capilano’s death in 1940. Since the 1920s, Mary has remained a fixture in British Columbia newspapers, with fairly even coverage distributed between The Province and The Vancouver Sun.97 This news coverage


95 See Noel Robinson’s interview, Item AAAB1468, BC Provincial Archives.


97 To view my interactive map that highlights over 50 selected newspaper references to Mary Capilano in Canadian newspapers since 1910, visit:
throughout the twentieth-century, however, also highlights the complicated tensions between representations of reverence and condescension towards Indigenous peoples; when writing about Mary, journalists often employed language with the intention of expressing respect, but with the ultimate effect of reasserting Mary’s place in a colonial hierarchical system. In fact, though several twentieth-century newspapers employed the word “matriarch” to describe Mary Capilano, the writers of these articles and headlines never really explained their use of the term (aside from using it to gesture towards her advanced age). In contrast, her descendants seem to consider Mary’s role of “matriarch” as something much more complex: a role that reflects her standing within the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh community, her legacy as a craftsperson and provider for her family, and her important role as a Sḵwx̱wú7mesh knowledge-keeper.

In 2011, Mary was included in a newspaper article titled “West Coast has always been wild with characters,” where she was recognized as one of the key personalities in Vancouver’s 100+ year history. The word “wild” in the title positions Mary (and other so-called “characters”) as marginal remnants of a bygone time, and as lacking modern civility; by presenting Mary as a marginal “character,” this article reveals the ways in which colonial assumptions and beliefs continue to infiltrate Canadian journalism with regards to Indigenous peoples. Between the 1930s-1950s, Mary was often mentioned in articles by local columnist Mamie Moloney and journalist Noel Robinson; though Robinson’s articles reveal attempts at a deeper, more respectful connection with Capilano and her family, Moloney’s columns reveal a tendency to reinforce colonial

[https://batchgeo.com/map/ce1ae19b92f9839441db06cdd9cd45a](https://batchgeo.com/map/ce1ae19b92f9839441db06cdd9cd45a). This map reveals that the majority of news articles referencing Mary Capilano were written locally, and that such local interest was sustained throughout the twentieth century; to compile this list of newspaper resources, I utilized the database Newspapers.com to keyword search across twentieth and twenty-first century Canadian newspapers.

98 Published in *The Province* on 6 April 2011.
assumptions and hierarchies. By reconsidering these two journalists’ recollections, it becomes clear how their accounts have obscured what Capilano’s descendants have described as her most important role: that of Sḵwx̱wú7mesh matriarch.

Noel Robinson, an English writer and editor who relocated to Vancouver in 1908, worked as a journalist for several local newspapers, including the Vancouver Daily World, The Province, and The Vancouver Sun. During the 1930s and 40s, Robinson published regularly on the topic of Mary Capilano, with major contributions in terms of character sketches – capturing Mary’s sense of humour, determination, and vouching for her reliability as a storyteller. For example, in a 1937 article for The Province titled “Mrs. Capilano’s Deception,” Robinson humorously explains how Mary, despite being over 100 years old, continues to go out paddling alone in her canoe against her family’s wishes. In an interview with her son, Chief Mathias notes: ‘My old mother impossible,’ said the chief, laughing. ‘We tell her she must not go to Vancouver by herself. So two days ago she gets up at five o’clock, while we all sleep, gets her canoe, which we had hid, and when we wake and look for her she has gone… Yes, you can’t stop my mother when she makes up her mind.’

In addition to providing rare glimpses of Mary’s determination (and occasional stubbornness), Robinson also sought to defend Mary’s authority and reliability as a steward for local Indigenous knowledge and histories. He notes that across their thirty-year friendship, he has heard her share the same stories on multiple occasions – “particulars which she has repeated to me at various times since without varying them in

99 See https://www.vancouverarchives.ca/2013/03/21/cats-in-the-archives/
100 Robinson states that he has known Mary “intimately for upwards of thirty years” (The Province, 3 June 1939, “Letters to the Editor”).
any degree.” In a speech typescript held in the City of Vancouver’s archives, Robinson similarly notes that Mary “never exaggerated, though she had a strong imagination.” These characteristics are, in many ways, bound up in her role as knowledge-keeper and storyteller; but even Robinson, who claimed to know her so well, never once mentioned Mary’s published “Indian legends.” He was also quick to come to Mary’s defense, especially when an unhappy Province reader, Mr. Anthony, claimed that Robinson was “responsible for the latest periodic imbecility re: Indian princesses – inventing royalty for the Siwashes of B.C.” In his response, Robinson refutes this ignorant claim: “I have never in my writings about Mary Capilano referred to her – or for that matter to any Indian – as a princess.” Most importantly in this article, Robinson addresses the inherent racism presented in Mr. Anthony’s letter, stating that the “term ‘Siwash’ is part of the old Hudson’s Bay jargon and one that the Indians very much dislike.” Though at times evoking a sense of exaggerated “white saviour” mentality, as if Robinson is the only person capable of speaking with authority on behalf of Mary Capilano or Indigenous peoples more generally, Robinson’s accounts do provide interesting anecdotal snippets for the historical record regarding Mary’s day-to-day life.

---

101 Ibid.
103 And it is ironic that so much of Mary’s news coverage would later occur in the very same newspaper (The Province) that privileged Chief Capilano’s voice over hers decades earlier.
104 See Robinson’s response in The Province titled “Splendid Indians” (14 January 1941).
105 The following story, for example, was recorded in Noel Robinson’s interview with former CBC Radio producer Imbert Orchard: “I used to meet her occasionally, she used to go to the Hotel Vancouver and get the ends of salmon, things like that they would give her, you see, and she would take them down and put them all in a bag and take them down with her to her canoe, you see. I met her one day accidentally by the corner of the Hotel Vancouver, and I said ‘Well Mary, this is a surprise.’ And she said ‘kloshe’ [Chinook], ‘good.’ And so I said well we’ll go and have lunch. I didn’t know where the hell we were going to have lunch – it was a busy Saturday morning – and she walked very slowly [laughs]. And she was in her Indian costume, you know, and I think she had a
Another Vancouver journalist, Mamie Moloney, published regularly on Mary across nearly four decades in her opinion column in *The Vancouver Sun*. Moloney worked as a reporter for the *Sun* during the 1930s, at a time when women were discouraged from working in the male-dominated industry of newspapers.¹⁰⁶ In a 1981 interview recorded for the Provincial Archives of British Columbia’s Sound Heritage Series, Moloney explained that she was “slightly afraid of [her] job in the *Sun* because there was a lot of agitation in the letters-to-the-editor column about married women not working, as there were so many men unemployed.”¹⁰⁷ But Moloney had a support system in place to help counter those in her opposition; as a member of the Canadian Women’s Press Club,¹⁰⁸ Moloney was part of a trained group of newspaperwomen, authors, journalists, poets, who described themselves as “sisters of the pen.”¹⁰⁹ Though her columns were much briefer than the articles written by Robinson, Moloney accomplished something different – by connecting Mary Capilano to topics of the day across several decades of local journalism, Moloney ensured that Mary’s legacy in the city of Vancouver remained relevant. This legacy, however, is similarly not without issue,

---


¹⁰⁷ See Moloney, “Mamie Moloney Interview.”

¹⁰⁸ As noted in Chapter Two, the Canadian Women’s Press Club was one of several local women’s groups that embarked on national fundraising efforts when Johnson became ill. The Vancouver Branch of the CWPC was initiated on 4 October 1909 with nine members, eight of them being “trained newspaper women” (“Pages from the History of Vancouver Branch Canadian Women’s Press Club,” Canadian Women’s Press Club fonds, City of Vancouver Archives, AM396).

¹⁰⁹ See files in the “Canadian Women’s Press Club” fonds, City of Vancouver Archives. See also https://dhil.lib.sfu.ca/doceww/person/459.
as Moloney’s descriptions of Mary often employed condescending language that contradictorily portrayed her as more of a “character” than revered matriarch.

Though Moloney doesn’t explicitly state in her columns whether or not she has met Mary, she describes with a barbed fondness that “sweet old Mary Capilano who many of us remember waddling down Granville Street with her Indian basket.”

Similarly, in Moloney’s 7 December 1964 column, she describes Mary Capilano’s livelihood in terms that reinforce Moloney’s comparative superiority:

I remember Mary Capilano as my eyes stray over the misty, rain-slicked waters towards North Vancouver. From the rear windows of the Pender Street office building where I once worked, we would watch for Mary paddling her dugout canoe over from the Capilano reserve. Tying (sic) up at the Immigration dock, Mary would balance huge, heavy baskets, filled with oysters and clams, from a coolie-pole across her shoulders, and go trotting up Burrard to sell them to the chefs of the posh clubs and hotels.

As Moloney describes the view, looking down upon Mary from her Pender street office building, she simultaneously reaffirms her relative superiority and critiques Mary’s lower-class status; the reference to the “coolie-pole” – the means by which Mary carries her baskets of seafood for sale – further racializes this description, and underscores the class divisions between the author and her subject. Furthermore, the use of verbs like “waddling” and “trotting,” aside from their obvious derogatory associations with animals, emphasize Maloney’s view of Mary as a “character” that is both physically inferior – lower to the ground – and lacking civility.

Despite being non-Indigenous, both Robinson and Moloney used their media platforms to imperfectly champion Indigenous causes and broadcast what must have been, at that time, considered an unpopular opinion. For instance, Moloney critiqued the government’s ban on potlaches, and also admitted to the white man’s “ignorance and

110 See Moloney’s 22 May 1953 “In One Ear” column, published in The Vancouver Sun.
misunderstanding” of Indigenous protocols and worldviews. But Moloney’s
descriptions of Mary Capilano remain problematic; and though her columns expressed a
certain admiration for Capilano, this admiration was ultimately embedded with critiques
of Mary’s relative inferiority. Likewise, though Robinson’s recollections provide rare
insight into the daily goings-on in Mary’s life, his tendency to speak on behalf of (or in
place of) Indigenous peoples while simultaneously praising them is indicative of his own
position of privilege and superiority. That sentiments of both reverence and
condescension can contradictorily co-exist in these newspaper representations speaks
to the ongoing impacts of settler colonialism on mid-twentieth-century Canadian
journalism.

![Figure 3.1 “Mrs. Joe Capilano” by Helen Moore Sewell]

*Image courtesy of Museum of Vancouver Collection, PA 139.*

_____________________

111 Ibid.
In addition to being covered in the local news, Mary also provided inspiration for several local artists. Her likeness was captured by painters, including Helen Moore Sewell, Margaret Wake, Nan Cheney, Maisie Hurley, and Mildred Valley Thornton.\textsuperscript{112, 113} Thornton, who “was known in her lifetime as the ‘lady who paints Indians’” (see Ashwell, 113).  

\footnote{112 \text{Helen Moore Sewell, “Mrs. Joe Capilano” (1940), Museum of Vancouver; Margaret Wake, “Portrait of Capilano Mary” (pre-1927), Museum of Vancouver; Nan Cheney, “Mary Capilano, age 97, Squamish Indian”, UBC’s Rare Books and Special Collections Library. A pastel portrait of Mary was also drawn by Maisie Hurley, founder of \textit{The Native Voice} newspaper. Hurley included a picture and brief biography of Mary Capilano in the “Special Pauline Johnson Centenary Edition” of \textit{The Native Voice}, published in July 1961.}

\footnote{113 \text{Though Emily Carr, renowned B.C. landscape artist and contemporary of Sewell et al. is not included in this list, it should be noted that Carr did at some point cross paths with Mary Capilano on the Skwxwú7mesh reserve. In the story “Sophie” (part of Carr’s 1941 collection, \textit{Klee Wyck}), we are incidentally introduced to Mary Capilano through Carr’s Skwxwú7mesh friend – but when Carr expresses interest in meeting Mary Capilano, Sophie refuses: “You fiend for me, not fiend for her” (61-2).}}
“Tribute to a lady who painted Indians”), also painted a portrait of Mary Capilano titled “Mary Capilano, ‘Lay-hu-lette,’ Squamish.” Thornton wrote an entire article on Mary Capilano for The Vancouver Sun, published on 2 November 1946 (six years after Mary’s death) under the title, “Mary Capilano, Daring, Venturous.” In this article, Thornton reflects on her visit to Mary’s house at the Capilano reserve:

She was willing to pause for a while and pose for me on the front steps. I admired the earrings she was wearing. They had a quaint, antique look, and I thought it was possible that I stumbled upon a bit of native metal work. When I asked her about this she threw back her head and roared with laughter. ‘I buy from white peddler,’ she announced between guffaws, ‘one time, long time ago, fifteen cents,’ she chortled. (The Vancouver Sun, 2 November 1946)114

In addition to capturing a snippet of Mary’s sense of humour and recognizable laugh, Thornton’s article also importantly draws attention to concerns regarding the effects of colonization on Indigenous culture – including the loss of Indigenous languages. Mary states, “‘Everything change now,’ she told me. ‘Young woman not make baskets any more. Lots of Indians can’t speak my language now. Mathias speak my language, but his children not speak my language. Some day nobody speak it.’” In this quotation, Mary astutely identifies the implications of cultural language and knowledge loss due to assimilation, and speaks to what would increasingly become key issues for Indigenous communities across Canada. That these concerns were articulated so clearly by Skwxwú7mesh matriarchs like Mary Capilano half a century ago underscores the importance (and necessity) of listening.

These tributes to Mary Capilano, in the form of newspaper coverage and artistic likenesses, show her impact on Vancouver’s arts scene – one that would continue for

114 This tribute to Mary Capilano (along with her portrait) was later published in Thornton’s book Indian Lives and Legends in 1966; this book was republished (with some edits) by her son under the new title Potlatch People: Indian Lives and Legends of British Columbia (2003).
decades after her death. For instance, retrospective references to Mary’s death appeared in *The Province’s* 1965 “25 Years Ago” column, as well as *The Vancouver Sun* “on this day in 1940” column in 1986. And yet despite these acknowledgments on behalf of Vancouver’s residents, Mary has remained a neglected figure in the story surrounding Johnson’s *Legends of Vancouver*. This treatment could, in part, be connected to the book’s largely out-of-province publication since 1911; with Toronto-based McClelland and Stewart controlling publication from 1914 until the Quarry Press edition of 1991, the book was not being produced locally – by people who might better recognize Mary Capilano’s importance to the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh and Vancouver communities. Though *Legends of Vancouver* has undoubtedly stood “the test of time,” it has done so without Mary’s stories or life-story included; and through Mary’s gradual erasure from the *Legends of Vancouver* text, as both a narrative voice and relevant historical figure in the life of E. Pauline Johnson, her legacy as a Sḵwx̱wú7mesh activist, matriarch, and craftsperson has faded from literary consciousness.

Part II: Mary Capilano’s Forgotten Stories

With a better sense of Mary’s background, and her impact on the Vancouver communities and beyond, we can now turn to her authorial contributions as they were presented in the early periodical versions of Johnson’s *Legends of Vancouver* stories. As noted in Chapter Two, most of the stories narrated by Mary Capilano were published in the American periodical *The Mother’s Magazine* between 1909-1912. Though Johnson published approximately twenty-nine “contributions” to *The Mother’s Magazine* in her lifetime (Strong-Boag and Gerson, *Paddling* 170), many of Johnson’s Canadian readers would never come to know these stories. Similarly, despite her popularity in
local newspapers, Mary’s “legends” were never the topic of any newspaper articles –
these stories were not in circulation in the Vancouver Province, and though Vancouver
readers would have surely enjoyed getting to know Mary through her storytelling, they
instead came to know Legends of Vancouver through Joe Capilano’s narrative voice.

Though Johnson first broached the topic of Indigenous stories through her
submissions to The Boys’ World, it was upon receiving these stories that editor Elizabeth
Ansley considered the possibility of a similarly interesting subject matter written
specifically for women and mothers: “The Indian stories and legends that you have sent
us for the Boys’ World have all been extremely interesting, and it has occurred to us that
you might have something equally pleasing suitable for The Mother’s Magazine.”115 The
“Indian” stories that Johnson penned for Mother’s were similar to Chief Capilano’s
stories for the Province, in that they usually involved some kind of hardship or journey,
with a moral, lesson, or gift often imparted by the Saghalie Tyee (Creator) as an
example for future generations to learn from. By focusing on Mary’s versions of the
Legends of Vancouver stories, most of which have never been anthologized, I argue for
a necessary revisiting of Mary Capilano’s stories as a means of further understanding
her role as an Indigenous storyteller. With a particular focus on the narrative framing of
each story – in other words, the narrative details that occur on the margins of each
legend – I suggest that this space is crucial for the development of Mary’s role as
storyteller, character, and narrator in the legends.

My analysis of Mary’s stories is presented in three parts, with her stories
arranged according to various narrative and/or publishing circumstances. The first

115 Ansley, Elizabeth. Letter to E. Pauline Johnson. 13 Aug. 1907. E. Pauline Johnson fonds, The
William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 1.
In this letter, Ansley mistakenly writes “stroies” instead of “stories” in the above quoted text.
section includes stories that were narrated by Mary Capilano in *Mother’s Magazine*, but were narrated by Chief Capilano in *The Province*. Stories in this category include: “The Legend of the Two Sisters,” “The Legend of the Squamish Twins,” and “The Legend of the Seven Swans.” The second section includes those stories of Mary’s that were published in *Mother’s*, but that never appeared in the *Province*; these stories include: “The Legend of Lillooet Falls” and “The Legend of the Ice Babies.” Finally, I will turn to “The Lost Salmon Run: A Legend of the Pacific Coast” to explore the significance of its inclusion in the original *Legends of Vancouver* collection. Throughout these sections, I point to different examples of Johnson’s descriptions of Mary’s gestures and mannerisms, and suggest that the inclusion of such descriptions is Johnson’s way of pushing back against anthropological methods of as-told-to storytelling.

“The Legend of the Two Sisters”\(^{116}\)

The first of Johnson’s “Indian stories” to appear in *The Mother’s Magazine* was “The Legend of the Two Sisters,” published in the January 1909 issue. A teaser for this story was published in the preceding December 1908 issue of *Mother’s*, stating: “When the daughters of the Chinook tribe of Indians step from childhood into the great world of womanhood, the occasion is made one of extreme rejoicing, and on this custom is founded the very beautiful legend of the Twin Sisters.”\(^{117}\) *Mother’s* had already published several of Johnson’s non-fiction pieces, focusing on topics such as “Outdoor Sports, Mother and Child out-of-Doors, Health Exercises, Picnics, Camping, etc., all


\(^{117}\) See “A Great Variety of Short Stories and Serials,” on page 70 of the December 1908 issue of *The Mother’s Magazine*. 
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written especially for the mother, and her family.”\textsuperscript{118} This story, in contrast, would be written from a distinctly Indigenous perspective, presenting readers of the American magazine with a new type of motherhood narrative unlike any of Johnson’s previous works.

From the opening lines of the \textit{Mother’s} version of the story, we can identify clear differences between this first version and the one that appeared one year later in \textit{The Province}. The legend opens with Johnson’s grand description of the mountains, describing “those twin peaks of the twin mountains that lift their pearly summits across the inlet.” She then introduces her narrator, Mary Capilano, who is never named in the story (or in any of Johnson’s legends) but instead referred to as the “ancient Klootchman”\textsuperscript{119}. In the framing story that precedes the legend, we are introduced to “the handsome chief of the Capilanos,” “his slim, silent young daughter,” and “the quaint old Indian mother” — and from the outset, the focus of this story remains on the old Klootchman. While \textit{The Mother’s Magazine} version begins with an image of the Capilanos as a family, the \textit{Province} version focuses solely on Chief Capilano. This version appeared over a year later in the weekend magazine edition of \textit{The Province} on Saturday, April 16, 1910 under the new title, “The True Legend of Vancouver’s Lions.”\textsuperscript{120} In addition to opening the legend with a focus on family, Johnson also uses the frame narrative to describe Mary’s highly-regarded basketry — a seemingly minor reference,

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{118} Ansley, Elizabeth. Letter to E. Pauline Johnson. 26 March 1907. E. Pauline Johnson fonds, The William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 1.
\item \textsuperscript{119} Similarly, Chief Capilano is generally not named explicitly (aside from the Author’s Foreword to \textit{Legends of Vancouver}, and the opening to “A Squamish Legend of Napoleon”), and is referred to throughout the stories as “Chief” or “my old tillicum.”
\item \textsuperscript{120} I would note here that this retitling in particular implies a sense of ownership of the mountains by the city of Vancouver, and privileges non-Indigenous relationships to the land (as befitting \textit{The Province}’s majority readership).
\end{itemize}
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but one that importantly acknowledges one of Mary’s main sources of income, as well as her expression of traditional skills and knowledge:

At our feet were baskets of exquisite weavery, all her handiwork, and that of her young daughter sitting before us. With housewifely care she had stowed these away before starting for the drive, for it was berry time and she had no thought of leaving such precious muck-a-muck for the foxes and birds, when her children and grandchildren had willing mouths to be filled. (12)

Beyond acknowledging basketry as a central component of many twentieth-century Indigenous women’s lives and livelihoods, this passage also gestures towards the process of passing these traditional skills on to the next generation – from Mary to her daughter, Emma. We might also consider the parallels between Mary’s basketry and the concept of oral storytelling as another form of weaving; through Mary’s processes of weaving strips of cedar bark to create baskets, she similarly weaves together layers of distinct yet interconnected stories, producing a narrative that has been crafted especially for her listener. We can connect this reference to basketry to another important historical moment, when Chief Capilano visited King Edward VII in 1906 and presented cedar baskets to Queen Alexandra – specially crafted by his youngest daughter.121

121 See “For Now We See Through a Glass Darkly,” Lionel Makovski’s 26 March 1910 tribute to Chief Joe Capilano in The Vancouver Daily Province weekend magazine.
Figure 3.3  Cedar basket woven by Mary Capilano
Property of the Mathias family; Image by A. Shield.

Figure 3.4  Cedar basket woven by Mary Capilano
Property of the Mathias family; Image by A. Shield.
Where I argued for the importance of Johnson’s inclusion of descriptions of Chief Joe and Mary’s unique storytelling gestures and mannerisms in Chapter Two, this concept becomes integral to Mary’s character development throughout The Mother’s Magazine legends. As we near the transition from the present to Mary’s “Land of Legends,” Johnson writes, “The silence was long. Once or twice she swept effective gestures that were filled with meaning. She wished me to notice the crags and ledges, haunts of the mountain sheep and wild goats, a winging hawk, a leaping trout, the crimsoning o-lil-lies” (12). And as Mary begins to share with Johnson the story of the two sisters, Johnson describes how “she placed her narrow brown hand on my arm, nor did she remove it during her entire recital” (12) of the story. Through descriptions such as this, we are better able to understand Mary’s relationship with Johnson – and also to understand how it differs from her relationship with Chief Capilano. The physical closeness between Mary and Johnson is exemplified again as the story concludes and Johnson writes, “And what of the two sweet daughters of the great Tyee? I asked, slipping my hand in hers” (13); in contrast, Johnson never mentions any kind of physical contact during her storytelling sessions with Chief Capilano, and their encounters exude a more formal, reverential nature. As the story of “The Two Sisters” seeks to honour the role of Indigenous women and mothers in Indigenous culture, so too are these values reflected in the relationship between storyteller and listener.

122 A similar gesture is described in the Vancouver Daily World article, titled “The Old Lady of the Siwashes” (12 March 1910): “As the visitor entered old Agnes came forward, and all doubts as to the warmth of her reception of the stranger, were dispelled at the clasp of her frail old hand.”
“The Legend of the Squamish Twins, or The Call of Kinship” (1910)\textsuperscript{123}

Over a year later, Johnson would publish her next “legend” narrated by Mary Capilano, titled “The Legend of the Squamish Twins, or The Call of Kinship.” With both the Mother’s and Province versions appearing in July 1910, this story illustrates an interesting example of Johnson’s ability to navigate between publishing venues – adapting her material according to the demands of each publication. Where the Mother’s version of this story is narrated by Mary Capilano and Joe Capilano together, the Province version eliminates Mary as narrator, and instead presents the story as told only by Joe Capilano.\textsuperscript{124} The Mother’s story begins by introducing our narrators: “The handsome Squamish chief had sat in silence for a full hour, a few feet from where I lounged. His wife was amusing herself casting for salmon in the rollicking stream, and had been rewarded with some success” (16). In this version, despite sharing the narrative stage with Chief Capilano, Mary is able to occupy an active role in the story as both storyteller and family provider. The Province version, on the other hand, refers to Mary only once, in passing: “It was singing in very melodious tones through the long August afternoon two summers ago while we, the chief, his happy-hearted wife and bright daughter, all lounged amongst the boulders and watched the lazy clouds drift from peak to peak far above us.”

In the Mother’s version, we gain further insight into Johnson’s storytelling strategies – in other words, how she goes about obtaining her stories from the Capilanos. Here, Chief Capilano comments on his preoccupation with the past, stating,

\textsuperscript{123} To view a side-by-side comparison of “The Legend of the Squamish Twins, or The Call of Kinship” and “The Recluse of the Capilano Canyon,” see: http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/IieVJZ.

\textsuperscript{124} See p. 38 in Chapter Two, where I address the possibility of editorial intervention during the preparation of the Legends stories.
“I see dead faces, hear dead voices, listen to dead legends.” To this, Johnson replies, “The legends at least will live again if you tell them – to me’ I suggested, with some craft.” This is an important moment of self-reflection regarding Johnson’s intentions to reinvigorate his stories through publication. Also, the inclusion of the phrase “with some craft” at the end of her sentence is significant – here, she acknowledges a certain self-awareness in her interactions with the chief, and gestures towards a practised, strategic approach in her role as listener. While both versions begin with Chief Capilano asking Johnson about various cultural superstitions regarding twin children, the Mother’s version diverges from the Province here by then turning to Mary Capilano for her input. Once Chief Capilano has hinted towards a story of twin children from the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Nation, Johnson states, “Won’t you tell me of it – both of you?” I added, for Mrs. Chief began to put up her fishing-rod. At the word ‘twins’ her eyes lost their interest in the stream, her hand went lax and inert in holding the rod: she forthwith climbed across the bowlders (sic) and seated herself close to me wordlessly, but I knew she had much to tell” (16). Though the two versions follow each other closely throughout the story of the banished chief, the Mother’s version uniquely assigns storytelling credit to Mary Capilano alongside her husband – and urges us to consider the many possible storytelling scenarios that may have presented themselves to Johnson, throughout her relationship with the Capilanos, and especially those that were not publicized through their inclusion in the Legends of Vancouver collection.
“The Legend of the Seven Swans” (1911)\textsuperscript{125}

The first version of this story, narrated by Chief Capilano, was published in \textit{The Province} under the title, “The Legend of the Seven White Swans” (15 October 1910). One year later, a version appeared in \textit{The Mother’s Magazine} that was narrated by Mary Capilano, under the similar title “The Legend of the Seven Swans” (September 1911). This story, along with “The Legend of Lillooet Falls” and “The Legend of the Ice Babies,” were added to the 1912 Thomson Stationery edition of \textit{Legends of Vancouver} to increase appeal to female readers. Yet of these three stories, only “The Legend of the Seven White Swans” was published in \textit{The Province} – the other two only ever appeared in \textit{The Mother’s Magazine}. That these three stories were selected for the rogue Thomson Stationery edition, which was “specifically marketed in part through the voluntary efforts of women’s groups across Canada” (Quirk 213), is significant, because it means that the editors deliberately went back to \textit{The Mother’s Magazine} to select versions of stories narrated by the female voice of Mary Capilano – even though in the case of “The Legend of the Seven Swans,” a local version published in \textit{The Province} was more readily available.

As for the Trust’s decision to exclude these stories initially, there is no archival evidence to explain this. One may argue that as these were some of Johnson’s last “Indian stories” to be published before her death, they may have missed the publication cut-off for \textit{Legends} – but this doesn’t seem likely, as the committee was putting \textit{Legends} together in the fall of 1911, and so could have theoretically selected “The Ice Babies” (Nov. 1911) and Chief Capilano’s version of “The Seven Swans” (Sept. 1910) for publication. However, it is more likely that those versions published in the American

\textsuperscript{125} To view a side-by-side comparison of “The Legend of the Seven Swans” and “The Legend of the Seven White Swans,” see: http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/9T2L1g.
periodical were not selected as they simply weren’t on the committee’s radar.\textsuperscript{126} Given that members of the Trust, namely Bernard McEvoy and Lionel Makovski, were also employed by \textit{The Province}, it seems logical that they would reach for those “legends” already in-house, and most recognizable to their loyal Vancouver readers.\textsuperscript{127}

For this story in particular, the differences in narration — a combination of their different approaches to framing the legend, and the ways their unique personalities contribute to the act of storytelling — make the two versions, Chief Capilano’s and Mary Capilano’s, quite distinct. In the chief’s version, for example, the initial interaction between the chief and Johnson is a bit more serious in tone, and reflects the familiar back-and-forth dialogue that usually precedes a story from the chief:

"A woman’s sweetheart is never true to her, but a man’s always is,” I remarked with cynosure born of much observation and some little experience.

His expression changed. "You know big world too well,” he said, “so I not tell you legend of swans.”

Instantly I discarded my sneer and banished my unbelief. "Oh! Chief, I promise not to know the big world or anything about it if you will tell me about them,” I urged.

After being convinced that she was deserving of his story, the chief proceeds to share his version of “The Legend of the Seven White Swans.” Of this encounter, Johnson shares a rare observation that is otherwise never mentioned in any of Chief Capilano’s

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{126 And yet it still remains unclear why Chief Capilano’s version of “The Legend of the Seven White Swans” (15 October 1910) was excluded from \textit{Legends}, when it was published in \textit{The Province} over one year prior to the book’s production.}
\footnote{127 In Strong-Boag and Gerson’s \textit{Paddling}, it is erroneously stated in the “Chronological List of Pauline Johnson’s Writings” that “The Legend of the Seven Swans” (appearing in \textit{The Mother’s Magazine}, Sept. 1911) was reprinted from \textit{The Province}’s 1910 version. This is incorrect – the \textit{Province} version is very clearly narrated by Chief Capilano, whereas the \textit{Mother’s} version is told in the voice of Mary Capilano.}
\end{footnotes}
“legends.” She writes, “The chief rarely used tobacco, but today he accepted a cigarette — the fragrance of an ‘Egyptian’ always brings back that day.”

The Mother’s version, on the other hand, is narrated by Mary Capilano and told to Johnson along the edges of the Capilano River. In contrast to The Province version, the Mother’s version has a lengthier preamble, showcasing the relaxed, comfortable nature of Johnson and Mary’s relationship. The story begins with a description of Mary busily working on her handicrafts, “glancing up from her basket weaving, and for a moment allowing her slender hands to lie idly in her lap” (17). As is similarly suggested in the Mother’s version of “The Two Sisters,” Johnson emphasizes the importance of Mary’s livelihood and role in supporting her family; we might infer that most of Johnson’s interactions with Mary involved some kind of necessary multitasking – whether it be fishing, weaving, or some other activity. The closeness of their relationship, and bond between Indigenous women, is further exemplified as Mary begins her story; Johnson describes how she “edged nearer” (18) to Mary for the telling of her story, revealing an intimacy of space that contrasts with the solemn, calculated responses that often precede Johnson’s interactions with the chief.

To enhance our understanding of the thematic differences across these two versions of “The Seven Swans,” we can utilize digital humanities tools for textual analysis such as Voyant Cirrus; this is a word cloud tool that displays the frequency of terms appearing in a given body of text. After uploading a source text, users can hover their cursor over any individual word to display its numerical frequency count within the text. The “stop words list” feature of the Cirrus tool is very important, as it gives the option to remove the most common or high frequency words that carry little meaning, including articles (the, a, etc.) and prepositions (of, to, etc.). Upon uploading each version of “The Seven Swans” individually, I noticed key differences in the frequency of
gendered words. For example, where the Mother’s version uses the word “mother” ten times, in the Province version it appears only half as often. Similarly, in Chief Capilano’s telling of the story, the word “hunter” appears ten times, but is used only nine times in the Mother’s version. Overall, a word cloud analysis in this context reveals a correlation between frequently used words and changes in narrative voice. As a form of distant reading, the word cloud offers an opportunity to consider literary patterns within the Legends stories through a different perspective.

![Word Cloud](image)

**Figure 3.5  “The Legend of the Seven Swans” (Mother’s) word cloud**
The 25 most frequent words in the Mother’s version of “The Legend of the Seven Swans” – note that the word “mother” appears 10 times in this version. To view an interactive version, see: [https://voyant-tools.org/?corpus=5d7ef47fcd0168e7fa283271fa94f0e8&visible=25&view=Cirrus](https://voyant-tools.org/?corpus=5d7ef47fcd0168e7fa283271fa94f0e8&visible=25&view=Cirrus).
Where normally most differences across versions occur in the opening and closing narrative frame, in this particular story we see one notable difference within the legend itself. In the *Province* version, narrated by Chief Capilano, he states that the mother called her child “Be-be” — defined as “the Chinook word one uses to pet a little one.” In the *Mother’s* version, narrated by Mary Capilano, Johnson writes: “Her mother called her ‘Kah-lo-ka’ (accent on lo), which in the Chinook language means ‘The Swan’” (18). It is unclear why, across these two versions, Johnson uses different Chinook names for the disabled child. In fact, it seems more logical to use the name “Kah-lo-ka,” or “The Swan,” to represent this character in the story, whose disability of a “trailing foot” is likened to the trailing feet of swans in flight, and who is ultimately transformed into a swan by the Saghalie Tyee. Though the two versions of “The Seven Swans” were published nearly one year apart, it is unlikely that Johnson lost track of the Chinook words she had used – especially since the first version to appear was in her local newspaper, *The Province*, and could easily be referred to if needed. It may be that with the passage of time, she decided she preferred the word “Kah-lo-ka” for this story, and used the opportunity of publishing it in *Mother’s* to make such changes.
Another aspect of this anomaly can be traced to the subsequent publication of “The Legend of Lilooet Falls” in the January 1912 issue of *The Mother’s Magazine*. In this story, the name “Be-be” is used again, but in reference to the Indigenous mother whose kiss upon her daughter created the Falls of Lilooet. However, the repetition of this term likely went unnoticed by Johnson’s Vancouver’s readers, as those who had read Chief Capilano’s version of “The Seven Swans” in *The Province* would presumably not also be subscribed to the American periodical, *The Mother’s Magazine* (and vice versa).  

“*The Legend of Lilooet Falls*” (1912) and “*The Legend of the Ice Babies*” (1911)

Both of Johnson’s final “Indian legends,” namely “The Legend of Lilooet Falls” and “The Legend of the Ice Babies,” appeared initially only in *The Mother’s Magazine*; they were eventually included, along with “The Seven Swans,” in the Thomson Stationery 1912 edition of *Legends of Vancouver*. The “Lilooet Falls” story also appeared in Johnson’s 1913 posthumous collection, *The Moccasin Maker* – this book featured a collection of Johnson’s late nineteenth and early twentieth-century prose, dealing specifically with representations of and issues relating to women (Indigenous and non-Indigenous). In “Lilooet Falls,” we encounter more examples of Johnson’s unique character sketches on the margins of the legend itself. The legend begins with Mary appearing at Johnson’s Howe Street apartment, making her presence known by

---

128 Though the Thomson Stationery 1912 edition was the only edition of *Legends of Vancouver* to include “The Seven Swans” in print, it is important to note that editors selected *The Mother’s Magazine* version of the story (i.e. Mary Capilano’s), rather than the one printed in the *Province* – therefore, the name used in the version printed in *Legends* was “Kah-lo-ka,” rather than “Be-be”.
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her characteristic “quiet little tap at the door.” As Mary enters Johnson’s apartment, rain-soaked from her journey, we learn of another of Mary’s oft-repeated mannerisms, borne from the “desire for neatness” that directly counters stereotypes of the “dirty Indian”: “Before she spoke she gave that peculiar gesture common to the Indian woman from the Atlantic to the Pacific. She lifted both hands and with each forefinger smoothed gently along her forehead from the parting of her hair to her temples” (19). This story also importantly acknowledges Mary’s travels beyond her regular canoe trips across the Narrows to Downtown Vancouver, again supporting Johnson’s descriptions of Mary as someone unaccustomed to idleness. According to Johnson, Mary “had been north to the Skeena River, south to the great ‘Fair’ at Seattle, but best of all seemingly to her, was her trip into the interior. She had been up the trail to Lillooet in the great ‘Cariboo’ country” (19).

As noted in most of the Legends stories, Johnson uses a frame narrative technique to lead readers into each legend. In this story, the narrative “frame” reveals more about Johnson’s self-awareness in her role as listener – and, most importantly, the importance of knowing when to speak, and when to respectfully keep silent. Johnson refers to this particular storytelling pattern as follows: “This was always the crucial moment with my Klootchman, when her voice lowers, and she asks if you know things. You must be diplomatic, and never question her in turn. If you do her lips will close in unbreakable silence” (19). A similar admission is shared in the frame preceding Mary’s version of “The Two Sisters”, where Johnson writes: “I nodded. I could see she liked that wordless reply” (12).

Where Johnson’s routine with Mary feels familiar and well-practiced, we might also consider how Johnson’s interactions with Chief Capilano compare. In her written interactions with the chief, there seems to be more emphasis on saying the right thing,
or, if desperation requires it, perhaps asking the chief straight out. In “The Recluse of the Capilano Canyon” for example, Chief Capilano asks Johnson a series of difficult questions without yielding, causing her finally to ask, “Won’t you tell it to me?’ I begged.” Both of these examples highlight the differences between Mary and Chief Capilano as individuals, but more importantly demonstrate Johnson's ability to understand her storytellers, and to modify her approach as a listener accordingly. Thus, by emphasizing each narrator’s unique qualities and mannerisms, Johnson underscores the importance of building individual relationships with knowledge keepers. There is no universal approach.

In this story, the waterfalls of Lillooet are likened to a spider’s web, which represent the tears of a mother for her lost child, and signify the unbreakable bond between Indigenous mothers and their children. As an Indigenous woman and mother herself, Mary is uniquely positioned to tell this story:

‘You have heard the Falls of Lillooet weep?’ I nodded.

‘It is the weeping of that Indian mother, sobbing through the centuries, that you hear,’ she uttered the words with a cadence of grief in her voice. (45)

This same story, told through the narration of Chief Capilano, would not have the same emotional impact on readers – nor would such physical gestures, demonstrating the shared connections between Johnson and Mary, be included. For instance, as Mary concludes her story and prepares to leave, Johnson explains how Mary “clasped my hand in good-by” (45), ending her storytelling session with a moment of brief but significant physical connection. Where Mary concludes the story by asserting the validity of her legend – “Yes,’ she said – ‘and it is true!’” – we can draw parallels between Johnson’s fictionalized representation of Mary and those accounts shared by Vancouver journalists (such as Noel Robinson) that attest to her reliability as a storyteller.
In a story that is similarly centered on Indigenous motherhood, “The Legend of the Ice Babies” describes the Indigenous journey to the afterlife, or Happy Hunting Grounds. Also narrated by Mary Capilano or “the Klootchman,” this story describes the monumental sacrifice of Sḵwx̱wú7mesh mothers, who give their children to the Great Tyee in a selfless act to benefit future generations to come. In the framing story, Johnson draws our attention to a seemingly minor narrative cue – one that prompts her to ask Mary for more details. When Mary states, “the lake is so still there is no wind now to keep it open from the frost,” Johnson sees her opening: “I caught at the word ‘now.’ ‘Was there ever a wind there?’” Through Johnson’s careful, patient listening, she demonstrates the kind of practiced conversational routine that often precedes Mary’s “legends.” This story in particular is more serious in tone, and distinctive from the rest of Johnson’s “legends” through its description of one’s passage into the afterlife.

Specifically, Mary states that,

‘As one nears that land one becomes again as a little child, one’s eyes grow innocent, one’s heart trusting, one’s life blameless, as they go down the steep shores of age to the quiet, windless, waveless lake where they must rest forever in the hollows of the Great Tyee’s hands, for he has kept these pure Ice Babies there for many to become like them before they cross the lake to the Happy Hunting Grounds on the far shore.’ (34)

As Mary concludes the story, she explains that these immortalized babies are there to welcome those transitioning to the Happy Hunting Grounds, and suggests that she herself is “growing old,” and may perhaps “see them – soon.” Though Mary was in her seventies at this point, she would live another thirty-odd years after this story was published; it was Johnson who was destined to meet the Ice Babies first.
“The Lost Salmon Run: A Legend of the Pacific Coast” (1910)\footnote{To view a side-by-side comparison of “The Lost Salmon Run: A Legend of the Pacific Coast” and “The Legend of the Lost Salmon Run,” see: \url{http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/7DMtfZ}.}

The story of “The Lost Salmon Run” is unique in that it was the only story published in the \textit{Province} to be narrated by Mary Capilano, and then consequently selected for publication in the \textit{Legends of Vancouver} collection. In other words, this is the sole story credited to Mary Capilano in over 100 years of \textit{Legends of Vancouver}’s publication. Though the \textit{Mother’s} (August 1910) and \textit{Province} (October 1910) versions are both narrated by Mary, they are not exact copies and exhibit slight differences across versions.

In both versions of “The Lost Salmon Run,” Johnson describes an encounter near Stanley Park with her “old friend, the klootchman.” As Mary comes ashore in her canoe to speak with Johnson, she explains that she has recently become a grandmother, and expresses her delight that the child is a girl: “Good sign for girl-child to be first grandchild. I tell you why. Girl-child maybe sometime be mother herself. Very important to be mother” (\textit{Mother’s} Aug. 1910).\footnote{Though Mary Capilano’s exact age was unknown, if we are to presume her birth year to be about 1840, this would make her about 70 years old when this story took place. This could be an example of Johnson’s own literary imagination, blurring dates and/or facts in depicting this grandchild as the “first.” However, given the high infant mortality rates at that time, it’s also possible that this grandchild was deemed the “first” because the other grandchildren were no longer living. See pp. 77n84, 79n90, and 80n92.} In the \textit{Province} version, Johnson describes Mary sharing this news “with some indescribable trick of expression that led me to know she preferred it so.” In fact, this “trick of expression” was likely a reflection of the particular context of their encounter – that Mary was divulging this information with Johnson is important, as the tone of this scenario would have been quite different if told by Chief Capilano. This idea is further supported in the story’s conclusion, when
Johnson admits, “I feel a vicious delight that your men of magic took it out [on] the people for their ill choice.” Mary responds, laughing, “That is because you girl-child yourself” (Mother’s Aug. 1910). As the old klootchman confides in Johnson about her exciting news, she explains that the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh are a “peaceful” tribe; this is in contrast to Johnson’s own Iroquois Nation, who Mary asserts “only think of fight” and thus “want plenty men” (Mother’s Aug. 1910). Though Johnson takes these comments in jest, this is one of the few occasions that Johnson’s indigeneity is integrated conversationally into the story in detail, and the only instance of this occurring with Mary Capilano. In most cases, Johnson makes statements like “I am one of you, and I shall understand” (“The Grey Archway”) or “It’s my heart that understands” (“The Sea-Serpent”), rather than providing cultural knowledge from her own experiences.131

In addition to reflecting on the differences between Sḵwx̱wú7mesh and Iroquois Nations, the Mother’s version also reveals how Johnson deliberately distances herself from her English background:

‘I not stay long, me,’ she explained. ‘I get out, maybe I stay too long; so I sit here and talk, me, then I not stay too long.’ I laughed. It was so like the remark I had often heard in ‘white’ houses and homes, when an informal caller refuses to remove her wraps, for fear she may ‘stay too long.” (13)

That Johnson chooses to portray this example in a mocking tone suggests that she considers herself an observer to this behavior, rather than a participant – and in the presence of the Capilanos, she certainly seems to identify most with her Kanien’ke-há:ka roots. However, this statement also highlights Johnson’s unique cross-cultural background and upbringing of mixed Kanien’ke-há:ka and English parentage, one that allows her to draw these kinds of connections across cultures.

131 Johnson elaborates on the traditions and beliefs of her Iroquois Nation in “The Recluse,” “The Deep Waters,” briefly in “The Sea-Serpent,” and in “A Royal Mohawk Chief.”
Another interesting difference across these two versions can be explained in their specific and unique relationships to location. For example, the Mother’s version of “The Lost Salmon Run,” having been published in an American periodical and for a majority American readership, included vague descriptions of the actual locations and landmarks in the story: “But late in August, one smoky, golden afternoon, I saw her curious high-bowed canoe heading up the inlet, and I hailed her in the Chinook tongue with such ardor that finally she heard me, even at that distance. Immediately the bow swung shore-ward, and, as she approached me, she lifted her paddle directly over her head in the Indian signal of greeting” (13).132 Despite the story being set along the shores of Stanley Park, there is no mention of this specific setting in the story. In the Province version, on the other hand, the initial description is much more anchored to place: “But one russet September afternoon I found her. I had idled down the trail from the Swan’s Basin in Stanley Park to the rim that skirts the Narrows, and I saw the graceful high-bowed canoe heading for the beach that is the favorite landing place of the ‘Tillicums’ from the Mission” (2). For the Province’s readers, Johnson’s use of landmarks would have appealed to Vancouverites – and also, later, to tourists visiting Vancouver, who would purchase Legends of Vancouver as a kind of narrative map to the city.133

132 When place names were included in the Mother’s version, they were often misspelled – e.g. “Mission” appeared instead as “Missouri” in “The Legend of Siwash Rock”; “Capilano River” appeared as “Capilain River” in “The Legend of the Seven Swans”; and “Fraser River” appeared as “Fayer River” or “Frazer River” in “The Legend of Lillooet Falls.” Since Johnson would have mailed handwritten manuscripts to the Illinois publication office (and her handwriting can, at times, be difficult to decipher), the errors likely occurred during production when the manuscripts were being typed up. Carole Gerson also notes that the spelling of “canyon” in Mother’s, which appeared as “cañon,” likely reflects “the original Spanish spelling (the word comes from American/Mexican south) – which was quite common in the US” (personal correspondence).

133 Although not mentioned in the Mother’s version, the Province version introduces us to another character, Maarda. She was likely a friend of Mary Capilano’s from the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Nation, and may have been familiar to some of the Province’s Vancouver readers — Johnson tells us in “The Tenas Klootchman” that Maarda “and her husband lived at the Squamish River, some thirty-five miles north of Vancouver City” (12). See Johnson’s The Moccasin Maker (1913).
As these forgotten stories of Mary Capilano reveal, there is an incredible wealth of narrative that deserves to be acknowledged within the Legends of Vancouver context. Not only do these stories serve as a form of literary “safekeeping” for both Sḵwx̱wú7mesh and Kanien’ke-ha:ka traditional knowledge, but they also broaden our understanding of the relationship between Mary Capilano and E. Pauline Johnson – particularly through those minor details on the margins of each story. That Johnson was able to move so convincingly between narrative voices, across publishing venues, can be attributed in part to her role as a good listener, and her attention to each individual narrator’s mannerisms, gestures, and unique qualities as a storyteller. Though the archives have not yielded information as to the possibility (or extent) of editorial intervention with regards to the Legends stories, they have afforded us with a greater understanding of Mary’s forgotten life and literary legacy; with this knowledge, it becomes necessary to consider the future of Legends of Vancouver – and, in subsequent editions, to prioritize the inclusion and celebration of Mary Capilano’s narrative contributions.
Chapter 4. The Publishing History of Maria Campbell’s *Halfbreed*

“I never doubted that he believed me. I just felt that he must have known that he was going to take it out when he told me he was leaving it in. And I trusted him” – Maria Campbell, CBC As It Happens Interview (29 November 2019)

While an analysis of the publishing history of *Legends of Vancouver* reveals a legacy of erasure and destructive paratextual changes, more recent editorial decisions in Canadian publishing suggest the extent to which things have not changed. For Métis author Maria Campbell, whose autobiographical text *Halfbreed* (1973) has become one of the most significant, celebrated works of Indigenous literature in Canada’s publishing history, this meant heavily revising her life’s story as a necessary condition of publication. As a direct result of my archival research, which returned two pages of excised text to Campbell, we can now begin to understand the context and implications of such editorial interventions.

In *Halfbreed*, Campbell tells the story of her life growing up in extreme poverty in northern Saskatchewan, her eventual move out West, and struggles with drug addiction and attempted suicide that eventually culminated in the decision to write about her life. To Indigenous, especially Métis readers, this book importantly represented and celebrated their existence in print; and for settler or non-Indigenous readers, *Halfbreed* provided an eye-opening and necessary account of the realities of life for many Indigenous people in Canada. Debuting several years earlier in 1967, George Ryga’s play, *The Ecstasy of Rita Joe*, importantly set the reception context for Campbell’s
Halfbreed by “awakening consciousness to the ‘Indian problem’” and highlighting the devastating effects of “white men’s violence and paternalistic attitudes towards First Nations peoples.”\(^{134}\) Though her publisher, McClelland and Stewart, expected that the book would be successful, they never anticipated that the initial print run of 4500 copies\(^{135}\) would immediately sell out. They ordered an additional 4000,\(^{136}\) then another 2500\(^{137}\) and struggled in that first year of publication to keep up with demand. Professors from across Canada lobbied for a paperback edition to teach in their classes,\(^{138}\) as universities at that time had little, if any, Indigenous content, and certainly nothing from a Métis perspective.\(^{139}\)

Despite the book’s immediate success and responses from readers, it was not known until recently that a key piece of Campbell’s life story had been removed by publishers without her permission – a piece that would change everything. In a 1989 interview with Hartmut Lutz, Campbell was asked if she would ever rewrite Halfbreed. She responded: “Yes, some day. I don’t think I’d make changes. What I would do with the book is, I would only put in that piece that was taken out” (47). With Campbell’s


\(^{135}\) Porter, Anna. Letter to Glen Witmer. 27 November 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

\(^{136}\) “Re-print Purchase Order for “Half Breed Woman,”” Alger Press Limited. 23 April 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.


\(^{139}\) Also published in 1973 was Rudy Wiebe’s The Temptations of Big Bear, followed by Margaret Laurence’s The Diviners in 1974 – both texts included Indigenous content, but were written by non-Indigenous authors.
permission, I sought to find this missing “piece” in the McClelland and Stewart archives in October 2017. Here, I discovered two excised manuscript pages and relevant correspondence, that would ultimately reveal how Campbell was raped at the age of 14 by members of the RCMP and that her publisher, McClelland and Stewart, had denied her the opportunity to write about this experience.

This chapter begins with an analysis of the publishing history of Campbell’s *Halfbreed*, referring first to my archival findings (the two missing pages and related publishing correspondence), and moving next to an overview of the different editions of *Halfbreed* that have existed since its initial publication in 1973. The first part of this chapter aims to reconstruct, with reference to archival documents, the events surrounding the initial publication of *Halfbreed* with particular attention to the RCMP “incident.” As I will explain in this chapter, we can consider the handling of Campbell’s manuscript by M&S, and mistreatment of Campbell as an Indigenous woman writer, as both indicative of the assumptions held within a predominantly non-Indigenous industry during the early 1970s in Canada. In the decades following the 1951 Massey Report, which recommended increased support and funding for Canadian cultural production in a post-WW2 era of “heightened nationalism” (Friskney 10), cultural institutions like McClelland and Stewart were focused on producing quintessentially “Canadian” content – and though McClelland may have recognized the importance of widening the scope of what constituted “Canadian” literature, he did not, as I will argue in this chapter, have the experience or cultural understanding to work respectfully with an Indigenous author. Campbell’s abilities as a writer were constantly put into question, and her experience of sexual assault was quietly dismissed by editors.\(^{140}\) Though *Halfbreed* has existed in

\(^{140}\) As the #MeToo movement (founded in 2006 by civil rights activist Tarana Burke, and reaching its peak in 2017) has revealed, the suppression of women’s accounts of sexual abuse/assault are culturally, geographically, and historically widespread. See https://metoomvmt.org/.
slightly different forms throughout the past 46 years, all editions up until 2019 have reproduced the original 1973 typescript that excludes Campbell’s experience of being raped. By examining the history of Campbell’s text, through both archival and publishing perspectives, I aim to both draw attention to the colonial publishing system that *Halfbreed* emerged from and contextualize the significance of the recently discovered missing pages.

**Halfbreed – A Publishing Timeline (1971-1973)**141

When asked in an interview with Hartmut Lutz about the original manuscript for *Halfbreed*, Campbell stated that the “handwritten manuscript was over 2,000 pages long” (42). She states, “part of the decision not to publish all of it was a good one, because I didn’t know anything about writing” (42). On coming to the decision to write *Halfbreed*, Campbell states:

> When I started to write *Halfbreed* I didn’t know I was going to write a book. I was very angry, very frustrated. I wrote the book after I had the dream!142 I had no money, and I was on the verge of being kicked out of my house, had no food, and I decided to go back out in the street and work. I went out one night and sat in a bar. And I just couldn’t, because I knew that if I went back to that, I’d be back on drugs again. I always carry paper in my bag,

141 I have also created an accompanying digital timeline of the full publication history of Campbell’s *Halfbreed*, available here: [https://cdn.knightlab.com/libs/timeline3/latest/embed/index.html?source=1p1_uz7DGSoljeeuzrAsy0zyxJZgWADVJY_WsBC4Krs&font=Default&lang=en&initial_zoom=2&height=650](https://cdn.knightlab.com/libs/timeline3/latest/embed/index.html?source=1p1_uz7DGSoljeeuzrAsy0zyxJZgWADVJY_WsBC4Krs&font=Default&lang=en&initial_zoom=2&height=650).

142 The “dream” that Campbell refers to, where she is given advice by the Grandmothers, is described earlier on page 53 in Lutz’ book: “When I say I really believe that the Grandmothers look after people: about 1972, 1971, I had a dream. And this voice told me that if I listen to them I would never be without food, that I would always have a good place to live, and that my children would be okay, and I would have good health. They told me I would work with people who would write, and paint, and sing songs. And I said, ‘Come on, I don’t know how to do any of these things!’ And that was when they told me not to worry. That if I did what they wanted me to do, they would look after me, and that this was my work. And they have.”
and I started writing a letter because I had to have somebody to talk to, and there was nobody to talk to. And that was how I wrote *Halfbreed*. (Lutz 53)

According to Campbell, who at that time was known by her legal name June Stifle, a friend of hers that was staying at her house recognized the importance of the resulting “piles and pounds of paper” (Lutz 53), and encouraged her to seek publication. Campbell would eventually express to M&S that she would prefer “to use the name Maria Campbell as her professional nom-de-plume, but doesn’t care about concealing her real identity and would not object to the use of a photo on the jacket or to in-person promotion.” The pseudonym ‘Maria Campbell’ was chosen for sentimental reasons, after her great-grandmother, and not as a means of hiding her identity.143

In 1971, Vancouver publisher Jim Douglas was the first to consider Campbell’s manuscript. At the time, Douglas was working alongside Scott McIntyre as co-founders of the Vancouver publishing house J.J. Douglas Ltd. (which would go on to become Douglas & McIntyre in 1979),144 but in this context both Douglas and McIntyre were acting as publishing agents. According to Douglas, he had been introduced to Campbell through a mutual acquaintance, Professor Rick Salter, who worked as a sociologist at Capilano College and was described as Campbell’s “friend and advisor.”145 In a letter to Jack McClelland dated 17 November 1971, Douglas writes to propose Campbell’s manuscript for publication with McClelland and Stewart. Though Douglas admits that he

143 See David Berry’s letter to Jack McClelland, 23 November 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84. As Carole Gerson noted to me in the preparation of this dissertation, Campbell’s choice of pseudonym for her public persona also bears comparison to Johnson’s adoption of her great-grandfather’s Mohawk name, Tekahionwake.


could take on the project himself, and will do so if he cannot find another publisher, he acknowledges in his letter to McClelland that “it should be you.”

In this letter of introduction to McClelland, Douglas describes Campbell’s manuscript as follows:

This is the story of her life and a grim life it has been. From a childhood of poverty in northern Saskatchewan... She has been a drug addict and a drug smuggler. A life of violence and meanness (sic) on the part of her men and her church and the police. Her first sexual experience was to be raped by R.C.M.P. officers in her own home – and it goes down from there. It is the round of indignity and degradation that sociologists write about. Here, an articulate, intelligent half-breed tells us what it is really like.

Though Douglas goes on to note that Campbell problematically “names names” and as such, the manuscript “is highly libellous (sic),” it’s unclear whether or not Douglas is referring in this statement to the incident with the RCMP, because early versions of the manuscript also included the names of prominent Vancouver businessmen (later removed) whom Campbell interacted with in her sex work. Beyond addressing these concerns, however, Douglas importantly expresses a profound belief in Campbell’s manuscript as it is – stating that it “should be treated extraordinarily.” In attempting to convince McClelland of the sales potential for Campbell’s book, Douglas compares it to the success of Cree writer Harold Cardinal’s *The Unjust Society: The Tragedy of Canada’s Indians*, published in 1969 by M.G. Hurtig Ltd. Douglas states, “The Cardinal sold over 30,000 copies and I think that this is a more appealing book because of its human qualities. It will be read by women particularly and should be read by all men.”

By acknowledging the impact of Cardinal’s work, Douglas also draws attention to

146 Ibid.
147 Though in this letter Douglas doesn’t reference this title by name, we can assume he is referring to his work of Cardinal’s based on the date of the letter. Cardinal’s other published works include *The Rebirth of Canada’s Indians* (1977) and *Treaty Elders of Saskatchewan* (2000).
important political issues in Canada at that time surrounding Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau’s 1969 White Paper. In the wake of the White Paper, which proposed to dismantle the Indian Act (and thereby eliminate Indian status and rights), nationwide rejections and responses followed including the 1970 “Red Paper,” drafted by Cardinal and the Indian Association of Alberta. The sociopolitical context of the time, particularly in relation to increasingly vocal Indigenous activism, might have influenced McClelland’s decision to move forward in publishing Campbell’s autobiography.

Despite the endorsement from Jim Douglas, Campbell’s manuscript was met with skepticism by editors at McClelland and Stewart. In a seven-page letter dated 30 November 1971, McClelland explains that despite agreeing that “there is something valuable and unique” in Campbell’s manuscript, he is skeptical about the next steps. In fact, McClelland suggests that Douglas must have been “overwhelmed by the author’s personality, by your meeting with her and possibly unduly influenced by her agent” to have led to his initial assessment. McClelland, it seems, is entirely unconvinced by the manuscript alone – and patronizingly seeks explanation for Douglas’s “error” in judgement through Campbell’s apparent “charms” instead. In this letter, McClelland also notably addresses his concerns regarding the “RCMP incident” for the first time. He writes:

One point that really bothers me is her experience with the R.C.M.P. I don’t know, because I haven’t checked with a lawyer but my suspicion is that this could not be used. The R.C.M.P. could almost certainly get an injunction stopping the distribution of the book and they almost certainly would. Then it would be up to her to prove the incident. I presume that this would be almost impossible and a messy business that she wouldn’t want to be involved in. As I say that’s a superficial opinion at the moment. I haven’t any doubt about the incident itself. I am sure it occurred (sic) just as I know

---

148 See https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/.
it occurs today, but I think the only time one can do anything about it is when it occurs.149

Where McClelland suggests that the rape scene is not worth such legal complexities, his approach fundamentally opposes Campbell’s own reasons for writing the book, which she describes “as a kind of therapy to purge myself” (qtd. in Woods). Considering this response with knowledge of McClelland’s ultimate decision to excise the passage without Campbell’s permission, his “support” reads as insincere – and highlights the drastic differences in power, social status, and privilege between McClelland and Campbell. Furthermore, by making “presumptions” about Campbell’s feelings on the possibility of having to prove the rape in court, a subject upon which McClelland is completely ill-equipped to pass judgements on, his initial handling of this part of the manuscript can be seen as dismissive.

In spite of these concerns, McClelland agreed to take the manuscript under consideration; and after consulting an encouraging reader’s report from former M&S representative June Sheppard, McClelland assigned the manuscript to several in-house editors (including Patrick Crean, Minty Rothwell, and Anna Porter – one of McClelland’s most trusted colleagues150) for their feedback. In Porter’s report, she expresses her support for the manuscript, but also acknowledges that substantial work is required on its latter half. “The beginning is the strongest and the best part of the manuscript… Judging from the first part of the manuscript, it would seem to me that June Stiffle (sic) herself should be able to bring the second part up to the level of the first.”151

149 McClelland, Jack. Letter to Mr. James Douglas. 30 November 1971. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.


151 Porter, Anna. Letter to Jack McClelland. 9 February 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
issue for McClelland at this time is that while most reviewers commented on the
originality of Campbell’s manuscript, particularly in terms of its contribution to literature
from a Métis perspective, he couldn’t reconcile this with the many issues he saw as
deply embedded in the manuscript itself – particularly in the later “Vancouver” section.
He needed reassurance that in taking on this book, Campbell would be willing to make
changes to these sections of the manuscript. Upon receiving Porter’s report, McClelland
penned a response to Douglas the very next day, reiterating his initial concerns as
articulated in the 30 November 1971 letter, and asking for both Douglas and Campbell to
“re-read the letter and answer some of the questions, such as what is her real
objective.” That McClelland uses the word “plead” in this letter, in directing Douglas to
“plead with her to re-read [his first] letter,” indicates the state of desperation that
McClelland was approaching – if Campbell was unable to meet McClelland’s demands
for revision, he likely wouldn’t take on this book for publication.

About a month later, Douglas’s associate Scott McIntyre arranged a meeting
with Campbell in Edmonton, where they discussed McClelland’s concerns and possible
next steps. The results of this meeting were summarized in a letter from McIntyre to
McClelland dated 14 March 1972:

152 “Socially it should do more for these people than many of the sociologists who are rushing into
print. This is the real thing.” Rothwell, Minty. Memo to Editorial Dept. 4 February, 1972. McClelland
and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster
University Library, Box 2CA84.

153 McClelland, J.G. Letter to Jim Douglas. 10 February 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds,
William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84. Also in
this letter, McClelland refers to Farley Mowat’s ideas regarding fact versus truth to justify the exclusion of some
aspects of Campbell’s life story: “Fact in itself is simply not important and can interfere with the story. What is
important is truth.”

154 Before his career with Douglas & McIntyre, McIntyre was working for McClelland and Stewart in
1969; he wrote a letter to Douglas in 1969 to indicate his intentions of leaving M&S and moving to
Vancouver. See Box 1 (Personal Correspondence) of the Scott McIntyre fonds at Simon Fraser
University’s Special Collections and Rare Books.
She has re-read your original letter and is agreeable to moving in the direction outlined in it. She feels she will have no trouble expanding the first section, and that she is now mentally prepared to have another go at the second part. I disagree that it should be simply condensed into a catalogue of events, but think there’s a good deal of room for her to rewrite, re-organize, and be far more selective in the choosing of events. I suggested that she focus on incidents that add to the angry tone of a book about what happens specifically to Indians and half-breeds, and she feels she can do this.

Though Campbell is described as seeming amenable to McClelland’s suggestions of a “selective autobiography,” McIntyre also draws attention to one of Campbell’s primary concerns relating to the publication of this text: that it may be affordable and accessible to the people she is writing for. He states, “She recognises that the Spring of 1973 is the earliest the book can appear, and her one strong feeling is that it must be available in paperback. Her central purpose in writing the book is to get a message of hope to as many of her people as possible, and I agree that a paperback format is the right one for this book.” Though neither Campbell nor McIntyre could foresee it at the time, this, along with the issue of the “RCMP incident,” would represent key examples of how Campbell’s wishes were ignored by her publisher.

In his response dated 29 March 1972, McClelland swiftly dismisses Campbell’s “strong” request to see her book published in paperback format. He states, “My view is that it should be a good looking $4.95 hardbound and that it should be made available in a mass-market paperback a year later. I think this book is going to be a big seller and I think that route is the best one for her but we can worry about that later and discuss it when we see you in June.” As publishing historian Janet Friskney asserts, it was standard practice for M&S to issue a hardcover book first (at a higher profit margin) and follow up with a paperback shortly thereafter: “By the 1970s, paperback editions had become a regular part of the publishing cycle for many books first issued in hardback. Consequently, as M&S imprints went out of print in hardback, or a pre-existing
paperback contract expired, the firm’s authors expected to see their books reissued in paperback editions” (84). Though McClelland assures McIntyre that publishing a hardbound version would be in Campbell’s best interest (i.e. M&S’s financial interest), and follows standard practice in publishing, this ignores Campbell’s reasons for wanting the book to appear in paperback – so that those Métis peoples living in poverty, for whom she writes this book, can afford to read it. But McClelland was likely also considering the difficulty and financial strain that previous paperback initiatives (New Canadian Library, among others) had taken on the company. At the 1958 launch of M&S’s low-cost reprint series, New Canadian Library (NCL), McClelland expressed this concern in stating that “paperback publishing is a gamble at ridiculous odds” (qtd. in Friskney 42) – and in 1972, with an increasingly uncertain financial future, this was not a wager that McClelland could afford to make. In McIntyre’s response dated 13 April 1972, he expresses satisfaction with McClelland’s proposal, but urges McClelland to keep a paperback edition in mind: “As far as format is concerned, the cloth book with a mass paperback following sounds fair to me. I think the important thing is that at some point not too distant from original pub date, the book will be available in a paperback edition. I suspect June will be quite happy with this.”

At this stage, Campbell officially signed a contract with McClelland and Stewart (dated 26 May 1972), and continued revising her manuscript – as per McClelland’s instructions – over the next several months. In a letter to Anna Porter dated 20 July 1972 (with an accompanying revised manuscript from Campbell), McIntyre explains the state of Campbell’s revisions: “My own feelings on the manuscript are mixed. It’s certainly a great improvement over the original version, but it isn’t changed as much as I would have hoped. I expect you and Jack may find the first section still short, and the last two sections not truncated enough… It’s not the book I had hoped would emerge at this
stage, but I’m still confident that June can do what additional work may be required under specific direction from there.”\textsuperscript{155} In this letter McIntyre also acknowledges the inefficiency of his position in the current publishing arrangement, stating, “I’m kind of in the middle here.”\textsuperscript{156} In fact, up until this point, the responsibilities of all parties involved – McClelland, Porter, Douglas, McIntyre, and Sheppard – remained largely undefined and seemingly overlapping. This would become clearer in the next few months, as the handover from Douglas/McIntyre to McClelland and Stewart was made official, and Campbell was assigned a case editor at M&S. In the meantime, however, McClelland was becoming increasingly frustrated with Campbell’s revisions. Upon reviewing the updated manuscript, McClelland expressed such feelings in a note to Porter: “It is in such lousy shape physically – that it is almost unreadable. I can’t believe it but between Jim Douglas, Scott, June Sheppard (or whoever) and the author this has really been fucked up… I am damned if I am going to take the time to read anything as sloppy as this.”\textsuperscript{157} He advises Porter to “assume we will publish,” and to assign the manuscript to an editor for more detailed feedback and, ideally, to see the book through to publication.

The revised manuscript was assigned to M&S editor David Berry,\textsuperscript{158} who provided a detailed report on the existing manuscript to Porter and McClelland in late August of 1972. In his evaluation, Berry acknowledges that in its current form, “the

\textsuperscript{155} McIntyre, Scott. Letter to Anna Porter. 20 July 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{157} McClelland, Jack. Note to Anna Porter. 31 July 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

\textsuperscript{158} Berry is described in James King’s \textit{Jack} as “young... known for his T-shirt, jeans and shoulder-length hair”; he was initially hired by M&S “to deal with the slush pile” of unsolicited manuscript submissions in the early 1970s (though quickly rose to the rank of ‘editor’). King writes: “His most productive day on the job was the one when he drank the Thermos of marijuana-enhanced tea he brought to the office. He quit abruptly when Jack and Anna took little interest in promoting C. Frank Turner’s book on Sitting Bull, \textit{Across the Medicine Line} (1973)” (237-8).
manuscript is rather confusing, but this may have to do with the copy we have in the house (pages missing, unnumbered, out of order).” 159 In terms of suggestions for the manuscript, Berry writes, “While we’re on the subject of cutting, I don’t think much is possible, or desirable (the ms is fairly short as is) but the author’s story does seem to drag awfully in the latter sections: same things happen over and over again – I found myself getting a bit bored by all the ups and downs (mostly downs).” In a comment that addresses the realities of systemic stereotypes regarding Indigenous peoples in Canada, Berry notes that “the writing is pretty rough; rightly or wrongly people will expect it to be, though it’s better than they will probably expect.” The implicitness of this statement, articulated as an agreed-upon fact amongst a team of non-Indigenous editors, reveals the extent to which the publishing industry existed in a realm exclusive of Indigenous voices. But despite some concerns and criticisms, Berry concludes the letter by stating that “I think this is a worthwhile book... What’s disturbing or depressing is there because it has to be, and I suppose that like the author we’ll just have to live with it.”

Berry reached out to Campbell in a letter dated 7 September 1972, to introduce himself as the official editor assigned to see *Halfbreed* through to production. 160 He writes: “I didn’t see the original version, but gather that you’ve done a good deal of work on it since last fall. What’s needed now is not heavy revision or a lot of rewriting but final

---

159 Berry, David. Letter to Anna Porter and Jack McClelland. 21 August 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

160 Strangely, Berry writes another letter of introduction to Campbell dated 24 November 1972, in which he also introduces himself (seemingly for the first time) to Campbell. "I'm writing mainly to introduce myself as the editor who will be picking up where Dianne leaves off. I'd have been in touch before now but didn't want to work at cross-purposes with Dianne. The new manuscript is wonderful - I can't think of a better word than that. I liked it before, but it was a manuscript, with a lot of problems. Now it's a book." Is it possible that the first letter of introduction addressed to Campbell was never sent? Or was it too much marijuana tea?
polishing. We may recommend a few minor cuts. Or it may be necessary to add a sentence here and there to tie things together. Nothing drastic.”¹⁶¹ He also explains that the manuscript is now officially being dealt with in-house at M&S: “I felt you should know that we were proceeding here, as up till now you’ve mainly been in touch with Jim Douglas. I know that Jim is very enthusiastic about the book and so are we.” With regard to the specific edits Berry had in mind, he notes in a letter to McClelland dated 11 September 1972 that the section containing “pages 52-100, following the death of the author’s mother, show a clear chronology and I don’t think any revision is required.”¹⁶² In a separate list of specific edits prepared by Berry, he notes that “p. 74 has been deleted. I’ve added the first 4 lines from the top of 74 to the bottom of 73. Text should pick up with ‘Grannie left us’ on p. 75.”¹⁶³ It is at this specific moment, in noting the deletion of page 74, that Berry officially removes the RCMP “incident” from Campbell’s manuscript; presumably, this was one of the “minor cuts” that he had referred to in his 7 September letter.

Nevertheless, this solution to the RCMP “incident” would be short-lived. In a letter to McClelland dated 23 November 1972, Berry notes that Campbell “has re-inserted the Mountie-rape incident in the revised manuscript. Her own lawyer apparently thinks this is OK, but as we might feel differently about it I thought you should know about it. Perhaps

¹⁶¹ Berry, David. Letter to June Stifle. 7 September 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

¹⁶² Berry, David. Letter to J.G. McClelland. 11 September 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

¹⁶³ Berry, David. “Stifle – Half-Breed Woman.” McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84. [this document does not have David Berry’s name on it, but can be inferred to be an earlier handwritten draft of the typed note he would send to McClelland on 11 September 1972. Furthermore, the handwriting of this document matches the handwriting of “DB” as shown in a document titled “Editorial to Production” dated 15 February 1973, also located in Box 2CA84].
we should consult Mr. Martin?" 164 Ironically, Berry pens a letter to Campbell the very next day in which he professes his admiration for the latest manuscript; such contrasting sentiments suggest the extent to which Berry, as lead editor, had to negotiate the competing demands of author and employer: "The new manuscript is wonderful – I can't think of a better word than that." 165 Prompted by Berry’s surprising revelation, McClelland reached out to the company lawyer, Mr. Robert I. Martin 166 (of the Toronto firm Hume, Martin & Timmins) for legal counsel. In a letter dated 27 November 1972, McClelland writes:

Sometime ago we discussed a problem relating to a book by a Metis (sic) woman, June Stifle… The point in question about the book related to an incident where she was raped by a couple members of the RCMP. We concluded jointly that we could not safely include this incident. Her lawyer tells her that we could. I would like to include it if we can, but I am still of the opinion that it could lead to an injunction. I enclose the relevant pages and would be grateful for your opinion. 167

Of note in this letter is McClelland’s reference to a previous conversation regarding the RCMP sexual assault; but where McClelland states that they “jointly” decided against its inclusion in the published text, this language suggests that the decision regarding this

164 Berry, David. Letter to J.G. McClelland. 23 November 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84. Handwritten on this memo, Jack McClelland has written, “Let me have a Xerox of the papers in which mountie scene exists – say 1 chapter” – we can presume that he’s going to send this Xerox onwards to his lawyer, Robert I. Martin, in the letter dated 27 November 1972.

165 Berry, David. Letter to June Stifle. 24 November 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

166 Robert I. Martin, Q.C. (1924-2005) served as legal counsel for McClelland and Stewart. The Finding Aid for the McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds reveals invoices paid to Robert Martin between 1970-1976, but his involvement with the company may have begun earlier. The firm of Hume, Martin & Timmins would also serve as solicitors for the 1981 case of McClelland & Stewart Ltd. v. Mutual Life, where M&S was awarded $100,000 plus costs in a case involving M&S author Terence Robertson. See the Supreme Court of Canada ruling here: https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1981/1981canlii53/1981canlii53.html?resultIndex=2.

167 McClelland, Jack. Letter to Mr. Robert I. Martin. 27 November 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
passage had already, in fact, been made. In a 2019 interview with CBC Radio’s *As it Happens*, Campbell herself echoed this sentiment: “I never doubted that he believed me. I just felt that he must have known that he was going to take it out when he told me he was leaving it in. And I trusted him.” Furthermore, the use of the word “safely” in this letter prompts the question – for whom? By focusing on the threat of injunction, rather than the potential legal implications or emotional harm caused to Campbell personally, we can clearly see that McClelland’s decision not to publish was determined by possible consequences to his business. Since Martin’s reply is not included in the archives, we cannot know exactly what was said in response to McClelland’s letter. However, given that the book was published without the RCMP incident included, we can presume that Martin advised against publication.

Despite Campbell’s insistence that the RCMP assault be included, M&S editor Berry proceeded to, once again, remove the three paragraphs in question before sending the manuscript onwards to Production. In a form dated 12 December 1972, Berry submitted the manuscript for “mark-up,” noting that in its present form, “chapter heads are presently in caps with Roman numerals (CHAPTER X, CHAPTER XI, etc.).” A list of specific edits accompanied this form, notably indicating the following change: “103-4 – mountie incident cut.”

---


169 “FROM EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT TO PRODUCTION.” 12 December 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

170 “Queries” - Accompanying List of Edits. Undated. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
Figure 4.1  Example of a chapter head using roman numerals
Campbell, Maria. “Halfbreed Woman.” Circa 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Series X, Manuscript Inventory. Reproduced with permission from Maria Campbell.

Figure 4.2  List of specific edits, including “mountie incident cut”
McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
Based on Berry’s note regarding the chapter heads appearing in roman numerals, and the accompanying “mountie incident cut” notation, it appears that these documents correspond to the following two manuscript pages, crossed out with a red X:

Figure 4.3  Excised manuscript pages detailing Campbell’s sexual assault by RCMP

Campbell, Maria. “Halfbreed Woman.” Circa 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Series X, Manuscript Inventory. Reproduced with permission from Maria Campbell.

These pages, recovered from the McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds in 2017, are the only existing copies of Campbell’s description of her sexual assault – the very same pages that McClelland insisted he had “destroyed” for Campbell’s own protection. As Campbell explained in a 2018 email to myself and Reder, “I didn’t think [Jack McClelland] kept it because when I asked him for it he said he had destroyed it so I
wouldn’t get into trouble.”171 Located in M&S’s “Manuscript Inventory,” the trauma contained in these pages makes the editorial tug-of-war between Campbell and M&S, between a sexual assault survivor and a prominent Canadian publishing company, all the more necessary for us to bear witness.

A “Selective Autobiography”172: Or, the Removal of the “RCMP Incident”

After months of silence from M&S, during which time they were busy preparing the redacted manuscript for publication, Campbell finally heard from Berry in a letter dated 12 January 1973. He writes, “We made very few changes in the manuscript, and since there was a big rush to get it to the printer I didn't think it would be worthwhile to send it back to you.”173 Several days later, Berry would send Campbell another letter, including the updated page proofs. In this letter, he notes, “I don't know if Dianne or Jack McClelland told you that we are taking out the incident with the Mounties. We'd like to keep it in, but our lawyer advises us that unless it could be proved the RCMP could get an injunction to stop the sale of the book.”174 While this statement basically reiterates McClelland’s sentiments from the very beginning (see letter to Jim Douglas of 30 November 1971), Berry’s letter seems to assign responsibility for this decision to the

172 McClelland, Jack. Letter to Mr. James Douglas. 30 November 1971. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
174 Berry, David. Letter to June Stifle. 15 January 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
company lawyer alone, rather than including McClelland – a strategy, perhaps, to maintain positive relations between publisher and author. Around this time, an internal memo was circulated at M&S, stating that they were to “drastically advance the schedule on this book” and that “we had all better give this title special attention whenever possible.”

Berry would send Campbell another set of updated page proofs in late February, after meeting her in person for the first time. And finally, in a letter dated 13 March 1973, Berry declares that book production is complete: “You should be receiving your copies of the book this week. Hope you’re pleased.”

With knowledge of Campbell’s sexual assault and related editorial struggles, it’s difficult to imagine Campbell being “pleased” when she received her author’s copies in the mail, revealing the removal of the RCMP passage. Ironically, in the very same year that *Halfbreed* was published, the RCMP were celebrating their organization’s centennial anniversary. Yet despite this cause for “celebration,” the RCMP were struggling to maintain a positive reputation – something that was publicly discredited in several mainstream exposés including a July 1972 article in *Maclean’s* magazine, and the

---

175 Scollard, David. Letter to Peter Scaggs, David Berry, Pat McLoughlin. 15 February 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

176 Berry, David. Letter to Maria Campbell. 19 February 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84. It’s interesting to note that after finally meeting Campbell in person – “It was a pleasure meeting you last week” – Berry begins addressing his letters to Maria Campbell (her preferred name and nom de plume), rather than to June Stifle.

177 Berry, David. Letter to Maria Campbell. 13 March 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

178 See “My Case Against the RCMP” by ex-Corporal Jack Ramsay (*Macleans*, July 1972). When searching through legal databases to determine if Ramsay faced any legal implications for publishing these opinions, I came upon a disturbing revelation: the very same Jack Ramsay, ex-RCMP officer and author of the 1972 exposé, was later accused of sexually assaulting a 14-year-old First Nations girl from Pelican Narrows, Saskatchewan in 1969. Ramsay was convicted in 2000 of attempted rape and spent 9 months in jail, but he appealed this verdict in 2001, and a new trial was ordered where he pleaded guilty to the lesser charge of indecent assault. He was ultimately sentenced to one year’s probation and community service. In the *Maclean’s* article he
1973 book, *An Unauthorized History of the RCMP*. This book, written by Lorne and Caroline Brown, importantly drew attention to the prevalence of sexual assault cases against Indigenous women in Saskatchewan. Furthermore, and perhaps even more disturbing, is that a newspaper clipping from the *Globe and Mail* titled “Saskatchewan natives, Metis say situation tense: RCMP harassing Indians, committing sexual acts against women, head of group charges” has been preserved in the McClelland & Stewart “Halfbreed Woman” correspondence at McMaster University, addressed to the attention of editor David Berry. This article was published on January 13, 1973, only months before the publication of *Halfbreed*. In this article, Jim Sinclair, president of the Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Society, states, “These things happen… Young girls tell us of many similar offences but they are afraid to testify because of what may happen to them.” That this information was being brought to Berry’s attention was not a coincidence; it was evidence of the widespread accounts of sexual assault/mistreatment of Indigenous persons by the RCMP, all corroborating Campbell’s own experience. One cannot help but hear echoes of Grannie Dubuque’s warning in these examples, that “no one ever believed Halfbreeds in court” (Campbell, “Halfbreed Woman” pp. 104), and that the legal system was pitted against Indigenous women and would always side with the oppressors.

In thinking through McClelland’s decision to exclude Campbell’s sexual assault from the published book, we might consider several factors as contributing to his position. The most influential factor likely revolved around McClelland and Stewart’s constant financial issues. Though the company suffered throughout the 1960s to actually

---


---

turn a profit, it was in 1970 that Jack McClelland announced that he would be forced to sell the company that was currently $2 million in debt.\textsuperscript{180} M&S, quite simply, could not afford an injunction or to strike out on Campbell’s book. However, though McClelland repeatedly refers to the threat of injunction in his letters, it should be noted that these are generally granted in “exceptional” circumstances only. For instance, in the decision \textit{Canada Metal Co. Ltd. v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.} (1975), Justice Stark explains:

> The granting of injunctions to restrain publication of alleged libels is an exceptional remedy granted only in the rarest and clearest of cases. That reluctance to restrict in advance publication of words spoken or written is founded, of course, on the necessity under our democratic system to protect free speech and unimpeded expression of opinion. The exceptions to this rule are extremely rare.\textsuperscript{181}

Given the rarity with which injunctions are granted, we might instead look beyond McClelland’s fears of an injunction or financial ruin and consider the implications for Indigenous survivors of sexual assault; that is, by refusing to accept these risks on Campbell’s behalf, McClelland was simultaneously affirming Grannie Dubuque’s fears about a legal system set up to fail Indigenous women and also implying that he didn’t believe Campbell would be able to prove her case against the RCMP. Though McClelland did receive a bail-out from the province of Ontario (in the form of an interest-free loan) which enabled him to keep the company afloat temporarily, money remained a constant stressor for McClelland until he sold the company in 1985.\textsuperscript{182} In fact, shortly after this 1971 financial bail-out, McClelland wrote letters to all of the M&S authors “apologizing for the delay in sending royalty cheques” – money that “had been held back in order to keep the firm solvent” (King 235-6).

\textsuperscript{180} See King, \textit{Jack: A Life with Writers} (1999, pp. 222-231).

\textsuperscript{181} See https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onsc/doc/1975/1975canlii661/1975canlii661.html?resultInd

\textsuperscript{182} King, pp. 310-1, 316-9, 377-8. See also Anna Porter’s \textit{In Other Words: How I Fell in Love with Canada One Book at a Time} (Simon & Schuster, 2018).
By comparing McClelland’s treatment of the RCMP “incident” in Campbell’s manuscript to his drastically different approaches to the censorship of other M&S authors, we can also see evidence of McClelland’s tendency towards double standards. When McClelland and Stewart took on the distribution of American writer William Burrough’s *Naked Lunch* in 1963, the Toronto stock of the book was seized by police (due to existing obscenity laws). However, McClelland made it clear during this incident that he would not risk his business over a book that he was “merely distributing.” He stated: “I am a businessman, though. I am not a crusader. I will not knowingly jeopardize our business in a censorship battle.” And yet, when it came to defending M&S “A-list” authors like Leonard Cohen, whose second novel, *Beautiful Losers*, was considered highly obscene, McClelland expressed his full support – even if it meant potential litigation. In a letter to Cohen dated 15 June 1965, McClelland writes,

> Migod, it’s a fantastic book. It astounds me and baffles me and I don’t really know what to say about it. It’s wild and incredibly and marvellously well written, and at the same time appalling, shocking, revolting, disgusting, sick and just maybe it’s a great novel… Are we going to publish it? At the moment I don’t know… I’m a little apprehensive about the reaction of the Catholic Church… I’m sure it will end up in the courts here, but that might be worth trying… You are a nice chap, Leonard, and it’s lovely knowing you. All I have to decide now is whether I love you enough to want to spend the rest of my days in jail because of you.

The generous tone of this letter, where McClelland light-heartedly addresses the possibility of legal action and imprisonment for literature’s sake, contrasts drastically to

---

184 Ibid.
185 In an undated document titled “Editorial Policy at M&S,” McClelland writes: “1. M. Laurence, Peter Newman, Farley Mowat can do no wrong. We indulge them. On a judgment issue, always balance in their favour. In doubt, ask for a ruling. Never be afraid to ask. 2. Lesser authors obviously are indulged to a lesser degree, without in any sense weakening the principle that we are performing a service.” See King pp. 174, 408n26.
the correspondence surrounding Campbell’s *Halfbreed*. In fact, in the letters that exist in the M&S archive at McMaster University, Campbell was never once asked for her opinion on the RCMP matter. These decisions were made in-house, without authorial consultation, and with Campbell always seemingly the last person to know. By denying Campbell the ability to express her life’s story on her terms, and dismissing her assault by the RCMP as extraneous to the book, McClelland showed Campbell that, unlike Cohen, he did not consider her a worthwhile risk.

On the topic of destructive editing, I would like to share a personal experience relating to my research on *Halfbreed*. When Deanna Reder and I decided to write an article, in consultation with Maria Campbell, detailing my archival findings, we initially approached a major Canadian media publication who agreed to publish our article. After several weeks of emailing back-and-forth updated versions of our article (where the editor wanted to collapse my sections of the article and instead “recast the article in Deanna’s voice”), we were approaching the print deadline, and the editor explained that it was necessary to involve Campbell in a fact-checking phone-call. Based on our experiences with this editor up until that point, Deanna and I had reason to be apprehensive about this call. Though we asked the editor to provide us with a list of questions that the fact-checker intended to ask Campbell, the editor declined. (We were also concerned that the editor deemed it necessary to contact the RCMP for comment – who then followed up with Campbell, on her home telephone number, directly).

During the fact-checking phone call with Campbell, which Deanna and I were not part of, the editor emailed us to express that the call “went well.” However, when we spoke with Campbell, she told us a different story – describing the phone call with the fact-checker as “traumatizing.” During the fact-checking call, she was asked questions along the lines of “was this your first sexual experience?” and “was this the most painful
experience of your life?” After this egregious and re-traumatizing phone call, Campbell no longer supported the publication of our article in this venue, and we withdrew from publication. This experience highlighted the ways in which Indigenous writers continue to face racialized systems and barriers that fundamentally oppose their ability to speak freely. The fact-checking process that Campbell endured effectively re-inscribed processes of violence and erasure, and draws attention to the flaws of this process for sexual assault survivors and Indigenous populations/other minority groups. We were thankful to eventually find an ideal home for this piece in Canadian Literature, with the help of editor Laura Moss.  

Though the publisher’s decision to remove these two pages occurred between 1972-3, it wasn’t formally documented until an interview between Campbell and German scholar Hartmut Lutz, recorded on 23 September 1989 (and published in Lutz’ 1991 collection, Contemporary Challenges: Conversations with Canadian Native Authors). This key moment from their exchange is reproduced below:

MC: I started out writing everything that was bad in my life. When I finished writing everything that was bad in my life, I thought, ‘Good gracious, there must have been something good, too!’ And that was when I started to write about my growing up. So, the decision to cut a lot of the stuff was good because it wouldn’t help anybody.

However, a whole section was taken out of the book that was really important, and I had insisted it stay there. And that was something incriminating the RCMP.

HL: Who decided to take it out?

MC: The decision was made by the publisher – without consulting me!

HL: So you didn’t know until it came out?

MC: It was in the galley proofs. And when the book came, it was gone. It was the 100th anniversary of the RCMP that year. The only proof I had to support that part, if the publisher or myself were sued, was my great- 

187 All quotations have been reproduced from personal email correspondence.
grandmother, and she had passed away. So they felt that, if there was a law suit, they wouldn’t be able to substantiate it. So they went ahead and took it out.

That whole section makes all of the other stuff make sense. And you can almost tell at what point it was pulled out. Because there is a gap. (Lutz 42)

The RCMP “incident” was also later referenced by archivist Brendan Edwards, in his 2009 article titled “Maria Campbell’s Halfbreed: ‘Biography with a Purpose’” and published as part of McMaster University’s Historical Perspectives on Canadian Publishing digital series. While he mentions an “alleged rape,” he does not acknowledge the existence of missing manuscript pages within the M&S archive. This archival work, and the work of McClelland’s biographers, brings up another interesting factor with regards to access: According to the “Sources” page in King’s 1999 biography on Jack McClelland, the M&S fonds and Jack McClelland fonds were both, at the time, “closed archives.” This means that any archivist seeking further information about the publishing history of Halfbreed, particularly given the revelation published in Lutz’ 1991 collection, would have required special permission to access to the files. Though Halfbreed has now been in publication continuously and successfully for 46 years, none of these editions have yet made reference to either the existence of missing pages or an experience of sexual assault. Only the recovery of these pages and their 2019 restoration have allowed Campbell to fully reclaim her life story.

188 Though Campbell refers here to her great-grandmother, Cheechum, she refers to Grannie Dubuque (her maternal grandmother) in the missing pages. This reference to Cheechum in the Lutz interview was likely in error, as Campbell states in Halfbreed that Grannie Dubuque arrived “during the holidays” (92) to help with the family after the death of Campbell’s mother’s, and stayed with them until “just before Christmas” (102) – it was Grannie Dubuque who would have been with Campbell when the assault occurred.


190 In a 9 January 2020 comment on Facebook regarding the recent release of Campbell’s newest edition of Halfbreed, Anjula Gogia (Events Coordinator at ‘Another Story Bookshop’ in Toronto) stated: “This is such an amazing and important story. We launched the new edition with Maria, Tanya Talaga and Lee Maracle in November. Maria spoke of how Jack encouraged her to

Though Campbell titled the book *Halfbreed*, it has also historically appeared under the hyphenated title, *Half-breed*, with no explanation for this variation. The change in title seems to be stylistic in nature, and as the examples below will suggest, the terms “Halfbreed” and “Half-breed” appear in Indigenous literary scholarship somewhat interchangeably. For instance, Gregory Younging uses the hyphenated term, suggesting that “the English-speaking Métis at Red River sometimes referred to themselves as Half-breeds, which is a term that has fallen out of use, although it is not necessarily offensive” (*Elements of Indigenous Style* 67). In another instance, Jodi Lundgren writes that Campbell’s *Halfbreed* “typifies the Halfbreed people through generalizations that counter the derogatory stereotypes associated with the word ‘half-breed’ in the dominant discourse. Campbell delineates the history of the Metis and demonstrates that they are a unique group, distinct from white Canadians, and ‘completely different from’ their ‘Indian relatives’ (25)” (65). In this quotation, Lundgren employs these two words seemingly interchangeably, asserting that Campbell’s use of the word is an act of reclamation. A similar oscillation between the two spellings of “Halfbreed” can be seen in the book’s correspondence files at McMaster, where the manuscript was inconsistently referred to by publishers as either *Half-breed Woman*, *Half-breed*, or *Halfbreed*. In fact, while writing this chapter, I came across an article in *The Star* announcing Campbell’s new
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191 Though not included in this analysis of editions, it should be noted that a Braille edition of *Halfbreed* was published in 2009 by Braille Jymico Inc. (Charlesbourg, Québec).

192 On the alternating uses of these terms in the *Halfbreed* correspondence, see also: Jean Jerman, Letter to Peter Scaggs, 29 May 1972; Anna Porter, Letter to Bob Wilkinson, 23 July 1973; Linda McKnight, Letter to Peter Scaggs, 4 September 1973; Peter Scaggs, Letter to Anna Porter, 25 May 1973 in McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
2019 edition of *Halfbreed* as one of “Five new Indigenous books to learn from, dream to, live by,” which also inadvertently used the hyphenated title *Half-breed*. ¹⁹³

Campbell expressed her preference for the spelling of “Halfbreed” in an email (17 May 2018) to Deanna Reder, as we were preparing our 2018 Canadian Literature article for publication:

One note from me, our peoples and my spelling is Halfbreed not Half-breed. Please ask her [Laura Moss, editor at Canadian Literature] to use our spelling. That was the spelling on the first published edition which also came from a great deal of conversation with Jack. He didn’t understand why it was so important but he agreed to it.

Furthermore, as the Libraries and Archives Canada website states, “The terms "Métis" and "Half-Breed" are used synonymously throughout this database to refer to those people in western Canada who trace their roots to a shared Aboriginal and European ancestry - an ancestry which at some point would have been enumerated by a Commission with the authority to issue land or money scrip. The term "Half-Breed" was used almost exclusively by the federal government throughout the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries when referring to these people” (“Métis Scrip Records”). The Canadian Oxford Dictionary (2nd ed., 2005) similarly includes an entry only for “half-breed” (not halfbreed), with the definition as follows: “offensive a person of mixed race.”

We might infer that Campbell’s refusal to adopt a state-sanctioned terminology in her book reflects a larger form of Métis resistance and reclamation in response to settler colonialism.

Since its initial publication in 1973, *Halfbreed* has been in print continuously, and is consistently being assigned as required reading in university courses. The book has

been handled by numerous publishers over the years, but has culminated recently with a fully-restored edition based on the discovery of these excised pages in the McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds at McMaster University. In terms of paratextual changes throughout these different editions, very little was changed or added to the original Halfbreed text, with the exception of the most recent edition published by McClelland & Stewart in 2019. The following section comprises an overview of the different editions of Halfbreed integrated with, where possible, relevant archival and/or contextual information surrounding each edition. An accompanying digital comparison of the synopses for each edition, as written on the book’s inner/back covers, also provides a sense of each editors’ differing approaches to framing the book throughout the past 46 years (accessed here: http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/FCU0Uq).
Though much has been said in this chapter about the publication process surrounding the first edition of *Halfbreed*, some additional details regarding the book’s title, cover image, and promotional efforts can add to our understanding of the evolution of this text. When Campbell’s manuscript was first sent over to McClelland and Stewart by Jim Douglas for consideration, he referred to it by the title *Half-breed Woman*. As the book neared publication, a number of titles were being considered for the book; in a memo from Dianne Woodman to David Berry dated 24 November 1972, Woodman

---

194 All book cover images in this section have been digitized from my personal collection.

states that of the list of titles they had been considering for the book, Campbell preferred: “GROWING UP HALFBREED; or BROKEN DREAMS: THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A HALFBREED WOMAN; or, MY GRANDMOTHER’S PEOPLE; or, HALFBREED: A MEMOIR (or MEMORY).” Woodman also notes in this letter that while she “asked June for the Cree word for halfbreed and it’s something like ‘Opeestokoosons,’” this word “isn’t exactly catchy.” At a slightly higher price-point than McClelland’s projected price, this hardbound first edition was sold for $5.95 per copy.

With regard to the design of the book jacket for this edition, Campbell was not thrilled that her photograph would be the focus. In response to David Berry’s comments regarding the book jacket in a letter dated 24 November 1972, Campbell writes:

I’m not very excited at the idea of having my face on the jacket design as I’ve already told Dian[n]e… Seriously tho I suggested to Dian[n]e about an old lady’s face in the background with high rises, log cabins, and people. Sort of like yesterday and today. Talk to Jack again the picture is so madamish, and I’m really not all that sterile and cold.”

This image of Campbell on the cover of the first edition would become iconic – and would be used for the cover of the 2019 updated edition of Halfbreed by Campbell as well. As part of the book’s “Preliminary Publishing Plan,” McClelland & Stewart proposed a strategy for marketing the book in which Campbell would play the role of victim to emphasize the “major theme of injustice to be promoted personally by the author” –

---

196 Woodman, Dianne. Letter to David Berry. 24 November 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

197 Ibid. The term Woodman is referring to is actually “Awp-pee-tow-koosons” or “half people” (Campbell 26).

198 Campbell, Maria. Letter to David Berry. 30 November 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

199 “Preliminary Publishing Plan.” Circa 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
an ironic concept given the publisher’s dismissal of her sexual assault. In terms of her role in promoting the book in Canada, Porter states that Campbell “did all the national TV and radio shows, as well as a great many local shows. We took her across the country to all major and some not so important, cities, from Montreal to Vancouver. The reaction has been very warm throughout. She’s extremely good on television and elicits support.”

In 1977, four years after its initial publication, McClelland & Stewart would also release the first paperback edition of *Halfbreed* (priced at $3.95 per copy). Though Campbell had initially expressed a strong desire to see her book published as a paperback, it took longer for this to happen than McClelland had initially projected.


201 McIntyre, Scott. Letter to Anna Porter. 20 July 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

202 “My view is that it should be a good looking $4.95 hardbound and that it should be made available in a mass-market paperback a year later.” McClelland, Jack. Letter to Scott McIntyre (cc: June Shepherd, Jim Douglas). 29 March 1972. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
While M&S was nearing the final push towards publication of the first edition of *Halfbreed*, senior editor Lloyd Scott began considering American publishers for the sale of the book’s U.S. rights. In a letter to McClelland dated 13 December 1972, Scott suggests a list of potential American publishers including Holt, Doubleday, Viking, and Harcourt. In his response, McClelland suggests that Scott “try [Aaron] Asher first,” the Director at Holt, who had recently published Dee Brown’s *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (1970). McClelland evidently thought that Campbell’s book would fare best with a publisher who had already dealt successfully with an Indigenous author and subject matter. Interestingly, of the letters that Scott wrote to U.S. publishers, most responses indicated a certain hesitation to take on Campbell’s book. Though publishers such as Holt simply declined, stating that they were “unable to add June Stifle’s manuscript to
our publication list,” others responded with more detailed reasons as to why they would not publish. The senior editor for Doubleday, for example, explained that “the opening section is quite fresh and interesting, but the script seems to bog down early on.” Other publishers seemingly couldn’t take on what they deemed the publication “risks” associated with Halfbreed. In a letter from American publisher Thomas Y. Crowell (New York), the Editor-in-Chief Paul Fargis writes to Lloyd Scott of M&S: “Thanks a lot for sending me THE HALF-BREED WOMAN. I agree with you: it's an important book. However, it’s much too risky for a trade list such as ours. Very bluntly, it would not fare well on our list” (8 March 1973). Though Fargis goes on to recommend a number of other American publishers (including Harper, Viking, or Farrar, Strauss and Giroux), M&S ended up publishing the first American edition of Halfbreed with the Saturday Review Press.

The Saturday Review Press U.S. edition of Halfbreed (titled Half-breed), similarly cloth-bound with a dust jacket, featured a cover image that provoked Campbell’s serious disapproval; but the publisher proceeded with using the image nonetheless. It’s possible that the publisher wasn’t made aware of Campbell’s feelings until it was too late, with the jacket design already completed. In a letter to Anna Porter dated 30 August 1973, Dianne Woodman writes:

I've just had a letter from Maria Campbell. As you suggested, I sent her a copy of the American cover and she's horrified with it. To quote: 'The jacket is gross, I hate it, is there anything you can do to have it changed. It looks like a mouldy body slowly creeping out of a grave. I find it very disturbing and would appreciate having it changed if it's at all possible.' At this late

---

203 Asher, Aaron. Letter to Lloyd Scott. 3 January 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

204 Prashker, Betty A. Letter to Lloyd Scott. 8 February 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
date I assume there's nothing to be done about it but I must admit I agree with her.205

Upon hearing this, Porter sent a letter onwards to her contact at Saturday Review Press a few days later, to inquire about the possibility of changing the jacket design. In this letter, Porter quotes Campbell’s comments regarding the “mouldy body” image, but also acknowledges that she “[doesn’t] know whether it is too late to make any changes at this stage.”206 As a sample of this proposed jacket design was located amongst the *Halfbreed* correspondence, identical to the one ultimately used by Saturday Review Press, we can presume that Campbell’s opinion on the U.S. cover was not considered and no changes were made to the design. The image is the same one that was used for the M&S cover, but rather than appearing in black and white, the image has been cast in black and orange, creating a parallel colour scheme between the image and the lettering on the cover.

Also notable with this U.S. edition is the stylistic choice to hyphenate the title (i.e. *Half-breed*) appearing on the book’s cover. However, this hyphenated title appeared only on the book jacket; the title on the spine of the cloth-bound book itself, along with the rest of the printed content, all used the original title *Halfbreed*. This editorial inconsistency would also be repeated in all future Formac editions of the text (published between 1983-2019; see below). From the *Halfbreed* publishing correspondence, we do know that Saturday Review Press paid M&S an “offset fee” to repurpose the text from the original book, rather than going through their own typesetting process (which would

---

205 Woodman, Dianne. Letter to Anna Porter. 30 August 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

take more time and cost more money).\textsuperscript{207} This means that text in the U.S. edition was identical to the M&S edition, aside from their added title pages (both bearing the unhyphenated titled \textit{Halfbreed}) and the copyright page. One would think that a copy editor might notice these differences in spelling of the word “Halfbreed” between the text and book cover; and since the U.S. edition was typeset from the original M&S edition, it would make the most sense to honour Campbell’s preferred spelling of the word. Another small change was made to the subtitle on the dust-jacket, which was changed from “A proud and bitter Canadian legacy” to simply “an autobiography.”

\textbf{Seal Books Edition (McClelland and Stewart-Bantam Ltd., 1979)}\textsuperscript{208}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.3\textwidth]{halfbreed_seal_edition.jpg}
\caption{Halfbreed Seal Books edition (McClelland & Stewart-Bantam Ltd., 1979)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{207} Smith, Susan T. Letter to Anna Porter. 5 March 1973. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fondo, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.

\textsuperscript{208} Other titles in the Seal Books collection included works by many of M&S’s “A-list” writers, including Pierre Berton, Margaret Atwood, Margaret Laurence, and Farley Mowat.
In contrast to the previous two cloth-bound editions, the 1979 Seal Books edition of *Halfbreed* was economically priced at $1.95 as a mass-market paperback. The Seal Books imprint was created by McClelland in 1977, under a joint partnership between M&S and Bantam. The copyright page for this edition reads as follows: “This low-priced Seal Book has been completely reset in a type face designed for easy reading, and was printed from new plates. It contains the complete text of the original hard-cover edition. NOT ONE WORD HAS BEEN OMITTED.” It seems rather unnecessary (and ironic) to proclaim this final sentence, especially given what we know now about M&S’s excision of the RCMP incident. This paperback edition would retain Campbell’s original, unhyphenated title, and would add two subtitles to the cover: “A WOMAN’S BURNING RAGE FOR DIGNITY” and “THE POWERFUL LIFE STORY OF MARIA CAMPBELL”; the words “A PROUD AND BITTER LEGACY,” part of which formed the original subtitle, would appear on the back cover. The cover for this mass-market edition uses a different image; it appears to be a painted portrait of Campbell, likely rendered from a photograph taken around the time of this edition’s publication. Though the artist who rendered this painting of Campbell is not credited, the signature on the cover painting is visible and appears to say “Blossom.”

---

210 I suggest this because with the Goodread and Formac editions of *Halfbreed* that appeared between 1983-4, this same photograph was used for the cover.
The 1979 Alberta Heritage Collection edition of *Halfbreed*, published in hardcover, was part of a provincial initiative to increase awareness of Albertan and Indigenous heritage in Canada. As Campbell served as the Writer-in-Residence at the University of Alberta between 1979-1980, this role may have encouraged the selection of *Halfbreed* for publication in this series. The artwork for this edition reflects more of what Campbell had initially suggested for the book, with an image of a log cabin.

---

in the background; the foreground features three Indigenous figures (the bottom in black and white, and the middle and top in colour), gesturing towards the connections between past, present, and future generations of Indigenous populations. The same artwork is featured on the back cover as well. On the copyright page, the cover design is attributed to David Shaw & Associates Ltd. This edition was offset from the 1973 M&S edition, and appears to be identical to the original with only minimal changes (mainly to the copyright page).

Second U.S. Edition (University of Nebraska Press, 1982)

Figure 4.8  Halfbreed second U.S. edition (University of Nebraska Press, 1982)
The 1982 paperback edition of *Halfbreed*, published by the academic publisher University of Nebraska Press, was a slim, very basic edition likely produced for a mainly student readership. This edition, like the other American edition that preceded it, adds no new paratextual content and is typeset from the original M&S edition. On the copyright page, it is noted that this edition is a reprint of the Saturday Review Press edition (which was typeset directly from the M&S edition), and has been “Published by arrangement with McClelland and Stuart (sic) Limited, Canada.” The cover image is an artist’s black and white rendering of an Indigenous woman, portrayed with unnaturally turquoise eyes; the back cover of the book reveals that the cover was designed by Swedish graphic designer Dika Eckersley. The woman portrayed on the cover does not bear any resemblance to Campbell, aside from perhaps the gesture towards Campbell’s blue eyes, and appears instead to represent Indigenous women more generally.
German Edition (Frauenoffensive, 1983)

The 1983 German paperback edition of *Halfbreed*, titled *Cheechum's Enkelin* (or *Cheechum’s Granddaughter* in English), was published by Munich-based feminist publisher Frauenoffensive and translated by Roswitha McCoppin. In an article titled “West German Feminist Book Publishers” published in 1979, Mary Grunwald states that “Feminist publishers are the sensation in the German book trade” (23) – a trend that arose during the mid-1970s in Germany and included other feminist publishing houses such as Frauenbuchverlag, Verlag Frauenpolitik, Frauenselbstverlag, and Amazonen Verlag. Grunwald notes that the publisher “does not accept books by males” (23), and has successfully published other translations of English books including Agnes Smedley’s *Daughter of the Earth* (1929), Ti-Grace Atkinson’s *Amazon Odyssey* (1974),
and Virginia Woolf’s *Three Guineas* (1938).\textsuperscript{212} It’s interesting to note that in their translation of *Halfbreed*, the German publishers chose to honour Campbell’s relationship with her Cheechum by retitling the book ‘Cheechum’s Granddaughter,’ rather than employing the literal translation of Halfbreed (although this translation is somewhat inaccurate, as Campbell was Cheechum’s great-granddaughter).\textsuperscript{213} This reflects a certain understanding of the relationship between Campbell and her great-grandmother that underpins the text, and is indicative of the degree of care that went into the translation process – highlighting key concepts rather than opting for literal translations that risk obscuring the bigger picture.

The cover depicts the same photograph of Campbell as used in the M&S edition, and the subtitle describes the book as an “autobiographie einer kanadischen halbindianerin,” or autobiography of a Canadian halfbreed. As to Campbell’s involvement with this edition of *Halfbreed*, she notes in her 1989 interview with German scholar Hartmut Lutz that she has minimal knowledge of the book thus far, suggesting that arrangements were made directly between Frauenoffensive and McClelland and Stewart. The interview proceeds as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item HL: ...You must be aware that there is a lot of interest in your book in Germany, and students write theses about it.
  \item MC: Actually I don’t know, because I never get any feedback! I’d never heard from the publisher! I don’t know how the book is doing.
  \item HL: I think it’s a publisher from Munich, “Frauenoffensive,” right?
  \item MC: It’s a woman’s outfit, yes. But I know nothing about it. I’ve never heard anything and I have never had my fee. Nobody has ever contacted me from
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{213} Campbell expressed a similar desire to Reder and I during our meeting at her home in Saskatoon (February 2018); she told us that the title she had wanted for the book was *All My Cheechum’s Children*.
Germany, other than the lady that came and spent a few days with me one time. (43)

In addition to suggesting that Campbell was not being kept well-apprised of her book’s international reception, this conversation also insinuates that Campbell felt somewhat neglected – particularly on the topic of royalties – by her Canadian publisher, M&S. This could be attributed, in part, to changes in leadership at M&S in the decade following *Halfbreed*’s publication, as well as the book’s recent acquisition by Halifax publisher Formac (1983) for its subsequent release in paperback format.


![Figure 4.10](image)

*Figure 4.10  Half-breed Goodread Biographies edition (an imprint of Formac Publishing, 1983)*
The Goodread Biographies edition, published in Halifax in 1983, would set the precedent for the subsequent Formac editions (published continuously between 1984-2019) which featured a hyphenated title: *Half-breed*. As part of publisher James Lorimer’s Goodread Biographies series, described by Roy MacSkimming as “a low-priced reprint series of Canadian biographies in paperback” (212), this edition, priced at $8.95 per copy, resembled the earlier Seal Books mass-market edition in both size and appearance. The cover for this edition features a photograph of Campbell, the very same image that was used to create the artist’s rendering as seen on the cover of the Seal edition (1979). The subtitle for this edition reads, “THE POWERFUL LIFE STORY OF A WOMAN WHOSE COURAGE AND STRENGTH YOU WILL NEVER FORGET!” – a slight variation on previous subtitles but of a similar sentiment. Where in previous editions, most back-cover summaries had relied loosely on the original M&S version, the summary on the back of this edition appears to have been completely rewritten.214

In a telephone interview with me, the series publisher, James Lorimer (who would continue publishing *Half-breed* under the Formac imprint between 1984-2019), explained that he had acquired Campbell’s text as part of the Goodread Biographies series because M&S was not going to keep it in print. He stated:

We did the book because one of the M&S executives pointed me to some titles that M&S had let go out of print or out of stock, and there were several, but I remember him saying that this was a book that he particularly felt needed to be kept in print, and that had had a good, strong response. And from his point of view, there was no reason why M&S had not reprinted it. But anyway, for whatever reason they hadn’t.215


Though he may not have realized it at the time, Lorimer would play an important role in ensuring continued access to Campbell’s text – particularly for university and college students in Canada – by creating space for *Halfbreed* in the mass-market industry. In fact, Lorimer has been described as someone who often published books that “spoke urgently to the times” (MacSkimming 210); he wasn’t afraid to ruffle feathers. This is evident through his decision to publish the scathing 1973 exposé, *An Unauthorized History of the RCMP*, in the same year that the RCMP were celebrating their organization’s centennial.216

**Formac Edition (Halifax, NS; 1984 – 2019)**

![Formac Edition of Half-breed](image)

*Figure 4.11*  *Half-breed* Formac edition (1984-2019)

---

The Formac edition, published by Lorimer the following year, closely resembled the Goodread biographies edition with the exception of a redesigned cover and colour scheme (and was priced comparatively higher at $14.95 per copy). This edition featured the same cover image of Campbell as was used for the Goodread Biographies edition, as well as an identical subtitle and back-cover synopsis. Like the previous edition (as well as the 1973 Saturday Review Press edition), this version employed the hyphenated title, *Half-breed*. When I asked Lorimer about the decision to hyphenate the title, he was surprised by my question, and it was apparent throughout our conversation that this was the first time anyone had brought this inconsistency to his attention. He responded:

If you look at it closely, you'll see that we used the original pages of the original edition. We didn't re-typeset the book. But we did need to do new prelims, so we would have done a new copyright page and new title page. So the most likely thing is some copy editor looked up some style guide and discovered that that was the appropriate style and, for whatever reason, decided to follow the style guide rather than to follow the original.217

In fact, it is quite jarring to flip between the original pages of text, which feature the ‘Halfbreed’ “running head” on the top of every right-hand page, and the cover/title page, which bear the title *Half-breed*. Though the decision to use a hyphenated title does present a stylistic conflict with the rest of the text, it’s curious that this point hasn’t ever been raised in-house to Lorimer, who has published *Half-breed* since 1984.

In early 2019, the final Formac version of *Half-breed* was published with an additional “Notice to Readers” on the copyright page. This “Notice” explained both the publication history of *Half-breed* since the early 1980s, and also importantly acknowledged my research discovery of the missing pages and resulting co-authored publication with Deanna Reder. Lorimer writes:

217 Ibid.
Until the publication of this article, we did not know that this edition reflected this deletion. Had we had this information or been given the opportunity, we would have immediately acted to restore the missing text. Formac sought to reach out to Maria Campbell in the light of this news. However, the opportunity was not offered.

With the discovery of the missing pages from Campbell’s text, and without successfully obtaining Campbell’s permission to publish those pages, Formac would only be able to continue reprinting their existing version of *Half-breed* – the one that excluded Campbell’s sexual assault by the RCMP. And in my interview with Lorimer, he assured me that “if we’d been aware that the material had been dropped, we certainly would have had no hesitation about doing what’s finally been done.”

---

218 Ibid.
The updated and newly restored paperback edition of *Halfbreed* was published in November 2019 by McClelland & Stewart. This edition includes a new Introduction by Kim Anderson (Métis), an Afterword written by Campbell, and, most significantly, includes the two excised pages detailing her childhood assault by the RCMP. In her Introduction, titled “The Grandmother Place,” Anderson provides readers with an important account of Campbell’s life and wide-ranging achievements since the 1973 publication of *Halfbreed*. As she states, “because of the widespread popularity of *Halfbreed*, people sometimes associate Maria primarily as the author of that book, but she has had a trail-blazing career in storytelling, writing, theatre, film, and television and radio” (xiv). On the topic of the newly restored pages, Anderson explains that we should consider this latest edition of *Halfbreed* as “a response to a silencing that is still too common for survivors of assault. By Maria agreeing to republish *Halfbreed* with this
section in it, her courage gives us strength once again” (xii). This courage can be understood both in terms of her willingness to share this traumatic experience of assault with the world, as a wound that she may have hoped to leave in her past, but also in Campbell’s ability to move forward and make amends with her original publisher. That she chose to republish with M&S is significant; she demonstrates that despite the manner in which her manuscript was initially handled, she sees the possibility of moving forward, of doing things in a better way – a concept she describes in the Cree term, kwaskastahsowin, or “to put things right.” She uses this term explicitly in relation to M&S in her Afterword, where she thanks “Jared and McClelland & Stewart for conciliation (kwayskasahsowin)” (194).

Furthermore, the decision to publish this updated edition in paperback hearkens back to Campbell’s initial wishes for the text, ignored at the time by M&S: that it be easily accessible to those for whom it is written. This edition also includes an updated biography for Campbell (appearing twice; on the final pages and again on the back cover), which includes a current photograph and summary of her many achievements and impressive career since Halfbreed. The juxtaposition between this more recent image of Campbell with the young woman on the cover is powerful, as it visually represents what 46 years looks like – the time it has taken for Campbell’s story, including her experience of sexual assault, to be published as she originally intended. Though reminiscent in appearance of the first M&S edition, this updated version provides a refreshed take on a canonical Indigenous text with an updated font and

---

219 Campbell, Maria. “Re: A question about your ILSA Keynote.” Personal Correspondence. 11 June 2019.

220 Note that this word, kwaskastahsowin, is misspelled on p. 194 in the most recent edition of Halfbreed (2019). I asked Campbell about this discrepancy, and she explained: “They misspelled it and I didn’t catch it.” (Personal Correspondence, 13 March 2020).
colour scheme. The cover subtitle, which originally stated “A Proud and Bitter Canadian Legacy,” has been removed altogether. In addition to the updated and fully-restored print version, Audible (an Amazon company) also released an audiobook version of Halfbreed, narrated by Campbell herself. This newly restored and re-framed edition symbolizes Campbell’s courageous reclamation of her narrative, on her terms, as she had always intended.

In the same interview between Campbell and Lutz which first acknowledged McClelland and Stewart’s editorial intervention, Lutz addressed the possibility of ever republishing Halfbreed:

HL: Would you like to rewrite Halfbreed sometime?

MC: Yes, some day. I don’t think I’d make changes. What I would do with the book is, I would only put in that piece that was taken out. I wouldn’t want to touch what’s there, because that was the way I was writing then, and I think that it’s important it stays that way, because that’s where I was at. (47)

With the discovery of these pages in the McClelland and Stewart archives, and their subsequent return to Campbell, the newly restored edition of Halfbreed has brought Campbell a sense of resolution. “I feel like it's finished now — because it never felt finished for me. I always felt like there was a part, well, there was a part of it that was missing, and that it didn't tell the complete story. And with that piece missing, it was like I just ended up on the street because there was nothing else to do — which is really not the case.”221 In 1989, Lutz considered Halfbreed “the most important and seminal book authored by a Native person from Canada” (41) – and this is even more true today, given the recovery of Campbell’s narrative and significance of those two missing pages.

---

Chapter 5. Conclusion

Within this dissertation, I have approached the authorial contributions of E. Pauline Johnson, Mary Capilano, and Maria Campbell with the purpose of *kwaskastahsowin*, using a combination of decolonial archival/digital methods to expose a legacy of editorial intervention in Canadian publishing. Through this approach, I have endeavoured to shift our attention from the stories we think we know, focusing instead on the complex backstories that can be uncovered from within the archives – stories that undergird, mediate, and have shaped many twentieth-century Indigenous literary works. In this sense, we can consider the archive as a form of paratext, in that it has the power to change the ways in which we read Indigenous literatures. For instance, by uncovering Evelyn Johnson’s letters that reveal Pauline’s wish for the alternate title, *Legends of the Capilano*, we are provoked to reconsider the importance of the Capilanos to the *Legends* stories. Similarly, in reading through Mary Capilano’s *Legends* stories and contrasting them with the versions attributed to Joe Capilano, we learn more about their differences as storytellers and narrators than has ever been known to literary scholars. And by revisiting Campbell’s *Halfbreed* in light of the recently recovered missing pages, we are prompted to both re-read the text (in its full, intended form) and to also think critically about its publishing history and context.

While this project draws on evidence from three case studies to illustrate the urgency of revisiting other works of twentieth-century Indigenous literature, it also highlights the problems that Indigenous writers continue to face today. For example, though the excision of Campbell’s sexual assault by M&S is one example of the unmitigated authority exercised by twentieth-century publishers, we must also consider
the ways in which our collective biases and legal systems have historically been structured in opposition to Indigenous women like Campbell. As Campbell’s sexual assault occurred during a time when there was a two-year statute of limitations on such claims, she would have needed to pursue legal action within two years of her assault – something any 14-year-old would be ill-equipped to undertake, especially one who was also, at that time, responsible for taking care of her seven younger brothers and sisters. And, as Grannie Dubuque warned Campbell in the recovered pages, the odds were already indisputably stacked against her as a Métis woman: “no one ever believed Halfbreeds in court.” Furthermore, until the Indian Act was amended in 1951, it had been illegal for Indigenous peoples in Canada to hire lawyers; thus, not only would her allegations have been dismissed in court, but she may also have also struggled to acquire basic legal representation.

Looking to the archival correspondence surrounding the publication of *Halfbreed*, it is clear that Campbell’s account of sexual assault was met by editors without empathy; it was dealt with in a way that prioritized the publisher’s commercial successes over authorial integrity. In trying to understand the realities of Jack McClelland’s fears surrounding the possibility of the RCMP pursuing an injunction, I contacted Vancouver criminal defence lawyer Lisa Helps, whose practice includes media and defamation law, for advice:

222 The statute of limitations on sexual assault cases changed in Canada with the 1992 Supreme Court of Canada case, M.(K.) v. M.(H.), where BC litigator Megan Ellis argued for the end of limitation dates, particularly for childhood assaults whereby the victim may not truly comprehend the effects of the assault at that time. See [https://www.ellisandcompany.ca/services/claims-for-sexual-abuse-and-assault/](https://www.ellisandcompany.ca/services/claims-for-sexual-abuse-and-assault/). (Thanks to Lisa Helps for explaining the significance of this legislation change in relation to Campbell’s assault).
AS: Are there precedents that you know of where, in the case of literary publishing, that people would actually say “there is a valid threat of the RCMP placing an injunction on the publication of this book if you proceed with it”?

LH: Yes. We don’t hear about those kinds of things, because what usually happens is informally called “Litigation Chill.” This is the idea that if we put something out into the world, we could conceivably get sued; and so people consult their lawyers and decide not to take the chance. And Litigation Chill was very prevalent when it came to a minority person publishing something about a majority group. The problem is that it’s one of those silent epidemics that we don’t generally hear about – and remember, they would have sued Maria Campbell, but they would also have sued M&S.

As Helps suggests, the prevalence of this fear-based “litigation chill” meant that those with the most to lose – i.e. those in positions of power, like M&S – made decisions to protect their reputations; even though Campbell was willing to risk everything to tell her story of sexual assault. Despite offering Campbell a platform to share her experiences as a Métis woman with Canadian readers, the publisher ultimately couldn’t reconcile the potential risks of exposing the RCMP incident. In essence, Helps argues, “the real problem is that no one wanted to go to battle for her.” And the same can be said for many other twentieth-century Indigenous women writers – like Anahareo, Mini Aodla Freeman, and Lee Maracle – who also worked within the contexts of colonial publishing systems, and whose writing has been similarly subject to destructive editing practices.

When Reder and I proposed an article about the recovered *Halfbreed* pages and publishing correspondence to a Canadian media publication in 2018, we realized that despite our nation’s ongoing efforts at “reconciliation” and repairing relationships with Indigenous peoples, such deeply-rooted, systemically-racist beliefs cannot be so easily unlearned. That Campbell was asked “was this your first sexual experience?” in relation to the recovered pages reveals the extent to which those in positions of power continue
to disbelieve Indigenous women’s accounts of colonial violence.\textsuperscript{223} This question was prompted by a quotation included in our article, taken from a 1971 letter from Jim Douglas, where Douglas had stated: “Her first sexual experience was to be raped by R.C.M.P. officers in her own home.”\textsuperscript{224} This 1971 letter from Douglas to McClelland was significant in that it accompanied Campbell’s manuscript when first sent to M&S for consideration, and for this reason we included Douglas’ quotation as part of the larger narrative surrounding the publishers’ treatment of her sexual assault. When the present-day fact-checker combed through our article for facts that required verification (i.e. “anyone quoted in the piece is called by a fact-checker”\textsuperscript{225}), he/she determined that it was important to clarify if, in fact, the rape was Campbell’s first sexual experience. In posing this question to Campbell, along with other similarly inconceivable questions, the unnamed publication essentially engaged in a kind of re-traumatization – of both M&S’s refusal to honour Campbell’s account in print, and of the actual sexual assault itself.

Why Campbell was even asked about her sexual history during the fact-checking phone call reveals the extent to which systems of “fact-checking” in Canada, particularly for survivors of sexual assault, are inherently, systemically flawed. In addition to subjecting Campbell to unnecessary and painful questioning, this incident underscores the urgency with which these largely unregulated fact-checking procedures in Canada require our attention, particularly in cases dealing with sexual assault. Deanna Reder, the co-author of this article, eloquently articulated a list of potential changes in response to the editor’s defense of their fact-checking process:

\begin{footnotes}
\item[223] See pp. 134-5 in Chapter Four for more details.
\item[224] Douglas, Jim. Letter to Jack McClelland. 17 November 1971. McClelland and Stewart Ltd. fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Box 2CA84.
\item[225] Notes from phone call with editor, 26 March 2018.
\end{footnotes}
I could imagine eliminating gratuitous questions; I could imagine consulting with the writers about appropriate questions; I could imagine sharing the questions with Campbell ahead of time and asking if she wanted to arrange for support to be present; I could imagine hiring a woman – an Indigenous woman – to be the fact-checker. I could imagine making certain that no part of the process could be similar to a court-room examination.226

As Reder’s response importantly recognizes, there are so many parts of this fact-checking process that went wrong; and it is clear to us that had the publication attempted to approach this process with any real awareness or empathy for Campbell’s situation, her experience might have been quite different.227

Though the lack of mindful protocols surrounding Campbell’s fact-checking experience emphasize the work that remains to be done within the fields of Canadian publishing and media, we can look to recent Indigenous publishing initiatives like the UMP’s First Voices, First Texts series as examples of what is being done right. In fact, as this dissertation focuses on the recuperative potential of critically re-framing Indigenous literatures, I also want to emphasize the possibilities of extending this approach beyond the book and into other spaces, both physical and digital. For example, as an invited co-curator for the Museum of Vancouver’s “Unbelievable” exhibit in 2017, I was asked to select objects from the museum’s holdings relating to the life and legacy of E. Pauline Johnson, and to write narratives around these objects. Since Johnson had bequeathed a small collection to the museum in her will, including her signature buckskin performance costume and family heirlooms, it was presumed that I would select from these items.228 However, as my research into the life of Mary Capilano

226 Reder, Deanna. Personal Correspondence with A. Shield and editor. 8 May 2018.
228 Other items bequeathed by Johnson to the Museum of Vancouver include: brooches, ermine tails, a lingerie bag, a red broadcloth blanket (used as part of her costume, and also draped on the chair for the Duke of Connaught when he visited Johnson in the hospital), a scalp lock, the “Ojistoh”
has revealed, the museum also possesses two portraits of Capilano in its holdings, painted by Helen Moore Sewell and Margaret Wake. Thus, my curatorial approach reflected both the integration of objects not traditionally considered part of the Johnson “collection,” and the creation of narratives (i.e. paratexts) around these objects that drew attention to lesser-known stories – such as the storytelling contributions of Mary Capilano, and the intended title of Legends of Vancouver being instead Legends of the Capilano.

Figure 5.1  E. Pauline Johnson section of the Museum of Vancouver’s “Unbelievable” exhibit (24 June – 3 December 2017)
Featuring a portrait of Mary Capilano by Helen Moore Sewell (PA 139).

Knife, an eagle feather, a bear claw necklace (gifted by Ernest Thompson Seton), her grandmother’s soup ladle, her father’s baby moccasin, a set of her moccasins and stockings, and four autographed letters. See Foster, The Mohawk Princess: Being Some Account of the Life of Tekahion-wake (E. Pauline Johnson), p. 200.
Within the digital realm, we can similarly apply this concept of critically reframing or re-envisioning the paratext for works of Indigenous literatures. For example, in 2018 I created a digital story-map using ArcGIS (a web-based “geographic information system” platform) for *Legends of Vancouver*; I utilized this platform to both highlight the connections between story and place (connecting the text from Johnson’s *Legends* to real locations on a map), while simultaneously rewriting and decolonizing the paratext by providing additional context around those stories. In her article “Land as Pedagogy: Nishnaabeg Intelligence and Rebellious Transformation,” Nishnaabeg scholar Leanne Betasamosake Simpson proposes a similar concept in which she highlights the importance of reconnecting with the land as a form of implicit teaching; this inextricable connection between Nishnaabeg knowledge and land, and the concept of “land as pedagogy,” leads us to the decolonial and “re-territorializing” possibilities of digital story-mapping. My digital story-map, which includes a combination of GIS mapping, story text, and archival/editorial context, functions as a kind of digital edition – allowing for the curation of a decolonial, reconceptualized paratext that highlights the important contributions of Joe and Mary Capilano.229 In the context of this dissertation, an extension of the digital humanities analyses provided throughout my chapters could also afford further insight into the stylistic changes made across versions of the *Legends* stories, and perhaps also provide clues regarding patterns and/or trends in regards to editorial intervention.

As Kwagu’l Gixsam Clan member Randy Bell articulates in the 2012 text, *Standing Up with Ga’axsta’las*, there are many possibilities for productive dialogues between Indigenous perspectives and digital technologies, and between archival

---

229 View this story-map here: http://arcg.is/1JW3IQ4.
repositories and Indigenous communities. He writes: “Now we have the computer knowledge, and the only thing missing is the history” (53). In fact, as Indigenous studies scholars including David Gaertner, Angela M. Haas, and Candice Hopkins (Tlingit) have argued, the connections between Indigenous knowledge and digital technologies continue to open up dynamic, relevant spaces for dialogue. Where Kimberly Christen has argued (within the context of Indigenous archives) that “digital technologies have altered how materials and knowledge are shared and circulated” (6), we can likewise apply this concept to the literary archive in Canada. By turning our attention to the untold stories held within archival repositories, it becomes possible to utilize digital technologies as a means of both recovery and decolonial reframing through the creation of updated, re-envisioned narratives. As Gaertner, Christen, and Bell all suggest in their own words, the digital technology exists – we just need to determine the right way to use it.

By discussing the significance of recovering the missing pages from Campbell’s *Halfbreed*, and exposing the realities of its publishing context, I underscore the necessity of reexamining other works of Indigenous literature published within these kinds of destructive colonial paradigms. The cases of Johnson and Capilano similarly illustrate the importance of honouring the words and intentions of Indigenous women writers and storytellers, and acknowledging their contributions to early twentieth-century Indigenous intellectual production. We can understand these three case studies, as well as Campbell’s 2018 “fact-checking” experience, as part of a larger call to “put things to right” in Indigenous publishing in Canada – through an increased attention to twentieth-century publishing contexts and a return to those untold stories that exist within the archives.

---
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Appendix A. Digital Humanities Visualizations

Figure A1. Side-by-side comparison of “The Sea Serpent” (Legends of Vancouver) and The Legend of the Salt-Chuck Oluk using JuxtaCommons: http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/80h6Nm

Note: The highlighted words indicate instances of change/discrepancies between versions.

Figure A2. An Interactive map highlighting newspaper references to Mary Capilano in Canadian newspapers since 1910, using BatchGeo: https://batchgeo.com/map/ce1ae19b9f9839441db06cddd9cd45a
Figure A3. Side-by-side comparison of “The Legend of the Two Sisters” (Mother’s) and “The True Legend of Vancouver’s Lions” (The Province) using JuxtaCommons:
http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/cVvDLp

Figure A4. Side-by-side comparison of “The Legend of the Squamish Twins, or The Call of Kinship” (Mother’s) and “The Recluse of the Capilano Canyon” (The Province) using JuxtaCommons:
http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/IieVJZ
Figure A5. Side-by-side comparison of “The Legend of the Seven Swans” (Mother’s) and “The Legend of the Seven White Swans” (The Province) using JuxtaCommons: http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/9T2L1g

Figure A6. Side-by-side comparison of “The Lost Salmon Run: A Legend of the Pacific Coast” (Mother’s) and “The Legend of the Lost Salmon Run” (The Province) using JuxtaCommons: http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/7DMtfZ
Figure A7. *Halfbreed* Publishing Timeline using TimelineJS:

Figure A8. Example of Correspondence in *Halfbreed* Publishing Timeline

NOVEMBER 1, 1871

**JIM DOUGLAS TO JACK MCCLELLAND**

"The author is Mrs. June Stifle... She is Metis, or as they prefer to be called, a half-breed. She is a very attractive mother of four, about 30 years old and active in native affairs. This is the story of her life and a grits life it has been. From a childhood of poverty in northern Saskatchewan... She has been a drug addict and a drug smuggler. A life of violence and meanness on the part of her men and her church and the police. Her first sexual experience was to be raped by B.C.M.P. officers in her own home - and it goes down from there. It is the round of indignity and degradation that sociologists write about. Here, an articulate, intelligent half-breed tells us what it is really like. It is not an angry book, but it will make you angry: not a bitter book but it will shame you: not a humorous book but it will make you smile. It has a happy ending but there is no happiness for her people. And she writes it for her people, particularly for the young girls. For their sake she will let herself be published, her past exposed, her family life jeopardized. Not only is she an extraordinary half-breed; she is an extraordinary woman. And her ms. should be treated extraordinarily. I am sending it directly to you because I think it is too important to follow usual channels. She names names as she found it easier to write this way so that the ms. is highly libelous - I feel therefore that the normal reading procedure in the house should be circumvented."
Figure A9. A comparison of the synopses for each edition of *Halfbreed* using JuxtaCommons: [http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/FCU0Uq](http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/FCU0Uq)

As written on the book’s inner/back covers, this comparison provides a sense of each editors’ differing approaches to framing the book throughout the past 46 years.

Figure A10. Side-by-side comparison of the original M&S *Halfbreed* synopsis vs. Goodread Biographies using JuxtaCommons: [http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/LNCgyJ](http://www.juxtacommons.org/shares/LNCgyJ)
"The Two Sisters"

The Lions, Vancouver, BC

"YOU can see them as you look towards the north and the west, where the dream-hills swim into the sky amid their ever-drifting clouds of pearl and gray. They catch the earliest hint of sunrise, they hold the last colour of sunset. Twin mountains they are, lifting their heads to a back-ground of gold."

Figure A11. Digital story-map of Legends of Vancouver using ArcGIS: http://arcg.is/1JW3IQ4
Appendix B. Interviews with Rick Monture and Rudy Reimer

[These interviews were recorded as additional paratextual matter for the forthcoming updated edition of *Legends of the Capilano*, with support from The People and the Text project]

Interview with Rick Monture

Rick Monture is Mohawk, Turtle clan, from Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, and an Associate Professor in the Department of English & Cultural Studies and Indigenous Studies at McMaster University. He is the author of *We Share Our Matters: Two Centuries of Writing and Resistance at Six Nations of the Grand River* (2014).

*This excerpt is taken from two recorded interviews, the first taking place at SFU Burnaby by phone on August 25, 2017, and the second in person at McMaster University’s Indigenous Student Services space on October 25, 2017.*

**AS:** Do you have a sense of the community’s attitudes towards E. Pauline Johnson as a writer? And towards the relationship between Johnson and the Capilanos?

**RM:** I’d say at Six Nations people are quite proud of Pauline as a personality, but they’re not so familiar with her work anymore. A lot of people are puzzled by her, I think even while she was alive. Her legacy now is her family’s house called Chiefswood – the house is still very much a presence on the reserve. People know about it. We’ve put a lot of money into restoring it and keeping up the grounds. It’s quite a showpiece, and we take a lot of pride in keeping it up. So her legacy and her presence is very much around and part of the community; her written legacy not so much. But how much do people know anybody’s literary work from the 1800s anywhere, right? It’s not that celebrated or talked about. However, there’s a small but vocal group of us who have championed her writing for a long time and continue to do so. I think people are sympathetic towards her now. I know growing up they saw her – I wouldn’t say as a sellout, or anything like that. But
because her connection to the reserve was so minimal, especially in the last few years of her life, there wasn’t much really to talk about. We’re pretty sure that she never did a reading that we know of on the Reserve. We haven’t found any record. I’ve talked to Tom Hill, Paula Whitlow, and others who have dealt many years with her archive, but they’ve never come across any kind of evidence that she gave a reading “at home”. Which is interesting. She probably did a reading in Brantford or in Hamilton. I’m sure a handful of people might have found their way out for that, but travel was difficult then.

AS: What do people from the Six Nations community know about the Capilanos?

RM: People here haven’t really paid a whole lot of attention to Legends of Vancouver because it deals with another nation in a faraway place. But people have focused on the Iroquoian content of her work, which is considerable for sure – especially the early stuff, like her poems about Joseph Brant or Red Jacket. I focused on some of this material a little bit in my book to give it some cultural relevance, and I find a lot of her language kind of puzzling at times. Bending towards stereotypes if you will. In doing work with her stuff, I sometimes wonder: is she just pandering to audiences, or does she really believe this, has she bought into this? Or is she just fulfilling audience expectations of what Native people were about?

One of the stories that I take up in my book, which I still like a lot and teach when I can is “Wehro’s Sacrifice.” I find it an intriguing story because she does accurately describe the really important ceremony that takes place in our community every year. The particular part of it that she talks about, the burning of the white dog, was a big part of that ceremony for many, many years but had been outlawed – well not outlawed – but was dropped from the program in the 1930s. So what she’s talking about is an accurate thing, it’s not made up by any means. She’s taken some poetic license to embellish the story of the little boy and his dog, but I think she gets some things right in terms of the openness with which our people invited other religious men into our ceremonies. We

231 Red Jacket (1750-1830) was a famous Seneca orator and elected chief of the Wolf clan; based in New York, he was a contemporary of Mohawk leader Joseph Brant. See Monture, We Share Our Matters (78-80), and also Johnson’s poems, “The Re-interment of Red Jacket” (1884) and “Brant,’ A Memorial Ode” (1886).

232 For Monture’s published discussion of this material, see We Share Our Matters (61-100).

233 This story was first published in The Boy’s World magazine as “We-eho’s Sacrifice” (19 January 1907), and was later reprinted in The Shaganappi (Toronto: Briggs, 1913).
were always an inclusive people – we still are – but our ceremonies have, for about 50 years now (since the 1960s), been closed off to non-Native people. But for years non-Native people were welcomed into our ceremonies. And she documents that time. It’s not without its problems, especially the stereotypical language she includes – you know, she talks about weird, mournful chanting of the singers, and this and that. If I didn’t know any better it would paint this weird, exotic image of what it is that we do and did back then. But I think the story itself about self-sacrifice and being proud of your spiritual traditions is neat, considering that time. But in typical Pauline style she’s presenting both sides, and that’s what makes her so compelling for us today. What did she really think? I don’t know what she really thought.

**AS:** Can you tell me a bit about your relationship with Johnson’s life and work?

**RM:** I grew up on the Reserve, and we’d visit her home and everyone was afraid of it because it wasn’t very well-kept at a particular time when we were school kids. It was always considered haunted and it probably still is. But I’ve been around there a lot, and it doesn’t seem nearly as dark and dreary as it once did – it’s been nicely restored.

I continue to teach her stuff, though I pick and choose the poems. Some of it isn’t that teachable because to do the cultural-historical explanation of the context of what she’s getting at is difficult, and kind of bogs down the story. I’ve taught mostly the Iroquoian poems and I’ve written about them in my book a little bit. I sort of scratch my head as to whether she really believed that assimilation was best for our people, or if she was very proud of our traditions and history.

There’s always been two segments on the Reserve – the Traditional and the Christian community in our territory. And it’s still that way. From everything I’ve ever heard, we were always very tolerant of each other, the Christian and Traditional people, and still are to this day. But if you were to read other anthropologists and historians in the last century or so, you’d hear otherwise. They represent us as a divided community around religious differences, and that’s not really true.

My own family is of Traditional and Christian backgrounds throughout, as are many, many people. To me it was always about how well you get along; it doesn’t really matter what you do or don’t do on Sunday. It’s about tolerance for each other and respect for people’s religious beliefs. Which I think is very much a part of our community, even
though it may not appear like that to outsiders sometimes. A lot of the conflicts are mostly in a joking way, you know – at the end of the day we all get along pretty well. Pauline did a pretty good job of documenting some of that stuff. I was just telling you about “Wehro’s Sacrifice,” about the pride in our traditions that our traditional people carry with them. They’re unashamed of stuff even though we were made to feel ashamed. They were not.

As surrounded as we are by the most populated region in Canada, here in Southern Ontario, we do maintain these ceremonies. Probably all the ceremonies that were around in Pauline’s time are still conducted throughout the year in our community and in our languages. And that’s something to be proud of, because again it’s a responsibility that our people have felt for a long time. Her grandfather, John “Smoke” Johnson, was an advocate for tradition, so she would have grown up around it. It would have been during her time, in the late 1800s, when the people in the community would have been asking: how do you navigate tradition, history, progress, assimilation, and survival – all that kind of stuff. In many ways she probably didn’t see a real threat to language and culture and tradition the way we face it now in 2017 and have for the last half century. Back then all of our things were pretty strong. So she was documenting both sides of that, reflecting a community that was partly Christian and assimilated, and partly Traditional and – I don’t want to use the word conservative because that paints a different kind of picture – but adaptable, and proud of our culture and traditions. And this was through one of the worst eras of the Indian Act and Residential Schools. Our people have survived and shown remarkable resilience to keep these traditions alive despite a lot of these measures taken against us and our traditional government. All of this was in place when Pauline was alive.

After 20 years of working with her stuff, I’m still trying to figure her out. Which I think is great – it shows real substance and depth to her work that I find quite fulfilling and fun to dig into. If it was one-dimensional, then that would be easy – we’d have her all figured out. But 100 years after she’s gone, we’re still talking about her, and we’re seeing a lot of what she was concerned with in her lifetime being talked about today. The roles and importance of Indigenous women, identity issues, non-recognition of history and treaties — all that stuff. She addressed all those things a hundred and more years ago. We’re still talking about them, still trying to figure them out.
People say she was too soft in her politics, and I’ve said this a bit too. But I also know that it would have been difficult to really stand up and voice real criticism at that time because she wanted to be published – she was trying to survive. As I was saying earlier, I’m not really sure what she actually thought. I’m sure what she said or thought was very tempered by her need to sell tickets, publish her books, and keep everybody happy. She couldn’t be too critical. She chose her moments, and I think she chose them pretty well. That’s why I hold her up as someone who fought the good fight, in her time, when very few Native people had that stage – literally had that stage, let alone a woman. And so that really excites students, Native and non-Native, about an early feminist. All the traveling she did by herself, didn’t feel the need to marry – or maybe she did, we don’t know, her love life is a whole other mystery to us all. But yeah, she’s a really compelling, intriguing figure that we’re still trying to figure out all these years later.

AS: Definitely. In your article, “Beneath the British Flag: Iroquois and Canadian Nationalism in the Work of Pauline Johnson and Duncan Campbell Scott” (2001), you talk about Johnson’s story, “A Royal Mohawk Chief.” This story concludes Legends of Vancouver with an idealistic, reconciliatory gesture between the English and the Iroquois, and your article discusses how this comes across as disingenuous. Could you speak to that?

RM: Sure. It’s quite accurate the way she brings her father into the story; that much is true. But he wasn’t a big deal Chief. At the time, he was more of an interpreter; there are stories about how his mother forced his way into a leadership position. That’s 150 years ago so we can’t really know, but she takes a lot of license with his portrayal. It is true that her grandfather and father played a role during that time in 1869;234 but that was essentially a Six Nations response to the recent Confederation of Canada, and they were building relationships, reminding the Crown of our ally-to-ally relationship way back before Confederation.

Johnson had an imperfect understanding of our culture and ceremony; she wasn’t raised traditionally, and she wasn’t that interested in understanding or portraying traditional

234 Monture is referring to the plot of Johnson’s “A Royal Mohawk Chief,” which describes how Prince Arthur, Duke of Connaught, was given the honorary title of “Chief of the Six Nations Indians.”
culture accurately. You see it in some of the language in “A Royal Mohawk Chief” where she mentions the “weird monotones” and the adjectives she uses to describe Iroquois ceremony. It’s a complete misrepresentation of what took place that day. She makes it sound like Prince Arthur was raised above all else. And that’s wrong.

And so this story would have been a reminder – we call it polishing the chain – that we were once again reaffirming those ties in the wake of Confederation. We’re not Canadian, we are a sovereign nation — remember, England? That’s what that whole moment was about, and that’s not how she portrays it. I don’t know if she’s trying to make that connection between Six Nations and England again – isn’t that where she met Joe Capilano?

**AS:** In London, yes.

**RM:** So I don't know if she’s trying to harken back to all of our ties to the Crown, but that’s imperfect too given B.C.’s history. Maybe she just needed a place for that story to appear, so it got tacked on at the end. It really has no connection to *Legends of Vancouver.*

I can see why she sort of sprinkles, “well my people do this or that” in a couple of the other stories; it makes some sense, even though when she does this it’s often wrong. There’s one point where she talks about twins as being unwelcome, and known as “rabbits” (“The Recluse”). Well I’ve never heard that. My dad’s an identical twin. We’ve never heard that. No one’s ever said that to me, and they’ve never heard it said. So I don’t know where she is getting that from. It’s moments like that where you just raise your eyebrows.

**AS:** The book has been in publication now for over 100 years, and yet no edition thus far has attempted to involve members of the Skwxwu7mesh or Mohawk communities. What are your thoughts and/or experiences in regards to community-based projects today, and the difficulty in negotiating the demands of the institution/academia while respecting the cultural protocols of Indigenous communities?

**RM:** I can’t speak for the accuracy of her portrayal of the Skwxwu7mesh traditions, that’s for Rudy to take up, but if it’s anything like the way in which she portrays traditional Iroquoian culture, there are problems. It seems that she gets the general philosophies
right about our ceremonies – thankfulness, inclusivity, men’s roles and women’s roles – but she doesn’t go into depth about these things either. Yet I think it’s important that they be documented.

It’s always difficult to talk about cultural representation when there’s a language barrier. Even if she’s transcribing or relaying Skwxwu7mesh stories in English, there’s always a kind of translation barrier, right? That’s huge. Even the way stories work: they’re not always accurate portrayals of authentic narratives, because it’s always depending on the teller. At home there were always moments in which traditional folks — let’s call them informants — would talk to ethnologists and anthropologists, but they didn’t always give them the most accurate information. They weren’t going to give away too much of our knowledge. Who knows if Pauline might have heard some of that. That’s how the misinformation gets generated and perpetuated, because it was never told to be completely accurate to begin with, and they had their reasons, right? They didn’t want to share too much. Some of it was sacred knowledge, and not for a general public. So they would self-censor. And maybe that’s what’s happening here.

**AS:** I’m wondering if you could speak about doing this type of work, about republishing and re-framing a book that’s been in publication for such a long time. What are your thoughts on this as a scholarly practice, as something that we can do to re-centre the stories and roles of Indigenous storytellers?

**RM:** That’s a good question, and a big question. That’s part of the larger project of The People and the Text. I think it’s vital that we keep these texts in circulation, and keep talking about the old ones. I see the use and value of having annotated critical editions; I can see *Legends of Vancouver* appearing alongside some essays by Indigenous folks that talk about Pauline’s legacy, and maybe the cultural inaccuracies oraccuracies, that kind of thing, or modern day retellings of those same stories, or any number of things. I know that I would certainly welcome the opportunity to do that in an Iroquoian setting where you separate her Iroquoian poems and stories into one text that then is followed by essays that take those things up critically and challenge some of the more inaccurate language that I’ve described. There’s a way of being critical but also holding her up as
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someone who was telling these stories and finding beauty and truth in the ceremonial aspects.
Interview with Rudy Reimer

Rudy Reimer (Yumks) is an Indigenous Archaeologist from Skwxwu7mesh Uxwumixw who implements Indigenous perspectives into his research. He is an Associate Professor in the Departments of First Nations Studies and Archaeology at Simon Fraser University, and is also the host of Wild Archaeology on the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network.

This excerpt is taken from a longer interview, recorded in-person at SFU’s Burnaby campus on December 5, 2017.

AS: Do you have a sense of how the Skwxwu7mesh community feels about this collection of stories, the Legends of Vancouver stories, in general?

RR: I think overall in the Skwxwu7mesh Nation community the work by Pauline Johnson and the Legends of Vancouver book are fairly well-respected. There’s a certain amount of pride there, that going that far back, there was someone, you know another First Nations person, who had an interest in Skwxwu7mesh/Coast Salish culture and was accepted into the community. The book, I know, is on many shelves within the Skwxwu7mesh Nation community; having gone and done interviews myself, people go to their bookshelf and go ‘oh, is this what you’re talking about?’, and I say yes, but no, at the same time. And that’s just the result of various historical contingencies of colonization. I’ve heard in other communities where I’ve been, people will bring down another James Teit book, on ethnography in the Interior, and go ‘here, this is the source’, and it’s an interesting process where those people know what’s in that book, but they don’t feel authoritative enough to speak about it. Very often people will grab a book like Legends of Vancouver and go ‘okay, it’s in here, some of our history’. Yes, there’s a certain amount of pride that there’s something to access. But I think with younger generations people in the Skwxwu7mesh Nation are questioning what might be in there and in other texts, like The Salish People of Charles Hill-Tout, or what other anthropologists like Wayne Suttles and others have written about Skwxwu7mesh and other Coast Salish communities. I think maybe the appreciation for Legends of Vancouver with younger generations might be substantially less, or they might just not know about the book, because it’s over a hundred years old.
**AS:** The next question is about the Chinook jargon. I’m wondering what your sense is of the use of Chinook jargon within the Skwxwu7mesh community. Is it still a language known or used? Do you think that Chief Joe Capilano’s or Mary Capilano’s use of Chinook to communicate with Johnson was reflective of a wider phenomenon or practice during the early twentieth-century?

**RR:** I think definitely it was. And if we go further back – I’m thinking as an archaeologist here – talking with people in various communities, prior to contact with Europeans, people in Skwxwu7mesh or Sechelt or Musqueam or up in Stó:lō or even Lil’wat and other places, people in our communities didn’t speak just one language. People were involved, either through exchange of goods or even through conflict, or more often likely through family connections to these different places. If your son or daughter would marry off into another group, you would come to know that family, and you’d come to know their language. Our languages were similar, but they were distinct. So prior to contact I think people in our communities spoke multiple languages, similar to modern-day Europe where someone living in Germany probably knows Italian, Swiss, French, and English, as an example. But when Europeans showed up, it was an entirely different ball game, because there was the advent of the Maritime fur trade in the early 1800s. There were Americans, Russians, British, and Spanish, a multitude of people from totally foreign places speaking different languages. And so that’s where Chinook comes in. I believe its origins are down around the Columbia River. It was a language mixed of Salishan, French, English – it’s a really interesting mish-mash. It became heavily relied upon and quickly learned by many people who were involved in these endeavours.

Also at that time there was a lot of social, political, and population change. There was the smallpox and other epidemics that came in and decimated our populations. There were changes in settlement patterns, where villages were abandoned and others sprung up, or congregated together. And so there was a need for a language to converse amongst multiple communities. I think it grew organically and served a purpose probably for a number of generations. But in my lifetime, no one really speaks Chinook. I remember growing up in Skwxwu7mesh, we would use certain words – we thought they were cool, but we never really knew what they meant. But there are no “fluent” speakers, and today people in the community are more interested in reviving our language, and that’s very active with some of my relatives. That’s also happening in other communities as well.
As an anthropologist/archaeologist, or even as an historian, we have to be wary about the telling of a story or history by someone speaking in a given language – whether it be Skwxwu7mesh, or Chinook, or English. The way they tell it and the choice of words are very important. If that’s going through the ear of a translator, and then to a third person – so from Chief Joe Capilano, or Mary, to Pauline — there may be changes. And what words are stressed, because I’ve heard language speakers say, “In Skwxwu7mesh we don’t have a word for that”, and so something is substituted or changed. By the time it gets to someone like Pauline, she is writing notes or drawing from memory, which is probably a reflection of how she was brought up at Six Nations. That’s oral history. She may have had a slightly different process as well, of taking in those stories, remembering them, and then writing them down. There may have been changes, there may have been embellishments, or stressing the importance of one thing more than something else. That’s something from my archaeological training that I’ve been trained to be wary of.

It’s interesting to look at the version of a story in Legends of Vancouver, and if there are the same stories, published or unpublished, elsewhere. You can put them side-by-side and go, ‘this is the same story but it’s being told in different ways.’ And to some people that might be a very troublesome thing to deal with, but in essence when you boil down those histories, those narratives, what is the essence of the story? What’s being stressed? It gets down to who is telling the history, and what are they trying to convey to the person who is learning or interested in it. And that’s the process we need to be wary about. If you have three or four different versions of a story, that’s not necessarily a bad thing; every oral history, our history, has multiple layers. This is why we need to consider place names, and the names of people, and where they’re from, to give us insight about how those stories are told.

**AS:** The book has been in publication now for over one hundred years – it was published first in 1911 – and yet no edition thus far has attempted to involve members of the Skwxwu7mesh or Mohawk communities. What are your thoughts/experiences in regard to community-based projects today, and the difficulties of negotiating the demands of the institution while also respecting the cultural protocols of these Indigenous communities?
RR: I think what you’re doing is great. It’s a big endeavour. I’m glad to know you’re working with the Mathias family in the community, that’s a great starting point. And there are other people too, I’m sure they have some relation and would like to be involved. But I don’t think it would be negative. I think people would welcome that. I’ve seen that change throughout my career, over the last twenty years in the Skwxwu7mesh community, where I’m going back to my community and saying ‘I’m an archaeologist, I would like to talk to you about this’ and they go ‘oh, what are you going to do, dig up my ancestors?’ There’s been a change historically, and people in the community have a better sense of who historians are, anthropologists, archaeologists, or other academics in different disciplines. There’s a better sense of trust, maybe? Maybe that’s a strong word. But acceptance, because I think they’ve seen, not just through myself but other researchers making the attempts – successful attempts – of learning the protocols, of going about things the right way. And I understand that you’re doing that, and so coming at it from that direction, not just sort of bombing into the community saying ‘I’m going to do this, and I just need to check off my boxes, see you later’ or ‘I’m going to republish the book, maybe make some money out of it, and you’re not going to get anything’, right? So we do things differently. Which is good. The book being republished, I think you mentioned under a different name – Legends of the Capilano – would go a long way; not just within the Skwxwu7mesh community, but other neighboring communities, because Joe Capilano had relations to other places. But I can say with some degree of confidence that within the Skwxwu7mesh community it would be very interesting, particularly for older people in the community, who are probably more aware of the book. And maybe having a Foreword or a section where the family can come together and become part of the book. I’ve seen that open doors to older texts. I’m looking at my bookshelf here at the Conversations with Khahtsahlano – I would love for someone to tackle that book, to literally tear it apart and glue it back together. Because a book like that was created haphazardly, where there’s two indexes. It’s confusing to go through, but when you learn the system of how to get through it, there’s some really good information in there. Pauline’s work, though, is a lot easier – as a version of our history, it’s got a historical legacy that people can look at and create a sense of curiosity for themselves and say, ‘I’ve heard that story but it was told differently. Why is this version here?’ At first people might be confused, but as people think about it more, they’ll realize, ‘oh okay, I can go and talk to so-and-so about this,’ and I think that just engages people more into learning our history.
AS: And as a follow-up to that, thinking about how the book has been in publication for so long, and has always been in the hands of non-Indigenous editors and publishers?

RR: That’s the historical legacy of a lot of academia. You know, archaeology was the bad poster-child for decades, right? We archaeologists went and dug up burials and other things without consent. It was that criticism from Indigenous communities that forced the discipline to change, and thankfully the discipline has changed. So what we have now in archaeology, working with Indigenous communities is called “Indigenous Archaeology.” There are guidelines and ethics, and standards of practice. I see this happening in other disciplines. Scholars are realizing, ‘okay, if we want to move forward, this is the way we have to do things’. And if it’s publishing or re-publishing a book, having knowledge about the community protocols and processes, I think that’s very important. As long as that’s followed, I don’t think there will be any issues.

AS: I know you’ve done some work on the “Sea Serpent” story. In Johnson’s story, “The Sea-Serpent,” she writes about the vice of “avarice”, or greed, and in the story she likens this idea of greed to a slimy, two-headed sea-serpent that can only be destroyed by a warrior who embodies upstanding morals and virtues. Are there any other versions of this story that you are familiar with? And does her interpretation of the story resonate with the version(s) that you know?

RR: Yes, well partially it does, and again there are multiple versions of that narrative. The one that I tell is to the place names, to the archaeological sites, that are along the eastern flank, the shores of Eastern Howe Sound. These places, you can’t understand their meaning, their literal translations don’t make any sense, until you knit them together with the narrative of Sinulhkai and Xwechtaal. Pauline’s version is correct, where Xwechtaal is the warrior brandishing the weapons of purity and strength and vitality, and in the version that I tell I agree with that. That’s something he had to achieve through a lot of training, physically, mentally, spiritually, and emotionally. He had to go into the mountains, into the lakes, into the salt water, and get the powers from all of those different places to be able to take on something so large and powerful. Pauline probably used the term “avarice” or greed because that is a very potent thing that is associated with bad things. But in the versions I’ve always heard, and what I’ve been told, is that the serpent has two heads for a reason. It’s sort of an analog, or for lack of better words, there’s your good side and your bad side, and there’s a center where they come
together. And so whenever you look at how Sinulhkai and Xwechtaal are portrayed in art, there’s always the two heads, and it comes together in the middle and there’s usually a face – and that’s typically Xwechtaal. That’s the coming together, where you always have some good, you always have some bad, and it’s about finding that balance within your life, through doing similar training – through bathing or fasting, going into the salt water, encountering animals, knowing about plants and about our landscape. That’s how you figure out how to find balance in your own life.

In Pauline’s version, greed was probably the most powerful word at the time, because there were changes in our economy, there were changes in flux with Christianity, the Missionaries, and the Residential Schools, right? I remember going to Catholic school as a child, and the first thing you learn is that greed is bad. These things are hammered into you. Whereas I think traditionally it would have been different things. It goes back again to that process of when someone comes to you and asks, ‘can you tell me that story?’ And you say, ‘well, why do you want to hear it?’ and you get a sense from that person of what they’re about, or what they are seeking. And then you can tell the story in a certain way, so that they can get something out of it. That’s why we have multiple versions of that story. It’s about who is telling the story, and who they are telling it to. And who is the bigger audience?

In the version I tell, Xwechtaal cuts off the Sinulhkai’s heads, and those are islands just off Whytecliff Park in West Vancouver. When the tide is low, there’s a little bridge that goes out and connects the islands to the land. But when the tide comes up, that’s the history of the serpent getting its head cut off. There’s another version of the story of Sinulhkai and Xwechtaal over at Bunsen Lake and in Indian Arm. It’s a very similar story, but it’s different, because their version reflects their history and where they are located. It’s a big story all up and down the coast. When I was up at Tla’amin territory up on the Sunshine Coast many years ago, I went on a little tour and one of the community members pointed out a rock armour or pictograph. He goes, ‘that’s the Sinulhkai and this is where it met its end.’ And I was like, ‘we have pretty much the exact same story in Skwxwu7mesh.’ But they have a slightly different version.
The stories collected in *Legends of Vancouver* are essentially Skwxwu7mesh stories reinterpreted through Johnson’s own Mohawk/English imagination and memory. Do you recognize these stories as Skwxwu7mesh stories?

Yes and no, I guess. I guess no because I’ve heard different versions, and that probably gets back to my own family history and experiences. But I’m sure that other people in the Skwxwu7mesh Nation community would say yes, and I don’t think there’s any definitive yes or no to that. Again, it gets back to why she was accepted by the people in the community – she was essentially adopted in, and she’s still known and respected today, and I have no problem with that. I think she just went through a different process than what we do in modern day, and that’s a challenge for us as scholars, looking at these historical texts and thinking, ‘how did this come together, and under what circumstances?’

Is there anything that we haven’t touched on that you would like to say in conclusion?

I think this could be the interesting start to a whole career – if one chose to go about doing this. There are multiple texts like this that could be examined or re-evaluated; and I’m glad you’re doing it. It’s timely. It will be interesting, and a good contribution. And it resonates with the philosophy of how I do archaeology now. You know, earlier in my career, I would go and dig up sites, and collect things and bring them back. I, and many others throughout Skwxwu7mesh territory have done that, and there’s this huge collection of stuff up in my lab, and I said to the community, ‘I’m not going to dig anything up anymore’. And they said, ‘why not?’ And I said, ‘there’s just too much here to look at’. And so my form of “texts” are different than yours – you’re looking at books, and I’m looking at stone tools. For you there are multiple texts out there, and for me there are multiple boxes of tools. It’s good that we are at a point in academia that we can realize the importance of re-evaluating and revisiting some of this older stuff. It keeps that stuff alive. For me, that stuff is not just collecting dust in a box. It’s stuff I can talk about in a publication, or through presentations to the community, or involve youth, or even grad students so that somebody gets something out of it. Keep it relevant.