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Abstract

In developing the thesis that maps transmit the values, truth-claims, and perspectives of the cultures that commission them, geographers have tended to forget that maps are also tactile artefacts, made in accordance with specific geographical directives. Indeed, as elements in a wider institutional network, organized and reified by actors in pursuit of certain goals, maps serve to not only sustain, but actively create, territorial interests. In a colonial context, moreover, maps can arrest and de-legitimize the territorialization of some cultural groups even while they enfranchise and legitimize that of others. Maps function, on this view, as ideological weapons. In this thesis I use a 'materialist hermeneutic' to interpret and understand the way in which maps made by European discoverers, explorers, and colonizers during the imperial and (post)colonial periods helped actualize the territorial dispossession of the (Ab)original inhabitants of what is now British Columbia. Beginning with the charts of George Vancouver and Alexander Mackenzie, and finishing with the reserve plans of the 1916 Royal Commission, I illustrate this thesis by tracing the cartographic encirclement of the First Nations of the northwest coast between 1793 and 1916. There are three essential themes: a) the 'positioning' of the map artefact in an ideological power network; b) the subjective emplacement of the objective 'Other' in the geographical perspective authorized by the network; and c) the representational discourses on the 'surface' of the map that comprise the rules under which that emplacement is achieved and maintained. Our entry (and exit) point is the 1991 B.C. Supreme Court case Delgamuukw vs. A.G., in which maps were used as evidence by both the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en Nations (the plaintiffs) and the Crown (the defence). Given the manner in which the Court interpreted this evidence, the thesis has implications not only for our
understanding the social function of maps in historical or contemporary land claims, but also for the way in which we establish, sustain, and defend our own territorial legitimacy at the expense of another.
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In this respect I have been brutal (*Delgamuukw* vs. *A.G.* 1991, 3).

On March 8 1991 in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, Smithers Registry, the Honourable Chief Justice Allan McEachern delivered his judgment in *Delgamuukw* vs. *A.G.* The plaintiffs were the Hereditary Chiefs of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en First Nations. They were seeking juridical recognition and declaration of their inherent, Aboriginal, and unextinguished right(s) to ownership and governance of all the 133 separate House territories stretching from Skiikm Lax Ha and Niist (Gitksan) in the north to Samooh and Goohlaht (Wet'suwet'en) in the south, and from Tenimgyet and Delgam Uukw (Gitksan) in the west to Hagwilnegh (Wet'suwet'en) and Nii Kyap (Gitksan) in the east, and including all the lands and rivers encompassing the villages of Kuldo, Kisgegas, Kispiox, Gitanmaax, Tse Kya, Gitsegukla, Gitwangak, and Kyah Wiget, in the realm of the Thunderbird, Turtle Island. The defendant was Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia and the Attorney General of Canada. They were expecting juridical recognition and reaffirmation of their existing ownership and governance of some 58,000 km² of resource-rich territory lying between the headwaters of the Nass and Skeena Rivers in the north and Ootsa and François Lakes in the south, and between the height of the coastal ranges to the west and the Babine and Finlay River watersheds to the east, and including the towns of Hazelton, Kitwanga, Smithers, Burns Lake, and Houston, in the Province of British Columbia, Canada. It was one of the most unique cases to ever come before a Canadian court.

Throughout 374 days of trial between May 11, 1987 and June 30, 1990 both plaintiff
and defendant made extensive use of maps in their attempts to justify in the eyes of the Court the validity of their respective geographical and historical claims. I can think of no previous case, in fact, where maps were wielded so tenaciously and so consistently by both litigants. On both sides academic and professional cartographers and historical geographers were key witnesses. The Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en used maps drawn according to accepted contemporary scientific standards, but which painstakingly transcribed orally recorded and transmitted House genealogies and histories into graphic form. The Crown used maps drawn by Euro-Canadian explorers, colonizers, and 'theoretical geographers' to confirm the validity of its own genealogy and history and, in so doing, invalidate that of the plaintiffs. In essence, two competing versions of the territory and its history — two human geographies — fought it out before an arbitrator effectively charged with determining which one was 'fact' and which one was 'myth'. The hard question he faced was that both claims occupied the same physical space. The hard reality was that a ruling in either direction could be a ruling not merely on self-government or fee simple ownership of resources, but on nothing less than sovereignty itself.

In the end, the Chief Justice ruled against the plaintiffs, and in favour of the defendants. He not only rejected the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en declarations of sovereignty and self-government, but accepted the Province's counter-claim that their Aboriginal rights were lawfully extinguished in the colonial period. That he did so was perhaps to be expected, if only because the case was adjudicated in an arena in which all the discursive rules (legal or otherwise) had been written (then or previously) by the defendants. At the same time the Court is supposed to be (or at least is believed to be) about the administration of justice. And yet there can be no doubt that justice was not
done. This suggests that either the rules of discourse were improperly invoked or, alternatively, that there is something about the framework within which that invocation took place that demands closer scrutiny. Since, by definition, the former is a logical impossibility — for they would then no longer be 'discursive rules' — we are effectively coerced into a confrontation with the latter. It is towards an explication and understanding of this alternative that this thesis is addressed.
Introduction

*Delgmuukw* vs. *A.G.*

The territory no longer precedes the map, nor survives it. Henceforth it is the map that precedes the territory...it is the map that engenders the territory...it is the real, and not the map, whose vestiges subsist... (Baudrillard 1983, 2)

Anthropologist Hugh Brody called *Delgmuukw* vs. *A.G.* "the most important test of aboriginal rights the legal world has yet faced" (cited in Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, back cover), and it is perhaps telling that most of the (academic or professional) critique of *Reasons for Judgment* (hereafter referred to as 'the judgment') has been delivered by anthropologists (and, to a lesser extent, historians). I will return to this critique in the course of the thesis, but I here want to go directly to the heart of the judgment's *geography*. For even though the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en Hereditary Chiefs' Opening Statement stated clearly that they were "not interested in asserting aboriginal rights [but were in court] to discuss territory and authority" (Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 9, emphasis added), a specifically geographical analysis and critique of the decision has been conspicuous in its absence. To that end, I want to borrow Robin Fisher's methodological metaphor (see footnote 1[c] above) and apply a little 'scissors-and-paste' editing of my own to the judgment's Summary of Findings and Conclusions and, in so doing, elucidate a "geographical narrative of judgment" (Delaney 1993, 51) that reads something like this:

At the outset, archaeological evidence does suggest habitation of the disputed territory going back three to six thousand years "but does not establish who those early inhabitants (or visitors) were" (3). The Hereditary Chiefs (who allege they are the direct descendants of those
early inhabitants) claim the following: a) ownership of the territory; b) the right to govern themselves within said territory under Aboriginal laws; c) that they have, alternatively, unspecified Aboriginal rights to use the territory; d) damages for loss of resources removed or pending removal by 'third parties'; and e) court costs (4). The Chiefs allege ownership of 98 Gitksan and 35 Wet'suwet'en House territories (6) and have produced maps showing the collective "approximate external boundary" and the individual internal House boundaries on them (7). Aboriginal interests in the territory arise by either: a) "occupation and use of specific lands...for an indefinite, long period prior to British sovereignty"; or b) under the 1763 Royal Proclamation (8). If (a) applies, then Aboriginal rights arise in law, at the pleasure of the Crown, and constitute a burden on Crown title to the soil (9). Option (b) is a non-sequitur because the Royal Proclamation "has never applied to or had any force in the Colony or Province of British Columbia or to the Indians living here" (10). It is "the law of nations and the common law [that] recognize[s] the sovereignty of European nations which established settlements in North America" (18) but it is irrelevant to this case "when sovereignty was first asserted" (19). The plaintiffs' ancestors were, under 8(a), entitled to certain Aboriginal interests and rights, but they "did not include ownership of or jurisdiction over the territory" (23). Since the assertion of sovereignty the Crown enacted laws that would: a) "allot lands to the Indians for their exclusive use, called reserves, comprising their village sites, cultivated fields and immediately adjacent hunting
grounds"; b) "encourage settlement by making land available for agriculture or other purposes"; and c) would permit Indians rights of usufruct in vacant Crown lands of the colony (25). As it turned out, the provisions of 18(a) "did not...work as well as intended....Although reserves in the territory included most occupied villages they were very small because it was thought secure access to strategic fishing sites was more important than acreage" (27). "It is the law that aboriginal rights exist at the 'pleasure of the Crown' and they may be extinguished whenever the intention of the Crown to do so is clear and plain" (28). Since pre-Confederation enactments "construed in their historic setting" exhibit that intention, "the plaintiffs' claims to Aboriginal rights are accordingly dismissed" (29). Their usufructory rights to unoccupied land continue to constitute a fiduciary obligation on the Crown, but such obligation is not exclusive of existing provincial law (30). "As the Crown has all along had the right to settle and develop the territory and to grant titles and tenures in the territory unburdened by aboriginal interest" the claim to damages is dismissed (40). In any event, any Aboriginal rights which might be found to obtain under any of the foregoing "would attach not to the whole territory but only to the parts that were used by the plaintiffs ancestors at the time of sovereignty", and which are cartographically defined in the conclusion of this judgment (42). Over and above all of this, "some comments about Indian matters" are probably appropriate (46).
Cartography in the Courtroom

Even at its most transparent, the foregoing makes it clear that cartographic evidence occupies a central position in the judgment. Indeed, the Chief Justice acknowledges his exposure "to countless maps and photographs which describe the topography and important landmarks in the territory" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 305) during the course of the trial. As I shall elaborate in the thesis, the nexus of map, territory, and law is far more nuanced than suggested above, but it is enough to note at this point that the judgment invokes this evidence in three principle areas: A) to argue that King George III's October 7 1763 Royal Proclamation never applied to territories west of the Rocky Mountains; B) to circumscribe the allotment of reserves during the colonial and post-colonial periods within a framework of positive laws, the hard shell of which will forbid the admittance of 'extra-legal' facts; and C) to dismiss the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en First Nations' ('extra-legal') territorial claims as historical and geographic fantasy. It is to an explication and understanding of (B) that this thesis is addressed but for reasons which will become apparent shortly it will be in order to say something about (A) and (C) first.

In the case of (A) the Province entered as evidence a number of maps drawn by European cartographers in the years immediately prior to 1763 as 'proof' that the First Nations in the northwestern cordillera were never subject to either the letter or the intent of the Royal Proclamation. This 'distinction' is germane because it is this document which proclaims British colonial policy with respect to the First Peoples in the North American colonies following the Treaty of Paris in February 1763, and which prohibits European survey, patent, or occupancy of any Aboriginal lands not otherwise ceded to, or purchased by, the British Crown. And, of course, the majority of First Nations in British
Columbia have never (with 'one' exception) been signatory to any such treaties. The Chief Justice does accept that the document "is at least a statement...calling for liberal and generous treatment of Indians" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 97) but he cannot figure out "how the Proclamation, in areas beyond its reach, can be applied to displace the common law which recognizes the right of the Crown to create colonies..." (ibid, 97-8, emphasis added). In simple terms, because the maps of the 'theoretical geographers' show the northwest corner of the North America as terra incognita the Proclamation – and any Aboriginal interests or rights that might accrue to it – do not obtain (either then or now) west of the Rocky Mountains.

In the case of (C) the plaintiffs submitted as evidence maps of their House territories transcribed by First Nations' cartographers from 'territorial affidavits', the 'data base' for which was a combination of oral historical and genealogical testimony and a direct physical reconnaissance in which "the Chiefs went out into their territories and from the mountain tops pointed out to the researchers and map makers the metes and bounds of those territories..." (Delgam Uukw and Gisday Wa 1989, 58-9). In the same way that the Chief Justice rejected oral history and genealogy as inadequate to the standards required by the law, however, he determined that the 'accuracy' or 'reputation' or 'truthfulness' of any maps translated in whole or in part from that history or genealogy must be equally suspect. Not only did the affidavits seem "to have a language unique of their own" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 266) but "there [were] far too many inconsistencies in the plaintiffs' evidence to permit [the Chief Justice] to conclude that individual Chiefs or Houses have discrete Aboriginal rights or interests in the various territories defined by the internal boundaries" (ibid, 267). In short, the Court took the view that because the Hereditary Chiefs' territorial affidavits sometimes conflicted with one another, or
contradicted other maps, or, failing that, were just not 'accurate' enough, then any assertion of Aboriginal rights arising from long-term occupancy of specified territories prior to the assertion of British sovereignty must be rejected.

We are now close to the point at which we may return to the case of (B) but before doing so I want to suggest that even this most peripheral of excursions around and into Delgamuukw vs. A.G. forces an engagement with two ineluctible aspects of maps: a) they are fundamentally concerned with territory and territorial authority; and b) they are ideological constructions. In essence the Chief Justice invoked one cartographic construction of geographic 'reality' to discredit another, and, in so doing, effectively navigated his way around the provisions of item (8) in the Summary of Findings and Conclusions. He 'understood' – if only at a 'common sense' level – that to invalidate the connection between a people and its territory would be equivalent to invalidating their sovereign identity itself. But he clearly did not do so in an ideological vacuum, because the benchmarks of 'accuracy', 'reputation', and 'truthfulness' according to which the Chief Justice appraised the validity of the litigants' territorial arguments were not applied uniformly. For if Aboriginal dominium remains cartographically uncontested in 1763 – as his argument in the case of (A) implies – how is it that maps (apparently) drafted according to accepted Western (modern) standards of 'accuracy', 'reputation', and 'truthfulness' are insufficient to challenge the dominium of the Crown in 1991 – as his argument in the case of (C) implies? It cannot be that in simply mapping this territory one acquires exclusive sovereignty over it, for the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en have maps of their own. At the same time the Chief Justice has already admitted that neither armed conquests nor treaties are germane to the case (ibid, 225). Leaving aside for the moment the question of the law itself, then, the only conclusion that can be drawn seems to be
that while maps are somehow essential to the assertion, maintenance, and defence of sovereignty and territorial authority, it is only certain maps that are qualified to do so.

Throughout the judgment the Chief Justice is clearly "impressed by the unequivocal fact that the Crown...was both setting aside reserves and marketing the...balance of the colony (ibid, 124), and much of the defence's evidence in the case of (B) is indeed presented "in the form of detailed maps describing the extent of their alienations within the...territory" (Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 62-3). The most striking thing, however, is that we are never introduced directly to any of these maps in the 394-page judgment. In cartographic terms, the two genres of maps in (A) and (C) seem to be the 'endplates' in a 'territorial atlas' whose contents are never explicitly revealed to us, but whose definitive theme seems to be that "by accepting reserves and seeking to add to them, the Indian people [have] acknowledged the loss of their larger territories...the reserves are those places we have given them, so we acknowledge them to be their lands. On this view, the rest of the land is not theirs, but ours" (ibid, 54-5).

The judgment suggests that the substantive power of maps is not to be found in their semiology (Wood and Fels 1986; Wood 1992; Lewis 1993, 98-106), their iconography (Gilmartin 1984; Woodward 1985; Harley and Woodward 1987; Harley 1988), or their textuality (Harley 1989), these being instead the discursive 'media' through which that power may be operationalized (and, as I will show, identified). It suggests, rather, that it obtains in their capacity to contour, sustain, or challenge the territorial world-view of one (or some) cultural groups at the expense or detriment of another (or others). Maps must be seen as an ineluctible part of a process of territorialization; as elementary, 'always-emergent', yet highly authoritative interlocutors of the life-world, made by actors and
social groups in pursuit of certain goals and in defence of certain interests. They not only express the will towards, but actually serve to create, real territorial control.

**Spatializing the Contact Process**

It is at this point, then, that we can now dispense with *Delgamuukw vs. A.G.* until the Conclusion of the thesis – although throughout it will lurk, as it were, just below the surface – and go directly (if a little melodramatically) to "the dark reality of what lies behind the Province's colour-coded maps" (Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 62-3). For it is precisely this 'reality' which constitutes the subject matter of this thesis: namely, the European usurpation of First Peoples' *dominium* in what is now British Columbia between 1793 and 1916, and for which the territorial circumscription of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en First Nations is paradigmatic. In what follows I will indeed argue that this usurpation was accomplished in large measure through maps – or at least through the European newcomers' ability (and need) to make maps – and, in so doing, exercise ideological (if not actual physical) control over hitherto 'unknown' territories. This is a strong statement, but one which I think will be qualified in the course of the thesis. I am not here suggesting that 'material' power played no part in the European appropriation of First Nations' territories. Certainly, for example, it would be as naive to ignore the biological and cultural devastation wreaked by imported epidemics as it would be to disavow the lasting impressions of omniscient (re)social(izing) power that must have accompanied the occasional shelling of an Aboriginal village. But even here I think it must be admitted that while depopulation by disease or military offensive might make it a lot easier for an alien power to seize a given territory, the actual seizure must still be secured through other means. What I am suggesting is that the First Nations in what is
now British Columbia were separated from their territories less by physical offensive than by a concatenation of 'ideological' forces, some of which were more overt – e.g. missionary activity, residential schooling – and some of which were less so – e.g. photography or the seizure of cultural artifacts (see, also, Harris 1991, 678-81). It is my contention in this thesis that mapmaking in colonial and post-colonial British Columbia, although often 'inadvertent' to the point of subtlety, was (and still is) one of the most versatile and powerful weapons in the Euro-Canadian ideological arsenal. Its role in the reconfiguration of Aboriginal space has received almost no attention in the literature, however.8

It is in this context, then, that I consider this work to be part 'exploration', part 'pilgrimage', and part 'commitment'. By exploration I do not mean that the thesis will 'travel' where no one else has gone – for this is precisely the ideology of imperialism and colonialism I seek to unveil – but rather that exploration is – for researchers as well as explorers – always "in reality a guided examination of the established pathways of original peoples" (Ruggles 1991, 13). In the welcome, if protracted, retrieval of cartography from its empiricist cocoon I am by no means the first to recognize that it is much more about process (Carter 1987; Rundstrom 1991, 1-12; Wood 1993, 1-9; Edney 1993, 61-7), ideology (Helgerson 1991; 1993, 68-74; Turnbull 1986), empire (Harvey 1989, 240-59; Edney 1993, 61-7; Livingstone 1994, 132-54; Godlewska 1995), and contact (Said 1979; Rundstrom 1991, 1-12; Orlove 1991, 3-38; Harley 1992, 522-35) than it is about methodology or the coffee-table atlas. So far as I am aware, however, I will be the first to follow this particular trace while doing so.

By pilgrimage, similarly, I am not proposing a quest for some artefact or place of religious significance, although there is, as the Chief Justice has already alerted, a sense in
which maps do have an 'at-a-glance' authority that borders on the sacred. I mean it, rather, in the sense that something (of our own place in the order of things) has been somehow 'lost' (if it was ever 'found') and needs to be recovered. For the most recent (and only) systematic treatise on the mapping of British Columbia per se we must go back to Albert Farley's 1960 PhD dissertation. For its institution, time, and place it is an empirical tour de force – indeed some of the maps he discusses will be referenced herein – but by today's standards it is a gazetteer at best. By the time he acknowledges that "the historical cartography of the [northeastern] Pacific reflects political evolution and overseas expansion of European nations" (1960, 37) – an idea he subsequently never engages at any depth – he has already made it clear that, for him, 'evolution' means nothing more than a self-evident transition "from unknown Indian territory to a province with precisely surveyed boundaries, accurately measured altitudes and carefully mapped planimetry [which] has been gradual and is not yet complete" (ibid, ii-iii, emphasis added). Given this view it is not surprising that Farley's dissertation played the part that it did in Delgamuukw vs. A.G. – as 'expert witness' for the Crown (see footnote 3, above) – and my hope is that this desperately needed rewrite will help ensure that it never is ('complete').

Finally, this brings me to 'commitment'. Not only in the political sense that I have just outlined – i.e. as a contribution to a rapprochement between Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian in British Columbia – but in the sense that this thesis is my answer to both Trigger's call for more studies on European colonial policy-making and "how these policies were administered" (1988, 38), and my own earlier suggestion that (aside from those few authors acknowledged hitherto) the "comprehensive cultural cartographies of the...post-contact period in North America have yet to be written" (Brealey 1993, 25,
emphasis in original). If this work has an Achilles' heel, it is that it will simply not be able to unravel each and every thread in the intersecting and overlapping networks of cartographic modernity as they unfold in and around a Thunderbird's nest (ibid 1995, 1). But it may well be here -- in this nest or this province -- that one can come the closest to it. For it is here, as Cole Harris has observed, that over four centuries of (restive and often rapacious) post-Renaissance modernization is so conveniently 'telescoped' into a period of less than half of that (1992, 6). It is to this particular 'time-space compression' (see, in this connection, Harvey 1989, 147) that I now turn. Summarized, the work unfolds as follows.

**Tracing the Outlines of the Territorial Atlas**

In Chapter One I construct a theoretical framework that is (roughly speaking) a hybridization of the writings of four thinkers. From the English historical sociologist Michael Mann I first accept that 'societies' are best conceived as 'overlapping and intersecting sociospatial networks of power' (1986, 1), in which the *original* source of territorial authority is nothing more than actors and their institutions in pursuit of goals, and from which maps acquire their ontological status and validity. I then defer to the Palestinian literary theorist Edward Said and the French Marxist Henri Lefebvre in order to carve the epistemological lens through which to access that ontology. From the former I take the realization that European (territorial) power has always depended as much on its capacity to 'stage' or 'network' the 'Other' (Said 1979, 1-110) as on the immanent inflationary dynamics of modernization. From the latter I take the insight that in 'filling the gaps' between 'representational spaces' and 'representations of space' maps and plans
'pre-interpret' the field of 'spatial practice' (Lefebvre, 1991, 37-8) upon which such networking and staging obtains. Finally I go to the English social theorist John Thompson and retrieve the essence of his 'interpretive transformation of doxa' (1990, 25) and from which I develop the methodological stratagem of the materialist hermeneutic that will be used to circumnavigate the network.

In Chapter Two I 'export' this framework directly to 1793 and the northwest coast of *terra incognita*, where "a pincer movement of explorers close[s] in...from both east and west and white men [come] into this, the Thunderbird's nest" (Kopas 1972, 7). I discuss the maps of George Vancouver, Alexander Mackenzie and the Arrowsmith Firm, and the earliest toponymic 'staging' of the First Peoples that (I will argue) constitutes the definitive moment in the assertion of British sovereignty and the 'construction' of New Caledonia. From there I go to the cartography of the Hudson's Bay Company and the territorial attenuation of the First Peoples that accompanies the land-based fur trade. It is also the epoch of the 'new imperialism', in which 'emergent' scientific discourses of archaeology, anthropology, sociology, and geography are starting to cleave out their disciplinary niches in Europe, and where cartographic 'ethnographies' help support the transformation of Darwinian evolutionary theory "into an ideology for the pursuit of power and...a superior strategy for the control and subjugation of technologically weaker peoples" (Smith 1985, ix). Finally, I go to 1849 and the establishment of the crown colony of Vancouver Island, in the words of Undersecretary to the Colonies Herman Merivale, still "the last corner of the earth left free for the occupation of a civilized race" (1843, cited in McNab 1983, 96), and where Joseph Pemberton (from landward) and the British Admiralty (from seaward) initialize the territorial power network that makes that occupation possible.
In Chapter Three I go to 1858 and the establishment of the crown colony of British Columbia, where the influx of the gold rush convinces Governor James Douglas of "the obvious necessity that the whole country be immediately thrown open for settlement" (June 10 1858 letter to Lord Stanley, cited in Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 106). It is here that Douglas first confronts the logistical challenge of developing in the colonial periphery a 'regional framework' wherein the ideological imperatives of 'responsible government' and 'free institutions' can somehow coexist with the material 'assimilation' and 'insulation' of the Native races (McNab 1983, 85-103). I discuss the cartography of the Royal Engineers and the Royal Navy, and the larger-scale territorial destabilization of the First Peoples that is evinced in their charts to the goldfields, before moving to the maps of Alexander Anderson and Alfred Waddington, and their 'variations on a theme' (Brealey 1995) in the cartographic representation of the 'Other'. I then address the first systematic staking, surveying, and mapping of 'Indian Reserves', beginning with the comparatively 'irregular' alienations by Charles Sinnett, William McColl, and Hermann Tiedemann along the lower Fraser River and around Victoria, and subsequently with the increasingly 'regulated' Lockean landscape engineered by Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works Joseph Trutch. Finally I 're-evaluate' the space of the northwest coast on the eve of Confederation and show how the power networks of imperialism and colonialism have not simply consolidated the territorial stage upon which an alien landscape may be 'thematically' superimposed, but sustained the ideological superstructure upon which the legitimacy of that superimposition depended.

In Chapter Four I go to 1871 and Ottawa, where federal officials discover that the trusteeship of Indian lands "as liberal as that hitherto pursued by the British Columbia government" (Article 13 of Terms of Union, cited in Cail 1974, 185) is anything but
(liberal). But if both provincial and federal parties disagree on the exact content of that trusteeship, they at least agree on its form: namely, that the Dominion shall aim for "a concentration of the Indians upon Reserves" (Aug 17 1875 memo to the Executive Council from Attorney General George Walkem, cited in Delgamukw vs. A.G. 1991, 128), the ideological corollary of which is already reflected in the maps of the colony, and which proclaims that said "Indians have no [and never did have any] direct interest in the land" (October 16 1871 letter from Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works B.W. Pearse to the Colonial Secretary [British Columbia 1987, 103]). I discuss the larger-scale maps and plans of the Indian Reserve Commissioners Gilbert Sproat and Peter O'Reilly and the smaller-scale 'legal geographies' of the 1876 Indian Act against and within which they are thematically networked. I also examine the more ephemeral cartographic 'taxonomies' of G.M. Dawson, A.G. Morice, and the British Columbia Provincial Museum, and which collectively confirm the staging of the First Nations in the 'representational spaces' of Pax Britannica. Finally I outline the work of the 1913-6 Royal Commission, the cartographic 'final solution' to the 'Indian Land Question' in British Columbia.

In Chapter Five – in some sense the most important Chapter of the thesis – I return to the theoretical framework developed in Chapter One with a view to clarifying two essential points: a) that as (ideologically) powerful as Euro-Canadian cartography was (and is), it could not (and cannot), 'by itself', bring about "the encapsulation of one originally self-sustaining society within another" (Trigger 1988, 37); and b) that in a consideration of this thesis we shall 'discover' why the territorial tactics of the First Peoples were essentially irrelevant to that outcome. I retrieve the essence of Bruno Latour's 'sociologies of science' to show that the successful coercive strategy is always the
one which is most able to accumulate facts and marshall alliances – the most able to 'plug' the interstitial pores in the overlapping and intersecting power networks of contact – and that it is precisely this feature which gave (and still gives) the maps and mapmakers of modernity the incorporative ideological and territorial power that they have always commanded.

Finally, in the Conclusion and Postscript I 'fast forward' back to 1989, Smithers, and Delgamuukw vs. A.G., where Chief Justice Allan McEachern interstitially 'enters' the accumulated, allied, and adjudicated power networks of the territorial atlas navigated hitherto, and, like the 19th century colonialists before him, reminds the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en of their proper place in the order of things. I revisit the nexus of map, territory, and law first broached at the outset, and reconsider our own positioning in that same order. I conclude with some comments on ideology, geography, the 'Indian Land Question', and other judgmental matters.
Footnotes to Introduction

1. This critique has highlighted, *inter alia*: a) the Chief Justice's improper use of evidence (Miller 1992a, 3); b) his rejection of oral testimony as either hearsay or inadequate to the law (Cruickshank 1992, 28; Culhane 1992, 67); c) his 'scissors-and-paste' decontextualization of documentary history (Fisher 1992b, 45); d) his dismissal of over 1000 pages of contemporary anthropological and ethno-historical research (Cruickshank 1992, 27-8; Culhane 1992, 74-6); and e) his failure to examine his own cross-cultural assumptions (Ridington 1992, 22). Unable to accept that Aboriginal cultures might have their own 'expert witnesses', he effectively forced the plaintiffs to prove in Court what their very presence in that same Court should have already demonstrated: that they actually existed as an independent people (Wilson-Kenni 1992, 9).

2. The Summary of Findings and Conclusions is broken into numbered paragraphs and appears on pages vii through xi of the 394-page judgment. The numerical coding in this abridgement corresponds to those numbered paragraphs. Except where indicated by direct quotes the summary (of the Summary) is in my own words.

3. The defendants cited, *inter alia*: Robert Vaugondy's 1750 *l'Amerique Septentrionale*; Joseph de L'Isle's 1752 *Carte générale des découvertes de l'Amiral de Fonte et autres navigateurs espagnols, anglais et russes...*; G.F. Mueller's 1754 *Nouvelle carte de découvertes faites par des vaisseaux Russiens...*; and Jacques Bellin's 1755 *Carte de l'Amerique Septentrionale* – all of which portray the northwest coast north of the 45th parallel and west of the Hudson's Bay watershed as *terra incoy2ytues* – and Bowen's 1763 map – which was "probably attached by the Board of Trade to the draft of the Royal Proclamation and shows hardly any detail of northwest North America west of Lake Superior..." (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 87). Historical cartographer Albert Farley testified that "it is inconceivable...that the framers of the Proclamation...could have had access to more than a very rudimentary knowledge of this rather remote area" (cited in Monet and Skanu'u 1992, 154). As I shall elaborate below, Farley's contribution to the outcome of the trial is significant.

4. The Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en share with other First Nations the legal opinion that the *Royal Proclamation* is an unequivocal statement of British colonial policy, and that it thus remains binding on the Province via the 1865 *Colonial Laws Validity Act* and on Canada via the 1867 *British North America Act* (Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 74). They argued that the document should be viewed 'prospectively' (i.e. that it applied with equal force to First Nations 'not known' in 1763, but with whom the Crown later became 'connected'). The Court, however, sided with the defendants, who argued that it was less 'treaty' than 'statute' (i.e. it was not an acknowledgment of Aboriginal sovereignty, but a commercial edict restricting private individuals from purchasing Aboriginal land). I shall return to this issue in Chapter Three and the Conclusion.

5. Altogether the plaintiffs submitted 53 territorial affidavits, 30 of which were cross-examined by counsel for the defense. Presumably because of space limitations only five – for the Houses of Gyolugyt, Antgulilbix South, Gwinin Niitxw (all Gitksan), Samooh, and Madik (both Wet'suwet'en) – are reproduced in detail in the judgment.
6. In one instance the Court cited a map prepared by Wet'suwet'en Chiefs for a 1986 All Clans Feast at Moricetown, and which overlapped territories claimed elsewhere by the Carrier-Sekani Tribal Council (*Delgamukw* vs. *A.G.* 1991, 258); and, in another, a Gitksan land claim map (which included the territory around Gitanyow) submitted to the Department of Indian Affairs in 1977, but which contradicted Marvin George's Statement of Claim submission (which excluded it). In short, "the credibility of [the external boundaries] is seriously weakened by earlier, different assertions of ownership or use" (ibid, 264).

7. Using the five territorial affidavits and the associated cross-examinations (see footnote 5, above) the Court sought whatever 'inconsistencies' it could find between pieces of oral, cartographic, genealogical, and historical evidence in order to call into question the 'accuracy', 'reputability', and 'truthfulness' of the individual House boundaries. The Chief Justice accepted, in other words, the Province's 'house-of-cards' theory: namely, that if the boundaries of only five Houses were 'suspect', then so must be the boundaries of every other House adjacent to them.

8. Aside from my own work (Brealey 1995) two exceptions are found in Clayton (1992, 29-59) and Ruggles (1991, 12-3). The former touches on the spatial 're-ordering' of the Coast Tsimshian at the mouth of the Skeena during the contact period, citing, in particular, the 'cartography of power' that helped bring "distant [Aboriginal] regions into the regulatory fold of [colonial] government" (1992, 54); while Ruggles, in his exhaustive survey of the maps of the Hudson's Bay Company, notes the role of the First Peoples in not only the initial reconnaissances of the land-based fur trade, but their subsequent incorporation in the cartographic record. On the one hand Clayton's is the more theoretically informed, but cartography is not the central concern of the paper. Ruggles' contribution, on the other, is almost an aside in a much larger empirical work which is not specific to British Columbia. The Company's activities are so central to the subject of this thesis, however, that I shall find it necessary to engage Ruggles in more depth below.

9. Of a handful of other 'case studies' that do exist I shall be concerned with four: a) Verner's biography of the Arrowsmith Firm (1988, 47-54); b) Lamb's navigation around the charts of George Vancouver (1988, 99-112); c) Sandilands' survey of Admiralty hydrography on the northwest coast (1988, 113-132); and d) Spittle's gazetteer of maps lithographed in New Westminster during the 1860s (1988, 193-204). It should be noted that while they too are all strictly empirical works, it will be their incorporation in this thesis that gives them a context they have so far elided.
Chapter One

On Maps, Territories, and Theatres of Colonization

Ideology per se might well be said to consist primarily in a discourse upon social space (Lefebvre 1991, 44).

The judgment adds considerable substance to David Turnbull's observation that to the extent that "our experience of the world and our representations of it are mutually interdependent...there is a sense in which the two are inseparable..." (1989, 20), and that (for the Chief Justice certainly) "the map is the territory" (ibid, emphasis added). At the same time the map is also a selective (because subjectively drafted) 'surface'; a 'field of spatial practice' upon (and within) which expectations (or future experiences) may be 'imagineered', represented, and possibly mobilized. This suggests that to get to the source of cartographic power we must begin not somewhere on that surface — with some sort of 'deconstruction' of the legends, borders, thematic texts, or symbolic codes — but with the physical artefact proper — as a material 'interlocutor' in a network of multiple cross-cutting (and spatialized) discourses as we actually 'know' and 'live' them. To the extent that it implies a common 'language', the concept of 'workability', or an immersion in a realm of 'junctures' and 'possibilities', the concept of the network is indeed metaphorically suggestive (see, for example, Chambers 1990, 79), but what I have in mind is a network that is in no way adjectival to, but part of, ontology itself.

Theorizing Cartographic Power Networks

It is in this context that I have previously advanced Mann's thesis that 'societies' are constituted by 'overlapping and intersecting sociospatial networks of power' (1986, 1).
The complete account of its implications for, and conceptual osmosis with, cartography and territorial practice is outlined elsewhere (Brealey 1993, 15-50), but I here want to re-emphasize two points. The first is that military, economic, political, or ideological power networks share organizational, geographical, and institutional components which can be identified empirically. Organizationally, social power may be distributive — in which 'fixed quanta' of power are allocated among actors in 'zero-sum' fashion — or collective — in which actors come together to enhance power over nature or other social groups. Geographically, power may be extensive — implying the ability to coerce minimal cooperation amongst actors over large, often discontinuous, territories — or intensive — able to command a high level of commitment from tightly organized groups over large or small, but usually coterminous, domains. Finally, power may be exercised authoritatively — through some sort of 'logical infrastructure' demanding an elevated degree of 'conscious' obedience — or diffusely — through a 'universal(istic) infrastructure' in a more decentered, spontaneous, and 'unconscious' manner. The process by which these networks 'overlap' and 'intersect' with one another — and through which are created the 'junctures' and 'possibilities' for the extension (or, subversion) of them — is called interstitial emergence. I will come back to this point most substantively in Chapter Five and the Conclusion, but suggest for now (if a little crudely) that maps belong to that select class of material artefacts that 'occupy' the interstices of social networks, and which have the potential of effecting interstitial emergence on small, medium, or large scales.

With respect to maps and territorial authority, the second point of re-emphasis is that we are here subscribing to what amounts to a functionalist theory of ideology. This is to acknowledge, on the one hand, that ideology is inevitably a dependent concept,
"construed in the image of the epistemological and historical system within which it functions" (Aronowitz 1988, 146). It is to recognize, on the other, that ideology is more concerned with the forms and strategies of the organizing discourses of social life than it is with the metaphysics of the camera obscura. In Mann's schema, specifically ideological power derives from three spheres: a) the monopolization of the claim to meaning; b) the shared norms of social behaviour; and c) aesthetic/ritual practices. It may be organized into two essential types: a) transcendent — i.e. in the sense that it "generates a 'sacred' form of authority, set apart from and above more secular authority structures" (Mann 1986, 23); and b) immanent morale — i.e. that it intensifies] the cohesion, the confidence, and therefore, the power of an already established social group" (ibid, 24). In what follows I shall have occasion to 'reconfigure' this typology somewhat, but for now it should be enough to reiterate what I suggested at the outset: ideological power networks are inherently territorial, and all territories are, to some extent, ideological constructions.

Objectively, then, maps do not 'do' anything. It is the actors and institutions making them that do the 'doing'. Subjectively, however, maps do 'do' a great deal. They effectively record and transmit the terms of reference — the ideological framework — in which concepts of space and territory (and the cultural discourses connected to them) are formulated, evaluated, rhetoricized, and 'memorized' for subsequent generations. But if maps are 'subjectively objective' they also engage an 'objective subject' (Wood 1992, 23), and especially so in a (colonial) contact situation, where the mapmaker becomes complicit in not only the (geo)politics of territorial (re)organization but the (re)socialization of those who are being 'contacted' (see, also, Orlove 1993, 42). It is at this point, however, that we must reconnoiter, as it were, to the surface of the map. For
while we have established the ontological status of the artefact itself, we are still some distance away from unpacking the question of representation upon which the actual mediation of its ideological power and territorial authority depends, and about which Mann has admittedly very little to say.\(^6\)

**Representing Others**

It is in this context that I now want to turn to Edward Said and retrieve the kernel of his analysis of the cultural force he calls Orientalism, and 'reconstitute' the geography of the 'Other' which he so brilliantly evokes (but never quite 'completes') while doing so.\(^7\) It is a geography that "embodies a systematic discipline of accumulation...of human beings and territories" (Said 1979, 123), and its premise is that the 'Other' has always been such "an integral part of European material civilization and culture" (ibid, 2, emphasis in original) that the colonial 'expert' (politician, academic, scientist, travel writer, etc.) has never been satisfied with merely 'studying' (much less 'understanding') the 'Other' \textit{qua} non-European, but has striven (whether consciously or unconsciously) to secure its \textit{performance}, and, in so doing, enlist its power on the side of his or her own values, interests, and goals (ibid, 238). I am going to suggest that insofar as we have established the centrality of cartography to the maintenance and extension of Western power networks, then \textit{anyone} who makes maps in a colonial situation effectively sets themselves up as one of those 'experts'. To the extent that such maps are necessarily selective, moreover, they also generalize, and in so doing they constitute a kind of 'window' through which the colonized may be both 'contained' and 're-presented' within the geographical world-view of the colonizer (ibid, 40-3).\(^8\) Cartography-as-process is, in
this sense, a kind of *theatrical performance*, one which is operationalized in an 'enclosed' physical space, but whose ideological effects may extend well beyond the boundaries of that space (ibid, 63).

This is a profound metaphor, and I will come back to it again and again in the course of the thesis, but insofar as it carves the prime cut in the epistemological lens referred to in the Introduction, it needs to be justified a little more substantially here. Denis Cosgrove has shown that the metaphor owes its substantive explanatory power to the European Renaissance of the 15th and 16th centuries, a time and place in which the science of optics was considered the key to unlocking the secrets of God's construction of the 'machine of the world' (1990, 344-9). While they eventually found their way into cartography, landscape painting, architecture, and technology, it was in the theatre that the principles of cosmic perfection were most fully represented. The theatre was, on this view, much more than merely 'entertainment'. It was (and to some extent still is) the *conspectus* (literally, the synopsis) that "acted as a paradigm of the entire mode of discourse" (ibid, 350) that defined the Renaissance, including those discourses of the 'Other' that spawned, accompanied, and legitimized the 'export' of Europe to the 'New World'. Cartography came to embody, in other words, the global and international expression of those very themes "of culture and public display" (Berthon and Robinson 1991, 98) that the theatre most capably advanced at the local and intranational levels. In this thesis I want to push this metaphor a little further to suggest that the European and Canadian mapping of First Nations' territories (on the northwest coast or, equally, elsewhere) involved a 'double movement': an ideological networking in which the 'master-slave' relationship was graphically defined first on the level of the stage — i.e. in terms of relative *geographical position* — and subsequently at the level of the
performance — i.e. as a thematization (see, also, Malek, cited in Said 1979, 97).

There are two qualifications to be made about this metaphor. The first is that I shall use the term 'thematization' in its broadest sense. On the one hand, it will suggest a thematic in the sense that cartographers have traditionally understood it; while, on the other, it will imply a discursive continuity in the sense that it reflects an underlying or essential subject of some aesthetic representation. The second is that this stage should not be imagined as some tabula rasa upon which geographies are simply scripted, for this would be the stage of cause-and-effect, the stage upon which imperial history later arises (Carter 1987, xvi). It should be seen, rather, as a stage that is itself in a constant state of flux, even as the actors and their institutions jockey for position upon it. The consequence of this view is essentially this: in the subjective mapping of the objective subject we are no longer circumnavigating social networks only in the domain of spatial metaphor (or territorial 'substitution'), but in the domain of spatial metonymy (or spatial 'displacement') (see, for a different spin on this theme, Bonycastle 1991, 84). It is to recognize, in other words, that metaphor and metonymy are not figures of speech as much as they are activities in space (Lefebvre 1991, 138). For as esoteric as all this talk of maps, ideologies, stages, and performances might be, what is a territorial power network without the actors and institutions that give it life?

It is at this point, then, that I can now defer to Henri Lefebvre in order to retrieve the essence of his architectonics of space, and in so doing not only 'complete' the theoretical scaffolding under construction here, but consummate the 'missing link' to the methodological stratagem of the materialist hermeneutic referred to earlier in the Introduction. All we have to do is what 'real actors' do whenever they use a map: debark, as it were, from its surface, and enter the field of spatial practice itself. In his
theoretical project Lefebvre distinguishes between two general 'typologies' of space: a) representations of space, which are conceptualized spaces — the spaces of scientists, planners, and social engineers — and the dominating spaces in almost all societies; and b) representational spaces, which are experienced spaces — the spaces of buildings, monuments, and cities — and the dominated spaces in almost all societies (Lefebvre 1991, 38-9; but see, also, Harvey 1989, 225). Curiously, Lefebvre devotes very little attention to maps, but to the extent that he does, it is clear that he considers them as consigned to the former. But it is instructive to note that when he does confront the question of what might belong to both the first answer he comes up with is the theatre. For it is in the theater, where spatial 'substitution' and 'displacement' go hand in hand, that corporeal bodies can effectively pass from an immediate (constructed) physical space to an imagined (thematic) symbolic space and back again (Lefebvre 1991, 188).

As I have already argued, however, the 'surface' of the map is also a 'place' where corporeal bodies 'navigate' a space both physical and mental, and if by praxis we mean both conceptual and material practice, then it must be the case that the map as artefact is, like the theatre, a 'bridge' between representations of space and representational spaces. It is a link, in other words, between the dominating and the dominated, and between the imagined and the real.

But Lefebvre's schematic does more than this because it now demands of us a clearer distinction between discourse and ideology; two terms I have used more or less interchangeably up until now, but whose conceptual separation is prerequisite for the materialist hermeneutic. For if representational spaces are the spaces of quotidian discourse — Lefebvre's spaces of lived experience — and if representations of space are the spaces of ideology — Lefebvre's spaces of form and conceptual thought (Lefebvre
1991, 117), it suggests that discourse and ideology are not the same. But if both are part of the field of spatial practice, then neither are they necessarily 'different'. Both identify semiotic processes and involve truth-claims (Purvis and Hunt 1992, 497) and both imply a relation between utterances and statements on the one hand and broader social contexts on the other (Eagleton 1991, 9). The reconciliation of this 'paradox' is, however, fairly straightforward. In this thesis I am going to 'fertilize' Mann's bipartite typology of ideological power with the work of Said and Lefebvre, and in so doing arrive at what I think is the essential point of 'theoretical convergence' between these three authors, however implicit or circuitous that convergence might be. I will return to this convergence again in Chapter Five and the Conclusion, but for now I will suggest that ideology is immanent to a form of life, and form of life is fundamentally about the organization of space (e.g. proprietary, national, colonial, et. al., but also architectural, urban, monumental, etc.). Discourses, however, are immanent to expressions of life, and expressions of life are fundamentally about the organization of practices (linguistic, economic, political, et. al., but also juridical, anthropological, ethnohistorical, etc.) in space. Ideologies are, in this sense, 'supra-discursive' because they proscribe the "conditions of existence of the meanings and subjectivities produced" (Purvis and Hunt 1992, 497) in quotidian discourse. But it is only through their 'embeddedness' in systematic relations of domination, subordination, and 'Otherness', conversely, that quotidian discourse authorizes and reifies the claim(s) to meaning and the sharing of behavioural norms within a given social formation. Discourse and ideology are simultaneities; each begets the other (see, also, Lefebvre 1972, 25-8).

The 'theoretical proposition' that enframes this thesis can now be summarized. The map, by virtue of its positioning in (and of) a power network of junctures, gaps, and
possibilities, constitutes the field of spatial practice upon (and within) which actors and institutions — their collective accumulated past experiences constantly 'pre-interpreting' a constellation of possible futures — extends (or subverts) that network. In "mak[ing] the past and future present" (Wood 1992, 7) it is (inter alia) the map that 'converts' raw, absolute, corporeal space into authorized, organized, and socially controlled territories. But when cultural trajectories are in collision — as they are in a contact situation — it is the concatenation of discourses on the objective subject represented on the surface of the map that donates to ideology its substantive coercive content, and which facilitates the 'reconfiguration' of an existing territorial power network within the interstitial pores of another. At the same time, however, I want to emphasize that this thesis will employ this proposition in a comparatively 'unstructured' manner. Indeed, each of the three authors I have hitherto traced are operating at the 'perimeter of theory' to begin with, and if there is just a ghost of Foucault in all of this that is probably because there should be (see, for example, Cousins and Hussain 1984, 1-15). Ideological power networks are, after all, 'open-ended', and it is important to remember that while we may be able to justify their conceptual separation from military, political, and economic power networks, we can never really do so in practice. Theory per se should obviously be substantive enough to allow one to make lucid some set of phenomena (or noumena), but to the extent that it does it should be judged less by its internal coherence than its utility in doing so. In any event, I am primarily concerned in this thesis with the way maps and plans create, sustain, and legitimize a form of life, and the study of forms is not concerned at all with theoretical closure. It is "fundamentally and inescapably a matter of understanding and interpretation" (Thompson 1990, 274, emphasis added).
The Materialist Hermeneutic on the Northwest Coast

This line of thinking we owe to the tradition of hermeneutics, a 'method' of textual analysis first developed in the classical world, but which, in the contemporary human sciences, is concerned with the interpretation and clarification of meaning more generally (see Gregory 1986). It is in this context that I think hermeneutics provides the methodological blueprint that will allow us to circumnavigate the territorial atlas under consideration in this thesis, but since we are more concerned with the forms (ideologies) within and upon which meaning, behavioural norms, and aesthetic practices (discourses) are interpreted and clarified, it first has to be freed from the idealist instrumentalism of the Geisteswissenschaften that has hitherto prevented its employment in a materialist critique (Pickles 1992, 223). As it turns out however, this is precisely the starting point for what John Thompson has called the interpretive transformation of doxa, the interpretation "of the opinions, beliefs, and understandings which are held and shared by the individuals who comprise the social world" (1990, 279), but which are nonetheless embedded in wider socio-historical and ideological contexts. It is to examine the ways in which meaning serves to sustain relations of domination and 'Otherness' (ibid, 146), even as those relations constitute the "structural features of symbolic forms which facilitate the mobilization of meaning" (ibid, 292) in the first place. Thompson's methodological project 'begins' from the primordial and unavoidable starting point of quotidian discourse, but it only 'ends' with an analysis of the conditions of discursive production (the symbolic forms) which 'pre-interpret' such discourse. The consequence of this approach is that explanation and objectification conjoin with interpretation as complementary terms in a "unique hermeneutical art" (ibid, 278). This is the essence of
what Thompson calls *depth hermeneutics*, but which I am going to call instead the *materialist hermeneutic*.

To some extent, this 'redefinition' is largely a matter of semantics, but I differentiate myself from Thompson for two reasons, both of which are related. On the one hand it is clear from Thompson's conceptual language that ideology and ideological analysis are understood in primarily *aspatial* terms, and if Lefebvre and Mann have shown us anything it is that ideology is fundamentally about the organization of *space*. While he acknowledges early on that the conditions of discursive production include the "spatio-temporal location of action and interaction" (ibid, 135), his subsequent accounting of ideology is virtually devoid of any references to space or territory. On the other it is clear that specifically *textual* discourses loom large in Thompson's reading of discourse analysis. To the extent that hermeneutics grew out of a concern with establishing the 'proper meaning' of written texts in the first place this is perhaps to be expected, but the discourses of *modernity* are, as I will illustrate, as much *visual* and *graphic* as they are textual. What I do want to retrieve intact from Thompson, however, is his focus on the role of *technical media* in social (re)production, because under conditions of social modernity it is these media which endow symbolic forms with "a certain degree of fixation, a certain kind of reproducibility, and a certain scope for participation among the subjects who employ the medium" (ibid, 238). For is this not precisely what maps, charts, and plans do?

As far as this thesis is concerned, in other words, it is these media themselves that will provide the major part of the 'data base' for the materialist hermeneutic. Indeed, to the extent that *maps* are an 'interface' in the field of spatial practice there is certainly more than a sense in which they do effect interstitial emergences which are virtually
'self-networking', and, on this account, can almost 'stand alone' while doing so. The problem with confining ourselves to only these media, however, is that we then end up with reductionist theses and dissertations (or, for that matter, judicial decisions) which objectify everything, but explain nothing. But as I have argued cartographies do (and require) much more than merely this, and especially so when cultural trajectories are in collision. For they are always contextualized within a wider socio-historical and geopolitical domain "constituted as much by force as by meaning" (ibid, 278), and if a cartographic artefact "displays a distinctive pattern through which something is said" (ibid) about an objective 'Other' it is only because it is map authors and readers who say so. The materialist hermeneutic as employed here travels, in other words, 'beyond' the surface of the map (or plan) and into the field of spatial practice proper, where ideology conflates with discourse to construct territorial authorities in particular, and claims to geographic 'reality' more generally. It still views the artefact as its own ontological 'entry point', but it remains constantly and insistently aware that this is but one point (if a particularly sharp one) in a wider open-ended sociospatial power network created, sustained, and reified by persons or social groups in pursuit of certain goals and defence of certain interests. This means that within the limits proscribed by the length of the thesis I will also have to be concerned with inter alia: a) the voyage logs of (and royal instructions to) George Vancouver and the British Admiralty; b) the journals and letters of (and royal instructions to) the Hudson's Bay and North West Company fur traders and 'explorers'; c) the colonial dialogues between the surveyors, the commissioners of lands and works, the governors of both crown colonies, and the Colonial Office, the majority of which are taken from the Papers Connected With the Indian Land Question 1850-1875; d) the letters and memoranda of the Indian Reserve Commissioners and officials in
the Department of Indian Affairs, some of which are 'personal communications', but the
majority of which are sourced in the 1871-1916 Annual Reports of the Department of
Indian Affairs; d) the logs, writings, drawings, and paintings of governmental and non-
governmental territorial actors in pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial British
Columbia; and e) the 1916 Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Affairs for the
Province of British Columbia.

This leads me to offer two last 'methodological caveats' before re(tracing) the
territorial atlas under consideration here. The first is to admit at the outset that the atlas
will be (re)traced almost exclusively from the standpoint of Euro-Canadians, and to
acknowledge freely the inherent 'one-sidedness' of my own analysis. In part, this is a
necessary consequence of the nature of the 'data base' itself; much of the First Peoples'
oral history has not survived, and while they did sometimes make 'map-like' artefacts
(usually at the request of Europeans), they were not mapmakers in a modern sense, if by
'making' we are implying a true 'map consciousness' that necessarily accompanies it.
More importantly, however, I am not seeking to interpret and understand the 'spatial
information fields' of the Aboriginal Peoples in their own right, even less a comparison
between their own and those of the Euro-Canadians (even though such a comparison
does emerge, as it were, 'out the back door'). I am seeking, rather, to explicate the way
in which the one was used over and against the other in what was, by definition, an
asymmetrical power equation to begin with. I will come back to this point in substance
in Chapter Five, except to suggest here that if the First Peoples own territorial strategies
(appear to) play a marginal role in this thesis, it is not because they were so in practice,
but because that role must be 'teased out' in the course of the (re)trace itself. In short,
the empirical 'evidence' used in this thesis is almost exclusively European and Canadian
archival, but engaging it as I will below ought to be enough to: a) preserve the integrity of meaning these maps "must have had for those for whom [they were drawn]" (Pickles 1992, 225, emphasis added); b) elucidate the interconnections between the map artefact (as an ideological form) and the map author/reader (as a discursive agent); and c) not compromise the sensitivities and nuances of the understanding I seek to interpret.

The second is that when I am actually engaged in this (re)trace it is my intention to dialogue in the present tense. If this somehow 'interrupts' the narrative flow of the thesis itself, then so be it. On the one hand I want to consciously avoid the tendency to lapse into historicism, because it is precisely this lapse that has objectified the 'frozen' view of Aboriginal rights that permeates contemporary judicial reasoning (Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 41). On the other I want to reiterate that while I am more concerned to elucidate and understand the atlas's (ideological) form than the discourses contained in its plates, such "forms find their historical meaning not in some abstract configuration of lives and language but rather in the experience of particular communities" (Helgerson 1991, 124, emphasis added). The unity of the materialist hermeneutic resides not simply "in the unity of a procedure which is applicable to any object and any practice capable of bearing a meaning" (Connerton 1989, 96). It also depends on the added qualification that there are certain objects and practices which 'transcend' contemporaneity while doing so. The maps and mapmakers of imperialism and colonialism may no longer be with us in a corporeal sense, but it is the continuity of their formation(s) in today's discourse(s) that effectively amounts to the same thing. In short I want to 'insert' myself as much as possible in the very (territorial) experiences I am trying to empathize, and in so doing, find that "middle path between dogmatism on the one hand and the abdication of understanding on the other" (Lefebvre 1991, 65). I
only ask that readers bear in mind two things: a) that while I intend to let the maps and plans 'speak for themselves' (which, of course, they never do!) it is their ideological positioning in (and of) the process of territorialization that is significant; and b) that while my selection of map artefacts is 'selective', it is not arbitrary. The maps chosen are representative of entire 'genres' of map artefacts made in different (synchronous and diachronic) historical 'epochs' and (cross-cut by) alternative socio-political contexts. I shall identify and paradigmitize a number of such genres en route to 1916, by which time Euro-Canadian cartography has effectively "served to dispossess [the First Nations of the northwest coast] by engulfing them with blank spaces" (Harley 1992, 531).
Footnotes to Chapter One

1. In its *barest* essentials Mann's thesis is that "a general account of societies, their structure, and their history can best be given in terms of the interrelations of...the four sources of social power: ideological, economic, military, and political relationships" (1986, 2), and whose unifying force is restless, purposive, human nature. Prinacy does not come from 'motivation' alone, however, because all actors operate in a field of existing social relations which have 'emergent' properties of their own. On this view, 'societies' are neither 'unitary', 'evolutionary', or necessarily 'diffusionary'. They are networks of interaction and organized institutional creations. As I will illustrate in the thesis, 'accidental conjunctures' in particular historical and ecological contexts play a major role in cross-cultural convergence or divergence (see, also, Ashworth 1987, 426-9). For a concise comparison of the 'meta-theoretical' systems of Mann, Giddens, Foucault, and Habermas see Harris (1991, 671-83).

2. Richard Helgerson has evoked a similar argument in his brilliant dissection of the literary, legal, cartographic, theatrical, exploratory, and ecclesiastical discourses that collectively 'wrote' 16th century England (1992, 13-6). His conceptual language is somewhat different than mine, but the parallels are clear; in any network (or set of 'overlapping' and 'intersecting' discourses) there are always key (paradigmatic) artefacts (texts, works of art, maps, etc.) or actors (writers, artists, cartographers, etc.) that weave them together. I shall return to this theme again in the course of the thesis.

3. By no means am I suggesting that ideology is not often about domination or 'falsity'; indeed it usually is. But ideologies need to be more than this if they have any hope of securing allegiance from social actors. Successful (ruling) ideologies must, to some extent, naturalize, universalize, and 'dehistoricize' if they are to guide interests and goals, but they can never do so independently of the language(s) or institution(s) used to advance them (see, for example, Eagleton 1991, 206-23). I certainly want to save the entire concept of ideology from its perjorative reductionist framework, but not at the expense of losing its critical edge.

4. As should be apparent, Mann makes no secret of his hostility to Marxism, but his parallel to Gramsci is unmistakable. In equating hegemony with a 'war of position' Gramsci opens up to critical analysis not only the question of power in general, but the role of institutions in exerting it in particular (see Mouffe 1979, 185-201). He also 'understands' ideology in 'territorial' terms; i.e. as "the terrain on which men move, acquire consciousness of their position [and] struggle..." (ibid, 185).

5. One of the added 'benefits' of this account is that it restores the concept of territory to the center of geographical analysis without our having to enter the thorny garden of theorizing it in epistemological terms. I think this goes a long way to explaining why we have to go back to Ratzel's *Politische Geographie*, de la Blache's *France de l'Est*, and Mackinder's *Democratic Ideals and Reality* for the most sustained engagements with the politics of space and territory by geographers (Gregory 1990, 59; but see Gottman 1971). The contemporary exception, perhaps, is Bob Sack, who has defined territoriality as "the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people,
phenomena, and relationships by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area" (1986, 19). As Soja has noted, however, Sack never works out a satisfactory ontology of territoriality (1989, 150). Indeed, he cannot do so since he never seriously grapples with the centrality of maps in creating it. In part I think this is because Sack is a little careless with his suffixes; he is really talking more about the socio-cultural forces that constitute territorialism than he is about the geographical 'experience' that is territoriality. Sack's contribution is paradigmatic to the extent that he excises 'territoriality' from the confines of biological instinct, but beyond that it is a theoretical dead end because it has nothing substantive to say about the process and strategies of territorialization proper.

6. It is true that Mann fails to give an adequate account of precisely how moral and/or cultural systems intersect and overlap in the construction of meaning, norms, and aesthetic/ritual practices (Turner 1987, 155). He does not, for example, develop a satisfactory theory of either ethnology or nationalism (Ashworth 1987, 428), and he has nothing to say about the impact of science on the organization of more 'advanced' societies. As I have suggested previously, however, his historical and geographical scope is so capacious that it would probably be unrealistic to expect him to 'cover everything' (Brealey 1993, 39). It is when his schematic is adapted to empirical case studies that these elements have to be brought into the equation – as I do in this thesis.

7. Said defines Orientalism as that particular late 18th and 19th century institution developed in Europe for dealing with the 'Other', by "making statements about it, authorizing views of it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it" (1979, 3). To the extent that it suggests a geographic imbalance of power – manifested and organized by territorial actors in pursuit of goals and defence of interests – there are some clear parallels to Mann. The difference is that Said unpacks what Mann's Eurocentrism tends to gloss over: the appropriating, dominating, and specifically colonial discourses of ethnicity, nationalism, and techno-science (see footnote 6, above) that help create, contour, and sustain that imbalance.

8. Long before historical cartographers found it fashionable, Yi-Fu Tuan made this same point, sourcing the representation of territory in cultural ethnocentricity. Anticipating Said's argument he stated that "the illusion of superiority and centrality is necessary to the sustenance of culture" (1974, 32), and he recognized that after the Renaissance Europe defined its own culture as much by its physical and social distance from Asia and the Americas as it did by self-introspection. Curiously, however, he went on to suggest that "the Europocentric viewpoint is not often expressed cartographically" (ibid, 42), a conclusion that is simply not supported by the evidence.

9. Renaissance cartography is filled with theatrical metaphors. Abraham Ortelius called his seminal 1570 compendium of 53 copperplates and 35 pages of supporting text the Theatrum Orbis Terrarum and Maurice Bouguereau called his 1594 regional atlas of France Le Theatre Francais. Jan Blaeu never completed his New Theatre of the Towns of the Entire World, but he did manage, circa 1660, to finish his hemispheric mosaic on the floor of the Amsterdam town hall, where Dutch burghers, in true theatrical fashion, could literally "wander freely around...the symbol of a world shaped, possessed, and exploited by the nations of Europe" (Berthon 1991, 99). And there are literally scores
of 16th, 17th, and 18th century European maps in which the borders are an illustrative mezzanine of non-European peoples in various theatrical poses (usually kowtowing before Europeans of course) and idealized styles of dress (see, for example, figure 9). The metaphor is prevalent in the English Renaissance as well. John Speed titled his 1612 atlas the *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine* and Helgerson has already shown how Shakespeare not only wrote his 'national history plays' precisely at the same time as Speed's predecessor Chris Saxton was drafting England's first 'estate atlas', but had them performed in the Globe Theatre to boot (1991, 197-9). In point of fact, the allegory between theatre and map pre-dates even the Renaissance (see, for example, Tomasch 1992, 82-6).

10. It is impossible to do justice to Lefebvre in the short space allotted to me here. In *La Production de l'Espace* he ranges through art, literature, architecture, economics, and Marx in an attempt to reconcile mental and physical space, the spaces of theory and practice, and the spaces of philosophy and reality (for a concise summary see Molotch 1993, 887-95). To the extent that he 'forces' the reader to synchronously 'negotiate' a number of divergent traces it lacks the 'directedness' of a Mann or Said, and it contains a number of generalizations which are never clearly articulated. I would still argue, however, that there can be no sustained engagement with the politics of space and territory without a serious engagement with Lefebvre. In this thesis I shall concern myself with only two of his insights: a) the architectonics of space, which disclose the transmutations between the 'absolute space' of the corporeal body and the 'abstract space' of social modernity; and b) his distinction between 'representational spaces' and 'representations of space', and its implications for ideological and discursive analyses.

11. It should be noted that in Lefebvre's schema, these two 'typologies' are part of a conceptual triad, whose third component is 'spatial practice'. Lefebvre also considers 'representation' to comprise the broader conceptual category within which 'ideology' is subsumed. Indeed, if ideology has in fact lost its critical edge (see footnote 3 above) it is precisely because ideology means nothing without a space (territory) to which it is referential (Lefebvre 1991, 44-5). I cover these, if in somewhat different terms. In some sense Lefebvre struggles with the same question(s) that preoccupied Mann: if cultures produce distinctive 'spaces' (Mann's territories), and these spaces embrace a number of 'intersections' (Mann's interstices), then exactly what is it that 'occupies' the intersections? (ibid 1991, 33). As we shall see, Lefebvre arrives at his answer by a rather different trace, but it is essentially the same answer nonetheless.

12. Dilthey, Heidegger, and, Gadamer have been the theoreticians most responsible for highlighting the importance of *verstehen* in the contemporary human sciences, but it was perhaps Gadamer who drew the most explicit link between the 'historicity of experience' and discourse (see Thompson 1990, 275-7). He argued, for example, that every presentation (even a 'distorted' one) of a picture or work of art is a repetition "as original as the work itself" (Gadamer 1989, 122), and that in retaining "an indissoluble connection with its world" (ibid, 144), it "shares in what it represents" (ibid, 153). The echo to my argument concerning the map's 'ontological valence' is unmistakable, but Gadamer never acknowledged that these historical experiences could sometimes obfuscate or occlude the terms of reference that 'pre-interpreted' them. The German school released hermeneutics from the confines of scholasticism in order to embrace the understanding,
reflecting, and acting author/reader/interpreter, but in failing to extend it to a critique of ideology, it remained forever subjectivist.

13. There are actually three 'strata' to Thompson's methodological framework. The first is socio-historical, and includes discrete analyses of spatio-temporal settings, fields of interaction, social institutions, social structure, and technical media of transmission. It is the concatenation of these elements that constitutes the conditions of discursive production. The second is formal or discursive, and includes semiotic, conversational, syntactical, narrational and argumentative analyses. It is the concatenation of these elements that comprise discourses proper (1990, 281-8). The third is the interpretive process itself, a process which is always, in part, a 're-interpretation', and so prone to reductionism or tautology if the elements of the first two strata should be somehow 'misinterpreted'. It will not be necessary to invoke this level of detail in the thesis, however.

14. Benjamin Orlove has already observed that any sustained investigation of the manner in which maps and plans author(ize) different 'reality claims' inevitably involves a parallel movement: a) the analysis of form, which is to study the ways in which people 'draw' maps; and b) the analysis of practice, the study of the ways in which people 'draw on' maps (1993, 29-30). But if Orlove arrived at the same convergence that I have he did so entirely through the methods of ethnology and ethnohistory, a trace that emphasizes (b) at the expense of (a), and which is thus incapable of positing quotidian (modern) experience in ideological terms (see, in this connection, Lefebvre 1971).
Chapter Two

Setting the Stage: Cartographies of the New Imperialists

Thus navigators going on voyages of discovery, furnished with a commission from their sovereign, and meeting with islands or other lands in a desert state have taken possession of them in the name of their nation: and this title has been usually respected, provided it was soon after followed by a real possession (de Vattel 1863, 98).

In 1793, however, George Vancouver and Alexander Mackenzie are concerned with a 'blank space' of a rather different kind: the *terra inconnues* of northwestern North America/Turtle Island, virtually the last portion of the western hemisphere to be reconnoitered and mapped by European imperialism. Their territorial stage is, for all intents and purposes, the 'theoretical cartographies' of, *inter alios*, Vaugondy, Bellin, de L'Isle, and Mueller, but their field of spatial practice is that particularly 'Anglicized' discursive arena that hovers somewhere 'between' the older, relatively 'unorganized' Elizabethan geography of Richard Hakluyt, John Dee, and Sir Francis Drake and the more recent, 'organized' Georgian empire of James Cook, Alexander Dalrymple and the independent maritime fur traders. Like those whose traces they are following, both men are children of the Enlightenment, an ideologically transcendent cultural trajectory that envisions global space as a mathematically knowable totality (Harvey 1989, 245-6), and which bespeaks rational human control over the natural and social worlds. At a more immanent authoritative level, however, they are the 'leading edge' of an extensive, if distributive, imperial power network that has been expanding outward from its trans-Atlantic metropole at about 250,000 km² per annum (Eldridge 1973, 23), and whose current institutional anchor in London, England is a quadrate of the Colonial Office, the British Admiralty, the Royal Society, and English mercantile interests. Converging on the
northwest coast 'for king and country' they are to substantiate a precarious claim to sovereignty on the one hand, and investigate the region's economic and commercial potential on the other. In brief, these men make their maps and charts according to the imperatives of a geometric (and geopolitical) territorial ideology and for specifically English material purposes. In itself, this is perhaps unremarkable. But insofar as these maps serve to network a stage from which others will eventually inaugurate their own performances, they are also subverting. For even as their authors strive to 'make' one geography become, they are 'unmaking' another.

Constructing the Imperial Grid

Out of King's Lynn in April 1791 with the latest and best scientific measuring equipment George Vancouver is now in the middle stanza of a three year undertaking to chart the northwest coast between Baja California in the south and Cook Inlet in the north. He is riding the crests and swells of an extensive, but diffused, oceanic military power network, and he is as impressed by the sublime grandeur of the landscape as he is concerned to avoid conflict with those who live there. As evidenced in the almost exquisite detail with which he measures and charts one of the world's most convoluted coastlines, his surveying and navigational skills are beyond question, but there is nonetheless something unsettling about the professional detachment of his cartographic record. It is certainly not the case that this record is somehow devoid of human (social) content. On the contrary, his charts represent an intensely personal engagement in which the naming of coastal features applies a genealogy that creates for him (and those who will follow in his trace) the discursive space in which to move, and, in so doing, captures the specificity of the historical and geographical experience that is 'exploration' in the first
place (Carter 1987, 4-7). In superimposing this genealogy, moreover, he does not restrict himself to canvassing the lineages of English royalty, naval colleagues, or even his own family. He is certainly unwilling to trust the accuracy of surveys not of his own making, but in complying with the royal instructions to "make to [any Spanish commander] reciprocally, a free and unreserved communication of all plans and charts of discoveries made by you or him [on] your respective voyages" (cited in Lamb 1988, 105), he shows no such reluctance in retaining Spanish toponyms.

What is striking, however, is that he does not extend this 'courtesy' to the coastal peoples, for on none of the sectionals that are eventually published in the 1798 folio atlas titled *A Chart shewing part of the Coast of N.W. America...* (figure 1) are there any textual or graphic references to the Aboriginal occupants whatsoever. Vancouver's ethnographic curiosity is perfunctory to begin with (Fisher 1992a, 32) and it is true that as part of his diplomatic duties he is only instructed to record the number, extent, and location of any and all European settlements within survey limits (Lamb 1988, 107). But given that he has served under Cook (on Cook's second and third voyages), that he has already come in frequent contact with the First Peoples of the northwest coast, and that much of the diplomatic manoeuvring for which he is typically best remembered occurs while a guest of Nuu'chah'nulth Chief Maquinna at Nootka Sound the previous year, his lack of cartographic interest in the land settlement patterns of the 'Other' is salient. Vancouver's rendering as 'absence' (see, in this connection, Shields 1992, 192) the *terra incognita* that stretches beyond the coastal trace is not only an act of spatial *metonymy* (or 'horizontal' displacement) on a (sub)continental scale, but is the perfect territorial *metaphor* (or 'vertical' substitution) for a corporeal lack of interest in filling the 'blank spaces' within his
Figure 1

Plate 17 from George Vancouver's *A Chart shewing part of the Coast of N.W. America*, London 1798; summarizes the surveys of his first (1792) season during which he established the insularity of Vancouver Island. It is by no means coincidental that these charts were eventually published in atlas form. As Wood has argued, atlases are made not simply to increase the visual tidiness of the plates, but to make of their collective juxtaposition *something larger than the individual maps can be* (1987, 29), a point I will come back to in the Conclusion. Vancouver may have rendered the continental land mass as a 'blank space', but he did give it a name, and in so doing not only 'displaced' those who were already there, but created a field that, for him, was "active, locating future histories" (Carter 1987, 24). (British Columbia Archives and Records Services, Map Collection, CMX10)
Figure 2

Section from Dionisio Galiano's and Cayetano Valdez's *Carte Esferica de los reconocimientos hechos en 1792 en la Costa N.O. de America*, San Blas (?) 1792; delineates the Spanish surveys 'pirated' (and 'published') by Vancouver. Although these maps lacked the discursive detail of Vancouver's portfolio the similarities in graphic form and the subjectification of an objective subject as 'absence' are self-evident. For each (European) nation the representational challenge of 'undelimited spaces' were the same: "either dismiss them as unknown...bits of *terra incognita*, or incorporate them as territories not yet known but still definable in their potentiality by inclusion through graphic visualization" (Tomasch 1992, 79). (British Columbia Archives and Records Services, Map Collection, CM/A176)
own knowledge horizon. In Vancouver's (human and physical) geography the continental land mass remains a tabula rasa, even if it is one now bounded by science.

In retrospect one might provisionally accept the argument that the Spanish presence on the northwest coast was, discursively speaking, a more benign and empathetic one than the British (see, for example, Archer 1981, 37-65; but also Green and Dickason 1989, 185; and Fieldhouse 1982, 28). But insofar as the cartographies of both subscribe to (and extend the networks of) an Enlightenment ideology which proclaims the 'Other' as a landlocked (and 'landless') nomad in 'desert lands' just awaiting the assertion of dominiun by positive prescription, they are as identical as they are mutually reinforcing (compare, for example, figures 1 and 2). As far as acknowledging the territorial rights of non-Europeans are concerned, in other words, the First Peoples of the northwest coast are, for Vancouver and the British Admiralty, as well as the Spanish, at best merely an inconvenience, at worst a non-entity. This is not to say, of course, that in conceptually 'emptying' the western cordillera of its original occupants, Vancouver dispenses with their physical presence as well. What he does do, rather, is interstitially 'emerge' a field of spatial practice within and upon which alternative (and increasingly 'directed') geographies of the 'Other' may now be networked – from either side of the coastal interface. The irony is that Vancouver has no idea that such a performance is already well underway long before his atlas even sees the light of day in England.

Out of Stornoway in 1774, by way of New York and Montreal, Alexander Mackenzie is on the last leg of the second of two attempts at completing "the favourite project of [his] own ambition" (cited in Lamb 1970, 57). He is riding the ridges and furrows of an extensive, if diffuse, economic power network and he is as compelled by "the magnificent theatre of nature [and] all the decorations that the trees and animals of
the country can afford it" (cited in Armstrong 1982, plate 37, emphasis added) as he is concerned to make peace with those "small bands of wandering Indians" (cited in Lamb 1970, 58) who are already there. He is the first non-Aboriginal actor to cross the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean north of Mexico, and he 'misses' an encounter with George Vancouver in Nuxalk territory by a mere six weeks. Like Vancouver he carries no professional artist, but, unlike his seafaring counterpart, his trace involves — in fact depends on — much closer contact with the 'Other', and it is virtually inevitable that his cartographic record will add visual substance to his (rather ambivalent) comment that the First Nations on the "coasts of the Pacific Ocean, where the villages are permanent, and the inhabitants in a great measure stationary...are the only people [that he] shall introduce to the acquaintance of [his] readers" (ibid, emphasis added).

The map that substantively tenders this introduction is Aaron Arrowsmith's Map of America...Exhibiting Mackerzie's Track, first published in 1801 (figure 3), and then subsequently updated and revised (and retitled) in 1802, 1814, 1824 (figure 4), 1832, and 1837 as the 'discoveries' of Fraser, Thompson, Lewis and Clark, and the Northwest Company and Hudson's Bay Company fur brigaders are incorporated into the original rendition. The 1801 edition is the earliest known prototype of an entire genre of early 19th century maps that effectively 'position' a northwest coast First Nation — in this case those we now know as the Nuxalk and Southern Carrier First Nations — within an European geopolitical frame of reference, and which substantially converts Vancouver's 'absence' into a 'presence' at the same time. As far as the subjective mapping of an objective subject is concerned, in other words, this map constructs a distinctly 'modern' territorial stage even as the 'primitive' is assuming its role upon it. But to the extent that this role is more a function of the cross-cultural discourses of contact proper than it is of
Figure 3

Detail from Aaron Arrowsmith's *Map of America, between Latitudes 40 and 70 North and Longitudes 45 and 180 West, Exhibiting Mackenzie's Track...*, London 1801; the first cartographic staging of a First Nation west of the Rocky Mountains and north of Mexico within an European geographical framework. If Vancouver's chart(s) constituted the 'frontispiece' of the territorial atlas of dispossession on the northwest coast, then this map was surely Chapter One, 'contouring', as it did, the field of spatial practice upon (and within) which all subsequent territorial acts would be based. Certainly Mackenzie entertained few doubts about the geopolitical or commercial significance of this map, which "by unfolding countries hitherto unexplored [he presumes] may now be considered as part of the British dominions" (cited in Lamb 1970, 60, emphasis added). (British Columbia Archives and Records Services, Map Collection, CMIB116)
Figure 4

Detail from Aaron Arrowsmith's *Map Exhibiting all the New Discoveries in the Interior Parts of North America...*, London 1824; names the various First Nations, locates some of their villages, and includes (gendered) census data. There is no better illustration of late 18th century European 'imaginings' in the northeastern Pacific theatre than the name Mackenzie gave to the settlement at the head of Bentinck Arm: 'Village of the Rascals'. The Arrowsmith firm may have come "into existence at the time when map making was becoming a more exact science" (Verner 1988, 54), but it depends entirely on what kind of science one is talking about. Mackenzie himself held the firm in the highest esteem, writing "[Aaron's] professional abilities are well known, and no encomium of mine will advance the general and merited opinion of [him]" (cited in Lamb 1970, 59). (British Columbia Archives and Records Services, Map Collection, CMM10)
a reconfiguration of territorial form per se, it is less an act of spatial metonymy than it is of metaphorical substitution. The ability to identify, situate, and represent the 'Other' is a strategic advantage in any encounter, of course, and there is no doubt that the Colonial Office, the chartered companies, and the learned societies would have seen Arrowsmith's map in that light. It is true that it is constructed at such a small scale that its quotidian field utility would have been extremely limited – in that time and place the Thunderbird arguably still holds the balance of territorial power – but I would still suggest that it is with this particular map that England is able, for the first time, to take conceptual possession of the 'desert lands' (and the 'bands of wandering Indians' within them) that lie between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Ocean.

The same cannot be said, however, of the 1824 edition (figure 4), by which time Arrowsmith has networked Fraser and Thompson more fully into the field of spatial practice – a theme I will elaborate on momentarily – and where other less 'neutral' classificatory discourses of the 'Other' – enumerative, racial, and gendered among them – have by now made their appearance. Here, the representational rhetoric is certainly more strident, but again, in 1824, it is probably intended less as ulterior design on the subject(s) being mapped than as a convenient way to differentiate an hitherto abstract homogenous space into more manageable territorial units. It is, rather, in these maps' commitment to a fixed medium, and their acquiring a corporeally independent existence while doing so, that the substantive ideological work is performed, and a real territorial appropriation takes place. Mackenzie only reaches the Pacific, after all, by traversing the Nuxalk-Carrier 'grease trail', a proto-historic trade route between the coast and the Fraser River which he probably would have missed had the Carriers not directed him to it. While this genre of maps suggests that a European imperial state is being parachuted into a 'peopleless'
wilderness, the reality is that the one is being grafted onto another which is already there. In short, the Arrowsmith maps deny half their own birthright, and in so doing an Aboriginal territorial network – sustained across the generations by purposeful bodily activity – is effectively 'incorporated' (through a sort of 'reversed' interstitial emergence) into an European 'grid of modernity' – which can be maintained at a distance, cartographically. Whether Mackenzie really believed that "the whole of this country will long continue in the possession of its present inhabitants" (cited in Lamb 1970, 411) or not, Arrowsmith's maps constitute a cartographic tradition which has precisely the opposite effect. Through a toponymic 'staging' of the First Nations of the northwest coast, British sovereignty is asserted at the farthest periphery of imperial power just as surely as if they had marched in and taken it by force.¹⁰

The Mercantilist Space Economy

The ability to 'decouple' itself from its authorial network and interstitially open up a discursive space 'in between' is, as I have argued, a feature of all map artefacts. How that space is filled, however, still depends on material context, and in the increasingly 'crowded' cross-cultural quarters of New Caledonia – the territorial theatre that is Vancouver's and Mackenzie's legacy – three qualitatively different, yet indissoluble, cartographic representations of – and three qualitatively different, yet indissoluble, discursive communities on – the First Peoples can now be (net)worked out. All of them find their genesis in the field of spatial practice constructed by the Arrowsmith maps proper, but each negotiates a rather different (if sometimes parallel) trace within it. For when these maps are apprehended diachronically, as 'chapters' in a territorial atlas, at least
two of these representational themes are immediately invoked. The first is that beginning with the 1832 edition, the empirical information that positions and classifies the First Peoples of the northwest coast—which is so evident in the 1824 version (figure 4) illustrated here—begins to decrease. It is not simply that the small scale of these maps physically prohibits the representation of more and more 'social data' (although it certainly does). It is that as Hudson's Bay and North West Company voyageurs interstitially consolidate the economic power networks of the land-based fur trade—and return more and more of their own toponymic or topographic data to the cartographer(s) while doing so—it is no longer necessary, or even desirable, to go to the Aboriginal populations for it. With the establishment of Forts Alexandria (Soda Creek, 1821), Langley (Langley, 1827), Chilcotin (Chilanko Forks, 1829), Simpson (Nass River, 1831), and McLoughlin (Bella Bella, 1833), in other words, a territory hitherto seized primarily in ideology is now being appropriated materially.11 I am not here suggesting that the Hudson's Bay Company did not make maps—on the contrary, their cartographic output is nothing short of exhaustive—but that the maps they do make (in the first third of the 19th century in the western cordillera anyway) are drawn on a much larger scale than anything which precedes them, and yet seem to share no consistent representational pattern or stylistic convention(s) except one of complete 'fragmentation'.12

The complete (empirical) survey of this record is found in Ruggles (1991), but I here want to emphasize (and contextualize) a couple of points. Until very late in its colonial tenure the Company has no official surveyor, cartographer, geographer, or map librarian. Their mapmakers are mostly fur traders, corporate clerks, or tradespersons with little or no scientific or cartographic training (ibid, 11). The maps they make are almost exclusively manuscript maps—i.e. not intended for publication—they are drawn on all different kinds
of media – i.e. everything from animal hides to linen, to birchbark, and paper – and they are stored in different repositories – if they are stored at all. They are made on an ad hoc basis to facilitate "making decisions about trading strategy, transport routing, and the movement of goods [and to provide] the locational and spatial information necessary to the development of an inland trading system" (ibid, 3). What these maps do share with their small-scale (Arrowsmith) progeny, however – and which explains why they seem to share no consistent representational pattern or stylistic convention other than one of 'fragmentation' – is that their 'data bases' are in large measure retrieved from the First Nations (see, also, Lewis 1993). Indeed, the First Peoples contribute far more to the Company's overall cartographic record – and hence to the geography of western Canada – than they are given credit for (then or now). It must be remembered, however, that they are viewed by Company personnel primarily as 'economic objects' (Clayton 1992, 39), and if they are not represented in that record (Ruggles 1991, 9) it is certainly because their "habits of mind, attitudes and way of life [are] not well understood" (ibid, 14) to begin with and because these maps and plans still draw their essentialist form "from the social and economic viewpoint of European traders and [so express and sustain] their cultural biases and outlook" (ibid). It is not that the fur traders deliberately emphasize the 'negative' or consciously suppress the 'positive' (ibid, 12-3) in their maps and charts of First Nations' territories on the northwest coast of Turtle Island, in other words, that is significant, but their complete indifference towards them that constitutes the governing theme.14

It is in this context, then, that in 'unpacking' the representational discourses of contact in the cartography of the Hudson's Bay Company we are directed less to the mundane and the quotidian in that record than we are to the 'exceptional'. The full substance of this
claim will have to wait until the end of this chapter, but I here want to mention just two of
the Company's many territorial actors who do have 'starring roles' in the larger-scale cross-
cultural theatre that is being constructed in the imperial frontier: Alexander Caulfield
Anderson and Archibald McDonald. Easily the most scholarly and widely travelled of the
cast of Company officers west of the great divide, only the First Nations themselves
possess more intimate physical knowledge of the cordilleran topography than Alexander
Anderson. Not only does he serve in a number of different capacities at almost every
outpost in the territory, but he reconnoiters the two principal brigade routes between Forts
Alexander and Langley: a) in 1846 via Harrison, Seton, and Anderson Lakes; and b) in
1847 via Yale and Kamloops (see, in this connection, Bancroft 1976, 1-3; Ruggles 1991,
94-5).15 Again, the 'data base' for both is largely supplied by the First Peoples. Anderson
clearly enjoys mapmaking (as will be illustrated in Chapter Three) and although few of the
maps he draws while in Company service survive, the traces he surveys do (as we will
also see in Chapter Three).

Archibald McDonald, by contrast, certainly cannot match Anderson's sojourns in
either administrative or geographical terms, but he does draft one of the most remarkable
maps ever made in the territory, and which, fortunately, does survive. His 1827 Sketch of
Thompson's River District (figure 5) just happens to be the earliest known map that
attempts a differentiation of First Nations of the northwestern cordillera with solid borders.
Like the linear trade-route sketches drawn by McDonald's colleagues it is drawn at a much
larger scale than is found in Arrowsmith but, unlike those sketches, the report which
accompanies it includes the names of the Chiefs or principal men of each Nation
delineated and a census (Ruggles 1991, 93). This map constitutes an absolutely seminal
interstitial emergence not only because it anticipates (conveniently) by three decades the
Archibald McDonald's *Sketch of Thompson's River District*, Kamloops 1827; one of the least 'fragmented' of all early 19th century Hudson's Bay Company sketch maps, one of the very few ever made in colour, and the earliest I have found that submits First Nations' territories proper to cartographic 'enclosure'. It was McDonald who took the first censuses of the First Peoples along the Fraser and Thompson Rivers, but, like those recorded by Mackenzie on the central coast and along the Blackwater River, they came on the heels of drastic depopulations by small pox, tuberculosis, and other imported European diseases, and so would have been notoriously inaccurate (Harris 1992, 11). I will come back to the map's ability to 'marshall' discourse(s) and 'collate' facts more frequently in the course of the thesis. (Hudson's Bay Company Archives, Provincial Archives of Manitoba, B97/a/2 fos. 39d-40 [N12154])
Figure 6

Detail from John Arrowsmith's *Aboriginal Map of North America denoting the boundaries and the location of various Indian Tribes*, London 1857; one of the earliest 'small-scale' cartographic 'ethnographies' of the First Nations of the northwest coast. The 'ordering' of cultures into those that qualify for *dominium* and those that do not constitutes the discursive nexus of all colonial maps, but it is perhaps in this particular genre that it is most poignantly vented. As Dickason has noted, "the importance of that classification is almost impossible to estimate, as it became the theoretical mainspring not only for *repartiemento* and slavery, but also for the colonial movement itself" (Green and Dickason 1989, 188). The name 'Wakash' goes back to Cook's 1778 encounter at Nootka, and is a derivative of a Nuu'chah'nulth phrase meaning 'applause' or 'friendship' (Gough 1992, 51). (For a similar representation see Dr. Prichard's 1851 *Ethnographical Map of North America from the Earliest Times.* (1857 Report of the Select Committee On the Hudson's Bay Company, University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division, HR F5515.4 G88)
Figure 7

Detail from John Arrowsmith's *Town of Victoria Vancouver Island*, London 1861; a dramatic example of the genre of cadastral mapping that Joseph Pemberton brings to the island colony in the 1850s. By the time this tracing appears he is Surveyor General for the colony proper, but much of the data base was collated while he was still in Hudson's Bay Company employ. Note, especially, the 'positioning' of the Songhees village and the 'staging' of the structures within it – a common representational technique in Pemberton's plans. What the map does not represent, however, is that the entire area for which it is an 'ontological substitute' was uncontested Songhees property less than a generation previously! More importantly, it hints at a more 'directed' territorial delimitation of the First Peoples which is looming, as it were, just around the corner. (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Victoriatown])
second representational theme in the Arrowsmith series of maps to which I alerted above, but appears a full half century before Franz Boas or James Teit even sets foot in the imperial theatre. In short, it 'reorganizes' First Nations' territorial form in exactly the same manner that the disciplines of anthropology and ethnology will 'reorganize' First Nations' discourse during the second half of the 19th century.

The Objectification of Otherness

That second theme is their increasing reliance on colour, an aesthetic and technical option facilitated by the invention of lithography at the turn of the 18th century. More importantly, however, the middle third of the 19th century in England is a period in which mid-Victorian ideals of the 'civilizing mission' are in the ascendancy and the evangelism of the Aborigines Protection and Church Missionary Societies is bending ears in the Colonial Office. In addition, the superficial disciplinary bifurcations in and between the zoology, Lyellian geology, and Linnaean botany of the late 18th century natural sciences are starting to 'spill over' into the more discreet classifications in and between the ethnology, anthropology, and Darwinian geography of the early 19th century human sciences (see, in this connection, Kiernan 1967; Eldridge 1973; Smith 1985), and class divisions at home are being translated into racial categorizations of the 'Other' abroad (Gray 1977, 73-93; but see, also, Billinge 1984, 28-67). The important point is that as representational frameworks overlap (and intersect with technological advancements) so too do ways of imagining the connections between peoples and their territories. For it now becomes possible to represent colonized Aboriginal Nations on maps not only as undifferentiated homogenous masses clearly demarcated from each other – i.e. as thematics on a base map.
drawn by Europeans – but as *taxonomies* – i.e. as objects to be sorted, classified, and studied by *science*.

It is certainly more than coincidence that the genre of 'ethnographical cartography' exemplified by John Arrowsmith's 1857 *Aboriginal Map of North America*... (figure 6) appears virtually at the same time as detailed textual and/or graphic references to the colonized are being wiped off the (earlier) map(s). This is a stunning development, and one which I will come back to in force in Chapter Five. For now it is enough to note that we are not confronting an imperial territorialization based on the mere 'throwing away' of Aboriginal cartographic information as soon as more culturally 'appropriate' (large or small-scale) data becomes available. What we are witnessing, rather, is a *networking of representations* in which the First Nations must first be (metaphorically) 'mapped onto' the British colonial stage (figures 3 and 4) in order that they may be then thematically (and metonymically) 'mapped out' of the British imperial field of spatial practice (figures 5 and 6). Such is the power of modern cartography that it can ideologically transform sovereign Indian Nations into 'ethnographies' of the 'Other'.

There is, however, a third representational theme (and discursive community) that emerges within that same field of spatial practice, and without which the Arrowsmith 'ethnographies' would not be able to authorize the substantive ideological power that they do. Its material source is the interstitial juncture between the existing (larger-scale) economic power networks of an Hudson's Bay Company increasingly faced with the impending loss of its mercantilist privileges and the emergent (smaller-scale) political power networks of colonial consolidation and settlement in an imperial frontier.17 On January 13 1849 the House of Lords passes the Charter of Grant which establishes the crown colony of Vancouver Island and 'awards' to the Company the responsibility for "the
advancement of colonization and the encouragement of trade and commerce" (cited in Mackie 1992, 6). In July of that same year, in New Westminster, the Act to Provide for the Administration of Justice in Vancouver's Island introduces English common law to the young colony, and in December Chief Factor James Douglas is authorized to use said law to extinguish Aboriginal 'proprietary' rights (ibid, 7). The person charged with surveying and mapping the territorial stage upon which this organizationally collective and geographically intensive (discursive) nexus of regulation, commerce, and colonization (and, supposedly, extinguishment) may be (net)worked out is Joseph Pemberton, the first (and last) official surveyor/cartographer of the Hudson's Bay Company.18

Effectively asked to serve 'two masters' in the person of the Chief Factor, Pemberton will spend the better part of the 1850s measuring, staking, and charting, inter alia: a) the Fur Trade Reserves set aside for the Company's own commercial activities; b) the farms of the Puget's Sound Agricultural Company (an Hudson's Bay Company affiliate); c) the first town plans of Victoria, Esquimalt, Nanaimo, Yale, and Fort Rupert; d) the trails to the Cowichan, Nitinat Lakes, and Barkley Sound; and e) the first ever private property allotments (mostly to Company employees) west of the great divide and north of the 49th parallel (see, in this connection, Ruggles 97-105). He will do all of this, of course, in a large-scale landscape with an intense Aboriginal presence – indeed he hires out many of the First Peoples (including some resident Métis) as labourers (ibid, 99) – and it is during his most 'productive' seasons (between 1850-4) that Douglas secures the first purchases of Aboriginal possessory rights to the lands of the colony (see, in particular, British Columbia 1987, 5-11).19 Aboriginal settlements, lands, or structures are represented only peripherally (if at all) in Pemberton's own work, however, and whatever drawings (by any author) that may have been specifically associated with the fourteen conveyances in the 'Douglas
treaties' have not survived. In short Pemberton's maps and plans interstitially engineer at a large scale the same act of spatial metonymy of the 'Other' that Vancouver's charts invoked at the smaller a half-century earlier. The difference now, however, is that this territorial 'displacement' is increasingly buttressed not only by the consolidating (and appropriating) discourses of property and capital, but by a related act of spatial metaphor in which missionaries fan out into the field of spatial practice and spiritual proselytization backs up an alienating land policy with divine sanction (Fisher 1981, 113-26). As illustrated in his 1861 Town of Victoria... (figure 7), it is Joseph Pemberton who imports cadastral mapping to the northwest coast and in so doing effectively accomplishes a kind of 'double' ideological (and, by extension, material) movement. At a more diffuse, transcendent level he is poised at that particular (small-scale) interface where the geography of colonialism is first superimposed onto the geography of imperialism which necessarily preceded it. At a more immanent, authoritative level, however, he provides the blueprint by which the comparatively irregular representational spaces of mercantile capital may now be reconfigured into the more organized representational spaces of not only industrial capital, but the commodity in land that has always been the latter's definitive social expression.

Colonial Imaginings on the Northwest Coast

We are now in a position to take a much closer look at the emergent nuances of (and variations on) that superimposition and reconfiguration, but before doing so it is appropriate to briefly summarize what we have '(re)discovered' about the territorial atlas circumnavigated hitherto - as selective as that circumnavigation might be. At the very least it suggests that we can no longer dismiss the 'theoretical cartographies' of the 'Age of Exploration' as mythical fantasies just waiting implosion by the hard probes of science.
The salient point—and one which Farley's dissertation completely missed—is that such 'imaginings' denoted a merging of 'theory' and 'reality' to define territorial objectives. As Allen has already noted, European 'explorers' predicated their own goals and interests on a combination of 'empirical' data acquired through direct observation and immediate experience, and 'non-empirical' lore passed down by others through myth, rumour, and geosohphical imagination (1992, 500-1). Speculative geography not only dramatized the difference and distance between what was far and what was near (Said 1979, 55), in other words, but demanded that the distant be brought nearer. More importantly, however, it seems to cast considerable doubt on two of our most cherished 'factual' assumptions, both of which flow from this insight, and which constituted 'unexamined' starting points in Chief Justice McEachern's Reasons for Judgment.

The first is that the question of exactly when British sovereignty was first asserted on the northwest coast is no longer as clearcut as has been previously thought. Most academic and legal authorities seem to have concurred on the 1846 Oregon Treaty as the definitive moment in that assertion, but if, as Pufendorf had suggested, dominium depends on occupancy, and said "occupancy of...land [may be affected] by the feet, along with the intention of cultivating it and of establishing boundaries either exact or with some latitude" (cited in Green and Dickason 1989, 62, emphasis added) then it does require that this moment be backdated at least to 1801 (as I have alerted) if not earlier. The second—and which flows directly out of the first—is that we can no longer accept Verner's assertion that Arrowsmith's 1795-1857 series of maps of western Canada were the first based entirely on original surveys (1988, 50). On the contrary, we have seen that if Mackenzie, Anderson, and the Hudson's Bay Company fur traders share anything beyond an obedience to the orderings of Enlightenment space or the discursive rules of contact
with the 'Other' in that space, it is that they all constructed their geographies on the residues of an Aboriginal geography which pre-dated them (and did so at more than one scale to boot). To put it another way one might say that the essential territorial form of the former only acquires its fullest ideological authority through its ability to 'gather together', 'assemble', and 're-present' the 'fragments' of the latter. In point of fact it calls into serious question the Chief Justice's conclusion that the maps of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en are somehow less 'reputable', 'truthful' or 'accurate' than those made by Europeans because they are obviously based on Aboriginal sources!

It is with this insight, furthermore, that we are able to enjoy something of a 'sneak preview' of a performance I hinted at in the Introduction: namely, the capability of the artefactual map to marshall alliances and collate 'hard' facts. The full explanation and objectification of this performance will have to wait until Chapter Five, but it does seem at this point that the map is much more than merely a vehicle by which "the implicit geography of the natives [sic] is made explicit by geographers" (Latour 1987, 216), 'discoverers' or 'explorers'. Indeed, there may be no better mid-19th century illustration of this than Thomas Devine's 1857 Map of the Northwest Part of Canada, Indian Territories, and Hudson's Bay (figure 8), within whose borders we can readily identify discursive statements on, inter alia, exploration, geomorphology, economics, surveying, and (geo)politics. But the alliance I most want to highlight in this particular representation is one we have now seen for the third time, and which will surface again and again as we circumnavigate the territorial atlas under consideration in this thesis: the census. The map seems to create and sustain, in other words, the very ontology upon and within which a whole (potentially unlimited) series of intersecting and cross-cutting discourses of 'Otherness' may be organized, presented, and 'hardened', and that it is precisely through
Figure 8

Section from Thomas Devine's *Map of the Northwest Part of Canada, Indian Territories and Hudson's Bay*, London 1857; an excellent example of not only how the map can marshall 'discursive alliances' and collate 'hard facts', but of how an *human* geography of disparate and unique cultural trajectories can be graphically condensed to a single *physical* taxonomy (here, in the form of a census) in exactly the same way one might classify rocks or sort profiles of railroad surveys. Note, especially, the excerpts from Mackenzie's journals (upper right). Few mid-19th century maps network acts of spatial metonymy and territorial metaphor of the 'Other' as effectively (or in as aesthetically pleasing a manner) as this one. (University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division, Maps, 610a D3)
John Tallis' *A Map of North America*, London 1857; reflects the cartographer's deliberate attempt at creating a particular vision of 'Otherness' while constructing a familiar territorial theatre in which that vision may be staged (see, also, footnote 9, Chapter Five). Apparently inspired by George Catlin's 1844 *North American Indian Portfolio* (Goss 1990, 176) pictographic conventions like those being staged here were a common thematization in the 17th and 18th centuries but were almost unheard of by the early 19th, by which time they were generally considered 'unscientific'. Still identifying Vancouver Island by Cook's 'Wakash', and showing Hudson's Bay Company forts more than a decade after the last of them was disbanded, the map also illustrates the relatively slow pace at which (geographic) information travelled at that time. (photoreproduced from 1990 *The Mapping of North America*, Studio Editions, London)
London Weekly Dispatch's *Atlas of Vancouver Island*, London 1857; does to the First Peoples' territorial rights at a medium scale what Vancouver's charts did at the smaller. It metonymically appropriates them to a universal condition whose defining theme is one of absolute 'non-territoriality'. Like Tallis' map (figure 9) it is a deliberate attempt at creating a particular vision of 'Otherness', but if the former seems to encourage closer examination of the objective subject, this one completely circumvents it. Indeed, with the exception of the reference to the 'Village of the Comox Inds' the reader would be hard-pressed to imagine that non-Europeans ever lived here at all. (University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division, Maps, 615a w394)
this mechanism that "the local knowledge of the savages [in the periphery] becomes the universal knowledge of the cartographers" (Latour 1987, 216) at the center.

It would be wrong, of course, to suggest that in the first half of the 19th century, this 'center' was a particularly sharp one. On the contrary, the logistics of communication meant that it took a long time for such knowledge to percolate back across the ocean, through the various strata of English officialdom, and on down to the general public. It took four years for Vancouver's portfolio to reach publication – eight in the case of Mackenzie's journals – and while Arrowsmith's maps were always intended for sale – either in sheet form, or dissected and mounted on folding linens – they tended to be expensive (Goss 1990, 152), and so inaccessible to large sections of the working and lower middle classes. Rather than discourage a public thirst for information concerning the 'New World' and its inhabitants, however, these maps and journals only intensified it. It was, after all, the period of Gibbon Wakefield and the 'great migration', and, like the 'discoverers' and 'explorers' whose adventures they avidly traced, these readers "were [also] choosing directions, applying names, imagining goals, [and] inhabiting the country" (Carter 1987, xxi) being (re)presented to them. It is not surprising, then, that while maps printed at home for public consumption tended to be somewhat dated, the particular discourses of representation of the 'Other' contained in their borders covered the spectrum from the 'noble savage' on the one hand – as illustrated in John Tallis' 1851 Map of North America (figure 9) – to the 'polished idler' who never did have any territorial substance on the other – as suggested in the London Weekly Dispatch's 1863 Atlas of Vancouver Island (figure 10). What united them, however, was that they shared and transmitted the essential ideological form through which discourses of economic or scientific authority, sovereignty, and 'Englishness' manifested themselves. If these maps were the principle means by which
Britain visualized her 'New World' dominions it was less because they necessarily created an image of distant picturesque places (as suggested in figure 8) than because they accessed the (overseas) field of spatial practice where the "horizons, possible tracks, [and] bounding spaces" (Carter 1987, xxi) which preceded those places were inevitably and inexorably translated into an "abrogation of the [territorial] rights of the indigenous peoples" (Berthon and Robinson 1991, 84) who were already there. That abrogation would still have to be completed in situ, however, and it is to this process that we now turn.
Footnotes to Chapter Two

1. As Helgerson has shown, it was Richard Hakluyt in his *Principal Navigations of the English Nation* who first conjured up the idea of the 'merchant hero' and 'wrote' Elizabethan England into the world of commodities (1992, 171-5). But it was the geographer John Dee who 'imported' Mercator and Ortelius from Amsterdam and changed England's view of its place in that world. Together they 'imagineered' the traces of a power network that took Sir Francis Drake to the northwest coast in 1579, but it would be almost two full centuries before James Cook's 1778 landfall at Nootka Sound brought it fully "into the realm of scientific understanding [and] linked [it] with the oceanic channels of world trade" (Gough 1992, 68). But if it was Cook who inspired the high seas corsairing of James Hanna, James Strange, George Dixon, and John Meares, it was East India Company associate Alexander Dalrymple and his 'scheme of economic empire' that helped convince the English government in 1789 of the necessity to occupy Nootka and defuse Spanish territorial claims at the same time (ibid, 107-9).

2. As a number of scholars have noted, the European mapping of the Americas coincided directly with the shift to cartographic modernity (see, for example, Harvey 1989, 240-83; Butzer 1992, 360-1; Harley 1992, 531), a point I will return to in detail in Chapter Five. For a thoroughly readable account of this shift as seen from within Vancouver's own ideological perspective I recommend Fisher (1992a). In Mackenzie's case we can go directly to his own hand: concerned that his charts and logs would "not be thought unworthy of the scientific geographer" he wrote of the "utility of [his] discovery...as the completion of it extends the boundaries of geographic science, and adds new countries to the realms of British commerce" (cited in Lamb 1970, 60). (For two interesting contemporaneous accounts of this shift a half-world away, see Edney [1993] and Godlewska [1995]).

3. If there was one imperial aim basic to all others it was *profit*. In addition to his diplomatic duties Vancouver sought to "facilitate an intercourse, for the purposes of commerce" between the coast and the known "opposite side of the continent" (Royal Instructions, cited in Lamb 1988, 99). Mackenzie, likewise, remarked on "the advantages that might be derived from advancing the trade of [the country] and by the spirit of commercial enterprise" (cited in Lamb 1970, 57).

4. Paul Carter actually develops this concept in reference to Cook's circumnavigation (and naming of coastal points on the coast) of Australasia, but the argument is just as germane to Vancouver and the northwest coast. He shows that it is not enough to simply suggest that place names are 'ideological elements' in the construction of a political landscape. Such names only network ideological power when they cross from a representational space to a representation of space and back again. (For a different spin on this theme see Tuan [1991, 687-8]; but also Cohen and Kliot [1992, 653-7]).

5. Beginning with his first voyage to Nootka Vancouver was instructed to cooperate fully with the Spanish. Indeed, of the 19 charts dispatched overland from Mexico with William Broughton at the close of the 1792 season, eight were 'copies' of Bodega y
Quadra's surveys and one was lifted from Dionisio Galiano's chart of Vancouver Island (figure 2) (Lamb 1988, 105). Spain's hold on the northwest coast was arguably the more tenuous of the two (Archer 1981, 37), but it had less to do with an imbalance in military power than with her reluctance to make public the logs and charts of the San Blas mariners (Sandilands 1988, 115).

6. Vancouver's 'observational skills' have been the subject of much debate. He missed the mouths of both the Columbia and Fraser Rivers, and he tended to generalize the coastal peoples to a far greater extent than Cook (Fisher 1992a, 29-32). But most of his original logs and personal letters have not survived, and he had no professional artist systematically capturing Aboriginal settlements in the same manner that John Webber did for the Royal Society in 1778. This is an important point which I will come back to in some detail in Chapter Five.

7. Surviving three successive generations the Arrowsmith map publishing firm came to be the guardian of imperial geographic knowledge, dominating English cartography during the first half of the 19th century. Founded by Aaron Arrowsmith in 1790 it passed to his sons Aaron Junior and Samuel, and then to his nephew John, who ran it until his death in 1873. All of them had connections in high places, and Arrowsmith maps were purchased in quantity by the Navy, the Colonial Office, and the 'learned societies'. Between 1795-6 Aaron Senior worked with Alexander Dalrymple (by then Admiralty hydrographer) and Aaron Junior became Hydrographer to King George IV in 1823. Aaron Junior and John were also founding members of the Royal Geographic Society (Verner 1988, 48-53). Most of the actual map inventory was produced by Aaron Senior and John, however. Insofar as it was Arrowsmith that most "consolidated and integrated information from many divergent sources to provide a perception of the country as a whole that was clear and reliable" (ibid, 54), there is a sense in which the firm literally 'wrote the atlas' on the geography of western Canada.

8. There is no better illustration of British imperial aspirations in North America than the pompous title Aaron Arrowsmith gave his (in)famous 1795 map of western Canada: *A Map Exhibiting all the Discoveries in the Interior Parts of North America Inscribed by Permission To the Honorable Governor and Company of Adventurers of England Trading Into Hudson's Bay in Testimony of their Liberal Communications, To Their Obedient and very Humble Servant. Mackenzie's contribution to "the principle instrument..of diffusion of knowledge about Canada" (Verner 1988, 52) does not appear until the 1801 version, however.

9. A partner in the Northwest Company Thompson's original motives were undoubtedly commercial (Gough 1992, 186) but it is clear he took the greatest pride in his artistic, astronomical, and cartographic skills. Upon completing the reconnaissance of the Columbia River watershed in 1811 he wrote "[t]hus I have completed the survey of this part of North America from sea to sea, and by almost innumerable astronomical observations have determined the portions of the mountains, lakes, and rivers, and other remarkable places of the northern half of this continent; the maps of all of which have been drawn and laid down in geographical position, being now a work of twenty seven years" (cited in Hopwood 1971, 299). Thompson's relations with the First Peoples ran the gamut from outright hostility to intimacy – to some of them he was known as 'Star
Man' (Gough 1992, 186) – but if he does not play a more direct role in this thesis it is less because most of his earlier surveys were pirated and incorporated by Arrowsmith than because it is a rather different concept of science that is most relevant. (For a thorough account of Thompson's adventures see Hopwood [1971].)

10. Some non-Arrowsmith maps that similarly stage and represent the First Peoples of the northwest coast include Dan Harmon's hand-drawn 1820 Map of the Interior of North America and G.J. Cary's lithographed 1811 A New Map of North America From the Latest Authorities and 1825 Chart of the World on Mercator's Projection.

11. The Hudson's Bay and Northwest Companies were appendages of a geographically extensive (and exploitative) mercantile network "which played a highly important role in the adolescence of capitalist industry" (Dobb 1963, 209). In 1821 they amalgamated under the former's banner, partially fulfilling Mackenzie's dream of a transcontinental commercial enterprise. At that time major trade routes on the northwest coast were the Fraser, Bella Coola, Skeena, Nass, and Columbia Rivers. Although characterized by unequal exchange indigenous modes of production were easily articulated within the confines of mercantile capital (Fisher 1977, 24-48; Warburton and Scott 1985, 29-30). This tenuous osmosis would not last long, however.

12. The Hudson's Bay Company did not begin operations in the 17th century with any systematic mapping scheme in mind, but company servants were encouraged to make sketches of trade routes as needed. Eventually the Company did pay and supply certain employees to explore and survey, but there was never any central place of publication for the maps they made. Company charts were considered commercial documents, "to be made subservient to promote [its] interests and increase [its] trade" (Ruggles 1991, 1) and were generally not available to the public. This changed after 1795, however, when Samuel Wegg (a colleague of Dalrymple's, and a member of the Royal Society) decided secrecy to be detrimental to the Company's future success; and by the second quarter of the 19th century it was sharing information freely with the learned societies (ibid, 4). It was through Wegg and Dalrymple that the Company struck its lasting business relationship with Aaron Arrowsmith.

13. To the extent that their material interests and goals were usually satisfied by a direct reconnaissance of 'fragments' of networks, Aboriginal 'cartographers' often failed to distinguish – to the degree expected by Europeans anyway – streams from trails or portages. Tributaries would sometimes be emphasized at the expense of trunk rivers into which they flowed. Scale and direction were often 'distorted', and 'pictographic' conventions were common. Few had borders. It was inevitable that some of these representations would be uncritically transposed into Company traders' sketches (see, also, Lewis 1987, 77).

14. "[A]s agents of merchant capital [European traders] had no direct interest in the territories occupied by the native [sic] population....In general they made no attempt either to seize these lands or to change native [sic] culture. Their only concern was to make a profit" (Warburton and Scott 1985, 39). Hudson's Bay Company trader John McClean put it more bluntly: "I never saw any [caring]" he wrote, "the history of"
commercial rule is well known to the world; the object of that rule...is gain" (cited in Clayton 1992, 39).

15. Anderson was 18 years of age when he first surfaced in Company employ in 1832 at Fort Vancouver. He helped outfit Forts McLoughlin and Stikine, before being transferred to Fort George in 1835. He then reconnoitered the Yellowhead to hook up with the Columbia brigade before assuming his first factorship at Fraser Lake. In 1839 he returned to Fort George, and early the following year departed with the brigade for Fort Vancouver. He spent the balance of 1840 at Fort Nisqually, and in 1841 returned to Fort Vancouver. In 1842 he accompanied the express to York Factory before returning to Fort Alexander, where he turned his attention to surveying the brigade routes to Fort Langley. In 1848 he was appointed Chief Factor in the Colville district, and in 1851 he returned to Fort Vancouver for the fourth time. He 'retired' in 1854 and travelled to Victoria where James Douglas encouraged him to seek public office (Bancroft 1976, 1-3). I shall return to this point in Chapters Three and Four.

16. Although the source of the competitive 19th century capitalist ethic, the mid-Victorian power bloc was not monolithic. It was a concatenation of aristocratic landowners, industrial entrepreneurs, and humanitarian intellectuals in which laissez-faire combined with divine faith to produce a political economy with distinct moral overtones (Gray 1977, 78). As late as the 1840s the Aborigines Protection Society opposed empiric expansion (favouring instead 'protection' of the 'native races') but the idea of imperial 'trusteeship' was never far from the surface. As the Edinburgh Review editorialized in 1850, "[i]t is a noble work to plant the foot of England and extend her sceptre by the banks of streams unnamed, and over regions yet unknown...and to diffuse over a new created world the laws of Alfred, the language of Shakespeare, and that Christian religion, the last great heritage of man" (cited in Eldridge 1973, 238)

17. It was the impulse of competition and the increase in costs that first forced the Company to begin commodity production in agriculture, fishing, and forestry, and it was the interaction between mercantilism and indigenous production systems that provided the 'primitive accumulation' of industrial capital that facilitated it (Warburton and Scott 1985, 28-36). This all took place, moreover, against a backdrop of recession and unemployment in Europe after 1815, when talk of social revolution was rampant, and John Stuart Mill, Charles Buller, and, especially, Gibbon Wakefield advocated systematic colonization as a panacea for pauperism, poverty and metropolitan distress (Eldridge 1973, 27-8). An account of Wakefield's theories on land, labour, and capital is found in Morrell (1966, 6-7). These ideas proved unworkable on Vancouver Island (see Mackie 1992, 3-40) but diversification nevertheless required the Company to become more involved in activities which previously had been beyond the scope of its charter – like surveying and mapping.

18. To be perfectly accurate Walter Grant was the Company's first choice, but his work proved unsatisfactory and he was dismissed in 1851. At 29 years of age, Pemberton was Professor of Practical Surveying and Engineering at, and Second Master of, the Royal Agricultural College in London. He had little first-hand experience in 'new territory', but with previous employ as a railway engineer and member of the Irish Ordnance Survey he was certainly familiar with the concept of the regional survey.
Under pressure to work quickly he adapted principles of triangulation that had been experimented successfully in New Zealand and Australia during the earlier 19th century (see footnote 6, Chapter Five). His survey office in Victoria was a joint Company/colonial enterprise until 1859 (when the Company withdrew) and his first apprentice was B.W. Pearse (whom we shall have occasion to meet again in Chapter Three). By the time he retired in 1864 Pemberton drafted the largest single block of maps made by any author under corporate directive, and almost 50% of the Company's entire catalogue west of the Rocky Mountains. Much of his work – including the first three town plans of Victoria (figure 10) – was incorporated by John Arrowsmith (Ruggles 1991, 97-9).

19. Although the word 'treaty' does not appear in these conveyances Canadian courts have maintained that insofar as Douglas was acting as agent for the Crown they were, and remain, valid treaties under international law. As Tennant has argued, however, "[t]he most important fact about the Douglas treaties is that they stand as unequivocal recognition of Aboriginal title [and that] it was with this initial acknowledgement that the British established their rule in British Columbia (1990, 20)

20. In 1786 James Strange cultivated at Yuquot what is believed to be the first garden on the Pacific coast north of Mexico but it is unlikely this would have been sufficient to secure 'possession' in any 'international court' of the day (Pufendorf or de Vattel notwithstanding). In 1788 John Meares built a factory and sailing ship at Nootka, and claimed Maquinna had sold him the land on which he did so, leading some British imperial authorities to 'adopt' him as representative of their own interests. Meares, however, sailed illegally, misappropriated place names, was ungracious in crediting others, claimed 'discovery' where others had preceded him – he arbitrarily confiscated Charles Barkley's charts in the course of making his own – and the Nuu'chah'nulth Chief disputed the sale in any case (see Gough 1992, 89-101). If Gosnell is right in suggesting that the establishment of a frontier is sufficient to acquire sovereignty (1976, 15-7), and if the 'frontier process' is in fact defined as "the methods by which Europeans extended their jurisdiction, occupied lands, managed a resource base, developed an Indian policy, and established sites for exploration of the sea coast and the interior land mass" (Gough 1982, 233, emphasis added) then a strong case can certainly be made for the assertion of British sovereignty in 1846. Indeed this is the date that Chief Justice McEachern arrived at (if somewhat reluctantly) in the judgment. The problem is that all these claims are Eurocentric in origin since they all define sovereignty only in terms of its relation to other European states. I think Kopas is on much firmer ground when he suggests that the establishment of fur trade fortifications was sufficient "evidence of white man's sovereignty" (1972, 52, emphasis added) on the northwest coast, but he still shares in an entirely 'physicalist' conception of it. It was, as I have alluded, only because of Mackenzie and Arrowsmith that those forts were there in the first place. I will come back to this point again in the Conclusion.
Chapter Three

The Plot Thickens:

Variations on a Theme of Colonial Cartography

Because he lived in nature the Indian too would have to be subdued. The intrinsic desire of the mapper is to produce a perfect transcription of the land....If the Indian protested saying "I am where my body is", the colonist answered "I am where my boundaries are" (William Boelhower in Through the Glass Darkly, cited in Berthon and Robinson 1991, 92)

Perhaps more succinctly than anything which predates them, Pemberton's charts and maps remind us that in mapmaking – as in exploration and learning – traces inevitably beget spaces. But there is a still a world of difference between spaces that are merely 'filled with ideology' – those that are filled 'in spite of themselves' – and created 'ideological spaces'– those that are filled as a consequence of deliberate spatial strategies.

I am not here suggesting that map authorship must necessarily privilege either approach, or that the overall 'discursive effect' of the one is any less or more intense than the other. The construction of ideological power networks is, in this sense, 'independent' of the territorial imperative(s) which propels them. What I am suggesting is that Pemberton – and the field of spatial practice within which he is 'constituting' (and being 'constituted') as a territorial(izing) agent – 'navigates' the interstices of a particular constellation of emergent northwest coast political, economic, and military power networks along which the territorial (mis)representations of the First Peoples are becoming less the 'unintended' consequence of the maps being made, but the very object of them. For the year is now 1858 and cartography is no longer being driven by furs or geosophysical lore commodified and collated at the imperial center, but by gold, mined and minted, and settlement,
sanctioned and surveyed, in the colonial perimeter. On August 2 the House of Lords
passes the Act to Provide for the Government of British Columbia and twelve days later
Secretary of State for the Colonies Edward Lytton hands James Douglas the governorship
of the new mainland colony, effectively introducing English common law to the theatre
of New Caledonia, and (officially) ending the exclusive tenure of the Hudson's Bay
Company at the same time. What it means, in other words, is that the institutional
nexus which has hitherto been anchored (almost) exclusively in London is being
'exported' across the ocean to the outer fringes of western North America, where the
exercise of (re)social(izing) power phases into an altogether different organizational and
tematically context, and where the 'time-space compressions' of British colonialism are
being accelerated accordingly. The two bodies of (territorial) actors charged with
(cartographically) enforcing this compression are the Royal Engineers and the Royal
Navy, and, just as we saw in the Arrowsmith series of maps, it follows at least three
relatively distinct, yet indissoluble traces while doing so.3

Corridors of Capital

The first is a throwback to the linear route charts of the Hudson's Bay Company fur
traders, but to the extent that this newer genre of maps marshalls 'harder' alliances they
are far less 'fragmented' than those earlier sketches, and their representations of the
'Other' are consequently a little more overt. Lieutenant R.N. Mayne's and Captain G.H.
Richards' 1859 Sketch of the Upper Part of the Fraser River from Langley to Yale (figure
11) and Lieutenant Henry S. Palmer's 1862 Sketch of the Route from North Bentinck Arm
to Fort Alexander (figure 12) are archtypical of those genres of medium- to large-scale
maps drawn by the British Admiralty and Royal Engineers respectively between 1859
and 1863, and which delineate possible (fluvial or terrestrial) transport routes between the coast and the Fraser and Cariboo goldfields. Mayne's and Richards' chart is arguably the more (discursively) 'spartan' of the two, but it may well be one of the first linear route maps in the mainland colony proper that uses the methodology of science to substantially circumvent a reliance on Aboriginal sources. Indeed, its style of representation is a direct consequence of its authors' (ideological) perspective as they measure (by immediate observation) and record (in vignette) the course of the channel directly from the deck of H.M.S. Plumper as it moves upriver. The care with which they metaphorically substantiate unnamed Aboriginal villages and structures coheres perfectly with their metonymic dismissal of the terrae incognitae of the Halnokolem and Nlaka'pamux First Nations whose domains presumably extend from those villages and into the 'desert lands' beyond the hachured heights of land which constrain them. In short, Aboriginal villages are seen less as islands or elements in a particular political (or physical) landscape than as 'points of disinterestedness', as hurdles to be surpassed in a progression from one fixed and more 'interesting' geographical place to another.4

Palmer's map shares the essential representational style of its fluvial cousin, but to the extent that its delineation 'on the ground' would have required a more intimate contact with the 'Other' it does seem (at first glance anyway) more sympathetic to Aboriginal territorial rights. Village names are phonetically approximate to those used by the Nuxalk and Ts'ilhqot'in Nations themselves, and, with its inset and profile, it has an air of planimetric authority that is not found on any (land-based) map of the colony which predates it. But it is nevertheless a fabricated authority. When Palmer first debarks at the head of Bentinck Arm only three Europeans reside in the entire valley
Section from R.C. Mayne's and G.H. Richards' *Sketch of the Upper Part of the Fraser River...*, London 1859; graphically represents the channel and surrounding topography as it would have been experienced from onboard the survey vessel. (In this cropping the vignettes referred in the text are out of frame, below.) Obviously, the lower Fraser was about the only place in the entire colony that could be mapped in this manner, but Navy Officers often collaborated with the Royal Engineers on land-based surveys as well (see footnote 4). In sharing discursive thematizations found in Mackenzie – i.e. the staging of the various First Nations in the 'unexperienced' *terra incognita* 'outside' the fluvial corridor – and in Pemberton – i.e. the positioning of village structures 'inside' it – the chart constructs a representation of space that oscillates between metonymy and metaphor. (Simon Fraser University Library, Maps Division, G3512, F68)
Henry Palmer's *Sketch of the Route from North Bentinck Arm...*, New Westminster 1862; crosses Nuxalk territory until underneath the word 'Bentinck', and Ts'ilhqot'in country from there to the Fraser River. Native appellations have been (phonetically) restored to Nuxalk settlements – Mackenzie's 'Village of the Rascals' is now Koomkootz – but outside the corridor it is still the *terra incognita* of the 'Bella Coola Indians' and in Ts'ilhqot'in country, it is just a series of 'Indian shanties'. The profiles and inset allow this map to marshall harder alliances and collate more facts than Mayne's and Richards' (figure 11) but the geographical form and context in which the statement of 'Otherness' is being made is the same. (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Roads and Trails])
(Kopas 1972, 56), and much of the route erects itself on a direct reconnaissance of either Mackenzie's track or pre-existing Nuxalk trails. Most tellingly, the map makes no mention of villages emptied by small pox, horrific accounts of which fill Palmer's journals. Again, it is not so much that the map silences that reality (although it does), but that it interstitially inscribes itself in the field of spatial practice more intensively than the journal. The latter is serialized in the local *Columbian* (although it does get published in book form the following year) but the former (unlike Mayne's and Richards' chart) is immediately lithographed (in New Westminster) and circulated in the colony proper (Spittle 1988). Colonial field actors who use Palmer's map will 'memorize' Nuxalk and Ts'ilhquot'in settlements not as sites of great human tragedy, but—like Mayne's and Richards' 'Indian villages', or, for that matter, the Arrowsmith 'ethnographies' against which they are necessarily juxtaposed—as chimeras, as mere mileposts on the road from here to there.

In going from here to there, however, Mayne's and Richards' and Palmer's charts evoke something else that we have already seen a hint of in McDonald's sketch (figure 5). They 'reconstruct' at a larger scale what the earlier Arrowsmith maps effectively 'deconstructed' at the smaller: the geographical interface(s) between the various First Nations on the northwest coast of Turtle Island. But they do so not on the symbolic terms of the Nuxalk, Ts'ilhquot'in, Halmokolem, or Nlaka'pamux themselves—who were trading across the coast ranges, and up and down the river valleys since long before Mackenzie, Fraser, or Thompson—but according to the rules of spatial form networked by a territorial discourse interstitially imposed from without. And it is precisely along the corridors of these networks that two of the great dramas of British Columbia colonial geography and history are acted out.
Introducing the Reserve System

The first of these performances just happens (not surprisingly) to constitute the second of the two traces alluded to at the start of this chapter, and whose first graphic expression was actually previewed in the cadastral cartography of Joseph Pemberton. Specifically, it is still a trace whose essentialist spatial form is a reflection (if further refinement) of that transcendent Enlightenment ideology whose definitive theme has always been 'a place for everything, and everything in its place'. Its discursive contents harken back not to the more inadvertent representations of Aboriginal space that were typical of the maps presented in Chapter Two, however, but 'surface' here in a more explicit perspectival framework – as a visual counterpart to the textual language of conveyance of the possessory rights of the First Peoples found in the fourteen Douglas treaties on southeastern Vancouver Island a decade earlier. Charles Sinnett's 1861 Katzie Indian Reserve (figure 13) is the prototype of a series of plans of 'government reserves' that formally introduce to the colonies of the northwest coast all the essential components of the deliberate territorial strategy that is the reserve system. From the vantage point of ideological power networks, that system is not only James Douglas' specific 'locally tailored' answer to Edward Lytton's suggestion that "it might be feasible to settle [the tribes] permanently in villages [where] law and religion would become naturally introduced among the red men" (December 30 1858 despatch to Governor Douglas [British Columbia 1987, 15, emphasis added]), but the geographical 'solution' (in the eyes of the Colonial Office anyway) to the thorny theoretical problem of how to open up the lands of the colonies to European commerce and settlement while 'protecting' (read 'assimilating') the existing territorial interests of those 'red men' at the same time. From
the standpoint of their positioning in (and of) the *interstices* of those networks, in other words, these plans are the specific artefactual documents that effectively *legislate and legitimize* the subjective alienation of the lands of the objective subject (in this case the Halmokolem Katzie). They do so by 'making perceptual' the discursive interconnections to Douglas' February 14 1859 and January 4 1860 *Land Proclamations*, those instruments *in law* which have already proclaimed their dominion over this (now) *Crown territory* upon which that alienation is thematically staged. To the extent that this plan implies (and engenders) *a real displacement* the actual alienation is *metonymic* in nature. But insofar as the architectural, agrarian, urban, and proprietary discourses of that alienation graphically reflect (and reify) not only what has already been hinted at in Pemberton's (figure 7) and Mayne's and Richards' (figure 11) renditions, but Lytton's concern that "it should be an invariable condition [of all land conveyances] that subsistence should be supplied...*in some other shape*" (ibid, emphasis added), the representation itself is an act of spatial *metaphor*. Their ideological *piece de résistance* is that by virtue of their being *lithographed in situ*, such plans (and the territories for which they are 'ontological substitutes') open themselves up to a *reproducibility* and *capacity for surveillance* that hitherto would have been comparatively limited. In short, Sinnett's plan interstitially emerges *a field of spatial practice* whose definitive thematicization is the territorial 'imagineering' of the quotidian *representational spaces* of the 'Other' according to the symbolic imperatives of a geographical *form of life* transmitted and 'memorized' in the *representations of space* of modernity. Such is the power of modern cartography that it can ideologically turn sovereign Indian Nations into islands on the shores of the colonial protectorate.
Charles Sinnett's Katzie Indian Reserve, New Westminster 1861; the vision of the future of 'Indian lands' on the northwest coast. Like the other six 'government reserves' laid out by Sinnett between the estuary and Lytton (see Spittle 1988, 203) it was not physically staked until Katzie 'complaints over the exact boundaries of the allotment solicited a visit from Moody in 1863 (see, in this connection, correspondence between Moody and Magistrate Chartres Brew [British Columbia 1987, 28-9]). On April 8 1867 settler John McIvor asked Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works Joseph Trutch to 'move' the south bank reserve eastwards to allow his cattle access to the creek, arguing that the Katzie had not cultivated their garden for the previous six years anyway. The request was denied, one of a handful of occasions that Trutch ever ruled against a settler (see, in this connection, his correspondence with Surveyor A.R. Howse [British Columbia 1987, 39-40]). It was surveyed and gazetted in 1868. (British Columbia Archives and Records Service of British Columbia, Map Collection, CMWA6)
Section from William McColl's *A Rough Diagram shewing the position of the Reserves laid off for Government Purposes..., New Westminster 1864;* oriented south on top, to the best of my knowledge the first map to delineate more than one reserve on a single sheet, and the first to visually 'anticipate' the 'discursive discontinuities' between Douglas and Trutch. Instructed in writing by Brew to mark out any ground "which has been cleared and tilled for years by the Indians" (April 6 1864 enclosure [British Columbia 1987, 43]) and to enlarge any reserve not already equal to ten acres per family, McColl defended his larger allotments by arguing that Douglas had also instructed him verbally that "the Indians were to have as much land as they wished, and in no case...under 100 acres" (May 16 1864 Report to Trutch [ibid, 43]). This is the map that Trutch was looking at when he decided that "these reserves should, in almost every case, be very materially reduced" (Aug 28 1867 letter to the Acting Colonial Secretary William Young [British Columbia 1987, 41, emphasis added]). (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Land Reserves 31T1])
Hermann Tiedemann's *Plan of the Indian Reserve at Esquimalt*, New Westminster 1866; introduces the practice of 'isolating' larger allotments on a single sheet. This was actually the second reserve map made by Tiedemann – the first was an 1865 sketch of a ten acre plot adjoining Douglas' own property – and if both have more than a trace of Pemberton in them, they should. Tiedemann was Pemberton's chief draughtsman and he did much of the preliminary work on the three town plans of Victoria (figure 7), one of which was traced for the 1865 sketch. Like many surveyor/draughtsmen of the day Tiedemann fancied himself as something of an artist, and he also dabbled in architectural design. This 'discursive alliance' between the form(ulation)s of perceptual, aesthetic, and built (representational) space is of fundamental importance, and one which I will come back to in Chapters Four and Five. (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves])
As it turns out, Sinnett's plans of 'government reserves' are the first and last to be lithographed under the military authority of the Royal Engineers, but to the extent that Richard Moody is appointed Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works in late 1861 and three quarters of his staff are hired out as colonial surveyors after the detachment's de-commissioning in 1863, "the prominent features of the [reserve] system" (Mar 14 1859 despatch from Douglas to Lytton [British Columbia 1987, 17]) are inscribed in colonial cartographic discourse. It would be wrong to suggest that during the first half of the 1860s this inscription is particularly 'systematic' or 'cohesive' either in geographic (locational), methodological (procedural), or aesthetic (representational) terms, but there are at least four complementary 'discursive themes' whose essential features are defined early.\(^{10}\) William McColl's 1864 *A Rough Diagram shewing the position of the Reserves laid off for Government Purposes on the Fraser, Chillukweyak, Sunass, and Masquee Rivers* (figure 14) introduces two of them: a) the delineation of multiple reserves *on a single sheet*; and b) the elaboration of the visual field with a supporting 'texted thematic'. In this example that thematic includes a census (again!), the acreages of the individual allotments, some remarks on the ecological context in which they are situated, and a commentary on the surveying methodology used, but the essential point is that both techniques save the colony money by *minimizing production costs*. What is particularly striking in this representation, moreover, is the utter 'artificiality' of the delineation of these allotments 'on the ground'. It is not so much the visual dissonance between the angular measured surveys and the undulations of the topography upon which they are thematized that bespeaks ideological power, however, but that its authorship clearly *sees nothing unusual about it*. 
By way of comparison Hermann Tiedemann's 1866 *Plan of the Indian Reserve at Esquimalt* (figure 15) introduces the other two: a) the *isolation* of the single allotment with respect to its wider geographical setting on a single sheet; and b) the deliberate 'aestheticization' of the 'contents' of the allotment in order to force 'the gaze' to the 'optical center' of the map artefact and the 'discursive center' of the space being mapped at the same time. It is true that in this example a quotidian viewer would likely identify with two such 'centers' – the Craigflower farm and the reserve proper – but I think the essential point is the cartographer's selective deployment of the stylistic conventions of the impressionist painting to subjectively 'three-dimensionalize' the objective subject on its 'two-dimensional' stage. This is an absolutely seminal movement, not only because it anticipates a thematization that will not appear again until the post-colonial period, but because it evokes the map's ability to marshall and collate what I shall call, for now, 'soft facts' (on and of the 'Other') in precisely the same manner as we saw Devine's (figure 8) and McColl's (figure 14) marshal and collate the 'hard'. I will come back to this point again most forcefully in Chapter Five, but for now it should be enough to suggest that Tiedemann's map conveys a 'double de-definition' of Esquimalt Nation territoriality. It metonymically 'externalizes' it – by interstitially integrating it in the junctures of an alien geographical framework – even as it metaphorically 'internalizes' it – by forcing it into a picture (window) which can be contemplated from a distance.

It is difficult to solicit from the written record, as one-sided as it is, the exact nature of the objective subject's response to what amounted to legalized theft.\textsuperscript{11} Douglas clearly had "much confidence in...this simple and practical scheme...[and]...little doubt of the *ultimate success of the experiment*" (March 15 1859 despatch to Lytton [British Columbia 1987, 16, emphasis added]), but whether or not he really believed that "the plan of
forming Reserves of Land...has been productive of the happiest effects on the minds of the 
Natives" (January 21 1864 address to the Legislative Assembly cited in Delgamuukw vs. 
A.G. 1991, 125, emphasis added) is another matter altogether. Indeed he has already 
admitted (by his own actions, as we have seen) that "the native [sic] Indian 
population...have distinct ideas of property in land, and...would not fail to regard the 
occupation [of said land]...as national wrongs" (March 25 1861 despatch to the Secretary 
of State for the Colonies the Duke of Newcastle [British Columbia 1987, 19, emphasis 
added]). This seems to confirm, in my view, that if the actual allotment of reserves 
around Victoria or along the lower Fraser during the first half of the decade did not 
"produce a feeling of irritation against the settlers" (ibid; but see, also, Fisher 1977, 154-
7) the ideological imperatives that propelled it certainly did. To put it another way, the 
second great drama of colonial geography and history to which I 
referred above was less 
a consequence of policy 'weakness' on Douglas' part (Cail 1974, 175), his de facto denial 
of (or failure to explicitly extinguish) Aboriginal title after 1854 (Tennant 1990, 37-8), or 
the reconfiguration of colonial political power networks that accompanied his succession 
in early 1864 (see, in this connection, Fisher 1977, 156-60) than it was of the quotidian 
realities of the process of (de)territorialization itself.12

**Variations on a Theme on the Northwest Coast**

The so-called Chilcotin War was the only instance of sustained military resistance to 
colonial authority waged by Aboriginal people west of the Rocky Mountains, and Alfred 
Waddington's 1863 (?) *Sketch Map of the Chilcotin War* (figure 16) is the only known 
cartographic record of that event.13 Aesthetically stark, it is arguably one of the colony's 
most rudimentary map products. Ideologically, however, it is certainly one of the most
rhetorical. For in selectively emphasizing events on only one side of the conflict, the map reverses cause and effect and turns fact into fancy. It suggests the Ts'ilhquot'in Nation to be rebels, indiscriminately murdering law-abiding Europeans in a 'borderless' territorial theater that has always been the sovereign and material property of the latter. It was, rather, the Europeans who were invading Ts'ilhquot'in territory, and the historical reality is that Governor Frederick Seymour's expeditionary forces – two separate divisions commanded by Gold Commissioner William Cox and Chief of Police Chartres Brew respectively – were outnumbered on the ground, and frustrated by the defensive guerilla tactics used by the Ts'ilhquot'in resistance. Armed only with Palmer's and Waddington's route sketches the intervening topography could only be guessed at, and the command of superior firepower meant nothing if it could not be deployed. Ultimately, both divisions spent most of their time idling in camp while the Ts'ilhquot'in dictated the character and pace of the encounter. Only a deceitful bit of 'diplomacy' by Cox secured the Ts'ilhquot'in surrender after some three months of sporadic fighting. Waddington's map may be the quintessential cartographic lie, but it illustrates perfectly how colonial mapping places the European less in the First Peoples' territorial theatre than it does the First Peoples in the European's (see, also, Wood 1992, 42). Over the short term, in other words, the Ts'ilhquot'in might have won the battle (and in terms of body counts they certainly did), but over the long term they still lost the war.

From a 'theoretical' standpoint the events of the Chilkoot War are a forceful reminder that the conceptual seizure of 'unknown territories' (as substantive as that seizure might be) always demands some degree of interstitial engagement with extant economic, political, or military power networks. At the level of quotidian discourse,
Alfred Waddington's *Sketch Map of the Chilcotin War...*, New Westminster 1863 (?); oriented west on top, denotes in script Aboriginal hunting grounds and fishing stations, describes the general physiography of the district, and identifies the 'scene of the massacre of Brewster and party', 'McLean killed', 'murderers surrendered 15th August 1864', and 'Mr Cox's and Mr Brew's camp'. Puntzi Lake was the junction of the Bentinck Arm and Bute Inlet trails, and a Ts'ilhqot'in campsite until 'occupied' by the Hudson's Bay Company in the 1840s. Other than the conflict itself, the best evidence of Frederick Seymour's *ad hoc* approach to Aboriginal affairs (never mind his selective distillation of reality) may well be his remark "that Europeans should thus run down wild Indians, and drive them to surrender in their own hunting grounds...appears to me, I confess, little short of marvellous (September 9 1864 letter to Secretary of State for the Colonies Edward Cardwell, cited in Rothenberger 1987, 198, emphasis added). (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Old Maps 4T2])
Figure 17

Section from Alexander Anderson's *Map of a Portion of the Colony of British Columbia*, Victoria 1867; easily the author's cartographic piece de résistance, and, of all colonial maps, perhaps the one that comes closest to representing the cross-cultural character of the field of spatial practice that is the (mainland) colony at that time. Bancroft recalls him as pompous, pedantic, and verbose (1976, 1-2) and this map, hand-drawn in colour, certainly reflects it. (The quality of this microfiche reproduction does not do the original justice, but storage media — it is sheathed in plastic at the back of the Archives map vault, and measures some 16 ft² — made it virtually impossible to photograph with the regular format equipment at my disposal.) To the extent that it is a compilation of fragments of 'exploratory' traces it shares some similarities with A. Petermann's 1866 *Originalkarte von Vancouver Insel*. The main difference is that while Petermann's summarily and metonymically expunges the First Peoples from the territorial stage, Anderson's constructs discursive alliances and collates facts to metaphorically inscribe them back onto it. (British Columbia Archives and Records Service, Map Collection, CM/F9).
however, they also remind us of the practical difficulties of enforcing that engagement in
the physically challenging territories of the colonies of the northwest coast during the first
half of the 1860s. What I am suggesting is that 'exploration' and 'discovery' are as much
a part of the field of spatial practice at the large or medium scales as they are at the
small, and that, the inscription of major network corridors or the reserve system
notwithstanding, said seizure still depends on the efforts of territorial actors who may or
may not be directly concerned with the subjectification of an objective subject per se, but
who, in the pursuit of their own goals, secure what amounts to the same thing. One such
effort is found in Robert Brown and his 1864 Vancouver Island Exploring Expedition, a
'scientific mission' sponsored by Governor Arthur Kennedy to engage a systematic
reconnaissance of the the (still) largely 'unknown' interior of the island colony, and which
illustrates that while adventurism along the third trace alluded to at the start of this
Chapter may be somewhat 'down', it is by no means 'out'. Brown's exploits make for
some interesting 'drama' of their own (see, in this connection, Hayman 1989) but my main
point here is simply to show: a) the substantive (and continuing) role of the First Peoples
in the opening up of colonial lands; and b) their own subsequent 'consignment' in the
graphic and textual record that flows from it. Indeed, Brown's journals and articles in the
popular press of the day are literally stuffed with references to the First Peoples. As he
records his travels he comments at length on the difficulty of penetrating 'unknown'
country, acknowledges repeatedly that existing trails are all Nuu'chah'nulth' trails, sojourns
frequently at Aboriginal camp sites, and thinks nothing of taking over (what he thinks are)
abandoned canoes and structures while doing so (ibid, 78). He regrets that earlier
European traces have not been more carefully recorded on maps (ibid, 30-1), remarking at
one point that "the map of Vancouver [Island] would have been a sorry blank yet, and the
first Exploring Expedition a forgotten affair" (ibid, 12) were it not for the devoted assistance of his Nuu'chah'nulth guide Tomo. In commenting on Tomo's mapping skills the Victoria Daily Chronicle remarks that "Dr. Brown has two sketches of the courses of rivers made on tracing cloth which have been...found to be remarkably correct, and show wonderful skill for a native (cited in ibid, 139, emphasis added). But Brown later refers to Tomo as "a good dog" (ibid, 49) and the Chronicle goes on to suggest that Tomo's charts are the "unassisted work of this disorderly admirable crichton, except the calligraphy" (cited in ibid, 139). In fact, the First Peoples are not represented at all on either Brown's own field sketches or on the finished map of Vancouver Island which is compiled from them. What does insert itself in quotidian discourse, in other words, is restricted to Frederick Whymper's drawings and Brown's own pseudo-scientific treatises on the potlatch and 'Indian myths and legends', and it is perhaps in this sense that Brown's diaries 'invert' the 'ordering of inscription' in the field of spatial practice that we saw in Palmer. Brown's contribution to the reconfiguration of the human geography of Vancouver Island is substantial, but when all is said and done he is a direct (metonymic) echo of Herman Merivale, who suggested six years earlier that "[a]ccording...to English real property notions, the Indians ha[ve] no 'territorial rights' at all..." (cited in Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 134).

Just as every library has its Shakespeare, however, and every gallery its Rembrandt, so too, speaking metaphorically, does every atlas have its Ptolemy: those 'canonized' works against which every other of its genre is inevitably measured. And within the territorial power networks that rewrite the geography of Turtle Island, that map is surely Alexander Anderson's 1867 Map of a Portion of the Colony of British Columbia (figure 17), the most textually 'complete', yet ideologically effusive, 'carto-composition' of its time
(and place). Not only the personal signature of its author, it graphically represents, in painstaking detail, the 'heterotopia' that British Columbia is at the cusp of the 19th century. The map annotates virtually all of the topographic, hydrographic and biotic information – rivers, lakes, elevations, geology, animal migration routes, vegetation and soil types, etc. – that could have 'reasonably' been accommodated at the scale in which it is drawn. It incorporates all the major (British) reconnaissances of the previous 75 years: Mackenzie's track, Palmer's Bentinck Arm route, Waddington's Homathko Canyon surveys, the ill-fated 1866 Kispiox telegraph line, fur brigade trails, portages, as well as Anderson's own travels (which, as we have seen, were extensive). It depicts the (former) sites of Forts Chilcotin, McLoughlin, Langley, and Alexandria and the communities that are by then being built in their place. But it also charts all the Aboriginal settlements mapped out by Palmer and Mackenzie, and it delineates the (assumed) geographic boundaries of the various First Nations throughout the territory. Its most striking visual feature, however, is that qua 'ontological substitute' it does all of this and yet seems to emphasize none of it. Oscillating freely between graphic and written commentary the map is a 19th century simulacrum, a field of spatial practice of texts, fronts and surfaces.

At the same time it may well be the First Peoples' 'last cartographic gasp' in any European artefact which even remotely expresses a 'reputable', 'accurate', or 'truthful' representation of their (historic or contemporaneous) territorial interests ('within' or 'without' the simulacrum). For the remainder of the colonial period, in fact, only one of the three representational themes circumnavigated hitherto – and only one of the associated set of (spatialized) discourses on the 'Other' – emerges to dominance. It is that interstitial domain of 'texts, fronts, and surfaces' evoked at the deepest currents of Enlightenment thought, custom-tailored by the immanent (geo-political and cultural)
morale(s) of Edward Lytton, Herman Merivale, and James Douglas, 'stereotypified' in the 'Otherness' of Alexander Anderson and Robert Brown, and discursively networked into the field of spatial practice by the likes of Charles Sinnett, William McColl, and Herman Tiedemann. The difference in the second half of the 1860s, however, is that the ideological power networks of colonization and (de)territorialization engage more fully a dimension of 'systematization' and 'cohesiveness' that was only hinted at in the first. The person charged with affecting that engagement is Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works Joseph Trutch, in Fisher's words, the quintessential "product of imperial Britain's confidence in the superiority of her own civilization" (1977, 161).19

Consolidating the Reserve System

As far as the territorial reconfiguration of 'Indian lands' is concerned there are perhaps three interrelated discursive 'tendencies' that most 'separate' Trutch's field of spatial practice from that of his predecessors: a) his increased reliance on the map artefact qua mediator of the 'white man's law'; b) his apparent 'willingness' to 'share' that mediation directly with the objective subject as graphic 'evidence' of the truth of that law; and c) his 're-directing' of cartography qua representational practice from a trajectory of 'inclusivity' to one of 'exclusivity' while doing so. I will come back to this point at the end of the chapter but I am not here suggesting that the allotment of Indian Reserves under Trutch is any more or less a deliberate spatial strategy than it was with Douglas. What I am suggesting is that in Trutch's hands cartography becomes less the means by which Aboriginal (territorial or other) rights are interstitially 'expanded upon' according to the (transcendent 'imperial') doctrine of Emer de Vattel and the 'laws of nations', than the
Edgar Dewdney's *Sketch of the several Indian Reserves in the Kamloops, Shuswap, and Adams Lake Districts*, New Westminster 1866; not all of which were 'officially' surveyed *in situ*, but all of which were accompanied by detailed written descriptions of the terrain, where the trees were blazed or posts were driven, and the markings on them (see, for this text, British Columbia 1987, 38-9). It was submitted as Sheet Q in the *Schedule of Indian Reserves* submitted to Ottawa in 1871 (see footnote 1, Chapter 4; and Appendix 1). According to Dewdney "the chiefs of the different tribes as well as several of their Indians accompanied me during the progress of the surveys, and made themselves thoroughly acquainted with the boundaries and stakes" (letter to Trutch [British Columbia 1987, 38]), but whether or not they "appeared perfectly satisfied with their reserves as laid out by me" (ibid) can only be guessed at. (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves])
J.B. Launders' *Indian Reserves (Fraser R. and Sloughs)*, Victoria 1868; reconnoitered by Trutch and Magistrate H.M. Ball in November 1867, officially surveyed by B.W. Pearse and Edward Mohun in 1868, and appended with Launders' own detailed physical description(s) of the terrain and where the posts were driven (see, for this text, British Columbia 1987, 56-7). It was submitted as Sheet I in the *Schedule of Indian Reserves* submitted to Ottawa in 1871 (see footnote 1, Chapter 4; and Appendix 1). Based on his own census (see, for this chart, British Columbia 1987, 47) this map is the 'solution' to Trutch's (earlier) concern "that [the] reserves [as laid out by McColl in figure 14] are in almost every instance too extensive...but...there will be no practical difficulty in reducing them, with the full concurrence of the Indians themselves, within much narrower limits" (November 19 1867 letter to Young [ibid, 46, emphasis added]). Compare, in particular, the ‘re-definition’ of the (south bank) Katzie Reserve (extreme lower left corner) with that in figure 13, and of the Matsqui 1 and 2 Reserves (upper left) with McColl's Masquee 3 in figure 14 (center). (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves])
J.B. Launders' *Indian Reserves (Chil-luk-wey-uk River)*, Victoria 1868; also reconnoitered by Trutch and Ball in November 1867, officially surveyed by Pearse and Mohun in 1868, and appended with Launders' own detailed physical description(s) of the terrain and where the posts were driven (see, for this text, British Columbia 1987, 56-7). The map shows the pre-emptions of those district settlers who were apparently "very useful and obliging in pointing out McColl's...posts [and who all seemed] thoroughly satisfied with their prospects" (October 21 1868 letter from Pearse to Trutch [British Columbia 1987, 53, emphasis added]). We can be less sure, however, of the truthfulness of Ball's earlier comment that "the Indians...all appeared perfectly satisfied with the reserves laid out for them...[since] great anxiety existed amongst most of the villages to have a final settlement of the limits of their land made..." (October 17 1868 letter to Seymour [ibid, 52, emphasis added]). Compare, in particular, with McColl's allotments along the Chilliwack in figure 14 (extreme lower left). (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves 12T2])
Figure 21

B.W. Pearse's and J.B. Launders' **Cowichan District Indian Reserve**, Victoria 1867; visually displays the legacy of Arthur Kennedy's general lack of concern over settlers pre-empting lands allegedly promised by Douglas for the Nuu'chah'nulth (see footnote 12). Apparently the consequence of an 1867 "misunderstanding between Mr. Pearse and [the] Indians" (May 4 1869 letter from Trutch to Morley [British Columbia 1987, 61]), the dispute between Rogers and Chief Techamalt over the ownership of Range VII Section 14 was finally resolved, as indicated here, in the latter's favour (with Trutch authorizing a legislative reimbursement to Rogers!). The Chief was less successful, however, with his claims to Munro's preemptions in Sections 15 and 16, which, according to Trutch "were never included in Mr. Pearse's survey" (ibid). Disagreements between Chief Lowha and settlers Mariner, Botterell, and Brennan, the latter of which was a result of the survey posts having 'disappeared' (see, in this connection, May 21 1869 report from Mohun to Trutch [ibid, 62]), were apparently 'resolved' to the satisfaction of both parties, if temporarily. (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves 3T1])
means by which they are interstitially 'delimited' according to the (immanently moralistic 'colonial') doctrine of John Locke and the 'laws of property'. With Trutch, in other words, the map acquires more the character of an ideological weapon whose goal is no longer to arbitrarily network what belongs to the 'Other' – i.e. in the sense that it 'maps up' their existing domains – but to unequivocally define what does not – i.e. in the sense that it 'maps down' what they already 'have'.

Trutch makes his first substantive reductions in 1866 when he agrees that existing reserves laid out by William Cox at or near the confluence of the North and South Thompson Rivers have been so extravagant that they have "ha[d] the effect of putting a stop to settlement in th[os]e parts" (July 17 1865 letter from Gold Commissioner Philip Nind to the Colonial Secretary William Young [British Columbia 1987, 29], and that, consequently, "the settlement of the boundaries of Indian reserves is...a question of very material and prospective importance" (September 20 1865 letter from Trutch to Young [ibid, 30, emphasis added]). They come immediately on the heels of the April 11 1865 An Ordinance for regulating the acquisition of land in British Columbia and the map which visually confirms that legality is Edgar Dewdney's 1866 Sketch of the several Indian Reserves in the Kamloops, Shuswap, and Adams Lake Districts (figure 18). As far as the discourses on landscape aesthetics, territorial insularity, thematic support, and cost-effectiveness are concerned, the map contains elements of (or at least refers to) all the essential representational themes previously identified in Sinnett, McColl, and Tiedemann. The difference now is that each 'window' is conjoined to its neighbours through a consistent representational style, with the result that any lingering sense of individuality (of either the places or the individuals that currently or historically
inhabit them) is effectively erased. In addition Dewdney makes sure that the Chiefs "have each a plan of their respective reserves" (November 8 1866 report to Trutch [ibid, 37]) as if to suggest that by showing them their proper place in the order of things said erasure is not 'restricted' to settlers or colonial administrators, but 'extended' to the First Peoples themselves.

The following year Trutch turns his attention to William McColl's allotments along the Chilliwack and lower Fraser Rivers (figure 14), where, again, the "boundary lines [should be] surveyed and exactly marked...so that the uncertainty...as to what lands are to be permanently held by the Indians may be terminated, and the risk of disputes and collisions [with settlers...may be] practicabl[y] removed" (August 28 1867 letter from Trutch to Young [British Columbia 1987, 41, emphasis added]). Referring to his previous 'success' in the Shuswap, Trutch expresses dismay that McColl seems to have "merely walked over the ground claimed by the Indians...and to have estimated the acreage contained therein" (ibid), and that to the extent that they "really have no right to these lands [which are of] no actual value or utility to them" (ibid, emphasis added) it shall be in order to pare back those allotments so that "the remainder of the land...be thrown open to pre-emption" (ibid). The reductions come immediately on the heels of the March 31 1866 An Ordinance farther to define the law regulating the acquisition of land in British Columbia, and the maps which visually display, justify and reify their legitimacy are J.B. Launders' 1868 Indian Reserves (Fraser R. and Sloughs) (figure 19) and Indian Reserves (Chil-luk-wey-uk River) (figure 20). Both elicit, in other words, the same discursive tendencies we saw in Dewdney, and both are to be copied to the respective Chiefs "so that the boundaries thereof should be clearly understood" (Nov 19 1867 letter from Trutch to Young [British Columbia 1987, 46]). But in each case there are some representational
'refinements' that serve to marshall more concrete alliances and collate 'harder facts', and which have the collective effect of strengthening the interstitial bonds to the territorial ideology which conditions and envelops them. On the one hand, the individual allotments are no longer staged within a conventional map border. The effect is to 'detach' them from any kind of geographical context and in so doing not only conceal their positioning in (and of) the territorial power network which 'imagineered' them, but defeat even the merest suggestion that the Nlaka'pamux or Halmokolem might still be First Nations in their own right. On the other, it is clear from their 'thematic consistency' that insofar as these allotments are no longer simply 'estimated' and staked out on the ground by wooden posts (which are subject to physical decay) but by properly measured and surveyed metes and bounds (which are not), there is that (legalized) sense of 'accuracy', 'reputability', and 'truthfulness' that has, for the most part, only been obliquely inferred hitherto.22

Colonizing the Grid

History, of course, has not been kind to Joseph Trutch, and there is no doubt that if any one individual must be retrospectively selected as the agent provocateur of the territorial atlas circumnavigated in this thesis it is the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works between 1864 and Confederation. To a certain extent he misrepresented his predecessors, falsified records, was less than truthful with his colleagues and superiors (see, in this connection, Shankel 1945, 36; Cail 1974, 179-84; Fisher 1981, 158-67), and when asked by the Secretary of State for the Provinces Joseph Howe to defend colonial policy towards the First Peoples, he professed, evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, "[t]he strongest motives of duty and interest...to advance the material and moral condition of our Indian population" (September 26 1871 letter [British Columbia 1987, 11,
emphasis added]) and that the "[land] system need[ed] not change or reform, but only increased means to bring out its real merits and capabilities" (ibid, emphasis added). At the same time, however, it has to be recognized that if Trutch broke with Douglas -- and it is not at all clear that he did (see, for example, Tennant 1990, 37-43) -- it was less because of his duplicity (Cail 1974, 186) or predilection to favour compulsion over coercion (Fisher 1981, 161) than because he was a player in a field of spatial practice that had by then interstitially (and completely) severed itself from the constraining institutional and geographical influence(s) of Lord Grey, Exeter Hall, and the Colonial Reformers, and upon which the "mystique of race [increasingly became] democracy's vulgarization of an older mystique of class" (Kiernan 1967, 230). It is doubtless true, in other words, that Trutch has virtual carte blanche authority to carry out his program of territorial delimitation, but it is equally true that it is (colonial) 'public opinion' which effectively sources that authority. Indeed, most of that (largely settler) public accepts unconditionally that insofar as "colonization necessarily involves the...collision...of two races of men [of which] one is superior and the other inferior..." (December 2 1865 British Columbian, cited in Fisher 1981, 166) it is simply unrealistic to expect "a few red vagrants to prevent forever industrious settlers from settling on the unoccupied lands" (December 8 1861 editorial British Colonist, cited in ibid, emphasis added). In point of fact, with the possible exception of certain of the missionaries -- a point I will come back to in Chapters Four and Five -- I can find no substantive evidence that any of Trutch's contemporaries would have approached the 'British colonial land question' any differently. It is not enough to simply state, on this view then, that "the great change to maps deriving from the colonial rather than the imperial function is contemporaneous with the first efforts to establish administrations on the ground..." (Stone 1988, 59). What must be added (and
re-emphasized) is that by virtue of their capacity to bridge the gap between representations of space (the space of imagination) and representational spaces (the space of the quotidian) these maps were as much the means by which that occupation and administration was envisaged and evoked (by Europeans) to begin with, and if this entire Chapter seems altogether more 'accelerated' than its predecessor, it is precisely because that is exactly how quotidian colonial actors on the northwest coast would have experienced the 'time-space compression' of the late 1860s being retraced here.

Of a number of cartographic evocations of that compression, at least a hint of which we have just seen (figure 20), the quintessential example may well be B.W. Pearse's and J.B. Launders' 1867 Cowichan District Indian Reserve (figure 21), which not only graphically networks in(to) the field of spatial practice the (constructed) territorial form of the 'grid of modernity' at the largest of scales, but visually evokes the proclivity of colonial authorities to carve out sections of reserve land within the grid for pre-emption by settlers. Indeed, it reminds us that while the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works is still negotiating a landscape with an intense Aboriginal presence, he is nevertheless doing so with the singular purpose of opening up the soil of the colony to settlement and cultivation by European immigrants, and the governing philosophy is that in the event that the territorial interests of the two come into direct conflict, the legal survey shall henceforth be that particular discursive alliance which will (almost always) adjudicate in favour of the latter. The exchange between Trutch, surveyors Mohun and John Morley, settlers Brennan, Rogers, Mariner, and Botterell, and Munro, and Chiefs Low'ha (Comiaken) and Te'cha'malt (Quamichan) over the precise position and extent of pre-emptions and/or allotments allegedly authorized by Douglas as early as 1859, but not officially staked by Pearse until 1867, is beyond the scope of this thesis (see, in this
connection, the correspondence in British Columbia 1987, 58-62). But the essential point is that it is this map that Morley is ultimately instructed to hand over to the Nuu'chah'nulth Chiefs, while "inform[ing] them again that the boundaries of the land to be reserved for the use of themselves...have now been finally settled, and that no trespass will...be permitted, either of Indians...or of white men...and that any such trespass will be punished as the law directs" (July 15 1869 letter from Trutch to Morley [British Columbia 1987, 62, emphasis added]).

The effects of this compression on the First Peoples, of course, must have been phenomenal. I will defer a consideration of the substance of this claim until Chapter Five, however, except to suggest here that any challenge they may have been able to muster would have been utterly defeated by the onslaught of alienating discourses now being marshalled and collated (by and through the map) against them. Not only have we seen a repeat of the process by which the census (metaphorically) imposes on the First Peoples themselves what the map (metonymically) imposes on their territories – i.e. as in McColl and Launders – or of the process by which the terrae incognitae of the First Peoples is recursively welded into the terrae cognitae of the Europeans – i.e. as in Brown or Anderson – but the additional (territorial) staging (by and through the map) of the law, in both its 'international' and 'positive' forms. Initially, as under Douglas and Matthew Begbie, that staging is somewhat tentative, but with Trutch and the cadastral surveyor it is much more explicit.23 Hardened by the institutional nexus in which he is 'constituting' (and being 'constituted') as a territorial(izing) agent, Trutch may have differed from Douglas in his 'apprehension' of the discursive contents of Aboriginal (territorial or other) rights. But insofar as they both shared Charles Buller's moralistic view that "[i]t seems wicked to dispute the right of man to cultivate the wilderness" (cited in Eldridge 1973,
129, emphasis added), de Vattel's transcendent philosophy that "we do not...deviate from the views of nature in confining the Indians within narrower limits" (1863, 100, emphasis added), and Locke's materialist manifesto that "he who appropriates land to himself by his labour does not lessen but increase the common stock of mankind" (1966, 20, emphasis added), they both were actors in the ideological power networks of a form of life along which colonization and 'civilization' were ineluctibly and increasingly stitched together, and where the map created the field of spatial practice upon which the pseudo-Darwinian conflation of property, science and divinity could effectively consolidate itself.24 It was Trutch's particular 'vision' – and the First Peoples' great misfortune – to have been the first to grasp completely the tremendous geographical potential (see footnote 2, above) that was British Columbia on the eve of Confederation, and to (consciously or otherwise) recognize the power of the cadastral map or plan to not only interstitially 'emerge' that potentiality, but convert [t]he fuzzy, approximate, and ungrounded beliefs of the locals...into a precise, certain, and justified knowledge (Latour 1987, 216, emphasis added) at the colonial center at the same time.25 The substantive difference between this 'center' and the 'center' we closed out Chapter Two with, however, is that it is no longer a half-world away, but right here, in the First Peoples' own back yard. More significantly, we can now see more discretely, the atavistic traces of that (specifically legalized) territorial atlas re-opened (and re-interpreted) 118 years later by Chief Justice McEachern in Delgamuukw vs. A.G. It is to the 'aestheticization' and 'perfection' of this atlas that we now turn.
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Footnotes to Chapter Three

1. The gold strike along the lower Fraser changed radically (and permanently) the material trajectory of British colonial economic power networks in the Pacific theatre. It was not so much that the rush brought capitalist social relations to the northwest coast. Indeed, to the extent that the fur trade had already introduced (English) private property and (Aboriginal, as well as English) wage labour relations to Vancouver Island it must be admitted that the colony was already a capitalist enclave (Warburton and Scott 1985, 40). But it was with the rush that the export of capital assumed a dimension it had not achieved hitherto (see, in this connection, Dobb 1963, 217).

2. As far as the consolidation of (geo)political power networks is concerned the second crown colony on the northwest coast differed from its predecessor not only because of the 'absence' of the Hudson's Bay Company, but because it was territorially more extensive and therefore potentially more emergent. What they did share, however, was that both were initially denied the prerogative of responsible government. Most colonists certainly assumed they enjoyed the same rights as any other British subject (Fieldhouse 1982) but mid-Victorian colonial policy was driven less by constitutional theory than by the pragmatics of geography. Edward Lytton and Herman Merivale believed free institutions to be impractical for 'rough-and-tumble' settler colonies, and each thought a strong central authority would foster the proper transition to a more civilized regime in any event (see, in this connection, Gough 1982, 237-8; McNab 1985, 85-103). In entrusting Douglas with a dual (if 'limited') governorship, the Colonial Office made it fairly clear it expected him to be the principle agent of that transition.

3. The Royal Engineers were a 165-man contingent dispatched by Edward Lytton to the northwest coast to "survey those parts of the country which may be considered most suitable for settlement" (July 31 1858 despatch to Douglas, cited in Delgamaukw vs. A.G. 1991, 108). Commanded by Colonel Richard C. Moody, and selected "for [their] high qualifications, in surveying, from the most scientific branches" (January 31 1859 letter from Moody to Douglas, cited in Spittle 1988, 195) the two senior officers were Captain Robert M. Parsons and Lieutenant Henry S. Palmer. By the time of its disbandment in 1863 the Engineers would, inter alia, lay out the townsites of New Westminster, Yale, Lytton, Clinton, and Quesnel, assist the Royal Navy in military protection, originate the colonial coat of arms, print the first colonial stamps, build the North Road, rebuild the road from Port Douglas to Lillooet (originally surveyed by Alexander Anderson), and assist in the construction of the Cariboo Road (Kopas 1972, 56).

4. Other examples of this genre include G.H. Richards' 1859 Fraser River and Burrard Inlet (which locates 'Indian villages'); R.C. Mayne's 1859 Sketch of part of British Columbia (which locates 'Indian villages' and designates 'unknown' territories by First Nation toponym); and John Arrowsmith's 1860 Map of a portion of British Columbia (which shows neither, and is a joint compilation from Mayne's and Palmer's surveys).

5. In addition to Parsons and Palmer the New Westminster survey office consisted of
fourteen non-commissioned officers, all of whom were qualified surveyors, and at least twelve of which would remain in the colony after disbandment. A technological complement of considerable importance in the ensuing cartographic construction of ideological power networks on the northwest coast, the office received the colony's first lithographic press from England in 1860 (Spittle 1988, 195). On March 5 1861 The Royal Engineers were 'officially' asked to begin "marking out distinctly the sites of...Indian Reserves throughout the Colony" (letter from acting Acting Colonial Secretary Charles Good to Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works Richard Moody, [British Columbia 1987, 21-3]). I will return to both these points momentarily.

6. Other examples of this genre include Alexander Anderson's 1858 Map showing the different Routes of Communication with the Gold Region on Fraser's River, James Wyld's Map of the Gold Regions on the Fraser [sic] River and the Washington Territory (both of which make no reference to the First Peoples); Palmer's 1859 Map of the Route from Port Hope to Fort Colville (which locates 'Indian villages'); R.C. Moody's 1859 Sketch of the Proposed Road from Yale to Hodges Store (which locates 'Indian burial grounds'); and Alfred Waddington's 1862 and 1863 Sketches of the Bute Inlet Route (neither of which make any reference to the First Peoples).

7. Cole has defined the reserve as "a geographic area established by treaty, statute, executive order, or as defined by the courts, over which a tribal entity exercises some degree of civil jurisdiction" (1993). Insofar as this definition properly distinguishes it from the more vague historical entity of 'Indian lands', it does capture its specifically institutional character, but I think what must be added is that as an ideological strategem the reserve is also a kind of 'social laboratory' (Tobias 1983, 41) where hypotheses on an objective subject may be 'tested'.

8. Douglas engaged the reserve system not only out of basic humanity, but because it was good business (Cail 1974, 172-4). To the extent that he saw it as the means by which the First Peoples would learn to cultivate the land by their own labour, be encouraged to acquire property and possessions, be accepting of proper moral and religious training, and be subject to the protection of positive laws, he shared the prevailing morale in the Colonial Office (see, in this connection, Morrell 1966, 22-8; and, subsequently, the text of Douglas' March 14 1859 despatch to Edward Lytton [British Columbia 1987, 17]). Where Douglas differed from his superiors, however, was that he saw the reserve in transitional terms — i.e. as an interstitial 'entry point' into colonial society proper — and his inducement to that end was to extend the right of pre-emption to the First Peoples themselves, an hitherto unprecedented 'privilege' in any 'New World' colony. The tradeoff for the First Peoples, of course, was that in exchange for the right of British citizenship under Crown law, they would henceforth be treated as immigrants without prior land rights. It constituted, in short, a de facto denial of Aboriginal title, and solved, for Douglas, the problem of where to acquire the funding to purchase it at the same time. As such it was a direct reversal of his earlier position on Vancouver Island (see, in this connection, Tennant 1990, 26-38).

9. The 1859 Proclamation provided regulations "respecting the alienation and possession of agricultural lands, and lands proposed for the sites of towns in British Columbia..." (cited in Delgamukw vs. A.G. 1991, 114) while the 1860 edition allowed preemption
of any unsurveyed agricultural lands by British subjects "not being...an Indian Reserve or Settlement" (cited in ibid, 115). Since 1973 referred to as Calder II and III (after their invocation in Calder vs. A.G. of British Columbia) they are the two major pieces of colonial legislation cited by the Province in Delgamuukw vs. A.G. as evidence of the Crown's 'clear and plain' intention to extinguish any and all pre-existing Aboriginal rights. I will come back to this extremely important point in the Conclusion.

10. What I am suggesting here is simply that the settlement process during the first half of the 1860s was geographically 'discontinuous' and that insofar as the Colonial Office has already determined that "the acquisition of...title is a purely colonial interest" (October 19 1861 despatch from Newcastle to Douglas [British Columbia 1987, 20]), the survey office confronted from the beginning an (alleged) lack of funds. When Moody asked the Colonial Secretary to authorize a monthly expenditure of £35 (!) for the marking and surveying of Indian Reserves, Young replied that he was not aware "what necessity may exist for the present survey of [them...and] that for all present purposes, the marking...by conspicuous posts driven into the ground would be sufficient..." (June 9 1862 letter to Moody [ibid, 24, emphasis in original). This carelessness would come back to haunt both the First Peoples and the colonial administration, as we shall note (see footnote 22, below).

11. Regardless of what may be inferred in the available correspondence, it is clear that the First Peoples did not understand what Europeans really meant by 'title' (at least not at first). They only thought they were ceding the right of exclusive usufruct to the soil of the colony, and not outright 'ownership' (see, also, Cail 1974, 173-82). While British colonialism generally acknowledged in the abstract the territorial rights of indigenous peoples, colonial acts typically disposed of Aboriginal lands without any reference to the actual possessors whatsoever (Morrell 1966, 25).

12. It is true that Douglas' successors Arthur Kennedy and Frederick Seymour were comparatively weak administrators, and his failure to establish a clear-cut statutory land policy would prove crucial for subsequent developments (Fisher 1977, 157-9; Tennant 1990, 37). Kennedy, for example, was prepared to let settlers occupy reserve land, while Seymour saw the mainland colony as no more than "a wagon road with a gold mine at one end and a seaport at another" (cited in Howay 1976, 23). Neither governor was particularly concerned with Aboriginal affairs, but if relations between the colonists and the First Peoples were less harmonious after 1864 it was primarily because of the new Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, whom we shall have occasion to meet shortly.

13. The only military chart made in British territory west of the Rocky Mountains that I am aware of, the authorship and year of this untitled map are unclear. The Provincial Archives credits Waddington in 1863, even though the only signature on it appears to be Seymour's, and the encounters recorded on it do not take place until 1864. It may be that the Archives are simply in error or that the map was made from Waddington's traces in 1862-3, and the references to the conflict added later. In any event, it is what the map proclaims in a territorial context that concerns us here.

14. The specific sequence of events that precipitated, constituted, and concluded the War
cannot be reiterated here. For the mainstream academic account see Hewlett (1973); the more popularistic telling is found in Rothenberger (1978). To see it as the Ts'ilhquot'in remember it, however, I recommend Glavin (1992). Almost an aside in mainstream (imperial) history most First Peoples still view the trial and execution of the Ts'ilhqot'in Chiefs as a seminal interstitial emergence in the construction of colonial political power networks on the northwest coast (Sarich 1993, 8).

15. A Botanical Association of Edinburgh botanist, Robert Brown was 29 years of age when he arrived in Victoria in 1863. He was to collect botanical specimens but relations with his original sponsor soured quickly, and when rumours of gold strikes at Goldstream stirred local interests he leapt at the chance to head up the Expedition. For a compendium of his diaries and letters, and Frederick Whymper's drawings, see Hayman (1989).

16. A self-professed expert in geology, linguistics, ethnology, and geography, Brown's dissertations on the First Peoples are among the earliest made in the island colony. An admirer of James Douglas, he commented frequently on Aboriginal complaints over the location and size of their reserves and their encroachment by white settlers. At the same time, however, he thought an acre or two enough for a house and garden, and he suggested that in the event of disputes "the Chiefs be summoned to Victoria, matters fully explained to them, their voice be heard on the subject [and] after all is settled, let each of them receive a sealed paper with the Government seal and a sketch of his reserve" (ibid 126, emphasis added). He admitted that the First Peoples had not been treated well, and that "their lands have never been paid for" (ibid, 44), but his solution (and a rather prescient one at that) was to "give them a speech and reasonable Potlatch for the rest of their lands [and] let an agent be introduced to them...who will remove them (if necessary), point out to the Chiefs their limits and generally be the mediator and law-giver" (ibid, 126, emphasis added).

17. Brown's 'official' Memoir on the Geography of the Interior of Vancouver Island was not picked up by any British publisher, and it lacked the immediacy and vivid detail of his popular articles to begin with. A. Petermann's 1866 Originalkarte von Vancouver Insel — the only finished map compiled from Brown's (and Tomo's) sketches — was lithographed in Germany, and so would have been inaccessible to most colonial readers.

18. In contrast to an utopia — literally a 'non-place' — a heterotopia is, following Foucault, a kind of 'every-place', where all the 'real places' are simultaneously represented, contested, and juxtaposed together. They are, to put it crudely, 'multiple geographies', and while they are a part of all cultures, they are especially evident in modern transitional ones. For a detailed analysis of this concept by a geographer see Soja (1990, 6-39).

19. Recommended for the position by Douglas, Trutch arrived in British Columbia in 1859 with eight years experience as a farmer and surveyor south of the 49th parallel. A settler's advocate he saw the colony as land to be developed, and his view that the First Peoples of the Oregon Territory were the "ugliest and laziest creatures I ever saw" (cited in Fisher 1977, 155) was not to be modified north of it. A firm believer
in the unconditional authority of English law, he would be the principal architect of "the recession of "the uncivilized native...before the civilizer" (December 2 1865 British Columbian, cited in ibid, 166) on the northwest coast.

20. Since 1973 referred to as Calder X, this Ordinance provided that all lands in the colony "not otherwise lawfully appropriated belong to the Crown in fee" (cited in Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 126, emphasis added) and that all unoccupied and surveyed land "not being the site of...an Indian reserve or settlement..." (ibid) would be open to preemption.

21. Since 1973 referred to as Calder XI, this Ordinance provided that the right of preemption would no longer extend "without the permission aforesaid, to or any of the Aborigines of the Colony..." (cited in Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 126, emphasis added). Doubtless written in large part by Trutch, this amendment was a deliberate reversal of Douglas' intended policy and legal sanction for the second-class status of the First Peoples' henceforth. It was not officially repealed until 1953.

22. As alluded previously (see footnote 10, above) it was generally deemed more cost-effective to simply blaze trees or stake out the allotments on the ground, and leave the actual survey(s) until settlement 'justified' the extra expense. Surveyors often complained of "not being provided with chain or suitable instruments...sufficiently accurate to answer official purposes" (January 17 1866 letter from surveyor John Turnbull to Magistrate J.C. Haynes [British Columbia 1987, 35, emphasis added]), never mind the "the scarcity of labour...during the Indian fishing season" (October 6 1868 letter from surveyor Edward Mohun to Trutch [ibid, 52). Aside from the potential for physical rot or concealment by overgrowth, moreover, posts could be simply removed (by settlers or First Peoples), as they sometimes were.

23. What I am suggesting here is that inasmuch as mapmaking was part of Begbie's 'extra-judicial' duties, and that he and Douglas together "personified the conservative determination to establish British constitutional practices" (Foster 1984, 10) on the northwest coast the 'ideological unity' between the common law and the space of the commons was blueprinted early. To the extent that there were substantive frictions between the various colonial agents charged with administering it, however, that authority was conditional. Begbie sent his sketches to Moody frequently, only to have the latter dismiss them as the work of a 'non-professional'. Despite Douglas' repeated requests, Parsons was opposed to the survey office being used to produce guide maps to the gold fields (Spittle 1988, 195-7); and while Richards shared the Governor's views on the future development of the northwest coast, he was also quick to renege when asked to reconnoiter Bute Inlet and Bentinck Arm for possible townsites in 1862 (Sandilands 1988, 121). With Trutch, however, that authoritative relation was effectively reversed. Technically, of course, Trutch was, from the beginning, Seymour's subordinate, but insofar as the definition of colonial lands per se was concerned he held, so to speak, all the trump cards; a hand which became geographically stronger with colonial union under the 1866 British Columbia Act, and institutionally stronger through his closer relations with his own supporting cast of characters (inter alios, Brew, Pearse, Cox, Young, etc.). It certainly did not hurt that when it came time to cite the authorities under which he pursued the land policy that
he did, he only had to refer to the 1865 and 1870 Land Ordinances — the latter since 1973 referred to as Calder XIII, it was an 'omnibus' bill which repealed and summarized Calder's II through XII — authored in large part, of course, by himself (see, for example, November 3 1871 letter to Howe [British Columbia 1987, 102]).

24. It is worth noting here, perhaps, that while few scholars seem to have seriously examined the original source of the 'ten acre per family' formula that came to be the standard reserve allotment during the latter half of the 1860s it must have surely come from Locke, who wrote that "he that encloses land, and has a greater plenty of the conveniences of life from ten acres than he could have from a hundred left to nature, may truly be said to give ninety acres to mankind, for his labour now supplies him with provisions out of ten acres, which were but the product of an hundred lying in common" (1966, 20, emphasis added).

25. The best cartographic evidence of this 'vision' is Trutch's own 1871 Map of British Columbia to the 56th Parallel, North Latitude. Doubtless a masterpiece of late 19th century topographical mapping Farley called it the "outstanding summary" (1960, 288) of the geography of British Columbia at Confederation. It almost goes without saying, however, that it makes no reference to the First Peoples whatsoever.
Chapter Four

Acting it Out: Reservations Recommended

To the Indian, the land question far transcends in importance all others, and its satisfactory adjustment in British Columbia will be the first step towards allaying the widespread and growing discontent now existing among the native tribes of that Province (November 2 1874 memorandum from Minister of Interior David Laird to Lieutenant-Governor Joseph Trutch [British Columbia 1987, 151])

The human geography of British Columbia that is 'delivered' to Ottawa in 1871 is a geography at its most 'raw' and 'abstract' in at least three senses: a) it does not have much 'fill' in terms of discursive content; b) its symbolic form is almost completely contoured by the cartographic de-territorialization of the First Peoples during the pre-colonial and colonial periods; and c) the alliances marshalled on (and through) the (colonial) field of spatial practice where ideology conflates with discourse are almost exclusively of the 'hard' variety. I will come back to this point in a moment, but I am not here suggesting that territorial actors west of the great divide have been any more or less directed to network certain discursive communities in(to) the maps they make than are their eastern counterparts, or that the configuration of their respective fields follow different ideological transcendencies. What I am suggesting is that Parliament Hill simply does not know a whole lot about the northwest coast qua territorial potentiality — even less about the people (European or Aboriginal) who live there — and that what they do know is almost exclusively in the maps and mind of the (by now) Lieutenant-Governor Joseph Trutch.

Excepting some of the sketch maps to the goldfields, certain of the Royal Engineers' town plans, and the Chief Commissioner's own 1871 provincial map (see footnote 24, Chapter Three), in fact, what colonial cartography does exist has been primarily concerned with
the surveying and mapping of Indian Reserves (Cail 1974, 60), and of the handful that
have been officially gazetted, most are "naturally scattered and often at great distances
apart" (October 16 1871 report from Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works B.W.
Pearse to Howe [British Columbia 1987, 103]).¹ To the extent that Confederation as a
(geo)political act effectively bifurcates the 'center' into two geographic locations, in other
words, all existing power networks (regardless of which center has hitherto constituted
their principle institutional nexus) suffer a kind of 'interstitial rupture', the 'repair' of which
depends on the immediate (re)consolidation of the ideological. What I am suggesting is
that in rather the same manner that Vancouver's and Mackenzie's conceptual seizure of the
northwest coast constructed the stage upon which its physical appropriation depended, so
too must Ottawa's conceptual 'acquisition' of British Columbia precede its own material
investment in it.

National Imaginings on the Northwest Coast

The initial overtures at affecting that repair are made in 1872 with the appointment of
Dr. Israel W. Powell as Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Province of British
Columbia, but the (re)consolidation itself turns out to be a very formidable (for both
colonizer and colonized) and protracted performance indeed.² Certainly this is a period in
which the First Peoples are "learning what white men [mean] by ownership of land" (Cail
1974, 197), various missionaries are involving themselves more intensively in Aboriginal
affairs, and the 'agrarian discontent' envisaged by Douglas is beginning to surface
(predictably) in the Shuswap and along the lower Fraser (where Joseph Trutch
interstitially set the whole process in motion a few short years previously), and I do not
want to minimize the real differences of opinion, even antipathies, between the political centers within which Powell is necessarily 'constituting' (and being 'constituted') as a territorial(izing) agent. Indeed, the impasse between the Province and the Dominion that flows from the 'confusion' over the interpretation of Article 13 of the Terms of Union (see, in this connection, Cail 1974, 190-6; Fisher 1977, 175-87; Tennant 1990, 45-52), and which is bracketed by Powell's attempts at securing both "a statement or record of all the lands held or reserved for Indians" (October 28 1872 letter to Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works George Walkem [British Columbia 1987, 107]) and various "statistics as to the number and character of tribes" (October 28 1872 letter to Provincial Secretary A.R. Robertson [ibid]) make for some 'fascinating' drama of their own. But the essential theme that I want to cull from all of this is that without those maps and statistics Powell quickly finds himself unable to (re)consolidate much of anything at all. Even when he does secure them he still has to deal with the fact that there are, it appears, certain "discrepancies...between the schedule of Indian Reserves furnished by Mr. Pearse [in Appendix 1] to the Dominion and Provincial Governments and the book of tracings" (August 10 1874 letter from Chief Commission of Lands and Works Robert Beaven to Powell [ibid, 138]) in his own possession, and, worse, that some of the reserves previously allotted, and on which the First Peoples have since been residing are "not laid down in the official maps...[made by]...Lands and Works" (September 3 1874 letter from Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs H. Moffat to the Provincial Secretary [ibid, 141]) at all! The problem (for the First Peoples as well as Powell) is not so much that the Superintendent is viewed by provincial authorities as an 'outsider', but that, insofar as federal authorities have scripted him a 'game plan' which he is patently not equipped to play, he, in fact, is one. Geographically, Powell's office is a stone's throw from the
Provincial Legislature, but his institutional anchor is in Ottawa, and the net effect is to 'maroon' him at the perimeter of the very territorial power network he is charged with tracing, and 'on the bench' of the field of spatial practice at the same time. Ultimately frustrated at his having to spend more time as 'mediator' than on 'Indian affairs' per se, and "owing to the unsettled condition of the land question" (October 1 1875 Report to the Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs [Canada 1875]) unable to marshall the alliances he needs, Powell recalls his survey parties without them having allotted or mapped a single reserve. Four years after Confederation, in other words, "the great national question seeking solution at the hands of [both governments]" (November 2 1874 memorandum from Laird [British Columbia 1987, 153, emphasis added]) remains unresolved. What both governments do agree on, however, is the form that this resolution must take. For the year is 1875 and the material force is not so much settlement per se — much less furs, gold, or ethnographic curiosity — but the driving power of an emergent nation-state that has promised a 'network of steel' to consolidate its outer bulkhead — and the Indians of the northwest coast are still in the way.⁵

The institution charged with affecting that removal is the joint federal/provincial 1876 Indian Reserve Commission, which is instructed by Order-in Council to "visit, with all convenient speed, in such order as may be found desirable, each Indian nation (meaning by nation all Indian tribes speaking the same language) in British Columbia, and...to fix and determine for each nation separately, the number, extent, and locality of the Reserve or Reserves to be allowed to it" (November 5 1875 memorandum from Minister of the Interior R.W. Scott [British Columbia 1987, 161, emphasis added]).⁶ Its de facto legal authority is, from the Province's perspective, the 1875 Free Grant Act, and, from the Dominion's, the 1876 Indian Act, and, as during the (pre)colonial period, it will (net)work
the territorial circumscription of the First Peoples at two different, yet indissoluble, scalar perspectives, and, as previously, in two ontologically distinct, yet complementary, domains: the one of relative geographical position, the other of thematization. The essential difference between this (net)working and the one that preceded it, however, is not that it is necessarily less concerned with the quantitative collation of the 'hard' discourses of 'Otherness' – i.e. as expressed through proprietary surveying, census, and the law – but with the qualitative staging of the 'soft' – i.e. as expressed through art, historical (re)interpretation, and the collector. In a word, this difference is primarily one of territorial aesthetics.

**The Indian Reserve Commission (Act I)**

Our entry point is Gilbert Sproat's 1878 (?) *Plan of The Indian Reserves, Cowichan* (figure 22), a prototype of an entire genre of large-scale reserve plans drawn by the Commissioners between 1877 and 1910 and which collectively confer a superficial legitimacy on the legality and ethical 'correctness' of outright theft. Like most of his contemporaries Sproat has few doubts that "colonization [is that] wonderful agent, which, directed by laws of its own, has changed and is changing the whole surface of the earth" (1987, 8), but, unlike many of them, he is concerned to ensure (as far as he is able) that Aboriginal rights are "enjoyed in full and the reserves of land distinctly marked on the maps of the colony" (cited in Shankel 1945, 41, emphasis added). To the extent that this plan certainly appears (and 'feels') a lot larger than the territories actually being mapped it shares the essential form of its colonial predecessors, and the inclusion of a compass rose evokes that equivalent capacity for surveillance by direct observation that is reminiscent
of the 14th century *portolanos*. But in recapturing something of the artistic sensibilities that we saw briefly in Tiedemann (figure 15), the style of representation *per se* is altogether 'softer' than almost anything we saw under Trutch. Drawn and hand-coloured on linen there seems to be as much attention to the representation of the *landscape* proper as to the 'grid of modernity' being interstitially imposed on top, and the calligraphy in the text adds just enough visual flair to partially obscure the fact that it is, after all, simply a plan.

I will return to this dialectic between artistic creativity and technical skill in the plans of the Indian Reserve Commissioners in a moment, but briefly detour here to suggest that it is not merely within the 'window' of this plan that the aesthetics of 'Otherness' to which I am referring manifest themselves. On the contrary, just as a work of architecture does not evince its full 'textuality' in isolation from its physical setting, neither does the plan do so without a geographical context. The problem is, as we have already noted, that this is a plan whose organizational anchor is now in two different places, at least one of which is still wrestling with 'obtaining' conceptual access to the (larger scale) field of spatial practice that constitutes that context. A solution, albeit a temporary one, is found in, of all theatres, the British Admiralty's 1861 *Vancouver Island and the Gulf of Georgia* (figure 23), the earliest known map that I am aware of which actually superinscribes as a *thematic overlay* the 'government reserves' first envisaged by Pearse and the Select Committee in 1863, and some of which are 'officially allotted' as Indian Reserves by Sproat in 1879.\(^{10}\) It is true that the Cowichan Reserve does not appear on this map but the 'development' I most want to highlight is the 'appropriation' of a representation of space *from a past time and place* to construct the stage upon which the representational spaces *of today* may now assume their 'proper position'. It is not, however, simply the
Figure 22

Gilbert Sproat's *Plan of the Indian Reserves, Cowichan*, Victoria 1878 (?); first surveyed in 1874 by Edward Mohun (who was the Commission's chief surveyor from 1877 to 84 [Eastwood 1979, 12]), and again by Ashdown Green in 1878, this linen includes a large section that does not appear on Pearse's and Launders' earlier plan (figure 21), but Sproat's own role in this addition is unclear. The compass rose, calligraphy, and topographical tinting are standard Sproat signatures although not all plans in this particular style were necessarily completed by him. Whether or not the location of the small upstream allotments were a material manifestation of his observation that "the village sites are generally well chosen...are often beautiful, occupying picturesquely the made ground at the bend of a river" (Sproat 1987, 31) can only be guessed at, but the plan does indeed evoke a greater concern with territorial aesthetics than almost anything that preceded it. (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves])
The British Admiralty's *Vancouver Island and Gulf of Georgia* London 1861; subsequently 'appropriated' by B.W. Pearse and the Select Committee in 1863, and 'retitled' (then or shortly thereafter) as *General Map Showing Reserves*, it is the earliest I have found that metonymically displaces Indian Reserves proper as a thematic overlay on a European base map, and in so doing constructs a vision of 'Indian lands' which at once has both spatial and temporal components. It is by no means clear exactly when this overlay was applied, or even if it was applied in one stroke, and I have not found any direct evidence that Pearse himself ever navigated the west coast of Vancouver Island. It was common practice in those days, however, to set aside certain localities as 'government reserves', a great majority of which were eventually 'converted' into Indian Reserves (recall, again, figure 13), however reduced in size those (re)reservations might be. Compare, for example, with figure 27(b). (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves])
W.F. Tolmie's and G.M. Dawson's *Map shewing the Distribution of the Indian Tribes of British Columbia*, Ottawa 1883; a direct descendent of both Arrowsmith (figure 6) and Devine (figure 8), but a far stronger thematization of the First Nations as 'ethnohistorical objects' than either. Borders are indeed more discriminating, but there is no doubt as to whose borders are the really important ones. One of the more sophisticated blends of artisanship and technical craft in the representation of 'Otherness' during the (post)colonial period, it would be difficult to miss the influence of the 19th century human sciences even if one knew nothing about its authorship. By projecting 'primitive societies' onto a modern stage the map promotes a mimesis in which "the theory of cultural space [is] transformed into a cultural model of space" (Lefebvre 1991, 305). (British Columbia Archives and Records Services, Map Collection, CM/C385)
parallel acts of geo-cartographic displacement and substitution of Aboriginal Nations as 'proprietary islands' in someone else's territorial atlas that constitutes the aesthetic movement at its deeper currents. It is that in constructing this (new) perspective the specific experiences of Captains Henry Kellett, G.H. Richards, and George Vancouver that had attended its material production 'in place' are effectively 're-interpreted' and 're-inscribed' in quotidian 'space'. To put it another way, it is through the creation of an historical depth of field, that this map is now able to network in ideology an apprehension of 'Otherness' that has not only a geographical, but a temporal, component.

This is yet another of those 'absolutely seminal' interstitial emergences I have identified previously, but it may be with this one that we are first able to conceptually 're-weave' the three main strands of cartographic representation whose divergence I earlier located in Arrowsmith. Again, I will come back to this point more substantively below, but the cartographic piece de résistance that 'coheres' this visual amalgam of the 'exploratory edge', the 'administered space', and the 'ethnography of viewing' (see, in this connection, Orlove 1993, 39) of the 'Other' along and (with)in those 'edges' and 'spaces' is W.F. Tolmie's and G.M. Dawson's 1883 Map shewing the Distribution of the Indian Tribes of British Columbia (figure 24).11 It is certainly more than coincidence that this map is published virtually at the same time as Franz Boas and James Teit are subjecting the objective subject to their anthropological microscopes, and it is perhaps in this sense that this map 'inverts' the 'order of inscription' that we saw in McDonald (figure 5) a half century earlier. Again, however, we see a similar enrolment of colour (the artistic creativity) and lithographic technique (the technical skill) to (super)impose on First Nations' territories the same sort of taxonomization that the human sciences are imposing on the First Peoples themselves. The 'hard' quantitative difference is that this
representation is interstitially networked at a much larger scale than its Arrowsmith progeny, and there is consequently (for Euro-Canadians anyway) a greater degree of 'accuracy', 'reputability' and 'truthfulness' attenuated from it. The 'soft' qualitative difference is that the map is made at a time when photography and the collection of cultural artefacts by European and North American museums are entering more fully onto the territorial stage. Both constitute extremely significant ideological stratagems in their own right, and I will engage them in turn towards the end of this Chapter and in Chapter Five, but it is enough to note for now that it is not, once again, simply a matter of cartographically 'discarding' Aboriginal territory now that a more 'appropriate' one may be 'substituted' for it. It is that the First Nations must first be (metonymically) 'mapped out' of the provincial theater at a larger scale (as in figure 22) so that they may be subsequently (metaphorically) 'mapped back into' the field of spatial practice at the smaller (as in figures 23 and 24). This map evokes, in point of fact, the validity of that particular 'double movement' to which I alerted in Chapter One; a movement in which the essential symbolic form of the territorial space of the 'Other' is sustained by (and across) all three maps (figures 22, 23, and 24), and through both ontological domains (the large and the small scales), and 'along' which the conflation of ('hard' and 'soft') discourses of 'Otherness' enlisted at one end of the field is not necessarily the same as that being regurgitated at the other.

Returning to the Indian Reserve Commission proper, Gilbert Sproat spends most of 1877 laying out reserves in the Malaspina Strait, and making some cosmetic alterations to those in the Cowichan District and on the Saanich Peninsula (see, in this connection, Powell's December 31 1877 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1877]). In 1878, by now working alone, Sproat allots reserves up the Fraser to
Lytton, along the North Thompson to Hat Creek, and then into the Similkameen and Nicola valleys, leading Powell to state confidently at season's end that "[t]he Indian land question has thus been adjusted...throughout the whole southern interior of the mainland of the Province (October 20 1878 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1878])." In 1879 the Commissioner returns to the coast, laying out allotments in Halmokolem and Kwakiutl territory, and around the northwestern tip of Vancouver Island, by which time Dominion surveyors are busy 'confirming' his allotments in the interior districts the year previous. Regardless of how much some provincial actors might share Sproat's sense of territorial aesthetics, however, they are not at all happy with their 'contents', and while they have made a commitment to not interfere with the Commission's work they are far less willing to accept its decisions. Almost from the beginning settlers in the Nicola, New Westminster, and Cowichan Districts complain bitterly about the 'generosity' of Sproat's allotments, and the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works refuses to authorize any of the 257 reserves he has laid out (Shankel 1945, 136-7; Cail 1974, 224-5). By 1880 Powell has also had enough and in March of that year, under increasing political pressure in Ottawa, Sproat resigns. His replacement is Peter O'Reilly, but insofar as his own discourse(s) on 'Otherness' cohere more closely with the interests of his superiors, it will be his goal to not simply continue where Sproat left off, but to actually 're-visit' and reduce what his predecessor has already allotted.

The Indian Reserve Commission (Act II)

Peter O'Reilly's 1889 Plan of Bella Coola Indian Reserves, Coast District (figure 25), 1891 Plan of Osoyoos Indian Reserves, Osoyoos Division, Yale District (figure 30[a]),
Peter O'Reilly's *Plan of the Bella Coola Indian Reserves, Coast District*, Victoria 1889; first surveyed in 1888 by W.S. Jemmett, is archtypical of a series of 'multiple-reserve' plans commonly made in coastal districts. The scale of this reproduction aside, these linens tended to be large (between three and five ft²), belying the fact that most coastal reserves comprised only a few hundred acres. They were generally not lithographed, but traced at Lands and Works on an 'as-needed' basis, an important point I will return to in Chapter Five. Powell thought the Nuxalk to be one of the most 'resistant' of all the coastal nations, but he had "no doubt that even here the residence of an active and intelligent Agent of long experience...will soon be productive of a much desired change..." (August 13 1881 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1881]). As illustrated here (and again in figure 33[b]), this plan certainly helped. For the surveyor's log and its 'incorporation' in dialogical discourse see Appendices 2 and 4(i) respectively. (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves])
Figure 26

Section from Peter O'Reilly's *Plan of the Toosey Indian Reserves, Chilcotin, Cariboo District*, Victoria 1895; is archtypical of 'single-reserve' plans commonly made in the interior, where acreages of a few thousand acres were more common. Although Sproat's pre-1880 plans were usually sepia-toned in earth-like colours, most of O'Reilly's were tinted (perhaps deliberately) in red. First surveyed by O.S. Fletcher in 1891, and then again by E.M. Skinner in 1894, the Commissioner had stated confidently that "[t]he chief expressed his satisfaction and that of his people... and at the prospect of having their lands defined" (August 16 1887 Report to the Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs [Canada 1887, emphasis added]). The rectilinearity of its delineation 'on the ground' however, is striking, and A.W. Vowell's conclusion that the land was "worthless on account of the poverty of the soil and [lack of irrigation] water..." (November 11 1890 ibid [Canada 1890]) is certainly not supported here. For the (1894) surveyor's log and its 'incorporation' in dialogical discourse see Appendices 2 and 4(iv) respectively. (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves])
PLAN
OF THE
TOOSEY INDIAN
CHILCOTIN, CARIBOO
BRITISH COLUMBIA
Sections from (a) Peter O'Reilly's *Plan of the Nootka Sound Indian Reserves...*, Victoria 1894; and (b): G.H. Richards' *Esperanza to Clayoquot including Nootka Sound*, London 1862; illustrate (dramatically, in fact) how apposite plates in the territorial atlas narratively evoke "a palimpsest of the explorers' experience, a criss-cross of routes gradually congealing into fixed lands and seas" (Carter 1987, 23), but do so only by defining the territories of the 'Other' by *what they are not* (see, also, Said 1979, 228). Compare, especially, the size of these allotments (shown in red in [b]) with those originally envisaged in figure 23. Three quarters of a century ago Randall suggested that "a study of gradual progress [of the law] century by century illustrated with maps and considered in relation to commercial progress and the lines of the trade routes...may be a solvent of [legal or geographic] controversies" (1918, 212, emphasis added). As far as Euro-Canadians on the northwest coast of Turtle Island are concerned, Nootka Sound might be a good place to start. (both British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [(a)Indian Reserves; (b)Old Maps])
1894 *Plan of the Nootka Sound Indian Reserves, Nootka District* (figure 27[a]), and 1895 *Plan of the Toosey Indian Reserves, Chilcotin, Cariboo District* (figure 26) are archtypical of an entire genre of reserve plans produced by the Commission after the 1881 subdivision of the province into discreet Indian Agencies. They not only graphically perfect that particular geographical image of 'Indian lands' that dates back to Joseph Trutch, but refine that same unity of artistic creativity and craftsmanship that was initially suggested, if obliquely, in Sproat (figure 22). Like Sproat's they are drawn and hand-coloured on linen, but, unlike Sproat's, the textual addenda on these plans display a typographic consistency that bespeaks the 'accuracy', 'reputability', and 'truthfulness' of technical draughtsmanship. Additionally, the colours are just rich enough to recapture that volumetric sensibility that was first hinted at in Tiedemann (figure 15), but not so polychromatic as to either confuse that text or defuse the visual networking between the 'optical center' of the map *qua* artefact and the 'discursive center of the objective 'Other(s)' being mapped. Each plan comes with a supporting cast of written topographical report, census, and surveyor's log (see Appendix 2), but any visual disjuncture between the lay of the land in the representational space *proper* and the angular measured survey being (super)imposed upon it by the representation is 'softened' by sylvan descriptions of the enclosed terrain. Like a landscape viewed from in front of an easel, in other words, these plans indeed suggest the tranquility and 'self-assuredness' of an impressionist painting. Commissioned, signed, and dated as graphic title deeds, however, they have that 'at-a-glance' authority that confirms ownership and a capacity for surveillance.

Not quite so striking, but just as important from an ideological standpoint is the rendering as 'absence' the space(s) *behind* (and outside) the easel. Floating like islands on a glassine sea these plans evoke the same metonymic displacement that we saw in
Launders (figures 19 and 20) – i.e. their interstitial 'detachment' from both the power networks of modernity that 'floated' them there, and the Aboriginal territorial archive that was their 'real' (but by now their 'metaphysical') genesis – but what is particularly evident is just how miniscule some of these 'islands' really are (see, especially, figure 27[a]). Plans of reserves in coastal regions almost always include insets (figures 25 and 27[a]), but in no way is this intended to suggest any kind of contiguity between the 'islands'. As far as these plans are concerned they have always been 'islands', and the insets are – like the 'Indian villages' in Mayne and Richards (figure 11) and Palmer (figure 12) – merely 'reference markers' for those colonial actors who will be making further use of them. As alluded to above (in figures 22 and 23), moreover, this large-scale 'de-definition' also happens to supply the structural components of a smaller-scale territorial power network which is not merely 'superstructural' to them, but in fact is their very containment. I will address that containment in more substantive form a little later in the Chapter, but in fin de siècle British Columbia there is still a real paucity of maps upon which provincial and federal authorities can visualize their own eminent domain, much less the delimited domains of the First Peoples. So once again into the breach sails the British Admiralty, the requisite temporal depth-of-field in which that delimitation may be ideologically sustained supplied here in the form of G.H. Richards' 1862 Esperanza to Clayoquot including Nootka Sound (figure 27[b]), and upon which Peter O'Reilly's version of the history and geography of 'Otherness' is thematically superimposed (compare with figures 23 and 27[a]). This is, of course, precisely where Captain James Cook first scripted the screenplay for the very territorial theatre whose foundations he helped network in 1778, but as far as this map is concerned the original cast of characters on that stage (Chief Maquinna and the Nuu'chah'nulth) might as well be on the moon. Such is the power of
modern cartography that it can – if I may be allowed to stretch the metaphor just a little – turn sovereign Indian Nations into mere beacons in a sea of tranquility.

Actually, the metaphor may not be that far-fetched after all. I am certainly not suggesting that O'Reilly, Powell, or anyone else really envisages British Columbia in these terms, but to the extent that the quotidian is something they experience week after week, and month after month, there is a sense in which the allotment of reserves is, for them, simply what they 'do for a living', another day, as it were, 'at the office'. It is patently not perceived this way by the First Nations, of course, and I will come back to their own response to this particular 'time-space compression' in a moment. But if I seem to be giving more 'visual weight' to O'Reilly than almost any other actor in the territorial atlas under consideration in this thesis (with the possible exception of Joseph Trutch) it is precisely because the geographical scope of, and institutional power concentrated in, his own praxis demands it. It should be remembered that with the exception of an interpreter and (sometimes) an assistant (Shankel 1945, 147) O'Reilly is, for all intents and purposes, reconnoitering the province solo, and his reconnaissance is as territorially extensive as it is difficult. It is not simply that he is the actor that is methodically and exhaustively (re)tracing out the representational spaces of the First Peoples 'on the ground'. It is that in authoring the representations of space that evoke and validate them he applies a genealogy and a 'direction' to the landscape in which he moves in exactly the same way Vancouver did along the coastal interface. O'Reilly is not merely an interstice in the ideological power networks he navigates, in other words, but an interstice in motion along those networks at the same time. The full import of this insight I will engage more fully in Chapter Five and the Conclusion, but to the extent that O'Reilly effectively constitutes his own field of spatial practice in the course of quotidian discourse as much as he traces
within one whose form is already 'seeded', it seems that we then have to admit that the 'personal' geography of the Indian Reserve Commissioner is, in no small measure, the human geography of the province of British Columbia itself.

The Indian Land Question Emergent

The First Peoples, of course, are not at all pleased with either O'Reilly as an interstitial tracer or the human geography he is charged with tracing, and almost everywhere do they express to Powell their dissatisfaction with his parsimonious allotments. The Superintendent concurs that they may "deserve more than sympathy for [their] trying position" (November 5 1884 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1884, lv]), but insofar as most of the arable land is usually pre-empted before the Commissioner shows up in any case, the best he can do is ask the Province to cease authorizing purchases and/or leases until the latter completes his (net)work (see, for example, November 5 1886 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, [ibid, 104]). It is a solicitation that is, of course, categorically (and repeatedly) denied. The 1880s, however, also happen to be the decade in which the First Nations start to engage in a little 'direct action' of their own. The (geo)political networkings of what will become known as the 'Indian Land Question' are beyond the scope of this thesis, but it comes into bold relief in 1886 not too far from Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en territory when the Nisga'a forcibly eject one of Powell's survey parties, and H.M.S. Cormorant is sent upcoast from Victoria to arrest the 'instigators' (see, in this connection, ibid, xi).16

The following year the provincial and federal governments agree to the formation of the Commission to Enquire into the State and Condition of the Indians of the North-West
Coast of British Columbia, which is instructed to "proceed to the Nass River and Port Simpson, and there meet with the Indians of those localities, for the purpose of hearing the expression of their views, wishes, and complaints...[but to be very]...careful to discountenance...any claim of Indian title to Provincial lands" (September 29 1887 letter from Attorney General E.B. Davie to Commissioner J.P. Planta [British Columbia 1888, 2]) while so doing. That, however, is exactly what the First Peoples want to discuss. The Chiefs speak of O'Reilly's insensitivity to their needs, their distaste for the 1876 Indian Act, their expectations of justly and fairly negotiated treaties, and at one point Kincolith teacher Frederick Allen asks Commissioner Clement Cornwall "for another paper of authority [because he is] told the maps [the Tsimshian] have are nothing" (ibid, 30). Cornwall dismisses Allen's maps as "not official, as they are not signed by anyone" (ibid, emphasis added), and Planta's response is that "[t]he whole question of the Indian lands in British Columbia was settled long ago by law" (ibid, 19, emphasis added) in any case. Since it has already been established elsewhere (by O'Reilly) that the First Peoples are "naturally anxious to have their reserves...defined" (November 2 1885 Report to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs [Canada 1885]), and (by Cornwall) that "the Indian in his wild state has no idea of property in or title to land...[and]...has no definite boundaries within which he claims...[and that]...the beasts of the field have as much ownership to the land as he has..." (cited in Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 166, emphasis added) to begin with, then it follows that the solution is less a matter of re-evaluating the size or location of (much less the policy behind) O'Reilly's allotments, than it is of a more prompt delivery of "copies of the [officially signed] maps of reserves...to the Indians" (British Columbia 1888, 45). The Commissioners conclude (predictably) that the 'problem' is primarily due to a paucity of jurisdictional presence in the person(s) of an Indian Agent.
and/or magistrate, a surfeit of 'outside agitation' by certain missionaries (especially William Duncan and Robert Tomlinson), and a general lack of economic opportunity, but "the present method of dealing with the Indians in this respect is as proper and fair as a one as can be devised...[and as]...far as the land is concerned it is impossible to go beyond this" (cited in Delgammukw vs. A.G. 1991, 166). So far as British Columbia and Canada are concerned, in other words, it will be business as usual, another 'day at the office' for the map-makers and the law-givers of Euro-Canadian modernity on the northwest coast.

As I have already illustrated, in fact, O'Reilly and the surveying crews pretty much pick up where they left off after 1888, and by the time the Commissioner retires in 1898 over 800 reserves comprising a total of 718,568 acres are laid out (Cail 1974, 226). After 1900, however, the 'pace of the trace' abates somewhat, leading the new Reserve Commissioner A.W. Vowell to opine that, his earlier expectations to the contrary, the work of allotting and surveying reserves "will never be finished...[for while]...it was at one time supposed that such bands as had been visited by the Commission and had reserves appointed to them...were done...such, however, proves with the development of the country and the changed conditions...not to be the case" (January 22 1907 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1907, emphasis added]). By this time, moreover, First Nations' political activism has elevated itself to another level, and the breach between the Province and the Dominion over the size and extent of reserves to be allotted, the question of 'reversionary interest', and the 'legal status' of Aboriginal title has widened substantially. While he allows that surveyors shall continue to chain and compass those reserves already allotted (whether by himself or O'Reilly), Vowell suspends the allotment process proper in 1909 (see, for example, his February 5 1909 Report to the
Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [ibid 1909]), and the following year the Commission itself is dissolved, his own dual position as Superintendent and Indian Reserve Commissioner along with it.20

Cartographies of the Royal Commission

In 1912 the Dominion and Province agree by Order-in-Council to the "appointment of a Commission to settle all differences [between both governments] respecting Indian Lands and Indian Affairs" (British Columbia 1916, 10) in British Columbia. Section 2 of the agreement provides that in the event "the Commissioners are satisfied that more land is included in any particular Reserve as now defined than is reasonably required for the use of the Indians...the Reserve shall, with the consent of the Indians, as required by the Indian Act, be reduced...[and that should they decide]...an insufficient quantity of land has been set aside...[in any reserve they]...shall fix the quantity that ought to be added..." (ibid, emphasis added). Again, however, and just as in 1887-8, the Commission is "confined to matters affecting Indian lands which require adjustment between the parties...[and may not address any]...matters appertaining to general Indian policy" (June 10 1913 Confidential Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia, 4, emphasis added).21 The net effect is to forbid discussion on the First Peoples' three main concerns of Aboriginal title, treaties, and self-government, and when Parliament eventually passes the 1920 British Columbia Indian Lands Settlement Act any hope the First Nations may have entertained that Canada would at least keep its promises in Section 2 effectively vanishes (literally as well as metaphorically) 'out the window'.22 After three years of field meetings and deliberations the Commission confirms
Ashdown Green’s *New Westminster Agency*, Victoria 1916; one of a series of agency maps comprising the cartographic support to the *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Affairs for the Province of British Columbia*. Stuffed with tables, charts, censuses, and minutes of the decision the *Report* comprised an endless totalizing classificatory grid: a ‘paper GIS’ (see, for the paradigmatic illustration, Appendix 3). Each map used a colour-coded legend to define the ‘final ‘adjustment’ of the ‘Indian Land Question’, but they were clearly cosmetic adjustments at best. A *thematic overlay* in the sense that cartographers have traditionally understood it, “the fragmented native life-worlds [of the post-contact period] are starkly manifest in the map[s] of native reserves [and are] the insignificant cadastral corollary of the opening of most of the resources of British Columbia to others” (Harris 1991, 680). (University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division, Maps, HR E78 B9 B96)
Ashdown Green's *Williams Lake Agency*, Victoria 1916; graphically evokes not only the practice of allotting reserves in advance of white settlement (as around Alkali Lake and environs) or the capacity of the map to "create a single territorial and political entity out of a fractured and fragmented reality" (Edney 1993, 65), but puts the lie to Superintendent-General Frank Oliver’s belief that provincial development suffered because the First Peoples held all the best land (Titley 1986, 138). On the contrary, Powell sympathized with Ts'ilhqot'in requests for larger reserves, recognizing that "nearly all the land was taken up and to a great extent fenced" (January 22 1907 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1907]). Compare, especially, the 'perceptual size' of O'Reilly's representation of the Toosey Reserve (figure 26) with Green’s (almost dead center here). Still, "if the aborigines [sic] realize[d] that what at first seemed satisfactory [was] altogether inadequate" (ibid), well, that was just their tough luck. (University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division, Maps, HR E78 B9 B96)
Sections from (a) Peter O'Reilly's *Plan of Osoyoos Indian Reserves, Osoyoos Division, Yale District*, Victoria 1891; (b) Ashdown Green's *Okanagan Agency*, Victoria 1916; and (c) G.B. Martin's *Map of Portion of Osoyoos District*, Victoria 1907; a 'narrative sequence' that demonstrates how reserve plans *qua* representational 'container' comprise the building blocks of not only their own 'containment' but interstitially 'access' other fields of spatial practice while so doing. To put it another way, the sequence shows how territorial power networks intersect and overlap not merely along an 'horizontal' (and diachronic) horizon, but 'vertically' (and synchronously), across ontological domains of *differing scales*. The cadastral map may indeed be the quintessential representation of ownership and title (Kain and Baigent 1992, 336-41), but the real source of its alienating (and ideological) power may well be its *portability*. [(a] and [c] British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault; [a] Indian Reserves; [c] District Maps); [b] University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division, Maps, HR E78 B9 B96)
666,640 acres of existing reserve lands, the addition of 87,291 acres as new reserves, and the 'cut-off' of 47,058 acres already allotted, for a net territorial 'gain' of 40,233 acres (about 62 mi²).

Ashdown Green’s 1916 New Westminster Agency (figure 28) and Williams Lake Agency (figure 29) are two of a series of 17 Indian Agency maps produced for the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia, and which represent (for the Dominion and the Province anyway) the cartographic 'final solution' of the 'Indian Land Question'. Embellished with over 1000 pages of graphs, charts, censuses (see Appendix 3), and minutes of the decisions, and spread across four huge volumes, these maps 'complete' the ideological (and, by extension, the material) networking of the First Peoples of the northwest coast of Turtle Island into the Euro-Canadian territorial orbit. They effectively 'immobilize' in provincial and national consciousness(es) what the reserves themselves physically inhibit on the ground. First Nations' travel from one reserve to another now means crossing a fully 'legalized', 'economized', and 'aestheticized' space ruled by an alien power. Fragmented and alienated from one another, moreover, these reserves are not only 'positionable'; they can be moved, removed, or adjusted at the stroke of a pen or the drop of a lawful writ. Collectively, they constitute a thematic overlay in the most multivalent sense of the term, and it is precisely here that we are not only able to reconnoiter with at least two of the three main strands of cartographic representation whose divergence I earlier located in Arrowsmith (figure 6) and convergence I subsequently established in Tolmie and Dawson (figure 24), but trace that same 'double movement' of spatial metaphor and metonymy that we saw in Sproat (figure 22) and the British Admiralty (figure 23), and in O'Reilly (figure 27[a]) and Richards (figure 27[b]). The crucial difference is that this thematic – cast as it is in the
universalizing language of the geometric grid, positive law, and scientific politics, and reproducible at virtually any scale and in any desired quantity – can be 'exported' to other maps: cadastral, property, pre-emption, booster, railway belt, or whatever. As illustrated perfectly by the juxtaposition of O'Reilly's 1891 Plan of Osoyoos Indian Reserves, Osoyoos Division, Yale District (figure 30[a]), Green's 1916 Okanagan Agency (figure 30[b]), and G.B. Martin's 1907 Map of Portion of Osoyoos District (figure 30[c]), these maps evoke and confirm, conjoined or alone, in all their stunning clarity and simplicity, the purified, rationalized, and abstracted essence of a process of cartographic representation of 'the Other' and its place in the order of things that goes back to Mackenzie and Vancouver. Such is the power of modern cartography that it can ideologically convert sovereign Indian Nations into proprietary enclaves of the modern nation-state.

As tightly organized and administered as this territorial network might be in and of itself, however, none of it can be sustained without the 'aesthetic' alliances engendered by that third representational theme to which I have referred previously (and narratively invoked in figures 6, 9, 15, 17, and 24). By no means am I suggesting that Sproat, O'Reilly, or the various Commissions do not command institutional support for the work that they do. On the contrary, the fin de siècle administration of Indian Affairs and 'Indian Lands' is arguably as severe and spartan as anything we witnessed under Trutch or Walkem.24 What I am suggesting is that the Department does not enjoy particularly high status on the parliamentary pecking order to begin with, and that the infrastructural logistics of political authority issuing from Ottawa rely as much on diffuse, distributive, and extensive power sources as much as Victoria relied on the authoritative, collective, and intensive during the colonial period. I will come back to this inter-dependence on
Section from A.G. Morice's *Map of the Northern Interior of British Columbia*, Victoria 1907; divinity in metonymy on the northwest coast of 'Turtle Island'. Surveyor-General G.S. Andrews later wrote of Morice's "catechismic cartographic peregrinations in this huge area [from] 1883 to 1904" (cited in Morice 1978, v); and how — as if in anticipation of Delgam Uukw and Gisday Wa — "from mountain tops...he sketched what he could see but not reach on foot" (ibid, iii, emphasis added), or — in echo of Company fur brigaders or Robert Brown — "other inaccessible and hidden features were sketched...on the advice of faithful native guides and hunters, in whom he found a highly developed topographic sense, and an intimate knowledge of the country" (ibid, emphasis added). Given its authorship (see, in this connection, footnote 25), there may be no better illustration of Harvey's observation that the map is a "homogenization and reification of the rich diversity of spatial itineraries and spatial stories [as it] eliminates 'little by little' all traces of 'the practices that produce it'" (1989, 253). (British Columbia Lands, Surveyor-General Branch, Plans Vault [District Maps])
Provincial Museum's *Ethnological Map of the Province of British Columbia*, Victoria 1913; racial theories, the clamour for territories, the nature of origins, all were the conflation of politics, science and culture that flowed from the imperial center (Said 1979, 232), and all of them are represented here, where, through a cartographic inversion of *dominium* "the conquered peoples bec[o]me the creators of a picture of the world which satisfie[s] their European masters" (Berthon and Robinson 1991, 89). Maps like these say as much about the subjectives of their makers as they do about the objective subject, and it is in this sense, I think, that "thematic maps are the most rhetorical of all our maps" (Harley 1990, 18). Whether or not "the period of their ascendancy in geography [will come to symbolize] an age of geographic antiquarianism" (ibid), however, will depend largely on our own ability (and willingness) to recognize the difference between 'rhetoric' and 'truth'. As the Chief Justice has shown, we are some distance away yet. (University of British Columbia Library, Special Collections and University Archives Division, Maps, 615ecd B862)
what I have occasionally called 'soft' alliances and facts in more substantive form in the following Chapter, except to demonstrate here that the cartographic representations of the administration and control of the 'Other' and its territories are not generally (or even necessarily) the representations that are being absorbed and 'memorized' by the 'general public'.

The Nations that Never Were

What the public does see, rather, are the likes of Oblate Father A.G. Morice's 1907 Map of the Northern Interior of British Columbia (figure 31) and The British Columbia Provincial Museum's 1913 Ethnographical Map of the Province of British Columbia (figure 32). While we have already touched on proselytizers' 'advocacy' for Aboriginal land claims and rights, Morice's map provides graphic evidence that ecclesiastical authorities are much more than mere cameos on the territorial stage that is fin de siècle British Columbia. Like many of his contemporaries (secular or otherwise) he fancies himself as something of an anthropologist, musicologist, photographer, lexicographer, ethnographer, historian and 'explorer', and it is fairly clear that he is no amateur when it comes to surveying and mapping either. The book which 'accompanies' this map (see Morice 1978) is one of the most sought after dissertations of its day, but what is most germane to the subject matter of this thesis is that while it is literally crammed with discourses on the original occupants of the territory in question, the map is not. The First Peoples are rendered in Morice's representation exactly as they were 'not rendered' in Brown's: as absences, as atavistic echoes of a cultural trajectory that once was, but which has now been displaced (figuratively and materially) by the representational spaces of
another. In an *opposite* plate of the territorial atlas, as it were, the Provincial Museum's interpretation of that same trajectory evokes rather the *opposite* impression of First Peoples' *dominium*, and it is perhaps more than coincidental that it is published at precisely the same time as the 1913-16 Royal Commission is making its own preparations for the 'final adjustment' of the Indian Land Question. Here we see the cartographer deploying the same unity of lithographic science and artistic licence advanced in the maps that professed to answer that question from an administrative standpoint (figures 28 and 29), except that in this case the map is marshalling and collating 'soft', as opposed to 'hard', alliances and facts. Effectively networked as 'archaeologies' in the recesses of the museum of natural history this map may be *the* quintessential visual statement that the *First Nations* are only 'nations' to the extent that Euro-Canadian discourses on 'Otherness' permit it. It interstitially constructs for the 20th century 'citizen public' the field of spatial practice upon (and within) which the ideological power of O'Reilly's (figures 25, 26, 27[a], and 30[a]) and Green's (figures 28 and 29) renditions ultimately depends in exactly the same way that the biases and stereotypes of the 19th century 'settler public' supplied the discursive scaffolding of the stage upon which Trutch was able to authorize and legitimate the power networks of colonialism that preceded it. Once again it is not simply a matter of 'tossing aside' the territories of the First Peoples now that the territories of Euro-Canadian modernity can be 'substituted' for it. It is that the one must be first (metonymically) 'mapped out' in the administrative and juridical orbits, so that the 'Other' may be then (metaphorically) 'mapped back in' in the proto-historical and the cultural. Both Morice and the Museum follow altogether different traces while doing so, but their discursive 'destinations' are what amounts to the same place.
The New(er) Imperialism

From the vantage point of 1995, of course, hindsight is always 20/20, and it is easy for us to be as highly critical of actors like Powell, O'Reilly, Cornwall, or even the Provincial Museum, as it is of Trutch. In point of fact, it is a necessary part of the dispensation of justice (and the cross-cultural healing process that is networked along with it) that this be the case, a theme I shall return to in substance in the Conclusion. But the events retraced in this Chapter did not unfold on the field of spatial practice of 1995; they were acted out on a late 19th century stage that had already been structured by the inscriptions and enactments of those whose traces preceded them. Certainly there was throughout, as I have illustrated, a continuing dialogue on the discursive contents of Aboriginal (territorial or other) rights, but when it came right down to the symbolic form in which those rights could best be expressed, most (post)colonial actors tacitly concurred with Powell's moralistic belief that the "recognition and protection of individual property rights are the first and distinguishing principles of civilization...[and that by]...giv[ing] the Indian...a tract of land, the boundaries of which are recognized as his own, and allow[ing] whatever he can produce from it to be considered his individual property..." (October 1 1876 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, [Canada 1876]), assimilation was not only inevitable, but justified. If the symbolic 'bisection' or 'pulverization' of even the remnants of 'Indian lands' - as suggested in Green's (?) 1898 (?) Plan of the Esquimalt Indian Reserve, Esquimalt District (figure 33[a]) and 1906 Plan of the Bella Coola Indian Reserves, Coast District (figure 33[b]) respectively - did not raise colonial actors' eyebrows any more than the material metonymies on terra firma, it is precisely because it was (and is) in the pragmatics of quotidian discourse that ideology qua social
Figure 33

Section from (a) Ashdown Green's *Plan of the Esquimalt Indian Reserve, Esquimalt District*, Victoria 1898 (?); and (b) Green's *Plan of the Bella Coola Indian Reserves, Coast District*, Victoria 1906; visually evoke the potential for the commodification of the 'interior' of the 'container' just as the container is commodified by its own 'containment' (as in figures 30[a], [b], and [c]). Cornwall's solemn declaration that "the reserve [at Victoria] on which the Indians lived was very much wanted for railway purposes [but]...all that has been taken is a narrow strip...for public purposes" (British Columbia 1888, 21-2) would have been of small consolation to those who were so 'stripped'. Compare, this image, for example, with Tiedemann's (figure 15). The Bella Coola estuary, on the other hand, had a habit of flooding, and so it was in 1905 that "Green was despatched...there to superintend the...protection of the banks of the river at that place...[and subdivide] into 20-acre lots a portion of the reserve..." (A.W. Vowell's February 16 1906 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1906]), which, two years previously, had been moved to the north side of the river to make room for the white community on the south (Kopas 1972, 257-8). Green simply (re)traced O'Reilly's 1889 plan (figure 25) to provide the 'base map' for the subdivision. (Note, also, provision for a 'right-of-way' intended for the Pacific and Hudson's Bay Railway, one of a host of late 19th-century railroads that never made it past the charter stage.) Geographically it is right 'on top' of Mackenzie's 'Village of the Rascals', but discursively, it is a very long way away indeed. (both British Columbia Lands, Surveyor General Branch, Plans Vault [Indian Reserves])
(re)organizer was (and is) operationalized in its most transcendent domains.\textsuperscript{26} The territorial circumscription of the First Peoples was less the consequence of a deliberate policy of 'developmentalism' \textit{per se}, in other words, than it was of happenstance and opportunism on the part of the 'developers' (see, also, Morrison 371). It has to be remembered that British colonialism had always presumed its Native policy to be the most humane and proper one (see, again, the correspondence between Douglas and Lytton [British Columbia 1987, 12-20]), and \textit{fin de siècle} Canada was still as British as they come. But with the rapid (and sometimes rapacious) territorial and institutional consolidations of the power networks of \textit{Pax Britannica} during the last three decades of the 19th century – fertilized and crosscut as they were by Darwinian theories of racial superiority and the 'survival of the fittest' – "the moral conception of [the] imperial civilizing mission became as popular as it had [ever] been in the early Victorian age..." (Eldridge 1973, 253), and the geographical appetite that flowed from it could take on the moral neutrality of an impulse to explore, discover, and settle (Said 1979, 216) \textit{all over again}. It was during this epoch that huge expanses of the empire were mapped for the first time, London was (still) the world center of cartography, geographies were measured from Greenwich (Morrison 1968, 372), and even the most consummate of apologists for the rights and privileges of the 'Other' were swept up in the 'euphoria' that came with "painting much of the map red" (William Gladstone, cited in Eldridge 1973, 252).

That this painting would translate 'on the ground' as both art and craft, then, seems evident enough, but it must also caution us to not draw too sharp a distinction between 'colonialism' and 'imperialism' \textit{in cartography} on the one hand, much less between 'art' and 'science' \textit{in maps} on the other. To a certain extent, perhaps, 'imperial cartographies' may be 'thematically' associated with surveillance, speculation, and classification (and the
'international' dimension), and 'colonial cartographies' with ordering, calculation, and exploitation (and the 'national') (Stone 1988, 61). I certainly think that the former must, by definition, precede the latter but it would be a mistake to suggest that either ever supplants the other in either chrono-historical or synchrono-geographical terms. On the contrary, it is patently clear from the circumnavigation of the territorial atlas under consideration in this thesis that both are simultaneities, and that each only exercises ideological power and territorial authority in concert with the other. The cadastral map may well be the nonpareil instrument of control that most separates the (post)colonial cartographer's arsenal (Kain and Baigent 1992, 344) from its imperial cousin, but it is only when it marshalls and allies itself in discourse with the more ephemeral 'ethnographies' of 'Otherness' that "the cartographer [now truly] dominates the world that dominated the explorer" (Latour 1987, 224). I am not convinced, on this view then, that late 19th century Orientalism was necessarily less textual than it was administrative (Said 1979, 210), any more than I agree that it was the cartographers who really 'discovered America' (Robinson 1992, 35). The strength of late 19th century Orientalism was precisely that it was both aesthetized ('softened') and legalized ('hardened') at the same time, and that it was by and through the map that 'America' (or some given portion of it) was, in fact, made. More significantly, it is perhaps with this insight into the dialectic between artistic creativity and technical skill that we can now perceive more plainly (than at the end of Chapters Two or Three) that the maps (and documents) which Chief Justice McEachern decided 'speak for themselves' in 'clear and simple' language (see Miller 1992b, 57) really do nothing of the sort. It is towards the 'internal homogenization' of that dialectic in its historical and geographical context that we may now turn.
Footnotes to Chapter Four

1. The "tracings of the Indian Reserves existing in [the] Province, together with the statistics of the Natives generally" (October 16 1871 report from Pearse to Howe [British Columbia 1987, 102]) included 81 allotments on 18 alpha-numeric sheets and a Schedule (see Appendix 1). No reserves had been surveyed (or mapped) outside the lower Fraser or Thompson River corridors, north of Burrard Inlet on the mainland or Comox on the island, or on the west coast of Vancouver Island.

2. From 1867 to 1873 Indian Affairs was under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Secretary of State (with the Secretary himself the Superintendent-General) and from 1873 to 1880 the Department of the Interior. In 1874 the province was divided into two superintendencies, with Powell the senior officer retaining authority over the coastal regions, and James Lenihan the interior. Both appointments were the result of political pressure, and neither could be considered appropriate. Powell continued to practice medicine when his new duties should have demanded his undivided attention and Lenihan proved to be a poor negotiator and something of a simpleton to boot (Fisher 1977, 180-1). Doubtless Powell was a better advocate for the First Peoples than his provincial colleagues, but insofar as he thought policy "calculated to wean them of their migratory habits, by locating appropriate reservations, and regulating existing ones...[was]...the duty of judicious administration on their behalf..." (January 13 1873 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1873, emphasis added]), he was as quintessentially Victorian as the rest.

3. Most of this difference concerned the acreage to be allotted, and on what basis that acreage should be calculated. Powell was instructed to seek 80 acres per family (March 21 1873 Order-in-Council [British Columbia 1987, 114]) but the Province countered with no more than 20 (July 28 1873 letter from the Provincial Secretary John Ash to Powell [ibid, 119]), an offer Powell accepted (August 27 1873 letter to Ash [ibid, 120]), if reluctantly. Neither party could concur on how many persons it took to define a 'family', however, (see, in this connection, April 30 1873 letter from Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works Robert Beaven to Powell [ibid, 115]; and Powell's July 29 1873 rejoinder to Ash [ibid, 119]), and available censuses were suspect to begin with. Additionally, it soon became clear that because of established development certain existing reserves, such as the Musqueam and Tsawwassen, could not be enlarged to meet even this requirement (see, in this connection, July 31 1874 letters from Powell to Beaven [ibid, 134-5]). By this time, moreover, the First Peoples were becoming more "aware that the Government of Canada [had] always taken good care of the Indians [east of the Rockies] and treated them liberally, allowing more than one hundred acres per family" (July 14 1874 letter from Hope Chief Peter Ayessik to Powell [ibid, 136]) and felt that "20...acres of land per family will not give satisfaction, but will create ill feelings, irritation amongst our people..." (ibid). Much of the 'advocacy' on behalf of the First Peoples was advanced by the missionaries (see, in this connection, February 3 1871 letter from Reverend J.B. Good to the Colonial Secretary [ibid, 89]; and August 28 1874 letter from Reverend C.J. Grandidier to the Victoria Standard [ibid, 145-8]), a campaign which did not exactly endear them to provincial authorities.
4. On October 5 1871 Trutch advised the Secretary of State that the documents were "now being prepared...and will be transmitted...as soon as completed, which, however, will not be for some considerable time yet, as the copying of the maps of Indian Reserves is a lengthy undertaking" (British Columbia 1987, 101, emphasis added). On November 3 he sent the completed tracings to Ottawa with the October 16 1871 enclosure from Pearse (see footnote 1, above; and Appendix 1) advising that the province had "no statistics as to the number of Indians in each tribe, and...no means of obtaining them [since] it would cost a great deal of time and money; and would involve a visit to each Indian Village throughout the Province" (ibid, 102, emphasis added), and with his own added proviso that if any additional maps were needed, he would "defray any such reasonable charges from Dominion funds" (ibid, 101). On October 28 1872 Powell asked the Provincial Secretary for "a map or general plan...with such other particulars...as may be in [your] possession" (ibid, 107), only to be told by the latter on November 4 that they were already "in the hands of the Department at Ottawa" (ibid, 108). The next day Powell sent a second letter seeking a copy of Trutch's covering despatch from January 1872, and received essentially the same answer. He finally secured the records sometime in December 1872 or January 1873.

5. In exchange for the promise of the Pacific railway the province was to convey to the Dominion a strip 20 miles wide on either side of the right-of-way, including a sufficient amount of land from contiguous areas to compensate for any land already under pre-emption (Cail 1974, 127). Unfortunately (for the First Peoples certainly) no provision was made for existing Indian Reserves which might already be laid out in the railway belt (see footnote 7, below), but the most immediate problem (for the Dominion anyway) was what to do about those areas where no reserves had been allotted at all. At that time Esquimalt was the intended terminus, and Marcus Smith was already on the Fraser plateau, where memories of the Chilcotin War were still fresh. On December 5 1872 Walkem advised Powell of the "desirableness of [at once] map[ping] out the [Chilcotin] Indian reservations [to] throw the country open to intending settlers...[since]...the Indians seem[ed] to differ on their requirements..." (British Columbia 1987, 110-1). Powell responded the next day that he had not yet received instructions as to the extent of his duties, and that it would be impossible for him to "take up land for reservation...unless it had been sketched" (ibid, 111) in any event. On January 15 1873 Beaven proposed simply "taking off the reservation in the Chilcotin Valley" (ibid), a threat that is somewhat confusing not only in light of 1864, but because no reservation had yet been allotted! Powell answered that he considered "the removal of the whole of the present reservation...a fruitful source of Indian difficulty...[and that he would]...endeavour as soon as practicable, to select the quantity of land necessary..." (January 15 1873 letter [ibid, 112]). It would be more than a decade before this was done, however.

6. Most of the guidelines in Scott's memorandum were based on (by now) Attorney General George Walkem's August 18 1875 Report of the Government of British Columbia on the Subject of Indian Reserves (see, for this text, British Columbia 1987, [17]1-[17]9) and Reverend William Duncan's May 1875 letter to Laird (see, for this text, ibid, 13-16, Appendix C). Insofar as he felt that "without surveillance no
satisfactory relationship can ever exist between the Government and the Indians" (ibid, 14, emphasis added) Duncan had asked for large contiguous 'national' reserves, but Walkem used a bit of 19th century 'class analysis' to argue that since the great majority of the First Peoples were fishermen and hunters, "large tracts of agricultural lands [would] not be required" (ibid, [17]-[17]8.). Scott's memo suggested that: a) the Commission consist of three members (one from the Dominion, one from the Province, and one to be selected jointly); b) there be no fixed acreage, and that each nation's needs be considered separately; c) the Commissioners be guided "generally by the spirit of the terms of Union...which contemplates a 'liberal policy'..." (ibid, 163); d) an agent be assigned to each nation; e) each reserve be held in trust by the Dominion and, in the event of population increase or decrease, be enlarged or reduced as proportion demanded; and f) should lands be released through the latter they revert to the Province. The first three members of the Commission were Gilbert Sproat, Alexander Anderson (whom we have already met), and Archibald McKinlay.

7. The first major piece of provincial legislation since Confederation the 1875 Free Grant Act was a complete revision of the 1870 Land Ordinance. It provided for the conveyance of any land not "lawfully held by record, purchase or lease, or Crown grant...for the use and benefits of the Indians, or for railway purposes..." (cited in Cail 1974, 28, emphasis added). (The 1874 edition had accorded no privileges or rights to Indians with respect to lands, reserves, or settlements whatsoever [see footnote 5, above], and was disallowed by a federal Order-in-Council in March 1875.) The 1876 Indian Act provided for a municipal style of government on Indian Reserves proper, but without prejudice to any inherent Aboriginal rights already affirmed under imperial law by the 1868 Act (see footnote 4, Chapter Five). Insofar as it effectively defined who was and who was not 'an Indian', and that its express purpose was one of assimilation, it was (and remains), for the First Nations, the most hated piece of federal legislation in Canada.

8. Unlike most of Sproat's other linens this one is not dated, but his other Victoria area reserve plans are all dated 1877, and the Commission did spend most of its 1877-8 seasons in either the Cowichan or New Westminster Districts. I think the reference to Green's 1878 survey settles it.

9. One of the island colony's earliest entrepreneurs Sproat spent much of the 1860s 'on the ground' with the Nuu'chah'nulth, and he proved to be a keen observer (and sympathizer) of the coastal peoples (see, in this connection, Sproat 1987). Like most mid-Victorians he subscribed to a legalized land tenure regime as the rule among 'civilized nations', but he knew that "any extreme act...or systematic...ill-treatment of the dispossessed people" (ibid, 9) would lead to trouble (Fisher 1977, 189). He was one of the first of a handful of colonial actors to take issue with European beliefs that the First Peoples automatically relinquished titular claims because they only used fragments of the land (Shankel 1945, 183), but he also thought they could be circumvented with large and generous reserves (Harris 1992, 15). His efforts in this area would eventually cost him his job, however. Sproat remained in public life and went on to serve as Gold Commissioner in the Kootenays between 1885-90.

10. While it is by no means clear exactly when this overlay was applied (or who applied
it) it certainly was not Gilbert Sproat in or after 1878. He did spend most of his 1879 survey season between Cape Mudge and Quatsino Sound, however, and it is likely that he would have had access to this chart not only for general reference purposes, but as a 'blueprint' for the size and location of the reserves to be allotted. In any event, it is what the map proclaims in a territorial context that is of interest, for I have found no other pre-1880 map at this scale in any (provincial) archive that does so in quite so dramatic a fashion as this one.

11. An Hudson's Bay Company medical officer, William F. Tolmie arrived at Fort McLoughlin in 1833, before being appointed Chief Factor at Victoria in 1856. He served in the legislative assemblies of both Vancouver Island (1860-6) and British Columbia (1874-8). His passion was botany, but he also dabbled in ethnoology and linguistics, publishing his *Comparative Vocabularies of the Indian Tribes of British Columbia* in 1884. One of Canada's pioneer geologists, George Dawson came west in 1875 with the international boundary survey, and spent most of latter half of the decade surveying and 'exploring' for the Canadian Pacific. He too developed an interest in ethnology, and his 1878 journals on the Queen Charlotte Islands include what may be the earliest photographic record of the Haida (see Cole and Lockner 1993). Another of Dawson's maps which is not reproduced in this thesis is his 1887 *Geological Map of the Northern Part of Vancouver Island and Adjacent Coasts*. It accompanied his field report on the Kwakiutl (Dawson 1887), and (like Devine's [figure 8]) combined a graphic thematic on rock types with a textual overlay on Kwakiutl linguistics and a census. Dawson became Director of the Geological Survey of Canada in 1895. For a readable biography see Winslow-Spragge (1993).

12. From the outset the Commissioners were delayed by inadequate transport and confusion over the 'accuracy' of the surveys. They also found themselves spending as much time on fiduciary concerns as on allotments proper, and a key question was whether or not land could be taken from existing reserves without the First Nations' consent. The Dominion said no, but the Province insisted it had the power to order the surrender of reserve lands and assess the amount of compensation (which was what the agreement stated). The Commissioners also found it necessary to buy out pre-emptions and leases, but when the Dominion asked the Province to authorize the expenditures, the latter argued it was only liable for the enlargement of reserves in unoccupied Crown land (which, again, was what the agreement stated). On Feb 4 1878 the Province asked the Dominion to dissolve the Commission. Arguing that it should be maintained at least until all the reserves in the settled areas had been laid out, however, the Dominion refused, but it did agree to reduce the Commission to one person, and Sproat carried on alone in that capacity thereafter (Shankel 1945, 125-45; Fisher 1977, 190-9).

13. Born and educated in Ireland O'Reilly arrived in the colony in 1858 and was appointed Assistant Gold Commissioner and stipendiary magistrate in 1859. He made full Gold Commissioner in 1864 and sat on the legislative council from 1863-71 (Keir 1976). Recommended for the position by his brother-in-law Joseph Trutch (!), he actually laid out his first reserves in the Nicola in 1868, and it is certainly more than coincidence that one of his first tasks as Indian Reserve Commissioner was to reduce Sproat's allotments in that district. As should be apparent, he shared none of his
predecessor's emapthies towards to the First Peoples, and the stinginess of his reserves (graphic evidence of which we shall see in a moment) would prove to be a major factor in increasing Aboriginal political resistance during the 1880s.

14. The subdivision took place incrementally after 1881 but eventually there were 15: the Babine, Bella Coola, Cowichan, Kamloops, Kootenay, Kwawkwelth, Lytton, Naas, New Westminster, Okanagan, Queen Charlotte, Stikine, Stuart Lake, West Coast, and Williams Lake Agencies, and they covered all provincial territory except the northeast sector, which was 'adhered' to Numbered Treaty 8.

15. O'Reilly's traces (as well as those of the surveyors who followed in them), read like a 19th century travelogue. In 1881 he allotted reserves in the New Westminster, Williams Lake, and Lytton Agencies; 1882 in the West Coast, Naas, and Bella Coola; 1884 in the Kootenay; 1885 in the Cowichan and Kamloops, 1886 in the Bella Coola, Cowichan, and Kwawkwelth; 1887 in the West Coast, Williams Lake and Kootenay; 1888 in the Okanagan, Bella Coola, and Kwawkwelth; and in 1891 in the West Coast, Naas, and Babine, at which time he reported having completed all the allotments on the coasts of the mainland and the island(s). In 1892 he laid out reserves in the Stuart Lake and Babine; 1893 in the Okanagan; 1894 in the Stikine and Naas; and in 1895 in the New Westminster. O'Reilly apparently filed no report for the 1883, 1889, or 1890 seasons, although the surveyors were active throughout. The great majority of the reserves were 'completed' by 1897. Most of this was done by canoe and horseback (and a great deal of that along existing Aboriginal trails) and huge tracts of it were either poorly mapped, or not mapped at all.

16. The first indications of Aboriginal activism came in 1872 when the Halmokolem rallied at the land registry office in New Westminster. In 1874 they joined with Nlaka'pamux and Stl'atl'imx communities in a larger protest, petitioning Powell to implement the 80 acres/family proposal (see footnote 4, above), and in 1879 the Nlaka'pamux struck an assembly in Lytton, which was attended by Sproat. The question of title, however, was first raised by a Nisga'a delegation to Victoria in 1881, and in 1885 three Tsimshian Chiefs accompanied William Duncan to Ottawa, where they met with John A. MacDonald. For a concise summary of these dialogues see Tennant (1990, 53-67)

17. Insofar as most of the proceedings were recorded through an interpreter, the syntactical accuracy of the transcripts should be treated cautiously, but there can be little doubt that the Nisga'a and Tsimshian understood exactly what was at stake and had learned how to express it in European discourse. Fewer said it more eloquently or passionately than Greenville Chief Gary Russ: "In the first place we did not like the name 'reserve' but now it is all right...but if we have the reserves, there is one thing we want with them and that is a treaty. We have no word in our language for 'reserve'. We have the word 'land', 'our land', 'our property'. We cannot believe the words we have heard, that the land was not acknowledged to be ours. We took the Queen's flag and laws to honour them. We never thought that when we did that she was taking the land away from us" (cited in British Columbia 1888, 18-9, emphasis added).
18. This averages out to about 30 acres per capita, but if broken down by Agency it varies from a low of 7.5 per along the lower Fraser and on Vancouver Island to a 'median' of 50 or 60 per in the Shuswap and Kootenays, to a high of 230 per in the Okanagan (Shankel 1945, 149). Shankel has suggested that the Indians often 'over-enumerated' themselves "with the result that the acreage of land exceeded what rightfully belonged to the Indians" (ibid, 137). What this says about Shankel's objectivity (or politics) can only be surmised, but given that this total works out to about .3% of the provincial land mass I would have been more surprised had they not.

19. The qualitative difference between Aboriginal political activism in the 1880s (see footnote 17, above) and the 1900s was that the former was advanced by 'traditional leaders' in the full sense of the term. Few of them understood the machinations of European government, and even fewer could speak English in any case. This new crop of activists, however, were among the first to have 'graduated' from English schools, were fluent in English, and were consequently more familiar with not only who wielded political power, but how to challenge it. For a concise summary of the constitution of the Nisga'a Land Committee, the Indian Rights Association, and their appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council after 1910 see either of Cail (1974, 227-43) or Tennant (1990, 84-95).

20. Vowell succeeded Powell in 1889, and with O'Reilly's retirement the positions of Superintendent and Commissioner were combined into one. Most of Vowell's tenure involved the surveying of O'Reilly's earlier allotments, but in 1895 two of the three surveyors were let go, allegedly due to lack of funds (see O'Reilly's November 24 1895 Report to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs [Canada 1895]), and in 1896 no reserves were surveyed at all. Thereafter surveyors were hired on an 'as needed' basis (see, for example, O'Reilly's October 20 1897 Report to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs [ibid 1897]; and Vowell's April 3 1908 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [ibid 1908]), but several never did get surveyed, and a handful were not even allotted until the Royal Commission did so in 1916 (see, for example, Vowell's February 5 1909 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [ibid, 1909]). Overall, between 1877 and 1910, $236,791 was spent on the Commission. Certainly, in those days, it must have seemed like a lot of money (see footnote 24, below) but for 97.7% of the province it was a steal by any definition.

21. In addition to Section 2 the Commission was instructed to: a) have the Province create the legal framework necessary for the allotment of any additional lands; b) ensure that any lands reduced be subdivided through public auction, the proceeds to be divided equally among both governments, with the Dominion holding their share in trust for the tribe or band; and c) have confirmed reserve lands conveyed to the Dominion in trust, except that in the event of extinction of any tribe or band return such lands to the Province. The Commission was to consist of five members (two from the Dominion, two from the Province, and the fifth to be a joint selection of the other four, and who would serve as Chairman), and they were J.A.J. McKenna, S. Carmichael, J.P. Shaw, D.H. Macdowall, and N.W. White.

22. Also known as Bill 13, the Act was a joint collaboration of Prime Minister Arthur Meighen and Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs Duncan Campbell Scott (see
footnote 24, below). The latter justified this deliberate breach of promise by arguing that the First Peoples might not give their consent to the 'cut-off' of existing lands, and that the proceeds from the sale of said lands would go to the tribe or band in any case. Predictably, the bill made no mention of Aboriginal title, treaties or self-government (see, in this connection, Tennant 1990, 96-103).

23. The Report was broken down by Agency, each section of which included a general synopsis of the district, a number of charts listing the physical and social conditions of the various tribes or bands, and a detailed record of the Commissioners' decisions. Some samples are reproduced in Appendix 3. If there was ever a 'text-book' example of Orientalism in action, this Report was it.

24. Lawrence Vankoughnet, Deputy Superintendent-General between 1874 and 93 and a close friend of John A. MacDonald, was the quintessential Victorian civil servant. A workaholic with few public skills, he was inflexible with his own staff, and never tried to understand the needs and aspirations of those whose administration and care he was responsible for. Having joined the Department as an accountant, he was governed completely by principles of efficiency and economic expediency (see Leighton 1983, 105-13). Duncan Campbell Scott, who held the same position after 1913, is remembered by Canadians mostly for his poetry, much of which discoursed romantically on the First Peoples. In his 'official' capacity, however, he was a closet imperialist who believed savagery and indolence to be innate genetic flaws of the 'Native races' and assimilation just as inevitable. An admirer of William Duncan he saw the First Peoples of British Columbia proper as ideal candidates for experiments in 'social engineering' (see Titley 1986, 26-35).

25. Arriving in British Columbia from France in 1880 Morice spent the earlier part of the decade in Ts'ilk'ot'in territory before moving to Fort St. James, where he devoted himself to proselytization and the study of linguistics. His 1907 production was the first of the northern interior to be officially sanctioned by the provincial government, but it was actually a refinement of his own earlier effort, the 1904 (?) Map of New Caledonia, which was compiled sometime before the turn of the century, and which received the silver medal from the Société Geographique de Paris. After leaving the mission in 1906 Morice went to Kamloops, and in 1908 he moved to Winnipeg, where he published histories of the Catholic Church and western Canada, a number of biographies, articles for various scientific journals, and his massive two-volume treatise on the Carrier language. He taught anthropology at the University of Saskatchewan, and received an honorary doctorate in 1933.

26. The exact date and authorship of the tracing in (a) is unknown, but most of the plans made during the years immediately following O'Reilly's retirement and leading up to the 1913-6 Royal Commission were drawn in this style by Ashdown Green. My citation is a 'best guess' and is based on a virtually identical plan of the Katzie Reserve, which was signed by Green in 1898.
Chapter Five

On Maps, Ideology, and the Power Networks of Contact

Irrationality is always an accusation made by someone building a network over someone else who stands in the way; thus there is no Great Divide between minds, but only shorter and longer networks.... [It is] the resources scattered along networks [that] accelerate the mobility, faithfulness, combination and cohesion of traces that make action at a distance possible (Latour 1987, 259).

There is now but one more curtain to raise on the performative dialectics in (and of) the territorial atlas being (re)traced in this thesis, but before doing so it is necessary to detour, as it were, through the wings of the theatre in order to retrieve, center stage, a couple of thematizations which I have hitherto left hanging, and which now need to be elaborated. The first is that the cartographic de-territorialization of the First Peoples on the northwest coast of Turtle Island/North America was by no means 'systematic'. It was geographically 'irregular' and temporally 'discontinuous'. Given the topographical context it could not, in practice, have been otherwise. In point of fact, however, it did not, as an ideological strategem, have to be. The settlement process was itself erratic, and, even where it was less so, it was not until well after Confederation that railroad surveys and the consolidation of the agrarian economy that attended to them began to seriously compromise First Nations' territorial integrity outside southeastern Vancouver Island and the Fraser and Thompson River corridors, and it was not until 1879 that the (theoretically) polyconic survey system was formally codified in law in any case (Cail 1974, 63).

Almost from the beginning in fact — and as we have already graphically seen — it was "generally...the practice to lay out on the ground the Indian Reserves synchronously with the settlement of the district by whites" (October 16 1871 letter from Chief Commissioner
of Lands and Works B.W. Pearse to the Colonial Secretary Joseph Howe [British Columbia 1987, 102]), and, even at that, the surveyors usually lagged far behind the Indian Reserve Commissioner.² At the same time, it is important to remember that ideological power networks are always interstitially interwoven with military, political and economic power networks, and it is ultimately the degree to which actors can marshall and collate these resources into an organized infrastructural package that determines the overall pace and character of territorial (dis)possession. I am not here suggesting that any of these overlapping and intersecting networks was any more or less 'cohesive' or 'systematized' than any other. On the contrary, their relative degrees of 'development' varied widely throughout the young colonies. What I am suggesting is that out of a whole concatenation of often discordant socio-spatial power networks that make up a colonial geography, cartography-as-process is generally one of the most concordant.

The Significance of Perspective

There are, I think, at least two 'ontological strata' to this concordance, one of which is 'nested' or 'enframed' inside the other, and each of which, taken 'in unison', impinge directly on something I have referred to on a number of occasions hitherto but have yet to properly expand upon: the dialectic between artistic licence and craftsmanship in cartography on the one hand, and the capacity of the map to marshall discourse and collate facts on the other.³ Gadamer has suggested, in this connection, that architecture is the most 'holistic' of all the arts not only because the architect must consider both the 'intentionality' behind the design and the spatial context in which that intentionality is exercised, but because in its organization of space, in its embrace of all other forms
of art, in its exerting its perspective everywhere, it also decorates (1989, 157-8). Works of architecture 'belong' to their world, they are 'mediators' of that world, and it is in this sense that they "do not stand motionless on the shore of the stream of history, but are borne along by it" (ibid, 157). If, however, he does not explicitly address the apposite possibility — that such works are as much bearers of history as they are 'teleported' by it — it is less because he failed to envisage architecture as but one expression of life among many (although it is) than because his version of hermeneutics remains (as I alluded in Chapter One) forever subjectivist and is thus unable to account for the fact that the form of space itself might be sourced (and 'memorized') at some deeper current. What I am suggesting is that as much as Gadamer may have 'skirted the margins' of a properly materialist hermeneutic (which I think he did) he was unable to penetrate its outer perimeter because he began with a consideration of discursive productions proper, and not the conditions under which they were produced.

What Gadamer does raise, however, is the question of perspective, and it is in this context that I want to briefly re-engage with the space of the European Renaissance, since it is precisely here that we are able to (re)establish not only the deeper 'strata' of concordance to which I referred to a moment ago, but the 'outlines' of the form of life that is the transcendent ideological framework within which the discourses of the entire colonial movement were (and continue to be) subtended. Samuel Edgerton has noted, in this connection, that the Florentinian 'encounter' with Ptolemy's geometrical grid in the Geographia, Alberti's 're-discovery' of the 'rules' of linear perspective in de Pictura, and the blossoming of the artistic and technical sensibilities of the quattrocentro were much more than merely coincidental to one another (1975, 113). On the contrary, Ptolemy's cartographic referencing system impregnated the Renaissance mapmaking consciousness
precisely at the same time as perspectivism and the concept of the 'fixed observer' infused itself in *pictorial representation* (ibid, 97). The Ptolemaic grid gave Renaissance thinkers "a perfect, expandable cartographic tool for collecting, *collating*, and correcting geographical knowledge...*[supplying]* to *geography* the same aesthetic principle of *geometric harmony*...demanded in all their art" (ibid, 114, emphasis added). The summative effect was to explode open the discursive spaces 'between' artistic creativity and technical craftsmanship that had remained hermetically sealed within the (essentially textual) canon of the Christian *oikumene*, and, in so doing, guarantee the *theatre* as the embodiment of the corporeal architectonics of a new (primarily) "visual strategy of knowledge" (Knoespel 1992, 100, emphasis added).

This innovative (but not original) geometrical prospectus conjoined with the counting house and the scientific vision of the cosmos as a living (and exploitable) *organism* (Rees 1980, 63-8) to consolidate the *modus vivendi* of the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, sending Europeans out "to confront the unknown terrestrial world and, closing the latitudinal circle, to discover their own planet" (Edgerton 1975, 122). In the 'low countries' (e.g. Holland, Belgium, and France) schools of landscape painting and guilds of cartography 'developed' in synchrony with one another, and (post)Renaissance artisans and designers engaged increasingly in engraving, surveying, and mapmaking, inscribing and reifying the interconnections between measurement and pictorialism on the one hand, and between *abstraction* and the *graphic representation of nature* (Wallis 1973, 7) on the other. The 'theoretical problem' (for Europeans), of course, was that such a "spectacular expansion...of...geographical knowledge of the world, and of the world's relationship to the universe" (Green and Dickason 1989, 143) immediately ran up against the presence of those who truly made it 'natural' in the first place, and the need to *legitimize* the seizure
and occupancy of the territories of the 'Other' "was crucial to the development of notions of political authority that would lead to the emergence of international law" (ibid, emphasis added). But in precisely the same way that the 'grid of modernity' could be visually apprehended at multiple geographic scales, so too could (indeed must) 'the law' be textually inscribed in multiple legal codes. It was during this world-historical movement, in other words, that the Elizabethans first wrote the English common law in explicitly spatial terms at the (intra)national level, and, while so doing, suffused the grid with the impervious hard shell of positive law (see, in this connection, Helgerson 1992, 1993; Blomley 1994). To put it another way, these 'deep strata' of perspectival concordance effectively 'bifurcated' themselves into what amounted to 'double transcendencies' (one visual/graphic and one textual/legal), each of which cross-cut a range of geographic scales, and each of which 'piggybacked' itself 'on top' of its apposite. At no time should it be imagined that this organized, justified, and divinely sanctioned infrastructural package of surveillance and territorial control was consciously networked by a specific institution from a particular (English or otherwise) geographic center. But juxtaposed, as it necessarily was, against the seemingly endless 'desert lands' of the 'New World', and propelled by the 'time-space compressions' of global(izing) capitalist enterprise, it comprised a technologized, economized, legalized, and aesthetically contoured concoction that must have seemed (for Europeans and Native alike) "positively demonic" (Morrison 1968, 362).

Strategies of Knowing on the Northwest Coast

This amalgam of science, culture, race, and political authority flowing from the
imperial center all 'comes together' in, of all places, the northeastern Pacific theatre of the late 18th century, where liberalism and empiricism intersects with the topographical and the aesthetic of the picturesque in a naturalistic ontology, and the likes of James Cook, George Vancouver, and Alexander Mackenzie become the standard-bearers of a "new generation...[that has started] to realize and take an interest in the inescapable relativity of their own perceptions" (Smith 1985, vii). It is here, along the land/sea interface, that the Royal Society first sets down instructions for surveying, mapping and the delineation of coastal profiles, and artisans begin to apprehend the landscape, and those who are already there, through the perspectival lens of observational science (ibid, 1-4). But it is on the terra inconnues of New Caledonia proper that overland 'explorers' and traders most elicit a variety of 'visual strategies of knowing' in order to reconcile the 'inhospitable wilds' of the 'Other' with their own Ruskinian preconceptions of the 'noble savage', and where the ability to survey and the ability to illustrate are interstitially woven together (Tippett and Cole 1977, 26-7). This new 'way of seeing' is first manifested in the paintings and drawings of Paul Kane, Edmund Coleman, and the documentary artists, and subsequently in the photography of George Dawson and Edward Curtis, where it then submits itself to the technical authority of mechanical reproduction (see, in this connection, Benjamin 1969, 219-45; Berger 1972). It also appears in more corporeal form in the person of the collector (sometimes 'professional', but just as often as not), pillaging, as he does, the cultural archives of the First Peoples for the 'raw materials' of the North American and European 'museums of man' and 'natural history', as if the possession of such artefacts is conclusive evidence of the inexorable and inevitable cultural decay of the 'nations that never were'. And lastly, but by no means least, it is found in the architectonics of the late 19th and early 20th century 'Wild West' shows, where the 'vanishing Indian' and the
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'imaginary Indian' go hand in hand (Francis 1992, 97-108), and are enlisted as *performers* in a screenplay written for Euro-Canadian consumption just as surely and succinctly as their 'vanishing' and 'imaginary' territories are being 'staged' and 'positioned' in the territorial atlas by the cartographers. But it is in that atlas proper, where *dominium* is effectively *decided*, that this power of visualization, of perspectival concordance, and of surveillance of the 'Other' is networked and sustained at its most universal, abstract, and transcendent level.

In British Columbia, as in most corners of the Empire, I would provisionally accept the thesis that it was ultimately *the surveyors* who were "the [real] point-men of British imperialism" (Edney 1993, 62; but see, also, Carter 1987, 99-135). In Europe the cadastral surveyor marked out land already in royal or manorial hands, and to this extent functioned as much as an 'editor' of 'pre-scripted' (if sometimes conflicting and discordant) legal landscapes as he did an 'interstitial tracer' of 'emergent' ones. In the colonies, however, incongruities in political principle were utterly secondary to 'getting onto the land' in the first place, and here — buttressed, as he was, by the authoritative power of statute *and* international law — he was indeed *the* conduit for "the imposition of a new economic and spatial order in 'new territory', either erasing the [pre-colonial] indigenous settlement, or confining it to particular areas" (Kain and Baigent 1992, 329). But if this is so, then it was surely *the cartographers* who were British colonialism's 'gate-keepers' on the northwest coast. In theatrical terms, it was they who stepped a little 'closer' to the stage, metonymically and metaphorically forcing the 'vanishing point' further beyond the backdrop, 'injecting' the territorial(izing) agent into discourse, and commodifying the field of spatial practice at the same time. It was the mapmaker who took the 'data base(s)' of 'Otherness' being drafted by the painter, the photographer, the collector, the census taker,
the proselytizer, and the surveyor, and 'mounted' them on the 'grid of modernity', reducing "the traditional heterogeneity of the [provincial] surface to complete geometrical uniformity" (Edgerton 1975, 113) while doing so. It was not necessary, on this view then, to methodically and synchronously 'replace' or 'supplant' the (sometimes fragmentary) linear route maps and sketches of Alexander Mackenzie, G.H. Richards, Henry S. Palmer, or Alexander Anderson with 'completed areal' ones (see, for this thesis, Tuan 1991, 688). Like tapestries on a loom, all that was required of actors like Joseph Trutch, Israel Powell, Gilbert Sproat, and Peter O'Reilly was to 'hang' enough surveyed and censused fragments — almost all of which were Indian Reserves — on the territorial 'scaffolding' those earlier players helped construct (see, also, Edney 1993, 65). In this way did the mapping of 'Indian lands' not only engender the 'new territory' of British Columbia — a thematization I will elaborate on in a moment — but perforce conjoined it with the law which proclaimed its dominion over it (see, also, Wood 1992, 68). Harley was absolutely right in suggesting that maps of the Americas would have 'unrolled' much more slowly had there not already been Aboriginal occupants (1992, 526). His only oversight was that it could be equally true at the scale of a province, or of a river valley, or even a Thunderbird's nest, as well.

The Dialectics of Disfranchisement

This leads rather directly (if conveniently) into the second detour alluded to above, and relates to the nature and incorporative cross-cultural scope of ideological power itself. For to speak of ideology is to speak of, inter alia, the power of persuasion and coercion, and I have not said much of anything about whether or not the First Nations themselves
'accepted', or even 'understood', much less challenged, the discourses of cartographic encirclement being exerted against them. As alluded in the Introduction, this has been a deliberate strategy on my part, and if there is a 'tension' in this thesis it is as much a result of that elision as anything else. It goes without saying, in short, that it always 'takes two to tango' in any contact situation. But if I have done so it is precisely because that is exactly how the mapmakers (and lawgivers, proselytizers, collectors, ethnographers, etc.) of modernity on the northwest coast would have experienced and interpreted the networkings of the 'Other' and its territories in their own praxis. To put it bluntly, in other words, it really did not matter to Europeans just what the original occupants might have thought, felt, or desired in the first place. Certainly, the First Peoples were just as capable of 'understanding' representational discourses as anyone else, and the colonial and post-colonial records, as one-sided as they may be, contain enough references to suggest that while they may not have initially comprehended the full significance of what Euro-Canadian maps and plans meant from the standpoint of discursive alienation, they did recognize the adjudicative authority attached to 'written' documents. But 'understanding' something does not mean — regardless of what most (post)colonial actors may have surmised — 'accepting' it, for it was the wider concept of ownership, not its representation, that mattered most. It is true that the First Nations sometimes used European-made maps and plans to negotiate, inter alia, the size and location of reserve allotments. In point of fact, any hope of a successful political resistance would have demanded it. But this did not connote — as some contemporary authorities have since argued — a consent to the proprietary fragmentation of their territories, much less a repudiation of their own assertion of sovereignty within them. On the contrary the First Peoples resisted vigorously the theft of their land by any means. The 'practical problem'
they faced was that they had few realistic options in doing so.

Aside from everything else we have just discussed — as if that alone was not enough — it has to be remembered, in this connection, that in 19th century British Columbia it was a small nuclear coterie of colonial officials and provincial bureaucrats who were not only surveying and drafting these maps and plans, but codifying the law, staffing the judiciary, regulating commerce, administering the police and civil service, and taking care of public works. Most of this I have already touched on, but what needs to be (re)emphasized here is the internal class solidarity of these agents. It is true that at the geographical and administrative outskirts of colonial power maps were comparatively scarce, disciplinary power was more diffusive, and there was some 'controversy' on how to best 'fill the container' of the 'Indian Land Question'. But within the more immanent restricted domain of quotidian political practice, where it counted, these maps' ideological effect must have been profound. Repeatedly and purposively circulated through the hands of people like Aaron Arrowsmith, Herman Merivale, James Douglas, Joseph Trutch, Peter O'Reilly, George Dawson, Israel Powell, or Duncan Scott, these maps, charts, and plans must have been, for them, tremendously persuasive, self-validating, documents. Truth is essentially 'agreement', and it was precisely these maps that played a major part in not only constructing that (territorial) agreement, but in reifying in their own minds the absolute 'correctness' of geographical connaissance (literally 'true knowledge'). Perspectivism is, after all, as much a matter of authorship and the technological apparatus at the place of production as it is of readership and 'voyeurism' at the place of consumption. It was less the way in which they 'dispowered' and 'dispossessed' the First Nations, in other words, than the manner in which they empowered the possessors that is the singular most important consideration.
Obviously there are two sides to any encounter, and I accept the accusation that too much Western scholarship has been guilty of underwriting the role of the First Peoples in contouring the sociology and geography of contact. The danger lies in swinging the pendulum too far in the opposite direction and in denying the staggering asymmetry in institutionalized (re)socializing power that existed at the time. It is true that the First Peoples were, to some limited extent perhaps, as much authors of their own enclosure as were their enclosers. But it was never the case that in doing so they somehow acquiesced to the directives of a territorial ideology not of their own making. It was that within the broader geopolitical context of the colonization process they simply could not counterract the infrastructural logistics of control commandeered by their opponents. I will come back to this point in substance in the Conclusion, except to state here that in endeavouring to make the best of a bad situation the First Nations were, to use Mann's terminology, "organizationally outflanked" (1986, 8).

But in 'rewriting' the geography of the northwest corner of Turtle Island these colonialists and their maps engaged something far more subliminal and (so far anyway) amaranthine. They dialectically 'imagineered' the territorial support for their own '(sub)national community' which — while in some sense still tied by tradition to its trans-Atlantic umbilical — could then begin to consolidate its own sovereign identity. As Anderson has forcefully argued, the concept of the nation-state as a sociological organism looming out of an immemorial past and gliding calendrically through time into a limitless future first emerged not in metropolitan Europe, but at the farthest extremities of imperial power, in the colonies. For it was here that the 'inheritance' of Aboriginal sovereignties by exported administrative cartels in 'new' physiographical contexts created, on the one hand, the definitive territorial boundedness that is the foundation of independent states,
and, on the other, the historical 'depth-of-field' that is prerequisite for the formation of national communities and the birth of *nationalism* as an ideological force in its own right (1991, 11-26).\(^{20}\) Within the totalizing perspective of cartographic modernity, the concept of Aboriginal 'Otherness' could not only be admitted and allowed to flourish "in the secure knowledge that their 'place' in the spatial order was [now] unambiguously known" (Harvey 1989, 250), but could be securely consigned to the pages of someone else's national atlas. So it was, in other words, that the First Nations were not merely 'mapped out' of their own territory, but 'mapped into' the manufactured antiquity upon which our own territorialization and nationhood has always depended (Anderson 1991, 185).\(^{21}\) Such is the power of modern cartography that it can turn sovereign Indian Nations into museums, and historical chance into (inter)national destiny.

**The Lives of Power Networks**

Representations of space (like maps) have a major role in the *material* production of representational spaces (like Indian Reserves) not simply because they "intervene in and modify spatial textures which are informed by effective knowledge and ideology" (Lefebvre 1991, 42), but because knowledge and ideology are *already* inherently and immanently *spatial* and therefore 'pre-interpreted' in quotidian discourse (Mann 1986, 5; Turnbull 1989, 48). 'On-the-ground' spatial practice *per se* only 'initiates' itself at that precise moment at which the corporeal body 'crosses' the infinite(smal) gap 'between' the two spaces, between the dominating and the dominated, between the imagined and the experienced, and between the mental and the physical. It is in this sense that *action* in the field of spatial practice *regulates* the quotidian; it is the map, however, that properly
creates that field to begin with. This is an extremely important distinction and I will come back to it in the Conclusion, but by no means am I claiming in this chapter that it is only maps that 'do' this. To the extent that maps, charts, and plans are argumentative systems of statements that capably (re)organize and (re)order both territory and knowledge (Turnbull 1986, 50) they do share, as I have illustrated, some similarities with not only other kinds of technical media — i.e. architecture, works of art, monuments, built landscapes, and so on — but also with certain 'non-technical' discursive communities — i.e. those of literature, music, history, economics, and the law. But if systems of statements acquire their discursive 'hardness' the more they are buttressed by newer subsequent statements, if they adsorb connaissance in their being incorporated in(to) those newer statements (see, again, Latour 1987, 25-9), then maps marshall alliances and collate hard ('quantitative') and soft ('qualitative') facts at a much deeper current than any of these other expressions of life, and especially so in modern (Western) social formations where map artefacts and the 'map consciousness' that is necessarily conjoined with them are so central to ontology itself (see, also, Wood 1993).

What is most remarkable, however, is that when it comes to the mapping of an objective 'Other' these facts and statements do not necessarily have to be marshalled and collated from 'within' the discursive system through which they ultimately secure expression. As we have seen, in fact, power networks do not overlap and intersect along an horizon or in a 'single dimension', but at a multiplicity of scales and across a (potentially infinite) number of ontological domains, and it is precisely this feature that allows "in certain circumstances maps [to be] mobilized to move from one network or form of life and inserted in another" (Turnbull 1986, 55, emphasis added). It is in this context that interstitial emergence along a given cultural trajectory may sometimes
constitute the Janus-face of interstitial submergence elsewhere, and that it is through this performative dialectic that incorporation 'in ideology' can be tangibly translated into appropriation 'on the ground'. It is entirely incorrect to suggest, on this view then, that the cartographic 'conventions' of modernity necessarily elide the complex 'interrelatedness' of the simulacra they are struggling to represent (see, for this thesis, Lewis 1991, 620). On the contrary, there may be any number of 'territorialisms' co-existing in, and competing for validation on, the same field of spatial practice at the same time (which defines, of course, exactly the 'plate' at which we first opened the territorial atlas in the Introduction, and the place to which we shall return momentarily). Indeed, what is characteristic of modern social formations is that the conquest of, and subsequent control of, territory demands that it be apprehended as something which is utilitarian and malleable. The way to achieve this is to homogenize it, to 'pulverize' it, and to 'fragment' it, by imposing an Euclidean framework upon it (Harvey 1990, 254). Certainly we are obliged to address our inquiries to the modern world itself (Lefebvre 1974, 123), but no 'space' ever vanishes completely in that world; it just metamorphoses into something else (ibid, 412). To a certain extent I would accept Bryan Turner's observation that "it is...a matter of empirical investigation to determine which component of the power network is dominant" (1988, 154), but I think what has to be admitted is that in modern social formations, there is a fundamental sense in which cartographic power networks are always dominant, because it is these networks that construct the 'stage' upon which all other networks are (more or less) interstitially 'dependent'. If the ideological power network happens to be as much an ontological reality as it is a metaphor for the process of territorialization qua quotidian activity it is precisely because power resources are concentrated at interstitial junctures (like maps and mapmakers), and because such
junctures are connected with one another by the links and mesh(es) of \textit{praxis}, which comprise, in turn, nothing more or less than the concatenation of historical, anthropological, juridical, economic, ethnic, and aesthetic discourses that give that network \textit{material substance}. Socio-spatial power networks are interstitially embedded in (\textit{inter alia}) maps and plans, territorially, through ideology. As to the question, then, of exactly where in the map one should 'look for ideology', the answer must clearly be everywhere (Brealey 1993, 43). As to the question of where to 'unveil' that ideology, however, the answer must be \textit{wherever it may be most amenable to interstitial challenge}, and it is to \textit{that} arena that we may now, finally, (re)turn.
Footnotes to Chapter Five

1. The logistical challenges on land we have already alluded to, but coastal travel could be just as arduous, if not more so. F.A. Devereux wrote of his surveys in the mid-coastal area, "I regret to say that this return is unusually small owing to the great distance that these reserves are apart, their smallness in extent, the inclement state of the weather during the whole of the season and the great difficulty in travelling from one inlet to another. I was detained as much as three and four days in several places while making these moves, not daring to venture out on the open ocean until a favourable opportunity offered itself. I may, perhaps, take this opportunity to inform you that the canoes which I have been using for the past season, and which have been in use for a term of six years are unfit for further service on the west coast of Vancouver Island" (November 1 1892 Report to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs [Canada 1892]).

2. On average, the surveyors trailed the Commissioners by at least a year, but often a lot more than that. The Toosey and Stone Reserves, for example, were allotted in 1887 but not surveyed until 1891, and the Nemiah Valley allotments were not surveyed until 1909, ten years after they were staked. This caused problems (for both Native and non-Native) because, theoretically, reserves, like private property, were not legal entities until gazetted, and they could not be gazetted until surveyed. It was during these times that settlers took advantage of the fact that boundaries were not fixed or distinctly staked to begin with, and the First Peoples generally refused to fence their land fearing that doing so would weaken claims to unalienated portions (Shankel 1945, 80). On more than one occasion, lands intended for the First Nations were simply pre-empted before the surveyor showed up (Cail 1974, 216-22).

3. As alluded to in the Introduction (and epigrammatically, above) I owe the essence of this line of thinking to Bruno Latour's *Science in Action*, but given its centrality to this Chapter it needs to be elaborated here. Latour's concern is with the 'sociologics' of scientific practice; the way in which literature, laboratories, or institutions supply the alliances with which scientists, their theories or egms, or the machines they make, 'acquire' discursive authority. Whatever works to consolidate this authority (or, conversely, deflect charges of irrationality) Latour calls hard facts, and their organization in networks he refers to as technoscience. Its relevance to maps almost goes without saying, and it is by no means coincidental that Latour cites cartography as the quintessential example of how centers of calculation (like 'Europe') position themselves "inside...networks...[to]...mobilize, cumulate, and recombine the world" (1987, 228). As should by now be clear, however, I differ from Latour in two key areas: a) by understanding networks as embracing more than 'just science', and in ontological as opposed to methodological terms; and b) by differentiating 'hard facts' (roughly speaking the facts of 'quantity') from 'soft' (roughly speaking the facts of 'quality'), without necessarily attributing more or less import to either.

4. Insofar as the artist (like the cartographer) "does not look on a place, [but] enters into its space, dwells in it, is absorbed by it" (Tippett and Cole 1977, 11) the connections between art and cartography pre-date even the Renaissance. There is, after that, a
sense in which they 'separate' from one another, but even then they do so only in terms of their 'content', and not their 'form'. Both media continue to share concepts of selectivity and context, and in both "abstraction [continues to lay] great emphasis on relationships" (Rees 1980, 62-3). Mercator was a calligrapher and engraver before he started making maps, Ortelius was a crafts-person, art dealer, and close acquaintance of the painter Pieter Bruegel, and Leonardo da Vinci also dabbled in cartography, his 1502 Pianta della citta di Imola perhaps the first true orthogonal plan ever made by an European (ibid, 61). The connectivity between map and built landscape proper is consolidated in the oblique panoramas of the 16th century, as the perspective of the artist/cartographer begins to shift from a position 'on the ground', and 'in front' of the vertical 'canvas', to a more disembodied 'birds-eye' view 'above' that same 'canvas', and which is, in turn, 'reduced' to a two-dimensional plane surface by the geometric grid imposed upon it (see, in this connection, Hillis 1995, 1-17). The relationship between mapping, pictorialism, and surveying per se I will address more directly below.

5. As germane to this thesis as it might be, even the most cursory summation of the development of international law in the writings of Vitoria, Textor, Grotius, Wolff, Pufendorf, and, especially, de Vattel, is impossible in the short space allotted here. The essential point is that sovereignty was initially conceived in 'personal' terms, with monarchs and popes directing the politics of overseas expansion (Green and Dickason 1989, 244). But as soon as it became clear that imperial and colonial expediencies could not be justified under natural or canon law, these writers drew on Aristotelian theories of natural servitude to argue that 'infidels' were 'subhuman' and therefore incapable of forming political societies that qualified for dominium in the first place (Christian 1989, x-xiii). For a thorough account of this world-historical doctrine I recommend Green and Dickason (1989), but the quintessential statement that upheld the legal right of European states to occupy the Americas is de Vattel, who conjoined his own concepts of natural law with the pragmatism of state practice to argue that because Amerindians' "unsettled habitation in those immense regions [could not] be accounted a true and legal possession...the people of Europe, too closely pent up at home...were lawfully entitled to take possession of it, and settle it with colonies" (1863, 100). It should come as no surprise that to the extent that Chief Justice McEachern even considered the 'foundations' of international law (a point I will come back in the Conclusion) he went no further than de Vattel in doing so.

6. For a concise account of the surveying and mapping of the English estates by Chris Saxton and John Speed during the late 16th and early 17th centuries the reader should see Tyacke and Huddy (1980). For the authoritative referencing of the discursive linkages to the overseas prognostications of Richard Hakluyt, the 'national history' plays of William Shakespeare, the literary exploits of Edmund Spenser, the ecclesiastical polemics of Richard Hooker, and the legal writings of Edward Coke I recommend Helgerson (1992). The substantive geography of Coke's 'golden metewand (literally, 'measuring stick') of the law' in the Institutes of the Laws of England, however, is elucidated by Blomley (1994, 67-105). The essential theme is that it is with Coke that doctrinal law is first made subservient to the jurisprudence of the court, and that it is with Saxton and Speed that the surveyor's chain and compass is charged with transposing 'on the ground' what said court is henceforth charged with
enforcing in statute. As I have already hinted at the start of the thesis, these linkages are of fundamental importance, and I will come back to them in the Conclusion.

7. It was on Cook's third and Vancouver's first voyages that the practice of hiring artists, draughtsmen, and scientists from within Navy ranks first took hold (Smith 1985, 190). The pioneering agent in the Pacific theater was Sir Thomas Livingstone Mitchell, who brought triangulation to New South Wales in 1827, and promulgated the idea that the surveyor and painter of picturesque landscapes ought to be one and the same person (see, in this connection, ibid, 281, but also Carter 1987, 99-135). At Nootka, however, Webber's paintings tended to emphasize First Peoples' villages at the expense of landscapes, and while Vancouver carried no professional artist, a number of his crew did carry this inversion back to England in their own engravings (Tippett and Cole 1977, 18-22). (I certainly do not intend to absolve Vancouver of his own ethnographic 'weaknesses' [see footnote 6, Chapter Two] but this may provide at least partial explanation of why he apparently took so little cartographic interest in Aboriginal settlement patterns.)

8. It should be remembered that most overland adventurers on the northwest coast had already 'memorized' a vision of 'Otherness' that had been instilled not only through Cook, but by de Bougainville's, d'Urville's, and la Pérouse's 'gardens of paradise' in the south and mid-Pacific (see, in this connection, Cameron 1987, 146-67), and so were generally 'unprepared' for the more sublime (and 'savage') landscapes of New Caledonia. Vancouver and Dixon both contrasted the 'estate-like' serenity of Puget Sound with the formidable terrain north of Burrard Inlet, and early Victorians saw their own colonial fortress as an island of 'calculated nature' in a sea of 'dreary wilderness' (Tippett and Cole 1977, 22-30). The discursive connections between surveying and artistry in the persons of David Thompson (see footnote 9, Chapter Two), Hermann Tiedemann (figure 7), Frederick Whymper, and W.G.R. Hind (see, in this connection, Tippett and Cole 1977, 38-45) I have already hinted at.

9. The coherence between aesthetic representations and the ideological perspectives of the cultures that commission them is characteristic of all art, but in 19th century British Columbia it was typically the landscape of the 'Other' that comprised the Orientalist's "artistic counterpart to the biological explanation of life on the planet provided by the theory of organic evolution" (Smith 1985, xii). Inspired by George Catlin (see, also, figure 9) Paul Kane was the first artist to take the First Peoples of the northwest coast as his principal subject, but, like most of his contemporaries, was convinced that their genre de vie was destined for the scrap heap, and he painted them as such. It was Edward Curtis, however, who first recorded this vision on film, idealistically posing the 'traditional (read 'good') Indian(s)' much as a tourist would have expected to see them (Francis 1992, 21-4), and in so doing submitted them fully to the 'loss of the aura' that is the bane of replicability (see, again, Benjamin 1969, 219-45).

10. Euro-Canadian attempts at eradicating the potlatch, sun dance, and other aesthetic or religious ceremonies have been well documented in the literature (see, in this connection, Fisher 1977, 119-45; Titley 1986, 162-83), but the seizure of artefacts (masks, 'spirit catchers', and coppers, etc.) used in them has not. Ethnographers (like
C.F. Newcombe) and missionaries (like Thomas Crosby) certainly made a 'career' of acquiring cultural artefacts for museums and/or private collections, but there was no shortage of 'amateurs' either. Fillip Jacobsen, a little-known German collector wrote of his travels in Nuxalk country, "I have made big collections of them but people [sic] here in this country take no interest in the Indians. They certainly are interesting from a scientific [sic] stand point" (cited in Kopas 1972, 221). I will come back to this theme below.

11. The most (in)famous of these exhibitions was the Buffalo Bill Show (which took 18 railway cars to haul itself to Toronto in 1885) but they ran the gamut from small 'county fairs' to huge carnivals entertaining European heads-of-state. Officially, the federal government frowned on such exhibitions because they thought they stood in the way of progress, but the public loved them, and they remained the most popular purveyor of the 'Indian image' until replaced by the cinema after World War I. The essential point is that these shows simplified that image corporeally in exactly the same manner that Kane's paintings or Curtis' photographs had previously done on canvas or celluloid. In either case the Indian was effectively enlisted as a role-player in another's story (see, especially, Francis 1992, 97-108).

12. I have already cited a number of occasions where colonial authorities endeavoured to deliver copies of maps to various Chiefs, but at no time were they concerned to solicit input from them. They did so only to the extent that it would have fulfilled their own preconceptions of what was then considered 'due process' towards those thought incapable of forming political societies. What is noteworthy, however, is that they did this even though most of them had already satisfied themselves that the First Peoples were incapable of "appreciating any abstract idea" (September 16 1871 letter from Trutch to Howe [British Columbia 1987, 101, emphasis added]) in the first place. The only other conclusion that can be drawn is that (post)colonial actors did not consider maps and plans as abstractions, a point I will touch on again in the Conclusion.

13. Literacy was not, as a rule, a discursive component in most (pre-contact) Aboriginal societies, but there is plenty of evidence to support the thesis that they placed great trust (and legal weight) in written documents when confronted with them. This was certainly true of treaties, and we have no reason to suppose that it was any different with maps. One of the best illustrations of this recognition occurred in 1869 when Methodist Reverend A. Browning advised the Colonial Secretary that Magistrate H.M. Ball had "inserted the names of [a Catholic Priest's] nominees in the duly authorized map of the [Chilliwack] District as the real Chiefs, thus at once defacing the map and placing the first named Chiefs in the position of being....no Chiefs at all" (July 6 letter to Phillip Hankin [British Columbia 1987, 71, emphasis in original]). As it turned out, however, the "first named Chiefs" were not "the Indians to whom the majority of their respective tribes wish[ed] the maps to be given" (December 15 1869 letter from Ball to Hankin [ibid, 74], and when 'corrected' maps were supplied the 'nominees' acceded to their 'rightful' chieftanship, with Ball and the Priest being vindicated of Browning's 'charges'. As often as not, however, the First Peoples solicited maps not as 'proof' of their own title but as part of the legal remedy for settlers invading lands they thought were (lawfully) theirs. That same year, for example, six other Chiefs in
the District complained to the Magistrate of settlers encroaching on their reserve, and demanded that their "place [be] surveyed and marked out as soon as possible" (August 26 letter from Charles Saltemten, Jules Skoukieten, Adolph Koukeaten, et. al. to A.T. Bushby [ibid, 79]; and Reverend F.G. Claudet advised Trutch that "the Coquitlam Indians [had] applied to [him] for a map of their reserve...on account of the neighbouring settlers having...[threatened] to have them removed" (August 28 letter [ibid, 95]). Eventually, of course, the First Peoples became more comfortable with Euro-Canadian cartographic discourses, even to the extent of making maps and plans of their own. In 1875 Magistrate John Morley advised Powell that settlers appeared to be encroaching on reserve territory that did not belong to them, and that a Cowichan "Indian has drawn a sketch map to show where his land is situated" (May 12 letter [ibid, 159]); and in 1915 the Nisga'a Chiefs presented self-authored maps of their claims to Scott (Titley 1986, 144). Frederick Allen's appeals to Commissioners Planta and Cornwall at Kincolith in 1888 we have already noted.

14. The best illustrations of this discourse are found in the minutes of the field meetings between the First Nations and the 1913-6 Royal Commissioners. Given that much of it was recorded through an interpreter, their textual accuracy must be treated with caution, but as to the centrality of surveys, maps and plans to the discussion there can be little doubt. The minutes were not published in the final Report, but if there is a more vivid evocation of not only the huge gulf in cross-cultural empathy yet faced by the First Peoples over a century after contact, but of the way in which cartographic dialogue facilitates 'incorporation', I have yet to find it (see, for an illustration, Appendix 4)

15. I am here referring to the so-called 'argument of acquiescence' which proclaims, in general terms, that because the First Nations have (by now) 'adopted' or 'participated in' European and/or Canadian cultural discourses they have effectively abdicated claim to any and all Aboriginal rights (including territorial) they might otherwise be entitled to, either as 'original occupants' under imperial law, or as provided for in Section 35 of the Constitution. It has been advanced by the Crown in a number of recent land claims cases, and especially in British Columbia where such rights have not been 'extinguished' or otherwise coopted by treaty. The argument seems a spurious one — not the least because it is refuted by provincial political history — and judges have generally rejected it as a valid argument in law. It continues to enjoy circulation in some 'extralegal' circles, however: government bureaucracies, 'third-party' corporate interests, certain academia, and the media among them. I will come back to this argument in the Conclusion.

16. I am not here suggesting that class structure in the colonies was necessarily less variegated than in the metropole, but that in a frontier society it was imperative that administrators maintain at least the 'appearance' (if not the 'materiality') of what amounted to the same thing. This was especially the case during the colonial period proper (1843-71), when a 'professional cartel' of magistrates, military officers, gold commissioners, customs house officials, assemblymen, surveyors, and mapmakers changed clothes (and places) with equal aplomb. By no means was their association with the First Peoples a 'class relationship' in the usual sense of the term, but the theoretical parallels between class and race permeated Orientalist discourse: as
Kieman has written, "discontented native in the colonies, labour agitator in the mills, [all] were the same serpent in alternate disguises" (1973, 316). While sympathy for the 'lower orders' at home might occasionally translate into humanitarianism and compassion abroad, in other words, it was usually the case that fear of the masses at the center appeared as barbarism and brutality (however diluted) in the periphery (ibid; but see, also, Morrison 1968, 129-55). The essential point is that these agents were not merely interstices in their respective fields of spatial practice, but that, by virtue of their institutional 'interchangeability', they were those fields. I will come back to this important observation at the end of the Chapter.

17. I am not suggesting here that there was any disagreement among Europeans over the form of the 'container', but simply that there was some debate over its 'contents', even if much of that was 'instigated' by the missionaries. Obviously, the further one moved away from the center, the 'weaker' the ideological power networks tended to be, and, consequently, the greater the dependency on various forms of military or economic compulsion should the security of the frontier be threatened. Even at that, however, a paucity of adequate maps could still prove detrimental to the 'efficient' exercise of European authority, as the Chilcotin War capably demonstrated.

18. The profound ideological significance of the conjunction between lithography and the authorship (and readership) of representations of space I have already touched on, but what needs to be added here is that it is with the mechanical reproduction of representational images in general that (a given) perspective is effectively infused in the quotidian (see, again, Benjamin 1969, 219-45; Berger 1972). If the Arrowsmith firm occupies the interstitial watershed that it does it is less because of its concern with empirical 'accuracy' or territorial 'specificity', than because it was perhaps the first English mapmaker to not only express the imperial aspirations of the class(es) that sourced, commissioned, and consumed its product, but subject that perspective to mass replication at the same time. As alluded to above (figure 25) I have found no direct evidence as to why reserve plans proper were generally not lithographed, but it was likely as much a consequence of their not being intended for public sale as anything else. Theoretically, they were supposed to be prepared in triplicate—one for the Dominion, one for Lands and Works, and one for the Reserve itself—but if more were required it was physically easy enough—and probably just as cost-effective—to return surveyors behind a desk during the off-season, where they could be 'engaged in making tracings of the plans...for the department, for the provincial government, for the different Indian Agents, and for the respective Indian Chiefs whose people were particularly interested in such work" (A.W. Vowell's October 24 1901 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1901]).

19. Olive Dickason has also made this point, observing that European ascendancy in the colonies was less the consequence of the inviability of Aboriginal government than because "European state organization made for strategic advances that Amerindian prestate societies could not match" (Green and Dickason 1989, 247, emphasis added). She considers this organization exclusively in military and political terms, however. With respect to cartography per se Denis Wood has come rather nearer to my own position, suggesting that it is the "system of production with the technology it implies of generation, manufacture, and distribution that...radically differentiates mapmaking
cultures from those that [are not]" (1992, 39-40, emphasis added). He does not extend this insight to a critique of ideology, however, in my view slipping dangerously close to a kind of technological determinism while doing so.

20. The literature on nationalism and state formation is extensive (see, for starters, Gellner 1983; Mann 1986; Hobsbawm 1987, 142-64), but the notion that such constructs were as much (if not more) a peripheral as opposed to a metropolitan phenomenon has received less exposure. To the extent that "Europe's imperial expansion and the nationalist ideology that fostered expansion...got started in the 16th century" (Helgerson 1992, 17, emphasis added) there is more than a sense in which both views are 'right', but I would still concur with Anderson (and Said, for that matter) that it was in the colonial theater, and in the presence of the 'Other', that (transplanted) Europeans most rigourously and consciously networked the 'property-histories' of their new territorial possessions vis-a-vis those of other European states (1991, 174-5); substituting, as it were, the 'dotted' lines of tradition with the 'solid' lines of modernity as they did so. It is important to note, in this connection, that of the multitude of 'discourses' that contributed to the construction of this network Anderson actually identified three as essential: the map, the census, and the museum (see ibid, 162-82). The only emendation I would insist upon is that insofar as it is the first of these that consolidates more completely perceptival concordance in the field of spatial practice proper, the map necessarily 'does what it does' more in the realm of symbolic form than in the domain of discourse per se.

21. John Pickles has also made this same point, suggesting that states attempt to 'capture' the discursive field not only by the material appropriation of space, but "by the symbolic constitution of mapped space as national space...[and it is by doing so that] fledgling national territories...establish a national identity abroad, and...create a national ideology at home..." (1992, 201). As to the specific dialogical mechanisms by which the map might actually 'incorporate' the space of an 'Other', however, he does not elaborate. In any event, we see it invoked here in a rather more 'secondary' (but ideologically no less strategic) form than in, say, Arrowsmith, Brown, O'Reilly, or the Royal Commission.

22. Paul Connerton has already argued for a hermeneutics that recognizes a distinction between 'incorporating' and 'inscribing' social practices: the former being associated with 'unintentionality' and purposive bodily activity (as in ritual, ceremony, theatre, etc.), and the latter with 'intentionality' and 'activity' recorded by fixed media (as in photography, cinema, etc.) (1989, 72-3); a classification made germane to process cartography by Rundstrom (1991, 1-12; but see, also, Wood, 1992, 72-3). 'Certainly I think it has some heuristic validity but if I have avoided employing these terms antonymically it is because I think that doing so confuses more than it clarifies. Both authors agree that all inscriptions necessarily involve some sort of incorporation — a qualification which I think has been confirmed in this thesis — but neither addresses the apposite possibility: namely, at what point (if any) does an incorporation acquire the status of an inscription? (Totems and crests, for example, are 'fixed' territorial deeds [see, in this connection, Duff 1956], but I doubt if either author would consider the cultures that made them as 'inscribing'.) This seems to be, in short, an apposition that must cut both ways, as I think the Conclusion and Postscript will attest.
Conclusion

*Delgamuukw vs. A.G. Revisited*

Thus we can now see that the real distinguishing characteristic of Western maps is that they are more powerful than aboriginal maps, because they enable forms of association that make possible the building of empires, disciplines like cartography, and the concept of land ownership that can be subject to juridical processes (Turnbull 1986, 55).

In a work that seems to contain an inordinate share of 'quotable quotes' Berthon and Robinson have written that "the settlement of the New World gave maps and surveying a vital new relevance. They became the seals which conferred a spurious legitimacy on the European takeover of America. Some fascinating recent research demonstrates how the earliest European maps acknowledged Indian names and territory, and how these were then quite literally wiped off the face of the map" (1991, 7). Certainly, it almost goes without saying that the mapping of Indian *Lands* and/or Indian *Reserves* on the northwest coast (or anywhere else in the Americas for that matter) was not only central in adjudicating the geographical division of the territory, but facilitated (in the eyes and minds of the 'dividers', anyway) the First Peoples' incorporation into Euro-Canadian land values. Indeed, to suggest in a general sense that the cartographies of modernity have played 'starring roles' in the theatres of imperialism and colonialism is not to suggest anything particularly novel. But it is not enough to simply suggest it. Such a declaration needs to be (net)worked through, analytically, empirically, interpretively, and in specific geographical, historical and institutional contexts, and across a range of ontological domains (see, also, Said 1979, 123). As I alerted in the Introduction, our circumnavigation of the territorial atlas of disenfranchisement of the 'Other' on the northwestern shores of Turtle Island between 1793 and 1916 has been, of necessity, a
somewhat selective (re)tracing of a finite number of hitherto established traces, and neither the acts of interpretation or understanding of those (re)traces can ever be completely disassociated from the ideological directives within which they were (and continue to be) operationalized. All maps are made and read, after all, through the discursive rules of the system from which they emanate (see, also, Turnbull 1989, 50; Godlewska 1995, 6), and my own authorship is as much a part of that system as any other. But I do think the circumnavigation has been of sufficient 'depth', and has maintained enough 'critical distance', to ascertain something of substantive (and hitherto neglected) importance not only about the First Peoples and their discursive (em)place(ment) in the Euro-Canadian order of things, but of the ordering ideologies of Orientalism itself. For the year is 1989, the theatre is the Supreme Court of British Columbia, Smithers Registry, and the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en are poised to dust off the plates of the atlas, and interstitially network some representations of space of their own.

Colonialism in the Courtroom

Those representations comprised, as I alerted, the cartographic evidence submitted in the case of (C) in the Introduction, and while we are now finally knocking, as it were, on the 'doors of perception' of exactly why that evidence was unable to 'break' the (post)colonial arrow, it is incumbent upon us to first recap what we have 'discovered' about that presented in (A) and, especially, (B). Everything hinges, of course, on (A), because it is really 'here' that British sovereignty is first asserted, and it is only that assertion that: a) establishes the legal authority of the court as Crown agent in the first place; and b) "carr[ies] the underlying title to the soil that allow[s] the sovereign to
convert common resources into private property" (Flanagan 1989, 602) in the second. From the standpoint of international law it is doubtless true that "it is part of the law of nations...that discovery and occupation of the lands of this continent by European nations...gave rise to a right of sovereignty" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 81), and it is in this context that the Chief Justice is on terra connues when he declares that "the law recognizes [absolute] Crown ownership" (ibid) of the territory, and that it does not matter, on this view, when sovereignty was first asserted. But to suggest that this, by itself, gives the Crown 'underlying title' is to make a purely tautological argument, not only because it "leaves unanswered the question of whether [said law] can be used to abrogate or diminish the native communities' rights of ownership over land" (Gormley 1984, 42), but because international law is meaningless without a geography to which it is concordant. This law cannot, in other words, be disassociated from the space over which it intends dominion any more or less than political, military, or economic power networks can be disassociated from the ideological. On the contrary, it was codified precisely 'along' the latitudes and longitudes of the perspectival grid that was being contemporaneously and interstitially 'exported to' the imperial theatre(s) by the maps and mapmakers of modernity. As Christian has put it, "it would be odd [indeed] if international law did not authorize the expansionist activities of the leading colonial powers, for the law of nations was [and remains] little more than a self-serving crystallization of state practice (1989, x, emphasis added)."

Once this is brought into the equation then it not only matters when, but how sovereignty was first asserted, because the 1763 Royal Proclamation was not — the Province's position notwithstanding — mere statute, but a prerogative legislation under the Great Seal of Great Britain that confirmed the right of Aboriginal self-government in
the North American colonies as an inherent and full jurisdiction. The Chief Justice stated that the Proclamation must be "construed in its historical setting" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 84), but this, however, is precisely what he did not do. Not only does the wording of the Proclamation make it clear that it was intended prospectively, but the maps that did exist had been made, as I have argued, with exactly the same objective in mind. To put it another way, it was not that the authority of the Proclamation did not obtain on terra inconnues simply because existing maps (mis)represented it as such. It was that it would have applied whether that particular space had yet been committed to a fixed medium or not. In point of fact the entire geo-political context of the Treaty of Paris itself can only be regarded in expansionist terms to begin with. To suggest otherwise is to not only disavow the intentionalities of state practice as they were constituted at the time, but the discursive continuities between the law and the territory in its international, positive, and perspectival forms. The British may not have been physically on the northwest coast in 1763, but insofar as it was by then circumscribed on at least three sides by terrae connuæ, they were plainly already 'on it' ideologically. Vancouver and (especially) Mackenzie simply 'made sovereign' what was already a 'pre-interpreted' hard fact.

There is enough jurisprudence to support the thesis that "the mere existence of a treaty does not exclusively establish that aboriginal title is no longer an issue within a given territory" (Gormley 1984, 41), but once the Proclamation is made germane to the territories of the northwest coast then the absence of such pacts becomes a very serious matter indeed. The Chief Justice seems to have admitted as much when he suggested that "the question [was] not did the Crown through its officers specifically address the question of aboriginal rights but rather did they clearly and plainly intend to create a legal
regime from which it [was] necessary to infer that aboriginal rights were in fact extinguished" *(Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 241, emphasis added).* Unable to disprove First Nations' long-term occupancy of the territory during the proto-historical period, the Province and Dominion had resorted to a two-pronged defence that said: a) the Calder XIII instruments were of sufficient legal weight to establish 'clear and plain' intent to extinguish in law; and b) the maps of Indian Reserves presented in the case of (B) were "a symbol of Indian capitulation to European presence in [British Columbia]" *(Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 54)* in any case. In essence, their submissions were networked precisely along the same twin strata of perspectival concordance to which I referred above in my own (re)interpretation of the intentionality and scope of the *Royal Proclamation*: namely a) an attempted (de)contextualization (if a somewhat tenuous one at that) of (pre)existing statute law in *legal discourse*; and b) the 'argument of acquiescence' (see footnote 15, Chapter Five) as 'confirmed' in present-day territorial *form.* The Chief Justice rejected the defence in (b), but he did agree that the Calder XIII in (a), along with (pre)existing imperial legislation and "other enactments [were adequate] to extinguish any possible right of ownership on the part of the Indians" *(Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 242)*, and it is precisely for this reason that we were not (necessarily) introduced directly to any of the maps presented in the case of (B) in the judgment. For the Chief Justice it was simply sufficient, *in this instance*, to let the law 'speak for itself'.

Again, however, the essential point is that if these laws do 'speak for themselves' it is *only* because there happens to be a territorial (re)configuration *to which they are referential*, and it is precisely in the maps in the case of (B) that this (re)configuration is in fact validated. Certainly there is no *explicit* language in the Calder XIII, or in any of the other enactments cited by the defence, that could be construed as constituting 'clear
and plain' intent to extinguish Aboriginal title or rights. It is only when subjected to the perspectivism of the 'grid of modernity' and to the jurisprudence of the court, that these laws are effectively impregnated with the transcendental legitimacy that they have. To put it another way, it is the maps in the case of (B) that most authoritatively marshall and collate the accumulated concatenation of enumerative, anthropological, historical, ethnological, performative, and artistic discourses on (and of) 'Otherness' that 'deliver to ideology' its substantive — and, in the theatre of the court, inescapable — content.

Indeed, if one had to choose any two plates in the territorial atlas that most represent and memorize the territorial connaissance in (and of) the Chief Justice's own field of spatial practice they are doubtless figures 28 (or 29) — the 'space of capitulation' — on the one hand, and 32 — the 'space of ephemerality' — on the other? As should be anticipated, no one has encapsulated the hard reality of this perspective more poignantly than the plaintiffs themselves, who suggested that "[t]o see the reserve as such a symbol is to imply a particular historical process...[an] alleged continuum of ever contracting land contain[ing] a stereotype which is closely allied to...evolutionism; the roaming hunter, with the life of limitless freedom that comes with dependence only on subsistence resources is progressively defined. There is a perceived inexorable logic that Indians who once had territories in their 'traditional' life now have remnants of those territories, their reserves matching the remnants of their 'traditional' culture" (Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 54-5, emphasis added). The Chief Justice may have indeed rejected the 'argument of acquiescence' in law, but it — or at least something which amounts to the same thing — permeates the judgment from start to finish in ideology anyway.

It is on this view, moreover, that I can now properly vindicate my 'metaphor' of the territorial atlas. By no means have I been suggesting that Arrowsmith, Trutch, Sproat,
O'Reilly or the Royal Commission consciously 'imagineered' these maps as quotidian entries in some sort of geographical (or historical) narrative. What I am suggesting is that this is exactly how the Chief Justice (re)interpreted them as they were unfolded in court. For precisely the same reasons that Vancouver's publisher committed his charts to a portfolio, in other words, so too were the maps in the case of (B) effectively consigned to the plates of an atlas whose definitive thematization is the teleology of developmentalism (the very ideology that constituted the unexamined 'starting point' for Farley's own gazetteer in 1960). As Wood has correctly observed "the atlas is not a hodgepodge of 'neutral' maps, but a lively polemic about a self-perpetuating system of sovereign states" (1987, 33); a polemic that (re)constructs (and validates) what Carter has called "diorama history" (1987, xx), that particular history where the past is settled more effectively than the country itself. I might be inclined to concur with Randall that 'the law' is "a growth conditioned by the national consciousness of each people" (1918, 203, emphasis added), but only with the added proviso that it is the 'atlas of the law' that makes it so.

Geography on Trial

Which brings us, finally, to the case of (C). For we are now able to throw open the 'doors of perception' and perspicaciously understand exactly why the representations of Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en space could not network, in the perspective of the court, the representational spaces for which they proclaimed ontological valency. They lacked the collective authority that derives from the successful appeal to higher and more numerous allies in either its 'external' or 'internal' forms (see, again, Latour 1987, 31). As may be recalled in the Introduction, the Chief Justice 'handled' this evidence by: a) dismissing the
'data bases' of Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en cartography as transfactual hearsay; b) arguing (the approximated) territorial boundaries as untenable in a modern legal regime; and c) accusing the plaintiffs (and those that delivered evidence on their behalf) of suspect research techniques in the first place. In the case of (a) he suggested that "few, if any, of these sketch maps, accorded closely to the evidence adduced by or on behalf of these plaintiffs at trial, and some were markedly different" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 258, emphasis added). He admitted that the territorial affidavits required substantial work because they had to be retrospectively networked to real geographic features, but he concluded that the adaawk and kungax purporting to describe these connections were so vague that the oral histories or genealogies allegedly contained in them "could have occurred almost anywhere in the territory" (ibid, 260-1). But could not the same charges be levelled against the logs and charts prepared by Vancouver, Mackenzie, and the Hudson's Bay Company traders (never mind by the 'theoretical cartographers')? In point of fact, were these maps themselves not 'cantilevered' out of precisely the same Aboriginal geography whose representations the court dismissed as "seriously lacking in detail about specific lands to which they [were] said to relate" (ibid, 58)? And what then does this suggest about the cartographies of Arrowsmith, Anderson, Launders, Brown, Morice, O'Reilly, Green, and every other pre-colonial, colonial, or post-colonial territorial actor who followed in those 'original' (re)traces? As I have already averred, this is the hard-edged reality of the 'house of cards' theory taken to its 'logical limit'; once you pull out those at the bottom of the stack, the whole edifice comes crashing down on the table.

In the case of (b) the Chief Justice did defer to the plaintiffs' territorial 'propositions' in a 'general sense', but to the extent that "the unusual shape of some [of them led him] to doubt their authenticity" (ibid, 262, emphasis added), it was "the nature of [their]
association and the details of precise boundaries [that prevented him] from accepting the internal boundaries as proven facts in [the] case" (ibid, 270, emphasis added). He even argued that "there was no reason, until the fur trade, for these people to have any boundaries" (ibid, 262, emphasis added) at all, with the consequence that the territorial affidavits "appear[ed] to be excessively gerrymandered or artificial, which [seemed to him] inappropriate for an aboriginal society" (ibid, emphasis added). But since when does 'shape' enjoin any necessary relation to 'authenticity'? And just what would be deemed 'appropriate' for an Aboriginal society that he has already summarily dismissed as having "no written language, no horses or wheeled vehicles...[and where] life...was, at best, 'nasty, brutish, and short'" (ibid, 13)? In point of fact, is there, as I have argued, a representational space anywhere that is more 'excessively gerrymandered or artificial' than the Indian Reserve? Stereotypes certainly derive their authoritative power from their (apparent) simplicity, their ('common sense') recognizability, and their "implicit reference to an assumed consensus [on] some attribute of complex social relationships" (Perkins 1982, 141), but when structurally supported by laws and applied to land itself they can be doubly damaging indeed.

Finally, in the case of (c) the Chief Justice suggested that to the extent that Marvin George's "technique of preparing a draft map, and list of geographical features based on other researchers data and working maps, in advance of his interviews...as well as [their contradiction] with other affidavits, illustrat[ed] the serious problems with his research techniques" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 393), then it supervenes that "the process in which [they] were prepared has not been objective" (ibid, 262, emphasis added) to begin with. But he has already accepted that it was "not possible to discuss this case except in an historical context" (ibid, 17) on the one hand, and that he "should not disregard all the
viva voce evidence which fails to comply strictly with the form of [his] reputation ruling" (ibid, 55) on the other. How, then, can 'non-traditional' (read 'non-positivist') forms of evidence be generated without some recourse to 'non-traditional' research methodologies? And why should geography be any less concerned with context than history (or, for that matter, any other academic discipline in the human sciences)? The fact of the matter is that "positivism is an implausible reference point for determining the plausibility of competing interpretations, [for] interpretations are political acts, contested and argued over as representations of political interests" (Clark 1989, 217, emphasis added). As the plaintiffs cautioned the court at the start of the trial, evidence (and the research that sources it) can only be assessed, after all, from within the networks in which it is promulgated (see, for example, Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 24).

In the end, the Chief Justice concluded that the plaintiffs were entitled to some rights in some part(s) of the territory, but since they did not appear to be 'attached' to specific territories, and because he must, with judicial eyes, be more scrutinizing, "the [only] question [that remains] is where to draw the line" (Delgam uukw vs. A.G. 1991, 274, emphasis added). And that is exactly what he did, arbitrarily delimiting on the map of the claimed territory the area circumscribed by the external boundary by some 60%, dismissing the internal House boundaries 'out of court', and severely restricting the geographical scope and discursive content of Aboriginal rights that might accrue to either at the same time. What now stands out in all its bold relief, however, is that the 'inconsistencies' between this defence and those advanced in the cases of (A) and (B) are by no means erected on the same footing as those identified between (A) and (B) alone. Because in this instance there were no inconsistencies. The point, however, is that it is precisely in this ruling that there should have been. To put it another way, it was never
the case that the cartographies (and laws) of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en were less 'accurate', 'reputable', or 'truthful' — or any more 'mythical', 'imaginary' or 'fictional' — than those choreographed (and scripted) by Euro-Canadians. It was that in their (unavoidably forced) transmutation from one symbolic form of life, and set of attenuating discourses, to another they (necessarily) 'abandoned' what their own 'at-a-glance' authenticity and ideological authority ultimately would have depended upon: a) the evidence (or at least the inference) of developmental status on the part of their own history, geography, or genealogy on the one hand; and b) the capacity to accumulate, marshall and collate facts and statements of 'We-ness' on the other. The Chief Justice was able to (re)trace back 'along the network', to higher and more numerous allies, and not only 'draw his line', but 're-inscribe' (in the quotidian) the territorial atlas in which he was 'drawing' at the same time. When the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en traced back, however, all they could find, in the perspective of the Court, was empty space, and so were unable to affect interstitial emergence within it.

The Persistence of Mind

In the final analysis, then, there is more than a sense in which Reasons for Judgment opens up a Pandora's Box of questions concerning not only the First Nations' place in the order of things but the manner in which we sustain and regulate our own place in that same order. It is a truism that the First Peoples have always been treated unjustly by the legal and judicial systems, but it is the inscribed imbalance of power from the colonial movement itself that is the real villain in the piece (McCaskill 1983, 288). For in restricting their territorial rights to those that can be 'explained away' by evolutionist
dogma Dominion and Provincial governments continue to disavow the very existence of the First Nations themselves (Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw 1989, 11-22). I would concur with Delaney when he suggests that space is not just 'filled with ideology', but with "conflicting and contradictory ideologies" (1993, 63, emphasis added), but the essential point is that not all ideologies are of equal discursive weight. It is in this context, then, that I think Delaney is quite wrong when he claims that the law is 'anti-geographic' and that geography is 'anti-legal', because the former is concerned only with the general and the universal, and the latter with the unique and the particular (ibid, 50). As Randall has observed, statute law is clearly a construction, but "the same observation really applies to the great bulk of the rules in all the great legal systems, i.e. they are definite efforts of the human intellect to formulate the rules under which men [sic] play the great game of life (1918, 203, emphasis added). The essential point, however, is that this is a game that requires a field of spatial practice on which it may be played (and 'referred') in the first place. In 1912 — when the Pax Britannica was teetering, ironically enough, on the very brink of its own dissolution — Lord Nathaniel Curzon suggested that it was imperial expansion that paralleled the transformation of geography from the "dull and pedantic into the most cosmopolitan of all sciences" (cited in Said 1979, 215), for it was (mostly) geography that was "part of the equipment that [was] necessary for a proper conception of citizenship, and [was] an indispensable adjunct for the production of public man [sic]" (ibid, 216). If it is true, as the Chief Justice determined, that the Dominion and Province are sovereign, and the Constitution can only be modified constitutionally (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 225), it is only because, from the outset, the colonizer has carried the common law around as his or her own 'personal possession' (Randall 1918, 210), and because as far as international and statutory law are concerned, colonization
and conquest over land (or civilization and reconfiguration of it) have always been two sides of the same coin. The Supreme Court certainly executes a pivotal role in how human geographies are constituted, judged, and passed on from generation to generation, but the Chief Justice was absolutely correct when he stated that "the Court [was] not free to do whatever it wish[ed]" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 2). As I have alluded at the close of both Chapters Three and Four, the implications of this view are as profound as they are socially deep-rooted.

What I am getting at here is that while the Chief Justice wrote in barely concealed awe of Christopher Columbus' and John Cabot's "discovery of North America in 1498" (ibid, 1991, 19), and of the "heroic efforts" (ibid, 20) of Francis Drake, James Cook, George Vancouver, and other "intrepid navigators from Europe and Asia" (ibid, 83) who followed in those traces, it should not be dismissed as merely nostalgic adulation of the exploits of the 'great men' of European history. For in exactly the same way that Israel Powell 're-experienced' Alexander Mackenzie's "[finding] salt water after his journey of discovery" (August 13 1881 Report to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs [Canada 1881]), and his just missing George Vancouver's "historical voyage of discovery in the same region" (ibid) on his first steamboat to Bella Coola, so too did Chief Justice Allan McEachern discourse on his own "fascinating voyage of exploration and discovery" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 306) as he toured the 'abandoned' Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en villages during his pre-trial reconnaissance of the claim. He commented at length on "the overwhelming vastness and isolation of this magnificent but almost empty territory" (ibid, 305), and on how he found "exploration by land in such country [to be] a long, slow, tedious, and often uncomfortable enterprise" (ibid). The essential point is that this is an experience he would have re-lived each and every time he was confronted with the maps.
in the cases of (A) and (B) in the courtroom, and it is in this sense that the Chief Justice was inevitably and unavoidably a 'prisoner' of his own colonial ideology (Ridington 1992, 21). But is this not basically what all of us do any time we, as 'citizens' — who are, after all, also players in the 'great game of life' — pick up a road map of the province of British Columbia, or the Historical Atlas of Canada, and tactilely trace out with the tips of our fingers the itinerary that we intend to follow, or the historical narrative that we want to re-experience? Does this not comprise precisely our own paraphrase of the architectonics of the 'bodily trace', the point at which we also 'cross that gap' between our representations of space and our representational spaces, between the dominating and the appropriated, and between the imaginary and the real? It is by no means a 'purposive' bodily trace in the sense that it was for those who built the grease trails — it is experienced indirectly, 'filtered' by (and through) the grid — but it is a bodily trace nonetheless. For "when we reverently trace the explorers' tracks, we [just like the Chief Justice] can claim to be explorers no less than they, and writing up our own experiences pretend it is history" (Carter 1987, xxi). Or, for that matter, geography. We may have started our networks as 'explorers' and 'discoverers', but we have always truly engaged them only as 'tracers' and 'followers'. And it seems we are tracers and followers still.

I would concur with Santos that "[i]t is a supreme irony that maps, though they are one of the most common cultural metaphors, are still far from occupying the place they deserve in the history of mentalities" (Santos 1987, 283). But if this is so it is precisely because maps are much more than mere metaphor, and because ideology prevents us from "wonder[ing] whether cartography is per se an adequate medium for representing spatial distribution [although] the question of accuracy continually arises" (Cousins and Hussain 1984, 87). Indeed, there was a time when I would have pulled out my own highway map
of the province and driven the dusty Ts'ilhqot'in Highway to the 'Village of the Rascals' in blissful ignorance of Mackenzie's or Palmer's track, never mind the Nuxalk-Carrier grease trail over which they were generally (re)traced. Certainly I will do so never again (in ignorance, that is). But it never occurs to the 'silent majority' that for the First Peoples the geographic (or legal) questions might be entirely different ones than they are for Canadians (McCaskill 1983, 295). As thoroughly networked in(to) the (post)colonial ideology as the latter are, they are utterly unaware of their own role in perpetuating its existence. By no means do I intend to absolve the Euro-Canadian cultural trajectory of its collective responsibility to ensure that justice is done (because it can) but it is unfortunately true, as Delaney has correctly noted, that "geographies of power cannot easily be interpreted away" (1993, 63). Indeed, while I think it is probably safe to suggest that we have reached that point in our traces where we generally accept the ethical exigency to 'return' to the First Nations their discourses — i.e. their language, their art and artefacts, even their self-government — we are some distance away from extending that courtesy to their 'form' — i.e. the soil, the land, the territory itself. This remains yet (an)'Other' matter altogether, and it is this space, I think, that is continually and cartographically regenerated by the ongoing saga of the imperial and colonial dialectics at their deep currents; dialectics in which we are all — not just Aboriginal Peoples, but judges, geographers, cartographers, historians, and citizens alike — necessarily and equally implicated.
Footnotes to Conclusion

1. It should be noted that the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en admitted as much in their own submissions. They would have had to in order to bring the case to court in the first place. The point, however, is that this 'allodial', or 'radical' title of the Crown need not necessarily conflict with (existing) Aboriginal rights, if by 'rights' one means the rights of self-government and the equivalent to fee simple ownership of land (see, in this connection, Clark 1990, 1-10; and footnote 4, below).

2. This is a theme that permeates critical legal studies. Cohen, for example, has suggested that insofar as law is not science, but practical activity, critiquing legal rules in purely legal terms is an hopelessly circular exercise (1935, 812-4); while Cotterell has echoed that to the extent that the law constructs its own object, legal discourse is a 'self-validation' that immunizes itself against 'extra-legal' knowledge claims (1986, 16-20).

3. The discursive interconnections between the laws of nations and state practice go back at least to Grotius — their first inscription in a North American context being the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht (Green and Dickason 1989, 61) — and it is largely on this account that the Chief Justice was able to dispense with the entire question of the foundations of international law in a mere two and a half pages (!). He reduced to a single paragraph las Casas' and de Vitoria's more 'sympathetic' exegeses codified during the Spanish occupation, and while he at least cited two of de Vattel's most sustained 'justifications' (see footnote 5, Chapter Five), he incorrectly referred their publication as 1844, when, in fact, they first appeared in print in London in 1758, a mere five years before the 1763 Royal Proclamation. His voluminous writings on treaties were ignored completely. Flanagan has made essentially the same point, arguing that "[a]ny realistic inquiry must focus on the actions of states, for they were directly and primarily involved in...conquest or treaty making" (1989, 602. emphasis added).

4. Prerogative legislation is, in short, 'king-made' law, and it is this law — historically issued under the Great Seal in the form of commissions or proclamations — which not only authorized the assertion of sovereignty (through 'discovery', conquest, or treaty) but subordinated all subsequent colonial, provincial, and federal governments to the imperial. The Royal Proclamation is a confirmation of the Aboriginal right of self-government because: a) it did not explicitly invest (post)colonial governments with the constitutional capacity to govern the First Peoples in unceded territory; and b) it explicitly recognized Aboriginal rights to not be molested or disturbed in their occupancy or use of those territories (see, in this connection, Clark 1990, 58-83). The significance of this view is that Aboriginal rights have always existed under constitutional common law, even though governments have chosen to ignore it in practice.

5. Employing his 'scissors-and-paste' methodology the Chief Justice stated that he did "not propose to consider every word of the Proclamation because [he was] satisfied beyond any question that it applied only to the benefit of certain lands and specified
Indians" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 96, emphasis added). Not only is this an overt denial of the fact that the Proclamation was a prerogative, and therefore prospective, enactment (see footnote 4, above) to begin with, but it states elsewhere that it applies equally to "lands and territories lying to the westward of the sources of the rivers which fall into the sea from the west and northwest..." (cited in Getty and Lussier 1988, 34, emphasis added), and nothing less than that. It should be noted, in this connection, that when Farley was asked by plaintiffs' counsel why he did not refer Thomas Jeffreys' 1761 A Map of the Discoveries Made by the Russians on the Northwest Coast of America — which does delineate a fixed coastline between Cape Blanco and the Alaskan panhandle — he answered that he did not consider it a 'proper derivative' (see, again, footnote 3, Introduction). Nor did he mention that Jeffreys was Royal Geographer to King George III himself! (Monet and Skanu'u 1992, 154). Commenting on Farley's "offer[ing] numerous useful opinions which [he] generally accepted" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 52), the Chief Justice may have indeed admired his credentials as "a collector and explainer of history by the use of interesting maps" (ibid), but they were only opinions just the same.

6. As should be immediately evidenced by his own words the Chief Justice did not attach the same standards of 'accuracy', 'reputability', or 'truthfulness' to the maps in (B) as he did in (A). In the latter case he is suggesting that 'intent' and 'inference' will be enough to establish the object in question. In the former, however, he has already concluded precisely the opposite. In short, (B) is interpreted in the widest possible terms, while (A) is interpreted in its narrowest. This inconsistency comes into even bolder relief in the case of (C), below.

7. In essence, the defence rationalized 'extinguishment' a posteriori, as a post facto justification for what had been a duplicitous, if not patently unlawful, seizure of territory in the first place. They suggested the reserve policy had been an 'humane and enlightened' one, when in fact it was implemented, and subsequently sustained, on a policy of denial, deceit, and misinformation. Certainly, from their standpoint, they 'had the law on their side', but it is worth noting that throughout the trial both counsels spent as much effort on ensuring their testimonies did not contradict one another as they did on the legal argument per se (Monet and Skanu'u 1992, 172-3). Their 'argument of acquiesence', however, was even more tenuous, and not simply because it had been rejected in previous jurisprudence, but because it was based on the "assum[ption] that what was recorded by whites [could] be used in a transparent manner as evidence of 'acceptance', and that to question British sovereignty one [had to] prove that white discourses were actively resisted and protested" (Clayton 1992, 57). As I have already illustrated, however, such a defence "hide[s] the specificity of [resistant strategies] in time and space, and [does] not address the possibility that natives were often silenced by the way they were incorporated into discourse" (ibid, emphasis added).

8. This simply (re)confirms, I think, exactly the same perspective that first 'surfaces' with Saxton and Coke in the late 16th century (footnote 6, Chapter Five); not only that 'outlook' that proclaims that "laws are maps [and] written laws are cartographic maps" (Santos 1987, 283, emphasis added), or even that "customary laws are mental maps" (ibid), but that judicial decisions are among those aesthetic/ritual practices that
(re)affirm the interstitial interfaces 'between' the two. Without a geography to which it appertains, in other words, jurisprudence is, like 'the law' itself, "a special branch of the science of transcendental nonsense" (Cohen 1935, 821).

9. Aside from our own traces, we need go no further than the Chief Justice himself for confirmation of this perspective. Following his own pre-trial 'reconnaissance' he wrote that "the most striking thing one notices in the territory...is its vast emptiness" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 29), a view that can only be sustained by imagining its original occupants as ephemera without prior land rights. He acknowledged that "some of [the] reserves...are so miniscule...[as to be] of little or no value" (ibid, 300), but it was the First Peoples' inability to adapt "to changing circumstances, [and] not limited land use, that is the principle cause of [their] misfortune" (ibid, emphasis added).

10. Again, we can go directly to the judgment itself. The Chief Justice wrote how, as a consequence of his having to deal with the Royal Proclamation, he "studied the 'opening up' of the west...explored the discovery of the Pacific Coast...[and how] much of this was done through historical records...and by maps prepared during the 15th to 19th centuries, which [told] the fascinating story [he] was honoured to hear described by such eminent and knowledgeable scholars" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 83, emphasis added). I will come back to this act of performative nostalgia at the 'conclusion of the Conclusion'.

11. The terms adacaawk and kungax have no translation in English, but in a general sense refer to an undocumented collection of history, legend, laws, rituals, traditions, and territorial descriptions of a given Gitksan or Wet'suwet'en House (see, for example, Duff 1956). The Chief Justice admitted (however reluctantly) that they did "contain much that is properly receivable as evidence" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 267) but it was clear from the start of the trial that the only history that mattered [to him] was legal history, that same documentary history that interprets the past in terms of the present (i.e. ahistorically), and that had already ruled proclamations and treaties as 'historical farces' (see, in this connection, Fisher 1992b, 50-1). He rejected the declarations of ownership attached to them on that basis.

12. Even allowing for the Chief Justice's predisposition to legal (read 'proprietary') space, this is arguably one of the most preposterous of all his determinations. Given that fully one third of all the First Peoples in what is now Canada were concentrated at the coasts (or at least along river valleys emptying out of them) at contact (DUFF 1965, 8), that he had already concluded that "skirmishes with other Nations were not uncommon" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 13), and that "they had well established trails permitting visiting other villages" (ibid, 261) I think one should have expected an high awareness of boundaries, if irregular ones at that. Indeed, pre-Renaissance space in Europe was 'unusually shaped', but I doubt very much whether he would have considered that space as 'inauthentic'.

13. Despite his earlier comments (see footnote 10, above) The Chief Justice was especially hostile to 'academic' evidence, and not only the cartographic. He never did
separate 'amateur' from 'professional' witnesses (Miller 1992b, 62), and when anthropologists tried to make him understand Aboriginal law he dismissed them as advocates (Ridington 1992, 12). On the one hand he assumed that reports prepared by Hudson's Bay Company traders and missionaries 'spoke for themselves', while, on the other, he categorically denied that the First Peoples could do this quite well on their own (Cruickshank 1992, 32). The problem (for the plaintiffs) was simply that the Chief Justice was as unable to recognize that even 'legends' have a basis in fact as he was incapable of seeing the discursive connections between stories or songs on the one hand, and territories or trails on the other (see, for example, Brody 1981; Peterson 1991). His refusal to accept 'traditional' forms of knowledge was straight out of the 19th century, and proved to be the singular most damaging blow to the plaintiffs' case. 

14. My choice of the 1980 Historical Atlas of Canada is deliberate. While I have been critical of Albert Farley's role in the trial, the Chief Justice did not rely on Farley alone for his geographical delimitation of the 1763 Royal Proclamation. He cited directly plate 42 of this Atlas, which was "compiled by many of Canada's leading historians and geographers" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G., 1991, 96, emphasis added), and "which limits the territory of the Proclamation to the St. Lawrence watershed and to other lands east of the Mississippi" (Delgamuukw vs. A.G. 1991, 96). The lesson (for academics as well as cartographers) is that what might otherwise seem to be the most innocuous and innocent of exercises are charged with deep ethical and political questions.
Postscript

The maps can change, you see, you can draw a map here and they say cut it in half and then — but Spookw's territory has its own boundaries from the time that they were here. You see, this is what I mean, I'm going to explain to you...maps can change, but the territory itself stays, and we know (Robinson, cited in *Delgamuukw vs. A.G.* 1991, 382)

The 'deeper dialectic', of course, is that the discourses and networks of modernity are inherently subversive to their own ideological project, and even museums have a life of their own. For despite the narratives we have told ourselves about the 'exploration', 'discovery' and 'settlement' of the 'New World', the fact remains that it is a very 'Old World' indeed. Monet and Skanu'u recalled how defence lawyers looked frantically at their maps as the Hereditary Chiefs recounted all the House villages and fishing sites throughout their territory (1992, 44); and how the Court had to be continually reminded that just because these places were not physically plotted it did not mean they did not exist or that the plaintiffs did not know their own place in the order of things. As insulted as they were by the judgment, however, it was a 'victory' just the same. Not only in the sense that for the first time, perhaps, that geography was firmly inscribed and recorded in the maps, texts and discourses of modernity —"written in black and white...for anyone to see in [the] transcripts" (Wilson-Kenni 1992, 11) — but also in the sense that in so doing the Court 'wrote' itself into the plaintiffs' theatre — became part of an altogether different alliance, part of their history and genealogy, an entry plate in the 'territorial atlas' of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en. Every dominant ideology must engage with genuine needs and aspirations, and if the Chief Justice's (or our own) reverent (re)tracings(s) of the 'explorers' tracks demonstrates anything it is that the extension of existing territorial power networks is always ideology's never-ending challenge. But to do
so it must always recognize the 'Other' to itself, and inscribe this otherness as a potentially disruptive force within its own forms" (Eagleton 1991, 45).

So it was that in 1993 in the British Columbia Court of Appeal the Honourable Chief Justices John Taggart, Douglas Lambert, Henry Hutcheon, Alan McFarlane, and Wilfred Wallace, in a three-two majority decision, partially overturned Delgamuukw vs. A.G. In a 372-page judgment "replete with maps of the disputed area" (Still 1993, B8) they rejected Chief Justice McEachern's extinguishment argument, reaffirming — as earlier jurisprudence had already done — that the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en continue to enjoy (non-exclusive) Aboriginal rights, and that these rights are constitutionally protected in Section 35 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Court did not, however, extend those rights to the ownership and governance of land. The arrow may be 'bent', but it is by no means 'broken'. The Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en have since won leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, but they have consented with the Crown to postpone that hearing pending negotiations at the British Columbia Treaty Commission. But at least now — and rather unlike in 1888 or 1916 — they go before that Commission as soldiers and not supplicants.

And so it is that First Nations continue to make new maps...marshalling, collating, and incorporating brand-new alliances and facts...opening up interstitial pores, edges, fields, and potentialities...where the representations of space of the disenfranchised in pursuit of their own goals can take root...and from which the territorial power networks of resistance gather force...
so it must always recognize the 'Other' to itself, and inscribe this otherness as a potentially disruptive force within its own forms" (Eagleton 1991, 45).

So it was that in 1993 in the British Columbia Court of Appeal the Honourable Chief Justices John Taggart, Douglas Lambert, Henry Hutcheon, Alan McFarlane, and Wilfred Wallace, in a three-two majority decision, partially overturned Delgama ikw vs. A.G. In a 372-page judgment "replete with maps of the disputed area" (Still 1993, B8) they rejected Chief Justice McEachern's extinguishment argument, reaffirming — as earlier jurisprudence had already done — that the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en continue to enjoy (non-exclusive) Aboriginal rights, and that these rights are constitutionally protected in Section 35 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Court did not, however, extend those rights to the ownership and governance of land. The arrow may be 'bent', but it is by no means 'broken'. The Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en have since won leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, but they have consented with the Crown to postpone that hearing pending negotiations at the British Columbia Treaty Commission. But at least now — and rather unlike in 1888 or 1916 — they go before that Commission as soldiers and not supplicants.

And so it is that First Nations continue to make new maps...marshalling, collating, and incorporating brand-new alliances and facts...opening up interstitial pores, edges, fields, and potentialities...where the representations of space of the disenfranched in pursuit of their own goals can take root...and from which the territorial power networks of resistance gather force...
## Appendix 1

**SCHEDULE of all INDIAN RESERVES (surveyed) in the PROVINCE of BRITISH COLUMBIA.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheet</th>
<th>Locality and short description of Reserve</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Tribe to which Natives belong</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vancouver Island Districts.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Esquimalt District (Esquimalt Harbour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Victoria Harbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Sooke District (Mouth of Sooke River, left bank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>North Saanich District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>South Saanich District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Cowichan District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Quamichan District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Chemainus District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Nanaimo District (Reserve W. side of Harbour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>(mouth of Nanaimo River, W. side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>(do. do. E. side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Cranberry District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Westminster District.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>Burrard Inlet, Junction of 1st Narrows and Kapilana Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>North side of Fraser River, near mouth of Coquitlam River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Next Reserve, further up Coquitlam River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Coquitlam River, 200 yards from Fraser River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>North Arm of Fraser River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West bank of Harrison River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Left bank of Fraser River, 1 1/2 miles from Harrison River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Right bank of Fraser River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The acreages are approximate and subject to change. The exact acreages can be found in Appendix 1. The reservations are owned by various tribes as indicated. The Indian Schools on this Reserve are also noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Left bank of Fraser River</td>
<td>52 Matsqui.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>108 Katie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sumas River, near Chady's Slough</td>
<td>43 Sumas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>440 Clatsass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Sumas River</td>
<td>80 Squilzit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right bank of Fraser River, near junction with Nicoamen Slough</td>
<td>32 Nicoamen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do. at junction with Small Slough</td>
<td>73 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junction of Harrison and Fraser Rivers</td>
<td>330 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right bank of Nicoamen Slough</td>
<td>109 Nicoamen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left bank of do.</td>
<td>185 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South-east of Greenwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>junction of Enst North-west side of Little Lake, on trail to Adam's Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Left bank of Fraser River, about 10 miles below Hope</td>
<td>488.50 Okanaml.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>375 Checm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>364 Popkum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>380 Squilzit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwood Island, opposite Hope</td>
<td>10 Squilzit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Left bank of Thompson River, at junction with Fraser, just outside of Lytton</td>
<td>14 Nickelpalm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South-east of Lytton</td>
<td>12 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left bank of Fraser River, 2 miles north of Lytton</td>
<td>18 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Right bank do. at junction with Small Slough</td>
<td>111 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>297 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 35 and 36 mile-post, on Waggon Road (Boothroyd's Flat)</td>
<td>204.50 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left bank of Fraser River, between 42 and 43 mile-post, on Waggon Road</td>
<td>40 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right bank do.</td>
<td>23 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>100 Macaia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>110 Skihum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>58 Skihum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>61 Kopachicken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>30 Kopachicken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>30 Kopachicken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left bank do. at junction with Small Slough</td>
<td>21 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Right bank of Similkameen River, Vermillion Forks</td>
<td>21 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left bank do.</td>
<td>342 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>Do. do.</td>
<td>1028 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right bank of Fraser River, 4 miles below Yale (Albert Flat)</td>
<td>163.50 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>135 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small valley, about 1 mile from Spellumcheen River</td>
<td>200 Squenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left bank of Spellumcheen River</td>
<td>18.50 Nicola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junction of Nicola and Thompson Rivers</td>
<td>30.60 Nicola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Left bank of Fraser River, between 67 and 68 mile-post, Waggon Road</td>
<td>61 Nicola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadman's Creek</td>
<td>575 Nicola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicola River, junction of Trail from Cook's Ferry to Savona's Ferry</td>
<td>918 Nicola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonaparte River, between 113 and 114 mile-post, Waggon Road</td>
<td>471 Nicola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicola Lake, east bank</td>
<td>670 Nicola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>60 Nicola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Right bank of Thompson River, extending back to Lake</td>
<td>3112 Shuswap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North-west side of Little Lake, on trail to Adam's Lake</td>
<td>1900 Adam's Lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East side of Adam's Lake, mouth of Adam's River</td>
<td>1000 Kamloops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junction of North and South Branch of Thompson River</td>
<td>6000 Kamloops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These Indians chin. sq. on
**Statement of Indian Reserves, &c., surveyed by Captain Jemmett during the season of 1888, showing the number of miles actually run.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vols.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reserves, &amp;c.</th>
<th>Mileage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888.</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>&quot;Bella Bella,&quot; Work in el Lak or Res. No. 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Yeller-lee or Res. No. 12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Bella Bella or Res. No. 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Grave Is.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Kanso or Res. No. 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Injustus or Res. No. 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 do</td>
<td>&quot;Kokayt,&quot; Koqui or Res. No. 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Tek-ke-uh or Res. No. 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Kokayt or Res. No. 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Grief Island, or Res. No. 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Ky-ar-te or Res. No. 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Nekas or Res. No. 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>&quot;Bella Bella,&quot; Quarcha or Res. No. 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Noota or Res. No. 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Klatse or Res. No. 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Hooness or Res. No. 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Elcho or Res. No. 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 August</td>
<td>&quot;Kesquis,&quot; Kesquis or Res. No. 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Chatseah or Res. No. 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>&quot;Bella Coola,&quot; Noos-seek or Res. No. 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Bella Coola or Res. No. 1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Tal-e-o-way or Res. No. 3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do Kvatua or Res. No. 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>&quot;Bella Bella,&quot; Kis-a-weet or Res. No. 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do How-a-eet or Res No. 8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**William S. Jemmett,**  
*Dominion Surveyor.*
## SCHEDULE of Reserves Surveyed by E. M. Skinner, 1894

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Chains</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Chains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May...</td>
<td>Penticton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 2</td>
<td>240.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 2a</td>
<td>173.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tie line No. 2a to Lot 116</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portion of Reserve No. 2 cancelled</td>
<td>220.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boundary of Reserve No. 1 at Lot 191</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection do do</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similkameen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 12a</td>
<td>480.42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 10b</td>
<td>349.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June...</td>
<td>do No. 10a</td>
<td>643.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Similkameen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 26</td>
<td>161.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 2a</td>
<td>420.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 4</td>
<td>196.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection to pre-emption No. 834</td>
<td>76.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 7</td>
<td>113.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 7</td>
<td>82.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 1</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection to township lines</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 6</td>
<td>40.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July...</td>
<td>Nicola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Lake extension</td>
<td>856.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>30.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soda Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 2</td>
<td>1,120.32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August...</td>
<td>Anaham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 1</td>
<td>1,355.93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 2</td>
<td>320.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial Government Reserve</td>
<td>320.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September...</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 1</td>
<td>894.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection to Lot 154 and grave-yard</td>
<td>82.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do Minton's farm</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 2</td>
<td>240.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October...</td>
<td>Toosey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection Lot 68 to Reserve No. 1</td>
<td>80.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 1</td>
<td>960.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 2</td>
<td>300.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 3</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soda Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 1</td>
<td>432.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection to town-site</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter Mountain</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canim Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve No. 1</td>
<td>1,020.30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do No. 2</td>
<td>160.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicomen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection line, Pulkwa and Shusshchen</td>
<td>157.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 152 | 69.94 |
### Appendix 3(a)

**ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE—TABLE A—REFERENCE AND GENERAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIBE OR BAND</th>
<th>RESERVE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>OCCUPIED OR UNOCCUPIED</th>
<th>PAY SCHEDULE</th>
<th>VISITATION AND INSPECTION</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>PER CAP. ACREAGE</th>
<th>GENERAL CONDITION</th>
<th>COMMUNITY BUILDINGS</th>
<th>FACILITIES OF ACCESS</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>SPECIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack:</td>
<td>Skwahls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Jan. 12, 1925</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>Partially developed farming area.</td>
<td>Public road: 6 miles East of Chilliwack.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skwahls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Two miles from Chilliwack: connection by road much desired.</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>On eight bank of Hope River, 1½ miles from Chilliwack, by road and water; bridge connection with Skwah Reserve No. 4.</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skwah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>Village site and partially developed mixed farming area similar to Nos. 1, 2 and 3.</td>
<td>R. C. Church and Day School. Adjoins Reserve No. 2, ½ miles from Chilliwack by road and water; bridge connection with Skwah Reserve No. 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skwah</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>Village site on low land adjacent to Fraser River Slough and subject to flood.</td>
<td>R. C. Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwa-kwa-am-pilt Band</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>Village site on low-lying land adjacent from No. 3 by Kwa-kwa-am-pilt Slough.</td>
<td>R. C. Church</td>
<td>Ford from Reserve No. 6</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equaha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>Low-lying tract adjoining Reserve No. 6.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Intermittently</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>See Individual Bands</td>
<td>Camping place, fishing station and garden plot on the left bank of Chilliwack River at location near the Fraser River and extending up to Chilliwack Mountain.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>River (sawm) or road</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alchelitch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>Village site on low-lying land on the left bank of the Chilliwack River.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>River and wagon road; 5 miles from Chilliwack</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skukkay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Jan. 16, 1925</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>Developed farming area and village site.</td>
<td>Methodist Church</td>
<td>Road; 3 miles from Chilliwack, near Eardis P.O.</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>Farming tract in a high state of cultivation.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Adjoints Reserve No. 16</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 3(b)

## ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE—TABLE B—PHYSICAL CONDITIONS, RESERVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESERVE</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CHARACTER OF SOIL</th>
<th>ESTIMATED PROPORTION UTILIZED</th>
<th>CHIEF PRODUCTS</th>
<th>PROPORTION TIMBERED</th>
<th>GRADE OF TIMBER</th>
<th>STOCK, ETC.</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low level land—rich alluvial deposit; Indians say &quot;99% good if cleared.&quot;</td>
<td>88 acres</td>
<td>Hay, vegetables, butter, eggs and fruit</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Spruce, cottonwood, cedar and birch; a considerable quantity merchantable</td>
<td>3 horses, poultry and implements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skwah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rich river loam.</td>
<td>20 acres</td>
<td>Vegetables, nuts and fruit</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Spruce, cottonwood and birch</td>
<td>Included in No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skwah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rich alluvial deposit.</td>
<td>14 acres</td>
<td>Root crops, hay and butter</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Cottonwood and birch</td>
<td>Included in No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skwah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rich alluvial deposit. Indians say &quot;All good and cultivated.&quot;</td>
<td>224 acres</td>
<td>Root crops, hay vegetables, nuts and fruit</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Non-merchantable cottonwood and birch</td>
<td>50 to 25 horses, 70 (Indians say) cattle, 235 sheep, 281 hogs, 26 goats, 23 ducks, 3 cottonwoods, implements, wagons, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Generally good but subject to overflow; high land good if cleared.</td>
<td>250 acres</td>
<td>Mixed farm produce and fruit</td>
<td>500 acres</td>
<td>Cottonwood, crabapple and birch—drawwood size</td>
<td>20 horses, 20 cattle, 75 hogs, 18 sheep, poultry, implementa*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwawhwa-su-pit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>River bottomland—rich loam all cultivable if cleared.</td>
<td>200 acres</td>
<td>Hay, vegetables, grain and fruit</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Cottonwood, crabapple and willow—drawwood size</td>
<td>15 horses, 5 cattle, 10 sheep, 50 hogs, poultry, implements (Indians say 15 hogs, 37 acres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squak-su-a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor: 100 acres possibly cultivable; balance low and subject to overflow.</td>
<td>60 acres</td>
<td>Hay, vegetables and fruit</td>
<td>60%—on the ridges</td>
<td>Cottonwood, crabapple and willow—drawwood size</td>
<td>15 horses, 5 cattle, 20 to 50 sheep, 50 hogs, poultry, implements (Indians say 15 hogs, 5 sheep, 50 hogs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squak-su-a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good cultivable.</td>
<td>250 acres</td>
<td>Small gardens</td>
<td>100 acres on mountain side</td>
<td>Spruce, cottonwood and fir; dense scrub along river</td>
<td>See No. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkalihatch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fairly fertile but soggy; 90% subject to overflow.</td>
<td>69 acres</td>
<td>Hay, potatoes and oats</td>
<td>NUI</td>
<td>8 horses, 6 cattle, 90 hogs, 40 bison, implements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skaw-keum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rich black loam—river bottomland.</td>
<td>200 acres</td>
<td>Hay, vegetables, grain and fruit</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>Firewood and brush</td>
<td>77 horses, 40 cattle, 75 sheep, 145 hogs, implements—revised on examination of Agent to 20 horses, 30 cattle, 80 to 100 hogs, 43 sheep, 350 bison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rich and fertile black loam.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Firewood and brush</td>
<td>See No. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukwa-kwu-lone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Almost all</td>
<td>Almost all</td>
<td>Mixed farm produce, fruit, etc.</td>
<td>NUI</td>
<td>*For Band</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passchoten</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100 acres good but wooded; 175 to 200 acres excellent and non-cultivatable</td>
<td>70 to 100 acres</td>
<td>Vegetables, nuts and fruit</td>
<td>600 acres</td>
<td>Cedar, cottonwood and spruce—pile and drawwood grade</td>
<td>10 horses, 30 cattle, 50 hogs, poultry, implements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3(c)

#### Analysis of Evidence—Table C—Population, Social Conditions, Etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Heads of Families</th>
<th>Youths Over 18</th>
<th>Widows</th>
<th>Orphans</th>
<th>Chief Occupations</th>
<th>Condition of Indians</th>
<th>Facilities of Education</th>
<th>Views of Indians as Education</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schlewet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in No. 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farming, fishing, hop-picking, hunting and working</td>
<td>Prosperous and comparatively well-to-do</td>
<td>Day School on Skwah Reserve No. 4</td>
<td>Facilities satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skwahs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skwall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skwah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agent: 210</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Day School on Reserve</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agent: 28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed farming, fishing, hop-picking and working for</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Day School on Reserve No. 4</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwas-kwas-a-pit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agent: 28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed farming, fishing, hop-picking and working for</td>
<td>Comfortably well-to-do; compare favourably</td>
<td>Day School on No. 4</td>
<td>None expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squ-al-a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agent: 18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farming, stock-raising, fishing, working for wages,</td>
<td>Fairly comfortable</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See No. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hop-picking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altschditz</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agent: 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farming, fishing, hop-picking, hunting and working</td>
<td>Comfortably well-to-do</td>
<td>No children of school age</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See No. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skul-kayn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>For Band: 71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed farming, stock-raising, dairying, hop-picking,</td>
<td>Prosperous, industrious and fairly well-to-do</td>
<td>Coqualeetza Institute</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Reserve: 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fishing, hunting and working for wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>See No. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahwe-a-kwoses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66 to 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Indians say too far for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>children to attend school on No. 4, Reserve and Coqualeetza Institute overcrowded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NEW WESTMINSTER AGENCY—ADDITIONAL LANDS APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIBE OR BAND</th>
<th>LAND APPLIED FOR</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>PER CAP. ACREAGE OF APPLICANT INDIAN</th>
<th>STATUS OF LAND DESIRED</th>
<th>DECISION OF COMMISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Tribe</td>
<td>Hillside land of undefined area.</td>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td>Evidence P. 233, 604.</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>Question as to the right of use of an established Reserve</td>
<td>Not entertained: Territorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>General application for enlargement of Reserve areas.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Evidence P. 281, 604.</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>Not entertained, land applied for not being available</td>
<td>Not entertained: Indefinite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Re allotment of Case I, R. No. 15 for the use in common of the several bands of the Chilliwack Tribe. Special report requested by Department of Indian Affairs.</td>
<td>Material on R. C. File 3582, and on File P.129, Department of Indian Affairs; Evidence P. 416, 604; 421, 604; 431, 604; 432, 604; 438, 604; 439, 604.</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>Question as to the right of use of an established Reserve</td>
<td>Not entertained: Territorial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Unstated acreage of land; location not specified; as an enlargement of Sameehil I, R. No. 15.</td>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td>Material on R. C. File 3582; Evidence P. 416, 604.</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>Not entertained: Indefinite and not reasonably set out.</td>
<td>Not entertained: Indefinite and not reasonably set out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Application of Indian Jimmy Johnson for (A) Flat Island and (B) one hundred (100) acres on the adjacent mainland, a portion of which has been logged off.</td>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td>Exhibit Rb, on R. C. File 3582; Evidence P. 416, 604; File 4588, Department of Lands, B.C.</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>Not entertained: Already an established Reserve.</td>
<td>Not entertained: Already an established Reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3(e)

**NEW WESTMINSTER AGENCY**

**CORRECTION OF INDIAN RESERVES AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIBE OR BAND</th>
<th>RESERVE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ACREAGE AS SHOWN BY SCHEDULE OF INDIAN RESERVES, 1813</th>
<th>ACREAGE AS PASSED UPON BY COMMISSION</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe: Skwash Band</td>
<td>Skwash</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>313.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Thirty acres allegedly lost by erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe: Skway Band</td>
<td>Skway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>338.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Ten to 15 acres allegedly lost by erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe: Squiala Band</td>
<td>Squaila</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>509.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Reducible by allowance of C.N.P.R. Co. right-of-way 0.59 acres to 203.42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe: Soowahlie Band</td>
<td>Soowahlie</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,140.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Approximately 50 acres allegedly lost by erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe: Sk Wah, Skwahls, Kwaw-kwaw-a-pit, Squiala, Skway and Ahualite Bands, in common</td>
<td>Skumasph</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,138.00</td>
<td>1,137.40</td>
<td>Reduced by allowance of 0.60 acre for public road right of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homalco</td>
<td>Homalco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>710.80</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Considerably reduced by erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Tribe: Whonock Band</td>
<td>Whonock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Less deductions of rights-of-way of C.P.R. Co. and for public road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONFIRMATIONS OF RESERVES
### NEW WESTMINSTER AGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIBE OR BAND</th>
<th>RESERVE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>DATE OF CONFIRMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe, Skwash Band</td>
<td>Schelowat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Westminster District, in Tps. 2 and 3, R. 29, W. 6th M., on the right bank of Hope Slough.</td>
<td>215.00</td>
<td>April 10th, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe, Skwash Band</td>
<td>Skwashla</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Westminster District, in Tp. 3, R. 30, W. 6th M., on the left bank of Hope Slough.</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>April 12th, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe, Skwash Band</td>
<td>Skwall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Westminster District, in Tp. 3, R. 30, W. 6th M., on the right bank of Hope Slough and the left of Shellford Slough.</td>
<td>298.00</td>
<td>April 10th, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe, Skwash Band</td>
<td>Skwah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Westminster District, in Tps. 2 and 3, R. 30, W. 6th M., on the left bank of Hope Slough at its mouth.</td>
<td>313.00</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe, Skwash Band</td>
<td>Skway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Westminster District, in Tps. 2 and 3, R. 30, W. 6th M., on the right bank of Chilliwack River at its mouth.</td>
<td>338.00</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe, Kwaw-kwaw-a-pilt Band</td>
<td>Kwaw-kwaw-a-pilt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Westminster District, Tp. 25, E.C.M., on the left bank of Kwaw-kwaw-a-pilt Slough.</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Tribe, Squala Band</td>
<td>Squal-a-sla</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>New Westminster District, in Tp. 25, E.C.M., on the right bank of Chilliwack River.</td>
<td>309.00</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>New Westminster District, in Tp. 25, E.C.M., on the left.</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>Do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

(i) Transcript of exchange between Chief Tom Henry and the Commissioners at Bella Coola Aug 16 1913 [reference Figure 25]:

**Tom Henry:** A surveyor by the same of Captain Jemmett came and asked us if he could survey a piece of land for a Reserve for us...at the time the land was surveyed we had...settlements up and down the valley and on salt water...now...there are posts saying that this land belongs to the white man...

**Q:** And you call the big No. 1 Reserve Bella Coola, No. 2 Noose Neck, No. 3 Tallowomi or Talleo, No. 4 Kwatina of Kwatna?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** How much good land [at Noose Neck]

**A.** I don't know...if I was a surveyor I would tell you, but as I am not...I cannot say.

**Q.** Well, you ought to have some idea. As you are asking for more land it is up to you to tell us how much is good land

**A.** I don't know about the boundary of that land.

(ii) Transcript of exchange between the Kemsquit Chiefs and the Commissioners at Kemsquit August 22 1913:

**Commissioner Young:** You Indians asked the Department to apply to the Provincial Government for some land at Skowquiltz. Can you show me on this map where the land is,and tell me what you are going to do with it when you get it? This is Dean's Channel, and here [indicating] is Kemsquit. There is a place I have marked with ink 'Indian Reserve', is that the place the Indians want?

**A.** Yes...we don't want to lose that place.

**Q.** It is that place at the mouth of the Skowquiltz River?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** There is an old Indian village there. Is that correct?

**A.** Yes, there was a white man came there and built a house. He wanted to stake some of the land, but we sent him away. We told him it was Indian Reserve.

**Q.** This place on this map is Bella Bella No. 6 (Eloho) Reserve. This is not the same place is it?

**A.** No it is not.

**Q.** Are there any more land these Indian want this Commission to give them besides this place at Skowquiltz?

**A.** Across the river there is a piece of land, which you have not marked on the map there, which we claim...

**Q.** Show me on this map where it is. Mark it on the map here

**A.** [No reply...witness pointed it out]

**Q.** Is this land on No. 1 Reserve any good?...How many acres are there of fair land?
A. I don't know...because it has not been surveyed.
Q. You must give us some idea otherwise we will have to 'find' against you.
A. We want some kind of deed or assurance that this land belongs to us.
Q. The best deed that you can have is to know that the reserve has been set apart for you...

(iii) Transcript of exchange between Chief George Robinson and the Commissioners at Kitamaat Sept 1 1913:

Commissioner Young: The reserve marked No. 5 on the amended schedule is marked 'I.R.' on the blueprint which I now show to you?
A. Yes.
Q. The reserve marked No. 6 Bish, 100 acres, is where on this map?
A. [Witness indicated on the map, stating] It is marked I.R. No. 6 on this map.
Q. No. 7, marked Kitasa, is further down the arm and is marked No. 7 on this map?
A. Yes.
Q. The Reserve No. 8, on Kitimaat Arm, is not shown on this map?
A. No it is not.
Q. Then, in addition, the Kitimaat Indians are applying for a reserve called Wahquash, can you mark that on this map?
A. Yes, that is marked on this blueprint [indicating]. They don't want the land to the north because it is all covered with tide water. They want the land to the south. That is where the totem pole is.

(iv) Transcript of exchange between Chief Toosey and the Commissioners [via interpreter] at Toosey July 21 1914 [refer Figures 26 and 29]:

Q. Where do they [Toosey] cut their hay?
A. We have meadows of our own up along the creek.
Q. Is it on this reserve or the reserve above Beacher's?
A. There is another reserve above Beacher's.
Q. How many acres of land is there that could be cultivated?
A. I don't know what an acre is. There is quite bit of flat land there, though...
[break]
Q. Is there any unoccupied land adjoining the reserve?
A. I don't know. I think it is government land.
Q. What side is it on? Have you a map of the reserve?
A. Yes [producing map].
[break]
Q. How far is it from the northwest corner of the Reserve to the spring?
A. It is right near the corner.
Q. Captain Frank's place is close to the northern boundary of the Reserve to the west, and you want the reserve extended beyond where Captain Frank is located? Do you want the Reserve Boundary extended that way?
A. Yes
Q. *And you want the western boundary extended to take in the spring?*
A. Yes, I desire to have the western boundary so as to take in the spring referred to. I think a width of 20 chains would take in the spring.

(v) Transcript of exchange between Chief Kapoose and Commissioners at Ulkatcho [via interpreter] June 7 1915:

Q. *And you yourself want some more land besides this piece you have?*
A. Yes.

Q. *Where do you want it?*
A. [Examining map] I want land south of Lot 24, commencing at the S.W. corner of Lot 398, pre-emption record 2363, thence west to Abrentlet Lake, thence following the river and lake to the place of commencement, and containing more or less 320 acres.

Q. *Is that all the land you want?*
A. [Examining map] I want some more land marked Lot 351.

Mr. Shaw: *That is marked 'pre-emption' but it may be open... We don’t know whether we can get that piece... Is there any more land that you want?*
A. [Examining map] I want the south fractional half of Lot 356, also the south fractional half of Lot 355, and I want Lot 353.
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