An Archive of Settler Belonging:
Local Feeling, Land, and the Forest Resource on Vancouver Island

by

Kelly Black

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in
partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy

in

Canadian Studies with Specialization in Political Economy

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

© 2017

Kelly Black

Abstract

This dissertation explores the local, material, and affective processes of Settler (non-Indigenous) attachment to land on southern Vancouver Island, British Columbia. I describe these feelings for land as Settler belonging and my research is guided by a reflexive and interdisciplinary approach that seeks to “explain Settlers to ourselves.” Through original archival research and personal reflection, I argue that “(dis)possession,” a term that encompasses Settler efforts to *take* the land and *belong to* the land, is a generational process, one that is worked at over time in an effort to link the past with the present and serve future Settler belonging. Through a study of plants, forest resource extraction, roads and railways, park creation, and real estate development in the Cowichan Valley and Sooke-Juan de Fuca regions, I argue that Settler feelings for land manifest in locally specific and contradictory ways. I build upon studies of Settler colonialism and political economy in Canada by adapting the staples approach, as developed by Harold A. Innis, Mel Watkins, and others, to trace the intersection of belonging with the resource economy and the characteristics of Settler colonialism. This dissertation links historical and ongoing transformations in the relations of production, such as the conversion of private forestry lands into real estate, to reveal the ways in which belonging adjusts to political and economic changes that both assist and threaten its future. I argue that studying the locality of belonging contributes insight and nuance to our understanding of materiality and affect, class relations, the staple economy, and Settler colonialism’s broader processes. In doing so, I demonstrate that Settler attachment to land is entrenched and expanded through a series of recurring events that are shared, personal, and conflictual.

Acknowledgments

This dissertation was researched and written primarily in the territories of the Lekwungen (Esquimalt and Songhees), W̱SÁNEĆ, (Pauquachin, Tsartlip, Tsawout, Tseycum), Malahat, Cowichan, Pacheedaht, Scia'new, T'Souke, and Suquamish peoples. My education as a PhD student was made possible by my status as a student at Carleton University, located on the territories of the Algonquin peoples. I wish to express my gratitude and respect to the first peoples of these lands, and I offer this dissertation as one of the many steps I will continue to take toward respectful and meaningful Settler-Indigenous relations.

To Eva Mackey, my supervisor and friend: your enthusiasm for my research never waned and has been a constant source of comfort and encouragement over the past several years. You have had confidence in me when I was doubtful, and you have pushed me to show the work and to claim that work as a product of my efforts. I am thankful for all the time spent chatting on the phone and for all the honest discussions of academia's ups and downs.

JoAnne, my best friend, wife, and partner: it is not an exaggeration to say that I would not have made it to the end of this project without you by my side. We started this dissertation together and you have been a sounding board, editor, book-lender, peer-reviewer, and champion throughout. Our crafting, meal making, walks, and travels are the welcome escapes that every person trying to complete a PhD needs. "You got this" are the words that have sustained me. You have tolerated and even encouraged my local history book collection, despite the lack of shelf space in our home. It is your love and ability to see the finish line that made this possible. Thank-you – I love you.

To my parents: you raised me to value family and friends, curiosity, and community and I hope this dissertation reflects that. You have always supported and encouraged me in my studies and travels and, as the first in our family to earn a PhD, this unwavering support means so much to me. I am in awe of how hard you have both worked for your family, in spite of, and because of, the many ups and downs along the way.

Scott, thank-you for the countless hikes and off-trail adventures, and for building a retreat where thoughts can be written, shared, and debated around a woodstove. Sarah, your care for family and friends is a constant source of inspiration and I am grateful for how much of this you took on during my time in Ottawa.

I am thankful for all of the time spent with my grandparents, Grace and Art Bennett. You never turned down my requests to pull out the old photo albums or share a family story. You have generously shared your knowledge and it is central to my work.

Thanks to Rick for use of the Mountain Cabin. Thank-you to my hiking and camping friends, especially Stew, Dave, and Steve. Amanda Murphyao, thank-you for the collaboration, chats, and commiseration (TAIFOGDS). To all the folks I worked with at the Graduate Students' Association: I am incredibly lucky to have learned from and with such amazing activists and academics. Jill, Paul, Grace, and Jamie – I am grateful for your love and support and thankful to have met you while on this journey.

I want to express my gratitude to the many academics who have provided guidance, mentorship, resources, and funding during my studies, especially Peter Hodgins, Frances Abele, Wallace Clement, and Jennifer Henderson. I also owe thanks to

Patrick Dunae for sharing his knowledge of BC history with me and for encouraging my participation in Vancouver Island heritage and history circles.

Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to those who left before they had a chance to read it: Herb Stovel, Sophie Smith, and Grace Bennett.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Acknowledgments.....	2
List of Figures.....	7
Map	8
Introduction	9
Unsettling & Settler Colonialism	12
Affect and Belonging.....	17
The Local and the Particular	21
The Staples Approach.....	27
Staple Linkages	32
Methodology.....	34
Chapter Layout.....	53
Chapter One: Tough Beginnings	59
Arriving to Stay.....	61
A Permanent Memorial.....	66
A Staple Shift	70
Conclusion	76
Chapter 2: The Pioneer and the Gunboat.....	78
“Taking Possession”	81
Settler Origins and the ‘Impenetrable Forest’	84
Exploring for Exploitation.....	89
They Knew Their Roads	92
<i>Vignette: And So We Came to Cowichan</i>	97
Conclusion	100
Chapter 3: The Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway	102
“Thereupon, therein, and thereunder”	103
The Settlement Act	105
The Torrent of Settlement	114
The Forest Staple & Real Estate	117
<i>Vignette: The Farm at Little River</i>	122
Conclusion	128
Chapter 4: Extraction in Perpetuity	130
“No right to the lands they claim”	131
“From the wooden cradle to the wooden coffin”	139
<i>Vignette: Now You’re Logging</i>	144
Conclusion	151
Chapter 5: Land Swaps for the Future	154
Creating Parks.....	156
Exchanging Lands	159
Sooke Potholes	163
Koksilah River Park	170
Mill Bay Nature Park	172
<i>Vignette: Manley Creek</i>	174

Conclusion	176
Chapter 6: Recession and Recognition	179
The Crown's Fantasy	181
Fall-Down: Recession in the 1980s	185
Acquiring Parks	187
The "Special Cultural Flavour" of Botanical Beach	191
Sombrio Beach.....	194
Juan de Fuca Provincial Park & Marine Trail	196
Conclusion	203
Chapter 7: Our Common Lands?.....	206
<i>Vignette: Arbutus Ridge</i>	208
The Bitumen Boom.....	213
The Real Estate Market	217
Albertan Buyers	221
Higher and Better Use	224
The Circle of Culpability	227
Conflict and Spatial Reconfiguration	230
Belonging and Class Relations.....	236
Our Common Land?.....	238
First Nations Responses	242
Wild Hills and Beaches.....	243
Conclusion	250
Chapter 8: The Great Land Grab, Redux	253
"Recreationland"	254
The 2002 Referendum.....	258
Regional Park Acquisition.....	263
The Koksilah Ancient Forest	266
Lifestyle for Sale.....	269
The Ladysmith Boundary Dispute	274
Conclusion	279
Conclusion	282
Explaining Settlers to Ourselves	292
Reference List.....	299
<i>Secondary Sources</i>	299
<i>Primary Sources</i>	327

List of Figures

1. Map produced by Scott Black © Scott Black. Reproduced here with permission.....	8
2. The Kinsol Trestle.....	10
3. A billboard featuring the Kinsol Trestle on the Trans-Canada Highway, near Cobble Hill, British Columbia.....	18
4. Botanical Beach Provincial Park interpretation sign, Port Renfrew, BC.....	59
5. The purple flower of the camas.....	64
6. Cairn to the Settlers who arrived aboard the HMS <i>Hecate</i> in 1862.....	85
7. The “A-frame” on Hatch Point Road.....	97
8. My Brother Scott and family dog Lady in front of a cedar tree.....	99
9. Plan for land clearing from a 1909 E&N pamphlet.....	121
10. Reg, Alfred, and Ellen Bennett near Merville, BC, approximately 1920.....	124
11. My Great Grandfather Alfred with his horse Blackie and (likely) my Grandfather Arthur.....	127
12. Plaque presented to A.S. Bennett for 30 years accident free service with British Columbia Forest Products, 1982.....	145
13. My Sister Sarah and I at the BC Forest Museum (now the BC Forest Discovery Centre).....	148
14. A Parks Branch leaflet circa 1970, found in my Grandparent’s home.....	155
15. Mrs Turner, a descendant of William Manley, at the opening of Manley Creek Community Park.....	175
16. A local history, found during a visit to a Victoria bookstore.....	191
17. A sign recognizing the trail building efforts of First Nations youth.....	200
18. Logging waste on the trail to Mystic Beach.....	213
19. Lots for sale near Jordan River next to the West Coast Road.....	214
20. A VICFAN/WildCoast sign above a Capital Regional District rezoning notice. The handwritten sign reads “Say NO to Urban Sprawl Save the Park www.wildcoast.ca .” Picture taken 2012.....	235
21. A certificate in my name from The Land Conservancy’s Wild Hills & Beaches Campaign.....	245
22. A variety of warning signs above an orange forestry gate, near Nanaimo. One sign reads “Private lands and roads”.....	255
23. A Couverdon Real Estate sign advertising “The playground you’ve dreamed of...right outside your door.”.....	273
24. Scotch broom lines a private logging road near Nanaimo, BC.....	282

All images © Kelly Black and the Black/Bennett families, unless otherwise indicated.

Map

Figure 1: Map of southern Vancouver Island. Map produced by Scott Black © Scott Black, 2017. Reproduced here with permission.

Introduction

During the summer of 2009, I had recently completed a Bachelor of Arts degree in History at Vancouver Island University and worked as a summer student at the Cowichan Valley Museum and Archives (CVMA). One of my projects at the museum was to assist in the development of an exhibit on the past, present, and future of the Kinsol Trestle – a wooden railway trestle that crosses the Koksilah River and is well known on southern Vancouver Island. Completed in 1920 and built to transport minerals and timber, the trestle is named for the King Solomon (Kinsol) copper mine. The last train crossed the trestle in 1979 and the wooden structure stood unused for over three decades. When I came to work at the CVMA, I participated in the launch of a fundraising initiative to restore the crumbling trestle and save it from impending demolition by the Province of British Columbia.

In conducting research for the museum, I was struck by the fact that during the nearly four decades since the end of the trestle's industrial life, residents of the Cowichan Valley consistently advocated for its conservation as a heritage site and tourist attraction. The trestle had not been forgotten, its advocates made their voices known through the local media and directly to government. Still, successive local and provincial governments failed to act while the trestle suffered serious damage from the elements and arson. It was not until 2011 that the fundraising project reached its goal and the trestle was finally opened for use by the public.

During the trestle's dormant years, conflict between those who wanted the trestle conserved and those who saw it as a liability and money pit was periodic (Black, 2014b). The trestle's slated demolition in 2007 was the final event that galvanized many

communities on southern Vancouver Island to pressure various levels of government into reconsidering the fate of the structure. As the summer of 2009 came to a close, I finished my work at the museum but the trestle remained top of mind. In August, I moved to Ottawa to pursue a Masters degree in Canadian Studies at Carleton University. Through my selection of Heritage Conservation as a specialization in the program, I wanted to research and write about the community struggle to save the Kinsol. Soon after, I came to realize that advocating for the protection of the Kinsol's heritage was at odds with my growing knowledge of Indigenous ¹ rights and title and Settler colonialism in Canada. How could I hold up the Kinsol as a symbol of community pride when its very existence is based in the extraction of resources from stolen Indigenous lands? Confronted with the complexities and contradictions of my own Settler identity, the Kinsol, to me,

Figure 2: The Kinsol Trestle.

came to represent the ways in which places and spaces can be (re)made into a reflection of Settler society.²

¹ This dissertation uses “Indigenous” to refer to First Nations, Inuit, and Métis/metis peoples in Canada, as well as in the global context. When discussing Vancouver Island and British Columbia, I use the term “First Nations.” I occasionally use “Indian” when discussing historical context.

² I use the uppercase “Settler” throughout this dissertation. A debated term (Lawrence & Dua, 2011; Morgensen, 2014; Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015), Settler is used here to reference non-Indigenous peoples who occupy lands taken from Indigenous peoples through the process of historical colonization and ongoing Settler colonialism. Although some have made a temporal distinction between a historical “settler” and the present-day “Settler” identity (Veracini, 2010; Battell Lowman, 2017), I use only the latter, except in the use of quotations, to provide clarity to the reader and support the tracing of connections between past and present.

This brief recollection of the Kinsol Trestle and my involvement in studying and advocating for it is instructive to the project I undertake here. This dissertation asks how Settler feelings of attachment to land can be identified, interrogated, and challenged as part of a larger project of dispossession of Indigenous territories. I describe this as *Settler belonging*, a sense of feeling connected to specific places and organized spaces taken from Indigenous peoples.³ I ask: do Settlers create and maintain a sense of belonging to land? If so, in what ways is this belonging deployed, complicated, and perpetuated by and for Settlers? What are the contingencies of localized belonging, the provisions created for its continuity? How does this belonging hinder, or potentially assist, the restitution of lands to Indigenous peoples? That people come to identify with their community or a particular structure like the Kinsol Trestle is not a profound assertion. However, I argue that addressing the *why* and *how* of such experiences has something to offer the study of Settler colonialism in Canada. It is not my intention to suggest that Settlers should be ashamed of building a connection to place, nor is it my intention to suggest that these connections should be used to justify ongoing dispossession. Yet, such feelings do exist; to ignore them or reject them as baseless is to allow them to carry forward without

³ The terms “space” and “place” carry different and complex meanings. At its most basic interpretation, space is a more abstract concept than place; organized spaces, such as parks, have boundaries and a geographic location, but they are also the site of social relations that circulate and pass through borders. In this way, it is the specificity of place that can give space meaning. Places exist on a scale, from the kitchen, to a beach, a city, and so on. For example, a provincial park is a place, but it is also a space through which a multiplicity of social relations exist and flow. Geographer Doreen Massey argues that

one way of thinking about place is as particular moments in such intersecting social relations, nets of which have over time been constructed, laid down, interacted with one another, decayed and renewed. Some of these relations will be, as it were, contained within the place; others will stretch beyond it, tying any particular locality into wider relations and processes in which other places are implicated too (1994, p. 120).

Both place and space are necessary concepts for understanding material and affective attachment to land. What I mean is that land exists as a specific place, a particular location, while land also exists as a space made up of myriad and ongoing social relations the flow through and beyond place. Understanding land in this way helps to draw connections between the locality of Settler colonialism and the spatialization of broader social and economic relations.

analysis and critical engagement. A sense of belonging can be fostered in countless ways: citizenship, ancestry, familial relationships, socio-economic relations, race, religion, gender, sexuality, and class, to name a few. Although many of these diverse connections are discussed in the work that follows, the primary focus is on Settler affect or feeling as it pertains to *belonging to* land. I argue that this belonging is fostered across generations and I show how belonging intersects with the mode of production in the resource economy and the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous territories characteristic of Settler colonialism.⁴

Unsettling & Settler Colonialism

Settler colonial studies begin from the understanding that colonialism is not relegated to the past – it is something that is ongoing (Wolfe, 2006). The study of relations between colonizer and colonized developed from the ‘decolonization’ of African and south-Asian territories that began during the 1950s. In this context, decolonization refers to the process of the colonizer relinquishing power and/or packing up and leaving a colonized territory. To better understand this process, anti/post-colonial and sub/altern scholarship emerged and was focused on colonial discourse, cultural hybridity, difference, and globalization (e.g.: Fanon, 1963; Said, 1978; Spivak, 1988; Hall, 1992; Guha, 1993; Gilroy, 1993; Bhabha, 1994). Most early post-colonial and sub/altern studies did not engage with Settler colonial states, such as Canada and the United States, where the colonizer continues to exert control over Indigenous peoples and territories.

The study of Settler colonialism has often been engaged with what Patrick Wolfe

⁴ The mode of production is the combination of productive forces (labour power, tools, technology, land etc.) and the relations of production (property, power, law, social structure etc.)

(2006; Lloyd & Wolfe, 2016), Andrea Smith (2010), Mark Rifkin (2011) and others call the logics of Settler colonialism – “the social, ideological, and institutional processes through which the authority of the settler state implicitly and explicitly is enacted” (Rifkin, 2011, p. 343). In Settler colonial studies, Wolfe’s concept of the “logic of elimination” (1999, 2001, 2006) is highly influential (e.g.: Morgensen, 2011; Simpson, 2011; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Strakosch & Macoun, 2012; Preston, 2013; Coulthard, 2014; Veracini, 2014b). Writing of Australia, Wolfe argues that the logic of elimination refers to Settler colonialism’s efforts to destroy and replace Indigenous peoples by arriving to stay, thus making their invasion a structure, not an event (2006, p. 388). Through this concept, Wolfe, and those who have built upon his thinking, reveals a way to understand Settler colonialism as a social formation of complex relations that remains *in progress*. Use of the term “structure” has been critiqued for suggesting a rigidity and inevitability to Settler colonialism’s processes (Macoun & Strakosch, 2013; Rowse, 2014). Lorenzo Veracini argues that this critique misunderstands the main thrust of Wolfe’s argument: that the structure of Settler colonialism is *unfinished* and that the logic of elimination, in a diversity of forms, has failed to destroy Indigenous peoples (2014b, p. 311). The concept of a “structure” and reference to “logics” offers a macro framework for understanding a range of Settler relations, including elimination, state actions, capitalism, genocide, hetero-patriarchy, and white supremacy. These are useful starting points for analysis, but such necessarily general frameworks, and the diversity of Settler colonialism’s global geography, make it necessary to be explicit regarding flexibility in specific locations. What I mean here is that Settler colonialism must also be understood as flexible since historical and ongoing processes of land alienation and settlement have any number of

variables based on the specifics of location, including the geography, population, and logics under examination.

Acknowledging the particularities of place, Wolfe notes that “to characterize the impact of settler colonialism in any given site of its operations, the human dimension should not be bracketed off from the particularities of the ecological setting in and with which it formatively interacts” (2013, p. 15). Despite this clarification, the term “structure” does seem to describe a rigidity that is incongruous with the close study of local, complex, and shifting relations. Likewise, use of the term “logic” brings to mind a systematic or codified set of actions and appears to present Settler colonials as proceeding in a deftly coordinated manner. I am not arguing that ongoing dispossession does not function within a set of unfinished parameters such as those described above; “logic” and “structure” are important terms for directing inquiry and analyzing evidence (Williams, 1976, p. 257). Lindsey Schneider has called for exploring the “geographically specific manifestations” of Settler colonialism (2013, p. 149) and in this dissertation I show how a focus on local processes reveals a flexibility to dispossession not captured in “logic” and “structure.” As such, I build upon studies of the Settler colonial project through research that supports the case for investigating locally specific and affective dynamics of Settler claims to land. Together, studying affect and the local help to uncover the particularities of attachment to land by connecting individual and shared feelings with location.

Many who study Settler colonialism describe legitimation of the Settler presence as a form of “indigenization” or “self-indigenization” (Johnston & Lawson, 2000; Veracini, 2008; Pearson, 2013; Wolfe, 2013). I am interested here in identifying the *why* and *how* of attempts to naturalize the Settler presence. The task here is to provide an

analysis of Settler colonialism that does not presume an unchanging future (Strakosch & Macoun, 2012; Macoun & Strakosch, 2013), but instead offers paths to alternative futures where land is returned and new relationships are formed. While this dissertation gestures towards alternatives, I argue that they will continue to remain elusive if Settlers such as myself do not engage with the contradictions and complexities of our belonging.

It must be the task of Settlers to unsettle and confront our belonging to land (Murphyao & Black, 2015). In this vein, Roger Epp explains that the promise of reconciliation “lies in breaking free of Lockean myths and thinking anew about history and inherited obligations” (2003, p. 127). Building upon this, Paulette Regan argues that Settlers in Canada must unravel an identity rooted in the Canadian myth of “benevolent peacemaker” and “turn the mirror back on ourselves” to solve, not an Indian problem, but the Settler problem (2010, p. 11). Similarly, Eva Mackey calls for an unsettling of

‘settled expectations.’ The change we need, I contend, has to do with how we – and by ‘we’ I mean relatively privileged non-Indigenous citizens of settler nations – think and act when it comes to the dominant and self-evident frameworks that many of us share (Mackey, 2016, p. 11).

These and other efforts to unsettle must take place simultaneously if Settler society in Canada is to undertake meaningful transformation. I am reminded here of the 1975 T.H.B Symons report into the teaching and study of Canada titled, “To Know Ourselves.” My research asks: what does it look like ‘to know our *Settler* selves’?

Many academics in Canada and elsewhere have offered significant insights into the characteristics of Settler societies (e.g.: Furniss, 1999; Mackey, 2002, 2014, 2016; Green, 2003; Coulthard, 2007, 2014; Mawani, 2010; Rifkin, 2011, 2013; Daschuk, 2013; Wolfe, 2013; Goldstein, 2014; Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015; Piterberg & Veracini, 2015) and I contribute to this work by offering a distinctly local and reflexive approach to

the study of Settler colonialism. In this dissertation, I take up calls for Settlers to focus on learning the history of the land and situating ourselves in the story of colonization (Alfred, 2010). The point I am making here, and throughout the following pages, is that the study of Settler belonging to land, bound up as it is with questions of the nation state and other logics, requires a local focus if the restitution of Indigenous lands is to occur. To dismiss Settler feelings for land and home, or to deem them invalid because of their rootedness in colonialism, is to underestimate their role in ongoing dispossession.

Access to and control of land is the foundation for *ongoing* Settler colonialism (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Pasternak, 2014). For example, the writings of seventeenth century English Philosopher John Locke, who held that the right to property is vested in those who labour, cultivate, and do not ‘waste’ the land, are an important way to frame the alienation of Indigenous territories in Canada (Seed, 1995). What analyses of Lockean philosophy do not offer is the lens of Settler colonialism’s general characteristics or the context of space and place. What we see as “property” is always part of a *particular* locality, part of a *particular* Indigenous territory. The building of the Kinsol Trestle was precipitated and legitimated by Lockean philosophy, *terra nullius*, and the myth of the ‘disappearing Indian,’ but it was nonetheless built to extract resources from a specific section of Hul’qumi’num territory.⁵ As I describe below, the rise and decline of the

⁵ Hul’qumi’num peoples are a Coast Salish peoples whose territories encompass parts of southern Vancouver Island and the Lower Mainland in British Columbia. Sarah Morales explains:

The core territory of my people, the Hul’qumi’num Mustimuhw, includes southeastern Vancouver Island, the Gulf Islands and the lower Fraser River. It encompasses the land and waters in and around the watersheds of the Cowichan, Koksilah, Goldstream, Chemainus and south Nanaimo river systems on Vancouver Island, the Gulf Islands and the mouth and the south arm of the Fraser River to Douglas Island. The marine territory includes all the waters of the Strait of Georgia, the Fraser River south of Yale, Juan de Fuca Strait and upper Puget Sound (2014, p.11).

The present day Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group (HTG) consists of six First Nations: Chemainus, Cowichan, Halalt, Lake Cowichan, Lyackson and Penelakut. Recognizing the complexities of discussing Indigenous territories in the past and present, as well as the problematic nature of the modern BC Treaty process

trestle's use is also implicated in global economic relations. However, Settler colonialism is also a local process that has a specifically local impact (de Costa & Clark, 2016). This dissertation engages with macro processes, but my focus is on belonging at a local level as this is where connections to land have been destroyed and built and it is at the local level that land will be returned to Indigenous peoples.

Affect and Belonging

A material object such as the Kinsol Trestle is invested with feelings of attachment that, when understood in connection with other social relations and material objects, may reveal something of how Settler attachment to land is manifested and maintained. I argue that Settler belonging can be subjective and it can be shared; that it is worked at through a set of practices that are both supported and endangered by the Settler legal system and the capitalist mode of production. To study the local and personal relations of belonging, the concept of an 'archive of feelings' is instructive. In *An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures* (2003) Ann Cvetkovich explores cultural texts concerning trauma, particularly among Queer communities. Cvetkovich notes that her book "is organized as an 'archive of feelings,' an exploration of cultural texts as repositories of feelings and emotions, which are encoded not only in the content of the texts themselves but in the practices that surround their production and reception" (2003, p. 7).

The post-modern study of feeling is most commonly associated with affect theory which has its origins in psychology, post-structuralism, and psychoanalysis (Watson, 1999; Thrift, 2004; Johnson Thornton, 2011). However, scholars in the area note that "the

(Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, 2005; Thom, 2009; Egan, 2013), this dissertation is, primarily, a study that takes place within the territories of the Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group, the Te'mexw Treaty Association (Malahat, Scia'new/Beecher Bay, Songhees, Snaw-aw-as /Nanoose, and T'sou-ke First Nations), and Pacheedaht First Nation.

concept of ‘affect’ has gradually accrued a sweeping assortment of philosophical/psychological/physiological underpinnings, critical vocabularies, and ontological pathways, and, thus, can be (and has been) turned toward all manner of political/pragmatic/performative ends” (Gregg & Seigworth 2011, p. 5); this includes studies of Settler colonialism (cf: Davis, Denis, & Sinclair, 2016). Building upon the work of Raymond Williams (1977), Mark Rifkin argues that settlement is a structure of feeling and that affect

registers how individuals participate in broader social processes....Such analysis draws attention to structures of feeling that connect individual emotion to socio-political formations while highlighting the ways that understanding feeling as expressive of individual identity stymies the capacity to envision large-scale social change (2011, p. 345).

Emotional appeals to protect and restore an object such as the Kinsol Trestle can be directly linked with *historically specific* understandings of what is, or should be, valued

Figure 3: A billboard featuring the Kinsol Trestle on the Trans-Canada Highway, near Cobble Hill, BC.

by local communities (Williams, 1977; Johnson Thornton, 2011).

That is, feelings are not only isolated and personal. The trestle’s construction and eventual restoration – and the feelings associated with these events – are linked into a broader significance given to forms of Settler attachment that, in this

case, are generated from the extraction of raw natural resources dependent upon the dispossession Indigenous territories. Describing the concept of “Public Feelings,”

Cvetkovich notes that the difficulty in studying affective attachment to a Settler “home and land” lies in doing so without “inciting violent nationalisms or separatisms. It is the spirit of Public Feelings not to tell people what to feel or to judge how they feel, but instead to find better ways to describe the complexity of what they are feeling” (2012, p. 82). To this end, this dissertation does not seek to shame or condemn Settlers for having established a sense of belonging. Rather, I seek to identify these feelings as they have been established over time so that we – Settlers – may grapple with the potential of alternative futures.

Whereas Wolfe argues that Settler colonialism is a *structure rather than an event*, and Rifkin argues that settlement is a *structure of feeling*, Historical Geographer Cole Harris views the dispossession of Indigenous territories as an *event* followed by a resettlement where Settler colonials created a new human geography (2004). However, dispossession is more than a single event, it has to be sustained when the elimination of Indigenous peoples fails – as it has in Canada (Wolfe, 2006). Audra Simpson explains that “the condition of Indigeneity in North America is to have survived this acquisitive and genocidal process and thus to have called up the failure of the [Settler colonial] project itself” (Simpson, 2011). As such, refusal of Indigenous peoples to disappear has made dispossession a series of (thus far) recurring events. I argue that these events built, and continue to build, the Settler project in particular contexts.

To underline my approach, the rest of this dissertation uses *(dis)possession* (Murphyao & Black, 2015) rather than “dispossession” to make the point that processes of dispossession – the taking and alienation of Indigenous territories by Settlers – and possession by Settlers are active and intertwined. Legal scholar Carol Rose writes of

possession and notes that “common law gives preference to those who convince the world that they have caught the fish and hold it fast. This may be a reward for useful labor, but it is more precisely the articulation of a specific vocabulary within a structure of symbols approved and understood by a commercial people” (1985, p. 88). Possession is not simply the act of holding the land; it is also an ongoing commitment to maintaining attachment. What I mean here is that Settlers describe land and ascribe meaning to land in ways that evoke feelings and particular versions of past, present, and future possession (Mackey, 2016). That is, Indigenous peoples are dispossessed of their lands while, simultaneously, Settlers form(ed) affective and material possession of those lands. (Dis)possession is therefore synonymous with Settler belonging. To maintain attachment to land over time, Settlers enact a range of practices that generate particular forms of belonging. I will explain by elaborating upon the example of the Kinsol Trestle.

The completion of the trestle and railway line by 1921 was a dispossession event that claimed Indigenous territory for resource extraction. Construction of the line was made possible by British Columbia’s refusal to acknowledge Indian title, best exemplified by the lack of treaty in the area, and the promise of resource wealth for the ‘progress’ of Settler society (Roy, 2012). When use of the rail line ended in 1979, appeals for the trestle’s protection as a local attraction began immediately, but it was not until 2011 that the trestle was restored and made into an official heritage site (Peake, 2010; Black, 2014b). Decades of efforts to conserve the Kinsol brought Settlers together in an emotional and material claim to its presence and history and, in this way, the trestle represents both dispossession *and* possession: it made possible claims to, and extraction from, unceded Indigenous territories, and it has been transformed into an example of

local Settler claims to those territories. The Kinsol Trestle is not tied to a single past event such as its construction; it is entangled with processes of land alienation and belonging *over time*, across generations of Settlers. In this way, the trestle is a marker or *waypoint* within the Settler project of (dis)possession. The concept of a “waypoint,” defined here as a point in physical space along a route of travel (“Waypoint,” n.d.), is used in the chapters that follow to explain how certain events and material objects, such as the Kinsol Trestle, become physical and/or temporal markers for Settlers.⁶ These waypoints are a practice of belonging and they act as guides that are intended to recall and reinforce belonging across generations. As I explain below, the terms *(dis)possession* and *waypoint* offer a way to understand how something locally specific, like the Kinsol Trestle, can be implicated in and contribute to relations that perpetuate the alienation of, and affection for, land.

The Local and the Particular

Through violence and the deployment of European knowledge systems, policies, violence, and legal structures, Indigenous peoples were dispossessed of their territories to make way for settlement (Harris, 2004). Yet, the historical, geographic, and institutional contexts of land alienation in British Columbia are much different than other places in Canada and the Pacific Northwest (Roy, 1990; Barman, 2010b). Frequently referred to as

⁶ This is similar to the concept of affect as a ‘refrain’ taken up by some theorists (cf: Bertelsen & Murphie, 2011; Seigworth, 2016). The term refers to the “looping of ‘pre-personal’ affective forces into a variable temporal ‘texture’” (Bertelsen & Murphie, 2011, p. 143) that evoke certain forms or politics before they are known (e.g.: climate change). A refrain is also “an erratic and evolving distribution of both coming into being and the power to affect or be affected” (Bertelsen & Murphie, 2011, p. 145). However, I use the term ‘waypoint’ rather than ‘refrain’ to make explicit the link between affect, land, and territory. Like a refrain, the affective qualities of a waypoint are not static and are linked with broader processes of feeling; unlike a refrain, the encounter with a waypoint is fixed to a particular geography. In this way, ‘waypoint’ captures the material and geographic aspects of affective attachment to land that I am exploring in this dissertation.

the “edge of empire” by historians and geographers (cf: Clayton, 2000; Perry, 2001; Harris, 2004; Bosher 2005), studies of British Columbia, and in particular Vancouver Island, are a necessary addition to studies of colonialism that take on a more national or global perspective (see below). Historian Ruth Sandwell observes that histories of land use in British Columbia have tended to focus on either colonial ideology (read: logics) or the consequences of “resettlement” for First Nations (2005, pp. 4-5). Sandwell argues that

notwithstanding the general fact of racism in nineteenth-century British Columbia, the experience of resettlement *on the ground* involved complex, varied, and change-able relations amongst *all* the populations involved (First Nations, African-Americans, English, etc.). The model that polarizes Native and non-Native cultures and economies cannot capture the complexity of the rural in a place like Saltspring Island [emphasis in original] (2005, p. 5).

Sandwell describes her book as engaged with micro-history (2005, p. 5), but the point here is that the study of British Columbia has much to gain from research that works to further understand the nuances and localities of Settler colonialism.

Studies of colonialism in British Columbia, particularly its history and geography, reveal the differences that set the region apart from other areas of Canada (Gough, 1984; Mackie, 1992-1993; Blomely, 1996; Wickwire, 1994, 1998; Arnett, 1999; Perry, 2001; Reimer, 2000; Harris, 2002; Thom, 2005; Barman, 2005, 2010b; Rossiter, 2007; Stanger-Ross, 2008; Mawani, 2010). Laura Ishiguro argues that more recent engagements with the study of Settler colonialism in British Columbia

owe much to deeper traditions of Indigenous activism and resistance as well as to scholarly studies that have long understood and challenged British Columbia as a fundamentally colonial place. To identify a settler colonial turn as a distinguishing mark of current historical practice would do injustice to earlier research, insurgent work, and lived experience in British Columbia (2016, p. 6).

Indeed, I am indebted to the work of the Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group (2005, 2007) and Indigenous academics, activists, and elders, such as Richard Atleo (2004), Cindy Blackstock, Geraldine Manson, and Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun, who challenge and resist Settler colonialism through their work. In addition, my research is influenced by the works of Chris Arnett (1999), Jean Barman (2005), Bruce Braun (2002), Cole Harris (2002, 2004), Richard Mackie (1992-1993, 2000, 2009), Renisa Mawani (2003a, 2010), Adele Perry (2001), and Wendy Wickwire (1994, 1998). Their studies of colonialism in British Columbia show the ways in which gender, labour, extraction, place-making, juridical/racial order, and narratives of encounter were deployed to particular effect from and at particular sites. For example, Wickwire's research challenges Settler representations of contact (1994) and complicates any tendency to see all Settlers as operating from the same motives (1998). Arnett's book, *The Terror of the Coast: Land Alienation and Colonial War on Vancouver Island and the Gulf Islands, 1849-1863*, first revealed to me the violent colonial incursions and resistance by First Nations that preceded land alienation in the Cowichan region. In Harris' *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia* (2002), I was given an early introduction to the geographic, cartographic, and specifically local processes of dispossession. Perry (2001) explores the importance of gender, race, and material relations in the formation of Settler identities in BC and, similarly, Mawani (2010) reveals the intersections and localities of race, class, gender, and capital accumulation in the province's salmon canning industry. Regarding extraction, Mackie demonstrates its importance to early settlement patterns (1992-1993) and working class life (2000, 2009) on Vancouver Island. Both Barman (2005) and Mawani (2003a) show how parks and

urban spaces became sites of erasure and Settler myth making, while Bruce Braun (2002) takes past efforts to make meaning from place and reveals the ways that they shape a neo-colonial present on Vancouver Island's west coast. This scholarship forms a foundation for my own work and I build upon these and other works by linking the processes of Settler colonialism, as they occur over time, to a localized application of the staples approach and affect theory.

A key example of British Columbia's particular pattern of colonization is revealed by the limited number of historic treaties in the region: the Colony of Vancouver Island and Colony/Province of British Columbia made no effort to make treaties with First Nations between 1854 and 1993. Another illustration of Settler colonialism's varied and specific geography is the Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway land grant of 1884/1887, the focus of inquiry in chapters three and eight. For completion of the first railway on Vancouver Island, the E&N Railway Company, led by coal magnate Robert Dunsmuir, obtained nearly two million acres, mineral rights, and \$750,000.00. The "Great Land Grab" turned unceded First Nation territories into private property (Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group [HTG], 2007) and led to decades of conflict between Settlers, the railway company, and First Nations (Black, 2017b).

Despite the extent and effects of the land grant, these conflicts are the subject of limited study, particularly in the field of BC History. Take, for example, two of the most well known histories of the province, Margaret Ormsby's *British Columbia: A History* (1958) and Jean Barman's *The West Beyond the West: A History of British Columbia* (2010a). In Ormsby's book, construction of the E&N is explained from the perspective of politicians and industrialists, reflecting the preoccupations of historical inquiry at the time

it was written. (1958, pp. 265-271). Barman spends less time on the E&N, dedicating just a few sentences to the subject (2010a, pp. 128, 134). If the grant is mentioned in other studies, it is often in passing, as an event linked to the terms of union with Canada, the Dunsmuir industrial empire, or the operations of the railway (cf: Roberts, 1937; Cail, 1974; Taylor, 1975; Reksten, 1991; MacLachlan, 1986). However, the Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group (2007) and legal scholar Sarah Morales (2014) do demonstrate the devastating impacts the grant continues to have for First Nations. Taken together, the land grant and a lack of treaties present locally distinct challenges for affected First Nations seeking restitution of their territories. Through a tracing of the E&N land grant's role in generating conflict, both in the past and present, I argue that it is much more than a typical nineteenth century attempt at nation building; it is an example of ongoing (dis)possession. By highlighting this lack of study and showing that the grant has been a fluid feature of settlement, I challenge the self-evident nature of previous studies and contribute to the study of BC history.

While there is a distinctiveness to Settler colonialism in British Columbia, I am also arguing for further study of Settler colonialism's nuances in *all* locales. It is not just that BC is different than Alberta; Victoria is different from Vancouver, Calgary is different from Lethbridge, and so on. It is not my intention here to detract from an understanding of Canada or British Columbia as having cohesive elements that make up a broader Settler state. Many have shown the ways in which national identity construction relies on particular narratives and appropriations of an Indigenous other (e.g.: Grant, 1998; Furniss, 1999; Mackey, 2000, 2002; Henderson, 2003; Mawani, 2006, 2010; King, 2012), and the extent to which Canada and Canadians have developed legal and racial

justifications for colonization (e.g.: Cardinal, 1969; Manuel & Posluns, 1974; Richardson, 1993; Lawrence, 2004; Coulthard, 2014; Manuel & Derrickson, 2015; Truth & Reconciliation Commission, 2015). These national narratives and jurisprudence serve (dis)possession which is carried out through a coalescence of international, national, provincial, regional, and local relations. Nevertheless, the question of how access to land has been enacted and maintained demands more attention be given to local dynamics.

In the book *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*, Emma Battell Lowman and Adam J. Barker focus on Canadian national and state constructions of Settler identity in an effort to explain to Canadians that we have “deep moral and ethical responsibilities to change our relationships to the lands that we call home” (2015, p. 15). They note that Settler identity and Settler colonialism are not strictly the same and that the former “is based on location-specific relationships” (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 15). This is vital work and Battell-Lowman and Barker make an important contribution to the understanding of Settler colonialism in Canada. Yet, their discussion of belonging does not engage with the affective attachment of Settlers to land. Instead, Settler belonging is portrayed as an almost formulaic or bureaucratic and impassive process (2015, pp. 58-68). For example, belonging is described as the work of “imagined” geography (Veracini, 2010) and narrative constructs, especially *terra nullius*, citizenship, and the forced dispossession of Settlers from a prior homeland (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015, pp. 58-61). Certainly these are important factors, but the question that arises is: at what point does the “imagined” give way to the affective and material? Does the myth of an empty land transform over time? As I have noted, Settler colonialism in Canada (and globally) has many shared characteristics, and these are important elements

of my work here, but I am arguing that *belonging* is more than simply a social or political justification of the Settler presence; it is a set of practices bound up with *feelings* that manifest in specifically local ways.

The Staples Approach

The staples theory, as outlined by Harold Innis, is a particularly instructive way of comprehending settlement and the alienation of land from Indigenous peoples in Canada.⁷ Innis argued that demand from the metropolitan core (e.g.: Paris or London) shapes extraction in the “new country” or periphery (e.g.: New France or British North America). In the seminal work *The Fur Trade In Canada*, first published in 1930, Innis provides a generalized economic theory pertaining to the operation of the Canadian economy, but he also offers specific and nuanced details of technological innovation and geographic particularities:

The economic history of Canada has been dominated by the discrepancy between the centre and the margin of western civilization....Population was involved directly in the production of the staple and indirectly in the production of facilities promoting production. Agriculture, industry, transportation, trade, finance, and governmental activities tend to become subordinate to the production of the staple and indirectly in the production of facilities promoting production (Innis, 1999/1930, p. 385).

While Innis’s insights were particularly applicable to the trade relationship between metropole and hinterland, I argue that a staples approach that uses Settler colonial and Indigenous theories looks beyond the external demand for raw resources. If various institutions become subordinate to staple production, the conditions for settlement and the development of social relations are directly influenced by the primacy of extraction. Writing on the importance of Indigenous labour and demand for goods in the early fur trade, Innis argued that “we have not yet realized that the Indian and his culture were

⁷ W.A. Mackintosh (1923) is also an architect of early staples thinking.

fundamental to the growth of Canadian institutions” (1999/1930, p. 392). It is important to note that Indigenous culture and labour played a role in extractive industries (Abele & Stasiulis, 1989; Knight, 1996; Lutz, 2008). It is Indigenous land, however, that is primary to extraction. Canada’s expansion from colonial resource periphery to Settler Dominion demonstrates a shift in demand for both resources *and* settlement lands. The 1881 land grants given to the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) are just one example of the ways resource extraction, capital accumulation, and settlement are linked in Canada (Chodos, 1973). On Vancouver Island, the fur trade, fishing, coal mining, and forestry have all played a central role in the regional, provincial, and national economy (Bowen, 1982; Marchak, 1983; Mackie, 1992-1993; Newell, 1993; Marker, 2001; Belshaw 2002).

The relationship between the dispossession of Indigenous lands and changes in the mode of production has been the subject of limited theoretical engagement in Canadian political economy. Despite a number of important exceptions (e.g.: Watkins, 1977; Bourgeault, 1983; Abele & Stasiulis, 1989; Abele, 1996; Warburton, 1997; Green 2003; Yard, 2012; Mills & Sweeney, 2013; Pasternak, 2014), Elaine Coburn has noted that within

historical materialist theorizing in the Canadian academic context....imperialism is usually understood as happening “outside” of Canada, leaving unexamined the ways in which Canada is itself a colonial nation; such literature might entirely set aside theorizing by Indigenous peoples across lands claimed by Canada. Likewise, it is not unusual to write about capitalist dispossession in Canada without referring to Indigenous scholarship and the dispossession of Indigenous peoples by the Canadian state, by capital, and by non-Indigenous persons (2016, p. 286).

This passage reflects a critique of Canadian political economy’s long-standing concern with the nature of the Canadian state and its potentially dependant or marginal relationship with the United States (e.g.: Levitt, 1970; Panitch, 1977; Clement, 1975;

Clark-Jones, 1985; Watkins, 1977, 2006b/1977, 2006c/1977). Regarding use and innovation of the staples approach, studies have tended to focus on trade and investment (McNally, 1981; Barnes & Hayter, 1990; Drache, 1995a; Hayter, 2000; Watkins, 2007; Stanford, 2014) and empirical analysis of staple extraction's role in the national economy (e.g.: Hutton, 2007; Kellogg, 2008, 2015a, 2015b; Fast, 2014). A look at Patricia Marchak's 1983 book *Green Gold*, a seminal work in Canadian political economy and staple studies, offers insight into the development and application of the staples approach. Marchak's study of the BC forest industry argues that theories of comparative advantage, with its global and national focus, ignore the perspective of those who reside in the resource region (1983, p. 18). Similarly, Marchak argues that dependency theory, the idea that resources flow from poor periphery regions to wealthy cores, is inadequate as it fails to explain the prevalence of high wages and the limited investment in industrial development by a 'wealthy core' (Marchak, 1983, p. 21). This leads Marchak to the staples approach which, with its focus on core-periphery interaction and externally imposed technological development, she sees as applicable to the forest resource economy:

To explain the continued dependence, then, on the export of staples, we need to consider both the investment practices of capitalists and the development of a high-wage, strongly unionized labour force. The former directed surplus out of the region toward manufacturing industries elsewhere; the latter curbed the outflow to the extent of increasing labour's share in surplus value. The high wage structure then added a disincentive to capital for investment in the region, and, of course, an incentive to increase productivity not through increases in employment but through labour-saving technologies. The technology was developed at the centre and imported by the resource region (1983, p. 26).

Marchak's use of the staples approach is indicative of the engagement with Innis' theory by political economists during the late twentieth century, and its use in *Green Gold* was

innovative with regards to the BC forest industry. Marchak's study is sociological and empirical and, while it offers critical insight into the class structure of the forest industry at end of the post-war 'long boom,' it does not take up questions of how staple extraction and workers may influence the occupation of Indigenous territories.

Northrop Frye argued that "Innis...will always be rewarding to study, but he will also be in constant need for modification, revision and updating" (as cited in Siegel, 2007, p. 119) and, in this dissertation, I demonstrate how the staples approach can be aimed at improving our understanding of Settler colonialism and the extractive economy. My research contributes to Canadian political economy by turning away from external and state-focused inquiry in favour of a staples approach that accounts for the local and affective relations of production. Economists may argue the extent to which Canada is a staple state (Kellogg, 2015a), but that communities in Canada continue to be shaped by demand for raw resources should not be overlooked. In the 2007 article "Staples Redux," Mel Watkins argues that staples, as analysed by Innis, were not regional or national, but rather imperial in nature (2007, p. 221). Watkins sees a return to understanding the global dimensions of resource exploitation as a next phase in the staples approach and argues that the relevancy of the staples approach holds; it "still needs to be taken seriously in Canadian studies." (Watkins, 2007, p. 224). However, a call for returning to an international focus leaves out the ways in which the regional and local dynamics of extraction are intertwined with Settler colonialism. As Wallace Clement notes, the staples approach has been disproportionately concerned with external or international relations, "with scant attention paid to the explanatory power of internal social relations" (1989, p. 41). While demand for resources and investment in their extraction may be driven by

international capital and demand, the impacts of this economic structure have real consequences for both Indigenous and Settler communities. Increased environmental destruction and layoffs due to commodity prices may be related to the waxing and waning of international demand for commodities, but the impacts are distinctly local.

In the book *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Angloworld* (2009), James Belich seeks to explain the phenomena of global Anglo-Settler migration and population booms of the nineteenth century. Belich argues that population booms and busts do not coincide with the cycles of resource extraction, therefore making the staples approach a “fallacy [that] stems from the reluctance to concede that explosive colonization was driven as much by dreams as by reason” (2009, p. 288). Staple production may not explain, in Belich’s terminology, the “mass transfer” of Settler populations and ideologies from the metropole. Nevertheless, it remains the case that the staples approach can help to explain *how* settlement took place and the Indigenous-Settler relations that followed. In part, emigration was driven by “dreams” or the “hope” of avoiding the mistakes of capitalism in “oldlands” (Belich, 2009, pp. 556-557; Piterberg & Veracini, 2015), but it is important to understand that in Canada the actualization of such hopes and dreams often shared its fate with reliance on the extractive economy. Colonial and state policies, such as monopoly land grants to the Hudson’s Bay Company or Canadian Pacific Railway, worked to encourage or stabilize the position of the staple in economic development (Drache, 1995a, pp. xxxiv-xxxv). International demand may provide the impetus for exploiting particular resources, but gaining and maintaining access to Indigenous lands had to happen first and involves a complexity of national, regional, and localized dynamics. In this sense, the staple’s link to “mass transfer” and

the international economy becomes peripheral to understanding how the Settler colonial project is intertwined with staple extraction.

Staple Linkages

In the 1963 article “A Staple Theory of Economic Growth,” Mel Watkins articulates a more exact application of the staples approach. Watkins argues that the “spread effects” of the staple economy – the economic inputs and outputs resulting from staple extraction – should be classified as “linkages.” Building upon the work of Albert O. Hirschman, Watkins outlines three types of linkages in Canada’s staple economy: backward, forward, and final demand:

Backward linkage is a measure of the inducement to invest in the home production of inputs...for expanding export sectors [e.g.: transport systems for staple collection]...Forward linkage is a measure of the inducement to invest in industries using the output of the export industry as an input...Final demand linkage is a measure of the inducement to invest in domestic industries producing consumer goods for factors in the export sector (2006a/1963, pp. 9-11).⁸

According to Watkins, a failure domestically to take advantage of beneficial linkages related to staple exploitation may result in what Innis called a “staples trap.” In a staples trap scenario, economic growth is determined by external or centre demand, thus trapping periphery areas in a reliance on external demand and staple exploitation. The trap is particularly dangerous as it is subject to the boom/bust cycle where staple-based economies (and especially periphery communities) can face a period of crisis as demand for one staple ends and the next staple is sought (Clement, 1989, p. 38). As moments of rapid economic growth or decline, the boom and the bust are rich sites of study that reveal the expansion of, and conflict within, the Settler project. In the chapters that follow, the boom and bust cycles of British Columbia’s forest industry,

⁸ The concept of “fiscal linkage,” described as royalties and rents accrued to the state from surplus value, was later added to this suite of linkages (Watkins, 1977).

particularly/approximately 1886-1914 (boom), 1943-1979 (boom), and 1980-2000 (bust), are analyzed for their part in (dis)possession.

Innis argued that the economic, social, and political characteristics of each staple left a particular ‘stamp’ on Canada’s geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political development (1995/1931, p. 135; 2007/1950, p. 24). For Watkins, the concept of linkages provides the means to understand how this stamp influences economic development and investment in Canada (1977). It is necessary to note that, like Settler colonialism, the stamp of the staple is not a single event generated at the moment of extraction; rather, it is ongoing and transformative. The point I am making here is that the spread effects of staple extraction extend beyond the concerns of external demand or the inducement to invest; they are material, affective, and bound up with the processes of Settler colonialism. Hirschman argues that

the linkage approach also takes characteristic features of technology and production processes as points of departure for understanding social events, but it does so on a much smaller scale, in much more minute detail, and for a much more limited time frame. Hence, ‘micro-Marxism’ might be a good term for this attempt to show how the shape of economic development, including its social and political components, can be traced to the specific economic activities a country takes up (2013, p. 181).

Linkages provide ways to reveal the local or micro dynamics of staple extraction and aid a better understanding of staple production’s role in Settler life; to this “micro-Marxism” I add affect. To further develop my work with the staples approach and Settler colonial studies, I have built upon studies by Watkins and Hirschman and developed the term *material-affective linkages*. Material-affective linkages describe the physical and affecting aspects of the staple’s stamp and offer a way to make explicit the connections between extraction and practices of Settler belonging. To explain, it is helpful to return to

the example of the Kinsol Trestle. In Watkins' sense the trestle may be classed as a backward linkage, but it is also a material-affective linkage that stands as a marker or waypoint on the landscape bound up with the alienation of Indigenous territories, the mode/relations of production, and Settler feelings of belonging.

Methodology

The Kinsol Trestle debate was not the only event that raised questions for me about Settler attachment to land. My sense of belonging as a Settler on Vancouver Island is formed by the geography of my upbringing: our first family home, local roads, and landscapes are all part of this affective attachment. Hiking and camping experiences across Vancouver Island – that is, access to a range of Indigenous territories – are central to my claims to being from, and of, the region. I value the ability to escape with friends and family to the coast or forest where few other people are present. For myself and many others, affection for such recreation sites was thrown into turmoil in 2007 when the provincial government allowed Western Forest Products to remove and sell its private properties from jointly managed tree farm licences (TFL) adjacent to the popular Juan de Fuca Marine Trail Park. These properties were then sold for potential development, sparking nearly five years of protest, as well as legal and jurisdictional fights. How could the integrity of the trail and park be disregarded? How did the forest company come to own so much private land in the region? What did this mean for the future of other parks and recreation sites in the province? These are just a few of the questions that I began to ask in an effort to understand how such events came to be. While I acknowledged that the lands belonged to First Nation peoples, I did not recognize the contradiction inherent in a recognition designed to protect ongoing Settler access. I discuss this event and my

reaction in greater detail in chapter seven, but I mention it here because it became an impetus for the project that follows.

This dissertation is guided by a reflexive and interdisciplinary approach designed to track material and affective social relations. My project stems from a desire to better understand the ways in which Settlers, including myself, create an affective attachment to lands taken from Indigenous peoples. Events such as the 2007 TFL removal led me to ask the following key questions explored with this dissertation: if Settlers develop affective attachment to land, does, and if so in what ways, does this belonging adapt, remain the same, and become entrenched overtime? How is this belonging linked to broader processes of resource extraction and (dis)possession?

To answer these questions, I begin my research with the understanding that the colonization of Indigenous territories in Settler states such as Canada did not end; instead, colonization is an ongoing phenomenon. This is a position clearly articulated by scholars within Indigenous studies and Settler colonial studies (Wolfe, 2006; Barker, 2009; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Simpson, 2014). Approaching Settler colonialism as a distinct form of ongoing social relations situates the everyday events, actions, and discourse of Settlers within broader processes required to establish and maintain authority over Indigenous territories.

Many scholars note that Settler colonialism is ‘all about the land’ (Goeman, 2008; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Schneider, 2013; Coulthard, 2014; Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015). The Settler colonial project in Canada has been characterized by the need to exploit natural resources in the pursuit of economic development (Innis, 1999/1930; Pasternak, 2016) and it is a regime of private property that remains central to Settler

claims to land in a capitalist economy (Harvey, 2014). With this in mind, my work is informed by the study of historical materialism, an approach that understands economic activity to be a structuring force in the lives of people. (Marx, 1932; Antonio, 2003; Palmer, 2006). As a methodology that analyzes the ways in which societies are organized around capitalist production, historical materialism is well suited to an inquiry of private property, class, and natural resource extraction. Bryan D. Palmer argues that historical materialism

does not so much centre class and the dominant relations of production as the categories of analysis, as it insists that they be related, with due consideration given to their significant place in the complexities of determination, to a host of other developments, increasingly important in the shifting gears of modernity's movement: gender, race, empire and imperialism, social movements, identity and subjectivity, national states, and the collectivities of struggles localized and generalized (2006, p. 58).

To this “host of other developments” related to class I add (dis)possession.⁹ That is, this dissertation seeks to identify the relationship between Settler belonging and the mode of production. I do not undertake a quantitative analysis of class; instead, I identify, where possible, who is doing the work and their relationship to various regimes of private

⁹ Glen Coulthard argues that Marx's concept of capitalist primitive accumulation – the violent transformation of non-capitalist ways of living into capitalist ones – reveals dispossession, the question of land, to be a structuring force in the relationship between the Canadian Settler state and Indigenous peoples (2014, p. 13). David Harvey (2003) describes primitive accumulation in the neo-liberal era as “accumulation by dispossession,” wherein capital seeks new sites of accumulation by removing people and communities from wealth and land, usually through methods such as privatization, financialization, manipulation of crises, and state redistributions. Coulthard shows that capital accumulation in Canada resembles primitive accumulation through demands that Indigenous communities and their resources “remain open for exploration and capitalist development” (2014, p. 77). Both primitive accumulation and accumulation by dispossession offer important insight into relations between the state and capital, historically and in the present. However, for the purposes of this dissertation, neither term adequately captures the often contradictory relationship between Settlers, belonging to land, and the capitalist mode of production. By contradictory, I mean the ways in which Settlers frequently foster belonging by both embracing and resisting capitalist social relations. That is, what I am seeking by using a term such as (dis)possession is a way to talk about *how* Settlers make meaning from the land as they are aided and/or hindered by ongoing primitive accumulation/accumulation by dispossession.

property.¹⁰ Clement (1983) explains that the earliest staples (wheat, fur, fish) were commercial commodities gathered by independent commodity producers (for example, the wheat farmer, placer miner, handlogger); these producers were not reliant on a wage-labour structure. Although much of the early settlement in the Colony of Vancouver Island began as subsistence farming (Sandwell, 2005), I show that wage labour, particularly through road building and seasonal work in extraction, shaped (dis)possession. The shift to wage-labour through staple extraction marked a transformation in the mode of production, making class analysis an essential component of a fully developed staples approach:

The argument here is that a more fruitful approach to the subject of staples is provided by an analysis of transformation in the modes of production....Fundamentally, this means abstracting from Innis those concepts and observations that contribute to an understanding of the forces of production and developing in their implications for the relations of production (Clement, 1983, p. 176).

Within the context of gaining and maintaining access to Indigenous lands, analysis of the staple's stamp, its linkages, and class structures offers a way to understand if, and if so how, (dis)possession – the taking and ongoing possession of land – changes because of, or in spite of, transformations in the mode of production. What I mean here is that if the staple leaves a stamp, the social relations that develop from this stamp also shape particular forms of belonging.

To extract natural resources, Indigenous peoples had to either be made partners in extraction, as was the case with the land and maritime fur trades, or be removed from the

¹⁰ Class is understood here as the social relations that emerge based on one's property rights to the means of production and control over the labour power of others (Clement, 1988, pp. 20-21). However, as Clement notes, "class relations are everywhere, but they never exist in 'pure' form; that is, they always combine with other social relations....It involves not simply categories, but dynamic relationships" (1988, p. 22).

land so that more intensive extraction, as required for mining and forestry, could take place. Examinations of historical patterns of resource extraction in Canada, specifically the staple resources of fur, fish, minerals, and timber, led Innis to the conclusion that settlement, culture, social relations, regionalism, and growth of the national economy were driven by international trade in natural resources (Innis, 1978/1940). Although a staples approach is often concerned with the impacts of external trade, a staple “is usually thought of as a kind of shorthand for describing the social and economic relations of production, settlement and commerce” (Drache, 1995a, p. xxxviii). In this way, my methodology takes up the staples approach prevalent in Canadian political economy as a way to interrogate the relationship between a particular resource and the Settler colonial project in Canada. In other words, I treat the forest staple, or rather the tree/forest, as a heuristic device that can allow insight into Settler belonging and vice-versa.

In developing a methodology to investigate resource extraction, Settler colonialism, and affect, I struggled to find a way to bridge such tangible and material actions as cutting down (or trying to protect) a tree with the more intangible nature of feelings related to these actions. To study affect, I align myself with Feminist and Queer cultural studies that study feeling as a site of analysis and criticism (Cvetkovich, 2003, 2012; Sedgwick, 2003; Brennan, 2004; Ahmed, 2004a, 2004b, 2010, 2011). The point here is that affect is more specific than and different from simply the social relations of production; it exists outside, within, and because of such relations. My study explores Settler feelings of belonging, particularly as they pertain to staple resources and land use. As such, this dissertation takes up Feminist methodologies that call for reflexivity in

research (Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Pillow, 2003). Sandra Harding argues that feminist analysis

insists that the inquirer her/himself be placed in the same critical plane as the overt subject matter, thereby recovering the entire research process for scrutiny in the results of research. That is, the class, race, culture, and gender assumptions, beliefs, and behaviors of the researcher her/himself must be placed within the frame of the picture that she/he attempts to paint (1987, p. 9).

Reflecting on my reaction to the development threat to Juan de Fuca Marine Trail Park, I am able to see my own feelings as part of a larger affective event. I do not attempt to create a sense of scholarly objectivity here, but rather I show some of the ways in which I am located within the/a Settler project. As a white, male, Settler I participate in and benefit from Settler colonialism in particular ways. Reflexive research has the potential to descend into ‘navel-gazing,’ as many colleagues reminded me in the drafting of this project, and the task is to be reflective but also balance other views and evidence. To do so I have sought the thoughts and opinions of others within the documentary record (see the methods section below). The point is to explain Settlers to ourselves (Macoun and Strakosch, 2013) and it is this idea that informs my methodology. To offer such an explanation demands self-critique (Ellis, 2004); it also demands discussion of places, spaces, and events that Settlers may recognize as contributing to their sense of belonging. To do this I take a localized approach to the study of Settler colonialism. What I mean here is that my study is focused primarily on the local and lived experience of belonging in specific regions and specific Settler communities.

It is not my intention here to portray the study of Settler belonging as a “move to innocence” that seeks absolution for (ongoing) colonialism (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Snelgrove, Kaur Dhamoon, Corntassel, 2014). Instead, this dissertation shows that Settler

attachment to land is a material and affective phenomenon that cannot be dismissed or explained simply by the invocation of *terra nullius* or the logic of elimination. Instead, the task is to reveal the locally specific, shared, conflictual, and flexible characteristics of Settler colonialism.

Returning to the centrality of private property within Settler colonialism and the capitalist mode of production, it is important to understand that property is always part of a *particular* locality, part of a *particular* Indigenous territory (Black, 2016). In an effort to comprehend how and why specific locations were (dis)possessed, it is the study of the local that guides my research. While the study of macro processes is essential to an understanding of Settler colonialism, Settlers may reject or struggle to see themselves within a more generalized framework that seeks to explain their actions (Snelgrove, Kaur Dhamoon, Cornthassel, 2014). It is at a local level that land will be returned to Indigenous peoples and therefore my aim is to make explicit the ways in which locales that Settlers have come to identify with are bound up with *historical* and *ongoing* (dis)possession. My methodology seeks to meet Wallace Clement and Leah F. Vosko's call for Canadian political economists to "trouble and challenge conventional ways of framing issues, in particular, in the present era...ultimately for the possibility for social transformation" (2003, p. xiii).

In his exploration of nature, culture and power on the west coast of Vancouver Island, Bruce Braun (2002) adopts a genealogical approach (Foucault, 1979/1975) to understand how the rainforest has come to be viewed in complex ways. The concept of genealogy "provides a means to explode the self-evident character of things, in order to show their constitutive qualities, histories and relations...it shows the conflicts, accidents,

and practices that are constitutive of the present” (Braun, 2002, p. 20). Genealogy seeks out the origins and trajectories of the self-evident and demands the “coupling together of scholarly erudition and local memories, which allows us to constitute a historical knowledge of struggles and to make use of that knowledge in contemporary tactics” (Foucault, 2003/1997, p. 8). In part, I use historical materialism and genealogy together, because they allow for the tracing, over time, of normalized, localized, and material nature of Settler claims to Indigenous territories.

Given the temporal span of my project, I have limited my scope in particular ways (see below) in an effort to trace, unpack, and make explicit changes and continuities, or “particular tellings” (Cameron, 2015, p. 25), of Settler belonging. Still, some assumptions are necessary; that Settlers attempt to make a home on Indigenous lands, that Settlers generate feelings for land, that Settler colonialism is ongoing. Reflexivity is also important here: I have a sense of what matters to my own Settler belonging and thus have worked to unpack the ways in which that belonging is manifested and linked to broader processes. Trees are central to my own belonging and thus are a site of inquiry. I have chosen to look at trees and the forest, for example, knowing that Settlers on Vancouver Island had, and continue to have, something to say about this. However, a strictly historical study would have created a distance or gap between the past and present, resulting in a failure to comprehend if Settler belonging “then” constitutes something of Settler belonging “now.”

In conducting my research I did not infer a direct line between myself and past Settlers. I did not assume to know the historical Settler experience, but I did conduct research seeking to understand if and how a Settler experience of belonging is established.

Joan W. Scott writes of experience and argues that

it is not individuals who have experience, but subjects who are constituted through experience. Experience in this definition then becomes not the origin of our explanation, not the authoritative (because seen or felt) evidence that grounds what is known, but rather that which we seek to explain, that about which knowledge is produced. To think about experience in this way it to historicize it as well as to historicize the identities it produces (1991, p. 779-780).

My own experience as a Settler generated some of the questions and provisional assumptions I had when I began this project and, by tracing efforts to make meaning from settlement in the materials I examined, these were proven to be the case more broadly. My research showed that Settlers do attempt to make a home on Indigenous lands over time, that Settlers do generate feelings for land in complex and contradictory ways, and that Settler colonialism is ongoing. The connections that I show and the conclusions that I draw come from the tracing and uncovering of particular affective and material relations in specific documents and sites. Scott emphasizes that exploring the history of a concept “understood to be contested and contradictory” – in this case Settler belonging – “becomes the evidence by which ‘experience’ can be grasped and by which the historian’s relationship to the past he or she writes about can be articulated. This is what Foucault mean by genealogy” (1991, p. 796). In other words, it is through genealogy, historical materialism, the selection of particular foci, and the constant of geographic location that I work to reveal both shared and unshared feelings of belonging *over time*. Of course, there remain limitations to my study; I do not propose to understand all Settler feelings for land nor do I claim to identify all the ways in which Settlers carry out (dis)possession. My dissertation is specific and limited to the materials and contexts I address in my research. Nevertheless, I demonstrate complex patterns and relations that can tell us something about the texture and locality of Settler belonging.

This dissertation explores affect, materiality, and the forest staple to argue that Settler belonging is a series of affective, and at times contradictory, events and that it adjusts or adapts alongside transformations in the mode of production. To gather evidence in support of these arguments, I began with documents collected well before starting my doctorate program. Having moved from Vancouver Island to Ottawa in 2009, I signed up to receive local and regional news alerts related to keywords through my email account. These alerts were set to notify me of information related to the actions of forest companies (“TimberWest,” “Island Timberlands,” and “Western Forest Products”) in particular. I have received these alerts weekly since 2009 and they were designed to keep me apprised of the Juan de Fuca Marine Trail debate and protests against the tree farm licence removal happening on southern Vancouver Island. Around this time, I also registered for the electronic/paper newsletters of the following organizations/companies:

- Wilderness Committee
- Ancient Forest Alliance
- The Land Conservancy of British Columbia
- Couverdon Real Estate (a division of TimberWest)

While conducting research for my MA thesis in 2010, I visited the Cowichan Valley Museum and Archives in Duncan, BC to collect documents relating to conflict over forestry lands, the local forest industry, and Settler-First Nations relations. I spent several hours photocopying the ‘clipping files’ comprised of news items and letters to the editor from local newspapers. Perhaps as an overeager researcher does, I copied stacks of documents that never made it into my thesis (Black, 2011). These news alerts, newsletters, and clipping files form the foundation of this dissertation. Letters to the editor and petitions are a particular focus of chapters five, six, and seven. I have read these and other documents for what is explicit and present, particularly feeling and

conflict, and for what is implicit or absent, for example an acknowledgment of Indigenous rights and title. To read for presence, absence, and power may be described as critical discourse analysis or, in the case of archives, reading “against the grain” (Stoler, 2009). Yet, my primary interest here is not only reading for the absent or implied. I pick up on the argument of Sarah de Leeuw who demonstrates that

Working along the grain involves paying critical attention to details in the materials under scrutiny, as opposed to analyzing them predominantly for reflections of a broader sociocultural context. The difference between working ‘along’ as opposed to ‘with’ the archival grain is that, unlike the latter’s connotation of passively accepting the archival record, the former requires a committed, impassioned and emotive response to the archival record...Working along the grain, feeling the pulse of the archive, recognizing its affective nature and the affective nature of the subjects within it, offers the potential of seeing colonial settlers as more than monolithic, seamless, dispassionate, homogenous, and logical powers against which [the] subaltern subject railed...Reading along the archival grain demands investing in, not distancing oneself from, the stories extrapolated from the records being dealt with (2012, pp. 275-276).

As de Leeuw suggests, I have read archival documents and collections *along the grain* to understand the shared and personal particularities of Settler belonging. I am cognizant of the historical context in which these material and affective relations arose, but I am also aware that I share with many of the historical actors found in the archive an effort to make meaning from/at the locality in question. I agree with de Leeuw that this method can also aid an explanation of present-day Settler colonialism. The letters section in a newspaper, for example, is an important location where reading *along the grain* can yield results:

letters to the editor are reflexive, referring to language, issues, and discussion that have previously been reported and discussed in the newspaper....They define the salience of issues for readers. They indicate not just *what* people are thinking about, but *how* they are thinking about it [emphasis in original] (Hessing, 2003, p. 28).

Both historical and more recent letters, newspaper articles, correspondence, reports, and

meeting minutes from local government are the subject of inquiry in this dissertation. Other sources used include field notes and correspondence, photographs, and everyday objects such as real estate signage and park/heritage interpretation (Black, 2014a).

Local histories are central to this research and those read for this dissertation were mostly written between the 1950s and the early 1980s. These histories are largely uncritical (Reimer, 2000), at times racist, and often have little concern with Indigenous stories beyond the many tropes of colonization, such as the civilized-savage binary (c.f. Olsen, 1963). Nevertheless, local histories are studied here as both secondary and primary sources that are key to the study of (dis)possession. What I mean is that local histories offer Settler perspectives on historical events from the time they were written while, at the same time, they reveal the specific author's feelings for the past. Historians Linda Hale and Jean Barman argue that local histories have a "special importance" for the study of British Columbia:

More than any other printed sources, they document the history of existing settlements, particularly those that never achieve provincial prominence. It is at the level of the locality that the lives of ordinary British Columbians emerge most vividly from the obscurity of the past...Many local histories acquire particular value if we consider them more as source documents or primary sources than as secondary or interpretive works. However misleading or even inaccurate may be some pieces of information, they nonetheless reflect the perceptions of at least some individuals in a particular community at a particular point in time (1991, n.p.).

I do not approach these local histories uncritically. As with other sources, they are read along the grain for evidence that Settler belonging is a series of affective events. As I conducted research I began to find countless mentions of concern for the next generation(s) of Settler. I did not initially identify "generation" as a category of study, but reading for affect revealed the ways in which Settler belonging is a generational

phenomenon, fostered and maintained in particularly local ways. Graham Carr argues that “generational motifs” represent a “biological and social continuum that imprints the character of the past on to the future...to activate the space between memory and history while simultaneously blurring the distinctions between them” (2006, p. 59). It is the perception of continuity that accompanies the discourse of generations that is integral to belonging as it provides a reason to work at affective attachment and is a reassurance that this work will be carried forward. Andrew Baldwin argues that “various forms of whiteness are shaped by discourses of futurity” (2012, p. 184) and it is the discourse of acting for future Settlers that is constitutive of a particularly white Settler project.

Given the complexities and variables involved in making meaning, both historically and in the present, I have also examined these local histories for material-affective linkages and waypoints (such as the Kinsol Trestle) and linked these with successive manifestations of feeling. The idea is to reveal (dis)possession’s intersections and transformations and to make explicit the connection between the past, present, and attempted future of belonging.

In addition to these sources, I also conducted original research at the Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives. To find information about the creation of parks and recreation sites I completed a research access agreement and was granted permission to view restricted files related to the British Columbia Heritage Conservation Branch (GR 2940) and the British Columbia Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division (GR 1991 and GR 1614). These records offer insights into state decision making regarding parks, heritage, and recreation sites and, most importantly, they contain a large amount of correspondence from the public regarding demands for park creation. My work with

these collections informs much of chapters five, six, and seven and the findings stemming from this research contribute to the study of parks in the province. As per the research agreement, individual identifiers found in the records have been removed. I also looked at fonds pertaining to Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway belt lands (GR 0791), the Department of Lands and Works (GR 0868), the British Columbia Land Settlement Board (GR 0929), the Premier's papers from 1883-1933 (GR 0441), and the Commission on Forest Resources, 1943-1945 (GR-0520). Except for the Premier's papers (GR 0441), research agreements were not needed for these records.

Choosing which documents and words to analyze involved a further narrowing of my focus. To do so, I have developed the concept of (dis)possession within the following framework:

- Plants (especially invasive species, trees/the forest)
- Staple Resource Extraction
- Roads and Railways
- Parks and Recreation Sites
- Real Estate Development

In the chapters that follow, I demonstrate the ways in which these areas reveal a particular project of (dis)possession. I have chosen this framework as I believe it best captures belonging as locally manifested by Settlers through their exploitation *and* conservation of land. It is possible to explain (dis)possession with different, related, or overlapping parameters, but the key basis for these categories is *territorially specific* land. Racism, whiteness, or nationalism, for example, could be included as categories of analysis, but these are not the main focus of my framework. Let me be clear: I do not mean to state that these or other relations are not factors in (dis)possession – they are (Anderson, 1991; Harris, 1993; Peake & Ray, 2001; Razack, 2002; Edmonds, 2010a;

Baldwin, 2012; Simpson, 2016a). However, an examination of their specifically local material and affective qualities would be a different dissertation. Nevertheless, it is necessary to name this project as one that is focused primarily upon a Settler colonialism that is white and working class. However, I have not left out the examples of racialized Settlers that I encountered during my research. In the text and various footnotes, I show that Settlers of colour were/are bound up with a Settler project. I recognize that this participation was/is also subject to the prejudice and control of a white Settler project and global processes of colonization and displacement. I do not claim to know or study the belonging of various racialized persons and, although potentially similar to white Settler belonging in some ways, I acknowledge that analysis of racialized (dis)possession requires an additional and modified set of questions be asked (Lawrence & Dua, 2011; Phung, 2011; Bhatia, 2013). Melissa Phung observes that “relying on monolithic notions of the term ‘settler’ runs the risk of reducing settler-Indigenous relations to overly simplistic binary models of thinking” (2011, p. 296) and I include the examples of Settlers of colour encountered in my research to repel this binary and offer potential sites for further study.

The interdisciplinary study of fluid and complex relations requires limitations and, as such, this study is further limited in its geographic scope. Terms such as “community,” “local,” and “region” are not easily defined and are often disputed (Amato, 2002; Keil & Kipfer, 2003; Herbert, 2005; Dupeyron, 2008; Harris, 2010; Major & Winters, 2013). This dissertation focuses on southern Vancouver Island, specifically the Cowichan Valley and the Sooke-Juan de Fuca regions. These descriptions are not fixed and may bring to mind certain cities and towns, depending on the reader and their familiarity with the area.

Take, for example, the Cowichan Valley. In the colonial period, “Cowichan,” anglicized from the Hul’qumi’num word Quwutsun, meaning “the warm land” (Marshall, 1999), was used to refer to First Nations and their territories in the valley. As settlement increased in the late nineteenth century, “Cowichan” referred both to a surveyed land district, a bay, a lake, and a valley, a particular hamlet (known today as Cowichan Station), and to the portion of the region south of the Cowichan River (Norcross, 1975; The Pioneer Researchers, 1986). Today, the Cowichan Valley Regional District, local government for the region, covers an area far greater than any historical description (Cowichan Valley Regional District, n.d.). All of these descriptions appear at some point in the sources used, though the exact meaning may not be apparent to all readers.

Despite a variety of legal and affective boundaries, association with a particular descriptor or location has relevance to the study of local history/histories. In the 1963 local history *Water Over the Wheel*, author W.H. Olsen describes the shifting boundaries and meanings of “Cowichan” and “Chemainus” (the latter being located in the present-day Municipality of North Cowichan):

In spite of the Victoria newspapers’ tendency to report Chemainus events as Cowichan news, (a failing that still endures) the pioneers of this area stubbornly maintained they lived in the Chemainus District, not the Cowichan...Newcomers had no objection to the idea that Chemainus was a mere appendage to the vaguely-defined Cowichan District. To many of them, the name Cowichan had a connotation of refinement not provided by Chemainus, a place known to be populated mainly by mill-hands (pp. 110-111).

We can see here that the definition of a locality is messy; it shifts over time and can be a subjective pursuit. In providing a map for the reader (see figure 1), I have chosen boundaries based on where the majority of my research takes place. In a more precise way, I look at particular locations within these regions, such as parks, roads, and housing

developments to provide what might be called a hyper-local or micro focus (Gizburg, 1993; Sandwell, 2005). At times I discuss other cities and areas on Vancouver Island, including Victoria, Ladysmith, Nanaimo, and the Comox Valley.

In the way I started this introduction, with a reflection of my time working on the Kinsol Trestle exhibit, anecdotes of my own Settler belonging are interspersed throughout. In some cases these are taken from memories and experiences within the areas I am writing about, in others they are derived from past conversations with family members and friends. In *The Ethnographic I*, Carolyn Ellis explains that there are various types of autoethnography:

Essentially, reflexive/narrative ethnographies focus on a culture or sub-culture and authors use their life story in that culture to look more deeply at self-other interactions...The researcher's personal experience is also important for how it illuminates the culture under study (2004, p. 47).

A primary method of reflection employed in this dissertation is through the use of short vignettes. The technique of reflexive or autoethnographic vignettes has been shown to “enrich the story, ethnography, or case study and enhance the reflexivity of the methodology” (Humphreys, 2005, p. 853). The use of vignettes is also a stylistic element used in many of the local histories I examine. These are often organized as a series of short stories that discuss everything from early pioneer families to a town's first car; rarely are they compiled thematically or chronologically. I have undertaken a similar approach in that my reflexive vignettes are not necessarily included in chapters for their contribution to a specific timeline or event. Instead, these vignettes function to place myself and my relationships within the project of (dis)possession.

Although a discussion of methodology and methods suggests an organized and planned undertaking, many of the sources used in this dissertation were encountered in

the everyday movements of my life as a Settler on Vancouver Island. As I began to know more about Settler colonialism I also began to see it as a nearly ubiquitous force; local histories, invasive plants, roads, and plaques that may have been otherwise overlooked became linked to my study. For example, chapter one takes its title, “Tough Beginnings,” from a heritage interpretation sign I encountered on a visit to Botanical Beach Provincial Park; the visit that day had nothing to do with research, I was simply hiking with friends. Yet, in stopping to read the sign, the words and images evoked a historical sense of belonging in the area. As Donna Haraway notes, “Feminist objectivity is about limited location and situated knowledge, not about trans-cendence and splitting of subject and object. It allows us to become answerable for what we learn how to see” (1988, p. 583). The point here is that reflexivity allowed me to shift the lens of Settler colonialism to my surroundings, not just to the documents I thought I should study. In this way, reflexivity, and my lived experience of reflecting on Settler colonialism, is both my methodology and a method (Scott, 1991). This evokes Sara Ahmed’s concept of an “unhappy archives” that “take shape through the circulation of cultural objects that articulate unhappiness with the history of happiness” (2010, p. 18). Ahmed notes that this concept of an archive is “assembled out of encounters, taking form as a memory trace of where we have been....So my archive is also my world, my life-world, my past as well as present” (2010, p. 19). I describe my method/ology as *reflective encounter*. While the plaque at Botanical Beach interested me because its content relates to my research interests, it cannot be said that its inclusion here stems from an organized and conscious effort to seek it out. In fact, the discussion of this park’s creation in chapter six stems mainly from the questions raised by my encounter with this sign.

Adapting the concept of an “archive of feelings” from Ann Cvetkovich (2003), I describe this dissertation as an archive of *belonging*. Through reflective encounter, personal reflection, family stories, and original primary document research, the contents of this manuscript and the range of sources consulted, taken together, constitute such an archive.¹¹ This archive of belonging, however, is not fixed to me (Ahmed, 2004b). My family, friends, and many others familiar with the geography featured here will find events, objects, and feelings that are attributes of their own personal and familial belonging. “Records are not memories. Rather, they are triggers or touchstones that lead to the recollection of past events. And there is not a one to one relationship between the record kept and the memory it stimulates” (Millar, 2006, p. 114). As the creator of this archive of belonging, I have brought together seemingly disparate records and encounters, personal and public, to argue that belonging must be identified and accounted for in order to understand its role within Settler colonialism. Among my affective responsibilities (Caswell & Cifor, 2016) to this archive of belonging is that I must not shield my personal relationships from an identification with (dis)possession, but rather carefully associate otherwise banal documents, objects, and actions with ongoing Settler colonialism.

To conclude, it is through this reflexive and interdisciplinary methodology that I track material and affective social relations. This research agenda has helped me to develop the argument that Settler belonging is generational and that it is entrenched and expanded through a variety of shared, personal, conflictual, and affective events.

¹¹ Although the terms “affect,” “emotion,” and “feeling” can have varied meanings, they are used in this dissertation as alike terms (Stearns & Stearns, 1985; Ellis, 1991; Rosenwein, 2002; Cvetkovich, 2012, pp. 4-5).

Chapter Layout

Each chapter that follows is designed to link up with and build upon the evidence detailed in the section that came before. In literary terms, the dissertation is designed to reflect the ‘rising action’ of a plot, wherein each chapter introduces a set of events that creates interest in their culmination – in this case, chapters seven and eight. This structure, while generally chronological, traces the processes of (dis)possession to reveal the influence of the past in the present.

Chapter one argues that Settler belonging is, in part, a series of contradictory and affective events. I compare Settlers to the invasive Scotch broom plant to explain that Settlers take root and spread across the landscape through material and affective cultivation. This chapter looks at the founding of the Colony of Vancouver Island (approximately 1842-1858) and argues that trees and the landscapes of Vancouver Island were factors in Settler efforts to remove Indigenous peoples from the land and, simultaneously and anxiously, belong to the land. I show that (dis)possession is not a single event (Wolfe, 2006), but rather a series of events, worked at over time as part of a Settler project upon which subsequent generations are encouraged to embrace and expand. Scotch broom, as a metonym for Settler colonialism, is an explanatory device used throughout the dissertation.¹² Primarily, this first section sets up the key threads that are taken up in each subsequent chapter.

In chapter two I examine the arrival of the HMS *Hecate* and the first large group of Settlers to the Cowichan Valley in 1862. This is the region where I grew up and I

¹² As an explanatory device, the metonym of Scotch broom is not used here to normalize or justify colonization (cf: Merchant, 1996). I do not suggest that Scotch broom, and therefore the Settler, is a natural successor to native plants/Indigenous peoples. Scotch broom, like Settler colonialism, has failed in its effort to eliminate (Simpson, 2011). The point is to demonstrate and draw out the processes of Settler colonialism’s spread and not to echo historical justifications for ecological imperialism and colonization.

focus on land alienation, road building, agriculture, and Settler descriptions of the forest to trace the ways in which Settlers worked to establish and expand a regime of property known as “home.” My key argument is that understanding material, emotional, and locally specific manifestations of home is integral to revealing the generational nature of Settler belonging. I make this point through a focus on the transformation from subsistence agriculture to wage labour and staple trade/industry in the fledgling settlement of Cowichan. Using archival records and local histories, I argue that the staple’s stamp – its geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political imprint – will influence, and is influenced by, existing property relations, affective/collective attachment, and the Settler relationship with the forest. I conclude the chapter with a reflexive vignette that makes an affective connection between my first childhood home, its surrounding roads, and early colonization.

Chapter three focuses on the creation of the Esquimalt & Nanaimo (E&N) Railway in 1886 and the transformation in the mode/relations of production – from subsistence agriculture to staple extraction – that followed. I focus on the E&N land grant, which privatized nearly two million acres of southern Vancouver Island, and the ensuing conflict over property rights between Settlers, monopoly capital, and the state. Central to this chapter is my argument that the land grant was not a single event; instead the grant must be understood as a waypoint, a fluid and ongoing feature of settlement on Vancouver Island. By understanding the grant as an event that led to countless other (dis)possession events, I demonstrate that private property is both the advent of and a potential threat to Settler belonging. I also provide a vignette of my Great-Grandfather’s

farm at Little River to reveal my familial ties to the ways in which the land grant and the stamp of staple extraction intersect, root, bind, and spread (dis)possession.

Chapter four explores changes in the means of production – the tools and infrastructure used to develop the forest staple industry – and changes to the mode of production, specifically from independent extraction to state-organized sustained yield forestry. The chapter is focused on the reduction of Indian Reserves, specifically as carried out by the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs in British Columbia (1913-1924), or McKenna – McBride Commission, and the findings of the Royal Commission on Forest Resources, or Sloan Commission (1943-1945). I argue that reserve reductions were an effort to maximize lands available for the creation of beneficial economic linkages. I show that staple linkages are territorially specific and rely upon broader processes of Settler colonialism. Changes in the mode/means of production, particularly the introduction of steam power, truck logging, and tree farm licences, created material-affective linkages that are personal, classed, generational, and bound with efforts to make legitimate the Settler presence. These linkages, both material-affective and economic, are integral to the project of (dis)possession. A critical point explained in this chapter is that the alienation of the forest resource prior to the First World War occurred in such a way that it had the effect of privatizing large sections of land. In this same period, E&N grant lands came to be owned by forest companies, creating a property regime of private forestlands that has led to ongoing conflict. I address this conflict in the successive chapters.

In chapters five and six I discuss the creation of parks and recreation sites in the Sooke-Juan de Fuca and Cowichan regions. Beginning with parks created during the

‘long-boom,’ approximately 1945 to 1980, I show how Settlers clashed with the extractive economy in often contradictory attempts to foster generational belonging to land. Settlers frequently wrote to the provincial Parks Branch to demand the creation of parks and recreation sites. As forestry corporations owned most proposed sites, park creation became an opportunity for forest capital to dispose of already logged or unproductive lands in exchange for forestlands elsewhere. These lands swaps offered a “spatial fix” (Harvey, 2001) for forest capital and for Settlers. That is, forestry corporations were granted new spaces of accumulation while Settlers gained new spaces to foster affective attachment. I place these events within the context of the Province of British Columbia and Canada’s ongoing denial of Indigenous rights and title. Chapter five introduces the creation of the regional district system of local governance to set the stage for a later discussion (chapters seven and eight) about the ways that local government makes (dis)possession possible. I also argue that parks act as and contain waypoints where belonging is encountered and (re)created to the benefit of future Settlers. Similarly, chapter six argues that economic recession, environmental degradation, and increasing recognition of Indigenous peoples during the 1980s and 1990s spurred Settler belonging to be worked *at* and *out* in new, often anxious, ways. Through the example of Sombrio Beach and Juan de Fuca Provincial Park, I show that the working out of Settler belonging is subject to the classed and contradictory nature of inter-Settler conflict and political economic transformation. This chapter also features a vignette about the Arbutus Ridge real estate development and my childhood home. What is key among these examples is the finding that Settler feelings are *put into action* by real or perceived threats to belonging.

In a combination and recombination of the threads analyzed in chapters one through six, chapters seven and eight are case studies that demonstrate the ways in which (dis)possession changes, manifests, and clashes with class relations and the stamp of staple extraction. Chapter seven examines the provincial government's 2007 decision to allow Western Forest Products to remove and sell its properties from tree farm licences (TFL) in the Sooke-Juan de Fuca region. I argue that the reverberatory effects of the Alberta bitumen bubble (approximately 2000 to 2011) are essential to understanding this TFL removal and the proposed real estate developments that followed. Building upon the work of David Harvey and Mel Watkins, I find that land in the form of real estate acts as an *auxiliary staple linkage* during crises of capital accumulation. I argue that this form of linkage does not break the trap of a boom/bust cycle for those working in the extractive economy, but rather serves the needs of capital. The conflict that arose from these TFL land sales led to class conflict and the entrenchment of belonging; in turn, the interests of First Nations in these lands were passed along what I call a *circle of culpability*, wherein issues of rights and title are found to be the responsibility of 'someone else.' This allows Settlers/capital/the state time to carry out (dis)possession while First Nations rights and title are subsumed into the unbroken circle. In chapter eight I pick up these concepts as they pertain to the sale of private forestlands for real estate development in the Cowichan region. Present-day treaty negotiations do not include private property, a criteria that impedes negotiations, particularly for First Nations on Vancouver Island whose territories fall within the E&N land grant and historically alienated forestlands. I examine the role of local government in determining the use and development of these uncaded lands and, using the example of logging roads, I show how a perception of entitled access to private

forestry lands leads to conflict and the entrenchment of belonging that continues (dis)possession. In both chapters, I find that class analysis offers insight into Settler belonging as the perception of class position during land use conflicts designates insiders and outsiders and helps Settler identify those who may pose a threat to the past/present/future of belonging. In concluding,

What follows this introduction is a reflexive, political economic, and genealogical framework for understanding how the locality of Settler belonging transforms over time. To conclude the dissertation, I return to the metonym of Scotch broom and make the case for understanding Settlers as an invasive species who form an attachment to land that is simultaneously individual, shared, classed, contradictory, and local. I summarize my conclusions to show that Settler belonging is a generational process, one that seeks out local and territorially specific ways to maintain the attachment to land into the future. I argue that tracing the material and affective nature of Settler belonging contributes nuance to our understanding of the Settler project's broader processes. To explain Settlers to ourselves, I make a case for linking feeling with anti-capitalist and class critique. Finally, I gesture toward ways that Settlers might begin to unravel belonging and envision new pathways toward the respectful relations with Indigenous peoples.

Chapter One: Tough Beginnings

At the entrance to Botanical Beach in Juan de Fuca Provincial Park, an interpretive sign greets visitors to the park. Located in a small pull out area at the top of the short road to the parking lot, the sign would be easily missed in the descent to the famous tide pools on this corner of Vancouver Island. Titled “Tough Beginnings,” the sign is significant for the origin story it is meant to provide visitors. In part, the sign reads: “During the 1880’s, on the strength of a promised road from Sooke to Port Renfrew, homesteaders settled here in the San Juan Valley.” On the sign, photographs with captions describing logging operations and early modes of transportation are the substance of these rugged origin stories. It is common to encounter this trope of the hardy Settler on Vancouver Island. With an emphasis on resource extraction and carving out an existence,

Figure 4: Botanical Beach Provincial Park interpretation sign, Port Renfrew, BC.

signs such as the one at Botanical Beach are characteristic of Settler colonialism; they present the Settler as original and give passing acknowledgment to, or simply ignore altogether, the presence of First Nations peoples.

For the Pacheedaht First Nation, Botanical Beach is called ?apsawa? and was the site of a winter village (Pacheedaht First Nation, n.d.). Choosing instead to begin with the

first Settlers, the sign describes settlement as enmeshed with the transformation of the forest resource into a commodity. In this example, the absence of the Pacheedaht and the narrative of “tough beginnings” presents Settlers as making something – a home, a community, an economy – from little more than the resources around them. This is more than simply a gesture to *terra nullius* typical of settlement discourse; the implication is that what the visitor encounters during their visit to the park and region *follows from* this difficult starting point. That is, over time, Settlers have created and developed connections to land by making meaning through material practices. To break apart the self-evident narrative of settlement, this chapter ‘begins at the beginning’ with a summary of imperial exploration and establishment of the Colony of Vancouver Island (approximately 1842 to 1862). I demonstrate the ways in which the territorial dispossession of First Nations peoples occurs simultaneously with anxious efforts to possess, and therefore belong-to, the land (Adese, 2012; Regan, 2010; Mackey 2014).

I am particularly interested in how forests and trees, as landscape and commodity, and introduced plant species, as representations of a home-away, become bound up with Settler processes of (dis)possession, defined here as the taking and ongoing possession of land. As an invasive and colonizing shrub that arrived early in the colony’s founding, I see Scotch broom as a metonym for Settler colonialism on Vancouver Island. When Scotch broom takes root, only a sustained attack involving cutting and pulling can eliminate it from a patch of ground. Even if a small piece of land is reclaimed, the plant remains a constant and encompassing threat. In 1971, the Sooke and North Sooke Women’s Institute described broom as a “permanent memorial” (p. 11) to settlement, but

I see broom as a permanent reminder of ongoing (dis)possession. Broom, like Settlers, invaded and it is here to stay (Asch, 2014).

In this chapter, I lay a historical foundation for the argument that Settler belonging is, in part, a series of contradictory and affective events that take root and spread through material and emotional cultivation. By contradictory, I mean that the events and processes that Settlers call upon to root themselves do not always work in concert or originate from the same goals. To explain this, I trace the place of trees and plants, beginning with the arrival of Captain James Cook in 1778 and ending with the fledgling Colony of Vancouver Island in the 1850s. I reveal the material and affective role that flora play in the narrative of Settler origins, the encouragement/discouragement, of belonging, and the making of ‘home.’

Arriving to Stay

Apocryphal voyages to the Northwest coast are a foundational part of the “discovery” narrative prevalent in the historiography of the Pacific Northwest (Reimer, 2009; Gough, 2012). Preceded by independent traders and other visitors, the Spanish anchored at Nootka Sound in 1774 and traded with the Nuuchah-nulth peoples. This anchorage, and subsequent claims of possession by both the Spanish and British, launched the place into the European imagination (Clayton, 2000). In British Columbia, the 1778 arrival of Captain James Cook at Nootka Sound features prominently in the narrative of settlement as Cook and his men were the “first” to come ashore and document this part of the coast for British interests (Norcross & Tonkin, 1969; Lillard, 1993). Aside from general information and supply gathering, Cook’s crew also fell a tree for use as a new mast. Through a dioramic recreation of this event, the British Columbia Forest Discovery Centre in the Cowichan Valley tells visitors that the cutting of spars by

Cook's crew "was the first recorded use of British Columbia's forest resources by Europeans" (field notes). In Cook's diaries, the trees of Nootka Sound are noted for both their sublime aesthetic and economic features (Currie, 1994, p. 82). However, given that "British Columbia" was not in existence when Cook visited, to describe the forest as *belonging to* the province reveals the foundational place of the forest in the origin stories of Settler colonialism.

In 1792, British Captain George Vancouver and Spanish Captain Bodega y Quadra revealed that Nootka was actually next to a much larger island which they named Vancouver and Quadra's Island.¹³ Botanist Archibald Menzies, on board HMS *Discovery*, made many detailed observations of the region's landscape, flora, and fauna. However, Menzies could only speculate at the ways that plants and trees were used by Indigenous peoples (Gorsline, 1992, p. 38). He did, however, recognize non-Indigenous resource extraction when he saw it:

In strolling about the verge of the wood with some of the officers, we saw several stumps of small trees as if they had been cut down with an Axe [sic] not many months ago, from this it was thought probable that some other Vessel might have been here before us, as I never observed the Natives on any part of this coast make use of an Axe in felling of Timber or any kind preferring always an Instrument of their own construction somewhat in the form of a small adze which hackd [sic] it in a very different manner from an Axe (as cited in Gorsline, 1992, p. 39).

Whatever the reason for this small cut block, Menzies' journal entry provides an early example of the visual contrast between Indigenous and non-Indigenous forest practices. This recognition, however, was not always extended to landscapes modified by Indigenous use. Certain of these spaces were frequently described by Menzies and others as natural lawns, plains, or prairies and became symbolic of the potential for cultivation

¹³ Shortly thereafter, Quadra was dropped from the name.

and settlement (Grant, 1857, p. 272; Gorsline, 1992, pp. 39-40; Mackie, 1995, p. 70). Menzies' observations exhibit the ways in which the British imperial/colonial project viewed material practices, especially gardens and specific ways of labouring the land, as techniques of possession (Seed, 1995, p. 29).

To see a potential ship's mast or farming site in the land stands in stark contrast with Indigenous ways of being and knowing. In the forests of Vancouver Island, trees modified through First Nation cultural practices stand as a testament to these divergent worldviews (British Columbia [BC] Archaeology Branch, 2001). For example, T'Souke Nation elder Susan Lazzar Johnson describes working to collect cedar branches for basket making:

My Grandma, before we start cutting down she says, 'Wait now. We'll talk.' So she'd talk – look up at the tree and then she'd say she's here to get some of that branches off so we'll use it for making our baskets. She'd say 'Thank you, Thank you.' She'd have a little – could be a stone, it could be a shell. You use that and just throw it to the tree and it will land down on the ground there. And after she got through praying, she'd tell me to start cutting. She'd point at the right ones. You got to know which ones to get. The best one, it's the one that the branch goes toward the ground, like that, and there's no leaves on it. Nothing on there up until you get close to the end and then you see the new little ones. It's easy to split it then. That's one little thing I learned not too long ago (Johannesson, 1990, p. 26).

This oral history reveals the intimate knowledge and ceremony involved in selecting trees for particular uses. As local sources for everything from medicine, food, housing, clothing, and transportation, trees and plants represent a presence on the land since time immemorial. Cultural modifications to the land were inconspicuous to many non-Indigenous visitors who brought with them their own distantly-formed values, and valuations, relating to the flora and fauna of what became known as Vancouver Island. In this way, we can begin to unsettle the idea that there is anything original in the way Cook and other visitors encountered the land.

In 1842, HBC Chief Factor James Douglas recommended that the territories of the Lekwungen¹⁴ peoples, on the southern tip of Vancouver Island, become the location for a new Hudson's Bay Company fort. The HBC had been forced to relocate from Fort Vancouver due to the increasing presence of American settlers in the Oregon territory and Douglas described "Fort Camosack,"¹⁵ later Fort Victoria, as a "perfect 'Eden,' in the midst of the dreary

Figure 5: The purple flower of the camas.

wilderness of the Northwest Coast" (as cited in Edmonds, 2010a, p. 95). Douglas chose this site, in part, based on its agricultural potential and Edenic oak meadows (Corntassel & Bryce, 2012). In the spring, these meadows are recognized by the purple blooms of the camas lily, and the edible bulbs of the camas have long been an important source of food for Salish peoples. The landscape Douglas described was extensively managed and cultivated by the Lekwungen, particularly through controlled burning and species selection (Acker, 2012, p. 13), and it was exactly this cultivation that led Douglas to describe the area as a paradise on earth (Cavers, 2008). Despite, or perhaps because of, its reference to a nearly empty and untouched land, "perfect Eden" is a frequently quoted line that has become synonymous with the exploration and settlement of southern Vancouver Island (cf: Layland, 2016).

¹⁴ Today known as the Songhees Nation.

¹⁵ From the Lekwungen "Camossung," a sacred site on the Gorge Waterway, named for a girl turned to stone by the creator there (Keddie, 1991).

The oak trees Douglas identified were later named Garry oaks for HBC employee Nicholas Garry. The namesake never set foot on Vancouver Island. He did, however, write of his affinity for the North American oak:

A beautiful Oak on the Banks of the Water brought to my mind England and all I love...The Sight of Oak never fails to produce this Effect and has the same Influence on the Feelings which the meeting with a Country-man in a distant Clime has on the Spirits (Garry, 1900).

In this excerpt, Garry reveals the oak's affecting qualities and the potential for a tree or landscape to stir up feeling. To Douglas, and the Settlers that followed, the meadows of Coast Salish territories were not signs of an intricately managed ecosystem; rather, they became proxies for the pastoral beauty of a distant home. As such, these verdant landscapes evoked sentiment and became a *tabula rasa* for Settler beginnings (Pelly, 1846). The point here is that the identification of and with flora, while characteristic of the imperial/colonial project, is taken up in local and territorially specific ways by Settler colonialism.

Fort Victoria and its environs were developed based on the needs of a changing fur trade and a changing imperialism (Mackie, 1992-1993, 1997; Mouat, 2005; Gough, 2012-2013). However, increasing pressure to establish a sovereign British presence in the Pacific Northwest led the Crown to grant a five year charter to the HBC in 1849. The company was required to establish a settlement using E. Gibbon Wakefield's principles of colonization.¹⁶ For a rent of seven shillings per year, the HBC received total control of

¹⁶ Marx expressed his contempt for Wakefield's ill-fated theory of colonization in *Capital*: "How then can the anti-capitalist cancer of the colonies be healed? If men were willing to turn the whole of the land from public into private property at one blow, this would certainly destroy the root of the evil, but it would also destroy – the colony. The trick is to kill two birds with one stone. Let the government set an artificial price on the virgin soil, a price independent of the law of supply and demand, a price that compels the immigrant to work a long time for wages before he can earn enough money to buy land and turn himself into an independent farm. The fund resulting from the sale of land at a price relatively prohibitory for the wage-labourers, this fund of money extorted from the wages of labour by a violation of the sacred law of supply

the Island, the rights to all minerals, and all revenues from land sales. Captain Walter Colquhoun Grant, styled by historians as the first Settler independent of the HBC (Ireland, 1953; Hendrickson, 1975; Lillard, 1993), described the Island's landscape as "wild without being romantic, and which, from the absence of any bold outline, never approach to the sublime or the beautiful" (1857, p. 272). When he arrived in the Colony of Vancouver Island in 1850, Dr. J.S. Helmcken shared a similar perspective: "[the coastline was] forbidding altho grand - nothing but mountains on both sides wooded to the top – they appeared weird and gloomy" (Blakey-Smith, 1975, p. 79). Descriptively, these recollections share much in common with Captain Cook's diary entries for Nootka. The difference, however, is that Grant and Helmcken were not 'discoverers,' they intended to stay as Settlers (Veracini, 2010). Viewed from the deck of a ship, the density of trees became a source of anxiety that made flat and open spaces (many of which were a result of Indigenous agricultural practices) a striking and easing presence. When Settlers arrived on Vancouver Island, belonging to land, making a home, required both emotional and physical cultivation.

A Permanent Memorial

It all started from a handful of seeds. On a trip to Hawaii in the early 1850s, Captain Grant received a package of Scotch broom seeds from the British consul there. Grant settled at Sooke in 1849, and upon his return to the Colony of Vancouver Island, he planted the broom – a reminder of his distant Scottish home. At least, that's how the story has been told (Lee, 2010, p. 2). In an environmental history of the plant, Troy Lee notes

and demand, is to be applied to the government, in proportion to its growth, to the importation of paupers from Europe into the colonies, so as to keep the wage-labour market full for the capitalists....The land-price laid down by the state must of course be 'sufficient', i.e. it must be high enough 'to prevent the labourers from becoming independent landowners until others had followed to take their place'. This 'sufficient price for land' is nothing but a euphemistic circumlocution for the ransom which the worker must pay to the capitalist in return for permission to retire from the wage-labour market to the land" (1977, pp. 938-939).

that Grant may or may not have been the originator of the seeds, nor can he be held primarily responsible for its proliferation (2010, p. 3). In the local history *At the Foot of the Hill (Cobble Hill History)*, written in 1982, author Adelaide Barry Ellis writes of Scotch broom:

Weeds came too, some as stow-a-ways, and some brought for memories of home. The broom, for one. The Helgeson family of Sooke are said to have brought seed, and J.F. Pemberton as well. Mr. Pemberton was one of the early motorists and could often be seen tearing along, at all of twenty-five miles per hour, his white hair flying. He was blamed for scattering seed along the Malahat. But what could be more beautiful than a hillside covered with the golden glow of broom in May? (p. 69).

Whatever broom's origins on the Island, the persistence of these stories reveals a desire to select and promote particular narratives of settlement, such as the struggle and progress of the hardy pioneer and the founding moment of a Settler community (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 28). Today, the Coastal Invasive Species Committee (2016) and the Invasive Species Council of BC (2014) classify Scotch broom as an invasive species, but it has not always been viewed as a threat. The local history *Sooke – Past and Present* explains that Grant “left us a permanent memorial in the clouds of golden broom which no doubt will continue to delight Vancouver Islanders for many centuries to come” (Sooke & North Sooke Women's Institute, 1971, p. 11). A perennial shrub, Scotch broom, or *Cytisus scoparius*, can reproduce either vegetatively or by seed and it grows in abundance in disturbed sites, especially clearings and bluffs, along roadsides, and in fields. In the spring and early summer, broom is heavy with bright yellow flowers, making its presence known on the landscape. Broom is allelopathic, meaning it displaces native species through resource competition and changes the chemistry of the soil to influence their growth and survival (Muir & Vamosi, 2015). I argue that it is this behaviour that is part of the processes of Settler colonialism.

Within their first year at Sooke, Grant and his indentured labour, brought as part of the HBC colonization scheme, had cleared land and begun farming (Grant, 1857, p. 274). If Grant did plant the few broom seeds he received, they likely took little time to invade the landscape surrounding the homestead. Well established by the 1870s (Lee, 2010, p. 4), the plant took over as Settlers took over – establishing itself and choking out native plants where the land had been ‘improved’ or brought under cultivation.

The circulation of seeds and plant specimens between colony and metropole was commonplace during the colonial project (Cook, 1990-1991; Beinart & Middleton, 2004; Ginn, 2008; Lee, 2010; Baber, 2016; Taylor, 2017). Four decades after his arrival in 1850, Dr. J.S. Helmcken recalled:

I had daisies – the first was brought to Victoria by Captain Mouat from California in a little garden pot and I paid one dollar for it – a red one, double. The single daisies were imported from Scotland by Douglas in seed – and the shamrock by Mr. Work – the thistle was an accidental coming – but no one supposed that the daisies or the thistles would have become the troublesome critters they now are. I recollect the first one that grew in my garden accidentally – it was looked on with great favour – probably came in the grass or other seed from the old country (Blakey-Smith, 1975, p. 133).

Helmcken’s recollections reveal both the shared and individual connection between particular plants and particular Settlers. John Work, born in Ireland, brought the shamrock, Mouat and Douglas daisies – each in an attempt to cultivate their presence and a home. These seeds and plants arrived via Settlers and ships in the service of Empire and the staple trade. In *The Fur Trade In Canada*, Innis emphasizes the early Settler’s reliance on the relationship between metropole and the hinterland:

If those needs [of the Settler] are to be supplied he will be forced to rely on goods which are obtainable from the mother country. These goods were obtained from the homeland by direct transportation as in the movement of settlers’ effects and household goods, involving no direct transfer of ownership, or through gifts and missionary supplies, but the most important device was trade (1999/1930, p. 384).

Herein is the core of the staples economy: the raw resource is transported to the metropole in return for manufactured goods. Yet, the circuit of exchange in flora was not a direct line from Victoria to London. Grant received his broom seeds from the British counsel to Hawaii and Settler colonials frequently imported plants and other goods from California, Kew Gardens in London, and other places around the world (Lillard, 1993, p. 84; Blakey-Smith, 1975, p. 134; Lee, 2010, p. 3; Wickham, 2012). Zaheer Baber argues that

in addition to gardens and plants, a number of heterogeneous networks connecting the colonies to Europe facilitated the transfer of expertise, experience, and botanical knowledge in complex and contradictory ways. There was circulation, not just of plants but also of institutions, expertise, knowledge – practical and tacit, as well as formal, from the colonies to Europe and vice-versa (2016, p. 671).

The transfer of flora reflects the patterns of transfer that characterize the Settler colonial project (Veracini, 2010). However, the circulation of plants was not only scientific and economic, and understanding the affective qualities of certain plants makes explicit the Settler effort to create a sense of belonging (Wickham, 2012; Rifkin, 2016). This effort is a contradictory one: some native flora become signifiers of a Settler home-away; other plants are imported and intended for cultivation, both emotional and physical; still others are brought or spread by accident, while plants once desired by Settlers are targeted for elimination as “invasive species.” Like broom, belonging spreads to sites where Settlers have disturbed the land. Traced over time, the Settler perspective on broom and invasive species is contradictory, but we can also see that this contradiction is a part of the process of working out, and at, Settler belonging.

Daisies, Scotch broom, thistles and other invasives are directly linked to the political economy of the staple trade and the affective wants of Settlers. Like broom,

Settler society had to take root, establish itself as a colonizing presence and, to the greatest extent possible, take over land. Claiming native trees and importing seeds were acts of (dis)possession; that is, they were material and affective events that took the land and fostered possession. These acts were inherent to the claim for Indigenous territories and a first attempt at cultivating belonging. This attempt, however, was an anxious one – the Settler was trapped between developing feelings for their present home and their existing feelings for a home-away.¹⁷

A Staple Shift

As the capital of a Crown colony, the early political and social life of Victoria was largely controlled by Chief Factor/Governor James Douglas and the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC). The company owes its existence to monopoly control and the HBC did little to encourage settlement as dictated by its corporate charter. Fort Victoria's environs were granted to top company men and the Puget Sound Agricultural Company, a HBC subsidiary (Barman, 2010a, p. 60). These lands were developed as estates and cultivated to serve the mechanics of the fur trade. When intending Settlers such as Grant arrived seeking agricultural land, there was little to be found outside of Douglas' HBC-occupied "perfect Eden." Barriers to settlement – the cost of travel to the colony, the high price of land compared to that available in the American west, and the remoteness of potential settlement areas from Victoria – kept Victoria's population low and intimately connected with the HBC (Blakey-Smith, 1975, p. 118; Lillard, 1993, p. 93; Van Kirk, 1997-1998). Indeed, it was primarily HBC employees that drove early settlement on Vancouver Island as they were among the few who could afford the high cost of land set by the Colonial

¹⁷ Many HBC employees were married to Indigenous women – creating "tender ties" to the west, as James Douglas put it (cf. Van Kirk, 1980). However, constant relocation, particularly following the 1846 Oregon Treaty, likely made establishing belonging an anxious endeavour.

Office (Mackie, 1992-1993). Alongside mariners and a handful of intending Settlers, the HBC assessed the Island's resources, purchased land, and hired Indigenous¹⁸ labour to develop trade in forest and marine staples (Mackie, 1997). It was initially the pursuit of a resource-based economy, not an agricultural one, which drove the transition from corporate outpost to colonial settlement. This complicates Gabriel Piterberg and Lorenzo Veracini's interpretation that

whereas metropole-centred colonialism is characterized by exploitation, settler colonialism is primarily characterized by transfer: the transfer of indigenous peoples and land ownership, but also the transfer of settlers from one locale to another, and the transfer of specific social forms (2015, p. 470).

Interrogating the differing philosophies of Wakefield and Marx, Piterberg and Veracini explain that “metropole-centered colonialism” describes colonies where Indigenous labour was exploited for the purposes of an export trade (e.g.: India), while “settler colonialism” describes a form of “pure” settlement wherein “what is desired from the indigenous society is all the land and none of the labour” (2015, p. 466; Wolfe, 1999; Piterberg & Veracini, 2015; Veracini, 2014a). The early stages of the Colony of Vancouver Island do not fit neatly into either of these categories. Furthermore, the above definition of “metropole-centred colonialism” relies upon a rejection of the staples approach (Piterberg & Veracini, 2015, footnote 70). Vancouver Island, although intended to be a Wakefieldian experiment of systemic colonization, began as a *corporate* Settler colonial formation, one bound up with the HBC's use of Indigenous labour, resource exploitation, *and* the transfer of Settlers, their plants, and institutions. The point here is that if a colonialism that is exploitative of Indigenous labour is distinct from Settler colonialism, as Veracini (2014a) argues, the task for those studying Settler colonialism is

¹⁸ Native Hawaiians and Métis/métis are included in this definition as they were employed by the HBC.

to provide evidence of this distinctiveness. In the case of the Colony of Vancouver Island, I have shown that the distinction is not a clear one. As I continue to demonstrate below, such insights are gained when studying the local processes of Settler colonialism.

In December 1851, the Vancouver's Island Steam Saw Mill Company was founded – its Chairman was James Douglas and the shareholders were all directly connected to the HBC (Blakey-Smith, 1975, p. 126, footnote 1). The company proposed constructing a mill at Cordova Bay, north-west of Victoria. The fur trade necessitated the establishment of a myriad of relations with Indigenous peoples, particularly through marriage (Van Kirk, 1980; Adams, 2011/2001; Perry, 2015), but the shift to other staples required adjustments to governance of the colony. The fourteen Vancouver Island Treaties, negotiated between 1850 and 1854, facilitated the transition to staple industries that required sites of production outside Victoria.¹⁹

For the WSÁNEĆ/Saanich peoples, it was the harvesting of trees that led to the signing of the 1852 North Saanich Treaty. Tsartlip First Nation Elder Gabriel Bartleman recalled the event that led to a “peace offering” from Douglas in testimony to the Supreme Court of British Columbia:

There was some trees taken off of Cordova Bay, and I was told that these trees were especially suitable for masts – sailboat masts. And the people on the inside of the bay, that's Brentwood Bay, now known as Brentwood Bay, they decided to stop them.

¹⁹ Also referred to as the Douglas Treaties or Fort Victoria Treaties (Duff, 1969). As with all historic treaties in Canada, the meaning and intent on both sides was misunderstood and has frequently been misinterpreted (Rose Knighton, 2004; Arnett, 1999; Claxton, 2008). These treaties were made with the following First Nations: Teechamitsa now called Esquimalt Band; Kosampson now called Esquimalt Band; Whyomilth now called Esquimalt Band; Swengwhung now called Songhees Band; Chilcowitch now called Songhees Band; Che-ko-nein now called Songhees Band; Ka-ky-aakan now called Becher Bay Band; Chewhaytsum now called Becher Bay Band; Sooke now called Sooke Band; Saanich (South) now called Tsawout and Tsartlip Bands; Saanich (North) now called Pauqhachin and Tseycum Bands; Saalequun now called Nanoose and Nanaimo Bands; Queackar now called Kwakiutl (Kwawkelth) Band; Quakiolth now called Kwakiutl (Kwawkelth) Band (Te'mexw Treaty Association, n.d.)

So they had several, several canoes and several men left there is a battle dress. They were going to then – they were going to do what they had to do to stop Douglas’ men from taking those trees. They did arrive there and they say – the canoes were facing the shore, and they called for someone that would come down who was able to communicate. Whatever was said, I never heard all of that, only that Douglas’ men packed up and left (as cited in Rose Knighton, 2004, p. 12).

Bartleman’s oral history of this event reveals the presumptive approach by Settlers toward the forest resource. The best spar trees had been located – that they were on unceded lands was not initially a concern, an expression of certainty regarding their claim (Mackey, 2016). This encounter is the reason the Vancouver’s Island Steam Saw Mill Company abandoned Cordova Bay in favour of a location closer to the Royal Navy base at Esquimalt (Keddie, 2003, p. 49). More importantly, this attempt to harvest spars led to a meeting with Douglas where Saanich peoples believed restitution was being offered for the cutting of trees. However, for Douglas and the HBC, the meeting was the finalization of a purchase signifying that the Saanich people’s lands, excluding village and food gathering sites, had become “the entire property of the white people for ever” (Verspoor, 2012). The Vancouver Island Treaties were undertaken to extinguish First Nations title, as was supposedly the desire of the Crown (British Foreign Office, 1849). Yet, as the example of the North Saanich treaty demonstrates, several of the treaties were very much the result of particular events: at Cordova Bay, it was the desire to start a sawmill company; at Nanaimo and Fort Rupert, the pursuit of spars, shingles, and coal necessitated the supposed surrender of title (Gough, 1983; Peterson, 2002). As studies of colonization in British Columbia make clear (Norcross, 1983; Mackie, 1992-1993), we can see that, at least initially, it was resource exploitation, and not the transfer of Settlers (as Piterberg and Veracini argue), that necessitated the extinguishment of Indian title on Vancouver Island. Examining colonizing processes in specific locales over time adds

nuance and complexity to broader top-down theories about Settler colonial processes and characteristics. Wolfe argues that Settler colonialism is not a single event, but a structure (2006). What I am demonstrating here is that (dis)possession is better understood as *a series of recurring events* that have both material and affective implications.

Though negligible compared to the geographic and financial scope of the fur trade, forays into timber and coal anticipated the shift away from the fur trade. Maritime historian Barry Gough explains that “British naval officers, who in British men-of-war were sent to ‘show the flag’ in the waters of Puget Sound and Vancouver Island, reported on the value of the maritime assets of that area, most notably its harbours, timber, and coal” (2012-2013, p. 36). Vancouver Island gained a reputation for its mineral potential and its large trees, especially after the Fraser River gold rush of 1858. For the 1862 International Exhibition, a 200 foot fir spar was sent from the Island to the botanic gardens at Kew in London (Macfie, 1972/1865, p. 132). The spar functioned as a flag pole there – a symbol of the strength and enormity of the Island’s original contribution to Empire. From exploration and settlement’s earliest days, giant trees were associated with the Island and eventually became integral to economic development of the colony. From the outset, trees have been, and continue to be, entangled with efforts to expand settlement and make meaning from the land. Aspects of the landscape, such as Garry oak meadows, were appropriated as evocations of home while, at the same time, plants and other goods were brought from away to support feelings of possession. What I mean is that *taking the land*, for settlement or extraction, and *belonging to the land* – (dis)possession – are both interrelated and distinct processes.

Settlers such as the Helmckens had children who developed their own belonging based on the home their parents had established; Garry oak trees became as much a symbol of home as daisies and thistles. When artist Emily Carr visited Kew Gardens as a child, botanical specimens from North America became a focus of her attention:

Kew was a bouquet culled from the entire world. I found South America, and Asia, Africa, China, Australia – then I found Canada (even a grove of pines and cedars from my own province). I rubbed their greenery between my hands – it smelled homey. I stabbed my nose on our prickly blue pine. I sat down on the grass beneath a great red cedar tree. From close by came the long-drawn cry of a peacock. Suddenly I was back in the old barn studio! (Carr, 1966/1946, p. 88).

Kew Gardens was a clearinghouse for seeds and plants from across the Empire (Brockway, 1979). Cedars, firs, and countless other specimens, were brought to the metropole for both economic and aesthetic reasons (Macfie, 1972/1865, pp. 134-136; Schefke, 2008), but for Carr their smell and texture brought flashbacks to her Victoria home. Carr's father had arrived in Victoria in 1863 (by way of the 1849 California gold rush) and his garden featured an array of English plants and flowers. Emily Carr resented her father's strict adherence to all things British – "More English than the English" was the phrase used to describe him (Reksten, 1986). Writing of central British Columbia during the 1990s, Elizabeth Furniss notes that

assertions of quasi-indigenous local identities – identities rooted in the unique relationship that rural settlers have to the land – are not unique to the Cariboo-Chilcotin or even to Canada....Over time, these groups have developed distinct cultural traditions and identities centred on their relationship to the landscape (1999, p. 98).

Carr's descriptions of Kew Gardens and her father demonstrate the anxiety and fluidity of Settler belonging and in this example we can begin to understand the generational progression of Settler belonging. Whereas Carr's father had, perhaps zealously, attempted to cultivate something of a home he had left behind, it was the smell of a native cedar tree

and the call of the non-native peacock that evoked a new and settled home for his daughter. The point here is that Settler belonging is subjective, but it is also shared; it adjusts over time through recurring events as Settlers work at affective attachment and attempt to make themselves the original inhabitants (Johnston & Lawson, 2000, p. 369).

Conclusion

Settler belonging can be understood as, in part, a series of contradictory affective events. A key point here is that well before the extraction of trees became a dominant feature of Vancouver Island's economy, Settlers developed divergent understandings of the role trees and plants play in making home. The forest has been, and is all at once, seen as wild, sublime, home, and commodity. As such, the Settler relationship to it is in uncertain – never more so than when contrasted with the relationship between Elder Susan Lazzar Johnson's grandmother, cedar trees, and the Creator. Over time, Settler colonialism worked to erase this relationship and, as with Scotch broom, it changed the land to limit Indigenous growth and survival in favour of its own.

The circulation of plants and seeds was an important thread in exchanges between metropole and periphery (Wickham, 2012; Baber, 2016). These exchanges aided a larger cause of Empire and colonization, but they also had material and affective qualities that manifested in specifically local ways. As the shift away from the fur trade occurred, Settlers spread out from Fort Victoria, aided by an increasing awareness of the Island's resources. These shifts in the staple trade required land and labour and thus the further occupation of First Nations territories. Through an analysis of the staple resource trade and treaty making on Vancouver Island and engagement with the arguments of Piterberg and Veracini (2015), Wolfe, and others, I have shown that focusing attention to the locally distinctive processes of colonization reveals the importance of nuance and

difference within discussion of broader theorizations of Settler colonialism's characteristics (Smith, 2010; Rifkin, 2011; Veracini, 2014a). That Scotch broom has shifted from a signifier of a home-away and a "permanent memorial" to an invasive species demonstrates the contradictory, complex, and fluid nature of Settler belonging.

As I argue throughout this dissertation, and as I have shown in this chapter, the *taking* of land and *attachment* to land are not single, temporally fixed events; (dis)possession is a series of events and it is worked out over time as part of a Settler project upon which subsequent generations are encouraged to embrace and expand. In the next chapter, I explain how the gold rush of 1858 brought the colonies of British Columbia and Vancouver Island to the attention of new cohorts of Settlers, and with these new arrivals in new territories "tough beginnings" – the material and affective processes of (dis)possession – started anew.

Chapter 2: The Pioneer and the Gunboat

I grew up in the community of Cobble Hill, located in the southern end of the Cowichan Valley on Vancouver Island and, although I currently live a 45-minute drive away in the City of Victoria, much of my family continues to reside in the area. I consider Cobble Hill/Cowichan to be my home, even if I do not currently live there. This chapter looks at settlement in the Cowichan Valley from about 1862 to 1886 and I focus on a number of events related to land alienation, agriculture, and road building to trace the ways that Settlers work(ed) at belonging in an effort to create, maintain, and expand a regime of property that would become ‘home.’ I show that Settler feelings associated with these events, and reinforced through local histories, support self-evident narratives of settlement, particularly those of legitimate invasion and the hardy pioneer. Moreover, I argue that analysing the material, affective, and locally specific aspects of making a place ‘home’ is integral to understanding the ways in which (dis)possession creates markers or waypoints that evoke belonging for subsequent generations. I do this by exploring Settler encounters with the forested landscape that predate the dominant forest staple economy of the twentieth century. Finally, through a reflexive vignette of my first childhood home, I explore how my own sense of belonging is bound up with early settlement in the Cowichan Valley.

Before the forest staple became a dominant part of the Vancouver Island economy during the early twentieth century, trees were central to the story of arrival/invasion, occupation, and attachment. In the next two chapters I explore the creation of material-

affective linkages²⁰ brought about by the rise of the forest staple economy, but in this chapter I provide a foundation for understanding the material, affective, and localized practices of Settler belonging.

For colonial Governor James Douglas, his leadership of military incursions into Hul'qumi'num territories during the 1850s solidified the Cowichan Valley's rumoured reputation as a fertile place well suited to agriculture (Gough, 1984; Arnett, 1999). By the spring of 1858, news of gold deposits on the Fraser River reached California and the wider world. As a result, the Colony of British Columbia was established and in a matter of weeks Victoria became a hub for travel to and from the goldfields and new colony. As the rush moved further up river during the 1860s, many unsuccessful prospectors made their way back to the coast to start businesses or pre-empt land for settlement (The Pioneer Researchers, 1986, p.17; Sandwell, 2005).

The date of the first Settler's arrival in the Cowichan Valley remains an object of speculation among historians of the area (Norcross, 1975, p. 1). Whenever the "first" arrived, the Cowichan region gained a reputation during the mid-nineteenth century as a place rich in timber resources and agricultural potential. Joseph D. Pemberton was appointed Surveyor General for Vancouver Island in 1859 and one of his first tasks was to survey lands north of Victoria. From March to May 1859, Pemberton's assistant laid out five districts in Hul'qumi'num territories – Cowichan, Shawnigan, Somenos, Comiaken, Quamichan, and Chemainus (Marshall, 1999, p. 109). Two years later, the House of Assembly in Victoria wrote to London requesting financial assistance in extinguishing title on parts of Vancouver Island, including the Cowichan and Chemainus

²⁰ The physical and affecting aspects of the staple's stamp that connect extraction and practices of Settler belonging.

Valleys (Arnett, 1999, p. 97). The colonies/British Columbia did not pursue the extinguishment of title after the Vancouver Island Treaties. Chris Arnett shows that between 1860 and 1864, the colonial government set aside increasing funds for this purpose in the Cowichan region – yet these funds went unspent (Arnett, 1999, p. 98). This is, in part, because Hul’qumi’num peoples refused to cede their territories (Marshall, 1999; Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group [HTG], 2007).

A jurisdictional quagmire between the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC), colonial administration, and the Colonial Office in London, combined with the accelerated arrival of Settlers during the gold rush, launched a series of disjointed land alienation strategies in the 1860s (cf: Cail, 1974). Beset by demands for agricultural land following the 1858 gold rush, the Colony of Vancouver Island deployed surveys, maps, reconnaissance, violence, and British legal authority – what Cole Harris calls the “new geographies of settler colonialism” (2004, p. 175) – to diminish the need to acquire and extinguish Indian title. The colonial legislature held the view that the Colonial Office should pay for extinguishment, while London understood this to be a local concern (Arnett, 1999, pp. 93-100). Meanwhile, knowledge of the Island’s topography and resource potential increased through various excursions and violent incursions. For example, in 1858, with the HBC Charter to Vancouver Island set to expire in spring of the following year, the colonial government issued scrip for nearly 10,000 acres within Hul’qumi’num territories to over a dozen speculators – most of them directly affiliated with the Royal Navy and HBC (Norcross, 1975, p. 11; “The meeting last night,” 1862). These scrips were later recalled in 1862 under pressure to free up agricultural lands from speculators for more immediate and “bona-fide” settlement (“Vancouver’s Island,” 1862).

For those without connection to the HBC, colonial land ordinances were issued with the intention of dictating how, where, and under what criteria settlement and resource extraction could take place. In 1861, the *Land Proclamation Act* allowed for pre-emption of Crown lands (the right of first refusal to a Settler who occupied and improved land) in certain districts on southern Vancouver Island. Cowichan, however, was not included. As Robert Cail explains, these early proclamations were rarely adhered to as Settlers “were not greatly concerned with niceties of phraseology in a land act which they had never read and for which there was no administrative agency close at hand” (1974, p. xii). Acts of colonial violence, surveys, and haphazard proclamations provided a basis for the early pre-emption of lands and a semblance of certainty relating to Settler property rights. What is important to note here is that land speculation and “new geographies” did not, in themselves, inculcate feelings of Settler belonging. As I demonstrate below, intending Settlers worked to form their own grids on the land, drawn through material and affective relations.

“Taking Possession”

With agricultural land surrounding Victoria taken up by HBC families and farming ventures, arrivals to the Colony of Vancouver Island turned their attentions to the rumours of vast tracts of arable land found in the Cowichan, Chemainus, and Comox Valleys, and on Saltspring Island. The clamour for cheap land outside of Victoria was addressed at a meeting on the evening of July 29th, 1862 held at the legislative buildings in Victoria. At the event, attended by as many as 300 people, plans for the imminent settlement of Cowichan District were announced by Attorney General George Cary. *The Daily British Colonist* newspaper described the scene:

Mr. Cary commenced by saying that there was a large number of persons here who were desirous of settling upon the Crown Lands, and becoming citizens of Vancouver Island, and as there was only one place upon which they could settle, and as there were many obstacles in their way at present, several had suggested to him that a plan be introduced by which the Cowichan District might be settled up, and that Government had decided, if 70, 80, or 100 men could be obtained who were willing to settle there, that they should be put in possession of the land... A gunboat would accompany the party, and also a competent party to deal with the Indians. All that the government wanted was an assurance that a sufficient number of men would go up in a fortnight and a vessel would be provided to take them, and he did not fancy that there would be the least trouble in taking possession of the lands...What was to be avoided was ill-feeling between the settlers and Indians ("The meeting last night," 1862).

Despite several years attempting to convince Hul'qumi'num peoples to sell their lands, the demand for agricultural lands precipitated by the gold rush made Cowichan "one place upon which they could settle." The image of 300 people clamouring to become yeomen farmers portrays an immediacy well suited to the newspaper's editorial stances that demanded settlement of the Island; but this was not the first time Settlers had gathered to petition for land. In June 1859, a meeting at a Victoria hotel provoked the drawing up of a petition to Governor Douglas by *Daily British Colonist* editor Amor de Cosmos, calling for an invitation to the "hardy pioneer" to occupy agricultural lands (Sandwell, 2005, p. 22). Within three weeks of the 1862 petition, a gunboat and the "competent party" of Governor Douglas accompanied nearly 80 Settlers into Cowichan territories.

August marked the beginning of the Fraser River salmon fishery when many Hul'qumi'num peoples and Cowichan Indians²¹ were absent from their territories and located at food harvesting sites on the mainland. This was not lost on Douglas or the other colonial and Royal Navy officials that accompanied the Settlers. HBC officials at

²¹ The present-day Coast Salish Cowichan Tribes.

Fort Langley, established in 1827, were keenly aware that seasonal food gathering brought First Nations from Vancouver Island to the Fraser River (Marshall, 1999, pp. 80-83; Lillard, 1993, p. 57). Douglas also knew this. It was August 1856, when the governor mobilized a gunboat and over 450 men to respond to the shooting of a Settler by Tathlasut from the village of Somenos. In the oral history, it is known that the Settler had been intimidating the Cowichan peoples and Tathlasut, in an act of defiance, shot him in the arm (Arnett, 1999, p. 55). After using the ship's guns to fire on Cowichan homes and disembarking the large force, Tathlasut was surrendered to Douglas. Following a brief trial, a jury of naval officers reached a guilty verdict and Tathlasut was hanged from a Garry oak tree. It may simply have been a matter of convenience, but the decision to hang Tathlasut from an oak must have seemed fitting to Douglas and his men. Their colonial outpost was, in part, chosen for the oak's affective qualities – the settlement to follow would be enabled through the strength of its branches. Following the event, Douglas observed that most of the Cowichan warriors were absent at the Fraser River, making the show of British justice much easier to carry out (Arnett, 1999, p. 56). With this in mind, the July 1862 meeting in Victoria came at a time when intending Settlers could be deployed to take up land and take advantage of this moment of absence. Yet, through their repeatedly rebuffed attempts to alienate lands in the Cowichan Valley, Douglas and others knew that Hul'qumi'num territories were not for sale (Marshall, 1999, p. 102).

In the important article “How Did Colonialism Dispossession? Comments from an Edge of Empire” Cole Harris shows the vital role that maps, legal authority, violence, and the civilized-savage binary played in dispossession (2004). Harris pulls back from his more localized work (e.g.: Harris, 1992) to make the point that surveys, gunboats, and

show trials were the basis from which a loosely coordinated settlement could take place – with or without the extinguishment of title. The organized and affective demands of Settlers provoked the coalescence of colonial efforts to overcome First Nations resistance and, taken together, these events formed the foundation for (dis)possession on Vancouver Island. What I mean is that the affective wants of Settlers, as evidenced in their impassioned appeals for agricultural land described above, also affected a change in policy whereby land in the region could be taken – dispossessed – and attachment – possession – fostered. However, the local remains integral as it was not simply an emphasis on Settler colonial knowledge and ignorance of First Nations ways of knowing that facilitated invasion of the Cowichan region. Knowledge of First Nations land use cycles made the arrival of this large group of Settlers possible. The arrival of the *Hecate* relied on information gathered at the hanging of Tathlasut and was used to aid settlement. While “technologies of power” (Harris, 2004, p. 179) and British legal authority played a key role, I am arguing that a focus localized events in Cowichan demonstrates that knowledge about Indigenous ways of being on the land were not always ignored to the benefit a new “geographical imaginary” (Harris, 2004, p. 175). In other words, Settlers made use of territorially specific knowledge *about* First Nations. Such knowledge was vital to the project of (dis)possession in the Cowichan Valley and, in this way, we can see that the study of local events adds important nuance to our understanding of Settler colonialism’s processes.

Settler Origins and the ‘Impenetrable Forest’

At the end of Cowichan Bay, near where the Koksilah River meets the ocean, wedged between Theik Indian Reserve 2 and the Cowichan No. 1 Reserve, a small park on the side of the road invites drivers to pull over. Robert Service Memorial Park, named

for the poet who briefly lived in the area, features a stone cairn and two stone benches that serve as memorials to the Settler past. In 1958, British Columbia's centennial year, the Native Sons of British Columbia Prevost Post Number 10 erected a cairn at the site.

The plaque on the cairn reads:

To commemorate the landing of the first group of pioneer settlers from H.M.S Hecate at Cowichan Bay at 4 P.M. on the 18th day of August, 1862. There were about 100 settlers in the group and His Excellency, the Governor, accompanied the expedition (field notes)²²

The arrival of the *Hecate* in 1862 is, in effect, the origin story for Settler colonialism in the Cowichan Valley. As in a birth announcement, the very hour of the ship's arrival is highlighted, providing a date, time, and place for the launching point of (dis)possession in the region. The inscribed birth date allows local Settler history "to be plotted in a linear

Figure 6: Cairn to the Settlers who arrived aboard the HMS *Hecate* in 1862.

fashion" (Reimer, 2001-2002) from this event. In Greek Mythology, Hecate is the goddess of, among other things, a three-way crossroads. Apt, then, that the intending Settlers disembarked the *Hecate*, separated into three groups, and set off towards the Shawnigan, Somenos, and Quamichan land districts surveyed in 1859. 120 years after the *Hecate*, local historian Adelaide Barry Ellis described the scene she thought those on board would have encountered as the paddlewheel steam

sloop entered Cowichan Bay:

²² Later, a memorial bench to the women pioneers who "bore the burden and toil of the day" was added (field notes; The Pioneer Researchers, 1986, p. 6).

The island would appear to be an impenetrable forest. Small groups of natives could have been seen on the beach with camp fires and rude shelters....The Indians welcomed them as long as they didn't interfere with their villages or potato patches. The Indians were given two blankets each as payment for their land (1982, p. 13).

Barry Ellis repeats the claim of an agreeable reception published in the *British Colonist* in the days following the *Hecate's* arrival ("The Cowichan Expedition," 1862). The fact that the arrival was determined precisely to avoid resistance receives no mention, perhaps because to acknowledge that the ship's arrival was unscrupulous calls into question the sentimentality attached to this foundational event.

Barry Ellis's note of payment being made to the Indians appears to be gathered from the *British Colonist* which reported that the Indians welcomed compensation "aggregate to the value of a pair of blankets" each for their land ("The Cowichan Expedition," 1862). There is little in the historical record or oral history to indicate that such a payment was ever received and, either as a verbal or material offer, it was never accepted as a surrender of land by the Cowichan peoples (Marshall, 1999, p. 122). Yet, the idea that a number of blankets were accepted in return for land is one that matches well with North American narratives that seek to legitimize settlement and (dis)possession (Trichur, 2004). Through this local history's inclusion and omission of certain details surrounding the *Hecate's* arrival, August 18, 1862 at 4:00 p.m. becomes a foundational event that tells a particular story of settlement. The stone cairn is the manifestation of this story, and it serves as a marker or waypoint to remind Settlers of the *Hecate's* importance to their ongoing presence. The cairn, as a waypoint, provides a precise location where feelings for the past may be encountered, taken up, and cultivated over time. Belonging, like affect, can be subjective, but the cairn and its plaques are

intended to link place and feeling, to push along Settler attachment to land: “Affect is what sticks, or what sustains or preserves the connection between ideas, values, and objects” (Ahmed, 2011, p. 29). If a waypoint of belonging is encountered, feelings for the locality of a Settler project may be what “sticks.”

Those who disembarked the *Hecate*, and a majority of those who arrived in the years after, intended to attempt farming. In south Cowichan, the Dougan family rose to prominence as pioneer farmers; the existence of Dougan’s Lake, Dougan Road, Dougan Park and the James Dougan Memorial Cemetery speak to this. Through place names²³ and several local histories written by their descendants (Dougan, 1973, 1986, Dougan, n.d.; Benjamin, 2001), the Dougan family’s pioneer story is rooted to place and tied to the narrative of settlement in the Cowichan Valley. James and Annie Dougan first arrived in British Columbia by way of the Australian gold rush and, like many others who came to the Colony/Province of British Columbia during the 1860s and early 1870s, they spent some time prospecting in the Cariboo goldfields before moving to Vancouver Island (Dougan, 1973).

Local histories often use the narrative of a limited First Nations population to legitimize the Settler presence (Marshall, 1999, pp. 168-169). Recalling the trope of the ‘vanishing Indian,’ the idea that the population was small, in decline, and relegated mostly to the ocean shore has been necessary to cast aside Settler invasion and foster fond memories of the hardy pioneers who were brave enough to penetrate a wild interior. In the anthology *Cowichan My Valley*, published in 1973, R.I. Dougan writes:

Think of a land where silence, except for the muted voice of the wilderness forever reigned; where no commotion of hurrying feet disturbed: a land peaceful,

²³ Place names also have the potential to serve as waypoints of belonging. See for example, Murphy & Black, 2015.

silent, serene...The Indians came, small bands of them made homes by the sea, lakes or rivers; but the paths they made were few and little impressed by their feet (p. 29).

A community history of Shawnigan Lake, written for the centennial of Canada in 1967, echoes the same:

Unaware, until a short eight decades ago, of the creeping tide of white civilization and the reluctant awakening of a giant continent, Shawnigan Lake lay silent and untouched during all past ages of time...A peaceful tribe, the Salish fought only to protect their coastal homes...Although the Indians have never lived at the Lake, the balance of public opinion seems to give them credit for naming it (Gibson, 1967, pp. 1-3).

Descriptions of the Cowichan Valley or Shawnigan lake as “silent” give the impression that no place-based language and voices existed before the Settler, an impression that is not only false, but belies the complex place-based property relations of the Hul’qumi’num and Coast Salish peoples (Thom, 2009). The portrayal of the Cowichan Valley as a trackless wilderness, populated with just a handful of scattered water-side villages, transforms the historical deception of the *Hecate*’s arrival into a self-evident paradigm. Absolved from the theft of land by these tropes and false claims, material and affective attachment by those who followed the pioneers is sanctioned. Such narratives are “the means through which violent colonization is transformed into the story of heroic struggle and the inevitable establishment of an exceptionally successful, just, and distinct society” (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 33).

The movement of Settlers inland initiated the clearing of land for cultivation and the gradual establishment of a local economy. The ‘impenetrable forest’ became an obstacle to be eliminated: a family could clear the land, demonstrate ownership, and, over generations, form a society that mirrored the one they had left behind:

Subsidence of the Australian, Californian and Cariboo gold excitement induced many land-hungry immigrants from the British Isles to fare forth destined to reach Cowichan, Vancouver Island. Not for fame or fortune came they, but to found new homes in a new homeland; and each in mind and heart, brought something of the land he came from (Dougan, 1973, p. 29).

This passage exemplifies Cole Harris and David Demeritt's comment that, in many ways, "agriculture was a culmination of the processes of imperialism and colonialism" (1997, p. 219). Ruth Sandwell also argues that agriculture was "central to the meaning of land, and to the material and ideological processes of re-making British Columbia as settler space" (2005, p.18). In the earliest years of settlement, the cutting down of trees was essential to establishing productive land from which to make a home and raise a family. This transformation of land from forest to farm represented the ideal model of a Lockean property regime that privileged 'improvements' to the land. Similarly, Patricia Seed notes that the erection of fences was a central aspect of possessing land in English colonies as they "kept cattle from destroying evidence of private property ownership, the act of possessing by planting" (1995, p. 23). Yet, looking at the Cowichan region, Settlers frequently left their livestock unfenced or inadequately fenced, leading to the destruction of First Nations potato patches and traditional food harvesting sites (Norcross, 1975, p. 15; Sandwell, 2005, p. 136; Morales, 2014, p. 171). Markers of First Nation possession were destroyed by a lack of fences, giving some insight into the disregard for First Nations agriculture and the certainty with which Settlers understood their claims.

Exploring for Exploitation

As individuals and families took up the mantle of agrarian Settler, the search for staple resources was also underway. Small-scale saw mills were established as early as 1860, including Sayward's Mill at present day Mill Bay. Like other operations across southern Vancouver Island, the mill took advantage of water from Mill Creek (now

Shawnigan Creek) and the abundance of large accessible timber – mainly fir and cedar – located beside the water. Settlers often found temporary and seasonal employment at mills. In this way, agrarian Settlers and staple extraction worked in symbiosis, supplying labour and supplemental income to aid the maintenance and expansion of their presence (Sandwell, 2005, p. 129).

Lumber produced at these mills found its way into local use but also travelled to markets in the Pacific, including California and South America (Macfie, 1972/1865, p. 135). However, the giant size of the trees being felled and the use of horse or oxen teams to bring logs out of the forest meant that production was relatively low. Nevertheless, sawmills dotted the landscape and stands of timber were frequently identified and targeted for future extraction (cf: Hayman, 1989, p. 68). The gold rushes of the mainland, however, placed a more immediate emphasis on mineral resources and demand for a detailed account of the Island's resources resulted in the creation of the Vancouver Island Exploring Expedition (VIEE) in 1864. The commander of the expedition, Robert Brown, arrived in the colony a year prior on assignment from the British Columbia Botanical Association of Edinburgh. Brown's task was to collect seeds, roots, and plants for study in Scotland. Not being satisfied with simply collecting specimens, Brown applied for and was awarded leadership of the VIEE (Hayman, 1989). However, it soon became apparent to Brown that his job was not to take a comprehensive or holistic naturalist's account of the Island. Rather, the primary objective was the discovery of valuable minerals, gold in particular (Hayman, 1989, p.13). In his journal, Brown noted the extensive cultivation Settlers had underway in Cowichan – the first stop of the expedition:

Wednesday June 8 [1864] Entered one of the many mouths by which the Cowichan River empties itself into the sea, & landed at M. Jean Campagnon's.

We were received by the venerable old gentleman, a great friend of Capt. Verney's. Saw through his garden. He had only been here two years and yet what had formerly been a wild desert was now in such a state of cultivation that it was difficult to suppose ourselves in one of the wildest of the wild districts of Vancouver Island. He had about 100 acres under cultivation & the soil was of the richest quality- in fact he told us would grow anything. What surprised us most was Oregon grapes (*Berberis*<*Aquifolium*>*Bulbannonana*) in his garden...He presented us with some fine Cowichan grown tobacco & considered that the whole valley might be planted with it, with immense profit to the cultivator...Scenery very fine- Mount Prevost in the distance with Indian village & Church on the Hill. Behind lay the shores dotted with settlements...

[Thursday] June 9 [1864] The Indians are complaining of the conduct of the whites. They say "You came to our country. We did not resist you – you got our women with children & then left them upon us – or put them away when they could have no children to keep up our race (a fact or nearly amounting to as much). You brought diseases amongst us which are killing us. You took our lands and did not pay us for them" (1989, p. 44).

This excerpt from Brown's account of the VIEE's time in Cowichan paints a particular picture of Settler colonialism's infancy in the region. Brown's imagery presents a settlement that has started to overcome the "wild." Compagnon's boastful claims reveal pride in making a home – and potentially a profit – from the rich soil. If Cowichan was a wild district, something was emerging that could be recognized as *of that place*, but made in the Settler's eye: the native Oregon grape transferred from the forest to the garden, the landscape a pastoral parallel of somewhere else. Belonging to the land was being cultivated and worked at.

If "ill-feeling between the settlers and Indians" was to be avoided, Brown's journal entry reveals a failure in this regard ("The meeting last night," 1862). Conflict was recurrent as hunting grounds were pre-empted and Settler-owned animals trampled Indian potato patches, all of it worsened by aggravation with the theft of their land. This is not to say that some friendly relations did not exist; early settlement relied on First Nations peoples for, among other things, transportation, local guidance, and temporary

labour (Dougan, 1973; Knight, 1996/1978). The existence of such relations, however, does not mean that Settler invasion was forgiven or forgotten.

They Knew Their Roads

As Settlers gained their bearings and made their homes, the survey grid that had dictated their initial pre-emptions became crisscrossed with trails and roads and slowly turned sundry settlements into communities. As with logging and mill work, construction and clearing of these routes provided supplementary income to Settlers. Furthermore, these routes became essential lifelines to markets north and south of the Cowichan Valley. Although a steamer would call at Cowichan Bay and Maple Bay for such purposes, Settlers regularly discussed and demanded transportation infrastructure. These discussions are deposited in letters and petitions, public works reports, road design, and road names. Beginning in about 1860, the route from Victoria to Cowichan was a central cause of concern among the colony's population. Construction began on the Goldstream Trail in 1861 and was completed in just over one year – in time for use by the passengers of the *Hecate*. The trail, while wide enough to drive cattle over, was not passable for wagons as it was narrow in parts and followed rough terrain through the Goldstream Hills, along the eastern shores of Sooke and Shawnigan Lakes and down into Cowichan Bay (Black, 2009). Roads were vital to the political economy of the fledgling settlement and the trail was the only overland route between Victoria and Cowichan; its limitations and its maintenance became a frequent source of frustration for Settlers.

Writing of the colonization road scheme in Ontario (1850-1890), Derek Murray notes that the question of road construction plagued rural communities and that

their petitions were part of the process of negotiating reconstruction of the local landscape. In some cases, locals took the initiative in building and maintaining their own roads, while in others they appealed to the perceived responsibility of

the state to provide aid. These petitions can tell us something about the character of the community (2013, p. 118).

To make the case for a particular road, Settlers joined together in an affective and material claim that made known their intention to stay and to make a home in the area. I have always had a fascination with the rural roads of the Cowichan Valley, a feeling that manifested in the subject of my final essay for my undergraduate BC history class in 2009. In the closing sentence of the essay, titled “‘They knew their roads and where they wanted to go.’ Trails and Roads in the Southern Cowichan Valley, 1860-1875,” I wrote: “accounts of early roads and trails offer insight into the development of the southern Cowichan Valley. Roads are our connection to the community, both past and present” (Black, 2009).²⁴ Below, I elaborate on this potential “insight,” equipped with the lens of (dis)possession.

Following BC’s entry into Confederation in 1871, expenditures on roads and trails were curbed as the railway promised in the Terms of Union with Canada seemed imminent. In the lead up to the 1875 provincial election, a wagon road from Victoria was a key issue. At a meeting in Cowichan candidates were pressed by constituents about the status of the road (“Politics at Cowichan,” 1875), but by 1876 both railway and road remained unrealized. To address the matter, Settlers south of the Cowichan River held a meeting in July 1876 to draft a petition outlining the advantages of the proposed “Coast” and “Middle” road routes. The minutes of this meeting, found in the Department of Lands and Works files at the Royal BC Museum and Archives (GR 0868), demonstrate the changes underway in the region, as well as the strong feelings Settlers held regarding

²⁴ When I joined the Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives as a summer student in 2009, I spoke of this essay to the staff and volunteers and was encouraged to deposit it in the archives, which I did. This essay is not only a part of my personal archive of belonging, it is also part of an institutional archive.

transportation. The petition claimed that the two routes they proposed were shorter than the Goldstream Trail, and therefore cheaper, received less snowfall, and would be a greater convenience to the people living in the area (Marshall & Dods, 1876). The signatories claimed a road to Victoria that passed Saywards Mill would also be of “great advantage to the settlement in disposing of produce and getting lumber &c &c” (Marshall & Dods, 1876). A later survey of these proposed routes by the government found them far too steep and rocky for construction of a road (Howse, 1876) and it was not until the early twentieth century that the proposed routes would take shape in the form of the Malahat route. Through descriptions of the landscape and climate, the petition reveals the extent to which the signatories developed a claim of belonging; by gathering to share collective knowledge about their surroundings and demand a road, they expressed the intention to become settled. There is a contradiction of belonging present in this petition: private property, the right to exclude others from land, is essential to the claim of the individual Settler, yet it is a collective or shared claim that is invoked as a way to connect these individuals. I am arguing here that private property and shared claims to connect private property demonstrate the complex and contradictory interplay between individual and shared Settler belonging.

At the July 1876 meeting mentioned above, Settlers also requested a bridge over the Koksilah River:

The bridge [?] would have been built had the settlement been given any money to devote to local purposes as it is urgently required the settlers & their wives and families having to pack everything in and out on their backs for want of a bridge [emphasis in original] (Marshall & Dods, 1876).

In this example there is a feeling of frustration but also the idea that something more than a few scattered pre-emptions has emerged from the forest. No longer was it reasonable to

expect a single male Settler could ford the river to their home – local infrastructure was needed to meet the needs of families. There is a generational element to this letter in that the bridge is understood as serving present Settlers and those to come, and thus contributing to the reproduction of the Settler project in the area. James Dougan, a signatory to the petition, expressed similar frustrations a year prior when the government withheld his payment for clearing the Goldstream Trail:

Our Government fume about Canada building an overland railway, while they themselves compel us to use the dangerous and expensive steamboat connection with town available once a week, rather than expend some \$18,000 on the construction of a road which would do more to populate this Island and develop its resources than three times the above amount expended in any other way (Dougan, 1875).

With little capital investment in the settlement at this time, Settlers frequently solicited provincial officials for investment, contracts, and infrastructure projects. The building of a road was not a single event that simply produced a new human geography or facilitated capital accumulation. Over time, feelings have been deposited in roads, feelings that constitute Settler belonging. In local histories such as *Cowichan My Valley* (1973), vignettes about roads and road building feature prominently.²⁵ The Dougan family was regularly awarded trail and road contracts, perhaps a key reason why *Cowichan My Valley* features so many stories about roads and trails. Roads are constitutive of a Settler experience:

Land-questing settlers, some of them driving a few cattle to form the nucleus of a herd in Cowichan, a lone young woman leading a cow; a swindling merchant of sorts with covered wagon, muleteam and muleteer; an impecunious peddler with covered wagon drawn by a single horse. Over the hills and sylvan, winding road, through the years came these and many others (Dougan, 1973, p. 31).

²⁵ See also Norcross, 1975; Barry Ellis, 1982; Bonner, 2001.

For the Dougans and many other Settlers, trails and roads provided necessary wage labour and, later, became tangible evocations of a hardy pioneer life. Take, for example, an excerpt from 1975's *And So They Came to Cowichan* where author Margaret Bishop recalls her Father's road building activities in Cowichan:

Not much remains of the old days, and not many who knew the beginnings. But I like to think of Somenos Road, which still runs through our valley, as a monument to David [Father] and Margaret [Mother], who came when they were very young and stayed to see it grow into usefulness, in this place which the Indian named 'Somenos,' the Sleepy or Tranquil Land (p. 22).

Setting aside the dubious translation and appropriation of Somenos (S'amuna'), Bishop reveals that the road acts as a waypoint for her feelings of attachment to the land. In this way, the road is not unlike the stone cairn dedicated to those aboard the HMS *Hecate*. Through an association with Settler origins, roads, in their materiality, are integral to taking and belonging to the land. Even if each turn or straight stretch no longer recalls those who built the road, roads remain historically and geographically specific – they are *of that place* and therefore are part of the materiality of Settler feeling and the processes of (dis)possession.

Routes such as the Goldstream Trail or Somenos Road did not come into being *solely* as a result of external demand for the forest staple; they were/are primarily developed for agrarian settlement. Yet the tree is a central and recurring feature that describes and guides these roads and settlement patterns: it is blazed for the survey; it is the “impenetrable” barrier that roads break through; it is a source of building material and early wage labour; it is marked for future extraction and external trade (Dougan 1973, p. 105; Hayman, 1989). What I mean is that roads enable the movement of goods and resources to market while, at the same time, they generate affective connections to land

and among Settlers over time. The material and affective characteristics of transportation reflect development of the mode of production.²⁶ In exploring the relationship between Settler colonialism and the staple economy of southern Vancouver Island, a focus on international demand offers one limited possibility as a place to begin. My argument is that private property, affective/collective attachment, and the Settler relationship with the forest are also key starting points as they help to understand the conditions and context for the transformation from subsistence agriculture to wage labour and staple trade/industry. The point here is that if the staple leaves a stamp – a geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political imprint – then the local processes of (dis)possession that are already underway will influence the stamp, and vice-versa. Belonging must be worked at, it must adjust and adapt, if it is to overcome transformation in the mode of production.

Vignette: And So We Came to Cowichan

In 1982, my Dad, Jim, and Mom, Valerie, purchased a home in Cobble Hill and moved from Brentwood Bay on the Saanich Peninsula. The home, a

Figure 7: The “A-frame” on Hatch Point Road.

three story A-frame, is located at the corner of Telegraph and Hatch Point Roads. This property, and the roads, trails, and surrounding forest are where my Brother Scott, my Sister Sarah and I lived until 1990.

Historic Crown grant documents show that the property is a small part of Section

²⁶ A combination of productive forces (labour power, tools, technology, land etc.) and the relations of production (property, power, law, social structure etc.).

12, Range 9 of the Shawnigan Land District and was purchased in 1922 by Lancelot Frederick Walton for \$500.00 (British Columbia, 1922).²⁷ Barry Ellis writes that “Lance and his wife came to the district in 1909 and settled on Telegraph and Lafortune Roads. There they raised nine boys and girls...Lance was a road foreman for twelve years” (1982, p. 80). As a route, Telegraph Road predates the 1879 construction of a telegraph line and was the main trail/road to Sayward’s mill (Dougan, 1973, p. 34). To this day, our former home is the only house directly on Hatch Point Road. On the opposite side of the road from the house is a large hay field and, at the end of the road, a long driveway leads to the associated house and farm.²⁸ This property was originally part of the William Manley pre-emption.²⁹ R.I Dougan writes that Manley came from the goldfields of Australia in the early 1860s and called his settlement “Springvale” (1973, p. 109). Despite a of lack of roads at this time, Manley “overcame this drawback by making a road from the farm to the beach and when he had produce for the city, he carted it there and rowed out to the steamboat with it on ‘boat days’” (Dougan, 1973, p. 109). Although we never knew of Manley’s “indefatigable” (Dougan, 1973, p. 109) efforts as we played in the field, the landscape – its form and

²⁷ Library and Archives Canada records indicate that Walton came to Canada in 1887 as a British Home Child with the Middlemore Homes project. As an undesired child of Empire, it is possible that Lancelot Walton’s affective attachment as a Settler manifested within a much different range of feelings from the willing immigrant or Settler born in Canada or the region (Dunae, 2001). Lance and his brother Tom feature in several local histories (Dougan, 1973; Barry Ellis, 1982; Bonner 2001), particularly because of Tom’s construction and operation of a general store in the Cobble Hill Village. Built in 1911, the building continues to operate as a convenience store.

²⁸ The name “Hatch Point” was in use as early as 1877 when it was attributed to a nearby fishing station set out as an Indian Reserve for the Pauquachin First Nation by the Joint Indian Reserve Commission.

²⁹ Pre-empted in 1863 and 1870 (British Columbia, 1863; British Columbia 1870). Granted to William George Manley (likely his son) in 1883 (British Columbia, 1883)

character – is a central feature of our memories, and thus our feelings, associated with the area.

Like roads and fields, trees were also part of our Hatch Point Road experience. In particular, a photo from a family album shows my brother with his arms stretched across a cedar tree. Scott's outstretched arms evoke the enormity of old growth trees and the growing opposition to their destruction during the 1980s. As my Dad tells it, these large trees were far too close to the house and posed a threat to our safety. Despite my Brother's objections, the trees were cut with the assistance of a family friend who worked as a logger. After the "A-frame," which my family still calls it, was sold in 1990, Scott went back to take down the sign for Hatch Point Road. Hopefully the statute of limitations on this minor act of vandalism has passed, but the sign, still in our

Figure 8: My Brother Scott and family dog Lady in front of a cedar tree.

possession, represents more than simply a teenage caper. Its theft was – and is – an act of belonging.

In a similar way, Telegraph Road remains a favourite drive for our family. Despite the speed or convenience of the highway, we often take this route simply for the pleasure of its pace and scenery. When visitors from out-of-town arrive, we chauffeur them down Telegraph, pointing out the fence our Dad built between

the property line and the road. Telegraph Road and its tributaries recall our origins in the Cowichan Valley and evoke a feeling that is not adequately captured in words such as ‘nostalgic’ or ‘romantic.’ ‘Belonging,’ however, does seem to encapsulate the sentiment. The Hatch Point sign, the house, and the roads – these were long ago deposited in the Black family’s archive of belonging.

Conclusion

To make a home on stolen land required more than a survey, violence, and legal authority. Certainly these things made possible Settler invasion, yet it is through affect and material practices that Settlers work(ed) to *become of that place*. Events such as the HMS *Hecate*’s arrival or the building of Somenos Road are not solitary or static; they are made into waypoints of (dis)possession that allow subsequent generations of Settlers to invest in and cultivate a legitimized belonging. In my analysis of the *Hecate*’s arrival, I have shown the ways in which settlement took place in territorially specific ways and through a series of events. The hanging of Tathlasut in 1856 and petitions for agricultural lands in 1859 and 1862 are directly linked to the context of the ship’s entry to Cowichan territories on August 18, 1862 at 4:00 p.m. Erected in 1958, the cairn dedicated to this event demonstrates feelings of belonging from the time of its creation, but its sentiments remain “sticky” with the intention of passing on affective attachment. Belonging can be subjective, but it is guided, led along in particular ways; waypoints are one form of guidance. Self-evident narratives of limited land use by First Nations or of a willful surrender of territory are perpetuated by local histories and are an integral part of this process. I have shown in this chapter that locating these narratives and waypoints allows us to dissect the social and economic relations of settlement and understand how (dis)possession – the taking of land and the ongoing affective and material possession of

that land – comes into being, albeit in sometimes contradictory ways. Roads, for example, were demanded by groups of Settlers who, having pre-empted individual parcels of private property, made a collective claim for better access to markets and much needed wage labour in the fledgling agrarian settlement. Before the forest staple became a dominant part of the Vancouver Island economy in the early twentieth century, the forest was central to the story of arrival/invasion, occupation, and attachment. Identifying the material and affective conditions of settlement prior to the transformation in the mode of production, in this case from agriculture to staple extraction, is essential to understanding where and when the staple will leave a stamp (dispossession – how the land has been and will be taken) and how this stamp may complicate the practices of belonging (possession – ongoing attachment to land) already underway. In the next two chapters, I explore the creation of material-affective linkages brought about by the rise of the forest staple and its stamp, but in this chapter I have provided a foundation for understanding the material, affective, and localized practices of Settler belonging.

Chapter 3: The Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway

When British Columbia joined Confederation with Canada in 1871, politicians and capitalists, mostly located in the capital of Victoria, were eager to see the promised railway cross over from the mainland and terminate in the nearby port of Esquimalt (Reksten, 1991, p. 55). However, the Terms of Union stipulated only that the railway was required to make “the seaboard of British Columbia” and so the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) chose the shortest distance – tidewater at the head of Burrard Inlet on the mainland. When this proved to be an unfit port, Coal Harbour/Vancouver was later selected. Having missed out on the construction of a Pacific terminus for the “national dream” (Berton, 1970), Vancouver Island was eventually provided with a consolation route that would come to be known as the Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway (E&N).

In this chapter, I focus on conflict generated by the massive land grant awarded to the E&N Railway Company during the 1880s. Specifically, I highlight state efforts to juggle the private property rights of Settlers with those granted to the E&N through the *Settlement Act* of 1884. I argue that the land grant is not a single event temporally fixed or territorially bounded, but rather a fluid feature of settlement that is entangled with (ongoing) belonging. With the advent of the railway, the mode/relations of production transformed from agriculture to resource extraction. Settlers invoked waypoints of belonging to challenge and comprehend the grant/railway’s meaning for the future of settlement on Vancouver Island. To explain these events, I examine records from the Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives relating to Settler grievances stemming from the *Settlement Act*, the legislation that granted the E&N Railway Company monopoly land and resource rights. The E&N land grant is an overlooked subject in

British Columbia History (see Introduction) and this chapter contributes to the field by highlighting the complex, conflictual, and enduring property relations stemming from the grant. I conclude the chapter with the examples of real estate development and a vignette about my Great Grandfather's farm in the Comox Valley to demonstrate that the land grant and the stamp of staple extraction intersect to root, bind, and spread (dis)possession over time. Finally, I show that analysis of the grant's history, or what the Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group calls "Great Land Grab" (2007), is central to understanding the ways in which the grant continues to generate conflict in the present, a subject I explore in the chapters that follow.

"Thereupon, therein, and thereunder"

Coal was one of Vancouver Island's first staple resource trades. Exploited by the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) at Fort Rupert and Nanaimo using labour from local First Nations, Native Hawaiians, and migrants from Britain, Vancouver Island coal helped fuel the Royal Navy and aided the imperial project in the Pacific during the 19th century (Belshaw, 2002, p. 31). In the summer of 1853, Robert Dunsmuir, hired from Scotland to work in the company's coal mining operations less than two years prior, began prospecting on his own. By 1869, ten years after the HBC monopoly right to Vancouver Island ended, Dunsmuir was granted claim to several coal deposits in the Nanaimo area/Snuneymuxw First Nation territory (Peterson, 2002, pp. 132-133). From these claims, the Dunsmuir family would rise to become British Columbia's preeminent industrialists and robber barons.

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the construction of railways was central to nation building and expanding the fledgling Canadian economy (Charland, 1986). As an investment in domestic production for the purposes of export, railways are a

backward linkage of the staple economy (Watkins, 2006a/1963). To construct a transcontinental railway, the *Manitoba Act* of 1870 and the signing of the numbered treaties were intended to secure access to Indigenous lands following the Red River Resistance. To encourage investment in the project, the Canadian government offered financial backing and massive land grants that guaranteed access to real estate and resources (Chodos, 1973). For Dunsmuir and his American investors, similar terms were proposed for the Island railway in the early 1880s, including the private ownership of over two million acres of Vancouver Island upon completion.

Attempts to “extinguish” Indian title to land on Vancouver Island ceased after 1854 when the last Vancouver Island Treaty was signed. Regarding Indian title, the 1871 Terms of Union stated only that Canada would undertake a “policy as liberal as that hitherto pursued by the British Columbia Government,” a misleading and vague statement intended to evade the ‘Indian land question’ in the province (Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs [UBCIC], n.d.; Harris, 2002, p. 73). In a coordinated effort between the newly associated federal and provincial powers, the Joint Indian Reserve Commission of the 1870s laid out numerous Indian Reserves across the province. These small reserves and other select Crown lands were excluded from the E&N grant, but nearly everything else was not. For construction of just over 70 miles (113kms) of track, Dunsmuir and investors were given nearly two million acres of uncaded First Nations territories, \$750,000.00, and, with the exception of gold and silver, the rights to “all coal, oil, ores, stones, clay, marble, slate, mines, minerals and substances whatsoever thereupon, therein, and thereunder” (as cited in Taylor, 1975, p. 4). Like the HBC before it, the E&N Railway Company had a virtual monopoly over resource extraction. When

the line was completed in 1886, the company stood to benefit from land speculation and the influx of settlement that would accompany the railway.

The Settlement Act

Before the terminus of the CPR was fixed to the mainland, politicians and business owners in the provincial capital of Victoria were eager to see the railway cross over the water (at Seymour Narrows) to Vancouver Island and terminate at the harbour of Esquimalt. This route seemed to be fixed by an 1873 federal Order in Council (Canada, 1873), and shortly thereafter the province reserved a largely unsurveyed “strip of land Twenty Miles in width along the Eastern Coast of Vancouver Island between Seymour Narrows and the Harbour of Esquimalt” (Taylor, 1975, p. 4). Although these lands were set aside for the railway, it did not stop the arrival of Settlers; during the late 1870s and the early 1880s, Settlers occupied lands throughout the reserve. In August 1883, after ten years of delay and political conflict, including the Pacific Scandal of 1873 and abandonment of the Seymour Narrows crossing/Esquimalt terminus, the Dunsmuir-backed Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Company secured the contract for a separate Island railway. The next step was for the Province to transfer reserved lands to the Dominion which, upon completion of the railway, would confer the grant upon the company. This has often caused confusion about the date of the grant – lands were conveyed from the Province to the Dominion in 1884, but not to the E&N Railway Company until completion of the line in 1887. Recall that between 1873 and 1883, Settlers continued to occupy lands within the boundaries of the original 1873 railway reserve. Although they were prevented from pre-empting or purchasing land in the reserve, Settlers were under the impression that once the question of an Island railway was settled they would be permitted to purchase fee-simple title to their occupied lands.

As I explain below, the failure to grant fee-simple title, understood as an absolute and sole right to the property and its resources, generated decades of conflict between Settlers, the state, and the railway company.

First proposed in 1883, the *Settlement Act*, so-called as it was intended to settle the question of the railway (Reksten, 1991, p. 61), was the provincial legislation that granted land and property rights to the Dominion for transfer to the E&N Railway Company. The act led to disagreement between Settlers who feared the monopoly on land and resources and those who saw land grants as a necessary part of doing business in Canada (Ormsby, 1958, p. 29). In a November 1883 edition of the Dunsmuir-promoter *Daily Colonist*, a letter to the editor attributed to “Progress” described one argument:

I am opposed to monopolies of a vicious character which are supported by class legislation, but not to the centralization of capital for the purposes of development. If it has been found necessary to give large bonuses for the prosecution of vast undertakings in countries easy to develop how much more necessary is it to do so in a country like ours where the valleys of the interior are almost inaccessible and *roads must first be made* before settlement can take place? The speedy commencement of the Island railway guarantees an *absorption of all the white labor* coming into the country, and as the line progresses its gradual settlement. It also *insures an enhancement in the value of property*, a market for all we can raise and a high price for everything we can produce” [emphasis added] (“Progress,” 1883).

“Progress” presents the E&N monopoly as a necessary action that will continue the steady march of white settlement over the whole of Vancouver Island. Mention of roadwork through difficult terrain recalls the labour of a ‘hardy pioneer’ and is followed by the foreshadowing of increased settlement if the railway is built. Those few hundred Settlers who managed to alienate land prior to the grant stood to gain through rising property values and business/employment opportunities.³⁰

³⁰ In the book *Those Island People* (2013), author Lynne Bowen details the life of Black settler Louis Stark. Stark pre-empted land near Nanaimo prior to the *Settlement Act*, and thus owned the mineral rights to his

Not all saw the E&N monopoly in the same way. In the fall of 1883, members of the legislative assembly from Nanaimo and Cowichan held a series of meetings to convince Settlers that the impending *Settlement Act* was a bad deal. The *Daily British Colonist* described members O'Brian, Abrams, and Pimbury as spouting "tawdry buncombe and claptrap about giving away the heritage of our children for a paltry piece of railway" ("Cowichan as ever," 1883). In this excerpt, the *Colonist* is skeptical of the grant's impact upon future generations, but it is clear that the future stability of Settler belonging was in question. The *Colonist's* reporting on the meetings held at Maple Bay and south Cowichan is particularly biased and overly disdainful of efforts to oppose the railway, describing it as an "attempt to impede the revolutions of the wheel of progress" ("Cowichan as ever," 1883). It was reported that the Settlers at the "well attended" Cowichan meetings rejected the arguments of the three MLAs. In Nanaimo and Comox, however, the *Settlement Act* was a source of anger and hundreds of Settlers signed a petition opposing the railway monopoly (British Columbia [BC], 1884a; BC 1884b; Peterson, 2002, p. 203; Mackie, 1995, p. 167).

Robert Dunsmuir was first elected MLA for Nanaimo in 1882. Historian Terry Reksten notes that this did not translate to support for the terms of the *Settlement Act* (1991, p. 64). At the 1883 Nanaimo meeting concerning the Act, great animosity followed the reading of a letter from Dunsmuir, a letter which echoed the sentiments espoused by "Progress" in the *Colonist* (Reksetn, 1999, p. 64). The presence of coal throughout Nanaimo and Comox and the gifting of mineral rights to the E&N, as well as

property. In 1895 he rejected an offer from the Dunsmuirs to buy the property and, a short time later, his body was found at the bottom of a cliff – his white neighbour implicated, but never convicted, in his death. Stark's alleged murder shows that the Black Settler was understood as a Settler of a different order and offers a complication to any idea that settlement and land disputes were the sole domain of white Settlers.

a real or perceived betrayal by their elected official, may help to explain the different reactions between Cowichan, Nanaimo, and Comox. Agriculture remained a key economic driver in the Cowichan and Comox Valleys but, unlike Cowichan, Comox had an incipient coal economy in the 1880s while Nanaimo's was well established. In other words, Settlers expecting to purchase lands within the E&N grant in Nanaimo and Comox stood to lose out if mineral rights "thereupon, therein, and thereunder" were granted to the railway company. Support for the E&N's terms was far from universal, but better access to markets was a primary concern for farmers in Cowichan. For example, residents Graff, Hollings, Chapman, and Lafortune of Shawnigan Lake wrote to Premier Smithe in 1885 arguing that the railway, while important, was only part of the solution to market access:

The Island Railway will make new roads an imperative necessity. We are, however, of the opinion, that the presently available money [from the provincial budget] might with the greatest advantage be used for a wharf at Whiskey Point (Mill Bay) and a larger sum placed on the next estimates for roads leading to the railway station at Cobble Hill likely to be on Mr. Graffs land there (1885).

In this letter, Settlers demonstrate their understanding of how the imminent railway could best benefit their lives and the local settlement pattern. Looking at the debate surrounding the *Settlement Act* reveals Settler concern for the future of land use and the transformation from agrarian settlement to a series of railway stations surrounded by the interests of monopoly capital. For many farmers, the railway would mean greater access to the markets of Nanaimo and Victoria. However, the loss of mineral rights through the *Settlement Act* led to decades long conflict with the Province, Dominion, and the E&N.

Sufficiently pleased with the completion of the E&N in 1886, the Dominion transferred ownership of the lands reserved by the Province to the Esquimalt & Nanaimo

Railway Company in 1887. To account for the presence of Settlers who had occupied lands within the railway reserve after its creation in 1873, the *Settlement Act* contained a provision allowing for the sale of land:

[any] bona fide squatter who has continuously occupied, and improved any of the lands within the tract of land to be acquired by the company from the Dominion Government for a period of one year prior to the first day of January, 1883, shall be entitled to a grant of the freehold of the surface rights of the said squatted land, to the extent of 160 acres to each squatter, at the rate of one dollar an acre (as cited in Taylor, 1975, p. 6).

This clause, however, did not grant these “squatters,” as they came to be called by the E&N, fee-simple title (Canada, 1918). The right to subsurface minerals was excluded and, as this exclusion became known to Settlers, their protests led to several attempts to rectify the matter. For example, the question of title to the railway reserve lands produced no fewer than ten legal cases brought before the Supreme Court of Canada and/or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London between 1894 and 1921 (Black, 2017b).³¹ In addition, an 1897 inquiry undertaken by the federal government found that the affected Settlers did not have legal claim to coal or other minerals, but did conclude that a form of redress from the province was needed (Canada, 1897). These findings were followed by a provincial commission in 1900, which reported against Settler claims for redress. Complaints from Settlers did not end there and, as I explain below, the

³¹ Cases brought to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the United Kingdom include: *David Hoggan v The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company (Canada)* (1894); *Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v William Herbert Bainbridge (British Columbia)* (1896); *McGregor v The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company (British Columbia)* (1907); *The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v H. W. Treat (British Columbia)* (1919); *Angus Mackenzie and others v Bing Kee (British Columbia)* (1919); *The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v The Granby Consolidated Mining Smelting and Power Company Limited (British Columbia)* (1920); *The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v Elizabeth Dunlop (British Columbia)* (1919); *The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v Charles Wilson and another (British Columbia)* (1919); *The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v Elizabeth Dunlop and others (British Columbia)* (1921); *Charles Wilson and others v The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company (British Columbia)* (1921). For a more detailed look at how Settlers understood their claims see *High handed proceedings on Vancouver's Island, or, How settlers were evicted in 1895* (Waddington & Hoggan, 1899).

persistence of those affected kept the issue alive well into the twentieth century. The point here is that the *Settlement Act* did not actually settle anything; instead of a single event granting monopoly property rights to capital, the E&N land grant generated decades of conflict between capital, Settlers, and the state, and led to protracted and shifting claims for land and resources, over time. Some Settlers felt angry; others welcomed the grant and/or the potential for local economic development. Still other Settlers feared for future generations that would be encompassed by the grant, while some resented Dunsmuir and his favourable terms. The common link within this array of feelings is that Settlers understood that the grant would bring about changes to already established affective attachments to land. What I am showing here is that study of the E&N grant reveals a *working out* of land alienation and belonging through claims to private property and mineral rights, shared claims to community development, and concern for future generations.

By 1902, aggrieved Settlers began to find support among politicians, including from Nanaimo Member of the Legislative Assembly J.H. Hawthornthwaite who argued that their claims were “just” and should be “settled with equity and fairness” (1902). The 1904 *Vancouver Island Settlers’ Rights Act* attempted to do just this by retroactively giving certain Settlers full title to E&N lands and allowing them to pursue the matter in court. The act returned fee simple title to those who, upon application, could provide “reasonable proof of such occupation or improvement and intention” within one year of the legislation (as cited in Taylor, 1975, p.7). In requesting evidence of “occupation or improvement” the Act summoned the primacy of a Lockean conception of rights in property.

Although the *Vancouver Island Settlers' Rights Act* passed through the provincial legislature, it encountered the pitfalls of Dominion-provincial relations. The *British North America Act* (1867) gave the federal government the power of disallowance, the authority to prevent provincial legislation. In the E&N's application to the federal government for disallowance of the *Vancouver Island Settlers' Rights Act*, the company argued that the Dominion had contracted the E&N based on the stipulation that the company would own the grant lands, with the exception of any "bona fide" squatters, when the work was completed (Canada, 1918). The E&N agreed that the squatters were entitled to a grant that excluded the surface rights, but to remove the company's access to timber and subsurface rights (coal) would be a "unjust confiscation of the company's rights in the property" (Canada, 1918, p. 2). In response, the province argued "the Legislature by the Settlement Act did not convey to the Dominion, under which Government the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company claim, any lands in the Railway Belt as to which any other person had a lawful claim" (Canada, 1904). Essentially, the provincial government came to recognize that the "bona fide" squatter had a right to full, fee simple title. The federal government disallowed the *Vancouver Island Settlers' Rights Act* in June 1904. Just one year later, the Province transferred 86,346 acres to the Dominion for conveyance to the E&N in an effort to rectify the *Settlement Act*'s omission of a specific figure related to lands already alienated within the grant boundaries (Taylor, 1975, p. 8).

The first test case of the *Vancouver Island Settlers' Rights Act* was *McGregor v. Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company* and it proceeded to the highest judiciary for Canada at the time, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (JCPC). The JCPC ruled on the case in 1907 and agreed that the province's grant to the Dominion did include

parcels of fully alienated land (*McGregor v. The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company*, 1907). As a result, the legislation was upheld, reversing the Dominion's disallowance. This led to a third grant of 20,000 acres – including some foreshore and undersea mineral rights – to the E&N in 1910.³² Despite these settlements, a 1916 provincial commission heard further requests for redress. In submissions to the commission, Settlers provided local knowledge and rudimentary maps to support their claims of occupation prior to 1883. In a submission for coal rights in the Comox Valley, one claimant evoked Settler relationships as proof of occupation:

This land was taken up about 1873 or 4 and was occupied about 1872 by a shoemaker by name of Reddy who lived there some years. We believe that J Shields afterwards owned the property and sold to Samuel Fulton Crawford, afterwards purchased about 1905 by WJ. Andrews, and thence to present owners. Both Mr. Reddy and Mr Shields were very well known by the old timers here, such a [sic] Mr. McPhee, Mr. A Urquhart and others and there is little difficulty in obtaining this history (Bigelow, 1916).

In Ladysmith, another claimant focused on significant land improvements:

I will remember George Cassidy living on and improving Lot 8, Oyster District in the year 1881. In the said year 1881 I drove a team of oxen on to the said Lot 8 Oyster District, which the said George Cassidy packed a plough on his back for the purpose of cultivating the said lands which he afterwards did (Michael, 1916).

These and other depositions found in the Royal BC Museum and Archives reveal the important place Settler relationships, to each other and to land, and local history have had in justifying and upholding Settler property rights. In many ways these depositions are recorded oral histories, but what is critical to note here is that the defence of Settler claims relies on a project of (dis)possession. That is, the alienation of land and affectionate recollection are entangled and deployed to show attachment over time; as the relations of production transformed, from agriculture to resource extraction, examples of

³² In 1905, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company purchased the E&N Railway Company.

Settler belonging, through improvement and inter-Settler relationships, were presented as a challenge to the E&N's monopoly rights. The acceptance of these claims by the state evokes the duplicitous policies of the provincial and Dominion governments that have rejected the validity and legality of Indigenous oral traditions (Sparke, 1998). I am demonstrating here that the Great Land Grab is more than a single transfer of land; decades after the transfer of lands in 1887, Settlers consistently exerted claims in the face of monopoly property rights while subsequent grants attempted to rectify any perceived loss to the company. Private property is both the advent of and a potential threat to Settler belonging.

By 1917, continuous claims to fee-simple title convinced the provincial government to again amend the *Vancouver Island Settlers' Rights Act*. Full title was to be retroactively granted to those who had not applied in the year between 1904 and 1905. Once again the E&N Railway Company, supported also by Canadian Collieries (Dunsmuir) Ltd.³³ and the National Trust Company (bondholders), opposed the retroactive effort. The federal Committee of the Privy Council recommended to the Governor General that *An Act to amend the Vancouver Island Settlers' Rights Act, 1904* be disallowed based on the same premise as 1904: that allowing yet further claim to subsurface rights was "an invasion of valuable proprietary rights" (Canada, 1918, n.p.). This time, the petitioners pushing for disallowance met with Prime Minister Robert Borden, the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Justice "in exception of the ordinary procedure" (Canada, 1918, p. 4). Lobbying clearly had the intended impact as the legislation was disallowed in May 1918 while further legislative attempts to achieve Settler land rights in 1919 and 1920 never became law (Taylor, 1975, p. 9).

³³ By this time associated with Dunsmuir in name only.

As Settlers grappled with understanding the political economic transformations a railway would bring, the question of Indian title continued to be ignored and this made both Settler occupation and the Great Land Grab possible. The E&N railway and land grant called into question the legitimacy of many Settler claims and placed a renewed importance on proof of labour in the land, history of occupation, and Settler community. The Dominion and provincial governments went to great lengths to defend the property rights of both the E&N and Settlers, a reminder that both Settler colonialism and capitalism demand the concept of private property be upheld at all costs, albeit in sometimes contradictory ways.

The Torrent of Settlement

Even before the tracks had been laid, news of an impending deal to construct the railway had an immediate impact on the communities along the proposed E&N route. Land speculators drove up property values and contracts for labour and supplies brought income from wage labour to both Settler and First Nations families³⁴ (Norcross, 1986, p. 141; Knight, 1996; Benjamin, 2001, p. 42). For those who arrived in Cowichan during the 1860s and 1870s, the railway brought changes that were quickly apparent. Local Cowichan historian and daughter of early Settlers Elizabeth Blanche Norcross explains: “New people started to come in, people with capital to buy land and the equipment and stock to work it. When the trains actually started regular service this third wave of settlement could almost be characterized as a flood” (Norcross, 1986, p. 141). Although the majority of pioneer families had been in the area for less than three decades, their presence became venerable when contrasted with the torrent of new arrivals. As an engine of “progress,” the railway sped up and built upon the (dis)possession undertaken

³⁴ E&N Railway workers also included migrant Chinese labourers and, despite barriers put in place by the federal and provincial governments, many did choose to settle in British Columbia.

by early Settlers who were now ‘settled’ and felt invaded by new arrivals. However, the E&N also created a temporal and material waypoint for the narrative of belonging as it organized Settlers into those who came before the railway and those who came after. In the discourse of local histories, the distinction made pre-railway settlement a signifier of the “old timer’s” legitimacy:

Down our way the railroad changed the whole tenor of life. It was an institution of first-rate economic and social importance. Business began to develop and new settlers continuously arrived. Shawnigan Lake had been an uninhabited wilderness; Cobble Hill a place where the wolves made weird music in the long winter nights, and where the city of Duncan now stands, the barefoot boy Kenneth Duncan herded his fathers cows (Dougan, 1973, p. 65).

Whereas before there was only “silence” (chapter two) broken by the sound of animals, the imprints of the first Settlers underwent an upheaval when the railway came. Various local histories describe the railway as bringing “great changes” (Olsen, 1963; Dougan, 1973, 1986; Norcross 1975; Barry Ellis, 1982; Bonner 2001), but it also had the effect of consolidating the majority of settlement alongside and near the rail line. This was not only because of the social and economic benefits to be derived, but also because the E&N Railway Company, through its grant, had come to own the surrounding landscape. Historically, the E&N Railway serves as a waypoint that recalls and reinforces different, but related, forms of (dis)possession relative to the Settler’s arrival. This distinction reflects the performativity involved in legitimatizing the Settler project:

The intellectual and political technologies for justifying the assertion of jurisdiction over Native peoples and expropriation of their lands do not simply disappear when Indians are (declared to be) no longer there. Rather, they remain vital in the ongoing performance of quotidian modes of inhabitation and selfhood, which rely on the reiteration of settler sovereignty and its accompanying legal and normative templates (like the extra-political character of place and personhood) (Rifkin, 2013, p. 330).

Building from this, I am demonstrating that those who arrived before the railway recall and put to work the ‘before time’ as an integral aspect of their Settler identity and claim to land, whereas those who arrive after must undertake new efforts to belong.

Whatever the Settler relationship to the E&N, First Nations never ceded these lands. Resistance, ongoing since before the HMS *Hecate* arrived at Cowichan Bay, took a new approach beginning in 1901 through a petition sent directly to the “sovereign,” King Edward VII (Marshall, 1999, p. 146). In 1906, three chiefs claiming to represent the First Nations of British Columbia, including Chief Charlie Tsulpi’multw of the Cowichan Tribes, travelled to London and delivered another petition, this time directly to the King. In an appeal to the honour of the Crown, the petition observed:

In other parts of Canada the Indian title has been extinguished, reserving sufficient land for the use of the Indians, but in British Columbia the Indian title has never been extinguished, nor has sufficient land been allotted to our people for maintenance (as cited in Marshall, 1999, p. 149).

In addition to a framed portrait of the King, it is said that the chiefs received a guarantee from the King that action would be taken (Marshall, 1999; Thor Carlson, 2005; Morales, 2014). Yet, Canada took no action, forcing the Cowichan to petition the King again in 1909. Hamar Foster explains that this “remarkable document was the first legally sophisticated articulation of the doctrine of Aboriginal title on behalf of Aboriginal people in British Columbia, by which I mean that it based the Cowichan claim squarely on British law” (2007, p. 66). The 1909 petition invoked the *Royal Proclamation* of 1763 and can be understood within the context of a growing movement in British Columbia to have Indian title recognized (Foster, 2007). For example, in 1910 the Interior Tribes of British Columbia drafted the “Laurier Memorial” and delivered it to Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier who was then on a pre-election tour of the country (Feltes, 2015). The

memorial condemned “the whole policy of the B.C. government towards the Indian tribes of this country as utterly unjust, shameful and blundering in every way” (Shuswap Nation Tribal Council, 2010). Wendy Wickwire notes that

one theme that permeates every piece of documentation produced during this period is the importance of the land to the Native way of life. The chiefs portray land as belonging to all the people and the source of all their needs....The chiefs rarely spoke of their 'ownership' of the land. Rather, they spoke of land as shared (1998, p. 234).

Canada and British Columbia’s inattention to these and other petitions and delegations (Foster, Raven, & Webber, 2007), exhibits a severe disparity between the treatment of aggrieved individual Settlers, as evidenced in E&N land grant claims, and First Nations assertions of injustice. This sharp contrast is reminiscent of Wolfe’s argument that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society” (2006, p. 388). What I mean is that the question of Indian title was supposed to disappear along with the Indians, whereas the claims of Settlers and capital would persist and continue to be worked out.

The Forest Staple & Real Estate

News of the E&N railway and its impending land subsidy enticed both resource and real estate speculators to Vancouver Island. Seeking to capitalize on the E&N’s need for wooden ties and trestles, Henry Croft travelled from the Washington Territory in 1883 to purchase nearly 500 acres at Chemainus and, with his partner, establish a milling operation (Reksten, 1991, p. 125). Croft married Mary Dunsmuir in 1885 and became Robert Dunsmuir’s son in law, but when the E&N was completed in 1886, demand for lumber initially declined (Reksten, 1991, p. 125). Decreased demand left Croft in financial trouble and provided Robert Dunsmuir with the opportunity to purchase the mill, land, and associated timber. Coal extraction had always been the dominant focus of Dunsmuir’s operations and the mill, lands, and other timber holdings were sold. The

Dunsmuir made significant profits from the sale of land and timber granted to them, but for much of the late-eighteenth century, logging and sawmilling on Vancouver Island was a low production endeavour. It was not until the start of the First World War that the value of forest production in BC finally surpassed the value of coal and mineral production (Hayter, 2000, pp. 38-39). Robert Dunsmuir died in 1889, and by 1901 control of the E&N and other Dunsmuir assets passed to his wife Joan and their son James. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company (CPR) purchased the E&N Railway Company and grant lands (save those required for operating coal mines) from James in 1905. The CPR, recognizing the value of such vast privately owned lands, created its own logging firms and began selling off lands and access to resources (Marchak, 1983, p. 35). This is a crucial point: the prevalence of private E&N lands and the transformation to forest staple production began to shape (dis)possession in different ways. For example, the extent of private property turned the E&N Railway Company into a promoter of settlement and real estate development. Whereas the E&N land grant took a large swath of territory, the grant was to be further divided and sold, making it a root cause of countless (dis)possessive events.

A 1909 prospectus issued by the E&N Railway Company aimed to encourage purchase and settlement of lands within the railway belt. Claiming to detail the timber, agricultural, and industrial possibilities of E&N lands, the small booklet described each settlement along the rail line for the intending Settler:

Esquimalt and Nanaimo's Railway Company Lands

....The greater portion of Agricultural Land in the Railway Grant is more or less heavily timbered, but as the timber is cut, and the land is gradually cleared it will become open to settlement.

In addition to their acreage lands the Company have suburban lots for sale at Shawnigan and Sooke lakes, where excellent hunting and fishing may be enjoyed amongst magnificent scenery....

Further north lies the famous Cowichan Valley, noted for its beauty of scenery and fertility of soil. Cowichan, including the districts of Comiaken, Quamichan, Somenos, Sahtlam, Seymour and Shawnigan, is one of the most flourishing settlements on the Island.

The soil of the Cowichan Valley is of peculiar richness, being strongly impregnated with carbonate of lime, with usually a depth of two or three feet and a subsoil of blue clay and gravel...The roads throughout the district are the best on Vancouver Island, where bad roads are almost unknown, thanks to the efforts of the local municipal council...(Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Company, 1909, pp. 26, 28)

A Word of Advice

In presenting this brief description of Vancouver Island and the lands in which it is directly interested, the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company desires to state that the lands now available for settlement are limited in extent, but that large areas will be gradually cleared and placed on the market. The object of the Company in publishing this book is to draw the attention of homeseekers to the exceptional advantages possessed by Vancouver Island and to outline its future possibilities. Immediately that a section of country is cleared and ready for farming the fact will be advertised and full information furnished concerning its adaptability (Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Company, 1909, p. 38).

In these passages the potential for settlement is tied in with clearing the land or, rather, the cutting of the forest. The description of Cowichan as a scenic and fertile place echoes the first impressions of Robert Brown and James Douglas upon their arrival to the valley (chapter two). Whereas early Settlers struggled against the “impenetrable forest,” new arrivals seeking E&N lands need only wait for industrial forestry to undertake this task, another marker of difference between those who came before the railway and those who came after.

In testimony before the Royal Commission on Imperial Trade in 1916, Leonard Solly, Land Agent for the E&N Railway Company, explained the role of speculation in the settlement of company lands:

For instance, all the land around Shawnigan Lake here, that was all laid off into suburban lots, chiefly for suburban homes, for shooting and fishing, boating and so on. And when we had a boom here a few years ago, practically all the land that was unsold was taken up: that was, taken up for speculation, most of it. Most of the land around the shore had been bought years before in a boom, in 2 ½ acre blocks. There are people that subdivided that again, possibly into half – acre holdings; and they have sold at a very high advance (Canada, 1916d).

Shawnigan Lake, once an “uninhabited wilderness” (Dougan, 1973, p. 65), was home to the Shawnigan Lake Lumber Company in the 1880s and 1890s. However, properties along the shoreline – those already logged – were lucrative for the E&N. In turn, subdivided properties benefited both the speculator and the E&N as property values in the area increased. Solly identifies the boom and bust cycle as a driver of speculation. Yet, the value of the company’s lands were not impacted by this cycle in the same way as the staple economy. In response to a question from the Commission about the expense associated with land clearing, General Superintendent of the E&N, H.E. Beasley, noted that if a Settler had the capital to clear the logged-off land, the cost was actually negligible on southern Vancouver Island:

But a point I would like to bring to your attention, and I think it is well worth consideration, is the fact that this process [of colonization] has been going on now for a number of years, ever since we have completed construction, and beyond our line, in the Courtenay valley; and there even is to-day up there I should say 6,000 or 7,000 acres of splendid logged-off land, fit for agricultural purposes; but unfortunately the class of farmers, the class of people we have had in there, have not been able to pay the expense of clearing the land. It would be wrong to get the impression that because we have to pay for clearing that land that it makes it too high; because, in the opinion of nearly everybody here - and as they learn more about it they seem to be of the same impression – our climate here is such that we can afford, they can afford, to pay a little more for it. For instance, we have a climate here that is the mildest in Canada – I am safe in saying so. And consequently it will always be desirable in that way (Canada, 1916d).

Beasley’s emphasis on climate reveals something of the railway company’s understanding of its real estate holdings: land in a mild climate will both increase in value

and attract a class of people willing to pay more to live in a “desirable” region. It is important to note that the emphasis placed on attracting only the most well suited and capitalized Settler reflects the long hangover of the Wakefieldian system, wherein gentlemen farmers supplied the capital needed for a flourishing colony. Moreover, Beasley and Solly’s arguments demonstrate the self-evident way in which the real estate market is seen as a reward for the labour of the hardy Settler; improved land will continue to rise in value, resulting in a healthy return to the early and well capitalized Settler, thus

Figure 9: Plan for land clearing from a 1909 E&N pamphlet (reproduced from Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Company, 1909, p. 32)

creating a class of Settler above the others. The E&N Railway Company’s ability to make properties available for both real estate and extraction is evidence of the land grant’s status as a flexible regime of property. Moreover, I

am arguing that the E&N, as a waypoint for Settler belonging, is also bound up with class relations. What I mean is that land sales and court cases made it possible to mark the difference between a squatter, a pre-emptor, a pioneer, and a well-capitalized arrival. Some properties within the grant were targeted for extraction while others were marketed to Settlers, allowing the company to elude the pitfalls of a boom/bust cycle. As I make

clear in the following chapters, this shift to forest staple production and real estate within the E&N grant shapes the project of (dis)possession into the present day.

Vignette: The Farm at Little River

Beginning in 1915, both the provincial and Dominion governments began investigating schemes for the re-integration of soldiers returned from the Great War. In 1917, the province passed the *British Columbia Land Settlement and Development Act* to make provision for the government to acquire agricultural lands for cultivation by returned soldiers. That same year, the Dominion passed the *Soldier's Settlement Act* creating the Soldier Settlement Board, an entity to manage loans to soldiers for land improvements and building construction. The idea behind the scheme was that veterans with farming skills would be offered land, a loan, and, in just a few years, pay back the loan from the success of their agricultural pursuits (Koroscil, 2000).

The first problem encountered by both levels of government was a large number of applications and a dearth of suitable Crown land. With financial support from the Dominion, private lands were purchased and made available to veterans in two types of settlements: settlement areas and development areas. The former were lands that, up to that point, had limited agricultural production and undeveloped land; the latter were identified as timbered areas where soil conditions suited agriculture (Koroscil, 2000).

In 1919, the Provincial Land Settlement Board acquired 14,000 acres of logged over land from the Comox Logging & Railway Company (a subsidiary of the Canadian Western Lumber Company). The lands, named Merville, were located on parts of Block 29 in the Comox Valley and were originally purchased

from the E&N Railway Company in the late 1890s. Like other timber holdings on the Island, Block 29 was a “very irregular shape” as it had been cruised and surveyed for the best timber rather than settlement (BC, 1919a). The Board also purchased farms already under cultivation, and subdivided them for soldier Settlers – reward for the Settler’s early arrival (Mackie, 2000, p. 88). By all accounts, the settlement at Merville was far from a success. Some veterans knew nothing of farming, the soil was less than fertile for agriculture, and the land was difficult – and dangerous – to clear. To add to the settlement’s difficulties, a fire in 1922, originating from logging operations, destroyed what the intending farmers had managed to build. The problem of clearing was not one confined to Merville. The term “stump ranch” was coined to describe the expanse of stumps and slash littered across the farmer’s former forestry lands. In the novel *Broken Ground*, Jack Hodgins describes the stump menace in Comox:

Taylor examined a sixth stump, bigger than the rest, back against the edge of the woods. This one was taller than the others and twisted, with jagged spikes thrust up from the top – a tree that had probably fallen when cut only halfway through. Some poor logger may have been killed by the kick. Its giant roots were half-exposed, curled around boulders as though refusing to budge, like a wisdom tooth wrapped around your jawbone (1998, p. 57).

A picture provided by my Grandfather shows my Great Grandmother Ellen and two Great Uncles, Reg and Alfred, posed next to such a stump (figure 10). These stumps were frequently attacked with dynamite or a steam powered donkey engine. Unfortunately, the return on investment was minimal at Merville – most were unable to succeed as stump ranchers, and thus unable to pay back their

government loans. Following the 1922 fire, only a handful of Settlers, mostly abandoned by the government, continued to live in the settlement.

Records from the Land Settlement Board show my maternal Great Grandfather, Alfred Edward Bennett, arriving at Merville on May 26, 1919 (BC, 1919b). He had immigrated from England in 1911 and started a family in Victoria. Prior to the First World War, he worked as a gardener and builder, and during the war he served as an ambulance driver. When I recall past conversations about Merville with my Grandfather and his

Figure 10: Reg, Alfred, and Ellen Bennett near Merville, BC, approximately 1920.

older sister, my Great Aunt Cathie, the why and how of Alfred's arrival in the settlement remains fuzzy and somewhat speculative. Nevertheless, Alfred does not appear to have participated in the settlement scheme for very long. By 1920 or 1921, he had purchased land nearby in the hamlet of Little River, Comox.

The Bennett's farm at Little River, in the territory of the K'ómoks First Nation, is linked directly with the E&N land grant and changes in the mode of production. In 1889, shortly before his death, Robert Dunsmuir arranged for the sale of his son-in-law's Chemainus mill and its E&N timberlands to the American-owned Victoria Lumber & Manufacturing Company (also known as the Chemainus

Company) (Mackie, 2000, p. 35). By 1901, forestlands around Comox were targeted for liquidation via a logging railway at Little River and in 1910 the Comox Logging & Railway Company came to own these expansive timber holdings (Mackie, 2000, p. 38). In the Comox region, logging was a vital source of wage labour for those who could not subsist on farming alone (Mackie, 2000, pp. 84-88; 2009, p. 272). My Great Grandfather, however, was able to eke out a living on these former E&N grant lands by growing and selling vegetables, particularly tomatoes. Directly and indirectly, the logging industry was an important customer for the farm and his livelihood.

Alfred's ledger books, dating from 1929 to 1940, detail the farm's products, prices, and customers. Although Alfred grew many vegetables, including "spuds," cauliflower, cabbage, onions, beets, lettuce, and onions, his main crop was tomatoes. Imported seeds such as "Essex Wonder," "Grand Rapids," and "John Baer" were grown and the farm supplied grocery stores in the region including Safeway, Overwaitea, Wilcock & Co. Ltd., Malpass and Wilson, Allen Dry Goods, Low Brothers, and the "Chinese store" (field notes). Settler neighbours also purchased vegetables from the farm, frequently on credit. Captain Vernon, Captain Bates, Mrs. Owen, Miss Hart, Mr. Green, Matt Brown, and the "Japanese" are listed among the many regular customers. "Headquarters," the administrative, social, and industrial centre for the Comox Logging & Railway Company, can also be found in our family's facsimile of the ledger. For example, on September 18 and October 2, 1929, Alfred sold twelve 25 pound crates of tomatoes to Headquarters/Comox Logging at a price of \$1.25 each (field notes).

Alfred's ledger is a snapshot of the family's daily life on the farm. Weather and harvest events are recorded, including the farm labour of my Grandfather, Arthur, his two sisters, Florence and Cathy, and his two older half-brothers, Alfred and Reg. The labour of my Great Grandmother, Ellen, is less explicit in the ledger, though it is revealed in a selection of items from a list of household expenditures:

Lemons	Knives
Currants	Bread
Oats/Flour	Soup
Twine	Olive oil
Bacon	Dairy
Roast Beef	2 girls hose
Ammonia	Tea, Coffee
Crayons	Ellie's shoes and socks
Candy	Arthur's pants
Chocolate	Macaroni

Ellen ran the household and these items reveal her work: cooking, baking, cleaning, and caring for the family. The absence of her labour in the ledger mirrors the gender relations of settlement in BC which "have been sharply divided into industrial and public spheres, effectively labelled male, and domestic and private space, assigned preeminently to women" (Creese & Strong Boag, 1995, p. 20). Although Ellen's vital labour within the home is unremarked upon by Alfred, it was, nonetheless, a constant and essential presence.

If there are expressed feelings to be found in Alfred's entries, those for May 25 and June 9, 1936 are the most evocative. The subject of these few lines, the longest of the ledger, is the farm work horse, Blackie. On May 25, 1936 Blackie fell sick and, just two weeks later, was shot and buried. These events are

not detailed in any deeply sentimental way by Alfred, yet, read/viewed alongside other notes about the horse and images of the two on the farm (figure 11), they reflect Blackie's important place in my Great Grandfather's life. Blackie not only helped with cultivation, he was also essential to bringing in extra money for the

Figure 11: My Great Grandfather Alfred with his horse Blackie and (likely) my Grandfather Arthur.

family. According to my Grandfather and Great Aunt, their Father supplemented his income, not through logging, but rather through road building and maintenance. The ledger reflects these memories:

1933

May 12 started road work

June 8 started road work to put in 11 days

1934

March 5 finished road work with Blackie

1935

May 8 started road work

July 13 finished 5 days on road

This work is likely linked to relief programs during the Great Depression and it is probable that Alfred's ownership of Blackie created particular opportunities for work that may not have existed for others. Unfortunately, the depression seems to have had an impact on the success of the farm. By 1940, the family moved to

Saanich in Greater Victoria, pushed to the city due to unpaid taxes on the Little River property.

The farm at Little River is part of my family's origin story on Vancouver Island. Alfred's ledger was a repository for the farm's finances and important events, but it is more than simply facts and figures. Although there appears to be little sentiment in the ledger's pages, it is imbued with feelings through the act of its long-term possession by my family. The care taken in preserving the ledger over generations recalls a shared affection for life on the farm. These feelings recall the setting down, quite literally, of roots; they signal adversity by clearing the land, making a living, and raising a family through economic depression and war. Yet, placed within its context, the ledger also uncovers the political economic and generational forces of belonging. It is the stamp of the staple and the agricultural potential of cutover land that led to the creation of the soldier's settlement at Merville. May 26, 1919: This date marked a new beginning for the Bennett family and their (our) sense of belonging on Vancouver Island. In this way, Alfred's arrival is also the start of a personal thread within a project of (dis)possession. The farm ledger and related images are objects within my archive of belonging and they help to reveal some of the ways in which my/our belonging is made possible by the E&N land grant and related forms of (dis)possession.

Conclusion

The 1884/1887 E&N land grant or, more appropriately, the Great Land Grab, conferred monopoly property rights across most of the southern Vancouver Island landscape. As I have demonstrated in this chapter, the grant is not a singular event, nor is it territorially bounded: the grant is a fluid feature of settlement that is bound up with the

material and affective practices of Settler belonging as they are worked out over time. Significantly, I have contributed to knowledge of the grant and its history through my archival research and study of the decades of conflict between the E&N Railway Company, the federal/provincial Crown, First Nations, and Settlers. Through commissions of inquiry in 1897, 1900, and 1916, and the *Vancouver Island Settler Rights Act* of 1904, the province attempted to defend Settler property rights against those of the Dominion-backed railway company; First Nations had no such support.

I have shown in this chapter that the E&N land grant became a temporal and material waypoint for Settlers who came before and Settlers who came after. The taking of land and maintaining possession of land was made possible by private property and also threatened by the E&N's monopoly rights to private property. In this way, through claims to private property and mineral rights, and by showing concern for future belonging, Settlers worked at and worked out (dis)possession. The railway and the terms of the grant transformed the mode and relations of production, from agricultural settlement to resource extraction. As the forest was logged, certain grant lands became real estate, evidence of the grant's status as a flexible regime of property. The Settler's relationship to the E&N grant was both affective and material, but it was also classed as the pre-emptor, pioneer, squatter, and well-capitalized Settler became categories entangled with the processes of (dis)possession. Although the value of forest production in British Columbia did not surpass coal and minerals until 1914, the land grant removed the much of the forest staple from Crown ownership and hastened extraction, the topic of discussion in the next chapter.

Chapter 4: Extraction in Perpetuity

Following the completion of the E&N and Canadian Pacific Railways during the mid 1880s, exploitation of the forest in British Columbia began to intensify as the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth. A growing availability of capital, mainly from the United States, and technological developments helped get more trees out of increasingly difficult terrain. This chapter traces transformations in the mode and means of production between 1886 and the 1950s to do three key things.³⁵ First, I examine the allocation and reduction of reserves during the first Joint Indian Reserve Commission (1876-1878) and the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs in British Columbia (1913-1924). I show that already small Indian reserves were further reduced to maximize the land base available for extraction and beneficial economic linkages and I argue that these reductions should be understood within this context. Second, I provide an outline of provincial forestry policy up to the Second World War and discuss the ways in which forest production on Vancouver Island became concentrated on private lands. This concentration relied, in part, upon the certainty of private property and the idea that First Nations lands, especially reserves, were ‘wasted.’ Third, I consider the Royal Commission on Forest Resources (1943-45) and show that the commission’s recommendations for sustained yield forestry marked an important transformation in the mode of production. I argue that this transformation, from unplanned extraction to state-sponsored and long-term management, buttressed the belief that extraction and Settler society are, together, perpetual undertakings. Finally, in a closing vignette I use the

³⁵ The mode of production refers to the ways that human subsistence is carried out based on a combination of productive forces (labour power, tools, technology, land etc.) and the social relations of production (property, power, law, social/class structure etc.). The means of production refers to the physical inputs of production, such as tools and infrastructure.

adoption of sustained yield forestry as a stepping off point to discuss the creation of material-affective linkages – the physical and affective aspects of the staple’s geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political stamp – that foster Settler belonging. Material-affective linkages support the taking of land and belonging to land through extraction, a connection with feelings for work, and a sense of place. Overall, this chapter, like those that preceded it, provides the requisite background for understanding the conflicts discussed in chapters five, six, seven, and eight.

“No right to the lands they claim”

Access to land was, and is, made possible through British Columbia and Canada’s denial of Indian title. All lands in the province, including reserves set out for and occupied by First Nations, have been targeted for their potential contribution to settlement and the extractive economy (Harris, 2002). During the early twentieth century, the size of reserve lands became particularly important as First Nations refused to be eliminated or vanish, as it was often believed they would. It is not my intention here to provide an analysis of the reserve system in British Columbia. Rather, I begin by demonstrating how Dominion/provincial efforts to allocate and reduce reserves shaped property relations and became tied in with extraction of the forest staple. Like all Indigenous territories, reserves were seen as holding wasted resources and as potential impediments to beneficial linkages, particularly backward and forward linkages such as transportation and manufacturing. In this way, the creation, reduction, and exploitation of reserve lands is interwoven with transformation of the forest from “trackless wilderness” to agrarian settlement, and then to a staple resource.

When Governor James Douglas retired in 1864, Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works Joseph Trutch rejected the existence of Indian title and reduced the size of reserves created under Douglas' direction. Trutch argued that

Indians really have no right to the lands they claim, nor are they of any actual value or utility to them; I cannot see why they should either retain these lands to the prejudice of the general interests of the Colony, or be allowed to make a market of them either to Government or to individuals (as cited in Fisher, 1992, p. 164).

For Trutch and other colonial officials, the objective was to maximize the area of settlement and avoid the hostility of Indians who knew very well the extent of invasion into their territories (Harris, 2002, p. 57). As one of three BC delegates to confederation negotiations in Ottawa, it was Trutch's motives that shaped the misleading clause in the Terms of Union (described in chapter three) that permitted BC to shun the Indian land question. Trutch's views were also central to the mandate of first Joint Indian Reserve Commission (JIRC), 1876 to 1878, created to address the growing conflict between Settlers and Indians. Cole Harris (2002) shows that the Dominion and province were immediately at odds regarding the amount of land to be allocated by the commission. However, Canada eventually acquiesced to the province's plans for small reserves and the JIRC was instructed to quickly and cheaply create reduced and scattered reserves throughout BC (Harris, 2002, p. 101). Indian reserves account for 0.2% of land in Canada, and there is a disparity between reserves sizes in British Columbia and, for example, the larger (though obviously still inadequate) reserves in the prairie provinces (Indigenous & Northern Affairs Canada, 2010).

Trutch's approach to the "Indian land question" continued to influence policy after his departure from the provincial government. For example, in January 1884, reserves laid out by the JIRC were deemed to be in excess by the provincial legislature:

Whereas large areas of land have been assigned to the Indians by the Indian Commissioners; and whereas such lands are not utilized by the Indians in any manner, and are not fenced or improved, although the same would be valuable to settlers on account of their agricultural character and quantities of timber, and it is advisable, owing to the increasing scarcity of agricultural land for settlement, that such lands should be open to improvement and cultivation, and their resources utilized; Be it therefore resolved that a respectful Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying His Honour to recommend to the Dominion Government the re-arrangement of Indian Reserves, so that the agricultural and timber lands not used or required by them may be thrown open to settlers, and the Indians located upon wild lands equally suitable for the purpose for which they require them (British Columbia [BC], 1884c).

Any and all agricultural and timbered lands are targeted in this resolution, due to a supposed lack of fences or other signs of improvement on the part of First Nations. This motion was followed by approval of the *Settlement Act*, which led to the granting of nearly two million acres to the E&N Railway Company. Together, these legislative measures anticipated a need for unencumbered access to as much land as possible in advance of a renewed Settler invasion. As I explained in the previous chapter, Settlers took time to organize their support for and opposition to the railway monopoly; Indian rights to land, however, gained little support.³⁶

If the forest was "impenetrable" (Barry Ellis, 1982, p. 13.) or "weird and gloomy" (Blakey-Smith, 1975, p. 79) when Settlers first arrived, envisioning the potential increase in economic production that the railway offered overtook these views. The earliest

³⁶ This is not to say that there were not Settlers who believed First Nations had been wronged by settlement policies. As Cole Harris notes, G.M. Sproat was quite frustrated with the JIRC's narrow parameters, as were many missionaries (2002). Wendy Wickwire (1998) and Hamar Foster (2007) also detail the efforts that some Settlers undertook support First Nations in their appeals to the Crown. Similar to the way that localized study reveals nuance where there can be a tendency to over generalize, these examples demonstrate that Settlers did not always engage with the Settler colonial project in the same way or from the same understandings (cf: Asch, 2014).

logging outfits harvested giant but easily accessible trees using workers supplied with axes, hand saws, spring boards, skid roads, and teams of oxen or horse.³⁷ By the early 1900s, a transformation in the means of production was underway as steam powered machines began to surpass more manual hand-logging methods (Rajala, 1998). For example, to yard cut trees from the forest, cables attached to a ‘donkey’ engine pulled the logs in so that they could be loaded and transported. Historian Richard S. Mackie has used the term “stump to dump” to describe the many steps of these logging processes (2009, p. 24). Coupled with the construction of main line and branch railways, these changes eliminated certain skilled jobs but also increased the backward, forward, and final demand linkages of the forest staple (Rajala, 1998, p. 19).³⁸

In the United States, rapid liquidation of forests during the mid to late nineteenth century led American forest barons to seek out the largely untouched forest resources of Vancouver Island (Hayter, 2000, p. 47). Leasing and licensing arrangements for access to timber in the province were unsystematically modified in the decades before the First World War. As a result, hundreds of thousands of acres of private land, free from the encumbrances of most Crown regulations, were purchased for forestry, primarily by US firms (Hak, 2007, p. 44).³⁹ Former logger and local Vancouver Island historian Joe Garner recalled:

³⁷ I am not concerned here with the design and implementation of equipment, nor am I interested in an empirical analysis of economic linkages stemming from technological innovation (Clement, 1988, p. 37). These matters have been covered elsewhere (cf: Marchak, 1983; Rajala, 1998; Hayter, 2000; Mackie, 2000, 2009).

³⁸ An example of a backward linkage is a transportation system, such as the E&N Railway. A forward linkage is a measure of the investment of profits from exports into facilities such as sawmills. A final demand linkage measures the level of investment in domestic industries producing consumer goods for an export market (Watkins, 2006a/1963, pp. 9-11).

³⁹ For example, an 1865 land ordinance let the Crown grant timber rights without relinquishing title and, between 1871 and 1913, access to timber could be gained either by purchasing land and timber, purchasing

When they learned of the E&N timber, [Americans] Humbird and Weyerhaeuser made a deal to purchase 100,000 acres of E&N railway land and timber to be selected at random anywhere in the Cowichan, Chemainus, or Nanaimo River valleys, and north of the Malahat to Campbell River, a vast area...When they found good quality timber they just blazed a compass line around it. One block at the head of Ladysmith harbour resembled a four leaf clover when it was put on their maps (1988, pp. 28-29).

The availability of private forestlands brought timber speculation to new heights. As a region close to shipping routes and rich in large, easily accessible timber, Vancouver Island and the mainland coast were the primary focus of timber production in the province. On Vancouver Island, many of the most valued stands of trees, already demarcated, purchased, and separated from less valuable stands, were either within private E&N lands or were alienated prior to 1913 when Crown policies included selling land along with timber rights (Travers, 1993, p. 177).

The 1909-1910 Royal Commission of Inquiry on Timber and Forestry found that the disorganized system for disposing of Crown forests had “lent itself to the culling of the choicest patches of a forest whose intervening areas – large fractions of irregular outline – were left unproductive in the hands of the Crown” (BC, 1910, p. 15). Overall, the province lacked a comprehensive knowledge of the extent of the resource, a situation borne out of these previously unclear land policies. Following the creation of the first provincial *Forest Act* in 1912, the province retained ownership of Crown lands while selling rights to timber, a policy that persists today (Travers, 1993, pp. 177-8). Still, through railway grants and earlier purchases of both timber and land, much of the forest resource on Vancouver Island was (is) located on private, and not Crown, land. Below, I

rights to timber but not the land, or by leasing or licencing timber rights from the province (Travers, 1993, p. 177; Drushka, 1993, p. 5)

explain the significance of this situation as it pertains to forest production and the processes of (dis)possession after the Second World War.

It may not be surprising that so much timber could be alienated so quickly. The provincial government under Premier Richard McBride (1903-1915) was driven almost exclusively by the promise of prosperity through extraction (Roy, 2012). Garner notes that timber policies reflected this:

Timber licences then were readily available from the B.C. government. It was only necessary to set one corner-post with a written description of the boundaries to identify a square mile block of timber. Those licences usually started at or near the beach and extended back in a desired direction to take in the best timber (Garner, 1988, p. 64).

Timber cruisers simply set posts in the ground to define the boundaries of their claims. The ease with which timber could be cruised or settlement could be taken up offers juxtaposition to the restrictive criteria that guided the allocation of reserves by the JIRC (Harris, 2002). Settlers believed that Indians were “vanishing” (Roy, 2011-2012, p. 37), but they were not vanishing fast enough for the increasingly rapid pace of production. Although the province lacked comprehensive knowledge of the forest resource in 1909, it had long been confident that Indian land was totally wasted in all locations.

With the advent of new tools and transportation routes, production of the forest staple quickened during the early twentieth century. Under Premier McBride, small First Nation reserves throughout the province were selected for extraction and mature stands of timber were a primary target. In 1912, the Forest Branch of the Department of Lands noted that *not* cutting trees was, in itself, a wasteful act:

At present the lumber-output of British Columbia is about a billion and a quarter feet a year. At the present rate of cutting, making no allowance at all for annual growth, it would take the lumber industry of British Columbia nearly 250 years to use up merely the mature timber now standing...These figures indicate clearly

what, at least in part, should be the forest policy of British Columbia. Several times as much timber is now going to waste each year through natural decay as is being used in the same year...What is not cut is wasted in the end (BC, 1912).

“In the end” trees rot. The idea that cutting trees down ensures economic prosperity and saves them from an inevitable fate has been a popular justification for the liquidation of old growth forests (Bedard, 2010). Once trees were logged, either urban/agrarian settlement or future extraction could take place. As such, standing timber on First Nation reserves meant that land was interpreted as being wasted *twice over*.

McBride spent as much time denying Indian title as he did championing the “progress” of the province and, as I am arguing in this chapter, the two were bound together (Roy, 2011-2012). When the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs in British Columbia, also known as the McKenna-McBride Commission, issued a report in 1916, it recommended high value land be cut off from Indian reserves across the province (Canada, 1916a).⁴⁰ The *British Columbia Indian Lands Settlement Act*, passed by the province in 1920 and approved by the Dominion of Canada in 1924, gave the state the supposed authority to reduce or cut-off reserve lands without seeking permission. Resource extraction and (related) public works such as roads, railways, and lighthouses were all used to justify taking high value reserve land. Regarding timber, the commission took the view of the Forest Branch: “It has also been noticed that much of the timber of commercial value [on reserve] is ripe and, from an economic standpoint, it would be wise to have such timber cut and sold before it goes to waste” (Canada, 1916b). What is clear from studying timber and reserve policies such as those mentioned above is that the commission, like the JIRC before it, was also an elaborate and successful reconnaissance

⁴⁰ For example, in Cowichan, the Halalt Band had 95 acres cut off while in the Sooke region the Beecher Bay Band had 13.5 acres cut off (Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, 1975). Other reserves in these areas were also resurveyed, adjusted, and/or confirmed

mission. The commissioners identified “wasted” timber supplies on reserve, but also became concerned about how certain reserves might block backward linkages, such as transportation routes, and forward linkages, such as sawmills (Harris, 2002, p. 254; Canada, 1916a). For example, a 1915 interim report from the commission recommended that the Comox Logging & Railway Company be granted nearly two acres for a railway right-of-way from within the Pentledge Indian Reserve No. 2. (Canada, 1915). Resistance from First Nations to the McKenna-McBride Commission was constant. The commission, however, was prevented from engaging with the question of Indian title (Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, 1975; Harris, 2002, pp. 248-261). When the commissioners arrived at the Cowichan Indian Reserve in May 1913, Chief Tsulpi’multw brought forward the portrait of King Edward VII he received during his visit to London in 1906 (see chapter three). Chief Tsulpi’multw told the commissioners:

I am glad to see you gentlemen today, and I thank you for speaking favourably towards us. I went to the King a few years ago to try and get some settlement from the King, and when I got there, the King gave me this photograph. His Majesty promised to do something for us, and said he would send somebody out to look into the matter. The King told me that I need not feel very sorry about these things, as, if there was anything that he could do anything [sic] for me, he would do it. His Majesty promised to give each male Indian on the reserves, 160 acres of land, as the land belonged to us Indians. I hope you will take what I say into consideration, and do what you can for us (as cited in Marshall, 1999, p. 160).

Although the commissioners were faced “with actions, stories, facts, and figures that challenged and unsettled their self-imposed authority” (Black, 2017a), demands for the return of Cowichan lands were dismissed (Marshall, 1999; Morales, 2014). Instead, the potential for these already fractured lands to contribute to capital accumulation became paramount. The key point I am making here is that as the organization of forest production transformed – through changes to the tools, infrastructure, property regime,

and labour of extraction – maximizing access to, and control of, Indigenous territories also gained increasing importance.

Watkins argues that an analysis of linkages and their spread effects (the economic inputs and outputs resulting from staple extraction) turns Innis' staple theory into a theory of how capital was/is accumulated in Canada (Watkins, 2006a/1963, p. 9). This analysis explores the mode of production to comprehend “the particular mix of factors of production – of land (that is, natural resources), labour, and capital, used to produce the staple within, at any moment of time, a given technological and institutional framework” (2006c/1977, p. 55). In the case of reserve policies in British Columbia, I am demonstrating how linkages played a role in the selection of lands to be taken from Indian reserves. Linkages, as a method of revealing the spread effects of staple production, are not only related to economic activity such as investment – they are also reliant on broader processes of Settler colonialism (such as labouring and improving the land). Moreover, I am arguing that linkages are material, locally specific, and demand a path free from the obstacle of Indigenous rights to land (Watkins, 2006c/1977, p. 57). As we shall see shortly, the spread effects of forest staple production also foster affective attachments, making them part of the process of (dis)possession.

“From the wooden cradle to the wooden coffin”

In the years prior to and during the Second World War, a conservation movement, spurred on by overcutting and poor replanting strategies, advocated for a new approach to timber extraction (Travers, 1993, pp. 178-181). The largest forest companies operating in the province also demanded new policies that would provide increased certainty over their access to the resource (Marchak, 1983, p. 35). The 1943 to 1945 Royal Commission on Forest Resources, also known as the Sloan Commission, after Commissioner and

Chief Justice Gordon McGregor Sloan, sought to address the growing tensions between conservation, exploitation, and public and private ownership.

As with past forestry commissions and reports, the Sloan Commission spent a great deal of time trying to ascertain the scope of the resource and its economic impact. In keeping with the trends of the period, the report also focused on silviculture, conservation, and fire protection (Sloan, 1945). The repercussions of the E&N land grant on production are addressed by Sloan, and the impact of forestry on salmon bearing streams also receives brief mention. Indian title and use of the forest resource are never addressed, reinforcing the idea that trees were simply wasted before the pioneer arrived (Sloan, 1945, p. 8). In this way we begin to see that the ‘common sense’ certainty of Settler claims to land, wherein the previously circumvented question of First Nations title does not even register (Mackey, 2016, p. 108).

Sloan embraced the concept of continuous production or ‘sustained yield’ forestry as essential to future management of the forest resource. Already underway in the United States, sustained yield suggested a solution to the lack of forest regeneration and the question of long term access through tenure in-perpetuity. Sloan described sustained yield as

a perpetual yield of wood of commercially usable quality from regional areas in yearly or periodic quantities of equal or increasing volume. That is my understanding of the concept expressed in its basic form. That, then, must be our objective: To so manage our forests that all our forest land is sustaining a perpetual yield of timber to the fullest extent of its productive capacity (Sloan, 1945, p. 127).

The idea was to view the forest through an agricultural lens to ensure that once the forest was cut, cyclical replanting of certain commercially viable crops would result in long-term supply and certainty. The farming of trees largely eliminated natural regeneration

and therefore prevented the growth of other tree and plant species (Bremer & Farley, 2010), not unlike the characteristics of the invasive Scotch broom plant. The point here is that the agricultural techniques first hindered by the forest (see chapters two and three) were adopted to transform native tree species into a crop, and thus part of a continual staple industry. Extraction and its benefits for Settlers were intended to accrue forever; ripe timber, “wasted” by First Nations, was targeted for harvest and replacement to sustain these benefits into the future.

By 1939, fewer than 60 companies controlled the majority of timber production in the province (Marchak, 1983, p. 36) and these companies argued that larger land holdings and longer harvesting rights would provide them with the necessary resources and certainty to implement sustained yield. Former provincial chief forester and head of one of the provinces’ largest forestry firms, H.R. MacMillan, wanted Sloan to address the certainty of private forestlands:

The practise of forestry by private ownership depends upon individuals being absolutely confident that title conditions will hold good for such periods as are required to produce a crop, which is not likely to be less than 80 to 100 years on the average forest land. The best basis upon which to develop such confidence will be that the State shall not alter or cast a cloud over the forest land titles now in good standing (MacMillan, 1945, p. 18).

Given the piecemeal alienation of timber rights in the previous decades, sustained yield forestry would need to cover both private and Crown lands to achieve the desired results. The concern for MacMillan and forestry corporations was that efforts to implement a comprehensive system of harvest on Crown lands could threaten the status of their extensive private holdings.

Changes to the *Forest Act* in 1947 began the shift to sustained yield forestry. In 1956, to assess these new legislative and bureaucratic measures, Sloan led a second

commission on the subject. Although various changes have occurred to the tenure and licensing system since 1947, the basics of the system envisioned by Sloan are still in effect. Public Sustain Yield Units (PSYUs), now called Timber Supply Areas, and Forest Management Licences, now called Tree Farm Licences (or TFLs), remain a primary tool of sustained yield forestry on Vancouver Island and in British Columbia. Timber Supply Areas are based on timber volume and licences are allocated among several different operators. TFLs are area based and give exclusive, long term harvesting rights to a single company. To encourage sustained yield, many TFLs required operators to bundle private land holdings with Crown land to create more cohesive areas subject to provincial forest management directives; corporate owned lands retained their status as private property. In a study of the west coast of Vancouver Island, Bruce Braun argues that “perhaps more than any other single act since the separation and segregation of First Nations on a reserve system, in the late 1800s, [TFLs] would work to isolate...First Nations such as the Nuu-chah-nulth from their physical surrounds” (2002, p. 62). In contrast, TFLs created certainty for forestry corporations by granting access to bundled Crown/private lands in perpetuity. These terms were adjusted in 1958 to 21 years, and again in 1978 to 25 years.

The minutiae of forest licensing and management following the Sloan Commission has been described elsewhere (Marchak, 1983; Drushka, 1993; Rajala, 1999, Hak, 2007). Nevertheless, there are a few outcomes of the shift to TFLs/sustained yield I wish to highlight. First, it is important to understand that sustained yield forestry and the TFL system had the effect of rapidly concentrating control of the forest resource in the hands of just a few companies. For example, by 1990 just ten companies controlled

almost 70 per cent of the cutting rights in the province (Drushka, 1993, p. 11). The TFL and licensing system was the manifestation of the idea that only the largest companies could be trusted to manage the resource and invest in forward linkages such as sawmills. Melissa Clark-Jones argues that the rise of monopoly capital in Canada's immediate post-war years "required legitimation in the form of rewriting the rules of the game so that not only is monopoly no longer a 'sin' or a 'crime,' but it is actively encouraged, particularly in the industrial resource sectors" (1987, p.8). Although Clark-Jones does not address sustained yield forestry in BC, the requisite changes to tenure and licensing can be understood as legitimizing corporate consolidation over time. For example, TFLs required the licence holder to invest in a local or regional processing facility and accept responsibility for the ongoing management of the resource. This "appurtenance" clause was removed in 2003, but it did contribute to several years of high-wage employment in sawmills, forest product manufacturing plants, and pulp and paper mills across the province.⁴¹ As Mackey argues, "Western concepts of possession, private property, personhood, certainty and uncertainty are mobilized and contested on the ground in face-to-face human relationships, but also in philosophy, law and government policies" (2016, p. 20). Viewing the creation of sustained yield and TFLs as part of a project of (dis)possession exposes a link between long-term extraction policies and Settler futurity (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 1). That is, like the E&N land grant (chapter three), monopoly property rights and their certainty are entangled with an ongoing Settler presence.

⁴¹ Eventually, the 1978 Royal Commission on Forest Resources, also known as the Pearse Commission, acknowledged that this concentration of capital had negative impacts on smaller producers and mandated that contractors be provided 50 per cent of the logging work undertaken in TFLs (Marchak, Aycock, & Herbert, 1999, p. 61).

In anticipation of Sloan's 1947 report, smaller forestry companies and their holdings were bought-out and amalgamated to form larger firms. In 1946, British Columbia Forest Products Limited (BCFP) formed with capital from Canadian industrialist E.P. Taylor. With its access to capital, BCFP invested in both forward and backward linkages, including mills and logging road construction. BCFP's application for a Forest Management Licence (later, TFLs) was accepted in 1955 and combined private and Crown lands near Tofino with like parcels around Port Renfrew and Lake Cowichan (Baptie, 1975, p. 9). As a condition of granting the licence – and a form of legitimizing monopoly access – the company built a pulp mill at Crofton, the Cowichan Valley town named after Robert Dunsmuir's son in law and business partner, Harry Croft. The Crofton mill represents the materiality of the spread effects from forest staple production after the Second World War. In chapter two, I discussed the affective qualities of roads and trees and argued that the character of the staple and the alienation of land are key starting points for understanding the foundation for material-affective linkages. Building upon the preceding discussion of forest resource production in the early to mid-twentieth century, I argue below that transformations in the mode/means of production generate linkages that are material *and* affective and contribute to Settler belonging. Below, a vignette featuring a personal example from my family and a discussion of public logging history support this argument.

Vignette: Now You're Logging

When the Bennett family first arrived in Saanich from Little River in 1940, my Grandfather Art found a job at a furniture factory in the Burnside-Gorge neighbourhood of Victoria. My Grandmother, Grace, lived her entire life in Saanich and that is where she and my Grandfather met; they lived down the street

from each other and Art worked with one of Grace's brothers at the factory. Following the Second World War, Art worked a series of jobs before landing employment at BC Forest Products' new and state-of-the-art plywood division in 1952 (a forward linkage). Constructed to make use of wood waste from other company operations, the mill manufactured plywood and consumer products such as fireplace Presto-logs (a final-demand linkage).

My Grandfather worked for BC Forest Products (BCFP) for over 30 years and, since I was old enough to recall, a plaque and radio from the company, given for safety and length of employment, have been features of my Grandparent's kitchen. On the upstairs bookshelf at their home, a 1975 BCFP corporate history – likely given to employees as a commemorative souvenir – recalls what I now see as a pinnacle of state, capital, and labour's commitment to accumulation through resource extraction. The BCFP plywood mill is an example of forward linkage from the forest staple, but the plaque, book, and radio do not fit into this category. In these objects are deposited a complex array of feelings, each one

Figure 12: Plaque presented to A.S. Bennett for 30 years accident free service with British Columbia Forest Products, 1982.

dependent on the person who encounters them; my Grandfather, Uncles, or my Mom may feel differently toward the plaque in the kitchen than I do, particularly given their longer history with its origins and presence. For most of us, the plaque may no longer recall a singular feeling or moment in time, perhaps that of my Grandfather's pride in accident-free service. In explaining "structures of feeling," Raymond Williams notes that social experience is *in process* and the characteristics of this experience are often

recognizable at a later stage, when they have been (as often happens) formalized, classified, and in many cases built into institutions and formations. By that time, the case is different; a new structure of feeling will usually already have begun to form, in the true social present (1977, p. 132).

In this sense, these objects take on meaning across generations and become part of different, yet connected, structures of feeling. In a discussion of trauma, Ann Cvetkovich argues that related memories are "embedded not just in narrative but in material artifacts, which can range from photographs to objects whose relation to trauma might seem arbitrary but for the fact that they are invested with emotional, and even sentimental, value" (2003, pp. 7-8). The plaque, radio, and book are *material-affective linkages* in that they hold feelings that, consciously or not, are bound together with staple extraction. Sara Ahmed argues that "to experience an object as being affective or sensational is to be directed not only toward an object, but to 'whatever' is around that object, which includes what is behind the object, the conditions of its arrival" (2011, p. 33). For my Grandparents, Art and Grace, transformations in the mode of production – sustained yield, TFLs, plywood etc. – helped them purchase a small farm in

Saanich where they would raise six children. These objects play a role in my own sense of belonging in that I see them as holding memories and feelings related to my Grandfather's employment, as well as conversations in the kitchen, Christmas dinners, and the labours of raising a large family. Yet, as with roads, these objects become part of an archive of belonging that orients myself and my family within a project of (dis)possession tied to the forest staple.

As forest tenure systems became entrenched, the means of production continued to evolve. Truck logging, power chainsaws, self-loading/dumping log ships, and other innovations quickly surpassed the previously hands-on and involved methods of extraction (Baptie, 1975; Marchak, 1983). Efforts to memorialize and preserve the disappearing days of 'man and the forest' began to emerge as each new iteration of machinery and corporate control "made obsolete much of the remaining reserves of traditional knowledge responsible for west coast logging's distinctive occupational culture" (Rajala, 1998, p. 50). In a discussion of working-class "yard art," Clark-Jones explains that "as cultural artifacts, [the lawn decorations] are imbued with meanings and feelings that link them as symbol systems to other human activities" (1990, p. 111). In other words, objects can reveal something about affective investment in the nature of work and, in the case of staple extraction, I argue that material-affective linkages such as my Grandfather's plaque also help us understand the generational, classed, personal, and locally particular processes of Settler belonging.

The Cowichan Valley Forest Museum – later the BC Forest Museum and now the BC Forest Discovery Centre – was first conceived of by former logger

and Cowichan Valley resident Gerry Wellburn. By 1966, with the support of local

Figure 13: My Sister Sarah and I at the BC Forest Museum (now the BC Forest Discovery Centre).

businesses and his friend H.R. MacMillan, Wellburn had amassed a collection of antique forestry equipment. Steam donkeys, locomotives, saws, and skidders were put on display at

Wellburn's 100 acre property located just a few minutes north of the City of Duncan (Garner, 1988, pp. 36-38). When the museum encountered financial difficulties during the early 1970s, it was temporarily taken over by the province. The 1974 Certificate of Incorporation as the BC Forest Museum describes its mandate:

To preserve, maintain, and operate...as a memorial to the pioneers of the forest industry, and to develop a living museum for the purpose of illustrating the inter-relationship of man and the forest environment...To stimulate interest in the history of the forest industry...and by the preservation and enlargement of the Museum, to educate the general public, particularly students and scholars, in the history, progress, and significance of the development of the forest industry and its value to the Province of British Columbia and the integrated use of forest lands. (BC, 1974)

With its steam train rides and accessible artifacts, the Forest Museum was a frequent destination for my family and our childhood friends; it is a waypoint that indicates our upbringing in the region. Yet, more than just a collection of antique

equipment, the museum operates as a “memorial” to the hardy pioneers of forestry. Through its affection for the past, the museum forms part of the “cultural infrastructure” of identity formation (Hodgins, 2004, p. 102). Elizabeth Furniss explains that frontier histories found in local and regional museums provide “Euro-Canadians with a sense of collective identity...[and] a public apparatus for shaping and defining Euro-Canadian historical consciousness” (1999, p. 78). That is, the narrative structures encountered at the museum position the forest staple, and the taming of it by masculine pioneers, at the heart of Settler belonging on Vancouver Island. Put another way, the museum promotes its archive, its objects of extraction, as material-affective linkages that support the certainty of *possession* through the story of extraction.

A selection of titles from a 1977 volume of the historical digest *Sound Heritage* (Day, 1977), a collection of transcribed audio recordings and accompanying artwork published by the Provincial Archives (now the Royal BC Museum and Archives), reveal efforts to document the passing of coastal logging’s occupational culture:

- “The Last Handfallers.”
- “MacMillan Bloedel Limited, Franklin River (A farewell to a lover).”
- “Saga of a West Coast Logger: An Interview With George L. McInnes.”
- “Logging Camp Characters: Interview With Al Parkin.”

These stories recall the days before production was organized to reflect the tree farm system and sustained yield, when trees were cut with manual cross-saws and only the select blocks of the finest and largest timber were logged. Their publication and inclusion in the Provincial Archives further uncovers the generational, personal, and collective character of material-affective linkages. The

logger's experience and affective attachment to the mode/means of production become examples 'of this place;' the forest as staple is a part of belonging *in process*. In a review of the 1978 comic book *Now You're Logging*, the reviewer explains the author's success in capturing latent feelings for the connection between Settler and staple:

In *Now You're Logging* I don't think Bud Griffiths so much creates a myth about logging and the bush as he does give language and images to one that already exists in the atmosphere of this place. Our history as distinct from its native counterpart is brief in time, but such is the nature of the place that that history is from the beginning bound up with trees and water. In an imaginative sense, the first man here was a logger and from then until now the fact and fancy of logging have been inextricably part of this place (Robertson, n.d., p. 135).

In this excerpt, the "native" is subsumed into the origin story of resource extraction and becomes a signifier for the logical progression of Settler colonialism. Developing upon Williams' concept of 'structures of feeling,' Mark Rifkin argues that affective formations such as those described above normalize the Settler presence and control over Indigenous territories (2011, p. 342). For the book reviewer, the culture of staple extraction is a natural part of the "atmosphere of this place," something made evident through the recreation and recollection of the past. In these and other examples, the labour of First Nations in the forest industry is not described, although such recollections are available. In the 1980s, Pacheedaht First Nation Chief Queesto (Charles Jones) spoke of his time logging in the forests near Port Renfrew:

The company [Malahat Logging Company/BC Forest Products] was always interested in hiring native boom men, because booms were constructed out on the open water, and the natives had the experience of working the sea. When we quit and the white men took over, they didn't

last very long because the booming grounds were so rough (Jones & Bosustow, 1981, pp. 90-91).

Chief Queesto's skills on the log booms interrupts the pioneer narrative and the erasure of First Nations labour. This example is instructive to the ways that First Nations peoples resisted elimination by taking advantage of the staple economy's spread effects when and where they could. The passage evokes the ways that Indigenous peoples are also involved in a process of identity making tied to resource extraction. Moreover, Chief Queesto's recollection is a reminder of the complexity of material-affective linkages – they can build belonging and, simultaneously, summon feeling that may be related to the violence of Settler colonialism. What I mean is that the physical and affective aspects of the staple's geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political stamp are not only connected to Settlers and nostalgic or happy events, they also have the potential to evoke that which Settler colonialism works to suppress: the destructive and harmful effects ongoing (dis)possession has for Indigenous peoples.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I argued that transformation in the mode/means of production, from unplanned resource extraction to state-sponsored sustained yield forestry, results in changes to the processes of (dis)possession. This transformation altered the tools, labour power, and infrastructure of extraction, and the property and legal regimes that uphold Settler claims to land. That is, how Settlers took the land and how Settlers developed belonging to land – (dis)possession – underwent changes alongside this transformation. As the organization of forest production changed in the early twentieth century, from manual hand-logging to steam-powered production, choice stands of trees located on

private E&N grant lands and Crown lands were purchased for staple extraction. In discussing the creation and reduction of Indian reserves, I demonstrated that the McKenna-McBride Commission (1913-1924) understood reserve lands with standing timber as being “wasted” twice over. It was a belief in the disappearing Indian and the fear that “unimproved” reserve lands could block beneficial linkages, such as railways and sawmills, that drove the cut-off lands policy. Importantly, this chapter’s discussion of Indian reserves and the forest economy’s spread effects (economic inputs and outputs) shows that staple linkages are territorially specific and reliant upon broader processes of Settler colonialism.

To capture beneficial linkages in perpetuity, the Sloan Commission (1943-1945) endorsed the adoption of sustained yield forestry, a concept that turned the forest staple into a crop to be managed for future Settlers. Through the bundling of private and Crown lands into tree farm licences, productive forces and the social relations of production were again transformed. By focusing on these transformations, the forest staple’s geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political “stamp” is made clear. The spread effects of linkages can also be understood as having spread *affects* through the creation of what I have called “material-affective linkages.” I have contributed to the study of affect and the staples approach through the development of this concept by showing that identifying and interrogating of these linkages provides insight into the practices of Settler belonging and the mode of production. Material-affective linkages are personal, collective, classed, and generational, and they are bound up with the stamp of the staple, affective investment in the nature of work, and broader efforts to legitimize and secure Settler attachment to land over time. The spread effects and affects of extraction are made

possible through efforts to limit and destroy Indigenous presence and sovereignty, and thus make space for the spread of Settler roots.

Chapter 5: Land Swaps for the Future

Sustained yield forestry entrenched a property regime of staple extraction that surrounded and sustained many communities on southern Vancouver Island. After 1945, the economic primacy of forestry came into increasing conflict with Settler belonging. That is, as the Settler population grew, demands on space and the environment changed. Like the Scotch broom plant that changes the soil to its own benefit, Settlers expanded across the landscape, claiming land and adjusting their affective attachment to it. This chapter explores the property relations of parks and recreation sites from the 1950s to the 1980s in the Sooke-Juan de Fuca region and the Cowichan Valley. I show that Settlers clashed with the extractive economy in an effort to protect locally important recreation sites and foster generational attachment. I argue that the creation of parks in this period offered a spatial-fix to both Settlers and forestry corporations in the form of land swaps. These swaps were a ‘fix’ because they allowed forestry corporations to locate to new spaces of capital accumulation and, in capital’s withdrawal, they provided Settlers with a space where affective attachment to land could be fostered. With this in mind, I conclude the chapter with a vignette about local park creation linked directly to my family’s early years in the Cowichan Valley.

When I began to examine the records of the British Columbia Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division (Royal BC Museum & Archives, GR 1991 & GR 1614) and the British Columbia Heritage Conservation Branch (GR 2940) I intended to seek out the rationale for the creation of certain parks. This reasoning was certainly indicated in the documentary record, but there were two recurring themes in each park I investigated: concern for future generations and the acquisition of parks through land-swap

agreements. I found that Settlers frequently corresponded with the Parks Branch regarding properties they wanted set aside and that concern for ‘future generations’ and the ‘public’ was regularly invoked. For forestry corporations, parks became an opportunity to dispose of logged-over or unproductive lands in exchange for forested land located elsewhere. In the context of (dis)possession, I noticed from the documentary evidence that transformation in the mode of production (to

Figure 14: A Parks Branch leaflet circa 1970, found in my Grandparent's home.

sustained yield forestry) created tensions within the practices of Settler belonging; where once Settlers had fought against giant trees to clear the land and earn a living, they now/also demanded protection for sites that recalled past Settler encounters with the landscape. Moreover, the prevalence of land-swaps between the Province and forestry companies indicated that the E&N land grant and other private forestlands alienated prior to the First World War played a central role in the creation of parks. In other words, I found that the stamp of staple extraction is bound up with parks and Settler belonging, a process I explain in this chapter. The provincial government, and beginning in the 1960s local regional districts, mediated these processes of (dis)possession, made possible by the ongoing denial of First Nations rights and title.

On the occasion of the BC park system's 100th anniversary in 2011, the journal *BC Studies* released an issue dedicated to parks in British Columbia. In the introduction,

authors Jenny Clayton, Ben Bradley, and Graeme Wynn highlight some of shifting reasons for the creation of provincial parks and recreation sites. In particular, they note that during the post-war era “providing recreation and supporting economic development were considered more important than preservation” (Clayton, Bradley, & Wynn, 2011, pp. 11-12). Under the leadership of Premier W.A.C. Bennett (1952-1972), parks, especially large wilderness parks, became targeted for extraction and hydro-electric development. Ben Bradley explains that

to maintain the illusion that it was possible to have it all – a booming economy predicated on resource extraction as well as appealing, unspoiled surroundings – it was understood that the motoring public should see for itself – “naturally,” without any obvious manipulation or structuring of roadside landscapes – that British Columbia’s scenic beauty, historically significant sites, wildlife, and natural environments were not becoming scarce or otherwise endangered (2011, p. 42).

On Vancouver Island, the creation of parks after the Second World War can also be understood in this context. Yet, as I argue in this chapter, Settlers were not an entirely passive part of the “illusion” – they actively pursued the alienation of land for park/recreational purposes and were aware that extractive industries threatened spaces they had come to enjoy. In what follows, I make a contribution to the study of parks in British Columbia by showing that Settler belonging – the sense of attachment to land – and the organization of forest staple production were factors in park creation on southern Vancouver Island. Through a focus on China Beach Provincial Park, Sooke Potholes Provincial/Regional Park, Koksilah River Provincial Park, and Mill Bay Nature Park I argue that a property regime of private forestry lands influenced, guided, and complicated Settler belonging and the creation of parks between the 1950s and the 1980s.

Creating Parks

The first parks in British Columbia were created in the mid to late nineteenth

century, including Victoria's Beacon Hill Park in 1862 and Vancouver's Stanley Park in 1887. In particular, Stanley Park has been the subject of much scholarship, and the removal of First Nations and other inhabitants to create this large urban park has been well documented (Barman, 2005; Mawani, 2003a, 2006; Kheraj, 2013). Indeed, the erasure of the Indigenous/human presence has been integral to the creation of parks and the concept of untouched 'wilderness' in North America (Rosenzweig & Blackmar, 1992; Spence, 1999; Porter-Bopp, 2006). Pristine and wild nature is a key aspect of Canadian national identity formation (Francis, 1997; Grant, 1998; Mackey, 2002; Forkey, 2012). In a discussion of Algonquin Provincial Park in Ontario, Jody Baker argues that

the wilderness that Algonquin and other parks reproduce is a central component in the historically dominant national imaginary. A special, ideal space like Algonquin Park engenders contradictions between those values it strives to represent and the (obscured and displaced) social practices that constitute it (2002, p. 200).

Parks are integral to the Settler project in Canada; they function as spaces where relations and feelings such as those related to wilderness, conservation, and landscape circulate and are organized. Below, I argue that as specific places parks also act as and contain waypoints where Settler belonging can be remembered, created, and recreated over time. Although the letters and petitions supporting parks that are discussed here may not represent an ecologically motivated environmental movement, working out from the words and expressions found in the documentary record reveals a clash with the dominant narrative of the post-war years that unfettered extraction had no cost (Wynn, 2004). Settlers were (are) beneficiaries of resource extraction, but they also sought local spaces free from the increasing pace of extraction so that they could foster and pass on affective attachment.

The first provincial park in BC, Strathcona, dates from 1911 and encompasses a large portion of the Vancouver Island Range of mountains on central Vancouver Island. At the time of its creation, park advocates “appreciated nature for its scenic value, for its contribution to the intangible value of nationalism, and, most important, as a scenic resource to compete with other resources” (Young, 2011, p. 28). Under pressure to create a spectacular park, but lacking large tracts of suitable land not already alienated, the McBride government passed the *Strathcona Park Act* in 1911. The boundaries of the E&N land grant formed its eastern border giving the park a distinctive angular shape, a reflection of the dominant position of private property and resource claims as deciding factors in the park’s creation.

By 1930, 13 provincial parks were set aside in British Columbia and in 1939 the Forest Service received authority for provincial parks, tying parks directly to management of the forest resource. It was not until 1957 that responsibility for parks transferred to the newly created Parks Branch of the Department of Recreation and Conservation (Clayton, Bradley, & Wynn, 2011, p. 11). The Parks Branch established a number of criteria for new parks, including existing park inventory, population growth, natural features, ‘provincial significance,’ scenery, access, and amenities (British Columbia [BC], 1959). Either through their own initiative or at the request of the Settler population, Parks Branch officials conducted reconnaissance and made assessments of potential park sites. Although First Nations archaeological sites could add to the desirability of setting aside a location, negotiating individual and industrial property rights, not questions of Indian title, preoccupied those working toward the expansion of the park system (BC, 1936-1985; BC, 1912-1979). On southern Vancouver Island,

finding locations of “provincial significance” unencumbered by private property rights proved difficult as most land accessible from population centres was alienated in the decades prior.

Exchanging Lands

Prior to the Second World War, many Victorians who were able to afford it owned recreational properties outside of the city. Given their close proximity to the provincial capital, places such as Lake Cowichan, Shawnigan Lake, Mill Bay, Sooke, and Jordan River became centres for the recreating classes (Cole, 1996, p. 352). Lots surrounding the choicest swimming holes and fishing spots were subdivided and purchased or leased to Settlers who built rustic shacks and refined cabins (Gibson, 1967). My maternal Grandmother Grace’s parents, for example, owned a cabin at Weir’s Beach near Metchosin (Greater Victoria) where they often took their nine children on summer weekends. For Settlers who did not own recreational properties, certain beaches and lakes provided spots to spend leisure time; most of these destinations, however, were not designated as public parks (cf: Little, 2011). Passenger service on the E&N and steamships made weekend excursions to these places possible. After the Second World War, rapid expansion of the provincial highway system paralleled an increased demand for recreational spaces; for example, over 70 roadside parks were created between 1951 and 1957 (BC Parks, n.d.).

Until 1957 there was no public road between the Vancouver Island communities of Port Renfrew and Jordan River. In 1946, the West Coast Road Association began advocating for a route, but it was BC Forest Products that completed the road in 1957 (Baptie, 1975). The West Coast Road made the traditional territories of the T’Souke and Pacheedaht First Nations accessible to drivers and it also marked the rise of truck logging

as a means of production in the area (Baptie, 1975, p. 277). This new access prompted motoring Settlers to appeal to the Parks Branch for their favoured sites:

On a recent trip along the Jordan River-Port Renfrew road my family and I enjoyed the natural beauty of two fine recreation areas:-- the trail to China Beach, 150 yards past the fourth bridge from Jordan River, and the wooded area at the south-west bank of the Sombrio river.

We wonder if these areas can be preserved for the public or whether in time they will be logged. In the past few years our favorite picnic sites at Tugwell, Muir and Sandcut (Sandstone) Creeks [between Sooke and Jordan River] have been spoiled, and we hope that the same will not happen at Jordan River and the Sombrio...Could the Rayonier Corporation perhaps provide recreation areas within their tree farm, as they do in Washington? (BC, 1958-1963).

Rather than use cartographic or legal descriptions for China Beach, the Victoria correspondent uses the road as a marker for locations free from logging activity. The road, however, was constructed precisely to enable 'spoiling' through logging. With access between Port Renfrew and Jordan River opened up, the Parks Branch viewed China Beach as a potential addition to the park system that could meet demand for campsites in the region (BC, 1958-1963). The land above the beach, however, was owned by the Alaska Pine and Cellulose Company, a division of Rayonier Canada (B.C.) Limited (owned by the International Telephone and Telegraph Operation), and was a part of a tree farm license agreement (TFL; see chapter four). Aware of Parks Branch interest in the property, the company suggested in 1958 that it would be willing to donate the required land after reviewing a boundary proposal from the province (BC, 1958-1963). Taking into consideration the engineering and space requirements associated with the park plan, the Parks Branch faced limited options for the boundary. When presented with a Parks Branch proposal that required the forestry company to part with both the beach and nearly 55 acres of forestland, the corporate benevolence of the Alaska Pine and

Cellulose Company began to fade:

[The Chief Forester for Alaska Pine] assures us that the Company's views on turning over the beach to the Province of B.C. have not changed but in view of their need to build up the allowable annual cut on the Jordan River operation they require all the forest land they can get. The company has been purchasing forest land on the south end of Vancouver Island (at \$15-\$35/acre). The Directors of the Company ask why they should give away forest land on one hand and buy it on the other (BC, 1958-1963).

Through 1959, Alaska Pine maintained that if productive forestland was deleted from their TFL, compensation or an exchange of forestlands would be required in return (BC, 1958-1963). Framing the donation of land as a loss for the company, the terms of tree farm tenure and the demand for camping in the region gave leverage to Alaska Pine. Faced with the prospect of not acquiring China Beach, the Parks Branch approached the Forest Branch and the Lands Branch with the idea of a land-swap: 160 acres at Lot 10 Renfrew District (China Beach) in exchange for 160 acres at Frenchman Creek (BC, 1958-1963). However, a 1960 report from the Lands Branch turned up two encumbrances on Lot 10 that would prevent conveyance until resolved: a three year timber sale permit issued in 1957 and use of the property as a Department of Highways gravel pit (BC, 1958-1963). Alaska Pine also successfully negotiated the right to log one corner of the land at China Beach, free of stumpage royalties (tax); the right to all timber cut but not used in construction of the park, also free of stumpage; and the cost of the survey to be picked up by the Crown. Still, the deal seemed reasonable to the Parks Branch Director:

It might appear that the Company has, in effect, offered a donation and is now getting full returns on a trade. This is not altogether true as the Company will be charged for their timber at a considerably higher rate on the new block and they are losing a valuable parcel of real estate in the beach itself. (BC, 1958-1963)

In this passage the identification of land as *real estate* situates China Beach within the market of recreational property development and subdivision. The Parks Branch

envisioned two scenarios: acquiesce to the forestry company's demands, or lose the site to an expanding real estate market. The possibility of acquiring a "scenic attraction" excited Parks Branch officials and in 1963 the exchange was finalized. In a last act of ownership, Rayonier logged the southwest corner of the new park property.

The example of China Beach park uncovers a key aspect of post-war park creation on southern Vancouver Island: the interests of certain Settlers and the Parks Branch frequently clashed with the interests of forestry corporations and real estate development. I am demonstrating here that the land-swap enabled the future campground and scenic area to be "preserved for the public" and it is therefore the stamp of the forest staple, the resource's "peculiar type of development" (Innis, 1995/1931, p. 135), that shaped the park's boundaries and its landscape. Moreover, the park's creation also brought a separate parcel of land at Frenchman Creek into the space of extraction. Considering that Alaska Pine logged the property prior to exchange with the province, it is helpful to understand the land-swap mechanism as part of what David Harvey describes as a "spatial fix:"

In my own use of the term, the contradictory meanings [of "fix"] can be played out to reveal something important about the geographical dynamics of capitalism and the crisis tendencies that attach thereto. In particular, I use it to focus on the particular problem of "fixity" (in the first sense of being secured in place) versus motion and mobility of capital. I note, for example, that capitalism has to fix space (in immoveable structures of transport and communication nets, as well as in built environments of factories, roads, houses, water supplies, and other physical infrastructures) in order to overcome space (achieve a liberty of movement through low transport and communication costs). This leads to one of the central contradictions of capital: that it has to build a fixed space (or "landscape") necessary for its own functioning at a certain point in its history only to have to destroy that space (and devalue much of the capital invested therein) at a later point in order to make way for a new "spatial fix" (openings for fresh accumulation in new spaces and territories) at a later point in its history (2001, p. 25).

With this knowledge of capital's functions and flows in mind, the land swap process becomes synonymous with a kind of "spatial fix." What I mean is that once property owned by a forestry company is either logged over or becomes more valuable for uses other than extraction, the land swap allows capital to locate to new spaces of accumulation. Having benefited from cutting the trees at China Beach, Alaska Pine did not have to wait for the decades-long growth cycle of sustained yield forestry because park creation provided a way to reduce the time and costs of accumulation (Smith, 1984, p. 93). Yet, there is another type of 'fix' at work here. The land swap provides a fix for Settlers who see extraction as a threat to the belonging of future generations; the former forestry land becomes a park, a space free from extraction where Settlers may work at and carry forward affective attachment to land.

Sooke Potholes

Located just outside the town of Sooke, the Sooke River Potholes are a popular swimming location for both locals and visitors to the region. The potholes are a geologic formation characterized by a series of canyons, waterfalls, and connected pools along a section of the Sooke River. As early as 1959, the Parks Branch became aware of the site's significance to recreation and expressed interest in obtaining Lot 21 alongside the river, but below the potholes, owned by forestry company Rayonier. At this time, the only access to the potholes existed through a series of privately owned parcels along a narrow riverside road. Given the location's close proximity to both Victoria and Sooke, the popular swimming hole became a flashpoint for Settler park demands during the 1960s. The popular site was surrounded by private properties, creating conflict between a Parks Branch looking to spend little money and a Settler public seeking unfettered access to the river. This conflict was drawn out over 13 years as bureaucrats worked to unravel the

intersection of private property rights, market values, tree farm licenses, and the self-evident right of Settler access to the river.

In 1961, Douglas Hawkes Realty (Victoria) approached the Parks Branch on behalf of an owner with an offer to purchase one of the main access points to the potholes, Block 20 between the road and the river, for \$500.00 (BC, 1959-1974). The Parks Branch rejected the offer based on the calculation that the parcel, crammed between the river and a road right-of-way, contained too little useable land for a park (GR 1991). Although access to the potholes remained private, sustained public use of the site appears to have fostered a belief that the site was already public. A letter from the Sooke Conservation Council to the Parks Branch asked for provincial intervention to deal with “messy, ill-kept grounds and an irruption of inferior shacks in the vicinity” (BC, 1959-1974). This appeal to clean up the site reflects the varied uses of the swimming hole and the perception that province had some jurisdiction over the area. Unfortunately for the province and the Conservation Council, a plywood shack was erected on Block 20 in advance of the 1962 swimming season. The owner had

been endeavouring to charge the public for parking to swim this area and has gone so far as to rope the public bridge [on the road] and interfere with loggers trucking from operations upstream on the Sooke River (BC, 1959-1974).

Whereas swimmers previously enjoyed largely unimpeded access, the plywood shack generated anger and led to letters, media coverage, phone calls, and a 58-name petition (BC, 1959-1974). A few years later, the Sooke River washed the shack away, but the disruption galvanized Settler efforts to gain permanent and public access to the river and potholes:

This has been *a favourite place for our family for a number of years* and we always had the impression that it was a public park or at least owned by the

province. We sure felt bad when told we were trespassing as there had not been any indication of the property being offered for sale [emphasis added] (BC, 1959-1974).

As knowledge of the site grew, so too did the belief that Settlers had, over time, secured access to and use of the river:

For over sixty years the Pot Holes have been the favorite swimming spot and steelhead fishing grounds of *successive generations*. We ask that this beauty spot *not be lost to future generations*, but be kept wild and open to all [emphasis added] (BC, 1959-1974).

The appeal to past, present, and future Settlers above is an act of rootedness; of belonging and entitlement over generations:

When I think on my boyhood and remember all the wonderful places where I was free to roam at will and now wherever I go I am faced with a closed gate or a ‘no trespassing’ sign (BC, 1959-1974).

Gates and signs denoting private property were an obstacle, not only to park creation, but to the ability of Settlers to make connections with and expand onto the land and make it their home. With transformations in the mode of production underway (through the introduction of sustained yield forestry and its associated requirement of continuous control over space), Settler belonging confronted changes by invoking continuity with the past and preservation for the future. The point here is that Settlers demanded parks to stabilize their past belonging and generate reassurances that the next generation of Settlers could carry belonging forward. The Sooke potholes park debate reflects Ahmed’s argument that feelings can bind subjects together and that “emotions work as a form of capital: affect does not reside positively in the sign or commodity, but is produced only as an effect of its circulation” (2004a, p. 120). In other words, a fear of loss and concern for future generations circulated and accumulated around and within the potholes and Settlers as months and years of uncertainty about the site’s future went by.

By 1966, land for a park at the potholes had yet to be secured. The inability of the Parks Branch to reach agreement with Rayonier and other landowners surrounding the potholes led organizations such as the Lions Club and the Sooke Committee for Parks to undertake negotiations with private owners. As the months and years passed, the Parks Branch and Settlers grew anxious that either the Rayonier lot or those of nearby Settlers would be subdivided and “exposed to the market,” logged off, or both (BC, 1959-1974). The threat of subdivision and the building of homes with scenic water access represent what John R. Wagner has described as the “commoditization of a landscape aesthetic” in BC, wherein the landscape becomes a marketable feature of the region (2008, p. 23). Those Settlers demanding a park, however, acted against this commodification. That is, having secured their own private property, they sought a shared claim to property, a claim rooted in the denial of First Nations title. In 1966, a petition, this time signed by 1270 people, was sent to the Parks Branch seeking the creation of a park at the potholes, as well as at nearby Grassy, Shields, and Crabapple Lakes (BC, 1959-1974). However, internal Parks Branch communications used the language of sustained yield forestry to explain that logging near the potholes had already “spoiled the scenic aspect for one rotation” (BC, 1959-1974). Still, Settler advocacy for access to the potholes continued. As Settler communities expanded and demands for recreation sites grew in the 1960s, new forms of local governance were created that provided new ways to achieve park creation.

The creation of parks and recreation sites in British Columbia mirrored broader social and economic changes of the post-war era and the rapid population growth that accompanied the economic dominance of extractive industries created problems for those

living beyond urban centres. Rural areas were faced with growing responsibilities for local services, but had no effective mechanisms or financial support for matters normally addressed by municipal government. It was out of this situation that the regional district governance concept was born in 1965. Regional districts group rural unincorporated areas with municipalities to provide a political and administrative framework for shared services such as wastewater, fire protection, and planning (BC, 2006). Regional districts have been a fluid governance structure in the province, taking on certain functions, including park creation, based on directives from the province and electors. The Capital Regional District (CRD; Greater Victoria) and the Cowichan Valley Regional District were created in 1966 and 1967, respectively.⁴²

During the late 1960s, the Parks Branch viewed the Sooke River potholes as an ideal candidate for a nascent regional park system (BC, 1959-1974). The creation of the Capital Regional District was proposed as a potential source of funding for acquisition of various properties (BC, 1959-1974). The geographic location of the potholes, their proximity to the southern E&N Land Grant boundary, an existing road allowance, an adjacent Canadian National Railway line, and various privately owned parcels – including by Rayonier, Munn Lumber, and Pacific Logging – made acquisition by the province increasingly difficult. For example, the owner of several parcels surrounding the potholes periodically suggested to the Parks Branch a willingness to sell or donate land,

⁴² Today, the Capital Regional District includes the following municipalities and electoral areas: Central Saanich, Colwood, Esquimalt, Highlands, Langford, Metchosin, North Saanich, Oak Bay, Saanich, Sidney, Sooke, Victoria, View Royal, Juan de Fuca Electoral Area, Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area, Salt Spring Island Electoral Area. The Cowichan Valley Regional District contains the following municipalities and communities: City of Duncan, Town of Ladysmith, Town of Lake Cowichan, District of North Cowichan, Cobble Hill, Cowichan Bay, Cowichan Lake South, Cowichan Station, Diamond, Glenora, Gulf Islands, Malahat, Meade Creek, Mill Bay, North Oyster, Sahtlam, Saltair, Shawnigan Lake, Skutz Falls, Youbou.

depending on the financial return (BC, 1959-1974).⁴³ However, without the fiscal authority to “compete with real estate agencies, loggers, and other private individuals” the Parks Branch hoped to appeal to the owner’s “public spiritedness” in acquiring the properties, especially since any failure to acquire these lands seemed to make subdivision and increased land values inevitable (BC, 1959-1974). The owner of these parcels, however, was not persuaded by calls to act for future Settlers. Receiving no financial support from the regional district, and facing vociferous demands for public access, the Parks Branch felt increased pressure to purchase smaller and less desirable properties.⁴⁴ To this end, they approached Rayonier in 1968 about their parcel at the potholes. The company was open to providing the property, but made it clear that

in exchange we [Rayonier] would like to have an area of forest land...in the Renfrew Land District...This area is larger than the one we propose to surrender to you because we believe our property in the popular Sooke River area is worth more today than land without access and no popular traction (BC, 1959-1974).

As with the example of China Beach, Rayonier’s leverage in this swap hinged primarily on Settler demand for access to recreational properties. Rayonier’s calculation was correct – theirs was the only land with access being offered. In the spring of 1972, the exchange was completed and the 6.8-acre Devil’s Potholes Park was created. Likely aware the exchange between Rayonier and the Province had been completed, Douglas Hawkes Realty again approached the Parks Branch with a \$10,000 price tag for Lot 20, once home to the plywood shack offered in 1961 (11 years earlier) for just \$500.00. The two parties eventually agreed on a second offer of \$8,000, slightly increasing the overall acreage of the park (BC, 1959-1974). With the park’s boundaries secured, Sooke

⁴³ Lots 166, 181, 182, 200, and 203, Malahat Land District.

⁴⁴ In a memo to the Park System Planning Office, one worker describes Rayonier’s property as steep, small, and of little value (BC, 1959-1974).

Potholes Provincial Park became a waypoint for belonging, a place where Settlers could recall the struggle to gain access and a space where future Settlers could circulate their own feelings for the land and water. Parks are social spaces and, as such, are “empowered by collective agreement that they exist...But all of these spaces say nothing of who else might have a claim on the land” (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 31). My point is that parks serve as, and contain, markers or waypoints that call for and sanction the circulation of affect between and among Settlers. The swimming hole’s popularity surged with creation of the park and traffic problems along the narrow road arose almost immediately, requiring the RCMP and a traffic plan for busy weekends (BC, 1959-1974). The name “Devil’s Potholes,” however, was far less popular and a source of “local resentment...instead of the now familiar Sooke Potholes” (BC, 1959-1974). Parks officials speculated that “Devil’s” may have been chosen because the park actually sits below the pothole formation (BC, 1959-1974). Whatever the reason, the park was renamed Sooke Potholes in 1973.

Study of Sooke Potholes reveals that, in addition to Settlers, Rayonier, real estate companies, and the owner of the plywood shack were the key beneficiaries of park creation. Spatial fixes occur on many scales and have countless reverberations (Harvey, 2006, p. 108). With regards to (dis)possession, capital’s spatial fix also provided a type of spatial fix for Settler society. That is, parks became an increasingly utilized form of property, a way of taking the land and maintaining affective attachment over time. Through land swaps, parks were bound up with the spatial relations of the staple’s stamp. Although real estate and logging were seen as a threat to belonging, they were also rewarded through the park’s creation – a necessary contradiction to ensure Settler

futurity. The Sooke Potholes became a waypoint for Settler belonging, marking them as a location that could foster feelings for land as the Settler project faced the changes brought by population growth and the rapid pace of extraction in the post-war years.

Koksilah River Park

Land swaps were a common tool used to create several parks on Southern Vancouver Island. For example, Matheson Lake, Portland Island, Montague Harbour, Rebecca Spit, Harwood Point, and Koksilah River were all swapped for forestland in Sooke Mountain Park alone – 1,229 acres in total (BC, 1945-1973). Sites in the Cowichan Valley were also singled out for parks by forestry, the state, and Settlers. In 1959, the Parks Branch arranged a swap of Lot 191 on the Koksilah River with Oak Bay Lumber. The logging company had an ideal land exchange in mind:

We originally contemplated logging the site but due to its natural beauty have over the last three years retained it as a summer camp. We have now decided to dispose of it, rather than to remove the timber...Our sawmill is located on the upper part of Sooke Harbour. There is a considerable volume of standing timber in the Sooke Mountain Park which is not available to the public and which could be logged without spoiling the scenic value of the park itself (BC, 1945-1973).

The proposed swap would add Oak Bay Lumber's property to neighbouring lands reserved by the province in 1945 and 1958. The riverside park was sought for its access to the Trans-Canada highway, swimming holes, and flat infrastructure-ready land (BC, 1945-1973). The right-of-way through part of the park, however, remained subject to reservations because it was a logging road for the E&N Railway Company, Kapoor Sawmills Ltd,⁴⁵ and Lakeside Sawmills Ltd. (BC, 1945-1973). Lot 191 was also held in the Vancouver Island Plantations Forest Reserve but released for park use in 1960. As

⁴⁵ A company that, until a buy out by BC Forest Products, was owned by Sikhs who immigrated from the Punjab region of India. In 2000, the Capital Regional District created Kapoor Regional Park, named for the Kapoor family.

with parks previously described, the stamp of the staple determined the park's final boundaries.

Koksilah is an Anglicization of the Hul'qumi'num village site called Xwulqw'selu located on a bank of the river's lower reaches. When the land swap was finalized, Koksilah River Provincial Park and its small cabin became the source of solicited and unsolicited use by Settlers. Thus far, I have shown that the creation of parks, like Sooke Potholes, China Beach, and others, emerged as method that further alienated lands from First Nations and made possible ongoing possession. Scouts and Cubs, Girl Guides, Shawnigan Lake Easter Seals Camp, the Canadian Scottish Regiment, the Garden City Horseman's Club, and the South Cowichan Recreation Commission, among others, all contacted the Parks Branch seeking approval for various uses in the park (BC, 1945-1973). Correspondence also includes a letter from one of my elementary school teachers interested in outdoor education in the park (BC, 1945-1973). I felt surprised to encounter this letter, but I also felt a sense of fondness for the teacher and my elementary school. This moment was also slightly unsettling. To think that Koksilah River Provincial Park, linked as it is to (dis)possession, played a role in the education of one of my teachers laid bare the potential for countless layers or threads of Settler belonging attributed to this one park and my own lived experience.

In 1961, a Victoria Scout group gained official use of the park's cabin and the building became a source of concern for the group by 1965:

As this area is marked on the maps as a Provincial Park, we have found the public making more use of it as each year goes by and the security of this cabin has been continually threatened by break ins, broken windows etc. In particular, it seems to be an attraction for teen-age "picnics" or "parties" (BC, 1945-1973)

The park's official placement on a map increased Settler awareness of the area and made

it a destination for recreational groups and unsanctioned behaviours. For example, in 1972 the derelict cabin was in use by “American transients,” likely resisting the Vietnam War draft (BC, 1945-1973). Having gone to high school in south Cowichan, I have driven the gravel logging roads to teenage parties at Koksilah River Provincial Park. But, by the time I started attending parties at the river in the early 2000s, the cabin had long since disappeared. However, a gate across the river bridge, preserving logging road access and serving as a material reminder of the staple’s stamp, remains locked to the public. Before looking at Parks Branch records, it had not occurred to me that our parties were part of a series of events, events that are bound up with the processes of (dis)possession. We were not the first teens to party there, nor were we the last.

Mill Bay Nature Park

Through my analysis of parks and the staple’s stamp – the staple’s geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political characteristics – I am arguing that parks are an essential part of the development and entrenchment of the Settler project’s material and affective claims to land. The Parks Branch regularly received unsolicited suggestions for park and recreation sites. Those suggestions deemed to not be of provincial significance – in most cases sites too small for facilities or featuring minimal natural attractions – were often passed along to local governments and private organizations. As early as 1970, the Mill Bay Community League wrote to the Parks Branch regarding a piece of property adjacent to the former Sayward’s Mill (see chapter two). The League sought the land as a nature park to accompany the nearby and newly created Kerry Park Arena sports facilities (BC, 1970-1975). In decades prior, the property was acquired by forestry corporation MacMillan Blodel to serve as a log booming ground. Although the League suggested that an arrangement between the Parks Branch and the company could coincide with

celebration of the 1971 centennial of British Columbia's confederation with Canada, Parks did not see provincial significance in the site. Perhaps as a counter to this argument, the League attempted a sentimental appeal to belonging:

At almost every meeting [of the League] someone has voiced concern or made an inquiry as to the disposal of this plot of land. Pioneer residents, in particular, are deeply concerned that it should remain as it is – *a gorgeous stand of virgin timber preserved for future generations*. I have found it a moving experience to hear these older residents describe how the entire area about Mill Bay once resembled this forest [emphasis added] (BC, 1970-1975).

Given its proximity to the former mill, it is questionable how much “virgin timber” might have existed on the property. Nevertheless, these sentimental phrases evoke a fear that the landscape once encountered and subdued by pioneers could be “forever lost to the public” (BC, 1970-1975). This excerpt also makes clear the generational importance placed on park creation – the potential park becomes a stand in for the “moving experience” of comprehending the efforts of the hardy pioneer. In a discussion of Vancouver's Stanley Park, Renisa Mawani argues that in spite of the presence and long occupation of Coast Salish peoples, Settlers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries worked to make the park “a cultural symbol of Vancouver's colonial identity, a land that was not only ‘uninhabited’ but also ‘pristine’” (2003, p. 119). Regarding the proposed park at Mill Bay, the letter writer's reference to “virgin timber” describes more than a longing for the days of giant timber, it implies the absence of Indigenous peoples inherent to the wilderness myth and essential to visions of a Settler past and future (Wolfe, 2006).

By 1975, MacMillan Blodel sold the property to an unknown buyer, leading the Parks Branch to suggest that the Cowichan Valley Regional District (CVRD) should be approached with the park idea. It was not until the 1980s, however, that the CVRD completed purchase of the land, leading to the creation of Mill Bay Nature Park. In this

example, the park is proposed as a memorial to hardy pioneers and thus the preservation of a Settler past for the future. Herein appears a contradiction: “pioneer residents” proudly overcame the forest to create ‘home’ and later sought protection of the forest to be reminded of that home. The point here is that Mill Bay Nature Park represents the tensions between attempted Settler belonging and staple extraction. Efforts to connect Settlers, temporally, affectively, and materially across the project of (dis)possession reveal a critique of resource extraction. This critique, however, is primarily concerned about coming to grips with the contradictions and transformations of unfettered extraction and affective attachment to the land. That pioneers fear a loss of the landscape they once encountered demonstrates the importance of time to the practices of Settler belonging. What I mean is that portrayal of Mill Bay Nature Park as an example of what the landscape “once resembled” (BC, 1970-1975) is intended to connect Settlers over time through the preservation of, and protection against, locally specific events.

Vignette: Manley Creek

The founding of the regional district system in 1965 spurred the creation of new parks and in many cases these sites were chosen for their connection to persons and places of a local historical significance. During the late 1980s, my Dad sat on the Cowichan Valley Regional District’s (CVRD) Parks and Recreation Committee and, although my family had only been living in the area for a few years, participated in the creation and maintenance of several new parks. Indeed, as it grew, the CVRD park system and its volunteers assumed support for the memorialization practices first taken up by local pioneer societies, the Native Sons of British Columbia (see chapter two) and other service organizations (The Pioneer Researchers, 1986).

In 1984, planning began for an adult (55+) seaside village on the land directly adjacent to our home on Hatch Point Road (see chapters two and seven). The CVRD's approval for the multi-phase "Arbutus Ridge" development rested on the developer's donation of a small parcel of parkland; a swap or fix to rationalize the project. The details of planning for the park fell to the small Parks and Recreation Committee, of which my Dad was a member. The minutes from the March 2nd 1988 meeting, found in a storage box in my Dad's garage, are one page, typewritten, and document the selection of Manley Creek Community Park as the park's name. Manley Creek is named for the "indefatigable" pioneer William Manley (Dougan, 1973, p. 109; see chapter two).

The day of the park's dedication, my family was in attendance as it was only a short walk up the hill from our home on Hatch Point Road to the new park. A picture from that day shows a woman my Dad identifies as Mrs. Turner, a descendent of William Manley, speaking to a small crowd. I was about four or five when this event occurred, yet my presence at this event, the meeting minutes, and the photograph demonstrate just a few degrees of separation between myself, my family, and John Manley's preemption. The

Figure 15: Mrs Turner, a descendant of William Manley, at the opening of Manley Creek Community Park.

minutes from the Parks and Recreation Committee also offer details on the establishment and maintenance of Settler colonialism's materiality:

The donkey man was discussed and whether we would be in favor of his plans.

The historical significance of the grave on Telegraph Road was noted and it was decided to see if it would be possible to contact the family and see if we could perhaps paint the fence and perhaps clean up some of the bush and include the cost in our budget (personal correspondence).

Not to be confused with the animal, the donkey man refers to the donation of a piece of historical logging equipment called a steam donkey for the Quarry Park (now Cobble Hill Mountain Regional Park). The donkey man's plans were eventually approved and the engine installed – the steam donkey remains a material-affective linkage and a waypoint within the park. The grave referenced is that of Richard William Chapman and dates from 1885:

One day while Mr. Chapman was haying, helped by young Richard, the boy was stricken with severe abdominal pains...and the boy died before help could be obtained. As was the custom in those days, the grave was dug on the side of a field and a picket-fence put around it (Barry Ellis, 1982, p. 27).

Associated as it is with an untimely death, the grave is also an affective waypoint that reminds Settlers their origins are of and in the ground, rooted to place. The minutes of the Parks and Recreation Committee, Manley Creek, the Quarry Park steam donkey, and the Chapman grave are also entries in the archive of belonging; they bind myself and my family to existing threads within a project of (dis)possession and, simultaneously, create new threads of belonging tied to the same.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have shown that, in the early decades of sustained yield forestry

(approximately 1950 to 1980), parks became a way of mediating conflict between Settler belonging and capital accumulation. It is not simply that parks were created by the state; close analysis of their inception helps to explain how processes of (dis)possession and efforts to grapple with political economic transformation led to demands for parks. The alienation of forestlands prior to the First World War significantly reduced the availability of Crown lands on southern Vancouver Island, making land swaps a primary tool of park creation. These swaps provided a ‘fix’ for both forestry capital and Settlers; as the pace of extraction quickened and regional population grew in the post-war years, forestry corporations looked for new spaces of extraction as Settlers sought the protection of natural areas from this extraction. Real estate development and logging were a threat to sites of affective attachment, but in a contradictory manner characteristic of Settler belonging, the originators of these threats were also rewarded through land swaps and the purchase of land for parks. In explaining the material and affective context for park creation, I have demonstrated that the stamp of staple extraction – the geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political characteristics of the staple – is bound up with parks and the past, present, and future of Settler belonging.

I have contributed to the study of parks in British Columbia by explaining the ways in which parks became increasingly favoured forms of (dis)possession used to further alienate lands from First Nations and aid the practices of Settler attachment to land over time. Furthermore, I have shown that parks are spaces that also *serve as and contain* waypoints of belonging used to recall, reinforce, and circulate affect between and among Settlers and across generations. The metonym of Scotch broom is instructive here: older broom plants (the hardy pioneers) supply the seeds that take root within newly

disturbed or cultivated soil. Having changed the conditions of the soil to best support these seeds, the spread of broom continues to new spaces (parks) as native plants (First Nations) become confined and obstructed from flourishing. Settler belonging and extraction spread across land and across generations in an opposing, or contradictory, symbiosis, certain in the denial of First Nations rights, title, and presence.

Chapter 6: Recession and Recognition

In the previous chapter I discussed the creation of parks during forestry's 'long boom,' approximately 1950 to 1980, and here I explore the economic and affective motivations for parks during the forest staple's bust cycle, from approximately 1980 to 1997. By 1980, a global collapse in demand for forest resources ushered in a recession that would last much of the decade. This recession had roots in "a convergence of factors" (Carroll & Ratner, 1989) from the preceding decade and the ensuing policies of austerity created social unrest in British Columbia (Hak, 2013). Economic Geographer Roger Hayter refers to the 1980s recession in British Columbia as a "trigger" for conflict within BC forests (2003, p. 714). Although this conflict is often described in us versus them terms (Stefanick, 2001), this chapter shows complexity by exploring support for park creation as an effort to escape the bust rotation of the staple economy's boom-bust cycle. As a form of political economic transformation, recession caused Settlers and the state to adjust the processes of, and justifications for, (dis)possession. Through analysis of primary resources, including government reports and newspaper articles, I examine Botanical Beach, Sombrio, and Juan de Fuca Provincial Parks and argue that economic recession and Canada's changing recognition of Indigenous rights and title during the 1980s and 1990s pushed Settlers to engage with what Glen Coulthard (2007; 2014) describes as the politics of recognition. I argue that park creation during this period became an expression of Settler and state efforts to grapple with the unknown outcomes of economic recession and First Nations resurgence.

Parked on a street near my current residence in Victoria is an older Volkswagen van, the kind seen regularly in the cities, towns, and back roads of Vancouver Island. On

the rear bumper, a faded sticker asks readers to “Save Clayoquot – Call the Premier.” The bumper sticker is a reminder of Vancouver Island’s so-called War in the Woods, when First Nations and environmentalists protested the destruction of old growth forests on the Island’s west coast. As a form of ecologically-minded activism, the campaign tactics carried out during the War in the Woods can be traced to the counter culture movements of the 1960s and, in some cases, even earlier (cf: Zelko, 2004). Actions to halt the liquidation of old growth forests were led by the Tla-o-qui-aht First Nation/Nuu-chaalnuth Peoples at Meares Island in 1984 and the Haida Nation at Lyell Island in 1985. These events brought unprecedented provincial, national, and international attention to the environmental impacts of clearcut logging practices (Blomley, 1996; Stefanick, 2001; Braun, 2002). Their culmination was 1993’s Clayoquot protests when over 850 people were arrested for blockading MacMillan Bloedel’s access to the forests of the Clayoquot Sound.

Images from the Clayoquot Sound confrontations between forestry workers, environmentalists, First Nations, and the RCMP are etched in the minds of many in the province, and the War in the Woods (particularly conflict at Clayoquot Sound, Carmanah/Walbran, Stein Valley, South Moresby Island) has frequently been understood as a conflict between a global environmental movement, forestry workers and corporations, First Nations, and the province (Burda, Gale, & M'gonigle, 1998; Stefanick, 2001). These characterizations capture the key players, yet widely publicized conflict of the War in the Woods tends to obscure more local movements to establish new parks and land use policies, particularly in regions closer to urban centres where old growth forests were already altered and/or liquidated. Communities on southern Vancouver Island

looked to parks as a response to declining employment in the forest industry, population growth, and the potential of nature tourism as an economic alternative. Concurrent with these efforts was the slowly shifting legal and political acknowledgment of Indigenous peoples and their rights.

The Crown's Fantasy

The denial of First Nations rights and title continued to be the defacto position of the provincial government throughout most of the twentieth century. However, two landmark court cases, *R. v. White and Bob* (1965), and *Calder v. British Columbia (Attorney-General)* (1973), forced the Province to publicly defend its opposition to treaty rights and the acknowledgement of Indian title. In 1963, Clifford White and David Bob, two First Nations men from Nanaimo, went deer hunting on the slopes of Mt. Benson. Returning with the game they had hunted, both were arrested and charged under the *Game Act* of British Columbia for possessing deer in a closed hunting season.

White and Bob argued a treaty right to hunt based on the Vancouver Island Treaty signed at Nanaimo in 1854. In court, the Crown argued that the document was not a treaty, but rather a commercial paper that represented an exchange of cash for land (Royal BC Museum & Archives, n.d.). Furthermore, the Crown argued that, even if the document was a treaty, it did not have any bearing as the province did not exist when the Royal Proclamation of 1763 was issued. The Crown's final argument was rooted in the "frozen rights" theory that all Indigenous cultures become frozen at the moment of "discovery" and that any advancements that occur since contact are only a result of European influence (Godlewska & Webber, 2007). That is, Indians were deemed too primitive to have ideas of property equivalent to those held by Europeans and, furthermore, if Indians now had such ideas, it was only because of assimilation.

Therefore, they reasoned, there was no justification for a claim to special rights. The court found the two men guilty and issued a \$100 fine or 40 days in jail if they could not pay (Royal BC Museum & Archives, n.d.). White and Bob's lawyer, Thomas Berger, succeeded in getting a new trial in which his clients emerged victorious. The decision in favour of White and Bob was appealed by the Crown but upheld by the BC Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada in 1965: the 1854 document was deemed to be a treaty.

In 1967, the White and Bob case was followed by Nisga'a Chief Frank Calder's efforts to sue the province and have the Supreme Court of British Columbia issue a declaration stating that the Nisga'a held title to their territory prior to the assertion of British sovereignty and that this title had never been lawfully extinguished. Calder presented evidence that the Nisga'a had regularly petitioned the Crown for recognition of their title (Culhane, 1998, p. 79). The Supreme Court of BC, however, upheld the frozen rights theory. The Nisga'a appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada and in the 1973 *Calder v. British Columbia (Attorney-General)* ruling the court stated that the existence of Indigenous title was not contingent on recognition from the Crown. However, the court also confirmed Crown sovereignty and the Crown's authority to extinguish rights and title. Finally, the court ruled that BC alone does not have the right to extinguish Indigenous title, forcing the federal government to take a more active role in land claim negotiations (Indigenous & Northern Affairs, 2013). Despite the unravelling of the Crown's arguments presented in both cases, it was not until 1990 that the Social Credit government in BC decided it would participate in federal land claim processes. In 1992, the New Democratic Party government continued this approach by creating the BC

Treaty Commission. One year later, the commission undertook negotiations between federal, provincial, and First Nations authorities (BC Treaty Commission, 2017).

Due to the efforts of Indigenous peoples across Canada, the inclusion of Aboriginal rights in Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982* was another significant victory for the recognition of Indigenous peoples in Canada (Mandell, 1984). With jurisprudence recognizing the possible existence of some form of Indigenous rights and title, 1993 became a pivotal year in the history of First Nations-Settler relations in British Columbia: the War in the Woods came to a head, the BC Court of Appeal rejected Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en claims to title in *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia* and the new BC Treaty Commission began its work. The point here is to place park creation during the 1980s and 1990s in the context of a shifting legal and political relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples. Despite acknowledgment of an ill-defined set of rights, John Borrows argues that legal contortions and contradictions in cases such as *Delgamuukw* are central to maintaining the supremacy of Crown title:

The Court might as well speak of magic crystals being sprinkled on the land as a justification for the diminution of Aboriginal occupation and possession. Crown title simply does not make sense to Aboriginal people (and one suspects to many non-Aboriginal people) (Borrows, 1999, p. 563).

Similarly, Michael Asch refers to this fantasy as the “settlement thesis,” an idea that

rests on the concept that the territory claimed by the colonists was previously a *terra nullius*: a territory without people....Reliance on the ‘settlement thesis’ when colonists claim sovereignty and underlying title to lands where Indigenous peoples already live, as in Canada, has proven difficult and has required a certain elasticity of logic (2002, p. 24).

This legal fantasy of the supremacy of Crown title is built into the BC Treaty Commission process (Blomley, 2014; Asch, 2014). Eva Mackey notes that

if we examine legal cases after Calder in terms of if and how they defend certainty for settler property, we find that they ultimately continue to play out the same fantasy of Crown entitlement, making the fantasy law and providing certainty to settler society through the careful limiting of Indigenous title and sovereignty (2014, pp. 244-45).

Despite moves to reaffirm certainty, Settler anxiety about, and hostility towards, the treaty process was particularly prevalent in the first ten years of the BC Treaty Commission's mandate, stirred up by inflammatory political rhetoric and the discourse of equal rights reminiscent of the 1969 federal White Paper (Furniss, 1999). Jennifer Adese describes Settler anxiety as "feelings of fear, terror, and unease. They involve feelings of restlessness, breathlessness, rootlessness" (2012). Whereas parks created during the 'long-boom' were created without consideration for the presence of First Nations (let alone rights and title), increased Indigenous activism demanded Settler attentions. For Settlers facing the reality of Indigenous rights and recession-induced feelings of instability, rootedness became uneasy. I am making the point here and in the following sections that Settlers grappled with the recognition of Indigenous peoples and economic recession because both presented challenges to the future of belonging. Glen Coulthard describes the politics of recognition

as the now expansive range of recognition-based models of liberal pluralism that seek to reconcile Indigenous claims to nationhood with Crown sovereignty via the accommodation of Indigenous identities in some form of renewed relationship with the Canadian state (2007, p. 438).

An exploration of the recession and parks on southern Vancouver Island reveals the intersection of the politics of recognition, the stamp of staple extraction, and the practices of Settler belonging.

Fall-Down: Recession in the 1980s

To understand the transformation of Settler belonging during the 1980s and 1990s, it is necessary to recall the nature of the staple trap, wherein communities and regions become dependant on external demand for staple resources and thus become subject to the turmoil of rising and falling demand, also known as the boom and bust cycle. Exploring the writings of Innis, Daniel Drache observes that “when the flow of economic life reversed direction, market structures and even the economy had to be realigned. The key to it was the way the market forces had generated the need for new state forms” (1995a, p. xxix). In this way the politics of recognition and the BC Treaty Commission represent “new state forms” that emerged during the staple trap’s cycle. I do not wish to overstate the role of the resource cycle in bringing about the politics of recognition; yet, in the case of park creation during the 1980s, it was a factor.

The recession of the 1980s had multifaceted and complex consequences for workers and communities in British Columbia (Barnes, Hayter, & Hay, 1999; Hak, 2013). Still, the recession had little influence on forest product exports as they continued to rise into the 1990s (Barnes & Hayter, 1990, p. 171). The concept of a spatial fix (see chapter five) provides some understanding of this apparent contradiction. Writing in the early 1980s, Patricia Marchak argued that global capital’s increasing control of forestry in the province meant that

decisions about expansion, contraction, withdrawal, relocation, further investments, development of ancillary or more advanced industries, employment, shutdowns, growth of company towns, and so much else that fundamentally determines the social and economic conditions for residents of B.C. are made in Toronto, Montreal, New York, San Francisco and Tokyo (1983, p. 112).

The point here is that, despite a recession, the mobility and availability of capital allowed for extraction to continue in certain places while it slowed or ended in others. Forests

were subjected to increased corporate control, decreased government regulation, and technologies that sped up extraction and reduced labour costs (Barnes, Hayter, & Hay, 1999). With the close of the 1970s, overcutting and a failure to achieve coordinated and monitored replanting generated a crisis in timber supply; the term ‘falldown’ was coined as a way to describe the culmination of these events. For many communities, economic instability followed the shift from Fordist production (mass production, high wages, stable single-industry communities) to neo-liberalism and globalization (Marchak, Aycock, & Herbert, 1999, p. 65; Wilson, 1987-1988; Barnes, Hayter, & Hay, 1999). The 1975-1976 Royal Commission on Forest Resources, also known as the Pearse Commission, attempted to address these matters, explaining that “the new problem today is to rationalize ‘forestry’ as it is traditionally understood in the context of timber production, with the protection of the environment and other social values” (British Columbia [BC], 1976). This commission brought about incremental changes to tenure and forestry practices, but as the War in the Woods demonstrates, these were too little, too late for those who opposed destruction of the forest landscape. Clearcut logging was the preferred method of extraction and was associated with

a complex and confusing mix of non-binding guidelines and site-specific provisions...[British Columbia’s] forest practices regulations were characterized by a limited or uncertain legal basis, substantial regional variation, and weak enforcement (Cashore, Hoberg, Howlett, Rayner, & Wilson, 2001, p. 65).

Within this context, forestry companies operated with limited restraint and denuded mountains and valley bottoms became a visual truism of the time: “Cut then move on / Cut then move on” (Cockburn, 1988).

In 1984, President and CEO of the Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia wrote to the chairperson of the Parks in B.C Symposium. His letter was

published as an addendum to his symposium paper titled “Resource Use Conflict: The Forest Industry Perspective.” (Lanskail, 1984, p. 46). He wrote that his organization was

indeed nervous about the seemingly unending and uncoordinated list of new park proposals in B.C....the cumulative effects might be disastrous for the forest industry or perhaps for our society as a whole (Lanskail, 1984, p. 52).

That parks could be “disastrous,” not only to forestry but also “society,” reveals how the staple’s economic dominance is used as a threat to communities. More than that, the quote reveals a rising fear of uncertain property rights, whereby any property could be selected for park designation and removed from extraction. Attached to the letter by the CEO and published in the symposium proceedings, an article demands “caution in considering all such proposals” (Lanskail, 1984, p. 53). The article’s title calls for the rejection of feeling in matters of land use:

A hard look at Redwood Park – for once, leaving out emotion.

This title suggests that past decisions have been saturated with feeling and therefore impaired an otherwise rational approach to protected areas. Read within the context of ‘falldown’ and the rapid exploitation of the forest resource, the CEO’s attached article and warning of disaster signals a fear and anxiety about any emotional appeal that may reduce access to forest resources, including the return of First Nations lands.

Acquiring Parks

During this time in BC, population growth, urban sprawl, and increased environmental awareness brought land use discussions to the fore, particularly in places such as Greater Victoria and Metro Vancouver (Hayter, 2003, p. 709). Changes to the provincial *Municipal Act* during the 1960s and the creation of the Agricultural Land

Reserve in 1973 reflect these developments.⁴⁶ At a more local level, population growth pushed municipal governments such as the Capital Regional District (CRD) to dedicate increased time and resources to park creation. This work was facilitated through taxation, as well as provincial and federal grants (Capital Regional District, 1982, np). CRD residents supported park acquisition and development through a mill levy that accompanied the creation of a Regional Parks Acquisition Program in 1966. A 1980 report from the CRD describes the justification for seeking an increase to the mill rate:

It was inherent in the original decision to implement a parks programme that it would be of a changing nature, commencing with the direction of all financial resources toward property acquisition and gradually blending this with a proportion of development and operating expenditures until the programme of acquisition had essentially been completed...At a time when area population is increasing and more people are relying on the Regional Parks System for outdoor recreation activities, dollar amounts available to meet this challenge are actually declining due to escalating costs and yearly inflation. This predicament is a growing regional concern (1982, n.p.).

Following the Parks Branch acquisition efforts of the 1950s and 1960s, new state forms of land use policy expanded to meet demand. Both private groups and the state developed means to acquire sites for recreation and conservation. Poor economic conditions are not necessarily an impediment to the purchase of land for conservation. Instead, acquisition for conservation purposes offers a spatial fix: “When landowners need to unload property in bad economic times, government subsidized acquisition becomes the solution to an

⁴⁶ In 1973 the newly elected New Democratic Party government introduced the *Land Commission Act*. The act proposed a provincial land commission with authority to zone, purchase, sell, and hold land within a special land-use area called the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). Between 1974 to 1976, 4.7 million hectares (11.6 million acres) of land were identified for inclusion in the ALR (Petter 1985). The goal was to slow urban sprawl in places such as the Saanich Peninsula on Vancouver Island and the Fraser Valley on the Lower Mainland. About 5% of BC contains arable lands, making agricultural settlement a perennial problem facing governments. The stump ranches of Merville is just one example that links the ALR to historic and ongoing Settler and state efforts to expand agricultural settlement. Although the ALR has been a source of conflict since its inception (Baines, 2017), its creation demonstrates the pressures of urban growth and evolving land use debates during the 1970s and 1980s.

impressive array of problems” (Fairfax, Gwin, King, Raymond, & Watt, 2005, p. 10). In what follows, I outline how municipal acquisition policies, private land trusts, and provincial/federal funding for Settler commemoration attempted to address the complexities and uncertainties of economic decline/diversification, conservation, and belonging.

During the 1950s and 1960s, tourism to the province was largely limited to the urban centres of Victoria and Vancouver. By the 1990s, however, BC’s landscape, particularly old growth forests and rugged coastline, became a marketable experience (Wagner, 2008). The 1987 Capital Regional District’s Regional Parks Plan identifies tourism as the fastest growing sector of the region’s economy:

Tourism relies on aesthetic surroundings to attract visitors and to keep them in an area longer. A good park system could keep people in the region longer, therefore they must spend money on food, gas, accommodation. Parks could be used as a drawing card to encourage people to visit the CRD and to promote resident tourism. A recreation corridor would be especially attractive (1987, p. 1.38).

Recreational tourism was viewed as the next economic boom for Vancouver Island and frequently held as a tangible compromise between extraction and conservation. Outside of Greater Victoria, the series of parks between Jordan River and Port Renfrew, including Botanical and China Beaches, were identified as key components in a “recreation corridor.” The opening of Pacific Rim National Park Reserve and the West Coast Trail in 1971 was an early federal effort to draw wilderness tourism to the region. Although the trail’s popularity increased rapidly during the 1980s and 1990s, its distance and difficulty attracted a select demographic of tourist (The West Coast Trail, 1980, pg. 9).

This focus on non-urban tourism is correlated to the political economic realities of communities in the Juan de Fuca and Cowichan regions at the time. The depletion of the

forest resource, coupled with recession and corporate restructuring (Marchak, 1983, pp. 93-106) demanded strategies that could blunt the impact of the staple trap. The Juan de Fuca region's proximity to Victoria made tourism an early viable option compared to more distant communities such as those around Clayoquot Sound and on Haida Gwaii. Support for parks in mainly resource-dependant areas would seem at odds with the parks or extraction, us-versus-them dichotomy of the War in the Woods. However, as Maureen G. Reed shows, the portrayal of loggers on one side and protectors of the environment on the other does little to help our understanding of complex relations (2003). Writing of women in resource communities on northern Vancouver Island, Reed explains:

The visions and goal of rural resource communities will vary in content and scope. In some cases, communities want economic diversification and funding for social planning; in others, they seek to block the allocation of new wilderness sites, to terminate specific projects, or simply to have a meaningful voice in land use debates (2003, p. 225).

Therefore, while some Settlers involved in resource extraction may view old growth trees as waste or blame parks for job losses, others may appreciate potential benefits from protecting ecosystems around their communities (Reed, 2003, p.178). For park advocates, both increased access and ecosystem protection are reasons given for the purchase and acquisition of land. I am demonstrating here that the parks discussed in this dissertation act as waypoints that provoke belonging *and* that they are material-affective linkages; they are bound up with the stamp of the staple and its cycles, affective investment in the nature of work, and broader efforts to legitimize and secure Settler attachment to land over time. What is common between the views described above is the sense that extraction and conservation, either in opposition or in concert, are part of the Settler

working-out of affective attachment. In other words, belonging is subject to inter-Settler relations and it must be consistently worked *at* and worked *out*.

The “Special Cultural Flavour” of Botanical Beach

In 1994, Botanical Beach Provincial Park became part of the newly announced Juan de Fuca Provincial Park and Marine Trail. Beginning in the 1960s, the Parks Branch acquired land around Botanical Beach, near Port Renfrew. When Settlers arrived in the area at the close of the nineteenth century, they established logging and sawmill operations (Jones & Bosustow, 1981, p. 90) and by 1898 the beach itself was identified by Settlers for its rich marine life. University of Minnesota botanist Josephine Tilden purchased land at the beach and from 1901 to 1907 it was the site of the Minnesota Seaside Station, which specialized in researching marine life (Moore & Toov, 2015). In the local history *Pioneer Days of Port Renfrew*, author Josephine Goodman describes a boardwalk that extended

“almost to Botanical Gardens.

John Quing, a Chinaman, built it to haul out timber bolts from his mill and it was a lovely walk until the bush took over” (1973, p. 43). Land was set aside for a park at Botanical

Beach as early as 1961, but it was not until 1982 that a park

was proposed for the beach and upland portion of property. Two years after the park was officially designated in 1989, an estimated 6,500 groups visited between July and

Figure 16: A local history, found during a visit to a Victoria bookstore.

September – most from the Victoria area (British Columbia [BC], 1992, p. 6). Awareness of the park and its tide pools was widespread, to such an extent that “the efforts of the provincial government to acquire title to lands at Botanical Beach generated considerable public attention” (BC, 1992, p. 24). Although the province reserved 47 hectares during the 1960s, much of upland portions of Botanical Beach, including access, remained in private hands. Efforts by BC Parks to bring these parcels into a cohesive park plan emerged during the 1980s.

In 1984, the Nature Trust of British Columbia purchased twelve hectares of beach front at Botanical for conservation purposes. Founded in 1971, the trust received a multi-million dollar Federal grant that year to celebrate the province’s confederation centennial (Nature Trust of British Columbia, 2017). The trust’s seed funding allowed for the acquisition of sites deemed scientifically and environmentally important. As with the creation of park acquisition funds by regional districts, this example reveals the development of new practices, new state forms, that take the land and create opportunities for Settler belonging. Despite the Nature Trust’s purchase, BC Parks sought more land. In June and July 1987, a Nanaimo-based logging firm began falling trees near the beach, generating media reports (“Forest owner,” 1987). A land swap was proposed, at this point a normal mechanism for creating parks. In this case, the landowner was not a multi-national forestry corporation, but rather contractor Nick Andreeff who purchased 243 hectares of land encompassing much of the area above the beach:

The Nanaimo-based logger said he would consider any fair proposal the government puts forth. “You have to be open because coastal timber is allocated to the major companies, but I have financial obligations to meet,” he said. “I couldn’t wait.”

“After I purchased the land (last year) I approached the government,” he said. “But these things take a while, I guess, and I couldn’t wait.” Andreeff employs 20 loggers but said he has laid off half of them since he halted falling operations. (“Forest owner,” 1987).

Andreeff’s comments contrast the ‘little guy,’ the independent commodity producer, with the growing dominance of the large forestry corporations, who, despite state efforts to rework forest tenure policies, continued to dominate the industry (Drushka, 1993, p. 11). Andreeff describes his willingness to reach a fair agreement, but by invoking layoffs he implies that parks can be a threat to local employment. The threat of local job losses was a key part of the discourse during the War in the Woods, as evidenced by the Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia’s 1984 comments discussed above. Such invocations fuelled conflict and aided the representation of parks as both solutions to, and also the cause of, precarity in resource extraction (Reed, 2003; George, 2006, pp. 108, 129). Though the Ministry of Forests rejected a swap for land near French Beach (“Land swap,” 1987), an agreement for Crown acquisition of the land was eventually reached, leading to the incorporation of the upland and shoreline parcels into a 351 hectare provincial park in February 1989.

A 1992 master plan for the park describes the marine station and a Second World War plank road and defence site as adding “a special cultural flavour” to the park (BC, 1992, p. 4). Scenery, wildlife viewing, and a small stand of old-growth trees are identified as primary values within the park (BC, 1992, pp. 16, 52). The report notes that the Pacheedaht First Nation should be consulted in order to better understand the significance of the area to their culture, particularly as the park contains three known archaeological sites; this is a form of recognition largely absent from park discussions during the 1950s and 1960s (see chapter five). Yet, such recognition did not extend to seeking consent

from the Pacheedaht First Nation to make a park on the land. The report makes passing mention of First Nations rights and title (BC, 1992, pp. 19, 52) and the summary of public comments contained within the plan reveals a limited interest in the subject: two comments suggest an exception to a ban on shellfish harvesting be granted to First Nations; another suggests “an effort should be made to employ local Renfrew and band people [First Nations] in development, maintenance and staffing of the park” (BC, 1992, p. 105). While these commentators recognize the importance of including the Pacheedaht in the park’s future, environmental protection, access, and the provision of economic benefits to the Port Renfrew (Settler) community dominate the submissions. I am showing here that First Nations presence, rights, and title did briefly enter the discussion, but the politics of recognition are manifest; Settler belonging adjusts to incorporate acknowledgement, but the fantasy of Settler sovereignty over land is not ruined.

Botanical Beach’s popularity among Settlers can be traced to at least the early 1900s. Its incorporation within the provincial park system rested on its popular mix of natural and cultural markers found inside the park – a plank road, tide pools, and old growth trees. While Pacheedaht archaeological sites such as the winter village of ?apsawa? were an acknowledged part of this mix, funding and support for returning these lands was not made available. Instead, faced with the uncertainty of economic downturn, the protection of Settler access and the future of Settler economic well-being was paramount.

Sombrio Beach

Sombrio Beach, (re)named by the Spanish in 1790, is also within the territory of the Pacheedaht and was established as a new park within Juan de Fuca Provincial Park in the mid-1990s. The mouth of the Sombrio River was a fishing and food gathering site

known as Qwa:qtlis (Pacheedaht First Nation, n.d). The river was also the site of Chinese placer mining in the early 1900s and, like Botanical Beach, resource extraction by both white and Chinese Settlers took place on the land. By the early 1980s, Western Forest Products targeted trees around the river and beach for logging, prompting three concerned Victoria residents to submit an unsolicited park proposal to the province (Felber, Taylor, & Zemek, 1983).

The Sombrio proposal echoes the values and justifications for park designation identified at Botanical Beach: population pressures, economy, aesthetics, and the forest ecosystem are the prevailing arguments for a park. The Pacheedaht fishing site at the mouth of the Sombrio receives a passing mention in the proposal, but only as a justification for the ‘special cultural flavour’ of the beach:

It is said that the Spaniards came seeking gold and gold-mining was actually carried out in the early 1900’s. Charlie Jones, a centenarian Pacheenaht Indian living in Port Renfrew, tells of working in the gold mining operation there in 1915. There was a Pacheenaht fishing village, located at the river’s mouth in the late 1800’s. Records exist attesting to gold-mining, trapping, fishing, and Indian history.

Over the years purposes and events have shaped this region and it is insensate to claim the value now lies only in logging potential. Much of the past would be forgotten, ignored, or destroyed if the Sombrio area were to be logged. Who would wander through a tangle of charred stumps and blackened roots seeking history? We suggest that historical continuity would be better served by designating the Sombrio area a park (Felber, Taylor, & Zemek, 1983, p. 6).

In this example, Sombrio is identified as a waypoint, as a place to “seek history” that has yet to be destroyed by logging operations. For the proponents, the pursuit of this history through a park generates value and continuity with past forms of *taking* and *possessing* the land. My point is that this continuity, expressed and legitimized through the “records,” is not identified for what it is: ongoing (dis)possession. This sense of history as a direct

and continuous line has been central to Western thought and the rationalization of colonialism (Chakrabarty, 2000). For example, in the excerpt above, Qwa:qtlis is unnamed and it does not exist before the Spanish, but rather “in the late 1800’s” – in this way the Pacheedaht are presented as merely a component of Sombrio’s historical progression from the moment of contact and, more importantly, as an aspect of the site’s economic and cultural value to the Settler project. This linear thinking is reminiscent of the “frozen rights” theory proposed by BC in the Calder case and recalls the importance of founding dates and origin stories within narratives of colonization (see chapter two). In other words, “Sombrio” and its cultural sites come into existence when Settlers arrive. Even though some of these sites, such as early fishing stations or gold mining, may be obscured or erased by the regeneration of the forest and changes in the river and ocean, they may be resurrected to act as waypoints (literally and figuratively) that both oppose and propose ‘higher and better’ land use. With the creation of Sombrio Provincial Park and the Juan de Fuca Marine trail in the 1990s, logging practices and squatters were condemned as a threat to these markers, despite their continuity with the project of (dis)possession.

Juan de Fuca Provincial Park & Marine Trail

To expand the reach of tourism dollars, particularly from visits originating in Vancouver and Victoria, the provincial government announced the creation of the Commonwealth Nature Legacy Fund in the spring of 1994 (Downie, 1998). This park acquisition fund sought to capitalize on the promotion of Vancouver Island and BC stemming from Victoria’s hosting of the 1994 Commonwealth Games. Several significant land acquisitions resulted from the creation of this fund (Downie, 1998, pp. 241-243), but I am interested here in the creation of Juan de Fuca Provincial Park and Marine Trail.

Juan de Fuca Provincial Park connected existing parks⁴⁷ with acquired lands; within these connected parcels the 47 kilometre Juan de Fuca Marine Trail was constructed. Youth from communities such as Port Renfrew and the Pacheedaht and T'Souke First Nations were recruited for trail building through the Environment Youth Team program. Nearly two million dollars was proposed for trail and park facilities, but the focus on youth and First Nations became a source of frustration for some Settlers:

Preference will be given to natives and young people who live in the area, which has prompted criticism from the Port Renfrew Community Association. Association spokesman Jack Chester wants his group to sponsor construction of the trail from Loss Creek to Botanical Beach...

"We have 80 per cent unemployment in Port Renfrew. Our suicide rate is one of the highest in Canada and our drug and alcohol problems are out of hand," he said. "We need jobs for everyone in this community – natives and non-natives, young and old, male and female. We need equity." With many Port Renfrew residents moving away in an effort to find work, "we can probably only come up with a couple of people that age," said Chester. "I'd like to see it opened up. A lot of people in their 30s and 40s are trying to raise families and they are on welfare" (Lavoie, 1994 June 14).

The demand for “equity” in hiring reflects the Settler backlash against the creation of supposed “special rights” for Indigenous peoples in Canada (Blomley & Pratt, 2001; Rossiter & Wood, 2005; Henderson, 2015). Following creation of the BC Treaty Commission in 1993, the provincial government had public polling firms measure the (Settler) population’s appetite for treaty negotiations. “Special rights” were a main source of anxiety. One poll’s results found that

compassion notwithstanding, many [Settlers] feel that encouraging native self-sufficiency would also benefit non-aboriginals, because there would be less of a need to give them “special privileges”; they could then become “Canadians like the rest of us.” Indeed, not far beneath the surface of the compassion shared by most participants lies a resentment towards aboriginal peoples for the perceived special treatment they receive in the system as it is now (BC, 1994).

⁴⁷ Loss Creek (1959), China Beach (1964), Botanical Beach (1989), Parkinson Creek (1993).

In the case of the Port Renfrew Community Association spokesperson's views, the exclusion of unemployed non-Youth or non-First Nations workers is entangled with the unease and uncertainty of economic recession and the possible outcomes of the BC Treaty Commission process. Demands for equity in hiring demonstrates the Settler acknowledgment that First Nations may participate, but a rejection that they should receive anything in addition. Canada's approach to Indigenous sovereignty is similar:

Instead of proceeding with negotiations based on the principle of Indigenous self-determination, Canada's policy framework is grounded in the assumption that Aboriginal rights are subordinately positioned within the ultimate sovereign authority of the Crown (Coulthard, 2014, p. 123)

Faced with declining employment in the forest industry, economic stimulus via trail construction and park creation became an entitlement for Settlers impacted by the boom/bust cycle and a government encouraged shift to tourism.⁴⁸ The potential loss of this entitlement to First Nation youth seems to play into anxiety about the treaty process described in the polling data. In turn, this anxiety is amplified by the loss of community members "moving away" (Lavoie, 1994 June 14), rooted in a fear that Settler belonging *in place* will not be carried forward if a generation is lost to the staple trap.

The Botanical Beach-Loss Creek section of the trail did end up being built by Pacheedaht and T'Souke First Nations Youth. Unemployed forestry workers also received an opportunity to participate in the park's creation through the Forest Renewal BC (FRBC) program. FRBC was intended to promote "the resolution of forest-environment conflicts by providing a mechanism to compensate workers displaced by

⁴⁸ The move to create more parks, at a cost of over \$60 million during the early 1990s was not welcomed by all in the province and division was most evident along political party (generally, New Democratic versus Social Credit/BC Liberal) and regional lines (e.g.: interior versus mainland) ("Advice to critics," 1995). Nevertheless, the decision to advance park creation on southern Vancouver Island did have support, evidenced by the concentration of NDP MLAs in the region and re-election of the NDP government in 1996.

environmental reforms,” with the objectives of “‘renewing forests’ and ‘creating more value, strengthening communities’” (Cashore et al, 2001, p. 213). FRBC workers were deployed to create ‘value’ at Sombrio Beach by assisting with the eviction of squatters living in driftwood and found-material cabins on Crown and private land at the beach. Many of those living at Sombrio had been present since the 1960s, but the announcement of Juan de Fuca Provincial Park in 1994 instantly made them an obstacle to the creation of the trail and park.

The squat of about 20 individual and family cabins is not detailed in the aforementioned Sombrio park proposal, likely because its existence ran counter to the image of pristine wilderness and Settler progress the authors sought to portray. Certainly, the squat did not fit with the objectives of BC Parks who moved to evict the squatters. In the media, one BC Parks official stated concerns such as sanitation and water supply, but also noted “‘they’re sitting on some pretty significant archaeological sites’” (Lavoie, 1996). This passing remark is not followed up in the article; the statement lingers as a judgment placed on the squatters – not only are they deemed to be trashing the beach and living illegally, but they pose a threat to the site’s cultural history now recognized as having value to a larger Settler project. Although it is not stated what these sites are, evidence of Pacheedaht occupation at Qwa:qt̓lis is the likely reference.

A 2006 documentary created with footage taken at the time of eviction, simply titled *Sombrio*, demonstrates that some living at the beach hoped that their removal could at least result in returning the land to First Nations peoples (Manly, 2006). Whatever the disparity between these comments and their 40-year occupation, a mere mention of returning the land is more than BC Parks was willing to entertain. The park is positioned

as a steward for First Nations culture, yet by including the archaeological sites within a park they also become accessible to, and the property of, a Settler public. The ‘public’ is a shared understanding that prohibits Settler acceptance of First Nations rights and title, and it is the ultimate invocation of equity that is characteristic of Settler opposition to ‘special rights’ for Indigenous peoples (Blomley & Pratt, 2001; Rossiter & Wood, 2005; Henderson, 2015).

Knowledge and stewardship of archaeological sites contributes to the ‘cultural flavour’ and ‘historical continuity’ of Sombrio. Squatters are not seen as a legitimate part of this – they operate outside the dominant property regime, their claim lacking legitimacy compared to those unemployed due to recession. Had the Sombrio squatters

Figure 17: A sign recognizing the trail building efforts of First Nations youth.

arrived a century earlier they would be described as pioneers today. Instead, their eviction echoes the distinction made between the *bona fide* Settler and the *squatter* prevalent in the conflict stemming from the terms of the Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway land grant

(see chapter three). Of course, they are unlikely candidates for pioneers because they did not purchase and ‘improve’ the land. This inter-Settler conflict indicates the contradictory and classed nature of Settler belonging. The main point here is that Sombrio and Juan de Fuca Provincial Parks are evidence of state-supported reprieve from the staple’s bust and, at the same time, are examples of how forms of Settler belonging are continually put into action, worked at, and adjusted when confronted with political economic transformation.

In 1994, TimberWest and Western Forest Products offered 53 hectares and 211 hectares of private forestland, respectively, for the Sombrio park in exchange for timber in the Youbou and Jordan River areas (Lavoie, 1994 June 6). Much of the land acquired by the province in these exchanges had already been cut over, something that did not go unnoticed by early trail users (Hanna, 1996). In the short term, the park provided a stimulus to forestry companies, through fresh infusion of timbered land, and a stimulus to local economies through construction contracts. Long-term economic benefit was envisioned as well:

the effect on communities such as Jordan River is likely to be dramatic, said Len Wansbrough, president of Juan de Fuca Chamber of Commerce. ‘There’s going to have to be development – restaurants and grocery stores so people can pick up supplies. It’s going to be a great benefit to Jordan River,’ he said (Lavoie, 1994 June 6).

The sentiment was the same from the Sierra Club, a founding conservation group in British Columbia:

It will create all kinds of business and tourism opportunities in the surrounding communities and we have to diversify our economy in British Columbia and this is one way we can do it,’ [Vicky] Husband, told reporters (Hunter, 1994).

These promises of economic development/diversification gesture to the hope that the transformations underway, social and economic, will pay dividends for the Settler project.

Regarding the politics of recognition, the Pacheedaht and T'Souke received contracts to build trails, not the return of their territories. In these ways, (dis)possession is perpetuated by adjusting itself: cut over lands near scenic sites are fixed into a conserved Settler heritage – of logging, of an appropriated Indigenous past, of connection with wilderness – while capital receives a local fix; extraction remains in operation, but just beyond view of the lands it has already exploited.

The eviction of Settlers living at Sombrio took place over four years, drawn out due to resistance from those living there and because BC Parks waited to acquire a privately-owned parcel at the mouth of the Sombrio River. While some eventually left, others congregated on the private land, beyond the authority of the province. By 1997, only a handful of people remained on the 1.2 hectare lot; eventually it too was purchased for inclusion in the park. A typical recreational visit to Sombrio would reveal little of the squat and previous First Nation occupation. No signs describe First Nations use of the park, and the material presence of the squatter was erased so that a sanctioned version of Settler belonging could be carried forward. One former resident of the squat recalled: “Sombrio introduced me to killer whales. Pods played in the bay, the black fins glistening in the summer sun. It bred in me an abiding love for the West Coast, the beaches, the forest, the wildlife” (Flawith, 1996). As I have demonstrated throughout this dissertation, private property is both the advent of and a potential threat to Settler belonging. Although the Settlers living at Sombrio built a sense of belonging based on their occupation, the failure to abide a regime of private property placed them outside the dominant processes of Settler belonging and, ultimately, led to erasure of their material presence. To undertake this erasure, the presence of First Nations archaeological sites were deployed

as a justification for removal of the squat by Forest Renewal BC workers. What I am showing is that the politics of recognition (in this case, of protection of First Nations archaeological sites, but not recognizing rights and title) and economic recession (characterized by the bust of the forest industry) reveal the ways in which (dis)possession adjusts itself over time in response to political economic transformation.

As a child, the Juan de Fuca parks were frequent destinations for our family. Pictures from my Grandmother Grace's photo albums show my sister, cousins, and I playing in the sand and climbing over logs and rocks at French Beach. My Grandmother was an avid walker and, with her walking group The Recycled Teenagers, she hiked and explored countless beaches and parks during the 1980s and 1990s. We would sometimes accompany her on these adventures and we would later benefit from her knowledge and familiarity with these places when we were old enough to go on our own hikes. Understanding that the processes of (dis)possession adjust over time within particularly local, material, and affective contexts offers the potential to explain Settlers to ourselves through identification of present-day events with the past. Today, Sombrio's popularity among Settlers stems from its long beach, expansive views, and surfable waves – on any given day the parking lot is filled with the bumper-stickered cars and vans of surfers and day users. Settler claims to Sombrio were not abated by the evictions of the 1990s, they were simply altered to meet the circumstances of the time.

Conclusion

I have shown in this chapter that the acquisition of land for park and conservation purposes took place within the context of a shifting legal and political relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples. An analysis of park creation on southern Vancouver Island uncovers some of the locally specific ways in which Settler belonging

anxiously grapples with economic recession and Indigenous resurgence. I have argued that the development of a politics of recognition and creation of the BC Treaty Commission in 1993 generated feelings of fear and anxiety about the future of Settler belonging. The creation of new parks during the 1980s and 1990s was also a source of anxiety for forestry corporations and for some Settlers employed in resource extraction. A key finding of this chapter is that Settler belonging is subject to the conflict of inter-Settler relations, meaning that belonging must be worked *at* and worked *out* over time. Within the context of regional population growth, declining employment in the forest industry, and the War in the Woods, new land acquisition strategies offered ways to address Settler concerns about conservation, belonging, and political economic transformation. These strategies included municipal taxation for land acquisition, the purchase of land by non-governmental actors, and the use of provincial commemoration/legacy funds to fund park creation.

Despite the forest staple's bust and the crisis of 'falldown,' forest exports continued apace during this era. While forestry companies pointed to parks as a contributing factor in economic downturn, these same companies also benefited from land swaps to create parks. This chapter has demonstrated that parks such as Botanical, Sombrio, and Juan de Fuca emerged from the staple's stamp and therefore are material-affective linkages, bound up with the mode of production and affective investment in the nature of work. Analysis of events at the Sombrio beach squat and the removal of its material presence by unemployed forestry workers supports my argument that Settler belonging is subject to inter-Settler conflict and that it is carried out in classed and contradictory ways. The recognition of First Nations cultural sites at Sombrio justified the

removal of squatters, but did not factor as a reason for Settlers to return the land. Instead, these sites were bound up with other material examples of Settler heritage and became the property of a Settler public through their inclusion in the park. Despite this and other examples of recognition, the fantasy of Settler sovereignty was not ruined; the means of taking and possessing the land – (dis)possession – adjusted and stabilized itself so that it could be carried forward.

Chapter 7: Our Common Lands?

Chapter seven works to unravel the complex entanglement of Settler belonging, staple extraction, and class relations during a particular moment of conflict. This moment emerged from the provincial government's 2007 decision to permit Western Forest Products to remove its private properties from jointly managed tree farm licences (TFLs) surrounding Juan de Fuca Provincial Park and Marine Trail. When it was revealed that the company intended to market and sell these properties as real estate, park users and local residents, including First Nations, mobilized opposition and protest against the development of these former forestry lands. I argue that this transition from forestry to real estate put Settler feelings for land into action and led to class conflict and an entrenchment of belonging. Throughout the following pages, I combine original research with threads from the previous chapters to explain how forestry lands became a target for real estate development. I demonstrate that the discourse and actions of those involved in these events, including myself, are bound up with the broader project of (dis)possession – the taking of and belonging to the land – being examined in this dissertation.

A key objective of this chapter is to uncover the connections between real estate, Settler belonging, class relations, and crises of capital accumulation brought on by the boom/bust cycle. To explain these connections, I begin by establishing the reverberatory effects of the Alberta bitumen boom (approximately 2000-2011) on southern Vancouver Island. I argue that the economic dominance of the Alberta oil sands, and the declining dominance of BC forestry, became a catalyst for investment in BC real estate and, consequently, a source of conflict between the forest industry, provincial/regional government, developers, Settlers, and First Nations. What I mean is that the boom of a staple industry can reverberate across and between disparate regions to influence the

processes of (dis)possession. This chapter shows that an analysis of revenue circulation stemming from the bitumen boom (wages, profits, taxes, rent, etc.) is essential to understanding the tree farm licence removal and the controversial events that followed.

As in previous chapters, I argue that transformation in the mode of production, in this case the boom of extraction in the Alberta oil sands, resulted in conflict and adjustments in the practices of belonging. What I demonstrate here is how the boom of a staple industry in another province can have locally and territorially specific impacts. I examine how property and space may become monopolized and trap certain patterns of circulation emanating from an outlying region (such as the circulation of revenue during a resource boom) at the local level. I will offer here a cursory example to prepare the way for a more detailed explanation later in the chapter. Consider the development of a number of ocean view cabins in a community on Vancouver Island: these may be proposed by a developer who sees an opportunity to use their capital to capture the circulation of revenue from the Alberta bitumen boom. Large holdings of private and vacant land, such as those owned by the forest industry and acquired in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, make this kind of development possible. As such, a resource boom in one place has the potential effect spatial configurations of land, class, and belonging in another. As the largest private landowners in British Columbia, forest companies Western Forest Products (WFP), TimberWest, and Island Timberlands are uniquely positioned to use their monopoly property rights to appropriate the circulation of both revenue and capital through the sale of land. In 2007, Western Forest Products, with the assistance of the province, did just this.

For First Nations, their interests in the tree farm licence lands were subsumed by local government, the province, developers, and Western Forest Products into what I describe as a circle of culpability, allowing the issue of title to be both acknowledged and ignored to secure development and/or Settler access. While some Settlers supported First Nations in protesting the TFL land development, the preservation of Settler access to land and the exclusion of Settlers seeking real estate and development properties were the leading issues. I argue that exploring Settler belonging aids an analysis of class relations because it reveals the ways in which Settlers collectively work at attachment to land, yet it also shows how perceived class position influences an understanding of who participates in and who threatens this attachment.

Vignette: Arbutus Ridge

In the fall of 1980 my Dad, born in Edmonton, Alberta, worked as a roughneck on drill rigs in that province. At the end of October 1980, the federal Liberal government announced a National Energy Program that aimed to “expand Canadian ownership and control in the booming energy sector” (Pratt, 1982, p. 30). This proposed Canadianization of the energy sector sparked a backlash from the Alberta government and the American firms operating there. As my Dad tells it, the uncertainty of these events seemed like a good opportunity to leave behind the Alberta winters and move to the coast. He ended up living with a friend in Saanichton on Vancouver Island and it is there that my parents met; they purchased the house on Hatch Point Road in 1982 and were married the next year.

From 1981 to 1984, my Dad continued to work in drilling, not in Alberta, but offshore in the North Sea, off Brazil, and Newfoundland. These jobs were well paid but meant long durations away. My Mom was not employed, but ran the

home in Cobble Hill and cared for my Brother, Sister, and me. After 1984, my Dad worked closer to home, back on rigs in Alberta. However, another economic downturn in 1985-1986 led to lay-offs. Thanks to a referral from a neighbour, he found a job at the Cowichan Joinery in Cobble Hill, a mill producing wood mouldings. This forward linkage – predicated largely on the housing market – kept him employed until 2008 when it was closed and production moved to Washington State. My Dad was lucky to get the job at the joinery as opportunities in the Cowichan Valley were few at that time. Like the rigs, the joinery was repetitive physical labour; sorting and feeding wood into machines, stacking it as it came out the other end. At home, my Mom looked after us, bought groceries, cooked, cleaned, baked, canned fruits and vegetables, and made some of our clothes. Outside, my siblings and I explored the property, splashing in the creek, climbing trees, playing on the tire swing, and exploring the hay fields and forest across the road.

According to my parents, one morning they heard chainsaws on the adjoining property. Upon investigation, they learned that the owner, MacMillan-Blodel, was logging the property. My Dad recalls that when they were finished, the only trees left standing were the arbutus trees the loggers had no use for. The property was then sold as real estate to a couple living just down the road from us. At the same time, the owner of the adjacent waterfront parcel, Jim Patrick, planned to develop an “adult seaside village.” A February 1988 article in the Vancouver Sun explained the vision:

Billed as the first retirement community of its kind in Canada, Arbutus Ridge consists of 220 acres with a mile of private shoreline. An ambitious

target of 676 housing units has been set for the property, with construction expected to be finished in five years.

At first sight, this seems an unlikely setting for a major retirement complex. The property is 1.5 km east of Highway 1, just south of Duncan, and a 40-minute drive from Victoria. It's an isolated and beautiful spot overlooking the Saanich Inlet and Saltspring Island.

Long owned privately by the family of Jim Patrick, president of Canadian Retirement Corp. (the development company behind Arbutus Ridge), the site is undeniably isolated, requiring residents to drive to shops or theatres (Balcom, 1988).

All in the “isolated” community did not welcome Arbutus Ridge. Dad, however, was in favour, seeing it as a much-needed provider of jobs in the area. He put petitions in local stores and pubs, encouraging people to support the development. Many people he spoke with viewed Arbutus Ridge as a threat to their rural lifestyle: “They want to live here but they want to be the last ones in,” my Dad often said. Construction at Arbutus Ridge began in 1987 and among the people who gained employment from the development were my Mom and our neighbour, Anne; together, they started Arbutus Cleaning Services. My Mom’s youngest Brother also found work as a head gardener with the golf and country club. Tidman Construction had an exclusive contract to build the homes and infrastructure in the retirement village; Arbutus Cleaning Services made a proposal to Canadian Retirement Corp. for the cleaning of the sales centre, and later they were approached by Tidman to become a sub-contractor for post-construction home cleaning. As homes were occupied, Mom and Anne went to homes and solicited clients. The development did have the impact on employment that my Dad and others had hoped for; the site was a frenzy of activity with

construction contractors, from excavating companies to plumbers and flooring installers.

As the “first retirement community of its kind in Canada,” the development had an undeniable impact on class relations in the region. Arbutus Cleaning Services’ first clients were not from the Cowichan Valley. Those buying homes in Arbutus Ridge were mainly from east of the Rocky Mountains, particularly the prairies. My Mom remembers that early clients were retired doctors, judges, lawyers, and dentists, or couples who had sold their farm or left it to their children and moved west to “get away from the weather” (field notes). For others, Arbutus Ridge was a second home or, as a gated community, a place to live part-time while spending six months of the year at a snowbird destination. David Harvey argues that this kind of residential differentiation provides for “distinctive milieus for social interaction from which individuals to a considerable degree derive their values, expectations, consumption habits, market capacities, and states of consciousness” (1989, p. 118). Indeed, a 1988 Vancouver Sun exposé on Arbutus Ridge and the phenomenon of retirement communities notes that interested buyers “are looking for a new lifestyle more than they are looking for a new house.” (Balcom, 1988, June 18). A golf course, swimming pool, tennis courts, ocean views, security patrols, and walking trails, were, and are, part of the lifestyle at Arbutus Ridge.

For our family, the backyard remained a place to play, but it soon became a place to collect golf balls. Shortly after people began moving into Arbutus Ridge, the former MacMillan-Blodel property was sold again for the expansion of

the golf course – from nine to 18 holes. The country club and driving range, located by the lone Arbutus trees, backed onto the rear of our property. While my Mom and Anne gained employment from the development, it was employment predicated on facilitating and maintaining the lifestyle purchased by Arbutus Ridge residents. Construction contractors benefited as well. In fact, the project lasted much longer than five years; at the time of writing, construction is still underway.

A one page document my Mom has kept since the late 1980s titled “The History of Arbutus Ridge” describes the area as originally inhabited by

the Cowichan Indians. Their territory centred around the Cowichan River and estuary....Hatch Point was part of the substantial land grant made at the turn of the century by [the] Dominion government to Robert Dunsmuir, Vancouver Island’s coal baron. In return for the grant, Dunsmuir built the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. Until the early ‘50s Hatch Point remained wilderness. Then Mr. A.J. Ratcliffe of Cobble Hill came on the scene. He purchased the land and harvested the trees” (field notes).

Viewed from the water, the 220 acres of Arbutus Ridge is a mass of housing, delineated by a sharp, straight border of trees on the left side: this is the boundary of the Hatch Point Indian Reserve – a fishing station set out for the Pauquachin First Nation in the 1870s. This reserve receives no mention in the Arbutus Ridge history document. Yet, the visual contrast of the reserve and development offers a representation of two very different spatializations with different, yet directly connected, histories. A plaque inside the recreation centre at Arbutus Ridge is dedicated to the development’s first buyers: “Arbutus Ridge salutes the premier purchasers who had the vision and foresight to become the proud pioneers in Canada’s first master planned adult community” (field notes). The buyers are

“proud pioneers” of a shift in class relations in the Cowichan Valley and this reference establishes Arbutus Ridge as a waypoint for Settler belonging. What I mean here is that development’s approval and construction, with its supporters and detractors, is a physical and temporal marker that, not unlike the E&N railway, created conflict and marked off those who came before and those who came after. Arbutus Ridge is a waypoint, but it is also part of my archive of belonging as it reveals something of my family’s complex relationship to, and position within, a larger project of (dis)possession.

The Bitumen Boom

In early September 2016, my wife JoAnne and I took a trip to Mystic Beach, located within Juan de Fuca Provincial Park, to visit friends camping there for the weekend. As we approached the entrance off of West Coast Road, cars lined the shoulder in either direction. The large parking lot was full and so we joined the dozens of other vehicles parked on the road. The hike to the beach takes about 30 or 40 minutes, requiring the crossing of a suspension bridge and a walk through the forest. The forest understory is mostly bare soil since the second growth trees all grew up at the same time, blocking daylight from the understory and making it difficult for other plants to thrive. At

Figure 18: Logging waste on the trail to Mystic Beach.

one point, directly beside, and virtually on, the trail a large pile of cable used for yarding

trees lay rusted and coiled; a discarded piece of logging waste, a waypoint left behind to inadvertently symbolize a heritage of extraction. At the beach, on a typically grey west coast weekend at the close of summer, there were many people: marine trail hikers, day users, overnight campers, families, teenagers, children, and seniors.

A drive along the West Coast Road/BC Highway 14 to Mystic, Sombrio, or Botanical beaches does not lead past many prosperous commercial developments. The sporting good and grocery stores predicted for communities such as Shirley, Jordan River, and Port Renfrew did not materialize when Juan de Fuca Provincial Park was created in 1994. This is not to say that the park has not contributed to the local economy, most people on the road are likely on their way to one of the many parks. However, it is B&Bs, resorts, forestry cut blocks, and real estate signs that dot the highway landscape between Sooke and Port Renfrew. “For Sale” signs advertise water views, whale watching from your living room, or cleared and build-ready acreages backing onto creeks and forests. There are derelict development signs, too, evidence of property speculation gone bust.

Forestry remained integral to the BC economy during the early and mid-2000s (British Columbia [BC], 2007). However, employment in the industry declined significantly between 1997 and 2010 (BC, BC Stats, n.d.). A softwood lumber trade dispute with the United States and increased raw log

Figure 19: Lots for sale near Jordan River next to the West Coast Road.

exports were often blamed for this decline (e.g.: Prudham, 2009). What interests me here

is the rising national economic influence of the Alberta oil sands during this time, its connection to inter-provincial migration and property investment in British Columbia, and its relation to Settler belonging. In pursuit of high-wage jobs, many workers from communities in the Juan de Fuca and Cowichan Valley regions (among others) left these places, either temporarily or permanently, to work in extraction of the bitumen staple. Simultaneously, this growth generated wealth among many Albertans who purchased real estate in the Pacific province. This movement of workers recalls the departure and arrival of Settlers in the colonial era, as they moved between gold rushes or across territories seeking land and a future home (see chapter two). However, departures caused by the bust of one staple industry and the boom of another also present a potential threat to Settler belonging that is already in place. That is, an increase in departures makes it more difficult to work at and pass along territorially specific attachment to land.

Since the oil strike at Leduc, Alberta in 1947, oil and gas extraction has played a major role in Canada's extractive economy (Pratt, 1982). As with other commodities, it has been subject to the boom and bust of international demand; my Father's employment in oil and gas during the 1970s, and the loss of his job during the 1980s, is a personal connection to this cycle. The early and mid-2000s witnessed a return to the boom of oil and gas in places such as northern BC, Newfoundland, and Saskatchewan, but the driver of this boom was primarily Alberta through the extraction of bitumen, commonly referred to as oil or tar sands (Fast, 2014). This 'bitumen bubble' sparked a renewed debate about the place of staples in the Canadian economy (cf: Watkins, 2007; Hutton, 2007; Sylvester, 2013; Stanford, 2014; Kellogg, 2015b), but these debates tend to place emphasis on the empirical case for understanding extractive relations in Canada, particularly as they

pertain to international markets and trade policies. The boom of the oil sands has had a significant and transformative impact on the Canadian economy, generating spread-effects that have supported and challenged understandings of the staples approach and the Canadian economy. Here, I look at the reverberation of this resource boom to understand how staple extraction in one province can create territorially specific effects/affects in another.

The increased demand for oil during the 2000s reflects rising consumption, geopolitical conflict, particularly after September 11, 2001, and increased demand for cheap energy from rapidly developing economies such as China and India. In Canada, crude oil production rose 21% between 1997 and 2006 while the value of that production increased by 184% (Fuelling the Economy, Stats Canada). During that same period, employment in oil and gas grew by 43% and employment in support industries (e.g.: transport, drilling, environmental services, construction) grew by 88%; 75% of these jobs were found in Alberta (Williams, 2007). The availability of these jobs attracted workers from across Canada, many of whom faced downturns in other extractive industries.

The correlation between staple sector decline in one province/region and the pursuit of similar employment in other parts of the country is a subject well researched, lamented, and even celebrated in Canada. I am thinking specifically of the decline of the cod fishery and the exodus of Newfoundlanders/Maritimers to the oil fields of Alberta during the 1970s and 1980s: “Well, it’s living they’ve found, deep in the ground / And if there’s doubts, it’s best they ignore them / Nor think on the bones, the crosses and stones / Of their fathers that came there before them” (Rogers, 1980). This is similar to a phenomenon that Innis noted in *The Cod Fisheries*: “The opening of the West in Canada

and the relative decline in the Maritimes were followed by a migration to western Canada and to the Central Provinces” (1978/1940, p. 498). In 2004, my Sister Sarah’s partner at the time pursued an ‘oil patch’ job by moving to the small Saskatchewan-border town of Provost, Alberta. Sarah worked a \$6.10/hour retail job while they fit oil and gas pipes.

About 17,100 people from others [sic] provinces moved to Alberta in the last three months of 2005, the most to date in a single quarter...The migratory rush to Alberta exceeded even activity during the previous energy boom that peaked in 1979 and 1980, Statscan said (Ebner & Scoffield, 2006).

The move to Provost lasted less than two years, but the motivations were similar to many from Vancouver Island and across the country who flocked to Alberta: a higher-wage and, maybe, a chance to make enough money to buy a house, start a family, or pay off debt. By 2008, the bitumen boom generated unprecedented income for capital operating in Alberta (Fast, 2014, p. 50). The availability of higher wages in the oil and gas industry, combined with the need for labour to meet demand, resulted in earned income growth and thus demand for products and services (Ciuriak, 2014, p. 98). Consumption is also key here – the increased use of oil and gas products drives extraction and feeds the circulation of revenue and capital. Simply put, the oil sands economy and its spread effects – the economic inputs and outputs of extraction – transformed class relations and distressed the practices of belonging. One need only look at the suburban sprawl and urban development of cities such as Calgary or Edmonton during this period to understand these changes.

The Real Estate Market

“They all want a little piece of British Columbia” (Stewart, 2006).

Real estate, understood here as a mechanism to acquire private property in the form of land/housing, is a function of the capitalist state and integral to Settler

colonialism. That is, real estate markets are the primary way that individual Settlers and groups (such as corporations) gain private property rights.⁴⁹ These rights to exclude others from the use or benefit of land are codified in law and upheld by the state at all levels and they are a basis for affective attachment to land. Although these rights in property seem to be guaranteed by the state, they are contradictory in that they are also subject to alteration, regulation, and revocation. Despite such provisions, state defence of *private* and *productive* property was necessary to exclude Indigenous peoples from the land (Harvey, 2014, p. 40; Watkins, 2006a/1963, p. 10). Through an analysis of the work of C.B. Macpherson (1973, 1978), Clement explains that the state has created these rights but also kept them for itself to secure revenue and/or meet political demands (1983, p. 213). The conferring of monopoly rights in the case of the E&N land grant, or the bundling of private property and Crown lands to realize sustained yield forestry are examples of this flexibility. How, then, do these monopoly property rights factor into the spread effects of the oil sands and influence real estate markets in British Columbia? What are the consequences for (dis)possession? David Harvey explains that when revenues are distributed – in the form of wages, profits, taxes, rent, and the like – their circulation by various social classes creates “opportunities for various secondary forms of exploitation” (1989, p. 98). The sale of trucks to oil patch workers is an example of this. In Harvey’s analysis, rent, a money payment for the use of land, is another example. Real estate markets and the development of land are a way of capturing and exploiting this circulation of revenue and capital; from the workers on a drill rig to contractors and investors.

⁴⁹ Of course, real estate has not always been the primary means of acquiring land. Pre-emptions, land grants, and squatter’s rights, for example, all allowed for the possession of land and acquisition of property rights prior to the development of commercial real estate.

Within the staples approach, the term “rent” is often used to refer to royalties and taxes accrued to the state from surplus value; Watkins and others refer to this as fiscal linkage (Watkins, 2006c/1977, 2014). In the language of staple linkages, Harvey’s analysis of rent most resembles final demand linkage. In Watkins’ theorization, final demand linkage is presented as a possible way to break out of the staple trap:

It is a market-oriented way for domestic industry to grow up around resource workers, if their consumer spending creates sufficient demand to support a broad range of local goods and services. If the population grows enough, it can sustain economic activities that have nothing to do with the original resources, or later discovered ones (Laxer, 2014, p. 56).

Final demand linkage is also concerned with the appropriation of “the income received by the commodity producers or workers on consumer goods” (Watkins, 2006c/1977, p. 55). Truck sales in Fort McMurray, Alberta (if those trucks are built in Canada) are an example of realizing final demand linkage. Although real estate does not fit neatly into the concept of final demand linkage, it is a market-driven and secondary form of exploitation that captures capital and revenue (Watkins, 2006a/1963, p. 10). A staple boom will provide an opportunity for secondary exploitations of revenue due to rising wages, profits etc., although neither real estate nor fossil-fuelled truck sales will necessarily break the cycle of a staple trap. A key difference between trucks and land is that land, and title to land, is form of “fictitious capital” in that, like the stock market, money investment and speculation in land is not an investment in the physical means of production. Property prices are, in part, determined by future flows of capital and labour, meaning land speculation does not require an immediate labouring of the land (in Lockean terms), but rather speculation makes a claim upon future labour or future circulation of revenue (Harvey, 1982, p. 367; 1989, p. 107).

Real estate speculators and developers shape patterns of land use by using “the land as an element of production” (Harvey, 1989, p. 102) to capture revenues generated from contemporary, ongoing, or future extraction and return profit. I am arguing here that land speculation and real estate development serve to capture revenue circulations during the boom cycle and, during the bust cycle, make a claim against future circulations when/if the boom returns. What is important to note is that real estate development, rather than breaking the staple trap, may perpetuate the trap for workers and communities by providing a spatial fix to capital during crises of accumulation (the boom/bust). In this way the concept of final demand linkage is inadequate to an analysis of real estate, and I am making the case that land development/real estate has a particular relationship with the staple economy. Put another way, land development in a staple economy can be understood as an *auxiliary linkage* that serves to absorb surplus value and revenues for capital during the boom cycle, and, for certain social classes, acts as a financial hedge during the bust. Equipped with this concept, we can begin to see that the boom/bust cycle can influence the processes of (dis)possession in locations that seem to have no relation to the production of a particular staple.

Given the nature of the staple(s) and the cycle(s), revenues and attempts to appropriate them will manifest in various and complex ways:

The level of appropriation of rent from one kind of revenue cannot be understood independently of the others. The relations between land and property rent, transport availability, employment opportunities, and housing, as well as other consumer functions, all in the context of shifting geographical patterns in the circulation of both capital and revenues, then define the nexus of forces shaping the spatial configuration of land uses (Harvey, 1989, p. 102).

The staple, then, is only one of many forces that determine the where and why of real estate markets. The factors that drive land prices (location, improvements, lot size etc.)

are both social and economic and are entangled in the circulation and appropriation of revenue and capital. Yet, because capitalism does not function without private property and its associated monopoly rights, “situations arise in which space can be collectively monopolized and a given pattern of the circulation of revenues trapped within its confines (Harvey, 1989, p. 102). Herein lies a key finding for uncovering the relationship between staple extraction and real estate development: the *stamp* of one staple and the *spread effects* (circulation of revenue and capital) of another staple create particular conditions for the exploitation of private property. The waxing and waning of different staples is a factor in locating investment in real estate and I am arguing that this has implications for understanding how property conflict sparks the material and affective practices of belonging. The purchase and development of real estate in British Columbia at the height of the bitumen bubble offers insight into this phenomenon.

Albertan Buyers

In the early days of conducting research for this dissertation, I decided I would try to make a note of each Alberta licence plate I encountered in my daily life on Vancouver Island. From past conversations and experience, I knew there was at least a perception that Albertans were re-locating and/or visiting BC to such an extent that it was noticeable phenomenon (field notes). This presence was more than a perception; at the height of the oil sands boom, BC became a key market for Albertans seeking second homes, recreational properties, and retirement homes. I started my licence plate count during the summer of 2014, but I quickly realized it would be easier to track days when I did *not* see an Alberta licence plate. I abandoned this method after a few weeks when I finally realized that the empiricism of licence plates was not important. What mattered were the feelings about the phenomenon, feelings that revealed a shift in class relations.

“Everywhere you go in Courtenay or Comox (B.C.), you see Alberta licence plates” (Ohler, 2006). This statement from the owner of a BC-based real estate website reflects the frenzied interest in BC real estate from Albertan buyers in 2006. In this case, the licence plate signifies a hot real estate market. On the back of a large truck, the Alberta tags may evoke pride in a high-wage oil sands job. Licence plates may also raise feelings of anger or resentment; the purchase of secondary homes by Albertans has not gone unnoticed in certain communities, and, despite the best efforts of the state, the “Wild Rose Country” tagline on Alberta plates evokes tar sands, pipelines, and climate disaster for many people (field notes). In this way, the Alberta licence plate resembles what some affect theorists call a “refrain” – it becomes a mark seen over and over that triggers other refrains – about climate change, pipelines, or real estate development, for example (Bertelsen & Murphie, 2011). Working on my dissertation proposal in a Victoria coffee shop a couple of years ago, I took a break to grab a refill on my coffee. The worker asked me what I was up to, and I told him I was working on my dissertation. This led to the inevitable question, “What’s it about?” I indicated that I was working on a section about the forest industry and the transformation of forestlands into real estate. Unsolicited, the worker told me he was from Alberta and that he really loves the forests “out here.” I began to tell him that it was interesting that he should say this as one of the questions I was interested in is “Who are the people buying these properties?” Without hesitation, another customer chimed in as he headed out the door: “It’s the Albertans!” (field notes).

In a June 2006 report, the real estate data company Landcor made the connection between the BC real estate market and Alberta explicit: “Alberta Buyers and the Effect on Land Prices in British Columbia” (Landcor, 2006, June 7). The report’s data tables

make the connection even more clear by visually contrasting the rise in home sales between 2000 and 2006 with the rise in the price of a barrel of oil over the same time period (Landcor, 2006, June 7, p. 4). As a company working with banks and companies involved in real estate, Landcor revealed to its clients that they were experiencing “the hottest residential market in 40 years” (Landcor, 2006, August 16). According to Landcor, in 2007 67% of those who purchased secondary property in BC from outside of the province came from Alberta (for a total of 6,319 purchases). That these buyers can afford secondary homes and come overwhelmingly from the urban centres of Calgary and Edmonton, and not from the periphery of bitumen-extracting Fort McMurray, offers an indication of their likely class position. Whether through the purchase of a secondary home or place for retirement, the BC real estate market pulled in revenues from Alberta generated by the boom of the oil sands. The type of real estate sought by these buyers supports this class interpretation – properties with waterfront views, resort condominiums, detached homes, and vacant land were among the most sought after by Alberta-based buyers (Landcor, 2006, June 7). These property types, combined with a complex mix of other values such as climate and availability of services, drove purchases in all regions, though the majority were made in Greater Vancouver and on Vancouver Island (Landcor, 2008, p. 9). Through these examples we can begin to understand how property and space may become monopolized and trap certain patterns of circulation.

Given this demand, individuals selling their home in a community such as Port Renfrew or Mill Bay stood to make some financial gain. Yet, these individual examples do not necessarily reflect the monopolization of land I want to highlight here. Rather, it is real estate developers, through their access to capital, who buy up land to use as an

element of production, that shape multiple and simultaneous real estate offerings based on the pattern of demand. With knowledge of the bitumen boom and real estate demand, forestry companies such as Western Forest Products, as owners of extensive private properties on Vancouver Island, saw an opportunity.

Higher and Better Use

To understand how Western Forest Products (WFP) took advantage of a growing demand for real estate it is necessary to recall the stamp of the forest staple and, specifically, how forestry companies came to own vast tracts of private lands on Vancouver Island (see chapter four). To summarize, forestry companies purchased much of the E&N land grant and vast tracts of forestland were acquired in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, before a comprehensive Crown policy regarding the forest resource (see chapters three and four). Tree farm licences (TFL), brought about in 1947 as a feature of sustained yield forestry, bundled these private lands with Crown lands to co-manage forestry and provide security of access to the TFL holder through long-term tenure. This mandatory bundling of property rights was unravelled in 2003 and 2004 when the BC Liberal government introduced legislation targeting tree farm and other forestry policies. These changes to forest policy placed increased responsibility for resource management in the hands of capital and were touted a way to minimize the effects of mill closures, unemployment, trade disputes, and corporate restructuring (Parfitt, 2008). The *Private Managed Forest Land Act* (2004) gave owners of private forestlands the ability to remove their properties from forestry use altogether, subject only to the zoning requirements of local government. The removal of private land from TFLs began as early as 1999, but these removals remained designated for forest use (BC, 2008, p. 18). After the passing of the *Private Managed Forest Land Act*, forestry companies

were able to select lands for removal and, at the discretion of the minister, these lands could be removed and made available for non-forestry uses, including development and real estate. This is exactly what Western Forest Products did in 2007 when the province granted its 2004 request to remove over 28,000 acres from three of its TFLs on Vancouver Island. The point here is that both capital and the state acted to allow for the conversion of private forestlands into development properties. In doing so, they made explicit the auxiliary role of land and real estate in a staple economy.

The ministerial decision to allow WFP to remove its private lands rested upon the province meeting (or at least being seen to meet) its duty to consult with affected First Nations. In a 2005 decision, *Hupacasath First Nation v British Columbia (Minister of Forests)*, the Supreme Court of British Columbia found that the removal of lands from TFLs, in this case TFLs 39 and 44 in Hupacasath First Nation territory, required the Crown to fulfil its duty to consult. To meet this duty for the WFP lands, the Ministry of Forests and Range sent letters to eight First Nations whose territory encompassed lands proposed for removal.⁵⁰ In a report on the 2007 TFL land removals, the Auditor General of BC commented on this consultation:

the ministry did not receive extensive input from the First Nations groups notified....We also acknowledge that most First Nations we spoke with as part of our review felt a strong sense of grievance and loss arising from the removal of the private land...Most First Nations we spoke to felt that the process of consultation did not adequately accommodate them (BC, 2008, p. 45).

Despite the Supreme Court's 2005 decision, provincial efforts to engage First Nations can be understood as, at best, superficial. Chelsea Vowel explains that

the duty to consult is already considered by many Indigenous peoples to be

⁵⁰ Kitasoo, T'Sou-ke. Quatsino, Kwakiutl, Pacheedaht, Haida, We Wai Kai, Mowachaht/Muchalaht First Nations.

inadequate, and too open to interpretation and abuse. Allowing regulators and industry to wield the duty to consult as a way to circumvent legal restrictions on their activities, is not a precedent that the federal or provincial governments should be comfortable with, and First Nations are certainly not going to let it happen without a fight (Vowel, 2016).

Through this largely preordained consultation process, the Pacheedaht First Nation requested that lands in their territory (TFL 25) not be removed (BC, 2008, p. 39). As a reminder that the duty to consult is a product of ongoing (dis)possession and does not mean the state must act according to First Nation responses, the Western Forest Products land removal was approved in January 2007. In total, Minister Rich Coleman approved the removal of 28,283 hectares of private land within TFLs 6 and 19, located on northern Vancouver Island and the central mainland coast, and TFL 25, located on southern Vancouver Island, near Jordan River. The removal of lands within TFL 25 are the subject of inquiry here.

With over 28,000 hectares unencumbered by forest tenure regulations, Western Forest Products moved to sell lands with a ‘higher or better’ use. In deciding to approve the removal, the Ministry of Forests and Range was aware that WFP intended to sell its private forestlands (BC, 2008, p. 68). Public condemnation of this decision was immediate and within ten months the Auditor General launched an investigation into the matter. Protest against the minister’s decision stemmed from opposition to urban sprawl, a loss of or threat to recreation sites, the perception of a corporate giveaway, and, to a lesser extent, the loss access for First Nations (Vancouver Island Community Forest Action Network [VICFAN], 2011). The first parcels of land, nearly 2000 hectares around Jordan River and the Sooke River, went up for sale in early 2007. By October that year, Ilkay Development Corporation secured an option to purchase WFP’s 2000 hectares at

Jordan River and also finalized a purchase for seven lots (about 250 hectares) nearby (Lavoie, 2007).

I want to highlight here the various threads of (dis)possession that I am trying to unravel in this chapter. What I mean is that the decision to allow the removal of private lands from the tree farm licence marks the culmination of several events and issues detailed in this dissertation: the alienation of forestlands prior to the First World War; the fantasy of Crown sovereignty and the politics of recognition; sustained yield forestry; monopoly property rights; park designation; the stamp of the staple/material-affective linkages; and the adjustment of Settler belonging when faced with transformation in the mode of production. Put another way, to understand how land development functions as an auxiliary linkage requires interrogation of the locally particular events and processes of (dis)possession.

The Circle of Culpability

At an October 2007 public meeting held in the community of Shirley, Ender Ilkay, President of Ilkay Development Corporation, spoke tentatively of plans to undertake a 20 year development plan for the 2000 hectares, assuring the audience “that they are better off with his vision of a planned development than they would be with separate sales of all 65 titles” (Lavoie, 2007). Here, the spectre of lost access is threatened and the development plan portrayed as the clear choice: multi-phased, multi-use development best benefits the communities around which it will be built. Multi-phased development acts as a hedge for/against the boom/bust cycle, allowing the developer/investors to plan for the exploitation of future labour/revenue/capital. The Alberta bitumen bubble is an essential part of understanding the rationalization for the TFL land removal and

development proposal. Like so many others involved in holding and developing property, both Western Forest Products and Ilkay knew there were revenues to be appropriated:

Alberta's notable presence reflects its strong economy and demand for recreational property....Nearly one-half of Albertan buyers are from Calgary. Its close proximity to BC's and high income level make it a natural market for secondary properties. The Edmonton area is the next most frequent source of BC property buyers (Landcor, 2008, p. 24).

Western Forest Products' *2006 Annual Report* told shareholders that the removal of private timberland from tree farm licences allowed the company to "gain flexibility and surface value" (2007, p. 4). My argument is that these events in the Jordan River area are the manifestation of land development's function as an auxiliary linkage. With revenue and capital circulating from Alberta's boom, the property regime of southern Vancouver Island, defined by its large tracts of private forestlands, presented a way to appropriate these and meet investor demands. The real estate market does not break the boom/bust cycle for workers and communities. More precisely, it is a support, a fix that provides capital with an escape from the staple trap.

Many who had taken an interest in fighting the WFP and Ilkay proposals were not swayed to support by the threat to beach access. In defending his proposal, Ilkay portrayed himself as a disconnected developer: "A piece of land came on the market offered for sale, and I am under contract to purchase it" (Lavoie, 2007). Minister of Forests and Range Rich Coleman also avoided any responsibility for the conflict over parks, First Nations rights, and development. In the provincial legislature, Coleman argued the 28,000 hectares, valued at \$150 million, would aid WFP in a time of financial crisis and keep forestry workers employed:

Part of the consideration taken at the time was, quite frankly, that there are 3,300 people working for a significant company on the coast as it's trying to restructure

its company and save those jobs in British Columbia. If the Leader of the Opposition doesn't care about those 3,300 families and their jobs in British Columbia, that's sad. I do... anything that happens with these lands outside of forest management will go through a public process just like any other piece of land through a community would for any rezoning or community development...The reality is that I know you [Leader of the Opposition, Carole James] don't like the fact that maybe some company and private land rights exist. I know you may not like the fact that maybe 3,300 people's jobs are important to the economy of the coast of British Columbia and those communities. I believe they are (Coleman, 2007).

The Auditor General's findings note that the Ministry did not actually look into the financial health of Western Forest Products, nor did it calculate whether or not the land removal would result in the retention of jobs (BC, 2008, p. 28). The minister's comments seem easily dismissed as political rhetoric, but the invocation of 'working families' and "private land rights" establishes a discursive case for land as an auxiliary linkage. That is, to keep good paying jobs in extraction, and to respect monopoly rights in property, the removal and sale of land from TFLs in times of a bust economy is justified. Moreover, by passing the decision making for development onto local government, the province placed the outcomes of spatial reconfiguration squarely on the Capital Regional District (CRD). For Ilkay, presenting himself as an individual simply acting on his rights to private property, any blame is seen to lie elsewhere. At a public meeting on his proposal he stated: "If you buy a house where a couple got divorced, are you responsible for the divorce?" (Worthing, 2011). Western Forest Products is also understood to be acting within their private property rights while at the CRD, the province, through its failure to consult with local government, became the party responsible (Capital Regional District [CRD], 2008). This is what I describe as the *circle of culpability* regarding land use matters in BC: if the duty to consult is overcome, development of some sort becomes self-evident and any blame for a failure in this consultation or decision making is passed

along. The circle of culpability is a primary function of ongoing (dis)possession as it sends any problems stemming from the taking of land and the fantasy of Crown sovereignty around an unbroken circle. This deniability, in turn, makes time for Settler belonging to be worked out. Below, I argue that this circle is bound up with the politics of recognition. In the case of the TFL removal, some Settlers and some First Nations worked together to oppose development. However, as is now familiar, a restitution of First Nations lands did not occur.

Conflict and Spatial Reconfiguration

The removal of the TFL lands from forest staple production and the proposed Ilkay development took local government, First Nations, and Settler community groups by surprise (Lavoie, 2007). In the months prior to the TFL 25 decision, staff reports to the Capital Regional District's parks committee recommended the need to further study the potential for new parks and trails west of the Sooke River (CRD, 2007). The proposed Ilkay development endangered the potential acquisition of these beach and river areas deemed significant by the CRD and residents. In April 2008, the CRD moved to amend zoning and Official Community Plan (OCP) by-laws in an effort limit lot sizes and density in the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area. This 'down-zoning' aimed to restrict development to "Settlement Containment Areas" (areas already designated for growth) and included a minimum lot size of 120 hectares for most other parts of the region.

To bring the public onside, Ilkay revised his proposal for the Western Forest Products lands into the development of a community of 10,000 people around Jordan River. Whereas Ilkay's previous statements were vague on the place of parks within a development (Lavoie, 2007), this proposal included the donation of 1,190 hectares of parkland to the CRD in exchange for the development's approval (Lavoie, 2008). In a

transparent effort to aid Ilkay's proposal, and therefore achieve the highest price for the land, WFP submitted a subdivision application for the lands before the 2008 bylaw changes received provincial approval. The WFP application proposed 300 waterfront acreages without public access or parks (Faulkner, 2008; Lavoie, 2008). In this way, parks and access became part of the incentive or, more precisely, a coercion tactic, for winning development approval. To further protect its property rights, and the rights of potential purchasers, WFP took the CRD's bylaw changes to the Supreme Court of British Columbia. The forestry corporation and the mysterious British Columbia Landowners Association⁵¹ argued that CRD Board members improperly voted upon adoption of the bylaws.⁵² In December 2008, the court ruled in favour of WFP, finding that the vote had been taken incorrectly (CRD, 2008). Upon appeal by the CRD in 2009 the ruling was upheld and the bylaw changes invalidated.

Although Western Forest Products removed over 28,000 hectares from its TFLs across Vancouver Island, it was land in the Juan de Fuca region that drew the most vociferous opposition from Settlers. Harvey argues that when land markets are dominated by money power and the ability to pay, there is a reaction whereby a society uses "whatever powers of domination it can command (money, political influence, even

⁵¹ It seems that this organization was formed for the sole reason of arguing against the bylaws. I am unable to find any reference to it outside of the court rulings and a few media reports and community association meeting minutes. Presumably this was an organization of landowners/developers, including Ilkay, interested in retaining development rights.

⁵² At the risk of oversimplifying a complex governance matter, the issue stemmed from the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area's (JDFEA) unincorporated status. Essentially, as an institution made up of municipal and unincorporated governments, the Capital Regional District (CRD) had developed various complicated voting procedures based on which area/city the matter was affecting and which committee was discussing it. As an unincorporated area, the JDFEA had just one director, making it necessary for others to vote on matters pertaining to the JDFEA. When the 2008 bylaw changes were passed, CRD directors from Central Saanich and Metchosin voted to approve, along with the JDFEA director. In 2008, the Supreme Court of British Columbia ruled that this vote was not taken in accordance with the provincial Local Government Act; all members of the CRD board should have participated in the vote. After the granting of a stay and then an appeal by the CRD, the appeal was dismissed in 2009 and the 2008 bylaw changes invalidated (*Western Forest Products Inc. v Capital Regional District*, 2009).

violence) to try to seal itself off (or seal off others judged undesirable) in fragments of space within which processes of reproduction of social distinctions can be jealously protected” (1989, p. 178). This characterizes the reaction to Western Forest Product’s land removal and the proposed development; the threat against Juan de Fuca parks inspired protest that drew upon particular configurations of material-affective attachment and class relations, as I discuss below.

The legal status of TFL properties was largely unrecognized by Settlers. What I mean here is that as both trees and Settler feelings for land matured over time within a system of sustained yield forestry, access to forestry land was checked only by the erection of gates and, in some cases, not even then (a subject I address in greater detail in the next chapter). The delineation of bundled Crown and private forestlands is often of little concern to a mountain biker.⁵³ As such, the TFL removal threatened to bring real estate development *and* take away the assumed entitlement of access to forestry land. A letter from the Otter Point and Shirley Resident and Ratepayers Association (OPSRRA) to the Minister of Environment and CRD Parks Committee is instructive here:

[Western Forest Product’s parcel at] Muir Creek runs between the two rural communities of Shirley and Otter Point and has been the location for recreation, social events and commerce over this area’s long history. Preservation of the creek and its watershed would mean different things to different groups; but to our community it would mean the protection of one of the most significant natural areas west of Sooke and one of the few places along this section of the coast where you can easily access the ocean (2009).

In this excerpt, the appeal for acquisition of the land rests on both the ‘cultural flavour’ of the site and the importance of maintaining access that, over time, has come to be normalized, despite WFP’s private property rights. Although it is possible that the

⁵³ This is perhaps made all the more confusing given that forestry companies with private holdings do provide limited access for recreational purposes.

description of a “long history” of uses by various groups includes First Nations, such as with claims to Sombrio or Botanical beaches (see chapter six), the core of the appeal is on behalf of a Settler public. In this way, forestry lands, whether private or Crown, are understood as belonging to the (Settler) public, a sentiment fostered by the logic behind sustained yield forestry and the bundling of Crown/private lands in TFLs. Like the BC Forest Discovery Centre display discussed in chapter one, the resource, and therefore the land, is seen as *belonging to* the Province of British Columbia.

By 2010, Ilkay’s option to purchase the majority of WFP’s Jordan River lands lapsed. Although WFP succeeded in quashing the CRD’s bylaw changes, reversion to the previous bylaws still posed problems for large-scale development around Jordan River.⁵⁴ In the summer of 2010, Ilkay returned to the CRD and community with a proposal for the seven lots he purchased. Ilkay’s “Marine Trail Resort” proposed development for six of the seven parcels, including 257 cabins, six caretaker residences, recreation centres, a restaurant, a store and spa; in return, 98 hectares would be donated to BC Parks. Access for the Pacheedaht First Nation to “Cultural Lands” was also suggested, a tacit move intended to portray the proposal as overly accommodating in the face of an unreasonable – that is, emotional – opposition (CRD, 2011; Worthing, 2011). Indeed, a 2011 opinion piece, titled “Land use follows rules, not emotion,” argued this very point:

There has been much protest against the way the provincial government allowed Western Forest Products to take its land out of TFL 25 and sell it to pay off debt. But again, this was a private landowner.

Angry activists and confused locals battled it out at a number of town hall meetings. Friends and neighbours disagreed and tempers flared. Those protests

⁵⁴ The pre-April 2008 bylaws (which were reverted to after August 2009) limited development in the Jordan River area to either two to five hectares or 120 hectares, depending on the parcel (Colliers International, 2010, p. 38).

and accusations went on for two years and have rolled over onto the rezoning application of Marine Trail Holdings.

The issue should be one of legal rights and freedoms under the current regulations. No one wants to be told what they can and cannot do on their land (Raits, 2011).

This opinion, written by then editor of the *Sooke News Mirror* newspaper and published in the *Goldstream News Gazette*, presents Ilkay as an individual simply acting on his rights as an owner of private property who has become the target of unwarranted outrage. The idea that emotion should be removed from decisions about land recalls the forest industry CEO's recommendation that park advocates read an article titled "A hard look at Redwood Park – for once, leaving out emotion" (Lanskail, 1984, p. 53; see chapter six). Considering the rights and title of First Nations, the sentence "No one wants to be told what they can and cannot do on their land" lays bare the dissonance required to uphold the private property rights of Settlers.

While Western Forest Products proceeded with placing its Jordan River properties on the real estate market, opposition escalated when the Marine Trail Resort development was announced. In a 2011 reflection on the fight against the resort, the Vancouver Island Community Forest Action Network (VICFAN; also known as WildCoast) explains that in 2007 a "loose" coalition of environmental groups, local residents, and community associations came together to form the Jordan River Steering Committee (n.p.). The class dimension of the cause is frequently suggested by VICFAN. For example, they identify Ilkay as a "West Vancouver real-estate baron" (VICFAN, 2011, n.p.), a reference to the Lower Mainland community's wealthy residents and luxury properties, and the fight against development is described as "a tiny non-profit versus a millionaire developer" who is "funded by private investors" (VICFAN, 2011, n.p.). VICFAN members and

others undertook various campaign tactics that reflect strategies honed by the environmental movement during the War in the Woods (see chapter six). Hiking and bearing witness, mapping, surveying, public meetings, protests, and concerts, as well as polling and coalition building were all part of mobilizing opposition to the development (VICFAN, 2011, n.p.). Environmental organizations such as the Dogwood Initiative, Wilderness Committee, Ancient Forest Alliance, Sea to Sea Greenbelt Society, Surfrider Foundation, West Coast Environmental Law, Sierra Club, Council of Canadians, and the Protect our Parks Alliance organized or participated in a few or all of these campaign tactics (VICFAN, 2011, n.p.). I am demonstrating here that the removal of TFL lands in 2007 ignited a campaign for Settler access to parks *and* forestry lands,

Figure 20: A VICFAN/WildCoast sign above a Capital Regional District rezoning notice. The handwritten sign reads “Say NO to Urban Sprawl. Save the Park www.wildcoast.ca.” Picture taken 2012.

and that the discourse used to support this campaign was, in part, reliant upon implied class difference and the identification of those from within and those from without the communities. In other words, the inter-Settler conflict characteristic of Settler belonging’s mobilization is a classed phenomenon.

Three main concerns informed the discourse of opposition to TFL removal and Ilkay development: urban sprawl, loss of access, and potential harm to the Juan de Fuca

marine trail. The seven lots that would make up the resort bordered on, and in one spot overlapped with, the popular hiking trail. In this way, the overall loss of (Settler) access to forestlands, combined with a development threat to the park, widened the Juan de Fuca land removal/development from a Jordan River issue to a southern Vancouver Island issue. Belonging was mobilized and feelings for land were put into action by individuals and organizations to prevent spatial reconfiguration: “[a] property thronged by angry environmentalists is far less attractive than other opportunities just down the road” (VICFAN, 2011, n.p.).

Belonging and Class Relations

It is perhaps self-evident that the development of an oceanfront resort with spas, restaurants, and caretakers is targeted toward a particular social class. Yet it is necessary to understand that many in opposition to the resort could also be included in this impression of class. Extra leisure time and disposable income for hiking or surfing may not make one a member of the upper classes, but it also does not necessarily exclude one. In this example we are presented with the complexities of trying to understand class structures as if they are purely economic or in isolation from other factors (Clement, 1988, p. 23). Settlers *in place* may oppose Settlers who arrive, even if they identify as part of the same economic class. The point here is that class affects Settler belonging and vice versa, and efforts to maintain belonging in the face of political economic transformation manifest across, and conflict with, class structures. As a wealthy real estate developer, Ilkay, and by proxy those the development proposed to cater to, was targeted for condemnation. A website dedicated to mocking and generating internet memes of Ilkay and his resort described him this way:

Upon moving to West Vancouver in 2000, Ender began buying land and developing subdivisions, primarily in smaller waterfront communities...He lives with his wife...and their daughter attends Mulgrave school (a private gradeschool with yearly tuition costs of \$15,800 per year)...Promoting sprawl in small waterfront communities much be a lucrative business indeed...Having long since run out of room to expand in Toronto, Mr. Ilkay has brought his big-city attitudes to small communities around Vancouver Island...Apparently Vancouver Island residents don't know what they want, and only rich and powerful real estate speculators can tell us what we really need (Bombadil, 2011).

Ilkay's West Vancouver and Toronto origins are again raised as a symbol of his class position and outsider status. The implication is that wealthy mainland speculators have no place in rural Vancouver Island communities. Indeed, a defence of "rural character" and the effort to maintain past/present/future access were central to arguments against development:

We are so fortunate to have real wilderness within reach. "We" are not only local residents, but the citizens of Victoria and the surrounding area, many of whom come here to enjoy the peace and quiet of our beautiful beaches and forests. If we continue to allow one development after another in this pristine environment, we will lose the very quality that makes this area so attractive to both residents and tourists (Innes, Mark, Dexter, Gilbertson, & MacDannold, 2009).

In this letter to the local publication *Rural Observer*, the writers attempt to speak for many who see the "real wilderness" being lost to development. The reference to "We" would seem to be an inclusive statement, but it is in fact an exclusionary one. What is implied is that development brings people (from Alberta, perhaps?) who threaten the "quality" of the space. The fight for Juan de Fuca Provincial Park and the trail became a temporal waypoint, a marker for those who came before and fought, and those who intended to come after. As transitory visitors, and an economic justification for preserving "beautiful beaches and forests," tourists seeking to share in these values are not categorized as harmful. Of course, the qualities identified for protection by the writer are also the qualities that make the area desirable for real estate development. Indeed, in

an ethnographic study of real estate development on British Columbia's Sechelt Peninsula, Jamie Yard notes that

all of the people that I talked to, whether loggers, fishermen, incoming retirees, or seasonal residents, spoke of the tremendous attachments they held to the Peninsula as 'home' rather than a prudent speculative real estate investment.... In British Columbian property markets, perhaps especially in second-home property markets like those on the Sechelt Peninsula, the notion of the family home or cabin as "priceless" is precisely the social construction that drives up price. This value can be something abstract, like a beautiful view, or something more complex, like place attachment. Interestingly, it is still the latter that is believed by real estate specialists to generate the highest prices, especially in recreational property markets (2012, pp. 202-203).

In this way, efforts to create and protect parks, either in the 1950s or the 1990s, are part of series of affective and contradictory events that work at, yet also against, forms of Settler belonging. The TFL removal and subsequent events became a catalyst for conflict between Settlers who belonged and outsiders whose impending arrival is marked as linked to the flow of capital and labour in a staple economy.

Our Common Land?

When the TFL removal occurred in 2007, I was halfway through my second year as an undergraduate student. My reaction was not unlike that of VICFAN – I was angry at a corporate giveaway of lands I considered public and I feared a loss of access. I knew little of Settler colonialism or political economy, but from driving and hiking around Vancouver Island I knew that forestry companies owned or controlled most of the places my friends and I enjoyed visiting. Like the letter writers I have cited throughout this dissertation, I felt compelled to act.

In late 2009, I was living and going to school in Ottawa, but the proposed development and the sale of land continued to concern me. I created a social media group advocating for a moratorium on the sale of all private forestlands; in the group I posted

relevant news articles and blog posts I had written. Through a website titled “Our Common Lands” I solicited stories asking readers to explain why forestlands were important to them. In the naming of the site I invoked a “We” – a call to action for land users (at least those that shared my views). But, to advocate for the restitution of lands to First Nations was not my primary objective.

Our Common Lands was based on my belief that private forestry lands had become a commons because so many people accessed them, despite their legal status as private property. In a February 2010 blog post I wrote:

While these lands have been logged many times, for many years, they are part of an idea society has not readily embraced since before the Industrial Revolution; the idea of the commons, the notion that land and resources belong to community, not corporation. Land around communities such as Sooke or Shawnigan Lake may be “private” by definition of the law, but they are *common lands as defined by the people*. Loggers, mountain bikers, dirt bikers, ATV riders, truck drivers, horse riders, hikers, anglers, mushroom pickers, partiers, hunters, surfers, swimmers and birders form part of a large list of community members and groups who are stakeholders in these “private” lands [emphasis added] (field notes).

I cringe to read this passage now. If land is held in common, then “no one can make a property claim and, *ipso-facto*, no one can be excluded from access or use” (Marchak, 1988-1989, p. 4). These feelings were and are real, but describing my claim as equal to those of First Nations reveals my ignorance to the lasting consequences of taking and securing land over time. Still, the stories I collected were a reflection of these feelings. Certainly, as the examples above have shown, the perceived entitlement of Settler access was a fundamental part of the narrative. Examples from submissions to the website reveal the sentiment generated through continued access:

- Our diverse range of forests is why I am proud of our Island, why I miss it when I'm away, and what I love to come home to. I brag about our west coast forests and truly feel that they are a deep part of our identity as 'Islanders'.

- A place I have found true comfort and peace. To be in the presence of such age, to know these living things felt the wind against them hundreds of years before my spirit stood beside them. This energy is not to be misunderstood and ignored. We chose long ago to walk away from our connection to the land and now use it for our own personal gain. Its sad to know so many can feel so little about our misuse of the Earth our Mother when inside all of us there will always live our true connection to her, we just need to stop hiding from our inherent understanding of this.
- The Island Forests have been part of my life for as long as I can remember. I first went camping at Lake Cowichan on the forestry lands when I was 6 weeks old. My family had an annual camp right up till I was 18 in that location. Every year my family would gather, visit, relax, play, swim, canoe, hike and generally just enjoy being outside and together on that beach. We spread my grandmother's ashes there after she past on, solely because it was place filled with wonderful memories. Then the section of land we traditionally camped on was sold for development and we have had to go elsewhere since...The forests on Vancouver Island have been a huge influencing factor on my life and I hope they will be for my children as well. They need to be preserved for our future generations.
- These lands are our heritage! Canada is based on beautiful untouched landscapes of every conceivable type. Vancouver island is one such example. The old growth forests and rugged coastal mountains are our equivalent of the great cathedrals in Europe, Buddhist temples in Asia, and the pyramids of Egypt. All over the world natural landscapes are being destroyed for financial gain...We are a wealthy country and therefore should be preserving these lands and managing them responsibly so that later generations will have the opportunity to explore nature and revel in its beautify [sic] as we have.
- The forest has always been a part of my life, growing up in and around the Cowichan Valley. As a little girl, chasing bugs up and down nurse logs, never able to catch them as they evaded my little hands and screams of delight, I understood that in the forest the only thing that limits you is your imagination. As I grew up, the walks by the creek, the feel of bark, the smell of skunk cabbage, and the lure of being surround by life, never got old...In the city where I live now, it is beautiful, but it is nothing like the natural world. Coming home for a few days always means a hike, whether it be Cobble Hill, Mt. Provost, or Tshalum [Tzouhalem].

As a future mother, I have a strong hope that my children will be able to fall in love with the same joys that I was able to experience. This means protection. Just like a heritage building, these are our heritage forests. We need to preserve what we love about them; the luxury of a quiet hike, a canoe, a kayak, and a swim are all things that need to be watched and maintained, like anything at risk.

In my appeal to the ‘commons’ the responses were profoundly emotional.⁵⁵ While these may be individual stories and feelings, they evoke feelings *put into action* by a threat to belonging. What I mean here is that conflict can activate Settler feelings that have existed over time “in a living and interrelating continuity” (Williams, 1977, p. 132). The Settler belonging described in these submissions is generational, bound up with Settler futurity, family tradition, conceptions of nature and wilderness, and a critique of capitalist production. Forestlands are memory, identity, and connection – a “heritage” to be preserved for “future generations.” As Sara Ahmed argues, “proximity of an encounter can survive an encounter. In other words, the proximity between an object is preserved through habit” (2011, p. 40). Put another way, the ability to visit forests and campsites again and again anticipates and circulates affective attachment to them. These feelings circulate, but they are also material and sensory, being located within nurse logs, forest smells, campsites, and scattered ashes. These examples recall Emily Carr’s thoughts upon finding the “Canada” section of Kew Gardens: “I rubbed their greenery between my hands – it smelled homey. I stabbed my nose on our prickly blue pine. I sat down on the grass beneath a great red cedar tree” (1966/1946, p. 88; see chapter one). Such affective responses also reveal how dispossession gives way to and is intertwined with possession. That is, spatial reconfigurations such as the TFL removal and development proposal further alienate land from First Nations and also force the practices of belonging into action. My point is that affective attachment – belonging – is reinvigorated and deployed

⁵⁵ My efforts to have the former TFL lands protected from development also extended to attending rallies for old growth forests in Victoria (before moving to Ottawa) and writing various provincial and federal politicians and bureaucrats. In writing to the federal government, I advocated for the properties to be purchased and included in the nearby Pacific Rim National Park Reserve. The response from federal bureaucrats was that the matter was a provincial jurisdiction (personal communication). Through my education I learned more about why the lands were not “ours” to claim and I shut down the website and social media account.

against threats. None of those who submitted stories self-identified as First Nations, though one website commenter did identify themselves as having “indigenous heritage” – an unverifiable claim that was couched in the rhetoric of an “appreciation for nature” (personal communication). Neither do these stories call for a return of land to First Nations, likely because in my request for submissions I never suggested it as an option.

First Nations Responses

Within the debate over development of the TFL lands, the diverse opinions of First Nations communities, particularly the Pacheedaht, were used to support positions both for and against. When the TFL land removal was approved and announced by the province in 2007, many from the T’Souke and Pacheedaht First Nations remained opposed to the decision.⁵⁶ At a November 2007 meeting in Sooke, organized by the Jordan River Steering Committee, a spokesperson for the T’Souke First Nation

said they took offense at the fact they were not consulted or even considered in the transfer and stated they wanted to regain control of lands in their traditional territory. They were granted rights to hunt, fish and gather through the Douglas Treaty on those lands. At issue as well was the tract of land along the Sooke River which they say contains a burial ground. First Nations bands in the Capital Regional District have been at the Treaty table for many years and concerns were expressed about the rapid rate in which thousands of acres were being sold to private developers (Raits, 2007).

With a reported attendance of about 350 people, many Settlers at this meeting would have listened to these comments, making them aware, or reminding them, of the Vancouver Island Treaty and the T’Souke’s presence since time immemorial. But the meeting did not turn into a rally of support for First Nation rights and title. Other reported comments

⁵⁶ In 2010, the elected chief of the Pacheedaht First Nation submitted two letters of support for the Ilkay development to the Capital Regional District (Chek News, 2011). The letters caused confusion for both Settlers and Pacheedaht band members who were under the impression support for the development was not prevalent in the First Nations community. Indeed, the letters point to the problems inherent to a band council structure imposed by Canada. In September 2011, Pacheedaht members dismissed the chief and two administrators who had supported the development (Chek News, 2011).

revolved around the importance of stopping urban sprawl, protecting recreational spaces, and creating parks for future generations. This is not to say that members of the audience did not wish to see T'Souke lands returned or protected. Instead, First Nations opposition became part of a broader Settler narrative of demands for land protection and access. The Vancouver Island Community Forest Action Network report acknowledges the "traditional territory" of the T'Souke and Pacheedaht First Nations, but their campaign is not described as one for the restitution of First Nations land (2011, n.p.). A full-scale restitution could potentially mean Settler exclusion, a source of unspoken anxiety that evokes Settler unease with the modern treaty process (see chapter six). Although reflection of my 'common lands' description now gives me discomfort, such perspectives were very much the sentiment expressed during these events. Perhaps what is most revealing about these feelings is what goes unsaid by upholding First Nations land rights and also demanding access. What I mean here is that First Nations lands are seen to only exist in specific sites (Indian reserves or archaeological sites in parks), but these sites are mobilized by activists to lend legitimacy to a bigger project of stewarding the area for both Settlers and First Nations. In other words, belonging recognizes First Nations territory if beneficial, but does not recognize the contradiction of demands for access to unceded lands. Settler sovereignty is assumed and the circle of culpability preserved (Borrows, 1999; Veracini, 2010; Simpson, 2011; Sloan Morgan & Castleden, 2014; Mackey 2016).

Wild Hills and Beaches

While debate over the Juan de Fuca Marine Trail Resort dragged on, different proposals came forward for the remaining Western Forest Products lands. As early as 2009, a bid on the majority of TFL 25 lands from the University of British Columbia

(UBC) proposed the creation of a research forest and suggested that some areas could be made available for “land claim agreements” (Lavoie, 2010). The proposal fell apart after UBC and Western Forest Products could not reach an agreement on price and after the provincial government refused to guarantee a loan to UBC to cover the price difference (O’Connor, 2011). For potential buyers, the properties, listed with Colliers International commercial real estate company, were described as “unique” and having “significant underlying timber value,” as well as “incredible Juan de Fuca and Olympic Mountain Views” and “rare Juan de Fuca beachfront” (Colliers International, 2010, n.p.). Landscape aesthetics were a primary feature, but interested buyers were also warned that the properties were offered “as-is.” Any responsibility arising from the discovery of archaeological sites or environmental destruction rested with the new owner.

In March 2010, the Capital Regional District and Western Forest Products entered a letter of agreement to purchase 49 of WFP’s 61 parcels, specifically those around Jordan River and the Sooke Potholes.⁵⁷ Between August 2010 and August 2012, the 2350 hectares were transferred to the CRD at a cost of \$18 million. The majority of the cost was covered by the CRD Land Acquisition Fund; The Land Conservancy of British Columbia (TLC), the province, and private donors provided other funds (CRD, 2012, Winter). As a private non-profit, the TLC developed a public campaign to raise funds for the acquisition of the properties. The campaign, which I supported, was called the “Wild Hills and Beaches Campaign” and for Christmas 2010 my Mom made a donation in my name to the effort. As a result of the donation, I received a certificate for the “symbolic purchase of an acre” to assist the TLC in protecting “5,800 acres of spectacular land at

⁵⁷ The purchase of parcels at the Sooke Potholes finally achieved the objectives of the provincial Parks Branch and Settlers set in motion during the 1960s (see chapter five).

Sandcut Beach, Jordan River, and in the Sooke Hills. These wild hills and beaches are truly the definition of West Coast Paradise” (field notes). These certificates echo the granting of a pre-emption or title and create a material connection between the holder and the acquired properties. This certificate and my personal campaign for common lands are part of my archive of belonging. Although the properties are purchased for the Settler public, the symbolic purchase certificate generates affective attachment. I helped save the land and in doing so I joined the symbolic ‘throngs’ surrounding the properties. In this

Figure 21: A certificate in my name from The Land Conservancy's Wild Hills & Beaches Campaign.

way, Settlers protest monopoly private property rights but also take up these same rights to gain access to land and entrench belonging. I use the term entrench because the acquisition of these properties through the CRD takes the previously informal and perceived ‘common’ access and establishes that perception as both valid and justified. Belonging – affective attachment to land – is called upon to mobilize monies to purchase

land and resist development but, at the same time, entrench Settler attachment to (dis)possessed Indigenous territories. In turn, a new waypoint is created.

When I walk through the park at Sandcut Beach created from this public/private acquisition, I may recall this conflict and campaign and feel a sense of ownership over its creation. Yet, any perception of inclusivity resulting from the creation of the park must be challenged. The threat of a development, guided by the staple's stamp, mobilized belonging, as well as political action and financial power. Potential speculators and a social class of potential buyers were excluded. The recognition of First Nation rights became a part of the process of (dis)possession in that their land rights were acknowledged as aligned with those of Settlers, at least those claims that suited the Settler cause. In its acquisition of the properties, the CRD was required to purchase all parcels in the Jordan River area, including those deemed unworthy of park status (CRD, 2012, April 18). The regional government assured residents that it would take First Nation and local community interests into consideration when drafting park boundaries and selecting other parcels for re-sale (CRD, 2012, April 18). Consideration, however, can still be exclusion. In 2010, the chief of the T'Souke First Nation

said the waterfalls at Sandcut Beach [near Jordan River] is their church and a part of their people. They cleansed and held ceremonies in that sacred place and they want that land back. The land is called "sthunthunup" which means old home ("Looking back," 2012)

The Pacheedaht First Nation also expressed its opposition to park creation to the Capital Regional District:

The creation of Regional, Provincial and Federal parks has, to date, resulted in our homelands being largely inaccessible to the Pacheedaht peoples for the purposes of living off of the land and pursuing our traditions and cultures....To make the lands at Jordan River, specifically [parcel] JR2 into regional park land will deprive our First Nation of the ability to protect some of the richest and most bio-

diverse lands in our traditional territory. The creation of regional park land at JR2 will yet again dispossess our people from our homelands, impeding the return of our lands through Treaty negotiations. It is not our intention to exclude the public from these lands' but for all to recognize that the Pacheedaht First Nation have the rights and titles to these lands. We therefore call on the CRD and the public not to create a regional park on lands that are fundamental as part of our Treaty Settlement Lands [emphasis in original] (CRD, 2012 April).

In this letter, the Pacheedaht First Nation Chief and councillors make explicit the connection between the CRD's park plans and dispossession. Indeed, all parks in the region are linked to the exclusion of the Pacheedaht peoples from their own territories. Both Sandcut Beach and the Jordan River shorefront at JR2 became regional parks. This blatant rejection of First Nations unequivocal statements regarding land use reveals the limits of Settler consultation and the force of Settler belonging. Settler reactions to the removal of properties from TFL 25 must be understood in correlation with events discussed in previous chapters: the early pattern of settlement and treaty making (chapter one), the alienation of the forest resource (chapters two, three, and four), the creation of the West Coast Road and Sooke Potholes (chapter five) or Juan de Fuca Provincial Park (chapter six), for example. What I mean here is that belonging resembles that of past generations, but it is also changed and entrenched. The reverberatory effects of the Alberta bitumen boom caused a social and economic transformation with locally specific impacts. To address these transformations, Settlers deployed the practices of belonging, including past/present attachment and the circle of culpability, to their advantage. Through the invocation of past, present, and future of belonging, new waypoints defined by conflict, such as Jordan River Regional Park, were created. These became waypoints for the generation that fought for them and for generations to come. Moreover, these new sites of belonging (re)affirmed to Settlers that their access to parks and forestlands is

legitimate. Contrast the TLC's description of wild hills and beaches as "West Coast Paradise" with James Douglas' reference to "perfect 'Eden,' in the midst of the dreary wilderness" (chapter one). No longer foreign or weird, the landscape is celebrated and jealously guarded from certain efforts to change it. Settlers have rooted themselves and adapted, to such an extent that these roots are now cultivated by the concept of wilderness that once hindered them. What is consistent between Douglas' comment and the TLC's is that First Nations claims to land continue to be interpreted as site specific rather than sovereign and territorial.

The spatial reconfiguration of TFL 25 lands through parks and proposed development did not mean the departure of staple extraction or real estate speculation. Although the CRD obtained the Jordan River properties, Ilkay's proposal for a Marine Trail Resort remained before Capital Regional District officials. If there was any belief that the CRD's purchases would subdue opposition to the resort plan it was misplaced. Protests and public meetings continued throughout the spring and summer of 2011 and in September the Capital Regional District rejected the entirety of the development. In 2013, Ilkay moved to log the properties:

There comes a time when you have to generate some revenue,' said Ilkay, who waited 18 months after the CRD rejection hoping the land could be used as treaty settlement land to the Pacheedaht First Nation or that the province would buy it as a park addition (Lavoie, 2013).

Faced with rejection of the development proposal, the treaty process and/or park creation provides the possibility of a profitable exit for the developer. Ilkay, however, did not initially receive the favourable treatment the province showed Western Forest Products, and Pacheedaht Andersen Timber Holdings Limited Partnership proceeded to log sections of the properties. In 2011, this company, operated in part by the Pacheedaht First

Nation, also purchased harvesting rights from Western Forest Products to TFL 61, formerly TFL 25.⁵⁸ This purchase followed the signing of a Forestry Consultation and Revenue Sharing Agreement (FCRSA) with the province, giving the Pacheedaht a percentage of revenue from forestry within their territory (Raits, 2011). These forms of “Aboriginal Economic Development” (Atleo, 2015) add another complex layer to the role of staple extraction within the politics of recognition. Joyce Green notes that “the world of globalized capitalism drives not only colonial governments but, increasingly, Aboriginal ones” (2003, p. 67). Of course, participation in staple extraction is not new for the Pacheedaht or other First Nations (Jones & Bosustow, 1981, pp. 89-91; Knight, 1996; see chapter four). Significantly, participation in extraction in the present day is coaxed by provincial revenue sharing agreements and becomes a stopgap to the stalled treaty process. This is not to say that settlement of a treaty would bring about an end to logging on the part of the Pacheedaht, nor that it should. For Ilkay, logging provided revenue and the land paid dividends again. After they were logged, 6 of the 7 parcels purchased by Ilkay in 2007 were placed on the real estate market. In May 2016, the province and the Pacheedaht First Nation purchased 3 parcels:

Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation Minister John Rustad noted this is a “win-win” for British Columbians as the land buy allows the province to bring the entire Juan de Fuca Marine Trail into the B.C. Parks system, as well as advance treaty negotiations with the Pacheedaht First Nation (Lacatusu, 2016).

The province refused to negotiate for any park or treaty land when it released Western Forest Products from its TFL obligations in 2007. Thus, the description of a “win-win” might be better characterized as a fix for both Western Forest Products and Ilkay. While

⁵⁸ TFL 61 consists of the Crown lands between Jordan River and Port Renfrew previously bundled with Western Forest Products’ private lands and called TFL 25 prior to May 1, 2010 when it was renamed TFL 61 (Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, 2017).

efforts to halt development resulted in the purchase of properties by the Capital Regional District and the rejection of the resort plan, the province's actions show that both the forestry company and the developer were likely able to receive returns on their investments in land. Likewise, the province's 2016 purchase of Ilkay's parcels both satisfies Settler concerns regarding the hiking trail and provides a bargaining chip for ongoing treaty negotiations. Nevertheless, the private property rights invested in these lands will continue to be subject to the authority of the Settler state, and the dominant force of the Settler project.

Conclusion

I have argued in this chapter that Western Forest Product's (WFP) 2007 removal of land from tree farm licences (TFL) needs to be understood in the context of the reverberatory effects from Alberta's bitumen boom (approximately 2000-2011). The staple's cyclical boom/bust nature, including its shift between regions, is a factor in determining how and where capital will seek to tap revenue circulation (wages, profits, taxes, rent, etc.). I have shown this to be the case by exploring how the bitumen boom brought changes to inter-provincial migration and a surging interest from Albertans in British Columbia real estate. This scenario created the conditions for forestry companies to appropriate the circulation of revenue and capital by selling off private forestlands acquired in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In studying these events, I have found that land development, including speculation, is a type of *auxiliary staple linkage*, but it is one that does not break the staple trap for those working in the extractive economy. This linkage serves capital by working to absorb surplus value and revenues during the boom cycle, and acting as a financial hedge during the bust. I have

demonstrated the ways in which the seemingly unrelated stamp of one staple industry can combine with the spread effects of another to influence the processes of (dis)possession.

Through legislation, court cases, political rhetoric, and coercion tactics, capital and the state acted to make the conversion of private forestlands into real estate possible. In doing so, the role of land development as an auxiliary linkage was made explicit. As a form of spatial fix during crises of accumulation, real estate development leads to territorially specific spatial reconfigurations that, in turn, generate conflict and put the material and affective practices of Settler belonging *into action*. I have argued in this chapter that inter-Settler conflict is characteristic of Settler belonging's mobilization in the face of a perceived threat. Feelings for land were sparked by concern for past and future generations, but they also drew upon a distinction between insiders, outsiders, and their class position. As the example of Ender Ilkay and the Marine Trail Resort shows, class analysis provides insight into Settler belonging: perceived class position designates insiders and outsiders and helps Settlers identify those who pose a threat to belonging.

The interests of the Pacheedaht and T'Souke First Nations were recognized by Settlers in the TFL land conflict, but only insofar as they stood to secure 'public' access and halt development proposals. In other words, Settler belonging does not acknowledge the contradiction of supporting First Nations while it also seeks ongoing access to their unceded territories. In gesturing to, but not wholly endorsing, First Nations rights and title, Settlers participate in the circle of culpability, wherein ultimate responsibility for returning land is passed around an unbroken circle, between the local and provincial state, the forest industry, the developer, and Settlers. This denial provides much needed time so that belonging can be worked out. At Jordan River and Sandcut Beach, the Capital

Regional District's purchase of former TFL lands entrenched Settler belonging by creating new waypoints and establishing public (Settler) access as a self-evident and valid solution to conflict. The express opposition of First Nations became less of a factor once the land was secured for parks; (dis)possession won out as land was taken back and returned to the service of belonging.

Chapter 8: The Great Land Grab, Redux

Since its inception in 1884, the Esquimalt & Nanaimo (E&N) Railway land grant has brought railway, coal, and forestry companies into conflict with affected Settlers and First Nations. The *Vancouver Island Settler Rights Act* (1904) is an example of state efforts to mediate competing claims to these lands. Despite continued opposition from First Nations, the validity of the grant and monopoly rights to private property continue to be firmly upheld. As I argued in chapter three, the E&N grant was not a single event; instead it remains a fluid and ongoing feature of settlement on southern Vancouver Island. (Dis)possession manifests and perpetuates these conflicts by continuing the project of taking land and building, adjusting, and entrenching belonging. In this final chapter, I draw out the role of local government in determining use and development of lands within the E&N grant. Using the example of logging roads, I show that Settlers develop a perception of public access to private forestry lands made possible by the particular social and economic relations imprinted by the stamp of the forest staple. This perception gives rise to conflict among Settlers and with First Nations and I argue that ongoing access, as a series of recurring events over time, supports affective attachment. Through a discussion of the connection between forestry corporations and real estate development, I argue for the importance of understanding Settler claims to uncaded lands as simultaneously individual, shared, and classed. This chapter also looks at the 2002 referendum on the BC treaty process and a 2008 referendum to create a park acquisition fund in the Cowichan Valley. I find that both Settlers and capital drive the state's role as guarantor of property rights and that ongoing conflict regarding access to, investment in, and development of private forestry lands presents a number of contradictions in this regard. I conclude the

chapter by outlining some of the implications that my findings have for understanding the ongoing and local processes that make up the practices of Settler belonging.

“Recreationland”

Parks are not the only sites for recreational activities. For example, non-park land is used for a variety of activities, from 4x4 truck driving and firewood collection to mushroom picking. In almost all of British Columbia, access to non-park land for these types of activities tends to occur on Crown lands. However, due to the alienation of lands for forestry and the E&N land grant, little Crown land remains on much of Vancouver Island. Although the provincial government has legislated resource road use (British Columbia [BC], n.d.), forestry companies are, quite literally, gatekeepers. The book *Logging Road Travel*, published in 1975, describes an optimistic future for recreation on Vancouver Island:

Logging road travel for outdoor recreationists on Vancouver Island has only been a pursuit to be enjoyed by the average outdoorsmen in the past decade. During that time, thousands of miles of logging road have been opened for recreation use during non-operating hours on a program of shared use with the timber companies...They have provided road maps, erected signs declaring their multiple use policies, provided picnic and camping grounds...With an expanding population and an ever-increasing amount of leisure time the demand for recreationland is exploding. The logging areas are filling that demand on Vancouver Island. We are fortunate to have so much logging area. Nearly three-quarters of our Island is taken up in forestland that can provide recreation experience and jobs forever. There will be no housing subdivisions, shopping centres and blacktop jungles in our forests (Merriman, 1975, pp. 9, 11-12).

The demand for access described here mirrors the “exploding” demand for parks in the post-war era. Population increase, a primary reason for park creation, was also a factor in the pursuit of areas afield from parks. Books such as *Logging Road Travel*, or the more contemporary *Vancouver Island Backroad Map Book*, are used by recreationists as guides to many unmaintained public and private roads. Despite using these books, access is often

impeded by forest companies, especially through the erection of gates and the deactivation of roads. Having spent most of my teenage and adult years driving and hiking on active and abandoned logging roads, I have come into contact with staple production and the ways in which it has facilitated and restricted my access to Vancouver Island. Most road users find ways to achieve their goals, even if it means trespassing on private lands (“Vandalism,” 2010). Different uses may conflict and overlap as logging roads, gated or not, are used for motorized and non-motorized recreation, camping, shooting, hunting, firewood collection, foraging, and illegal dumping.

On any weekend, at any time of the year, it is common to see several vehicles parked outside a sturdy orange-painted forestry gate. The gates are meant to prevent access and denote private property, but those with mountain bikes, motorbikes, all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) or a desire to hike circumvent these barriers and trespass on forestry lands. In most cases, the area being accessed has been cutover at some point in the past and returned to the sustained yield cycle. It is possible the odd grove of old growth or a solitary giant tree can be found – but these are the exceptions (Ancient Forest Alliance, 2014). The blockade of logging roads by First Nations and Settlers was a defining tactic of War in the Woods protest; these roads are built for extraction, but they also make possible many forms

Figure 22: A variety of warning signs above an orange forestry gate, near Nanaimo. One sign reads “Private lands and roads.”

of (assumed) access. Gates and signage mark access rights across the landscape – and many users are aware of corporate ownership – yet, Settlers consistently act upon a perceived right of access. The point here is that the line between private forestland and Crown land is blurred. This perception creates conflict among road users, forestry corporations, regional and provincial governments, and First Nations.

Eva Mackey explains that entitlement in the context of Settler colonialism reflects “a longstanding, structured, collective privilege. In this sense it is more akin to class because it has been socially legitimized as a ‘right’ to land and other privileges, historically and in the present, through colonial and national projects” (2016, p. 9). In the case of forestry lands, the stamp of the staple, its geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political characteristics, is foundational to this entitlement as it makes possible the circumstances under which Settler access takes place. Whether or not access is legally granted, users proceed past gates and signs and assume access – myself included. Entitlement is not synonymous with belonging, but it is bound up with the processes of (dis)possession as it is derived from the idea, conscious or not, that land has been taken over and become part of a Settler project. Unlike belonging, entitlement is not worked at, it is presumed. On many occasions, friends and I have ducked under gates and hiked up a mountain, visited a river, or located a stand of old-growth trees. At the same time, gates have thwarted us, often by unexpectedly coming across them while driving. In a leaflet for visitors to their corporate office, Island Timberlands explains its policy regarding access to “Private Managed forest land:”

Island allows public access for the purpose of recreation and other approved uses when compatible with our forest management policies (e.g., active operations, concerns related to safety, fire protection, environmental protection or protection of assets). While you are visiting our timberlands, Health and Safety is the first

priority for you, your group, and all of Island Timberlands employees and contractors (field notes).

Island Timberland's policies resemble those of other forestry corporations: the protection of assets supersedes public access. Despite such policies, the regularity of conflict regarding access (cf: Cowichan Valley Regional District [CVRD], 2010) represents the assumed and self-evident right Settlers believe they have to forestry lands. This is not to say that the authority of forestry corporations is any more valid than Settler claims when it comes to the control of First Nations territories: all claims are implicated in the "fantasy of entitlement" that is Crown title (Mackey, 2016). Yet, these companies, by virtue of their state granted and protected monopoly property rights, control both exclusion and admittance. In a letter to the editor, one family expressed a sense of loss at encountering locked gates and "No Trespassing" signs on logging roads:

It would seem that there is indeed no private access to Timberwest lands....It is extremely disappointing to not be able to continue to pass on the appreciation of nature to my children and grandchildren. And as a low-income family this is one of our only sources of entertainment. We don't travel to Disneyland or Mexico. We don't go to the movies or bowling. This is what we do, and what we love. It's a shame to have this lost to us (Clarke, 2012).

From a corporate point of view, generational attachment is not compatible with asset management. The letter writer's emotional appeal is underscored by their identification as a "low-income family" – in this letter the backroads and forestry lands provide rootedness within a perceived class location. When the Capital Regional District entered a letter of intent to purchase Western Forest Products' former tree farm licence lands in 2010 (chapter seven), conflict arose between motorized and non-motorized recreationists regarding the conversion of forestland into parks:

- We grew up with knowledge and respect of the back country. Many of these excursions were well attended by small children and elderly

grandparents who could not hike the distance...My generation should not be gated and vilified for enjoying travelling the back country responsibly, just as on city streets. Families benefit by experiences together.” (Low, 2010).

- I’ve made a living off of picking salal for the last 32 years, and slowly but surely and recently more rapidly, I’ve watched with an empty stomach in anger and disgust this vegetation being decimated by various means (Hansen, 2010).

Logging roads in this way are material-affective linkages – defined as the physical and affecting aspects of the staple’s stamp that connect extraction and practices of Settler belonging – bound up with class relations. How access happens lends itself to perceptions of class; access is claimed through “knowledge and respect,” generational attachment, and employment opportunity. One writer seeks accessible nature through motorized travel, while the other harvests native plants to fend off “an empty stomach.” Forest staple production simultaneously creates and prevents access. As I argued in chapter seven, Settler feelings are *put into action* by threats to belonging, including when one Settler use is threatened by another. When the conditions of production are transformed – for example by the sale of properties, the closure of a mill, or the erection of gates – we encounter inter-Settler relations and the limits of our material and affective claims within a regime of monopoly property rights. The point here is that as material-affective linkages, logging roads make possible access to private forestry lands, access which generates views about property rights, gives rise to conflict, and leads to (classed) declarations of belonging.

The 2002 Referendum

In 1993, the Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group (HTG) began negotiations for a treaty in their territory, approximately 84% of which was alienated by the E&N land grant (Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group [HTG], 2005). The BC Treaty Commission, begun in 1993,

conducts negotiations within a six-stage framework and the HTG has been on stage four, negotiation of an agreement in principle, since 1997. By 2001, the modern treaty process had become stagnated and controversial (cf: Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, 2005; Rossiter & Wood, 2005; Fetzner, 2016). Settler fears stemming from the province's finalization of the Nisga'a Treaty in 2000 – the first treaty involving the Province of British Columbia⁵⁹ – led the newly elected BC Liberal Party to promise a province-wide referendum on the treaty process, to be held in the spring of 2002, despite the objections of First Nations ("Hulquminum," 2002). On the ballot, voters were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to eight questions⁶⁰; four of these are particularly important to a discussion of private property and Settler belonging:

- Q1: Private property should not be expropriated for settlement
- Q3: Hunting, fishing and recreational opportunities on Crown land should be ensured for all British Columbians.
- Q4: Parks and protected areas should be maintained for the use and benefit of all British Columbians.
- Q7: Treaties should include mechanisms or harmonizing land use planning between Aboriginal governments and neighbouring local governments.

Of the 35.8% of registered voters who participated in the referendum, all questions received majority "yes" selections of 84% or greater. These results did not alter the

⁵⁹ Although Treaty 8 (1899) encompassed much of the north-eastern corner of British Columbia, the province had no role in its negotiation.

⁶⁰ All eight questions appeared on the ballot as follows:

1. Private property should not be expropriated for treaty settlements.
2. The terms and conditions of leases and licences should be respected; fair compensation for unavoidable disruption of commercial interests should be ensured.
3. Hunting, fishing and recreational opportunities on Crown land should be ensured for all British Columbians.
4. Parks and protected areas should be maintained for the use and benefit of all British Columbians.
5. Province-wide standards of resource management and environmental protection should continue to apply.
6. Aboriginal self-government should have the characteristics of local government, with powers delegated from Canada and British Columbia.
7. Treaties should include mechanisms for harmonizing land use planning between Aboriginal governments and neighbouring local governments.
8. The existing tax exemptions for Aboriginal people should be phased out

already existing terms of the treaty process, but they did provide the provincial government with a mandate to stand firm against particular proposals for private and Crown lands (Fetzer, 2016, p. 163).

The perception of certainty in the face of Indigenous sovereignty is a top priority for the Crown. Carole Blackburn discusses some of the motives behind state interventions such as the treaty process and referendum:

The claims of capital, significantly, require that the state continue to exercise its sovereign authority as the guarantor of property rights within its national territory. These claims engender a situation in which new forms of governmentality are produced that mediate between populations, state sovereignty, and a transnational economy (2005, p. 593).

While Blackburn is interested in the state's role as a guarantor of property rights in support of capital, I have shown throughout this dissertation that the claims of Settlers, individually and collectively, are similarly, though perhaps not equally, a driver of state actions regarding property rights. These "new forms" that mediate these rights echo Drache's writing on Innis (chapter six), that the market forces of a staple economy "generated the need for new state forms" (1995a, p. xxix). The questions asked in the 2002 referendum were a signal from the state that revealed a willingness to act as "guarantor of property rights" – if backed by the Settler population. Private lands are not and never have been a part of modern treaty negotiations, but the idea that individual properties could be expropriated for settlement stoked Settler anxieties (Wilson, 2001). Of course, the referendum outcome was no mystery: a majority of Settlers would not, and did not, vote to support negotiations for land they had come to possess. Although approximately 94 per cent of BC is classified as Crown land, the exclusion of private property from the treaty process means that some groups, such as the HTG and others

whose territories were converted into private forestry lands, have very little land to negotiate for.

In 2007, the Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group submitted a petition to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR). At issue is Canada's violation of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (Inter-American Commission on Human Rights [IACHR], 2009), specifically Article XXIII, the right to property, Article XIII, the right to culture, and Article II, equality before the law (IACHR, 2009; Black 2011):

The petition alleges that the State has violated the human rights of the HTG because of the absence of demarcation, established boundaries and recording of title deed to their ancestral lands; the lack of compensation for HTG ancestral lands currently in the hands of private third parties; the granting of licenses, permits and concessions within ancestral lands without prior consultation; and the resulting destruction of the environment, the natural resources and of those sites the alleged victims consider sacred (IACHR, 2009).

Facing the circle of culpability (see chapter seven) within Canada, the treaty group turned to the international arena to challenge Canada's claims about its treatment of Indigenous peoples. It is not my intention here to provide an exploration or analysis of this legal case. However, the IACHR petition is a reminder of the ongoing resistance to (dis)possession on Vancouver Island. In her PhD dissertation, "Snuw'uyulh: Fostering an Understanding of the Hul'qumi'num Legal Tradition" (2014), Sarah Morales highlights the lasting trauma of the E&N land grant on Hul'qumi'num Peoples. Through IACHR affidavit interviews conducted with Elders and other treaty group members, Morales shows the Great Land Grab's destructive effects:

As these private lands became "developed," fences and locked gates went up to block our entry to places where we'd always hunted, harvested plant food and gathered other resources to meet our material needs...For over a century we've seen the natural wealth leave our territory, making others wealthy at our

expense...The loss of these lands also affects our cultural life. We are prevented from using areas of great cultural importance, including bathing sites, burial grounds and other special places. Many of these sites have been destroyed by development and are now lost to us forever (2014, pp. 190-192).

Whereas Settlers fear a loss of access will negatively impact future generations, loss of access and the destruction of cultural sites and practices *by Settlers* has been the reality for Hul'qumi'num peoples (and all Indigenous peoples) for generations. Settler access to forestry lands, and the belonging generated, continues due to the failure to return these lands. The ongoing status of this access evokes Wolfe's (2006) argument that Settler colonialism is not an event, but a structure – access, in one form or another, has been a constant of (dis)possession. Yet, this access is a series of recurring events that make possible ongoing attachment to land. It is not simply that Hul'qumi'num territories were taken in a single event of dispossession; if British Columbia and Canada were to suddenly change more than 130 years of policy and reverse the E&N land grant, we would still be faced with the question of Settler belonging as it has been built over time. What I mean is that such an event has the potential to spark conflict and mobilize the material and affective claims of Settlers. For example, when a final agreement for the Maa-nulth Treaty⁶¹ on the west coast of Vancouver Island neared completion, a letter to the editor from John Kimantas, author of several Vancouver Island recreation guidebooks, lamented the potential loss of recreation sites:

I can see some people shrugging and thinking it's only going to inconvenience a few kayakers and boaters. I see it as *our public legacy* and something now lost to the general public and for *future generations*...With apologies to First Nations, it is going to be tough paddling through these areas now without *feeling like an outsider in my own land* [emphasis added] (2007).

⁶¹ Finalized in 2011 between BC, Canada, and the Huu-ay-aht, Ka:'yu:'k't'h'/Che:k'tles7et'h', Toquaht, Uchucklesaht and Ucluelet First Nations

Settler belonging seeks mollification before/if First Nation rights are addressed. That the author fears becoming an outsider to a place he and the “general public” have developed an attachment to reveals a stark dissonance between the practices of belonging and the history of colonialism. The letter is an example of Settler colonialism’s “dynamic of displacement and replacement” (Edmonds, 2010b, p. 7; Wolfe, 2006) – First Nations belonging is replaced and superseded by a prioritized Settler or public belonging. The feeling of loss in the letter erases the losses long endured by First Nations. I have used Kimantas’ guidebooks to take me to many hiking trails and campsites across Vancouver Island and, like Kimantas, I have been an advocate for future access. It is likely that many guidebook readers hold a similar view: certain sites should be made available for the (Settler) public, for future generations (of Settlers). The treaty referendum in 2002 provided Settlers with the opportunity to support the provincial state’s role as the guarantor of property rights. However, the examples detailed above present an array of contradictions: Settlers seek the maintenance of private property rights, yet we also disregard private forestry lands and denounce the inclusion of particular Crown lands in treaty settlements. These feelings are indicative of the complexities of property relations but, as I have been arguing throughout this dissertation, they also uncover the affective and material practices of Settler attachment to land.

Regional Park Acquisition

As the Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group’s petition snakes its way through international legal proceedings, the sale of forestry lands by companies has accelerated. Local government is a lynchpin in this process as forestry or industrial lands sold for alternative purposes must be zoned to permit housing, subdivision, and phased development. Between 1980 and 2004, the annual number of development permit

applications received by the Cowichan Valley Regional District (CVRD) did not surpass 15 (CVRD, 2009). However, from 2005 to 2008 the number of applications jumped to 41, 45, 96, and 46 in each of those years. The 2007 treaty group petition is not only an event within the long history of resistance to (dis)possession, it also comes about within the context a renewed land grab, brought about by the bitumen bubble and attempts to capture revenue from the boom cycle (see chapter seven).

2007 was the highest year on record for development applications in the CVRD.

Harvey notes that

The land market *shapes the allocation of capital to land* and thereby *shapes the geographical structure* of production, exchange and consumption, the technical division of labour in space, the socioeconomic spaces of reproduction, and so forth. Land prices form signals to which the various economic agents can respond. The land market is a powerful force making for the rationalization of geographical structures in relation to competition (Harvey, 1982, p. 369).

The bitumen bubble and real estate demand from Alberta were a signal to forestry companies that their regime of private lands, inherited from historical forest policies and the E&N land grant, held potential for higher and better use. 2007 also marked the IACHR petition and the publication of *The Great Land Grab in Hul'qumi'num Territory* (HTG, 2007). This booklet produced by the treaty group gives “particular attention to the event that had the biggest, and the gravest, impact on our [First Nation] communities – the Esquimalt & Nanaimo (E&N) railway land grant” (HTG, 2007).⁶² Despite the booklet and petition as awareness raising efforts, the Cowichan Valley Regional District (CVRD) moved to expand and entrench the claims of its residents to forestlands. In the municipal elections of November 2008, electors in the CVRD were asked to vote “Yes” or “No” to a referendum question:

⁶² In my Masters thesis (Black, 2011), I explore some of the Settler backlash that occurred upon release of this booklet.

Are you in favour of the Board of the Cowichan Valley Regional District adopting CVRD Bylaw No. 3163 – Regional Parkland Acquisition Fund Service Establishment Bylaw, 2008 to establish an acquisition fund to provide for expenditures in respect to acquiring regional parkland within the Cowichan Valley Regional District? (CVRD, 2008).

In a flyer from the CVRD urging support for the question, the narrative is a now familiar one:

MAKE YOUR VOTE COUNT IN DETERMINING WHETHER WE LEAVE A LEGACY OF PROTECTED OUTDOOR PLACES FOR GENERATIONS TO COME [emphasis in original] (CVRD, 2008).

The call to “leave a legacy” for “generations” echoes the justifications given for park creation throughout the second half of the twentieth century. Again, Settler feelings and Settler futurity are called upon, put into action, to develop new waypoints of belonging. Due to the E&N land grant, the majority of land in the CVRD, greater than 60%, is privately owned. The acquisition fund, similar to those found in other regional districts (see chapter 5), was touted as a way to address “uncertainty over continued public access to many of these special spaces” (CVRD, 2008). Although the Fall 2008 issue of the Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group’s newsletter, *Treaty Talk*, did not cover the park fund referendum, an update from the Cowichan Tribes and Lake Cowichan First Nation did express concern over the sale of private forestlands and municipal zoning:

This zoning is very important because the courts have stated that some private land uses and Aboriginal uses are not mutually exclusive and this court decision was specifically around forestry lands. What this means is if lands are currently used for forestry purposes and are privately owned, some of our traditional uses and cultural practices can still happen on privately owned lands that are currently used for forestry. However, if these same lands become zoned for residential purposes we may not be able to use these lands anymore. According to the courts that is an infringement of our rights and must be seriously considered by the government making the decision to change the zoning on those lands (“Referrals update,” 2008).

The regional district is responsible for zoning and could prevent the conversion of forestry lands into residential land; while it may do so based on the interests of Settlers, the question of zoning and the treaty process is subsumed into the circle of culpability. Among those who voted in the park referendum, the results were overwhelmingly in favour of creating the fund.⁶³ The fund's approval needs to be understood as a way for Settlers to push back against real estate markets and "make real" the assumed, but contested, right of Settler access to private forestry lands. This brings us back to the circle of culpability: no one is deemed responsible for addressing the question of First Nations title or the treaty process; it is self-evident and assumed that Settlers may vote to increase the number parks in the region. Forestry companies sell, Settlers purchase, and (dis)possession extends across the landscape.

The Koksilah Ancient Forest

The issue of 'Private Managed Forest Lands' is a regular agenda item for many regional districts on Vancouver Island. In the case of the CVRD, the minutes of the March 10, 2010 Parks Committee meeting are explanatory. At this meeting, the committee dealt with several matters concerning TimberWest lands. At the meeting, the committee heard from public delegations and the first presentation came from Warrick Whitehead, formerly of the Sierra Club, who raised concerns over the potential sale of TimberWest lands containing the "Koksilah Ancient Forest." I first became aware of the Koksilah Ancient Forest when I attended a presentation given by Whitehead at the Shawnigan Lake Community Centre in 2009. The forest contains a few rare groves of old growth Douglas fir and cedar trees along the banks of the Koksilah River. It was saved from cutting in 1989 when two local fallers determined the trees were better left standing:

⁶³ 9,549 votes for, 3,987 votes against (Civic Info BC, n.d.).

Fallers Louie Van Beers, of Cobble Hill and Dan Hughes, of Mill Bay, were so struck by the beauty, they put down their saws.

“They reported to the bull buckler (Hans Post),” said Renfrew manager Eric Bentsen. “He came to me and said, “We’ll pull the guys out and have a look at it” And that is where it stands right now” (“FC loggers,” 1989).

This sentimental moment – the putting down of the saws – describes the forest with grandeur. The site became a personal material-affective linkage for the fallers and also serves as a foundation for the affective attachment of many who have visited and heard the story since. Dubbed the Koksilah Ancient Forest, Whitehead resurrected efforts to protect the property in 2007, leading a media campaign and encouraging visits – bearing witness – by the public.

When I learned from Whitehead’s presentation that the forest was only a few kilometers from Shawnigan Lake I set off with friends to explore it. Like other visitors, we trespassed across TimberWest lands to see the old growth remnants. The visit inspired me to join the campaign to acquire the land for a park. During my work at the Cowichan Valley Museum and Archives in the summer of 2009, I worked mention of the Koksilah Ancient Forest into a short documentary video we created about the Kinsol Trestle. As the video’s narrator, I concluded with these words:

Just up the Koksilah from the trestle, a new opportunity exists to create a world class destination in the heart of the Cowichan Valley. The Koksilah Ancient Forest...now requires the community’s support. Owned by a private logging company, and currently for sale, this is one of the last stands of valley-bottom old growth on Vancouver Island...Old growth trees such as these tell stories of First Nations heritage, pioneer, and logging heritage. Their cultural value is priceless, but just like the Kinsol, with enough money, political will, and advocacy, they can be embraced, not abandoned, as the Kinsol Trestle once was (Black, 2014b).

This video is an important inclusion in my own archive of belonging. Looking back on these words, the mention of “First Nations heritage, pioneer, and logging heritage” stands

out to me as a defence of affective attachment; in these words I appeal to multiple forms of belonging to build a claim against capital and save the forest. This appeal can also be read as a call to belonging, as an effort to put feelings into action. This ‘common’ claim, however, is dependent upon securing Settler access into the future. I gave no consideration to actually returning the land to First Nations. In Whitehead’s documents submitted to the CVRD Parks Committee, a quote from retired logger Buster Rowan reveals both the individual and generational character of material-affective linkages:

When I walked into the big trees I was immediately struck by the beauty of the grove and the incredible size of these trees still untouched so close to Duncan. I was pleased I could show [my grandson] Foster what I saw on a routine day when I worked in the bush as a faller on Vancouver Island. Even though I had cut down even larger trees in my time logging I could show him this small area away from traffic and development and I was so glad that he could enjoy what I had seen over those years. There is so little left like this now and this area is so accessible it must be saved (CVRD, 2010).

Much like the trees at Mill Bay Nature Park that were a reminder of “virgin timber” and the pioneer landscape (see chapter five) or the collections at the BC Forest Discovery Centre (see chapters one and four), the old growth recalls the labour of forestry workers and becomes a lesson or moral for future generations. Rowan’s testimony and my own reveal different yet shared reasons for acquiring the forest. The property serves as a material-affective linkage by evoking feeling and transformation in the means of production, before the logging of old growth forests gave way to the harvest of second growth crops; this linkage, in turn, shapes belonging. Permanent and certain access to the forest is perceived as essential if affective attachment is to be maintained and fostered.

The Koksilah Ancient Forest and CVRD park acquisition referendum speak to a scramble for land and echo efforts to acquire parks and access during the long-boom of the post-war years. For forestry companies, real estate is identified as an objective

alongside, rather than secondary to, extraction – a situation that bears a striking resemblance to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company’s sale of cutover lands throughout the early 1900s (chapter three). Faced with a renewed exertion of monopoly property rights, material-affective linkages such as the Koksilah Ancient Forest are put to work by Settlers and their local governments in the service of belonging. The point here is that what remains of the E&N grant lands is subject to ongoing, multiple, and overlapping claims from First Nations, Settlers, and forestry corporations. Once a park is created, a home is built, or a recreation site is secured, particular properties become one more step removed from restitution. Given the extent of private forestlands and the complex, concurrent, and historical events eroding their return to First Nations, (dis)possession seems intractable. Like Scotch broom, Settlers spread out across the landscape, take root, and change conditions to squeeze out First Nations. The task then is to uncover the processes of (dis)possession that make it seem as if Settler colonialism is unceasing and inevitable (Strakosch & Macoun, 2012; Macoun & Strakosch, 2013). To do so breaks apart the self-evident claims of Settlers to land by revealing the practices that made/make possible the taking of the land, entitlement to land, and belonging to the land. In other words, identifying the local contingencies of belonging, the provisions created for its continuity, helps to explain Settlers to ourselves and creates opportunities to work toward other possibilities.

Lifestyle for Sale

When Western Forest Products began to sell off its former TFL lands in 2007, it was not the first forestry corporation at the time to identify private lands for ‘higher and better’ (HBU) use. The Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives describes HBU as

music to shareholders' ears but a betrayal of the public trust. Forest-sector workers, conservationists, municipal and regional government officials and elected leaders, outdoor recreation enthusiasts, rural residents, First Nations and others were all led to believe that such lands were to be managed sustainably now and in future years as forestlands (Parfitt, 2008).

As early as 2003, TimberWest had identified 6,500 hectares that were no longer needed for forestry (Bainas, 2003). By 2007, as real estate interest was surging, especially from Alberta, TimberWest upped this number to 38,000 hectares, and in 2009 55,000 hectares were singled out for development and sale ("TimberWest hires," 2007; D'Amour, 2009). In one year, 2006, the company made \$32.9 million from real estate sales on Vancouver Island. The following year, Island Timberlands identified 14,000 hectares "that could be developed or sold for conservation purposes. It values those lands at \$104 million. In the nine months ending September 30, 2007, it sold \$14 million of those properties for a net gain of \$7 million" (Hamilton, 2008). The importance of land as an auxiliary linkage is demonstrated in these actions and numbers. That is, forestry companies facing a downturn were able to exploit the circulation of revenue from the bitumen boom by shifting certain lands to real estate. As of 2017, TimberWest owns 325,400 hectares on Vancouver Island while Island Timberlands owns about 254,000 hectares, mostly on Vancouver Island; the majority of these private forestlands can be traced directly to the E&N land grant.

TimberWest created a real estate division in 2009 called "Couverdon," named for the ancestral Dutch town of Captain George Vancouver. The company markets select properties for individual sale and proposes real estate development in an effort to create "perpetual value" for buyers and investors ("Timberest CFO," 2009; Black, 2011). Despite Couverdon's founding in the midst of the 2008 global recession, company

officials were not overly concerned: “We’ve always said the island is a great place and we have a lot of land on it and I think, despite the downturn in the market, the interest is recognition of that” (“TimberWest lands,” 2009). The idea that Vancouver Island is a “great place” for real estate recalls the testimony of E&N Railway Company officials in 1916: “we have a climate here that is the mildest in Canada-I am safe in saying so. And consequently it will always be desirable in that way” (Canada, 1916d; chapter three). With tens of thousands of hectares to choose from, Couverdon exploits this desirability: mild climate, scenic views, water access, recreation opportunities, and ‘lifestyle’ are central to the company’s marketing.

In 2010, I signed up for the Couverdon Realty Ltd. newsletter for information about new listings and proposed developments. One of the first communications I received advertised the availability of the last four acreages at Headquarters in the Comox Valley – the former logging camp to which my Great Grandfather once sold vegetables (field notes; see chapter three). Other examples from Couverdon’s newsletter reveal the discourse of marketing forestry lands:

- **Shawnigan Acreage**

At Shawnigan Lake you are in cottage country. With a backdrop of rolling hills, the Kinsol Trestle, and abundant wildlife, plus riverside trails and a lake for soothing summer swims, this popular recreation destination has something for everyone.

Couverdon's 2 available acreages are located along Renfrew Road toward Koksilah River Provincial Park, approximately 8 kms from "downtown" Shawnigan Lake...

Town: Shawnigan Lake, BC

Sales Price: Starting at \$249,000

Size: Starting at 22 acres

(personal communications, Aug 14, 2012)

- **The Playground You’ve Dreamed Of**

It's not just the kids that need a playground.

Just minutes from the amenities of Nanaimo on Vancouver Island lies an investment in your lifestyle, family and future. Take part in this limited opportunity to own riverfront acreages and dare to endeavor in the outdoor "playground" activities like swimming, hiking, and biking that will reinvigorate your way of life.

Town: Nanaimo, BC

Price: Starting at \$349,000

Size: 8 - 31 Acres

(personal communications, Sept 2, 2013)

- **A Beautiful Alternative for West Coast Living**

On Vancouver Island, a destination for many to escape the lower mainland and other congested urban centres, property remains affordable and mortgages manageable. With a strong and diverse employment market many city dwellers have already made the switch realizing they can enjoy all the perks of Island living – safe uncongested communities, beaches, ocean, mountains all within a temperate climate – and still have easy 20 minute float plane access to downtown Vancouver. If you are ready to embrace the coveted island lifestyle with an *attainable* and *realistic* cost of living – consider the numerous upsides to one of Couverdon's many real estate developments [emphasis in original] (personal communications, May 29, 2015).

Settler belonging can be characterized through work, to make a home, to extract the forest resource, but in Couverdon's marketing we can see that waypoints and material-affective linkages are absorbed into the desires of a different class of Settler. The "coveted Island lifestyle," with "beaches, oceans, mountains all within a temperate climate," "recreation," and "soothing summer swims" describes an idyllic landscape that has become the envy of many. As Couverdon presents it, the purchase of one of their lots brings more than property, it is an investment in a way of life – a way of life some Settlers understand as being worked at/for prior to the arrival of Couverdon's buyers. Properties are also promoted to those in particular class positions – the Vancouver business executive, young families, and those seeking a second recreation property.

Figure 23: A Couverdon Real Estate sign advertising “The playground you’ve dreamed of...right outside your door.”

Couverdon properties are presented as an opportunity for outsiders to gain privileged access to rural communities and a lifestyle that “makes even multi-generation islanders pinch themselves” (field notes). Only satellite lot images offer the newsletter recipient any idea that the “rolling hills” may be denude of trees or feature active logging operations. Viewed alongside the conflict in Sooke-Juan de Fuca (chapters six and seven), Couverdon’s marketing can be understood as part of a transformation taking place in the mode of production. What I mean here is that inter-Settler relations are thrown into turmoil as land turns from forestry to real estate. As I explain below, feelings of resentment develop when material-affective linkages and waypoints (the Kinsol Trestle, for example) created and fostered by “those who came before” are marketed and taken up by Settlers who are perceived as not knowing or shaping local belonging. Vancouver business elites or retirees from Alberta can now purchase ‘our’ playground. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly how much time legitimizes a “before” status. It is not necessarily marked by a specific date, but by certain events that threaten Settler belonging. These events become waypoints that determine a cut-off for insider/outsider status: those who lived here before Couverdon’s sell off of certain properties may be marked as insiders.

Not unlike the development of Arbutus Ridge (chapter seven), each person granted insider status also wants to be last to protect their status and Settler space. These feelings of resentment frequently break down along perceived class lines and associated, yet often distinct, understandings of past/present/future belonging. It is through the study of belonging and class that we gain insight into how Settlers see themselves in relation to (dis)possession and the mode of production. My argument here is that political economic transformation, in this case as it relates to the shift from forestry to real estate, is seen as a threat to the practices of belonging. Waypoints and material-affective linkages offer the opportunity to stabilize and entrench belonging in the hope that affective attachment can be carried into the future.

The Ladysmith Boundary Dispute

A collision of class, (dis)possession, and the staple economy can also be exemplified by the investment of public sector pensions in the forest industry. In 2011, the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, representing the federal Public Service, the Canadian Armed Forces, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and the British Columbia Investment Management Corp,⁶⁴ asset managers for provincial pensions, acquired TimberWest for \$1 billion:

“BCIMC and PSP Investments are both leading Canadian pension plans well-positioned to support the long-term development of TimberWest’s exceptional timber and real estate assets and emerging new businesses,” V. Edward Daughney, chairman of TimberWest, said in a release (Lam, 2011).

What I am showing here is that class links Settlers in different ways to processes of (dis)possession. In this case, the retirement of public sector workers became linked in with monopoly property rights and the circle of culpability, making the restitution of First

⁶⁴ As recently as 2012, BCIMC was invested Island Timberlands, TimberWest/Brookfield Asset Management Brookfield-related companies owned shares in Island Timberlands and Western Forest Products (Saxifrage, 2012)

Nations territories that much more difficult. The Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group and other First Nations affected by the E&N grant attempted to warn off investors by reminding them of the case before the Inter-American Human Rights Commission:

Just how concerned investors are at this point, is not too clear. The issue was not raised in the conference call following the release of TimberWest's quarterly results Tuesday. Analysts on the line had the opportunity to question CEO Paul McElligott about it but seemed satisfied with TimberWest's earlier response that sale of the lands will have no impact on unresolved aboriginal rights issues as that dispute is essentially a government issue (Hamilton, 2011).

Once again, the matter of rights and title is passed along the circle of culpability. Although no other bids were forthcoming after the spectre of uncertainty was raised by the HTG, the pension funds did acquire TimberWest.

In October 2014 I attended a Cowichan Valley Regional District Area E all-candidates forum for the upcoming municipal elections. Held at the Sahtlam Fire Hall, the public listened to and asked questions of those running to become Area Director. There was also a roundtable format where participants were encouraged to discuss and ask candidates questions as they rotated around the room. Each table was given a set of questions to stimulate conversation. One proposed question read:

What is your opinion of the development of large tracts of private forest lands into residential lands and how would you envision further development of these lands in Area E and other areas? (field notes).

I did not attend this meeting as part of this research. I went with friends who live in the area to hear the candidates speak on issues affecting their neighbourhood. I was surprised to see that event organizers placed the issue of private forestlands as among the community's primary concerns for the election. Despite my surprise, this is a concern held by many in the region. For example, Island Timberlands held a public meeting in 2008 to propose the development of 1730 acres around the community of Mill Bay.

According to media reports, “the developers received a chilly reception and left the meeting knowing most in the room opposed the idea” (D’Amour, 2009). These community meetings are an indication of the extent to which forestlands are being developed and, more importantly, show Settler engagement and opposition. As my Dad stated, “they want to live here but they want to be the last ones in” (chapter seven).

In 2008, the Town of Ladysmith, founded by James Dunsmuir for coal shipping in 1898, received a request from TimberWest/Couverdon to expand the Town’s boundaries by 700 acres so that the land could be serviced and developed. To encourage the extension, TimberWest/Couverdon proposed a type of land swap. A set of frequently asked questions provided to Ladysmith residents explained the proposal:

How does this process protect watersheds and views?

Most of our watersheds are within private managed forest lands owned in part by TimberWest. TimberWest also owns some of the forested hills behind Ladysmith. TimberWest/Couverdon has agreed in principle to sell to the Town approximately 500 acres of lands around Stocking Lake and Holland Lake to help protect our drinking water supply. They have also agreed to not pursue any active forestry on the above noted lands, nor sell the lands to another party as a condition of this process. These lands are in addition to the boundary extension lands and will remain in Cowichan Valley Regional District Area G (Saltair). The Town believes that these lands are important to the health of the two lakes (see the Boundary Extension Application at www.ladysmith.ca for more details). TimberWest has also made a commitment to the Town to manage their other lands which we can see behind Ladysmith (primarily Stanton Peak) in a way that we will continue to enjoy our views (Town of Ladysmith, 2014, March)

As a result of the E&N grant, Ladysmith does not own the land surrounding its watershed, a situation used to coerce approval of the development. That “views” were among the concerns is an indication of the desire to have extraction take place beyond the view of settlement. Views, like “lifestyle,” are also central to real estate marketing. The potential sale of a particular lifestyle, however, fostered resentment among some residents:

Chris Gerrand and Doug Copp said the majority of area residents are unaware of what's happening. Those who are familiar are opposed. And after 15 years of Ladysmith expansions, they've had enough.

Copp fears that if the Timberwest land is developed as planned, it will inevitably lead to Ladysmith incorporating the rural residential Diamond area — a move that would lead to at least double the taxes for Diamond residents, he said. The resulting urban encroachment will change the way of life out there considerably, Gerrand added.

“We feel that it's not in our interests,” he said. “We like a quiet lifestyle and we'd like to see the town stay within their own boundaries” (Bekolay, 2013).

Fear of losing a quiet and rural way of life is a feeling frequently evoked to oppose development (cf: Drew, 2007; Mayo, 2007). A survey conducted for Couverdon in 2014 presented a more divided view of resident opinion: 38% in favour of boundary extension, 42% opposed, and 20% undecided (Town of Ladysmith, 2014, October; Armour, 2014). The issue came down to a special meeting of Ladysmith Council in October 2014. At the meeting, over 200 people crowded the Agricultural Hall to voice their opinions and witness a council vote on whether or not to proceed with a referendum on the issue. The minutes from this meeting show that one attendee raised the question of local versus investor benefits:

Lynne Smith

Asked who other than a small number of Couverdon/TimberWest shareholders would benefit from development of the boundary extension properties. Frank Limshue [of Couverdon] responded that the company's owner represents a number of public sector pension plans, insurance funds and public trusts (Town of Ladysmith, 2014, October).

In answering the question, the Couverdon representative uncovered a contradiction: among those opposed to the boundary extension were likely people who also stood to gain from its approval. Public pension fund investment in extraction and development is characteristic of Settler belonging's complex and contradictory nature. Following

discussion and debate, Ladysmith Council rejected the proposed boundary extension by a vote of 5-2 (Town of Ladysmith, 2014, October).

The 2011 investment of public sector pension plans in TimberWest did not lead to widespread protests or condemnation from Settlers. In an almost farcical example of Settler futurity, the retirement savings of public sector workers were invested in a company that, as heir to an illegal land grant, has been integral to the destruction of First Nation territories (Thom, 2005; Morales, 2014). Put another way, the E&N land grant is an inheritance of (dis)possession passed on to future generations of Settlers. In previous chapters I have shown that Settlers frequently invoke the ‘public’ as reason to act for future generations; sustained yield forestry, parks, and access to forestry lands were/are all understood as being in the public’s shared interest. The point I am making here is that it does not seem surprising that there was little outrage from Settlers when *public* pension plans invested in the future of TimberWest/Couverdon. Despite the warnings of the Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group, investors speaking with TimberWest were satisfied to know that “sale of the lands will have no impact on unresolved aboriginal rights issues” (Hamilton, 2011). The level of confidence in this claim speaks to a self-interested and self-evident resignation of Settlers to the project of (dis)possession.

In the example of Couverdon’s marketing and development proposals, the contradictions and complexities of Settler society’s affective, physical, and financial investment in taking and holding the land are made clear. Certain Settlers may identify with a time “before” others arrived; they may drive their 4x4 truck in a cut block, or they may hike to an old growth forest; a teacher may oppose development but have a retirement plan dependent upon its success; a wealthy family may seek a second home

with a view of the ocean, this home may be built on another Settler's favoured hiking spot. The practices of Settler belonging are subjective and they are also shared, through location, class, and a diversity of waypoints and material-affective linkages. As Settlers, each of us is implicated in these processes in different ways. What is shared among Settlers is an inability, thus far, to achieve respectful relations with Indigenous peoples that are not rooted in a perpetual project of (dis)possession.

Conclusion

It is central to the claims of this chapter that local government, through its ability to make land use decisions upon unceded Indigenous territories, is implicated in the circle of culpability. As I have demonstrated in analysis of the Cowichan Valley Regional District, local government is able to sanction or reject real estate development on forestry land and, through the acquisition of land for parks, aids in the deployment and entrenchment of Settler belonging. However, once a property is zoned, a development approved, or a park created, it becomes one more step removed from potential restitution to First Nations. My argument is that in the conflict over real estate development and access, local government provides an avenue for the working out of Settler claims to private forestry lands. Settlers make, and are provided, opportunities to exert personal and collective entitlement to access these lands; the legal status of forestry land as unceded, Crown, or private has little bearing on these exertions. However, each time these lands are proposed for real estate development, the limits of Settler claims against monopoly property rights (re)surface and mobilize belonging. In other words, real estate development on forestry lands redoubles belonging.

Within the context of a restrictive modern treaty process and its unequivocal defence of private property rights, the flexibility permitted to capital and Settlers is

unsettling. The circle of culpability is essential to this process as it allows (dis)possession to forge ahead, unimpeded by First Nations rights and title. Through my analysis of the 2002 treaty referendum I have shown that Settler support for the provincial state's role as the guarantor of property rights also reveals a set of contradictions: Settlers seek to defend private property rights, yet also express anger and opposition when these same rights threaten material and affective attachments that have been worked at over time.

In exploring events surrounding the Koksilah Ancient Forest, I argued that Settler claims to belonging are both personal and shared. In my 2009 video narration, I invoked a defence of and call to belonging. For the former logger, the forest presented an opportunity to capture something of what the land was like prior to a transformation in the means of production. For him, making the forest a park meant that future generations could know and encounter these feelings. For me, a park meant a shared rejection of private forestry land sales. For both of us, the forest was already a waypoint, but a park promised to sanction this and hold our feelings so that they could be carried into the future.

I have engaged with the study of class relations in this chapter to show that class affects belonging and therefore provides knowledge about how Settlers see themselves in relation to the processes of (dis)possession and the mode of production. For example, the purchase of an expensive acreage "playground" carved from forestlands may prompt local resentment and spark efforts to root and bind the presence of those who came 'before,' particularly among those who know the waypoints or who root their belonging in the material-affective linkages of extraction. Simultaneously, the purchaser makes their own attachment and creates their own belonging that will, eventually, become entangled

with what came before. The seemingly intractable and contradictory nature of this is exemplified by the investment of public sector pensions in extraction and real estate. Retirees may see logging or real estate development as a threat to their rural way of life while, at the same time, they live off of the profits of that same threat.

“There will be no housing subdivisions, shopping centres and blacktop jungles in our forests” (Merriman, 1975, pp. 9, 11-12). Given the extent to which forestry companies have become involved with real estate sales, the dream of a “recreationland” within “our” (read: Settler public) forests on Vancouver Island seems ill-considered. A 2009 article (D’Amour) in the *Cowichan Newsleader/Pictorial* described it this way:

TimberWest’s big sell off is now underway

The Big Sell Off. The Great Land Grab. The two are not independent; they are an interconnected series of events in an ongoing Settler project. This finding highlights a central argument of this dissertation: if we are going to explain Settlers to ourselves, we must uncover the processes of (dis)possession as they take shape over time. Settler belonging is worked at and it is worked out, rooted in the understanding that future generations of Settlers will be guided by that which came before. Belonging across generations offers a way for Settlers to cope with the upheaval that capitalism and the boom/bust cycle have on land and social relations. Yet, in the attempt to carry belonging forward, Settlers rely on the continued exclusion of Indigenous peoples so that land can be taken and held. Knowing this, Settlers must expose the ways that each of us participate in and contribute to these processes if an alternative future is to be envisioned.

Conclusion

The Scotch broom plant is characterized as an invasive species in British Columbia (Coastal Invasive Species Committee, 2016). It displaces native plants through resource competition and changes the chemistry of the soil to influence its own growth and survival. I have shown in this dissertation that the characteristics of Scotch broom and its spread across the landscape are also the characteristics of Settler colonialism. In other words, Settlers are an invasive species. It is a contradiction that the once desired Scotch broom plant is now deemed invasive and is the target of elimination by Settlers.

Figure 24: Scotch broom lines a private logging road near Nanaimo, BC.

Broom is viewed as a threat to sensitive and endangered ecosystems such as Garry oak meadows; education programs and community events frequently remind Settlers to “Cut Broom in Bloom” and take other actions to prevent the spread of invasive plants (Collins, 2017). Whatever the good intentions of trying to push back against the relentless spread of broom, there is a disconnect, a contradiction, inherent in these actions: in the effort to restore the landscape to a pre-Scotch broom state, there is no attempt made to slow the

spread of its originator, the Settler. This might be understood as an effort to indigenize or make the Settler original (Johnston & Lawson, 2000; Veracini, 2008; Pearson, 2013; Wolfe, 2013), indicative of the transformation from fostering feelings for a new Settler home to becoming *of this place*.

Central to this dissertation is the question of how to explain Settlers to Settlers – what does it mean to know our Settler selves? Put another way, what might it look like if Settlers understood themselves as characteristic of the invasive Scotch broom plant? In the way that ecologists have studied broom to understand how it spreads and what the conditions for its proliferation are, I have asked similar questions about Settler belonging: do Settlers create and maintain a sense of belonging to land? If so, how is this belonging deployed, complicated and perpetuated? What are the contingencies of belonging, the provisions created for its continuity? What implications does Settler belonging have for the restitution of Indigenous lands? To answer these questions, I have argued, begins with exploring the locally specific, material, and affective processes of (dis)possession – the historical and ongoing efforts by Settlers to *take* the land and *belong to* the land.

I have developed the concept of (dis)possession as a way to show that Indigenous peoples are dispossessed of their lands while, simultaneously, Settlers form(ed) affective and material possession of those lands. Throughout this dissertation, I have provided examples of (dis)possession, including road building, park creation, and forest staple extraction, to demonstrate the ways in which a term like dispossession can be limiting. That is, dispossession only describes the attempt, successful or not, to take land from Indigenous peoples; it does not open up space to explain the practices that encourage Settlers to take the land and “hold it fast” (Rose, 1985, p. 88). I have built upon

scholarship that argues dispossession is ongoing by showing that it also takes place in locally specific ways (Wolfe, 2006, 2013; Veracini, 2010; Rifkin, 2011, 2013; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Coulthard, 2014; Mackey, 2014, 2016; Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015). Possession, or, more specifically, what I call Settler belonging, is not simply a form of ongoing dispossession, it is a commitment to maintaining attachment through a set of practices that guide or lead belonging into the future. In other words, how the land is taken and how the land is put to work for future belonging are interrelated, but they are also distinct. By tracing Settler belonging over time in particular localities, I have demonstrated how the macro processes or “logics” of the Settler project manifest in specifically local ways. Efforts to eliminate Indigenous peoples, the belief in Lockean conceptions of property, or the fantasy of Crown sovereignty are among the shared characteristics of Settler colonialism in Canada and around the world. What this dissertation has contributed is a reflexive, political economic, and genealogical framework for understanding the generational and transformative processes of (dis)possession.

Beginning with founding of the Colony of Vancouver Island (approximately 1842 to 1858), the forest landscape, and the importation of various plant species, I demonstrated that the earliest Settlers worked to create a home-away, a sense of belonging taken up and adjusted by subsequent generations. For the artist Emily Carr, whose father worked to cultivate gardens that resembled the ones he left behind in England, the native cedar tree and the non-native peacock, together, came to represent home. By tracing the locally specific ways that First Nations territories were taken and held onto by Vancouver Island Settlers, I have engaged with studies of Settler

colonialism that tend to make a more rigid distinction between “metropole-centred colonialism” and “pure” settlement-oriented colonialism (Piterberg & Veracini, 2015; Wolfe, 1999). I built upon these broader theorizations of Settler colonialism by showing *how* it is that local processes of colonization varied and I demonstrated the nuance and differences that emerge within specifically localized Settler projects, thereby complicating and enhancing our understanding of Settler colonial processes more generally. For example, I have shown that the Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway (E&N) land grant is not a single event temporally fixed or territorially bounded, but rather an ongoing and fluid feature of (dis)possession that is entangled with Settler belonging. This contribution to the study of BC history demands reconsideration of how we interpret and understand the ongoing implications of historical land grants and monopoly property rights on Vancouver Island and in Canada.

Patrick Wolfe’s argument that Settler invasion is a structure, not an event (2006, p. 388), is vital to understanding that Settler colonialism remains in progress. Similarly, Cole Harris argues that the dispossession of Indigenous territories was *an* event followed by a resettlement by Settlers (2004). In this dissertation, I have shown that thinking about (dis)possession as a *series of recurring events* is a form of inquiry that allows us to trace particular events and their territorially specific, material, and affective implications *over time*. These events are often contradictory, meaning that the processes and practices that Settlers call upon to develop belonging are not always consistent. For example, claims to land by early Settlers in the Cowichan Valley (between 1862 to 1886) rested upon the rights of *private* property, in particular the right to *exclude others* from land. Yet, in making demands for road construction, Settlers invoked a *shared claim* to the area in

order to improve a collective social and economic future. In the case of park creation during the ‘long-boom’ (approximately 1950-1980), real estate and logging were viewed as a threat to Settler belonging; yet both land owners and logging companies were rewarded when lands were purchased and/or swapped for parks – a necessary contradiction to ensure the future of Settler belonging.

It is a key finding of this dissertation that Settler belonging is a generational process, one that seeks out locally particular and affective ways to maintain the Settler presence into the future. To interrogate the question of how Settler belonging is deployed and carried forward, I developed the concept of a *waypoint*. Waypoints are markers in physical space that help to explain how certain events, such as the completion of the E&N Railway, and material objects, like the roadside cairn to Settlers and the HMS *Hecate*, become guides that recall and reinforce belonging. Waypoints are intended to link feeling with a particular place and/or time; they are a precise location where affective attachment to land may be encountered, taken up, and cultivated over time. The concept of a waypoint connects affect theory with the study of local Settler belonging. Sara Ahmed argues that “affect is what sticks” (2011, p. 29) and it is the Settler effort to bind one generation to the next that is made clear through my study of belonging and its waypoints.

As a set of practices, Settler belonging is both shared and subjective. These practices are supported and endangered by the Settler legal system and the mode of production. Throughout the preceding chapters, this dissertation argued that conflict, between Settlers, with First Nations, with the state, and with capital, serves to entrench belonging and adjust the processes of (dis)possession. I have shown that belonging is

provoked or *put into action* by conflict and I have done so by tracing political economic transformation over the length of the Settler project on southern Vancouver Island (approximately 1842 to 2011). Specifically, I have used the staples approach, as developed by Harold Innis, Mel Watkins, and others, to focus in on the connection between transformation and conflict in the staple resource economy and the processes of (dis)possession.

This dissertation contributed to a deeper understanding of the staples approach and Canadian political economy through the application and adaptation of key concepts from the field to the study of Settler colonialism. Rather than conduct an analysis of external relations that encourage a staple economy, as is usually the case within the staples approach, I have adapted concepts such as the “stamp” of the staple resource, – its geographic, ecological, social, economic, and political characteristics – “spread effects,” and “linkages” – the economic inputs and outputs resulting from staple extraction – to the study of Settler belonging. Turning the stamp or imprint of forest resource extraction to the study of belonging offers a way to investigate (dis)possession and the social relations that develop from extraction and shape belonging. For example, I have shown that our understanding of the staple’s stamp is incomplete without incorporating the material and affective conditions of settlement prior to extraction; these will be a factor in where and when the staple will leave a stamp and how this stamp may interact with the practices of belonging already underway. In addition, I have shown that the stamp of the staple is not a single event generated at the moment of imprint or extraction; rather, it is ongoing and transformative. Consider the alienation of forestry lands prior to the First World War made possible through the E&N land grant and private purchase: as production of the

forest staple quickened during the mid-twentieth century, the particular characteristics of extraction made necessary, and possible, the land swaps that created parks. Similarly, it was the threat that this extraction posed to sites of Settler belonging that drove demand for parks and recreation sites.

In chapter four, I examined transformation in the mode/means of production, from low-production extraction, hand logging, and steam engines to sustained yield management, truck logging, and tree farm licences, to explain that the forest staple economy on Vancouver Island has both spread *effects* (backward, forward, final-demand, fiscal linkages) and spread *affects*. Over the chapters that followed, I developed the concept of “material-affective linkages” to show that the physical and affecting aspects of the staple’s stamp offer a way to make explicit the connections between extraction and practices of Settler belonging. Logging roads, parks created through land swaps, and logging artifacts, are examples of material-affective linkages and reveal something about the nature of Settler feelings for work and attachment to land. Significantly, I have argued that material-affective linkages are shared, personal, classed, generational, and bound up with efforts to legitimize the Settler presence. In doing so, this dissertation has shown that concepts such as staples linkages and the staple’s stamp can be developed beyond spread effects; they may also show us the locally and territorially specific ways that extraction lends itself to particular processes of (dis)possession. Staple linkages also rely upon the broader processes of Settler colonialism that legitimize the taking of First Nations lands to be made effective, as my study of cut-off reserve lands and the McKenna-McBride Commission reveals.

Regarding the staples approach, this dissertation shows that the boom and bust

cycle of a staple economy has reverberatory effects across regional and provincial borders. Through analysis of the Alberta bitumen bubble and real estate development on Vancouver Island between 2007 and 2011, I have made the case for understanding land development, especially real estate and land speculation, as a form of *auxiliary staple linkage*. As an auxiliary linkage, land development provides a spatial fix to capital during crises of accumulation, and allows capital to capture surplus value and revenues during a boom cycle; this secures a financial hedge against the bust. The 2007 removal of Western Forest Products tree farm licence lands are the manifestation of land development's function as an auxiliary linkage. With revenue and capital circulating from Alberta's bitumen boom, the property regime of southern Vancouver Island, defined by its large tracts of private forestlands, presented a way for forestry corporations to appropriate these and meet investor demands. The concept of an auxiliary staple linkage demonstrates that the seemingly unrelated stamp of one staple industry can combine with the spread effects of another to influence the processes of (dis)possession. It is a key finding of this dissertation that the land/real estate market does not present a way out of the staple trap for those working in the extractive economy. Instead, it is a support, a fix, from the staple trap for capital.

The spatial fix can also serve the interests of Settlers. The study of parks in chapters five through eight shows that Settlers anxiously grappled with the increased pace of extraction during the 'long boom,' the decline in employment during the recession of the 1980s and early 1990s, and the unknown outcomes of the politics of recognition and the modern BC treaty process. These events challenged the future of Settler belonging and parks offered a 'fix' whereby new spaces for affective attachment to land could be

created. In this way, parks act as and contain waypoints where Settler belonging can be fostered and passed on to future generations. As a fix that sustains belonging through conflict and uncertainty, parks are one way in which Settlers work *at* and work *out* belonging. The example of the Sombrio Beach squatters and the hiring of unemployed forestry workers to clear their homes uncovers the role of inter-Settler relations in the practices of belonging. What I have shown is that Settler belonging aids an analysis of class relations because it reveals how perceived class position influences understandings of who participates in and who threatens certain forms of affective attachment. In other words, the spatial fix, inter-Settler relations, class, political economic transformation, and the uncertainty of Indigenous resurgence all force Settlers to adjust the working on and working out of belonging.

In chapters seven and eight, I used the examples of the 2007 tree farm licence (TFL) removal, the creation of TimberWest's real estate division, and the 2008 Cowichan Valley Regional District park acquisition referendum to demonstrate how the creation of new parks and the threat of real estate development can entrench belonging. This redoubling of the practices of belonging occurs when forestlands, both Crown and private, are perceived as part of a common or public good. It is ongoing access, aided by logging roads and the perception that the forest resource belongs to British Columbia, that supports affective attachment. By rejecting real estate development or creating parks, this perception of the public forest is deemed to be both valid and justified. The desire to protect common or public access mobilizes money and feeling to acquire parcels of land and resist development, simultaneously entrenching Settler attachment to Indigenous

territories. In turn, a new waypoint and/or a material-affective linkage for Settler belonging is created.

The circle of culpability supports ongoing (dis)possession as it sends any protest from Indigenous peoples regarding land use decisions around an unbroken circle. What I have shown is that this circle permits Settlers, the state (local/provincial/federal), and capital to avoid addressing Indigenous rights and title. As the question of who is responsible is passed along, efforts to belong are given time to be worked out. Settler belonging is worked out over time, making the circle of culpability a necessary practice that allows inter-Settler relations to play out while Indigenous opposition is held back and stalled. As I have shown through analysis of transformation in the mode of production, belonging is a way for Settlers to cope with the upheaval of capital accumulation and the boom/bust cycle. Consider, for example, the conflict that emerged from Western Forest Products' removal and sale of TFL properties in 2007: as forestry gave way to real estate development, *Settlers put feelings for land into action* in response to capital's efforts to reconfigure local spaces. With First Nations protests subsumed mainly into the circle of culpability, the Capital Regional District, private groups, and individual Settlers were given the time needed to assert attachment, purchase land, and create parks. Analysis of these events also reinforces my finding that the study of class relations lends insight to Settler belonging. Insiders and outsiders to community and region are designated by Settlers based on a variety of factors, including class. By identifying Settlers based on the relations of production, especially their ownership of or access to certain lands, Settlers signal their own perceptions of class.

Explaining Settlers to Ourselves

As a local, personal, and reflexive work, I approached my dissertation with a view to some of the places that have shaped me as a person. I describe this dissertation as an archive of belonging, the pages linking seemingly disparate materials and feelings to create it. My campaign to protect access to forestry lands (chapter seven) or the Koksilah Ancient Forest (chapter eight), Telegraph Road (chapter two), Manley Creek Park and the meeting minutes found in my Dad's garage (chapter five), a photo of my Brother with his arms stretched out in defence of a tree (chapter two) – these and other examples represent waypoints, documents, and feelings that, taken together, constitute an archive that orients myself and my family within a project of (dis)possession. This archive of belonging can never be physically brought together in a single location; it will never be part of an institutional repository. However, the archive of belonging does offer a reflexive way to exhibit the varied elements of past and present Settler belonging. In this way, it is my hope that my work here contributes not only to academic analysis, but also to the praxis of unsettling Settler belonging. Compiling an archive of belonging offers a way to situate oneself within the localized and broader processes of Settler colonialism.

Affective attachment and locality, together, offer a methodological and conceptual framework for understanding how Settler belonging manifests in specific ways. Without consideration for how people feel about the land, we risk portraying Settlers as vacuous occupiers carrying out a fixed agenda. I have shown here that the study of affect reveals belonging to be both an individual and shared motivation, one that is flexible, contradictory, and works alongside the other characteristics of Settler colonialism, such as the logic of elimination or Lockean conceptions of property. Together, affect and the locally specific form a bridge between dispossession and possession by allowing us to see

how Settlers, as with Scotch broom, work to displace, replace, and cultivate roots over time within particular Indigenous territories. Throughout this dissertation I have included personal reflections in an effort to interrogate my own feelings for places and spaces that have come into existence through the invasion and attempted elimination of Indigenous peoples. It must be the task of Settlers to unsettle and confront our belonging to land if we are to work for a future where Indigenous lands are returned. I have not argued here that Settlers should feel shameful for the making meaning from and belonging to land. Still, it is likely that such feelings may surface when Settlers are confronted with ongoing (dis)possession. It is necessary for Settlers to understand how belonging has made possible attempts to eliminate Indigenous peoples and life ways and exclude them from their own lands. Feelings of shame may have a role to play in this understanding, but simply declaring belonging to be shameful will not allow for comprehension, acknowledgment, or the opening up of space for the development of a different kind of Settler belonging. If we are all here to stay (Asch, 2014), how can we put feelings into action in ways that seek alternatives to (dis)possession?

In describing structures of feeling, Raymond Williams argues that the characteristics of such structures are often “recognizable at a later stage, when they have been (as often happens) formalized, classified and in many cases built into institutions and formations” (1977, p. 132). However, by the time this recognition occurs, Williams notes, a new structure of feeling has usually begun to form. With this in mind, alternative forms of belonging are possible, yet it seems unlikely that we will be able to comprehend their potential, if any, until a much later date. This aligns with my finding that Settler belonging is a generational process. Explaining Settlers to ourselves in locally specific

and affective ways creates the space needed to break apart self-evident Settler claims to land and develop new structures of feeling that grapple with alternative futures. Waypoints play an important role in this – the stories of belonging that Settlers create, work on and at, and encounter, matter when it comes to shaping the future. Of course, there are no certainties here. As Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth argue, affect and theories of affect offer “no ultimate or final guarantees – political, ethical, aesthetic, pedagogic, and otherwise – that capacities to affect and to be affected will yield an actualized next or new that is somehow better than ‘now’” (2011, pp. 9-10). Indeed, if land is returned we are still left with the upheaval of capitalist social relations. To return Jordan River Regional Park to First Nations would not mean that a forestry company would be prevented from selling nearby lands for real estate development. As such, it is necessary to integrate an anti-capitalist critique in the work of explaining Settlers to ourselves.

Through my analysis of the stamp of staple extraction and the concepts of material-affective and auxiliary linkages, I have provided examples of conflict, cooperation, and contradiction between the practices of Settler belonging and the capitalist mode of production. For example, opposition to monopoly property rights, the creation of parks, and campaigns against real estate development, all reveal an effort on the part of Settlers to push back, in varying degrees, against certain forms of capital accumulation and class relations. Explaining Settlers to ourselves involves demonstrating the existence and potential of anti-capitalist and class critique within practices of Settler belonging. However, as I discussed in chapters seven and eight, calls for common or public lands that may seem to align with such a critique are frequently out of step with

the interests of Indigenous peoples. As Glen Coulthard notes, the idea of a commons is not possible when land is taken and withheld from sovereign Indigenous peoples (2014, p. 13). Matthew Wildcat notes that there is potential for Settlers to “transform their practices towards Indigenous peoples from ones based on elimination to ones based on partnership” (2015, p.394). I am not suggesting that what I have written here offers an end to Settler colonialism, but neither am I arguing for a Settler future that remains unchanged. If Settler colonialism is not an event, then there will be no singular event or action that ends it. Elizabeth Strakosch and Alissa Macoun argue that to suggest a transformative event could end Settler colonialism is to portray

an inevitable and inescapable trajectory (although it may be consistently deferred or delayed). In this way, the eventual legitimacy and stability of the settler-colonial project is always-already assumed. Through this a priori assumption, settler colonialism is able to entrench and sustain itself on the basis of its eventual demise (2012, p. 53).

As a series of recurring events, (dis)possession must be addressed through events that provoke Settlers, both present and future, to *work on and at* changing its trajectory. Of course, explaining Settlers to ourselves must also involve the work of listening to and taking direction from Indigenous communities. Returning land is not a one-time act of benevolence that will absolve Settlers. As Gregory Younging observes, “Canadians need to undergo a type of micro-reconciliation within themselves. In so doing, the present generation of Canadians need to face up to what has been done in their name” (as cited in Henderson & Wakeham, 2009, p. 6). State efforts at reconciliation, better understood as the politics of recognition, are premised on the “eventual legitimacy and stability of the settler-colonial project” (Strakosch and Macoun, 2012), and are widely criticized by Indigenous peoples and an increasing number of Settlers.

Recognizing the role of the politics of recognition played in the creation of parks during the 1980s and 1990s (chapter six), and understanding the function of a circle of culpability in the denial of Indigenous rights and title, the notion of a reflective and “micro” unsettling has potential to provoke a break from ongoing (dis)possession. My focus on parks, land grants, private forestlands, and staple extraction in the preceding chapters is designed to spark such a provocation. There exist a number of initiatives and organizations devoted to parks, environmental stewardship, environmental and anti-capitalist activism, and Indigenous solidarity on southern Vancouver Island. What might it look like if these initiatives and organizations, acting at a local level, took up the tasks of breaking the circle of culpability and restoring lands to Indigenous peoples? Take, for example, the conflict arising from Western Forest Products (WFP) removal tree farm licence properties in 2007 (chapter seven). The Capital Regional District acquired most of the land sold by WFP for parks, primarily as a result of hard fought campaigns to have them do so. What if the countless individuals and organizations that sought to maintain Settler access to these lands focused their actions solely on the acquisition of land for restitution to the Pacheedaht and T’Souke First Nations?

Settlers have had, and can have, countless opportunities to demand the restitution of lands to First Nations. Consider the 2008 Cowichan Valley Regional park acquisition referendum. Rather than having local government collect taxes to acquire private property for inclusion in a regional parks program, what would it look like to have Settlers contribute a portion of their property taxes to a land restitution fund? In Hul’qumi’num territories, where 84% of their territory was stolen in the E&N land grab, such a project could make a meaningful impact. As I argued in chapter eight, First

Nations rights and title must also become a primary concern of local government and planning (cf: Lane, 2006). Existing parks could also be turned over to First Nations, either as co-managed sites, as is the case with several parks across BC and Canada (cf: Pacific Rim National Park, Gulf Islands National Park, or Newcastle Island Provincial Park) or, better yet, full title for parkland could be turned over. As I stated in the introduction, it is at the local level where connections to land have been destroyed and built, and it is at the local level that land will be returned to Indigenous peoples. To undertake any of these actions may mean that Settlers have to come to grips with not being permitted access to areas that have, over time, been integral to belonging. This is an area of consideration where the process of reflecting on belonging is key. I need to understand that there may come a time when Cowichan Tribes asks Settlers to keep out of the remaining Koksilah old growth forest (chapter eight). While I have trespassed on private forestry lands to get to this spot, I must reflect on the fact that the restitution of Indigenous lands also means respect for Indigenous directives.

I am only gesturing here to possible pathways. I have no prescriptions and nothing is possible without the formation of respectful relations. Nothing here is a substitute for other meaningful changes, including efforts to fight the systemic racism and discrimination that is characteristic of Settler society in Canada. Nor do these cursory examples present a remedy to the fantasy of Crown sovereignty (Borrows, 1999; Asch, 2014) or the dominance of a capitalist mode of production. Nevertheless, if all Settlers currently involved in protecting old growth forests, cutting Scotch broom, or acquiring land for conservation turned their efforts to the restitution of Indigenous territories, a powerful movement could be underway. Only a sustained and recurring attack of cutting

and pulling can remove Scotch broom from a patch of ground. As with invasive plants, eradication is unlikely, only containment is possible; generations of Settlers have spread out across the landscape and cultivated attachment, an attachment rooted in feelings and material practices. We must identify these roots and trace their origins so that Settler belonging and the project of (dis)possession can be untangled. This is the work of generations, and it will require each Settler to compile an archive of belonging as a record of that which we desire to leave behind.

Reference List

Secondary Sources

- Abele, F. (1997). Understanding what happened here: The political economy of Indigenous Peoples. In W. Clement (Ed.), *Understanding Canada* (pp. 118-140). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Abele, F. & Stasiulis, D. (1989). Canada as a "White Settler Colony": What about Natives and immigrants? In W. Clement & G. Williams (Eds.), *The new Canadian political economy* (pp. 240-277). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Acker, M. (2012). *Gardens aflame: Garry Oak meadows of BC's south coast*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- Adams, J. (2011). *Old Square Toes and his Lady: The life of James and Amelia Douglas*. Touchwood Editions (Original work published 2001).
- Adelman, J. (2013). *The essential Hirschman*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Adese, J. (2012). Anxious states and the co-optation of Métisness [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/anxious-states-and-the-co-optation-of-metisness-jennifer-adese/>
- Ahmed, S. (2004a). Affective economies. *Social Text*, 22(4), 117–139.
- Ahmed, S. (2004b). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2010). *The promise of happiness*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2011). Happy objects. In M. Gregg & G. Seigworth (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 29-51). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Alfred, T. (2010). What is radial imagination? Indigenous struggles in Canada. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action*, 4(2), 5-8.
- Amato, J.A. (2002). *Rethinking home: A case for writing local history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Anderson, K. (1991). *Vancouver's Chinatown: Racial discourse in Canada, 1875-1980*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Antonio, R.J. (Ed.). (2003). *Marx and Modernity: Key Readings and Commentary*. Malden; Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

- Arnett, C. (1999). *The terror of the coast: Land alienation and colonial war on Vancouver Island and the Gulf Islands, 1849-1863*. Vancouver: Talon Books.
- Asch, M. (2002). From *terra nullius* to affirmation: reconciling Aboriginal rights with the Canadian Constitution. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society / Revue Canadienne Droit et Société*, 17(2), 23-39. doi: 10.1017/S0829320100007237
- Asch, M. (2014). *On being here to stay*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Atleo, C. (2015). Aboriginal Economic Development and Living Nuuchah-nulth-aht. In E. Coburn (Ed.), *More will sing their way to freedom: Indigenous resistance and resurgence*. Black Point: Fernwood Publishing.
- Atleo, E.R. (2004). *Tsawalk: A Nuuchah-nulth worldview*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Baber, Z. (2016). The plants of empire: Botanic gardens, colonial power and botanical knowledge. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 46(4), 659-679. doi: 10.1080/00472336.2016.1185796
- Backroad Mapbooks. (2017). *Vancouver Island, BC - Victoria & Gulf Islands* (8th ed.). Coquitlam: Backroad Mapbooks.
- Baker, J. (2002, August). Production and consumption of wilderness in Algonquin Park. *Space & Culture*, 5(3), 198–210.
- Baldwin, A. (2012). Whiteness and futurity: Toward a research agenda. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(2), 172-187.
- Baptie, S. (1975). *First growth: The story of British Columbia Forest Products Limited*. Vancouver: British Columbia Forest Products Limited.
- Barman, J. (2005). *Stanley Park's secret: The forgotten families of Whoi Whoi, Kanaka Ranch and Brockton Point*. Madeira Park: Harbour Publishing.
- Barman, J. (2010a). *The west beyond the west: A history of British Columbia* (3rd ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Barman, J. (2010b, Spring). Taking local history seriously: A review essay. *BC Studies*, 165, 101-106.
- Barnes, T. & Hayter, R. (1990). Innis' staple theory, exports, and recession: British Columbia, 1981-86. *Economic Geography*, 66(2), 156-173.

- Barnes, T., Hayter, R., & Hay, E. (1999, September/October). "Too young to retire, too bloody old to work": Forest industry restructuring and community response in Port Alberni, British Columbia. *The Forestry Chronicle*, 75(5), 781-787.
- Barry Ellis, A. (1982). *At the foot of the hill (Cobble Hill history)*. Mill Bay: Adelaide Barry Ellis.
- Barker, A.J. (2009). The contemporary reality of Canadian imperialism: Settler colonialism and the hybrid colonial state. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 33(3), 325-351. doi:10.1353/aiq.0.0054
- Battell Lowman, E., & Barker, A. (2015). *Settler: Identity and colonialism in 21st century Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Battell Lowman, E. (2017, Spring). Mamook kom'tax chinuk pipa/Learning to write Chinook Jargon: Indigenous Peoples and literacy strategies in the South Central Interior of British Columbia in the late nineteenth century. *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, 29(1), 77-98.
- Beinart, W. & Middleton, K. (2004, February). Plant transfers in historical perspective: A review article. *Environment and History*, 10(1), 3-29.
- Belich, J. (2009). *Replenishing the earth: The settler revolution and the rise of the Anglo-world, 1783-1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Belshaw, J.D. (2002). *Colonization and community: The Vancouver Island coalfield and the making of the British Columbian working class*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Benjamin, D. (2001). *The Dougans of Cobble Hill: From the writing of Nathan Dougan and other archival sources*. No publication information.
- Bertelsen, L. & Murphie, A. (2011). An ethics of everyday infinities and powers: Félix Guattari on affect and the refrain. In M. Gregg & G. Seigworth (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 138-160). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Berton, P. (1970). *The National Dream: The Great Railway, 1871-1881*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhatia, A. (2013). We are all here to stay? Indigeneity, migration, and 'decolonizing' the treaty right to be here. *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, 31, 39-64.
- Bishop, M.W. (1975). *And so they came to Cowichan*. Victoria: Robinson Press.

Black, K. (2009). *"They knew their roads and where they wanted to go." Trails and roads in the southern Cowichan Valley, 1860-1875* (Unpublished undergraduate essay). Vancouver Island University, Nanaimo.

Black, K. (2011). *Enacting settler property, advancing Indigenous dispossession: The coloniality of property relations on southern Vancouver Island* (Unpublished master's thesis). Carleton University, Ottawa.

Black, K. [Kelly Black] (2014a, May 27). Rethinking public interpretation around the Salish Sea [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/kqL1udxsxUw>

Black, K. [Kelly Black] (2016, March 13). Localizing settler colonialism [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/xFbJb8FvyU8>

Black, K. (2017a, February 2). Unsettling an image: Behind the BC Studies conference poster [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://bcstudies.com/?q=blog/unsettling-image-behind-bc-studies-conference-poster>

Black, K. (2017b, May 5). *Unsettling the Settlement Act*. Paper presented at the BC Studies Conference, Nanaimo, British Columbia.

Blackburn, C. (2005). Searching for guarantees in the midst of uncertainty: Negotiating Aboriginal rights and title in British Columbia. *American Anthropologist*, 107(4), 586-596.

Blakey-Smith, D. (Ed.). (1975). *The reminiscences of Doctor John Sebastian Helmcken*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Blomley, N. (1996, Autumn). "Shut the province down:" First Nations blockades in British Columbia, 1984-1995. *BC Studies*, 111, 5-35.

Blomley, N., & Pratt, G. (2001). Canada and the political geographies of rights. *The Canadian Geographer*, 45 (1), 151-166.

Blomley, N. (2014). The ties that blind: making fee simple in the British Columbia treaty process. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 40(2), 168-179. doi: 10.1111/tran.12058

Bonner, V. (2001). *The hamlet with an attitude, 1886-1945: The story of Cobble Hill Village*. Duncan: Firgrove Publishing.

Borrows, J. (1999, Fall). Sovereignty's alchemy: An analysis of *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia*. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 37(3), 537-596.

Bosher, J. F. (2005). Vancouver Island in the empire. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 33(3), 349-368. doi: 10.1080/03086530500185845

Bourgeault, R.G. (1983). The Indian, the Métis and the fur trade class, sexism and racism in the transition from "Communism" to Capitalism. *Studies in Political Economy*, 12(1), 45-80. doi: 10.1080/19187033.1983.11675649

Bowen, L. (1982). *Boss whistle: The coal miners of Vancouver Island remember*. Lantzville: Oolichan Books.

Bowen, L. (2013). *Those Island People*. Nanaimo: Nanaimo District Museum Society and Rocky Point Books.

Bradley, B. (2011, Summer). Behind the scenery: Manning Park and the aesthetics of automobile accessibility in 1950s British Columbia. *BC Studies*, 170, 41-65.

Braun, B. (2002). *The Intemperate Rainforest: Nature, Culture and Power on Canada's West Coast*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bremer, L.L. & Farley, K.A. (2010). Does plantation forestry restore biodiversity or create green deserts? A synthesis of the effects of land-use transitions on plant species richness. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 19(14), pp. 3893-3915.

Brennan, T. (2004). *The transmission of affect*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Brockway, L.H. (1979). *Science and colonial expansion: The role of the British Royal Botanic Gardens*. New York: Academic Press.

Burda, C., Gale, F., & M'gonigle, M. (1998, Autumn). Ecoforestry versus the state(us) quo: or why innovative forestry is neither contemplated nor permitted within the state structure of British Columbia. *BC Studies*, 119, 45-86.

Cail, R.E. (1974). *Land, Man, and the Law: The Disposal of Crown Lands in British Columbia, 1871-1913*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Cameron, E. (2015). *Far off Metal River: Inuit lands, Settler stories, and the making of the contemporary Arctic*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Cardinal, H. (1969). *The unjust society: The tragedy of Canada's Indians*. Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig Ltd.

Carr, E. (1966). *Growing pains: The autobiography of Emily Carr*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited (Original work published 1946).

Carr, G. (2006). War, history, and the education of (Canadian) memory. In K. Hodgkin & S. Radstone (Eds.), *Memory, history, nation: Contested pasts* (pp. 57-78). New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

- Carroll, W.K. & Ratner, R.S. (1989). Social democracy, neo-conservatism and hegemonic crisis in British Columbia. *Critical Sociology*, 16(1), 29-53. doi: 10.1177/089692058901600102
- Cashore, B., Hoberg, G., Howlett, M., Rayner, J., & Wilson, J. (2001). *In search of sustainability: British Columbia forest policy in the 1990s*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Caswell, M. & Cifor, M. (2016, Spring). *From human rights to feminist ethics: Radical empathy in the archives*. *Archivaria*, 81, 23-43.
- Cavers, M. (2008, Autumn). "Victoria's own oak tree": A brief cultural history of Victoria's Garry Oaks after 1843. *BC Studies*, 163, 65-85.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Charland, M. (1986). Technological nationalism. *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory/Revue canadienne de theorie politique et sociale*, 10(1-2), 196-220.
- Chodos, R. (1973). *The CPR: A century of corporate welfare*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.
- Ciuriak, D. (2014). Re-reading staples theory in light of current trade and development theory. In J. Stanford (Ed.), *The staple theory @ 50: Reflections on the lasting significance of Mel Watkins' "A Staple Theory of Economic Growth"* (pp. 97-103). Retrieved from https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/03/Staple_Theory_at_50.pdf
- Clark-Jones, M. (1987). *A staple state: Canadian industrial resources in Cold War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Claxton, N.X. (2008). ISTÁ SC'IAÑEW, ISTÁ SXOLE 'To Fish as Formerly': The Douglas Treaties and the WSÁNEC' reef-net fisheries. In L. Simpson (Ed.), *Lighting the eighth fire: The liberation, resurgence, and protection of Indigenous Nations* (pp. 47-58). Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Clayton, D. (2000). *Islands of Truth: The Imperial Fashioning of Vancouver Island*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Clayton, J., Bradley, B., & Wynn, G. (2011, Summer). One hundred years of struggle: The ongoing effort to establish provincial parks and protected areas in British Columbia. *BC Studies*, 170, 5-15.
- Clement, W. (1975). *The Canadian corporate elite: An analysis of economic power*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.

Clement, W. (1983). Class and property relations: An exploration of the rights of property and the obligations of labour. In W. Clement (Ed.), *Class, power and property: Essays on Canadian society* (pp.210-224). Toronto: Methuen.

Clement, W. (1988). *The challenge of class analysis*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Clement, W. (1989). Debates and directions: A political economy of resources. In W. Clement & G. Williams (Eds.), *The new Canadian political economy* (pp. 36-53). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Clement, W. & Vosko, L.F. (Eds.). (2003). *Changing Canada: Political economy as transformation*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Coburn, E. (2016). Alternatives: Theorizing colonialism and Indigenous liberation: contemporary Indigenous scholarship from lands claimed by Canada. *Studies in Political Economy*, 97(3), 285-307. doi: 10.1080/07078552.2016.1249126

Cole, D. (1996). Leisure, taste and tradition in British Columbia. In H.J.M Johnston (Ed.), *The Pacific Province: a history of British Columbia*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

Cook, R. (1990-91). Cabbages not kings: Towards an ecological interpretation of early Canadian history. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 25(4), 5-16.

Corntassel, J. & Bryce, C. (2012, Spring/Summer). Practicing sustainable self-determination: Indigenous approaches to cultural restoration and revitalization. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 18(11), 151-162.

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Coulthard, G.S. (2007). Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the "politics of recognition" in Canada. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 6, 437-60.

Creese, G. & Strong-Boag, V. (1995, Spring/Summer). Taking gender into account in British Columbia: More than just women's studies. *BC Studies*, 105/106, 9-26.

Culhane, D. (1998). *The pleasure of the Crown: Anthropology, law and First Nations*. Burnaby: Talonbooks.

Currie, N. (1994). *Captain Cook at Nootka Sound and some questions of colonial discourse* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/304160794?accountid=12246>

- Cvetkovich, A. (2003). *An archive of feelings: Trauma, sexuality, and lesbian public cultures*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Cvetkovich, A. (2012). *Depression: A public feeling*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Daschuk, J. (2013). *Clearing the plains: Disease, politics of starvation, and the loss of Aboriginal life*. Regina: University of Regina Press.
- Davi Johnson Thornton (2011) Neuroscience, Affect, and the Entrepreneurialization of Motherhood. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 8(4), 399-424. doi: 10.1080/14791420.2011.610327
- Davis, L., Denis, J., & Sinclair, R. (2016). Pathways of settler Decolonization. *Settler Colonial Studies*. doi: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1243085
- Day, D. (Ed.). (1977). *Sound Heritage: Men of the Forest* (Volume VI, Number 3). Victoria: Aural History, Provincial Archives of British Columbia.
- de Costa, R. & Clark, T. (2016). On the responsibility to engage: Non-Indigenous peoples in settler states, *Settler Colonial Studies*, 6:3, 191-208, doi: 10.1080/2201473X.2015.1065560
- de Leeuw, A. (2012). Alice through the looking glass: Emotion, personal connection, and reading colonial archives along the grain. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 38, 273-281.
- Dougan, R.I. (1973). *Cowichan My Valley*. Cobble Hill: R.I. Dougan.
- Dougan, R.I. (1986). *A story to be told*. Cobble Hill: Fir Grove Publishing.
- Dougan, C.A. (n.d.) *My daughter's request: Spotlight on the yesterday of country folk*. Alexco.
- Downie, B.K. (1998). Parks: A British Columbia perspective. In J.S. Marsh & B.W. Hodgins (Eds.), *Changing parks: The history, future and cultural context of parks and heritage landscapes* (pp. 238-249). Toronto: Natural Heritage / Natural History Inc.
- Drache, D. (1995a). Introduction. In D. Drache (Ed.), *Staples, markets, and cultural change: Selected essays, Harold Innis* (pp. xiii-lix). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Drache, D. (Ed.). (1995b). *Staples, markets, and cultural change: Selected essays, Harold Innis*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Drushka, K. (1993). Forest ownership and the case for diversification. In K. Drushka, B. Nixon, & R. Travers (Eds.), *Touch wood: BC forests at the crossroads* (pp. 1-22). Madeira Park: Harbour Publishing.

Dunae, P.A. (2001). Gender, generations and social class: The Fairbridge Society and British child migration to Canada, 1930-1960. In J. Lawrence & P. Starkey (Eds.), *Child welfare and social action from the nineteenth century to the present* (pp. 82-100). Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Dupeyron, B. (2008, June). Cascadia revisited from European case studies: The socio-political space of cross-border networks. *Canadian Political Science Review*, 2(2), 84-103.

Edmonds, P. (2010a). *Urbanizing frontiers: Indigenous Peoples and settlers in 19th century Pacific Rim cities*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Edmonds, P. (2010b, Spring). Unpacking settler colonialism's urban strategies: Indigenous Peoples in Victoria, British Columbia, and the transition to a settler-colonial city. *Urban History Review/Revue d'histoire urbaine* 38(2), 4-20.

Egan, B. (2013). Towards shared ownership: Property, geography, and treaty making in British Columbia. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 95(1), 33-50.

Ellis, C. (1991, Spring). Sociological introspection and emotional experience. *Symbolic Interaction*, 14(1), 23-50.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Lanham: Altamira Press.

Epp, R. (2003). We are all Treaty People: History, reconciliation and the "Settler Problem." In C.A.L. Prager & T. Govier (Eds.), *Dilemmas of reconciliation: cases and concepts* (pp. 223-244). Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Fairfax, S.K., Gwin, L., King, M.A., Raymond, L., & Watt, L.A. (2005). *Buying nature: The limits of land acquisition as a conservation strategy, 1780-2004*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove.

Fast, T. (2014). Stapled to the front door: Neoliberal extractivism in Canada. *Studies in Political Economy*, 94(1), 31-60. doi: 10.1080/19187033.2014.11674953

Feltes, E. (2015). Research as guesthood: The memorial to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and resolving Indigenous-settler relations in British Columbia. *Anthropologica*, 57(2), 469-480.

Fetzer, J.S. (2016). The politics of British Columbia's 2002 Aboriginal treaty negotiations referendum: Democratic governance or electoral strategy? *Canadian Ethnic Studies / Études ethniques au Canada*, 48(2), 157-166.

Fisher, R. (1992). *Contact and conflict: Indian-European relations in British Columbia, 1774-1890* (2nd ed.). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Forkey, N.S. (2012). *Canadians and the natural environment to the twenty-first century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Foster, H., Raven, H., & Webber, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Let Right Be Done: Aboriginal title, the Calder case, and the future of Indigenous rights*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Foster, H. (2007). We are not O'Meara's children: Law, lawyers, and the first campaign for Aboriginal title in British Columbia, 1908-28. In H. Foster, H. Raven, J. Webber (Eds.), *Let Right Be Done: Aboriginal title, the Calder case, and the future of Indigenous rights* (pp. 61-84). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books (Original work published 1975).

Foucault, M. (2003). "Society must be defended." *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*. (D. Macey, Trans.). New York: Picador (Original work published 1997).

Francis, D. (1997). *National dreams: Myth, memory, and Canadian history*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.

Furniss, E. (1999). *The Burden of History: Colonialism and the Frontier Myth in a Rural Canadian Community*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Garner, J. (1988). *Never chop your rope: A story of British Columbia logging and the people who logged*. Nanaimo: Cinnibar Press.

George, P. (2006). *Big trees, not big stumps: 25 years of campaigning to save wilderness with the Wilderness Committee*. Vancouver: Western Canada Wilderness Committee.

Gibson, A.L. (1967). *Green branches and fallen leaves: The story of a community-Shawnigan Lake*. Shawnigan Lake: The Shawnigan Lake Confederation Centennial Committee.

Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. London: Verso.

Ginn, F. (2008). Extension, subversion, containment: eco-nationalism and (post)colonial nature in Aotearoa, New Zealand. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 33(3), 335-353.

Ginzburg, C. (1993, Autumn). Microhistory: Two or three things that I know about it (J. Tedeschi & A.C. Tedeschi, Trans.). *Critical Inquiry*, 20(1), 10-35.

Godlewska, C. & Webber, J. (2007). The Calder decision, Aboriginal title, treaties, and the Nisga'a. In H. Foster, H. Raven, & J. Webber (Eds.), *Let Right Be Done: Aboriginal title, the Calder case, and the future of Indigenous rights* (pp. 1-33). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Goeman, M. (2008). From place to territories and back again: Centering storied land in the discussion of Indigenous Nation-building. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 1(1), 23-34.

Goldstein, A. (2014). Introduction: Toward a genealogy of the U.S. colonial present. In A. Goldstein (Ed.), *Formations of United States colonialism* (pp. 1-30). Durham: Duke University Press.

Goodman, J. (1973). *Pioneer days at Port Renfrew*. No publication information.

Gorsline, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Rainshadow: Archibald Menzies and the botanical exploration of the Olympic Peninsula*. Port Townsend: Jefferson County Historical Society.

Gough, B. (1983). Fort Rupert, its coal and its spar trade. In E.B. Norcross (Ed.), *The company on the coast* (pp. 29-41). Nanaimo: Nanaimo Historical Society.

Gough, B. (1984). *Gunboat frontier: British maritime authority and Northwest coast Indians, 1846-90*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Gough, B. (2012). *Juan de Fuca's strait: Voyages in the waterway of forgotten dreams*. Madeira Park: Harbour Publishing Co. Ltd.

Gough, B. (2012-2013, Winter). Crown, company, and charter: Founding Vancouver Island Colony – a chapter in Victorian empire making. *BC Studies*, 176, 9-54.

Grant, S. (1998). Arctic wilderness - and other mythologies. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 33(2), 27-42.

Grant, H. & Wolfe, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Staples and beyond: Selected writings of Mel Watkins*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Grant, W.C. (1857). Description of Vancouver Island. *The Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London*, 27, 268-320.

- Green, J. (2003). Decolonization and recolonization in Canada. In W. Clement & L.F. Vosko (Eds.), *Changing Canada: political economy as transformation* (pp. 51-78). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Gregg, M., & Seigworth, G.J. (Eds.). (2010). *The affect theory reader*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Guha, R. (Ed.). (1993). *A subaltern studies reader, 1986-1995*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hak, G. (2007). *Capital and Labour in the British Columbia forest industry, 1934-74*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hak, G. (2013). *The Left in British Columbia: A history of struggle*. Vancouver: Ronsdale Press.
- Hale, L.L., & Barman, J. (1991). *British Columbia local histories: A bibliography*. Victoria: BC Heritage Trust.
- Hall, S. (1992). *The question of cultural identity*. In S.Hall, D. Held, & A. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp. 274-316). Cambridge: Polity Press in association with the Open University.
- Harding, S. (Ed.). (1987). *Feminism and methodology: Social science issues*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in Feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599.
- Harris, C.I. (1993, June). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106(8), 1707-1791.
- Harris, C. (1992, Summer). The Fraser Canyon encountered. *BC Studies*, 94, 5-28.
- Harris, C. & Demeritt, D. (1997). Farming and rural life. In C. Harris (Ed.), *The resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on colonialism and geographic change* (pp. 219-249). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Harris, C. (2002). *Making Native space: Colonialism, resistance, and reserves in British Columbia*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Harris, C. (2004). How did colonialism dispossess? Comments from an edge of empire. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94(1), 165-182.
- Harris, C. (2010, December). The spaces of early Canada. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 91(4), 725-759. doi: 10.3138/chr.91.4.725

- Harvey, D. (1982). *The limits to capital*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The urban experience*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2001). Globalization and the "Spatial Fix." *geographische revue*, 3(2), 23-30.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *New imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of global capitalism: Towards a theory of uneven geographical development*. London: Verso.
- Harvey, D. (2014). *Seventeen contradictions and the end of capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayman, J. (Ed.). (1989). *Robert Brown and the Vancouver Island Exploring Expedition*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hayter, R. (2000). *Flexible crossroads: The restructuring of British Columbia's forest economy*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hayter, R. (2003). The war in the woods: globalization, post-fordist restructuring and the contested remapping of British Columbia's forest economy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 96, 706-29.
- Henderson, J. (2003). *Settler feminism and race making in Canada*. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- Henderson, J. (2015). Residential schools and opinion-making in the era of traumatized subjects and taxpayer-citizens. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 49(1), 5-43.
- Henderson, J. & Wakeham, P. (2009, March). Colonial reckoning, national reconciliation?: Aboriginal Peoples and the culture of redress in Canada. *English Studies in Canada*, 35(1), 1-26.
- Hendrickson, J.E. (1975, Summer). Two letters from Walter Colquhoun Grant. *BC Studies*, 26, 3-15.
- Herbert, S. (2005, December). The trapdoor of community. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 95(4), 850-865.
- Hessing, M. (2003). Green mail: The social construction of environmental issues through letters to the editor. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 28, 25-42.
- Hodgins, J. (1998). *Broken ground*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc.

- Hodgins, P. (2004, Fall). Our haunted present: Cultural memory in question. *Topia*, 12, 99-108.
- Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group. (2005). *Getting to 100%*. Ladysmith: Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group.
- Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group. (2007). *The Great Land Grab in Hul'qumi'num Territory*. Ladysmith: Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group.
- Humphreys, M. (2005). Getting personal: Reflexivity and autoethnographic vignettes. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(6), 840-860. doi: 10.1177/1077800404269425
- Hutton, T.A. (2007). Contours of the post-staples state: The reconstruction of political economy and social identity in 21st century Canada. *Policy and Society*, 26(1), 9-29. doi: 10.1016/S1449-4035(07)70098-X
- Innis, H.A. (1978). *The cod fisheries: The history of an international economy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (Original work published 1940).
- Innis, H.A. (1995). Transportation as a factor in Canadian economic history. In D. Drache (Ed.), *Staples, markets, and cultural change: Selected essays, Harold Innis* (pp. 123-138). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press (Original work published 1931).
- Innis, H.A. (1999). *The fur trade in Canada: An introduction to Canadian economic history*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (Original work published 1930).
- Innis, H. A. (2007). *Empire and communications*. Toronto: Dundurn Press (Original work published 1950).
- Ireland, W.E. (1953). Captain Walter Colquhoun Grant: Vancouver Island's first independent settler. *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, 17(1&2), 87-125.
- Ishiguro, L. (2016, Summer). Histories of settler colonialism: Considering new currents. *BC Studies*, 190, 5-13.
- Johannesson, K. (Ed.). (1990). *That was our way of life: Memories of Susan Lazzar Johnson, T'Sou-ke Elder*. Sooke: Sooke Region Museum.
- Johnston, A. & Lawson, A. (2000). Settler Colonies. In H. Schwarz & R. Sangeeta, Ray (Eds.), *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies* (pp. 360-376). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Jones, C. & Bosustow, S. (1981). *Queesto, Pacheenaht Chief by birthright*. Nanaimo: Theytus Books Ltd.

- Keddie, G. (1991, Autumn). The legend of Camosun. *Discovery*. Retrieved from <http://staff.royalbcmuseum.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/The-Legend-on-Camosun.-Keddie-1991.pdf>
- Keddie, G. (2003). *Songhees pictorial: A history of the Songhees People as seen by outsiders, 1790-1912*. Victoria: Royal BC Museum.
- Keil, R. & Kipfer, S. (2003). The urban experience and globalization. In W. Clement & L.F. Vosko (Eds.), *Changing Canada: Political economy as transformation* (pp. 335-362). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Kellogg, P. (2008, Fall). Of nails and needles: A reconsideration of the political economy of Canadian trade. *Socialist Studies/Études Socialistes*. doi: 10.18740/S41W2W
- Kellogg, P. (2015a). *Escape from the staple trap: Canadian political economy after left nationalism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kellogg, P. (2015b, Fall). Prairie capitalism revisited: Canada, bitumen, and the resource colony question. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 49(3), 222-255.
- Kheraj, S. (2013). *Inventing Stanley Park: An environmental history*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- King, T. (2012). *The inconvenient Indian: A curious account of Native people in North America*. Doubleday Canada.
- Knight, R. (1996). *Indians at work: Native people in the BC labour force, 1860-1930*. Vancouver: New Star Books (Original work published 1978).
- Knighton, J.R. (2004). *The Oral History of the 1852 Saanich Douglas Treaty: A Treaty for Peace* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://web.uvic.ca/igov/research/pdfs/Janice%20Knighton%20CGP%20Aug.%202004.pdf>
- Koroscil, P.M. (2000). *British Columbia: Settlement history*. Burnaby: Department of Geography, Simon Fraser University.
- Lane, M.B. (2006). The role of planning in achieving indigenous land justice and community goals. *Land Use Policy*, 23, 385-394. doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2005.05.001
- Lanskail, D.A.S. (1984, February). Resource use conflicts: The forest industry perspective. In P.J. Dooling (Ed.), *Parks in British Columbia: Emerging realities* (pp.45-55). Proceedings of the Symposium on Parks in British Columbia at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

- Lawrence, B. (2004). *Real Indians and others: Mixed-blood urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Lawrence, B., & Dua, E. (2011). Decolonizing anti-racism. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagne (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (pp. 233–262). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Laxer, G. (2014). Alberta's sands, staples and traps. In J. Stanford (Ed.), *The staple theory @ 50: Reflections on the lasting significance of Mel Watkins' "A Staple Theory of Economic Growth"* (pp. 53-57). Retrieved from https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/03/Staple_Theory_at_50.pdf
- Layland, M. (2016). *A perfect Eden: Encounters by early explorers of Vancouver Island*. Touchwood Editions.
- Lee, T.V. (2010, Summer). "Glistening patches of gold": The environmental history of Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) on southern Vancouver Island, 1848-1950. *BC Studies*, 166, 39-54.
- Levitt, K. (1970). *Silent surrender: The multinational corporation in Canada*. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada.
- Lillard, C. (1993). Seven shillings a year: The history of Vancouver Island (2nd ed.). Ganges: Horsdal & Schubart.
- Little, J.I. (2011, Autumn). Vancouver's playground: Leisure and sociability on Bowen Island, 1902-57. *BC Studies*, 171, 37-68.
- Lloyd, D. & Wolfe, P. (2016) Settler colonial logics and the neoliberal regime. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 6(2), 109-118. doi: 10.1080/2201473X.2015.1035361
- Lutz, J.S. (2008). *Makúk: A new history of Aboriginal-White relations*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Macfie, M. (1972). Vancouver Island and British Columbia: Their history, resources, and prospects. Toronto: Coles Publishing (Original work published 1865).
- Mackie, R.S. (1992-1993, Winter). The colonization of Vancouver Island, 1849-1858. *BC Studies*, 96, 3-40.
- Mackie, R.S. (1995). *The wilderness profound: Victorian life on the Gulf of Georgia*. Victoria: Sono Nis Press.
- Mackie, R.S. (1997). *Trading beyond the mountains: The British fur trade on the Pacific 1793-1843*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

- Mackie, R.S. (2000). *Island timber: A social history of the Comox Logging Company, Vancouver Island*. Victoria: Sono Nis Press.
- Mackie, R.S. (2009). *Mountain timber: The Comox Logging Company in the Vancouver Island mountains*. Victoria: Sono Nis Press.
- Mackintosh, W.A. (1923, March). Economic factors in Canadian history. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 4(1), 12-25.
- Mackey, E. (2000). "Death by landscape:" Race, nature, and gender in Canadian nationalist mythology. *Canadian Woman Studies / Les Cahiers De La Femme*, 20(2), 125-130.
- Mackey, E. (2002). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mackey, E. (2014). Unsettling expectations: (Un)certainty, settler states of feeling, law, and decolonization. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society / Revue Canadienne Droit et Société*, 29(2), 235-252. doi:10.1017/cls.2014.10
- Mackey, E. (2016). *Unsettled expectations: Uncertainty, land and settler decolonization*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- MacLachlan, D.F. (1986). *The Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway: The Dunsmuir years, 1884-1905*. Victoria: B.C. Railway Historical Association/B.C. Heritage Trust.
- Macoun, A. & Strakosch, E. (2013). The ethical demands of settler colonial theory. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 3(3-4), 426-443. doi: 10.1080/2201473X.2013.810695
- Macpherson, C.B. (1973). *Democratic theory: Essays in retrieval*. London: Clarendon Press.
- Macpherson, C.B. (1978). *Property: Mainstream and critical positions*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Major, C. & Winters, T. (2013). Community by necessity: Security, insecurity, and the flattening of class in Fort McMurray, Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 38(2), 141-165.
- Mandell, L. (1984). The Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs fights patriation. *Socialist Studies: A Canadian Annual*, 2, 173-180.
- Manuel, A. & Derrickson, R.M. (2015). *Unsettling Canada: A national wake-up call*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

- Manuel, G. & Posluns, M. (1974). *The fourth world: An Indian reality*. Collier-Macmillan Canada.
- Marchak, P. (1983). *Green gold: The forest industry in British Columbia*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Marchak, P. (1988-1989, Winter). What happens when common property becomes uncommon? *BC Studies*, 80, 3-23.
- Marchak, P, Aycock, S.L., & Herbert, D.M. (1999). *Falldown: Forest policy in British Columbia*. Vancouver: David Suzuki Foundation.
- Marker, M. (2001, Spring). Stories of fish and people: Oral tradition and the environmental crisis. *BC Studies*, 129, 79-85.
- Marshall, D. (1999). *Those who fell from the sky: A history of the Cowichan Peoples*. Duncan: Cowichan Tribes.
- Marx, K. (1977). *Capital: Volume one* (B. Fowkes, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Marx, K. (1932). *The German Ideology*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/index.htm>
- Massey, D (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mawani, R. (2003a). Imperial legacies (post)colonial identities: Law, space, and the making of Stanley Park, 1859-2001. *Law/Text/Culture*, 7(1), 98-141.
- Mawani, R. (2003b). Legal geographies of Aboriginal segregation in British Columbia: The making and unmaking of the Songhees reserve, 1850–1911. In C. Strange & A. Bashford (Eds.), *Isolation: places and practices of exclusion* (pp. 163-180). London: Routledge.
- Mawani, R. (2006). From colonialism to multiculturalism?: Totem poles, tourism, and national identity in Vancouver's Stanley Park. *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature, (Special Issue on Law, Literature and Postcoloniality)*, 35(1-2), 31-57.
- Mawani, R. (2010). *Colonial proximities: Crossracial encounters and juridical truths in British Columbia, 1871-1921*. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- McNally, D. (1981, Autumn). Staples theory as commodity fetishism: Marx, Innis, and Canadian political economy. *Studies in Political Economy*, 6(1): 35-63. doi: 10.1080/19187033.1981.11675700
- Merriman, A. & Merriman, T. (1975). *Logging road travel: Volume one, Victoria to Campbell River* (Rev. ed.). Sidney: Saltire Publishing Ltd.

- Merchant, C. (1996). Reinventing Eden: Western culture as a recovery narrative. In W. Cronon (Ed.), *Uncommon ground: rethinking the human place in nature* (pp. 132-170). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Millar, L. (2006, Spring). Touchstones: Considering the relationship between memory and archives. *Archivaria*, 61, 105-126.
- Mills, S., & Sweeney, B. (2013). Employment relations in the neostaples resource economy: Impact benefit agreements and Aboriginal governance in Canada's nickel mining industry. *Studies in Political Economy*, 91(1), 7-34. doi: 10.1080/19187033.2013.11674980
- Moore, E.A. & Toov, R. (2015, Autumn). The Minnesota seaside station near Port Renfrew, British Columbia. *BC Studies*, 187, 291-302.
- Morales, S.N. (2014). *Snuw'uyulh: Fostering an understanding of the Hul'qumi'num legal tradition* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1828/6106>
- Morgensen, S.L. (2011). *Spaces between us: Queer settler colonialism and Indigenous decolonization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morgensen, S.L. (2014, May 26). White settlers and Indigenous solidarity: Confronting white supremacy, answering decolonial alliances [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://decolonization.wordpress.com/2014/05/26/white-settlers-and-indigenous-solidarity-confronting-white-supremacy-answering-decolonial-alliances/>
- Mouat, J. (2005, Spring). Situating Vancouver Island in the British world, 1846-49. *BC Studies*, 145, 5-30.
- Murphyao, A. & Black, K. (2015). Unsettling settler belonging: (Re)naming and territory making in the Pacific Northwest. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 45(3), 1-17. doi: 10.1080/02722011.2015.1063523
- Murray, D. (2013). Equitable claims and future considerations: Road building and colonization in early Ontario, 1850–1890. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association / Revue de la Société historique du Canada*, 24(2), 156-188. doi: 10.7202/1025077ar
- Muir, J.L. & Vamosi, J.C. (2015). Invasive Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*, Fabaceae) and the pollination success of three Garry oak-associated plant species. *Biological Invasions*, 17, 2429–2446. doi: 10.1007/s10530-015-0886-3
- Newell, D. (1993). *Tangled webs of history: Indians and the law in Canada's Pacific coast fisheries*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Norcross, E.B. & Tonkin, D.F. (1969). *Frontier days of Vancouver Island*. Courtenay: Island Books.
- Norcross, E.B. (1975). *The Warm Land: A history of Cowichan* (Rev. ed.). Duncan: Island Books.
- Norcross, E.B. (Ed.). (1983). *The company on the coast*. Nanaimo: Nanaimo Historical Society.
- Norcross, E.B. (1986). Section III: Then came the railway. The period 1887-1900. In The Pioneer Researchers (Eds.), *Memories never lost: Stories of the pioneer women of the cowichan Valley and a brief history of the valley 1850-1920* (pp. 140-146). Altona: D.W. Friesen & Sons Ltd.
- Olsen, W.H. (1963). *Water over the wheel*. Chemainus: Chemainus Valley Historical Society.
- Ormsby, M. (1958). *British Columbia: A history*. Vancouver: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited.
- Palmer, B.D. (2006). Historical materialism and the writing of Canadian history: A dialectical view. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association / Revue de la Société historique du Canada*, 17(2), 2006, 33-60. doi: 10.7202/016589ar
- Panitch, L. (Ed.). (1977). *The Canadian state: Political economy and political power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Parfitt, B. (2008, July). *Restoring the public good on private forestlands*. Vancouver: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Pasternak, S. (2014). Occupy(ed) Canada: The political economy of Indigenous dispossession. In Kino-nda-niimi Collective (Eds.), *The winter we danced: voices from the past, the future, and the Idle No More movement*, 40-43. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Pasternak, S. (2016). The fiscal body of sovereignty: To ‘make live’ in Indian country. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 6(4), 317-338. doi: 10.1080/2201473X.2015.1090525
- Peake, L. & Ray, B. (2001). Racializing the Canadian landscape: Whiteness, uneven geographies and social justice. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, 45(1), 180-186. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0064.2001.tb01183.x
- Pearson, S. (2013). “The Last Bastion of Colonialism:” Appalachian settler colonialism and self-indigenization.” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 37(2), 165-84.
- Perry, A. (2001). *On the edge of empire: Gender, race, and the making of British*

Columbia, 1849-1871. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Perry, A. (2015). *Colonial relations: The Douglas-Connolly family and the nineteenth-century imperial world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peterson, J. (2002). *Black diamond city: Nanaimo – the Victorian era*. Surrey: Heritage House.

Petter, A. (1985, Spring). Sausage making in British Columbia's NDP government: The creation of the Land Commission Act, August 1972-April 1973. *BC Studies*, 65, 3-33.

Phung, M. (2011). Are people of colour settlers too? In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagne (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: reconciliation through the lens of cultural diversity* (pp. 289-298). Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Pillow, W.S. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure: The use of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175-196.

Piterberg, G. & Veracini, L. (2015). Wakefield, Marx, and the world turned inside out. *Journal of Global History*, 10(3), 457–478. doi:10.1017/S1740022815000224

Porter-Bopp, S. (2006). *Colonial Natures? Wilderness and culture in Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve and Haida Heritage Site*. (Unpublished major paper). York University, Toronto.

Pratt, L. (1982). Energy: The roots of National Policy. *Studies in Political Economy*, 7(1), 27-59. doi: 10.1080/19187033.1982.11675694

Preston, J. (2013). Neoliberal settler colonialism, Canada and the tar sands. *Race & Class*, 55(2), 42-59. doi:10.1177/0306396813497877

Prudham, S. (2009). The moral economy of global forestry in rural British Columbia. In D. Brydon & W.D. Coleman (Eds.), *Renegotiating community: Interdisciplinary perspectives, global contexts* (pp. 83-102). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rajala, R. (1998). *Clearcutting the Pacific rain forest: Production, science, and regulation*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Ray, A.J. (1999). Introduction. In H.A. Innis, *The fur trade in Canada: An introduction to Canadian economic history* (pp.v-xix). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Razack, S. (2002). *Race, space and the law: Unmapping a white settler society*. Toronto: Between the Lines Press.

- Reed, M.G. (2003). *Taking stands: Gender and the sustainability of rural communities*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Reksten, T. (1986). "More English than the English": A very social history of Victoria. Victoria: Orca Book Publishers.
- Reksten, T. (1991). *The Dunsmuir Saga*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Reimer, C. (2000, Autumn). A sense of place: The local in British Columbia history. *BC Studies*, 127, 109-115.
- Reimer, C. (2001/2002, Winter). "Provincial in name only": The great birthday debate of 1926 and the early years of the British Columbia Historical Association. *British Columbia Historical News*, 35(1), 2-7.
- Reimer, C. (2009). *Writing British Columbia history, 1784-1958*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Richardson, B. (1993). *People of terra nullius: Betrayal and rebirth in Aboriginal Canada*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Rifkin, M. (2011). Settler states of feeling: National belonging and the erasure of Native American presence. In C.F. Levander & R.S. Levine (Eds.), *A companion to American Literary Studies* (pp. 342-355). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rifkin, M. (2013). Settler common sense. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 3(3-4), 322-340. doi: 10.1080/2201473X.2013.810702
- Rifkin, M. (2016). In search of my husband's gardens, or settler dreams of home [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/in-search-of-my-husbands-gardens-or-settler-dreams-of-home-mark-rifkin/>
- Roberts, J. (1937). *The origins of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway; A problem in British Columbia politics* (master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/831/items/1.0105546>
- Robertson, T. (n.d.). Review: Now you're logging. In H. White (Ed.), *Raincoast Chronicles No. 8* (p. 23). Madeira Park: Raincoast Historical Society.
- Rose, C. M. (1985). Possession as the origin of property. *Faculty Scholarship Series*. Paper 1830. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/fss_papers/1830
- Rosenwein, B. (2002). Worrying about emotions in history. *The American Historical Review*, 107(3), 821-845. doi: 10.1086/532498

- Rosenzweig, R. & Blackmar, E. (1992). *The park and the people: A history of Central Park*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rossiter, D. & Wood, P.K. (2005). Fantastic topographies: Neo-liberal responses to Aboriginal land claims in British Columbia. *The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien*, 49(4), 352–366
- Rossiter, D.A. (2007). Lessons in possession: Colonial resource geographies in practice on Vancouver Island, 1859-1865. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 33, 770-790. doi: 10.1016/j.jhg.2006.12.001
- Rowse, T. (2014). Indigenous heterogeneity. *Australian Historical Studies*, 45:3, 297-310. doi: 10.1080/1031461X.2014.946523
- Roy, P. (1990, Fall). Aspects of British Columbia. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 25(3), 3-4.
- Roy, P. (2011/2012, Winter). McBride of McKenna-McBride: Premier Richard McBride and the Indian question in British Columbia. *BC Studies*, 172, 35-76.
- Roy, P. (2012). *Boundless optimism: Richard McBride's British Columbia*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, Pantheon Books.
- Sandwell, R.W. (2005). *Contesting rural space: Land policy and practices of resettlement on Saltspring Island, 1859-1891*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Schefke, B. (2008). The Hudson's Bay Company as a context for science in the Columbia Department. *Scientia Canadensis: Canadian Journal of the History of Science, Technology and Medicine / Scientia Canadensis: revue canadienne d'histoire des sciences, des techniques et de la médecine*, 31(1-2), 67-84. doi: 10.7202/019755ar
- Schneider, L. (2013). "There's Something in the Water:" Salmon runs and settler colonialism on the Columbia River. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 37(2), 149–63.
- Scott, J.W. (1991, Summer). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry*, 17, 773-797.
- Seed, P. (1995). *Ceremonies of possession in Europe's conquest of the New World, 1492-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sedgwick, E. (2003). *Touching feeling: affect, pedagogy, performativity*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Seigworth, G. (2016). Like a refrain. *Cultural Studies*, 30(6), 873-874. doi: 10.1080/09502386.2016.1232680

Siegel, A. (2007). Northrop Frye and the Toronto School of communication theory. In M. Blondheim & R. Watson (Eds.), *The Toronto School of Communication Theory: Interpretations, Extensions, Applications* (pp. 114-144). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sierra Club of British Columbia. (1980). *The West Coast Trail and Nitinat Lakes: A trail guide by the Sierra Club of British Columbia* (4th rev. ed.). Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre Ltd.

Simpson, Audra. (2011). Settlement's secret. *Cultural Anthropology*, 26(2): 205-17. doi: 10.1111/j.1548-1360.2011.01095.x

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Simpson, A. (2016a). The state is a man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the gender of settler sovereignty. *Theory & Event*, 19(4), n.p.

Sloan Morgan, V. & Castleden, H. (2014). An exploration of Indigenous-settler relations in the Port Alberni Valley, British Columbia regarding implementation of the 2011 Maa-nulth Treaty. *The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien*, 58(4), 469-480. doi: 10.1111/cag.12120

Smith, A. (2010). Queer theory and Native studies: The heteronormativity of settler colonialism. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 16(1), 42-68. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/372444>

Smith, N. (1984). *Uneven development: Nature, capital, and the production of space*. New York: Blackwell.

Snelgrove, C, Dhamoon, R.K, & Corntassel, J. (2014). Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3(2), 1-32.

Sooke and North Sooke Women's Institute. (1971). *Sooke – past and present*. Sooke: The Sooke and North Sooke Women's Institute.

Sparke, M. (1998). A map that roared and an original atlas: Canada, cartography, and the narration of nation. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 88(3), 463–495. doi:10.1111/0004-5608.00109

Spence, M.D. (1999). *Dispossessing the wilderness: Indian removal and the making of the national parks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spivak, G.C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.

Stanford, J. (Ed.). (2014). *The staple theory @ 50: Reflections on the lasting significance of Mel Watkins' "A Staple Theory of Economic Growth."* Retrieved from https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/03/Staple_Theory_at_50.pdf

Stanger-Ross, J. (2008, December). Municipal colonialism in Vancouver: City planning and the conflict over Indian reserves, 1928-1950s. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 89(4), 541-580. doi: 10.1353/can.0.0113

Stearns, P.N. & Stearns, C.Z. (1985, October). Emotionology: Clarifying the history of emotions and emotional standards. *The American Historical Review*, 90(4), 813-836.

Stefanick, L. (2001, Summer). Baby stumpy and the war in the woods: Competing frames of British Columbia forests. *BC Studies*, 130, 41-68.

Stoler, A.L. (2009). *Along the archival grain: Epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Strakosch, E. & Macoun, A. (2012). The vanishing endpoint of settler colonialism. *Arena Journal*, 37/38, 40-62.

Symons, T.H.B. (1975). *To know ourselves: The report of the Commission on Canadian Studies* (Volumes I & II). Retrieved from <http://deslibris.ca.ezproxy.viu.ca/ID/244924>

Taylor, W.A. (1975). *Crown land grants: A history of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway land grants, the railway belt and the Peace River block* (fourth reprint). Retrieved from BC Land Title and Survey Authority: <https://ltsa.ca/docs/Crown-Land-Grants-A-History-of-the-E-and-N.pdf>

Taylor, D. (2017). Botanical gardens and their role in the political economy of empire: Jamaica (1846-86). *Rural History*, 28(1), 47-68. doi:10.1017/S0956793316000169

The Pioneer Researchers. (Eds.). (1986). *Memories never lost: Stories of the pioneer women of the Cowichan Valley and a brief history of the valley 1850-1920*. Altona: D.W. Friesen & Sons Ltd.

Thrift, N. (2004). Intensities of feeling: Towards a spatial politics of affect. *Geografiska Annaler*, 86(1), 57-78. doi: 10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00154.x

Thom, B. (2005). *Coast Salish senses of place: dwelling, meaning, power, property and territory in the Coast Salish World* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://viurrspace.ca/handle/10613/32>

Thom, B. (2009). The paradox of boundaries in Coast Salish territories. *cultural geographies*, 16(2), 179-205. doi: 10.1177/1474474008101516

Thor Carlson, K. (2005). Rethinking dialogue and history: The King's promise and the 1906 Aboriginal delegation to London. *Native Studies Review*, 16(2), 1-38.

Travers, O.R. (1993). Forest policy: Rhetoric and reality. In K. Drushka, B. Nixon, & R. Travers (Eds.), *Touch wood: BC forests at the crossroads* (pp. 171-224). Madeira Park: Harbour Publishing.

Tuck, E. & Yang, K.W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-40.

Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs. (2005). *Stolen lands, broken promises: Researching the Indian land question in British Columbia* (2nd ed.). Vancouver: Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs.

Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs. (1975). *Our homes are bleeding*. Victoria: UBCIC Land Claims Centre. Retrieved from http://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/ubcic/legacy_url/536/ourhomesarebleeding.pdf?1426350400

Van Kirk, S. (1980). *"Many tender ties": Women in fur-trade society, 1670-1870*. Winnipeg: Watson & Dwyer Publishing Ltd.

Van Kirk, S. (1997-1998, Autumn/Winter). Tracing the fortunes of five founding families of Victoria. *BC Studies*, 115/116, 149-180.

Veracini, L. (2008). Settler collective, founding violence and disavowal: The settler colonial situation. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 29(4), 363-379. doi:10.1080/07256860802372246

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism: A theoretical overview*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Veracini, L. (2014a). Understanding colonialism and settler colonialism as distinct formations. *Interventions*, 16(5), 615-633. doi: 10.1080/1369801X.2013.858983

Veracini, L. (2014b). Defending settler colonial studies. *Australian Historical Studies*, 45(3), 311-316. doi: 10.1080/1031461X.2014.946526

- Veracini, L. (2016). Afterword: A history of the settler colonial present. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 6(2), 174-179. doi: 10.1080/00048623.2015.1024304
- Verspoor, F. (2012). *The Fort Victoria and other Vancouver Island Treaties, 1850-1854 (BC Archives MS-0772)*. Retrieved from Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives website: <http://royalbcmuseum.bc.ca/assets/FortVictoriaTreaties.pdf>
- Vowel, C. (2016, December 7). Weaponizing the duty to consult: Old Harry. [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://apihtawikosisan.com/2016/12/weaponizing-the-duty-to-consult-old-harry/>
- Wagner, J.R. (2008). Landscape aesthetics, water, and settler colonialism in the Okanagan Valley of British Columbia. *Journal of Ecological Anthropology*, 12(1), 22-38. doi: 10.5038/2162-4593.12.1.2
- Warburton, R. (1997). Status, class and the politics of Canadian Aboriginal Peoples. *Studies in Political Economy*, 54(1), 119-141. doi: 10.1080/19187033.1997.11675311
- Watkins, M. (Ed.). (1977). *Dene Nation: The colony within*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Watkins, M. (2006a). A staple theory of economic growth. In H. Grant & D. Wolfe (Eds.), *Staples and beyond: Selected writings of Mel Watkins* (pp. 5-29). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press (Original work published 1963).
- Watkins, M. (2006b). The staple theory revisited. In H. Grant & D. Wolfe (Eds.), *Staples and beyond: Selected writings of Mel Watkins* (pp. 30-50). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press (Original work published 1977).
- Watkins, M. (2006c). The Dene Nation: from underdevelopment to development. In H. Grant & D. Wolfe (Eds.), *Staples and beyond: Selected writings of Mel Watkins* (pp. 51-70). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press (Original work published 1977).
- Watkins, M. (2007, Spring). Comment: Staples redux. *Studies in Political Economy*, 79(1), 213-226. doi: 10.1080/19187033.2007.11675098
- Watkins, M. (2014). Rejoinder: Bitumen as a staple. In J. Stanford (Ed.), *The staple theory @ 50: Reflections on the lasting significance of Mel Watkins' "A Staple Theory of Economic Growth"* (pp. 127-133). Retrieved from https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/03/Staple_Theory_at_50.pdf
- Watson, S. (1999). Policing the affective society: Beyond governmentality in the theory of social control. *Social & Legal Studies*, 8(2), 227-251. doi: 10.1177/096466399900800204

Waypoint. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/waypoint>

Wickham, L. (2012). *Gardens in history: A political perspective*. Havertown: Windgather Press.

Wickwire, W. (1994, March). To see ourselves as the Other's other: Nlaka'pamux contact narratives. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 75(1), 1-20.

Wickwire, W. (1998, June). 'We shall drink from the stream and so shall you': James A. Teit and Native resistance in British Columbia, 1908-22. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 79(2), 199-236.

Wildcat, M. (2015). Fearing social and cultural death: genocide and elimination in settler colonial Canada - an Indigenous perspective. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 17(4), 391-409. doi: 10.1080/14623528.2015.1096579

Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, J. (1987/1988, Winter). Forest conservation in British Columbia, 1935-85: Reflections on a barren political debate. *BC Studies*, 76, 3-32.

Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler colonialism and the transformation of Anthropology: The politics and poetics of an ethnographic event*. London: Continuum.

Wolfe, P. (2001). Land, labor, and difference: Elementary structures of race. *The American Historical Review*, 106(3), 866-905.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387-409. doi: 10.1080/14623520601056240

Wolfe, P. (2013). The settler complex: An introduction. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 37(2), 1-22.

Wynn, G. (2004, Summer/Autumn). "Shall we linger along ambitionless?" Environmental perspectives on British Columbia. *BC Studies*, 142/143, 5-67.

Yard, J.D. (2012). *Working natures: An ethnography of love, labour, and accumulation on the British Columbian coast* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/1323837598?accountid=12246>

Young, P.L. (2011, Summer). Creating a “Natural Asset”: British Columbia's first park, Strathcona, 1905-16. *BC Studies*, 170, 17-39.

Zelko, F. (2004, Summer/Autumn). Making Greenpeace: The development of direct action environmentalism in British Columbia. *BC Studies*, 142/143, 197-239.

Primary Sources

Advice to critics: Park the protest. (1995, July 20). *Times-Colonist*. [Editorial]. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/345563861/abstract/6ACE5FA8677B4641PQ/1>

Ancient Forest Alliance. (2014, April 24). “*Big Lonely Doug*” officially measured and confirmed as Canada’s 2nd largest Douglas-fir tree. Retrieved from <http://www.ancientforestalliance.org/news-item.php?ID=782>

Angus Mackenzie and others v Bing Kee (British Columbia), UKPC 88 (1919). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1919/1919_88.html

Armour, R. (2014, October 3). Ladysmith council votes against boundary proposal. *Nanaimo Daily News*. Retrieved from <http://www.nanaimodailynews.com/news/300469031.html?mobile=true>

Bainas, L. (2003, July 9). TimberWest wants to talk. *Cowichan Valley Citizen*, p. 12. [Newspaper article]. Clipping files (Loc. lumber & sawmills). Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives, Duncan.

Baines, D. (2017, June 9). Opinion. Farmland speculation: The buck stops with municipal politicians. *The Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved from <http://vancouversun.com/opinion/op-ed/opinion-farmland-speculation-the-buck-stops-with-municipal-politicians>

Balcom, S. (1988, February 27). A view to retirement. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. C1. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/243666791?accountid=12246>

Balcom, S. (1988, June 18). Place with everything out of nothing. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. D1. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/243636330?accountid=12246>

BC Parks. (n.d.). *A History of BC Parks*. Retrieved from <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/events/history/>

BC Treaty Commission. (2017). *About Us*. Retrieved from <http://www.bctreaty.ca/about-us>

Bedard, A. (2010, March 25). Ancient forests and new advocates. Old-growth advocates plan new protests as Earth Day passes. *The Ubyyssey*. Retrieved from <http://www.ancientforestalliance.org/news-item.php?ID=89>

Bekolay, N. (2013, May 15). TimberWest considers trading watershed lands for residential development in CVRD's north end. *Cowichan News Leader Pictorial*. Retrieved from <http://www.cowichannewsleader.com/news/207639591.html>

Bigelow, G.C. (1916). *Claim 7*. [Testimony]. British Columbia Commission of Inquiry Into Claims Re: Lands Within the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Land Belt (GR 0791, Box 1, File 10). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

Black, K. [Kelly Black]. (2014b, August 21). Abandoned, then embraced: the Kinsol Trestle [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/N0SYqi7a4yo>

Bombadil, T. (2011, May 24). About Ender Ilkay [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://marinetraillresort.blogspot.ca/2011/05/about-ender-ilkay.html>

British Columbia. (n.d.). *Resource roads*. Retrieved from <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/natural-resource-use/resource-roads>

British Columbia. (1883, June 28). Land grant issued to Manley, W.G. [Crown land grant]. Crown Land Registry - Government Access Tool for Online Retrieval (Volume 0013, Grant Number 2666, Document Number 2666/13, Land District Shawnigan). Retrieved from <http://a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/gator/crowngrantdetail.do?grantId=002302>

British Columbia. (1910). *Royal Commission of Inquiry on Timber and Forestry 1909-1910*. Retrieved from http://www.llbc.leg.bc.ca/public/pubdocs/bcdocs_rc/328209/328209_final_report_rc_timber_forestry.pdf

British Columbia. (1912). *Report of the Forest Branch of the Department of Lands for the year ending December 31st 1912*. Retrieved from https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/pubs/docs/mr/annual/ar_1911-30/annual_1912.pdf

British Columbia. (1922, August 2). Land grant issued to Walton, L.F. [Crown land grant]. Crown Land Registry - Government Access Tool for Online Retrieval (Volume 0476, Grant Number 0550, Document Number 550/476, Land District Shawnigan). Retrieved from <http://a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/gator/crowngrantdetail.do?grantId=058266>

British Columbia. (1974). *Certificate of incorporation, BC Forest Museum*. [Societies Act]. Heritage Conservation Branch (GR 2940, Box 5, File 24). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. (1976). *Royal Commission on Forest Resources Timber Rights and Forest Policy in British Columbia: Report of the Royal Commission on Forest Resources*. Retrieved from <http://www.llbc.leg.bc.ca/public/pubdocs/bcdocs/318064/index.htm>

British Columbia. Archaeology Branch. (2001, March). *Culturally modified trees of British Columbia: A handbook for the identification and recording of culturally modified trees* (v. 2.0). Retrieved from <https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/pubs/docs/mr/mr091/cmthandbook.pdf>

British Columbia. Auditor General. (2008, July). *Removing private land from tree farm licences 6, 19 & 25: Protecting the public interest?* Retrieved from <http://www.bcauditor.com/pubs/2008/report5/removing-private-land-tree-farm-licences>

British Columbia. BC Stats. (n.d.). *Forestry*. Retrieved from <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/business-industry-trade/industry/forestry>

British Columbia. BC Stats. (2007, October). *Exports, October 2007*. Retrieved from <http://www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/Files/1272b872-0506-4285-95f7-616ed29ea3e3/BCsCommodityExportsAreStillLargelyForest-Based.pdf>

British Columbia. BC Stats. (2016). *British Columbia employment by detailed industry, annual averages*. Retrieved from <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/employment-labour/labour-market-statistics>

British Columbia. Commission of Inquiry Into Claims Re: Lands Within the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Land Belt. (1916). *Records with regard to Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway belt lands* [Textual records]. GR-0791. Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Commission on Forest Resources. (1943-1945). *Commission on Forest Resources (1943-1945)*. [Textual materials]. GR 0520. Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Department of Lands and Works. (1863, November 12). *William Manley: Shawnigan District*. [Pre-emption record]. *Pre-emption records* (GR 0766, Box 4, File 94). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Department of Lands and Works. (1870, June 6). *William Manley: Shawnigan District*. [Pre-emption record]. *Pre-emption records* (GR 0766, Box 9, File 55). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Department of Lands and Works. (1871-1883). *Commissioner's correspondence*. [Microfilm]. GR 0868. Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Heritage Conservation Branch. (1960-1983). *Administrative and site files*. [Textual materials]. GR 2940. Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Land Settlement Board. (1916-1967). *Land Settlement Board records*. [Textual materials, cartographic drawing, multiple media]. GR 0929. Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Land Settlement Board. (1919). *Report of Development Area #1* [Report]. Land Settlement Board Records (GR 0929, Volume 41, File 2). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Land Settlement Board. (1919). *Community Record*. [Report]. Land Settlement Board Records (GR 0929, Volume 41, File 2). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Legislative Assembly. (1884a). *Petition against Settlement Bill - Nanaimo*. [Sessional papers]. Sessional Papers of the Province of British Columbia. doi: 10.14288/1.0060633

British Columbia. Legislative Assembly. (1884b). *Petition against Settlement Bill - Comox*. [Sessional papers]. Sessional Papers of the Province of British Columbia. doi: 10.14288/1.0060411

British Columbia. Legislative Assembly. (1884c, January 14). *Monday, 14th January, 1884*. [Archived Journals of the Legislative Assembly]. Legislative Assembly of BC (Volume XIII, Journals 1883 to 1884, pp. 1 to 78). Retrieved from http://archives.leg.bc.ca/civix/document/id/leg_archives/legarchives/1191950191

British Columbia, Ministry of Community Services. (2006). *Primer on regional districts in British Columbia*. Retrieved from https://www.regionaldistrict.com/media/28095/Primer_on_Regional_Districts_in_BC.pdf

British Columbia. Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks. (1992). *Botanical Beach Provincial Park master plan*. North Vancouver: Malahat District, South Coast Region.

British Columbia. Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division. (1912-1979). *British Columbia parks records*. [Microfilm]. GR 1991. Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division. (1958, July - 1963, December). *China Beach Park*. [Microfilm]. Department of Recreation and Conservation/Parks Branch (GR 1991, Reel Number B01826, Parks Reel Number 104, File 2-6-1-78, Section 1). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division. (1959, August - 1974, November). *Sooke Potholes Park*. [Microfilm]. Department of Recreation and Conservation/Parks Branch (GR 1991, Reel Number B01768, Parks Reel Number 46, File 2-6-1-58, Section 1). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division. (1945, December - 1973, December). *Koksilah River Park*. [Microfilm]. Department of Recreation and Conservation/Parks Branch (GR 1991, Reel Number B01826, Parks Reel Number 104, File 2-6-1-36, Section 1). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division. (1936-1985). *British Columbia parks records*. [Textual materials]. GR 1614. Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division. (1970-1975). *Mill Bay Beach*. [Textual materials]. Department of Recreation and Conservation/Parks Branch (GR 1614, Box 21, File 1-6-1-74). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division. (1959). *Sandcut Creek*. [Textual materials]. Department of Recreation and Conservation/Parks Branch (GR 1614, Box 21, File 1-6-1-79). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division. (1936-1985). *British Columbia parks records*. [Textual materials]. GR 1614. Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Premier. (1883-1933). Premier's Papers. [Textual records]. GR 0441. Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

British Columbia. Public Issues and Consultation Branch. (1994, August). *Aboriginal Affairs. Attitudes towards land claims focus group research - final report. Angus Reid Group (Vancouver)*. [Photocopy, textual material]. Opinion polls and consumer and commercial surveys (GR 2964, Box 10, File 5). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

British Foreign Office. (1849). *Vancouver's Island*. [Charter to Vancouver Island and resolutions of the Hudson's Bay Company]. National Archives of the UK (CO 305/1, p. 635). Retrieved from <http://bcgenesis.uvic.ca/getDoc.htm?id=V495PA03.scx>

Calder v. British Columbia (Attorney-General), SCR 313 (1973).

Canada. Privy Council. (1873, June 5). *Canadian Pacific Railway - Committee of Council on memo of [chief] engineer, 29 May, [recommends] that Esquimalt in Vancouver Island be fixed as the terminus of the railway and that application be made to the Government of [British] Columbia for conveyance*. [Order in Council]. Library and Archives Canada

(RG2, Privy Council Office, Series A-1-a, For Order in Council see volume 311, Reel C-3305, Access Code 90). Retrieved from <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/databases/orders/001022-110.01-e.php?PHPSESSID=luonulugmanagcskv6i6hg8qe7&q1=&q2=esquimalt&q3=&interval=20>

Canada. Department of the Interior. (1897, December 21). *British Columbia claims. Report of T.G. Rothwell, Commissioner, on claims of settlers in Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway belt, B.C.* Retrieved from http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2016/bcp-pco/Z1-1896-5-eng.pdf

Canada. Privy Council. (1904, June 14). *Act of British Columbia resp'g [respecting] rights of settlers in Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Belt and petition of Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry [Railway] Co for disallowance thereof - Act left to its operation - Min Justice. [Minister of Justice]. [Order in Council].* Library and Archives Canada (RG2, Privy Council Office, Series A-1-a, For Order in Council see volume 875, Access Code 90). Retrieved from http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/databases/orders/001022-119.01-e.php?&sisn_id_nbr=102426&page_sequence_nbr=1&interval=20&&PHPSESSID=luonulugmanagcskv6i6hg8qe7

Canada. (1916a). *Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia.* Retrieved from <http://publications.gc.ca/pub?id=9.828361&sl=0>

Canada. (1916b). *Confidential report of the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia.* Retrieved from http://www.llbc.leg.bc.ca/public/pubdocs/bcdocs_rc/326024/326024_rc_indian_affairs_confidential_report.pdf

Canada. (1916c). *Interim report No. 78, Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia.* Retrieved from <http://gsdl.ubcic.bc.ca/cgi-bin/library.cgi?e=q-00000-00---off-0interimr--00-0---0-10-0---0---0direct-10---4-----0-11--11-en-50---20-about-timber--00-0-1-00-0--4---0-0-11-10-0utfZz-8-00&a=d&c=interimr&srp=0&srn=0&cl=search&d=HASH35fd9c38a6efee519c6258.26>

Canada. Royal Commission on Imperial Trade. (1916d, September 21). *Minutes of evidence, of the Dominion's Royal Commission at Victoria on 21 Sep 1916 concerning land settlement and irrigation.* [Testimony]. Commission on Forest Resources (GR 0520, Box 10, File 10, Exhibit 135). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

Canada. Privy Council. (1918, May 30). *Minute of a Meeting of the Committee of the Privy Council.* [Meeting minutes]. Commission on Forest Resources (GR 0520, Box 10, File 11). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

Capital Regional District. (1982). *Regional parks: Directions for the 80's* (2nd ed.). Victoria: Capital Regional District.

Capital Regional District. (1987, May). *Official regional parks plan: CRD Bylaw 1492, Schedule A*. Victoria: Capital Regional District.

Capital Regional District. (2007, February 21). *Report To The Regional Parks Committee*. Retrieved from <https://www.crd.bc.ca/about/document-library/Documents/committeedocuments/regionalparkscommittee/20070221>

Capital Regional District. (2008, December 23). *CRD Returns to Former Land Use Subdivision Bylaw for Planning in the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area*. Retrieved from <https://www.crd.bc.ca/about/news/2008/12/23/subdivision-bylaw-jdf>

Capital Regional District. (2011, February 15). *Report To The Juan De Fuca Land Use Committee*. Retrieved from <https://www.crd.bc.ca/about/document-library/Documents/committeedocuments/juandefucalandusecommittee/20110215>

Capital Regional District. (2012, April 18). *Report to the Regional Parks Committee*. Retrieved from https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/crd-document-library/committeedocuments/regionalparkscommittee/20120418/2012-04-18---item-14-jordan-river-regional-park-reserve-boundary---public-consultation-summary-reportR.pdf?sfvrsn=b93440cb_0

Capital Regional District. (2012, Winter). *Jordan River Regional Park Reserve public consultation*. Victoria: Capital Regional District – Regional Parks.

Charles Wilson and others v The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company (British Columbia), UKPC 113 (1921). Retrieved from: http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1921/1921_113.html

Chek News. [Chek]. (2011, October 4). Port Renfrew dispute (September 24, 2011) [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bPTbj1ln984&t=5s>

Civic Info BC. (n.d.). *Local government elections 2008*. Retrieved from <http://www.elections.civicinfo.bc.ca/2008/reports/referendum.asp>

Clarke, M. (2012, July 10). Timberwest signs, gates spring up to block access to backcountry. *Comox Valley Record* [Letter to the editor]. Retrieved from <http://www.comoxvalleyrecord.com/opinion/timberwest-signs-gates-spring-up-to-block-access-to-backcountry/>

Coastal Invasive Species Committee. (2016). *Priority Invasive Plant List*. Retrieved from http://www.coastalisc.com/images/Plants/2016_Coastal_ISC_Priority_Plant_List_web.pdf

Cockburn, B. (1988). If a tree falls. On *Big Circumstance*. Golden Mountain Music Corp.

Coleman, R. (2007, October 27). "Removal of land from tree farm licences on Vancouver Island." British Columbia. Legislative Assembly. *Hansard*. 38th Parliament, 3rd session. Retrieved from <https://www.leg.bc.ca/documents-data/debate-transcripts/38th-parliament/3rd-session/H71022p>

Colliers International. (2010). *South Island portfolio*. Retrieved from <http://www.uniqueproperties.ca>

Collins, L. (2017, April 18). AVICC passes resolution to clear broom. *Parksville Qualicum Beach News*. Retrieved from <http://www.pqbnews.com/news/avicc-passes-resolution-to-clear-broom/>

Cowichan as ever, true as steel. (1883, November 30). *The Daily British Colonist*, p. 2. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/stream/dailycolonist18831130uvic/18831130>

The Cowichan Expedition. (1862 August 22). *The Daily British Colonist*, p. 3. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/stream/dailycolonist18620822uvic/18620822>

Cowichan Valley Regional District. (n.d.). *Our Regional District*. Retrieved from <https://www.cvrld.bc.ca/2379/Our-Regional-District>

Cowichan Valley Regional District. (2008). *Regional parkland acquisition fund: Fact sheet*. Duncan: Cowichan Valley Regional District.

Cowichan Valley Regional District. Development Services Department. (2009). *2008 year end report*. Duncan: Cowichan Valley Regional District.

Cowichan Valley Regional District. (2010, March 10). *Notice of Parks Committee Meeting*. Retrieved from <https://www.cvrld.bc.ca/Archive/ViewFile/Item/559>

D'Amour, M. (2009, February 21). TimberWest's big sell-off is now underway. *Cowichan News Leader Pictorial*, p. 8. [Newspaper article]. Clipping files (Loc.forestry; Land sales). Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives, Duncan.

David Hoggan v The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company (Canada), UKPC 29 (1894). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1894/1894_29.html

Delgamuukw v. British Columbia, 3 SCR 1010 (1997).

Dougan, J. (1875, November 14). *The Daily British Colonist*, p. 3. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/stream/dailycolonist18751114uvic/18751114>

Drew, L. (2007, May 18). Paldi concerns ignored. *Cowichan Valley Citizen*, p. 10. [Letter to the editor]. Clipping files (Loc. Paldi). Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives, Duncan.

Ebner, D. & Scoffield, H. (2006, March 29). Migration: Alberta becomes magnet for job seekers. *The Globe & Mail*, p. B9. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/1371116060?accountid=12246>

Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Company. (1909). *The timber, agricultural and industrial resources of Vancouver Island, British Columbia: a promising field for farming, fruit growing, dairying, lumbering, mining and fishing in the Esquimalt & Nanaimo railway belt*. [Information pamphlet]. University of Alberta Libraries, CIHM Monograph Collection. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/cihm_99376

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v William Herbert Bainbridge (British Columbia), UKPC 35 (1896). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1896/1896_35.html

The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v H. W. Treat (British Columbia), UKPC 83 (1919). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1919/1919_83.html

The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v Elizabeth Dunlop (British Columbia), UKPC 100 (1919). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1919/1919_100.html

The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v Charles Wilson and another (British Columbia), UKPC 99 (1919). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1919/1919_99.html

The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v The Granby Consolidated Mining Smelting and Power Company Limited (British Columbia), UKPC 89 (1920). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1919/1919_89.html

The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company v Elizabeth Dunlop and others (British Columbia), UKPC 112 (1921). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1921/1921_112.html

Faulkner, I.C. (2008, October 6). *Are Western Forest Products' subdivision applications contrary to the public interest? Submissions of Sea-to-Sea Greenbelt Society to Mr. Bob Wylie, Provincial Approving Officer*. Retrieved from <http://www.elc.uvic.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Public-Interest-Submissions-Oct-6-20081.pdf>

F-C Loggers spare fir trees. (1989, May 10). *Cowichan Newsleader*. Retrieved from <https://www.cvrld.bc.ca/Archive/ViewFile/Item/559>

Felber, J.S., Taylor, V., & Zemek, E.J. (1983, July 12). *Sombrio. Proposal: That the Sombrio area be studied for designation as a park*. [Textual material]. Special Collections (FC3815 S575F4). University of Victoria, Victoria.

Flawith, V. (1996, October 8). Love for coast learned at Sombrio. *The Province*, p. A17. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/267564871?accountid=12246n>

Forest owner talks swap to preserve famed beach. (1987, June 26). *The Vancouver Sun*, p. F10. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/243762653?accountid=12246>

Garry, N. (1900). *Diary of Nicholas Garry, Deputy-Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company from 1822-1835: a detailed narrative of his travels in the Northwest Territories of British North America in 1821*. [Published diary]. University of Alberta Libraries, CIHM Monograph Collection. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/cihm_06955

Graff, J. Hollings, H., Chapman, T. & Lafortune, J. (1885, July 15). *Need for better communication, a wharf at Mill Bay and roads to the railway station*. [Letter to Premier Smithe]. Premier's Papers (GR 0441, Box 1, File 3). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

Hamilton, G. (2008, January 4). Brookfield to spin off timber asset; Profitable Island Timberlands to become part of Bermuda-based partnership. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. D3. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/243903083?accountid=12246>

Hamilton, G. (2011, May 26). First nations turn up the heat over TimberWest sale [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://blogs.vancouversun.com/2011/05/26/first-nations-turn-up-the-heat-over-timberwest-sale/>

Hanna, D. (1996, May 3). Love and hate on the: Juan de Fuca Marine Trail: Clearcut offends, but the ocean compensates. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. C8. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/243036609/abstract/E5040AAFE34C4E1EPQ/1>

Hansen, W. (2010, April 7). Just trying to make a living. *Sooke News Mirror* [Letter to the editor]. Retrieved from <https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/crd-document-library/committeedocuments/regionalparkscommittee/20100421/2010-04-21-agenda-item-5-ayum-cree-kapoor-sea-to-sea-sooke-potholes-regional-parks-management-plan-updateR.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

Hawthornthwaite, J.H.(1902, June 6). *Victoria Times article by MPP, Nanaimo City, "Settlers' Rights in the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Belt."* [Newspaper clipping]. Premier's Papers (GR 0441, Box 23, File 373/04). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

Howse, A.R. (1876, September 25). *Malahat route condemned as impractical for waggon*

Road. [Letter to Commissioner of Lands and Works]. Commissioner's correspondence (GR 0868, Reel B16902, Box 2, Folder 16, File 2244/76). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

Hul'qumi'num group joins referendum lawsuit. (2002, April 14). *Cowichan Valley Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/358150917?accountid=12246>

Hunter, J. (1994, June 7). Firms donate land for new provincial park. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. B3. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/243177645/abstract/E78E2BAFEB6B4EC9PQ/1>

Hupacasath First Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests) et al., British Columbia Supreme Court 1712 (2005).

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2010, September 15). *Reports – Canada*. Retrieved from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100034846/1100100034847#analysis>

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2013, July 15). *Comprehensive Claims*. Retrieved from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100030577/1100100030578>

Innes, S., Mark, B., Dexter, J., Gilbertson, A., & MacDannold, F. (2009, June). *Dear Rural Observer* [Letter to the editor]. *Rural Observer*, p. 15. Retrieved from <http://ruralobserver.com/wp-content/uploads/Issue2009-06.pdf>

Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. (2009). Report No 105/09, Petition 592-07, Admissibility, Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group, Canada (October 30, 2009). Washington, DC. <https://www.cidh.oas.org/annualrep/2009eng/Canada592.07eng.htm>

Invasive Species Council of BC. (2014). *Scotch Broom*. Retrieved from <http://bcinvasives.ca/invasive-species/identify/invasive-plants/scotch-broom>

Kimantas, J. (2007, November 26). Public is not aware of treaty's real cost. *Times-Colonist* [Letter to the editor]. Clipping files (Local First Nations; Land claims). Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives, Duncan.

Lacatusu, O. (2016, May 24). Marine trail land secured. *Sooke News Mirror*. Retrieved from <http://www.sooke.newsmirror.com/news/380693491.html>

Lam, E. (2011, April 11). Pension funds to buy TimberWest. *Financial Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.financialpost.com/Pension+funds+TimberWest/4593993/story.html>

Landcor Data Corporation. (2006, June 7). *Albertan buyers and the effect on land prices in British Columbia*. New Westminster: Landcor Data Corporation.

Landcor Data Corporation. (2006, August 16). *The longest sustained real estate boom in the history of British Columbia*. "Updated for Q1/Q2 of 2006." New Westminster: Landcor Data Corporation.

Landcor Data Corporation. (2008, April 15). *British Columbia 2007 Residential Sales Summary*. New Westminster: Landcor Data Corporation.

Land swap for Island beach fails. (1987, July 18). *The Vancouver Sun*, p. C16. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/243754271?accountid=12246>

Lavoie, J. (1994, June 14). News. *Times-Colonist*, p. 1. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/345538194?accountid=12246>

Lavoie, J. (1994, June 6). New park, trail tie-in offer tide of tourism. *Times-Colonist*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/345531943/abstract/410095F7322B44A3PQ/1>

Lavoie, J. (1996, September 11). Move along: B.C. ready to evict Sombrio squatters. *Times-Colonist*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/345614887?accountid=12246>

Lavoie, J. (2007, October 24). Developer has high hopes for Jordan River community. *Times-Colonist*, p. A3. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/348202417?accountid=12246>

Lavoie, J. (2008, April 19). Developer unveils controversial Jordan River expansion plans; 10,000 residents envisioned in 20 years for popular surfing spot on south coast. *Times-Colonist*, p. A3. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/348257780/abstract/C7EC95DF87A94281PQ/1>

Lavoie, J. (2010, February 3). UBC, WFP no closer to Island land deal. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. D2. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/243913013/abstract/9791DB4DBC124AA9PQ/1>

Lavoie, J. (2013, May 24). Clearcut logging started near Juan de Fuca trail after failed bid to build resort. *The Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved from <http://www.vancouversun.com/news/Clearcut+logging+started+near+Juan+Fuca+trail+after+failed+build+resort/8431814/story.html>

Looking Back. (2012, February 8). *Sooke News Mirror*. Retrieved from <http://www.sooke.newsmirror.com/news/138877724.html>

Low, B. (2010, March 25). Back-country travel not just for hikers. *Times-Colonist*, p. A11 [Letter to the editor]. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/348366521?accountid=12246>

MacMillan, H.R. (1944, August 17). *Brief on conditions essential to sustained-yield policy for British Columbia coast forests. For submission to Royal Commission on Forestry*. [Submission to commission]. Commission on Forest Resources (GR 0520, Box 14, File 9, Exhibit 263). Royal British Columbia Museum & Archives, Victoria.

Manly Media (Producer), & Manly, P. (Director). (2006). *Sombrio*. [Documentary film]. Canada: Manly Media.

Marshall, T. & Dods, A. (1876, July 26). *Petition for Cowichan-Victoria road*. [Letter to Commissioner of Lands and Works]. Commissioner's correspondence (GR 0868, Reel B16902, Box 2, Folder 16, File 1677/76). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

Mayo, J. (2007, April 1). No one wants Paldi development. *The Pictorial*, p. 16. [Letter to the editor]. Clipping files (Loc. Paldi). Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives, Duncan.

McGregor v The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company (British Columbia), UKPC 44 (1907). Retrieved from http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKPC/1907/1907_44.html

Michael, W.E. (1916). *Claim 25*. [Testimony]. British Columbia Commission of Inquiry Into Claims Re: Lands Within the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Land Belt (GR 0791, Box 1, File 29). Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives, Victoria.

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations. (2017, July 13). *Forest Analysis*. Retrieved from <https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hts/tfls.htm>

Nature Trust of British Columbia. (2017). *Our History*. Retrieved from <http://www.naturetrust.bc.ca/about/history>

O'Connor, G. (2011, July 11). Where is Ida? [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:neqFYag5ZZQJ:dogwoodinitiative.org/blog/where-is-ida+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca>

Ohler, S. (2006, August 27). Albertans bring cash for B.C. properties: Costly hunt for retreats spills into Lotus Land. *Edmonton Journal*, p. A1. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/253313697?accountid=12246>

- Otter Point & Shirley Residents & Ratepayers Association. (2009, June). *Information update*. Retrieved from <http://opsrra.ca/Newsletter%20pdf/OPSRRA%20Newsletter%20Jun09.pdf>
- Pacheedaht First Nation. (n.d.). *History and villages*. Retrieved from <http://pacheedahtfirstnation.com/pacheedaht-first-nation-history-and-villages/>
- Peake, J. (2010, May 21). Kinsol trestle: past and future. *Cowichan Valley Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/312864207?accountid=12246>
- Pelly, J.H. (1846, October 24 1846). [Letter to Benjamin Hawes, Parliamentary Under-Secretary]. National Archives of the UK (1301, CO 305/1). Retrieved from <http://bcgenesis.uvic.ca/getDoc.htm?id=V465HB02.scx>
- Politics at Cowichan. (1875, August 27). *The Daily British Colonist*, pp. 2,3. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/stream/dailycolonist18750827uvic/18750827>
- Private Managed Forest Land Act (SBC 2003). Retrieved from http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/03080_01
- Progress. (1883, November 27). *The Daily British Colonist*, p. 2. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/stream/dailycolonist18831127uvic/18831127>
- R. v. White and Bob, 52 DLR (1965).
- Rogers, S. (1980). Free in the Harbour. On *Northwest Passage*. Fogarty's Cove Music.
- Royal British Columbia Museum and Archives. (n.d.) *Archival Records for Aboriginal Rights and Title Cases*. Retrieved from http://royalbcmuseum.bc.ca/assets/Archival_Records_Aboriginal_Rights_and_Title_Cases_draft.pdf
- Raits, P. (2007, November 8). Community opposition to tree farm licence sales growing on Vancouver Island. *Arrow Lakes News*. Retrieved from www.arrowlakesnews.com/news/11114326.html
- Raits, P. (2011, March 16). Pacheedaht get logging rights and revenues. *Sooke News Mirror*. Retrieved from <http://www.sooke.newsmirror.com/news/118019999.html?mobile=true>
- Raits, P. (2011, May 6). Land use follows rules, not emotion. *Goldstream News Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www.bclocalnews.com/opinion/121402419.html>

Referrals update. (2008, Fall). *Hul'qumi'num Treaty Group: Treaty Talk*. Retrieved from http://www.hulquminum.bc.ca/pubs/HTGTreatyTalk_Fall08.pdf?lphisphreq=1

Saxifrage, C. (2012, October 25). BC pension fund has deep stake in the timber companies liquidating Vancouver Island forests. *Vancouver Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.vancouverobserver.com/blogs/earthmatters/bc-pension-fund-has-deep-stake-timber-companies-are-liquidating-vancouver-island>

Shuswap Nation Tribal Council. (2010). *The memorial to Sir Wilfrid Laurier*. Retrieved from <http://www.kanakabarband.ca/downloads/memorial-to-sir-wilfred-laurier.pdf>

Sloan, G.M. (1945). *Report of the commissioner, the Honourable Gordon McG. Sloan, Chief Justice of British Columbia, relating to the forest resources of British Columbia*. Retrieved from <http://www.llbc.leg.bc.ca/public/pubdocs/bcdocs2011/274554/report%20of%20the%20commissioner,%20forest%20resources%20of%20bc,%201945.pdf>

Stewart, M. (2006, August 28). Alberta buyers driving B.C. resort demand. *Business Edge News Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessedge.ca/archives/article.cfm/alberta-buyers-driving-b-c-resort-demand-13339>

Sylvester, K. (Host). (2013, March 24). The staples trap - falling off the bitumen cliff [Audio]. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/radio/thesundayedition/the-staples-trap-falling-off-the-bitumen-cliff-1.2904529>

Te'mexw Treaty Association. (n.d.). *Douglas Treaties -1850 -1854*. Retrieved from <https://www.temexw.org/douglas-treaty>

The meeting last night. (1862, July 30). *The Daily British Colonist*, p. 3. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/stream/dailycolonist18620730uvic/18620730>

TimberWest hires real estate VP. (2007, April 27). *Cowichan Valley Citizen*, p. 9. [Newspaper article]. Clipping files (Loc. lumber & sawmills; TimberWest). Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives, Duncan.

Timberwest CFO selected to head real estate division. (2009, March 24). *Times-Colonist*. [Newspaper article]. Clipping files (Loc. real estate; Couverdon Real Estate; Park, Bev). Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives, Duncan.

TimberWest lands beginning to sell. (2009, May 15). *Cowichan Newsleader*. Retrieved from http://bclocalnews.com/vancouver_island_central/cowichannewsleader/news/45163172.html

Town of Ladysmith. (2014, March). *Proposed Couverdon boundary extension Q&A*. Retrieved from <http://www.ladysmith.ca/docs/couverdon-boundary-extension/2014-03-boundary-extension-q-a.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

Town of Ladysmith. Council. (2014, October 1). *Minutes of a special meeting of council*. Retrieved from <http://www.ladysmith.ca/docs/2014-council-documents/2014-10-01-council-minutes.pdf?sfvrsn=12>

Trichur, R. (2004, July 18). Blanket cover-up: Art exhibit exposes dark side of those iconic bay blankets. *The Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/240751800?accountid=12246>

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/Reports/Executive_Summary_English_Web.pdf

Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs. (n.d.). *British Columbia Terms of Union*. Retrieved from <http://www.ubcic.bc.ca/files/html/McKennaMcBride/bctu.html>

Vancouver's Island. (1862, June 19). *The Daily British Colonist*, p. 3. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/stream/dailycolonist18620619uvic/18620619>

Vancouver Island Community Forest Action Network. (2011, November). *Forest protection values, strategies, and tactics in the Juan de Fuca electoral area*. Retrieved from <http://forestaction.wdfiles.com/local--files/juan-de-fuca/Juan%20de%20Fuca%20Strategies%20and%20Tactics.pdf>

Vandalism to forestry companies' gate locks prompts warnings. (2010, March 19). *Nanaimo News Bulletin*, p. 7. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/374742070?accountid=12246>

Waddington, S. & Hoggan, D. (1899). *High handed proceedings on Vancouver's Island, or, how settlers were evicted in 1895*. [Booklet]. University of Alberta Libraries, CIHM Monograph Collection. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/cihm_15218

Western Forest Products Inc. (2007). *2006 Annual Report*. Vancouver: Western Forest Products Inc.

Western Forest Products Inc. v Capital Regional District, British Columbia Court of Appeal 356 (2009).

Williams, C. (2007). Fuelling the economy. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 19(2), 25-33. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.viu.ca/docview/213991421?accountid=12246>

Wilson, G.R. (2001, May 30). Native referendum only way to express views. *Cowichan Newsleader* [Letter to the editor]. Clipping files (Loc. First Nations; Treaties/Land claims). Cowichan Valley Museum & Archives, Duncan.

Worthing, M. (2011, March 10). Public, developer hash out Juan de Fuca development. *The Martlet*. Retrieved from <http://archive.martlet.ca/martlet/article/public-developer-hash-out-juan-de-fuca-development/>