

# UCLA

## American Indian Culture and Research Journal

### Title

The Same As Yesterday: The Lillooet Chronicle the Theft of Their Lands and Resources. By Joanne Drake-Terry .

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/98w4m8g1>

### Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 14(4)

### ISSN

0161-6463

### Author

Cole, Terrence

### Publication Date

1990-09-01

### DOI

10.17953

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Ernest Wallace and E. Adamson Hoebel (1952), or that fascinating collection of early Spanish records provided by *Forgotten Frontiers*, edited by Alfred B. Thomas (1932). Unfortunately, as Hagan has pointed out in the preface to this paperback edition, what we still lack is a major Comanche history per se, one that would give voice to the still largely silent Indian perspective of these events and their twentieth-century aftermath.

*James D. Nason*  
University of Washington

**The Same As Yesterday: The Lillooet Chronicle the Theft of Their Lands and Resources.** By Joanne Drake-Terry. Lillooet, British Columbia: Lillooet Tribal Council, 1989. 341 pages.

The Lillooet People, or the Stl'atl'imx, live along the Lillooet and Fraser river valleys in the rugged mountains of southern British Columbia. Like native peoples elsewhere in Canada, the United States, and the rest of the world who have lost their ancestral lands, they are lobbying for a land claims settlement.

This book, sponsored and published by the Lillooet Tribal Council, was written as part of that lobbying effort. The subtitle—"The Lillooet Chronicle the Theft of Their Lands and Resources"—makes it clear that this is not intended to be an objective, detached, scholarly treatment of the subject. Rather it is an adversarial document, a condemnation of British Columbia's disregard for Indian rights in the past, and an impassioned plea for justice in the future.

In the introduction the author calls her book "a case study of how various governments have dispossessed generations of the Lillooet and other Indian nations of their unceded lands and resources throughout British Columbia" (p. xiv). Throughout the book, she hammers home the theme of stolen lands.

According to the Lillooets, a "conspiracy of the governments of England, Canada, and British Columbia" enabled whites to steal virtually all the land of British Columbia from its rightful native owners by 1913 (p. 253). By that year the whites had taken the "most productive and desirable parcels of land," as well as "water, fish, game, and other natural resources" from nearly

thirty million acres, and reserved less than 700,000 acres of "mostly poor-quality land in the Interior of British Columbia" for the Indian nations of the province (p. 253).

The book details the history of the Lillooets and their land from the first arrival of whites in the nineteenth century to the "Declaration of the Lillooet Tribe" signed by seventeen chiefs in 1911, which stated unequivocally their right to their tribal territory. It was "the same as yesterday," the chiefs said, when whites first came to the land on which the Indians had lived for centuries. "We are aware the B.C. government claims our country," the declaration said, "like all other Indian territories in B.C.; but we deny their right to it. We never gave it or sold it to them" (p. 268).

The loss of native lands to Euro-American conquest is an old and tragic story. What's unique here is the Lillooet contention that the British and Canadians broke their own laws when they stole native land; not only was the taking of Lillooet land immoral, but it was also illegal. The Lillooets base their claim on the Royal Proclamation of 1763, an edict that followed the conclusion of the French and Indian War and was designed to reduce costs of administering the colonies by prohibiting white settlers from taking any more Indian lands west of the Allegheny Mountains. The 1763 proclamation stated that Indian land in British North America would forever remain Indian land unless first ceded to the Crown.

In other Canadian provinces, treaties were generally signed during the nineteenth century with local native populations ceding land to the Crown or the government, but no such treaties were ever negotiated with any of the Indian inhabitants of British Columbia. In the absence of such treaties, the Lillooet claim that the white occupation of British Columbia was illegal from the start. "England's failure to negotiate treaties with the Indian nations throughout the province before white settlement began," the author claims, "was then (and remains today) an embarrassing breach of the law" (p. 110).

Historically, Native North Americans have been treated very shabbily by Euro-American "invaders"; however, the legal arguments presented in this book are not convincing or consistent. On the one hand, the author repeatedly decries the lack of treaties in British Columbia as the root of the evil between whites and Indians; at the same time, she also claims that where treaties

were signed, such as in eastern Canada or on the prairies, it was only because "the white minority wanted to own and exploit Indian lands in a manner that appeared to be legal" (p. 105). Furthermore, she contends that the Indians who did sign treaties "never agreed to relinquish their jurisdictions, nor to give up their title to traditional lands . . . in exchange for reserves, promises of some benefits and services, and payment of small amounts of money and gifts" (p. 111). If the treaties were all fraudulent, how significant is their absence in British Columbia?

This book is roughly written and often is hard to understand. Those not familiar with the geography of southern British Columbia will find it especially difficult to follow the story. In addition to more careful explanations, one might wish for a more reasoned tone; the author's sarcasm does nothing but detract from her serious purpose. For instance, it is appropriate to note that Indian guides accompanied Alexander Mackenzie, but it is a gratuitous racial slap at the explorer to add, "The British later honored him for being the first white man to cross North America coast to coast" (p. 13). Is there a non-white who should get the credit for the first transcontinental crossing?

In her notes on sources, Drake-Terry correctly points out that she had to "contend with the prevailing distortions in the literature," because most written records relating to the period "are subjective and biased. They were made by non-Indians, most of whom presumed that Indian peoples were inferior to Europeans" (p. 304). It also is correct to note that oral histories and documents "originated by the Lillooet" will add "necessary insights," but it is worth remembering that these are liable to be just as biased and subjective as any other human record of the past.

*Terrence Cole*

University of Alaska, Fairbanks

**The Southeastern Ceremonial Complex: Artifacts and Analysis: The Cottonlandia Conference.** Edited by Patricia Galloway. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989. 389 pages. \$50.00 Cloth.

Most of the nineteen papers that appear in this book are the result of a conference held near the end of September 1984 at the