HISTORY FROM THE HEART: DIFFICULT PASTS AND POSSIBLE FUTURES IN THE HETEROGENEOUS DOUKHOBOR COMMUNITY IN CANADA

by

Sonya Natal White

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
Graduate Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Sonya Natal White (2011)

HISTORY FROM THE HEART: DIFFICULT PASTS AND POSSIBLE FUTURES IN THE HETEROGENEOUS DOUKHOBOR COMMUNITY IN CANADA

Master of Arts, 2011 Sonya Natal White

Graduate Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology University of Toronto

Abstract

This thesis shares the results of oral history interviews with members of the heterogeneous Doukhobor community in Canada. The stories and memories of fifteen different voices highlight the influence of intersecting demographic variables (age, gender, ideological affiliation, and geographic location) on the experience of Doukhobor life in Canada during times of sensationalized conflict. The interviews are framed and analyzed through broader questions of history and cultural sustainability. What considerations influence the representation of difficult Doukhobor pasts in Canada? In the contemporary context of unification and reconciliation, how does one speak of conflict?

This thesis shows that discussions of the past surface considerable contradiction in the collective memory of the Doukhobor community; the results outline various individual and community strategies that are used to manage the past in favour of the present. Ultimately, this thesis locates memory as a social and cultural anchor that must support a history for the future.

Acknowledgments

My heartfelt thanks goes out to all of the people who sat down with me and shared their thoughts and ideas about what it means to live as part of the heterogeneous Doukhobor community today. Thank you for your hospitality, your candour, and your courage.

Thank you to my *Deda* and *Baba*, who gave me the space and support to explore my own ideas and interests.

Thank you to Dr. Jean-Paul Restoule for your supervisory insight and your sensitivity to issues of community and culture. Thank you to Dr. Roger Simon for sharing your knowledge of issues pertaining to memory, history, and politics. Thank you to Dr. Kiran Mirchandani for your excellent thesis seminar. Thank you to the people who shared in my thesis journey and helped in my navigation of a big school and a bigger city.

Thank you to the library staff at Selkirk College.

Thank you to my mom and dad, both of whom shared their knowledge, their memories, their ideas, and their love. Thank you to my sister, Alisson, for your care, your friendship, your love, and your money.

Thank you to the University of Toronto and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for your financial investments in this research.

Last, but not least, I want to thank the people who cared for my family as we worked through a transformative journey of love and loss. This journey coincided with my graduate research and deeply influenced my thoughts and feelings about care and community. I want to say thank you *so much* for all that you did.

Dedication

For my mom.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Dedication	iv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Doukhobor History and Difficult Pasts	2
First Questions	
The Politics of Social Science	
Radical Realities?	9
The Troubles of Definition	
Chapter Conclusion.	
Chapter Two: The Consumption of History	14
Access	14
Context	
Origins	18
Migration	19
Arrival, or The Politics of Promise	21
The Building of a Nation	22
Go West	24
Loss	26
Dialogue	30
Today	
Chapter Conclusion	
Chapter Three: Ethics, Recruitment, and Participants	35
The Ethical Terrain of Research	35
Community Ethics	
About community.	
Confidentiality	
Establishing "the truth."	
Personal/Family Ethics	
Institutional Ethics	
Participant Recruitment	
Addressing Bias	
Indirect Recruitment	
Direct Recruitment	
Recruitment Parameters of Inclusion	
Age and generation.	
Geographic location.	46
Gender	47

Ideological affiliation	48
Introduction of Participants	49
Chapter Conclusion.	51
Chapter Four: Research Frameworks for Fieldwork and Analysis	52
Theory	52
Research and Reality	
Knowledge Production	
Scholastic Scrimmage	
Oral History and Life History Research	56
Interviews	57
Transcription	60
"Lost in Transcription"	60
Process	61
Negotiation	62
Joint Editing	64
Transcript Analysis	65
Chapter Conclusion.	66
Chapter Five: Resultsor Stories and Voices	68
Structure	60
Narrative Data	
Early Teachings and Experiences	
Troubled Times	
"That Was Then, and This Is Now"	
Chapter Conclusion.	
Chapter Six: Harmony and Dissonance	91
"The Rules of Your Heart"	93
Spectrums of Difference	
Conflict <-> Peace	
Shame <-> Pride	
Segregation <-> Solidarity	
Agency <-> Community	
Fear <-> Courage	
Peace Within <-> Peace Without	105
Then <-> Now	
Interpretations	
Chapter Conclusion.	
Chapter Seven: Strategic Negotiations of a Difficult Past	113
Strategies, in Focus	114
Strategies for Remembrance	
Bearing witness.	

Remembering together	116
Contextualization.	118
Strategies to Manage the Past	
Cultural activities.	
Silence.	121
Therapies	
Forgiveness	
Dialogue	
Evaluating Strategic Negotiations of History	
Criteria for Evaluation	
Inclusion.	
Transparency	128
Objectivity	
Piecework	
Chapter Conclusion.	
1	
Chapter Eight: A History for the Future	
Memory As:	133
Mediator	
Vision	
Distance	
Honour	
Transformation	
Crafting Futures	
Chapter Conclusion	
Chapter Conclusion	141
Chapter Nine: Conclusion	143
Chapter Time. Continuoron	1 14
Dafaranaas	1.47

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Iskra Submission	149
Appendix B: Research Recruitment Poster	151
Appendix C: Website Recruitment Protocol	153
Appendix D: Direct Contact Telephone Recruitment Protocol	155
Appendix E: Direct Contact Email Recruitment Protocol	157
Appendix F: Informed Consent Protocol	158
Appendix G: Interview Guide for Participants	161
Appendix H: Additional Interview Guide: On Representing Doukhobor History	163

Chapter One:

Introduction

Doukhobors first immigrated to Canada in 1899 from Batum, Georgia. More than 7400 members of the community left their homeland because of intense persecution by tsarist authorities who were threatened by Doukhobor principles of pacifism and communalism.

Doukhobor rejections of idolatry and mediated worship further threatened the control of the Russian Orthodox Church. In Canada, the Doukhobor community soon realized the challenges of life within colonial borders. The difficulties of negotiating with statutory and civic bodies intensified the stress of life in community. At the dawn of the 20th century, mere years after arrival in Canada, this ethno-religious community of radical thought and practice fractured.

The fault lines of ideology that marked these fractures were not wholly new to the community, but the unique conditions and circumstances of life in Canada exacerbated old tensions in new ways. The early history of Doukhobor life in Canada is thus characterized by the evolution of several different communities of practice. The Independent Doukhobors, the Orthodox Doukhobors, and the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors each developed practices that accommodated their ideological interpretations of Doukhobor faith. Some of these interpretations and practices met with resistance from inside and outside the Doukhobor community in Canada. The reasons for this resistance, and for the provocative practices that manifested it, generate questions that are still salient to discussions of Doukhobor life and experience today.

I use this thesis to ask how and why Doukhobor history in Canada gets remembered. My interviews with fifteen members of the heterogeneous Doukhobor community in Canada¹ explicate the nuanced experiences of Doukhobor life. They reveal the contradictions inherent to minority experience in Canada, and pose compelling questions about the social politics of remembrance. The theory that I draw on demonstrates how these politics might be reckoned with through the active construction of a history for the future.

Chapter one introduces my reasons for doing this research and presents the questions that guide my inquiry. Chapter two looks at the ways in which Doukhobor history is represented and consumed in Canada today. Chapter three addresses the reality of conducting social science community-based research. Chapter four presents the theoretical frameworks that guide my technique and analysis. Chapter five introduces the voices and ideas of my research participants. Chapter six looks at the influence of contradiction on subjective experience and cultural practice. Chapter seven addresses the various strategies that are used to guide the remembrance of Doukhobor pasts in Canada. Chapter eight asks how memories of Doukhobor life in Canada can serve community interests in the present and future. Chapter nine summarizes the major themes and ideas of the thesis and asks how and why this research can contribute to contemporary Doukhobor life.

Doukhobor History and Difficult Pasts

My interest in the Doukhobor community in Canada grows out of personal experience with members of the community. My mother grew up in an Independent Doukhobor household in the West Kootenay region of British Columbia during the 1950s and 1960s. This was a time of

¹ When I refer to the heterogeneous Doukhobor community in Canada, I speak of a broad and inclusive community of Doukhobors who share roots of ancestry, faith, and culture.

particular tumult for people of Doukhobor background in Canada; consequently, my mother guarded her stories of childhood and adolescence carefully. This caution and care has always intrigued me, for I am not of this same reticence. My own early learning environment nurtured a great deal of trust and freedom. I have grown to speak openly of my experiences in life and I now study the different ways that people relate to their personal and collective histories. These differences in interpretation and remembrance of the past are important. They give context to community discussions of history and offer insight into the tensions that animate cultural dialogue.

Within the Doukhobor community today, it is of relevance to ask how a diverse membership relates to individual and collective experiences of life in Canada since 1899. I discuss the particularities of these experiences in chapter two, but it is fair to say that the history of Doukhobor life in Canada is a history of complexity and contradiction (Plotnikoff, 1998). This history speaks to immigrant experience within colonial borders, and it speaks also to the limits of freedom that characterize citizenship rights. Just as Doukhobor principles of pacifism and communalism threatened the ruling class in Russia, so, too, did these same principles threaten the project of nation-building in Canada.

The early response of Canadian authorities to divergent Doukhobor practices was swift and ruthless. Demands made by the Canadian government caused considerable upheaval within the community, and the reciprocal response of Doukhobors to these demands varied widely according to ideological interpretation. Some Doukhobors responded with behaviours that drew explicit contempt from a non-Doukhobor civic majority. These controversial acts of protest, often referred to by academics as "the depredations" (Rak, 2004), were attributed to a very small percentage of Doukhobors in Canada, most of whom identified as Sons of Freedom Doukhobors

(Androsoff, 2007; Mealing, 1975). The depredations included arson, public undress, bombing, and the destruction of property.²

The depredations were hard to reconcile with the overarching Doukhobor framework of pacifism. The depredations generated hostility and suspicion within and outside of the community, and they had significant consequences for the cultural expression of Doukhoborism in Canada. As such, both Doukhobors and non-Doukhobors are challenged – to this day – by the prospect of speaking to this difficult past, which I speak of in this thesis as the Doukhobor troubles. The 21st century finds the Doukhobor community committed to reconciliation and unity (Popoff, 2008), so the task of representing the past in the present demands a compatibility with these contemporary goals.

Teeger and Vinitzky-Seroussi (2007, p. 58) identify "difficult pasts" as pasts that are marked by moral trauma, disagreement, and discord. Difficult pasts tell stories of perpetration and victimhood both. They generate regret and they defy interpretive consensus. Difficult pasts are unwieldy and they present considerable challenges to projects of remembrance and representation. I consider the Doukhobor troubles to be a difficult past because of the interpretive challenges that this particular past poses. Remembering the experiences of depredation and victimization in western Canada is a troubling enterprise, for this remembrance is also a project of morality. It seeks moral judgment. Who was right? Who was wrong? These questions nag at the remembrance of Doukhobor history.

² For a detailed accounting of bombings and burnings in British Columbia from 1940 - 1983, consult the work of Cran (2006, pp. 141-151).

³ I explain the derivation of "the Doukhobor troubles" at a later point in this chapter. The Doukhobor troubles refers to the *lived experiences* of the contested behaviours and associated repercussions; thus, the Doukhobor troubles references a past that had impact on many Doukhobors, regardless of their participation or non-participation in the depredations.

Referencing the Doukhobor troubles as a difficult past aligns the project of Doukhobor remembrance with the memorial projects of other human communities that have experienced injustice or trauma and are faced with the challenges of remembrance and interpretation. The Japanese Canadian community is challenged by the remembrance of internment (Miki, 2005; Sugiman, 2004), communities in Northern Ireland are challenged by memories of "The Troubles" (Conway, 2009), the Jewish community is challenged by remembrance of the *Shoah* or Holocaust (Baum, 2000), communities in Latin America are challenged by memories of dictatorship and repression (Jelin, 2002/2003), communities in India and Pakistan are challenged by memories of Partition (Butalia, 1998), and indigenous communities are challenged by memories and ongoing experiences of colonization (Kennedy, 2004; Wesley-Esquimaux & Smolewski, 2004).

This alignment of different pasts is not a project of relativism; I am not evaluating degrees of injustice or inequity in the treatment of different human communities. I align these histories and past experiences because they present common challenges for remembrance by survivors and subsequent generations. They share themes of statutory oppression and community division. The memorial struggles are exhibited by – and in – individuals, families, neighbourhoods, and nations. They affect people who lived through experiences of difficulty, and they affect the generations that come after.

First Questions

I have always been resolute in my desire to probe familiar places and spaces. When I began my graduate degree, I knew that I wanted to do research within a human community that I cared for and felt love towards. Subjectivity complicates the research process, but I persist with it because I believe that this is how things become meaningful. Human life is messy. When we

ignore the messy bits and pieces, we lose out on opportunities to learn about love and loss and joy and pain. Berry and Warren (2009) defend the value and merit of reflexive scholarship in the following way: "By extensively historicizing our work, we, in turn, render scholars, properly, people; we become persons whose ways of being as cultural critics are forever inseparable with the conditions that make possible and necessary cultural phenomena" (p. 605).

In acknowledging the value of memory and experience, I remain aware that certain situations demand an intentional forgetting, but in my life – at this moment in time – I feel that it is possible and acceptable to approach the history of Doukhobors in Canada as an heir of this history. Jocelyn Létourneau (2000/2004), a historian with interests in the remembrance of difficult pasts in Quebec, employs the concept of "heirs" to distinguish the unique memorial task of "custodians of a legacy of memory" (p. 10).

I want to know how Doukhobor people approach their pasts in Canada and what the heirs of Doukhobor history – myself included – should understand and take away from these experiences. Specifically, I want to know how the heirs of Doukhobor history might address the Doukhobor troubles of the recent past without aggravating the conflicts of that past. I want to explore the potential burdens of this representation, and I want to know if these burdens can or should be relieved. History and culture are rich anchors in human communities. What distinguishes anchor from burden?

Below, I share the primary questions that first established the basis of this thesis. These were the questions that carried forward my research proposal, and these were the questions that lingered as I developed my interview guides.

1) How were the Doukhobor troubles and the associated repercussions of such conflict experienced by diverse Doukhobor adults and elders who lived through the 20th century

conflict in the heterogeneous Doukhobor community of the West Kootenay and Boundary districts of British Columbia?

- 2) How, and under what conditions, are lived experiences of historical conflict remembered, understood, and negotiated in contemporary life by Doukhobor adults and elders who lived through the community conflict?
- 3) How can processes of acknowledgment and discussions of lived experiences of historical conflict inform the crafting of sustainable personal, family, and community histories that simultaneously reflect difference and encourage peace?

I first posed these questions in 2007. Though I remain interested in the content of these questions, I am less comfortable with the concrete specification that they demand. Perhaps because these questions are now tied directly to the people with whom I spoke, I am less inclined to derive a structural knowledge of *how* memory operates in their lives. Rather, I am more interested in how daily life accommodates the full gamut of human experience. I am also more settled in the knowledge that people vary widely in their ability and willingness to accommodate difficult pasts in representations of history.

There is a part of me that can valiantly defend why Doukhobors should speak through the fear and pain of hard times past. But that part of me needs theory for its defense; the act of dialogue is convened in the corporeality of everyday life. Dialogue is storytelling and storytellers are tethered to all of the emotions and consequences that their practice evokes. This knowledge tempers the theory that I draw on and the expectations that I hold. More importantly, it highlights an interesting tension between the goals and beliefs of people who want to hear about history and the goals and beliefs of people who have reason to hesitate in their sharing of the past.

The Politics of Social Science

The questions that I have used to ground and inform my research conversations with members of the heterogeneous Doukhobor community in Canada strike at the core of social science research. Social science is a research discipline that seeks to understand the human experience of life on earth (Sil, 2000). What does it mean to be human? What are the stories that we tell of ourselves? How do we live in community with others? Though basic, these questions are not benign. They are powerful, indeed: when pursued, they illuminate the exercise of power within social systems of family, community, diaspora, and state.

Dialogue with my research participants has taught me that questions about history and memory invoke parallel questions of power and responsibility. My participants were generous with their time and their insight, but they also used their judgment to consider the implications of my research and to ask questions based on these potential implications. I, in turn, felt accountable to the questions that they posed back to me.

People who have lived as part of a minority population learn to carefully assess the risks and liabilities that come with the sharing of personal and collective stories (Razack, 1993). This is very much the case for Doukhobors in Canada and I have grappled with the risks and liabilities that are posed by research into difficult Doukhobor pasts. My thinking on these risks and liabilities forms an ongoing thread in this thesis. It is a topic that has caused me to think deeply about ethics, equity, and safety in research. Thus, the research framework that I have developed for this project puts the welfare of my participants – and other members of the Doukhobor community in Canada – at the centre of the research project. As I write this thesis, I trust that my attention to ethics results in a set of stories and ideas that offer alternative ways of seeing and understanding Doukhobor life.

Radical Realities?

The Summer 2007 issue of Kootenay Mountain Culture magazine has a front cover photograph of approximately seventeen men and women standing and kneeling on a dirt road in front of a burning building. Some of the people in the photograph are naked from the waist up, while others are covered with blouses and shirts. There is another man in the photograph, fully clothed, who is standing apart from the rest, separated by a fence. Most of the faces in the photograph are turned toward the burning building, so it is hard to decipher the emotional landscape of this moment that was captured in time some fifty-plus years ago. The cutline, found on the credits page of the magazine, explains that "Onlookers watch as Sons of Freedom members burn their barns in protest, Krestova, BC, 1959" (p. 4).

The photograph could only appear as bizarre to contemporary readers who have little or no context for the history of Doukhobors and Doukhoborism in Canada. For those readers who do have familiarity with such a history, the photograph probably conjures up memories and assumptions of Doukhobor terrorist activity and fanatical religiosity in rural spaces. The diverse articles in this specific issue of Kootenay Mountain Culture are flagged with title headings that essentialize the various personalities of Kootenay Country; alongside "The Artist," "The Activist," "The Entrepreneur," "The Consumer," and "The Athlete," the reader finally finds "The Radical" on page sixty-two of the magazine.

Ah, yes. "The Radical." Is there really *one* Doukhobor radical? Is the radical male or female? Young or old? How does the radical affiliate to the Doukhobor community? Have the opinions and beliefs of the radical changed over the last half century? What is the radical's contemporary understanding of history? How does the radical conceive of Doukhobor futures in Canada? And what would the radical think of this 21st century front-cover fame?

For me, the politics that surround the naming and framing of one person – or one culture – by another is the larger story that often gets missed in the telling of Doukhobor history. There is not one radical within the Doukhobor community, nor is the Doukhobor community a homogeneous collective of like minds. The Doukhobor community in Canada certainly exists as a community that perceives a future for itself in this nation, but that goal does not undermine the ability for diverse Doukhobors to pursue diverse expressions of self. It is this idea of diversity in community that compels me. I want to know how diverse people experienced a momentous period in Doukhobor history from which contemporary notions of "Doukhobor" or "radical" are derived. I want to know if the explication of diversity can inform an understanding of a difficult past without perpetuating or reinforcing community divisions.

The Troubles of Definition

Words tell stories. Similarly, a writer's choice of words has considerable impact on the subtext of the story. In this thesis, I use a variety of words and phrases to attempt characterization of the different ways in which some Doukhobors expressed their discontent.

Even this generalized statement has baggage, as noted by Ashleigh Androsoff (2007). Androsoff takes care to tease out the commonly discarded spiritual context for undress, arguing that nudity was not wholly tied to discontent:

Sons of Freedom defended their use of nudity, explaining that removing one's clothing indicated sincerity and humility before God. Generally, the Canadian press ignored or belittled the religious context for the Freedomites' nudity, emphasizing instead its use as a form of protest and its ridiculousness. (Androsoff, 2007, p. 98)

As a means of representing the varied *behaviours* of expression, "depredations" has considerable currency (Androsoff, 2007; Cran, 2006; Rak, 2004). I, too, use this word, though I am aware that it can leave a questionable moral aftertaste. Within the community, people often

speak of periods of conflict or violence with concise reference to specific acts of protest; thus, in the research transcripts for this project, my participants often speak of "the bombings" or "the burnings" or "the roadblocks." It is worth considering that non-participant Doukhobors objected more to the violence of destruction than the act of undress.

"Zealotry" and "terrorism" were common terms that the media employed to report on conflict activities, while "zealot," "terrorist," "fanatic," and "cultist" were words that displaced identity and saturated external opinion of the Doukhobor community. Many of these terms were also used by non-participant Doukhobors to distinguish the presumed perpetrators of violence from the victims. Journalists at the Christian Century (1950) reported the following news under the headline "Fanatics blacken reputation of all Dukhobors":

A source of concern to other religious groups in Canada is that the trouble made by this 2,000-member sect has given a bad name to all the Dukhobor [sic] communities. The 10,000 orthodox Dukhobors, known as the Spiritual Communities of Christ, have repeatedly protested the terrorism practiced by the Sons of Freedom. They held a mass meeting recently at Brilliant, B.C., and petitioned authorities to take immediate steps to halt 'terrorism and criminal acts.' ("Fanatics Blacken Reputation," 1950)

"The Doukhobor problem" was used extensively by Peter Maloff, a philosopher of Doukhobor ancestry, as he struggled to understand the experience of Doukhobors in Canada. Though the phrase seemingly indicts Doukhobors, Maloff was careful to address the problem as a problem of relations between Doukhobors and other public and institutional bodies in Canada: "All I know, as everybody else knows, that this Doukhobor muddle is the work of many hands, Doukhobor and non-Doukhobor" (1957, p. 8 [Report 1]). Maloff acknowledged five parties as being complicit in the Doukhobor problem: Sons of Freedom Doukhobors, former Doukhobor members of the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood, the Independent Doukhobors, federal and provincial civil servants, and the Canadian public (1957, p. 8 [Report 1]). His writing

on the subject advances the understanding of Doukhobor experiences as experiences that were situated within the confines of state power.

"The Doukhobor troubles" is an uncommon reference, but I use it extensively in this thesis because of its strategic implications and advantages. It alludes to the 20th century ethnoreligious and political violence of "The Troubles" in Northern Ireland, which are rooted in experiences of subordination dating back to the 1600s (Conway, 2003). This allusion is advantageous because it locates the Doukhobor troubles *within* the overlapping contexts of religion, culture, and politics. It also reminds readers that Doukhobors are not alone in their struggle to negotiate conflicts that have considerable bearing on internal and external community relations. Furthermore, the Doukhobor troubles allows me to name the social and cultural *experience* of the depredations. I want to underscore the fact that Doukhobors of all beliefs and affiliations were affected deeply by the sensational publicity and hostility that the depredations generated. Thus, "the Doukhobor troubles" distinctly acknowledges a diffuse experience of marginalization.

Last, but not least, I want to problematize the words "conflict" and "violence" as they pertain to Doukhobor history in Canada. Both words are somewhat awkward because they appear to violate the Doukhobor maxim of "toil and peaceful life" that Peter Vasilievich Verigin extolled. Nevertheless, the word "Doukhobor" translates as "spirit wrestler" and this serves as a reminder that Doukhoborism was borne from turmoil. Some members of the community may object to my use of language. The fact that I choose to articulate the Doukhobor troubles as an expression of violence does not mean that I disregard or malign the people involved.

Chapter Conclusion

Including the Doukhobor troubles within a remembrance of Doukhobor life in Canada is a tricky proposition. This thesis explores the issues and challenges of such inclusion. It also considers the value and potential of learning to remember good times and bad. This chapter explored the issues that arise from words, stories, and memories. It contextualized the Doukhobor troubles as a series of activities and experiences that had – and continue to have – considerable effect on the representation of Doukhobor history in Canada. It defined the Doukhobor troubles as a "difficult past" and acknowledged the memorial challenges that difficult pasts pose to many communities around the world.

Chapter Two:

The Consumption of History

Stories have value in community: they can be shared to increase knowledge, broaden empathy, and encourage risk. But narratives can also be used for or against the people who tell the stories. I use the word "consumption" to focus this chapter because I want to highlight the many ways in which (hi)stories are accessed, understood, routed, and used.

Access

Who should know about the influence and effects of the Doukhobor troubles on Doukhobors in Canada? In answering this question – which is one of the founding questions of this thesis – I begin with myself. One of my paramount reasons for exploring diverse life stories and experiences of community conflict is to better understand my mother and her community. For some time now, I have had the impression that "being Doukhobor" was a hard row to hoe in the 20th century. Though many Doukhobors were distanced from the conflict by ideology and/or physical space, I want to know how diffuse the impact of the depredations was.

I will always be candid in acknowledging my personal investment in this research, but the research itself is grounded in the assumption that my questions overlap with the curiosities of others. Thus, I desire for this research to support the learning and growth of other people within the Doukhobor community, too. In recruitment materials that I developed through the summer and fall of 2007, I wrote:

I am mindful of the Doukhobor unification efforts that many people across the country have contributed to, and I have paid close attention to the discussions and debates about the future of Doukhoborism in Canada. Such debates always seem

to come back to questions of conflict, healing, representation, and remembrance...

Ultimately, I hope that participants will experience the research conversations as an opportunity to talk about their experiences and ideas about community futures and Doukhobor representation in Canada. As participants, you might help your friends, families, and neighbours understand Doukhobor pasts, presents, and futures with sensitivity and increased awareness.

The choice to use conversation and dialogue as my primary research method was made with the expectation that dialogue could open up learning opportunities for me and my research participants. My stated commitment to sharing the research results was another way of offering and espousing greater possibilities for learning and questioning.

Beyond my family and the people with whom I share a common heritage, I want this research to speak to other Canadians. I have been talking about my Doukhobor heritage with other Canadians for many years and these conversations have often been difficult and vexing. It is not easy to find common ground in the perspectives that different people have on Doukhobor history. Some do not know who Doukhobors are, while others are immediately reminded of Sons of Freedom activist strategies and have no awareness of the diverse structure of the Canadian Doukhobor community. Many people in areas of traditional Doukhobor settlement acknowledge the capabilities and virtues that flourish within the community, but people who live beyond these borders know very little about the complicated life histories that Doukhobors have. Overall, the stories told back to me by friends and acquaintances are haphazard, hesitant, and sometimes disparaging.

I inevitably struggle with ideas of representation and obligation as I hear the cavalier anecdotes of people who know little about my ancestors. In turning to oral history as a research

methodology, I continue to struggle with the possibilities and liabilities that it provokes. The iteration of oral history is, first and foremost, the iteration of people's lives. I have been tremendously aware of this for some time and am always distressed if and when my narration of Doukhobor experience stops short of conveying this fact. It is important to me that people hear the embodiment of Doukhobor experience within historical narratives, but this is difficult to achieve when the narratives are often told in isolation from the bodies themselves. How does one speak, ethically, about the experiences of another?

It is only recently that I have come to the – obvious! – realization that my anxieties about the ethics of representation are surely felt by other people of Doukhobor ancestry, too. Learning to speak in a voice that offers something new to trite stories of Doukhobor life in Canada is an inherently difficult task because it puts a historically marginalized group of people at risk of further marginalization. Doukhobors heralded the 1999 centennial celebrations as an opportunity to put their divided past behind them and move forward in peace and positivity (Popoff, 2008, p. 52). I endeavour, with this thesis, to identify how difficult histories can be spoken of without impeding this desire for peaceful progress.

Context

Some of the people who read this thesis will have an immense knowledge of Doukhobor history in Canada, while others might have none. As a means of addressing people at both ends of this information spectrum, I use this chapter to answer a question that I previously posed to each of my research participants. My answer will provide context and access to the questions and stories in the following chapters; it will also help to substantiate my voice and my vision within the larger enterprise of crafting Doukhobor history. I draw on a number of sources – some written by academics, some written by journalists, and others published independently by people

in the community – to introduce the experience of Doukhobors in Canada and to specify certain elements of the Doukhobor troubles. I further introduce the voices of some of my research participants, all of whom are formally introduced in chapter three.

This peripatetic approach reveals my attraction to pluralism. I firmly believe that divining one truth or one story is an act of betrayal in qualitative oral history projects that involve more than one participant. Such an approach also allows for a wandering into historiography, or the study of how history is written. In asking who knows what, and who *should* know what, questions of access and consumption emerge. Just as I present multiple stories and understandings in subsequent chapters, I present multiple sources and viewpoints in response to the following question:

Question: As part of my Master's project, I have done a lot of reading about Doukhobor experiences in Canada over the past century. A lot of this reading refers to times of conflict throughout the 20th century in the West Kootenay and Boundary Doukhobor communities. How would you define or explain these events to somebody who was not familiar with Doukhobor history in western Canada?

Answer: The story of Doukhobors in Canada is inextricably bound to stories of migration. It is difficult to know how and where to initiate the story of a people who have struggled and survived for many centuries in various regions on multiple continents. I declare this anxiety right upfront because I know that my answer will inevitably eclipse certain elements of Doukhobor experience that others view as vital to a proper narrative. In answering, I try to stick closely to the specified question while simultaneously acknowledging the broader goals of this research. How does one share and explain a history of love and anger, communalism and independence, agency and oppression, and peace and violence? Can a full history be acknowledged without trivializing the past or undermining the future?

Origins

As a Canadian narrator, I tend to focus on historical events that chronicle Doukhobor experiences in Canada. However, this belies the extensive period of cultural formation and development that occurred in Russia. When the eye is cast back to prior centuries and foreign lands, a depth emerges to contextualize the development of Doukhoborism alongside other radical ethno-religious systems of belief and practice. Redekop and Hostetler (1977) identify the Doukhobors as one of many different "social groups" to be encompassed by the "plain people phenomenon" (p. 266). Their sociological approach is dated and some of their generalizations would be recognized, today, as harmful contributions to the history of Doukhobors. Nonetheless, their perspective provides important context. They locate Doukhobors alongside Amish, Hutterite, and Molokan collectivities, and note that plain people were characterized by sociocultural segregation, religious inspiration, rural lifestyles, and traditions that emphasized family structure, economic independence, and social regulation (Redekop & Hostetler, 1977, p. 267).

These social groups also share histories of persecution; Doukhobor history certainly exhibits this struggle. The word *Doukhobors* derived from *Dukhobortsi*, meaning "spirit wrestlers" (Mealing, 1975, p. 5). This label was a hostile attempt, imposed from outside the community in 1785, to disparage the radicals who refused to comply with the demands of the Russian elite. Instead, Doukhobors accepted the name in the belief that it justly represented their struggle for religious and spiritual authenticity. Doukhobors were early champions of pacifism because they believed that the Spirit of God lived inside of each human being (Woodcock &

⁴ The concept of suffering is significant in the traditional Doukhobor worldview. Mark Mealing (1975) interprets the Doukhobor relationship to suffering in the following way: "Suffering is something that all believers may expect to know. Westerners would shy away from the concept, which they hold in a more narrow sense; but to Doukhobors it is an experience that, though bitter, is also creative and redeaming" (p. 7).

Avakumovic, 1968, p. 19). Respect for God was thus respect for life, and a strict and principled communal lifestyle took hold under Doukhobor leadership, particularly that of Peter Vasilievich Verigin, who occupied a position of guidance and leadership within the community from 1887 to 1924.⁵

Despite the earnest and righteous conduct of Doukhobors – or perhaps because of such conduct – the empirical elite of the tsarist system were threatened by the implications and possible consequences of Doukhoborism. Ongoing changes in tsarist leadership brought persistent threats and upheaval to Doukhobors in Russia. The trauma of these times remains imbued in the psalms and sacred songs of remembrance that Doukhobors still sing to acknowledge and recall important acts of faith. Although I don't speak or understand Russian, I knew from an early age that the Burning of Arms in 1895 was a momentous act. This renunciation of weapons precipitated sharp retaliation from the governing class, and the subsequent mistreatment of Doukhobors attracted engagement and advocacy from fellow pacifists, including Leo Tolstoy and members of the Religious Society of Friends abroad. After much politicking and negotiation, and a failed attempt at relocation in Cyprus, Doukhobors first set sail in 1898 for the opportunities that beckoned from Canada. Ultimately, close to 7500 men, women, and children arrived at the docks in eastern Canada and set off for the promise of the prairies (Mealing, 1975, p. 15).

Migration

Emigration opened up tremendous possibilities for peaceful living, but the decision to leave must have been hard. Not all Doukhobors came to Canada; some decided against

⁵ The Verigin family has provided leadership and guidance to (some) Doukhobors for over one hundred years. Peter Vasilievich Verigin was also known as "Lordly," or *Gospodnie*. His son, Peter Petrovich Verigin, was also known as "the Purger," or *Chistiakov*.

emigration because their allegiance rested with spiritual leaders who remained in Russia. Others were simply bound by the complex obligations of family. Lovette reflected on this during our research interview together:

I've gone to Russia a few times and a lot of people say, "Do you think that..." the people there, that were left behind, "Do you think that we really wanted to stay behind? It was our family issues, or whatever that didn't..."

Just as those who stayed behind faced strong feelings of longing, so, too, did those who left. As part of the emigration agreement, Doukhobors who left Russia renounced the right of return (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1968, p. 117). The emigrants were surely mindful that this agreement complicated the prophecy of Lukeriya Kalmykova – a Doukhobor leader in the 19th century – who claimed that Doukhobors would leave from Russia, but then return. Academics and members of the Doukhobor community have written about the persistence of Kalmykova's migratory prophecy in the cultural memory of Doukhobors in Canada. Writing in *Iskra*, a contemporary Doukhobor publication, Natasha Jmieff (2006b) notes how permeable the present is to the past:

For the last fifteen years she lived at home [in Canada], Baba [Grandmother] had two packed suitcases in her bedroom. One with her funeral suit, the other with warm clothes and essentials in case the Doukhobors, as prophesied, had to flee back to Russia. My childhood was scarred by the feeling of impermanence this prophesy created. (pp. 3-4)

These struggles in time and space reflect a broader current of tension that runs throughout the cultural history of Doukhobors. Like many other human communities in Canada, the Doukhobors form a diasporic community. Julie Rak (2004) uses the contemporary definition of diaspora when she applies it to Doukhobors living in Canada, explaining that its traditional definition has been opened up to represent groups of people "forcibly expelled from their lands"

of origin" (p. 59). Defining Doukhobor experience in Canada as the experience of a diaspora allows for the longing and confusion about roots and homeland to be contextualized and validated.

Arrival, or The Politics of Promise

I remember, this is years ago...well not years ago but...our *grandparents* were saying of how they came on the ship. The first one...it took them over a month to come from Batum, Russia to Halifax. And they hit such a storm and they were, you know, this was a cattle ship that they cleaned up and made to handle over a thousand people. And they were below the deck. And being flicked around, you know, the storms. I say "We can never forget that because it was *hell* on earth sort of thing." And when they got to Halifax, every one of them barely got off the ship and knelt on the ground, kissed the ground, back on land sort of thing. (Mike)

Arriving in Halifax was the first step towards a new embrace of toil and peaceful life: "The Doukhobors came to Canada with firmly established ideologies and principles which they considered to be infallible and they had no intention to abandon them. It was the ultimate meaning of their life" (Maloff, 1957, p. 10 [Report 1]). Doukhobors believed that the inner spirit of God equalized human beings, so systems of hierarchical governance were thus perceived as a blasphemous distortion of equality. Nevertheless, the Doukhobor migrants and their supporters had enough political savvy to foresee the possibility of ideological conflict with the Canadian state. When Doukhobors arrived in Canada, they arrived with the impression that the terms of their immigration had been negotiated to accommodate for spiritual and cultural sustainability. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior at the time that the immigration was negotiated, had conceded exemption from military service. He had also permitted Doukhobors the right to organize themselves as they desired, and granted them blocks of land in present-day

Saskatchewan that would sustain their communal practices (Rak, 2004, p. 38). These accommodations enabled optimistic settlement by the radical migrants. The discussion of theory to follow helps to explain why this optimism was so short-lived.

The Building of a Nation

Sunera Thobani (2007) presents a critical, even scathing, interpretation of the nation-building that happened on the land we now call Canada. Thobani argues that exaltation, a technique of political seduction used to retain power and dominance in the hands of those who dominate, has warped the expression of diversity in Canada since colonization began. Privilege was written into colonial law and endowed on settlers who conformed appropriately. Those who failed to conform were ostracized and outcast. This polarization of subjects created a productive tension that behooved those in power. The outcasts, or Others, served to remind the "good subjects" that threats to their privilege were always close at hand. Thus, the good subjects – who required the protection and safeguarding of the state – behaved accordingly to reinforce the structural systems of elite white settler power.

Doukhobors were perceived as a threat by the "good subjects" of Canada. Doukhobors were strong, insular, successful, and hard working. They were radical in thought, uncompromising in faith, and communal in practice. Because of this, they made the people around them nervous. By 1907, the government had reneged on the original accommodations that the Doukhobors were promised. Doukhobors were given an ultimatum that demanded their compliance with the Oath of Allegiance. They were further ordered to homestead as individuals and forego practices of common ownership (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1968, pp. 220-221). This ultimatum was a massive setback to members of the Doukhobor community and exacerbated the factional tensions within.

Thobani's thesis implies a certain inevitability of betrayal by the state. Though she overlooks the specific experience of Doukhobors, her analysis of Aboriginal experience within colonial Canada is early predictive of Doukhobor experience:

The extension of citizenship to Aboriginal communities was tied to the goal of encouraging private ownership of land by Aboriginal peoples as individuals. It sought to destroy their collective ownership of these lands, hence making them available to Europeans. Access to citizenship rights was thus extended to Aboriginal peoples upon their renunciation of Indian status and their adoption of the civilized institutions of private property, wage labour, and the money economy. (Thobani, 2007, p. 82)

By articulating the conditions on which Aboriginal people were given access to citizenship, Thobani illuminates the cultural loss that many Aboriginal communities and nations faced, and continue to face, today. Similarly, the cultural unity of Doukhobors was compromised when the government of Canada reneged on its commitments. Some Doukhobors agreed to the new conditions of entitlement, while others outright rejected them. The Doukhobors who refused compliance lost the land that they had worked so hard to prepare:

[W]ell over half the land entered by the Doukhobors between 1903 and 1905 was taken away from them completely, and on 1 June [1907], 258,880 acres were made available to the general public, resulting in a land rush such as had never before been seen in the Canadian prairies. (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1968, p. 222)

In my opinion, it is beneficial and necessary to understand the experience of Doukhobors as the experience of a capable and thoughtful group of people whose beliefs were completely intolerable and incompatible with the political mission of the colonial state in Canada. Members of the state supported Doukhobor beliefs until the expression of these beliefs undermined their political favour with other populations of "good subjects." Such subjects were distressed by the considerable efficacy of Doukhobor agricultural practice and further unnerved by the demonstrative potential of Doukhobor spirituality.

In 1902, a group of Doukhobors left their lands in Saskatchewan and began a trek to protest materialism:

Doukhobor activity of any kind seemed to fly in the face of what most Anglo-Canadians considered to be the responsibilities adhering to Canadian identity: citizenship, patriotism, and the separation of faith and political activity. Thus, the 1902 trek became the first in a long series of nude protests and depredations intended to protest Canadian materialism, which marked these Doukhobors in particular and all Doukhobors in general as unassimilable. (Rak, 2004, p. 41)

In spite of the accomplishments that Doukhobors achieved during their first years in Canada, these years also revealed considerable tension. These tensions grew in the decades that followed and paralyzed many opportunities for cultural growth.

Go West

Within a decade of arrival in Saskatchewan, the diasporic community of Doukhobors fractured. Those members who rejected the new requirements of the Canadian state travelled to British Columbia as early as 1908 under the leadership of Peter Lordly Verigin. In contrast to the homesteading strategy that Doukhobors had initially adopted in Saskatchewan, land in British Columbia was purchased through private sale:

On behalf of the Community [the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood], Peter Verigin purchased 2800 acres extending over the long plateau from the site of Waterloo, which he renamed Ootischenie, and including the piece across the Kootenay river which he named Brilliant because of the sparkling river waters. Later that same year, 2700 acres were purchased west of Grand Forks, which he named *Fruktovaya Dolina* (Fruit Valley) in reference to the orchards that were already growing there. (Popoff, 2008, p. 13)

Doukhobors anticipated another opportunity for toil and peaceful life in the verdant valleys and river benches of southern British Columbia. The people who travelled west were united by their acceptance of Peter Lordly as spiritual guide and businessman. The Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood – referenced commonly in retrospect as the CCUB –

thrived as a private communal enterprise. Fruit, jam, honey, grain, bricks, and processed logs were just some of the materials and goods that Doukhobors developed and produced for self and others (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1968). Yet, again, this industriousness marred the reception of Doukhobors by other Canadians. In documenting the success of the communal enterprise, Julie Rak (2004, p. 48) is candid in her assessment that the CCUB provoked hatred by outsiders, particularly during times of war, when Doukhobor men remained in Canada as conscientious objectors. The local newspaper editors in southern British Columbia made no attempt to disguise their antipathy toward the objectors, condemning them for their stance against war as early as 1899:

This is a time when Great Britain must put loyal men on guard. The man whose only interest in the country is to eke out an existence without contributing to the responsibilities of the subject is a base counterfeit and infinitely more dangerous in time of war than the open enemy. We want no more pauper laborers in Canada. Better have a small population, loyal, contented and free, than a horde of foreign assassins. (The Nelson Economist, 1899)

As in Saskatchewan, the controversial protest strategies of a subset of Doukhobors found no sympathy from the non-Doukhobor civic majority in British Columbia, who, in turn, retaliated with vitriol and menace. The Doukhobor community suffered intensely throughout the 20th century, in part because of the uncompromising generalizations that persisted among non-Doukhobors. Though the Sons of Freedom represented less than ten per cent of Doukhobors in Canada (Androsoff, 2007, p. 82), structural discrimination influenced the lives of everyone who was perceived to be Doukhobor. Rak (2004, p. 49) explicates the incredible actions that were taken against Doukhobors, including banishment from public buildings and public pools. The

Website: http://www.doukhobor.org/sources.html#Military.

⁶ There were Doukhobors who joined with wartime Canadian forces, though the vast majority of Doukhobors remained in Canada as conscientious objectors. For more information on the people of Doukhobor background who enlisted in Canadian forces during World War I and World War II, spend some time at the Doukhobor Genealogy

right to vote was gained, and lost, multiple times. This episodic pattern was repeated in the frequent incarceration of Doukhobor activists in British Columbia, the first of which happened only two years after their arrival in the West Kootenay (Maloff, 1957, p. 8 [Report 1]). Mass sentencing continued over the next half century, leaving many families to work through the haunting effects of institutional violence.

Loss

The theme of loss requires careful treatment by those who craft Doukhobor history. Without such caution, the narrative can easily degenerate into a pessimistic appraisal of futile cultural resistance. Loss is a part of this story, yes, but it should not overshadow or negate the experiences of gain and progress that also contribute. I address specific events of loss in this section because they are an integral part of the story of Doukhobors in Canada. Readers should understand that part of their job in reading this thesis – and in contemplating the difficult histories of other communities – is to find ways of allowing for loss without losing sight of all that was and is borne of loss.

It is still very difficult to understand or reconcile the Doukhobor troubles without first understanding the incommensurability of government prerogatives with certain Doukhobor belief systems. Ellison, a research participant, articulated one of the most succinct and straightforward interpretations of this ideological friction:

You will find that most of these misunderstandings are a cause of two separate thoughts. One is the law, and one is the Doukhobors. And the Doukhobors said "I can't. What am I gonna do? I can't. This is what I believe in and I can't change my God. If you want, tear the God out of me, *kill me*, what the hell the difference. You know, that's the only way that you will kill the Doukhobor in me." (Ellison)

Though Ellison is right to commemorate the strength and conviction of Doukhobors, the death of Peter Lordly Verigin – and eight other train passengers – near Farron, British Columbia on October 29, 1924 had catastrophic cultural consequences that tested the resilience of the diasporic community. The government investigation that followed Verigin's death only deepened the suspicion of Doukhobors towards hierarchical systems of authority. No closure was afforded to the community because the mystery of death was never solved, nor was the investigation properly concluded (Cran, 2006, p. 163).

A historiographic accounting of the Doukhobor troubles needs to consider the multiple ways in which this specific loss of leadership was addressed. Some historians and members of the Doukhobor community view Peter V. Verigin's death as an inflamed turning point in Doukhobor protests of the 20th century. Others are wary of accepting or acknowledging this causal relationship. Ellison's own historiographic interpretation of the matter is that bureaucrats are unwilling to link the Doukhobor troubles to the 1924 train explosion because of the many questions about the explosion that remain unanswered and ignored. This is an inherently political interpretation of memory, and one that suggests some interesting ideas about the escalation of animosity that occurred. Specifically, it posits that there can never be closure until the government of British Columbia adequately addresses Verigin's death. It also troubles the notion that the "Doukhobor problem" was manifested by one group of Doukhobor delinquents. Ellison's interpretation shifts the nucleus of blame for the collection of "problems" from a) within the Doukhobor community to b) within the fraught negotiations between the Doukhobor community and the government(s) of Canada.

⁷

⁷ Inquiring into the death of Peter Lordly Verigin is beyond the scope of this thesis, though his death remains one of the most controversial mysteries of the 20th century in Canada. The Great Unsolved Mysteries in Canadian History project has recently explored this mystery online at http://canadianmysteries.ca. For readers with an interest in this mystery, the link provided may serve as a starting point for access to documents relating to Peter V. Verigin's death.

Regardless of how one understands the volition behind the depredations, it is impossible to avoid an acknowledgment of the losses that intensified following Verigin's death. From material loss to cultural loss to family loss, the depredations had enormous consequence for Doukhobors across Canada and others living in traditional Doukhobor areas. The easiest loss to account for today would be the material loss: schools were burned, homes were burned, civic spaces were burned, and businesses were burned. In many situations, the arsonists purged their own possessions. At times, the possessions of others were purged. Sometimes activists were identified and prosecuted; sometimes acts of depredation remained unattributed to specific perpetrators, though the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors were generally assumed to be at fault by the broader community. Overall, the Doukhobor troubles represent years of intense confusion and incoherence.

The protest strategies were provocative and stigmatizing and Doukhobors struggled with the amplified factionalization inside the community. Because the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors were responsible for many of the depredations, marginalization occurred as other Doukhobors negotiated their obligations to family, community, and country. Media personnel sensationalized the events without contextualizing the ideological basis for protest. Doukhobors in other western provinces were forced to deal with the sensational fall-out, too, despite being geographically isolated from most of the depredations.

Investigations, inquiries, and incarceration occurred consistently as Doukhobors of all ages encountered the heavy hand of the state. Research and inquiry committees were struck in 1950 and 1979, investigative commissions were ordered in 1906, 1912, 1947, and 1954, and

⁸ The Doukhobor Research Committee, comprised of non-government participants, inquired into Doukhobor experiences of life and social relations in British Columbia; the committee produced a report in May, 1952 (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1968). The Kootenay Committee on Intergroup Relations was formed in 1979 in

the "D Squad" of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police formed in the early 1960s for purposes of surveillance and investigation of suspected terrorists or perpetrators of depredations. These are just some of the bureaucratic measures that were established to address the "Doukhobor problem." The arrest of 148 Sons of Freedom adults at Perry Siding was followed by the detention and institutionalization of Sons of Freedom children in a sanatorium in New Denver, British Columbia, during the period of 1953-1959. This period saw the detention or apprehension of more than one hundred Sons of Freedom Doukhobor children; some were released back into the community, while others were institutionalized and obliged to become students of the provincial curriculum (Office of the Ombudsman of British Columbia, n.d.).

All of this was experienced at the level of the everyday. Some Doukhobors were born into this reality of conflict, while others moved away to expressly avoid it. People found refuge in ambiguity, learning to speak vaguely of "Russian" roots instead of admitting to Doukhobor roots. "Mixed" families were caught up in the cultural politics of non-fraternization, which sought to identify non-participating Doukhobors from those who perpetrated acts of depredation. Inevitably, the conflict was internalized and many people across the spectrum of Doukhobor affiliation were faced with the confusing task of reconciling their love for family and community with the stress of violence and loss.

_

response to ongoing depredations (Cran, 2006). This latter committee receives more attention in my thesis later on in this chapter.

⁹ The McDougall Commission of 1906 was given the task of finalizing issues related to original Doukhobor landholdings in present-day Saskatchewan (Szalasznyj, 1995). The Blakemore Commission of 1912 was appointed to inquire into the origins of doubt and misgiving between Doukhobors and the province of British Columbia (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1968). The Sullivan Commission of 1947 was appointed to inquire into the activity of depredations in British Columbia; the commissioner was further requested to "recommend remedial measures" (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1968, p. 326). Justice Lord was given the job of commissioner in 1954 to "investigate the sale of Doukhobor lands" (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1968, p. 343).

¹⁰ Despite the sensationalism and xenophobia of Simma Holt's (1964) book, she is one of few people to publicly reference the "D" Squad.

Dialogue

Elements of transformation began to surface in the second half of the 20th century when Doukhobors established their own pathways for change. As previously discussed, the toll of conflict within and beyond the borders of the Doukhobor community was tremendous. There came a time when new ways of being-in-community seemed possible. People were fatigued from conflict, youth introduced new possibilities for integration and communion, and leaders brought new perspectives to the table. The experiments in dialogue varied in scope, from student-centred initiatives to interprovincial conferences. Within and amongst this diversity, the broader community identified the suspension of violence as the first desired outcome of collective cooperation.

The Joint Doukhobor Research Committee (JDRC) was established in 1974 by members of the Doukhobor community; representation and participation was encouraged from all Doukhobor groups. In his review of Doukhobor life in British Columbia, Jim Popoff (2008) summarizes the committee as follows:

With a mandate to review all aspects of Doukhobor history in Canada in order to gain a better mutual understanding, the JDRC carried out 68 public symposiums over the next eight years, making significant inroads into various built-up misconceptions and misunderstandings. (p. 52)

Julie Rak (2004) interprets the JDRC activity as functioning to bring people together to "work out what Doukhoborism had been and what it would be in the future" (p. 109). These same goals were being pursued simultaneously by the Union of Young Doukhobors (UYD). The UYD began in 1968 in Vancouver, where many young Doukhobors were living after leaving the traditional settlement areas of the interior valleys for the opportunities that the city afforded.

One of the most prominent initiatives of the UYD was the establishment of *Mir* magazine. *Mir* was "[I]ntended to serve as a forum and a means of communication for all Doukhobors and others who may be interested" (1973, p. 2) and allowed young people to interrogate aspects of conflict and reconciliation from their own cultural vantage points. The pieces in *Mir* often privileged a U.S.C.C. interpretation of Doukhobor history, but they also engaged alternate interpretations through a very effective interview format. Lengthy interviews and special submissions voiced the views of Doukhobors who affiliated to the Sons of Freedom group, the Independent group, and the Named Doukhobors of Canada. In addition, non-Doukhobors wrote in to the magazine and further broadened the scope of the forum. *Mir* was thus a positive and progressive antidote to the sensationalist journalism that it competed with.

The Kootenay Committee on Intergroup Relations (KCIR) was a dynamic venture that involved people of diverse Doukhobor affiliation, members of the British Columbia civil service, and local residents of the municipalities affected by the Doukhobor troubles. ¹¹ The conflict resolution framework of the KCIR was proposed by the provincial government and established in 1979. The process gained momentum when Robin Bourne, assistant deputy minister of police services for British Columbia, became involved (Cran, 2006, p. 42).

Perhaps because my father sat on the committee – we discussed the history of the EKCIR at length before my research began – I approached this piece of the reconciliation story with heightened assumptions about its impact on the Doukhobor community. There is certainly no doubt that the committee was instrumental in facilitating dialogue during times of extreme agitation. Members of the EKCIR also developed the Interim Accord, which was signed by

¹¹ The KCIR became the Expanded Kootenay Committee on Intergroup Relations (EKCIR) in 1982.

representatives of the U.S.C.C. and Reformed Doukhobor communities.¹² Nevertheless, many of my research participants had little to no awareness or understanding of the committee and the contributions that it made to the suspension of violent depredations.

My sense is that cultural transformation is most broadly understood within culturally-relevant frameworks. Because the KCIR was born from bureaucracy, its formality and function derived from the bureaucratic worldview. The Doukhobors who participated were able to successfully speak and work within this process, but other Doukhobors – who were not actively involved – remember the process of reconciliation and unification as it was seen and experienced in their everyday activities.

Today

Adult and elder Doukhobors who lived through the depredations are quick to qualify their gratitude for the reconciliation efforts. Though not all of my participants spoke comfortably about their experiences of conflict, their appreciation for contemporary life highlights a major shift in lived experiences over the past several decades:

I don't know if anybody's going to come to the golden key. But it's a very intriguing history, and I'm glad that it's where it is right now. I'm really grateful that as far as the Doukhobor history, that it is where it is, that it's come to this crossroads or this pass or this era where it's at. (Vera)

One of the primary examples given to contextualize this crossroads is the success of the joint Doukhobor choirs. Traditionally, Doukhobors practiced an oral culture. Psalms and folk

¹² The "Interim Accord" was developed as part of the EKCIR process in 1985. It was a written statement that called for the ceasing of violent depredations and the fostering of collaboration and mutual understanding within diverse factions of the Doukhobor community. The U.S.C.C. Doukhobors and the Reformed Doukhobors signed it, while the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors agreed orally to the terms of the accord. For a transcription of the accord, consult *Negotiating Buck Naked* (Cran, 2006, p. 87).

songs were created and passed on to narrate Doukhobor history and articulate Doukhobor morality. Today, Doukhobors engage fully in literate practices, but the symbolic significance of collective singing is still very strong. As part of the 1995 centennial celebrations to commemorate the Burning of Arms, people of diverse Doukhobor background came together on stage at the Brilliant Cultural Centre:

We just said, "Let's get together and stop this baloney of meeting up on the street. Let's let bygones be bygones." I mean, some of us suffered more than others, but, so that's what happens. And today, we've gathered together, and I know there was some people, they were involved in bad things in their early years, but I'm not gonna go there. I says "If you want to stand beside me and sing and do good things, let's do that." So that's what we've been doing. (Harry)

Transformation and progress are clearly illustrated in the transcripts of my research interviews, and I share more from these transcripts in the chapters that follow. At this point, I want to introduce the cultural juxtaposition of gratitude with frustration. This juxtaposition is a part of contemporary life for some Doukhobors and I do not want to overlook the tension that it produces. The website of the New Denver Survivors¹³ exhibits the frustrations of many Doukhobor people who were incarcerated in New Denver during the 1950s; the public report of 1999 has not been followed up with to the extent that the survivors demand, and they continue to live with unfinished business. While many Doukhobors believe that conflict and discord are both "in the past," some people are uncomfortable with the presumed dismissal of these residual traces in contemporary life. If I am to ask, honestly and authentically, what it means to be a Doukhobor in Canada today, I need to take up these concerns and explore them in dialogue with others.

¹³ This website is found at the following address: http://www.newdenversurvivors.tk/.

Chapter Conclusion

Speaking the truth requires courage; remembering with others is one way of opening up to truth(s). This chapter proposed one narrative, one *route* for memory. I chose to contextualize the Doukhobor troubles within the everyday experiences of those who lived through and/or were affected by periods of conflict. In introducing theories of subjecthood and nation-building, I framed everyday experiences as sites of political activity and potential.

The Doukhobor troubles represent a spectrum of experiences that encapsulate conflict, marginalization, and violence. Recognizing the troubles as a part of Doukhobor experience in Canada threatens to overshadow other, more joyful aspects of this experience and this history. Nevertheless, finding a way to integrate and allow for all of these experiences within a public history remains an important project for people who are interested in issues pertaining to Doukhobors in Canada.

Chapter Three:

Ethics, Recruitment, and Participants

Research is not just about canvassing the outside world for data. When done well, it involves a great deal of introspection. I use this chapter to discuss the various processes that I engaged with before making contact with potential participants. I then discuss the experience of "contact" and reflect on the anxieties that community-based research summons. Finally, I introduce the people who participated in my research and explore how they reflect the diversity that constitutes the heterogeneous Doukhobor community in Canada.

The Ethical Terrain of Research

The ethical terrain of research is an intensely terraced landscape: institutional ethics on one level, community ethics on another, and personal ethics on yet another. It is up to the individual researcher to knit these various ethical frameworks and resultant responsibilities together. Such integration poses dilemmas, so I use this discussion of ethics to consider 1) the distinct obligations imposed from intellectual and cultural institutional bodies, and 2) the emergent obligations and problems that arise from the individual synthesis of various accountabilities.

Community Ethics

About community.

A consideration of community ethics begs a definition of "community," and I want to tailor this definition to the specific community that I am working within. I have taken to calling the Doukhobor community in Canada a "heterogeneous community" because there are multiple expressions of faith that occur within the cultural realm of Doukhoborism. This should not be

interpreted as a weakness of the community.¹⁴ April Bumgardner (2001) documents the historical maturation of Doukhobor philosophy and her observations help to contextualize the contemporary heterogeneity in Canada: "While the metamorphic nature of Doukhobor philosophy may appear as excessive compromise to many traditional religionists, it is this fluidity which has ensured the survival of the Doukhobor movement" (p. 21). Similarly, while the heterogeneity of the contemporary community in Canada calls to mind the conflicts of expression throughout the 20th century, the retention of this ideological diversity within a process of reconciliation is a special feature of the community today.

Access to membership is always an issue in any community. Historically, membership to the Doukhobor community was extended along genealogical lines. Nevertheless, with the erosion of language and other distinctive means of cultural expression, Doukhobors have had to re-evaluate what constitutes membership (Bumgardner, 2001, p. 18). I raise this issue here, within a larger discussion of ethics, because I have had to ask myself what my ethical commitment to this community is based on. My mother is my only parent of Doukhobor background and I was not raised to speak Russian, nor have I been exposed to the Doukhobor Sunday School teachings. So where do I fall with/in the community?

The effects of this question played out during my research field work. Some of my participants assumed my community privilege without question, while others seemed to intuit my own misgivings about where and how I belong. I have no conclusive answers to this question of personal membership, except to say that membership is context-dependent. Different people extend different offers and that is okay with me. Rather than argue my entitled privilege of

¹⁴ I use community to reference the diffuse and heterogeneous group of Doukhobors in Canada. This reference is to be understood as entirely distinct from "Community," which is a common notation of "Community Doukhobors" or Doukhobors belonging to the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, which evolved from the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood.

membership to the Doukhobor community, I approach this research project from a position of ally. I feel strongly about the Doukhobor community and its representation within Canadian public life. My desire to raise questions of social equity is what generates my momentum for research and dialogue, and it is this desire that draws me in/to the community.

Confidentiality.

While "confidentiality" is a technical term that has a lot of currency in university ethics offices, I want to consider how this term plays out within the Doukhobor community and what my experience of confidentiality was during my field work in western Canada. It helps to first understand that the Doukhobor community was traditionally structured in such a way that families lived in shared units of accommodation (Mealing, 1975, p. 29). Everybody knew everybody, as Gordon recalled during his interview with me:

Gordon: - [A]nd the older people always used to sit out in the, in front, on a bench. Well, we called them older people but they weren't that old. Not as old as I am now. And, ah, before we came up to them, we'd stop as kids, and we'd say, "Well, we have to [Russian words said]." You know what that means?

Sonya: I do not.

Gordon: Oh. "We have to say 'hello." ... and say greetings to them and, ah, these people would say, "Oh, boy, whose children are you?" You know. But they knew everybody.

Sonya: Right.

Gordon: And they'd say, "Well, when you go home, you make sure that you say your greetings to your mother and father and grandfather," or whoever, you know...

Despite the fact that family accommodations have changed, people *still* know everybody in the community. My mother told me that she was immediately asked to identify her grandfather

and her genealogical lineage when she encountered a new acquaintance of Doukhobor faith. People mind the business of one another and like to know how relations fall in the community. This is a complicated issue to negotiate during research, and one that I had to give considerable thought and time to. Often, as participation in my project was being discussed, potential participants would ask "And who else have you spoken with?" It was always an anxious moment for me, as I wanted to retain the confidentiality of others without offending or alienating potential participants. I learned to respond to this question by stating that I was trying to maximize diversity and heterogeneity within my participant population, seeking people of various ideological affiliations, genders, birth places, and ages. This helped to address the implicit connotations of the questions that were posed to me, as I often felt that "And who else have you spoken with?" translated as "Have you spoken to the right people?"

Establishing "the truth."

My research with members of the Doukhobor community has taught me that ethics are fluid. They are context-dependent, they change through time, and they represent the interpersonal negotiations of all who engage. My gauging of appropriate ethical community conduct evolved in line with my research as my participant count grew. With more interviews came more perspectives, and I began to clearly identify the tensions and contradictions of belief within the community.

Despite the fact that I – and many others – can relate to the desire for truth to be championed in the Doukhobor historical narrative, I have grown increasingly wary of the role that truth might occupy in my research. I have tried to share participant voices in such a way that individual ideas are exhibited as *individual* truths, with the acknowledgment that individual

truths will express a unique set of perceptions and experiences. My pursuit is not of truth, but of expanded knowledge and understanding.

Personal/Family Ethics

Reflexivity – the process of informing practice with theory, and theory with practice – turns any research project into an enormous personal learning opportunity. As the research is crafted, so, too, is the researcher's ethical code of conduct and belief. While empirical results are privileged by the academic community, the ethical progression of a researcher is important to note.

I came to this specific project because I wanted to better understand my mother and her community. Acknowledging this intention meant that I was not only researching as a university student, but also as a daughter and granddaughter of people who belonged to my community of interest. It was important to me to gain feedback and insight from my mother as I developed my research proposal. While my supervisor provided feedback on content and application, my mother gave feedback on community etiquette and ethics. She did so with the knowledge that I would bear responsibility for my research. Nevertheless, we both had a tacit understanding that my work in the community had some bearing on her and her family. I had to negotiate the plural responsibilities to self, family, community, and institution.

If each of these responsibilities matter, and all are conjoined, does it make sense to privilege one over another? Is it possible? I have found that factoring gain – and even loss – into a conversation about ethics and responsibility is useful in broaching this question. As a researcher, I stand to gain from both the academic community and the community in which I have done my research. Members of the academy can offer me certification, accolades, and

opportunities to publish. Members of the Doukhobor community can share stories, relationships, and wisdom with me. Key to this latter statement is the word "share." Benefit in/from community is really a benefit derived through relationship and reciprocity. It is a shared benefit from which both parties can gain. Benefit in the academy is most often a benefit of singularity and isolation. Understanding how different sets of responsibilities are suspended in different webs of relationship helps to gauge the potential effects of gain, loss, and even harm in research.

In my case, I wanted to maximize the potential benefit for/with the community, which meant that I endeavoured to privilege my responsibilities to the community. As my research questions evolved, I came back to the issue of benefit and asked myself how and if the community stood to gain from the questions that I was asking. Clearly, benefit is differential, and not everyone in the Doukhobor community of Canada will find my research of relevance or interest. Nevertheless, the perspectives that I have heard and read from within the community are close to me as I write. They help to guide me *through* the data. In returning to these perspectives over and over again, I feel that I am articulating a set of ethics in research that I can stand by and be proud of.

Institutional Ethics

Every scholar at the University of Toronto who wishes to initiate research with human subjects must first go through an ethical review submission process. The forms for review are provided by the university and require the researcher to detail the research design and intention of the proposed project(s). Graduate students require the signature of their supervisor prior to submission. The submissions are reviewed by a group of scholars, administrators, and ethical research specialists. Often, this committee requires extensive revisions before the researcher is given approval to move ahead with the project; on rare occasion, the committee denies the

project entirely. Researchers are bound by the commitments they make in the review process, and any significant deviations from the proposed design require a new ethical submission.

"Ethics," as it is casually referred to in academic communities in Canada, is often considered by qualitative social science researchers to be a fraught process that fails in the adjudication and advancement of actual research integrity (Bosk & De Vries, 2004). The data that scholars publish from is gathered *after* ethical review, so the rewards of research – published documents – are traditionally linked to the active stages of field work and data collection. My own experience with ethical review was both instructive and tolerable. The feedback that I received from the review committee was insightful, but I benefited most from simply working through the review forms and discussing my design repeatedly with my supervisor. Ethical review forced me to consider issues of confidentiality, cultural propriety, information appropriation, and aggression in research. It kept my ego in check and forced me to reckon with the reality of participants as people. The review process also encouraged me to think deeply about the ethics of recruitment, and I responded with a recruitment strategy that was more diverse and comprehensive than I had initially intended it to be.

Participant Recruitment

Addressing Bias

The recruitment strategy is an important part of ethical research design, as is the consideration of bias in research. I have learned that a thoughtful exploration of bias before, during, and after data collection helps to generate research findings that are honest and astute. An acknowledgment of bias forces the researcher to surface personal beliefs, to declare personal contacts, and to evaluate epistemological standpoints. All of this work is then channeled into the

recruitment strategy, where a constructive counterpoint is developed to balance the bias and enhance the research integrity. My own bias was borne of primary exposure to Independent Doukhobors who lived through the Doukhobor troubles in British Columbia without fully understanding them. The conflict of identity that this confusion created was a quiet but palpable part of my experience as cultural witness.

With this awareness, I used my bias as a starting point to move outward into the beliefs and experiences of others. My goal was to maximize participant diversity across variables of gender, age, geographic location, and ideological affiliation to the Doukhobor community. I developed a recruitment strategy that relied on direct *and* indirect recruitment techniques. Access to both techniques allowed me to gauge the diversity of the early participants and then recruit using direct methods to increase representation in areas of weak diversity. Indirect recruitment techniques are generally considered to be more ethical, as they reduce the potential for coercion, but I felt comfortable in justifying the use of both techniques. My research is premised on the desire to reflect positions and experiences within the Doukhobor community that do not have popular visibility in Canadian society. By employing direct and indirect recruitment techniques, I was able to extend an open offer of participation, while simultaneously working to ensure that a diverse set of voices was represented.

Indirect Recruitment

Indirect recruitment means that there is no direct initial contact between a researcher and a potential participant. The participant comes to know of the research opportunity through recruitment documents or word-of-mouth discussion. The measured distance that characterizes indirect recruitment helps to protect potential participants against coercion or pressure. Because of my familial and cultural involvement with the Doukhobor community in Canada, I was aware

of appropriate venues and mediums through which to publicize my research indirectly. *Iskra* is a Doukhobor publication of the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ that has wide distribution across Canada. I submitted a letter to the editor that detailed my research intentions and openly invited participation in the research; this letter was subsequently published in the September 2007 issue (see Appendix A). I also distributed posters (see Appendix B) to a couple of different public venues in the West Kootenay/Boundary region of British Columbia and asked various members within the community to speak to others about my research if they felt comfortable doing so.

The potential of the internet has been harnessed by many different historians with interests in Doukhobor experience. I made contact with publishers of the Doukhobor Genealogy Website, the Spirit Wrestlers website, and the Columbia Basin Institute of Regional History website. Is asked each of these publishers to post my recruitment letter online, and all obliged; the website recruitment texts were edited by the respective publishers, so Appendix C represents one version of the post that was sent to the publisher of the Doukhobor Genealogy Website. Two of the publishers asked for photographs to accompany my letter, indicating that this would generate more interest in my research and substantiate me as a real person. One of the publishers edited my submission and identified my mother's family name to the readership. The intention behind this was to locate me within the community, and both my mother and I were open and accepting of this editorial decision.

⁻

¹⁵ Doukhobor Genealogy Website address = www.doukhobor.org; Spirit Wrestlers website address = www.spirit-wrestlers.com; Columbia Basin Institute of Regional History website address = www.basininstitute.org.

Direct Recruitment

My direct recruitment was concurrent with my indirect recruitment. Serendipity presented me with the opportunity to attend the opening of the Mir Centre for Peace at Selkirk College in September of 2007. This opening celebrated the conversion of a traditional Doukhobor *dom* – on College property overlooking the confluence of the Kootenay and Columbia Rivers – into a recognized institution of peacemaking and peacebuilding. Doukhobors made significant contributions to the development of the Centre and were actively involved in its opening. I attended the ceremony with my grandparents and used my attendance as an opportunity to learn about community vision. I was then able to better locate my research within this vision.

The day of the opening ceremony stands out in my memory as a day of significant personal stress and anxiety. I was very intimidated by the prospect of moving into the active phase of my research. I was also concerned about the ethical considerations of direct recruitment. These ethical considerations arise in theory and practice because potential participants are not guaranteed the comfort of a discrete and anonymous declination when a research invitation is directly delivered. These considerations weighed on me, but I walked into the ceremony for the Mir Centre with the belief that I had adequately contemplated the ethical quagmire of direct recruitment. My *Deda* introduced me to certain acquaintances of his and I spoke with them about my work. Some members of the community were disinterested in my research, but I was able to politely acknowledge this and move on. At other times, people showed strong interest in my research vision and I extended direct invitations to participate.

Despite my nerves, this part of the recruitment strategy was successful and I made contact with several potential participants on the day of the Mir Centre ceremony. I subsequently

spoke with each of these people by telephone. These follow-up calls gave them time to further consider my research and provided them with an opportunity to safely withdraw from it if they so desired.

The Mir Centre event was my most memorable encounter with direct recruitment, but I pursued this strategy in other ways as the autumn progressed. The fact that my extended family was located inside the cultural sphere of Doukhoborism presented me with opportunities to speak to a variety of neighbours, acquaintances, and friends. In addition, I had familiarity with the history and evolution of the community in western British Columbia, so I reached out via email to people who had been – or were still – active in their questioning of cultural practice and philosophy. My direct recruitment scripts for telephone and email can be viewed as Appendix D and Appendix E, respectively.

Recruitment Parameters of Inclusion

Age and generation.

My initial research strategy proposed to contain participant recruitment within the population of Doukhobors in Canada who had *lived through* periods of protest. As my recruitment strategy evolved, I became more interested in the possibility of also interviewing younger people who were born after the peak of protest and conflict activities. This broadening of inclusion parameters implied my acceptance of theories on the intergenerational transmission of memory.

The ceasing of conflict activities does not mean that the human experience of these activities ends. Remembrance confuses space and time so that human beings move liminally from one experience to another. Conflict and violence engender memorial legacies of speech and

silence that are negotiated by diverse members of a community (Baum, 2000; Jelin, 2002/2003; Sugiman, 2004). People born into communities with legacies of conflict will have some form of relationship to the "difficult past" of their community.

Geographic location.

Because my experience with Doukhobor culture derives from relatives who live in the West Kootenay and Boundary regions of British Columbia, I have an intellectual curiosity based in the experiences of people who live in these regions. The activities of strategic protest that make up the Doukhobor troubles occurred largely in these same regions, though several of my research participants note that nudity and arson also occurred in Saskatchewan, with similar consequences for surrounding human communities there. I initially proposed research with people who experienced the periods of conflict while living in British Columbia. Nevertheless, over time, this research parameter felt increasingly artificial as my knowledge of the Doukhobor community in Canada broadened. Members of the community do make distinctions across interpretive faith and geographic location, but these distinctions do not, ultimately, prevent the sense of community that encompasses Doukhobor people across Canada. Likewise, the sensational media interpretations of the depredations were carried by currents of hot air all across the prairie provinces.

With this in mind, I made the decision to directly invite participation from people who grew up in Saskatchewan, too. The resultant input from prairie people is small, but in no way insignificant. The narratives of Saskatchewan Doukhobors make a good deal of sense within the context of depredation activity and they highlight the impact of these activities on Doukhobor identity across Canada.

Gender.

Gender is a curious construct in the Doukhobor community. Women have intermittently occupied positions of strength and leadership, but strong currents of paternalism still characterize some of the history and experience that represents the community. Much of this representation has been ignorantly imposed from outside of the community, as exemplified by the salacious and misguided public treatment of early photographs that document women pulling ploughs on prairie land. Ashleigh Androsoff (2007) presents a thorough discussion of the ways in which images of Doukhobor women were used by non-Doukhobor Canadians to construct and imagine similarity and difference. Other criticisms of gendered experience derive from inside the community, as noted in Natasha Jmieff's (2007) compelling and controversial *Iskra* article:

I've spent the last couple of months staying as far away from Doukhoborism as possible...I have kept this distance in part because of my disillusionment about the Doukhobor community, well-encapsulated by a fellow young person who described trying to help an elder lift a wooden bench after a meeting. The man got angry at her because, "Women aren't supposed to do that." All my friend wanted was to feel acceptance and a sense of belonging. (p. 3)

Jmieff doesn't explicitly link gender with age, but the quote above suggests that variables of gender and generation are entwined in Doukhobor experience. Similar issues have been discussed by feminist theorists who argue that gender cannot be addressed outside of race and other forms of difference (Ahmed, 2000; Crenshaw, 1989). Theories of intersectionality thus stand to inform future considerations of gender in Doukhobor research. Gender is not the primary focus of this thesis, but I purposely recruited both men and women to speak of their experiences of conflict in Canada.

¹⁶ A photo of Doukhobor women pulling the ploughs can be viewed at: http://www.basininstitute.org/home/search/details.html?id=2679

Ideological affiliation.

Factional thought characterizes many ethno-spiritual communities. In North America, a variety of scholars have written on the divisions, differences, and subjective crises within the Mennonite community (Klassen, 1998; Urry, 1999; Winland, 1993), at times defending ideological divisions as an expected form of social conflict that should not be hidden or glossed over (Ainlay & Kniss, 1998). In the Doukhobor community in Canada, ideological divisions have certainly driven acts of violence and conflict, but I do want to tease apart the presumptuous marriage of ideology with conflict. Today, it is more productive to consider the distinct forms of Doukhobor thought as affiliated ideologies instead of divided ideologies. This allows for more room to understand how new opportunities for peace and reconciliation might sustain multiple forms of belief. Furthermore, in reference to the mention of intersectionality above, many people of Doukhobor background believe that the distinctive expressions of Doukhobor belief have more resonance in the elder population that lived through the depredations. It remains to be seen whether or not new generations of Doukhobors will persist with these same patterns of thought.

My research strategy clearly demonstrated the desire for representation of lived experience across the spectrum of Doukhobor ideology. I did not propose to cluster these experiences, nor did I propose to generalize these experiences through the lens of ideology, but I did want active representation of people who grew up as Independent Doukhobors, as Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ Doukhobors, and as Sons of Freedom Doukhobors. Some participants did not dwell on affiliation, while others insisted that the affiliation was central to their past and present identity as a member of the Doukhobor community.

Introduction of Participants

Ultimately, fifteen people went through the informed consent process (see Appendix F) and participated in a research interview with me. Three of these participants initiated contact with me after reading about my research online and in *Iskra*. Of the other twelve participants, five people were recruited directly via telephone, two people were recruited directly at the Mir Centre event, and four people were recruited directly via email. One participant was recruited indirectly through an intermediary who passed on my contact information and invitation to participate. The person of interest subsequently contacted me and agreed to an interview.

I withhold a formal introduction of each individual because I want to respect the anonymity that several people requested; participants were offered the choice of a pseudonym in their representation within this document, and some chose to accept this offer. I list below the names of the participants as they have asked to be identified. I then resort to first names throughout the thesis, so as not to call unnecessary attention to the people who requested anonymity.

The names of my participants are as follows (in order of *alphabetized first name*):

Corinne Postnikoff, Ellison, Gordon, Grace Legebokoff, Greg Nesteroff, Harry Osachoff,

Jonathan Kalmakoff, Koozma J. Tarasoff, Lovette Nichvolodoff, Mike William Popoff, Natasha

Jmieff, Nina Leontowicz, Patricia Paul William, Steve Lapshinoff, and Vera Kanigan.

These participants represent unique life experiences across many different variables. I interviewed seven women and eight men; within this category of gender, I was able to speak to men and women of diverse age. The youngest participant was born in 1977. The oldest participant was born in 1918. It is also relevant to ask how many people were born after the last of the depredations. According to Gregory Cran (2006), the last depredation occurred in October,

1982 (p. 151). Therefore, all of my participants were born before the last of the depredations occurred, though some of them would have been very young as the depredations ceased.

Two of the people whom I interviewed spent their full childhood and adolescence in Saskatchewan. The majority of the other participants spent their full childhood and adolescence in British Columbia, though some participants travelled back and forth between the western provinces. With the exception of one participant, everybody grew up in popular areas of Doukhobor representation and settlement. The one participant who grew up without this cultural support spoke at length about the influence and effect of this cultural isolation on experiences of the Doukhobor troubles.

Two of my participants experienced the Doukhobor troubles as people who identified as Sons of Freedom Doukhobors and four of my participants experienced the Doukhobor troubles as people who identified as Independent Doukhobors. Seven of my participants experienced the Doukhobor troubles as people who identified as Orthodox Doukhobors. One participant was born into a nuclear family unit that actively expressed two different ideologies. One participant is of Doukhobor ancestry, but does not identify with a distinct pattern of faith. Two participants were born to families in which only one parent was of Doukhobor background. One participant experienced the depredations as a Doukhobor, but has since converted to an alternate Christian faith. Many participants experienced segregation from other extended family members because of ideological family differences.

I hesitate to further classify or reduce the people who participated in my research. My goal is to express diversity without reifying difference, so I will simply remark that every one of my participants was extremely giving of their time and kindness. Their individual experiences

are remarkable, as is their resilience, and they expressed a deep gratitude for the strength that Doukhobors have sustained through the ups and downs of history.

Chapter Conclusion

In getting to know others, we come to know ourselves. Social science research of high integrity requires a reflexive evaluation of personal history. We must know where and how we are located and situated in social reality in order to fully understand our ethical obligations.

Although academic institutions have formal processes of ethical review, cultural and social institutions have alternative juries. Understanding the needs and concerns of these juries is crucial to a successful community-based project.

Similarly, researchers must give consideration to the ways in which they have learned to understand and frame their research interests. My prior knowledge of the Doukhobor troubles was limited to the stories that were told to me by family members and acquaintances. I explicitly identified the need for diverse participant representation in my research as a means of expanding my exposure to the experiences and narratives of Doukhobor people in Canada. While acknowledging that this research can only tell the stories of those who chose to speak, I do believe that my integration of direct and indirect recruitment strategies has resulted in a strong set of interviews from which public conceptions of "Doukhobor" can be interrogated.

Chapter Four:

Research Frameworks for Fieldwork and Analysis

Though recruitment feels like such a momentous hurdle at the start of the research project, it really is just the beginning. Then comes the implementation of theory in action, when the researcher moves out of the head space and into the home space. This chapter introduces the supporting theory for my research approach. It then details my experience of applying this approach "in the field." In this research project, the field is a diasporic Doukhobor space of multigenerational activity. Kitchen tables realized this space and memory made it soar. Different participants defined this space differently, but everyone shared it generously with me.

Theory

Research and Reality

My very first graduate school course provided instruction on qualitative research. The required readings for this course underscored the value of defining and articulating personal beliefs about knowledge and its construction. Part of this work entails asking what our assumptions of reality are, and how these assumptions influence an approach to research. Two of the more commonly known research approaches are qualitative research and quantitative research. The quantitative research approach often has a statistical orientation and defines reality in concrete terms. It claims that the nature of reality exists independent of human perception, and that researchers are removed from the phenomena they observe (Pring, 2000). While some qualitative researchers persist with quantitative philosophies – this approach is termed "qualitative positivism" (Prasad, 2005, p. 4) – most qualitative researchers have a distinct philosophy that complements their nonstatistical choice of methods. The philosophy generally

associated with qualitative research assumes that realities are interpreted through unique human subjectivities (Pring, 2000). Thus, qualitative researchers admit and insist that inquiry occurs *through* the researcher. The quantitative claims of objectivity and distance are refuted.¹⁷

My work with members of the Doukhobor community in Canada is compatible with the qualitative research approach for many reasons. Research in human communities is often risky because it exposes the lives of individuals to the judgment of an outside audience. When I, as researcher, accept that the research occurs through me, I take responsibility for the interpretations that I derive. This is one way that the qualitative research approach can address participant vulnerability, particularly if feminist principles frame the way in which the approach is adopted. While I am not focused on making meaning about feminism with this particular research project, I have attempted to respect and integrate the research considerations that feminists privilege, including: acknowledgment and illumination of structural inequality; advocacy with and for people who are affected by structural inequality; attention to power imbalances in research; and attention to essentialized expressions of difference (DeVault, 1999).

The qualitative approach is also useful to my work because it allows for data that is ripe with discord and diverse claims to truth. "Reality" is understood to be different for each person because each person moves through the world with a unique set of experiences that colours the process of social construction. Within the Doukhobor community in Canada, people hold interpretations of history and truth that vary widely. The qualitative research approach allows me to represent this diversity without apologizing for it or whittling it away. I can derive conclusions and propose explanations for this diversity, but I am not entitled to claim that my conclusions are

¹⁷ It is beyond the scope of this project to further discuss the disparities between quantitative and qualitative approaches. Pring (2000) provides an excellent starting point from which to begin an interrogation of the quantitative/qualitative dichotomy and its utility in educational research.

the only valid way of making meaning. In this way, qualitative research offers something substantive to its readers. Readers are encouraged to take up the perspectives posed to them and ask how their own understandings of reality contribute to the meaning-making project.

Knowledge Production

Just as research is framed by an approach, it can be further guided by a research tradition. Prasad defines "tradition" in the following way: "A scholarly or intellectual tradition intimates an entire *way of conducting scholarship* rather than merely offering a choice of technique or a uniform set of assumptions" (Prasad, 2005, p. 8). Affiliating with a tradition is a momentous commitment that generates expectations of fidelity. I am not yet in a position to follow the nuanced demands of any specific research tradition, but I do know where and how to locate my own views on knowledge production. The interpretive tradition is classified as a "meta-tradition" and encourages a "scholarly position that takes *human interpretation* as the starting point for developing knowledge about the social world" (Prasad, 2005, p. 13).

The assumption that meaning arises from interpretation is basic to the interpretive tradition. I have always been attracted to the particularities of voice, so the framework of this tradition aligns well with my own inclinations towards community-based research settings and oral history research methods. I believe that listening carefully to the stories of people's lives is a valid way of recognizing and evaluating larger social and cultural structures. Inevitably, the interpretive tradition requires me to interpret the interpretations of my research participants, but I do attempt to cite consistently and extensively from participant transcripts in order to let participant voices shine through. Rather than re-interpreting the details of other people's lives, I believe that my contribution to the construction of knowledge lies in the generation of a bigger picture. I can identify interpretive patterns and ask why and how these patterns have formed

within human communities. I can also ask how these pathways of meaning-making might shift to allow for new ideas and interpretations to emerge.

Because my research strategy encourages active interpretation on the part of my participants, I have been more than willing to reciprocate with my own interpretations of social reality. This notion of reciprocity underpins feminist theory on research methods and methodologies. Progressive qualitative researchers have also explored interviewing techniques and oral history methodologies within a broader exposition of research as dialogue (Janesick, 2010, p. 16). I use these theories and perspectives to validate my active participation in the research conversation. Thus, reciprocity allows for engaged meaning-making to occur *during* data collection, too, and I want to highlight it as one of the most transformative elements that I have experienced within the qualitative research approach.

Scholastic Scrimmage

Oral history generates a lot of attention and debate in the academic discipline of history (Cruikshank, 1994; Grele, 1978; Soapes, 1977; Yow, 1995). This methodology is well-positioned to reveal the details and colours of human recollection (Janesick, 2010, p. 17), but such attributes are tempered by concerns about the error and bias in oral history research (Henige, 1986). I am sympathetic to these concerns, but I am cynical enough to see this same potential for error in archival research and other forms of inquiry (Ritchie, 1995, pp. 6-7). This scrimmage for methodological privilege within the academic history community is remarkably similar to the scrimmage for privilege that occurs between quantitative and qualitative researchers. Both debates are predicated on the belief that "truth" is the ultimate research product.

As a researcher located in a community where truth and fact have been contested for decades, I am aligned with other researchers in the belief that there are alternatives to Truth as the ultimate knowledge outcome (Cran, 2006, pp. 28, 132, 136; McNeill, 1986). Perhaps rejecting truth as the most desirable outcome of my research risks confusion and disappointment from people within the academic community and the Doukhobor community in Canada. What I want to suggest is that oral history can generate information and knowledge of considerable merit and utility, and that linear truths do not always yield outcomes of peace and justice, both of which the contemporary Doukhobor community desires.

Oral history methods are quite basic, as discussed below, but the stories and memories that arise can be sophisticated and nuanced. In addition to revealing much about the operation of human memory through time (Frisch, 1979, pp. 75-76; Tosh, 1991, p. 216), oral history research methods can yield masterful assessments of human reality. In this sense, then, I *am* attracted to the truths that emerge from oral history data, but these truths are just as easily found in the best of the world's stories.

Oral History and Life History Research

The broad category of oral history encompasses many different ways of "doing history." Life history research represents one such specialization in which participants are interviewed at length about their cumulative life experiences (Cole & Knowles, 2001; Ritchie, 1995, p. 16). My own research limitations made lengthy life history interviews impossible, so I chose instead to pursue a discontinuous exploration of lived experience with each of my participants. I focused this discussion/exploration on experiences that related in some way to the Doukhobor conflicts of the 20th century. By asking about subjective experiences, and contextualizing these experiences within the broader Canadian climate of colonization, I sought to avoid a narrative

recourse to intra-community blame. It is easy to understand why people resort to blame when they interpret a difficult past. Yet it is also easy to understand how blame can inflame remembrance and disturb the present. I wanted to see if experiences of Doukhobor conflict could be explored by members of the community without an adjudication of guilt.

Interviews

My research approach was to use a semi-structured interview guide (see Appendix G) to help focus the interviews. Some participants requested a copy of the guide in advance and I met their requests whenever possible. Many of the interviews were conducted in the homes of my participants, though two of my participants requested that we meet in a quiet public place, which we did. Other interviews were conducted by telephone if I was unable to travel due to scheduling conflicts or distance. A couple of interviews were facilitated by email and these interviews entailed extensive back-and-forth discussion. For those participants who were professional or amateur Doukhobor historians, I provided an additional interview guide (see Appendix H) that focused on specific questions about the formal representation of Doukhobor history in public life. My goal with this set of questions was to further expand on the subjective experience of representing community to inside and outside audiences.

Participants responded in diverse ways to the semi-structured interview guides. Some people were comforted by the guides and used them extensively to navigate the interview. Other people looked at them only briefly and relied on me to gauge the progress and content of the interview. In these latter situations, I often allowed for the conversation to unfold naturally, while making notes of which questions were being answered indirectly. I then directed the participant to any remaining questions once the momentum of the discussion slowed. Often, my

participants and I were able to touch on many, if not all, of the questions on the interview guide(s).

Most of the in-person research discussions were completed in a single session; one inperson research discussion was spread over two sessions, both of which occurred in the same
week. On average, the telephone interviews took 89 minutes, while the in-person interviews took
74 minutes. Each email interview took place over several days. I received one immediate followup telephone call from a participant who wished to clarify the content of the information that had
been provided in an in-person interview a couple of days prior. This participant made contact to
request that certain parts of the interview be omitted to protect the identity of other community
members whom we had spoken of. I respected this participant's wishes and deleted the content
as requested.

In total, fifteen people went through the informed consent process with me and participated in a research discussion during the fall of 2007 or winter of 2008. One community member – who had been recommended by another participant – agreed to participate when first approached by me, but declined to participate when I phoned to schedule an interview. This person simply stated: "I don't want to go into the past like that." All of the participants who went through the informed consent process agreed to permit my use of audio-recording equipment during phone and in-person interviews. Each person was shown how to turn the equipment off as part of the preliminary research introduction to in-person interviews. The equipment was turned off during several interviews for refreshment breaks and one participant asked to have the equipment turned off during a particularly sensitive and emotional recollection. The equipment was subsequently turned back on when the participant was ready to continue with the recording.

This practice of shared control by interviewee and interviewer is somewhat contested in the oral history literature, particularly in older texts. Ritchie (1995) adopts a traditional view in his discussion of interviewing techniques: "An oral history is not a journalistic interview, so there is little to be gained by hearing a story 'off the record.' Politely but firmly, interviewers should decline to interrupt the interview" (p. 72). To this, I simply suggest that respect for participant rights is a tremendous gain for all.

Several participant spouses were in their homes while the interviews occurred and none of my participants seemed bothered by this. I paid heightened attention to body language and social cues for any indications of discomfort, but I also respected the autonomy of my participants in their own surroundings. No one expressed discomfort with the dynamics of their interview situations. A couple of spouses sat in on the research conversation and contributed information as well. These latter experiences were positively affirming for me. I took them to mean that my research questions did have some resonance in contemporary Doukhobor life, and that families are capable of discussing difficult Doukhobor pasts without losing sight of the present and the future.

As mentioned above, all interviews occurred during the fall of 2007 and winter of 2008. Though many of the opinions expressed in the transcript citations have likely stayed the same over this period of time, some have changed and evolved. My own constraints make it impractical for me to return for further interviews in 2011, so I shall simply take care to note that this paper is reflective of diverse Doukhobor opinions as they existed three years ago.

Transcription

"Lost in Transcription"

The simple act of transcription belies a complicated proposition. After oral historians record a sequence of sounds, they then play the recording back and make a written record of it. This is a tedious task, an onerous task, but not an overly difficult task. The proposition that arises from this task, however, is much more demanding. The transcript of an oral conversation is supposed to represent the conversation; it asks us to believe that the dynamics of narration, or of conversation, *can* be adequately captured in written form. Many people involved in oral history research forget about this leap of faith, though DeVault (1999, pp. 76-77) discusses the contributions and insights that conversation and discourse analysts have made to the larger project of learning from *talk*.

In order to learn from talk, the process itself must be acknowledged as valuable. Researchers tend to forget about the potential of "real time" conversation when the transcript makes research life so much easier. This act of translation is also an act of separation, for the postal and email systems allow for researchers to touch base and confirm outstanding details with their participants from a distance. There is often no obligation to return to the community once the data has been gathered.

I say all of the above with the admission that I, too, did my interviews "in the field" and transcribed in the safety of my office. My analysis has been done with transcripts instead of the original recordings because transcripts enabled tremendous time savings. I have retained the original audiorecordings and will work with my participants to establish what, if anything, will be done with this oral history collection when my thesis is completed. Nevertheless, there is no guarantee that any of us will ever return to the sound origins of this research. In certain ways,

transcription reduces research dialogue to a means instead of a valued process in and of itself. This has significant consequences for the ways in which non-academics view qualitative research, particularly the research that gets done in community. In order for participants to feel that their lives and experiences matter beyond the narrative wealth that interviews and observations generate, there needs to be recognition of these lives outside of the data collection process (Huisman, 2008). Despite the fact that my thesis represents the conclusion of this project, I continue to ask myself how I might use this project to further a dialogue with members of my research community.

Process

All of my research interviews were conducted in English, though many of my participants are fluent in the Doukhobor dialect of Russian. Occasionally, participants slipped into Russian when imitating conversations from their past. Lena Sherstobitoff (2005), a Doukhobor researcher who conducted interviews in her home region of West Kootenay, has analyzed the linguistic switches that her participants employed (p. 23). Because I am not fluent in Russian, and was therefore unable to stimulate or respond to linguistic switches, I have noted linguistic switches in my transcripts but have refrained from any further analysis of code switching. When possible, I have consulted my participants for English translations of their Russian words. I include these translations in the transcripts.

The audiorecording device that I used during the interviews was a digital audiorecorder. It allowed me to transfer the sound recordings onto my computer and then, in turn, onto DVDs, which I used to store and transport the data. I gave participants the option of requesting a copy of their sound file, and those who did received a DVD in the mail. I used transcription software to link my sound files up with a manual foot pedal that plugged into my computer. The foot pedal

allowed me to advance and rewind the sound files as I transcribed the recorded dialogue. In general, the sound files were easy to understand and transcribe from. The quality of the in-person recordings was very good, though the low volume of the recordings was a challenge. The sound files that I recorded during telephone conversations – with the aid of an adaptor – were inconsistent in quality and the recorded volumes were so low as to make transcription an enormous challenge. My telephone participants were very accommodating and helped to fill in the transcription holes when possible.

The transcripts that I produced from the sound recordings are minimally stylized.

Emphasized words were transcribed in italicized bold script – like *this* – and long pauses were accounted for with a [...]. I used hyphens to indicate interruptions in speech. Words and phrases that were inaudible on the sound files were noted as follows: [words missing].

Negotiation

Anyone who has transcribed knows that a spoken conversation is ripe with pauses, coughs, tangents, incidental sounds, errors, "ums," and stutters. These conversational elements pose a real methodological challenge to a researcher. Since transcription occurs before analysis and interpretation, a hasty assumption could be made that transcripts are devoid of a researcher's subjective imprint. Contrary to this assumption, I have learned that the actual act of "doing" transcription requires an infinite amount of subjective decisions: Should I exempt all of the "ums" and "ahs"?; Should I exempt this extraneous piece of information?; Am I allowed to decide what is extraneous and what is not?; Should I add in additional information for context?; Is it interference to punctuate the speech of my participants?; and If I don't interfere, will my audience make inappropriate judgments about the worldliness and education of my participants?

These are questions of an ethical nature, but the guidance in the literature to help researchers establish an ethical framework for the decision-making that transcription requires is somewhat scant (for examples, see DeVault, 1999; Reinharz, 1992; Ritchie, 1995). I chose to abstain from any sort of intensive editing, which meant that the transcripts that I sent back to my participants were not groomed. To contextualize this styling, I appended a letter to each transcript that explained the methodological dilemmas that I was faced with. Below is a portion of this letter:

Lastly, I just want to address the issue of style in the transcripts. As with all of my research transcripts, I have transcribed word for word. It is evident that this kind of style is not perfect, but that to me is the whole point. The conversation was an honest engagement between two people – both you and I have run-on sentences or interrupted sentences that make use of slang, etc. Please, please do not feel that I am in anyway making fun of our conversation by transcribing word for word. I did not feel that it was appropriate to edit for grammar or perfection. In using these transcripts in the final research document, I will take care to use the transcript quotations in such a way as to pay respect to you and other participants.

Nevertheless, I did receive back the following comment from one of my participants after this person had read the transcript of our interview:

Hi Sonya – Upon reading your report I found it very interesting. I'll leave it as presented, but it opened my eyes as to how unorganized I was in my presentation without prior preparation. It goes to show that I probably should have continued on with schooling. Ha! Ha!

I was disturbed by this response because of the self-deprecation that it conveyed.

Research methods almost always position the researcher above the research participant and I have found that participants will intuit or reinforce these hierarchies, even when I am trying to

subvert the traditional placement of researcher and research participant. It is important for me to acknowledge that I was unable to anticipate or mitigate against all of the arrogance that comes with the practice of academic research. With refreshing candour, Lena Sherstobitoff (2005) writes of her own methodological negotiations that occurred during interviews with members of the Doukhobor community: "[T]he informal atmosphere prompted many participants to ask my opinion on certain matters, while others redirected my questions back towards me" (p. 24). It is, therefore, possible to find an ethical equilibrium in community-based research, and I do believe that transcripts offer an insightful medium through which to approach and understand the workings of community in research.

Joint Editing

I made a guarantee to my participants that they would each have an opportunity to view the first draft of their respective transcripts. First drafts were sent to participants by mail or email, with a self-addressed and stamped envelope included in which the edited transcripts were to be returned to me. Each participant was cued to any specific questions that I had about the relevant transcript and I checked back in about each person's decision to accept or forego the option of a pseudonym. I used the first draft to highlight any questionable spellings of place names or given names. I also used the first draft to clarify trailing and confusing statements. Participants were asked to consider any missing words that I was unable to hear on the recordings; if they were able to make sense of the statements and fill in the missing words retrospectively, they were encouraged to do so.

More importantly, the first draft also provided participants with an opportunity to delete anything that embarrassed or concerned them. They were asked to draw lines through the words that they wanted omitted. Some people made use of this opportunity, while others felt no need to

do so. Several of my participants were extremely conscientious in their editing and they returned the transcripts with detailed annotations. One participant wrote to me that the interview had provided an opportunity to think through elements of the past that had not yet been sorted in this person's mind. I feel privileged to this day that all of my participants trusted me to witness and engage in their memorial labour.

Transcript Analysis

My transcript analysis process was cumulative and slow, though it gained a certain momentum at the end. The beginning of this process was undeniably – and unexpectedly – agonizing. I was completely overwhelmed with the amount of data that the transcripts contained. In the midst of this hesitation, I returned to my interview guides to review my questions, wondering if I had erred on the side of excess. The questions still seemed salient and the ordering of them followed a logic that I believed in. I subsequently turned to my supervisor for advice and he suggested that I summarize each of the transcripts, one by one, to distill the interpretive voices. In doing so, I began to develop a list of words that represented the feelings and convictions that I was summarizing.

Part of my early hesitation derived from discomfort with the diversity that the data conveyed. I wanted to produce something of value to the community, but the data bore out some strong and oppositional ideas about what *was* of value within the community. How could I represent paradox without implying parody? This question obliged me to sit with my data for a long while before I was able to find a way through it.

In the end, I felt that it was important to honour the tensions in the data. I came to this conclusion because I had been told by my participants how committed they were to the sustainability and growth of Doukhoborism in Canada. Marginalizing the contradictions seemed

like an epic betrayal of the love for community that I observed. In sharing these ideas with my supervisor, we agreed that I would contextualize my concerns and give voice to them as part of the thesis narrative. That decision allowed me to return to my data with a renewed confidence and excitement.

The voices of my participants were so candid and vivid that I knew I wanted to begin with a "results" chapter of stories and memories. The chapters that follow the results were brainstormed out of the list of words and ideas that I had been building from the summaries.

Once I had a meta-theme to frame each of the analysis chapters, I returned to the transcripts and began to pull paragraphs of text that advanced these themes. The process itself was very literal. I cut up the transcripts and moved the different voices and ideas around. I matched ideas that were congruent, I matched ideas that were contradictory. I layered transcript citations so that they would read, collectively, as a story that was both accessible and thought-provoking.

The meta-themes forced me to organize the data so that the early motivations of my research could be addressed. I relied on overarching concepts of community, memory, history, and empathy to help develop logical and representative arguments and considerations. With this part of the analysis done, I looked to sources that could locate the concerns and considerations of my research within a broader intellectual discussion of culture and community. I have used these sources to guide the following chapters. My own interests are borne out in the analysis, but I have tried to simultaneously address the needs and interests of the people who participated in this project.

Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has shown how destabilizing it is to go from theory to practice. The theoretical world itself is fraught with opposition as scholars debate what makes research valid.

Once a researcher has proposed and defended a choice of method(s), the application of such methods embeds the researcher in a new web of committed relations that further intensify understandings of responsibility. Transcription and analysis are powerful processes in which the qualitative researcher reckons with the subjective interpretation of real thoughts from real people.

Chapter Five:

Results...or Stories and Voices

Authors and artists use storyboards to depict the layouts of their work. Without losing sight of the fact that I am, in this context, a researcher, I have chosen to use elements of storyboard process to inspire this initial presentation of my research results. The shimmer of the distant past introduces the multi-voice narrative that structures this chapter; these reminiscences of early childhood represent the voices of elder participants and often convey a strong sense of appreciation for youthful experiences of life in community. The narrative gathers momentum as discernible tension reveals the complex and confusing dynamics of life as a Doukhobor during – and after – the depredations in western Canada. As the storyline crests and falls, the voices work to assemble the elements of Doukhobor history and experience that give meaning to life in Canada today. These voices seek – and find – narrative turns that yield hope and possibility for Doukhobor futures.

So, yes, the trajectory of this chapter shows how stories make waves. For that matter, so do people. I have laid out this chapter with a storyline that is evident in many of the transcripts that inform my work. This is not to suggest that the lives and stories of all Doukhobors take this particular path, but it is a familiar route of ups and downs, and one that potentiates access for people in Canada who have little prior knowledge or context for Doukhobor history. I hope that the narrators of this chapter lift the material from the pages and illustrate how complex, entwined, and vivid their life experiences are.

Structure

The transcript citations below evoke themes and ideas that I analyze and interpret in subsequent chapters. In the present chapter, my goal is to simply allow for space in which to begin an approach of Doukhobor experience in Canada. In effect, these citations represent the qualitative research results from the interviews that I conducted with fifteen different participants. They do not encompass *all* of the stories and thoughts that were shared with me, but I use this chapter and those that follow to work with as much of the transcript material as possible. In moving through this material, I have adhered to the questions that framed my initial research proposal as a means of containing and structuring the data.

Memory is a partial and incomplete enterprise, admittedly, but it is a powerful enterprise nonetheless: it paints our subjective interpretations of life in technicolour. The dialogue citations below thus hint at the bigger picture of Doukhobor experience in Canada. They are organized into three collections which, when read together, give rise to a storyline that speaks to life experiences before, during, and after the Doukhobor troubles. I am aware that the coherence of these narratives may challenge readers who are not familiar with the geographic and cultural histories of this particular community. My desire to retain participant confidentiality and to refrain from troubling essentialisms means that the additional context I provide is limited. This makes comprehension more difficult for an outside readership, but I hope that the analysis in the following chapters helps to clarify any holes that emerge in this chapter.

Contextual guidance is provided by me at the beginning of each of these three sections, after which I fade out and let the voices speak for themselves. My voice is present in some of the transcript citations and I have retained these interactive elements as a way of acknowledging the reciprocal nature of the research discussions.

Narrative Data

Early Teachings and Experiences

The narratives in this section identify many of the 20th century practices and traditions that served to impart a Doukhobor identity through lessons of faith, song, language, labour, and morality. Children generally had a deep and engaging education within the home, and this reality troubles the popular 20th century perception of Doukhobor children as uneducated or depraved. Many of the Doukhobor children in western Canada did, in fact, attend public school, even while other Doukhobor families were protesting the ideological dangers of institutionalized public education. Nevertheless, regardless of institutional attendance, all children were guided by their families in lessons of cultural importance.

On the topic of "school," I want to clarify the narrative reference to the Boys' Industrial School in Coquitlam. The speaker who acknowledges life in this institution was incarcerated in response to the imprisonment of the speaker's adult family members on Piers Island. The imprisonment of Sons of Freedom Doukhobors on Piers Island – located within the province of British Columbia in the Pacific Ocean – in the early 1930s occurred in response to mass convictions of public nudity. The Piers Island incarceration was one of many mass Doukhobor incarcerations of the 20th century that destroyed family, cultural, and social bonds.

The following narratives draw from diverse Doukhobor experiences across the western provinces of Canada, yet they surface intriguing parallels that question the validity of historical assumptions. The supposed insularity of Doukhobor life was often a simple reality of rural conditions that were shared by many different cultural communities. For example, there are many references to the difficulties that a lack of transportation posed for integration. I suggest

that readers pay close attention to the multiple explanations that arise for the lifestyle circumstances of Doukhobor families in early-to-mid 20th century life in Canada.

Many of the voices below represent people and families who lived in traditional village structures during the 20th century. The place names are sometimes referred to in Russian. I am at fault for any inconsistencies or errors that exist in the representation of these place names. Some participants asked for specific spellings to be incorporated into this document, while others left that determination to me.

Grace: My dad and mom, they always taught us to read psalms. That's mean Doukhobors' prayer –

Sonya: Right.

Grace: - and even when we go to bed and they try to learn us so we would know, we don't have to read it from the paper. From our heart. Then it's okay. But from the paper, that's no good. That's, you're not, not spirit. [Laughing] You don't have spirit then.

Sonya: So it had to be in your heart and not just in your head.

Grace: Yeah, yeah. And from the paper, from the book, whatever, you have to...just, you are talking from your heart, you know.

Patricia Paul William: In our school I think there was the majority of English students. I know Marjorie was my friend. She used to tap dance and I wanted to learn. And we had a big basement in the school, which was nice in the winter time. She'd tap away and we'd look and feel good. But we kept, like, we always said the Lord's Prayer in school. It was in English. But it's the same Lord's Prayer that's in Russian. And...there wasn't fights there. There wasn't boys fighting boys, like, we had a ball diamond and the boys played ball, generally. I don't know if the girls played ball. We lived next to the school in Saskatchewan and we could hear them choosing sides already. Girl or boy. Choosing sides to play ball. And, you know, we hurried if we were milking the cow, we would hurry and hurry up and change -

Sonya: [Laughing]

Patricia Paul William: - and clean up and go [laughing] and play ball before school starts. My school years, I wish it on any child. I had, we had beautiful school days.

Ellison: Yes. So we were split into three groups for a while. The little ones, the middle-aged, and the boys sixteen and better, because the school [Boys' Industrial School in Coquitlam, British Columbia] was open for up to eighteen, I believe. One time...I was with the kids . . . and below us was what they called a "black hole." If the boys don't behave, the other prisoners don't behave, they put them into a black hole. Or as a detention barrack, place. So, this one time . . . so this one time there's a noise down below and this is getting to be after bedtime. All of us kids, there was about twelve of us in that dormitory at that time, we were laying on the floor, listening to them fighting. They're hollering and cursing. And we, at that time, we had a guard who was a prisoner himself. He was of Ukrainian descent and his name was Peter. And he happened to walk in on us. And he says, "Now why aren't you in bed?" And he says, "Okay, want to be up? Alright, put your clothes on." So, we put our clothes on. Take us into the basement, each one of us was poured a pail of water, and we had to scrub the whole basement floor on our knees, as a punishment. And that lasted for near into the morning.

Mike: It's amazing how fast the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood *grew*. Like all the villages that I've mentioned in the *Iskra*, there was eighty-nine, I believe. I think it was eighty-nine double and single villages. And they used to walk from Ootischenia to Glade! Across past the golf course, past the Brilliant dam, in along the two creeks that were there, because you had to cross them. And of course in the spring they were pretty high to cross them. To Glade, and help build those villages. By 1912 the villages in *Glade* were built. And there's twenty-six sets of villages *here*, in Ootischenia. Kamenoe, it's called, and *Ostrov*, where Selkirk College is. There's twenty-six sets of villages here. The timber was huge, which they tried to clear the land with horses. And they had a heck of a time 'til they went and bought a steam engine and a big drum, cables, and for land clearing they built it on sloops, like sleighs. He'd hook himself onto a stump, clear whatever he can all the way around him, even the big stumps, a lot of them

had to be blasted, you know, to blow them up because they were the size of maybe this table. And they cleared right from the far north end of Ootsichenia for approximately three miles to the south end of Ootischenia. All that flat, they cleared it by this machine.

Lovette: That they [Doukhobors] *are* hard workers. And they like to do things, you know, *well*. I, I think it's, like, this gardening thing and this food thing. It was, like, when they first arrived there was nothing to eat! They had to do something and it was always...Well, I even remember, like, our grandparents used to say, "You have to put your seeds away, so you have seeds." Like, you know, "You have to have the dry *beans* and the dry *peas* and..." You know. [Word missing] and wheat for flour.

Sonya: If I buy a chicken from Safeway; you know how you can buy a rotisserie chicken?

Lovette: Yeah.

Sonya: I'll phone my *Baba* and I'll say, "Oh, what did you have for supper?" And then she'll say, "Oh, what did you have for supper?" And I said, "Oh, I have, I had a chicken." And she *always*, without *fail*, says, "Put the bones in the fridge," or in the freezer, "and just make a little broth. Just make a little broth."

Lovette: [Laughing]

Harry: [E]leven, twelve, thirteen years old it was nothing to "Dad. Can I take the truck for a ride?"

Sonya: [Laughing]

Harry: And you'd jump in and you'd go riding around the old roads in Ootischenia. I mean, there was no restrictions –

Sonya: Yeah.

Harry: - there was, I mean, we were across the river and nobody cared. There was no police that came over or nothing. So, this is how we learned how to drive. We were driving by thirteen years old. You know, we'd go down to the meadows to pick up manure for our gardens and Dad made an old truck out of an old car so we'd load it up so when he's picking up manure I'd be driving. So this is how we learned how to drive our vehicles. You know. It was enjoyable. You didn't go to town, but, I mean, we stayed

around...there was all kinds of side roads and everything else...there was all kinds of stuff here where we were.

Koozma: Our closest neighbours were of English and Scottish origin and they lived two miles away. Our initial contact was connected to public school activities where my brother and I attended, including participating in a school Christmas Party where all parents and friends were invited. I recall that Dad hired an English fellow to bring his stud to the farm for breeding purposes. Both grandfather and Dad engaged Slavic immigrant men as hired hands. In general, as rural people we got along fine. Before my Dad was married, he, his brother and his Dad used to transport local and area people to the International Harvesters Demonstration events in the nearest town of Langham, Saskatchewan. Also my parents and grandparents were one of the first in the district to adopt cars and gas-powered farm machinery. I believe our family got along well with their neighbours.

I should also add that sports brought together both Doukhobors and non-Doukhobors in recreational games. These included baseball and soccer. During the late 1930s and the 1940s, there were regular Sunday Sports Days held in the *Pakrovka* village area near the North Saskatchewan River. My Dad, my brother and I played ball. Dad also played hockey on an outdoor rink. When they (and me) moved to Saskatoon, they all joined a local Curling Rink and became active players.

Jonathan: I grew up with family connections but also, sort of, physical history all around me. And just as an example, um, when I was growing up at about eight years old, um, I was playing along the side of a field, a cultivated field that my dad was farming, and I was finding adventures and things to explore that, ah, that as eight-year-old boys do, and I came across a, um, a hole or a pit.

Sonya: Hmm.

Jonathan: And, ah, proceeded to jump in and found bricks and rusty implements and – **Sonya:** Hmm.

Jonathan: - and other treasures. And as I emerged from the pit, I realized that there was another one. And then another one –

Sonya: Wow.

Jonathan: - and then another one after that. And, um, it was only years, many years later, that I came to appreciate what it was I had come across. And that is, um, that they were root cellars –

Sonya: Hmm.

Jonathan: - of Doukhobor houses. And they were all lined up in a row. As was the original, ah, Doukhobor village structures in Saskatchewan in 1899, where there were two rows separated by a wide central street. And that, ah, what in fact I had been exploring, at that age, was the ruins of the Doukhobor village of *Blagoveshchenie*, um, along the Whitesand River. That [word missing] has since been destroyed, as have many others, ah, even within my life experience

Vera: [W]hen the busses started to go past our place, then of course we associated with all kinds of people. It was no longer a closed circle and I had a lot of friends...I had friends, I remember, from the Japanese community, from the Anglo-Saxon, from all kinds of communities, so it was never closed. *But*, it's just that we still had so many of our own activities that we participated in. Sunday was always for Sunday school, we called it Sunday meeting, so then we would go again back to where the Fructova School was and there was an old *kuznia*, they called it, like a barn sort of. That's where the initial festivals used to be, before they built the big centre at Grand Forks. So we went to Sunday school and twice a week we went to Russian school, so there was a lot of our own activities that we took part in after school.

Mike: So all my Doukhobor life in Ootischenia was living with my parents and grandparents and uncles and aunts and brothers, sister. And living in a Doukhobor way of life, which was very simple. Trying to adhere to the principles of Doukhobor faith. When we were young we didn't notice the hardships, but when we started gettin' older things started goin' the opposite way that we thought they would. And it became a real...well, not a chore but we had to put in a lot of effort because water supply was very poor, the buildings were deteriorating, and all we did was just try to live off the land as much as we could. Well, we made out but it wasn't simple. So, came a time...even, you

know...started thinking about...school was one area where the classrooms weren't the best of shape. But we managed. We managed to go through public school 'til I guess I was promoted to grade seven. We lost our teacher that year and that's as far as I went in school. That was during the war where we lost our teacher and we couldn't go to school. As far as to Castlegar, it was just about impossible because you either had to walk or else stay somewheres in Castlegar and at our age...we couldn't do it. We couldn't afford to rent and couldn't afford to pay for schooling so started workin' locally. As a matter of fact, my dad bought a bike, which was too high for me so I had to pedal it under the crossbars and go to Robson to pick cherries, pick apples, and whatever...helped my uncle in Winlaw to supply and sell vegetables, fruit and vegetables to the Japanese when they were moved from the Coast to the Interior. So we had to go and sell produce all the way to Sandon, which was thirty-five miles or so from Winlaw, plus twenty miles from here to Winlaw. That was during summer holidays. Earned myself enough money, not to own anything, but just to get by a little easier than a lot of the kids my age.

Sonya: Maybe I can ask you a little bit about, um, just...since we're touching on the issue of relationships between Doukhobors and non-Doukhobors, ah, how did your families and your communities, um, kind of suggest that young people feel about non-Doukhobors? Ah, how did they talk about them when you were growing up . . .? **Gordon:** Well, they was, they were out, out of the picture as far as that goes. I remember, one time there was, ah, people coming over. And, ah, they tried to give you something, you know, if you'd read some of their stuff. And they'd give you a little gift of some kind. In other words, they were trying to, to convert you in other words.

Sonya: Wow! Do you remember which church they were from?

Gordon: No. I have no idea, but I do remember that, ah, they used to play music across the river from us.

Sonya: Huh.

Gordon: And, ah, some kids went over there to listen and they'd throw peanuts to the kids or candy or something like that. That was happening at that time.

Sonya: Right. And what does your family, like, what was their impression of that? Was there a judgment about whether that was right or wrong?

Gordon: No, it was wrong. It was wrong as far as our families went. All the Doukhobor people. They stuck, in other words, to their own. And we didn't have cars, and – **Sonya:** Yes.

Gordon: - and, ah, we...just knew the people, like, Shoreacres or Thrums or maybe Brilliant. You know. Just in the area. And that's who we associated with. We played ball and, ah, at gatherings like that. But, ah, nowadays, the kids, they know everybody for a hundred miles [laughing] around.

Harry: Growing up was enjoyable because we had a lot of friends, we were a close community, lived in villages where there was always a lot of people and, you know, kids our own age. There was no problem with friendship. Playing was outdoors most of the time, summer and winter. There was no elaborate toys, we had no power in those days. Just kerosene lamps living in the villages. Outside outhouses for wash facilities and all that stuff, and then water was very scarce, we had a little spring that we had coming from the top of the mountain, from the bottom of the mountainside coming to the villages just through an old, old pipe, a little half-inch pipe, and we'd have to go in the wintertime with a water bucket, fill it up with water, and bring it into the house and use that for our water supply. And you'd get up a lot of times in the morning and the stove would go out and the water would freeze inside the house. You'd have to break the ice to get a drink of water. So –

Sonya: So when fathers tell the stories "I had to walk uphill both ways..." You really do have these stories. [Laughing]

Harry: [Laughing] Yes. So we've gone through all that. There's nothing to regret. I don't regret anything; it was a good experience, actually, because to where we are today we can appreciate what we have. Even if we don't have everything, it's more now than we had before, so...and our kids, even to this day, don't know what it was like then. But, I guess life goes through stages and you enjoy what you have at whatever stage you're going through.

Troubled Times

As people remember times of trouble and depredation, they adjudicate the moral and cultural basis on which these activities were carried out. This process of adjudication is compelling in its complexity, but readers can easily identify how onerous and impossible it was – and is – to adequately represent and interpret "the Doukhobor troubles." Yet, people have struggled for decades to make sense of these times at the level of family, community, and society.

I encourage readers to pay heightened attention to the ways in which ideas of community, tolerance, and identity are simultaneously pulled in so many different directions as people remember the Doukhobor troubles. Furthermore, it is interesting to discern how people of a minority community maneuvered to address an outside majority. The strategy of address becomes more evident in this section of narrative, as does a nuanced economic analysis of the "minority" experience in Canada.

Lastly, the diverse – and divergent – perspectives on ownership and materiality suggest that it is important to really look at what it means to live and be located in multiple communities at once. Over their lifetimes in Canada, Doukhobors have come to hold membership – though fleeting, and oftentimes conditional – in more than one "community." Cultural community, civic community, social community, artistic community, natural community – these are but a few examples of the kinds of community that Doukhobors cultivate today. Expressions of Doukhobor faith change when these multiple affiliations are acknowledged, and these changes have important consequences for a contemporary adjudication of Doukhobor life.

Mike: *Then* the things started to *boil* in the Kootenay area. The Sons of Freedom started to really be aggressive. They started burning their own buildings and then started burning

buildings in Shoreacres. It got to where things were getting to where we *had* to come home to at least be with the family in case...it was said that "Once Shoreacres is cleaned up, Ootischenia would be the next."

Sonya: What year was this, Mike?

Mike: That would be in [19]47, [19]48. [19]48, I believe.

Sonya: Did you understand at that time why the Sons of Freedom were engaged in depredations?

Mike: Well, to some extent it...but, at that time it was really not that understandable to the fact that why they were doin' that sort of thing. But later on, you know, where it started to make sense that the Doukhobor way of life had deteriorated to an extent that...you know, whatever assets or whatever was left of the Doukhobor way of life was disappearing because the buildings were gettin' old. They couldn't fix them to where it could be liveable to the way other people lived in the area. Like in town, where they had electricity and water and inside plumbing and all, and we didn't have that. So lots of people started to move out and then at the time, also, that the land was taken over by the government, we just lived from day to day and paying very little rent because there was nothing, just a roof over your head and *that* leaked.

So, things started to change 'til there was no...the spiritual part in *believing* in the Doukhobor way of life was *there*, but it was starting to interfere with a *normal* way of living to where the other people within our area but in areas where there was power, there was water...and the interest of supporting the Doukhobor way of life was disappearing. Also the terrorists started scaring people away to where "Ah! It's not worth it, I'm gone." Goin' out of the area.

Corinne: I remember for myself, growing up, it was always important to identify myself to outsiders, and even to people within the Doukhobor community, that we were an Orthodox Doukhobor family because we didn't want the perception that we were affiliated with some of the more radical beliefs or actions of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors. We may have mixed and mingled on a social basis and at the school playground and at get-togethers and at kids' birthday parties and so on, but it was always very important for me, personally, to be able to say to people that I was an Orthodox

Doukhobor. And I suppose I continued throughout my life, even to the present day, I like that established even though we may have practiced maybe some of the same customs and traditions and food choices. You know, we had that *link*, but there was this area where we wanted to have some sense of separation for the general public. If that makes much sense.

Natasha: She [grandmother] told me this story of the police having put barricades around *Krestova*, like actually by the bridge, the Crescent Valley Bridge, to get in. And I don't know what was going on at the time, but she tells me this story of having been to town and she's trying to get home to her husband with a kid on her arm and one kid in her hand, and them not letting her through. And she either threatens to take off her clothes or she starts. And they're like "Okay, we don't want to deal with this woman right now" so they let her through. So that was her form of political protest and it was the only leverage she had. And I can understand both sides of it, but to me, in that story at least, that's admirable. That at least she was willing to do that.

Patricia Paul William: [I]n my life, I didn't see any [Sons of Freedom people] 'til I moved to B.C. I didn't know that there was such a thing. When I heard there was these people that can burn or do damage and it's to bring out the truth. Or it's to make the government realize and respect them, or I don't know. I don't even dwell into all their "Why?"s.

Jonathan: It's very easy to focus on the Sons of Freedom depredations in the West Kootenay and Boundary regions.

Sonya: Mm hmm.

Jonathan: Um...we have to bear in mind, however, that there were Sons of Freedom depredations in Saskatchewan, too. They typically occurred at a slightly earlier time – **Sonya:** Mm hmm.

Jonathan: - ah, but in the 1930s and 1940s there were small groups and bands of Sons of Freedom throughout Saskatchewan. And a...a large number of schools were burnt or under threat of burning. And this occurred throughout areas of Doukhobor settlement: in

Kylemore, in Langham, in Blaine Lake, in Kamsack, in Pelly, in Arran, in Buchanan. Where schools were burnt or schools had posted guards 24/7. And so it wasn't just a West Kootenay and Boundary phenomenon.

Sonya: Um, you've already touched on this briefly, but in terms of, ah, the, the media's approach to the conflict: I've come across headlines like "Naked Doukhobors Go On Rampage" or "Keep Your Clothes On," or "Trouble in Kootenay." And I'm just wondering how the response of the media and the non-Doukhobor public made you feel? **Lovette:** Well, especially when I was growing up, *very*...it was very, um, negative and affected, affected the way my everyday living was. Because of what was in the papers. I mean, the kids would bring this as a news item to school! Remember, you'd have to...do you remember, do you recall that? You'd have to bring a news item to school.

Sonya: Yep.

Lovette: There was certain days that...this is what they used to bring, you know. And I recall once that even, you know, attacked us to try to take my clothes off. You know, or my sweater. [Words missing] It was sad. You know.

Sonya: Yeah, that's a *lot* to carry.

Lovette: Yeah, for sure. And yet, there's a lot to be proud of. There is a lot, you know.

. . .

Lovette: I travelled to the Okanagan to celebrate our fiftieth reunion. Grad reunion.

Sonya: Right.

Lovette: That's the only grad reunion that we had.

Sonya: Hmm.

Lovette: And, ah, it was interesting. The minute I walked in, this one guy says, "Oh! Am I ever glad you're here." He says, "I have to apologize. I've lived with, with all this, that, you know, the way we used to chase you with a dead snake." I don't recall that. I don't recall that. But he said, "I remember you…" He says, "I wake up at night sometime, hearing you scream. The way you were screaming and we were chasing you with a snake."

Jonathan: [M]y father, who grew up in the fifties and sixties, grew up at a time when it was *very* unpopular to be Doukhobor. Both because of the Sons of Freedom depredations in British Columbia, –

Sonya: Mm hmm.

Jonathan: - because of the height of the Cold War, -

Sonya: Right.

Jonathan: - um, the general trends towards assimilation in Canadian society...it was not at all popular to be of that background.

Sonya: And he, and this was in Canora, as well, Jon?

Jonathan: In Canora, as well.

Sonya: Okay.

Jonathan: And, um, he came from an environment of having only spoke Russian in the household, when he was five years old, um, or six years old...after which he entered the school system and rapidly lost his Russian language abilities. Um, he can still listen and understand it, but he can't speak it anymore. Um, and...many people of his generation, and even *his* parents' generation, who lived through that time in the Canora area, ah, a number of them actively ceased to identify themselves as Doukhobors.

Sonya: Hmm.

Jonathan: They would define themselves as Russians and identify them as such. But when asked, depending on who asked, they would say, "No we're Russians. We're not Doukhobors." Um, I'm not saying everyone identified themselves that way –

Sonya: Right.

Jonathan: - but a surprising number did.

Sonya: How often do you think back to those times?

Harry: I don't make a point of it, but it does once in a while come back. Certain things will pop up and you will flash back to the old days. Flash back to the old days. Like, what really stands out in my mind was when they had those roadblocks at the old Raspberry School. And we had to go through...it was like going through a war zone and you had to be goin' through checkpoints with the military, like you see on shows in Europe.

Sonya: Did your mom and dad talk a bit about the discrimination that they faced as adults in the workforce?

Lovette: No, they didn't. No. I don't, they didn't...ah, my mother worked in the cannery and at that time there was a lot of Doukhobor women that used to come there, and young women from the Kootenays, to work there. So it was again a connection. You know. Because...hardworking people. I mean, that's why, they used to hire all these people. Like, there was a *lot* of people working in the orchards and that. The Doukhobor people. Went to Kelowna and worked picking apples or...you know. So there was a, the young people did work and there was a need for, you know, financial need.

Mike: Course, the jobs were available to us, too, but a lot of places, they wouldn't even *hire* the Russian people because they figured they were all fanatics or radicals or, you know, they would blow up the place or burn it or whatever.

Sonya: Did that happen to you ever?

Mike: No. Sonya: No.

Mike: No...jobs were available. At that time the jobs were available so, but you know, you hear it. I know Cominco, during the war, or it used to be Consolidated Mining and Smelting, they wouldn't hire Russian people during the war.

Sonya: How come?

Mike: I guess they were just...I don't know. Scared or...they hired Italians, but not Russians. And that's why you hear of Trail being an Italian city because a lot of them came from Italy and started working here and settled. But it was the hardship, was the fact that we were the "Dirty Douks." And it doesn't matter where. I remember we wanted to go to the show in Castlegar. So usually six or eight kids get together and we want to go to the show. If you went one or two, you sure were beat up by the kids in Castlegar because we were the "Dirty Douks from across the river." But even that, slowly started to where we became good friends. But those times, it's hard to forget them, you know, because it just...a hundred percent from one extreme to another.

Gordon: I was working with a, with a man and we were in doing some work in, in Kimberley. And then we stayed in Cranbrook. And I'd sit in the, you know, in the...I'd, I'd sit in the hotel in the living room, or whatever, you know. Because they had a television in there.

Sonya: Mm hmm.

Gordon: And the news would come on, and saying that these people are doing this and that. And the people would be talking, "Well, we should have a, a bounty put on these people," you know. "Just shoot 'em and that's it." So here you are, and they're talking about you. And "Doukhobors." They didn't say Sons of Freedom. They didn't say anything like that. "There should be a bounty on the Doukhobors." That's all there was to it.

Sonya: Did he, did those people know that you were Doukhobor?

Gordon: No! No. I kept my mouth shut.

Sonya: Mm hmm.

Gordon: I wouldn't dare say that, you know, I'm a Doukhobor or anything like that. And, you know, you run across things like this all the time, at that time. And even going, like, we used to go and work in the Okanagan a lot. Well, they told you at home that, ah, "You be careful because they don't like Doukhobors there."

Steve: And, like, any jobs that any place I worked, nobody there, there was no discrimination. Nothing.

Sonya: Really.

Steve: Yeah.

Sonya: Even though they knew that, that you were –

Steve: Oh yes.

Sonya: - a Doukhobor or Sons of Freedom person.

Steve: Definitely, yes. They knew that we were from the camp in Agassiz.

Sonya: Oh, that's very interesting.

Steve: And, ah, there was, ah, a store owner by the name of Owens, he used to own a store, and he was very, very good to the people. When people were leaving from Agassiz, in [19]72, there was one person, well, they all *liked* Doukhobors, because they're hard

workers to begin with. Or majority of them. And they would do their job without supervision or anything. And when the people were leaving from Agassiz, the Doukhobors, and he heard, and he had the whole patch of strawberries, no raspberries, and he got so upset that he just went and he ploughed everything under.

Sonya: Were you or your family members impacted by the public perception of, and response to, the depredations?

Greg: Not that I can think of, except for one anecdote: my mother's cousin visited Mexico in the 1980s and chatted with a shopkeeper who spoke Russian. She mentioned she was of Doukhobor background, and after a while, he asked: "Well? Aren't you going to take your clothes off?" Apparently, he wasn't kidding; in his skewed perception, that was what all Doukhobors did.

Nina: And, um, occasionally they would talk about the Sons of Freedom but it was dropped really fast because I think...I'm not sure why, and this is just a hypothetical thought, but there was great fear in being attached to an organization or a movement that somehow could be pinpointed and then you're attached to it. And that might be kind of the left-over stuff, the left-over genetic stuff from coming from Russia...the punishment that comes from being attached to strong voice.

"That Was Then, and This Is Now"

The distinct effects of generation and gender on styles of narration and interpretation become more noticeable and emergent in this section. This section also articulates reluctance, reticence, candour, and caution, each of which influences how a story is told and what gets spoken of. Considering how the past influences the contemporary workings of community helps to contextualize the mnemonic choices that get made in the present.

Corinne: But I wanted to tell you something else, that I thought it was interesting, when I was growing up I kind of almost assumed that we were going to be the last generation of people quite involved in the whole Doukhobor thoughts/philosophies movement, and I'm finding now that even though some aspects of...well, most of the aspects of the culture and the tradition have remained the same, I think, in the foods and some of the marriage ceremonies and the death and burial ceremonies and things like that...and even though the language is not as *strong* a component of the Doukhobors, *the interest*...is what surprises me is that the *interest among the current generations* and people like yourself is strong years after I would have thought "Oh, already that's all going to die out, who's going to be interested, who's going to follow through?" So that's kind of surprising to me, and it's a good thing, I think, that researchers and obviously just ordinary folk are still trying to have a look about the whole Doukhobor philosophy and movement.

Harry: My son, one of my sons has actually got a lot of friends from Krestova end and we've never, ever stopped him to say "Don't go over there" because we've had bad pasts. No, we encourage it.

Jonathan: And so, although I do distinctly recall instances where I heard derogatory references to them made on, sort of, the media in radio and on television, and even recall seeing television footage to that effect (which bothered me even then), um, for the large part I didn't have to grow up with the stigma of that. And, as a result, it was a lot easier for me to identify myself as Doukhobor and, in fact,...even where my parents' and grandparents' generation were hesitant to do so, I didn't have the same sort of shame and stigma that might have, um, influenced me in terms of *not* sort of publicly or actively identifying with that background. And so I think in my case, and I think in the case of a lot of people in the younger generation in their twenties and thirties who didn't have to, sort of, deal with those stigmas as acutely in the schoolyard or growing up, that take almost a more active and activist role in identifying themselves as Doukhobors. Where there was a reticence with past generations.

Sonya: Do you want to say anything more about how the struggles affected the lives of your family?

Natasha: Hmm, that's a tough one. I mean, I do see that it has affected everybody.

Sonya: So the reach is large?

Natasha: It's large...and it's complex. I wish something I could say could fix their lives or make their lives better. The only choice I've been able to make is to seek therapy to work out my own issues. So that helps me see it...you know, its influence in others.

And -

Sonya: At least [words missing] more compassion for those conversations, then? **Natasha:** It gives me compassion and I think it also makes me a bit angry that...I'm not sure what I'm angry about. I guess that the reconciliation between communities to worship together and socialize together was a great thing, but I really believe in the value of therapy, of working through things, of de-repressing, of breaking the silence...for every individual. And the community as a whole has not made that of value or a priority and it still feels like silence and denial are the way the community survives and functions. And that has not changed. And so when you have a community that is very much built on denying the truth in public or not making these stories public, it affects everybody and so people are more reluctant.

Corinne: [T]he fact that you had a chance to speak with people from diverse backgrounds and experiences and *age groups* is I think important. Because to me, that's a big one. What occurred in your formative years, perhaps, as to how much of an impact or lasting effect some of these incidents would have on you. It all comes down to *feeling*. How did we feel about things? Did we feel scared? Did we feel okay? Were we – Sonya: Yeah, it does. Feeling and confidence, I think. Especially for the people who were experiencing at a young age. Whether or not they had support with other Doukhobor peers seems to have been quite important.

Sonya: What are the memories that *you* have of difficult times? How would *you* describe those to somebody who didn't know anything about what it was like to be living here when there was Doukhobor struggle and Doukhobor conflict?

Grace: Well, Doukhobors struggling with Sons of Freedom more, and they, like, they are just like *enemies*, you know. Just like enemies. They disturb the meeting, disturb the ...and just making mess of it. And then they start to push them out, and doesn't want them there. And everybody was afraid: "Maybe they'll burn my house" or something like that, uh, of them. But, at the end, finally, they all get mixed up. Like all the Doukhobors has to get mixed up together. Well, that's kind of surprise me. [Laughing] I don't know why. I don't know why! At first they...they just burning the houses and business. At Brilliant there's big factories, you know. Everything went into the smoke. And "Oh, those Sons of Freedom, Sons of Freedom." And we all kind of afraid of that. Sometimes sitting all night guarding our house. And now —

Sonya: Where were you living when you were guarding your home, *Grunya*?

Grace: I live in Glade.

Sonya: Okay.

Grace: I married into Glade.

Sonya: Okay, so I see. So when you had a family, you were being careful about your

home?

Grace: Yeah. And in those villages –

Sonya: Yes.

Grace: - especially. And we sitting almost midnight, and then some will get up and sit 'til morning and we go to bed. But now, I don't know. They all together. They sing together. They get all the choirs together. And even the ones that was biggest enemies, they're the [word not clear] people now.

Sonya: Do you -

Grace: This thing disturbed me, and I can't understand, myself. Why?

Sonya: Do you think that they can come together and talk about the past? Or do you think that in order for them to be together they have to talk about the future?

Grace: I don't know. I don't know what they *talking*, what they *thinking*. But for me, I am disappointed.

Lovette: But, you know, so it's so sad, because some of us appreciate our culture and everything that happened in the past, but some of them were hurt by it. So deeply hurt,

you know, by a *rich* culture, I think. *Rich* heritage that we have. On the positive. I think if you look at the positive things that have done. Because my husband and I have been in choirs, and we've done, we've travelled. You know, in [19]95, the Voices for Peace. We travelled across Canada and went to Russia. In [19]99 we went to visit our ancestors with Friends in Unity Choir. The ladies' choir. And we were in the Heritage Choir. And Kootenay Choir. If you get on the email now, we're all on, you know. We've been singing ever since we were married, like. It was a social and a good culture and then we were good with our friends. And our kids grew up with that. Our kids still like the sing...our older kids were in choir, too. And, you know, Stanley Humphries Choir, they travelled to Victoria. The opening of Parliament. There was a lot of good things, you know.

Gordon: And some people come out and say that, you know, "We're happy to be who we are." Even the young, young people now.

Sonya: Mm hmm.

Gordon: They were, we're happy to be who we are. And, ah, we're no longer outcasts and stuff like that. And, ah, this just keeps going and going.

Jonathan: But I guess I'd like to underscore the point that the conflict as it occurred in the Kootenay and Boundary regions of British Columbia...had consequences and was relevant to the Doukhobor experience in Saskatchewan. Historically, in the forties, fifties, sixties, even thirties. But also *has* impacted the attitudes and viewpoints of Doukhobors in the younger generation today, and in this province. And, ah, that's something I've hopefully tried to impart. Um, I think the sooner we can, we can acknowledge that there was a conflict, acknowledge what that conflict *was*, and talk openly (but with a compassionate sensitivity about it) to all generations and all Doukhobor descendents and not just practicing Doukhobors, ah, the closer we'll be down the road to having reconciliation and to having a more healthy body politic, if you will, that's no longer focused just on the hurts of the past but is actively, ah, um, striving and embracing towards the future.

Chapter Conclusion

The mingled voices in this chapter hint at the vortex of memory and the centripetal force of human history. The recollections and ideas, taken as a whole, suggest that community exerts a strong hold on human life. This hold can be both stabilizing and nurturing, but these qualities must be actively cultivated and guided by the needs of community members.

The memories of the Doukhobor troubles that were voiced in this chapter are disturbing and uncomfortable, yet the voices – and the people behind the voices – have found strategies for negotiating between past and present. The majority of people that I interviewed seem so very pleased and grateful for the ease and harmony that they perceive in the lives of their children and grandchildren today. Nevertheless, it seems necessary to acknowledge that different generations have different needs, and that the ability to hear across generation is one of the most potent and promising catalysts for a sustainability of Doukhobor culture in Canada over the next century.

Chapter Six:

Harmony and Dissonance

An oral history collection that represents multiple voices has a unique ability to surface cultural harmony and cultural dissonance. When the interviews of multiple participants are read *together*, as a collection, the push and pull of cultural dialogue becomes evident. This push and pull occurs in the interstices of difference. It is found between and across differences of generation, gender, ideology, location, and lived experience. The Doukhobor voices presented here represent the thoughts and ideas of people who are young and old. They are male and female. Some were born in rural spaces, while others grew up in large cities. Many of the voices retain a staunch ideological affiliation to a specific Doukhobor perspective, but some are reluctant to iterate the beliefs and philosophies of any one point of view. All of these voices speak to experiences that were had, and continue to be had, within the diasporic Doukhobor community in Canada.

I have read this collection of transcripts, representing the voices of diverse Doukhobors, over and over again. I can hear the voices clearly as I read the words on the pages. I know when the people behind the voices coughed, when they cried, when they stopped to make coffee. I know when we laughed. I know when we paused. I know when I rambled on, full of nervous energy. I have read the transcripts in different orders. I have cut them up, mixed them up, piled them up, and matched them up.

The people behind the voices have heard the same stories of ancestry and rebellion. They have sung the same songs and psalms, sometimes standing together in the same room on the same day. But they remember these cultural experiences and stories with the unique perceptions of self. They vocalize ideas and hypotheses that are unique to their lives, to their families, to their

histories. When these vocalizations are shared in community, the web of culture is influenced, be it in predictable or unpredictable ways. The shaping of self by culture, and culture by self, continues, as it has for centuries.

The spectrum of experiences – as represented by the voices in the research transcripts – is large; voices swing from one end to the other with disarming speed. I have been perplexed and amazed at the insight that comes through in the transcripts, particularly when the stories and ideas shared in one part of an interview seemingly contradict the stories and ideas that are shared later on. Contradictions can also be found when the transcripts are read collectively. One voice understands Doukhobor history in this way, another in that way. Someone defines a "true Doukhobor" within this framework, while someone else understands cultural authenticity from a different lens entirely. This woman is ready to forgive and forget, but that man insists that nothing be forgotten, ever.

I sometimes have an instinct to run from the dissonance. But then I remind myself that the freedom to think through the past and the future on our own unique terms is a wonderful human liberty. Furthermore, the freedom to choose and think in contradiction to the established norms is a freedom that Doukhobors have celebrated and sustained for centuries. Doukhobors have harnessed strength from their collective position on non-violence, but there has also been considerable provocation from inside this collective, as the history of life in Canada demonstrates. This history suggests that freedom cannot be championed in one direction only. The freedom to object in unity against tyranny and violence must also be mirrored by the freedom to object *in community*. Otherwise, there is no freedom.

It is on this basis that I have made the decision to explore cultural dissonance and contradiction. To turn away from the tensions that animate these oral history transcripts would

betray a commitment to the principles of life that Doukhoborism upholds. Nevertheless, I keep my own set of research ethics close at hand as I analyze the transcripts. I remain committed to the well-being of my participants – and to the well-being of the broader Doukhobor community – and my analysis attempts to respect this commitment.

"The Rules of Your Heart"

Natasha: - [T]hen there's the conflict within the community, which I think hinges a lot on what a true Doukhobor is and the endless centuries of arguments about that. Is it right to fit into the place that you're living, as long as you're not, you know...what are the rules of your heart that you're living by? Is it okay to send your children to school, to take the oath of allegiance, which a lot of people chose. And some people said "No, that's not the way we should go."

As Natasha notes above, each of us has our own set of heart-felt rules that governs and guides our actions. These rules exist alongside codes of community, culture, society, and nation-state, and we are each obliged to negotiate our own heart-felt rules with the competing rules of conduct that implore us. It is this individual act of negotiation that manifests difference within a collectivity.

Diversity, dissonance, conflict, contradiction – there are many ways to acknowledge a manifestation of difference and I am aware of the liabilities that each lens of acknowledgment presents. My own process of learning has led me to perceive the manifestation of difference in Doukhobor discourse and action as "contradiction." This is my intuitive perception, influenced by a lifetime of discussions with family and an intensive period of research, but it is not my only perception. Contemplation has led me to other ways of understanding cultural tension within the Doukhobor community, and I use this chapter to address these other interpretive options, too.

But first, in advance of addressing hermeneutics, I explore the spectrums of difference that underlie the compelling contradictions of Doukhobor life in Canada.

Spectrums of Difference

The interpretive approach to qualitative research requires the interviewer, and the interview participants, too, to ask how meaning is derived, and why. This is a process of reflexivity. It involves judgment, reflection, inquiry, and dialogue, over and over again. It is not a static process, so the judgments and interpretations that form are thus not static, either. As research and dialogue unfold, wide spectrums of thought and opinion emerge in the data.

Such spectrums of thought and opinion reveal exaggerated polarities. I am interested in the perception of these polarities as contradictions, and my pursuit of these ideas is evident in the research data that I present in this chapter. If the "poles" of the contradictions are understood as concrete markers, everything inside of these poles speaks to experiences that are difficult to pin down. Doukhobor experience in Canada has been riddled with highs and lows, and the memory and knowledge borne of these experiences shift in context.

This flux is seen in the overlap of peace with conflict in Doukhobor history. The struggle to interpret this tension for self and others generates feelings of pride and shame, which manifest in behaviours of solidarity and segregation. Acknowledging the stress of this dissonance turns people inside and out as they seek the truth of life in community. This search for truth may illuminate the boundaries of then and now, but establishing these boundaries is a potent cultural act that summons both fear and courage. In the work that follows, I interpret all of these aforementioned contradictions as research results that validate the strength and vigor of today's Doukhobor community. These contradictions can burden the act of cultural representation, but I

argue that they should first and foremost be understood as results that lay claim to the contemporary presence of Doukhobors in Canada.

Conflict <-> Peace

The most definitive contradiction that the Doukhobor troubles pose is the contradiction of peace with conflict and violence. Many of the original tenets and practices of Doukhobor faith – such as vegetarianism, communalism, and worship in the Russian language – have changed or faded, but the practice of non-violence has persisted. With that said, an exploration of the Doukhobor troubles is an inherently difficult endeavour. Much of the contemporary dialogue that Doukhobors pursue is framed by the practice of pacifism; the collaborations that they participate in are founded through shared interests in peace. Thus, representing ancestry and history to people outside of the Doukhobor community necessitates acknowledgment of past with present, of trouble with tranquility, of conflict with peace. Members of the Doukhobor community themselves may be willing to forgive or forget, but successful engagement with a broader public demands an address of this historic and residual contradiction.

The premise of address – or redress, some might argue – is straightforward enough, but the practice itself is intimidating and awkward. Most Doukhobors still do not know how to approach the experiential and philosophical contradiction of peace with conflict:

Harry: [A]pparently, they [the perpetrators of the depredations] would not do any damage if there was people involved. Like, they didn't want to bomb something or destroy something and take life, because, that's not...their beliefs...they're Doukhobors. Doukhobors don't believe in taking another person's life. So, as long as there was somebody in the building, they wouldn't hopefully do anything. Or make it to the point that you can't get out and save yourself. Because they did start fires in buildings and stuff like that but they gave people time to get out and

stuff like that. We never, ever understood why that was happening, why that was their way of thinking, why they were doing this.

Furthermore, one could argue that Doukhobors still feel a commitment to their relations, regardless of ideological dispute:

Nina: [H]e [grandfather] never really talked much about it. Sometimes Sons of Freedom stuff did come up, it was very...you know, it was brethren stuff. There was carefulness not to oppose ideas of other people who were brethren, number one, but, you know, part of it is live and let live, right? That's part of the Doukhobor philosophy.

All of the feelings and contradictions that I write about in this chapter are rooted in the literal contradiction that the Doukhobor troubles posed, and continue to pose. Possibilities for address of this contradiction are discussed at the end of this chapter and in the chapters that follow

Shame <-> Pride

Vi Plotnikoff (1998) candidly acknowledges her contradictory feelings of pride and shame as she reflects on her growth and maturity as a member of the Doukhobor community in British Columbia:

To be Doukhobor was to hide your background, not flaunt it. To be Doukhobor was to be proud of your ancestors, customs, beliefs, yet at the same time to feel defensive or embarrassed about them. To be Doukhobor was to be a young adult working in Vancouver yet concealing your roots – the same roots you were so proud of when you stood on the stage of the cultural centre, singing the hymns and psalms your parents, and your grandparents before them, had sung. (p. 205)

This quote, taken from a longer exposition of Plotnikoff's life experiences, was adopted and integrated into the interview schedule that I used to guide my research interviews. I chose it

because of its rich description of the ways in which the Doukhobor troubles influenced processes of identity formation and cultural representation.

Plotnikoff's quote demonstrates that the experience of contradiction was a familiar experience for many Doukhobors in Canada. Moreover, the quote suggests that contradiction was experienced at the personal levels of emotion and behaviour across contexts of culture and society. Shifting contexts resulted in shifting emotional responses. Pride was experienced within the safe space of the cultural centre, while embarrassment and correlated emotions were experienced in environments that had no tolerance or respect for Doukhobor activity in western Canada. Shame resulted in the shrinking of self.

Several of my research participants knew Vi Plotnikoff personally, so their responses to her quote were formulated with the added knowledge of Plotnikoff as friend and/or acquaintance. Some responses were brief: "I think that is a perfect quote. Exactly, you know" (Lovette). Other participants responded pointedly to Plotnikoff's articulation of conflicted identity: "And it's true. You know, we had to hide. You know, outside of this area, if you were in Vancouver, if somebody saw you: 'Hey, a Douk!'" (Mike). Steve had a different recollection of what it meant to expose oneself as a Doukhobor outside of traditional Doukhobor environments. When I asked him if he, too, wrestled with the same conflicted feelings that Plotnikoff identifies in her writing, he distinguished his feelings from those of Plotnikoff:

Ah, no, not really. When we were in Agassiz, at first, the whole community was sort of against. But then, gradually, say within a year, things have changed. And they were saying, "Oh whatever there was in the press," about the Sons of Freedom or the Doukhobors, "It's completely untrue." (Steve)

It is important to note how memory and interpretation operate in the quote above. Steve identifies a set of remembered experiences that are markedly different from those that Plotnikoff writes of. He then acknowledges that his positive relations with non-Doukhobors were the product of social negotiation, established over the course of a year. Without this qualified extension of remembrance, Steve's response to Plotnikoff's quote would establish a divergence of experience without an explanation of difference. The factors that create heterogeneity are important to an understanding of social politics. Steve's answer, in full, demonstrates that he worked hard to change the opinion of his neighbours. Empathy was not a freely extended commodity.

Ellison's response is, perhaps, the most revealing of all. This response to Plotnikoff's confession of cultural struggle highlights the internal judgment within the community: "I don't think she was ever a Doukhobor. Like a true meaning of the Doukhobor. I never hid nothing." Acknowledging spectrums of difference in the experience of Doukhobor life means acknowledging that there is more than one way of living in righteous accord with Doukhobor principles. Yet, in practice, such acknowledgments are hard to make. I perceive Plotnikoff's candour as an expression of courage, but Ellison interprets it as a deviation from "true Doukhobor" behaviour. These opposing perceptions illustrate the sensitivity that is needed to approach and explore the Doukhobor troubles. Remembrance is not just a process of recall: it is also a process of judgment. These judgments are perhaps most capably made when they are challenged and evaluated by a large and diverse community of people.

Segregation <-> Solidarity

Themes of solidarity and segregation emerge in multiple references to both the past and present. These themes surface in the physical history of segregation that occurred during times of

trouble, but they also manifest in more elusive and liminal boundaries. Corinne's discussion of childhood life in the Slocan Valley illustrates how conceptions of self and identity shifted to accommodate and protect against the fickle public opinion of Doukhobor behaviour. The quote below reveals that Doukhobors who were isolated from the depredations received news about their own cultural community from the xenophobic journalism of non-Doukhobors:

Simma's Holt's "Terror in the Name of God" [first published in 1964] was more or less my first *visual* EXPOSURE to the nude parades, as I never saw any in real life. Her book, if anything, did much to cause Orthodox Doukhobors and others to identify themselves and even DEFEND themselves as Orthodox [as opposed to Sons of Freedom Doukhobors] to the general public.¹⁸

Yet, Corinne also acknowledges the solidarity that Doukhobors sustained:

I thought it was quite *incredulous* and I was really quite in awe of the fact about people giving up their homes and going to these treks to Agassiz. That would have been probably the mid-1960s. And then the families who had lived in the camps next to the prison while their loved ones were incarcerated. I mean, looking back upon it all, I thought, you know, "Really, this is really something. This is really different," and I couldn't maybe comprehend it nor accept it as something that I or my family would do, but we still somehow felt that because we all came from Russia, or it was our grandparents who came, that that was a common link and it was strange that we didn't sort of discriminate or necessarily have really strong, negative feelings about it.

Other participants reflected on the intimacy of traditional village structure, recalling that people of various ideological viewpoints often lived together, side by side. They were

¹⁸ Simma Holt is widely acknowledged within the Doukhobor community as a journalist of questionable integrity. Mark Mealing (1975), in his book on Doukhobor Life, made the following note: "The casual reader is cautioned against wasting good money on two books currently available: *Terror in the Name of God* [Simma Holt] and *Doukhobor Daze* [Hazel O'Neil]. Both are misleading works of little value other than as demonstrations of the depths to which prejudice may still plunge" (p. 66).

neighbours, even friends, but the solidarity of such relationships was tested and breached when strategies of protest and provocation impinged on the rights and safeties of non-participants. The death of a community member could yield collaborative efforts by all, but the ideological tensions would surface when the collective cultural responsibilities were satisfied. One person recalled that the Doukhobor troubles resulted in the shifting of authentic solidarity toward a weakened form of charity, in which the Sons of Freedom were regarded by other Doukhobors as simply "misguided."

The poignant friction of these times is perhaps most readily demonstrated by the segregation that occurred within families: "I think some families can associate, say, have a Christmas together. Some families haven't even had that. You know, they can't…they, why, their "Why?"s haven't come, given them an answer inside" (Patricia Paul William). Some segregation policies were forced on families by government officials, as in the New Denver detention of Sons of Freedom youth who violated the mandate of school attendance. Other forms of segregation were more informal, but damaging nonetheless:

The main thing, what happened, like looking back now that we're friends with everybody, I feel some of my other relatives that are also, say, in the Sons of Freedom or Doukhobor community, like I felt that I sort of missed out on any kind of contact. Like, for the longest time, it was as if those relatives were not a part of our life. Like, my mom's closest family, we were close to, but say my dad's cousins. Because of the conflicts there, like, we were not close to them. (Vera)

These data suggest that Doukhobors experienced solidarity as a conditional feature of community life during times of trouble. Such conditions have not been wholly overcome in the 21st century, as evidenced by the cautious relations between Doukhobors in British Columbia

and Saskatchewan. Nevertheless, the outreach across old fractures is considerable, and the unanimous desire for the sustainability of a Doukhobor presence in Canada encourages the continuation of this outreach.

Agency <-> *Community*

Doukhobors in Canada face the challenge of reconciling old with new. Doukhobor worship and custom originated in a historic context that differs substantially from the reality of life today, and communalism is but one of the cultural principles that Doukhobors are now forced to re-interpret. Viable solutions to this modern dilemma are predicated on trust, faith, and creativity. How can new people manifest the solidarity and peace of Doukhobor philosophy in diffuse communities of practice? How do these new communities of practice situate *self* with *community*?

To be sure, these questions have been asked before, but they have always been articulated by the social, political, and economic dynamics of the time. Many of my research participants have lived through various incarnations of the struggle between liberty and loyalty:

Sonya: When you think back to when you were living in the community and you had a family and you were part of the Doukhobor community, and you were believing in Doukhobor spirituality, what things for you do you remember the best?

Grace: Well, I don't know. It's, like...all we do, some of them, like, like to sing. They get together in the evenings, singing and knitting [laughing], knitting socks or something like that. Just like happy hour. [Laughing] But some of them, they don't care about that. But on the side, someone, lots of Doukhobor, they start to drink, you know, and to eat meat and they don't care about...little by little, especially men. Some of them, they got into alcohol, like...

Sonya: Why do you think that was?

Grace: Well, just, they think to live like that it's too tight.

Sonya: Right.

Grace: They want to be *free*.

It is ironic to read Grace pinpoint freedom as the operative desire in the struggle between self and community, given the philosophical Doukhobor commitment to freedom of expression. Nevertheless, this irony should not be exaggerated to symbolize anything unusual or unordinary. The push and pull of self-in-community is an inevitable source of tension in structures of human organization. If this friction is treated gently and respectfully, it has tremendous potential to inform the sustainable growth and evolution of culture. If the friction is ignored or labeled as deviant or disrespectful, the embrace of community fails those people who have the courage to ask questions.

In the context of Doukhobor life, during and after acts of depredation, the polarization of liberty and loyalty – or agency and community, as I earlier labeled this dynamic – played out in various activities of daily living. In our interview, Mike spoke repeatedly of his decision to move "across the river," from an area of traditional Orthodox Doukhobor settlement to a neighbourhood across the banks of the Columbia River:

Sonya: What was it like for you to live *here*, in Kinnaird, when there were very few Doukhobors in the area? To go from an area where there were many Doukhobors to an area where there were very few?

Mike: Well, at the time when we moved, there was...*lots* of people had moved before us...and it was, well it more or less made it for better accommodations, better way of life, and you had to move out of the area to get it . . .

We were workin' in Trail, workin' in Nelson but when I moved here, I wanted really to become a *citizen* of the village of Kinnaird to where I wanted to be part

of the community. The local community. But still hang on to the Doukhobor philosophy, supporting the Doukhobor way of life.

Today, Mike's neighbourhood is comprised of many families of Doukhobor origin, but his departure from village life in the middle of the last century was a move that stretched the expectations of community at that time. His own remembrance is a confident articulation of choices that he interprets as being congruent with Doukhobor commitment. Nonetheless, he alludes to the judgment that others passed on his decision to practice Doukhobor philosophy outside of the traditional structure:

But a lot of people still have carried that on their shoulders. "It's all those people. They want to control us, those people." Even now you hear from a lot of them: "All those people from Castlegar want to take us over in Ootischenia." And I say "Well," I say, "I'm from Castlegar." I say, "What do I want to take over?" (Mike)

In reading the research transcripts together, an additional element takes hold in the discussion of self in relation to community. Doukhobors today, and in the past as well, identify themselves as belonging to more than one community. The pressure to assimilate was exacerbated and intensified by the Doukhobor troubles such that identification with a broader community of non-Doukhobors afforded an advantageous leverage of identity. Speaking without an accent allowed for "passage" into the space of the English-speaking majority. Similarly, the independent ownership of land attracted "respect" from other Canadians. I highlight these examples within a consideration of agency/community because I want to underscore how complicated it was – and is – to practice membership properly. People who hold membership in more than one community face the possibility of having to reconcile contradictory practices. If

the reconciliation is not successful, the privilege of belonging to many circles becomes the burden of belonging to none.

Fear <-> Courage

Much like the collection of experiences that define the spectrum of shame and pride, fear and courage correlate to discussions of denial:

Harry: It never came to a point with me that I denied it, that I was a Doukhobor. No. I was, in my own way, proud to be a Doukhobor.

Sonya: What do you think about, or has there been an understanding of people who changed their names? Did you know those who did, or have you ever talked about –

Harry: There was some who did. I, somehow, didn't have a good feeling about those people. Like they were running away from something, that they were scared of something, they were not proud of who they were. Those people did not give their great-grandparents a sense of dignity for what they've done in Russia for us to be here. They burned the arms, a lot of them lost their lives. Suffered, beaten, and killed and everything else. Just for us to have a good life in Canada. To change your name was running from that, to be ashamed of it.

In the quote above, Harry alludes to denial as a product of fear and goes on to discuss his witness of fear and denial in the behaviours of his peers. His reference of good versus bad feelings shows that fear and courage operate as a dualism that is easily moralized: fear is bad, courage is good. Nevertheless, despite the easy slippage into moral reasoning, fear shadowed *many* Doukhobor people during times of trouble. In his interview, Harry also speaks of himself as someone who experienced fear:

Harry: Like she [Vi Plotnikoff] says, she was scared to say or reveal her roots. Yeah, probably some of us were at that time. We were scared. We didn't flaunt it,

let's put it this way. We didn't say "Oh, I'm a Doukhobor." You know, you didn't go all out.

Fear and courage, good and bad, respect and disrespect, denial and acknowledgment – Harry's contemplative accounts of the past and present show just how tumultuous life as a Doukhobor was and is. The rules and guarantees of culture were threatened by the seemingly irrational behaviours of depredation; shifting contexts resulted in shifting securities, and Doukhobors slipped in and out of contradictory experiences. Harry appears to have found a rootedness in the present, as have many others, but not everyone is at peace with the resolution of the troubles and the reconciliation of different ideological Doukhobor factions.

Peace Within <-> Peace Without

Doukhoborism encourages the practice of peace within and without. The spark of God lights the interiors of all humans, so internal contemplation is an intimate spiritual conversation. The practice of peace without – the demonstrative practices of peace that Doukhobors are famous for – has considerable significance in the contemporary Doukhobor movement and is a force of unification both within the community and beyond. Peace choirs, peace centres, and peace conventions are all ways in which Doukhobors work to further this fundamental tenet of Doukhobor faith.

The practice of peace "without" has a certain type of currency in the broader Canadian public sphere. Canadians understand and admire initiatives that focus on peace-building and, collectively, we cling to this part of our national identity. I mention this because I want to highlight the practice of peace without as a practice that is both authentic and strategic at the same time. People of Doukhobor heritage straddle various boundaries of community and are

inevitably faced with the task of representing different aspects of self in different community contexts. The aspects of self that are favourably received by others – particularly those "others" who are in a position of privilege and judgment – become important and manageable pieces of self to share.

"We've done enough good things around our society, around this world, that I hope people are respecting us more now" (Harry). This quote suggests that all of the work that Doukhobors have done for others is, at a more nuanced level, also a form of collateral for members of the community that strengthens their interactions with members of the majority public.

This is not to say that Doukhobors practice peace for superficial reasons. People in minority communities simply develop the know-how of when to balance their behaviours and histories. Life in the realm of the majority requires strategic admissions of self. Many of my research participants stressed how deeply pleased they are to now be receiving the "respect we deserve" from a broader community of Canadians. The sustainability of this respect depends on the articulation of common morals and sensibilities, and peace education provides one such bridge.

In her editorials and essays for *Iskra* in 2006 and 2007, Natasha Jmieff consistently broached the dualisms of inside/outside, silence/speech, self/community, and peace within/peace without. She advocated for a contemplative address of these dualisms and suggested that the modern Doukhobor community was struggling to effectively integrate and interpret these polarized ideas. As a young, female member of the community, her vision was both authentic and radical:

[I]n addition to making external changes in the structure and operations of our community, there are many internal changes we as individuals can make . . . Doukhobors have not had an easy time in history, and underneath the "official" histories and scholarly versions of our origins lie countless individual experiences . . . Peace is taking the time to listen to what our friends and neighbours have to say, and also taking time to listen to ourselves. (Jmieff, 2006a, p. 2)

Jmieff's writing acknowledged that young people have an aptitude and affinity for the language of introspective psychology and wellness, and she inferred an awareness that this was not the case for most elders in the community. Even so, her writing solicited agitation amongst *Iskra*'s readership. I presented an excerpt from one of her articles – "Riding a Lame Horse to Paradise" – in the interviews that I conducted for my research, and the responses of my participants were varied.

Thus, a consideration of peace as a mobilizing force within and without is a complicated foray into issues of interpretive difference across generation. Many of the people who lived through the Doukhobor troubles understand the contemporary moment as a time of peace, while those who have experienced the troubles vicariously identify underlying cultural disturbances at the level of self and family. Dialogue evolves culture, and the topic of peace reverberates in Doukhobor dialogue at micro and macro levels.

Then <-> *Now*

The data presented in this chapter illuminate the very human ups and downs of life as a person of Doukhobor heritage. The people whom I interviewed were willing to discuss these highs and lows, but many of them made clear distinctions about the timing of these tribulations. Life today is a product of the past, but it is not captive to that past, according to Vera, Harry, and many others who have lived in Canada for over half a century.

Vera: [F]or some reason or other, my parents and grandparents had a bit of a paranoia in that they didn't want me to go to university because that would mean that I would be out of the area and then for sure I would get married to somebody else, and they didn't want me to have too much education. And as a matter of fact, I gave up an award . . .

At this time, I look back at that and I have regrets about that. But it was *then*, and this is *now*. I think, at times, our family didn't see quite far enough into the future, they weren't futuristic enough. They were a little bit closed into their own circle and they felt that the Doukhobor ideals and lifestyle was much more important than the outside community.

Sonya: And has that changed within your family?

Vera: Oh, absolutely! Absolutely. That was at that time. It was a gradual change, but it did change.

Harry: And hopefully the younger generation like yourself will be the ones that'll kind of put...it'll peter out and that differentiation won't be there amongst the young people. That the young people get together and they'll respect one another, they won't be...because still, even in my generation, there is that little bit of polarization from the past. But, what I'm saying is it'll go away.

The dualism of then and now, while not a contradiction in the general sense of the word, constructs a polarity that is useful for the obligatory task of interpreting and representing the Doukhobor troubles. The act of distinguishing the past from the present allows for room to breathe. It acknowledges a history of "bad behaviour" – as judged from the sidelines by Sunera Thobani's exalted subjects – and contrasts this history with the "goodness" of today's Doukhobor community. It holds a "bad" judgment at length from contemporary life and provides Doukhobors with the space, the energy, and the joy necessary to build community. Alas, as previous citations and quotations have pointed out, the distinction of past and present is not wholly reliable. The sly and slippery agent of memory threatens temporal distinction.

Furthermore, these threats emanate not only from the interiority of Doukhobor memory, but also from the social memory of Canada's public body. There is no guarantee that the past will stay in the past, or that the present will continue to be judged as a time of goodness. This is why an investment in alternate interpretive frameworks is vital to the project of Doukhobor life.

Interpretations

Illuminating and acknowledging diverse experiences through the lens of contradiction is one way of understanding the heterogeneity within the Doukhobor community in Canada. My own observations of frustration in the candid reflections of Doukhobors achieves a certain resonance with this lens. Contradiction implies inconsistency – it tends to manifest frustration and demand resolution. It implores a rational explanation of difference.

The foreseeable problem with this demand is one of definition: rationality is context-dependent. I evaluate rationality differently than you. Just as yesterday had its own unique terms of definition, today brings something new. Thus, a resolution of contradiction will never hold. Rationality cannot satisfy the need for social pardon from an inexplicable past. A request for pardon is not explicit in the dialogue and discourse of Doukhobors today, but it is there and it gnaws at the experience of life in Canada.

Rather than explore other routes to social pardon, I want to consider the kind of work that could be done internally, within community, to find ways of recognizing and representing heterogeneity. Internal consideration gives Doukhobors a measure of control and creativity in the process of bearing witness to difficult pasts. It also opens up the possibility of building and sustaining healthy mechanisms for remembrance that are not contingent on the whims of an insecure body of exalted national subjects [see Sunera Thobani (2007) for greater theoretical background on the processes of exaltation and nation-building].

One piece of this work might involve a consideration of what it means to exist as a diffuse Doukhobor community in Canada today. Where does the validation and strength of this community derive from? Whose input is important? Whose input is not? What kind of relationship do Doukhobors – as individuals and as members of a community – desire to have with other people in Canada? Are Doukhobors indebted to state structures? Do they acknowledge the colonial structures of the modern nation-state? How does the Doukhobor community wish to be positioned and what are the costs of this positioning in Canadian society?

A lot of questions. Which means that a consideration of heterogeneity *within* requires open channels of communication. My own data shows that many Doukhobors lived through the troubles in ways that paralyzed certain forms of dialogue:

Sonya: Do you remember speaking about the conflict and the ways in which the conflict affected you with other members of your family or community? And if so, what kinds of things did you talk about?

Harry: Ahhh...we were always told "Just keep your own nose clean." And what them other people are doing, there's not much you can do to change them unless they realize themselves what they have to do to correct it.

Sonya: Can you just maybe talk a little bit more about what it, like, what it...how those experiences of discrimination affected your faith in Doukhoborism? And if that, if that made your identity more difficult to accept?

Gordon: Well, it didn't affect as far as the Doukhoborism went. But you, you just sort of had to, you know, not, just stay clear of it and keep your mouth shut and that's all.

Sonya: Yep. Did you talk to your parents about that [experiences of cultural discrimination in public school]? Like, did you feel comfortable talking about that?

Lovette: Well, we, we used to. But, you know, their English language wasn't all that good and it was, "Just don't pay attention to them." Or just, like, "Ignore them." Well, you don't ignore, you know, twenty kids. Like, it's, you've got to concentrate, and I think it also affected our learning, you know. I did, did, at one time, have a reading problem . . .

[A]ll that's on your mind, is "What's going to come next?" Or "Where do I go?" Or "Who do I join?"

Life during and after the Doukhobor troubles presents infinite complications.

Nevertheless, many of the Doukhobors who experienced intense distress and discrimination in the past have made the effort to focus on life today This shows that members of the community have the strength and skill to live in the present, to change, to adapt, to see new ways of living. People have changed and times have changed. The organic network of relations that defines community has changed, too. Thus, an exploration of the full potential that these changes offer seems necessary. Learning to speak and hear effectively across difference might be a timely way to harness some of this potential.

In suggesting that members of the community consider communication across difference, I want to return to the kind of demographic heterogeneity of which I have been writing throughout this thesis. Gender, generation, location, ideology – these variables of community life are the structural units of heterogeneity. Much progress has been made in learning to speak across *ideological* difference, and Doukhobors are constantly re-evaluating and re-establishing the guidelines that frame this communication. But generation, gender, and geographic location are units of heterogeneity that also deserve contemporary contemplation. These constructs have changed considerably over the lifetime of today's Doukhobor elders. Exploring these changes and the potential that such changes propose is an important means of caring for community.

It is my belief that expressions of care in the context of community present a viable pathway to healthy remembrance and representation. Acknowledging difference through a lens of compassion and care allows for a unique form of remembrance that seeks distance from the troubling and potentially destructive classification of *good* vs. *bad*. It allows for difference to be explored without a hasty imposition of familiar moral frameworks. It breathes courage into the *project* of community, and it asks when the interpretive framework of "rationality" poses harm to this project.

Chapter Conclusion

Membership in any community, cultural or otherwise, is endowed with responsibility: members must listen to their own needs and to the needs of others. Within the Doukhobor community in Canada, members are faced with the challenge of hearing and understanding needs that pull in various directions. These needs cannot be magnetized. Learning how to manage contradictory forces is part of the contemporary membership project that Doukhobors face. Finding compassion for contradiction is another piece of this project. Rather than establishing and representing *one* unified story of Doukhobors in Canada, members have the opportunity to engage with dissonance and use it as the platform from which to speak of diverse life experiences. This dialogue will help to mature relations between Doukhobors and non-Doukhobors, but it potentiates an exciting opportunity for dialogue within community, too.

Chapter Seven:

Strategic Negotiations of a Difficult Past

The tools of qualitative research probe ordinary actions and familiar turns of phrase. In doing so, aspects of human and social life that are often glossed over or lost altogether are newly illuminated. This allows for an active consideration of behaviours and strategies that have deep impact on the functioning of self, family, and community.

My research into difficult Doukhobor pasts reveals diverse articulations of life in Canada. This diversity persists in the ways that Doukhobors negotiate a complex and contested history. Because memories of the Doukhobor troubles are rife with confusion and distress – at times, even trauma – members of the community have ways of managing and responding to this past so that the balance of *then* and *now* works to support their needs and desires in the present. Stated a different way, the balance of *then* and *now* is managed strategically. Some strategies guide the act of remembrance, while other strategies manage the residual effects of the Doukhobor troubles on life today. I refer to these acts of guidance and management as *strategic* because I believe that they serve particular and identifiable purposes. As noted by Jelin (2002/2003, p. 5), human beings engage in intentional processes of memorial labour.

While conducting my research, I have heard and observed internal commentary within the Doukhobor community about who is managing the past appropriately and who is managing the past inappropriately. These are cultural judgments that form in relation to the well-being of the broader community, and they shift and change as understandings of "well-being" evolve. It is not my goal, nor my privilege, to extend my own judgments in this regard. My intentions with this chapter are to: 1) present the various strategies that I have analyzed; 2) explore the ways in which these strategies are evaluated by self and community; and 3) ask what factors influence

the evolution of these strategies in the Doukhobor community. Drawing attention to diverse perceptions of successful strategy may help members of the community to better understand the work that the past demands of them as both individuals and a collective whole.

Strategies, in Focus

Strategy is not a word that I used intentionally during the interviews with my research participants. Nevertheless, the idea that difficult pasts are managed strategically influenced the questions that I developed for my interview guide. In asking straightforward questions about rules, taboos, values, and traditions, I was able to gain insight into the socio-cultural factors that influence how the past is managed within the contemporary Doukhobor community. After reading the interview transcripts and analyzing the responses of my participants to questions of remembrance, "strategy" emerged for the first time as a concrete and distinct meta-theme. I subsequently used this theme to identify and categorize different forms of personal and collective strategy.

My participants and others in the community may have divergent interpretations of the research data that I present below. I want to here acknowledge that "strategy" can sound somewhat pejorative in its application to sensitive cultural history, but I use this word with a different intention. I am not espousing the reduction of human life to clinical social algebra. Instead, I want to consider the human reflex to history in a rich contemporary context, remaining cognizant of the factors that shape and limit the decisions that get made in everyday life.

Strategies that support remembrance are discussed first in the information that follows; these strategies include the act of bearing witness, the act of remembering with peers, and the narrative act of providing context. Strategies that support the management of the past in the present are then identified; these strategies include participation in cultural activities, the

evocation of silence, therapeutic interventions, processes of forgiveness, and the initiation of dialogue.

Strategies for Remembrance

The strategies that I present in this sub-section deal with the specific act of remembrance. Memory is never wholly controllable, but strategies exist for the purpose of harnessing memory in desirable ways. Interest in the sociology of memorial practice is growing, as evidenced by the descriptive terminology of "memory entrepreneurs" (Jelin, 2002/2003, p. 33) and "memory choreographers" (Conway, 2009, p. 399).

Bearing witness.

Bearing witness frames the act of remembrance with specific purpose. It allows for the exploration of a difficult past, but it tethers the witness to the present by permitting a judgment that gives voice and privilege to contemporary need. This speech, this testimony, this judgment... these words must be heard by another if the person giving testimony is to find solace or relief in the narrative act (Jelin, 2002/2003, p. 63). In the quote below, Natasha demonstrates how this memorial strategy serves Doukhobors today:

Natasha: You know, normally you think of going to somebody's funeral and people giving their eulogies and telling stories about what this person was like and how much they loved them. And there were people standing up at [grandfather's] funeral saying things like "He wasn't the best person" or "I remember the things that he did that were not good." You know, there were people bearing witness to that who then said "But I have come to his funeral anyway." And it was very powerful and yet I didn't know enough at the time. So now, in retrospect, I can see the power of that happening. People actually coming

and both bearing witness to the pain that he had caused and also saying "But I understand that that's over with and may he rest in peace."

The need to honour death is implicit in this quote and this need correlates to the traditional expectations of Doukhobor community members during times of mourning (Mealing, 1975, p. 37). Yet this quote addresses multiple levels of need, including the personal need to remember wrong-doings. I believe that fulfilling both personal *and* collective need is an essential part of achieving healthy distance from a difficult past. The memorial strategy of bearing witness permits individuals to speak their own truths while simultaneously acknowledging and respecting the bond of community. Though Natasha does not speak to the community interactions that followed her grandfather's funeral, I infer that those who offered their blessings of peace to her grandfather derived reciprocal benefit.

Remembering together.

A majority of my participants experienced the Doukhobor troubles first-hand. When I asked these participants if they ever thought back to "times of trouble," I was surprised to hear many of them respond in the same way:

Sonya: Do you have the chance to chat about this and try to make sense of it with people, now? Or is it something that –

Gordon: With, with, with some people of course, we would think back.

Sonya: Hmm.

Gordon: We talk about, you know, the things that went on and how we lived, and that.

Sonya: How often do you think back to the times of conflict? Like, in terms of in the present moment, how often do you think about those times of struggle?

Mike: Well, it's a...as a being alone sort of thing, I mean, living the normal way of life you don't think about them. But as soon as you start talkin' with other people and, you know. Those memories come back. And to see those people that were in that, lived in that way of life at the time. It brings back memories and we start talkin' and you know...they're hard to forget. Because there were good times and there was lots of trying times but, we lived together, you know.

Sonya: Right. Um, how often do you think back to times of struggle?

Steve: Oh, we have lots of conversations. And we laugh at them, actually.

Sonya: Mmm. You and people your age, you mean?

Steve: Yeah, oh yeah. Right.

Sonya: Okay, okay. So frequently -

Steve: Even with her [Ann]. A lot of times. And our friends.

Sonya: Right.

Steve: And of course, our friends right now were both from ...are both from Sons of Freedom and Orthodox.

Although the troubles alienated many people and forced segregation within the Doukhobor community, an overwhelming sense of togetherness lives on in the memories of those times. Regardless of whether or not people experienced them in the same way, those who remember the troubles are acutely aware that they share this past and these memories with others. Remembrance of the troubles occurs today *when* Doukhobors encounter other people from this shared past.

Surprisingly, the remembrance of these encounters is not dependent on a shared ideology, as Steve notes in the quote above. There is no guarantee that the moral judgments of one person will be validated by another in this form of remembrance. Instead, it appears that this memorial strategy is an affirmation of resilience and change: "Look what happened. Look what we lived

through. Look at the changes that time brings." Later in his transcript, Steve qualifies his statements about remembrance with the recognition that this kind of dialogue is predicated on forgiveness. Thus, some Doukhobors who lived through the troubles appear to have contemporary needs that move beyond the particularities of their conflict experiences. These needs substantiate the present as a time of old and new; there is the continuity of community and the relief of cultural renewal.

Contextualization.

If remembering together is a strategy that surfaces in the experiences of people who lived through the Doukhobor troubles, contextualization is a strategy that surfaces in the ideas of people who were born away from – or after – the depredations. In this sense, then, people without first-hand experience of the depredations remember the memories of others, but they do so with a unique sense of purpose and understanding. I, too, am someone without first-hand experience of the depredations and contextualization is a strategy that I use to guide my own interpretation of Doukhobor history. Readers of this thesis have already encountered my deployment of context, so I use this opportunity to highlight contextualization in the memories of others.

How *do* the people who were born with temporal and/or spatial distance from the depredations remember these times of trouble? They, too, tell stories, but their audience and purpose diverge from the audience and purpose of Doukhobor elders. Younger people have a different understanding of "we": identity is troubled by inter-marriage, language is lost, neighbours are not blood relatives. The "we" remains sacred, but the cues for remembrance differ, as do the intents and purposes. Social cues for remembrance surface *outside* of community, and remembrance becomes entwined with cultural representation. Remembrance for

Doukhobors with distance from the troubles is not so much an act of reminiscence and affirmation as it is an act of education and representation:

Jonathan: Much to my surprise, even in the last five years among, um, people I work with at my company and in the legal profession, when I...should the topic come up and when I identify myself as being a Doukhobor, um, in some cases there's almost a feeling or sentiment of surprise that I, that I even call myself that.

Sonya: Hmm.

Jonathan: And, ah, often I get the joke and I refuse to take any personal offense to it and just treat it as a joke, but I can't tell you how many times I've heard, "Oh, well, you must run around naked and burn down schools."...

[T]hen I very quickly and diplomatically inform them otherwise.

Jonathan's reflex to public ignorance is not tied to lived experiences of the Doukhobor troubles, nor are his passion and pride tempered by the residual harm of that time. This is not to say that he has forgotten what happened to the people of his family and community. Instead, his emotional levity leads him to a different form of remembrance in which he privileges historical context:

Jonathan: I think it's important as a writer and a historian and a researcher to, wherever *possible*, differentiate between and identify and put in context the perspectives and viewpoints of *others* that we are writing about. And endeavour to separate that from our own viewpoints. And if we're *really* insightful, um, be forthright about our own –

Sonya: Mm.

Jonathan: - perspectives and viewpoints on certain issues.

Nina, too, is comfortable with intercepting misinformed public knowledge and countering it with her own understanding of past experience. In addition to providing historical context for

the troubles, Nina makes a point of honouring the philosophical principles of Doukhoborism and noting the opposition that these principles garner in broader Canadian society.

The research participants who were born with distance from the depredations are apt to fuse memory with philosophy and education. They strategically deploy a form of historical memory that speaks to structural injustice and defends the honour of Doukhobor life.

Strategies to Manage the Past

In addition to managing the act of remembrance, strategy manages the access of history to life today. Such strategies reveal the potency of the Doukhobor troubles through time and the influence of this past on a heterogeneous community. Some of the strategies that I discuss below are authentic to cultural practices of the distant past, while other strategies reflect a conscious reach for new ways of invigorating Doukhobor practice. Some are well-established, while others still flounder for a toe-hold on tradition.

Cultural activities.

Singing and working are two activities that have strong resonance in Doukhobor culture. It is fitting that many of the active Doukhobor community members in British Columbia turned to these practices in the wake of the troubles. Joint choirs and traditional work groups opened across boundaries of ideology, and people managed the friction of the recent past with traditions of the distant past. Singing, sewing, spinning, woodworking – these are all things that Doukhobors do, and they do them *well*. These activities generate pride in community that is reciprocated by the admiration and interest of people outside of community:

Sonya: Yeah. Um, what kinds of activities, discussions, / relationships have you or others worked towards in response to the conflict of the 20th century?

Lovette: Well, being involved in the choirs.

Sonya: Mm hmm.

Lovette: Voices for Peace Choir. That was a big thing . . .

Like, we're trying to, even in the Culture Interpretive Society, we have opened up

to the community. And –

Sonya: Huh.

Lovette: - the non-Doukhobor people that come and say, "You guys have so

much to share."

Thus, in addition to bridging the hostility of conflict experiences, singing and working

also encourage friendship and learning with non-Doukhobor Canadians. These are important acts

of integration that initiate *from* minority space, reaching out to other minority communities, as in

the case of the dinners that now occur between the Italian and Doukhobor choirs in the West

Kootenay region of British Columbia. Integrated activities also reach out to members of a

broader majority public in Canada; this form of integration potentiates renewal of the salacious

body of public knowledge about Doukhobors that exists, still, in Canada today.

Silence.

Silence is a strategy that gets used – sometimes, by some people – to manage a difficult

Doukhobor past. This strategy is, by definition, difficult to broach. I choose to address it here as

an extension of the ongoing dialogue that *Iskra* and other cultural bodies have fostered in this

regard over the past decade.

Nina provides a thoughtful interpretation of silence as a strategy for management of the

past. Without lauding silence, she assesses it as an important component of an effective healing

strategy:

Nina: I think when it comes to just any kind of "healing," for lack of a better term

But, um, just that kind, um, of progress...often silence is part of it, but there comes a point in time when you do need to have a voice and you want to have a voice and if you're in a supportive environment, um, where people encourage and, you know, talk about having, um, feelings attached to that, and what that meant. I think, um, that's necessary, too, but often silence is the beginning stages of that.

Other female interview participants also spoke of collective attempts to extend a process of healing *beyond* the step of silence. Lovette spoke about the dialogue that is generated in the cultural interpretive centre where women and men gather, but noted that such dialogue skirts specific memories of the troubles or the ideological conflicts that underpinned them. Yet, she did not dismiss this form of dialogue, pointing out that it builds solidarity across other contentions, such as the proper way to prepare cultural foods. Vera spoke of a retreat in the recent past that brought women together. She remembered that some of the women at the retreat expressed sorrow about the personal shame that invaded their lives during and after the troubles. She was careful to note in our interview that all of the retreat disclosures were confidential.

Thus, my data suggests that there is a common understanding within the community that silence is a pervasive strategy for management of a difficult Doukhobor past. Silence as a contemporary strategy is not surprising in its application, since many Doukhobors have previously stated that silence was a dominant feature of life *during* the troubles. Contemporary silence seals the cracks of old conflict against the unpredictable interests of people today, particularly those people who will never know what the troubles felt like at that time, and thus cannot wholly gauge intellectual interest against the affective fear of recurrence. Nevertheless, the data also reveals important ruptures of silence. These ruptures occur in safe spaces, like the confidential retreat that Vera mentions, or the spaces of reminiscence in which small groups of

old friends and neighbours stop to speak to one another. General observation suggests that the coffee shop is another such place in which elders convene a familiar ritual that allows for an episodic address of complicated histories.

In spite of the stigma attached to silence, many participants shared astute and articulate interpretations of its operation across demographic factors. I consider these ideas more fully later in this chapter, when I explore mechanisms of evaluation for the strategies that Doukhobors use in the search for a healthy balance of past with present.

Therapies.

There is no one strategy that can achieve peace and mindfulness for everyone in the Doukhobor community. Psychotherapy – one type of therapeutic treatment – is a classic form of strategic management in which people work with others to find healthy ways of negotiating their lived realities. There exists a widespread public understanding of what therapy does and how it works, but there are no *roots* for this clinical form of practice in Doukhobor culture. Lovette notes that a support group was shunned as a possible strategy for solidarity building within the U.S.C.C. Without antiquating Doukhoborism, I want to recognize that classic forms of psychotherapy challenge older forms of cultural communication.

Natasha was born as the depredations ceased, but the effects of the troubles on the people around her had significant influence on her own maturation and well-being. In our interview together, she spoke at length about the utility of therapy in her own life and thoughtfully shared the push and pull of this practice on her relationships with friends and family:

Sonya: Did your family know that you were doing [therapy]?

¹⁰

¹⁹ The Canadian Counselling and Psychotherapy Association website notes that psychotherapy and counselling are terms that are used interchangeably to refer to a therapeutic practice, facilitated by a professional, that uses the power of dialogue and relationship to enhance the knowledge of self and the achievement of personal well-being.

Natasha: Yeah, they know.

Sonya: Okay. Do they see how that could be a useful thing for you?

Natasha: I think so. I think they see the changes in me as I've kind of worked through some of this stuff. But at the same time, it's not something I can talk with

about them [sic] because they haven't chosen to open up those boxes.

Sonya: Right. And have you found others that you can talk to about those kinds

of things? Or has this been somewhat of a...your own personal thing?

Natasha: I mean, with my close friends. They all know the story and they've kind

of been there with me. But most of my friends are non-Doukhobor, again, but we

live in an age of psychology where we're all kind of psychoanalyzing ourselves

all the time.

Forgiveness.

Grace spent her early years in isolated areas of traditional Doukhobor settlement in

British Columbia. She was exposed to many Doukhobor lessons via cultural osmosis and saw

first-hand how the Doukhobor troubles fractured families and relationships. I asked her if her

early years offered instruction on how to make amends. She spoke of forgiveness as an

important, but difficult, practice:

Grace: All day, special prayer, "Our father in heaven..."

Sonya: Right.

Grace: And they all have to stand up and read it and that's special prayer. But I

don't know if it's, uh, still, it said, like, Forgive my...

Sonya: *My sins*, right?

Grace: And I'll forgive –

Sonya: Those who trespass against –

Grace: But it's so hard to do that. [Laughing]

Sonya: Right, right.

Grace's candour is a reminder that any form of strategy for the management of past experiences requires considerable commitment and energy across the heterogeneity of the Doukhobor population. Many of the people in community today were not demonstrative in the active depredations; this creates a scenario in which people must ask themselves what they see in community *now*, and what this contemporary commitment requires of them in the collective address of history. Harry suggests that time is the key ingredient of change. This is a hard maxim to stand by, but people stand by it nonetheless. It is my impression that those people who have learned to trust in this slow process have valuable philosophies to share.

Dialogue.

Is it ironic that silence and dialogue are both used – simultaneously – within the Doukhobor community to manage the past? At a conceptual level, it might sound confusing, but at the level of lived reality...it makes sense. Communities are organic, dynamic social systems: they support and sustain immense contradictions and ironies. Yes, silence is a form of strategic behaviour that has been sanctioned within the Doukhobor community in Canada, but many, many people recognize that dialogue, too, has a major part to play in the execution of cultural growth in the 21st century.

Lovette is wise to integrate ideas of dialogue with perceived needs of Doukhobor youth: "And I feel that we do not have enough open discussions. I would like to see us open up our culture centre for young people to come together and just share these things together. We don't do that." Her focus on dialogue as a strategy to be encouraged amongst young people presents a sentiment that is shared by others. There is a common acknowledgment that some elders in the community are dubious of the unification, and that this doubt influences the broader membership. In recognizing the distinct needs of youth, Lovette expresses care and compassion.

Different people have different capacities for change. This may be an unsatisfactory reality, but people within the Doukhobor community are starting to recognize that "the heirs" of 20th century Doukhobor history have a unique offering that comes with unique needs. In recognizing and accepting that new people want new strategies, elders can both acknowledge their own limits and bless the new horizons that others envision.

Evaluating Strategic Negotiations of History

As a researcher with interests in adult education and community development, I see tremendous value in asking how, and on what basis, strategic negotiations of Doukhobor experience are judged and evaluated. Because my research data explores the thoughts and expressions of Doukhobors, I limit this discussion to evaluations that I have observed within the community. In this regard, observation occurred in the hearing and seeing of everyday conversations and behaviours. Readings from the archives of *Iskra* and *Mir* supplemented my learning. I also shared some of these readings and philosophies with my interview participants and asked what their responses were.

Criteria for Evaluation

Inclusion.

Inclusion is an important criterion for the evaluation of strategies that manage the history of Doukhobor life in Canada. It queries the access to, and equity of, strategic negotiation. It also locates strategy *in community* and demands a certain solubility of individual negotiation within this community. Inclusion is expressed most audibly in the questions that are posed across generation. Natasha, a vocal and thoughtful young person with roots in the West Kootenay Doukhobor population, talks about the alienation of strategic silence:

I've always felt it would be very valuable for me to *know* what they [community elders] have lived through. Their stories of struggle. And having come up against people who are very reluctant to tell those stories for obvious reasons, but it always leaves a gap in my experience because I really feel like I could learn from that. Even if the only thing I learned was where I came from and what...you know, to be able to sympathize with people I knew. That was very much not the case when I was growing up. Those stories were not told. (Natasha)

The "gap" that Natasha speaks of in the quote above resides in the lives of many people the world over who have inherited an understanding of the past from the intergenerational transmission of silence (Jelin, 2002/2003, p. 95). In choosing to withhold a discussion of the past, the silence of this retention conveys meaning which is intuited and interpreted by others.

Therapy is an option for working through the intergenerational transmission of the troubles, yet this strategy creates its own challenges. In speaking of her access to therapy, Natasha speaks also of the alienation that the stigma of therapy manifests. People who access therapy diverge from those who strategize in other ways; the affective labour that therapy demands contributes to this distance. Because different strategies succeed in the achievement of different goals, the respective points of arrival can be very different, even lonely. Consequently, issues of inclusion and outreach reside across strategies of historical negotiation, too.

Returning to the memorial strategy of "remembering together," the issue of generational alienation surfaces again. My elder participants revealed that remembrance occurs among people who share the lived experience of the Doukhobor troubles. Perceived from the vantage point of people born after the troubles, this gates the opportunity to learn from the past. Lovette, a woman with first-hand experience of the troubles, proposes that remembrance and dialogue be cultivated and encouraged at the level of family. I find this to be an interesting idea, as it straddles both

inclusion and exclusion. Family dialogue opens up remembrance across generations, but contains it within bloodlines.

These discussions validate the salience of "safety" as a condition upon which negotiations are shared. Delineating boundaries of remembrance seems imperative to the management of Doukhobor pasts at this moment in time. Thus, if inclusion persists as an important value and goal of community life, it will need to be reconciled with the ongoing project of safe remembrance. I write this with the knowledge that all of the people with whom I spoke accepted the risk of remembering with me. My offer of confidentiality mitigated this risk, but there were perhaps other factors that weighed in favour of participation, some of which conflict with the theorizing above. I am young and I have genealogical distance from the majority of my participants, yet many people said "yes" instead of "no." This is confusing, admittedly, but it is also an expression of optimism that I am grateful for.

Transparency.

It is hard to qualify, with one or two words, what I mean when I list "transparency" as a criterion for evaluation and judgment of the past as it is represented in the present. Honesty and truth are bundled up in this criterion, too, but neither of them fully embodies that which I have observed. Rather than question the integrity of Doukhobor strategy, this criterion evaluates the depth and disclosure of strategy. Does it build a comprehensive understanding of the past? Does it reveal the ups and downs of Doukhobor experience in Canada?

²⁰ Although Elizabeth Jelin (2003) does not use the word "safety," she speaks of the ethical concerns that arise in mnemonic spaces. Among these concerns are the retention of privacy and confidentiality, the reconstruction of normalcy, and the provision of committed witnesses to – and for – people who are remembering difficult pasts or traumas.

The data presented in this chapter clearly demonstrates a need, by some, for historical censorship. Many members of the community understand why censorship appeals, but some of these same members weigh this appeal against the perceived benefits of transparency:

Jonathan: It's a fine line that ends up being walked when one, as a Doukhobor researcher and writer, attempts to deal with this area of our history. Um, I feel very strongly that it *is* a part of our history, it *did* happen, and so to ignore or avoid having that dialogue, um, to me, seems to be fundamentally wrong. Um, the more we can acknowledge it and be open about it and have dialogue about it from the perspectives of 2008, and not 1938, ah, the more healthy a way we can deal with it. Um, at the same time, I'd be the first to acknowledge that it is still a very sensitive issue among the great deal of Doukhobor people, and so how one goes about having that dialogue about what happened, it has to take not only tact but sensitivity and compassion.

In the quote above, Jonathan suggests that an open accounting of Doukhobor history enables well-being within the community. As the publisher of a website on Doukhobor genealogy and history, his belief is grounded in his own experience of candid, open, reflexive historical research. Other participants exercise more caution in their willingness to evaluate memorial labour on grounds of transparency. Vera implies that difficult pasts deserve explication by and from those who lived through the worst of the difficulties. Interestingly, Jonathan's call for compassion finds purchase in Vera's ideas:

So perhaps those times, they did contain a lot of shame for people, and perhaps it is necessary. Like, but it just goes back to how I said; I wouldn't want to just have everything...it *has* to be from the people that were hurt, to bring those wounds to the surface. I wouldn't want to rub salt on anybody's wounds. (Vera)

Ultimately, the criterion of transparency raises broader issues of entitlement and privilege. Who should first be served by history? Whose needs are prioritized? And who makes these decisions?

Objectivity.

Steve experienced the Doukhobor troubles first-hand with close witness of the ideological tensions that underpinned the activities of that time. His active participation in the Kootenay Committee on Intergroup Relations sparked his interest in research, and he has continued to use the tools of research to ask critical questions of Doukhobor experience in Canada. The dialogic and reciprocal demands of research have influenced Steve's own processes of remembrance and negotiation. He is willing to discuss his life experiences as someone who grew up in the Sons of Freedom community of Gilpin, but his remembrance and dialogue are framed with objective distance:

Sonya: [D]o you think or feel that experiences of struggle and conflict should be talked about and shared within Doukhobor families?

Steve: Well -

Sonya: Across generations of people who experienced it differently. Is that something that *is* part of what a family discussion should entail?

Steve: Yes, I think so. Because when you talk about your experience, and your children, or your other families, or say, even the community, they wish to know. Another person will answer you with his own experience. But, again, as long as you...this is my belief. As long as you don't take it to heart. Because, like, past is past. And you cannot return it.

Much like the distinction of past from present, Steve also distinguishes fact from feeling.

The objective distance that these distinctions enact is crucial to his vision of historic representation. In contrast, many female participants defined affective labour as an important

piece of strategic negotiation. The analysis of gender and its role in strategic remembrance is now recognized as an important way of approaching and understanding the ways in which difficult pasts are addressed. In her book on the remembrance of oppression and repression in countries of the southern cone of Latin America, Elizabeth Jelin (2002/2003) considers how women and men turn to the past:

Other evidence suggests that women more often express feelings, while men convey their recollections within logical and rational frameworks, and also that women more commonly refer to their intimate sphere and interpersonal relationships, whether within the family or within political activism. (p. 82)

This kind of information allows for a more constructive and comprehensive exploration of memory. I share it here with the intention of provoking thought about the manifestation of demographic difference in community life.

Piecework

Peace work is piecework. Stitching together fabrics of difference is a practice of craft that Doukhobors have shared for centuries. Peace within and peace without are not wholly distinct projects, which means that the individual and collective goals of the Doukhobor community in Canada today are complementary *and* complex. People define peace in different ways, just as they feel peace in different ways; these differences have inherent reflection in the strategic choices that individuals make as they choose how to remember the recent past. Reconciling these differences is not easy, but piecework never is. Countless Doukhobors have sewed countless stitches into the corners of Canadian life. The community as a whole has tremendous experience in piecework...and peace work.

Above all, the data in this chapter proves how important it is to ask what the needs of Doukhobors are: individual needs, community needs, female needs, male needs, young needs,

old needs, British Columbia needs, Alberta needs, Saskatchewan needs, Sons of Freedom needs, Independent needs, U.S.C.C. needs, among others. Without having some gauge of need, it is impossible to represent Doukhobor histories with any sort of integrity.

The theoretical undercurrents of nationhood and subjectivity that I return to consistently in this thesis make it clear that many others would be ready and willing to write Doukhobor history *for* Doukhobors. But such a history would reflect their needs, not those of the heterogeneous Doukhobor community. Thus, all of the time and energy that the troubles have demanded of this community cannot be abandoned. Forward movement is still tailed by the past. The laws of shadow are irrefutable. Contemporary activities and future goals must address the mnemonic activities that persist in Doukhobor practice today. This form of piecework deserves the creative talents of the Doukhobor community.

Chapter Conclusion

The activities of Doukhobors today can reflect what it means to live with multiple responsibilities and competing demands. This chapter looked at some of the strategies that Doukhobors rely on to address the responsibilities that come from behind. These strategies are common-place and practical, and they can fade from view unless the eye is trained to see them. In learning to recognize these strategies, the operations of everyday life are situated in a continuum of past to present. Similarly, the experience of everyday life fades in and out of individual and collective realities. Addressing the past in the present is not an activity that exists in isolation from other activities. It reflects – and requires – the same commitment that Doukhobors have made to other labours in other times.

Chapter Eight:

A History for the Future²¹

The previous seven chapters have laid claim to the fact that history is important. With this chapter, I want to address the questions and considerations that arise from this claim. Jocelyn Létourneau (2000/2004) asks simply: "What history, for what present and, especially, for what future?" (p. 3). The discussion of what is now well underway in this thesis, so I turn to questions of whom, why, how, and ponder the doubts that they give rise to. I use Létourneau's formidable – and fantastic – first chapter of his book on memory and responsibility in Quebec to guide this discussion, and rely on his contemplative address of history to ask what memory – and, thus, remembrance – are, and what they do, in the Doukhobor community and beyond.

Memory As:

Mediator

Memory mediates. Human beings *think* through memory, as we think *through* memory. It is the mediator and the medium. If memory mediates thought, then it influences much about the way that we understand ourselves and others. If it mediates judgment, then it influences much of what we do to ourselves and others. If it mediates emotion, then it influences much of how we feel about ourselves and others.

We know this, already. Vi Plotnikoff (1998) told us this when she wrote about her life as a circle journey. Natasha Jmieff (2006b) told us this when she wrote about her *Baba*. The

133

²¹ I borrow the name of this chapter from a book of the same name, written by Jocelyn Létourneau (2000/2004).

Doukhobor oral tradition tells us this in the following excerpt, which has been translated from Psalm 64 of the Doukhobor Living Book²²:

The body is formed out of earth, but the spirit is in the sacred image of God and through it, we have a threefold power. In every quality of the spirit, the human power is this: memory, reason, will. By memory we are likened to God the Father; by reason we are likened to God the Son; by will – to the Holy Spirit, thus in the holy Trinity there are three persons, but they hold one spirit; three spiritual powers, but one God. (Mealing, 1975, p. 44 [Translation by the Doukhobor Society of Canada])

If memory is spirit, it is with us for our time on earth. So how should we remember? How should we orient our memories and remembrances? Létourneau (2000/2004) says this: "In order to enable the heirs to advance and to live, the past must be a springboard and a source of motivation" (p. 10). He demands a forward orientation, a history for the future. This kind of history uses memories of the past to support those who move ahead, the "heirs." It does not force the past into the future, but it makes the past available for the expression of who we are and who we want to be.

Vision

Memory sees. My mother used to tell me that she had eyes in the back of her head. That phrase scared me when I was little, but now it makes me smile. We see into the future with the vision that prior knowledge has given us. Our eyes look forward and back at the same time.

Just as memory articulates vision, vision articulates identity. The way that we see ourselves and the way that others see us are powerful images that code who we are as socially situated human beings. This is a complicated proposition within a contemporary address of

²² Mark Mealing (1975) describes the Living Book as an oral collection of psalms, hymns, and certain historic addresses of past Doukhobor leaders. The Living Book was transcribed into written form by Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich over several years spanning the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century. This transcription was first published in 1910 (Mealing, 1975, p. 42).

Doukhobor issues. Doukhobors have long been committed to the inner vision, or light within, but today, with feet that walk in many different realms, the eyes of others matter.

Many of my research participants have staked a claim on the horizon. I have cited Harry's claim already, but it is worth sharing again: "We've done enough good things around our society, around this world, that I hope people are respecting us more now." The eyes of others contribute to the vision of the future. When those eyes remember the turmoil and stress of the past, it is important to offer them new images. In distilling the visions that were shared with me during my research interviews, I can say that wellness, love, connection, encouragement, recognition, influence, sustainability, and peace are all layered together in the broader vision that the Doukhobor community in Canada has for the future.

This vision is positive; it privileges the "good things," which Létourneau says is crucial for a prospective history. But he also emphasizes that future visions must be left open: there needs to be creative potential, the "possibility of exploring new territories of identity" (Létourneau, 2000/2004, p. 12). Without knowing what will happen in the future, heirs must have access to their past so that it can be interpreted, remembered, and used for all that is necessary in the future moment.

Distance

Memory measures. It calibrates necessary distance. Not all memories are "good" memories, as evidenced by the discussion of difficult pasts. Memories that are suspect will find less traction in the contemporary desire to remember:

[M]emorial practices [that engage with traumatic histories] are thought to produce nothing but anguish, grief, and a righteous, desperate rage that only risks fueling more violence. Rather than offering the possibility of a reconciled future,

memories of victimization seem to fester social division and conflict. (Simon, Rosenberg, & Eppert, 2000, p. 1)

While memories of the Doukhobor troubles are not traumatic to all members of the community, they certainly generate some discomfort, particularly when perceptions of victimhood are unresolved. There is no dictionary of the Doukhobor troubles, no impartial and objective voice of reason that can claim the truth of that time, so judgments conflict. Rather than potentiate contemporary trouble, there is an inclination toward a measured distance from such memories:

Sonya: Do you think or feel that experiences of struggle and conflict should be talked about and shared within Doukhobor families?

Patricia Paul William: Um, it depends. You can light a little fire and it'll make a bigger fire. It depends on who you're talking with.

Sonya: Okay.

Patricia Paul William: The character of whoever you're involved with. Because you might be doing it because you need to do it for your own sake to heal.

Sonya: Mm hmm.

Patricia Paul William: Or, they can think that you're doing it to arouse –

Sonya: Right.

Patricia Paul William: - something deeper in them.

The complicating factor in this memorial strategy is the fact that memories are shared in concert with others. Calibrating measured distance is a personal judgment; when memories are shared in a collective, or when they come to represent a collective, the terms of calibration are negotiated. In the quote above, Patricia Paul William indicates that judgments must consider the needs of the person telling the story – or sharing the memory – and the needs of the person who is in receipt of that story or shared memory.

That which interests me most is the issue of perception: how do we know what the needs of others are? Do we simply assume? Do we project the experiences of self onto another? This is an outstanding issue, both within and outside of the Doukhobor community. It indicates that the content of the past is but one of many branches in the tree of history. Ethical and political issues must frame the approach to collective remembrance if it is ever to address difficult pasts: "It cannot be overemphasized that choice in relation to memory is unavoidably a matter of collective morality and political culture and is carried out in keeping with the stakes and challenges of the present" (Létourneau, 2000/2004, p.16).

Honour

Memory honours. Memory has special meaning in the Doukhobor community. Doukhobors have suffered at various times, in various places, but their continued existence in the world is celebrated as a triumph of peace. This celebration is enacted, in part, with an acknowledgment of all that the ancestors accomplished. Julie Rak (2004) spends a good deal of time analyzing and interpreting the Doukhobor phrase "vechnaiia pamit" (p. 58). It is a phrase that honours and affirms; Rak takes the English translation to mean "eternal memory and eternal consciousness in the Kingdom of Heaven after death" (2004, p. 58). I read this interpretation as indicating that ancestors have a strong pull on the heirs, and that this relationality is sacred.

Within a consideration of memory as honour, I want to bring back Létourneau (2000/2004): "To honour one's ancestors is to be accountable to the future" (p. 12). The ideas within this statement are not wholly congruous with the surface assumptions of honour and tradition in Doukhobor culture, but there are overlaps that deserve attention. *Vechnaiia pamit* honours the sustenance of action through memory; a history for the future honours the sustenance of culture through the act of living. Traversing Doukhobor concepts of honour and

memory is not an easy task, particularly for someone like me who speaks no Russian.

Nevertheless, I do sense that *presence* – be it in flesh or in spirit – is valued in Doukhoborism.

Létourneau would say that to be present is to be mindful of the needs that carry us forward. If Doukhobor culture is to be sustained, then the project of maturation and transformation will need to account for the needs of those who live here.

What does a history for the future do to cultural notions of "elder" and "respect"? It certainly interrogates them, for critical thinking is the foundation of Létourneau's thesis. But his respect for elders is not lost: he privileges their contribution to the making of history, yet he sees respect as an act of reciprocity: "In my mind, solidarity here implies the mutual responsibility of ancestors and heirs, based on a kind of intergenerational friendship, hospitality, and generosity" (2000/2004, p. 13). Here, again, we are reminded that the project of remembering is tied to critical questions of community.

Transformation

Memory transforms. The transformative potential(s) of memory is what makes "a history for the future" exciting. Because memories are socially framed (Jelin, 2002/2003, p. 11), the meaning and importance of them change through time. The way that they are remembered will reflect the social knowledge and insight of the moment in which remembrance occurs. Memories change as we gain new knowledge and new experiences. This idea, in and of itself, has liberating potential for people who transmit and/or inherit the memorial legacy of a difficult past. The meaning of memory is borne of interpretation. As the interpretive conditions change, the meaning of the past changes, too.

In the contemporary Doukhobor community in Canada so much has changed since the time of depredations in the 20th century. Hostilities are diluted, cultural practices are integrated, and people are writing and talking about Doukhobor life in print, on the radio, and online. Scholars are taking new interest in the impact and experience of Doukhobors in Canada (Androsoff, 2007; Berikoff, 2006; Bondoreff, 2008; Cran, 2006; Rak, 2004; Sherstobitoff, 2005) and non-Doukhobors feel comfortable approaching Doukhobor experience as a contributing element to the broader experience and history of people in Canada. This knowledge, this evidence, is important to the dialogue of remembrance within the community.

My participants exercised caution in their consideration of whether or not it was just and appropriate to speak of the Doukhobor troubles, and I value and respect their diverse perspectives. My own thinking on ideas of access and censorship is still growing, but I do believe that the change in interpretive conditions merits a consideration of what that *means* to memory. The heirs will see and hear things differently. The impact of these stories will be considerably different because the meaning of the stories will be different:

While it is clear that meaning is at least in part passed on from generation to generation...this meaning is nevertheless itself transformed to meet new needs, unforeseeable by the ancestors, that arise in building the present. This transformation is crucial. It is the essence of intergenerational transmission, the ultimate purpose of which is the advancement of humanity. (Létourneau, 2000/2004, p. 14)

Crafting Futures

Doukhobors have been crafting futures for a long, long time. Crafting requires art and industry, patience and talent, time and energy. Crafting requires knowledge and yields knowledge. In discussing futures, I remain mindful that this work is already happening:

²³ See the fictional work of Bill Stenson: Stenson, B. (2007). *Svoboda*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada: Thistledown Press.

Sonya: I'm wondering, at this point in time, given the work that has already been done – and she [Jmieff] acknowledges that there has been done some work – what kind of work do you think still needs to be done in terms of continued dialogue within the community or continued ways of trying, of, you know, building understanding.

Steve: Mm hmm.

Sonya: What would that look like to you, from your perspective?

Steve: Well, how much more is there need to be done? I don't know [words missing]. Because the ball is rolling already. And it's going to take its course.

You can't hurry it. Or you can't stop it.

The quote above has been a touchstone quote that I have returned to consistently during the writing of this thesis. Steve poses compelling questions that have resonance within the broader community. The ball is rolling, yes. What needs more discussion, more input, is this issue of destiny. Elders may have different sensibilities, influenced by different experiences and interpretations of tradition, when it comes to destiny. This is not something that I discussed during my interviews, though I now wish I had.

In persisting with Steve's metaphor, I concur that the ball must keep moving. It rolls with the momentum of community and cannot be stopped by maverick force alone. But I believe that the course is open. The body of memory held by the Doukhobor community in Canada is vast. Present forms of practice present contemporary uses of the past. New forms of dialogue, new voices, new stories, new families, new forms of communion and cultural practice – all of these factors that innovate and evolve will tap this body of memory in infinitely *new* ways. And that is exciting.

Chapter Conclusion

In planning for a history that breathes life into future possibilities, questions of *how* become increasingly relevant. Crafting demands an attention to intention. Questions of content are necessarily intercepted with questions of construction and technique. This chapter has broadly assessed the different things that memory does. In identifying the many manipulations of memory, it becomes increasingly clear that the forms of expression are infinite. Dialogue and engagement across difference allow for new ways to live, new ways to learn, and new ways to remember.

Chapter Nine:

Conclusion

Explicating diversity and heterogeneity within the Doukhobor community in Canada was a founding goal of this research. The results that I have shared in this thesis achieve this goal and validate the resilience of the contemporary Doukhobor community in Canada. Because public discourse has homogenized the expression of Doukhobor life over the last century, finding and revealing opportunities for expression from within the community are actions that have considerable salience and value. Nevertheless, such actions intersect with considerations of safety and care in community.

Discussions of the Doukhobor troubles highlight issues of responsibility and obligation to self and community. The tensions inherent in these responsibilities have surfaced throughout this thesis; such tensions are evident in the entwined memories and experiences of peace and conflict, pride and shame, solidarity and segregation, agency and community, and courage and fear. I have addressed these tensions honestly and openly because the project of building a history for the future is premised on the undeniable occurrence of change. The needs of a community change as conditions and circumstances evolve. There is no way of knowing what the sustainability of Doukhoborism in Canada will require. Thus, negotiating access to the various elements of a difficult past should inform collective remembrance.

This thesis has demonstrated how much work the remembrance of a difficult past is.

Different people respond to these mnemonic demands with various strategies. Within the

Doukhobor community, strategies include bearing witness, remembering together, and
contextualizing past events. The labours of memory are balanced with the needs of the present,
and people strive for balance through cultural engagement, silence, therapy, forgiveness, and

dialogue. In turning to the future, dialogue suggests tremendous potential for the collective practice of peace. Finding ways to speak and hear across differences of ideology, gender, age, and location are central to the inheritance and sustenance of a Doukhobor legacy in Canada.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2000). Introduction [Part II]. In M. McNeil & L. Pearce (Series Eds.) & M. McNeil, L. Pearce, & B. Skeggs (Book Eds.), *Transformations: Thinking through feminism* (pp. 111-118). London: Routledge.
- Ainlay, S. C., & Kniss, F. (1998). Mennonites and conflict: Re-examining Mennonite history and contemporary life [Electronic version]. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review, 72,* 121-139.
- Androsoff, A. (2007). A larger frame: "Redressing" the image of Doukhobor-Canadian women in the twentieth century [Electronic version]. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, 18(1), 81-105.
- Baum, R. N. (2000). Never to forget: Pedagogical memory and second-generation witness. In R. I. Simon, S. Rosenberg, & C. Eppert (Eds.), *Between hope and despair: Pedagogy and the remembrance of historical trauma* (pp. 91-115). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Berikoff, A. (2006). Inside memory: A story of living in the past and present of a social and cultural movement [Electronic version]. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12, 886-907.
- Berry, K., & Warren, J. T. (2009). Cultural studies and the politics of representation: Experience ↔ Subjectivity ↔ Research [Electronic version]. *Cultural Studies* ↔ *Critical Methodologies*, 9, 597-607.
- Bondoreff, A. (2008). Spirited differences: Doukhobor sectarianism, Freedomite terrorism and government policy. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
- Bosk, C. L., & De Vries, R. G. (2004). Bureaucracies of mass deception: Institutional review boards and the ethics of ethnographic research [Electronic version]. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 595, 249-263.
- Bumgardner, A. (2001). Current issues facing the modern Doukhobor. Rusistika, 24, 16-23.
- Butalia, U. (1998). *The other side of silence: Voices from the Partition of India*. New Delhi, India: Penguin Books.
- Cole, A. L,. & Knowles, J. G. (Eds.). (2001). *Lives in context: The art of life history research*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Conway, B. (2003). Active remembering, selective forgetting, and collective identity: The case of Bloody Sunday [Electronic version]. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *3*, 305-323.
- Conway, B. (2009). Rethinking difficult pasts: Bloody Sunday (1972) as a case study [Electronic version]. *Cultural Sociology, 3,* 397-413.

- Cran, G. J. (2006). *Negotiating buck naked: Doukhobors, public policy, and conflict resolution.* Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics [Electronic version]. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-167.
- Cruikshank, J. (1994). Oral tradition and oral history: Reviewing some issues. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 75, 403-418.
- DeVault, M. L. (1999). *Liberating method: Feminism and social research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fanatics blacken reputation of all Dukhobors. (1950, June 14). *Christian Century*, 67, 737. Selkirk College Archives [Castlegar, British Columbia, Canada], BX7446 Z99 no. 2.
- Frisch, M. (1979). Oral history and *Hard Times*: A review essay [Electronic version]. *The Oral History Review*, 7, 70-79.
- Grele, R. (1978). Can anyone over thirty be trusted: A friendly critique of oral history [Electronic version]. *The Oral History Review, 6,* 36-44.
- Henige, D. (1986). Where seldom is heard a discouraging word: Method in oral history [Electronic version]. *The Oral History Review, 14,* 35-42.
- Holt, S. (1964). *Terror in the name of God: The story of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: McClelland and Stewart.
- Huisman, K. (2008). "Does this mean you're not going to come visit me anymore?": An inquiry into an ethics of reciprocity and positionality in feminist ethnographic research [Electronic version]. *Sociological Inquiry*, 78, 372-396.
- Janesick, V. J. (2010). *Oral history for the qualitative researcher: Choreographing the story.* New York: Guilford Press.
- Jelin, E. (2003). *State repression and the labors of memory* (J. Rein & M. Godoy-Anativia, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 2002)
- Jmieff, N. (2006a, May 17). Let's get talking. *Iskra*, 1982, 2.
- Jmieff, N. (2006b, November 1). Who gave us permission? *Iskra*, 1988, 3-4.
- Jmieff, N. (2007, February 2). Riding a lame horse to paradise. *Iskra*, 1991, 3-4.
- Kennedy, R. (2004). The affective work of Stolen Generations testimony: From the archives to the classroom. *Biography*, *27*, 48-77.

- Klassen, P. E. (1998). Practicing conflict: Weddings as sites of contest and compromise [Electronic version]. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review, 72,* 225-241.
- Kootenay Mountain Culture. (2007, Summer). Mountain lifestyle [Issue].
- Létourneau, J. (2004). A history for the future: Rewriting memory and identity in Quebec (P. Aronoff & H. Scott, Trans.). Montreal, Quebec, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press. (Original work published 2000)
- Maloff, P. (1957). *In quest of a solution: Three reports on Doukhobor problem* (2nd ed.). Selkirk College Archives [Castlegar, British Columbia, Canada], BX7433.5 M34.
- McNeill, W. H. (1986). Mythistory, or truth, myth, history, and historians [Electronic version]. *The American Historical Review, 91*,1-10.
- Mealing, F. M. (1975). *Doukhobor life*. Castlegar, British Columbia, Canada: Cotinneh Books.
- Miki, R. (2005). *Redress: Inside the Japanese Canadian call for justice*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: Raincoast Books.
- Mir. (1973, May/June). [Editorial]. 1(5/6), 2.
- Nelson Economist. (1899, November 8). [No author or title].
- Office of the Ombudsman of British Columbia. (n.d.). *Righting the wrong* (Public Report no. 38). Retrieved January 9, 2011, from http://www.llbc.leg.bc.ca/public/pubdocs/bcdocs/328851/bc_ombudsman_pr38_99.pdf
- Plotnikoff, V. (1998). The circle journey. In K. J. Tarasoff (Ed.), *Spirit wrestlers voices:*Honouring Doukhobors on the centenary of their migration to Canada in 1899 (pp. 205-210). New York: Legas.
- Popoff, J. (2008). A turbulent century of transition. *Reflection and Progress* [Union of Youth festival programme]. Brilliant, British Columbia, Canada: Iskra Publications.
- Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist traditions*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Pring, R. (2000). The 'false dualism' of educational research [Electronic version]. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 34*, 247-260.
- Rak, J. (2004). *Negotiated memory: Doukhobor autobiographical discourse*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.
- Razack, S. (1993). Story-telling for social change. Gender and Education, 5, 55-70.
- Redekop, C., & Hostetler, J. A. (1977). The plain people: An interpretation [Electronic version]. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review, 51,* 266-277.

- Reinharz, S. (with Davidman, L.). (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ritchie, D. A. (1995). *Doing oral history*. New York: Twayne.
- Sherstobitoff, L. (2005). Flowers and weeds: Negotiating the contemporary Doukhobor diaspora. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
- Sil, R. (2000). The division of labor in social science research: Unified methodology or "organic solidarity"? [Electronic version]. *Polity*, *32*, 499-531.
- Simon, R. I., Rosenberg, S., & Eppert, C. (2000). Introduction. In R. I. Simon, S. Rosenberg, & C. Eppert (Eds.), *Between hope and despair: Pedagogy and the remembrance of historical trauma* (pp. 1-8). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Soapes, T. F. (1977). The Federal Writers' Project slave interviews: Useful data or misleading source [Electronic version]. *The Oral History Review, 5,* 33-38.
- Sugiman, P. (2004). Memories of internment: Narrating Japanese Canadian women's life stories. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *29*, 359-388.
- Szalasznyj, K. (1995). The Doukhobor homestead crisis, 1898-1907. In K. J. Tarasoff & R. B. Klymasz (Eds.), *Spirit wrestlers: Centennial papers in honour of Canada's Doukhobor heritage*. Hull, Quebec, Canada: Canadian Museum of Civilization. Retrieved January 9, 2011, from http://www.doukhobor.org/Szalasznyj.htm
- Teeger, C., & Vinitzky-Seroussi, V. (2007). Controlling for consensus: Commemorating apartheid in South Africa [Electronic version]. *Symbolic Interaction*, *30*, 57-78.
- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Tosh, J. (1991). *The pursuit of history: Aims, methods and new directions in the study of modern history* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Urry, J. (1999). Of borders and boundaries: Reflections on Mennonite unity and separation in the modern world [Electronic version]. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review, 73,* 503-524.
- Wesley-Esquimaux, C. C., & Smolewski, M. (2004). *Historic trauma and Aboriginal healing*. Retrieved January 4, 2011, from Aboriginal Healing Foundation Web site: www.ahf.ca/downloads/historic-trauma.pdf
- Winland, D. N. (1993). The quest for Mennonite peoplehood: Ethno-religious identity and the dilemma of definitions [Electronic version]. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, *30*, 110-138.

- Woodcock, G., & Avakumovic, I. (1968). *The Doukhobors*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Yow, V. (1995). Ethics and interpersonal relationships in oral history research [Electronic version]. *The Oral History Review, 22*(1), 51-66.

Appendix A:

Iskra Submission

Dear Iskra reader,

My name is Sonya White and I am writing as someone who has shared Iskra magazines with my extended family for many years. I was born and raised in Cranbrook, British Columbia, but my mother grew up in a West Kootenay Doukhobor family and I continue to visit the West Kootenay and Boundary regions frequently. I will be spending quite a bit of time in these regions this autumn as I conduct a series of research conversations about memory, history, and healing. My reason for writing today is to invite interested members of the diverse West Kootenay/Boundary Doukhobor community to participate in these research conversations.

I am presently studying at the University of Toronto, where I am enrolled in a Master's degree programme in Adult Education and Community Development. As part of my programme I am initiating a series of research conversations that will explore the different ways that Doukhobor people have used (and continue to use) memory and dialogue to heal from the 20th century conflicts in the West Kootenay and Boundary areas. I am mindful of the Doukhobor unification efforts that many people across the country have contributed to, and I have paid close attention to the discussions and debates about the future of Doukhoborism in Canada. Such debates always seem to come back to questions of conflict, healing, representation, and remembrance. Ultimately, I hope that my research conversations might help to address the following questions: Can experiences of conflict be remembered and shared inside and outside of the Doukhobor community as part of a healing process? and How do different members of the Doukhobor community in British Columbia live with difficult memories of 20th century conflict? It is my goal to conclude the research by identifying strategies for living with memories of conflict in ways that could help to bring healing to individuals and families who might still struggle to reconcile the present and future with the recent past.

I understand research to be a process that acknowledges the experiences of ordinary people and I will do my best to conduct the research conversations in a way that puts participants at ease. I will also do my best to maintain the anonymity of people who wish to share their memories and experiences without disclosing their identity.

If you experienced the 20th century Doukhobor conflict as a participant **or** non-participant living in the West Kootenay or Boundary districts, and are interested in exploring your memories of these experiences and the ways in which these experiences have influenced and affected your life, I would very much like to invite you to participate in my research. I am interested in hearing the perspectives of Doukhobors who experienced this conflict at different ages and at different times. If you have moved away from the West Kootenay and Boundary regions, I would be happy to coordinate a conversation by telephone if you are interested in this research. You are also welcome to contact me if you have general questions about this research. Ultimately, I hope that participants will experience the research conversations as an opportunity to talk about their experiences and ideas about community futures and Doukhobor representation in Canada. Participating in this research means that you could have the opportunity to help your friends,

families, and neighbours understand Doukhobor pasts, presents, and futures with sensitivity and heightened awareness.

If you are interested in participating, or have questions about this research, please contact me by email at swhite@oise.utoronto.ca, or by telephone at (250) 421-2055. Alternatively, you can reach me by mail at:

Sonya White 1631 Staple Crescent Cranbrook, British Columbia V1C 6J1

Thank you for reading, and I look forward to hearing from many of you. If you know of people who might be interested in participating in this research, please pass this article along to them and ask them to contact me if they would like to further explore the possibility of participating. Also, please remember that I value the memories and opinions of diverse members of the Doukhobor community, and hope to represent this diversity through discussions with women and men from across the heterogeneous Doukhobor community.

Sincerely, Sonya White

Appendix B:

Research Recruitment Poster

Exploring Doukhobor Pasts, Presents, and Futures in Canada

Invitation to Participate in Research Conversations about How Lived Experiences of Historic Conflict are Remembered Today

Hello. My name is Sonya White. I was born and raised in the East Kootenay region of British Columbia and I am presently doing my Master's degree in adult education and community development at the University of Toronto. As part of my degree, I am initiating research that seeks to explore ways in which people remember conflict and learn to live with difficult memories of conflict. Specifically, my research asks how the 20th century conflict in the West Kootenay and Boundary districts was experienced by members of the Doukhobor community. I am motivated to do this research because I think it is important to ask how people in the Doukhobor community are developing strategies for remembrance that help to heal difficult experiences of conflict.

This research aims to represent the *lived experiences of Doukhobors from across the Doukhobor community* who were present in the West Kootenay and Boundary districts of British Columbia during 20th century periods of conflict. I believe that this research has the potential to help individuals, families, and communities develop healthy ways of remembering difficult experiences of conflict. I also believe that it is difficult to build healthy and peaceful futures without adequately addressing past experience.

I would very much like to invite members of the Doukhobor community to participate in research interviews with me. I am hoping to interview women and men of different ages and different affiliations to the Doukhobor

community who lived in British Columbia during the conflict and remember their experiences (indirect or direct) of the conflict. Please contact me by email at swhite@oise.utoronto.ca, by telephone at (250) 421-2055, or by post:

Sonya White, 1631 Staple Crescent, Cranbrook, British Columbia, V1C 6J1

[The University of Toronto insignia was present on this poster.]

Appendix C:

Website Recruitment Protocol

Are you interested in Doukhobor pasts, presents, and futures in Canada? Would you like to share your views on the importance that memory has in contemporary visions of Doukhoborism?

Dear reader of the Doukhobor Genealogy website,

Hello. My name is Sonya White. I was born and raised in Cranbrook, British Columbia and am presently working on my Master's degree in adult education and community development at the University of Toronto. My mother grew up in a West Kootenay Doukhobor family and I have spent time in the West Kootenay and Boundary regions with adults and elders who have taught me about Doukhoborism and Doukhobor experiences in British Columbia. I am returning to the West Kootenay and Boundary regions this autumn to conduct a series of research conversations about memory, history, and healing. My reason for writing today is to invite interested members of the diverse West Kootenay/Boundary Doukhobor community to participate in these research conversations.

I am initiating this research project as part of my Master's degree to explore the ways in which memories of conflict persist in the lives of people who have lived through experiences of conflict. Specifically, I will be asking questions about the different ways in which diverse members of the Doukhobor community in south-central British Columbia live with and remember their experiences of 20th century Doukhobor conflict. I am conscious of the broad reach that conflict has and am therefore interested in speaking with people who experienced the 20th century conflict as direct participants or indirect non-participants.

As the researcher, I will be conducting individual interviews with adult and elder Doukhobors who lived in the West Kootenay and Boundary districts of British Columbia during periods of 20th century conflict. I believe in effectively representing a diversity of experiences and am hoping to interview men and women of different ages and different affiliations to the heterogeneous Doukhobor community who experienced the conflict as discussed above. If you fit this criteria, or know of people who fit this criteria and might be interested in having a research interview with me, please contact me directly or pass my contact information on to those people who might be willing to get in touch with me.

You might wonder why this research is important. I believe that it holds many potential benefits for Doukhobor people and non-Doukhobor people who are interested in knowing more about how people find peace after conflict has been resolved. Specifically, I see this research as being important and of interest to the broader Doukhobor community because it aims to accomplish the following goals:

- it will make an important contribution to the public understanding of Doukhobor history and experience in western Canada;
- it will validate and legitimize the knowledge of a minority cultural community in Canada;

- it will explore the ways in which different generations of Doukhobors experienced the "Doukhobor troubles";
- it will give diverse members of the Doukhobor community in Canada an opportunity to reflect on their experiences of conflict and ask how these memories of difficult pasts should be integrated into a contemporary understanding of Doukhoborism today;
- and it will identify different strategies for living with difficult pasts and learning to heal from direct or indirect experiences of conflict.

If you have specific questions about this research and/or would like to participate in a research interview with me, please contact me by telephone at (250)-421-2055, by email at swhite@oise.utoronto.ca, or by mail:

Sonya White 1631 Staple Crescent Cranbrook, British Columbia V1C 6J1

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely, Sonya White

Appendix D:

Direct Contact Telephone Recruitment Protocol

Hello, my name is Sonya White. I am ca	[insert last name of potential research participant]? lling you from Cranbrook, British Columbia – your nsert name of person who recommended Ms./Mr. as a

Is now a good time to speak with you?	

If **no**: Okay. I would very much like to speak with you about an invitation to participate in some research that I am conducting with members of the West Kootenay/Boundary Doukhobor community. My mother grew up in a West Kootenay Doukhobor family, and I have a deep respect for Doukhobor culture and history in British Columbia. I am presently conducting research that explores the different ways that the 20th century Doukhobor conflict was experienced by different members of the Doukhobor community. I am wondering if there is a time at which I could call back to speak with you about this invitation to participate in my research?

If yes: I am contacting you because I would very much like to speak with you about an invitation to participate in research that I am presently conducting with members of the West Kootenay/Boundary Doukhobor community. My mother grew up in a Doukhobor family in the West Kootenay during the 1940s and 1950s; because of her relationship to the Doukhobor community, I have visited the West Kootenay region many times and am presently conducting my research in small communities in the West Kootenay and Boundary regions of B.C. My research focuses on the different kinds of experiences that Doukhobors had with respect to the conflict that occurred throughout the 20th century. Is this something that I can talk to you a little bit more about right now?

If **no**: Okay. Would you mind if I contact you again in a couple of days to talk a little bit more about this research? [If the contacted person tells me that I can contact him or her again, then I will mention the following: I have recently submitted an article to *Iskra* that talks a bit about my research. If you are interested, I could send you a copy of this submission by email or post so that you can learn a little bit more about this proposed research and the opportunities for people interested in participating in the research.]

If **yes**: I understand that you were living in southcentral British Columbia during periods of conflict in the Doukhobor community. I would like to ask you to consider my invitation to participate in a one-on-one research interview with me that I would be happy to schedule at your convenience if you are interested in participating. During this interview, I would ask you to recall your experiences of the conflict, and the ways in which you were directly or indirectly

affected by conflict while you lived in the West Kootenay/Boundary regions. [Pause.] Also, I am interested to know how people who experienced the conflict remember the conflict today, and whether or not people such as yourself have had the opportunity to talk about your experiences with other members of your family, your neighbourhood, or the broader Doukhobor community. [Pause.] I am ultimately doing this research because I believe that people like yourself have much to share with other members of the Doukhobor community, and I think that dialogue and conversation are the best ways of achieving healthy and peaceful communities. Do you have any questions at this time?

Are you interested in considering the possibility of participating as an interviewee?

If **no**: Okay. Thank you for your time. Can I leave my contact information with you just in case you are interested in getting in touch with me later on? [If they answer yes to this question: Here is my contact information...]

Thank you very much for your time. Have a good day.

If **yes**: Okay. Maybe what I can do is send you (by email or post) a copy of an article I recently submitted to *Iskra* that explains a little bit more about my research. I would like you to have an opportunity to read this article and think about any questions you might have for me. Then I will make contact with you again in about a week and a half to schedule an interview with you. Can I ask you for your email address or mailing address? Thank you so much for your time. I look forward to speaking with you again soon. Here is my contact information, in case any questions arise before I get back in touch with you [pass along my email address and telephone number]. Have a good day.

Appendix E:

Direct Contact Email Recruitment Protocol

Dear Reader,

Hello. My name is Sonya White. I am a resident of British Columbia and I grew up in the city of Cranbrook. I am presently pursuing my Master's degree in Adult Education and Community Development at the University of Toronto. As part of my Master's work I am initiating research that will explore experiences of 20th century conflict as remembered by various adult and elder members of the Doukhobor community who lived through and/or were born into "the troubles" in the southern interior of British Columbia. Through this research, I hope to understand how different members of the Doukhobor community live with difficult memories of conflict. It is my ultimate goal to conclude the research by identifying strategies for living with memories of conflict in ways that could help to bring healing to Doukhobor individuals and families who might still struggle today with their recent pasts.

As the researcher, I will be conducting interviews with interested Doukhobor participants who lived in the West Kootenay and Boundary districts of British Columbia during periods of 20th century conflict. I believe that good research considers different kinds of experiences and viewpoints and I am hoping to interview men and women of different ages and different affiliations to the Doukhobor community who experienced the conflict as non-participants or participants. I expect the research interviews to last between 1-1.5 hours in length.

I am writing this letter because I would like to invite you to participate in my research. From what I understand, you fit the participant criteria as listed above and I believe that your views, experiences, and memories of Doukhobor life during times of conflict could contribute to the research that I am undertaking. If you choose to participate in this research, I will offer to protect your anonymity in any written documents that I produce from the research.

I was raised in the East Kootenay region of British Columbia and have travelled extensively in the West Kootenay and Boundary districts of B.C. where the 20th century conflict occurred. I believe that good research gives back to its participants, and I am undertaking this research with the expectation that it will produce knowledge that will be of benefit and interest to members of the diverse Doukhobor community in British Columbia.

If you have any questions about my proposed research, and/or would like to confirm your participation in this research, please contact me at swhite@oise.utoronto.ca, or telephone me at (250) 421-2055. Alternatively, my mailing address is:

Sonya White 1631 Staple Crescent Cranbrook, B.C., V1C 6J1

Sincerely,

Sonya White

Appendix F:

Informed Consent Protocol

[The University of Toronto insignia was represented on this document.]

Dear participant,

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this research project, which I am initiating as a Master of Arts student in the Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology at the University of Toronto. The title of this research project is *The Labours of Memory:* Conversations About Conflict, History, Remembrance, and Community Futures with Diverse Members of the Doukhobor Community in Canada.

The purpose of this research is to explore experiences of conflict as remembered by members of the Doukhobor community who lived through and/or were born into 20th century conflict in the southern interior of British Columbia. Through this research, I hope to understand how different members of the Doukhobor community live with memories of conflict. I also hope to identify and share strategies for living with memories of conflict in ways that could help to bring healing to individuals and families who might still struggle today with their recent pasts.

This letter outlines the goals of the research and your rights and opportunities as a participant in this research. It also outlines my responsibilities (as researcher) to you. Please note that this document also provides you with contact information for myself, Sonya White [email: swhite@oise.utoronto.ca, telephone: (250) 421-2055], for my supervisor, Dr. Jean-Paul Restoule [email: jrestoule@oise.utoronto.ca, telephone: (416) 923-6641 Ext. 2825], and for Bridgette Murphy at the University of Toronto Ethics Review Board [email: ethics.review@utoronto.ca, telephone: (416) 946-3273]. If at any point in time you have questions about this research and/or your participation in it, please feel free to contact any of us using this contact information.

My goal with this research is to represent the diverse experiences of conflict that are remembered today by different members of the West Kootenay/Boundary Doukhobor community. To this end, I am inviting men and women of different ages and different Doukhobor groups to participate in the research. You are eligible to participate in this research because you lived as a member of the Doukhobor community in the West Kootenay and Boundary districts of British Columbia during periods of 20th century conflict. Your experiences, understandings, and memories of this conflict will make an important contribution to this research, and I thank you in advance for your time. I expect to have approximately 11 other participants in this research. Once I have written my thesis and concluded my research study, I will be sending you a letter that summarizes the findings of the research.

Once my research study has been concluded, you can consider whether or not you would like to release any audio files that were made (with your consent) of our interview. If released, I will donate the audio files to a public history organization located in the Columbia Basin, whereupon members of the public will have access to the files for research and educational purposes.

There are several important issues that need to be addressed as you make an informed and freely-consenting decision to participate in the research project that I am undertaking as part my Master's degree. First off, let me describe your rights as a participant:

- Your participation is voluntary in this research project. You are free to decline to answer any or all questions that are posed in the interview; the subject matter may be sensitive, and I will respect at all times your personal level of comfort with the content of the discussion. You may at any point in time stop the interview and request that evidence of the interview be destroyed immediately.
- You may decide as to whether or not the interview can be audio-recorded. If at any point in time you wish for any audio-recording equipment to be turned off during the interview, you have the right to turn off the recording equipment for as long as you see fit.
- If I transcribe parts of our interview (make written documents that describe our interview word-for-word), I will send you these transcripts so that you can check them for accuracy and clarification. If you have any comments on the content of the transcript and would like these comments integrated into my analysis of the transcript and subsequent research documents, you must respond to me with these comments within four weeks from the time that the transcript was posted to you.
- You can have your anonymity protected to the best of my ability in any work that I produce from this research. When I say that I will try to guarantee your anonymity if requested, it means that I will do everything humanly possible to protect your identity.
- Alternatively, you can request that your given name be referenced if or when the written thesis document refers to words that you spoke during your interview.
- You have the right to withdraw your participation in this research and ask for all audio files, transcripts, or notes of our interview to be destroyed, without question or penalty. Because I will use this research to write my thesis, there will be a point at which it will no longer be possible to guarantee the elimination of your research contribution from the written thesis document. Please be advised that I cannot guarantee such elimination of your contribution beyond January 31, 2010, although you may be anonymous and not reasonably identifiable from the final thesis document.

Now let me describe my responsibilities to you as researcher and the ways that I hope to work with and use the research data that comes out of our interview:

- If you consent to having the interview audio-recorded, I will offer to provide you with an audio copy of the recording that is made from our interview it will be yours to keep.
- If you choose to speak about your participation in this project with your friends and family and questions arise that you do not wish to answer, I would be happy to speak with these people about the general purposes of the research and the positive contributions that participants such as yourself are making to important research about Doukhobor history. I will not disclose any specific information discussed in our interview together through such conversations.
- I will keep my copies of original audio-files and raw data in locked boxes or bags in my place of residence or my place of work, where only I will have access to them.

- I may use the information gathered from this interview in my written thesis and in academic publications, community documents, and/or public presentations that will share the research findings with the broader Canadian public.
- If you choose (at the end of the research project) to sign a release form that permits the donation of your interview audio files to a public history organization in the Columbia Basin, then I will follow through with that request and donate the files to an organization that supports oral history as a way of achieving understanding and equity within and between communities. Please note that your audio files will then be accessible by the interested public and I cannot be held accountable for the ways in which these files are used, though I would expect them to be used with respect and consideration.
- If you choose not to sign a release form that permits the donation of any audio files made during our interview together, my copies of all audio files produced from our interview will be destroyed by August 31, 2012.
- At the end of this research project that you are participating in, I will retain a copy of the transcripts or notes that I have from our interview for my own research files, but these transcripts or notes will *not* disclose the personal identity of participants unless they have previously indicated that they do not want anonymity.
- The research information that I collect through an interview with you will remain largely confidential. With the exception of any English/Russian translators or transcribers who may or may not need to see your data, the only people who will have access to the raw data (audio files or written notes) that I collect from the interview will be me (Sonya White) and my supervisor (Dr. Jean-Paul Restoule). If an English/Russian translator or transcriber is in fact employed to assist in the translation or transcription process, then I will ask this person to maintain all information as confidential.

Now, let me confirm the issues that you must indicate an answer to – I will record your answers on both of our copies of this document. Please remember that you can change your mind about any of the answers you provide as per the limitations already discussed above.

1) Do I have your permission to use the information (data) resulting from our interview in my written thesis and subsequent publications and/or presentations? Yes No
2) Do you want your real name placed beside any quotes from your interview or any references to your ideas and memories in the written thesis document and subsequent publications and/or presentations that result from this research? Yes \(\subseteq \no \subseteq \no \subseteq \)
3) Do you consent to having your interview audio-recorded and digital audio files made from the recording? Yes \square No \square
If you answered yes to question (3), would you like me to send you an audio copy of our recorded conversation for you to keep? Yes \square No \square
Thank you for taking the time to review these important aspects of the research with me. By

Thank you for taking the time to review these important aspects of the research with me. By accepting receipt of this document, you acknowledge that you have made an informed and freely-consenting choice to participate in this research, and that you and I have discussed to mutual satisfaction all the terms listed in this document.

Appendix G:

Interview Guide for Participants

- In which part(s) of the West Kootenay/Boundary regions were you born and raised?
- Describe what it was like for you to grow up in a Doukhobor family.
- What kinds of teachings and traditions were passed on to you? By whom?
- Did other Doukhobor families live in your surrounding town or rural area?
- How did you interact with other members of the Doukhobor community as a young person?
- How did you interact or relate to non-Doukhobor residents of the area?
- Were there family rules or cultural rules that defined or restricted these kinds of friendships or interactions?
- As part of my Master's project, I have done a lot of reading about Doukhobor experiences in Canada over the past century. A lot of this reading refers to times of conflict throughout the 20th century in the West Kootenay and Boundary Doukhobor communities. How would *you* define or explain these events to somebody who was not familiar with Doukhobor history in western Canada?
- Describe your own experiences of the conflict? How did the struggles affect your own life?
- How did the struggles affect the lives of your family members?
- What memories are strongest when I ask you to think about the conflict?
- Vi Plotnikoff (a Doukhobor author who recently passed away) wrote about the tensions that a Doukhobor identity created for her. She wrote: "To be Doukhobor was to hide your background, not flaunt it. To be Doukhobor was to be proud of your ancestors, customs, beliefs, yet at the same time to feel defensive or embarrassed about them. To be Doukhobor was to be a young adult working in Vancouver yet concealing your roots the same roots you were so proud of when you stood on the stage of the cultural centre, singing the hymns and psalms your parents, and your grandparents before them, had sung." When I read this section of her story to you, what kinds of things or feelings do you think about? Are your experiences similar or different to those of her experiences?

- I have come across many newspaper articles with headlines like "Naked Doukhobors Go on Rampage" and "Keep Your Clothes on" and "Trouble in Kootenay." How did the response of the media and the non-Doukhobor public make you feel?
- Do you remember speaking about the conflict, and the ways in which the conflict affected you, with other members of your family or community? If so, what kinds of things did you talk about?
- How often do you think back to those times?
- Has silence ever been a part of your response to the conflict?
- Do you think or feel that silence is a good thing with respect to memories of the conflict?
- What kinds of activities/discussions/relationships have you or others worked towards in response to the conflict of the 20th century?
- Have these opportunities changed the way that you feel about your past experiences?
- In a February 2007 letter to *Iskra*, Natasha Jmieff wrote the following: "*If we want to be famous for being a true spiritual community among those others on earth which are now struggling to come together, we have to work at healing our collective wounds; within ourselves, within our families, and between families and individuals. It's hard work, but like our ancestors, we do it because it has to be done." What kind of work do you think she's talking about?*
- How might this work occur in the West Kootenay and Boundary regions?
- Who needs to be involved in peace-building activities in order for them to be successful within the Doukhobor community?
- Do you think or feel that experiences of struggle and conflict should be talked about and shared within Doukhobor families?
- Do you think or feel that these experiences should be talked about and shared as part of Doukhobor history in Canada?
- Do you have anything you'd like to add that I may not have mentioned or that you think is important to include?

Appendix H:

Additional Interview Guide: On Representing Doukhobor History

- When you communicate about Doukhobor history in Canada, where or how do you begin if you are communicating with somebody who has little or no understanding of the Doukhobor community and its history?
- What (if any) issues or conundrums do you face when you write and communicate about Doukhobor history and experience in Canada?
- How would you define a historian's/writer's/communicator's **roles** and **responsibilities** regarding communication and/or analysis of the 20th century "troubles" in the West Kootenay and Boundary regions of B.C.?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of people who write and communicate about Doukhobor history in terms of **visually** representing the contemporary Doukhobor community with accuracy and integrity in communications and publications?
- According to your own beliefs, should historians and communicators incorporate the 20th century "troubles" or depredations and the effects these depredations had on the broader Doukhobor community into a contemporary understanding of Doukhobor history in Canada? Why or why not?
- Is there a way to communicate about the troubles or depredations in a way that supports and sustains the growing reconciliation between Doukhobors (in B.C. and in other areas of Canada, too)? If so, how?