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ABSTRACT

Background: As an exercise in decolonizing infrastructural approaches to communications, this article applies the framework of “Two-Eyed Seeing” to the example of Kwawaka'wakw social media communications related to the occupation of fish farms in the Broughton Archipelago in 2017.

Analysis: Kwawaka'wakw social media communications worked to enact a “living infrastructure,” upholding reciprocal relations with salmon and ocean waters, in support of the mutual flourishing of the waters, salmon, and people.

Conclusions and implications: Kwawaka'wakw nations and their allies drew on social media to shift communicational channels beyond mainstream media. This supported Kwawaka'wakw in building relationships with broader publics, who helped pressure government to make change.
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RÉSUMÉ

Contexte : Dans le but de décoloniser les perspectives infrastructurelles sur la communication, cet article emploie une approche à double perspective (« Two-Eyed Seeing ») afin d'examiner l'usage des médias sociaux fait par les Kwawaka'wakw pour communiquer sur l'occupation d'installations piscicoles dans l'archipel de Broughton en 2017.

Analyse : En communiquant par médias sociaux, les Kwawaka'wakw ont cherché à mettre en place une « infrastructure vivante » qui maintiendrait des relations de réciprocité avec les saumons et l'océan dans le but de favoriser l'épanouissement collectif du saumon, des eaux et des humains.

Conclusions et implications : Les nations Kwawaka'wakw et leurs alliés ont recouru aux médias sociaux afin de contourner les médias traditionnels. Leur approche leur a permis de rejoindre des publics plus larges qui ont aidé à mettre de la pression sur le gouvernement pour qu'il effectue des changements.

Mots clés : Infrastructure critique autochtone; Médias sociaux; Kwawaka'wakw; Oralité; Infrastructure vivante; Ordres juridiques autochtones
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Introduction
This article offers a qualitative examination of social media and media communications of Kwawaka’wakw. First Nations involved in salmon farm occupations in the Broughton Archipelago, in the southwestern corner of the Great Bear Rainforest, from late August of 2017, when the first occupation began, through to the June 2018 announcement that First Nations will have active involvement in the fish farm licensing process, including the ability to refuse consent and have farms phased out.

This article does not attempt a thorough or definitive analysis of “fish farm social media” by Kwawaka’wakw First Nations. Rather, it is a preliminary effort at what practitioners of Indigenous pedagogies refer to as “Two-Eyed Seeing,” with a goal of better understanding an instance of Indigenous communications acting infrastructurally. While the “infrastructural turn” has emphasized that infrastructures are always already both natural and cultural, ethnographies of communicational infrastructures have tended to focus on hardware such as undersea cables (Johnson, 2019; Starosielski, 2015), data centres (Hogan, 2013), cellphone networks (Parks, 2015), radio and television networks (Parks, 2013), and mobile film units (Larkin, 2008). While there is a recognition that these systems are not built on a tabula rasa but rather subtend a living landscape, sometimes directly overlaying Indigenous trails, trade routes, and systems of land and water stewardship (Spice, 2018), Indigenous communication systems have not received the same level of disciplinary attention for the ways that they act infrastructurally.

Through Two-Eyed Seeing, which Mi’kmaw Elder Albert Marshall explains as a decolonizing methodology that helps practitioners “To see from one eye with the strengths of Indigenous ways of knowing, and to see from the other eye with the strengths of Western ways of knowing, and to use both of these eyes together” (Marshall quoted in Peltier, 2018, p. 2), this article aims to explore the concept of Indigenous critical infrastructures as parallel to and as vital as the tacit taken-for-granted understanding of industrial hardware as the backbone of what infrastructure is.

The article begins with a discussion of methods and of Indigenous critical infrastructures. Next, it draws on a qualitative analysis of Kwawaka’wakw social media communications about salmon farms to explore how these acted infrastructurally. Following this more methodologically conventional exploration, the article switches perspectives to a second “eye.” This section takes a much longer view through generations, drawing on Indigenous worldviews in order to analyze patterns in Kwawaka’wakw communications as critical Indigenous infrastructure, of which social media expressions in the twenty-first century are but one articulation.

From this stereoscopic, Two-Eyed vision, clear patterns re-emerge over not only centuries but thousands of years: social media communications around fish farms are contiguous with a long history of Kwawaka’wakw sovereignty and legal
orders being asserted through public and semi-public performance of visual culture, song, dance, and language. These communicational patterns are made “legible” to different generations within ever-changing media assemblages and ever-shifting affordances, from pre-contact times through different iterations of Canada as a colonial and settler state. In so doing, they form part of a “critical infrastructure” supporting life in Kwawaka’wakw territories by acting to orient not only Kwawaka’wakw people but all listeners toward respectful, reciprocal relations with Kwawaka’wakw lifeworlds.

**Adapting Two-Eyed Seeing to communications research**

In recent decades, Two-Eyed Seeing has become a prominent decolonizing framework for collaborative research in natural sciences, and particular fisheries science, in Canada. As Andrea J. Reid, Lauren E. Eckert, John-Francis Lane, Nathan Young, Scott G. Hinch, Chris T. Darimont, Steven J. Cooke, Natalie C. Ban, and Albert Marshall (2020) describe, in common with other decolonizing frameworks, such as the Two-Row Wampum Belt, it begins from an understanding that Indigenous and mainstream knowledge systems must each be apprehended on their own terms as equally valuable knowledge forms anchored in their own ontologies and epistemologies.

This exercise is a preliminary application of the Two-Eyed Seeing framework. As Andrea Reid, Deborah MacGregor, and other Indigenous academics applying the framework to salmon and waterway management regimes make clear, to fully realize this framework requires Indigenous participation and leadership. However, as these academics also point out, the disciplinary groundwork required to realize these frameworks requires that non-Indigenous academics acknowledge and make space for Indigenous knowledge systems. In introducing this framework within a communication studies context, this article starts at a baseline level. By giving equal standing to qualitative social media analysis (a standard methodology in communication studies) of Kwawaka’wakw salmon media and to an analysis that instead frames the work done by this media in terms of Indigenous critical infrastructures, it aims to flesh out the concept of Indigenous critical infrastructures and bring it into dialogue with other infrastructural discourses within the field of communications—as a separate but equally valuable understanding of what infrastructure is. In so doing, this article strives to enact the action-oriented element of Two-Eyed Seeing as a framework that encourages knowledge co-existence and complementarity: “Knowledge transforms the holder and … the holder bears a responsibility to act on that knowledge” (Reid et al., 2020, p. 1).

The concept of Indigenous critical infrastructures helps broach how communication can act as a kind of materialization of underlying principles of Indigenous lifeworlds and legal orders. Anne Spice (2018) argues that defining infrastructure as the hardware of the settler state “leaves out … a world of relations, flows, and circulations that the settler state has attempted to destroy and supplant” (p. 49).
These circulations, too, are a type of materiality. In common with new materialism and the ontological turn, a number of Indigenous cosmologies have much broader understandings of different facets of the universe as being energetically linked, having agency, communicating/speaking, and being interrelated (Ingold, 2000; Rice, 2005). Drawing on Brian Larkin’s (2013) description of infrastructures as “the architecture for circulation” (p. 328), and Deborah Cowen's definition of infrastructure as “the collectively constructed systems that also build and sustain human life” (quoted in Spice, 2018, p. 47), Spice (2018) argues for a more expansive understanding of infrastructure, focusing on “what underpins and enables formations of power and the material organization of everyday life in time and space” (p. 47). She cites Unist’ot’en camp spokesperson Freda Huson describing the camp and blockade as protecting the “critical infrastructure” of Wet’suwet’en territory, “the interconnected networks of human and other-than-human beings that sustain Indigenous life in mutual relation” (p. 40). Communications plays a crucial role in rejuvenating and supporting the mutual relations of this infrastructure, in which rocks, water, and other “material” entities are communicative and animate.

Social media for wild salmon
Indigenous critical infrastructures are living infrastructures. Thus, this study begins by focusing on present-day salmon media—and especially Kwawaka’wakw social media—as part of the communicational “element” of the critical infrastructure that is anchored in the role salmon plays in the lands, waters, and life of Kwawaka’wakw and other Northwest Coast Indigenous peoples.

Multiple scholars (Callison & Young, 2020; Kino-nda-niimi Collective, 2014) have noted the rise of social media as a tool for Indigenous peoples to speak back to narrative frames of mainstream media that act as an “enforcer of social orders, and in particular as tenderers of and for settler colonialism” (Callison & Young, 2020, p. 161). The rise of Facebook, Twitter, and other social media has broken the “bottleneck,” whereby a small number of mainstream outlets set the tenor for media portrayals of Indigenous communities involved in land, resource, and rights-based conflicts. In Candis Callison and Mary Lynne Young’s (2020) research, Indigenous journalists credited the Facebook Live feed as making an important difference in coverage of the Standing Rock conflict. Through social media, those involved in the conflict could share their on-the-ground reality in a forum accessible to Indigenous and non-Indigenous publics, offering not only their own narratives but opportunities for others to connect to solidarity events, contextual information, and broader networks of individuals and communities involved in struggles for Indigenous rights.

Twitter hashtags and social media networks have helped grow awareness and connect people to a number of related social movements for justice for Indigenous people, ranging from organizing around individual cases, such as the death of
Colten Boushie (#JusticeforColten), to demands for large-scale structural change, such as the Idle No More (#idlenomore) movement and movements to call attention to missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls (#MMIWG) (Callison & Young, 2020). These networks help counter “quick turnaround journalism” (Callison & Young, 2020, p. 180), not only by providing publics with fuller depictions of current events but by sharing the broader context and histories behind the particular flashpoints making the news. When certain events, actions, and disputes do not make the news at all, they also function as a “vital platform for understanding what was happening on a day-to-day basis” (Callison & Young, 2020, p. 187). As the Kino-nda-niimi Collective (2014) notes in the case of Idle No More, social media amplified “good old word of mouth and discussions in lodges and kitchen tables” (n.p.) through a richly expressive context in which articles, essays, interviews, and tweets intermingled with artworks, music, and individual stories in “personal, intimate, and dynamic ways” (n.p.).

In the case of the Broughton Archipelago, social media played a key role in a dynamic in which salmon farm occupations formed a backdrop for the dramatic public staging of a First Nations assertion of rights, culture, and legal orders with respect to salmon governance. Through social media, publics in larger population centres gained access to the experiences and perspectives of fish farm occupiers in this remote archipelago. The resulting public scrutiny led to increased pressure on governments, and ultimately to substantive change in fish farm governance within a period of months, when there had previously been little progress for decades.

A qualitative analysis of fish farm social media: Context

Disputes over open-net pen salmon farming in the Broughton Archipelago, a group of islands east of northern Vancouver Island, and nearby coastal areas, such as Kingcome Inlet, began long before the occupations of 2017–2018. When the farms were introduced in the nineteen seventies and eighties, local First Nations objected from the outset to their lack of involvement in regulating the farms, whose licenses are issued by the federal department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, with the provincial government making siting decisions (Prystupa, 2018). Various issues with the farms—from infringement on Indigenous rights and title to concerns that the farms pollute the ocean and spread disease to wild salmon—were publicized through news coverage in mainstream newspapers, television shows, radio programs, and magazines; film and radio documentaries; community media, such as blogs; and through the ongoing campaign activities of environmental groups. Such campaigning includes not only social media elements but also media, policy, and community involvement components, such as supporting 35,000 streamkeepers in BC and Yukon through the Pacific Salmon Foundation’s (2020) Community Salmon Program. In recent years, the dispute has reached further audiences through a relatively new but influential form of media: founda-
tion- and subscriber-funded online magazines with a regional or national public policy or ecological focus, such as *Hakai*, *The Tyee*, and *National Observer*.

The social media “ecosystem” of communications from First Nations and their allies opposed to salmon farms overlaps with these other forms of media and contains multiple connections and cross-overs, such as that between official First Nation government communications and informal networks of circulation. This entire ecosystem grew in the wake of the salmon farm occupations; the occupations and the resulting solidarity campaigns and actions gave rise to increased traffic in existing networks and in new channels of communication. In the words of Callison and Young (2020), the “sedimentation” (p. 176) of prior journalism was ruptured. In moving beyond the structural pathways producing news stories that support existing social orders and suppress histories of injustice and colonial violence, Kwawaka'wakw social media posts helped grow new circuits for information and new narratives connecting people and communities in a “relational framework” (p. 161). These two-way communications, connections, and accountabilities shaped a different kind of public, one that was actively called on to recognize responsibilities to hold federal and provincial governments to account.

The following comments focus primarily on the qualitative observation of selected elements of this ecosystem: the Facebook page feed of the Swanson Occupation, which was mainly curated by hereditary chief Ernest Alfred of the 'Namgis, Lawit'sis, and Mamalilikala Nations and by the Maya'xala xan's Awinakola group; the Facebook page for the Musgamagw Dzawada'enuxw First Nation government’s Cleansing Our Waters initiative; and Instagram posts tagged with its associated #cleansingwaters hashtag. These were chosen as representative of the key recurrent messages and messaging forms used by Kwawaka'wakw leadership (formal and informal) that were expressed across a range of Indigenous-centred social media communications in relation to the occupations and their aftermath.

**Mediating the occupations**

From the outset, the salmon farm occupations in the Broughton Archipelago were deeply intertwined with social media and with issues of Indigenous law, rights, and title. On August 23, 2017, three days after over 300,000 farmed salmon escaped in the San Juan Islands, the Sea Shepard Society released shocking images of salmon with tumours, blisters, and swollen gills, swimming in open-net pens cloudy with fish feces at two farms in the Broughton Archipelago (Linnet, August 23, 2017). Hereditary chiefs Ernest Alfred and George Quocksister Jr. took these images. Supported by the *Martin Sheen* research vessel, they had boarded eleven fish farms in the region and lowered GoPros and other cameras attached to fishing rods into the pens. The farms are private property, but fish farm operators were reluctant to call the police on hereditary leaders present on their unceded territories.
The striking visuals, which circulated widely, further undermined already shaky public trust in government and industry narratives that disease was not a significant problem on the farms, and they stoked anger among local First Nations. The images mobilized community support for the initial occupation of the Marine Harvest Swanson Island fish farm, which began the following day and lasted 280 days. In addition to numerous solidarity visits by First Nations delegations and by dignitaries such as David Suzuki, the Swanson Occupation was supported by several shorter lived occupations spearheaded by coastal First Nations (including at Midsummer Island, Wicklow Point, Burdwood, and Port Elizabeth fish farms); by a Matriarch camp, first outside the premier’s office and later outside the office of Fisheries and Oceans Canada in greater Victoria; and by numerous solidarity campaigns and actions, ranging from protests outside government offices and courtrooms to the #GoWild4Salmon fundraising challenge, which saw people jump into frigid winter waters and post their plunge to Instagram to raise money for the occupations and related court challenges.

Social media amplified the reach of news about the occupations from the outset; a Facebook page was set up for the Swanson Occupation (n.d.) on August 26. As was the case with the footage of diseased fish, some of this media intervened in specific debates, providing new information and perspectives that influenced the news cycle. However, social media also did much more: it extended the reach of existing community networks that provided practical support to on-the-ground (and on-the-water) actions; it shared a fulsome picture of local people as not only deeply imbricated with the seascape but also as relatable, ordinary human beings existing within the everyday rhythms of their communities and not just in news headlines; it provided ‘eyes on the water’ or on land when tensions arose with police; and it continuously conveyed larger messages linking the survival of the salmon to Kwakwaka’wakw stewardship and resurgence through its displays of Kwakwaka’wakw life, visual culture, ceremony, and everyday governance.

**Surveillance and witnessing**

On October 17th, more than six weeks into the occupations, the Swanson Occupation Facebook page posted a press release describing a real time “escalation in tactical teams, equipment and police numbers” (2017d, para 4) as RCMP and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans escorted a ship contracted by Marine Harvest to refill salmon pens with juvenile fish. For several days prior, as the Viktoria Viking sailed north, it had prompted social media interventions such as an October 12th Instagram video post from Cleansing Our Waters (2017), in which a young Indigenous woman at the Midsummer Island occupation made a direct callout for people to boat in to observe and record the RCMP. This alert echoes the work of Standing Rock water protectors and Black Lives Matter protesters, who used livestreaming and real-time tweets and social media posts to allow outsiders...
to witness, and through that witnessing possibly help curtail, escalations of state violence (Callison & Young, 2020).

The October 17th press release (Swanson Occupation, 2017d) illustrates how social media was mobilized by fish farm opponents to hold governments to account through public witnessing of on-the-ground realities. The release highlighted the previous week’s meeting between the premier, three cabinet ministers, and 40 Kwakwaka’wakw hereditary and elected leaders in the ‘Namgis Big House, and the contrast between this public display of dialogue, and police escorts for Marine Harvest. The social media alerts helped mobilize allies who then occupied the premier’s offices in Victoria and Vancouver.

**Connecting to the everyday**

On December 25, 2017, the Swanson Occupation (2017b) Facebook page posted a “Merry Fishmas” message thanking supporters, complete with a Christmas carol “O Holy Chinook,” a reworking of “O Holy Night.” The carol, which celebrates the return of salmon and their spawning, playfully reveals a deep connection to the ocean and its creatures—from starfish to salmon to eagles. It offers a glimpse into the everyday world of people who live in small villages on the water in the archipelago.

This message seems simple; yet the ongoing depiction of everyday life at occupation sites, as offered through social media feeds—including the playful, the mundane, and even the boring—is a marked contrast to the imagery of Indigenous blockades, occupations, and other protest actions prior to the social media era. For example, the iconic image and “principle photographic representation” (Wilkes & Kehl, 2014, p. 496) of the Oka Crisis/Siege at Kanehsatà:ke is the highly confrontational, militarized, ‘soldier vs. warrior’ image “Face to Face,” in which a masked Indigenous warrior, weapons clearly visible, towers over a young white soldier, with whom his gaze is locked. Rima Wilkes and Michael Kehl (2014) discuss the mainstream dominance and powerful affective impact of this image, and the multiple ways it conjures negative stereotypes of Indigenous people. Social media posts of everyday experiences at fish farm blockade sites provided a powerful affective counter to such mainstream images of confrontation. They showed fish farm occupiers as relatable people with particular personalities, everyday concerns, and friends and family who stopped by to visit. Yet in small ways—from the tendency to begin or end posts with Gilakas’la (a Kwak’wala welcome phrase) to the West Coast Indigenous art motifs incorporated on the banners surrounding the “home” space of Midsummer Island occupiers—social media posts of the quotidian offered a subtle reinforcement of Indigenous legal orders and Kwakwaka’wakw culture’s continued liveliness, relevance, and connection to the land and sea. In the long days and weeks between newsworthy “events,” the posts foregrounded the ongoing nature of the occupations and of the larger structural conditions behind them continuing to go unaddressed.
The practical nature of some “everyday” posts offered opportunities for connection: call-outs for rubber boots, requests for supporters to join a meal train, and other small asks. These appeals provided a low bar for subscribers to Facebook and Instagram feeds to take a first step to connecting online or in person with those actively supporting the fish farm occupations. Such human connections, as well as simple, manageable asks, are key to joining the bottom rung of what Hahrie Han (2014) refers to as the “activist ladder” (p. 34) of engagement by which people link up with social movements.

In one colourful example of social media’s multiplier effect, Quin Molyneaux supported the Musgamagw Dzawada’enuxw Cleansing Our Waters project by plunging into a natural body of water every day in February with her friend Lauren. Each time, she posted a video to Instagram and nominated someone else to join the challenge by donating to the campaign and/or posting their own video with hashtags (beleaf media, 2018). Their challenge was part of the larger Go #Wild4Salmon challenge, which had begun on January 1, 2018. This campaign encouraged people to “dive in” to supporting the fish farm campaigns through taking a plunge, donating to Cleansing Our Waters, and challenging others to do likewise.

The Go #Wild4Salmon challenge, organized by Musgamagw Dzawada’enuxw Cleansing Our Waters, is one example of how salmon social media stressed a set of accountabilities and responsibilities that were rooted in Kwawaka’wakw lifeworlds, framing Indigenous presence as persistent, with Indigenous people in an abiding relationship with the lands, waters, non-humans, and each other … emphasizing resilience and resurgence in ways that set their stories and sources as navigating structures/institutions of settler colonialism; and … being accountable within a framework of relations with the land and peoples, locating themselves and their stories within historical structures and relations and drawing on Indigenous knowledges and expertise. (Callison & Young, 2020, p. 161)

These accountabilities, which Callison and Young (2020) describe as consistently underlining Indigenous journalism, can also be understood as Indigenous legal orders. They are “an intervention into both media practices and narratives as well as settler-colonial systems and institutions” (p. 184), as they insist upon another way of seeing, being, and governing oneself and one’s actions within the dynamic set of relationships that make up the lifeworld. Increasingly, nuanced collaborative work is being done with and by coastal First Nations to bring these orders, including those related to marine stewardship, into focus (Gauvreau, Lepofsky, Rutherford, & Reid, 2017; Napoleon, Friedland, Lascas, & Harland, 2016). In reflecting and sharing Kwawaka’wakw legal orders, Kwawaka’wakw social media communication addressed not only individual and collective relationships to open-net pen salmon
farming but also broader issues of relationship between Kwawaka'wakw nations and the settler state.

**Nation to nation**

While the First Nations involved welcomed solidarity actions, donations, and shows of support, what they sought was a nation-to-nation negotiated solution that recognized Kwakwaka'wakw stewardship, governance, and rights within their traditional territories. These issues were centred in multiple ways in social media communications from the outset of the fish farm occupations. The video of the August 23, 2017 boarding of Cermaq Canada’s Burdwood Farm posted to the Cleansing Our Waters Facebook page (Musgamagw Dzawada’enuxw Cleansing Our Waters, 2017) begins by showing a woman in a cedar hat in the front of a boat pulling up to Cermaq’s dock. In the first seconds of the video, when a Cermaq staffperson asks the delegation not to disembark due to it being an active jobsite, a man responds that this is his traditional territory and that the farm has “never been given rights to be here.” He is soon joined by dozens, from the elderly to youth, many wearing button blankets and vests, cedar hats, and other regalia. There is drumming and singing. Mothers holding their children say they have come to protect the waters for their children and their children’s children.

Young women, a demographic that played an important role in occupying the farms and supporting the occupations locally, are prominently featured in the video. One explains “It’s not part of who we are to allow this to happen. It’s a complete violation on Cermaq’s part, on Marine Harvest’s part, and the government of Canada’s part,” eloquently tying together her identity as a First Nations woman, the duty of stewardship she feels, and the nation-to-nation nature of the dispute with Canada over fish farm governance.

While mainstream media tended to focus on hereditary chiefs and other leaders, visual and verbal expressions of cultural resurgence by youth had greater prominence on social media. For example, a personal Facebook post from Ernest Alfred (2017) on October 21 tagged to the Swanson Occupation page acknowledges the contributions of youth—and especially young women—who had organized a classroom walkout in support of wild salmon. The page includes photos of the youth, many in regalia, and with some drumming, dancing, and singing. This emphasis on cultivating the next generation’s leadership, and stressing its role in renewal, is an important aspect of many Indigenous cultures and legal orders. Social media was a key place where Kwakwaka’wakw youth took a lead on the issue of fish farming, whether through artwork, memes and photos, vlogs, or written commentary from the occupation sites and at solidarity actions. For example, after a small group of young women, along with scientist Alexandra Morton, attempted to delay the restocking of smolts at the Port Elizabeth farm,
one youth posted a photo to Instagram of the group smiling with raised fists, making comments about finding unity and strength while facing down Marine Harvest and their RCMP escort, including an officer who made disrespectful comments (McIntyre-Smith, 2017). As Indigenous youth are profoundly underrepresented in mainstream media, the opportunity for youth, through social media, to “broadcast” their voice, define their experience, and share how they chose to express themselves as Kwakwaka’wakw, contributed to a process of cultural revitalization that went beyond insights and actions about fish farms.

Dancing, drumming, singing, speaking in Kwak’wala and other Indigenous languages, observing protocols, and wearing regalia were common features of social media posts of occupation supporters at fish farms, at protest actions, and in formal meetings with government and in court. For example, an August 30 post to the Swanson Occupation (2017c) page features Mamalilikala hereditary chiefs wearing regalia and demonstrating support by dancing on the front of their boat. When a delegation of Heiltsuk, Wet’suwet’en, Gitskan, and Haida leaders visited the occupations in November in solidarity, many wore regalia. They posed for a photo on the dock with fists raised. A short video posted by Carla Voyageur to Facebook live and shared to the Swanson Occupation (2017a) page on October 21 features drumming and singing at a solidarity action in Courtenay. It is captioned with

awesome! Our people standing united. laxwegila — gaining strength and standing up for our title and rights and our beautiful environment which is our responsibility to look after. Gilakas’la Gilakas’la Gilakas’la.

Michelle Raheja (2010) uses the term “visual sovereignty” (p. 9) to describe how Indigenous filmmakers have reimagined Indigenous sovereignty and Indigenous representation through their films. Social media posts such as the one by Carla Voyageur (Swanson Occupation, 2017a) extend this practice of visual sovereignty into the social media sphere.

The designs and colours of Kwakwaka’wakw regalia are striking, beautiful, and distinctive. Whether at a formal meeting in the ’Namgis Big House between the premier, cabinet ministers, and Kwakwaka’wakw chiefs, or against a backdrop of misty islands and docks next to salmon pens, gatherings of people in formal Kwakwaka’wakw dress made for arresting images that visually conveyed the power of Kwakwaka’wakw cultures. In the staging of the encounter with government in the ’Namgis Big House, the location, regalia, and following of protocols all lent a kind of visual dominance and authority to the Kwakwaka’wakw leadership, clearly conveying nationhood and that this was a nation-to-nation meeting. While these images made the mainstream news, followers of social media feeds had a more consistent and richer exposure to elements of Kwakwaka’wakw art, song, language, governance protocols braided into communications related to the fish farm occupations.
Opening another eye: Looking back on living infrastructures

Why were elements of Kwakwaka'wakw art, song, language, and governance protocols consistently braided into communications related to the fish farm occupations? The latter part of this article shifts focus to these elements, contemplating them as constitutive communicational practices that maintain flows and balances within the fluid relations that support the salmon “infrastructure” so critical to life in the region.

Just as Indigenous scholars and their allies worked to reframe what dominant culture marginalized as “tribal traditions” as legal orders of ongoing relevance and power, so too for political change it is necessary to foreground Indigenous critical infrastructure of salmon relations as flexible, living infrastructures of presence and potency, as infrastructures that must be recognized and taken into account within infrastructural discourses and their actualization in industrial projects. The undoing of parts of industrial forestry, fishing, transportation, and energy infrastructures is necessary for salmon to thrive. Recognizing this has been key to the recovery of salmon runs on the Klamath and other rivers where dams have been removed; it also holds true for the removal of open-net salmon farms. Salmon aquaculture has grown into a roughly $800 million a year industry in British Columbia (Government of British Columbia, 2018), while wild salmon stocks have plunged by 80 percent (Shore, 2016). This can be read as an example of the invisibilization of Indigenous infrastructures being accompanied by the cannibalization of their productivity into an industrially “legible” form: the current fish farming conflict concerns how lice and disease from the open-pen salmon farms have contributed to the collapse of the wild salmon runs that provide a core food source and cultural touchstone for almost all coastal First Nations. Many of the seventeen farms in the Broughton Archipelago were licensed by the federal government, many over the objection of Kwakwaka'wakw First Nations concerned about the impact these farms would have on wild salmon (Cox, 2019; Smart, 2017).

With this in mind, using Two-Eyed Seeing, this article casts a second glance back to earlier iterations of the communicational patterns resurgent in Kwakwaka'wakw salmon farm communications and the salmon farm conflict more broadly, in order to understand these patterns “infrastructurally,” as part of a dynamic, reciprocal relationship between Kwakwaka'wakw people and salmon. In this relationship, Kwakwaka'wakw stewardship plays a key role in ensuring that salmon runs thrive.

The text first investigates song, a component of Kwawaka'wakw communicational and legal orders since time immemorial. Next, it takes up the example of the ground-breaking film In the Land of the Head Hunters (Curtis, 1914), following “moments” in the film's more than hundred-year history, in order to examine how Kwawaka'wakw communities have mediated portrayals of Kwawaka'wakw culture and living infrastructures in nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first century en-
counters within mainstream media and Western imaginaries. The themes of liveness and circulation—which are vital to the oral tradition and key to understanding how repetition and rearticulation perform the broader cultural work of reasserting Kwawaka’wakw sovereignty, lifeworlds, and legal orders in new circumstances—are then brought into the present through the example of artist and hereditary chief Beau Dick, whose public sphere actions explicitly addressed Broughton Archipelago salmon farming, laying the communicational groundwork for the occupations of 2017.

Living infrastructures I: Singing gardens

When Indigenous salmon protectors gathered as part of the activities associated with the travelling Hexsa’am: To Be Here Always exhibit, a number of participants composed and performed a Rainbow Warrior Song, to be shared widely over social media, rather than recording meeting minutes. While this may seem illegible by Western paradigms, the parallel with meeting minutes becomes clear when song is considered as part of an animate, living Indigenous infrastructure, something not only material but a materializing force.

Steve Burgess (2019) tells the following story about Kwakwaka’wakw song:

Back in 2003 Chief Dick, also known as Kwaxsistalla from the Kawadillikall Clan of the Dzawatainuk Tribe of the Kwawaka’wakw First Nation, was asked by geomorphologist John Harper, at the suggestion of ethnobotanist Nancy Turner, about some unusual rock formations that had been found in the Broughton Archipelago, south of Haida Gwaii. “That’s just a lokiwey,” Kwaxsistalla told them.

Then he began to sing. His song was about the lokiwey (clam garden), a traditional First Nations structure (either natural or constructed) used to facilitate clam harvests. The song he sang was not just a celebration but an explanation of how the lokiwey should be made and utilized, intended to teach succeeding generations how to go about it. It was like a Kwakwaka’wakw how-to manual set to music. (para. 3–4)

Adam Dick knew hundreds of such songs. One of the many things academic researchers have learned through his songs is that a great deal of what was thought to be “natural” in the environment was actually present because of First Nations stewardship. In the case of clam gardens, research since Dick’s revelation has revealed clam gardens from the Columbia River to Alaska, some going back 3,500 years (Pynn, 2019). This is a type of infrastructure, existing on a massive scale, that somehow went almost entirely unacknowledged by mainstream society until well into the twenty-first century. The shaping of the seascape using natural elements (such as arranging rocks), while readily apparent to the trained eye, was simply invisible to the dominant society, as were the complex stewardship systems governing how Heiltsuk, Kwawaka’wakw, and other coastal First Nations gathered...
fish and seafood. The invisibility of these gardens of the sea—which include not only clam gardens but other carefully placed infrastructures of abundance, such as hemlock boughs and kelp weighted with rocks laid in the water for herring to lay their roe—had huge consequences. In a precursor to the salmon farm occupations, in 2015 Heiltsuk people occupied the central coast office of Fisheries and Oceans Canada to demand an end to further commercial herring fishery openings upon an already decimated herring stock.

Both herring and salmon conflicts developed against the backdrop of more than a century of state efforts to diminish and dismantle Kwakwaka’wakw knowledges through the potlatch prohibitions, through the presence of residential schools in the region into the nineteen-seventies, and through the removal of communities from their territories through forced relocation, including the torching of two villages in the nineteen-sixties by Indian agents. These actions have created immense fragmentation: much of the efforts of cultural resurgence involve bringing back and building from what has survived, whether in the case of the community of Alert Bay building the U’mista Cultural Centre to repatriate an extensive collection of masks and regalia that had been confiscated at a Christmas Day potlatch in 1921, and dispersed to private collections and museums worldwide, or in the case of language revival, where learners have access to only a small number of fluent native speakers.

In this context, it is worth highlighting the brilliance of Kwakwaka’wakw song as a reproductive technology. Songs are learned and retained through multiple modalities. They are catchy, they spread easily, and a simple melody line can spark memories to come flooding back. Research suggests that people retain their musical memory even through dementia (Rio, 2009). Song is a flexible and resilient technology. At the end of the nineteenth century, a delegation led by Chief Isaac entrusted the songs of his Han people to communities further down the Yukon River, so these would survive the disruptions of the gold rush. Many of these songs have been returned to the Han singers, more than one hundred years later. Songs have even been reformed through elders living in different communities coming together who were able to share different parts to make the song whole.

Adam Dick’s lokiwey song is all that is needed to recreate new clam gardens—even without material vestiges of past ones. This is no accident. Specific environmental and historical knowledge, as well as the cultivation of an orientation towards a dynamic awareness of relationships and the need to keep these in balance, is seeded within the very words and syntax of Indigenous languages (Basso, 1996; Neuheus, 2011). Sara Child (2016), in a thesis based on decades of language revitalization work in Kwakwaka’wakw communities describes that:

Our language conveys cultural knowledge that has been passed down for generations. It contains within it the knowledge, wisdom, protocols and perspective of our people ... (including) essential information of
the teachings, protocols, practices, moral and ethical principles that
guided our ancestors and will guide our youth to live their life in well-
ness and lead their people to wellness. (p. 11)

The oral culture of the Kwakwaka’wakw, like that of the Han people, has
seeded the knowledge for regeneration of its lifeworld—including the infrastruc-
tures that support it—in a multitude of places. Seeds of such knowledge infra-
structures—including song, dance, language, protocol, and ceremony—appeared,
connected, and circulated regularly in the social media ecosystem of Indigenous
opposition to fish farming in the Broughton Archipelago. Kwakwaka’wakw chan-
nelled these knowledge forms into how they expressed themselves. From the “frag-
ments” of social media postings, a remarkably consistent set of articulations
emerged of the understandings, orientations, and relationships with which
Kwakwaka’wakw had stewarded and sustained wild salmon for thousands of years.
The reach of social media helped boost the visibility and presence of these articu-
lations into the wider public sphere where debates and decisions about coastal
stewardship were taking place. As will be discussed in the next section, this work
was also about reshaping relations.

Potlatching and witnessing from past to future
From the earliest days of contact with film, photography and other “modern” media,
Kwakwaka’wakw people have proved exceptionally skillful in navigating new modes
of expression, including social media, to shape representations of their culture and
to claim their rights. This has proved true even in the face of confiscation of
Kwakwaka’wakw regalia and other cultural property, and overt repression of lan-
guage and ceremony. This section turns to more than a century of reinterpretations
and rearticulations of In the Land of the Head Hunters (Curtis, 1914) to further explore
encounters between Kwakwaka’wakw lifeworlds and the media forms of the settler
state. Through such encounters, the living infrastructures of Kwakwaka’wakw com-
municational forms inhabit any amenable space and grow understanding within
public culture, rather like wildflowers blooming between cracks in a sidewalk, their
roots aerating and breaking up soil for more seeds to take root.

After Franz Boas, who is often considered the founder of American anthropol-
ogy, made Kwakwaka’wakw peoples a primary focus of his work in the 1880s, a
steady stream of anthropologists, artists, and media makers visited Kwakwaka’wakw
communities in tandem with the early development not just of anthropology, but
also of photography, film, and wax cylinder sound recording. These intercultural en-
counters produced imaginaries and their material traces, ranging from Emily Carr’s
paintings (see for example, Baldissera, 2015) to Edward Curtis’ entire volume of
photographs devoted to the Kwakwaka’wakw in his North American Indian book
project, which shaped perceptions not only of the Kwakwaka’wakw but of “Indians”
more generally (see for example, King, 2012).
Brad Evans and Aaron Glass (2014), in discussing In the Land of the Head Hunters, the groundbreaking feature filmed by Edward Curtis in 1913–1914, while working closely with Kwakwaka'wakw associates, note that it is important to understand that what is represented by the film is not merely Curtis’ sensationalist exploitation of indigenous people but also a meeting of Curtis and the Kwakwaka'wakw in the shared enterprise of making a modern motion picture. Headhunters was one of the most ambitious in many such attempts undertaken by Kwakwaka'wakw — and by other First Nations, in other forms, across Canada and the United States — to use the emerging market for culturally inscribed goods as a form of self-preservation in a moment made precarious by colonialist expansion. (p. 7)

Curtis had embarked on producing Head Hunters as the Canadian state was tightening and stepping up enforcement of the potlatch ban, in place from 1885 to 1951. The choices Kwakwaka'wakw participants made in 1913–1914 around how facets of their songs, dances, and regalia were included in the film can only be understood in the context of the multiple ways Kwakwaka'wakw people challenged this ban: through open defiance, through repurposing other public events to allow for the banned practices (such as potlatch gifting), and through direct display and engagement with government officials. Head Hunters was the first feature film with an all-Indigenous cast, shot on location: its circulation throughout North America established a lived presence and a record of Kwakwaka'wakw dances, songs, and visual culture in the public sphere, in the most “modern” and high-profile of mediums—even as these practices were being driven underground through arrests, jail sentences, and confiscation of regalia. In the words of Andrea Sanborn, executive director of the U’mista Cultural Centre from 2002 to 2010, “I’m sure they understood what [Curtis] was trying to do … If I just think and imagine it, I would have done the same thing — flaunted some of our ceremonies in the face of the government” (quoted in Griffin, 2008, para. 20).

This record was also a “message in a bottle to future generations of people” Griffin, 2008, para. 15). After Bill Holm brought a recently recovered, and somewhat out of order, version of the film to individual Kwakwaka'wakw communities in the late sixties, the filmic encounters with regalia, artefacts, and practices became a point of reconnection with the potlatch system, an opportunity for lived practice of language and cultural life that itself was recorded and could be a touchstone for future generations. Kwawaka'wakw from many communities came together to record a new score for the film in Kwak'wala and featuring Kwak’wala song, in a process that sparked conversations not only with the remaining original actors and their families, but also with ancestors. Renowned filmmaker Barb Cramner (2014) describes the mixed nature of the legacy of this remade film, In the Land of the War Canoes: the joy of finding footage of two men throwing eul-
achon oil using huge feast spoons, which she could incorporate into her own film; the pain of remembering the wounds inflicted upon families living through an era of fear and turmoil; grief and a sense of loss tempered by pride and celebration of Kwawaka'wakw cultural continuity.

The “witnessing” function of some fish farm social media must be understood as contiguous with this longer history. Simone Browne (2015) notes the historically racialized history of surveillance as evolving out of the notion that Black slaves were property and should be prevented from escape and returned to their owners if they fled. In Kwakwaka'wakw territory, this racialized surveillance was also in effect, and also geared to supporting the dominant economic system, in this case by attempting to break the potlatch system, and destroy an economic infrastructure that shared wealth within and across communities and kinship networks. The RCMP, in acting as agents to support the activities of Marine Harvest and other fish farms, took up their historic role as agents enforcing the dominant economic order, supporting the state’s displacement and dismantling of the salmon economy on which coastal First Nations depend.

In 2008, the reworking of yet another version of Head Hunters became a site of staging of a broader intercultural dialogue that foregrounded Kwawaka'wakw presence, sovereignty, and rights, including rights to salmon. The film was launched through high-profile screenings across North America, with Seattle and Vancouver showings featuring the Gwa’wina Dancers, a present-day Kwawaka’wakw dance troupe. Their vibrant, colourful, and resonant performances introduced a rich Kwawaka’wakw cosmology of animals, birds, and supernatural and changeling beings. Dancers shared stories contextualizing the dances and their genealogy (rights to dances are passed down through families) from the time of Head Hunters through to a century later. They spoke powerfully not only about the potlatch ban but about the Kwawaka’wakw nation’s present-day struggles with government over land claim and treaty issues, and about the wild salmon crisis linked to fish farms in their territories. Interpretation of the Salmon dance, for example, made clear that the traditional stewardship roles toward salmon illustrated in the dance applied to conflicts over salmon farming, and that the past must be worked through to understand the present. As Glass (2014) articulates, Kwawaka’wakw “selectively reproduce(d) the past in order to manage relationships with non-Natives” (p. 347). ’Namgis First Nation Chief William Cranmer described the intercultural presentations and exhibitions as an explicit effort at public outreach in support of the larger project of Kwawaka’wakw resurgence, including not only language revitalization and the repatriation of cultural objects, but “reestablishment of control over resource management and cultural practice more broadly through contemporary treaties and land claims” (p. 324 Glass, 2014, p. 324).

This perspective shades another kind of meaning into “witnessing” as a First Nations practice, and particularly as a potlatch practice. Just as potlatch audiences
are expected to acknowledge and validate the family lineages and associated proprietary claims they witness, intercultural audiences are understood to have entered into a set of “protocols and expectations of obligation, exchange and ongoing relation” (Glass, 2014, p. 324) in which they will respect and uphold Kwawaka’wakw culture and sovereignty in exchange for the privilege they have been gifted of learning/partaking in Kwawaka’wakw ceremonial culture. Glass (2014) argues broadly that intercultural iterations of Kwawaka’wakw cultures of display (masks, dances, dramas, and oral histories) uphold the precepts of potlatch culture and not only extend but enact them in cross-cultural spheres, refiguring political and social relationships:

because expressive culture was deeply political in the context of the potlatch, it provided a means of maintaining a real and deeply politicized repertoire of Kwawaka’wakw self-fashioning even when presented outside of a ceremonial context under reiterative scenarios of intercultural exchange. (p. 322)

Dine/Seminole/Muscogee scholar Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie more specifically discussed Indigenous social media, and particularly YouTube videos, as “an extension of the Northwest culture of display” (Glass, 2014, p. 355). Social media posts produced by First Nations involved in the Broughton Archipelago fish farm disputes, such as clips of hereditary chiefs dancing in regalia on their boats, also fit this pattern, consistently invoking Kwawaka’wakw visual culture, practices, and protocol.

The extension of potlatch culture—whether through film, intercultural events, or salmon social media—brings a core element of Kwawaka’wakw critical infrastructure to bear in new surroundings. Through the potlatch, Kwawaka’wakw sovereignty, laws, and social and economic reproduction are enacted and assured. As Kwawaka’wakw expressive culture, including masks, dance, drama, and oral story, have extended from Kwawaka’wakw ceremonial contexts into intercultural ones, they have seeded Kwawaka’wakw worldviews, values, and relationships to take hold and become embodied and material in new places. To consider this expressive culture as a kind of communicational infrastructure—and more specifically, one that has seeded new values about salmon and supported a change in orientation to salmon farming in the political culture of British Columbia—the final section of this article cycles forward to the legacy of Beau Dick in order to explore the genius with which Kwawaka’wakw have articulated the political power of expressive culture to salmon conflicts in the present day.

**Sparking living infrastructures**

One of the most compelling examples of Kwawaka’wakw drawing on their vivid visual culture to reshape relations comes from the life of master carver Beau Dick, a ’Namgis hereditary chief who was a major figure in Northwest Coast art. In February of 2013, as the Idle No More movement was growing across Canada, he and his supporters—including scientist Alexandra Morton, whom he had specifi-
cally invited to “be the voice of salmon” (Watershed Sentinel, 2013) and to highlight the crisis with wild salmon and fish farms—walked from the northern Vancouver Island community of Quatsino to Victoria in order to break a copper on the steps of the British Columbia Legislature. In full regalia, in front of three thousand people, Dick performed this act of public shaming, complete with singing, drumming, speeches, and the smashing of a copper shield on a rock, in order to highlight government’s broken treaties with Indigenous people (Brown, 2017; Hopkins, n.d.). Dick revived the symbolic and performative potency of this Kwakwaka’wakw governance practice, suppressed for decades, articulating it powerfully to present grievances. The profound resonance of his blows upon the copper—a drumbeat of resurgence—became evident in the outpouring of grief on social media after Dick passed away in March 2017, with many posts recalling the copper breaking in photos, hashtags, and written tributes (Brown, 2017).

In another skillful demonstration of Kwakwaka'wakw visual sovereignty and legal orders, Dick twice, in 2008 and 2012, carved complete sets of masks to be used in potlatch ceremonies and then burned. Dick described this process as the masks being given new life by going to the spirit world. He declared “What we have to do is recreate them — and that keeps them alive” (quoted in Prierger, 2014, para. 5). Glass (2014) explains that masks and regalia are regarded by Kwakwaka’wakw as “the temporary—and potentially alienable—embodiment of the hereditary rights themselves, which are the true and inalienable form of ephemeral wealth” (p. 324).

The re-enactment of ancestral stories and lineage through song, dance, drama, and oral storytelling brings characters (human and non-human), stories, interactions, and rights, responsibilities, and privileges to life in an embodied way, helping to keep keep relations in the human and more-than-human worlds attended to and in proper balance. Glass (2014) explains

> There is thus an ontological and mutually corroborating relationship between material forms (masks and regalia), performance types (song, dance, and oratory), proprietary ephemerals (hereditary prerogatives), social identities (clan titles, genealogies, and dance society positions), and historical trajectories (ancient and recent paths of circulation and exchange). (p. 323)

More simply put, masks gain their value through their role in helping to materialize and perpetuate the relations that bind Kwakwaka’wakw lifeworlds.

Dick’s actions in respecting cultural protocols and destroying masks worth hundreds of thousands on the art market, were a specific refutation of capitalist economics, and of ethnographic logics of collection and commodity fetishization, in favour of upholding what Shiri Pasternak and Dayna Scott (2020) describe as “relational, generative, Indigenous economies of care” (p. 207). This economy shows itself in potlatch ceremonies and gifting, but also in the multiple actions that uphold the stew-
ardship orientation of Kwakwaka’wakw relations with the lifeworld. If infrastructure is, in the words of Winona Leduc and Deborah Cowen (2020), “how sociality extends itself” (p. 264), Kwakwaka’wakw stewardship relations—which are social relations with the more-than-human-world—are acting infrastructurally, creating the (re)generative conditions that support strong salmon runs, copious herring roe laid in kelp forests, and clams burrowing in sheltered “garden” bays. When Kwakwaka’wakw posted about a subset of these relationships on social media with reference to the salmon farming conflicts, they were growing the reach of Kwakwaka’wakw economies and stewardship relations toward new audiences and actors. Richly resonant with language and cultural practices that are thousands of years old—including the incredibly vivid visual culture of Northwest Coast art—these communications foregrounded Kwakwaka’wakw lifeworlds, and the infrastructures that support them, as realities that mainstream society must be accountable to and in relation with. These communications acted infrastructurally, extending the “sociality” of Kwakwaka’wakw lifeworlds along new paths of circulation and exchange.

Conclusion
Jo-Ann Archibald’s (2008) telling of the story of Coyote’s eyes well illustrates the challenges of Two-Eyed Seeing when there is a lack of balance between two worldviews: Coyote winds up with one bulging buffalo eye, one mouse eye rolling around in its socket, and very compromised vision. This article has attempted to exercise the “lazy eye” developed through settler-colonialism, training its focus again and again on common infrastructural elements in Kwakwaka’wakw cultural and communicational practices through thousands of years, and highlighting their resonances with the work accomplished by Musgamagw Dzawada’enuxw, ’Namgis, and other Kwakwaka’wakw in social media communications surrounding the Broughton Archipelago fish farm occupations in 2017–2018.

In a scenario where a remote First Nation had little mainstream media access, social media was effective in communicating a Kwakwaka’wakw perspective, both within First Nations communities and to more distant publics. Kwakwaka’wakw drew on the affordances of social media to create and distribute their own content, offering myriad “windows” for people to experience Indigenous legal orders at work in the world. These ranged from glimpses of the daily lives of fish farm occupiers in the Broughton Archipelago to the ways that First Nations people highlighted their concerns at rallies, in the court system, and in meetings with government. By using language, protocol, and song, through wearing regalia and centering their nationhood and the nation-to-nation relationship with the Canadian state, and in multiple other large and small ways, Kwakwaka’wakw not only foregrounded the problems with salmon farms. They also highlighted both settler and Kwakwaka’wakw accountabilities to the social, cultural, and communicative systems—infrastructures—that underlie the generative Kwakwaka’wakw economy.
These accountabilities raise difficult questions. What does it mean to acknowledge a Kwakwaka’wakw right of refusal on salmon farm licenses, while continuing to turn a blind eye to questions of rights and title, and of land and water governance? Is it enough for communications scholars to focus on ending the digital divide in broadband access for First Nations, when the sacred and difficult work of stewarding Indigenous languages, dances, and songs—so core to the revitalization and regeneration of Indigenous lifeworlds—receives such a paucity of financial support and policy recognition by the Canadian state? Decolonizing infrastructural thinking requires ongoing engagement with such questions, and with the First Nations challenging governments, industries, communities, and individuals to think and act differently.
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Notes
1. This article focuses on anti-salmon farm media. First Nations people are not monolithic in their opposition to the farms. However, in October 2017, forty leaders from eight Kwakwaka’wakw Nations in the region formally expressed united opposition to the farms to the premier (Morton, n.d.). There is an overall consensus among Kwakwaka’wakw against the farms in the Broughton Archipelago continuing in their present form.
2. I would also like to acknowledge the work of Zoe Todd, Kyle, and other Indigenous academics who do not work within a “biological sciences” designation but engage actively with Indigenous community relations with fish.
3. Some mark the beginning of the occupation with this incident. Another accounting begins on September 9, 2017, when Ernest Alfred took up residence in a Marine Harvest work cottage on Swanson Island (Prystupa, 2018).
4. Some posts of a similar nature circulated quite widely. For example, Karissa Glendale’s (2018) short video of her confrontation with marine harvest workers had over one hundred thousand views on her Facebook page and over 1,300 shares within the Facebook platform.
5. Artist and curator Tania Willard’s discussion of this event can be viewed on YouTube (Finding Flowers, 2020) beginning at 1:35:26. A performance of the song can be seen on Instagram (Willard, 2020). The exhibit, a product of multiple artists working together in residence on Dzawada’enuxw territories in summer 2018, “centres on the 2018 BC Supreme Court case launched by the Dzawada’enuxw First Nation to extend Aboriginal title to the ocean, claiming that the province does not have the authority to grant tenures to salmon farms in the Broughton Archipelago” (Alexandra, 2019 [para. 2]).
7. I witnessed one such coming together at a tribute to Chief Isaac at a Tr’ondek Hwech’in potlatch at Moosehide in July 2006.
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