

Developer's note:

This paper was written by Dr. William Wylie, Historical Services Branch, and accompanied a request that the Brilliant Bridge be considered as a National Historic Site. This was made before the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Spring meeting, July 6 and 7, held in New Brunswick, Canada.

Because this paper was scanned (OCR) from a photocopy, the images used throughout the paper are blemished (photocopies) and not suitable for this text document. That stated, the pages do not correspond with the original document pages but the text has not changed from the original) except for a few minor spelling corrections).

The following two pages are preamble to the paper itself but noteworthy for inclusion.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS BOARD OF CANADA

SPRING 1995 MEETING FREDERICTON; NEW BRUNSWICK, JULY 6 AND 7

NARRATIVE AGENDA

VOLUME I

1995-01
(p.1-30)

The Brilliant Suspension Bridge near Castlegar, British Columbia

Peter Oglow, Director of the Kootenay Doukhobor Historical Society, has requested that the Board- consider the possible national significance of the Brilliant Bridge a suspension bridge spanning the Kootenay River between the Doukhobor settlements of Brilliant and Ooteshenie.

Members will note that the bridge is of particular symbolic importance to the Doukhobors and that Dr Wylie's paper largely focuses on the structure's historical association with the community and on its symbolism.

Should a positive recommendation be forthcoming with respect to the significance of the bridge at the national level, the Kootenay Doukhobor Historical Society would like the structure considered as a candidate for funding: assistance through the National Cost-Sharing Program.

As cost sharing is being requested for the Brilliant Bridge, members are asked to bear in mind the priority setting criteria for cost-sharing adopted in 1985. Those criteria follow.

Resources considered of first or high priority for cost-sharing are those which in the opinion of the Board merit the immediate attention of the Program. They are seen as priorities for Program action because they are judged to be of exceptional national significance by virtue of their associations or because they are rare surviving resources or because they are under some immediate threat;

Resources considered to be of secondary priority for cost-sharing are those which in the opinion of the Board should not be seen to be of the highest priority for Program action. Such resources are of national significance and the possibility of entering into cost-sharing agreements should, of course, be pursued as funds become available;

however, they are not judged to be of such exceptional significance, rarity or so endangered as to demand immediate action.

Resources considered to be of a low priority for cost-sharing are

those which are under no immediate threat or for which contextual information is lacking which would permit determination of their level of significance; or those resources which would normally be assigned a higher priority for action by the Board, if it was not obvious that there were obstacles to be overcome before meaningful discussions with respect to cost-sharing would be possible; for example there may be no interest among other parties in participating in the preservation of the resource.

Resources that should not be considered for possible cost-sharing are

those which in the Board's considered opinion do not merit Parks' involvement beyond the level of commemoration by means of a plaque - when such resources are identified, the Board will, whenever possible, indicate to the Minister why it believes that it would be inappropriate to, consider providing financial assistance to aid in the restoration of the resource - that is to say why the resource was not identified as a priority for action with respect to cost-sharing.

We request the Board's advice in this matter.

Please note that

the Brilliant Bridge will be considered by the Cultural Pluralism Committee when it meets on the afternoon of Saturday, April 29.

and that

time permitting in April, we would appreciate it if the Cultural Pluralism Committee would discuss and reach a consensus on the nature and scope of those matters which it believes are legitimately its business and should, therefore, be referred to it for discussion prior to submission to the full Board.

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS BOARD OF CANADA

AGENDA PAPER

TITLE: THE BRILLIANT SUSPENSION BRIDGE NEAR CASTLEGAR,
BRITISH COLUMBIA

SOURCE: WILLIAM WYLIE, HISTORICAL SERVICES

BRANCH 19951

Built in 1913, the suspension bridge at Brilliant used a design common in North America at the time, in which the deck was hung from cables mounted above the length of the structure on both sides (see Figures 1-3). While the bridge was designed by the Vancouver firm of Cartwright, Matheson and Company, it was erected almost entirely by members of the Doukhobor communities in the West Kootenay region which it was intended to serve. The structure spans the Kootenay River between the Doukhobor settlements of Brilliant and Ooteshenie a short distance from the junction with the Columbia River in the southern part of the interior of British Columbia (see Figure 5).

While the bridge has been abandoned since 1966, it has recently become the object of attention from Doukhobors and others interested in heritage preservation who have sought to restore it and have it recommended for commemoration by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada.¹ To aid the Board in its decision, this paper will consider the circumstances surrounding the construction of the structure, its significance from a technological point of view, and the role it played in the regional transportation and economic network. The main focus of study, however, will be on the bridge's historical association with the Doukhobors and its symbolic importance to the Doukhobor community. To that end, the paper will review the history of the group in Canada and comment on the built historical heritage associated with the Doukhobor communities in order to evaluate the significance of the bridge as a surviving element of the Doukhobor cultural landscape of the early 20th century.

First European Penetration

Exceedingly rugged, the West Kootenay area is drained by three main rivers, the Columbia, Kootenay, and Slocan, which run between two main mountain ranges, the Selkirks and the Monashees. Until the late 19th century, this terrain discouraged permanent settlement by people of European origin. After the discovery of gold in 1863, prospectors flooded into the area and placer mining began on Wild Horse Creek south of Nelson. This activity gradually declined in the 1870s, but prospecting continued and finally resulted in new discoveries after 1880.

In the latter part of the 1880s, the discovery of silver and base metals prompted a mining boom which resulted in a population of more than five hundred in the West Kootenay region by 1890 and the emergence of a series of centres including Nelson, Rossland, Trail, and Slocan City. By 1896, smelters had been built at Trail and Nelson, but the early prosperity proved to be short-lived as many of the first mines petered out. After the turn of the century, the mining, which continued, was consolidated under the control of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company at Trail and was broadened to include the extraction of a larger variety of metals. By this time, the regional economy was becoming more diversified with the appearance of lumbering activities to support the needs of the mining industry for wood products and with the emergence of the first fruit farms, managed mainly by newly arrived British and German immigrants. Nonetheless, by 1908 when the Doukhobors appeared, much of the West Kootenay region was still in a state of wilderness.²

The Doukhobors: Origins to Arrival in British Columbia

Originating in southern Russia in the mid-18th century, this small religious group had long espoused religious views quite at variance with those of most Christians. At odds with the established church in their homeland, the group was actually named "Doukhobors" or "Spirit-Wrestlers" in derision by a Russian archbishop in 1785. Later, the faithful adopted the term themselves to mean that they fought for and with aid of the spirit of God.³

The central element in the Doukhobor faith was and is the belief in the immanence of God. Followers believe in the presence within each person of the Christ spirit which renders priesthood and the church, in the traditional sense, unnecessary. Because each person is in direct communication with God, the Bible is also rejected as the ultimate source of inspiration. Instead, the Doukhobors rely heavily on prayer meetings or "sobranies" in which the will of God is expressed communally through the participants: this depends on the willingness of each person to give up his individuality in order to listen to the common spirit within.

The Doukhobors place a great emphasis on choral singing as an expression of the divine spirit. The psalms and the hymns that are set to music express their beliefs and history, passed down by oral tradition in a culture, which did not become a literate one until well into the 20th century. The body of this work is called "The Living Book," a constantly changing Doukhobor version of the Bible, which, because it embodies the most recent words of God, marks the faithful as specially privileged Christians.⁴

These beliefs of the group tend to clash with the doctrines of most established Christian denominations. Before the early 20th century, the potential for conflict was heightened by the determination of the Doukhobors to resist interference of any kind from the outside world, which

provoked confrontations with both church and state whenever these forces attempted to impose their authority. The struggle with the state was particularly bitter over the issue of military service. Since all persons had the spark of God in them, the Doukhobors believed it was immoral to kill and repeatedly refused to be drawn into any situations, which might present a potential for violence.

The struggles of the group with the Russian Czars were frequently rancorous and extended intermittently over a period of more than a century. After years of persecution in the 18th century, the rule of Czar Alexander I began a period of greater tolerance, and in 1802 the Doukhobors were moved to the Crimea, which was then a frontier region. Alexander was succeeded by Nicholas I in 1825, who renewed efforts to suppress the sect. As a result, in the early 1840s the Doukhobors were forcibly removed to the Caucasus where they were settled among fierce hill tribes in a rugged frontier environment. In spite of these conditions, the group survived and ultimately prospered under their female leader, Lukeria Kalmikova.⁵

Popular with her followers, Kalmikova exerted an almost unquestioned authority among her followers. Like most leaders of the group, she was regarded as a prophet with visions and intuitions, which the rest of the group needed to acknowledge. She, however, faced a problem in preparing for her successor. Since the spiritual gifts of the Doukhobor leaders were thought to be passed on to their children, a form of leadership had emerged which tended to be hereditary. Having no children, she instead groomed a young man for the position who was not related to her by blood, but showed great talent. Peter Vasilevich Verigin (Peter the Lordly), the leader who would be influential in the exodus to Canada, came to power after her death in 1886.

Peter Verigin assumed the leadership at the beginning of perhaps the most critical period in Doukhobor history. Determined to control the sect, the Russian government immediately arrested him and sent him into exile in Siberia, where he continued to exert an influence from afar. When the government renewed conscription in 1895, the Doukhobors resisted and in several provinces burned the obsolete arms they had been issued when located to the Caucasus for defense against the Tartars. Never used, these arms were destroyed as a symbolic act of protest against the principle of violence and the interference of the state. This "Burning of Arms" incident, which has become an important part of the Doukhobor heritage, led to persecutions, tortures, and deaths. This in turn brought more attention to the plight of the Doukhobors until finally, with the aid of novelist Leo Tolstoy and British and America Quakers, plans were made to allow them to emigrate to Canada.⁶

In the years between 1898 and 1903, almost 9,000 Doukhobors took advantage of special arrangements offered by the federal government to settle in the area of present-day Saskatchewan. Under the leadership of Peter V. Verigin, they gathered on nearly 500,000 acres of prairie land in three main areas: one near Yorkton, a second north of Saskatoon in the vicinity of Blaine Lake, and the third in the Thunder Hill District near the boundary between the districts of Assiniboia and Saskatchewan near the Manitoba provincial boundary. On the basis of a precedent made in 1873 for Mennonite settlement in Manitoba, the Doukhobors were allowed to settle in groups rather than on individual homesteads. This allowed them to recreate their European village style of life: their homes were arranged in a village pattern, which maximized the opportunities for social contact. While the federal requirements for land clearing were met, the land was cultivated to a great extent communally.⁷

As hostility grew to immigrants from continental Europe, a major shift took place in federal government policy under Frank Oliver who became Minister of the Interior in 1905. Abandoning

the concessions agreed to in 1898, he was determined to make the Doukhobors conform to the usual regulations for settlement and naturalization. They were now required to register individually for their homesteads and to fulfill the conditions for clearing the land on each one. While Verigin's followers were willing to accept these conditions, they refused, because of their religious beliefs, to swear an oath of allegiance, which was a condition demanded to obtain final title. As a result, in June 1907, over 256,800 acres of land, much of it already cleared and improved by the Russian immigrants, was confiscated by the federal government.⁸

With many of their communities in disarray, the Doukhobors now turned to the possibility of establishing new colonies in British Columbia. In 1908, Verigin began to acquire land there, which, unlike that on the prairies, had been in private hands and thus was not subject to the same provisions regarding title. The first land purchased was 2,000 acres located at the juncture of the Columbia and Kootenay Rivers in the vicinity of the abandoned gold-mining camp of Waterloo. The Doukhobors renamed this place Brilliant, replacing a word with British military associations with one referring to the glitter of the nearby waters. Across the Kootenay River was a long plateau, which Verigin's followers also took over calling it Dolina Ooteshenie (the Valley of Consolation).⁹

In 1908, land was also bought over the mountains to the west near Grand Forks in the Kettle Valley. Eventually, the faithful also acquired more land in the area of the Columbia and Kootenay Rivers. By 1912, Brilliant was at the heart of a series of settlements extending south on the Columbia River as far as Champion Creek, north along the Kootenay to the Slocan River, and further north still on that river almost to Slocan Lake. There were almost 4,000 Doukhobors in British Columbia, a number which gradually rose until well over half of Verigin's followers were residents of that province. By 1924, 21,648 acres had been acquired west of the Rockies.¹⁰

While the majority of Verigin's followers were in British Columbia, substantial numbers also remained on the prairies. In addition to the original areas of settlement, new communities were begun at Kylemore and Kelvington in Saskatchewan, at Benito in Manitoba, and at Cowley and Lundbreck in Alberta. By 1924, Verigin's supporters were scattered over more than a dozen locations on the prairies and in British Columbia.

The community at Brilliant soon emerged as the commercial centre of a series of settlements based mainly on fruit farming, lumbering, and to a lesser extent bee-raising. By 1909, 500 acres of land had been cleared and planted with fruit trees in the area immediately around Brilliant. The surrounding hillsides were terraced to form orchards. A concrete reservoir was constructed across the Kootenay River at Ooteshenie with a pumping plant in order to generate electricity and to provide water for a series of irrigation channels cutting across the farm lands. By this time, there were 700 people at Brilliant and the physical infrastructure included two sawmills and a number of communal houses, stables and out-buildings. The most famous of the enterprises was the jam factory built about 1910. Making use of the fruit production of the area, this plant produced "K.C. Brand" jams, which gained a high reputation and sold in large quantities throughout western Canada until the late 1930s.¹¹

Brilliant gradually grew in status, eventually becoming an economic centre, an administrative headquarters, and a symbolic centre of authority. While of commercial importance almost immediately, it was not at first the administrative centre of Doukhobor affairs. The headquarters of the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood (CCUB), established in 1917 to govern the movement's operations, was instead established at Verigin in Saskatchewan. However,

by the end of the First World War the majority of the Doukhobor population was in British Columbia and Brilliant was at the heart of the most populous area in that province, that of West Kootenay. When Peter the Lordly died in 1924, his tomb was located at Brilliant and it was there that his son would be buried as well, fifteen years later, on a hillside which became a focal point for Doukhobor activities. In 1931, the community became the administrative capital when the headquarters of the CCUB was moved there from Verigin. After the collapse of the CLUB in 1938, the town continued to be the central administrative base for the main body of Doukhobors.¹²

The Construction of the Bridge

Following the arrival of the Doukhobors, the formation of transportation links was crucial to the development of their settlements in the West Kootenay region. Links were needed between the various communities and between the region and the outside world in order for the colonies in British Columbia to prosper and maintain contacts with the Doukhobor settlements on the prairies. Railways were already in the area. By the turn of the century, a series of lines connected the mines and the smelters between Nelson, the Slocan valley, Castlegar, Trail, and Rossland. An American line, the Great Northern, ran from the south as far as Nelson. To compete with this system, the Canadian Pacific Railway had been extended from the east to the foot of Kootenay Lake.

While the rail lines formed the main means of transportation within the West Kootenay region and between it and the outside world, it was essential that roads also be developed, mainly for local purposes (see Figure 5). By 1912, there was a road travelling from Trail in the south up the west bank of the Columbia to Castlegar near Brilliant. A route also ran from near Nelson in the north down the west bank of the Kootenay to Crescent Valley, near the junction of the Slocan River. Much remained to be done to cut through the difficult terrain between the Slocan River and Pass Creek near Brilliant. The Doukhobors had established a cable ferry across the Columbia at Castlegar to connect Brilliant with areas to the south. In the area round this settlement, they had also built several miles of roads.¹³

Peter Verigin and his followers also needed to link Brilliant with the large agricultural settlement of Ooteshenie emerging across the Kootenay River. They first established a ferry driven by a horse and windlass, but by 1912 Verigin had decided to erect a road bridge and was in contact with the Vancouver engineering firm of Cartwright, Matheson and Company. After members of the firm visited the site, a plan was prepared early in 1913 by J.R. Grant working under the supervision of A.M. Truesdale. Their proposal called for a suspension bridge. Widely used in mountainous areas of North America at the time, this design was well suited to spanning relatively deep and wide gorges and usually resulted in a structure, which was light and comparatively easy and economical to erect.¹⁴

The suspension bridge at Brilliant consisted of reinforced concrete towers, steel wire suspension cables, and steel deck structure and stiffening trusses (see Figures 1-3). This was a standard design except for the use of reinforced concrete, which had only recently been introduced for such purposes. The foundation of the structure consisted of two large concrete piers rising on opposite sides of the river, each monolith supporting two concrete towers rising above the bridge deck. The bases of the piers were about 12 feet thick and 34 feet wide. The tall columns at each end were to rise 48 feet above the road bed and measured about 5 feet by 10 feet in thickness at the bottom, tapering to 2 by 4 feet at the top. They were joined overhead at each end by horizontal cross-members also made of concrete.¹⁵

The design depended greatly on the strength of the cables, which were suspended from these towers and anchored in the solid rock of the surrounding hills. Four cables, each 2 inches in diameter and made of galvanized steel wire, ran the length of the bridge on each side and passed over the tops of the towers by means of saddles supported on rollers. On the banks of the river, the cables were fixed into cast steel sockets with the aid of 2 2-inch diameter bolts. The bolts were in turn embedded into concrete anchorages sunk about 8 feet into the rock faces.

The frame of the bridge deck was constructed of structural steel and suspended from the overhead cables by means of vertical hanger rods, each 1 inch in diameter. Three hundred and thirty-one feet in length between the towers, the road surface consisted of a wood deck laid over the metal crossbeams of the span. A layer of large stringers was first laid lengthwise; over it a series of joists ran across the stringers; finally, the flooring consisted of 4 inch by 10 inch planking laid lengthwise. This created a road surface of about 14 feet in width suspended approximately 60 feet in height above the high water mark.¹⁶

Several standardized techniques were used to strengthen the deck and prevent it from moving under great weight or in high winds. Steel stiffening trusses were mounted on each side of the bridge extending above the level of the roadway. Of a Warren truss design, these trusses consisted of a series of triangular panels interspersed with vertical posts (see especially Figure 2). The bridge also employed 4 wind guys of galvanized steel wire, 2 on each side running from near the middle of the deck to the riverbanks where they were sunk into concrete.¹⁷

The construction of the bridge began in April 1913 and extended over a period of about 7 months. With the exception of a supervising engineer sent by Cartwright, Matheson and Company, the work was done entirely by the Doukhobors themselves, utilizing mainly traditional hand-labour techniques. Thirty-five to 40 Doukhobors made up the workforce, all from the settlements of Ooteshenie and Brilliant. At Peter Verigin's behest, they laboured from 7 A. M. to 6 P. M. each day without wages for the benefit of the wider community.¹⁸

More than 60 years later, Peter Reibin, a carpenter who worked on the project, recalled the process of construction. Work began with the towers. Carpenters built wooden forms into which the concrete was poured. Scaffolding facilitated work on the columns as they rose higher. On the Brilliant side of the river, poles were erected and the cement was hoisted by elevator with the aid of a donkey engine. On the Ooteshenie side, there was much less room. The engineer arranged for a large derrick with a boom and a bucket which held two wheelbarrows of cement. The boom would swing from the cement mixer to the wooden forms where the concrete was poured.

Much of the initial assembly began on the Brilliant side of the river. Here the cables were laid out, measured for length, and cut. After the cables were suspended, the artisans and labourers started to work on segments of the bridge decking. On the advice of the engineer, they drilled holes for bolts and made some adjustments in the slight arching planned for the span.¹⁹ The next stage of the job was the most difficult: that of moving the deck sections into position on the bridge. Peter Reibin described this process:

When the cables were in place at the river, the bridge segments were moved to the river for final assembly. A cable was strung a little higher than the others and four men, two on each side and end of the bridge, sitting on small seats which were fastened to the cable, hooked rods first to the large cables and then to the bridge frame. This was one of the more

*dangerous jobs. After the rods were fastened, rails were bolted to the steel crossbeams. After three or so cross beams were in place we would proceed with the bridge deck; stringers, joists and flooring. We worked from both ends of the bridge in sections until both sides came together.*²⁰

In spite of the danger, no injuries were reported here or on any other part of the project.

The bridge was completed in October 1913 at a cost of about 60,000 dollars, of which the provincial government furnished 19,500 and the Doukhobors the rest. While the roadway was open to the public, it was clearly intended mainly for the use of the Doukhobors who took the main responsibility for its upkeep. About six months after completion, they put up a sign at the Brilliant end, which became a well-known expression of their principles. The inscription read: "Strictly Prohibited Smoking and Trespassing with Firearms over this Bridge."²¹

The Technological Significance of the Bridge

Ideally suited to the rough terrain of the British Columbia interior, suspension bridge technology was first used in the province in the design of the Alexandra Bridge, which was built in 1863 over the Fraser River near Spuzzum. This was the forerunner of many more structures of this type. By the early 20th century, a standardized design had emerged for suspension spans of moderate length of between 270 and 450 feet. These structures utilized wire suspension cables, steel stiffening trusses and usually included steel bent towers. At least four such bridges were built in British Columbia between 1910 and 1913.²²

The Brilliant Bridge was similar to the other suspension structures being built in British Columbia, except that it incorporated reinforced concrete in the tower foundations. Use of strengthened concrete for structural purposes was only then being introduced into bridge design. The earliest bridge in Canada known to have utilized the technology was the Canal Lake Concrete Arch bridge built across the Trent-Severn Waterway in Eldon Township, Ontario, in 1905. This structure was recommended for commemoration by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada in 1988.²³

Reinforced concrete was rarely used before the First World War. Indeed, in the same period that the bridge at Brilliant was being built, engineers of the Toronto Public Works Department were still so inexperienced with the process that they argued against its use in the construction of the Prince Edward Viaduct across the Don River. By the 1920s, reinforced concrete was to become the material of choice among bridge builders. In this sense then, the Brilliant bridge was near the cutting edge of design. An engineer and historian of bridge technology who recently studied the bridge commented "from the condition of the towers after nearly 80 years in service, the designers and builders ... had a much better appreciation of concrete construction than was usual at that date."²⁴

The Board has already evaluated the significance of two suspension bridges built across the Fraser River in British Columbia in the early 20th century. The structures studied were the Lillooet Bridge, which was built in 1910-11, and the second Alexandra Bridge, erected in 1926. The former was of a standard design with steel bent towers. It was not recommended for designation. The Alexandra Bridge had the more modern innovation of strengthened concrete towers. Though it was on the route of the historic Cariboo Road, it was not recommended for recognition.²⁵ Because of the

Brilliant Bridge's comparatively early use of reinforced concrete, however, it seems more interesting technologically than either of these structures.

The Bridge, Transportation, and Economic Development, 1913-1995

Poised between the communities of Brilliant and Ooteshenie, the bridge played an important role as part of the Doukhobor economic network and the local system of transportation for more than fifty years.

The Doukhobors made a significant contribution to commercial development in the West Kootenay region through their involvement in farming and the forestry industry. They were at the heart of fruit production, which was an important sector of the economy, especially before the end of the 1930s. Lumbering provided fuel and wood products needed by the mining industry and the railways. At first producing for their own needs, the Doukhobors began selling lumber for profit during the First World War and, afterwards, continued to supply forestry products for many decades. By 1948, there were still nine Doukhobor sawmills in operation in the area and the other sawmills in the vicinity relied greatly on Doukhobor labour. Brilliant was a major economic centre in this system: in it were the jam factory and flour and saw mills, all located close to the railway link which ran through the town and carried produce and supplies in and out of the West Kootenay region. In this system, the Brilliant bridge was important chiefly for transporting agricultural produce and supplies back and forth between the farming land on the east side of the river and the commercial centre on the west. While influential in forestry and farming, however, the Doukhobors had little involvement in the mining industry, which continued to be the major engine of the regional economy.²⁶

Until the late 1950s, the bridge at Brilliant continued serving chiefly the local transportation needs of the Doukhobors. The chief road in the area travelled south along the west bank of the Kootenay River, bypassing the Brilliant Bridge, and crossing the Columbia River at Castlegar by means of a ferry. While this road and the railway, the main means of transport in the region, were both on the west side of the river,²⁷ the Brilliant Bridge eventually enabled important development on the east side to occur. In 1957, it facilitated the establishment of the Castlegar airport in the Ooteshenie area, which greatly improved the transportation links in the whole region of West Kootenay. For the first time, the Brilliant Bridge began to be used regularly by non-Doukhobors, and the provincial Department of Transportation and Highways took responsibility for the structure.

The increased role of the bridge continued until 1966 when a new concrete span was built immediately downriver. The main road system now crossed the Kootenay River at Brilliant and then proceeded southward to Kinnaird where it crossed to the west bank of the Columbia by means of a second new bridge. While some interest was initially expressed in preserving the original Doukhobor structure, nothing was done and instead it was abandoned. At first used for pedestrian traffic, the wooden deck was later found to be in such poor condition from lack of maintenance that the provincial Ministry of Transportation and Highways tore down the trestle approach on the Brilliant side and barricaded the bridge in order to prevent its further usage. It has remained in this state until recently when interest began to grow in its restoration.²⁸

The Bridge and the Doukhobors: the Social Dimension

The Doukhobors are a multi-faceted religious and social movement which, during the 20th century, has fragmented into at least three discernible subgroups, which may be termed Orthodox, Independent, and Radical or Sons of Freedom. Intended to span the Kootenay River between two primarily Orthodox communities, the Brilliant Bridge was most closely associated with the aspirations of this main group, the largest and probably most influential of the three factions. For more than twenty-five years after its construction, the span facilitated the trading activities of a communal organization established by Peter Verigin, which itself represented a notable social experiment in Canadian history. After the demise of this system in 1939, the bridge facilitated the widening of ties between the Doukhobor settlements and the outside world.

Led by Peter V. Verigin, the main body of Doukhobors after 1908 attempted to establish a communal society having only minimal ties with the outside world. The plan had begun on the prairies where the land was worked in common for the benefit of all. In British Columbia, this system was taken a step further. The settlements there were to be fully collective, including the organization of Verigin's followers into communal residences, which had not been attempted on the prairies or even in Russia. To this end, the faithful were gathered in "village" or "family" units. Each consisted of two residences set side-by-side, containing in total between 60 and 100 people. Within each village, a network of members, mainly women, were available to help in raising the children. Meanwhile, the men were organized into co-operative groups to work in the fields or other local industries.²⁹

Verigin's goal was to create a system of communities which would be self-sufficient and hence protected from the interference of the outside world. To accomplish this, the Doukhobors made major investments in land and improvements designed to place agricultural and industrial production on a stable basis as soon as possible. Many of these investments were made in the Brilliant area, where the Doukhobors constructed the reservoir and irrigation system, the jam factory, and the suspension bridge. The cost of these projects was kept manageable by using volunteer Doukhobor labour rather than paid professional workers. The completion of the tasks represented a significant achievement for a pioneer community whose members had no known experience in these kinds of work: the highly motivated and organized nature of the workforce apparently allowed it to overcome its lack of professional expertise.

By 1913, there were about 8,000 people in the Orthodox settlements on the prairies and in British Columbia and a system of exchange had developed between these communities. Under Verigin's plan, the surplus industrial and agricultural production of each village was to be used for the benefit of other settlements as it was needed. To a great extent, the economic activities of the various communities complemented one another and thus it was not always necessary to go outside the Doukhobor settlements themselves to purchase necessities. The honey and fruit produced in British Columbia was transported by rail and exchanged for grain raised on the prairies. The excess of this production could be sold on the open market further to reduce the debt. Using these methods, the tightly-centralized communities organized under Verigin accumulated a substantial amount of wealth within a short time. In 1917 when the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood (CCUB) was formally incorporated to handle the financial affairs of Verigin's followers, it was capitalized at one million dollars. The organization still seemed to be on a firm financial footing at the time of Peter Verigin's death in 1924.³⁰

Ultimately, debt proved to be the Achilles' heel of the communal organization. More than \$40,000 had been expended on the Brilliant bridge, together with large expenditures for the construction of roads, irrigation facilities, the jam factory and other projects, all in addition to the original cost of the land in British Columbia. Special efforts were made to pay these debts. At the beginning, Verigin sent many of his followers out to work for employers in the region. Their resulting wages were then used almost exclusively to reduce the debt accumulated in establishing the new colonies. These efforts were successful in paying off the mortgage on the lands, but the overall financial burden remained heavy, in spite of the fact that a certain proportion of each man's income continued to be contributed to the community: Verigin tried to get aid from the province. In 1922, he sought \$30,000 for the bridge and additional compensation for the roads his people had constructed, arguing that these public works were of benefit to the region as a whole and not just to his communities. No funds were forthcoming, perhaps because the provincial government had already been antagonized by disputes with the Doukhobors over education, taxation, and registration of vital statistics, all areas where the Doukhobors were reluctant to accept the right of the state to intervene.³¹

By the 1930s, the financial burden was reaching crisis proportions. Further expenditures had been necessary for improvements to the jam factory and the irrigation system, and for repairs to damage done to community property by the Sons of Freedom, who believed the Orthodox group was becoming too materialistic. The financial problems became the main focus of Peter Christiakov Verigin, also known as "The Purger," who succeeded his father after arriving from the Soviet Union in 1927. He tried to increase efficiency by decentralizing the organization to allow more power to the various communities. While this might have improved morale, the effect was offset in part by his own erratic behaviour and unwise expenditures. As a result, morale plunged in the CCUB. During the 1930s, quarrels broke out between residents of particular settlements and their leaders, and people began to leave the organization in large numbers.³²

Ultimately, the economic depression of the 1930s destroyed the CCUB. With no hope of paying its creditors, by the late 30s it slid helplessly towards bankruptcy. In 1938, the Sun Life Assurance Company and the National Trust began foreclosure proceedings against the Doukhobor organization. The provincial government was willing and perhaps even eager to see the collapse of an institution with which they had sometimes been at odds. As a result, British Columbia did nothing to prevent the bankruptcy of the CLUB, but did act to prevent the social problem, which would have resulted from thousands of Doukhobors being thrown off their land. To avoid this, the province moved in 1939 to purchase the communal property for a fraction of the original cost and lease it back to the people living on it.³³

For the communities served by the Brilliant Bridge, the collapse of the CCUB marked a major change in their social organization and lifestyle. The main body of Doukhobors slowly evolved from a group segregated from modern society to one embracing more of the tenets of that world. The communal social organization of the communities in British Columbia gradually disintegrated. Left on their lands without equipment, working capital or title, Verigin's followers began to look outside their settlements for the employment necessary to sustain themselves.

In the changing milieu, the individual family soon became the main social unit and the faithful gradually lost contact with the land on which they resided. The Doukhobors made little effort to maintain the orchards or the old communal houses. Instead, they began to accept more of the materialistic trappings of the modern world such as clothing, cars, radio, and television. In this

new environment, the bridge became an element in the transportation system, which now facilitated the greater contact of the surrounding communities with the outside world.³⁴

The Doukhobors in these settlements continued to take steps to maintain their identity. Near the end of the CLUB, in 1938 they created the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ (USCC) to govern their affairs. Under the leadership of John J. Verigin, the grandson of Peter Christiakov, the USCC eventually negotiated the return of most of the land held by the provincial government. Faced with the ongoing resentment of the Doukhobors, the province in the early 1960s allowed them to buy back their properties on comparatively generous terms. This time, however, the property was held by individual Doukhobors rather than by a central organization.³⁵

Under the leadership of John Verigin, the Orthodox Doukhobors living in the Brilliant area and elsewhere have moved towards a greater acceptance of the modern world while retaining essential religious and cultural values. Since the 1930s, there has been a growing emphasis on the importance of literacy and on attaining higher levels of education. At the same time, the USCC has worked to maintain traditional cultural activities by organizing youth groups, Russian language classes, Sunday prayer meetings, and annual youth festivals. Religious principles have become the chief factor distinguishing most Doukhobors from other Canadian residents and pacifism has become the most-strongly advocated policy of the Doukhobors in the outside world. John Verigin has worked to create a relationship of mutual understanding between his community and their neighbours in British Columbia and elsewhere. Since the 1970s, the USCC has used the multicultural ideal to promote the survival of their customs while encouraging harmony with other Canadians.³⁶

In addition to the Orthodox group, at least two other factions, the Independents and Radicals, have been active within the Doukhobor movement in the 20th century. Both have their roots in the dissatisfaction with Peter Verigin's leadership felt by some Doukhobors soon after their arrival in Canada. The Independents tended to adhere to Doukhobor religious values and to the ideal of pacifism, but rejected the hereditary leadership of the Verigins and the degree of emphasis on communalism. They have tended to be much less numerous in British Columbia than on the prairies. A few persons began to leave the communal organization soon after the arrival of the Doukhobors in the mountains. The numbers grew during the 1920s and 30s when strife was severe within the CCUB, until in 1941 there were about 400 Independents in West Kootenay compared to approximately 3,600 Orthodox Doukhobors.³⁷ While less directly associated with the Brilliant Bridge than the Orthodox group, the Independents in the West Kootenay region have probably benefited from the presence of the bridge as a transportation link and have never been opposed to its existence, unlike some members of the radical Sons of Freedom faction.

The most controversial branch of the Doukhobor movement was the Sons of Freedom, founded in Saskatchewan in 1901. This faction eventually appeared in British Columbia in 1918 and soon became concentrated there. This was a devout group suspicious of any compromise with the ideals of piety and frugality and determined to renounce materialism as completely as possible. Early in the century, the Radicals demonstrated mainly on behalf of their own piety: nude marches reflected their belief in "Adamite simplicity." Burning of their own houses reflected their commitment to poverty and their aversion to materialism. Starting with a series of school burnings between 1923 and 1925, however, they also began to challenge the state and the legitimacy of the Orthodox Doukhobor leadership when these bodies were seen as threatening the purity of Doukhobor values.³⁸

By 1929, the largest communities of the Sons of Freedom were located at Gilpin near Grand Forks, and Krestova, a few kilometres north of Brilliant near the Slocan River. The sect was never a large one. By 1941, there were perhaps 1,600 members in the West Kootenay region, where they had their greatest strength. As most Doukhobors moved closer to the modern world, the Radicals became increasingly antagonized. Between the 1940s and 60s, they were associated with a growing number of acts of arson and sabotage-sometimes aimed at schools or other symbols of government interference, and sometimes at Orthodox Doukhobor structures, which were regarded as betrayals of the basic principles of simplicity and frugality. At Brilliant, the targets included the tomb of the Verigins, which was damaged on several occasions; the jam factory, destroyed by fire in 1943; and the suspension bridge, which was attacked unsuccessfully with dynamite in 1947.³⁹

This terrorist activity seems always to have been the work of a few within the sect and never to have been sanctioned by the leadership, for whom the violence was particularly embarrassing in view of the traditional Doukhobor commitment to pacifism. Since the 1960s, the frequency of acts of sabotage has declined and a subgroup of the Sons of Freedom, called the Reformed Doukhobors, has been formed which explicitly disavows violence. Yet, some acts of terrorism continue and the group as a whole remains opposed to the emphasis on materialism, which they believe the bridge and other such structures to represent.⁴⁰

* * *

The Brilliant Bridge's association with the Orthodox Doukhobors connects it to a significant social experiment in Canadian history. The main body of Doukhobors was one of a series of small Christian groups in the early 20th century including the Mormons, Mennonites, and Hutterites who attempted to establish self-contained utopian communities on the prairies and in British Columbia. All of these people were committed to the idea that, with God's help, man is perfectible and that the Kingdom of Heaven can be established on earth. While differing in their views of how this was to be accomplished, all attempted to set up discrete cohesive communities, isolated to some degree from the society around them.

The attempt of the Doukhobors to establish a communal organization was unusual. The Mormons and Mennonites were organized on the basis of individual property ownership. Among the utopian groups, only the Hutterian brethren, like the Doukhobors, resided in common houses and worked together on communal lands. Indeed, since the permanent arrival of the Hutterites in 1918, their small communities in Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan have been more successful economically than were the Doukhobor collectives and, partly as a result, the Hutterian communal system still survives to the present day.⁴¹ While the Doukhobor communal experiment thus was not unique, it was notable for its size and for the relative degree of success it achieved in the early part of the 20th century.

After the end of the communal organization in 1939, the Doukhobors began to struggle more vigorously with the dilemma of how to retain and express their religious ideals in a modern society. In most general terms, this was a dilemma faced by a variety of faiths, Christian and otherwise, in Canada in the middle of the 20th century. The challenge was to remain pious in the face of materialism and social and political institutions which threatened to drive a wedge between the faithful and their God. This question has engaged all three segments of the Doukhobor community, which by the 1990s amounted to about 30,000 people in Canada.⁴² For a small number of the Sons of Freedom group, the threat of materialism has justified an ongoing series of bombings and arson,

which have symbolized their repudiation of modern values. Ironically, however, the Orthodox and Independent Doukhobors have become more active in Canadian affairs, and some have argued, for instance, on behalf of pacifism, nonviolence, and nuclear disarmament in world affairs. In these ways, the Doukhobors have made an increasing contribution to Canadian life.

While chiefly associated with the Orthodox Doukhobors, the Brilliant suspension bridge has recently attracted attention extending beyond that community. The occasion has been a concerted effort to restore the bridge, led chiefly by Doukhobors, which has attracted a broad range of support embracing virtually all of the members of the faith in the West Kootenay region, with the exception of the Radicals who continue to account for a small proportion of the whole. A working group has been formed representing the Kootenay Doukhobor Historical Society; the USCG; the Canadian Society of Doukhobors - which has a membership among both Orthodox and Independent Doukhobors in the West Kootenay region; and the Doukhobor Cultural Association - which also cuts across factional lines. For all these people, the bridge has come to acquire a symbolic importance as a proud achievement of the Doukhobor movement during its pioneer phase in British Columbia. Andrew Davidoff, Liaison Officer of the Working Group, has written:

*The bridge represents the noble efforts of a pioneering culture and remains a symbolic relic and witness of that culture. Naturally, the culture affected strongly desires that the Bridge be restored and not be dismantled as is its only destiny if nothing is done to preserve it.*⁴³

The bridge then seems to be in the process of joining other structures and artifacts, most notably the Verigin tomb, as expressions of the cultural identity of the Doukhobors and as unifying factors in the preservation of that identity.⁴⁴ Next, this paper will look at the broader landscape of such features. What is the significance of the bridge in relation to the built heritage of the Doukhobors generally in Canada?

The Bridge and the Doukhobor Cultural Landscape

The Doukhobors have left a distinctive mark on the physical landscape of western Canada. In recent years, increasing interest has emerged within Parks Canada and on the part of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada in cultural landscapes, especially those that may have been influential in the larger pattern of Canadian development. In terms of influence the contribution of the Doukhobors was limited: their numbers were small and they did not have much effect on the settlement forms of other groups. Yet, to some extent on the prairies and, much more so, in British Columbia, they established complexes of buildings and other landmarks which were unusual and, in some cases, unique. The Doukhobors first left a significant imprint on the prairies. There, during the first decade of the 20th century, they established a series of agricultural villages, which, for the most part, did not survive the federal government confiscation of Doukhobor lands in 1907. The original village sites were in many instances then plowed under to make way for individual homesteading applications. Because these villages were so isolated and so short-lived, they were not included in the list prepared by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board in 1989, which described the settlement patterns deemed most influential in the evolution of the prairie landscape.⁴⁵

Perhaps the most important Doukhobor landmarks still remaining on the prairies are a series of community homes. These were central meeting-halls used for the prayer meetings or "sobranies" which were and are at the heart of the Doukhobor religion. Acting in 1977, the Board deferred

making a decision on the historical significance of these structures. Few have survived. The most impressive is that at Verigin, Saskatchewan. Built in 1917-8, this two-story building was larger and more elaborate than most, containing an assembly hall and residential space for the leader when he was in the area. Recognized by the Doukhobors as an important element of their heritage, the structure was converted into a museum in 1969, and later became a central part of the large National Doukhobor Heritage village, which opened in 1980.⁴⁶

The cultural landscape created by the Doukhobors was particularly distinctive in British Columbia. Here, it was dominated by the communal building complexes, which made up the village units, each consisting of two rectangular double-story residences, set side by side, and connected at the rear by outbuildings forming a U-shaped complex (see Figure 4). On the main floor of each residence were the living area and communal kitchen; on the second story were the family bedrooms. Around each village stretched its orchards and agricultural land, usually about 100 acres in extent. At the height of the CLUB, there were at least 74 such village units scattered throughout the British Columbia settlements.⁴⁷

A major collection of Doukhobor structures once existed in the area surrounding the Brilliant Bridge. At Ooteshenie on the east side of the Kootenay River stood the largest concentration of double houses in British Columbia: there were still 21 village units as late as 1948. On this side of the river too once stood the concrete reservoir and irrigation system used to provide water to the terraced orchards of the villages. The suspension bridge linked these settlements with more village units on the west bank and with the urban centre of Brilliant which contained the jam factory, leader's residence and office, railway station, and other buildings including flour and saw mills, boarding house, and community store. On the hillside overlooking the bridge stood the tomb of the Verigins.

Now, few of the elements of the Brilliant landscape remain. The jam factory and other commercial and industrial structures are gone. The irrigation system, the orchards, and most of the communal complexes on both sides of the river have also been allowed to decay and disappear. Today, only the bridge, the tomb, and several original communal houses still exist as important reminders of the early era.

This paucity of heritage resources is part of a pattern, which holds for the Doukhobor settlements generally in British Columbia. After the provincial government takeover of Doukhobor lands in 1939, the former residents continued to live in these complexes, but put little money into their upkeep, with the result that the houses gradually fell into disrepair. When the Doukhobors repurchased their lands after 1961, modern bungalows much like those in other parts of the province began to appear among the ruins of the former residences. By the 1980s, nearly all traces of the former communal culture had disappeared.

In these circumstances, the bridge at Brilliant stands as a particularly valuable remnant of a disappearing past. Partly for this reason, considerable support for its restoration has come not only from Doukhobors, but also from politicians and others in the region interested in heritage preservation. In co-operation with several levels of government, the restoration working group is planning a regional park in which the bridge would play a central role as a historical element and part of an extensive walking and trail network. To this end, the Regional District of Central Kootenay has agreed to acquire ownership of the bridge from the provincial Ministry of

Transportation and Highways. The provincial government has extended recognition and contributed funding for the restoration of the structure.

The first stage of the plan is to restore the bridge. BC Hydro has funded a comprehensive study of the bridge's structural components. Engineering studies have been completed by Cominco Engineering Services and Inter-Mountain Testing Limited which found the structure to be in remarkably good shape, requiring mainly the replacing of its wooden deck, a new trestle approach on the Brilliant side, and some repairs to the cables and anchor blocks at one end. At the time of writing of this report, much of the funding for the repairs has been raised and the working group hopes that the structural work, which should take about three months to complete, can be finished in time for the July 1995 centenary of the "Burning of Arms" ceremony, which marked the Doukhobors' renunciation of military service in Russia.

The restored bridge and park will complement a series of institutions already in place for commemorating Doukhobor history in Canada. In addition to the Doukhobor Heritage Village in Verigin, Saskatchewan, these include two museums in British Columbia. Privately developed during the 1970s, the Mountainview Doukhobor Museum in Grand Forks operates in a building originally erected as a community residence in 1912. In the immediate vicinity of the bridge itself is the Kootenay Doukhobor Historical Museum and Village in Ooteshenie. Opened in 1973, the museum complex contains a full size replica of a Doukhobor communal village including two buildings constructed to resemble original residences.

The Brilliant Bridge does not by its appearance immediately evoke the former milieu of community houses or orchards. Yet, it once constituted an important element facilitating travel and social ties between Doukhobor communities in the West Kootenay region. Its construction almost entirely by Doukhobor settlers was a major accomplishment for a pioneer community and demonstrated the considerable capabilities of a people acting communally. The structure itself was noteworthy for its early use of reinforced concrete. Today, it stands as one of the oldest surviving suspension bridges in the province and as an important symbol of achievement for most Doukhobors.

Endnotes

1. Mr. Pete Oglow, Director, Kootenay Doukhobor Historical Society, Castlegar, to Dr. Christina Cameron, Director General, National Historic Sites Directorate, 29 June 1994.
2. George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, The Doukhobors (Toronto and New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 224, 226; Malcolm E. Robinson, "The Russian Doukhobors in West Kootenay, British Columbia," MA thesis, Syracuse University, 1948, pp. 21, 24, 25; Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, "Thematic Study: A History of Mining in British Columbia," Agenda Paper No. 27, 1964, pp. 175-7; Koozma J. Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors (Grand Forks, B.C.: Mir Publication society, 1982), p. 99.
3. Ibid., pp. xi, 1-4; Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 17, 19.
4. Ibid., pp. 9, 21-2.
5. Ibid., pp. 60, 62-4, 69-71; Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, pp. 3, 5, 10-4.

6. See the *introduction* by Mark Mealing in L.A. Sulerzhitsky, To America with the Doukhobors, originally published 1905, *Canadian Plains Studies* No. 12 (Regina: University of Regina, 1982), p. 15; "Who Are the Doukhobors?" Manuscript enclosed in Oglow to Cameron, 29 June 1994.
7. Mealing, introduction in Sulerzhitsky, To America with the Doukhobors, pp. 17-8; Koozma J. Tarasoff, A Pictorial History of the Doukhobors (Saskatoon: Western Producer, 1969), p. 29; Lyle Dick, "Prairie Settlement Patterns: Preliminary Report," Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Agenda Papers, November 1984, p. 391; Lyle Dick, "A History of Prairie Settlement Patterns, 1870-1930," a study prepared for the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, August 1987, pp. 66-7, 136.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 138; Tarasoff, A -Pictorial History of the Doukhobors, pp. 30-1.
9. Ooteshenie is also spelled variously as Ootishenia or Oteshenia in some sources.
10. Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 226-9; Robinson, "The Russian Doukhobors in West Kootenay, British Columbia," pp. 62, 104, plates 12, 25.; Dick, "A History of Prairie Settlement Patterns, 1870-1930," p. 139; Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, pp. 102, 103.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 104, 106, 113, 120; Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 230-1, 233, 237; Vladimir Snesev (later Harry Trevor), The Doukhobors in British Columbia (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1931), p. 56.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 137; Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 237, 256, 287, 321, 330, 347; Gordon Kiyoshi Hirabayashi, "The Russian Doukhobors of British Columbia: A Study of Social Adjustment and Conflict," PhD thesis, University of Washington, 1951, pp. 7-8; Harry B. Hawthorn, editor, The Doukhobors of British Columbia (Vancouver: University of British Columbia and J.M. Dent & Sons (Canada) Limited, 1955), p. 9; Randy R. Rostecki and Janet Wright, "Doukhorbor Community Houses," Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Agenda Papers, 1977, pp. 463-4; Tarasoff, A Pictorial History of the Doukhobors, p. 32; Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, pp. 113, 164.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 99, 106; Robinson, "The Russian Doukhobors in West Kootenay, British Columbia," pp. 23-4, 29-30, 68-9, plate 15; Trail Creek News, 12 July 1913, quoted in Cyril Ozeroff, "The Brilliant Bridge," unpublished paper prepared for Dr. Mark Mealing, Selkirk College, December 1976, p. 12; I am indebted to Mr. Andrew Davidoff, Liaison Officer of the Brilliant Suspension Bridge Restoration Working Group for making this and other material available.
14. Nelson News, 12 June 1912, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 11; "General Layout of Suspension Bridge over Kootenay River at Brilliant, B.C." Cartwright, Matheson and Co., Engineers, Vancouver, B.C., 17 January 1913; Robert W. Passfield, "The Lillooet Suspension Bridge, Fraser River, British Columbia," Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Agenda Papers, 1982, p. 366.
15. William M. Rozinkin, "Historic Old Brilliant Bridge Soon to Disappear - Had Important Role in History of Area," from the Nelson Daily News, 10 June 1966, press clipping enclosed in Andrew M. Davidoff, Liaison Officer, Brilliant *Suspension* Bridge Restoration Working Group, to the author, 13 January 1995; Ozeroff, "The Brilliant Bridge," p. 14.

16. Interview with Peter A. Reibin, 12 December 1976, a carpenter who had worked on the construction of the bridge, transcript in *ibid.*, 21, 22; "General Layout of Suspension Bridge over Kootenay River at Brilliant, B.C." 17 January 1913; Rozinkin, "Historic Old Brilliant Bridge Soon to Disappear - Had Important Role in History of Area," Nelson Daily News, 10 June 1966.

17. "General Layout of Suspension Bridge over Kootenay River at Brilliant, B. C." 17 January 1913; interview with Reibin in Ozeroff, "The Brilliant Bridge," pp. 14-5; A.J. Cowell, P. Eng., Civil Engineering Manager, Cominco Engineering Services Ltd., "Brilliant Suspension Bridge - A Brief Historical Perspective," enclosed in Davidoff to the author, 13 January 1995; concerning the emergence of a standardized design for stiffening trusses, see Robert W. Passfield, "The Alexandra Suspension Bridge on the Fraser River, near Spuzzum, British Columbia," Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Agenda Papers, 1986, pp. 100, 104.

18. Rozinkin, "Historic Old Brilliant Bridge soon to Disappear - Had Important Role in History of Area," Nelson Daily News, 10 June 1966; Reibin in Ozeroff, "The Brilliant Bridge," pp. 17-8, 20, 22. 19. *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 20-1.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

21. The government of British Columbia contributed 10,000 dollars toward the cost of the bridge in the fiscal year 1912-3, and 9,500 in 1913-4 (Sessional Papers, British Columbia, Public Works Reports 1912-3 and 1913-4, reprinted in Ozeroff, "The Brilliant Bridge," pp. 13, 25, 26); see also Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, p. 106.

22. The four bridges were the Churn Creek bridge, Chilcotin bridge, and Lillooet bridge, all built over the Fraser, and in northern British Columbia, the bridge over the Hagueltgate Canyon and the Bulkley River near New Hazelton; see Passfield, "The Lillooet Suspension Bridge, Fraser River, British Columbia," pp. 366, 367, 369, 373, n. 25.

23. Robert W. Passfield, "Assessment of Canal Structures: the Trent-Severn Waterway," Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Agenda Papers, June 1988, pp. 14-6; Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Minutes, June 1988, p. 17.

24. Cowell, "Brilliant Suspension Bridge - A Brief Historical Perspective"; "The Prince Edward Viaduct: An Historic Site," Engineering Dimensions, March-April 1987, pp. 34-5; Jasper O. Draffin, "A Brief History of Lime, Cement, Concrete and Reinforced Concrete," Journal of the Western Society of Engineers, Volume 48 (March, 1943), pp. 14-47; I am indebted to my colleagues Arnold Roos and, especially, Robert Passfield for their references and *information* on this subject.

25. See Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Minutes, November 1982, p. 16 and June 1986, p. 27.

26. Robinson, "The Russian Doukhobors in West Kootenay, British Columbia," pp. 31, 38-42, 43-5, 47, 88-9, 91-2, 93, 101, 105. 27. *Ibid.*, pp. 46, 47, 55, and plate 6.

28. Ozeroff, "The Brilliant Bridge," pp. 28, 29; I am indebted to Dr. William Sloan, Selkirk College, Castlegar, for information on the road and bridge system; British Columbia Archives

and Records Service, Brilliant Bridge file, "Preservation of the Old Brilliant Bridge - Summary," c.1967.

29. Tarasoff, A Pictorial History of the Doukhobors, p. 31; Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, p. 106; "Who Are the Doukhobors?"; Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 235-6. 30. Ibid., pp. 229, 230, 231, 237.

31. Ibid., pp. 227, 230, 244-52, 255, 290.

32. Ibid., pp. 286, 288, 290-1, 292-4, 297, 305; Tarasoff, A Pictorial History of the Doukhobors, pp. 32-3.

33. Ibid.; "Who Are the Doukhobors?"; Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 297, 303-4, 306, 309-15.

34. Ibid., pp. 309, 322, 333-4; Hawthorn, editor, The Doukhobors of British Columbia, p. 17; Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, p. 167.

35. Tarasoff, A Pictorial History of the Doukhobors, p. 33; Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 335-9, 347, 348. _ 36. Ibid., pp. 333, 334, 349; "Who Are the Doukhobors?"

37. Robinson, "The Russian Doukhobors in West Kootenay, British Columbia," p. 61; Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 2402.

38. Ibid., pp. 243, 309-15

39. Ibid., pp. 309-16, 318-9, 322, 325-6; Robinson, "The Russian Doukhobors in West Kootenay, British Columbia," p. 61; Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, pp. 138, 179, 264.

40. Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 327-8, 333, 347; Dr. William Sloan, Selkirk College, personal commentary, 10 March 1995.

41. Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 11-2; I am indebted to my colleague Lyle Dick for his suggestions on this topic; for the settlement patterns created by each of these groups, see Dick, "A History of Prairie Settlement Patterns, 1870-1930," pp. 55-6, 67-8, 129-30, 139-40, 153-5; see also John Ryan, "Hutterites," in The Canadian Encyclopedia, second edition (Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1988), Volume 2, pp. 1031-2.

42. Koozma J. Tarasoff, "The Spirit Wrestlers," This Country Canada, Volume 4 (January 1994), p. 54; this was probably more than half of the world's total: there were still perhaps 20,000 in the area of the former Soviet Union, while a few hundred also resided in the western part of the United States.

43. Davidoff to Cliff Hewitt, Manager, British Columbia Heritage Trust, 7 April 1994, enclosed with Davidoff to the author, 13 January 1995.

44. For a discussion of the role of buildings, other objects, and rituals in preserving the identity of cultural communities generally in Canada, see Raymond Breton, The Governance of Ethnic Communities: Political Structures and Processes in Canada, Contributions in Ethnic Studies, Number 26 (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1991), pp. 140-1.

45. Dick, "A History of Prairie Settlement Patterns, 1870-1930," pp. 60-1, 136-7, 139, 161; Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Minutes, February 1989, pp. 13-4.

46. Rostecki and Wright, "Doukhobor Community Houses," pp. 463-5, 468-9, 470; Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, pp. 228-30, 264.

47. Ibid., pp. 106-10; Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, p. 235.

48. Ibid., pp. 230-1, 321; Robinson, "The Russian Doukhobors in West Kootenay, British Columbia," pp. 68-9 and plate 15; Andrew Davidoff, personal commentary, 14 February 1995; Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, pp. 113, 120.

49. Ibid., p. 167; Hawthorn, editor, The Doukhobors of British Columbia, p.17; Tarasoff, A Pictorial History of the Doukhobors, p. 158; Rostecki and Wright, "Doukhobor Community Houses," p. 464.

50. In addition to the Doukhobor organizations listed earlier, the heritage associations involved include the Castlegar and District Heritage Society and the British Columbia Heritage Society, The Tourism Action Society in the Kootenays, and the Kootenay-Columbia Interpretive Society have also expressed interest in the project.

51. Davidoff to the author, 13 January 1995; Davidoff, personal commentary, 12 January 1995 and 3 February 1995.

52. Ibid.; Davidoff to Hewitt, 7 April 1994; the total projected funding is \$140,000 of which approximately 75,000 had been raised at the time of writing.

53. Tarasoff, Plakun Trava: The Doukhobors, pp. 227-8, 230, 264; Davidoff, personal commentary, 14 February 1995.

----- end of document -----