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ABSTRACT

Talking Back to the West:
Contemporary Aboriginal Artists and Strategies of Counter-appropriation

Christina Froschauer

Over a twenty-year period, renowned artists such as Edward Poitras, Robert Houle, Jim Logan, Kent Monkman, among others, appropriate renowned colonial landscape paintings and art historical canonical works, and then alter them to include First Nations narratives, as methods of critiquing the exclusionary nature of grand colonial narratives and their associated historical, art historical and, by extension, anthropological discourses. Using counter-appropriation as an artistic strategy, they critique: the West’s disregard for First Nations histories in North America; Art History’s past failures to classify their art objects as Fine Art; and contemporary cultural constructions of “Indianness” originating from colonial history and ideologies about the “Vanishing Race.” With their works, the artists offer their viewers insight into First Nations histories and stories, thereby enriching the multiple narratives and pluralist discourses existent in North America.
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Introduction

As a part of an installation in Vancouver’s artist-run center ArtSpeak, in 1989, Métis artist Edward Poitras presented a black and white photocopy of French painter Nicolas Poussin’s painting *Et in Arcadia Ego* (1637-1638). Upon his photocopied version, Poitras painted over the human figures with white paint, ‘whiting them out’ of the image.

Poussin’s original 17th century painting (figure 1) illustrates three shepherds kneeling or crouching in front of a tomb, and pointing to an engraved inscription: *Et in Arcadia Ego*, as a female figure looks on beside them. The image is set in the symbolic and idyllic land of Arcadia, which was glorified during Poussin’s time for its unspoiled wilderness and simple pastoral lifestyles, an Edenic paradise.¹ *Et in Arcadia Ego* is a latin phrase meaning, “I too (was there) in Arcadia.” The figures in Poussin’s painting, read the tombstone’s message symbolizing that in the idyllic Arcadian life there is also death; the tombstone’s proprietor once experienced this Arcadian paradise also.²

Altering the name of the work to *Et in America Ego* (1989) (I too (was there) in America), Edward Poitras version of the painting (figure 2) draws the viewer’s attention to the Americas, its colonial history and notions of territoriality. Leaving the landscape of the painting untouched enables parallels to be drawn between the idyllic nature of 17th century Arcadia and the romanticized notion of the North American wilderness garnered by the 18th and 19th century appetites of the European explorers and colonizers. Continuing with this parallel, the tomb with the words still inscribed remains in Poitras’ image, inclining one to consider the ‘presence’ and ‘absence’ of First Nations people in
the wild New World. Recalling its making, Poitras states, “I was trying to alter it in such a way as to take out the ‘European’ and somehow maybe put in some ‘Indian’ content.”

Almost iconoclastic-like in gesture, Poitras’ removal of the human figures and title change, shifts the meaning and context of Poussin’s original intent for the piece, while simultaneously imparting new meanings. Edward Poitras’ artistic strategy in appropriating the image and recontextualizing it, is apparent in the practices of other Native artists like him, who are increasingly intervening with prominent artistic discourses (different than their own), and creating new contexts and meaning for their works, to include a Native presence.
History, Contemporary First Nations Artists and Counter-appropriation

Over the past century, Native traditional art works were subject to the scrutiny of the Western gaze of anthropologists and art historians. And Natives Peoples have been subjugated to dominant colonial powers. Colonization has resulted in centuries of misunderstandings, misconceptions, and misrepresentations of Indigenous cultures and their art objects in not only Canada, but also abroad. Changes in Canada’s culturally oppressive laws in the 1950s, civil rights movements and identity politics of the 1960s, an increased awareness through postcolonial theory since the 1980s, and for proper representation of Native art and culture in the museum setting since the early 1990s, have led to dramatic shifts in the lives of First Nations people in Canada. These events have contributed to a revival in both culture and tradition, as well as in the development of a Native art history and new forms of artistic expression led by innovative artists such as Norval Morrisseau and Alex Janvier.

Frantz Fanon’s article “On National Culture” (1967) suggests that the way for a suppressed culture to evolve, sustain itself, and gain power, under hegemonic colonial societies, is through the recognition, strength, and awareness of one’s own cultural past and tradition. The only way a culture can continue to exist however, he suggests, is to be cognizant of the changes that have occurred to that nation under colonial rule. To attempt to enliven abandoned or past traditions (as they were pre-colonial times), Fanon indicates, is to ignore the years of Western domination upon one’s culture, which opposes
the current condition of one’s own people. Fanon affirms that one’s focus should include modernity and the realities of the present day, and that one should remain cognizant of the dominant colonial influences imposed on one’s culture as opposed to resorting to the ‘non-existing’ past. As he relates this to art and literature, Fanon suggests that the artist should consider their past cultural traditions as well while also allowing for the present modified condition of his/her culture. These innovations, he implies, should be applied to the artwork and creative process.

Thirty years later, Homi Bhabha’s theoretical discourse elaborates upon Fanon’s ideas of the postcolonial prerogative to define what he outlines as a hybrid space. In *The Location of Culture* (1994), Bhabha explores the need for the marginalized individual to exist and function within the space of the ‘beyond.’ Bhabha defines this as an “intervening,” “in-between” and “intersecting” space, where an individual or collective exists at the interstice of tradition/origin, as well as within the contemporaneity of one’s culture. It is within an articulation of this space that both Fanon and Bhabha propose that individuals and/or collectivities can initiate new and innovative identities and cultures, where new ‘self-hoods’ can be elaborated. In Fanon’s discussion on art, he suggests that the artist should no longer reproduce versions of the pre-colonized traditional work, for that would most likely be faced with scrutiny of the colonizer, and not contribute to the evolution of one’s own nation. In this way, both theorists emphasize that the role of post-colonial artists is to create anew, to invent new cultural forms for the future.
Over the past forty years, Native artists have investigated ways to creatively express their varied realities by expanding on their cultural concerns: identity politics, land claim issues, the effects of forced religion, environmental concerns, sexuality, education, integration, and more. Pooling from Native tradition and postmodern modes of expression, as discussed by Fanon and Bhabha, contemporary artists have been gaining recognition nationally and internationally for their works in abstraction (Alex Janvier and Robert Houle), politically charged performance and video works (Rebecca Belmore and Kent Monkman), hybridized subjects articulated through sculpture and painting (Brian Jungen and Sonny Assu), and identity based photography (Shelly Niro), to name a few.

How Aboriginal artists are creating works of art over the past sixty years, have led to a multitude of stylistic tendencies and creativity across all disciplines of the arts. While some maintain traditional Native styles, forms, purpose and meaning in execution, as is seen in the works of Bill Reid for example, others amalgamate traditional styles with contemporary modes of execution creating new forms, what Homi K. Bhabha deems as hybrid in style, as is seen in the work of Robert Davidson, Laurence Paul Yuxweluptun, Norval Morriseau, Nadia Myre, and Sonny Assu, among many others. Increasingly common today is the use of modern and conceptual postmodern strategies of artistic execution, commonly viewed in the works of Carl Beam, Jane Ash Poitras, Rebecca Belmore, and Alex Janvier. Stepping away from traditional forms of Native artistic
expression, this latter group of artists uses their practice as an outlet for personal or political messages.

African postcolonial theorist, Olu Oguibe, refers to this latter category of artistic expression as reverse appropriation. Like Franz Fanon, Oguibe believes that in the postcolonial condition of art creation, the artist must not revert back to traditional modes of expression, so as to no longer perpetuate notions of otherness in the face of hegemonic cultures, but rather they must move forward and appropriate modern modes of Western art execution as a way to end omissive principles. He writes, the artist must, “[…] possess the contested territory by mastering the forms and techniques of Western artistic expression in order to cross out the ideological principles resident in its exclusivity.”

While many First Nations artists in Canada continue to execute traditional modes of expression, as previously mentioned, many contemporary artists are utilizing Western modern and postmodern modes of expression. Among them, a select handful of First Nations artists take what Oguibe calls reverse appropriation one step further, and they share in one unique strategy of art making: counter-appropriation.

For a twenty-year period, a select number of contemporary First Nations artists in Canada, like Edward Poitras, and artists after him, have been using a similar strategy of appropriation in their work, but expanding beyond Oguibe’s theories. They replicate renowned colonial landscape paintings and/or canonical works from the history of
Western art, and then alter them to include their own narratives about history and contemporary experience. Adding distinguishing elements to these images – using methods of humoristic intervention, surprise interruption, and radical response – the artists convey new meanings and interpretations within each work. Edward Poitras did so by erasing the figures in the idyllic landscape and symbolically removing European presence in North America, in his take on Poussin’s painting. This type of appropriation I refer to throughout this document as counter-appropriation. This concept, borrowed from modern Asian Art Historical theory, is one that I will return to later in the text. The strategy of counter-appropriation is being used by renowned artists of First Nations ancestry such as Edward Poitras, Robert Houle, Jim Logan and Kent Monkman, and more, as artistic interventions - critiques of the exclusionary nature of prominent colonial narratives and their associated historical, art historical, and by extension, anthropological discourses. This thesis focuses on the artistic practices of artists Jim Logan and Kent Monkman, who apply this strategy in large series of works. Each artist uses their own unique approach in their bodies of work to address similar and different issues concerning North American history and colonization, while simultaneously creating their own historical and contemporary constructs for the past and present. Several First Nations artists employ counter-appropriation as a strategy in their work, as can be seen in the art of Robert Houle and his version of Benjamin West’s, *The Death of General Wolfe* (1770) and in Theresal Marshall’s version of Charles Comfort’s *Captain Vancouver* (1938) for example, but Logan and Monkman have dedicated entire series of paintings using this artistic approach, and thus why their bodies of work are prominent in this text.
Jim Logan’s *Classical Aboriginal* Series (1991), comprised of twenty-two paintings, appropriates select paintings and sculptures from the Western canon, including works from revered artists dating as far back as Leonardo Da Vinci, Raffael and Michelangelo to the more recent prints by Andy Warhol. He then adds to, and changes these images to include Aboriginal content. Kent Monkman’s work investigates, in a way different than Logan, the impact of colonial history and hegemony on Native culture. Using mimicry as a means to cajole past narratives, the *Moral Landscape* (2001 - ) series targets a specific period – the eighteenth and nineteenth century - when racism and Euro-centric ideologies threw First Nations histories and art to the wayside. A time when Indigenous stories were not written into the discourse of history, Aboriginal cultural goods became objects for anthropology collections, and First Nations art was ignored by the Western canon. Monkman incorporates his alter-ego, Miss Chief Eagle Testickle, and creates mythic narratives in his paintings as a means to disrupt this past, drawing the viewers attention to a formative and yet misinformed period in history.

If First Nations artists use creative expression as a means to voice their contemporary experiences, why, for over eighteen years, have they borrowed imagery from Western canonical artists and North American colonial landscape painters? Who is this work addressing, and what are they communicating to their audiences, the Canadian and the European audience, the Western art historian and the Native art historian, and finally, to the international audience? What issues are these artists and their diverse works addressing and what are their contributions to the telling of history?
European settlers in North America possess a longstanding history of appropriation, with multiple layers and levels, stretching as far back as colonization of the New World. Scholarship addressing appropriation would describe this process as one where the dominant social power takes and possesses something from a group with lesser power in the society, and claims it as their own, most commonly without the permission of the owner. Beginning with taking possession of the land from Aboriginals, to collecting culturally significant objects in the 19th century, to the appropriation of Native American imagery and designs in the 20th century, North American colonial history is entrenched with appropriative acts.

In Canada today, appropriation of Aboriginal imagery is so common that we hardly even bat an eyelash at its occurrence. The First Nations art works lining the corridors of our airports, commercialized totem poles and tipis filling shelves of tourist shops, children’s toy sets based on Native stereotypes, are just a few examples of this phenomenon. Even though the Canadian government put cultural bans on Native communities and forced them to assimilate to Euro-culture in the late 1800s, Canada did not hesitate to ‘own’ Native imagery as a form of advertising itself to the rest of the world – since the time of North American Indian displays at World Fairs, to today’s anthropomorphized inukshuk symbolizing the Vancouver 2010 Olympic games. The practice of hegemonic society appropriating from the cultures of lesser power, or more definitively the West appropriating from the non-West, the colonizer from the colonized, the majority from the minority, is an ongoing practice. But, what if these power structures were reversed, and the minority were to appropriate from the majority, or the colonized from the colonizer?
Then you may be witness to unique strategies surfacing in the works of contemporary First Nations artists like: Kent Monkman, Jim Logan, Robert Houle, and Edward Poitras.

The developing scholarship of the past twenty years has primarily focused on surveying the progress of contemporary Native art and the development of First Nations Art History. Despite the number of artists practicing this form of appropriation, intervention, and reversal (or counter-appropriation), few art historians or First Nations scholars have written about this method or strategy used by Poitras, Houle, Monkman, and Logan. First Nations Art History is still in its infancy, resulting in a meager vocabulary and discourse available about the subject. Aboriginal art historians Janet C. Berlo and Gerald McMaster advocate a great need for in depth research which specifically addresses particular issues surfacing in contemporary art works, and urge for an expansion of artistic discourse relevant to the discipline. While catalogue essays have briefly touched upon the subject, no academic research has thus far addressed this unique strategy figuring in the works of these and other distinguished Native artists in Canada. With gaining recognition for contemporary Native art on a national and international level, developing a discourse becomes increasingly important; these artists and their ancestors have contributed significantly to the development of Canadian heritage and identity, and continue to play major roles in representing Canada abroad.

Authors briefly exploring contemporary First Nations artists featured in this study or other artists dealing with appropriation in their works, are Allen J. Ryan, who touches on
Jim Logan’s and Edward Poitras’ practices; Homi K. Bhabba discusses Brian Jungen’s work as it relates to a third space; and David Furnish’s and David McIntosh’s exploration of Kent Monkman’s Moral Landscape Series and his interrogations into the authenticity of colonial painters.

Canadian art historian, Allen J. Ryan, dedicated a body of research to the notion of irony and humour featured in the works of several contemporary Aboriginal artists in his book The Trickster Shift (1999). In Chapter 3, “Subverting the Systems of Representation,” Ryan investigates the unique strategies used by Edward Poitras and Jim Logan, and argues their purpose in using this technique is to subvert the dominant systems of representation as a humoristic method of dealing with and including Indians into the greater language of Art History. He suggests they are parodies, playful reversals. Terms Ryan uses to describe Poitras’ and Logan’s methods of borrowing imagery are “positive-negative” or “brazen appropriation and Indianization” of the works. He writes, “…Métis artist Edward Poitras and Jim Logan employ a positive-negative strategy to interrogate the exclusive and exclusionary nature of the Western canon.” Ryan’s research skims the surface of these ideas, as the main focus of the book lies in the symbols of irony or humour as methods, rather than an in depth analysis about the strategy the artists are choosing to subvert the dominant systems of representation as ways to convey new meanings.

Brian Jungen uses a different technique in his art practice. Rather than borrowing imagery from a previous time, in Prototypes for a New Understanding (1998 – 2003), Jungen reinvents objects. He uses a contemporary mainstream commodity item, the Nike
shoe, deconstructs it seam by seam, and reconstitutes it for a new function – a traditional Northwest Coast Native mask. His practice, although different from Logan and Monkman, is relevant as it relates to the work of Poitras, Monkman and Logan because they appropriate first from another culture or time period and then they alter them to create a new meaning, or in Jungen’s case, a new purpose for the final product. When asked about whether Jungen’s approach is to bring together two cultures (contemporary commodity culture and traditional native culture) creating a discourse between them, post-colonial theorist Homi K. Bhabha argued his approach as being “[…] continually a discourse of two different kinds of cultural iconicity, opening up a whole third area, even a virtual area of representation, which questions or interrogates the larger question of object, culture, consumption and fetishization.” I would argue Bhabba’s “third area” concept could also be applied to Poitras, Houle, Monkman, Logan and other artists practicing in this way as they not only create a discourse between the past and the present, but they also create a “new story.” In the case of these artists however, they examine historical exclusion and inclusion, current representation, and the impacts of colonial hegemony, as their greater overall projects.

In two separate articles featured in contemporary art magazines, authors David Furnish and David McIntosh survey Monkman’s artistic practice – performance, video, and paintings. Each author describes, in their own words Monkman’s performance works and Moral Landscapes. Furnish characterizes Monkman’s artistic strategy as a “contemporary reinterpretation of aboriginal culture and reinforcing it in a classical setting.” Under a different categorization, McIntosh offers, “[Monkman] undermine[s] and reconfigure[s]
the simulacral history of dominance through representational slight of hand."27 While the authors offer interesting descriptions for Monkman’s approach, neither author attempts to classify this strategy of appropriation and reinterpretation.

First Nations art historical scholarship is still emerging, as previously mentioned. Few have developed terms to classify the artistic approaches used by Kent Monkman, Jim Logan, Robert Houle, and Edward Poitras. When I came across John Clark’s expansion into modernization of Asian art, it became apparent how relevant his concept of counter-appropriation could be when applied to contemporary First Nations artists. To clarify, this terminology has never been employed to describe artistic strategies of North American aboriginals, rather it was a term first coined by modern and contemporary Asian art historian, John Clark, and used as a way to describe an artistic strategy and execution perceived in the work of modern Asian artists. He explains:

Counter-appropriation is a discursive process where art styles, contents or practices are borrowed from one art discourse into another, and then used to situate the art of the second discourse in terms of the first. This is both with the intention of broadening, even radically reconstructing the second discourse, but also of privileging its contents and intentions inside the discourse from which the borrowing originally took place. Since art discourses are much more flexible in practice than the overall cultural hegemony presumed of the art discourse from which the borrowing took place, usually associated in the 19th century with colonial domination, counter-appropriation is pre-eminently the way the art of the colonized looked back at, and claimed its own authority from, the art discourse of the colonizer.28

The practice of counter-appropriation in art, he suggests, not only references the context from which the borrowing is occurring, but also, as the original image is displaced and altered, new meanings incur.
Clark’s theory uses Werner Kraus’ study of the work of Indonesian artist Raden Salleh (1811-1880), a Javanese painter, as an example of counter-appropriation. Kraus’ article *First Steps to Modernity: The Javanese Painter Raden Saleh (1811-1880)* describes the artist’s experience and reaction to colonialism in Java.²⁹

When Raden Saleh first viewed Dutch painter Nicolaas Pieneman’s *Subjugations of Diponegoro* (1830) (figure 3), he recognized the conceptual nature of history. He felt Pieneman’s historical painting of Diponegoro’s arrest, was inaccurate and reflected Dutch superiority, rather than rightly portraying the Javanese experience. Pieneman’s work depicting the arrest of Java’s last rebel hero, Deponegoro, celebrates the glory of the Dutch and their superiority over Java - Dutch gains and Javanese losses. Disheartened by this portrayal of history, Saleh created his own version of the events in *The Arrest of Diponegoro* (1857) (figure 4) and recreated the image to reflect his point of view of the events. His version indicates a different treatment for the moment, in both composition and emotion.³⁰

*Kanata* (1992) (figure 5), the large painting by Saulteaux artist, Robert Houle, counter-appropriates Benjamin West’s historical painting *The Death of General Wolfe* (1770). Like Saleh, Houle critiques the significant historical events recorded by the hands of biased artists, specifically in this example, Benjamin West. He manipulates original
historical paintings as a way of reclaiming history. Houle felt strongly about exploring creative ways to do this and his practice focused on re-working Eurocentric art and written texts. Quoting Houle about his practice he state it is, “[…] a rewriting and re-thinking of history, and of how I position myself as an aboriginal artist, or as an aboriginal person.”

*The Death of General Wolfe* is a historical record, painted eleven years after of the death of British General Wolfe during Battle of Quebec in 1759. The various men in mourning – officers and soldiers surround, stand, lean toward or support the General - forming a triangular composition in the painting. General Wolfe and the flag above him are the focal point of the image, set in a backdrop of a battle torn landscape with numerous men. The only First Nations figure looking on was placed in the bottom left corner of the painting, and the sole individual seated on his knees, occupying the lowest placement of all figures in the frame.

Houle addresses numerous important elements in the counter-appropriation of Benjamin West’s work, including: French, English and First Nation’s relationships, accuracy of historical documentation, historical fact and fiction, and more. For the sake of brevity, however, we will solely consider how Houle addresses the First Nations character in his counter-appropriation of Benjamin West’s work. Houle sees this individual as cast by
Benjamin West and other colonial painters, in the role of voyeur in Canadian history, one that has watched passively as colonization of the New World unfolds.

Using colour effectively, Houle shifts the focus from General Wolfe, to the key figure in his work: the crouching Native character. Houle’s replication changes the colourful original to resemble a black and white image, but instead of black, he uses a tan brown colour. Singling out the First Nations individual, Houle highlights in coloured paint the dress and adornment of the Native individual, causing him to stand out from the otherwise bland and subdued image. Houle’s version of the painting effectively shifts the viewer’s gaze from the central figure, General Wolfe of the original painting, and changes the focus to the decorated and colourfully adorned Native man (now central to the image).

In *Kanata*, Houle underlines the historical marginalization of the Native people by heightening the allegorical reading of the painting. In so doing, he is drawing on the constructed Native presence in history - often the general appearance of First Nations people in art - and targets this matter as symbolic of patriarchy and the conquest.

What Houle and the other Native artists featured in this text are confronting, is the idea that history is a construct of humanity. This notion can also be applied to North American colonial history, whereby the notions of the past were very much formulated by the ideas of the explorers, colonialists and settlers of European descent, and these
voices have evolved to inform mainstream understandings of history.\textsuperscript{34} We are a witness to it in colonial depictions of history, and more specifically for the purpose of this discussion, within the frameworks of art institutions and art history.\textsuperscript{35}

History does not describe a true situation,\textsuperscript{36} and therefore we must question mainstream stories. The contemporary body of works by Edward Poitras, Robert Houle, Jim Logan and Kent Monkman challenge Canadian mainstream longstanding notions and concepts of history. Their art practices force us to reconsider the ‘constructed’ New World history, and confront our belief systems as we have been led to understand them. Through the creation and display of their paintings, these artists aim to establish power and recognition for their own individual voice, and in so doing they reinforce respect for their own individual cultures as well as for First Nations history.

Creating a new image, Saleh eliminated the colonial constructs present in Pieneman’s work, and in turn illustrated his own ideas about the same event in history. Saleh’s counter-appropriation of Pieneman’s painting is not all that dissimilar to how Jim Logan and Kent Monkman, as well as Edward Poitras and Robert Houle use this artistic approach. Like Saleh, these Native artists use counter-appropriation and challenge the concepts and paradigms of dominant history of North America laid out by Western artists, art historians, anthropologists, and historians as they relate to the inclusion or exclusion of Native presence and stories within North America. The artists use counter-
appropriation as a strategy to recall specific periods within North American history and their associated discourses. Intervening with the original imagery, and “Indianizing” them helps reverse the gaze of their colonial or canonical ideals, and shift their value to the First Nations references within them, thus creating new meanings, as suggested by Clark.

Western-centric imperialism, foundations in 19th century anthropology and ethnography, exclusionary museum and art historical practices, and images of the “imaginary Indian” have contributed to misunderstandings and misrepresentations of First Nations people and their art for centuries. Historical events and colonial imperialistic ideologies helped shape and inform today’s reception of Aboriginal peoples and their cultures. These remnants manifested within our society and institutions are what Poitras, Houle, Monkman and Logan respond to in their work.

**Jim Logan and The Classical Aboriginal Series**

If one were to peruse the table of contents in the sixth edition of Janson’s *History of Art* (2003) one would discover the volume follows a chapter-to-chapter linear and chronological progression of Western Art History from thirty thousand years ago to today. Aside from offering a few chapters on prehistoric art, art of the ancient Near East, and Egyptian art in the nine hundred plus paged text, there is little consideration given to non-Western art. Undergraduate survey classes in Canada today, use these introductory texts, teaching the next generation of art historians the canon of Western Art History.
from Janson, chapter by chapter from ancient times to American modernisms. The presentation of prehistoric objects in the preliminary chapters of Janson’s art history, includes cave paintings, fertility statues, relief carvings, and the like, all preceding European developments in art, designate these alternative forms of artistic expression to a time-locked past. Dismayed and struck by Janson’s supposedly comprehensive text, Jim Logan, a Canadian artist of First Nations descent, responds to this Western order by producing a series of works called *The Classical Aboriginal Series* (1991-1992).

This series, made up of twenty-two paintings, appropriates the works of famous European and American artists over a five hundred year period - including Michelangelo, Leonardo Da Vinci, Andy Warhol, and others. Logan changes the images by “Indianizing” them. To make them Indian as the artist says, he replaces the main European figures in all these works with Indigenous characters. Logan’s interventions into the canon of art history serve to position First Nations culture within the five hundred year period he references. Calling this body of work “Native perspectives 101” he introduces a broad spectrum of subjects: religion, myth, environmental concerns, social issues, stereotypes, among others. Complex and multilayered, Logan’s work is filled with symbols, subjects, and icons that not only reflect his own personal experience as a Métis Cree, but also touches on the lives of many First Nations people across North America. Logan’s goal is to reclaim a space for aboriginal artists in Canadian art historical discourses and offer alternate perspectives on a 500 year history.
Jim Logan’s work is a direct response to an ongoing Western-centric history, a Euro-centered art history, and the closed institutional frameworks in Canada. The first part of this section takes a closer look at his work and the methods Jim Logan uses to appropriate and interrupt certain canonical works, and to explore elements of indigenous identity and history added to them as a part of their Indianization. While the vastness of Logan’s project does not permit a close examination of each work, I will expand on a few paintings to illustrate how Logan engages with Native histories. The second part of this section investigates the context for First Nations contemporary art in Canada in order to gain a greater understanding of the driving forces underlying Jim Logan’s strategies as an artist.

Born in 1955 to a Cree father and Métis mother, Logan has played an active role advocating a positive awareness for First Nations communities, not only through his paintings, but also by working within art institutions. As a member of the now disbanded Society of Canadian Artists of Native Ancestry (SCANA) in the late 80s and early 90s, a curator in residence at the Gallery of Nova Scotia in 2000, and currently, as a Visual Arts Officer at the Canada Council for the Arts, Logan’s personal and professional politics have long promoted inclusion, repatriation, proper representation, and understanding for First Nations artists and their works within the Canadian artistic sphere.
Using both famous art historical works and elements of Indigenous culture to communicate meaning, Logan confronts the realities facing Aboriginal artists in Canada. Logan selects images that art historians, curators, gallery directors, and the general public would undoubtedly recognize, such as Leonardo Da Vinci’s *Mona Lisa* (ca.1503-1519), or Édouard Manet’s *Déjeuner sur l’herbe* (1862-1863). The artist offers an interpretation and perspective of history that is dramatically different from what is suggested by the original works. He does so by changing titles, adding First Nations individuals as central figures, and by introducing items of cultural and personal significance. Logan’s counter-appropriation of the Western canon functions to reverse the works’ aesthetic and cultural ideals, and instead shift the value in favour of a set of First Nations references.

Logan’s personalized additions to these paintings include depictions of family members who are significant to him. *Memorial Blanket for Eddy (my Marilyn)* (1991) (figure 6), for example, merges the patterns of a traditional Plains robe with the serial prints reminiscent of Andy Warhol’s work. Instead of the multiple Marilyn Monroes typical of Andy Warhol’s artwork, the main figure here is Logan’s father, whose image is repeated eight times as a young soldier and eight times in his later adult years. Logan replicates Warhol’s artistic style through repetitive imagery as well as by means of applying bright colours. Eddy is set in front of a blanket made of vibrant geometric shapes in orange, red, yellow and blue. Painting robes and weaving geometric designs is an artistic tradition of Plains culture, a practice dating as far back as the 16th century. As many of the Plains people were nomadic, artistic expression and historical accounts commonly adorned
clothing, tipis, and regalia - all items easily carried from place to place. And bright
coloured yarn, paint, beads, and porcupine quills are used as ornamentation. The manner,
in which a blanket or a robe was decorated, by a man or a woman, reflected the
significance and history of the individual who wears it, symbolizing their achievements
and rank within a culture. This is particularly true for the men as they were warriors and
hunters. Berlo writes, “A man’s accoutrements composed an easily readable constellation
of signs making his rank in one of the warrior societies, as well as his individual military
honours.” Logan coupling a colourful blanket with the repeated portrait of his father
suggests an individual of high honour and status, a recognition deserving of his deeds in
life.

Eddy Logan was a World War II veteran, who, like many other Natives fighting for
Canada wasn’t recognized by the nation for his contributions to the war effort - not
receiving the same post-war benefits as other veterans. With this work, Logan draws
attention to the uneven and unsettling discrepancy between Marilyn Monroe’s celebrity
and the lack of societal consideration given to his father and by extension, other
Aboriginal efforts in fighting wars. This is an image dedicated to his father, and he
comments, “[…] my father always wanted to be someone important […] he wanted to be
famous. Even as a World War II veteran, he couldn’t even get into a legion. Realizing he
had his dreams slip away, partially because of alcohol, partially because of the class
system in Canada would not allow it.” He proceeds to explain the work’s link to Andy
Warhol’s Marilyn reproductions, “I think Marilyn Monroe had the fame […] because she
is white, blond, and beautiful, she got everything. Because you are a Native man in a white society, those same sort of dreams that you wanted you could never obtain.” And with this painting, Logan provides a space for recognition to take place.

Logan raises the question of gender in some of his art works, as the representation of women in Native cultures of North America comes up against a very different presentation evident in canonical Western paintings. In *The Diners Club (No Reservations Required)* (1992) (figure 7), a take on Edouard Manet’s *Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe* (1863) (figure 8), Logan plays with the gender roles and power dynamics that are implicit in Manet’s famous painting. Depicting a luncheon between three individuals in a Parisian park, the famous painting spurred much controversy during its time for depicting two men, dressed in fashionable Parisian clothing of the late 1800s, engaging with a naked woman, who is seemingly unabashed by her nudity. This work received the most scrutiny from its viewers for how the woman is portrayed; the public considered it to suggest promiscuous behavior.

Set in the Cree northern plains, instead of the French countryside, the figures picnicking in Jim Logan’s painting are enjoying a bowl of Saskatoon berries and drinking diet cokes. Reversing the attire of the figures in Manet’s painting, the image here depicts two naked male figures and one clothed female figure. This painting plays with notions of authority
as Logan associates being clothed with power, and nakedness with vulnerability.\textsuperscript{47} He explains,

\begin{quote}
Some of our societies, Native societies, were matriarchical and the women carried a lot of power within the political system, so I wanted to put that sort of idea in the painting – that women here have the power. …If there’s anybody to be subservient to the other, or lower than the other, or with less power than the other, it would be the naked men rather than the clothed women. Clothing seems to suggest power, I don’t know why, but it seems like if you’re nude you’re vulnerable. If you’ve got clothes on you’ve got power.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

Dedicated to Native women, this version of the Manet painting illustrates his desire to stress the matrilineal nature of some native societies, where traditionally many women held positions of power within the political system.\textsuperscript{49} Logan successfully challenges the normative nature of patriarchy in Western society, and summons the viewer to consider an alternative.

Logan again considers the West’s unceasing use of the female nude, while also tackling environmental concerns and questions the exploits of corporate industries in his painting \textit{The Three Environmentalists} (1993) (figure 9). Raphael’s version, \textit{The Three Graces} (1504-1505) (figure 10), depicts three nude women - two facing forward and the middle figure with her back to the viewer. Inspired by Classical mythology, the three figures represent the stages of development of women; the figure on the left represents the maiden, and the woman on the right, symbolizes maturity.
Logan’s alternate version depicts three native women; each one holds a symbolic object. The woman on the right carries a turtle attached to a chain, which according to Logan, signifies the earth enslaved by Western thought. The middle woman bears a sacred heart, a reference to Christian domination over the earth. And the woman on the right holds a skull, symbolizing the possible state of human evolution unless our relationship to nature does not change. Like Raphael’s painting, this image symbolizes development, in this case the unfavorable developments taking place on Mother Earth as the three figures depicted are standing on a stumped tree amidst a clear cut. For centuries the forests have been sacred to First Nations communities, and for years they lived on the land sustainably. Logan questions what he calls “the backward ideals of the forestry industry and clear cutting practices,” adding the question, “what gives anyone the moral right to conquer? Western thinking has to change,” he states, “because there are too many past injustices and environmental injustices.”

Offering an intimate view of First Nations experience, Logan thus personalizes and “Indianizes” the paintings not only to introduce alternative narratives about the past, but also as a way to present important moments, people, and experiences, validating Native history and culture. The Classical Aboriginal series illustrates subjects that Aboriginal audiences can relate to and identify with, and at the same time, for non-Aboriginal viewers, Logan provides new stories from which to learn about Canadian history. “It wasn’t just a matter of mimicking the paintings, and painting them as Indian” Logan states, “there are other things involved in these paintings.” He also included token
elements he associates with Indigenous cultures throughout the series - such as bingo chips, coca cola cans, pilsner cans, peace pipes, coins and more - as decorative elements or added features in the paintings.

Logan’s *Classical Aboriginal Series* incorporates a sequence of artistic strategies, which include switching the identities of the main figures in canonical artworks, highlighting the significant people in his own life, raising important environmental concerns, and challenging power structures. In such ways Logan’s works prod the viewer to confront historical narratives and ways of thinking that are very different from the ideologies perpetuated by the West through its art history, and more specifically, through the canonical works he appropriates. Logan himself was not entirely satisfied with the audience response to this series, however. While the response was generally positive, and people seemed to enjoy the humorous aspects of the series, Logan suggests, “No one […] saw the real tragedy of it. Not too many people noticed the tragedy of our absence.” The tragedy Logan refers to is what inspired the execution of the work. Logan was compelled to announce the absence of First Nations people and culture throughout the annals of Western history.

Jim Logan’s critique is three-fold. Sparking the series was Logan’s initial dismay about the categorization of Native art under the guise of primitive art, epitomized by ignorant statements such as “primitive artists had little awareness of their own history”, which
appeared in a 1977 edition of Janson’s art history text. His paintings are a personal retort against the Eurocentric, ahistorical, and hierarchical discourses found within such texts, as well as the all-pervasive bias within art history, which is to say that Western art is considered the basis against which all other art should be judged. Secondly, his artwork is a reaction to how Canadians (through their institutional frameworks) easily assimilate and adapt European art history as their own, reflecting the Western-centered nature of art institutions and education systems in this country. It is certainly true, as Logan argues, that contemporary Aboriginal artists, at the time of the series’ execution in the early 1990s, were rarely being shown in Canada unless they fell under the rubric of Native specific art galleries, or museums of anthropology. And thirdly, he attacks the failure to recognize First Nations history by the so-called ‘writers of North American history.’ In order to gain a greater understanding of Logan’s goals as he set out to execute these paintings, certain aspects of historical, anthropological and museological practice in Canada must be examined.

In his book *Orientalism* (1978), Edward Said observes that history, as we know it, is a European construct, and that this view has remained dominant for a long time. European theories, literature, practice, and ideologies are simply a ‘system of knowledge,’ Said suggests, that add up to a hegemony in our culture. The hegemony he refers to is, “…the idea of the European’s identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures.” Said’s idea of history is applicable to the North American colonial context, in that notions of the past were very much formulated
by the explorers, colonialists and settlers of European descent, and these voices have evolved to form our mainstream notions of history today. About this same notion, First Nations scholar, Alfred Young Man writes, “Popular history is what we make it. It is written to a prescribed standard that makes ‘heroes’ of otherwise contemptible human beings. Such a history does not necessarily describe a true situation, nor how the mental faculties and visual perceptions functioned at any particular moment in the past. History’s description of discovery and conquest is limited in just that way.”

Logan was therefore contributing to a post-colonial discourse when he set out to challenge the dominant European account of historical development in Canada. He states, “People who are in power own the history, and when they own the history they tell the story from their perspective.” Logan’s work responds to this hegemony, by assimilating the dominant, and idolized forms of Western cultural expression – works from the canon – while introducing an alternate perspective on history, thereby creating a space that is inclusive of Native perspectives. By deliberately selecting works of art spanning as far back as 1492, Logan offers room for a dialogue, which was never really staged in relation to Canadian history, regarding the role played by First Nations people in forming this nation.

Mainstream historical narratives in Canada marginalized Indigenous histories for a long time, ignoring the fact that Native histories were often transmitted through oral tradition,
performance, and art, and were not written and documented in the way that Western history was. Selecting works spanning over five hundred years signifies the importance of this extended historical period to Logan. He wants his audience to recognize that “…there are other people in this world, there are other artists in the world, other visions of this world, that are just as valid and a part of the human story as [the West’s] story.” And while First Nations people have been acquainted with Western history since the 16th century, mainstream culture has not been aware or familiar with theirs.

Western-centric ideologies have filtered down through various discourses and disciplines, including art history and its accompanying institutions. As Rasheed Araeen suggests, Western institutions maintained the Eurocentric structures established at the time of colonialism and Western imperialist worldviews resisted change in such structures. In art historical terms, institutions maintained a biased framework within which all artwork could be judged. In Keith Moxey’s discussion of the canon, he states, “…it was always Europe that was used as the canon by which to judge the rest.” As such only one linear version of art history was maintained (until postmodernism/postcolonial awareness), resulting in the marginalization of other histories and experiences that might challenge this authority.

As previously noted, Logan’s work targets the core of Western art history as a means to confront its elitist and exclusionary nature. Logan’s artworks put forth a position, “…that
Aboriginal art has always been ignored, never been given the credit, or there has never been an actual art history involved with aboriginal art. It has never been recognized, never been written about, other than by anthropology museums or anthropological study.™ The artist Kent Monkman holds the view that because of Native objects’ ghettoization within anthropology museum collections, their art been ‘swept under the carpet’ by the discipline of art history.™ Likewise, Logan says, “The only way anyone would look at aboriginal art was in anthropology museums or for anthropological study. They don’t recognize it as being done by a real human being that existed in their time, that was their worldview.”™

Since the onset of colonialism, Native art objects were first gathered for personal collections and cabinets of curiosity, but when notions of the “Vanishing Race” came about, Westerners felt an urgency to amass objects.™ As a result of colonial domination, First Nations people became victims caused by assimilation, relocation, illness, and more. These significant changes and drops in populations caused settlers to believe that First Nations people of North America were reaching their end, resulting in a mass appropriation of cultural goods. And with the gathered objects, museums and research institutions built their museological collections, during the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth century. Anthropologists, ethnologists and art institutions classified First Nations goods as evidence of cultures situated in the past, as the collected materials were distanced from their present-day cultural contexts, and analyzed and evaluated only according to Western criteria.™ Ruth Phillips explains, furthermore, that these cultural
expressions were classified as something other than Art: “[b]ecause the ‘primitiveness’ of their arts was taken as a given, Victorian anthropologists focused most exclusively on the ‘inferior’ category of ‘ornament’ and often willfully blinded themselves to the existence of objects that could have fit their fine art category.”75 Sculpted or graphic imagery depicted on cultural objects was considered applied art, serving a utilitarian purpose, and thus could not be considered “purely aesthetic.”76 As such, the aesthetic traditions of First Nations artists in North America were denied a Fine Art status.

Shanna Ketchum and Daniel Francis propose that ideologies manifest in the late nineteenth century helped shaped today’s reception of Aboriginal peoples.77 Western stereotypes about Native peoples stemming from this time period, together with the founding precepts of anthropology and ethnography, have contributed to misunderstandings and misrepresentations of First Nations people and their art for over two hundred years. The stereotypes present in our culture facilitate these misinterpretations. Many Native art historians draw attention to how mainstream society easily associates Native artwork with romantic ideals and stereotypes based on what they think First Nations art should be. Often, the use of terms like Native or Indian conjure up associations with spirituality, a pre-industrial past, the natural realm, and shamanism, among other such qualities.78 These misinterpretations are not simply a question of audience perspective; it is also relevant to how Native art is framed by curators, art institutions, and critics. An explanation offered by Lee-Ann Martin and Lynda Jessup, is that art institutions functioned within a Western framework, whereby any art that did not
fit into the hierarchical system, fell under a rubric of other, and was thus marginalized within the gallery system. Over the past century, those who have written, organized shows, and housed works by First Nations people have in some cases not had the education to properly address these works. And I question whether the appropriate knowledge was even sought out at the time.

Due to racist ideas and ethnographical designations for Native arts, much misunderstanding and misrepresentation took place within gallery and museum settings across Canada. The exhibitions acknowledging First Nations art over the past forty years in Canada, however, were largely shows which served to accentuate the “Imaginary Indian,” and time lock their cultures into a permanent past by presenting anthropological collections as opposed to acknowledging contemporary practices. The National Gallery of Canada’s *Masterpieces of Indian And Eskimo Art* in 1969 and 1970 and the Glenbow Museum’s *The Spirit Sings* in 1988 are two noted examples of misrepresentation. Both exhibited works of art appropriated by museum bodies and anthropological collections wrongfully taken and amassed during the cultural suppression of First Nations people in Canada (1840s – 1951). In the case of *The Spirit Sings* exhibit, when First Nations communities pleaded with the Glenbow museum to not exhibit cultural works of sacred significance to an international audience drawn in by the Calgary Olympics, the museum didn’t listen. Many items exhibited in the collection had not returned to North America (or their rightful owners) prior to this exhibit; several families had not seen their sacred
goods since they were wrongfully taken from them, yet the exhibit went on despite their pleas.

Contemporary art practices were given very little attention in Canada until the late 1980s early 1990s, because the new and modern forms of artistic expression no longer fit into the paradigms of the past. Aside from Canada’s move to provide First Nations individuals with their own pavilion at the Montreal Expo of 1967, there had been little movement within the art institutions in Canada to include or involve First Nations contemporary arts. It wasn’t until 1987 that the National Gallery of Canada bought their first contemporary Native work of art, Carl Beam’s painting *The North American Iceberg* (1985), thirty years after contemporary art movements were taking root in Canada. These changes then lead to *Land, Spirit, Power* at the National Art Gallery in 1992, and a concurrent opposing show at the Museum of Civilization called *Indigena*. Both exhibits featured contemporary works of art by First Nations artists, however the event at the Museum of Civilization served as a voice to the opposition in celebrating the first explorer to Canada 500 years prior, which *Land, Spirit, Power* honoured.

The cumulative effect of anthropological discourses, stereotypes, and the misrepresentation of Aboriginal cultures, therefore all contributed to an under-representation of contemporary Native artworks in Canadian collections, until the end of the 20th century. Lynda Jessup explains that today’s art galleries still function within the
‘settler’ parameters for Aboriginal history; as a result of this narrative there is no place within which Native artists can tell their own stories.\textsuperscript{82} These institutional obstacles are the very driving forces for the creation of Logan’s Classical Aboriginal series, as he explains:

My audience at that time was basically curators and gallery directors. I was kind of on a tangent on them because...they were not appreciative of Aboriginal art in general. At that time back in the nineties, there was definitely a cultural apartheid, as we called it, in public galleries. We weren’t being shown, we weren’t being collected... We were not given any respect for our creativity, our genius as thinkers and painters, we had genuine work coming out with a historical reconstructive look at Canada that was totally being ignored at that time, so I was mad at those people.\textsuperscript{83}

Logan’s position is reinforced by the study carried out by Lee Ann Martin in 1991. Martin investigated the inclusion and exclusion of First Nations art works in regional and provincial galleries in Canada. The main gallery spaces to exhibit Logan’s \textit{Classical Aboriginal} series in the 1990s were Thunder Bay Art Gallery, Kamloops Art Gallery, and McMichael Art Gallery; Martin’s research emphasizes that these very galleries were the only ones in Canada with a mandate to collect and exhibit First Nations contemporary art at that time. Implicitly, then, all other regional and provincial galleries in Canada excluded First Nations works as a part of their mandates. Martin points to three main causes for this exclusion: the political nature of many contemporary works, the lack of understanding and education surrounding them, and insufficient funds to acquire new works. This inability to acknowledge contemporary Native artworks as cultural contributions to Canadian history, Martin argues, serves to deny complex historical and contemporary realities, and is a repudiation of Native voices.
Martin’s report, submitted to Canada Council for the Arts in 1991, reflected the practices of galleries and museums of the early 90s. Since this time, recognition for contemporary First Nations art works has grown and expanded in both Canada and abroad, with Rebecca Belmore, Edward Poitras and Brian Jungen’s International acclaim being excellent examples over the past 20 years. With the development of post-colonial theory and practices, considerations have shifted and awareness has broadened; this does not mean, however, all has been rectified. Taking a closer look at Kent Monkman’s contemporary series of paintings, one could argue this is the case.

**Kent Monkman and the Moral Landscapes**

Walking into the Canadian contemporary art wing of the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (MMFA), one would be shocked to find an immense nineteenth century landscape painting hanging amidst the abstract art works and hard edged sculptures of late twentieth century artists. At first, its placement might stop the viewer in their tracks, as they ponder the possible incorrect locale of the work. Prompting the question: why it is there? One may even wonder why it isn’t with the other colonial landscape works of the nineteenth century or could it be it a bad curatorial choice?

On the contrary, this work of art is placed exactly where it should be! Modeled after a sublime landscape typical of its period, the painting offers a lavish display of the North American wilderness, a dramatic sky, breathtaking mountain-scapes and a pristine
peaceful lake surrounded by lush green vegetation. The immense size, the glimmering golden frame, and especially striking painterly skill evident in the work, is enough to spark interest in anyone passing by. Upon further investigation, the complexity and curious narrative in the work is what draws the viewer in. A unique and strange addition to this painting and distinctly separating it from other nineteenth century colonial landscapes like it, are the figures that inhabit the space. A narrative is laid out across the vast landscape, made up of little fur traders, mountain men, artists, and explorers. Seemingly in a fury of daily activity, each one is depicted frozen in place, as if caught in a moment of epiphany, as they stare in awe at the central figure in their midst. An anomaly to her surroundings, this woman (or is it a man?) appears apparition-like, hovering lightly above the water, swaddled in a translucent fuchsia veil and sporting hot-pink pumps. Her name is Miss Chief Eagle Testickle and her appearance raises many questions: Who is she? Why is she central to the painting? What is so special about her that she has everyone stopping in their tracks?

The work is called the *Trappers of Men* (2006) (figure 11), painted by Kent Monkman, and acquisitioned by the MMFA. It is one painting of several making up the Toronto artist’s *Moral Landscapes* series (2001-).

Tackling issues of sexuality, power dynamics, stereotypes, Christianity, myth, reality and more, Kent Monkman’s work investigates differently than Logan, the impact of colonial
history and hegemony on Native culture. Kent Monkman (1965 -), born of a Swampy Cree and Irish/English descent, has been an active artist with a practice spanning from book illustration to set design; film and video creation to performance and acrylic painting works. Using what Olu Oguibe would refer to as reverse appropriation or mimicry as a means to cajole past narratives, Monkman’s *Moral Landscapes* series specifically targets landscape painting and Native painting of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in North America. Monkman’s renditions replicate, in both size and intricate detail, the landscapes created by colonial artists, specifically during the period of Lucius O’Brian and the Hudson River School of painters in the United States. Monkman also targets the dawn of anthropology and the colonial painters such as Paul Kane (1810-1871), Edward Curtis (1968-1954), and George Catlin (1798-1872), and their captivation with notions of the “Vanishing Race.” Including all kinds of characters in his works, selecting individuals who have played a significant roles in colonial history – explorers, artists, cowboys, priests, and more – Monkman creates unique narratives for any number of them within each painting, separating his works from the colonial landscapes he replicates.

Keeping true to each painting in the series, Monkman includes his central figure and alter-ego, Miss Chief Eagle Testickle, who takes on a transvestite homosexual identity as homage to the two-spirited people.84 An odd and unusual character to find amidst a vast sublime colonial landscape of the North American wild, she stands out because she is often depicted scantily clad, sporting hot pink pumps, an elaborate headdress, and
fashioning Louis Vuitton accessories. She is sexy. She is a Hollywood cliché. And she embodies visual stereotypes found in our culture today. Not suiting the 18th and 19th century sublime colonial landscapes, she mocks the motives of the colonial painters and their compulsion to record Native past. About her inclusion and colonial Native painters, Monkman writes, “I insert myself into many of my paintings as a way of challenging, or commenting on the subjectivity, ego, and self-aggrandisement of the original artists, many of whom painted themselves in their work as an act of showmanship or bravado. I represent myself as my drag queen alter ego, Miss Chief Eagle Testickle, as a flamboyant representative of gay, bi or trans-gendered Aboriginal sexuality in a historical context.”

Looking at two paintings from this collection, *Trapper’s of Men* (2006) and *The Fourth of March* (2004), this section will examine: colonial landscape painting as it was in the 1800s; the histories evoked by the Native painters and characters presented; address why Monkman uses counter-appropriation to revisit the past and bring it to a present space; investigate Miss Chief Eagle Testickle’s relevance to the painting; and how this serves to disrupt our own notions of Western history and add to a pluralist discourse.

Monkman’s work magnifies colonial constructs of the Wild West, notions of Manifest Destiny, and the Imaginary Indian found in the paintings of colonial artists. He does so to challenge our notions of Western frameworks particularly during the 19th century. What is unique about his project is that he recreates vast and breathtakingly large landscape
paintings stroke for stroke, most often selecting works from the Hudson River School of Painters. Why was he drawn to this time period, and what is his purpose for appropriating colonial landscape paintings already in existence?

Colonial representations of the New World came most commonly in the form of cartography, diagrams of plants and animals, portraits of notable settlers, images of First Nations peoples, and more. Prior to photographic practices, artistic interpretations of the New Land served an active role to visually identify this continent to those at home and abroad. It was not until the eighteenth and nineteenth century however, that artists in North America depicted images of the wilderness in the form of landscape paintings.  

This style of painting gained notoriety in North America and in Europe, as the pieces played an active role in the ongoing colonial project and served as symbolic reinforcements of European possession and dominance over the New World.

Maureen Ryan and Gillian Poulter write about historical landscape painting in Canada during the 19th century, and explain that as a part of the colonial project, British colonial painters, represented views of both nature and Natives of the new land as a means of ‘taking possession’ of the new nation, resulting in a large body of work particularly representing scenes of the Canadian wilderness and images of the First Nations people.  

Historical landscape paintings and Native paintings functioned as a means of informing both those in Canada and those abroad of the power and dominance the Western world
had over the land, the Natives, and informed the colonial constructed ideology of the New World. Monkman’s work resurfaces this time in Canadian and North American history with his project and compels the viewer to reconsider the colonial presence and dominance in the New World during the period his work alludes to, a time period which significantly contributed to and shaped Western History and its views for many years. Consequently, this period also marked a time when the noble salvage and “imaginary Indian”, took root. Stemming from Western belief systems, these constructs undoubtedly contributed to any long existing misconceived ideas about and misunderstandings for First Nations people rooted in the disciplines of Ethnography and Anthropology of the period and historical painting and photographs of First Nations people of the time.

The dominant Western ideology held in the last half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, was the aforementioned notion of the “Vanishing Race.” This spurred into action the desire to conserve an important part of New World identity, the ‘Native Indian,’ which led to extensive collecting and the appropriation of art works, cultural objects, and increased incentives to record languages, livelihoods and traditions, marking the dawn of anthropological and ethnographical collections in North America, and at the same time reinforcing misconceived notions about First Nations people. Three key artists responsible for recording the so-called ‘Vanishing Race’ were George Catlin, Paul Kane, and Edward Curtis. While their vast number of works served as major contributions to the development of the ethnographic record, these artists are
known for recording their own biased versions of Native tradition, one constructed by their own ideologies of what “tradition” should be, or look like. They were known for manipulating their subjects’ clothing, traditional regalia, embellishing recorded images to make them appear more authentic.\textsuperscript{93} These images forever time-locked a First Nations construct into the past, as these images quickly gained reverence in both North America and Europe for their reality and truth to life. Daniel Francis believes these artists’ works are responsible for contributing to an “Imaginary Indian” a stereotype still existent in our culture today.\textsuperscript{94}

Monkman’s \textit{Moral Landscapes} replicates Albert Bierstadt, Thomas Cole, and John Mix Stanley, all of whom played integral roles in depicting the unique elements of the American wilderness during the time of colonization. Working in a French and English romantic style,\textsuperscript{95} the Hudson River school artists were recognized for their panoramic views of the river valley as well as wilderness scenes across the continent.

The 19\textsuperscript{th} century landscapes were modeled after European fashions of the sublime. A sublime landscape was a romanticized one in which wide-open spaces, sheer and rugged mountains, high waterfalls, and dramatic skies were featured. These images were inculcated with transcendental qualities, elements of divinity, and majestic scenery; however, their characteristics are demonstrative of artistic interpretation and
embellishment rather than accurate reproduction.\textsuperscript{96} As such, they do not serve to precisely reflect the (harsh) realities of the North American wild.\textsuperscript{97}

In 2004, Kent Monkman created a Moral Landscapes series of paintings he called The Trilogy of St. Thomas, which is made up of three sizable landscape paintings: The Impending Storm, The Fourth of March, and Not the End of the Trail. The trilogy depicts a fictitious love story between Scott Thomas and Kent Monkman’s alter ego, Miss Share Eagle Testickle. With the trilogy, Monkman creates an allegory between First Nations and European relations, as well as addresses and challenges issues concerning sexuality, Christianity, and power.\textsuperscript{98} The Trilogy of St Thomas alludes to North American colonial history through the appropriation of the British picturesque colonial landscape painting style, in referencing an historical event in Canadian history, and with the inclusion of a First Nations transvestite character – Miss Chief Eagle Testickle - into the work.

The paintings making up this series, are inspired by the landscape paintings of Hudson River Group’s Thomas Cole, an English born North American landscape painter. The body of work Monkman references in particular is, The Voyage of Life (1841)\textsuperscript{99} made up of a series of four paintings following the stages of life: childhood, youth, manhood and old age. Cole “…saw nature as God's work and as a refuge from the ugly materialism of cities. Cole clearly intended the Voyage of Life to be a didactic, moralizing series of paintings using the landscape as an allegory for religious faith.”\textsuperscript{100}
Inspired by Cole’s work for the religious integrity and development of narrative, Monkman created three paintings over which a fictional narrative love story unfolds between non-fictional Thomas Scott and Miss Chief Eagle Testickle. For the sake of brevity, I will take a closer look at one of the three paintings in *The Trilogy of Saint Thomas*.

Monkman references a significant moment in Manitoban, Métis and Canadian history, and plays with the notions of real history and fiction interchangeably in *The Fourth of March* (2004) (figure 12). Referencing not only the title, but also the content of Goya’s *The Third of May* (1814), Monkman’s painting depicts the execution of Thomas Scott (March 4th, 1870).101

Appropriating from *Sierra Nevada* (1871-73) by Albert Bierstadt (figure 13), Monkman copies intricately each detail of the original landscape painting, from the smallest rock on the shoreline to the grandiose mountains looming in the background. Bierstadt’s dramatic setting, typical of a sublime landscape, depicts in the foreground a shoreline and lake view, with lush greenery and vegetation lining the edge of the waterline, and stark, breathtaking sun lit mountains looming in the background. Where the deer graze alongside the water in Bierstadt’s original painting, Monkman’s counter-appropriated version,
replaces them with the characters Thomas Scott, Miss Chief and Louis Riel, playing out their narrative.

The viewer is witness to a fleeting moment in time where Thomas Scott, an Irish born Canadian, is on his knees about to be executed for his rebellion against Louis Riel, who is depicted here on his horse holding up a cross. Three Métis men point their guns at Scott, while two others are at the aid of Monkman’s fainted Native persona, Miss Chief Eagle Testickle. Even though Miss Chief may be upstaging the event with her dramatic gesture, this is a significant time in Métis history. This incident did not take place in the natural setting depicted here, rather, it took place at Fort Garry Manitoba’s Red River Colony.102 Toying with our notions of fiction and non-fiction, Monkman prods the viewer to consider Canadian history, and in particular a moment in time when Métis were fighting for power and religious stability against the British and Canadian rule. Monkman’s displacement of historic events raises questions about the narrative, the truths and falsities of the past, effectively urging the viewer to reflect upon our sorted history.

Monkman’s counter-appropriation of a Bierstadt landscape painting, his inclusion of a real historical event mixed with a fictitious one involving his alter-ego, becomes a visual narrative that challenges the audience. In a way, this work becomes Monkman’s own reordering of history, as told from a contemporary perspective of the past. Monkman
writes, “The fictitious setting for this historical incident alludes to the fictions and subjectivity of the nineteenth century painters that I reference.”

With this work, Monkman confronts colonial notions of history, and forces his viewers to reconsider the long standing ideals and ideologies of the colonial past that have informed Canadian history and national identity for so long. In addition, this piece challenges the viewer to reconsider the sorted and complex relationships existing between Euro-settlers and First Nations people.

Kent Monkman’s *Trappers of Men* (2006), the image opening this chapter, acquired by the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts in 2006, appropriates an Albert Bierstadt painting *Among the Sierra Nevada, California* from 1868 (figure 14). Similar to the Bierstadt’s other painting of the *Sierra Nevada*, this one is a vast landscape painting offering a lush wilderness, a dramatic sky which plays with elements of light and dark, awe striking mountain-scapes and a pristine peaceful lake with a rich green shoreline. Emulating each and every detail of this vast landscape painting, and true to its original size, Monkman makes it his own by populating the shoreline with distinguishing characters from various time periods in history – all who played significant roles in the development of Western historical ideologies and constructs about First Nations people at the turn of the century. Littered across the landscape are: photographer Edward Curtis and artist George Catlin; painters Piet Mondrian and Jackson Pollock; winter count keeper Lone Dog; explorers
Alexander MacKenzie and Lewis and Clark; mountain men and First Nations individuals; and central to them all, captivating their attention, is Miss Chief Eagle Testickle.

To start, Monkman includes two figures significant for recording Native historical imagery: Edward Curtis and George Catlin. Catlin is depicted in *Trappers of Men*, kneeling in front of Lone Dog’s winter count, with an open book in front of him; undoubtedly recording the pictographic tradition.

George Catlin (1798-1872) set out in the 1830s to visually record the appearance and cultural customs of the so-called disappearing race, contributing significantly to the visual ethnographic record of Native North America. Producing over six hundred paintings and drawings, Catlin documented over forty-eight First Nations groups in North America, and numerous groups from South America between the years 1830 and 1860. Compiled to form “The Indian Gallery,” these images toured the United States and later Europe, receiving much public attention, acclaim, and press recognition.104 In addition, Catlin staged Native dances, songs, and war rituals as a part of European trade shows and World Fairs in the 1840s and 1850s.105

Edward Curtis, after Catlin, started a photographic record when he too had learned the idea that Indigenous peoples were slowly disappearing. As such, this self-taught
photographer made taking photos of First Nations peoples his specialty, by documenting the lives, customs, and folklore of the communities. Recording groups from Alaska to Montana, his photographic compilations reflect the ideals of the ‘noble savage’ as he constructed them.

Edward Curtis’s photographs like Catlin’s paintings before him, attracted much acclaim and attention for their authenticity and ‘truth to life.’ However, in wishing to document the vanishing culture of the rapidly Europeanized American Indian, Curtis romanticized the settings of his photographs, sometimes adding props, head-dresses and ceremonial costumes.

In the painting, Monkman has depicted Curtis standing beside his camera (figure 15). Two First Nation’s men posed on a rock opposite him are positioned for a picture. On the shoreline, to the right of Curtis, is an open suitcase with costumes and other staging paraphernalia.

In his book *The Imaginary Indian, The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture* (1992), Daniel Francis writes, “[Catlin’s] photographs were tiny time machines intended to take the viewer back before history began into a romantic world of a technologically primitive people. Any evidence of contact with White culture contaminated this image and Curtis
worked to eliminate it. Native people as they actually lived did not interest him because
in his eyes they were no longer Indians.” Curtis’ dedication to this project eventually led to publishing a number of books including *The North American Indian* (1907-1930).

In Monkman’s artist statement he argues, that Curtis and Catlin’s images have worked effectively as propaganda to disseminate the theory of the vanishing race, and caused the romanticized constructs of First Nations people to be forever ‘time-locked’ into a permanent past. An ideology, that Francis would argue, contributed to stereotypes of Indianness still existent in our culture today.

On the far right, wearing a purple jacket, is Alexander MacKenzie. Lewis and Clark are the two gentlemen on the left side of the log, holding a map. Explorers Lewis, Clark, and Alexander MacKenzie successes paid little tribute to First Nations individuals involved in helping them on their voyage. Western history books recognize the expeditions of Lewis and Clark and Alexander MacKenzie as influencing the expansion into the West for the purpose of economic growth and increase in the fur trade during the late eighteenth century. His voyage to the Pacific Ocean in 1793 is famed to be the first exploration ever to have crossed the country. Although he had racist inclinations toward First Nations people, they were pertinent players as guides and aids on his voyage. While MacKenzie’s achievements are awarded in historical discourse, First Nation’s involvement and contributions to his explorations are rarely given any credit.
Similarly praised are Lewis and Clark for their expedition West. Although they were second to MacKenzie, and third to the First Nations, to reach the Pacific (1804) American history texts honor them as the first to discover the West, the first to explore its bounds, and the first to write its history.\textsuperscript{113} While much attention is granted to the achievements of North America’s heroes, little has been given to alternative histories told or recorded among First Nations people of North America.\textsuperscript{114}

In this landscape, Lone Dog is sits in front of his winter count, beside Catlin and his open notebook. One form of recording history is the winter count. On a hide, the keeper of the winter count would mark in pictograph form the most significant events of the year. One hide alone could demonstrate several years of recorded events. Lone Dog’s winter count is recognized as the longest account of history, one that spanned from c. 1800 to ca. 1870.\textsuperscript{115} These pictographic records of history are equally as important and significant as Western history is, yet, they were not recognized as such, when they were accumulated as anthropological discoveries. Ethnologist Gaverrick Mallery (1831-1894) took great interest in the winter counts and eventually amassed the largest collection from the Sioux, Dakotah, and Yanktona. Today, these winter counts make up a part of the permanent anthropology collection of the Smithsonian Institution.
Piet Mondrian (1872-1944) and Jackson Pollock (1912-1956), two Modernist abstract painters, were included in the landscape of *Trappers of Men*. Monkman draws attention to the influence non-Western works had on these canonical artists. Here, the artist Mondrian is portrayed, beside his own painterly version of the landscape, fainting at the sight of Miss Chief, and Pollock is to the rescue (figure 16). Monkman highlights that Pollock is experiencing his own little epiphany, as he spots the red paint dripping from Mondrian’s brush onto Lone Dog’s winter count.\(^\text{116}\) He suggests the visual lexicon appropriated by them, was already established in non-Western culture, and because of Mondrian’s and Pollock’s failure to recognize their influential sources at the time, this further swayed acknowledgement for Native artistic contributing to the canon.\(^\text{117}\) He argues that this “…further ensured that already missing Aboriginal narratives would not enter the canon of Western Art History.”\(^\text{118}\)

This discussion has addressed the notable histories and controversies associated with each of the men situated in the landscape, but who is the central most figure of this narrative? She appears almost Christ-like in character, simulating a divine entity in *Trappers of Men* (figure 17), and a playful colourful character in *The Fourth of March*. By jest and gaze, her presence is awe striking. She is Miss Chief Eagle Testickle, a significant figure not recorded or written about in Western history books. An anomaly crucial to this story, but also responsible for its making; Miss Chief is both author of the painting and Kent Monkman’s alter-ego.
Stemming from Monkman’s previous artistic explorations into colonial history, religion, and sexuality, Miss Chief evolved and developed from an ‘Indian’ figure central to his previous films and performance works. She is also inspired from the notion of two-spirited people.119 Two-spirited is a term described by Westley Thomas and Sue Ellen Jacobs, as a person who took on the social roles of the opposite sex, one who lived a multi-gendered life, and fulfilled both male and female roles in Native communities.120 Two-spirited people were a part of the normative social constructs of the Indigenous cultures in North America, however, at the mark of colonialism, they were considered socially deviant and eventually experienced erasure due to colonial and religious worldviews.121 Monkman states, “Miss Chief represents a side of history that has been overlooked. These are characteristics that [artists like] Catlin encountered, but chose to edit from history.”122 She represents an empowered personality/sexuality, and an empowered response to the exclusionary nature of colonial history. Including Miss Chief Share Eagle Testickle into his work, he is addressing the relationship between the issues of colonial suppression of two-spirited people at the time of colonialism, but also confronting stereotypes surrounding homosexuality in our contemporary society, thus linking sexuality and its discourse to both the colonial past as well as the present.123

Today, as a commemoration to them, Miss Chief takes on a contemporary identity in transvestite form, modeled after actress and musician Cher’s album cover “Half-breed.”
A persona in Monkman’s films such as *Group of Seven Inches* (2005), performances like *Taxonomy of the European Male* (2005) and *Moral Landscapes*, Miss Chief is most often depicted scantily clad with veils, wearing hot pink high heel shoes, an elaborate headdress, and fashioning Louis Vuitton accessories (figure 18). Incarnating these derogatory spaces, Miss Chief reverses their meanings by owning the strength and power associated with them. Wherever Miss Chief is a star, she playfully pushes and prods the boundaries and limits of Western ideas and stereotypes. Playing the significant role of trickster, Monkman’s alter ego is both Miss Chief = mischief and Ego Testickle = egotistical, as she ‘flirts’ with notions of the past and the present, fiction and reality, and the reversal of roles.

Playing on the egos of nineteenth century painters, like Catlin, and bolstering her own authority, Miss Chief includes herself into *Trappers of Men*, making her both author and subject of the work. As author, Miss Chief places her gaze upon and toys with those responsible for romanticizing the land, idealizing the Vanishing Race, and expansion into the west. By recalling this historical time in her painting and placing herself as the central figure within the setting, she not only reclaims the landscape but she also interrupts its narrative, claiming her own space within history.

Monkman’s painting compels the viewer to reconsider a significant time when Western worldviews came to form the notions of North American history. Using mimicry as a
means to cajole past narratives, *Trappers of Men* targets a period when racism and Eurocentric ideologies threw First Nations histories and art to the wayside - a time when Indigenous stories were not written into the discourse of history, Aboriginal cultural goods became objects of anthropology, and First Nations art ignored by the Western canon. Monkman incorporates the various historical figures important in forming this fictional past, places his alter-ego into the painting as a means to disrupt this past, and offers an alternate version of history, one inclusive of First Nations communities.

As we examine *Trappers of Men*, hung in the Canadian Contemporary Art section of the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, our eyes move across the painting ingesting the involved narrative and the many little characters within the landscape. Like the figures in the painting, the viewer becomes captivated by the central figure, we stare in wonder at her presence. And once trapped in this gaze, perhaps they too become privy to the epiphany.
Conclusion

Today’s postcolonial and postmodern scholarship offers models on how to deconstruct, de-colonize, and de-centralize Canadian art institutions and North American colonial history, but this does not mean that organizations and art historical practices have yet reached these goals. Nonetheless, a heightened awareness of pluralist histories and multiple identities, is leading to positive changes for many artists in Canada. Jim Logan has recently acknowledged that while Canadian institutions have been slow moving, they are trying to catch up. “The National Gallery is trying to make amends, and public galleries are trying to increase their collections.” He stated, “Even institutions like the Canada Council are trying to prioritize Native Aboriginal endeavors in this country. So it is catching up, this transitional phase that we are going through.”

Gaining recognition for his work, a decade later, Kent Monkman’s paintings, performances, and film works have been well received among the Toronto and Montreal cultural scene. From 2004 to now Kent Monkman has been at the forefront of the arts community particularly in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver, but also, Internationally. He has participated in a number of shows including: Histories of the Americas (2004) at the Musée d’Art Contemporain de Montréal; The Hot Mush and Cold North (2005) exhibit at the Ottawa Art Gallery; as well as The Triumph of Mischief (2008) at the Winnipeg Art Gallery; and Kent Monkman: My Treaty is with the Crown in Montreal’s Leonard and Ellen Bina Gallery (2011). Over the past decade, Kent Monkman has gained
great notoriety for his work, and this recognition is demonstrative of the positive and swiftly changing art institutions and frameworks around him. These are undoubtedly favorable effects for Native communities across the continent. While Jim Logan was subject to exclusionary policies in the early 1990s, his works have since been exhibited and acquired by numerous galleries and museums both in this country and in the United States. Logan has participated in Walter Philips Gallery exhibit *World Upside Down* in 2007, as well as in *Ottawa Central* (2006) at Karsh-Masson Gallery, and exhibited works in the Smithsonian Institute for the American Indian traveling show *Who Stole the Teepee* (2000).

Exhibiting the works of First Nations artists, who in prior years had been marginalized, opens doors of recognition for Native histories and identities, and creates a space for Aboriginal self-representation, a freedom in expression of voice and personal experience, and an openness to un(dis)covered histories. In honor of Jim Logan’s and Kent Monkman’s projects then, we should follow Shanna Ketchum’s recommendation that the job of art historians, critics, and curators is to look to the truths in history and grasp the knowledge inherent in the works of Native art.\textsuperscript{127} To recognize that through bodies of work like Logan’s *Classical Aboriginal Series* and Monkman’s *Moral Landscapes* series, there are alternative explanations and views in existence, different from our own. In recognizing this truth, art historians, critics, and curators can evade a continuance of misconceptions and misunderstandings, and in turn, contribute to a greater understanding for First Nations art.
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Figure 1. Nicolas Poussin, *Et in Arcadia Ego*, 1637-1638
Oil on Canvas 87 × 120 cm (34.3 × 47.2 in)
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Mixed media installation
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Mixed media on canvas, 99 x 73 cm
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Figure 8. Edouard Manet, *Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe*, 1863
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**Figure 9.** Jim Logan, *The Three Environmentalists*, 1993

**Figure 10.** Raphael, *The Three Graces*, 1504-1505
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Figure 11. Miss Chief Eagle Testickle, (Kent Monkman), *Trappers of Men*, 2006
Acrylic on canvas, 213.36 x 365.76 cm

Figure 12. *The Fourth of March*, 2004
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Figure 13. Albert Bierstadt, *Sierra Navada*, 1871-1873
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Oil on canvas, 183 x 305 cm
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Figure 15. Edward Curtis with two First Nations models.
Acrylic on canvas, 213.36 x 365.76 cm
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Figure 16. Piet Mondrian, Jackson Pollock, and Lone Dog.
Acrylic on canvas, 213.36 x 365.76 cm
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Figure 17. Miss Chief Eagle Testickle
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Figure 18. Miss Chief Eagle Testickle
Kent Monkman. *Artist as Model* (detail), 2003
Acrylic on canvas, 50.8 cm x 61 cm