

An Analysis of The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples:
The Changing Representation of Aboriginal Histories in Museums

Stephanie Bolton

A Thesis

In

The Department

of

Art History

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts (Art History) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

August 2004

© Stephanie Bolton, 2004



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-94770-X

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-94770-X

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing the Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE TASK FORCE ON MUSEUMS AND FIRST PEOPLES: THE CHANGING REPRESENTATION OF ABORIGINAL HISTORIES IN MUSEUMS

STEPHANIE BOLTON

Debate erupted in the Canadian museum world of the mid-1980s in response to a contentious exhibition of Aboriginal art and artefacts, *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples* (1988), presented by the Glenbow Museum in Calgary. In order to address some of the issues circulating around the representation of Aboriginal peoples within museums in Canada, the Canadian Museums Association and the Assembly of First Nations jointly organized the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples. The Task Force consisted of arts professionals and scholars, Native and non-Native, along with concerned community members and elders. The group published a report, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples* (1992), which provided guidelines for better understanding between museums and Aboriginal Canadians.

This thesis examines the history and development of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, as well as an in-depth look at its report and recommendations. I consider the McCord Museum of Canadian History in Montreal as a case study for the implementation of the Task Force recommendations. It is my premise throughout this thesis that the Task Force report has influenced museum practices across Canada and that, more than a decade after the appearance of the report, museums, scholars, and Aboriginal communities are continually striving to cooperate and compromise to develop an acceptable framework for the presentation of Aboriginal arts, cultures, and histories in Canadian museums.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Joan Acland, for her support throughout the entire year this project was stewing: sometimes on the back burner, sometimes on “high.” She was always ready with encouraging words and enthusiastic advice, for which I am grateful.

Many of the ideas in this thesis were elaborated during several graduate seminars, especially Dr. Acland’s seminar on Aboriginal representation in museums, Dr. Brian Foss’ seminar on nationalism and Canadian art, and Dr. Cynthia Hammond’s seminar on space and identity. My thanks to these professors and my fellow students for giving me the opportunity to test my ideas on them, and for their feedback.

Professor Sandra Paikowsky and Dr. Kristina Huneault have been generous with their time and comments as my readers; they both have my sincere thanks. Louise Bolton edited countless drafts of this thesis and was always available to discuss the smallest detail yet again, despite her dislike of minutiae. She has my most profound gratitude.

Several members of the museum community who were involved with the Task Force and the McCord Museum have unstintingly shared their knowledge and experience with me. I am very thankful to Lee-Ann Martin, Tom Hill, Moira McCaffrey, Dolorès Contré Migwans, and Betty Kobayashi Issenman for their time, insights, and comments. Their collegiality has been outstanding.

I would also like to thank the archivists in Montreal and Ottawa who were incredibly helpful during my research: staff at the Indian Art Centre, the Canadian Museum of Civilization, the National Archives of Canada, the McCord Museum of Canadian History, and the Woodland Cultural Centre made my work much easier. Travel to these archives and time spent researching were facilitated through a research scholarship from the Department of Art History at Concordia University and through a travel grant from the Art History Graduate Students’ Association. I thank the Department and the Association for their support.

Finally, this thesis would not have been possible without the support, encouragement, and scolding of Nicolas Kenny, who has my deepest appreciation and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: THE TASK FORCE ON MUSEUMS AND FIRST	12
CHAPTER TWO: MUSEUMS AS PRODUCERS OF CULTURE	35
CHAPTER THREE: THE McCORD MUSEUM OF CANADIAN HISTORY	56
CONCLUSION	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDIX I: EXHIBITIONS AT THE McCORD MUSEUM OF CANADIAN HISTORY, 1986-1989	91
APPENDIX II: ABORIGINAL-THEMED EXHIBITIONS AT THE McCORD MUSEUM OF CANADIAN HISTORY, 1992-2003	93

INTRODUCTION

Public institutions which present history through the display of historical artefacts demonstrate the intersections of collective identities with publicly-acknowledged memory. Museums in particular have become an important point of exchange between private and public understandings of the past, and play a significant role in the debate concerning commodified public memory: the narratives presented in museums often correspond to the selective histories of a segment of the community, to the detriment of other community members. The underlying socio-political imperatives of museum collections, exhibitions, and administrative policies with regard to Aboriginal Canadians were brought into the spotlight in Canada in the late 1980s. In 1988, Calgary's Glenbow Museum presented an exhibition entitled *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples* as the highly-publicized showpiece of the Olympic Games arts festival. The exhibition featured Aboriginal art and artefacts from the period of early contact between Aboriginal Canadians and European explorers and traders, most of which are held in European institutions. Response to *The Spirit Sings* was mixed, with many critics deploring the exhibition as insensitive to the present condition of indigenous peoples, going so far as to suggest that the exhibition presented Native cultures as prehistoric vestiges. Presentation of *The Spirit Sings* coincided with negotiations between the Albertan, Canadian, and Lubicon Lake Cree governments regarding traditional land titles and the treaty rights of the Lubicon people. The Glenbow Museum granted exclusive corporate sponsorship for *The Spirit Sings* to Shell Canada, then adamant in its refusal to halt commercial exploitation of disputed land claimed by the Lubicon Nation. To protest the indifference and the autocratic attitudes of government

and corporations, and in reaction to the lack of respect accorded to First Nations peoples, the Lubicon Lake Cree boycotted *The Spirit Sings*. This boycott, drawing on the media attention focussed on Calgary as the host of the Olympic Games, led to a debate which expanded to include museums, activists, and scholars, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, from across the country. The resulting publicity exposed to a global audience the dismissive attitudes among Canadian cultural, social, and economic policy-makers of the late 1980s toward the concerns of Native peoples. Using the momentum begun by public debate surrounding *The Spirit Sings* and the questions being raised in the field of museology concerning the appropriate representation of Aboriginal arts and cultures in museums, the Canadian Museums Association and the Assembly of First Nations jointly set up the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples (1989)¹ to work out strategies to help resolve the deeply-ingrained differences between cultural institutions and Aboriginal communities.

The specific aim of this thesis is to examine the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples and to evaluate, using the McCord Museum of Canadian History in Montreal as a case study, the effects of the Task Force conclusions on the policies and practices of cultural and historical institutions in Canada. In order to coherently address this objective, a look at the role of museums in today's society, and at their successes and failures in presenting an accurate depiction of the Native historical record through their collections and exhibitions is necessary. A considerable volume of work examines the larger issues of collective memory, political ideology, nationalism, and societal consensus, and most modern museums now aim to situate themselves with regard to extant biases and unsubstantiated assumptions in their determinations of how best to

represent marginalized cultures. Native history has also been the subject of comprehensive studies, which have attempted not only to discover or to define Native identity, but also to examine the effect of colonial strategies employed to assimilate Native peoples into the culture of the dominant Euro-Canadian society. This thesis attempts to explore the reasons why many representations and images on display in museums require continuous review. At issue is the political and cultural development in museums, and specifically in the McCord Museum of Canadian History, occurring as a consequence of the Task Force recommendations. Plausibly, this line of inquiry, and future examinations of comparable museums, could also produce a distinct perspective on current debate regarding Native political, economic, and cultural efforts to define the place of Aboriginal peoples in the fabric of Canadian identity.

This study examines government policy documents as well as transcripts of interviews and conference proceedings gleaned from archival sources, and relies heavily on personal interviews with individuals concerned with the Task Force discussions. The archives consulted include those of the Indian Art Centre and the Canadian Museum of Civilization, both located in Gatineau, Quebec; the Canadian Museums Association Fonds held at the National Archives of Canada in Ottawa; the McCord Museum of Canadian History in Montreal; the Woodland Cultural Centre in Brantford; and the recordings available from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) online archives. Primary literary sources include newspaper and journal articles written by, among others, Julia Harrison, Michael Ames, and Bruce Trigger, key figures in the controversy surrounding *The Spirit Sings* and, in the case of Ames, in the subsequent Task Force discussions. Among the secondary sources used in this discussion, I found *Museums*,

Society, Inequality edited by Richard Sandell (2002) especially helpful. *On Aboriginal Representation in the Gallery*, edited by Linda Jessup with Shannon Bagg (2002), was useful for specifically Canadian perspectives. Stuart Hall's "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities" (1997) provided a base for an examination of postcolonial theory. *Museums and Memory*, edited by Susan A. Crane (2000), and David Lowenthal's works, *Possessed by the Past* (1996) and "History and Memory" (1997), helped to frame essential theoretical questions regarding the place of museums in society. Personal interviews with Tom Hill and Lee-Ann Martin, central members of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, and with museum professionals Moira McCaffrey, Betty Kobayashi Issenman, and Dolorès Contré Migwans, all with the McCord Museum, provided insights and information without which this study could not have been successfully completed.

Chapter One of this thesis discusses the outcome of the publicity surrounding the Lubicon boycott. In 1988, the Canadian Museums Association (CMA) and the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) held a joint colloquium at Carleton University in Ottawa, called "Preserving Our Heritage: A Working Conference Between Museums and First Peoples," to discuss concerns about the representation of Native cultures and histories in Canadian institutions. Subsequently, The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples (1989) was established, a collaborative effort between the CMA and the AFN initiated largely to address the concerns of Aboriginal people vis-à-vis the institution of the museum. Almost as important a mandate for some members of the Task Force was a determination to avoid further embarrassments such as those suffered by the Glenbow Museum, and Canada in general, during the Lubicon Lake Cree tribal actions. The Task Force

consisted of more than twenty-five museum professionals as well as members of Native communities across Canada. Task Force members planned to identify the specific areas of conflict in the relationship between museums and Aboriginal people, and to recommend solutions and lasting policies for dealing with these groups' differences. Stating its objective, the Task Force hoped "to develop an ethical framework and strategies for Aboriginal Nations to represent their history and culture in concert with cultural institutions."² For two years, Task Force members consulted with representatives from museums and Native groups to provide "a national perspective on the needs and aspirations of First Peoples with regard to museums and cultural collections."³ After receiving submissions from various stakeholders and following close review of the opinions expressed at national conferences, the Task Force revealed its findings in a widely-distributed report, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples* (1992).

The Task Force report identified three crucial areas most in need of reform: increased involvement of Aboriginal people in the interpretation of their cultures and histories by public institutions, repatriation of artefacts and human remains, and improved access to museum collections by Aboriginal people. The report focused particularly on the importance of increasing the agency and voice of Native people in institutions in which their cultures are represented, beginning with exhibition planning, and extending to the development of funding programs, the participation of Aboriginal people on museum boards, and their employment at all levels of museum operation.⁴

Pre-Task Force Aboriginal representation in museums in Canada was not a priority, and was almost entirely unacknowledged. In the *Report and Recommendations of the Task*

Force Charged with Examining Federal Policy Concerning Museums (1986), published by Communications Canada before the Lubicon boycott specifically targeting the Glenbow Museum had reached its peak, there is no mention at all of issues specifically affecting Native people.⁵ The Lubicon boycott, although essentially about land claims, also drew attention to the previously-ignored issues of the inaccurate representation of Aboriginal peoples, cultures, and histories in Canadian museums. Although there had been other boycotts and protests by First Nations peoples concerning museum policies and displays, these were more local in scope and did not attract significant media coverage.⁶ By focusing international attention on the topics of Canada's appropriation and glorification of traditional indigenous cultural symbols while the country's policies concurrently destroyed the means enabling continued cultural production by modern Native groups through encroachment on traditional lands, the actions of the Lubicon Nation and its supporters were instrumental in the establishment of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples.

The public disagreement between the museum profession – represented by the Glenbow and its supporters – and members of Aboriginal communities and their supporters – spearheaded by the Lubicon Cree – persuaded museum professionals of the need for guidelines in museum displays featuring Aboriginal historical and artistic records. Four years after the publication of the Task Force report, the arguments of the supporters for change in the use of Aboriginal material culture in museums were eloquently expressed by the 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, and provide insight into the offence felt at what the Glenbow Museum and the defenders of *The Spirit Sings* believed to be a “socially responsible” exhibition.⁷ The Royal Commission

concluded that most Canadians, particularly the largely urban population of museum visitors, have a preconceived and inaccurate idea of traditional Aboriginal life: “images of Aboriginal culture for many people are totem poles, stone carving, pow-wow dancing, canoes, moccasins and feather head-dresses.”⁸ Exhibitions of these items not only isolate the artefacts from their relevant contexts and make them virtually meaningless, but also confirm the assumption that Aboriginal cultures are things of the past rather than vibrant parts of a dynamic contemporary society: “the artistic and material aspects of Aboriginal culture, though important, are only a small part of its reality and need to be understood within the larger context of Aboriginal peoples’ worldviews, belief systems and changing ways of life.”⁹

Even before the Task Force report was written, and well before the Royal Commission had been formed, scholars were coming to realize that traditional definitions of Canada’s conception of the French and English as the two founding nations, with all other groups as peripheral, was problematic. In particular, excluding the original inhabitants of Canada from definitions of charter founders of the nation seemed increasingly suspect. In an independent report commissioned by the CMA, Victoria Dickenson wrote: “There has been a tendency to group native peoples with ‘ethnics,’ as being apart from the two Canadian charter groups, the French and the English. Recent scholarship...points to the importance of native peoples to the interaction which brought about the Canadian nation. Natives are beginning to see themselves, and to a large extent are being seen by others as the third charter group.”¹⁰ The co-chair of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Quebec judge René Dussault, stated that “Aboriginal peoples are not interest groups or racial minorities. They are political entities and should

be recognized as such.”¹¹ The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples identified the histories of Aboriginal peoples as integral to any complete understanding of Canada as a nation, and from this premise, sought to resolve the conflicting priorities of Native groups and museum policy makers.

Chapter Two examines the role played by museums in the formation of regional and national understandings of both the larger historical record and of the Aboriginal participation in the formation and the history of Canada. Museum theorists have dedicated much time and effort to discussions of public representations of the cultures and histories of traditionally disfranchised peoples. Acknowledging that the dominant cultural group has been largely responsible for defining and preserving traditional historical understandings, most museums and museum professionals are now attempting to eliminate retrograde assumptions and to revisit and restructure stereotypical presentations of the past in their institutions. Chapter Two considers how museums situate themselves in the process of providing more realistic and informed portrayals of multi-vocal perspectives of the historical record.

Chapter Three focuses specifically on the McCord Museum of Canadian History located near McGill University in downtown Montreal. A well-respected and comprehensive museum dedicated mainly to nineteenth-century Canadian history and to the history of industrialization in Montreal, the McCord Museum also has an important collection of pan-Canadian Aboriginal material culture, due to the collecting interests of its founder, David Ross McCord (1844-1930). The McCord became embroiled in the Lubicon debate because of the resignation of the museum’s honorary curator of ethnology, renowned archaeologist and author, Bruce Trigger, over the McCord’s

continued support of the Glenbow Museum's *The Spirit Sings* despite the protests of Montreal-area Native groups. The McCord has made many policy and exhibition revisions since the late 1980s, and it is one of the premises of this thesis that the Museum's wholehearted agreement with the conclusions of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples makes it a useful case study to determine what effects the Task Force had on one of Canada's more significant history museums. This examination of the McCord begins with the Task Force recommendations, then discusses the Museum's administrative policies and exhibition practices before and after the Task Force report was published. An assessment of changes in exhibition practices at the McCord can be obtained by studying two in-house exhibitions dealing with Aboriginal material culture: *Ivalu: Traditions of Inuit Clothing* (1988), and *Across Borders: Beadwork in Iroquois Life* (1999), although the emphasis of this study remains the policies of the Museum, and not the exhibitions themselves.

The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples was a landmark undertaking at a time when most visitors were content to accept museum administrators' selections in the determination of what items from the past deserved preservation and celebration. Twelve years after the publication of the Task Force report, what changes have occurred in Canadian museums regarding the representation of Aboriginal cultures and histories? The recommendations were bold and innovative, but the question remains as to whether the Task Force had a real impact on the way museums approach the issues of the representation and participation of Native peoples in cultural institutions in Canada. Was the Task Force report a well-meaning but ultimately useless gesture of appeasement to Aboriginal communities and their supporters? Did the Task Force recommendations alter

subsequent museum practices and administrative policies, or were those museum policy revisions more a result of changes dictated by government regulations or by increasing demands for inclusionary and equitable exhibitions from modern museum audiences? Through this examination of the changes the Task Force engendered in the McCord Museum, a typical, medium-sized, yet influential cultural institution, some light can be shed on questions that merit much closer study than has yet occurred.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

¹ The Task Force members were Tom Hill and Trudy Nicks, co-chairs, Henri Dorion, Joanna Bedard, Andrea Laforet, Gloria Cranmer Webster, Michael Ames, Miriam Clavir, Robert Janes, Carol Geddes, Katharine Pettipas, Donna Augustine, Bob McGhee, Gerald McMaster, Nicholas DeLeary, Dorothy Daniels, Bill Byrne, Cathy Martin, Alex Greyeyes, Marie Routledge, Ruth Phillips, Linda Jules, Chuck Arnold, David Miller, Nancy Hall, Liz Thunder, Karen Isaacs, John McAvity, Lance Belanger, and Lee-Ann Martin. Associate members were Deborah Smith, Moira McCaffrey, Gerald Conaty, Margaret Hanna, Reg Crowshoe, Phil Stepney, and Peter Christmas.

² Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships between Museums and First Peoples*, (Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations, 1992), n.p.

³ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1, 8-9.

⁵ Canada, *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force Charged with Examining Federal Policy Concerning Museums*, (Ottawa: Communications Canada, 1986).

⁶ Trudy Nicks, "Partnerships in Developing Cultural Resources: Lessons From the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples," *Culture* XII (1) 1992: 88.

⁷ Duncan F. Cameron, "Preface." in Glenbow Museum, *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples*, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987), 7.

⁸ Canada, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples: Vol. 4 Perspectives and Realities*, (Ottawa: Canada Communication Group, 1996), 523.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 523.

¹⁰ Victoria Dickenson, "Cultural Pluralism and Museums: a Preliminary Investigation," (Ottawa: Dickenson Harrison Associates, November 1990), 5. Unpublished brief; from Canadian Museum Association Fonds, National Archives of Canada, MG28 I344 Accession No. 1993/0271, vol. 1.

¹¹ "Righting 100 Years of Wrong," *The World at Six*, CBC Radio, 21 November 1996, CBC Online Archives <<http://archives.cbc.ca/400d.asp?id=1-73-516-2443#>>.

CHAPTER ONE: THE TASK FORCE ON MUSEUMS AND FIRST PEOPLES

The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples grew out of the longstanding political, economic, legal, and social circumstances of Aboriginal peoples in Canada which came to a head in the late 1980s. Simmering disagreements between Native peoples and the museum community boiled over into open hostility during the early stages of planning exhibitions and activities for the 1992 celebrations of the Columbus quincentenary and the 125th anniversary of Canadian confederation. Public institutions celebrating the “discovery” of the Americas by Europe was distasteful to Native groups and exacerbated the longstanding controversies around land claims and the appropriation of Native cultures by non-Native Canadians.¹

Despite such publications as Harold Cardinal’s *The Unjust Society* (1969), popularly known as the “Red Paper,” the booklet *Citizens Plus* (1970) by the Indian Chiefs of Alberta, and Howard Adams’ *Prison of Grass: Canada From a Native Point of View* (1975), all of which detail the continuing distinctiveness and viability of Aboriginal societies and insist on the cultural and human rights of Native people, Aboriginal issues did not often receive significant attention in the 1960s and 1970s. After years of trial and error, coupled with close attention to the successful publicity campaign strategies of the “Bilingual and Bicultural” and feminist movements, Canadian Aboriginal communities became more adept at using the media to highlight their concerns and broadcast them to Canadian society.

Cardinal’s Red Paper was a reaction against the Canadian government’s *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy, 1969*, commonly referred to as the White Paper on Indian Policy, written under the direction of then Minister of Indian

Affairs and Northern Development, Jean Chrétien. The White Paper proposed dissolution of the Indian Act, with the premise that “special treatment has made of the Indians a community disadvantaged and apart.”² According to this document, a “break with the past” would result in the “full, free and non-discriminatory participation of the Indian people in Canadian society...[This goal] requires that the Indian people’s role of dependence be replaced by a role of equal status, opportunity and responsibility, a role they can share with all other Canadians.”³ Though Native people believed the Indian Act to be fundamentally flawed, it represented the most important legal document holding the Government of Canada to its traditional treaty promises. Elimination of the Indian Act would, therefore, leave Native bands and tribes with little recourse to protect both their individually-negotiated and their federally-guaranteed treaty rights. The warning that the government was trying to abandon its traditional responsibilities to provide education and health care to Native populations inflamed Native leaders and councils, who counterattacked in the same media then trumpeting the government position.

As the 1970s’ federal government policies encouraging bilingualism and biculturalism took effect, many ethnic groups, and particularly the indigenous peoples of Canada, began to demand equal rights to those extended to the French minority. Recognizing the importance of cultural control over understandings of the past, in 1972 the National Indian Brotherhood presented to the Minister of Indian Affairs a policy paper titled *Indian Control of Indian Education*.⁴ By 1982, Native suspicions of Canadian government insincerities led to the formation of the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), an organization determined to present a united front to oppose any further encroachment on traditional rights, and to reverse past injustices.

Increasing frustration felt by Native Canadians towards governmental inaction and societal apathy regarding Aboriginal concerns was clearly expressed by Georges Erasmus. A political activist for Native rights since the 1970s, he has advocated land claim settlements and self-determination for decades. Erasmus, a charismatic and passionate public speaker, was elected National Chief of the AFN in 1985. After his re-election in 1988, Erasmus warned Canadians that avoiding peaceful discussions with Native leaders would result in violent confrontations with Native groups in the future. He claimed that “the Canadian government is not taking our issues seriously.”⁵

The larger need to familiarize the Canadian public with Native issues was reflected in the decision by the leader of the Lubicon Lake Cree, Bernard Ominayak, to hire a public relations consultant to assist the Lubicon people in their local land claim disagreement with federal, Albertan, and Shell Corporation officials. The public relations expert, Fred Lennarson, was initially expected to promote the Lubicon land claims, but later proved indispensable to the 1988 media campaign surrounding the boycott of the Glenbow Museum’s exhibition of Native life, *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada’s First Peoples*.⁶ The Lubicon Nation’s decision to recruit the media and foreign museums to assist its campaign against the Glenbow Museum and Shell Canada is not surprising. Years of talks with Canadian government officials had produced little satisfaction, and the Glenbow Museum’s invitation to discuss the Lubicon Nation’s concerns about the exhibition seemed to promise equally poor results.⁷

With the international public forum of the 1988 Calgary Olympics coinciding with increased attention to long-neglected land claims and the abrogation of the rights of Aboriginal peoples, *The Spirit Sings* seemed to exemplify the dismissive and uncaring

attitudes of public institutions towards sensitive Native issues. Asking Shell Canada, a company busily exploiting the rich oil and gas resources present on disputed Lubicon land, to sponsor an exhibition celebrating Native art and traditions, and allowing the company to advertise its name within the exhibition, seemed to many to illustrate the contempt demonstrated by political and legal policy-makers in Canada, here reinforced by a powerful cultural institution. Historians, museum personnel, and other scholars and theorists quickly took sides during the Lubicon dispute. Most famously, perhaps, was the extended debate between Bruce Trigger of McGill University and Michael Ames of the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology.

The controversy revolved around whether museums should support political causes, and focused on the dangers of succumbing to the wishes of special interest groups. Trigger held that it is the responsibility of cultural institutions to listen to the ultimate owners of the cultural artefacts they hold, and thus opposed the lending of items from the McCord Museum's collection to the Glenbow Museum, as it was against the explicit wishes of several Canadian Native groups. Trigger also strongly objected to Shell Canada's participation in an exhibition claiming to "[celebrate] the native spirit...from which flows the inspiration to create such objects,"⁸ while the fuel company was occupied in disrupting the traditional ways of life of the Lubicon people to the point that poverty and disease were rampant in the Lubicon community.⁹ Ames, however, maintained that yielding to the demands of the Lubicon Nation or to the ultimata of any protestors would imperil the autonomy of the museum, making it hostage to the interest group with the loudest voice. He stated emphatically that politics had no place in curatorship.¹⁰ Despite their disagreements, both Ames and Trigger acknowledged that

the major sponsors of museums in Canada are governments and wealthy companies, which Trigger understood as proof that museums are inevitably political, while Ames challenged any cultural or educational entity to survive without this “tainted money.”¹¹ Even John Kim Bell, president of the Canadian Native Arts Association, recognized the truth in Ames’s arguments: “About dirty money: all money is dirty when it comes to Native people. Most dirty money is from the federal government, and we take that all the time.”¹²

The unresolved debate moved into the public domain with the opposing sides of the argument featured in the Canadian Museums Association’s publication, *Muse* (1988), the scholarly anthropological journal, *Culture* (1988), and on CBC Radio’s *Morningside* (1988) talk show with Peter Gzowski, which was later transcribed in the arts publication, *Vanguard* (1989). In an article published some years after *The Spirit Sings* closed, then-Curator of Ethnology at the Glenbow Museum, Julia Harrison, credited controversy over the Lubicon boycott as providing the motivation for systemic reform in museum policy:

On one level the controversy initiated the development of policies within museums as they drafted more formal stands on repatriation, community involvement in programming, the nature of programming in general, and museums’ responsibilities to their various publics. Such actions formalized things that in some cases had been happening informally for years; in other cases they defined totally new relationships. This thinking took museums into new dimensions about the right to do what they do and challenged the very nature of the power of these institutions. The debate prompted by *The Spirit Sings*, which turned to dialogue between museums, Native peoples, and the academic community, predicts a challenging and productive future for these three groups, as each now has an entrée to begin to question the assumptions which drive its relationships with the others. The policies and programs being developed by museums are only the first step in this process.¹³

The Lubicon Lake Cree successfully made their plight known throughout Canada and Europe and embarrassed the Canadian government into renewing its efforts to resolve the debates surrounding the Lubicon Nation's land claim.¹⁴ However, in 1989 talks between the federal government and the Lubicon were suspended and, although they have since resumed, are making little progress.¹⁵

The boycott and debates organized by the Lubicon Lake Cree were instrumental in effecting changes to federal museum policy. The extensively-publicized debates familiarized a wider general audience to the issues of Aboriginal representation and cultural appropriation, making it impossible for either governments or cultural institutions to ignore these issues without alienating their constituents or patrons. "Preserving our Heritage," a conference held at Carleton University by the CMA and AFN in 1988, strove to articulate the issues causing the impasse between Canadian museums and Native communities and to determine the best ways for non-Native institutions to sensitively represent Native cultures, arts, and histories to the Canadian (Native and non-Native) public. At the closing of the conference, it was decided that the CMA and AFN would jointly organize and fund a task force to investigate the points raised at the conference and to make specific recommendations for museums and Native groups, which they would present at a later date. The first coordinator of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples was Lee-Ann Martin, then a freelance curator and researcher, and the two co-chairs were Tom Hill of the Woodland Cultural Centre and Trudy Nicks of the Royal Ontario Museum. To round out the Task Force, the chairs chose Native and non-Native members of the museum and arts communities, as well as representatives from Native communities across Canada.¹⁶

One of the primary purposes of “Preserving our Heritage,” as stated by the organizers, was “the establishment of ongoing mechanisms for exchange both between and amongst the Aboriginal and museum communities.”¹⁷ In his opening remarks, Georges Erasmus thanked the museum professionals who dedicated their professional lives “to showing what they believe is the accurate picture of indigenous peoples,” but he expressed the desire of Native peoples to leave behind the exhibitions in which non-Native experts analyse and represent Native people and subjects.¹⁸ He also voiced the frustration felt by Native people that “millions of dollars are spent on building, so we have a beautiful physical plant, but never enough money to bring in the Native people themselves.”¹⁹ Integrity of expression and creative control of representations of the Native historical and cultural record by Aboriginal people were important concerns to the Native community. As Chris McCormick, the representative of the Native Council of Canada stated at the 1988 conference:

The project of reconquest [of our homeland] must extend to the task of interpretation. We must affirm control and sovereignty over our cultures; if we do not, we will remain guests and onlookers in the museum world. To be sure, we will be asked to consult and cooperate but we will not be in control. A culture that is controlled, owned, or housed under another roof is at most a refugee, at worst a dead thing. My culture has survived, but...it must cease to be a refugee.²⁰

Cultural control is not, however, easily wrested from incumbent administrators. The major decisions in a museum are made by the board of trustees, and Native people are virtually absent from these Canadian museum boards. Prevailing attitudes among non-Native museum professionals were identified in the 1988 comments of Michael Ames:

Originating populations have a different claim on museums than constituents. Constituents usually go to be entertained and informed. Originating peoples are concerned about how they are being represented; how they are being used. The new museum philosophy needs to recognize originating populations have legitimate expectations and legitimate rights, and that museums have to serve their interests as well as those of the constituents. We cannot ignore the interests of the constituents, because that is where the funding comes from, but we must recognize the equally legitimate interests of the originating peoples.²¹

Ames' separation of originating populations and constituents into discreet categories is problematic. As citizens of the state, every member of the public in Canada is a constituent. Furthermore, depending on the exhibition under discussion, the "originating population" will vary. In the McCord Museum of Canadian History's exhibition *Across Borders: Beadwork in Iroquois Life* (1999), for example, the originating population is the Iroquois, but in the McCord's *The Scots: Dyed-in-the-Wool Montrealers* (2003), it is nineteenth-century Montrealers of Scottish extraction. Ames' separation of the originating peoples as the passive objects of an exhibition and the constituents as the source of funding (and therefore the legitimate source of power) of an exhibition is fundamentally flawed because the two categories inevitably overlap.

Ames' assumption that museums must retain an objective distance from the sometimes messy emotions and demands of various interest groups confirms Chris McCormick's claim that Natives could at best expect only to "be asked to consult and cooperate but we will not be in control," and McCormick's belief that: "A culture that is controlled, owned, or housed under another roof is at most a refugee, at worst a dead thing."²² Recognition of the cultural "refugee" status of "originating" Native populations in Canadian museums in the late 1980s was a striking counterpart to the political sore spots then erupting in the Native communities. In 1989, AFN delegates attended a

conference held by the Secretary of State in the Ottawa Senate to plan for the celebration of Canada's 125th year of confederation. AFN leader, George Erasmus, told the audience of the deep insult suffered by the First Nations when the premiers and the Prime Minister felt free to announce to the world that Canada proudly claimed only two distinct founding peoples.²³ Erasmus expressed the shock experienced by Native leaders who had been involved in extensive negotiations with those same government leaders for five years: "And yet they had the audacity, or the *ignorance*, to come out of there and not recognize that Canada – nowhere else! – nowhere else in this world do the indigenous people from here call home. And if we are not distinct here, where in the hell are we distinct?"²⁴

Erasmus spoke in a voice shaking with rage:

I don't like what has happened over the last five hundred years, one hundred twenty five years. I couldn't do a lot about it. Let's say the majority of the people in this room, in this country, couldn't do anything about it. But what are we going to do about the *next* five hundred years? What are we going to do about the next *ten* years?²⁵

The AFN, Erasmus vowed, was determined to change the image of Native peoples as quaint and powerless: "We are sick and tired of coming to events like this and being your conscience. Absolutely sick and tired of it! We'd love nothing more than to be able to go around and dance and feel good about ourselves, but by God, we have too many real things to be concerned about."²⁶ Despite his dismissal of dance displays as capable of effecting real change, Erasmus, in his address to the Carleton University conference of the AFN and the CMA a year earlier, recognized the importance of cultural control to the health of Native societies. Erasmus had told the "Preserving our Heritage" delegates that the Native groups present at the conference wanted to work in partnership with Canadian institutions to present Native arts, artefacts, cultures, beliefs, "and

everything else that goes into the making of a complete people” as evidence of their survival as a living civilization.²⁷

While the “Preserving our Heritage” conference was generally positive, and sparked initial enthusiasm for the creation of a task force to identify concrete measures and strategies for solving the troublesome issues between museums and Aboriginal peoples, Barbara Tyler, then president of the CMA, acknowledged in her closing remarks that the people gathered at the conference were largely “the converted.” There was no representation of trustees of museum boards, and few directors of institutions or government representatives. As well, many Native leaders were absent.²⁸ The reticence on the part of some Aboriginal groups to deepen their involvement with public museum institutions is understandable. As cultural studies scholar Lola Young writes: “...there are many who wish to remain ‘excluded’ because they do not wish to be a part of a system that promotes inequality and injustice throughout its structures. Any publicly funded organization may stand accused of reproducing the problems that it is supposedly attempting to resolve since it is, necessarily, part of the system and thus part of the problem.”²⁹ Lee-Ann Martin concurs and notes that Native curators and cultural workers may feel some ambivalence about working in an institution in which they see Aboriginal cultures and histories misrepresented or dealt with summarily.³⁰ Until Aboriginal people have representation in the power infrastructures of institutions controlled by the non-Aboriginal majority, commensurate with the importance of the Aboriginal collections of those institutions, they must regard the policy decisions of Board members with some suspicion.

The 1992 report submitted by the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples specifically cited the need for “the increased involvement of Aboriginal peoples in the interpretation of their culture and history by cultural institutions.”³¹ In the many discussions, reports, and submissions, “interpretation” referred to “all facets of museum administration, research, public program and exhibition planning, and the presentations that result from such planning.”³² The Task Force identified access to museum collections as another important factor which would increase interpretive control.³³ “Access” was defined as “not only physical access...for purposes of viewing, research, making reproductions and ceremonial use, but also access to funding sources, policy development and implementation activities, as well as training and employment in museums and other cultural institutions.”³⁴

The second major reform identified by the Task Force was the call for “the return of human remains and illegally obtained objects along with certain non-skeletal burial materials and other sacred objects to appropriate First Peoples.”³⁵ Repatriation has always been a hotly-contested issue, with museums loathe to endanger historical artefacts by removing them from museum storage. However, often the museum discourse surrounding repatriation tends toward the paternalistic. As Michael Ames stated at “Preserving our Heritage,” non-Native museums will remain important to Native communities, because they are “keepers of the heritage,” skill banks, and access to wider audiences and greater opportunities.³⁶ A common response by museums to requests of repatriation was also put forward by Ames: he suggested that long-term loans are equal to repatriation.³⁷ However, Lee-Ann Martin has emphasized that: “Museums have had [artefacts] on long-term loan for far too long!”³⁸

According to Martin, the Task Force recommendations on repatriation have not been implemented by sufficient numbers of institutions, nor have the many which did follow the recommendations been completely cooperative in returning all items. Most museums failed to initiate contact with the communities from which items in their collections originate to determine if an interest in repatriation existed. Currently, the responsibility for researching museum holdings for the purposes of repatriation lies principally with Native communities, which rarely have the resources or personnel to pursue such research. Martin holds that, until more Aboriginal people are on staff in museums with Native ethnological collections, the access of Native community members to the collections of these museums will be incomplete, and meaningful liaison will not occur.³⁹

The Task Force studied the American model of repatriation, as legislated by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), but determined that “partnerships should be guided by moral, ethical and professional principles and not limited to areas of rights and interests specified by law.”⁴⁰ Some sentiment exists among museum staffs, notes Moira McCaffrey of the McCord Museum, that written policies, such as NAGPRA’s forceful legislation, hinder the progress of meaningful discussion between museums and Aboriginal peoples. Simply putting policies on paper does not guarantee a commitment to see them through, and McCaffrey believes more effort should be made to establish friendly connections with appropriate representatives of a community.⁴¹ Tom Hill, director of the Woodland Cultural Centre and co-chair of the Task Force, believes that despite the pitfalls of legislation, repatriation agreements are moving in that direction.⁴² According to Hill, legislation such as NAGPRA is too

adversarial and, in the case of NAGPRA, there is no monitoring of the repatriated objects as governments (the principal funding bodies) are not concerned about the artefacts once they have been repatriated.⁴³ NAGPRA assures only the political ramifications of returning the objects to their rightful owners, but there is no clause in the Act to protect or ensure the integrity of the cultural objects. Lee-Ann Martin shares the views of McCaffrey and Hill, agreeing that, too often, written policies encourage token actions rather than producing the true spirit of cooperation necessary to support any real change.⁴⁴

The Task Force report was, however, influential in the drafting of the Canadian Museums Association's *Ethics Guidelines* (1999). The CMA updated its code of ethics in response to "a number of significant changes to Canadian society and in museum theory and practice," citing its support of the *ICOM Code of Professional Ethics 1986*.⁴⁵ The International Council of Museums publicly supported the Lubicon boycott of *The Spirit Sings* and, at its conference in 1986, called for museums to listen more attentively to the wishes and needs of indigenous groups.⁴⁶ The CMA shares this ICOM mandate, and its ethics handbook contains sections on "Respect for Traditional Customs" and "Culturally Sensitive Objects and Human Remains." Although the handbook does not specifically mention the Task Force report nor single out First Nations issues, the spirit of the Task Force is present and the CMA ethics committee issues the warning that the CMA Board of Directors would not hesitate to deal with violations of the *CMA Ethics Guidelines*.⁴⁷ This document differs significantly from the statement defining ethical behaviour published in 1979 by the CMA. The concerns of earlier policy makers focused more on potential conflicts of interest among museum workers.⁴⁸ Because CMA board

members are established cultural workers in Canadian institutions, the evolution of the documents produced by the boards of directors reveals in a practical and dynamic manner the changing priorities of Canadian museum professionals. Similar changes are striking on the federal front as well: in the *Canadian Museum Policy* of 1990, unlike the *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force Charged with Examining Federal Policy Concerning Museums* of 1986, the authors explain the importance of “our understanding of the roles played by the Aboriginal people ... in the development of our country,” and pledge support “for the professional development of Aboriginal museum personnel ... in close consultation with the Aboriginal and museum communities.”⁴⁹ The Canadian government has followed up on this pledge to some degree, instituting internship programs for Native cultural workers and incorporating into the Museums Assistance Plan a facet for developing Aboriginal museums and cultural institutions.⁵⁰ Many scholars agree, however, that there is not enough funding to go around, and the criteria for eligibility is often restricting.⁵¹

Under the rubric of the need for the increased involvement of Aboriginal people in the interpretation of their cultures and histories by cultural institutions, identified by the Task Force, was the issue of the integration of Native staff into various levels of operation within those institutions. Realistically, Canadian museums do not have the funding necessary to create more full-time, permanent jobs, despite government funding programs and affirmative action initiatives for hiring people of Aboriginal ancestry. Institutions which are not operated by Native communities nor solely dedicated to Native cultural studies have a disappointing record of including Native people in their permanent infrastructures. As positions become available through the departure of staff, some

museums are attempting to fill them with qualified members of Canada's cultural minorities and, where the institution has an important collection relating to a particular cultural group, efforts are being made to hire members of that group. These efforts, however, are not ubiquitous. An area over which museums have control that is not dependent on funding is the make-up of their volunteer boards of directors. There is a worrisome lack of prominent Native community members on museum boards.

Today, changes continue in the uneasy relationship between Aboriginal peoples and museums, albeit at a slower pace than in the early 1990s. The Department of Canadian Heritage provides funding for Aboriginal museums through its Museums Assistance Program and the Visual Arts Division of the Canada Council has different grants to aid Aboriginal curators and artists in their research and projects. These are important initiatives because they recognize the need to hire Aboriginal people to work in cultural institutions. As Martin states in a forthcoming article, research on Aboriginal cultural issues is still mostly done by non-Aboriginal people, which contributes to the exclusion of Aboriginal scholars.⁵² An exciting recent development by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) calls for prioritizing Aboriginal research in the designated SSHRC areas. SSHRC's Dialogue on Research and Aboriginal Peoples involved "over five hundred individuals from a wide variety of Aboriginal, academic, government and non-governmental organizations" who collaborated to produce "a series of program and organizational initiatives designed to launch SSHRC's Aboriginal Research Agenda."⁵³ Rather than another governmental discussion group about Aboriginal issues by non-Aboriginal scholars, half of the participants of the SSHRC round table talks leading to the paper presented to SSHRC's

Board of Directors and senior management were people of Aboriginal heritage, and included scholars, members of community organizations, and elders.⁵⁴ One of the proposed initiatives was to increase the number of Aboriginal people at all levels of SSHRC's operation, including the Board, committees, and staff.⁵⁵

As SSHRC is the most accessible granting agency for academic research in Canada, it is significant that in 2002 the SSHRC board of directors identified the representation and participation of Aboriginal Canadians in research initiatives as a major priority. By encouraging research on, and especially by, Aboriginal issues and peoples, SSHRC is contributing to a considerable increase in the understanding of cultural change affecting Aboriginal peoples and in the identification of areas of importance in their lives.

Cultural studies scholar Robyn Gillam takes a more cynical look at what she sees as bureaucratic proceedings run by government-funded bodies. She argues that the concerns of the real stakeholders are often shunted to the periphery in the allocation of government monies:

The battles are fought between politicians and bureaucrats and the museum professionals they fund, or else between museum professionals and the members of some societal or professional group. In the latter case, government generally steps in and adjudicates the conflict, holding hearings or conferences and producing reports. Community input is thus bureaucratized and institutionalized, becoming part of a national cultural ideology. Sometimes the museum itself responds, incorporating into its own argumentative discourse those who seek to question, causing them ultimately to 'disappear.' ... [W]ider social conflicts *can* be solved symbolically through cultural means, but the public tends to be sidelined as spectators of what are supposed to be their own institutions.⁵⁶

More than fifteen years after the decision to form the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples during the 1988 "Preserving our Heritage" conference, funding priorities

are still a source of frustration for Aboriginal cultural workers trying to break into the perpetually cash-strapped museum world: the general feeling is that there is never enough money to buy art by Native artists nor to fill full-time, permanent positions in museums and galleries with Native people.⁵⁷ The majority of museums with collections of Native ethnographic material hire Native peoples, but too often only in contractual positions: docents, workshop leaders, or researchers and guest curators. According to Martin, “there are still few Aboriginal peoples in powerful positions of authority and decision-making within these institutions... Such temporary and subordinate positions cannot adequately influence those structures and policies which most directly exclude the arts of Native peoples from these institutions.”⁵⁸ Despite the claims of George MacDonald, in 1988 director of the Canadian Museum of Civilization, that the museum community recognizes the positive nature of the challenge to include more Native people and is moving quickly to meet it, and that there no longer exist pockets of strong resistance to change in museums, what resistance remains is deeply embedded.⁵⁹

To put the importance of the changes of the last twenty years – and the rate at which they occur – in perspective, and to enable us to consider the future of Aboriginal involvement in museums with a degree of optimism, it may be helpful to repeat an example related by a community elder to Lee-Ann Martin: thousands of years ago, the people sitting near the glaciers did not realize they were melting. It is only in hindsight that we realize the immense changes taking place.⁶⁰

Did the extensive discussion and evaluation of the issues by the Task Force translate into concrete changes in the operations of Canadian museums with respect to Aboriginal issues? Martin believes that the most significant effect of the Task Force was

the development of a framework to help non-Native museums work with Native communities. The Task Force broke new ground, according to Martin, overcoming barriers to collaboration from both museums and Aboriginal groups; the latter hesitant to work with the former because of the history of colonialist anthropological and archaeological interventions in their communities.⁶¹ The Task Force helped to encourage a climate of trust and true partnership between museums and Native communities.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

¹ Some of the larger cultural institutions in Canada, however, planned these events in concert with Aboriginal people: of the different celebratory activities and exhibitions taking place across the country, the Canadian Museum of Civilization and the National Gallery of Canada hosted shows by Aboriginal curators: *Indigena: Perspectives of Indigenous Peoples on 500 Years* curated by Lee-Ann Martin and Gerald McMaster, and *Land, Spirit, Power* curated by Diana Nemiroff, Robert Houle, and Charlotte Townsend-Gault, respectively.

² Canada, *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy, 1969*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969), 3.

³ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁴ National Indian Brotherhood, *Indian Control of Indian Education: Policy Paper Presented to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development*, (Ottawa: The Brotherhood, 1972).

⁵ CBC Radio, "Deal With us Now or Suffer the Consequences," *Midday with Peter Downie*, (2 June 1988) CBC Online Archives <<http://archives.cbc.ca/400d.asp?id=1-73-516-2437#>>, Accessed 3 July 2003.

⁶ Robyn Gillam, *Hall of Mirrors: Museums and the Canadian Public*, (Banff: Banff Centre Press, 2001), 108. See also John Goddard, "Forked Tongues," *Saturday Night* (February 1988), Available online: <<http://www.lubicon.ca>>, Accessed 1 June 2004.

⁷ Representatives of the Lubicon Nation initially refused to meet with Glenbow staff to discuss the boycott of *The Spirit Sings*. They later capitulated and, according to Julia Harrison, "expressed no objection to the content of the exhibition but only to its sponsorship..." See Julia Harrison, "Museums and Politics: *The Spirit Sings* and the Lubicon Boycott," *Muse* 5 no.4 (1988): 12. Lee-Ann Martin, Tom Hill, and Dolorès Contré Migwans all relate personal incidents of frustrating encounters between museum professionals or academics and Aboriginal scholars and community members at which the former are only interested in "patting themselves on the back," (Lee-Ann Martin, interview by author, Gatineau, Quebec, 10 May 2004); are simply "white guys talking Indian," (Tom Hill, interview by author, Brantford, Ontario, 20 May 2004); or where a supposed dialogue is more of a monologue at which Native participants do not even get the chance to speak, (Dolorès Contré Migwans, interview by author, Montreal, Quebec, 18 May 2004).

⁸ Julia Harrison, "Introduction," in *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples*, Glenbow Museum, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987), 10. [exhibition catalogue]

-
- ⁹ Bruce G. Trigger and Michael Ames, "Share the Blame," *Vanguard* 17 no.2: 15.
- ¹⁰ Michael Ames, "Boycott the Politics of Suppression!" *Muse* 5 (1988): 15-16.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, 16; Trigger, "Reply to Michael Ames," *Culture* 8 no.1 (1988): 88.
- ¹² John Kim Bell, 5 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving our Heritage" conference, 4, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau, Quebec.
- ¹³ Julia Harrison, "Completing a Circle: *The Spirit Sings*," in *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, eds. Noel Dyck and James B. Waldram, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993), 354.
- ¹⁴ Gillam, 101-133. Note that the dispute remains unresolved; for more information, see Lubicon Lake Indian Nation, Lubicon Legal Defence Fund, (June 2003) <<http://www.lubicon.ca/>>, Accessed 25 July 2003; and Amnesty International, "'Time is Wasting': Respect for the Land Rights of the Lubicon Cree Long Overdue," (April 2003) <<http://www.amnesty.ca/library/canada/AMR200103.htm>>, Accessed 25 July 2003.
- ¹⁵ See Jean Chrétien, "Letter from Jean Chrétien to Friends of the Lubicon," (27 May 1993), Lubicon Legal Defense Fund, Available online: <http://www.lubicon.ca/1993_Chretien_letter.html>, Accessed 20 April 2004.
- ¹⁶ Although every effort was made to create a fully representative Task Force, the chairpersons encountered some difficulty finding members of the Inuit community. See Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, 8-9 November 1990, meeting minutes, 2, Task Force on Museums and First Peoples 1990, 2002.25 box 726f5, Canadian Museum of Civilization Archives. Lee-Ann Martin was the co-ordinator for the crucial first year of the Task Force, after which this post was taken up temporarily by Nancy Hall of the CMA and then Lance Belanger, artist and curator.
- ¹⁷ Georges Erasmus and John MacAvity to Barbara Tyler, 19 September 1988, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau, Quebec.
- ¹⁸ Georges Erasmus, 3 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving our Heritage" conference, 2, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau, Quebec.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 2.
- ²⁰ Chris McCormick, 3 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving our Heritage" conference, 12, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau, Quebec.

²¹ Michael Ames, 3 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving our Heritage" conference, 18, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau, Quebec.

²² *Ibid.*, 18.

²³ CBC Radio, "Nothing to Celebrate," *Morningside with Peter Gzowski*, (16 October 1989) CBC Online Archives <<http://archives.cbc.ca/400d.asp?id=1-73-516-2439>>, Accessed 3 July 2003.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Erasmus, 3 November 1988, 2.

²⁸ Barbara Tyler, 5 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving our Heritage" conference, 16, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau, Quebec.

²⁹ Lola Young, "Rethinking heritage: cultural policy and inclusion," in *Museums, Society, Inequality*, ed. Richard Sandell, (London: Routledge, 2002), 204.

³⁰ Martin, interview by author, 10 May 2004.

³¹ Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships between Museums and First Peoples*, (Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations, 1992), 1. The Task Force report was edited and submitted by Tom Hill of the Woodland Cultural Centre and Dr. Trudy Nicks of the Royal Ontario Museum, based on two years of consultations and regional meetings with fifty members, associate members, and contributors.

³² *Ibid.*, 4.

³³ "Collections" were defined as "not only human remains and artifacts, but also information associated with these materials: research results, photographs, works of art, and any other information related to First Peoples culture and history held in cultural institutions." *Ibid.*, 4.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 5.

-
- ³⁶ Ames, 3 November 1988, 20.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, 20.
- ³⁸ Martin, interview by author, 10 May 2004.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, 4.
- ⁴¹ Moira McCaffrey, interview by author, 6 May 2004.
- ⁴² Hill cites recent land claim contracts in British Columbia which have repatriation clauses embedded into them, interview by author, 20 May 2004.
- ⁴³ Hill, interview by author, 20 May 2004.
- ⁴⁴ Martin, interview by author, 10 May 2004.
- ⁴⁵ Canadian Museums Association, *Ethics Guidelines*, (Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association, 1999), 1.
- ⁴⁶ International Council of Museums, *ICOM '86* (Budapest: International Council of Museums, 1989), 101; Gillam, 118-119.
- ⁴⁷ Canadian Museums Association, *Ethics Guidelines*, 1.
- ⁴⁸ Canadian Museums Association, *A Guide to Museum Positions Including a Statement on the Ethical Behaviour of Museum Professionals*, (Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association, 1979), 22-25.
- ⁴⁹ Canada, *Canadian Museum Policy: Temples of the Human Spirit*, (Ottawa: Communications Canada, 1990), 15, 43.
- ⁵⁰ See Aboriginal Human Resource Development Council of Canada, "Partnering," (2003), <<http://www.ahrdcc.com/partnerships/>>, Accessed 27 July 2003; Canada Council for the Arts, "Grant Programs: Aboriginal Peoples Secretariat," (2002), <<http://www.canadacouncil.ca/grants/Aboriginalarts/default.asp>>, Accessed July 5, 2003; and Canadian Heritage, "Museums Assistance Program," (September 2003) <http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/pam-map/index_e.cfm>, Accessed 25 May 2004. See also Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, "Arts and Culture," *Services for First Nations People: A Government of Canada Guide*, (April 2004), <http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/sg/sg7_e.html>, Accessed 2 June 2004.

⁵¹ Hill, interview by author, 20 May 2004; Martin, interview by author, 10 May 2004.

⁵² Lee-Ann Martin, "Wordplay: Toward a Critical Vocabulary," unpublished article.

⁵³ Craig McNaughton and Daryl Rock, *Opportunities in Aboriginal Research: Results of SSHRC's Dialogue on Research and Aboriginal Peoples*, (Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 2003), 1, 3. Available online: www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/background/Aboriginal_background_e.pdf, Accessed 17 May 2004.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 36-38.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁵⁶ Gillam, 98, emphasis in original.

⁵⁷ Martin, interview by author, 10 May 2004.

⁵⁸ Lee-Ann Martin, "The Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion: Contemporary Native Art and Public Art Museums in Canada," (Ottawa: Canada Council for the Arts, 1991), 29, 31.

⁵⁹ George MacDonald, 3 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving our Heritage" conference, 6-7, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives.

⁶⁰ Martin, interview by author, 10 May 2004.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER TWO: MUSEUMS AS PRODUCERS OF CULTURE

Les musées ne sont pas des institutions neutres, innocentes, qui évoluent en dehors des luttes socio-politiques. Ils sont davantage des refuges pour les débris d'un passé révolu. Fenêtres ouvertes sur l'Autre et miroirs d'un Nous collectif, ils sont les cellules vivantes d'une mémoire sociale que créent et recréent sans cesse un passé accordé à ce que nous croyons être.¹

Memory of persons, objects, and events seems very personal, but remembrance is often shaped by collective experience and by public representations defining who we are, who we were, and how we lived. The importance assigned to specific memories determines for us what events in our past deserve commemoration and preservation. This chapter will examine the role of museums – traditionally regarded as neutral sites of historical commemoration but, more recently, studied as co-producers of publicly-accepted and officially-sanctioned histories – in forming our understandings of cultural memory.

As Roberta Pearson argues, public memory is hardly objective; rather it is created, and operates to unite society and to form images that attain the value of truth even if they deviate from fact.² Such inculcated historical inventions of the past have affected our notion of “culture” and influenced our selections of culturally important artefacts for preservation; in the process shaping both the present and an imagined future.³ Public display of what was essentially a univocal cultural perspective on history tended to glorify elite segments of society by celebrating the lives and accomplishments of distinguished individuals or groups chosen from those segments, paying little attention to those populations which were either unable to gain or uninterested in gaining political

power and authority. As a result of this repeated exposure to one authorized version of the past, citizens could all cast back and “remember” identical events and people from their regional and national pasts, creating a public memory that supported a narrow understanding of heritage and identity. Historians and museum scholars recognize and are attempting to address the existence of inaccuracies and omissions in the written records of the past, relying not only on documentary evidence, but also increasingly on folklore, literature, material culture, and oral communication as they explore the dynamics of cultural memory, history, and identity in a variety of contexts. As Susan Crane explains:

Museums are more than cultural institutions and showplaces of accumulated objects: they are the sites of interaction between personal and collective identities, between memory and history, between information and knowledge production. We go to museums to learn about ourselves, to witness what has been identified as significant art or history or science, and to come away with a stronger sense of ourselves as implicated in a vast web of tradition and knowledge.⁴

Traditionally, information sources such as museums and other centres of cultural, social, economic, religious, or political interpretation (such as art galleries, national or international fairs, sculptures in town squares, and photographs or paintings in churches or public buildings) have failed to represent equally all constituents of the larger society. Instead, cultural representations were organized to symbolize and honour the often sanitized histories of the dominant societal cultures, groups that usually made up only a minority of the population but controlled much of society’s wealth and institutions. Scholars such as Benedict Anderson have discussed the origins of national consciousness by examining the contribution of print sources which acted to spread common information over large geographical areas and through extended periods of time. The

face-to-face experience of community was replaced with an expanded “imagined” community, the members of which were connected by shared and “shaped” memories and opinions.⁵ Increasingly, museums and other foci of public recognition are taking a more nuanced approach to the construction of public memory. A broader intellectual recognition of the significance of class, ethnic, economic, and gender tensions, not only in the events of the actual past, but also in the construction of the historical record, has forced many cultural institutions to tell or to retell the stories of previously under-represented societal groups. Alternative histories are now redefining what constitutes a valid historical record, and are reconsidering whose versions of that record merit not only a hearing, but also dedicated efforts to remember and to preserve evidence of that inclusive record for future generations.

Revised theories in museology are making it possible for previously-disfranchised groups to reclaim their histories and to celebrate their often-discounted cultural memories. David Glassberg argues that a successful interaction between public history and political culture must incorporate an understanding of how individuals, families, social and ethnic groups, and communities interpret and reconfigure history and attach significance to events and places.⁶ Aboriginal Canadians occupy a unique space in this movement because versions of the stories of their past have always been an important part of the Canadian historical record. Their past, however, has been told by voices which appropriated and skewed the history of Native peoples, and by those who exploited Aboriginal symbols, art, and culture to foster a particular concept of Canadian identity. Late 1980s’ discussions leading to the formation of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples confirmed the growing awareness among stakeholders in Canadian museums and

Aboriginal cultural affairs of the important position of museums as creators of culture and the public understanding of history, and of museal responsibility for the continuing misrepresentation of Aboriginal culture. The participants of the 1988 “Preserving our Heritage” conference pointed to the problems inherent in retrograde and colonialist representations of Native culture and history by non-Natives:

It has often been said that many of our cultural institutions are controlled by the dominant culture, and tell the story of the past that perpetrates and perpetuates the power base of that culture. In this age of increasing democratisation, especially in the area of culture, it is a fact of life that local communities, indigenous peoples and ethnic groups are expressing interest in developing and controlling their own heritage activities and institutions.⁷

The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, which proceeded from the conference, did not discount the value of “the empirical knowledge and approaches of academically-trained workers” but emphasized that such knowledge must be harnessed to “the conceptual knowledge and approaches characteristic of First Peoples.”⁸ Academic researchers must navigate through huge depositories of archival and anecdotal records as they search for what they deem to be an accurate interpretation of the past. Deliberately or subconsciously, some records are selected and others omitted, resulting in stories that reflect a specific narration. Selective historical research can lead to peculiar results, as one museum scholar testifies: “A museum visitor would (until recently) have assumed that women played a merely decorative role in history, that the history of the American continent began when Europeans arrived, that immigrants from India or the West Indies had nothing to do with English history, and that art produced by non-Western artists is displayed only in anthropology museums.”⁹

Montreal, the largest site of political and economic exchange in Canada for most of its history and, even now, the focal point of cultural exchange in Quebec, has long endured a systemic ambivalence about what historical events should be recognized, studied, and preserved in memory. In a post-confederation Quebec, protective of provincial educational control, educational strategies concentrated on the inculcation of often ahistorical Catholic doctrine and racial memory aimed to ensure *la survivance* of French Canadians against both the North American Native traditions and the ideas of the English-speaking invaders.¹⁰ As most of those early Anglophones lived and worked in Montreal, some conflict in depictions of that city's history became unavoidable. André Renaud suggests that differing, entrenched, English and French accounts of the past ensured that regional and ethnic rivalries would be transmitted whole from generation to generation of Canadian students.¹¹ In addition, such propagandised history could not allow students the freedom to develop critical thinking skills, for fear that those skills might be used to discern the high level of subjective opinion underpinning their education.

Philip Schlesinger suggests that regional loyalties and hostilities stem from identification by language, culture, or religion, rather than from an arbitrarily assigned nationhood: "the making of identities is an active process that involves inclusion and exclusion. To be 'us,' we need those who are 'not-us'."¹² Criteria establishing who should be included in and who excluded from the "us" are often formulated in cultural institutions. In "Nationalism at a Micro-scale: Educational Segregation in Montreal," David Kaplan states that education creates the institutional mechanisms whereby identity, broadly defined within a territorial space, is transformed into "an emotional and symbolic

network of belonging and identification.”¹³ Many scholars would agree with Kaplan’s argument, concluding that compulsory schooling, coupled with the use of officially-sanctioned history textbooks that tell a prescribed story of the past, becomes an instrument of political and cultural hegemony.¹⁴ These studies reinforce the suggestions that public education functions not only as a source of social solidarity and as a means of social control, but also as a tool to promote social compliance with and reproduction of the dominant ethos. David Lowenthal reminds us that

In most school texts, history remains one-dimensional even where controversy is rampant. For example, the antiquity of Native American settlement is keenly disputed, but textbook readers would never know this; most texts portray either the ‘early’ or the ‘late’ arrival version as undisputed fact. Loose ends are avoided lest they unravel faith... No wonder historians find it hard to persuade people that there may be more than one ‘accurate’ version of the same event.¹⁵

Political geographer James Anderson argues that successful identity construction involves ongoing reinforcement of both internal cohesion and external distinctiveness. In other words, we form a community because we share certain past events and commonalities and because others do not.¹⁶ Ongoing reinforcement can come from many sources: academic history is only one part of the larger process of producing a common social memory. Nevertheless, academic history can privilege a narrow version of the past to the extent that subsequent, often-repeated constructions of memory spread official “public” memory and add weight to its initial impact. A citizenry educated into unthinking conformity with the dominant ideology, rather than taught to exercise critical discrimination, cannot successfully evaluate subjective historical “truths” displayed in other, non-textbook, venues. These omniscient and seemingly authorless “truths,” when

observed in museums or other institutions, help to preserve or encourage a specific historical cultural reality to the detriment of other, equally valid, realities.

Not surprisingly, the political and ideological visions of officials who decide what is taught in history classes have often determined the characteristics of subsequent regional and even national identities, as the events of the memorialized past are carefully constructed to reinforce those visions.¹⁷ Several participants at the “Preserving our Heritage” conference noted, “Museums are intended to preserve the past, but they also unwittingly preserve stereotypes,”¹⁸ and “the stereotyping does not necessarily start in museums, it begins with teaching those who work in museums, ... schools, universities, literature, the media, films, and television...”.¹⁹ For the last five years Dolorès Contré Migwans of the McCord Museum has been actively reviewing and revising educational programming. As an educator in the Native Programs division of the Museum, Migwans has integrated a personal discourse into tours of the collection by school groups, diminishing the objectification of Native peoples and cultures. She has also helped to create a team of Aboriginal guides and workshop facilitators to eliminate common stereotypes of contemporary Native people.²⁰ The McCord Museum is working steadily to help dismantle exhibitions that reinforce outdated understandings of archaic, univocal histories.

Public and private support for museum exhibitions devoted to disfranchised groups are helping to accomplish inclusive recognition of the validity of multicultural participation in Canada’s history but, even yet, many institutions cannot resist the lure of creating or building agenda-laden identities. A. W. Jefferson states: “We often choose to remember mistakenly what we *need* to remember...to preserve our individual and

collective identities.”²¹ Museums “can contribute to feelings of enrichment or feelings of alienation amongst [various] communities.”²² Broadening the diversity of subjects presented in museum displays serves not only to benefit under-represented segments of society, but to guide viewers to understand wider versions of historical events and to accept different cultural and national identities. It becomes the responsibility of museum visitors to approach displays and exhibitions with enough of an objective eye to realize that they are only seeing part of the story; but this is difficult when typical visitors have not been trained or even encouraged to regard officially-sanctioned histories critically. As Susan Crane explains:

At the end of the twentieth century, the average museum-goer may well ask, ‘Who decided which objects I may view here? Who has established this master narrative of meaning with which I am being presented?’ But I think it is far more likely that the individual museum-goer continues to go seeking to be impressed by the objects and meanings that s/he either expected to find, or is expecting to be initiated into. The sheer size, antiquity, scale, or scope of the exhibits may sufficiently impress viewers as significant, and we need to consider what kinds of memories inspire and form around these impressions.²³

The formation of public memory, and of rigid definitions of “us” and “other” are not simply theoretical musings by denizens of the ivory tower of academia. They are issues that should be raised and considered by all members of a pluralistic society. The importance of questions about the accuracy of the historical record and about acceptance and inclusion is sharply focused in museum studies. Lola Young asks:

“Who has the power/right to represent narratives of the past? Who has the right/authority to represent ‘other’ cultures? Once raised, these questions will not simply disappear if they are ignored, or treated as if they are questions to be addressed only by the ‘others’ themselves. Failure to act upon the issues raised by these critiques leads to a loss of credibility and of the authority that organisations and individuals seek to retain. Another

consequence is that alienated, disenfranchised people turn to other fantastical accounts of the past lacking in rigour and accuracy, in order to satisfy the demand for more historical knowledge.”²⁴

Underlying this examination of the role of museums is the question of how “public” interest is defined. Is the nearly exclusive presentation of the pasts of religious, economic, social, media, political, and cultural elites a justified expenditure of public funds; funds that come from a broader, distinctly non-elite public? At first glance, the answer is a resounding “no.” However, the commodification of culture is a constant reality in lean times, when many museums rely not only on public grants, but also on donations from wealthy patrons and on revenue from museum visitors. Museums, as with other cultural venues, must remain conscious of viewer preferences for exhibitions of the rich and powerful: in Lowenthal’s words, “Dispassionate precision wins few readers, as famed past historians well knew. Readers today are adjured to give up old history’s swashbuckling romp down the centuries for meticulous accounts of the miserable diet of roof thatchers in the 1750s. But this trendy populist fare is indigestible.”²⁵

To be sure, a more inclusive approach to representing public histories generates its own problems. Histories narrated by less powerful socioeconomic classes, including ethnic minorities and women, should not be exempt from critical examination. These histories are often as poorly-researched and error-filled as those compiled about the “swashbuckling rompers,” yet problems or inaccuracies in the histories of the marginalized are sometimes excused in the relief of having even a flawed representation of these groups available to the public. Even well-intentioned spokespeople for under-represented groups can be guilty of rushing an historically-spurious display into the

museum venue. Historian Peter Davis warns of the lure of “identity as an escape from uncertainty,” and the accompanying pressure to establish, or to preserve, a memory of a long-forgotten or repressed past, especially in a rapidly-changing world.²⁶

Locations that serve to commemorate and to preserve the selected memories of an individual, community, nation, or society surface in all cultures. Pierre Nora examines this relationship between collections enshrining memories and history: “‘Sites of memory’ like museums and monuments have been created to artificially organize the past, because collective memory no longer functions in an organic way.”²⁷ This move from “organic” tribal societies and small communities, who recounted the past through oral histories using commonly understood artefacts, to “imagined” unrelated communities who preserve authorized representations of the past, has given rise to formal institutions of memory preservation. These formal sites unavoidably create confusion in visitors’ understandings of heritage, as individual oral traditions can be, and often are, contradicted by the officially-sanctioned exhibitions offered as evidence of the “imagined” community’s past. Nonetheless, we can neither assume that oral traditions are uncompromised and pure forms of history and knowledge, as these also depend on who tells them, and the freedom with which they are told in small communities.

The role of museums in attaching historical meaning to displayed artefacts is problematic not only because selection policies often support limited historical truth. David Fleming writes: “Because of their partial nature, museum collections have an inbuilt set of biases, and even when curators are keen to give pictures of life in the round, ... they are handicapped by the range of material they have to hand.”²⁸ Accumulating and displaying artefacts present more challenges. Fleming explains: “*What* we collected

cannot be dissociated from *who* did the collecting. And this is where it starts becoming difficult, because our history collections, for example, reflect not the make-up of society at large, but the make-up of the collectors.”²⁹ Certainly the collection of the McCord Museum of Canadian History, the subject of investigation in Chapter Three, reveals the typical Victorian fascination of its founder, David Ross McCord, with amassing early Canadiana and Native “curios.”

Displaying collection items involves a determination of how discursive space is meted out. Such decisions often become compromises between reactionary individuals or groups with social or political power and, on the other side of the debate, public recognition that valid historical discourses must successfully integrate traditionally-displaced or -evicted groups into the space occupied by public history. Competing public and private interests can result in a conflict between stakeholders: “in representing the lives of the richer minority, [museums] have helped alienate the very people whom contemporary social inclusion policies are trying to address.”³⁰ Further complications arise when public money becomes scarce and private donations are solicited by cultural institutions. To maintain a balance between various interest groups, it is crucial for a museum or for any cultural institution to have a staff and a directorial board that are representative of its community and constituency. Acknowledgement of multiple perspectives in an institution ideally reduces the opportunities for oversights, inaccuracies, and accusations of unfairness.

Cultural inclusion, public memory, and museum studies coincide in modern theories of responsible history. Peter Davis writes: “Cultural identity demands that in a changing world we try and hold on to what is important from the past and adopt the best

features of the new.”³¹ But how do we determine what is important from the past? Arguably, this is different for everyone, depending on, in Davis’ term, their sub-communities. Cultural theorist Stuart Hall elucidates the “fragmentation and erosion of collective social identity” with the changing definitions of nationality, among other factors.³² Traditionally, by stating

where you came from; broadly speaking, what race you belong to, a nation state of which you are a citizen or subject; you have a class position, an established and relatively secure gender position. You knew where you fitted in the world... [M]ost of us now live with a sense of a much greater plurality... [These factors no longer] stitch us in place, locate us, in the way they did in the past.³³

With shifting borders, diasporic movements, and multiple ethnic communities existing within a single political territory, people can no longer define themselves based on their country of origin. This is especially true in the West, settled largely by successive waves of immigrant populations. As Hall writes, modern societies must discontinue the unhelpful practice of defining people by their ethnic affiliation: “The notion that identity has to do with people that look the same, feel the same, call themselves the same, is nonsense.”³⁴ By way of example, Hall discusses the current question of “Blackness” in Britain: “Black is not a question of pigmentation. The Black I’m talking about is a historical category, a political category, a cultural category.”³⁵ Identity associations more realistically can be determined on the basis of socioeconomic status. Though Hall is concerned primarily with the case of Britain, his reflections can help us consider the obstructive statistical division of communities in Canada into ethnicities, when much more affinity exists between people of similar socioeconomic circumstances.

This reality does not eliminate the phenomena of racist and classist prejudice, which are serious barriers to the formation of an inclusive understanding of shared identity. A disinclination to participate in the cultural history of other sub-communities can also work against the achievement of equality of representation in public memory locations. Reluctance to give up a cultural identity can shape opinions about what events from whose past should be commemorated. Though a shared interest in the past history of other societal groups is important in a pluralistic nation, how to foster that interest remains problematic. Museums displaying creative exhibitions revealing the difficulties and triumphs of various classes of society discover that some perspectives are not regarded as valid, even when supported by artefacts and written records: “Each class is internally variegated in elaborate ways, but each is seen from outside by the others in terms of one or two stereotypes which dominate their thinking about it. This is because the majority of people go through life without sharing any really significant part of it on equal terms with individuals from other classes, and therefore never really know people from other classes.”³⁶

Let us recall Lola Young’s comment on another, rarely-explored, problem of non-mainstream representation in the historical record: the unwillingness to participate in a public system that is seen as fundamentally unjust.³⁷ In Canada, private funding is scarce, so the cultural sector *must* rely on public funding. In the mid-1990s the Government of Canada created the Ministry of Canadian Heritage, which is essentially an amalgamation of different aspects of other departments, such as the Department of Communications, which previously dealt with national cultural issues. Canadian

Heritage's motto, "Creating Canada Together,"³⁸ indicates a mandate to foster a collective identity as a unifying national force.

Within the debates surrounding national identity, the Ministry of Canadian Heritage is asking for help in the creation of a Canada that includes all Canadians, and in which a distinct national Canadian identity can be discerned. Canadian attempts to promote inclusivity and peaceful social coexistence can easily be seen in the "multicultural patchwork" that adorns government publications and advertisements. By moving to actively include representations of visible minorities in all its publications and institutions, the government is trying to change the perception of a rigid and stratified Canadian society. Racism is still a problem in Canada's cities as well as on the national front, but with increasing media, pictorial, and educational reinforcement, public awareness of the rich contributions of all Canadians to the past and present substance of the nation is growing. Public attitudes and beliefs give power to official narratives and support Davis' words: "Museums are important because they serve to remind us of who we are and what our place is in the world. Their power is due to their ability to operate at a variety of levels: they are significant to us as individuals, as a member of a community, even as a statement of nationhood."³⁹ Our natural desire to belong to a community makes us eager and non-critical audiences of a well-narrated story, ensuring that museums will always have a place in our society. Fortunately, most cultural institutions are becoming more responsible in their presentations, and national and regional efforts encouraging inclusive hiring and programming in museums are incorporating and celebrating increased recognition of historical diversity.

Various museums and cultural institutions in Montreal have developed in recent years to present alternative versions of the histories of Montreal both as a unique region and as an important city in the development of Canada. Curators and researchers at these institutions are willing to stray from the received “grand” headlines of Montreal and Canadian history. The Centre d’histoire de Montréal, for example, is a popular museum which presents “stories” that are markedly different from Montreal’s traditional history establishments, such as the McCord Museum and the Château Ramezay Museum. The Centre d’histoire de Montréal prides itself on its pluralistic approach to history and its inclusion of “Montrealers of all origins.”⁴⁰ The Centre’s permanent exhibition has two parts. The first, *Montreal, Five Times*, is organized into five sections: “Contact 1535-1759;” “Tensions 1760-1849;” “Organization 1850-1899;” “Unions 1900-1949;” and “Explosions 1950-20??” These sections offer an alternative to the customary discourse focusing on important economic or industrial figures of Montreal’s past. For example, “Contact” features a taped reading of the proceedings of the Great Peace of 1701 and describes the mutual respect then present in the relationship between the European and Native leaders. The storyboards discuss why Montreal was chosen as a settlement site and explains the role language plays in the conquest of a country. One panel discusses the presence and situations of Pawnee and Black slaves in Montreal until slavery’s abolition in 1820. “Tensions” explores the volatile relationships between the British and French-Canadian populations, and how frictions were ultimately eased. Of interest in this section is an acknowledgement of the relative absence of women in the recounting of Montreal’s history: “They hardly existed, legally speaking, so it’s no wonder we’ve seen so few of them thus far...”. The early emergence of religious plurality in Montreal is

also introduced: “The British, who permitted their new subjects freedom of worship and allowed the Sulpicians to retain their rights as Seigneurs of the island, were themselves of various denominations and readily tolerated other faiths. So it was in Montreal that the country’s first synagogue was built in 1777 by the Shearith Israel Congregation of Spanish and Portuguese Jews, founded here in 1768.” “Organization” describes the infrastructural planning of the city and the results of the industrial revolution, including pollution and increasing divisions in socioeconomic standing. There is no mention of the leaders of industry, standard fare in the customary industrial history of Montreal. Instead, a strong undercurrent of the divisions between rich and poor runs through the storyboards, and panels detail the plight of female factory workers, early workers’ strikes, and two heroic figures for the working class: Jules Hebronner, a socially active journalist, and Joe Beef, an open-hearted publican. “Unions,” similarly, includes less well-known histories, such as that of Léa Roback and Madeleine Parent, who were instrumental in organizing the garment workers’ strikes of the early twentieth century. Mayor Camillien Houde’s Depression make-work projects, the founding of Hôpital Sainte-Justine by Dr. Irma Le Vasseur (the first woman admitted to the provincial College of Physicians and Surgeons) and her patroness Justine Lacoste-Beaubien, and the roles of Anne Greenup and the Reverend Charles Este in the fight for Black rights in Montreal are some of the often-ignored details of Montreal’s history discussed in the “Unions” display.

“Explosions” begins with descriptions of Expo ’67, details of the popularity of Maurice Richard, and the advent of the FLQ crisis and the Parti Québécois, then expands on the changing face(s) of Montreal with a series of maps showing the geographical locations of households speaking English, French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Greek,

Arabic, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Polish. The exhibition ends with a series of panels describing the establishment of groups mandated to protect Montreal's architectural heritage, such as Save Montreal and Heritage Montreal. All five sections of *Montreal, Five Times* aim to present the atmosphere of the city as its working-class residents experienced it through the years since European colonization, describing the political, social, and cultural circumstances of Montreal's non-hegemonic citizens.

The second half of the permanent exhibition, called *Montreal of a Thousand Faces*, is an innovative exhibition based on the memories and experiences of Montrealers, often immigrants – recent or otherwise. People of varying ages and ethnicities recount their experiences of Montreal as they and the city have changed. The exhibition's rooms are decorated in the styles of different rooms of a house, and visitors are encouraged to take a seat on the sofa or at the kitchen table to listen to the recorded memories.

Like the Centre d'histoire de Montréal, the Écomusée du Fier Monde displays the past of an often-overlooked segment of the population: Montreal's economically-disadvantaged Centre-Sud neighbourhood to the east of the downtown core. A museum of industrial history, the Écomusée exhibits subjects of the work, industry, and culture of the working class both during the neighbourhood's industrial heyday of 1850-1950 and today. In accord with the theory of the ecomuseum movement as a holistic view of a community, the Écomusée du Fier Monde works in collaboration with residents of Centre-Sud and members of community and cultural organizations to produce exhibitions and displays which reflect the community's interests and preoccupations while educating

the general population of Montreal about this important and historically-rich neighbourhood.⁴¹

Montreal offers particularly fertile ground for an exploration of identity, heritage, and public memory. With pronounced social and territorial divisions based on language, religion, ethnicity, and wealth, Montrealers have long been confronted with profound tensions over the construction of public identities and, in particular, the commemoration of a very contested past.⁴² The next chapter will look closely at the McCord Museum of Canadian History, an institution traditionally associated with the values and history of Montreal's Anglo-Protestant elite. Careful study of the McCord Museum provides the opportunity to observe how an important cultural institution has adapted both to changing ideas about museum theory and to the expectations of historical accuracy and representational fairness provided by the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

¹ Jean Hamelin, *Le Musée du Québec: Histoire d'une institution nationale*, (Québec: Musée du Québec, 1991), 9-10.

² Roberta Pearson, "Custer Loses Again: The Contestation Over Commodified Public Memory," in *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*, eds. Dan Ben-Amos and Liliana Weissberg, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999), 176-201.

³ Dan Ben-Amos and Liliana Weissberg, eds., "Introduction," in *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999).

⁴ Susan A. Crane, ed., "Introduction," in *Museums and Memory*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 12-13.

⁵ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Rev. edn., (London & New York: Verso, 1991).

⁶ David Glassberg, "Public History and the Study Of Memory," *The Public Historian* 18 (1996): 7-23.

⁷ Barbara Tyler, 3 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 4, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau.

⁸ Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships between Museums and First Peoples*, (Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations, 1992), 7.

⁹ Peter Davis, *Ecomuseums: a Sense of Place*, (London: Leicester University Press, 1999), 27.

¹⁰ Ken Osborne, "'Our History Has Us Gasping': History in Canadian Schools – Past, Present, and Future," *The Canadian Historical Review*, 81 (2000): 412-414.

¹¹ André Renaud, "Indians in White Culture Curricula and Society," in *National Consciousness and the Curriculum: The Canadian Case*, eds. Geoffrey Milburn and John Herbert, (Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1974), 38.

¹² Philip Schlesinger, "Europeanness: A New Cultural Battlefield?" in *Nationalism*, eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 85.

¹³ David Kaplan, "Nationalism at a Micro-scale: Educational Segregation in Montreal," *Political Geography* 11 (1992): 259-82.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 268.

¹⁵ David Lowenthal, *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, (New York: Free Press, 1996), 117.

¹⁶ James Anderson, "Nationalist Ideology and Territory," in *Nationalism, Self-determination and Political Geography*, eds., R.J. Johnston *et al.*, (London and New York: Croom Helm, 1988), 18-39.

¹⁷ Frank Kelly and Pauline Laing, "The Politics of Curriculum," *Education Canada*, 40 no.3 (2000): 43.

¹⁸ George MacDonald, 3 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 7, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau.

¹⁹ Tyler, 5 November 1988, transcript, "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 15, Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9, Indian Art Centre Archives, Gatineau.

²⁰ Dolorès Contré Migwans, interview by author, Montreal, Quebec, 18 May 2004; McCord Museum of Canadian History, "Schools Program 2004-2005, Preschool-Primary" and "Schools Program 2004-2005, Secondary," (Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 2004). [pamphlets]

²¹ Alphine W. Jefferson, in Jaclyn Jeffrey and Glenace Edwall, eds., *Memory and History: Essays on Recalling and Interpreting Experience*, (Lanham, MD: University Press of America and the Institute for Oral History, 1994), 106 cited in David Lowenthal, "History and Memory," *The Public Historian* 19 no.2 (1997): 34.

²² Lola Young, "Rethinking Heritage: Cultural Policy and Inclusion," in *Museums, Society, Inequality*, ed. Richard Sandell, (London: Routledge, 2002), 204.

²³ Crane, 12-13.

²⁴ Lola Young, 209.

²⁵ Lowenthal, *Possessed*, 109.

²⁶ Davis, 26.

²⁷ Cited in Crane, 6.

²⁸ David Fleming, "Positioning the museum for social inclusion," in *Museums, Society, Inequality*, ed. Richard Sandell, (London: Routledge, 2002), 215-216.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 215-216.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 215-216.

³¹ Davis, 40.

³² Stuart Hall, "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities," in *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, ed. Anthony D. King, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 44.

³³ *Ibid.*, 62-63.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 49.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 53.

³⁶ Bryan Magee, "Bound by the chains of glass," *The Guardian*, 30 May 1990, 21, cited in Fleming, 214.

³⁷ Lola Young, 204.

³⁸ Canadian Heritage, (n.d.) <www.canadianheritage.gc.ca>, Accessed 14 April 2004.

³⁹ Davis, 24.

⁴⁰ Centre d'histoire de Montréal, "Permanent Exhibition," (23 February 2004), <<http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/chm/engl/expermaa.shtm>>, Accessed 12 April 2004.

⁴¹ Écomusée du Fier Monde, "Historique de l'Écomusée du fier monde," (7 March 2003), <<http://fiermonde.cam.org/fiermonde/messages/2.html>>, Accessed 12 April 2004.

⁴² See Alan Gordon, *Making Public Pasts: The Contested Terrain of Montréal's Public Memories, 1891-1930*, (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001).

CHAPTER THREE: THE MCCORD MUSEUM OF CANADIAN HISTORY

Conceived as a national museum by its founder, David Ross McCord (1844-1930), the McCord Museum of Canadian History has an exceptionally broad collection for a mid-sized institution. Because of the economic, political, and cultural centrality of the city of Montreal in the early history of Canada, the Museum houses an extensive record of Canada's past that reflects the liberal and expansive interests of its founder. The McCord Museum has had a complicated history. In 1919 McGill University received the entire collection, after David McCord spent a decade persuading the University to accept his gift. The collection was originally displayed in Joseph House, located on the corner of McTavish and Sherbrooke Streets, and was moved to the McGill Student Union building on Sherbrooke Street in 1968. The Museum remained virtually unchanged until it closed in 1989 for major renovations and expansion to the former student union building.¹ From McGill University's initial hesitation to take on the burden of caring for and administering McCord's collection, to keeping abreast of changing priorities in research and public access in the 1980s and '90s, the McCord Museum now seems to have established its permanent mandate. Determined to reflect and record the many changes occurring socially, politically, and in the field of museum theory, the McCord is an appropriate institution on which to base a case study of the effects of the 1988-1992 Task Force on Museums and First Peoples.

The McCord Museum emphasizes an inclusive approach to history, and claims to be a museum of *Canadian* history which, from its earliest days, assumed that accurate preservation of Canada's true historical record must include representations from British, French, and Native communities. David McCord clearly stated his early ambitions to

create a collection with a national scope, and often repeated his vision for his museum: “I am not going to make a [P]rotestant or a [C]atholic museum. I will...make it as Indian as I possibly can, - a museum of the original owners of the land.”² Throughout its history, the McCord has added to its important collection of historical Aboriginal material culture. Particularly relevant to this study, the McCord was directly associated with the controversy surrounding *The Spirit Sings*, as it refused to support the boycott of the Calgary exhibition, lending dozens of items to the Glenbow Museum. This participation led to the resignation of Honorary Curator Bruce Trigger, who remained vocal in his denunciation of the McCord’s attitude toward Aboriginal proprietary rights over Aboriginal cultural property. This chapter will compare the policies and exhibitions concerning First Nations representations and collections at the McCord Museum before and after the Task Force report was published, to determine whether the McCord revised or modified its policies in the wake of the controversy surrounding *The Spirit Sings* and the recommendations of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples.

An examination of the McCord Museum immediately before the conflicts of the late 1980s and the appearance of the Task Force report reveals a museum whose exhibitions focused on nineteenth-century Canadian decorative arts, photography, and portraiture. Despite the remarkable breadth of its ethnographic collection and its often-stated ambition to “reach out to welcome and serve everyone: anglophones, francophones, the native peoples and our main cultural groups,”³ the vast majority of the McCord’s exhibitions in the 1980s either described the commercial history of Montreal and the surrounding area, or focused on aspects of Victorian culture found in Canadian history [see Appendix I].

From 1986, the beginning of the *Spirit Sings* boycott, until the closing of the McCord for renovations in mid-1989, only a few exhibitions dealt explicitly with Aboriginal subjects, including *The Métis* (1986), a travelling exhibition organized by the Glenbow Museum, and *Ivalu: Traditions of Inuit Clothing* (1988) organized by the McCord and guest-curated by Betty Issenman with Catherine Rankin. Another exhibition opened concurrently with McGill University's Inuit Studies Conference in 1986, but only featured information on the collectors and not on the arctic peoples themselves, and was somewhat revealingly titled *Curios and Culture: A Look at McCord's Arctic Collectors*. A photographic highlight of the nomadic lifestyle of the Naskapi and Inuit of Labrador, *O Darkly Bright*, was organized by the Christian A. Johnson Memorial Gallery in Vermont and was also shown at the McCord in 1988. The *Ivalu* exhibition, however, was the only large-scale presentation concerning Aboriginal peoples mounted by the McCord itself in the last three years before the museum closed for renovations.⁴

The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples cited the need for "increased involvement of Aboriginal peoples in the interpretation of their culture and history by cultural institutions."⁵ The *Ivalu* exhibition was envisioned, and most of the planning completed, before the Lubicon boycott began, therefore the curators of *Ivalu* would not have been influenced by the Task Force report or even by the 1988 "Preserving our Heritage" conference which led to the creation of the Task Force. As I shall demonstrate, *Ivalu* emerges reasonably well when examined in the sharp light of the criteria set by the Task Force for cultural sensitivity to Native concerns, particularly regarding interpretation and access. Even so, the Lubicon Cree wanted to stop *Ivalu* from being shown, leading curator Issenman to consult with McGill University's Department of

Northern Studies and with several Inuit cultural workers, who all agreed – even though they were in full sympathy with the Lubicon – that the exhibition was too important to be stopped. Issenman states that communication between the curators and members of various Inuit communities throughout the duration of the exhibition was always open.⁶ According to Issenman, Inuit and other arctic peoples helped with the research and planning processes of the show, and several Inuit were involved in public educational programmes, including sewing demonstrations.⁷ The exhibition presented a responsible view of one aspect of Inuit culture – clothing production – from prehistoric times to the present, even discussing the future impact of Inuit clothing and materials on the fashion industry. While its main purpose was to “emphasize the role of clothing as identifier and culture bearer embodying Inuit spiritual, social, and artistic conventions,” *Ivalu* affirmed the currency and vibrancy of the contemporary Inuit clothing production industry.⁸ In addition, the object labels in the exhibition and catalogue were all trilingual in English, French, and Inuktitut, an important inclusionary gesture toward Inuit audiences.

The idea for *Ivalu* grew out of a research project undertaken by Betty Issenman while she was working in the Costume and Textiles division of the McCord Museum. Asked by the Costume curator, Jacqueline Beaudoin-Ross, to write about a donation of Inuit clothing to the McCord, Issenman found no existing reference material that adequately discussed Inuit clothing. *Ivalu* came out of her own research, undertaken to better understand the McCord’s collection of Inuit ethnographic material. When Issenman approached the McCord with her idea for an exhibition on Inuit clothing, the Museum showed some interest, but, citing funding shortages, the McCord refused to hire outside help to get a prospective exhibition underway. Undaunted, Issenman did all the

preliminary work of planning the exhibition: arranging loans and doing much of the writing in a volunteer capacity until the McCord received a grant to hire additional people to help.⁹

Betty Issenman hoped that Inuit scholars would participate in all aspects of the planning and implementation of *Ivalu*, but she and associate curator, Catherine Rankin, encountered stiff opposition to suggestions of collaboration from the administration of the McCord Museum. At the time, the McCord had few ties with Inuit cultural institutions and their representatives, and the meeting between the McCord and representatives from the north, including delegates from the Avataq Cultural Institute in Inukjuaq, northern Quebec, set up by Issenman to discuss collaboration on the exhibition, went badly. Some McCord staff were disrespectful to the northern attendees and indifferent to the purpose of the meeting.¹⁰

Issenman, who has been involved with the McCord for over twenty years as an independent researcher and volunteer, is careful to point out that the atmosphere of the McCord today in no way resembles the attitudes of the 1980s. Even then, however, constant disagreements with the administration and unrelenting criticism of her ideas did not dissuade Issenman from her research nor prevent her from going ahead with *Ivalu*. As she now explains, she was hopeful that change, especially in the area of ethnography, was imminent, given the hiring in 1990 of Moira McCaffrey as the first permanent curator of the ethnographic collection. Issenman wanted to work to better the McCord's relationships with Native people; consequently she persevered and remained with the museum.¹¹

Looking at *Ivalu* in retrospect, Issenman sees many areas where improvements could have been made, noting particularly that more Native people might have been encouraged to participate in the exhibition. It can be assumed that Issenman's volunteer status severely limited her access to resources and her decision-making authority. Issenman further states that she would have rewritten parts of the exhibition catalogue, which she criticizes as situating Inuit culture in the past, especially in the French translation. However, Issenman conducted extensive debates with McCord administration about nearly every aspect of the catalogue, without noticeable success in her efforts to make revisions. The curators were dissatisfied with the layout and images chosen by McCord staff to illustrate the exhibition, and several names of artists and contributors were omitted or inaccurate. The curators were not shown the final draft of the catalogue before it was sent to the printers, though the catalogue was delayed and was not published until months after the exhibition opened. Despite repeated attempts by Issenman and Rankin to revise the catalogue, the final version contained many mistakes, and several requests to include *errata* slips with the catalogues were ignored. Even after the slips were inserted, the lists of works and contributors continued to contain errors and omissions until only weeks before the exhibition was scheduled to close. Consequently, objects of lesser importance were illustrated, and the tone of the catalogue matched neither the curators' vision of the exhibition nor the message they had hoped to communicate through their work.¹²

Ivalu was in its final planning stages when the boycott of *The Spirit Sings* was raging in Calgary, and *Ivalu* opened in Montreal before *The Spirit Sings* had left Calgary for Ottawa. The timing of these exhibitions dealing with Aboriginal cultures, combined

with Professor Trigger's resignation, confronted the McCord management with the need to reconsider its position regarding the representation of Native cultures within its walls. In mid-1989, the museum was given a three-year opportunity for theoretical contemplation as it underwent major physical renovations. Administrative changes occurred as well, with Moira McCaffrey becoming part of the McCord team in 1990 as the first Curator of Ethnology and Archaeology. During these years the Task Force was also preparing its report, hoping to influence policy in museums across the country.

When the McCord Museum reopened in 1992, it was altogether a revitalized institution, more accessible to the general public and with a new emphasis on the interpretation of Native cultures and histories. Five exhibitions inaugurated the new McCord on its opening day: *The McCord Family: A Passionate Vision*; *Mont Royal - Ville Marie: Early Plans and Views of Montreal*, and three exhibitions dealing with Native cultures: *A Village Called Hochelaga*; *Names and Lives in Nunavik*; and *Marks of the Micmac Nation*. The catalogue for the latter three exhibitions, entitled *Wrapped in the Colours of the Earth*, was edited by Moira McCaffrey. In the introductory comments to the catalogue by then-director Luke Rombout, the museum sent a clear message. Rombout's statement mirrors almost exactly the recommendations of the Task Force Report:

The First Nations exhibitions organized to mark the re-opening of the McCord Museum reflect our institution's past dedication to the collecting of artefacts made by the Native peoples of Canada. At a time when Native issues figure prominently in the political debates of this country, it is clear that our Museum has an increasingly important role to play in making accessible the cultural heritage and contemporary visions of the First Nations and, in so doing, generating in-depth dialogue with Native people. In our discussions with representatives of Native communities, in seeking their assistance in developing these exhibitions, we came

to realize that a new museological approach to the display of Native artefacts was called for. We were asked repeatedly to ensure that our displays link the past to the present and acknowledge the ongoing vitality of Native cultures.¹³

The decision to mount three exhibitions depicting different Aboriginal groups was made, according to McCaffrey, “in order to better represent the diversity of Native cultures in Canada.”¹⁴ These inaugural exhibitions, as well as the twelve shows focusing on Aboriginal history since 1992, clearly show the willingness and dedication of the McCord to represent Native cultures and histories responsibly and in concert with Native groups [see Appendix II]. McCaffrey, an associate member of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, states that her work was strongly affected by the Task Force discussions.¹⁵ The year McCaffrey was hired, the McCord’s Annual Report introduced the Museum’s plan for a permanent Ethnology and Archaeology gallery: “In the case of the Gallery of Ethnology and Archaeology, where the initial focus will be on eastern nations, such as the Micmac, Iroquoian and Inuit, subsequent shows will treat Athapaskans and West Coast. It is through these in-depth examinations that the McCord Museum will be making valuable contributions to scholarly research.”¹⁶

The McCord’s dedication to fair and equitable presentation of Native life can be seen not only in the post-1992 programming at the Museum, but also in one of the McCord’s highest-profile exhibitions, *Across Borders: Beadwork in Iroquois Life* (1999). *Across Borders* was curated by McCaffrey in concert with Kanataкта of the Kanien’kehaka Raotitiohkwa Cultural Centre in Kahnawa:ke; Sandra Olsen and Kate Koperski of the Castellani Art Museum of Niagara University; Trudy Nicks of the Royal Ontario Museum, (co-chair of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples); Ruth

Phillips of the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology; and Jolene Rickard of the University of Buffalo. Representatives of the specifically-concerned First Nations were involved in all aspects of the exhibition, and approval of the different facets of the exhibition was reached by consensus. Two members of the curatorial team were from nations of the Iroquois Confederacy, and beadworkers from Kahnawa:ke and the Tuscarora Nation in New York, two historic centres of commercial beadwork production, were instrumental in shaping the exhibition.¹⁷ *Across Borders* demonstrates a successful collaborative effort among stakeholders from within the museum and academic worlds and the First Nations communities, all of whom were aware of, and determined to follow, the recommendations of the Task Force report.¹⁸

Across Borders presented a brief history of early Iroquois beadwork before approaching the main topic of the exhibition: commercial beadwork production. Consisting largely of historic tourist art such as souvenirs and beaded art, the exhibition also included current trends in beading and beaded clothing. According to McCaffrey: “To create an exhibition that even attempted to explain the importance of beadwork in the lives of the Iroquois, we had to explore the spiritual, social, cultural, and economic significance of making beadwork.”¹⁹ The show was divided into six thematic displays rather than organized chronologically. The “Introduction,” while explaining the historic significance of beadwork to the Iroquois, also included photos of Iroquois people today and was anchored by a signed statement from the curatorial team, which explained the process of collaboration leading to the exhibition. The next section, “The Iroquois Universe,” detailed the iconography of many objects seen repeatedly throughout the exhibition. The universe was set under a starlit dome with a soundtrack of the

Thanksgiving Address, in the Mohawk and Tuscarora languages, playing in the background. “The Development of Beadwork” traced the transition from traditional materials such as moosehair and porcupine quills for embroidery to the use of post-contact glass beads, linking the latter, however, to the pre-contact propensity to use reflective, translucent materials such as mother-of-pearl. “Creating” described the technical and stylistic developments of historic souvenir art and contemporary beadwork designs, complete with photos of beadworkers in their workshops today and excerpts from interviews with Iroquois beadworkers. “Marketing” reviewed the entrepreneurial ventures of past and present beadworkers and the economic importance of beadwork in the Iroquois communities. Finally, “Continuing” stressed the place of beadwork in Iroquois cultural identity, and featured well-known contemporary artists Shelley Niro and Jeffrey Thomas.²⁰

Although the exhibition was collaborative in spirit and was developed closely with Aboriginal communities, it was not without its challenges. One of the most hotly-debated decisions of the curatorial team was to display a wampum belt in the exhibition. Despite the protests of some Iroquois communities that wampum is sacred and should not be displayed in public, the *Across Borders* team included wampum in the exhibition after “[drawing] on the knowledge and expertise of a number of Iroquois historians and elders” and consulting the Mohawk community of Kahnésatà:ke, where the belt originated.²¹

While not every museum nor every Aboriginal community is interested in working collaboratively, McCaffrey is encouraged by the considerable efforts she witnesses of people welcoming the opportunity to work together to ensure inclusionary practices. McCaffrey is quick to denounce what she sees as facile academic cynicism

which points often to earnest efforts by museums and members of the Native communities and labels such work as tokenism. Simplistic and uninformed accusations of tokenism negate the work Native people are doing in museums and insult the efforts of everyone involved.²² McCaffrey does not deny that tokenism can exist, and holds great contempt for those institutions content to draft a policy detailing their commitments to the Aboriginal communities without actually taking practical steps to work with appropriate representatives of Native groups. Often, McCaffrey states, the first generation of “collaboration” after the old model of exhibition – exemplified by *The Spirit Sings* – was rejected, consisted of a museum contacting an Aboriginal community, which would assign a political actor or community figurehead to engage in talks with the museum. This accomplished little, and most institutions and Native groups have now moved beyond this. Projects like *Across Borders* encouraged everyone involved to express his or her divergent views and differing opinions through sometimes loud and lively debate before negotiating a consensus.²³

The second major issue identified by the Task Force was the repatriation of artefacts and human remains. The McCord’s Acquisitions Policy reflects the Museum’s commitment to conform to the Task Force recommendations, stating “ethical considerations must always be taken into account when aboriginal artefacts are acquired by the Museum,” and specifically crediting, “in this respect, the guidelines presented in the report of The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples.”²⁴ Without using definite language, the Policy writes that objects *may* be deaccessioned in the methods described. For example, the policy’s definition of repatriation is “the return to appropriate First Nations of human remains, illegally obtained objects, and certain materials considered

sacred.”²⁵ The Acquisitions Policy was revised in 2002 from the initial, somewhat vague 1924 Museum Policy. According to McCaffrey, no formal, written acquisitions policy had been drafted in the seventy-eight intervening years.²⁶

Betty Issenman notes that the Task Force report brought up important issues, including repatriation, that she had never considered. The report clarified other matters that she had often thought about, such as the need to increase the participation of Aboriginal people in museums, and stimulated thoughtful analysis of these topics.²⁷ The McCord Museum’s exhibition record and its formal acquisitions policy reveal largely-successful efforts to abide by Task Force recommendations. The McCord now places more emphasis on its Aboriginal collections, hosts exhibitions mounted by Aboriginal groups and museums, and often works closely with consultants of Aboriginal ancestry.

Where the McCord falls short in this evaluation of the Museum’s accommodation of Task Force priorities is in the area of integrating Aboriginal staff into its various levels of operation: there is little evidence that the Museum supports the inclusion of Native people into the systematic administrative framework of the Museum. The McCord counts only one person of Aboriginal heritage on its permanent staff, although there are at least two more Native people working in the education department, and many local Aboriginal people conduct workshops and cultural demonstrations on contract.²⁸

Dolorès Contré Migwans is the Assistant to Native Programs at the McCord. This title, however, does not begin to define her actual role in the Museum. Starting in the Visitor Services department, Migwans was hired in 1999 as the coordinator of an outreach team, with a mandate to present aspects of Native cultures to youth groups and to encourage young people to visit the McCord. This team is called *Nitu Natshishkuatau*,

which means, in the Algonquin language, “let us go and meet the Other who is already travelling to meet us at the halfway-point, where our roads cross.”²⁹ The initiative was one of the public programmes designed in conjunction with *Across Borders*. Migwans and her team participated in summer festivals, visited summer camps, and held youth workshops, featuring dancing, crafts, singing, and storytelling, at the McCord. When the contract for her work with *Across Borders* was completed, Migwans was hired as the Assistant to Cultural and Educational Programmes to run Aboriginal cultural workshops, train new guides, and give tours on aspects of Aboriginal cultures and histories in the permanent and temporary exhibitions. In this capacity, Migwans noticed that the docents’ script for the guided tours of *Simply Montreal*, the McCord’s permanent exhibition, tended to objectify the Aboriginal cultures presented. The head of Cultural and Educational Programmes asked Migwans to revise and improve the guide material to provide more of an Aboriginal perspective, and this greater awareness in turn led to an increase in the number of workshops and school programmes with Aboriginal themes. These changes have been wide-ranging, having not only an impact on school and Native groups visiting the Museum, but also on exhibition practices at the McCord. Migwans works on integrating interactive components into the permanent and temporary exhibitions, giving Museum visitors a chance to speak with people of Aboriginal ancestry or see how traditional artistic skills are practiced today.³⁰ These days, Migwans also acts as a cultural liaison officer to various Aboriginal communities, conducts research for the departments of Ethnology and Research and Exhibitions (where she works in close collaboration with McCaffrey), and continues to develop educational programming at the Museum. Her current long-term projects include working out, with McCaffrey, a policy

detailing the McCord's accessibility and services to Aboriginal peoples, not specifically to create a legislative rulebook for the Museum to follow, but for reference purposes for McCord personnel in the event that Migwans and McCaffrey are not there to handle a request by a Native group. Migwans' future hopes for the projected First Peoples Gallery include plans to involve Native people in the gallery's development and also to enlist Native businesspeople as investors. Migwans holds that integrating Aboriginal consultants and collaborators into the historical, business-oriented, and spiritual aspects of the First Peoples Gallery will give all Native peoples a greater sense of ownership of their heritage presented at the McCord.³¹

Migwans realizes that Native history and issues are not the McCord's only concerns, but she knows how vital it is to remind Museum staff and administration of the importance of Native peoples and cultures to the McCord's collection and programming. She feels that her ideas are appreciated and well-received by the McCord's administration and management, and feels validated in her role at the Museum. When asked about her patience at the seemingly slow pace of change at the McCord, and her diplomacy at bringing about those changes, Migwans smiles and says that this is the way to change things: "*petit à petit; sans faire peur à personne.*"³²

Migwans' time at the McCord has not all been rewarding, nor easy: for years she was one of the lowest-paid employees at the Museum.³³ Migwans sometimes feels overwhelmed with her many different responsibilities, and often wishes she had more of a team to support her. Generally, however, she can find needed help from other employees, although this is becoming more difficult because of budget cutbacks at the McCord this year.³⁴

While the McCord Museum should be commended for its collaboration with Aboriginal community members in the presentation of individual exhibitions and for its development of educational programming, the small number of Aboriginal staff and the absence of Native board members are cause for concern. Twelve years after the appearance of the Task Force report, there is not one member of the Board of Trustees who is of Native ancestry. If no one of Aboriginal ancestry is a member of the governance structure of the McCord, it becomes difficult for the Museum to guarantee a long-term commitment to, and to take responsibility for, safeguarding Aboriginal issues should those issues lose importance in the public eye or the political arena.

The McCord is a private museum, relying on funding from a \$10 million endowment from the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation in 1986. It was also this foundation that provided the McCord with \$20 million to build its expanded premises. The Board of Trustees of the McCord Museum consists of two members nominated by McGill University, two members nominated by the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, plus the Chairman of the McCord Museum Foundation, the Director General of the Museum, and the Principal of McGill University. The remaining fifteen members are elected by the Board, which typically has a nominating committee that proposes candidates for election by the Board at large. According to Victoria Dickenson, Executive Director of the McCord, “the Board recently established a Governance Working Group which is examining the governance of the Museum, particularly in terms of improving the Board[’s] effectiveness and efficiency, ensuring member participation, and providing terms of reference for standing and *ad hoc* committees.”³⁵ The Board is also beginning to look at its composition vis-à-vis the community it serves: “The McCord

is conscious not only of the question of representation from the Aboriginal community but also from cultural communities that are part of Montreal's and Canada's more recent history. It is something that we will be bringing to the governance working group... The McCord Board is open to change and growth, but change in social institutions is often slower than many wish!"³⁶

One of the main purposes of a museum's Board of Trustees is to raise funds. The McCord Museum's reflections on the representativeness of its Board of Trustees is praiseworthy, but is frustrated by concurrent financial concerns that mirror those voiced by Royal Ontario Museum Curator of Ethnology, Trudy Nicks. Nicks implied at the Canadian Museums Association's 2002 annual conference that museums are placing more emphasis on "who can raise money rather than who can represent communities."³⁷ Gerald Conaty, Senior Ethnology Curator at the Glenbow Museum in Calgary, where First Nations' representation on the Board is actively encouraged, notes that fundraising for the Glenbow is not often undertaken in Aboriginal communities as these communities usually have serious local economic problems that must be their first consideration.³⁸ Many of Canada's Aboriginal communities, however, can boast of members with important ties to industry and who hold professional, political, or cultural ties with significant networking cachet.³⁹ Future Board recruitment could consider approaches to such individuals who, though they might not have Directorial experience, can bring fresh ideas and relevant skills to the Committee tables.

Although the McCord has not implemented every recommendation made by the Task Force, the Museum has made significant advancements in its exhibition planning and made considerable efforts to include the histories and cultural production of

Aboriginal peoples. The McCord has also provided an Aboriginal perspective by recruiting visiting curators and First Nations consultants, and by instituting educational programming. In addition, educational institutions and Aboriginal groups, working in concert with museum staffs to encourage people of Native ancestry to choose a career in the arts, should soon result in a larger and more diverse pool of qualified individuals applying to work in Canadian museums.⁴⁰ Canadian museums that have Native ethnographic collections but do not have much Native involvement could potentially examine the role played by Dolorès Migwans as a model of how to establish liaisons with local Aboriginal communities and to integrate different voices into the daily management of the museum. Migwans' optimism for the future of the Native Programs division at the McCord is infectious, and leads one to believe that the proposed First Nations Gallery will soon progress from the planning stages to provide a suitable showcase for the McCord's magnificent collection of Aboriginal material culture.

Jean Hamelin's remarks, cited at the beginning of Chapter Two, that museums are not neutral institutions, capable of remaining outside of socio-political imperatives, is proven true in the reactions of the McCord Museum to the recommendations of the 1992 Task Force report. When oversights and injustices surfaced, the museum professionals at the McCord made and are making sincere efforts to rectify errors and to ensure cultural equity. Although the McCord is not yet an ideal institution from the perspective of the Task Force recommendations, it is obvious that the Museum has welcomed and has paid close attention to those recommendations, progressing far beyond former entrenched exhibition planning and display policies. As Moira McCaffrey cautions, however, there is still considerable antagonism between indigenous groups and museums: a dozen years

of goodwill cannot erase centuries of colonial collection practices. There is still much to be done to assuage worries of territorial encroachment on both sides. Museums must be sensitive to the needs of Aboriginal communities, and Aboriginal communities must be patient with the sometimes maddeningly slow pace of change in museums and other cultural institutions.⁴¹ Nevertheless, careful review of the influence and repercussions of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples in the case of the McCord Museum reveals the timely and much-needed effect of the recommendations of that Task Force. In its aftermath, the historical, cultural, and intellectual integrity of the McCord Museum has been greatly improved, and the Native peoples of Canada reassured that concerns over the accuracy of representations of Aboriginal heritage and culture are important to all who share their country.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

¹ Brian Young, *The Making and Unmaking of a University Museum: The McCord, 1921-1996*, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), xiv, 56.

² Pamela Miller, "David Ross McCord," in *The McCord Family: A Passionate Vision*, eds. Pamela Miller et. al., (Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1992), 85.

³ McCord Museum, *Annual Report 1985-1986*, 10.

⁴ The exhibition *Inuit Hands: Samples of Arctic Survival* was mounted by guest curator Catherine Rankin for the McCord, but was shown only at the Stewart Hall Art Gallery, Pointe Claire, and the Fleming Museum, Burlington, Vermont, see McCord Museum, *Annual Report 1986-1987*, 39.

⁵ Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships between Museums and First Peoples*, (Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations, 1992), 1.

⁶ Betty Issenman, interview by author, Montreal, Quebec, 12 May 2004 and personal communication, 19 July 2004.

⁷ Issenman, interview by author, 12 May 2004. See also Betty Issenman and Catherine Rankin, *Ivalu: Traditions of Inuit Clothing*, (Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1988), 16 [exhibition catalogue]; McCord Museum of Canadian History, "Communiqué," 28 March 1988.

⁸ Betty Issenman, personal communication, 19 July 2004.

⁹ Issenman, interview by author, 12 May 2004.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*; Betty Issenman and Catherine Rankin, to colleagues, 10 October 1988, courtesy of Betty Issenman; and Betty Issenman and Catherine Rankin, "From *Ivalu*'s Curators," *Inuit Art Quarterly*, (Summer 1989). [letter to the editor] Note that, despite the curators' dissatisfaction with the *Ivalu* catalogue, public response to and feedback of the exhibition were very positive, Issenman, personal communication, 19 July 2004.

¹³ Luke Rombout, "Preface" in *Wrapped in the Colours of the Earth : Cultural Heritage of the First Nations*, eds. Moira McCaffrey et al., (Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1992), 11. [exhibition catalogue]

-
- ¹⁴ Moira McCaffrey, "Introduction." in McCaffrey et al., 37.
- ¹⁵ Moira McCaffrey, "Re: Graduate Research Project," E-mail to author, 9 June 2003.
- ¹⁶ McCord Museum, *Annual Report 1990-1991*, 14.
- ¹⁷ Moira McCaffrey, "Crossing New Borders to Exhibit Iroquois Tourist Art," in *On Aboriginal Representation in the Gallery*, eds. Linda Jessup with Shannon Bagg, (Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 2002).
- ¹⁸ This is not to suggest that stakeholders cannot belong to *both* the museum *and* the Aboriginal communities.
- ¹⁹ McCaffrey, "Crossing New Borders," 82-83.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 83-84.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 83.
- ²² Moira McCaffrey, interview by author, Montreal, Quebec, 6 May 2004.
- ²³ *Ibid.*
- ²⁴ McCord Museum of Canadian History, *Acquisitions Policy, McCord Museum of Canadian History, Montreal, Quebec*, 2002, 16.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.
- ²⁶ McCaffrey, "Re: Graduate Research Project," 9 June 2003.
- ²⁷ Issenman, interview by author, 12 May 2004.
- ²⁸ Dolorès Contré Migwans, interview by author, Montreal, Quebec, 18 May 2004.
- ²⁹ McCord Museum, "Communiqué," n.d.
- ³⁰ Migwans, personal communication, Montreal, Quebec, 8 July 2004.
- ³¹ Migwans, interview by author, 18 May 2004 and personal communication, 8 July 2004.
- ³² Migwans, interview by author, 18 May 2004.
- ³³ The McCord recently put into place government-initiated salary reforms, which served to rectify the gendered salarial inequalities.

³⁴ Migwans, interview by author, 18 May 2004.

³⁵ Victoria Dickenson, "Re: graduate thesis on McCord and First Nations: query on Board of Trustees," E-mail to author, 25 May 2004.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ Cited in Quyen Hoang, "First Nations People Mining the Museum: A Case Study of Change at the Glenbow Museum," M.A. thesis, Concordia University, 2003, 31.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 17.

³⁹ See Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, "Aboriginal People Profiles," (2004), <http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ks/3000_e.html>, Accessed 20 February 2004.

⁴⁰ See Eastern Working Group of the CMA/AFN Task Force, *A Listing of Select Professional Development Opportunities in Museum Studies and Related Programs: a Reference Manual for Native Museum Professionals*, (Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations, 1992).

⁴¹ McCaffrey, interview by author, 6 May 2004.

CONCLUSION

The Glenbow Museum in Calgary became the focus of considerable criticism as a result of its sponsorship arrangements and lack of consultation with Aboriginal people during the 1988 exhibition *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples*. Academics and museum professionals, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, censured the Glenbow's ethnology department and curatorial team for what was widely recognized as a colonialist exhibition situating Canadian Native peoples in the past and denying their contemporary realities. It should be noted, however, that the curators were working at a time when no guidelines existed, and they should not be vilified nor condemned for what was an honest effort at an innovative display. As Ruth Phillips, one of the members of *The Spirit Sings'* curatorial team, wrote in an article for *The Ottawa Citizen*, the curators researched this exhibition thoroughly and were attempting to repatriate Native cultural material, dating from the early period of contact between Europeans and First Nations, held in Europe and never before seen in North America.¹ Arguably, if the Glenbow had never organized *The Spirit Sings*, and if the Lubicon Lake Cree had not decided to target this exhibition as indicative of the larger problem of racist and neo-colonialist policies in Canada, the discussions that arose out of the various conferences, debates, and publications spawned by this controversy would not have taken place and the differences between museums and Aboriginal communities would have remained unspoken and only vaguely understood to this day.

The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples began the process of questioning blind public acceptance of museum administrators' selections concerning what items from the past deserve preservation and celebration. The Task Force reached into various

levels of government, affecting federal museum policy revisions and educating government policy-makers whose focus often differed from that of museum professionals.² Twelve years after the publication of the Task Force report, museum staffs are much more aware of the need to work closely with members of the communities represented by their institutions. Specifically, museums now approach the issues of the representation and participation of Native peoples in cultural institutions in Canada with a heightened sensitivity and within a spirit of mutual respect. The Task Force and its subsequent report, *Turning the Page: Forging Partnerships Between Museums and First Nations*, had a significant initial influence on museums, and *Turning the Page* continues to influence policy today. As Tom Hill, co-chair of the Task Force, states, museum workers still turn to the Task Force report when they have questions regarding issues or procedures to follow in the relationship between museums and Aboriginal representation.³ By targeting all fronts: government, museums themselves, and the public through popular media, the Task Force changed perspectives and effectively altered the ways Canadians see and think about the representation of Aboriginal life in museums. One of the most important contributions of the Task Force was to provide the guidelines and a workable framework for engaged museum professionals to engender changes in their institutions. Where the will to effect these changes exists, as at the McCord Museum of Canadian History, much can be done to forward the affiliation and cooperation of museums and Aboriginal communities and scholars.

Public cultural institutions needed pressure from official sources such as the International Council of Museums' resolutions and the Task Force Report on Museums

and First Peoples to galvanize them into action. It is increasingly obvious that unrelenting and continuous public scrutiny by all concerned Canadians is necessary to ensure that national institutions remain sensitive to the accuracy and completeness of the historical record in Canada. This need for constant assessment was recognized at the moment of the publication of the Task Force report, which included a proposal for follow-up investigations of the level of compliance to its recommendations. However, lack of funding to carry out such a potentially large-scale project has meant that little has been done to research the progress of the effectiveness of the Task Force in identifying and resolving potential problems or oversights in museum collections and exhibitions. More case studies are needed, but it is my hope that this analysis of the McCord Museum will contribute to the larger scholarship surrounding the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples and shed some light on the debate regarding the presentation of Aboriginal material culture in Canadian cultural institutions.

NOTES TO CONCLUSION

¹ Ruth Phillips and Judy Thompson, "The Spirit Sings: Opportunity for Understanding," *The Ottawa Citizen*, 24 August 1988, A9; Nancy Baele, "The Spirit Sings, a discordant voice. A controversial exhibition of native art," *The Ottawa Citizen*, 16 January 1988, C1.

² See Senate of Canada, First Proceedings on: Bill C-12, An Act Respecting Museums, *Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology*, Ottawa, 16 January 1990, 12: 38-54.

³ Tom Hill, interview by author, Brantford, Ontario, 20 May 2004.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aboriginal Human Resource Development Council of Canada. "Partnering." (2003)
<<http://www.ahrdcc.com/partnerships/>>. Accessed 27 July 2003.
- Abram, Ruth J. "Harnessing the Power of History." In *Museums, Society, Inequality*, ed. Richard Sandell, 125-141. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Ames, Michael. "Boycott the Politics of Suppression!" *Muse* 5 no.4 (1988): 15-16.
- "The Liberation of Anthropology: A Rejoinder to Professor Trigger's 'A Present of their Past?'" *Culture* 8 no.1 (1988): 81-85.
- Transcript. "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 3 November 1988. Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9. Indian Art Centre Archives.
- Ames, Michael, ed. "Are Changing Representations of First Peoples in Canadian Museums and Galleries Challenging the Curatorial Prerogative?" In *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian: Museums and Native Cultures*, 73-88. Seattle & London: University of Washington Press: 2000.
- Ames, Michael, Julia D. Harrison and Trudy Nicks. "Proposed Museum Policies for Ethnological Collections and the Peoples They Represent." *Muse* 5 no.4 (1988): 47-52.
- Amnesty International. "'Time is Wasting': Respect for the Land Rights of the Lubicon Cree Long Overdue." (April 2003)
<<http://www.amnesty.ca/library/canada/AMR200103.htm>>. Accessed 25 July 2003.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Rev. edn. London & New York: Verso, 1991.
- Anderson, James. "Nationalist Ideology and Territory," In *Nationalism, Self-determination and Political Geography*, eds. R.J. Johnston et al., 18-39. London & New York: Croom Helm, 1988.
- Baele, Nancy. "The Spirit Sings, a discordant voice. A controversial exhibition of native art." *The Ottawa Citizen*, 16 January 1988, C1.
- Bell, John Kim. Transcript. "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 5 November 1988. Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9. Indian Art Centre Archives.

- Ben-Amos, Dan and Liliana Weissberg, eds. "Introduction." In *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*, 56-85. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London & New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Bird, S. Elizabeth, ed. *Dressing in Feathers: The Construction of the Indian in American Popular Culture*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996.
- Cameron, Duncan F. "Preface." In *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples*. Glenbow Museum, 7. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987.
[exhibition catalogue]
- Canada. *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy, 1969; Presented to the first session of the twenty-eighth Parliament by the Honourable Jean Chrétien, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969.
- *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force Charged with Examining Federal Policy Concerning Museums*. Ottawa: Communications Canada, 1986.
- *Challenges and Choices: Federal Policy and Program Proposals for Canadian Museums*. Ottawa: Communications Canada, 1988.
- *Canadian Museum Policy: Temples of the Human Spirit*. Ottawa: Communications Canada, 1990.
- Canada Council for the Arts. "Grant Programs: Aboriginal Peoples Secretariat." (2002) <<http://www.canadacouncil.ca/grants/aboriginalarts/default.asp>>. Accessed 5 July 2003.
- Canada, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples: Vol.4 Perspectives and Realities*. Ottawa: Canada Communication Group, 1996.
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Radio. "Deal With us Now or Suffer the Consequences." *Midday with Peter Downie*. (2 June 1988) CBC Online Archives. <<http://archives.cbc.ca/400d.asp?id=1-73-516-2437#>>. Accessed 3 July 2003.
- "Nothing to Celebrate." *Morningside with Peter Gzowski*. (16 October 1989) CBC Online Archives. <<http://archives.cbc.ca/400d.asp?id=1-73-516-2439#>>. Accessed 3 July 2003.
- "Righting 100 Years of Wrong." *The World at Six*. (21 November 1996) CBC Online Archives <<http://archives.cbc.ca/400d.asp?id=1-73-516-2443#>>. Accessed 25 April 2004.

- Canadian Heritage. (n.d.) <www.canadianheritage.gc.ca>. Accessed 14 April 2004.
- "Museums Assistance Program." (September 2003)
<http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/pam-map/index_e.cfm>. Accessed 25 May 2004.
- Canadian Museums Association. *A Guide to Museum Positions Including a Statement on the Ethical Behaviour of Museum Professionals*. Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association, 1979.
- *Ethics Guidelines*. Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association, 1999.
- Centre d'histoire de Montréal. "Permanent Exhibition." (23 February 2004)
<http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/chm/engl/expermaa.shtm>, Accessed 12 April 2004.
- Chrétien, Jean. "Letter from Jean Chrétien to Friends of the Lubicon." (27 May 1993)
Lubicon Legal Defense Fund. Available online:
<http://www.lubicon.ca/1993_Chretien_letter.html>. Accessed 20 April 2004.
- Clifton, James, ed. *The Invented Indian: Cultural Fictions and Government Policies*. New Brunswick, NJ & London: Transaction Publishers, 1990.
- Crane, Susan A., ed. "Introduction." In *Museums and Memory*, 1-13. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Davis, Peter. *Ecomuseums: a Sense of Place*. London: Leicester University Press, 1999.
- Dickenson, Victoria. "Cultural Pluralism and Museums: a Preliminary Investigation." Brief. Dickenson Harrison Associates, Ottawa, November 1990.
- Dyck, Noel and James B. Waldram, eds. *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.
- Eastern Working Group of the CMA/AFN Task Force. *A Listing of Select Professional Development Opportunities in Museum Studies and Related Programs: a Reference Manual for Native Museum Professionals*. Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations, 1992.
- Écomusée du Fier Monde. "Historique de l'Écomusée du fier monde." (7 March 2003)
<<http://fiermonde.cam.org/fiermonde/messages/2.html>>. Accessed 12 April 2004.
- Edelman, Murray. *From Art to Politics: How Artistic Creations Shape Political Conceptions*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

- Erasmus, Georges and John MacAvity to Barbara Tyler. 19 September 1988.
Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9.
Indian Art Centre Archives.
- Erasmus, Georges. Transcript. "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 3 November 1988.
Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9.
Indian Art Centre Archives.
- Fleming, David. "Positioning the Museum for Social Inclusion." In *Museums, Society, Inequality*, ed. Richard Sandell, 213-224. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Francis, Daniel. *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*.
Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1992.
- Geller, Peter. "'Hudson's Bay Company Indians': Images of Native People and the Red River Pageant, 1920." In *Dressing in Feathers: The Construction of the Indian in American Popular Culture*, ed. S. Elizabeth Bird, 65-78. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996.
- Gillam, Robyn. *Hall of Mirrors: Museums and the Canadian Public*. Banff: Banff Centre Press, 2001.
- Glassberg, David. "Public History and the Study Of Memory." *The Public Historian* 18 (1996): 7-23.
- Glenbow Museum. *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples*.
Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987. [exhibition catalogue]
- Goddard, John. "Forked Tongues." *Saturday Night* (February 1988). Available online: <http://www.lubicon.ca>. Accessed 1 June 2004.
- Gordon, Alan. *Making Public Pasts: The Contested Terrain of Montréal's Public Memories, 1891-1930*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.
- Hall, Stuart. "Culture, Community, Nation." *Cultural Studies*, 7(3) 1993: 349-363.
- "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities." In *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, ed. Anthony D. King, 41-68. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Hamelin, Jean. *Le Musée du Québec: Histoire d'une institution nationale*. Québec: Musée du Québec, 1991.

- Harrison, Julia D. "Introduction." In *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples*. Glenbow Museum, 10-16. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987. [exhibition catalogue]
- "Museums and Politics: *The Spirit Sings* and the Lubicon Boycott." *Muse* 5 no.4 (1988): 12-13.
- "Completing a Circle: *The Spirit Sings*." In *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, eds. Noel Dyck and James B. Waldram, 334-357. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.
- Hoang, Quyen. "First Nations People Mining the Museum: A Case Study of Change at the Glenbow Museum." M.A. thesis, Concordia University, 2003.
- Hood, Adrienne D. "Toward Collaboration? Museums, Universities and Material Culture Studies in Canada." *Muse* 15 no.4 (1998): 37-40.
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. "Aboriginal People Profiles." (2004) <http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ks/3000_e.html>. Accessed 20 February 2004.
- "Arts and Culture." *Services for First Nations People: A Government of Canada Guide*. (April 2004) <http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/sg/sg7_e.html>. Accessed 2 June 2004.
- International Council of Museums. *ICOM '86: Proceedings of the 14th General Conference and 15th General Assembly of the International Council of Museums*. Budapest: International Council of Museums, 1989.
- Issenman, Betty and Catherine Rankin. *Ivalu: Traditions of Inuit Clothing*. Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1988. [exhibition catalogue]
- To colleagues. 10 October 1988. Courtesy of Betty Issenman.
- "From *Ivalu*'s Curators." *Inuit Art Quarterly* (Summer 1989). [Letter to the editor]
- Jamieson, Roberta. "Toward the Future: Promises and Compromises." *Muse* 15 no.4 (1998): 45-48.
- Jessup, Linda with Shannon Bagg, eds. *On Aboriginal Representation in the Gallery*. Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 2002.
- Kaplan, David. "Nationalism at a Micro-scale: Educational Segregation in Montreal." *Political Geography* 11 (1992): 259-82.

- Kelly, Frank and Pauline Laing. "The Politics of Curriculum." *Education Canada* 40 no.3 (2000): 41-50.
- Leclair, Denise. *Access and Awareness: Bringing Museums and People Together*. Ottawa: Communications Canada, 1988.
- Litt, Paul. *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Lowenthal, David. *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. New York: Free Press, 1996.
- "History and Memory." *The Public Historian* 19 no.2 (1997): 34.
- Lubicon Lake Indian Nation. Lubicon Legal Defense Fund. (June 2003) <http://www.lubicon.ca/>. Accessed 25 July 2003.
- Lusty, Terry. *Red Paper vs. White Paper*. circa 1970. [self-published pamphlet]
- MacDonald, George. Transcript. "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 3 November 1988. Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9. Indian Art Centre Archives.
- McCaffrey, Moira. "Introduction." In *Wrapped in the Colours of the Earth : Cultural Heritage of the First Nations*, eds. Moira McCaffrey et al., 34-39. Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1992. [exhibition catalogue]
- "Crossing New Borders to Exhibit Iroquois Tourist Art." In *On Aboriginal Representation in the Gallery*, eds. Linda Jessup with Shannon Bagg, 73-92. Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 2002.
- McCaffrey, Moira et al. *Wrapped in the Colours of the Earth : Cultural Heritage of the First Nations*. Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1992. [exhibition catalogue]
- McCord Museum of Canadian History. *Annual Report 1985-1986*.
- *Annual Report 1986-1987*.
- "Communiqué." 28 March 1988. [press release]
- *Annual Report 1990-1991*.
- *Annual Report 1994-1995*.

- *Acquisitions Policy, McCord Museum of Canadian History, Montreal, Quebec, 5 February 2002.*
- "Exhibitions Presented at the McCord Museum Since May 1992," 2 May 2002.
- "Schools Program 2004-2005, Preschool-Primary." 2004. [pamphlet]
- "Schools Program 2004-2005, Secondary." 2004. [pamphlet]
- "Information: The Museum Team." (19 June 2003)
<http://www.mccord.mcgill.ca/scripts/global.php3?Lang=1&PageName=homeeng.php3&Example_Session=b76cb434d3f74dc586db8f83daf90e59>. Accessed 3 July 2003.
- "Information: Press Releases." (19 June 2003)
<http://www.mccord.mcgill.ca/scripts/global.php3?Lang=1&PageName=homeeng.php3&Example_Session=b76cb434d3f74dc586db8f83daf90e59>. Accessed 3 July 2003.
- McCormick, Chris. Transcript. "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 3 November 1988. Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9. Indian Art Centre Archives.
- McLoughlin, Moira. *Museums and the Representation of Native Canadians: Negotiating the Borders of Culture*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1999.
- McMaster, Gerald and Lee-Ann Martin, eds. "Introduction." In *INDIGENA: Contemporary Native Perspectives*, 11-23. Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1992.
- McNaughton, Craig and Daryl Rock. *Opportunities in Aboriginal Research: Results of SSHRC's Dialogue on Research and Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 2003. Available online: <www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/background/Aboriginal_background_e.pdf>. Accessed 17 May 2004.
- Martin, Lee-Ann. "Wordplay: Toward a Critical Vocabulary." [unpublished article]
- "The Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion: Contemporary Native Art and Public Art Museums in Canada." Ottawa: Canada Council for the Arts, 1991.
- Martin, Paul. "Address by Prime Minister Paul Martin at the Opening of the First Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable." Ottawa, 19 April 2004. Available online: <http://news.gc.ca/cfmx/CCP/view/en/index.cfm?xml_search=true&articleID=82599>. Accessed 15 May 2004.

- Miller, Pamela. "David Ross McCord." In *The McCord Family: A Passionate Vision*, eds. Pamela Miller et. al., 85-87. Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1992.
- Museum of Jurassic Technology. "Geoffrey Sonnabend's 'Obliscence: Theories of Forgetting and the Problem of Matter,' an Encapsulation." In *Museums and Memory*, ed. Susan A. Crane, 81-92. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- National Indian Brotherhood. *Indian Control of Indian Education: Policy Paper Presented to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development*. Ottawa: The Brotherhood, 1972.
- Newman, Andrew and Fiona McLean. "Architectures of Inclusion: Museums, Galleries and Inclusive Communities." In *Museums, Society, Inequality*, ed. Richard Sandell, 56-68. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Nicks, Trudy. "Partnerships in Developing Cultural Resources: Lessons From the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples." *Culture* 12 (1992): 87-94.
- Osborne, Ken. "'Our History Has Us Gasping': History in Canadian Schools – Past, Present, and Future." *The Canadian Historical Review*, 81 (2000): 412-414.
- Pearson, Roberta. "Custer Loses Again: The Contestation Over Commodified Public Memory." In *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*, eds. Dan Ben-Amos and Liliana Weissberg, 176-201. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999.
- Phillips, Ruth and Judy Thompson. "The Spirit Sings: Opportunity for Understanding." *The Ottawa Citizen*, 24 August 1988, A9.
- Renaud, André. "Indians in White Culture Curricula and Society." In *National Consciousness and the Curriculum: The Canadian Case*, eds. Geoffrey Milburn and John Herbert, 30-47. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1974.
- Rombout, Luke. "Preface." In *Wrapped in the Colours of the Earth : Cultural Heritage of the First Nations*, eds. Moira McCaffrey et al., 11. Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1992. [exhibition catalogue]
- Sandell, Richard, ed. "Museums and the Combating of Social Inequality: Roles, Responsibilities, Resistance." In *Museums, Society, Inequality*, 3-23. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.

- Scheffel, David Z. "The Post-Anthropological Indian." *Anthropologica* 42 (2) 2000: 175-187.
- Schlesinger, Philip. "Europeanness: A New Cultural Battlefield?" In *Nationalism*, eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, 77-98. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Senate of Canada. First Proceedings on: Bill C-12, An Act Respecting Museums. *Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology*. Ottawa, 16 January 1990.
- Sollers, Werner. "Who is Ethnic?" In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, eds. Bill Ashcroft et al., 219-222. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 271-316. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Task Force on Museums and First Peoples. Meeting Minutes, 8-9 November 1990. Task Force on Museums and First Peoples 1990, 2002.25 box 726f5. Canadian Museum of Civilization Archives.
- *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples*. Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association and Assembly of First Nations, 1992.
- Taylor, Barbara E., Richard P. Chait, and Thomas P. Holland. "The New Work of the Nonprofit Board." *Harvard Business Review* (September-October 1996): 4-11.
- Titley, E. Brian. *A Narrow Vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and the Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986.
- Todd, Loretta. "What More do They Want?" In *INDIGENA: Contemporary Native Perspectives*, eds. Gerald McMaster and Lee-Ann Martin, 71-80. Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1992.
- Trigger, Bruce G. *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986.
- "A Present of their Past? Anthropologists, Native People, and their Heritage." *Culture* 8 no.1 (1988): 71-79.
- "Reply to Michael Ames." *Culture* 8 no.1 (1988): 87-88.
- "Who Owns the Past?" *Muse* 5 no.4 (1988): 13-15.

- Trigger, Bruce G. and Michael Ames. "Share the Blame." *Vanguard* 17 no.2: 15-18.
- Tyler, Barbara. Transcript. "Preserving Our Heritage" conference, 5 November 1988. Committees: Task Force on Museums and First Peoples of Canada, E1165-T9. Indian Art Centre Archives.
- Vickers, Scott. *Native American Identities: From Stereotype to Archetype in Art and Literature*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998.
- Walsh, Andrea Naomi. "Complex Sightings: Aboriginal Art and Intercultural Spectatorship." In *On Aboriginal Representation in the Gallery*, eds. Lynda Jessup with Shannon Bagg, 247-270. Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 2002.
- Whitt, Laurie Anne. "Indigenous Peoples and the Cultural Politics of Knowledge." In *Issues in Native American Cultural Identity*, ed. Michael K Green, 223-272. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1995.
- Young, Brian. *The Making and Unmaking of a University Museum: The McCord, 1921-1996*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.
- Young, Lola. "Rethinking Heritage: Cultural Policy and Inclusion." In *Museums, Society, Inequality*, ed. Richard Sandell, 203-212. London: Routledge, 2002.

APPENDIX I

EXHIBITIONS AT THE MCCORD MUSEUM OF CANADIAN HISTORY, 1986-1989

1985/10/01 – 1986/10

A Celebration: The St. Andrew's Society of Montreal, 1835-1985

1985/12/04 – 1986/03/30

Yesterday and Today

1986/01/15 – 1986/03/02

Legacy in Ice: The Vaux Family and the Canadian Alps [Whyte Museum of the Canadian Rockies]

1986/03/12 – 1986/09

Tunnels and Trestles: Building the Canadian Pacific Railway Through the Western Canyons, 1885

1986/03/28 – 1986/05/18

The Métis [Glenbow Museum]

1986/03/28 – unknown

The Wood Menagerie: The Maurice Lemay Collection of Folk Art

1986/04/23 – 1986/04/24

Ikebana [in cooperation with Montreal Multilingual Chapter of Ikebana International]

1986/05/14 – 1986/09/14

The Collector's Eye: Recent Acquisitions 1985

1986/06/04 – 1986/10/05

Francis Silver (1841-1920) Nova Scotia Folk Artist: Late 19th Century Oil Paintings and Murals

1986/09/20 – 1987/02/01

The Era of the Horse in Quebec: Quebec Folk Art, Paintings, Photographs and Early Veterinary Equipment

1986/10/22 – 1987/01/18

William Notman: The Stamp of a Studio

1986/11/06 – 1986/11/09

Curios and Culture: A Look at McCord's Arctic Collectors

1986/11/12 – 1987/03/08

A Victorian Christmas

1987/02/11 – 1987/06/21

Face to Face with History: Portraits from Early Canada

1987/04/17 – 1988/01/10

Grandmother's Flower Garden: Quilts of Yesteryear

1987/07/08 – 1988/01/03

The Painted Past [National Archives of Canada]

1987/11/25 – 1988/06

Magic Lanterns

1987/11/25 – 1988/11/27

Toys A to Zoo [travelled until 1990/02/18]

1988/01/27 – 1988/03/27

The Livernois, Photographers: 120 Years of Work in Quebec City (1854-1974)

1988/04/20 – 1989/01/29

Ivalu: Traditions of Inuit Clothing

1988/05/08 – 1988/08/21

O Darkly Bright: The Labrador Journey of William Brooks Cabot, 1899-1910

1988/07/13 – 1988/09/18

Unofficial Portraits: Self-Portraits of Canadian Politicians [York University Art Gallery]

1988/09/14 – 1988/10/30

When Winter was King: The Image of Winter in 19th Century Canada [Whyte Museum of the Canadian Rockies]

1988/10/20 – 1989/05/14

Souffrir pour être belle

1988/11/02 – 1989/01/29

Louis Dulongpré: A Closer Look [in collaboration with UQAM]

1988/11/23 – 1989/01/15

Maria Chapdelaine: Illustrations by Gagnon and Suzor-Coté

1989/05/05 – 1989/07/02

A Space in Time: Peel Street Revisited

APPENDIX II

ABORIGINAL-THEMED EXHIBITIONS AT THE MCCORD MUSEUM OF CANADIAN HISTORY, 1992-2003

1992/05/09 – 1999/01/10

A Village Named Hochelaga

1992/05/09 – 1999/01/10

Names and Lives in Nunavik

1992/05/09 – 1993/02/27

Marks of the Micmac Nation

1993/03/26 – 1993/05/25

Fluffs and Feathers: An Exhibit on the Symbols of Indianness [Woodland Cultural Centre]

1994/03/15 – 1999/01/10

Manituminaki: The Power of Glass Beads

1994/12/13 – 1995/02/05

Reclaiming History: Ledger Drawings by the Assiniboine Artist Hongeeyesa [Glenbow Museum]

1995/06/22 – 1996/01/07 and 1996/08/01 – 1997/01/12

Wathahine: Photographs of Aboriginal Women by Nancy Ackerman

1999/06/18 – 2000/01/09

Across Borders: Beadwork in Iroquois Life

2000/11/29 – 2001/05/06

Lost Visions, Forgotten Dreams. Life and Art of an Ancient Arctic People [Canadian Museum of Civilization]

2001/05/04 – 2001/09/09

Living Words: Aboriginal Diplomats of the 18th Century

2001/11/14 – 2002/04/02

Full Circle: First Contact – Vikings and Skraelings in Newfoundland and Labrador [Newfoundland Museum]

2002/06/21 – 2003/03/02

Gifts of the Forest: Native Traditions in Wood and Bark [Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Centre]