RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne
Canadian Art Review

RACAR
Revue d'art canadienne | Canadian Art Review

If Art is the Answer, What is the Question?—Some Queries Raised by First Nations' Visual Culture in Vancouver

Charlotte Townsend-Gault

Volume 21, Number 1-2, 1994

Représentation et identités culturelles
Representation and Cultural Identity

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1072668ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1072668ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (print)
1918-4778 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Townsend-Gault, C. (1994). If Art is the Answer, What is the Question?—Some Queries Raised by First Nations' Visual Culture in Vancouver. *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, *21*(1-2), 100–110. https://doi.org/10.7202/1072668ar

Article abstract

En ce moment, à Vancouver, on peut voir de l'art autochtone dans un certain nombre de galeries commerciales qui s'y consacrent exclusivement, dans quelques autres qui en montrent à l'occasion, et il existe aussi un très grand nombre de débouchés pour ce dernier, difficiles à distinguer des simples boutiques ou des magasins. On assiste, en outre, à une prolifération de livres luxueux, pleins de photographies brillantes montrant les trésors que musées et collections privées à travers le monde ont enlevés à la Côte Ouest, avant que la Colombie britannique ne change ses attitudes négatives envers les Premières Nations, attitudes qui considéraient les artefacts de ces dernières comme étant dépourvus d'intérêt artistique. Et même si c'est encore plus difficile à circonscrire, il y a encore plus à voir à l'extérieur des galeries et des livres : les grands mâts-totems dans les centres commerciaux, les « sweat-shirts » aux motifs imprimés par des artistes et les « logos » sur les emballages de saumon fumé. Autour de ces manifestations, de nombreux débats font rage quant à leur signification, leur destination et leur fonction. On considérera, dans cette étude, que ces artefacts doivent être regardés comme une réification de projets d'inscription de l'identité locale ou nationale, et comme tels, ils constituent des sites où peuvent s'exprimer les conflits entre les Premières Nations et la société dominante. On conclura en montrant que la situation permet une « offensive » de représentations culturelles que provoquent des affrontements et soulèvent de vives passions. C'est la nature des relations de la réception de l'art autochtone et c'est par elles que les arguments sur les implications de valeurs divergentes peuvent s'établir. C'est ici que les frontières se démarquent, s'élargissent ou se forcent au fur et à mesure que les politiques de l'identitaire sont retravaillées autant pour les Autochtones que pour les autres.

If Art is the Answer, What is the Question?— Some Queries Raised by First Nations' Visual Culture in Vancouver

Charlotte Townsend-Gault

Résumé

En ce moment, à Vancouver, on peut voir de l'art autochtone dans un certain nombre de galeries commerciales qui s'y consacrent exclusivement, dans quelques autres qui en montrent à l'occasion, et il existe aussi un très grand nombre de débouchés pour ce dernier, difficiles à distinguer des simples boutiques ou des magasins. On assiste, en outre, à une prolifération de livres luxueux, pleins de photographies brillantes montrant les trésors que musées et collections privées à travers le monde ont enlevés à la Côte Ouest, avant que la Colombie britannique ne change ses attitudes négatives envers les Premières Nations, attitudes qui considéraient les artefacts de ces dernières comme étant dépourvus d'intérêt artistique. Et même si c'est encore plus difficile à circonscrire, il y a encore plus à voir à l'extérieur des galeries et des livres: les grands mâts-totems dans les centres commerciaux, les «sweat-shirts» aux motifs imprimés par des artistes et les «logos» sur les emballages de saumon fumé. Autour de ces manifestations, de nombreux débats font rage quant à leur signification, leur destination et leur fonction. On considérera, dans cette étude, que ces artefacts doivent être regardés comme une réification de projets d'inscription de l'identité locale ou nationale, et comme tels, ils constituent des sites où peuvent s'exprimer les conflits entre les Premières Nations et la société dominante. On conclura en montrant que la situation permet une «offensive» de représentations culturelles que provoquent des affrontements et soulèvent de vives passions. C'est la nature des relations de la réception de l'art autochtone et c'est par elles que les arguments sur les implications de valeurs divergentes peuvent s'établir. C'est ici que les frontières se démarquent, s'élargissent ou se forcent au fur et à mesure que les politiques de l'identitaire sont retravaillées autant pour les Autochtones que pour les autres.

Native art can be seen today in Vancouver in a number of commercial galleries that are devoted exclusively to it, in a smaller number that show it on occasion, and in a greater number of outlets which are hard to distinguish from shops. There is a proliferation of coffee-table volumes full of glowing photographs of the treasures that were misappropriated from the Northwest Coast to museums and private collections around the world, before British Columbia overcame its attitude towards the "Siwash," that defined such objects as not worth collecting.[1] But although it may be difficult to categorize, and harder to name, there is much more to be seen outside the galleries and books: poles in shopping malls, artist-designed sweatshirts, the logos on boxes of smoked salmon, chocolates, button blankets at a blockade. Around these phenomena circulates a constellation of arguments, old, new and heated, about what they represent, whom they address, what they are for. I will argue that these things can be seen as objectifications of local or national identity projects, and that, as such, they mark the questions and the conflicts inherent in the relations between First Nations and the dominant society. First Nations have made land claims their priority; such claims should also be Canada's priority. Some favourable legal settlements notwithstanding, the disjunction between the rhetoric of rights and the reality of continuous repression, denigration and marginalisation persists.[2] The bad ethics of the situation are not improved by a vacuous celebration of native "art," however good. Art is never only art, as Lévi-Strauss famously remarked.

On the Northwest Coast the visual impact of built structures, poles, food vessels, ceremonial paraphernalia and garments has historically been one of the important ways in which these objects' intangible aspects, the values "inside people's heads," have been conveyed.[3] In communities up and down the coast, wherever social relations are being affirmed, negotiated or disputed, relationships with objects-as-representations are also in evidence. Wrapped round with stories of their making, histories of their iconographies, and with songs, dances and theories making claims about their value, they remain amongst the major forms of contemporary First Nations culture, supplemented, as always, by new forms aided by new technologies and materials, and by reciprocal appropriation.

There are, then, historical precedents for the role played by cultural representations, and for their persisting visual impact and intervention, in the social relations between the First Nations and the non-native population. Chiefs and others clad in button-embroidered red and blue or black blankets, accompanied by music, dance and ceremonial accoutrements, have become a familiar component in political negotiations and court battles. Such public representations have a history as markers of contest and embody assertions of position and status, settling, if only temporarily, disputes about power and position.[4]

To observe that, in oral cultures, symbolic capital is often vested in material objects is hardly controversial,[5] but it should not necessarily imply consensus as to their meanings and values in those cultures.[6] Multiple meanings, of-

ten disputed, focused on such objects-as-representations, have characterised their reception in historically bounded native communities as they do today in the multicultural and internationalist arena of British Columbia.

A postmodernism based on Lyotard's ideas about the absence of consensus does not necessarily present a break with the past.[7] Furthermore, histories of interpretation seldom follow a straight line, and for several of the cultures of the Northwest Coast history, meanings and interpretation have been severely ruptured. Rather than retreating to some imaginary older and purer categories it seems important to articulate the ways in which cultural representations are insinuated into the present. I want to suggest that it is precisely because of their contested status — as symbols, as treasures, as representations, as property, as art, as ethnographica — that objects-as-representations are at the flash points of identity politics, cultural debates and confrontations. Furthermore, a large part of their present significance lies in a challenge to colonialist authority, the assertion of survival, the demand for response and the provocation to action.

There is a highly articulate relationship between the visual manifestations of native cultures and contemporary social relations. In focussing on the politicized situation in contemporary urban British Columbia I want to argue that a whole range of responses, that I will call the relations of reception, is elicited by this very visual culture. Relations of reception imply some reciprocity between subject and object, even though it may be ruled out by certain ideologies, and, I would hope, could include the response of non-native observers who are, inevitably, it seems to me, also participants.

Over the past twenty years there has been a significant increase in the number of carvers/artists producing new work for native, non-native and overlapping markets. In addition, the mass reproduction of tangibles, in a range of media and formats, for wide distribution, overrides simple distinctions between items made for use within the native community and their promiscuous proliferation as consumer items for a non-native market. There is a long history of this type of production,[8] intensified in the twentieth century by association with the arts and crafts movement.[9] While clearly a market for consumer goods on the present growing scale is new,[10] the distinction between market commodities and items made for native use is not the key one. Neither, I suggest, is another often-cited distinction between the work of "traditional" and "assimilated" artists. Classificatory problems have been replaced by politico-economic problems — or have proved unresolvable simply because the labels have been moved around.[11] Histories of interpretation have created layers of meaning that cannot be completely unwrapped.[12]

The reason for assembling the following apparently disjunctive array (hereinafter referred to as "the list") — a random sample from an expanding field of representations to be found currently in Vancouver's public realm — is to acknowledge how far First Nations material culture extends in its confrontation with the dominant culture. Around these objects and structures, these cultural representations, turn the issues which mark the contested field of First Nations identity politics in British Columbia.

- A "welcome figure," in red cedar, seven metres high, carved by Joe David, "Tla-o-qui-aht" of the Nuu-Chah-nulth, as a focus for an anti-logging rally at the Provincial Parliament Buildings in Victoria in 1984, is now permanently installed outside the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver.
- The University is built on Musqueam land. A great hall, constructed on the model of the Coast Salish long house, is at the centre of the First Nations House of Learning, dedicated in 1993.[13] In an unprecedented juxtaposing of styles on this scale, each of the four immense supporting house posts was made by carvers from different coastal tribes.
- The silver object known as the Queen's baton, one of the accoutrements of the Commonwealth Games in Victoria in August 1994, was designed and made by three native carvers — one from each of Vancouver Island's three tribes, Nuu-Chah-Nulth, Salish and Kwagiulth — on the model of a soul catcher, in response to the theme of the Games, "Catch the Spirit."
- *Protector* and *Scorched Earth Policy, Clear-cut Logging on Native Sovereign Lands, Shaman Coming to Fix* are two of the most widely exhibited paintings by the Cowichan artist Yuxweluptun. That they include representations of shamans and spirit helpers is indicated by the titles, a clarity of designation running counter to the usual reticence of Yuxweluptun's people about spiritual matters.
- In an exhibition, *Multiplicities*, at the Museum of Anthropology, which included, but made no distinction between, artists elsewhere designated "traditional" and "innovative," Dempsey Bob (Tahltan/Tlingit) showed the plans for a pole to be called *Tribute to our Ancestors*. This would be unexceptional were it not for the fact that the ancestors referred to are two historically unidentified groups: master carvers (men) and master weavers (women).

- Robert Davidson, a Haida artist who works in a wide range of media, authorized an unlimited edition of his frog, which has also appeared as a limited-edition bronze sculpture, three metres in diameter, and as a miniature gold pendant, in high quality chocolate, two inches in diameter.

Most categorizations of significance or value would exclude at least one of the items on "the list:" the distance, both in terms of geography and goals, between makers and communities varies too greatly; there is no currently available paradigm for "art" which could embrace them all; they are objects and structures of such conceptual diversity that they can only be considered together by following the heuristic fashion which overlooks intention, and some irreconcilable propositions as to what art and popular culture is and is for.

However, to put such emphasis on the "objects themselves" may seem to be wilful evasion of the difficulties they present, vulgar empiricism, or mere replication of the startled gaze of early explorers with their guileless or (as they now seem) misleading and appropriative categories.[14] The list is, rather, intended to preempt an account in terms provided by art history or anthropology or any one way of codifying interpretation. It is also meant to acknowledge that the categories of art are seen by some as oppressive and irrelevant while ethnography is to be slurred. Such views are part of the post-colonial argument. The aim here is not so much to criticize as to cut across some of the more common typologies of value at work in order to reveal the contest over values in the late-colonial present.

Theorizing representation, in both art history and anthropology, has tended to re-define both "art" and "artefacts" as components in wider sets of socio-cultural representations. John Barrell, for example, uses the term "discursive representations."[15] The anthropologist Nicholas Thomas writes that his "curiosity avoids any constrictive typology of object-meanings in an abstracted domain of man, subject, and object, and is instead aroused by the variety of liaisons men and women can have with things in the conflicted, transcultural history of colonialism."[16]

Since the glory days of epiphanies at the Trocadero and their endorsement by Moore, Pollock, Newman and others, the frame of reference has been ethnocentric awe and escalating markets.[17] The gaffe embedded in the Museum of Modern Art's spectacular exhibition in 1984, *"Primitivism" in 20th-Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*, was the pegging of the formalist view just as the richness of this approach and its interpretations was widely perceived to have exhausted itself. It was followed by *Les Magiciens de la Terre*, at the Centre Georges-Pompidou in 1989, another magnificent, Eurocentric, awestruck error. Insofar as exhibitions are critical nodes, or the institutionalization of arguments, *Art/artifact* at the Centre for African Art in New York, which allowed for multiple, simultaneous readings of the same objects, seemed closer to what actually happens, but harder to follow through. The only permissible way out of the confusion of points of view was for aboriginal people to select and endorse their own exhibitions (a worldwide tendency),[18] or to open and run their own museums. This solution, however, begs some critical issues, and this matters if the debate is to be reciprocal and is to be joined in those discourses where critical issues are the *sine qua non*. If respect for a culture, rather than guilt or sycophancy, are sought, what is to be done, for instance, about "bad aboriginal art" and the issues of replication raised by Eric Michaels?[19]

In terms of relations of production, the objects on the list may well be found to have ascribed, determinate meanings within their makers' frame of reference. Considered in terms of the relations of their reception, however, they have meanings that vary, conflict, shift. But mobility of meaning is not to be taken as meaninglessness.

The objects are part of an ensemble of cultural representations more far-reaching and contentious than "art" allows. The social relations that can be discerned in the response to these material objects are fluid, adaptive, dynamic. In disputes as to what they mean lie conflicts over value that can be seen to focus the wider conflicts. Exactly *how* they are or should be perceived, and by whom, is at the crux of arguments in the field of intercultural relations. In the conflicts over what they are for and what they mean the relations of reception are played out. It is an ongoing argument in the process of which new meanings emerge within the larger society in which First Nations find themselves implicated.

What follows, as well as being synoptic, can only be speculative and provisional. For the sake of clarity I shall treat three of what I take to be the salient features of the field of cultural reception as if they were separate topics, which they are not.

Controlling Ownership

Ovide Mercredi, the Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations, has always insisted on the need for First Nations to maintain and "take back control" over their knowledge, "languages, cultures, traditions...to ensure the integrity of their societies."[20] Together with the sentiment expressed by Jerome Berthelette, "There are objects in museums which

we require to awaken us,"[21] Mercredi's remark is unequivocal on the need to regain ownership and control over symbolic capital. This need is securely on the political agenda in Canada now, since it underlies the debates about land, inherent rights, repatriation and appropriation. Rights to ownership and control of a cultural form were evident in the free hand the artists allowed themselves with the morphology and iconography of the "soul-catcher" in adapting it to its new function as a repository for the text of the Queen's opening speech.

Within the context of the University of British Columbia, the First Nations House of Learning asserts ownership of culturally specific knowledge by embodying it in architecture, carvings and spatial relationships in several distinct ways.[22] The building is aligned to the true north, disrupting the grid pattern to which the rest of the architectural hodge-podge of the campus conforms. This speaks against incorporation. The building looks different from anything nearby, the sinuous contours of its hyperbolic paraboloid roof serving to mould an aggregate of forms to the contours of the site, which includes a waterfall and old trees. It is also differently structured. The roof links several indigenous architectural concepts: the shed-roof construction of the Salish big house with untreated cedar planks and beams; the idea of a number of smaller roofed chambers under the main roof; a circular building, reached by a spiral staircase from an above-ground configuration of leaning poles, which recalls the earth lodges of the interior tribes. All of this accommodates library, archive, seminar rooms and lounges, the functional spaces essential to the idea of a western university. But here is also provision for culturally specific functions, as in the big house with its small ceremonial entry, a sweat lodge and a space set aside for elders.

In the big house, each of the four poles, a tribal style and iconography clearly expressed in each, is radically distinct, superficially disharmonious. But there is no lack of confidence in this unprecedented juxtaposition of work by Walter and Rodney Harris (Gitksan), Lyle Wilson (Haisla), Susan Point (Musqueam) and Ken McNeil (Tahltan/Tlingit/Nisga'a) with Stan Bevan (Tahltan/Tlingit/Tsimshian). A similar assurance of the right to break with (supposed) precedent is evident in the incorporation of hitherto alien representations and styles into the house poles: Point's pole prominently incorporates the representation of a large Salish spindle whorl as a tribute to the women students; in the Harris' pole the three humans, along with Wolf and a cub, represent university students; Wilson's innovation is to have played with the idea that a pole has both front and back views by "framing" each side with an edging running vertically down the pole, while limbs and features which are typically incorporated into the pole here grow out of it, "naturalistically."

Rather than seeing site, architecture and carving in terms of hybridity and therefore as a departure from authenticity, they can be seen as an argument — an argument, that is, against the silent imposition of the University, early in the century, on Musqueam land, ignoring its original inhabitants. Although a tiny minority on the campus, Musqueam and other First Nations students are claiming space, displaying their culture and doing new things with it as if they owned it, which, it should now be obvious to all, they do. With such assertion of cultural ownership comes the right to extend unilaterally what lies within any definition of culture. Controlling ownership includes controlling authenticity. The knowledge the House embodies has adapted to contemporary requirements but concedes little. It is not a monument. It embodies the presence of living, contemporary people on a campus where hitherto their cultures have been most visibly represented in the University's Museum of Anthropology.

In a book on the Nisga'a, that includes glossy colour photographs, a chief is seen wearing a plastic frontlet of the kind known to be turned out of a mould in Taiwan. The use of such simulacra is fiercely contested by some as unworthy of guardianship of the heritage: a travesty of the idea of wealth and pride inherent in the right to wear such regalia. For others owning the right to display or wear the representation, no matter what it is made of, or where, is of paramount importance. The same mixture of innovation, expediency and economic factors is to be seen in many other instances of adaptation — the use of plastic buttons instead of the "original" pearl ones from China, on some contemporary button blankets, or those Chilkat blankets where the designs are painted on canvas rather than woven.[23]

There are First Nations people on the coast today who seem to be thinking of their "culture" as an "externalised political symbol...as an entity, a symbolically-laden 'thing'." This is the definition of the anthropologist Roger Keesing who proposes that such a conceptualization is possible only under "a situation of domination."[24] In Keesing's terms, culture is resistance: a marked, articulated version of "culture." The House of Learning and the wearing of a plastic frontlet both represent this resistance. It implies ownership and control over native culture and the possibility of its survival through adaptation as, it is often pointed out, it has always done.

The remodelled duty-free shop in the international departures area at Vancouver International Airport was designed by Roy Henry Vickers, of First Nations descent, who was also responsible for the computer-derived murals for

the new Commonwealth Games pool in Victoria.[25] The shop is sheltered within a long-house configuration and flanked by four house posts in the form of animal figures. A notice explains how the theme of the new airport, "Land, Sea and Sky," is acknowledged by the representation on the house posts of bear, salmon and eagle. Rather as the House of Learning is both implicated in the University and an argument against it, so this duty-free long house is subsumed by the functions of the terminal building and yet is dominant enough to stand against them. It overarches the displays of international consumer goods, and the tills, even though it must submit to the ignominy of having its own architectural motifs interspersed with decorations composed, when last seen, of clusters of designer teddy-bears nestling in artificial spruce boughs. Whether the native cultural forms co-opt, or have been co-opted by, some cynical hucksterism on the part of the airport's designers, in a Baudrillardian chaos of signification, is not an argument to settle here. The structure does, however, make the argument unavoidable and, I would argue, is a cultural intervention before it is decor.

The reception of such large-scale forms must be coloured by their visibility: the assertiveness with which they mark a space and claim the attention. Great size, however, is not all. Robert Davidson's little chocolate killer whale masks, that fit in the mouth, also assert themselves by surprising, even shocking, as they cross the sanctioned boundaries of preciousness and durability for cultural valuables. They also cloud the boundary between expensive native art and inexpensive souvenirs. Davidson himself does nothing to prevent them from being read simultaneously as sound economics, aesthetic extension and cultural revival.

With the language of compromise heard rather more frequently from the party in power in British Columbia, the NDP, and from a growing number of non-natives, there has been a parallel foregrounding of native cultural forms and motifs by businesses and government agencies. This included, at the 1994 Commonwealth Games, the *presence* of native people. Tags such as "Super Natural British Columbia" and "Catch the Spirit" are calculated to bring intangible benefits, adding "heritage" and heft to the presentation of the province as it lures investment and tourist dollars.[26] They also activate argument, in both native and non-native communities, about authenticity and appropriation. Over the past decade there have been increasingly well-aired disputes with museums, archives and scholarly disciplines over fitting, and permissible, means of communication and presentation of native cultures. In the words of the Metis film-maker Loretta Todd, known for having clearly articulated the position against appropriation of aboriginal cultural forms by non-natives: "Cultural autonomy signifies a right to cultural specificity, a right to one's origins and histories as told from within the culture and not as mediated from without."[27]

How a museum and an owning family came to terms over the control of a treasure that had been alienated into the collection of Andy Warhol in New York has been recorded by Alan Hoover and Richard Inglis, the non-native curators of the Royal British Columbia Museum, which houses one of the world's largest collections of recent Northwest Coast material culture. Never having been un-crated while in Warhol's possession, the Nuu-Chah-Nulth ceremonial curtain (one of a pair of copies) was only rediscovered when much of his estate came onto the market after his death. It was repatriated in a four-hour event which culminated in the performance of songs and dances: "The speaker for the Frank family presented their history and meaning by referring to images on the curtain; for each one, an individual who was a descendant of the past marriage alliance represented by the image was called up on stage and seated."[28] The Museum is to care for the curtain, while the family is to control the circumstances of its display and use.

Native-run museums attest to a category of inalienable possessions, without these kinds of accommodation. The Kwakwaka'wakw were eventually successful in their demands that historical items associated with Dan Cranmer's potlatch at Alert Bay in 1921, during the period when the potlatch was banned, be returned, if not to their original owners then to the native-run U'Mista Cultural Centre at Alert Bay and the Kwagiulth Museum at Cape Mudge. These particular masks, dishes and regalia are not to be understood as examples of a timeless type, but as property over which named individuals at a precise historical moment can claim rights. However, in many cases ownership has been difficult, if not impossible, to determine across the disruptions of Kwakwaka'wakw history in the twentieth century, and has tended to shift from individuals to the group. The inalienability of the returned potlatch regalia persists even though it has been dealt with very differently by the two museums,[29] and even as the disputes attest to the potency of the treasure in both public and private struggles over identity.

Material culture is, thus, being used by First Nations politicians, artists and others as a form of resistance, as a counter-hegemonic strategy and as a way to reshape their own social world. The argument is about finding ways to translate, transform, reinvent, protect and sometimes obscure the knowledge that is integral to the representation of a culture. The culture's embodiments, the physical objects, are located at the cusp of the argument over what is

to be done about culturally specific knowledge and whether it should be put beyond the bounds of those outside the culture. The relevant parameters here are those between alienable and inalienable, sharing and withholding, translation and silence, between what is public, for anyone out there, and what is private, specific, local knowledge. This is the source of the power of cultural representations: that they are also discursive representations.

Limits of Translation

The disjuncture between public and private knowledge, evident in some items on "the list," and a subject for a number of contemporary artists, gives rise to some of the most disputed relations of reception. That there are affinities between a Kwakwaka'wakw mask and, say, Picasso's *Girl Before a Mirror* (1932) appeared self-evident to the organisers of *Primitivism in 20th-Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern.* This was one of many such juxtapositions, set up largely on the basis of formal affinities, which perpetuated the idea that, in the Kwakwaka'wakw longhouse and Picasso's studio, compatible languages were operating, with the possibility of moving from language A to language B and back again as the product of a kind of atemporal translation. It seems improbable that the position from which these formal affinities could be confidently recognized would be maintained today. The question now is: If a Northwest Coast mask was an art object to a modernist what is it to a post-modernist; what translatability does it have? The simple answer must be — many things; and, what is more important, different things for different audiences. However, a too easy postmodern relativism is not viewed kindly by many First Nations who see it as a threat to a cultural specificity which is best guarded by withholding translation.[30]

Culture, as the term has been defined by Roger Keesing, is clarified as *both* resistance *and* incorporation.[31] Herein lies the conflict. It may be helpful to consider the situation in British Columbia in terms of Keesing's Gramscian position on colonial and counter-colonial discourse: "the cultures and politics of subalternity are inherently oppositional. They are, to use Gramsci's phrase, structured by a 'series of negations.' And, indeed, they may be structured by 'affirmations' as well: that is the classic hegemonic process, in which subalterns are deeply implicated in their own subjugation."[32] This sheds some light on the apparently affirmative public statements made by totem poles, alongside the equally apparent ability of poles to be about things that the public does not get, and is not meant to get. They are oppositional, being about ways of measuring and expressing social values that are significantly different from those common in the dominant society. The duality is talismanic of the relations First Nations have to enter into with a society by which their own society has been repressed and destabilized.

Among the number of artists directly confronting the limits of translatability, Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun retains allegiance to his Cowichan people, a group of the Coast Salish, and participates in the winter dancing. His large (183 x 119 cm) painting *Protector* (1990) analyzes the common problems of "the toxicological environment." He proposes a solution which, up to a point, can be a common solution. He is prepared to explain that what many take to be a secular landscape, adequately described in geological and botanical terms, is actually populated by spirits of trees, mountains, the earth. They are not represented as a vague spiritual conceit, nor as the population of some Surreal Wonderland gone wrong. Those who have ravaged the terrain, and those who are complicit in it (and that is most of us) would have been less likely to have done so if they had known it was alive. Obviously this Cowichan fact, that the land is animate, has been in need of translation. When Yuxweluptun says that his paintings "are too big to be filed away and forgotten" that is what he is aiming for. But here we reach the limit of what he is prepared to divulge. The Coast Salish belief in spirit helpers informs a work like *Protector.* A spirit helper, who must be distinguished from the beings of the shared cosmology, is acquired by an individual as a result of a personal spirit quest. Details of the spirit helper's identity are kept private. For the non-native audience it is not necessarily clear how the shamanic paraphernalia should be read. Yuxweluptun has painted more into this work than he expects most of his audience to get out of it. He has set a limit to translatability, making apparent to the non-native cognoscenti that his culture's rules and their nuances are fully knowable only to those who live that culture.

The anthropologist Wayne Suttles long ago made a non-native readership aware of the privacy of Coast Salish spiritual practices.[33] The guardedness persists. In the carving of small wall plaques, virtually meaningless to their makers, which the Salish produce in quantity, there is a deflection of inquiry, a screen behind which the privacy of long house practices can be maintained. It also persists in disputes within some First Nations communities about disclosures which could serve to assert the endurance of the culture, or to weaken it.

An unidentified chief being interviewed on the CBC radio at the time of the Commonwealth Games, when asked to comment on the spectacular display of massed canoes in the largest gathering of Vancouver Island's native people in

the colonial period, gave a reminder: "We needed to display our rights to our culture to all these people. But you know, we usually we keep our ceremonial regalia hidden in boxes in the basement." The role of the spectacular regalia is fulfilled as much in being concealed as in being revealed. As for the adaptation of the soul-catcher into the baton that held the Queen's announcement of the opening of the Games, dissenting voices expressed doubts as to whether a form that had previously been too powerful to be touched by the uninitiated should be transformed in such a way. Amongst some groups, soul-catchers — part of the shaman's curing equipment — were used to capture errant souls or to suck the harm from the bodies of the afflicted. The association of a soul-catcher with the theme of the Games — Catch the Spirit — will undoubtedly strike some as a quintessential exemplar of post-modern banality and trivialization. But this is clearly not how it was intended by the Native Participation Committee who, collectively, thought up the idea and engaged one artist from each of the Island's three native tribes to carry it out. Art Thompson (Nuuchah-nulth), Richard Hunt (Kwakwaka'wakw) and Charles Elliot (Coast Salish) in turn devised motifs which intertwined their respective iconographies. The soul-catcher thus came to represent not just "the Spirit of the Games," but also an unprecedented reconciliation between the three nations. It can only be reported that this was viewed as either syncretism in a great cause, or a sell-out.

Generalizations about the people of the coast are inadmissible on spiritual matters as on any other, and there are great differences in the degree to which public display of ceremonial artefacts, or ceremonies themselves, has been or is permitted. It seems probable, however, that the shared imperative to limit translation is critically linked to the fact that many, if not most, items of material culture — the poles, food vessels, containers, speakers' staffs, spindle whorls, blankets, masks — bear upon them the representations of animals and spirit beings. More than this, the objects *are*, in some profound sense, the animal or spirit represented. Such tangibles are part of an ensemble of intangible factors, inseparable from the mythologies, histories and stories: "personifications of ancestral powers," as Barbara Saunders terms them.[34] There is good evidence for this in the historical discourse (in the Boas and Hunt material, in the oral poetry of the Haida John Sky and Walter McGregor, who told their stories to Swanton in 1900 and 1901, in the stories of their Tsimshian contemporary Henry Tate, and in accounts given by artists such as Dempsey Bob [1992], Robert Davidson [1993] and Ron Hamilton [1991]). It was with reference to these spirit beings that social relations were worked out, affirmed, re-negotiated or disputed at feasts and potlatches conducted around their display and use. They, which is to say their representations, were, and still are, the focus and ultimate arbiters of any conflicts in these relations. It is perhaps because of their ambiguous identity, as *both* representations of spirits *and* cultural representations, that disputes over the limits of their translatability are one of the flash points in the relations of reception.[35]

Reinscribing History

The reinscription of history takes place at many levels. In "Super Natural British Columbia," the tag "Superhost" was bestowed on deserving organizations and businesses. Eatons, for example, promoted itself with a huge banner proclaiming its status as "Your superhost store." It did not take long for the province's First Nations to point out that they had been the original superhosts.

Amongst contemporary artists the arguments about the rediscovery as against the reinvention of history tend to turn on the opposition between "traditional" and what are sometimes referred to as "assimilated" artists. Thus the "assimilated" Yuxweluptun, who studied at the Emily Carr College of Art and Design in Vancouver, on history:

> The system native people are governed under is the despotism of white self-interest. Because of this a lot of my pieces are historical. You cannot hide the real history or even the censorship of native history, a colonial syndrome. You can hide the Department of Indian Affairs documents from the time of Confederation, but you cannot hide my paintings. They are there for all people to see.[36]

Yuxweluptun distinguishes his work from that of Davidson or Bob which, for all its innovations, he and many others would label "traditional." "My work is very different from traditional art work. How do you paint a land claim? You can't carve a totem pole that has a beer bottle on it."[37] He can paint a pole with a beer bottle on it, with a little native figure trapped inside. He has done so. It is called *Alcoholics on the Reservation* (1988). In another, *Throwing their Culture Away* (1988), a car perches on a pole.

The dispute between "traditional" and "assimilated" modes can take many forms. Joe David's Welcome figure, however, provides an instance of how a "traditional" carved form can engage with contemporary politics. Formerly, welcome figures were not usually carved to the degree of finish associated with house poles, and were placed outside the long houses or on the beach to welcome guests arriving by water to feast or potlatch. David had in mind a proto-

type figure, carved by his great-great-great-grandfather. It is said to have recorded the statement of an ancestor who, at the time of the first European contact, had foreseen the threat posed to his community by the coming of the Europeans, and had warned the chiefs of the possibility of misunderstanding. David, in his turn, endorses the reconciliation process, which has transformed his figure from a marker of angry confrontation at the anti-logging rally (part of a process which resulted in the designation of Meares Island as a provincial park) to a marker of accommodation at the entrance to the Museum:

> Though my carving has its roots in ancient history, the story and lessons are continuing and changing. My ancestors once asked "Will the Europeans be made to understand your position and relationships with these lands and waterways and all there within?" The answer in relation to some of the current efforts is obviously "Yes." There has been a great deal of respect for our traditional arts, ceremonies and histories and it has been by means of these mediums that bonds and communications have formed.[38]

Despite the Museum's constant involvement with contemporary First Nations carvers and artists, the majority of its collection is of historical work, including many of the poles "rescued" during the 1950s from their sites in abandoned villages. Its policy towards the people of the Northwest Coast, as to other cultures whose work is represented in the collection, is to present the art as a "continually evolving tradition." The response of contemporary artists veers from that of Edward Poitras (who, in 1995, was the first First Nations artist to represent Canada at the Venice Biennale), who has always maintained that he is proud to have his own work exhibited in the same institutions that house the work of his ancestors, to that of Yuxweluptun, who describes such museums as "Indian morgues."[39]

Among recent events in the construction of the cultures of the Northwest Coast as anthropological objects with a past, but not a future, has been the ardent contestation of the forms of this construction by its subjects. "After contact," notes Robert Davidson, "there were other new images that were added to the vocabulary of what we call cultural images. The Haida people were always adapting. It was not a fixed culture as I was led to believe by anthropological attitudes and ideas."[40] In contesting the role of anthropologists in constructing and fixing their past, some First Nations artists also contest the category of ethnographic art imposed on them by those anthropologists. Others maintain it, or blur it. Doreen Jensen, Gitksan carver, cultural activist and educator, spoke at the opening of *Indigena: Contemporary Native Perspectives* at the Canadian Museum of Civilization in 1992:

> As aboriginal artists we need to reclaim our own identities through our own work, our heritage, and our future. We don't need to live any longer within others' definitions of who and what we are. We need to put aside the titles that have been imposed on us and our creativity, titles that serve the needs of other people. For too long our art has been situated in the realm of anthropology by a discourse that validates white artists, curators and writers.

When the Commonwealth Games were still five years away, it was decided by elders of the Vancouver Island peoples that, the provincial government having agreed to negotiate, the time for reconciliation had come. Poles marked the reconciliation. A delegation of sixty-four First Nations people went to Auckland, New Zealand, for the Games immediately preceding those in Victoria. They took with them a Coast Salish pole, especially commissioned for the occasion, which later was erected in a Maori village. At the same time, the first Salish pole ever erected in Victoria went up on the lawn of the provincial legislature. Thus the Games in Victoria occurred at a critical historical juncture when they could be used, with the approval of all parties, to foreground a culture that had long been a zone of public and political conflict. Once again, material culture was at the focus of a dispute. This time the dispute was over whether the rhetoric of reconciliation could overcome the historical irony that this gesture of inter-tribal solidarity and outreach took place in the same harbour, once the site of a Songhees village, that became the trading and distribution centre for the coast and a breeding ground for smallpox. From here, smallpox blankets, and other deadly afflictions brought by the colonists, were paddled to settlements all the way up the coast.

The Games opened with a dramatic enactment of the Kwakwaka'wakw wolf legend, the property of Adam Dick, framed by models of four Coast Salish house posts indicating that the ceremony was taking place on Salish land and with Salish cooperation. The cynical argue that any idea that political reconciliation would be furthered by such a spectacle probably escaped most members of the audience, as would the irony that the management of apartheid in another Commonwealth country seems likely to have been modelled on Canada's reservation system. In one view, Northwest Coast mythology present on its home ground and seen as a spectacle on the international stage, however imperfectly understood, is itself reconciliation. However, this view was countered by the perception that native participation in the framing of the Games had been,

at least in part, a political manoeuvre to forestall the use of the event as an occasion to air grievances before an international audience.

For some natives there can be no negotiation. Yuxweuluptun supports the position that rights to land are inherent rights and therefore not up for discussion and cannot be, for example, a Supreme Court issue. He maintains there is always the calculation that "it's cheaper to have uneducated Indians on welfare than to settle land claims."[41] This view is borne out by a report from the Canadian Human Rights Commission, in response to the 1991 standoff at Oka, which contained a devastating critique of Canada's policies towards its aboriginal populations. It recommended that the Federal Government scrap both the Indian Act and the Department of Indian Affairs as "relics of the past that must be put behind us" and that the current land-claims policy was "heavily weighted in favour of the government." "For every community where headway has been made on land claims, self-government or economic development, there are dozens of others with grievances still outstanding and aspirations yet to be realised."[42]

The voice of Nuxalk Chief Charlie Nelson, in an editorial in *Kahtou*, the B.C. First Nations' newspaper, comes across in a stinging address to the negotiators of the B.C. Treaty Commission:

> Are we all becoming Government Indians?...Are we going to allow this piece-mealing of our INHERENT ABORIGINAL RIGHTS AND TITLE to continue?
>
> We have in place in some of our communities, the commercialisation of our food fishing rights! Our education, health care, tribal police, and social assistance have been put in the line of fire by transferring the funding responsibility from the federal to the provincial. Pretty soon, we'll be out in the streets pan-handling our Indian songs for spare change! Making cultural prostitutes of ourselves. Now, is this SELF-DETERMINATION?
>
> This colonialist movement towards the native people has become so sophisticated compared to when Columbus first arrived. Our peoples are allowing themselves to be handcuffed with money in exchange for extinguishment! Are we all to become sophisticated slaves of their society?[43]

Contrary assertions are to be found. Dempsey Bob's drawings for his pole, *Tribute to the Ancestors*, involve a plan to re-present history in a very literal sense, and with great assurance. The figure at the base, always the most important, is the Master Weaver: "Women are the base of our culture. Women carry the crests and pass them on to our children. Women are teachers." Next up the pole is the Master Carver: "he is a teacher, he creates and makes the culture real." Then, in order, come the sun, raven and a human: "The voices of our ancestors are thundering over the trees, trying to make us see — *art* is change. Out of the cedar tree grew our culture. Respect it."[44]

To maintain that the things on "the list" are so divergent as to make them unrecognizable as objects of the same kind of attention, to say they are awash in hybridity, or in an assimilative muddle that it would be crazy to try to untangle, and that no "one" is in any position to do so, is to give up. That means giving up before an extraordinary onslaught of cultural representations. The values invoked by "the list" are indeed irreconcilable. The collisions of affirmation and negation arouse fierce passions. But this is the nature of the relations of their reception, and it is through them that the arguments about the implications of discrepant values take place. Here boundaries are set, extended or broken as the politics of identity are worked through, for native and non-native alike.

Some of the material in this article has been discussed in an ethnographic context in "Art, Argument and Anger on the Northwest Coast" in *Art and Contest*, ed. Jeremy MacClancy to be published by Berg Publishers in 1997 in the Oxford series of Debates in Anthropology.

1 A clear account of this attitude is given in Douglas Cole, *Captured Heritage* (Vancouver, 1985).

2 See, for example, Chief Joe Mathias and Gary R. Yabsley, "Conspiracy of Legislation: The Suppression of Indian Rights in Canada," *B.C. Studies*, Special Issue No. 89 (Spring 1991), 34-45.

3 The oral traditions, mythologies and written records of the Northwest Coast cultures attest, in their constant references, to the centrality of material objects and of property, which are to be understood in both a material and spiritual sense. Mythological encounters with, for example, canoes or treasure boxes, and the transformations between humans and animals or spirit beings from which masks derive, were the originary transactions that established their meaning. See, for example: George Swanton, *Haida Texts: Masset Dialect*, Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition X,2 (Leiden, 1908); Franz Boas, *Kwakiutl Tales*, Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 2 (New York, 1910); *Tsimshian Texts*, (New Series), Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition X,2 (Leiden, 1912); *Religion of the Kwakiutl Indians*, Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 10 (New York, 1930).

4 The term "fighting with property" originates with the Kwakiutl. See Helen Codere, *Fighting with Property*, American Ethnological Society Monographs 28 (New York, 1950).

5 This is clearly expressed in much of Robert Davidson's writing: "Since the almost complete destruction of our spirit, our dis-

connection from our values and beliefs, it has been the art that has brought us back to our roots." Robert Davidson and Ulli Steltzer, *Eagle Transforming: The Art of Robert Davidson* (Vancouver/Toronto, 1995), 15.

6 Several examples of multiple meanings in such societies are given in Jeremy Coote and Anthony Shelton, eds, *Anthropology, Art and Aesthetics* (Oxford, 1992). The elegant paradigm set up by William Empson in *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (London, 1930) is an early precedent for the reading of multiple meanings, if interpretative cues are sought in literary theory, which they often are; but see also James Weiner, ed, *Too Many Meanings?* (Oxford, forthcoming).

7 "The postmodern would be that which...refuses the consensus of taste permitting a common expression of nostalgia for the impossible, and inquires into new presentations — not to take pleasure in them, but to better produce the feeling that there is something unpresentable." Jean François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Explained* (Minneapolis, 1992), 15.

8 Ruth B. Phillips is currently completing a book on issues of hybridity and authenticity in commoditized art forms, entitled *Trading Identities: Souvenir Arts from Northeastern North America 1700-1900.*

9 This history is discussed by Gerald McMaster in "Tenuous Lines of Descent: Indian Art and Craft of the Reservation Period," *In the Shadow of the Sun: Perspectives on Canadian Native Art*, ed. The Canadian Museum of Civilization, Canadian Ethnology Service Mercury Series Paper 124 (1993), 93-120, and by Scott Watson in "The Modernist Past of Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun's Landscape Allegories," *Yuxweluptun: Born to Live and Die on Your Colonialist Reservations*, eds Scott Watson, Charlotte Townsend-Gault and Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun (Vancouver, 1995), 61-71.

10 Michael Ames, *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums* (Vancouver, 1992); Valda Blundell, "The Tourist and the Native," *A Different Drummer: Readings in Anthropology with a Canadian Perspective*, ed. Bruce Cox (Ottawa, 1989), 49-58; Valda Blundell, "Take Home Canada": Representations of Aboriginal Peoples as Tourist Souvenirs," *The Socialness of Things: Essays on the Socio-Semiotics of Objects*, ed. Stephen Harold Riggins (Berlin/New York, 1994), 251-84; J.C.H. King, "Marketing Magic: Process and Identity in the Creation and Selling of Native Art and Material Culture" (1993, unpublished ms.).

11 Ruth B. Phillips and Valda Blundell, "Indian Art: Where Do You Put It?" *Muse*, VI,3 (October 1988), 64-70, voices the concerns of museum professionals but now seems detached from the issues.

12 Aldona Jonaitis, "Creations of Mystics and Philosophers: The White Man's Perceptions of Northwest Coast Indian Art from the 1930s to the Present," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, V,1 (1981), 1-45; Charlotte Townsend-Gault, "Rethinking Food Vessels: The History of Interpreting a Category of Kwakiutl Property," Ph.D. diss., University College London, 1988.

13 According to its brochure: "The mandate of the First Nations House of Learning is to make the University's vast resources more accessible to B.C.'s First People, and to improve the University's ability to meet the needs of First Nations. The House of Learning is continuously seeking direction from the First Nations community in determining priorities and approaches. This is being achieved through consultation meetings and workshops held throughout the province." In a student body of approximately 30,000, some 250 First Nations students are enrolled at UBC. The aim is to increase this figure to 1000 by the year 2000.

14 For example, in noticing only what they recognised as "art," the point (as it now seems) was missed. Etienne Marchand wrote of the carving he saw on the Northwest Coast in 1801 "in which proportions were tolerably well observed, and the execution of which bespoke a taste and perfection which we do not expect to find in countries where the men seem still to have the appearance of savages. But what must astonish most...is to see painting everywhere, everywhere sculpture, among a nation of hunters." Quoted in Erna Gunther, *Indian Life of the Northwest Coast of North America As Seen By the Early Explorers and Fur Traders During the Last Decades of the Eighteenth Century* (Chicago, 1972), 419.

15 This use of the term "discursive representations" is derived from an articulation of John Barrell's: "The past is available to us only in the form of representations, and it was, equally to the point, available to the past only in the same form. To attempt to reconstruct the precise occasions of history is to attempt to reconstruct them in the only form in which they are or were available to be known, as representations articulated within the different discourses which combine and compete to represent the real." John Barrell, *The Birth of Pandora and the Division of Knowledge* (Oxford, 1992), 11.

16 Nicholas Thomas, *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture and Colonialism in the Pacific* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991), 26. Contemporary anthropological discourse tends to designate material culture variously as valuables, items of exchange, alienable or inalienable property or commodities. See: Marilyn Strathern, *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia* (Berkeley, 1988); Annette Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving* (Berkeley, 1992). These distinctions would make it hazardous to consider the items on the list together, as part of an ensemble. The anthropological study of art would want to consider which of them are art, by whose dictat and how they are evaluated. Cultural Studies might aim to overturn a reading of this list as extending promiscuously from the magnificent to the banal, pointing out that the tourist who takes home a "wolf" wall plaque, an "Indian" doll and a miniature chocolate totem pole is not necessarily aware that she has paid for banality.

17 Jackson Rushing, *Native American Art and the New York Avant Garde: A History of Cultural Primitivism* (Austin, 1995).

18 For example: *Te Maori: Taonga Maori. Treasures of the Maori*, 1986, *Indigena: Contemporary Native Perspectives*, 1992, and *Aratjara: Art of the First Australians*, 1993, all of which toured internationally.

19 Eric Michaels, "Bad Aboriginal Art," *Art & Text* (March-May 1988), 59-73.

20 Ovide Mercredi and Mary Ellen Turpel, *In the Rapids: Navigating the Future of First Nations* (Toronto, 1993), 198.

21 Jerome Berthelette, representing the National Association of Friendship Centres, during *Preserving our Heritage: A Working Conference for Museums and First Peoples* held at Carleton University, Ottawa, 3-5 November 1988.

22 The building was financed by donations made by individuals, corporations, tribal councils and churches, through the efforts of a fundraising committee. The sum raised was then matched by the Province of British Columbia through UBC's World of Opportunity Campaign.

23 A contrary view was recently expressed by a famous architect of Northwest Coast "art," Claude Lévi-Strauss: "The Pacific Coast Indians, whom I visited in 1974, are placing in museums — in this case of their own creation — the masks and other ritual objects that were confiscated more than half a century ago and have now been returned to them at last. These objects are brought out and used during ceremonies the Indians are beginning to celebrate again. In this climate they have lost a good deal of their ancient grandeur. The potlatch, formerly a solemn occasion, at once political, juridical, economic, and religious, on which rested the whole social order, has been rethought by acculturated Indians imbued with the Protestant ethic and is degenerating into a periodic exchange of little gifts to consolidate harmony within the group and to maintain friendship. Symbol: displayed next to traditional masks, some of which are among the highest creations of world sculpture, a mask of Mickey Mouse can sometimes be seen, whether made of papier-mache or molded plastic I do not know." "Saudades do Brasil," *New York Review of Books*, Dec. 21, 1995, trans. Sylvia Modelski, 19 -21.

24 This idea is taken from Keesing's discussion of the Malaita concept of *kastom*, of which he writes that it "does not represent simply the customary practices of Malaita peoples, but represents a hypostatisation of customs *as a body*, the elevation of custom into an externalised political symbol," and that "conceptualizing one's custom as an entity, a symbolically-laden 'thing' toward which one can take a stance — whether positive....or negative...is possible only under a situation of domination." "Colonial and Counter-Colonial Discourse in Melanesia," *Critique of Anthropology*, IV,1 (March 1994), 54.

25 It would be invidious to discuss in any detail here disputes over the selection of artists but inaccurate to overlook the fact that the choice of any artist for such commissions is likely to be disputed.

26 That there is a scarcely disguised irony in these strategies is made explicit by Valda Blundell: "The designers of touristic materials cannot employ representations of natives as they really appear and live in the contemporary world. They cannot depict the impoverished and alienating living conditions that have so often accompanied their colonization. They cannot portray native lands destroyed by the demands of modern development. Nor can they knowingly employ pictures of native produced cultural forms, be they artistic, social, economic of political ones, which look 'modern.'" "The Tourist and the Native," *A Different Drummer: Readings in Anthropology with a Canadian Perspective*, ed. Bruce Cox (Ottawa, 1989), 52.

27 Loretta Todd, "Notes on Appropriation," *Parallelogramme*, XVI,1 (1990), 30.

28 Alan Hoover and Richard Inglis, "Acquiring and Exhibiting a Nuu-Chah-Nulth Ceremonial Curtain," *Curator* (American Museum of Natural History), XXX,4 (1990), 283.

29 Barbara Saunders, "Kwakwaka'wakw Museology," *Cultural Dynamics*, VII,1 (March 1995), 37-68.

30 See, for example, Robert Houle, "The Spiritual Legacy of the Ancient Ones," *Land, Spirit, Power: First Nations at the National Gallery of Canada*, eds Diana Nemiroff, Robert Houle and Charlotte Townsend-Gault (Ottawa,1992), 43-73.

31 Roger Keesing, "Colonial and Counter-Colonial Discourse in Melanesia," *Critique of Anthropology*, IV,1 (1994), 41-58.

32 Keesing, *Colonial and Counter-Colonial*, 54.

33 Wayne Suttles, "Private Knowledge, Morality and Social Classes among the Coast Salish," *American Anthropologist*, 60 (1958), 497-507; *Coast Salish Essays* (Vancouver/Seattle/London, 1987).

34 Saunders, "Kwakwaka'wakw Museology."

35 Charlotte Townsend-Gault, "Translation or Perversion? Showing First Nations Art in Canada," *Cultural Studies*, IX,1 (1994) 91-105.

36 Yuxweluptun, quoted in *Land, Spirit, Power*, 221.

37 Yuxweluptun, quoted in *Land, Spirit, Power*, 221.

38 Joe David (1984), notes in the Museum of Anthropology archive, University of British Columbia (UBC).

39 Yuxweluptun in conversation with the author, 1995.

40 Robert Davidson, *Eagle of the Dawn*, ed. Ian Thom (Vancouver, 1993), 8.

41 Yuxweluptun in conversation with the author, 1995.

42 *Kahtou*, 24 February 1994, 11.

43 *Kahtou*, 24 February 1994, 11.

44 Dempsey Bob, notes from sketchbook pages included in his work *Tribute to the Ancestors* (1994), shown in the exhibition *Multiplicities*, at the Museum of Anthropology, UBC.