**Two Arctic Adventures: A Comparison of the Arctic Collections of
Diamond Jenness and Joseph Bernard**

by

Kathleen O'Reilly, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
January 14, 2003

©2003, Kathleen O'Reilly

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisisitons et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-83457-3

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-83457-3

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of 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 nationale du 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.

Canada

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

**Two Arctic Adventures: A Comparison of the Arctic Collections of
Diamond Jenness and Joseph Bernard**

submitted by Kathleen O'Reilly, B.A.
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts
Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Derek Smith, Co-supervisor

Andrea Laforet, Co-supervisor

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
January 24, 2003

ABSTRACT

Collections are narratives that when viewed as texts and placed within their own contexts can reveal the motivations of the producers, consumers and collectors of the objects. Collections are valuable only to the extent that their connection with people is established. These ideas are examined by comparing two Arctic collections: The Diamond Jenness Collection from the Canadian Arctic Expedition and the Joseph Bernard Collection. By analyzing the many factors that helped to create these collections it is shown that all collections provide information beyond their original intent. Reinterpretation of collections provides information on the transmission and creation of knowledge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is a culmination of hard work and patience by many people. I would like to thank Professor Derek Smith for many years of guidance and knowledge. It has been a pleasure to know you, through my years as your student, T.A. and colleague. To Andrea Laforet, I would like to show my deep gratitude for not letting me walk away when I could see no other alternative. I appreciate all your hard work, especially considering your own busy schedule. I would like to thank all my friends who supported me throughout these years. I especially thank Dorothy Toonders for her continuous encouragement in this endeavor and in all that I do. Your friendship has been a true blessing to me. To my family, Pat, Cathy, Colleen, Shelley, Mike and Ann, thanks for all that you did, I love you all. Finally, I would like to thank my mother, Marie, who truly knows how difficult this was for me. Your love and support carried me through my darkest moments and brightened my happiest days.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Chapter 1: Introduction	4-7
Chapter 2: Influencing Factors	8-36
- Jenness and the discipline of Anthropology	8-14
- Expedition Anthropology	15-16
- Museum Formation	16-27
- Formation of the CAE	27-36
Chapter 3: The Jenness and Bernard Collections	37-53
- The Copper Inuit	38-40
- The Jenness Collection	41-48
- The Bernard Collection	48-53
Chapter 4: Analysis	54-81
Chapter 5: Conclusion	82-84
Bibliography	85-90

LIST OF TABLES

1) Jenness' Trading Periods

39-40

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1) Joseph Bernard	1
2) Diamond Jenness	2
3) Western Arctic Map	3

Capt Joseph Bernard

Captain Joseph Bernard. Photograph provided by Mitzi Dodd, Bernard's great neice.

Diamond Jenness at Collinson Point, Alaska. April 10, 1914. Source: Arctic Odyssey, 1991: Back front cover.

Western Arctic Map showing the route of the *Karluk* and Coronation Gulf. Source: Arctic Odyssey, 1991: P. xxxv

Chapter 1: Introduction

"The wind had dropped a good deal, so after breakfast we hoisted sail and under combined engine and canvas set off for Nome" (Jenness, 1916).

With these words Canadian anthropologist, Diamond Jenness ended his personal diary written during one of Canada's largest and last expeditions to the mainland and high Arctic regions of Canada and Alaska. The Canadian Arctic Expedition (CAE), which took place from 1913-1918, was a monumental achievement in terms of ethnological and geographical exploration, but it was also fraught with political issues that shaped its organization, its outcome and Jenness' own anthropological career. It was an expedition that not only benefited the Victoria Memorial Museum, Canada's national museum, but it also benefited the Canadian state as it attempted to increase its sovereignty in the North.

In terms of this paper, my purpose is two-fold: 1) to outline the history of the CAE and the subsequent Jenness collection of Copper Inuit material, and 2) to suggest how the political, intellectual and social realities that permeated the national museum, the Canadian government, the CAE, and the discipline of anthropology affected Jenness and the creation of his collection.

Museums are social phenomena which have a "unique and specific role in the western scheme of things" (Pearce in Pearce, 1994: 1). They house certain types of objects and ideas that come to museums through practice(s) known as collecting. Much past research has focused on material culture theory, looking specifically at the meaning of objects. There is a need to expand this research and to focus more closely on the poetics of collecting and collections. Collections are not static. Nor do they simply represent the culture of the collected. Collections are texts that represent many meanings and many voices. To fully recognize these voices we must begin by understanding the factors which helped in the collections formation.

Collections are products of their own environments. To understand and appreciate their full value one must understand and recognize the factors that helped to form them. Jenness' collection was influenced by a number of factors that will be highlighted in the following chapters. These include anthropological expectations, political considerations, the assumptions and expectations of the Inuit, as well as Jenness' own personality and background. In terms of specific work on the Jenness collection, I will follow, at least generally, Susan Pearce's work on collections and collecting (1992). Although her focus is

primarily on private collections, I will extend it into the public arena. Pearce has analyzed collecting in terms of three differing, yet interrelated parts: practice, politics and poetics. Building on Pearce's work, I have defined practice as the means whereby collections are gathered and constructed. Poetics encompasses the study of collections as texts as well as the reasons why collectors collect the way that they do. In other words, Jenness' collection (and others) can be 'read' as we would read a written text. This reading forces us to perceive the collection in a different way from the past. We must recognize that the Jenness collection would not be the same as anyone else's. His own context and history affected what and how he collected. To illuminate this, I will also look at another Arctic collection: The Bernard Collection. Bernard's collection was chosen because it was formed during the same time-period as Jenness' and consists of Copper Inuit material. Finally, the political and intellectual realities of the CAE, the Canadian government and the national museum all played a significant role in the 'building' of the Jenness collection and can be lumped under the heading of politics.

This research requires the use of secondary sources of data. My main body of information comes from archival

sources, including the correspondences, journal entries and the actual material and non-material objects that formed the two collections. Other valuable sources include published materials written by CAE members and museum researchers.

I take an ethnohistorical approach to complete this project. As McLendon states (1981: 225), "one learns, and must remember, a great deal about the collectors of material culture and the context of collecting, as well as about the group from the which the collections were made." Thus my basic data have interpretive, descriptive, and qualitative features.

Chapter two discusses the many factors that helped to create the Jenness collection. The focus will be on the role of anthropological expectations as well as the formation of the CAE. In chapter three I describe in greater detail the Jenness collection itself. Chapter four focuses on the analysis of the previous material. It is here that the Bernard collection is used for comparison. Chapter five brings the analysis to a conclusion and gives final consideration to the issues raised.

Chapter 2: Influencing Factors

This chapter focuses on the factors that influenced and provided the necessary backing for the CAE. These include Jenness' training and understanding of anthropology, the formation and history of the Victoria Memorial Museum, including a discussion of early collecting and collection-making, followed by a description of the Copper Inuit as they existed when Jenness lived with them. This chapter ends with a brief description of the CAE from its inception, paying close attention to the initial formation of the expedition since many of the subsequent problems with, and changes to the CAE can be attributed to it. Included here is a discussion of sovereignty issues present during the CAE.

Jenness and the Discipline of Anthropology:

Jenness became an anthropologist during a time when anthropology was coming into its own as an academic discipline. The anthropology of the 19th century oriented itself in the search for a Science of Man (Marcus and Fischer, 1986: 17). Like the scientific laws found in the physical sciences, early anthropology focused on the discovery of similar laws, albeit social ones (Harris, 1968: 1). The latter half of the 19th century saw Darwin's

theory of evolution increase its influence in the natural sciences. His book (1859) *On the Origin of Species* discussed the ideas that natural laws did exist, that progress was inevitable and that "the vigorous, the healthy and the happy survive and multiply" (Darwin, 1858: 86). By 1871, Darwin specifically related idea of evolution to human populations. *The Descent of Man* focused directly on natural selection and human evolution (Harris, 1968: 118).

By 1850, however, Herbert Spencer was already attempting to show that all things in the universe were a product of the evolutionary process (Harris, 1968: 124). The merging of evolutionary theory with sociocultural theory resulted in an overemphasis on progress. The idea was that human cultures were moving forward, toward "ever higher standards of rationality (Marcus and Fischer, 1986: 17). As Harris maintains (1968: 107), the melding of the biology of history with the enlightenment's dream of progress led anthropologists to search for a single law of evolution.

The late 19th century was also characterized by the use of reconstruction, the comparative method, and the study of cultural survivals. One such researcher of the time was Edward Tylor. Like some of his fellow anthropologists, Tylor believed that present-day 'primitive' cultures could

be looked at in terms of what they could tell us about our own past culture (Harris, 1968: 150). Reconstruction techniques were also important, and Tylor notes the "debt that evolutionists owed to archaeology" (Harris, 1968: 149).

R.R. Marrett is an important figure in this discussion because he was Jenness' professor at Oxford. With academic training in the Classical Humanities, Marrett seemed to move easily into the realm of anthropological work (Urry, 1993: 7). In 1908, Marrett published a series of lectures pertaining to the link between the classics and anthropology. Marrett stated (1908: 5) that anthropology "has kept steadily in view the need of including classical scholars to study the lower culture as it bears upon the higher." He also pointed out the importance of evolution and evolutionary thought in the work of anthropology. In fact, Marrett stated that (nd: 8), "anthropology is the child of Darwin." Darwin's theory of evolution played an active role in Marrett's anthropology. Darwin's concept that all life forms are related includes humans. Human life is natural and is therefore bound to similar laws of nature. Thus, all human societies are kin with each other and share similar processes of continuity and change (nd: 11). Marrett stated (nd: 12), "that there shall not be one

kind of history for savages and another kind for ourselves, but the same kind of history, with the same evolutionary principle running right through it, for all men, civilized and savage, present and past."

Marrett also outlined a brief curriculum for new anthropology students, including Jenness. This included lessons on ancient human history, anatomy, world geography, social formation and language, family studies, law, religion and finally the role of the individual within a particular society.

By the 20th century, various 'schools' of anthropology began to appear. In the United States, the Boasian school maintained that the discovery of laws was impossible. Instead, they focused on the collection of massive amounts of data and were extremely ideographic in their emphasis.

There is no doubt that the influence Franz Boas had in restructuring anthropology in late nineteenth and twentieth centuries was and is important. Whereas British Social anthropology moved in one direction, due to the work of various people, American anthropology moved in a different direction due mainly to the work of Boas. Although both forms of anthropology emerged from a reaction to the evolutionary doctrine, Boasian anthropology focused on historical factors while British Social anthropology moved

more in the direction of science (Stocking, 1974: 17).

Boas' link with historical processes did not limit his look at evolutionary theory. In "The Aims of Ethnology" (in Stocking, 1974: 67), he recognizes the importance of the theory of evolution when he states that "it is a common characteristic of all forms of evolutionary theory that every living being is considered as the product of an historical development." Boas also placed a great deal of emphasis on the collecting of ethnographic data and ethnographic field experiences (McGee and Warmes, 1996: 128). His method of research became known as 'historical particularism' and focused on three perspectives and how they affected culture: the environment, psychology and, most importantly, history. This approach espoused the need to study prehistory, linguistics, and physical anthropology. Boas also believed in the importance of long periods of study among a group of people and that it was possible for different cultures to have similar characteristics arising from different processes. In general, Boas' system of anthropology can be summed up as follows: methodology was more important than theory, cultural change was linked to the acculturation and disappearance of aboriginal groups, the collection of data was of great importance, and language determined the

categories by which all people use to think (McGee and Warmes, 1996: 134-137).

One of the most influential aspects of Boas' work was his role in "salvage anthropology". Like British Social anthropologists, Boas was equally concerned that aboriginal culture would disappear under the strain of expanding 'civilized' societies. Cole noted that (1991: 50), "preservation was [the] key justification in all areas of historical collecting." This preservation was seen as a moral goal for all collectors and museum staff. As Cole further noted, time was an essential element in the discipline of anthropology. This sense of urgency permeated most, if not all, museum collecting. Bastien wrote (in Cole, 1991: 287), "what can be done must be done now. If it is not, the possibility of ethnology is forever annulled." Theorizing could be left to those who came after. There was no time to focus on such things, considering fear that information and material would soon be lost forever.

Edward Sapir, a student of Boas who became head of the Anthropology Division at the Nation Memorial Museum in Ottawa (1911-1925), shared this view of salvage anthropology. In a 1911 volume of *Science* he stated that

Now or never is the time in which to collect from the natives what is still available for study. In some cases, a tribe has already practically given up its aboriginal culture and what can be obtained is merely that which the older men will remember and care to impart. With the increasing material property and industrial development of Canada and the demoralization or civilization of the Indians will be going on at an ever increasing rate...what is lost now will never be recovered (*Science*, 1911).

Jenness was academically trained by British anthropologists, who themselves focused on evolutionary doctrines. Marrett was a contemporary of Tylor and believed in the search for the laws of Man. As we will see, Jenness' work on the CAE was influenced by this training. It will also be shown that the Boasian school influenced Jenness as well. Although Jenness did not know Boas, nor did he train with him, Jenness came to a country that was itself under the influence of Boas and his students. Canada had little or no anthropology of its own (McFeat, nd.: 149). Furthermore, Jenness worked under the mandate of the Anthropology Division of the Victoria Memorial Museum, led by Edward Sapir, a former student of Boas.

Expedition Anthropology:

The Jenness collection was formed during one of the last great 'expeditions' which followed in a line of other expeditions, including the expeditions of Amundsen, Shackelton, and Peary. One expedition in particular, however, is important at this junction because of its link with anthropology. The Torres Straits Expedition was a seven-month tour from April to October in 1898 (Herle and Rouse, 1998:3). The expedition leaders, W.H.R Rivers and Alfred Cort Haddon were also the founders of the Cambridge School of Anthropology. Both men worked in the Natural sciences but soon moved into ethnology. They wanted to ensure that the expedition was conducted scientifically. The remaining members of the group came from Rivers' and Haddon's own students in their anatomy and physiology classes.

Haddon organized the expedition to ensure that he had gathered the "best team of scientists he could muster" (Rouse, 1998: 58). He also spent a great deal of time acquiring the necessary funding and equipment for the trip. The majority of the funding came from Cambridge University and therefore the expedition became known as the 'Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Straits' (Rouse, 1998: 58). All scientific staff were under contract to

ensure that the research was the sole property of the museum and that nothing could be published by any of the members until Haddon's own account of the expedition was published (Rouse, 1998: 60). Although the expedition lasted seven months, Haddon and the other researchers were not in the field continuously. Some of the researchers returned to Cambridge during that period of time. This expedition was an important one in the history of both expeditions and the discipline of anthropology. It was a multidisciplinary work that provided vast amounts of research and broadened anthropology itself.

MUSEUM FORMATION

1) History of Collecting

The history of collecting is aligned with the rise of the scientific imperative. Pearce maintains that all collection studies are connected with three broad areas of emphasis: collection policies, history of collecting, and the nature of the collections themselves (Pearce in Pearce, 1994: 193-194). Although Pearce looks at collections in three different ways (Souvenirs, fetish objects, and systematics), the emphasis here is on the latter. Systematic collecting is frequently linked with museum collecting because it focuses on selection of objects

rather than on accumulation (Pearce in Pearce, 1994: 201). The samples selected are meant to represent all others of their kind and to fill in the gap of the collection. Thus the emphasis in early collecting was on classification and was seen as a "positive intellectual act designed to demonstrate a point" (Pearce in Pearce, 1994: 201-202). Museums, then, were public or private institutions that were concerned with the collection, classification, conservation and communication of objects or knowledge from both the natural and human worlds (Report #1, 1986: 83). It is no coincidence that the first role of a museum mentioned above concerns collecting. Museums house 'things' or 'objects'. In fact, "the history of collections (not limited to museums) is central to an understanding of how social groups that invented anthropology have appropriated exotic things, facts and meanings (Clifford, 1997: 240).

As object-driven institutions, museums were dedicated to the acquisition, exhibition and preservation of the objects collected. The early collecting imperative was a complex one. Objects and specimens were collected in numerous different ways, by numerous different people, for numerous different reasons.

Collectors themselves were as varied a group as any other. Individuals collected for numerous reasons, and, in spite of what we are told, not simply for the benefit of humankind or preservation. The agenda of collectors ranged from personal, career, or institutional advancement (Cole, 1991: 50). As Ruth Phillips points out in her article "Why Not Tourist Art? Significant Silences in Native American Museum Representation" (in Prakash, 1995: 98-125), there are four different kinds of collectors: the professional ethnologist, the rare art collector, the Native agent, and the tourist.

Although all four are prominent in the history of collecting, the primary focus here is on ethnological collectors. Phillips points out that (in Prakash, 1995: 106) "the project of ethnological collecting rested on the assumption that ethnicity and material culture were isomorphically related." In other words, material objects would tell anthropologists about a culture. Material objects, then, were seen as cultural representations beyond those of a simple material object. The fact that "objects are lumps of the material world" (Pearce, 1992: 15) means that they can be three dimensional and occupy their own space. James Deetz expands this by saying that (1997: 7) "material culture is that segment of man's physical

environment which is purposely shaped by him according to a culturally dictated plan." Objects, then, were constructed by humans for some purpose, whether it be functional, ritual, spiritual, cultural, or simply because of desire and imagination. The materiality of objects encourages a discussion of certain factors: their social life and history, their survival and their existence in the past, present and the future, and their ability to be possessed, valued and recontextualized. In other words, "objects live beyond their origins, and acquire new meanings, new uses and new owners along the way (Ames, 1992: 46). However, this emphasis on the 'object' can serve to eliminate the use of other forms of research, such as language, music, and oral tradition. Collecting is an active, subjective, selective and lengthy process. It is one in which both the collector and those that are collected form a relationship through trade. Both parties are at all times active in the process. This process is extended through time as collections take on new meanings and interpretations within new settings. Finally, collecting is influenced by a number of factors which include politics, economics, history, and personality.

The acquisition of objects by museums had another effect. These material objects became economic

commodities, thereby setting up a competing market system in most aboriginal communities (Phillips in Prakash, 1995: 107). Numerous official letters sent by Harlan Smith to Sapir and others during his collecting years at the Victoria Memorial Museum reveal that he bought many items from aboriginal peoples. For example, in a letter sent by Sapir to Smith on June 23, 1925 (CMC Archives), Sapir speaks of the purchase of objects and of the importance of such a thing for the museum: "my own tendency is to purchase rather than not to buy, if there is doubt, as first class Indian material is always a value for a museum even if one pays a little higher he is glad as time goes on to have the material."

Geological Survey of Canada:

Although the GSC was founded in 1842, it was not until 1877 that it became permanently attached to the government as part of the Department of the Interior (Dyck, 2001: 14). This change in status also increased the scope of its mandate. Instead of focusing solely on mineralogy and geology, members of the survey were now expected to collect information on the flora and fauna of the nation. In other words, the GSC mandate now included the scope of natural history (Dyck, 2001: 14). As noted earlier, the work of

Charles Darwin had a large influence on anthropology. This upheaval in popular thinking also stimulated similar discussions and debate in Canada. Darwin's ideas had severely challenged the traditional Christian beliefs that connected Human beings with God. With this new doctrine, this link was questioned. If it was true, then not only did humans share a bond with all other living things on the planet, they also shared a common evolutionary process (Dyck, 2001: 13). With this in mind, it became natural for the GSC researcher not only to collect flora and fauna specimens, but also to focus some of their attention on ethnological and anthropological work. For example, in 1878 George Dawson, assistant director of the GSC, traveled to the Queen Charlotte Islands where he made ethnological inventories of the Haida as well as a geological survey of the surrounding terrain (Dyck, 2001: 16). By 1907, the Government of Canada gave explicit authority to the GSC to contribute to ethnographic studies and to continue its role as manager of the Museum of Geology and Natural History (Dyck, 2001: 19). The government also began construction of a new building to house the research of the GSC.

Throughout this, there was also a movement towards obtaining a government-supported agency focusing solely on anthropological criteria. In 1882 the Royal Society of

Canada was established. Its focus was in literature and scientific endeavors (Dyck, 2001: 18). These endeavors included the collection of specimens in ethnology, natural history and archaeology. The Royal Society tried to lobby the government to build an anthropological agency to focus on Aboriginal traditions, language and artifacts (Dyck, 2001: 18). Although this proved unsuccessful, another association soon took on its cause.

The British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS) held a meeting in Montreal in 1884 (Dyck, 2001: 18). Although it did serve to shed light on the needed anthropology division by establishing a committee to investigate certain aboriginal tribes in Canada stating that "...It is therefore of urgent importance to initiate, without delay, systematic observations and records of native physical types, languages, beliefs and customs; to provide for the preservation of a complete collection of examples of native arts and industries in one central institution..." (in Zaslow, 1975: 279), it did not succeed in convincing the government to fund anthropological work. However, by 1909, with a new museum building under construction and the official mandate of the GSC expanding to include ethnographic analysis, BAAS sent petitions to

the Canadian Government requesting that they formally fund an anthropology agency (Dyck, 2001: 20).

Victoria Memorial Museum:

In 1910, a division of Anthropology was added to the GSC when they moved into the new Victoria Memorial Museum building (Dyck, 2001: 3). This new division began "with one full-time position, a few thousand specimens, a few glass exhibit cases, one office, ad hoc storage spaces, and an operating budget of \$4100" (Dyck, 2001: 3). The first museum anthropologist, and the head of the division, was Edward Sapir. Darnell (1976: 99) maintains that "the importance of the position of Edward Sapir as head of the anthropological research organization of the Canadian Government during the years from 1910 to 1925 has frequently been underestimated in the history of Canadian anthropology." Sapir's influence is important to this discussion because it was his Boasian perspective that led the museum to specific goals for development. These goals ultimately influenced the CAE and the Jenness collection itself.

When Sapir came to the museum, it was organized under the Department of Mines, or the Geological Survey of Canada. As Tom McFeat points out (1976: 151), the

connection with the GSC was significant as it ensured that the museum institutional structure was authoritarian and hierarchical while the scientific enquiry undertaken within or for that institution was individualistic and cooperative. As head of the Anthropology division, Sapir espoused a professionalism for government anthropologists which he felt was lacking. In 1916, Sapir stated (in Darnell 1990: 52) that, an anthropologist should be a man who "had received thorough training in the science at a university of standing, and who was imbued with the university spirit." Thus he believed that anthropologists should be rigorously trained and not be amateur.

In 1911, Sapir published a comprehensive paper in *Science* where he outlined his plan for the museum. He believed that his program would be "a step forward in the development of anthropological studies in America" (1911: 789). He continued by stating that,

The plan of the anthropological division of the Geological Survey includes fieldwork among the native tribes of Canada for the purpose of gathering extensive and reliable information of their ethnology and linguistics; publications of results obtained...all of these lines of work are important, but none is so pressing as that first mentioned. It is planned to make an ethnological and linguistic survey of several tribes of Canada.

In Sapir's view, the anthropological scope was a large one and must include ethnology, linguistics, archaeology, and physical anthropology. The method to be used when gathering data was that of extensive fieldwork. Anthropologists could no longer expect to obtain data without leaving their living rooms. They had to live and work among the cultures that they wished to understand. Sapir also emphasized the importance of language in the understanding of culture. A linguistic survey was needed to understand the various different groups found within Canada. Finally, Sapir mentions the notion of salvage anthropology. He notes that there is a necessity to gather this information now before the native groups disappear.

Throughout his time at the museum, Sapir maintained a visible and personal presence. The CMC archives are full of letters written to and from Sapir to other members in the field. Darnell states that (1976: 101), "the scientific aims of the Division were important, not just the practical service to the public." These aims included the need for survey work and extended fieldwork. His interest in this fieldwork came partly from his own emphasis on linguistics but also from his association with Boas. Boas championed the idea of fieldwork, and entering the field for an extended time was one of Sapir's goals.

He believed that it would be practical for anthropologists to spend many years among the group they wish to understand.

Publication of scientific results was also an important goal for the Division. McFeat points out that (1976: 160), early summary reports were extensive and occupied large portions of the early museum. This shows just how important the personal touch was to Sapir. The extensive publications also show us that science and the scientific imperative was not lost on Sapir.

Since fieldwork involved the collection of material objects, curatorial work within the museum became extremely important. Sapir's intention was to have equal representation for all Canadian tribes. By 1913, the Hall of Canadian Anthropology in the Victoria Memorial Building was open to the public. Sapir, like Boas, believed that acquisition and research were both important aspects to any museum work.

Shortly after becoming the head of anthropology, Sapir undertook work to expand the small Division. Not only did he need specimens, he needed researchers to collect those specimens and the information that could be gathered in the field. The model that he used was that of the Bureau of American Ethnology, which emphasized "cooperative projects

beyond the scope of a single scholar" (Darnell, 1990: 65). His plan was to focus on five cultural areas: Eastern Woodlands, Eskimo, West Coast, Plains and Plateau-Mackenzie (Darnell, 1990: 60-61). His exhibits would also follow this plan. By 1913, Sapir already had researchers out in most of these various locations. The Arctic region was to be covered by the CAE with Diamond Jenness providing the needed ethnographic material.

Formation of the CAE:

In 1912, Stefansson returned from his four-year Arctic expedition with Anderson. It was during this expedition that he 'discovered' the so-called Blond Eskimos and where he "enhanced his influence with American Scientific institutions, and with important forces within the Canadian government" (Diubaldo, 1978: 57). Eventually these connections would lead to financial support from the Canadian government for the CAE, but not before the expedition of 1913-1916 went through some major changes.

Before the completion of the Stefansson-Anderson expedition, Stefansson was already making plans for his next endeavor, one that was grander in design and much more ambitious in scope (Diubaldo, 1978: 58). Stefansson's initial backers were the American Museum of Natural History

and the National Geographic Society. Both institutions had their own specific areas of interest: all geographic information was to go to the Society while all the ethnological and zoological material would be the property of the museum (Diubaldo, 1978: 60). Because the American museum was currently funding an Arctic expedition of its own, they expressed concern that Stefansson not duplicate it. Therefore, Prince Patrick's Land was to be Stefansson's base (Diublado, 1978: 60). In spite of Stefansson's interest in expanding his research among the Copper Inuit, his need for funding required that he shift his focus from the Copper Inuit to geographical exploration. After all, discovering new land and claiming it for the United States was far more important and impressive than learning about a distant group of people living in the Arctic. Although Stefansson changed his focus, it soon became evident that more funding would be required to complete this work. He decided to approach R.W. Brock from the GSC, who was extremely interested in the project. Brock then approached Prime Minister Borden, who expressed concern that the American Museum and the Geographic Society were involved. Sovereignty in the north was a large concern during the time and in February, 1913 the Canadian Governmental Cabinet decided that they would

pay the entire cost of the expedition, thereby ensuring that any new land discovered would be claimed for Canada. Soon afterwards, the expedition became officially known as the "Canadian Arctic Expedition."

The American Museum relinquished control of the expedition quite easily since they already had an expedition in the north. The National Geographic was a different story, however. They had a clear interest in the research that would take place in the Arctic and they did not want to back down so easily. They told Stefansson that if the Canadian government could not ready the expedition to sail quickly, they were willing to send him up at a later date (Diubaldo, 1978: 66). With this potential threat, the members of the expedition, the GSC, and the Government of Canada were under a timeclock.

After the financial backing was established, researchers were contacted and asked to join the expedition. In February, 1913 Sapir sent a cablegram to Jenness asking him to study the Eskimos for three years with the CAE (Jenness, 1991: xxxi). Shortly after this, Jenness received a second cable from Sapir explaining that his expenses would be paid, and that he would receive \$500 per year and a salary once his results were written (Sapir, February 28, 1913: CMC Archives, Box 625 f1). Jenness

agreed to the terms and arrived at Victoria on April 30th, 1913 (Jenness, 1991: xxxi). Upon his arrival, he received a description of the plans for the CAE and for his role within it.

The expedition should bring back information as to the minerals which exist in these regions, as to the food fisheries which live in the sea, and as to the meteorological...conditions which prevail in these northern latitudes...The expedition will also have occasion to examine...the operation of the American whalers which frequent the northern waters of Canada, and of putting into force the customs and fisheries regulations which these whalers should observe (Diubaldo, 1978: 65).

Sovereignty in the Arctic has always been a contentious issue. Arctic exploration by the British had claimed the islands of the Arctic Archipelago for Britain (Zaslow, 1971: 249). It was not until the 1850's that the presence of other explorers were seen as a concern. Not only were American whalers present, but American explorers were also beginning to visit the area. In 1874, Lieutenant William Mintzer of the American Navy sent a request to the British government for land on which to mine mica (Zaslow, 1971: 251). This troubled the British government who wanted the area for Canadian expansion. By 1880, the British government formally ceded the Archipelago to Canada despite the fact that the Canadian government had done

little to confirm its sovereignty there. In fact, it was not until 1897, under the Liberal government of Laurier, that any major attempt at sovereignty was introduced (Zaslow, 1971: 259). William Wakeham was sent to the north to "proclaim Canada's authority over Baffin Island and the Arctic Islands generally (Zaslow, 1971: 259). In fact, much of the Canadian claim in the Arctic consisted of such broad claims of ownership. Between 1906 and 1911, Joseph Bernier went to the Archipelago to proclaim Canadian Sovereignty. On Dominion Day, 1909, Bernier placed a tablet stating this (Zaslow, 1971:266-267). Bernier also issued permits to the whalers and fishermen hunting and fishing in claimed Canadian waters. By 1911, much of the eastern Arctic had been claimed for Canada. The western Arctic, however, was still seeing activity from American whalers, fur-traders, and prospectors (Zaslow, 1971: 274). It was during this time that the beginnings of the CAE are visible. The GSC, under Brock, wanted to expand their anthropological work as well as their mapping work further north. It was at this time when Stefansson began his planning for what would become the CAE. For the government, this expedition provided the perfect means through which it could claim new territories for Canada. The members of the expedition would also observe the

activities of the American whalers and fishermen in the area.

A more detailed description of instructions was provided later on, focusing on specific goals for all researchers. Essentially, they stated that all scientific work will be under the direction of the GSC and that all reports, including photographs and field notes, were the property of the survey (Diubaldo, 1978: 67-68). However, given the expedition's focus on exploration and the Canadian fisheries in the north, the general organization and direction of the CAE was to be undertaken by the Department of Naval Service, with Desbarats as its head and the person to whom Stefansson was to report (Diubaldo, 1978: 66). The instructions further noted that the expedition would be separated into two parts. The Northern party, led by Stefansson, would focus on exploration in the far north. The Southern party, led by Anderson, would focus their studies on the Arctic mainland and look at geology, geography and ethnology. The specific instructions for both Jenness and Beuchat had them focusing on ethnological and archaeological work. Although the research was to be equally divided between them, it was determined that Beuchat would focus his attention on religion, festivals, social organization and language,

while Jenness would look more at Inuit physical characteristics and technology (Diubaldo, 1978: 68).

With the official instructions issued, Stefansson and Anderson began organizing the material, ships, crew and researchers needed for the voyage. For the majority of the time leading up to departure, Stefansson was in Europe attempting to secure the needed equipment. He therefore did not take an active role in areas of personnel. By the time Stefansson met up with the expedition in Victoria, he had already sold story rights to magazines and had organized public presentations for different academic societies (Diubaldo, 1978: 72). Stefansson had persuaded the Canadian Government that no other member of the expedition could publish any written work or give any public lectures on their work until he agreed that they could (Stefansson, 1991: xxxiv).

Given the organization of the expedition, Stefansson believed that two ships, rather than the one that was initially suggested, would be needed. The first ship selected was the *Karluk*. An old whaling ship, the *Karluk* was purchased for \$10,000 in 1913.

The second ship purchased, to be used exclusively by the Southern party, was the *Alaska* (Jenness, 1991: xxxiv). But this ship was not large enough to accommodate all of

the Southern party's equipment and personnel. To alleviate this problem, Stefansson purchased the *Mary Sachs*, which would be used to carry the remaining supplies and some men of the Southern party to their destinations (Jenness, 1991: xxxvii).

On June 17th, 1913 the expedition began to travel north. By the time it left Victoria, the expedition's flotilla included three schooners, five whaleboats, two motor boats, three canoes, two dories, one dinghy, and numerous skin boats (Chipman in Jenness, 1991: xxxvii).

The scientific members of the expedition included V. Stefansson, the expeditions leader; R.M. Anderson, leader of the southern party; K.G. Chipman, senior topographer; J.R. Cox, Chipman's assistant; F. Johnsen, marine biologist; G.H. Wilkins, photographer; B. McConnell, secretary; A.F. Forbes Mackay, surgeon; W.L. McKinlay, Magnetician and Meteorologist; G. Malloch, geologist; B. Mamen, assistant topographer; J. Murray, oceanographer; H. Beuchat, anthropologist; and D. Jenness, anthropologist (McKinlay, 1976: 18). There were also other members of the expedition, including numerous crewmembers for all the ships as well as Inuit interpreters and guides.

While traveling north-east to their destination, the *Karluk* became stuck in the Arctic ice close to Flaxman

Island (Niven, 2000: inside cover). On September 20th, 1913, Stefansson decided that he, Jenness, Wilkins, and McConnell would leave the ship for a ten-day hunting trip (Jenness, 1991: 1). "We expect to be away for about a week, caribou-hunting on the mainland to obtain a little fresh meat." Although this was intended to be a short hunting trip, in reality they never saw the *Karluk* again. Shortly after leaving the ship, it began to move with the ice. This movement brought the ship close to Wrangle Island near Siberia. The ship remained encased in the ice until it was eventually crushed and sank in January, 1914. Although eleven members of the crew and scientific staff perished, this news would not reach the rest of the CAE members for some time. For now, Stefansson was left without a crew and, more importantly, without the majority of his Northern party. Because the primary focus of the Northern party was on exploration, the loss of the *Karluk* made this impossible. Stefansson quickly made plans to deal with the situation. He stated that "now that we find ourselves situated as we are, we shall try to do as much scientific work as there is opportunity for. The two main features of my plans for the winter are a sledge journey north from Barter Island and the exploration of the Mackenzie Delta...".

Jenness' diary began shortly after leaving the *Karluk* for the hunting trip. It is at this point that the Jenness' collection began to take shape, and it is to this discussion that we now turn.

Chapter 3: The Jenness and Bernard Collections

The loss of the *Karluk* forced the remaining members of the expedition to change their original plans. Jenness spent the first winter of 1913-1914 on the north shore of Alaska doing archaeological studies and learning from the Western Inuit. His Book *Dawn in Arctic Alaska* (1957) documents this portion of the expedition.

Jenness spent his second winter along the coast of the Dolphin and Union Strait. The CAE base camp was set up in Bernard Harbour and Jenness often returned to this location to bring supplies and specimens which he collected from the Inuit on Victoria Island. On September 1st, 1914, Jenness made contact with his first group of Copper Inuit (Jenness, 1991: 286). In November, 1914, he traveled to Victoria Island, where he would spend the majority of his time working and living. The early part of 1915 was spent trading and traveling up the Coppermine river (Jenness, 1991: 381). From April, 1915 to November, 1915, Jenness lived on Victoria Island traveling with a family of Copper Inuit (Jenness, 1991: 415-545). By November, 1915, Jenness had returned to the Bernard Harbour base-camp. It was during the next few months that he focused on Inuit folk-

lore and traditions. In the morning of August 15th, 1916, Jenness arrived at Nome, Alaska with the other members of the expedition. His time in the Arctic was completed but his work would continue for some time. In fact, Jenness' work in the Arctic produced two ethnographies, *Dawn in Arctic Alaska* (1957), and *People of the Twilight* (1928); his own diary; and five volumes among the CAE reports (Jenness, 1991: xx).

Because Jenness spent the majority of his time during the CAE collecting and living among the Copper Inuit, it is important to understand some of their culture and history. Although historic to us, the Copper Inuit that are represented by Jenness were present-day to him. His description of events and the objects of his collection were actively used during the time that Jenness was there.

The Copper Inuit:

It is widely believed that the Inuit migrated from Asia across the Bering Strait to Alaska, Arctic Canada and Greenland some 3000 thousand years ago (McGhee, 1996: 24-43). The Paleo-Eskimo culture traveled eastward across the Arctic until the Dorset culture replaced them approximately 2900 thousand years ago. Eventually, the Dorset were dominated by the Thule culture, who prevailed until

approximately the 1700's (McGhee, 1996: 229). Between 1650 and 1850, a minor ice age occurred in the north. Because of the severe cold and lack of food, the Inuit moved south to the Arctic mainland. Many of these Inuit then moved out of the region leaving only small communities behind (Oakes, 1991: 10). Jenness believed that the Copper Inuit were formed when those few remaining Inuit intermarried with other migrants to the region (Jenness, 1923).

Very little contact was made between the Copper Inuit and explorers or traders from the 1700's until the 20th century (Oakes, 1991: 11). In 1771, Samuel Hearne came across a group of Copper Inuit living near bloody Fall (Jenness, 1923: 28). The majority of this group was massacred and the area was not visited again for nearly fifty years. From the 1820's on the area was visited briefly by Franklin, Dease and Simson, Richardson, McLure, Collinson, Hanbury, Klegenburg, Mogg, Stefansson and Anderson, and Bernard (Jenness, 1923: 29-31; Oakes, 1991: 11). Although Jenness stated that "Hanbury's journey was one of the most successful that has ever been made in these regions" (1923: 30-31), Oakes maintained that these explorers "had little interaction with or influence on the Inuit (1991: 11). In fact, Jenness believed that it was not until the CAE was underway that extensive encounters

and trading began among the Copper Inuit and outsiders. In 1916, the Hudson's Bay Company established a trading post at Bernard Harbour, taking over the location that had been built by members of the CAE. Jenness was deeply troubled by this, as is clearly seen in his journal "The Life of the Copper Eskimo" (1923: 31) when he stated that "the barriers which have separated this country from the outside world for so many centuries have been swept away, and this last outpost of the Eskimo race is now thrown open to the invader."

The region inhabited by the Copper Inuit was described by Jenness as having a "continental character" (Jenness, 1923: 13). At the time of his visit, the Inuit divided the year into five separate seasons: winter, early spring, spring proper, summer, and autumn (Jenness, 1923: 13). When Jenness encountered the Inuit for the first time he described it in his diary thus (September 1, 1914): "we sighted an Eskimo tent which was not there when we passed by in the morning...Both the men and the women told their names then paused for you to give your name-a custom wholly foreign to the Northern Alaska Eskimo. Both men and women have rank black hair, curling at the ends."

The Jenness Collection:

The Jenness collection is an extensive one consisting of ethnological, archaeological and zoological specimens. The archaeological collections came from Alaska (Nome, Barrow, and Barter Island) as well as from Amundsen Gulf (Jenness, 1991: Appendices 3-7). The zoological collection came from all regions visited and consisted of species of birds, plants, insects, and shells. Although not his main interest, he collected these items for his fellow scientists who would not likely reach the same localities as he. His ethnological collections consisted of some 2500 objects, which he gathered through trade and barter with the Inuit. This particular part of the collection can be broken down further:

1. fur garments for males and females
2. hunting and fishing equipment
3. women's cooking and sewing utensils
4. Dwellings (ie. tents)
5. travel items (ie. kayaks)
6. wax cylinder recordings of Inuit songs (137 total)
7. photographs
8. myths
9. string figures

In considering the Jenness collection I focus first on the material portion of the collection, followed by the non-material. The material consists of clothing, cooking and sewing utensils, hunting and fishing items, as well as objects required for daily living in the Arctic (tents, kayaks, etc.). Also included here are Jenness' archaeological and zoological specimens. The latter includes songs and myths, string figures, and photographs. Although Jenness' journals, diary and books are also non-material, they straddle both areas quite easily. In fact, they are the gel that holds everything together. Without these sources of information, the objects themselves are quite uninformative.

Jenness made two lists that represented two separate trading periods. The first represents trades made from December 1914 to March 1915. During this time, Jenness made a number of trades for food items (fish, seal meat, etc). I have decided to separate the two lists for representative reasons but I will give totals at the bottom of the tables.

CLOTHES	HUNTING/FISHING	COOKING/SEWING	LIVING/TRAVEL	FOOD
26 boots	17 arrows	5 pots	5 lamps	32 caribou
45 slippers	4 ugyuk lines	4 ladles	7 dogs	144 fish
14 mitts	2 harpoons	2 ulus	2 sleeping skins	19 seal

28 trousers	1 spear	6 scrapers		? deer
3 caps	3 seal lines	3 bowls		
1 goggle	5 seal toggles	9 needles		
33 atigis	2 adzes	2 forks		
18 socks		8 knives		
2 waterboots		2 dishes		
2ND LIST:	11 bow/arrows	5 thimbles/cases	3 sled toggles	33 deerskin
42 boots	8 spears	8 pots	7 lamps	11 fish
9 socks	5 spear-heads	2 forks	7 dogs	1 squirrel skin
5 mits	9 fish-lines	11 ladles	2 ice picks	25 wolverine skins
1 slipper	2 seal-toggles	3 blubber pounders	1 drill	10 seals
10 shoes	4 fish gaffs	1 bowl	3 dolls	8 fawn skins
1 goggle	9 snow-knives	2 needles/cases	3 rosaries	
1 coat	4 seal-scoops	1 dish	1 sleeping bag	
5 pants	14 harness toggles	2 scapers	3 cups	
1 belt	4 seal indicators	2 ulus	2 cups/ball	
26 atigis	2 seal harpoons		8 sinew slabs	

TOTALS:

CLOTHES	HUNTING/FISHING	COOKING/SEWING	LIVING/TRAVEL	FOOD
Boots: 70	Bow/arrows: 28	Ladles: 15	Dogs: 14	Caribou: 32
Slippers: 46	Ugyuk lines: 4	Pots: 13	Sleeping skins: 2	Fish: 155
Mitts: 15	Fish lines: 10	Ulus: 4	Sled toggles: 3	Seals: 29
Pants: 33	Spears: 9	Scrapers: 8	Lamps: 12	Deer: 7
Socks: 27	Seal lines: 3	Bowls: 4	Ice picks: 2	Squirrels: 1
Atigis: 59	Adzes: 2	Needles: 11	Drill: 1	Wolverines: 25
Belt: 1	Spear heads: 5	Forks: 4	Dolls: 3	Fawn skins: 8
Caps: 3	Fish gaffs: 4	Knives: 8	Rosaries: 3	
	Snow-knives: 9	Dishes: 3	Sleeping bag: 1	
	Seal scoops: 4	Blubber pounders: 3	Cups: 3	
	Harness toggles: 14		Cups/ball: 2	
	Seal indicators: 4		Sinew slabs: 8	

--	--	--	--	--

(Source: Stuart Jenness, 1991).

From the data above, it seems evident that Jenness collected more clothing and food items than any other type of object.

Throughout his time in the Arctic, Jenness gathered string figures from the Inuit. He collected them from the north coast of Alaska, the Mackenzie Delta, and from the eastern Inuit and from the Copper Inuit (Jenness, 1924). In total, he collected 83 string figures from the Copper Inuit alone, including those representing such varied objects as animals (bears, eagles, and squirrels), living objects (tents, knives, and lamps) and landscape objects (mountains, cliffs and sun). Some string figures even represented people (shamans, dancers, and a man with a kayak). The information Jenness gathered from the string figures was extensive and made its way into a CAE journal published after his return from the Arctic. In this journal (1924) he came to some specific conclusions about the Inuit. For example, it was taboo for the Copper Inuit to make string figures during certain seasons. The Copper Inuit also believed in a string figure, or cat's cradle spirit, a belief they shared with the Inuit in the western regions of the Arctic (Jenness, 1924: 190b).

In "Eskimo Folk-Lore: Part A: Myths and Traditions from Northern Alaska, the Mackenzie Delta and Coronation Gulf" (1924), Jenness outlined myths pertaining to animal stories, people's link with the animal world, historical stories, origin myths, myths about giants and dwarfs, and shamanistic myths. Jenness collected Copper Inuit myths of the origin of people, clouds, death, caribou, fish and even the origin of the day.

Jenness recorded and collected 137 wax cylinder recordings, more than 100 of which came from the Copper Inuit. These can be further organized into smaller categories based on the emphasis of the songs themselves. Many of the songs were dance songs, some were songs concerning the weather, some were magic songs, some were healing songs, while some were old chants passed down through the ages (Jenness, 1991: 707-712).

As has been noted earlier, Jenness' diary and his collection began shortly after he left the *Karluks* with Stefansson for their ten-day hunting trip. However, when the ship disappeared, the plans for the expedition changed. Jenness spent the first winter of 1913-1914 on the north shore of Alaska doing archaeological studies and learning from the Inuit who resided there. His book *Dawn in Arctic Alaska* (1957) recounts the events from that winter. Early

on, Stefansson determined that Jenness should stay in Cape Halkett to "stay behind with Arksiatark's family for at least part of the winter, learning the Eskimo language and picking up whatever information I could on Eskimo customs and folklore" (1957: 38). By May 1914, Jenness had traveled to Barter Island, where he soon began his archaeological investigations. He wrote (1957: 148), "was there not useful archaeological work that I could perform in this area? Had the Eskimos ever built permanent settlements here...?" On Friday, May 29th, while exploring the island, Jenness came across a structure that piqued his interest. He wrote (1991: 213), "there were curious formations in the ground resembling the English Neolithic camps on the hill-tops, only in miniature." On June 30th, 1915, he came across a site that contained two skeletons and their burial equipment (Jenness, 1991: 231-232). During this time, he also continued to gather ethnological data, and to organize that data into journals. On July 17th, 1914 he stated (1991: 240-241), "I hope that everything on Barter Island will be finished...It has meant a great deal of hard work-4 to 5 hours or so, packing, writing notes, labeling specimens, etc." Despite Jenness' desire to complete his work on Barter Island, it had to remain incomplete. The expedition members were moving on

to their original destination: the Coronation Gulf.

Jenness spent his second winter along the coast of the Dolphin and Union Strait in the Coronation Gulf. The CAE base-camp was set up in Bernard Harbour and Jenness would often return to this location to bring supplies and his specimens which he had collected from the Inuit on Victoria Island. On September 1st, 1914, Jenness and the rest of the his CAE companions made contact with their first group of Coronation Gulf Inuit (Jenness, 1991: 286). From the 8th of September until the 26th, Jenness and the others focused on the building of the base camp. It was not until the 28th that any trading of import began (Jenness, 1991: 306). In this diary entry, Jenness makes a specific list of the objects he had collected and what he gave to the Inuit in return. For example, he traded matches, used frying pans and Winchester cartridges for sealskin shoes, knives and pots.

In November, Jenness traveled across the strait to Victoria Island to make contact with the Inuit who had gathered there. Jenness stated (1928: 90), " I suggested to Ikpuuk that I might join his train to Victoria Island...the old man was delighted with the plan, and, having no children of his own, formally adopted me into his family" Jenness lived, traveled and collected among this

family of Copper Inuit for the next six months. The group also consisted of a few other hunters and their families.

Analyzing Jenness' collection reveals that he was attempting to show a whole culture. His goal was to describe, through the use of material and non-material objects, the Copper Inuit culture. He also described the culture in terms of what it meant to the Inuit. As we shall see, the collection assembled by Jenness contrasts with that of Bernard's in several ways.

The Bernard Collection:

Born on December 3rd, 1878 in Nail Pond, Prince Edward Island, Joseph Bernard began his trading career with his Uncle in Nome, Alaska (LCY, 1924: 21). In 1903, Bernard and his Uncle began actively trading for pelts along the Alaskan and Siberian coasts (Bernard, 1958: 3). In 1909, Bernard decided to branch out on his own and left the Alaskan coast to travel east in search of curios (LCY, 1924: 48). His collection was gathered during a fifteen-year period in which Bernard traveled to and from Nome with his many objects. By 1929, Bernard had completed his Arctic trading and collecting. He moved to Cordova, Alaska where he began a career of fishing and boat construction (Patriot: April 30th, 1931). In later years, Bernard's

hearing failed, forcing him to move into the Pioneer's Home at Sitka, Alaska, where he died on April 6th, 1973 (Barry, 1973: 251).

Bernard was initially backed by Ira Rank of the United States Mercantile Company, who provided trade goods and money for the expedition (Bernard, 1958: 3). When Bernard left Nome in 1909, he was carrying old army rifles, ammunition, cloth, beads, candy, knives, tea kettles, etc (Bernard, 1958: 6). He traded these objects for furs and ethnological items. In 1912 he sold 400 fox furs for \$60 each, a very good price considering that only two years later the price would plummet to \$4 each (Bernard, 1958: 9). With this money, Bernard paid his debt to Rank, enabling himself to be truly his own boss.

Before Bernard realized the importance of ethnological specimens, he was interested in collecting natural history specimens and furs for trade. The fur trade was going strong and he knew that he would make good money from it. Bernard began his journal on August 12, 1909. Throughout the early part of his travels he discussed hunting for pelts extensively (October 2, 1909; October 31, 1909). "To my surprise, I stopped the fox at 150 yards. When I picked him up I found I had hit him in the jaw so I had not hurt the skin" (Bernard, November 2, 1909). In August 1910,

Bernard anchored close to the Coppermine river (Moogh, 1982: 1). In close proximity were Stefansson and Anderson, who were collecting in the area (Moogh, 1982: 4). In 1911, Stefansson hired Bernard to ship his specimens out of the Arctic (Moogh, 1982: 1). It was after this meeting that Bernard began his ethnological collection. Anderson had taught Bernard the intricacies of object-gathering, including what to collect and how to determine the value of objects (Barry, 1973: 247). Bernard stated that (1958: 8), "Dr. Anderson patiently taught me many things: how to collect and preserve and properly describe the articles that I had obtained from the primitive Eskimos." By September 1914, Bernard had collected over two tons of objects and natural history specimens (Bernard, 1958: 12). He stated that "they were of great value and interest as the Eskimos I had lived and traded with were primitives. The very things they were using when I met them were museum pieces!"

Bernard's collection was a large one encompassing many fields of investigation. The majority of the collected objects were early Copper Inuit, and show little evidence of outside influences. However, his collection was limited to objects of technology, which, combined with his journal, allow some understanding of their social organization. The

collection consists of hunting and fishing gear as well as numerous tool kits containing saws, drills, knives and files (Bernard, 1958). He collected bows and arrows, spears, fish hooks, oil lamps, clothing, snow goggles, ulus, needle kits, ladles, children's toys, bone combs, and tooth pendants.

Not only did Bernard collect these items, but he also collected them in great quantity. Using the Inventory of the Joseph Bernard Collection (July, 2000) from the CMC, I have noted various items that are duplicated. They include 43 snow goggles, 23 fish hooks, 11 scrapers, 13 saws, 13 thimbles, 22 drills, 14 needle cases, 30 toggles, 49 ladles, 14 dishes, 14 pin kits, 15 metal knives, 33 scoops, 30 skin stretchers, 98 bone pins, 18 needles, 55 spatulas, 21 bows, 50 snow pounders, 45 arrows and 14 tinder bags. As Moogh points out (1982-84: 13) "the large numbers of each type of artefact offers a chance to measure the variations in any one type of object." Although his collection could be seen as an inventory of Copper Inuit life before contact with the Western Civilization, Bernard also spent a good deal of time attempting to gather unique items, such as a ceremonial cap and dancing cap. So, although his collection consists mainly of duplicates, Bernard also collected unique items. Although these items

were in his collection, there are few data regarding their importance or function to the Inuit. What accounts for the preponderance of duplicates combined with the unique?

It is clear that Bernard had no academic training in either natural history or anthropology. He was a free trader in furs that stumbled onto an area of collecting which museums and institutions would pay good money for. It was only after this realization that Bernard "decided to go farther into the Arctic to trade and explore for more such items" (Bernard, 1958: 4). Therefore, he needed duplicates for trade. He was not necessarily trying to understand the Inuit culture. He was attempting to amass a collection for sale. By September, 1914, Bernard had "over two tons of Eskimo artifacts, ornithological and natural history specimens" (Bernard, 1958: 12). While in Nome, he was advised that his collection was worth \$50,000 or more (Bernard, 1958: 13). He sold these items to the Smithsonian Institute, the Field Museum, the Museum of the American Indian, and the University of Pennsylvania (Bernard, 1958: 13). His Loyola collection follows this similar pattern. In 1921, Bernard loaned it to Loyola but hoped that they would buy it from him (Bernard, 1921: Bernard Correspondence, Loyola College). The response to this was "of course, we would like to be able to make you

an offer for the collection, but at present this is quite impossible" (Loyola Correspondence, May 29th, 1921). By May 10th, 1924, Bernard decided to donate his collection to Loyola as "a slight token of appreciation for the very kindness and courtesy shown me during my stay at the College" (Bernard, Loyola Correspondence: 1924).

In the next section, I will analyze the differences and similarities between these two Arctic collections.

Chapter Four: Analysis

Material culture studies have generally been associated with museum anthropology rather than university anthropology (Cruikshank, 1992: 1). Yet, even since Boas' time, it has been increasingly argued that a culture cannot be represented solely by their physical objects (Cruikshank, 1992: 1). As Cruikshank stated (1992: 3), collections are "shaped by explicit objectives of the collector and the funding institution. Their meaning frequently requires an understanding of the social conditions under which they were collected as well as the conditions under which they were produced and used." However, reading collections as texts allows for a more complex understanding of the collecting process. They are records of cultural exchange that embody more than just material culture. Only by placing collections within their own cultural and historical contexts can we document the true nature of a collection (Nicks, 1996: 483).

In this final chapter, I develop the idea that collections are products of their many environments, from those spaces in which the objects were made, to the many museum spaces that house the collections. Collections are

products of individual effort which make them subject to individual personality factors and behaviours. Both Bernard and Jenness' collections were shaped by their own respective histories, education, economics and politics. Collectors are unique individuals and therefore they form unique collections.

All collections provide evidence of the motivation, exchange and interaction of those who made, used and collected the objects within that collection (Nicks, 1996: 483). Jenness' collection can be analyzed as a text that documents his own involvement in the collecting process, the broader anthropological trends at play during this process, and the role of the Inuit throughout. In other words, collections are seen as "records of cultural exchange and interaction", thus becoming a more interactive model (Nicks, 1996: 504).

It is also important to place the Jenness collection within the broader scheme of Arctic collecting. To that end, I will focus on the Bernard Collection of Copper Inuit material.

Commercial trading and exploring was commonplace during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Museums and museum staff working 'in the field' often paid good money for the objects collected by traders and explorers. The

practice was extremely popular on the West Coast, as Cole's book (1985) demonstrates.

Bernard's focus on the economic value of the objects that he collected leads directly to a discussion of objects as commodities. The fact that Bernard was collecting Inuit objects for sale created a scenario in which these former cultural objects were commodified and took on a new value through economic exchange. As Appadurai states (1986: 3), "commodities can provisionally be defined as objects of economic value." In other words, the objects in question have more than one kind of value. The ceremonial cap was valuable to the Inuit for cultural purposes but became economically valuable through exchange with others. This kind of valuation occurred in all aspects of collection making.

His journal entries, while exciting, deal mostly with his own adventures at hunting, fishing and Arctic travel. It is not an academic work. His entries include hunting style, weapon use as well as descriptive accounts of the kill. His focus is clearly on his own adventures and hardships.

In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the collecting of Aboriginal material was highly developed throughout Canada and the United States. In fact, this

collecting was commonplace, especially on the West Coast and among the Indian tribes of central and southern North America. Whereas other collectors and traders were competing with one another for Aboriginal objects, Bernard had little competition. The Copper Inuit were active traders with other Eastern Inuit tribes and understood the value of such events. As is revealed through Bernard's entries, the Copper Inuit eagerly traded with him. It is perhaps these encounters that are most important to anthropologists. Reading Bernard's collection as a record of cultural exchange develops the idea that the Inuit were actively responding to his presence. By reading his collection in this way, we begin to counter the old stereotypes which assume that aboriginal cultures were unchanging victims of Western Civilization and were isolated from mainstream history and society (Nicks, 1996: 504).

The largest and most obvious difference between Bernard's and Jenness' collection concerns Bernard and Jenness themselves. Jenness was an academic individual who had received anthropological training and worked under anthropological paradigms. For Jenness, science was key as he worked under a specific plan, mandated from both the Victoria Memorial Museum (the GSC) and anthropology.

Jenness themselves. Jenness was an academic individual who had received anthropological training and worked under anthropological paradigms. For Jenness, science was key as he worked under a specific plan, mandated from both the Victoria Memorial Museum (the GSC) and anthropology.

As opposed to Bernard, Jenness' collection was an ethnographic one. Guided by anthropological paradigms, Jenness built his collection in terms of ethnography and salvage. An ethnographic collection includes material objects but they may also include fieldnotes, photographs, journals, sound recordings, correspondences, etc. As Parsons from the Library of Congress states (<http://www.loc.gov/folklife/ethno.html>) "there is, in every ethnographic collection, a conscious weaving together of different representational media to achieve a rounded statement." In other words, an ethnographic collection is more than the objects within it. The combination of material, when seen in context, reveals a complex interaction between the collector and the cultural group from which the objects came.

It was shown in Chapter Two that the paradigms influencing Jenness included early collecting themes such as the rise of the museum, natural history, salvage anthropology, the politics of the CAE and the scientific

imperative. The anthropology familiar to Jenness was extremely object-centered. British Social Anthropologists' focus on natural history led them to look at human populations in terms of evolution, migration and environmental variation. They were theory-driven and gathered evidence (objects) so that the theory could be tested. These same anthropologists relied on natural history models for examples. In fact, the large, systematic natural history collections were the impetus for ethnological collecting (Herle, 1998: 80). These natural history collections focused on ecological, geographical, and environmental factors. In his report on the Copper Inuit (1923) Jenness attempted to decipher their origins by using migration theory.

Jenness clearly situated the Inuit as primitive peoples and held fast to the belief that they would soon disappear or change. He cited the Alaskan Inuit as his example noting that they had already adapted to many of the 'white man's' customs. He believed the Copper Inuit to be more primitive than their Western counterparts because their encounters with civilization were rare (Jenness, 1928: 46). Furthermore, he describes himself as having to shake off his own civilized life to take on Inuit life (Jenness, 1928: 129). On July 15th, 1915 he stated that,

"it is sad to see the ravages our diseases make among the natives in all parts of the world, but it seems inevitable." He adds further (October 18th, 1913) that "the easy merging of one man's will into another's makes for the 'tolerance' of Eskimo society, where one person does what he likes without interference. It would account in part for the ease with which they are dominated by Europeans."

This 'easy' dominance leads to the idea that Aboriginal cultures were disappearing under the strain of expanding 'civilized' societies. Cole noted that (1991: 50), "preservation was [the] key justification in all areas of historical collecting." A sense of urgency was felt in most areas of museum collecting. As Bastien wrote (in Cole, 1991: 287), "what can be done must be done now. If it is not, the possibility of ethnology is forever annulled." It will be recalled from Chapter Two that Sapir himself was concerned about the disappearance of Aboriginal culture.

Like Bernard, Jenness also had a mandate from which he was working. Unlike Bernard's, this mandate was extremely specific and comprehensive. In a letter of instruction to Jenness on March 6th, 1913, Sapir explained that he should focus on the Copper Inuit of the Coronation Gulf and make a full collection of ethnographic material, with complete

physical data (CMC Correspondences: Box 625f1). A more detailed description of work was also given stating that Jenness and Beuchat should focus on both ethnological and archaeological work. Beuchat would look at religion, festivals, social organization and language, while Jenness focused more on Inuit physical characteristics and technology (Diubaldo, 1978: 68).

The formation of the CAE, and the reasons behind it, also shed light on this collection. In the previous chapter, I discussed at length the political maneuverings and the overall planning of the expedition. There were many factors at play before and during the CAE. Stefansson was eager to continue his work among the Copper Inuit, but to gain financial backing he was forced to change his focus to one of geographic exploration. With his initial backers from the United States, it was understood that he would claim any new land for them. Despite these backers, however, he still required more funding. When Stefansson approached Brock of the GSC it was thought that they would be co-funders of the work. It was only after Prime Minister Borden decided that Canada should fund the expedition itself, with no American backers, that problems arose. The fact that the Canadian government was interested in claiming land before others had the chance to

do so, meant that the CAE had to be ready to leave Victoria quickly. It was this haste that led the expedition to problems of both authority and ultimate purpose. Add to that the competing interests of various scientists, and the expedition was bound to face some difficulties. For example, the scientific endeavor was under the direction of the GSC while the geographic exploration was organized under the Department of Naval Service (Diubaldo, 1978: 66). The expedition was thus separated into two distinct parts: the Northern party, led by Stefansson, would focus on exploration in the far north, while the Southern party, led by Anderson, would focus on the geography, ethnology and geology of the Arctic mainland.

Given the haste of organization, supplies and people ended up on different ships. With the loss of the *Karluk*, Jenness was left with little supplies for his work. Furthermore, Stefansson had lost the majority of his Northern party. Both these facts changed the face of the expedition and the Jenness collection. The primary change for Jenness was his focus. On September 20th, 1914, Jenness received a letter from Sapir confirming this. "You are hereby instructed to undertake as complete a general study of Eskimo anthropology, technology and social anthropology as circumstances will allow." Furthermore, given the loss

of the *Karluk* Jenness was unable to reach his original destination: The Coronation Gulf. He therefore could not research among the Copper Inuit, as was originally planned. Jenness spent the first winter of 1913-1914 on the north shore of Alaska doing archaeological studies and learning from the Inuit who resided there. His book *Dawn in Arctic Alaska* (1957) recounts the events of that winter. Early on, Stefansson determined that Jenness should stay in Cape Halkett to "stay behind with Arksiatak's family for at least part of the winter, learning the Eskimo language and picking up whatever information I could on Eskimo customs and folklore" (1957: 38). By May 1914, Jenness had traveled to Barter Island where he soon began his archaeological investigations. He stated (1957: 148), "was there not useful archaeological work that I could perform in this area? Had the Eskimos ever built permanent settlements here...?" On Friday May 29th, while exploring the island, Jenness came across a structure that piqued his interest. He noted (1991: 213), "there were curious formations in the ground resembling the English Neolithic camps on the hill-tops, only in miniature." On June 30th, 1915, he came across a site that contained two skeletons and their burial equipment (Jenness, 1991: 231-232). During this time, he also continued to gather ethnological

data, and to organize that data into journals. On July 17th, 1914 he wrote (1991: 240-241), "I hope that everything on Barter Island will be finished...It has meant a great deal of hard work-4 to 5 hours or so, packing, writing notes, labeling specimens, etc." Despite Jenness' desire to complete his work on Barter Island, it had to remain incomplete. The expedition members were moving on to their original destination: the Coronation Gulf. Jenness' disappointment is clear and reveals a man who is a conscientious worker, even at tasks that were not in his original mandate. On July 22nd, 1914 he stated that (Jenness, 1991: 243), "I am very disappointed that they are not finished...[but]...I have-or will have, if my scattered notes prove as full as I think they are-rough plans of all three villages and notes of each place in each village, with a fairly complete list of everything found in it."

The loss of the *Karluk* was the catalyst for the changes to the organization of the CAE. These changes increased Jenness' focus and workload. On November 18th, 1913 he wrote "another day without any sign of Stefansson. How often our plans (if one may call them plans) have been changed. When the *Karluk* disappeared he determined to go to Herschel Island. Suddenly he chose Point Barrow instead, intending to go to Herschel Island subsequently."

In this statement there is a clear sense from Jenness of his frustration with both the overall expedition but also specifically with Stefansson. He is clearly aware of the discord that existed between Anderson and Stefansson when he stated on May 16th: 1915, "we have not only discord between the leaders of the Expedition but among the rank and file."

In fact, Jenness' frustration with Stefansson began the moment he arrived in Victoria. In letters sent to Sapir on May 1st and May 13th, 1913 Jenness noted that he had yet to hear from Stefansson regarding the CAE and his role within it (CMC Archives, Box 625 f1). Also in Victoria, and again in Alaska, he joined with his fellow scientists questioning the organization and plan of the expedition. In fact, it was this organization (or lack thereof) that seemed to cause the most difficulty for all involved. Stefansson was an arctic researcher. It was his desire to continue his research and his desire that produced the CAE. It was also this desire and his desperate need for funding that led him and the expedition into different directions. While his focus turned from research to exploration, the federal government saw an opportunity for expansion into the north. The specific instructions also mentioned that the CAE would examine the work of the American whalers in

the region, enabling the government to formulate new customs and fisheries regulations. By approaching the government, Stefansson was assured his needed funding, but it also increased the size and the mandate of the expedition. This increase led to a building of the tension that already existed and the political dilemmas continued to grow.

Stefansson was neither a good leader nor a good organizer. As leader of the CAE, Stefansson affected its formation and also affected the changes to its plans after the loss of the *Karluk*. There is no way of knowing whether the CAE would have lost so many of its members had a more suitable ship been chosen to carry them to their destination. It would seem likely that a better ship and a better organized expedition would have produced better results. But this is mere speculation. As it was, Stefansson and the Canadian government were under a deadline to get the CAE organized and up into the North. What is known for sure is that the *Karluk* was indeed lost and so were eleven members of the expedition, including the second (and more experienced) anthropologist, Henri Beuchat.

On the other hand, Jenness was in an interesting position during the CAE. Unlike the GSC scientists, he was

not openly involved in the conflicts between Stefansson and the GSC. The nature of his work enabled him to leave the CAE base camp and although that provided another influencing factor, it did take him away from the tensions between Anderson and Stefansson.

In general, then, it can be stated that the politics of the CAE affected Jenness and his collection indirectly by forcing him to enlarge his focus to include archaeology, mythology, ritual, songs, and string figures. The disorganization of the expedition can be seen directly in the collection itself by focusing on the two collecting periods discussed earlier. It is clear from the objects collected in the first collecting period that Jenness was gathering more for his own needs than that of the museum. In the second collecting period we see Jenness focusing more on Inuit social life by collecting their games and other living objects. Early in 1913-1914 Jenness realized that he could not fulfill exactly his intended research on the Copper Inuit. However, he did gather as much data as possible on the Alaskan Inuit. While at Point Barrow, Jenness documented many forms of Inuit technology. For example, on October 22nd, 1913, he sketched a bow-drill and an Inuit pipe in his diary, describing the pipe thus: "the long pipe [had] a very tiny bowl lined inside with the

metal casing of a cartridge. The part the stem fitted into was also of cartridge casing, the rest of wood with an ivory mouthpiece. The bowl was about $\frac{1}{2}$ an inch in diameter; the amount of tobacco it would contain was very small."

On November 3rd, 1913 Jenness described an Inuit home and even provided a sketch within his diary. He wrote, "Our house was large and well constructed, notwithstanding the fact it had taken only three days in the building, as they told us. It had no sleeping platform; the man and his people slept at each end, and visitors wherever they could find room...The door, hinged with skin was set back a little behind the line of the wall, and there was a corresponding small alcove opposite just behind the stove." He later provided a description and sketch of an Inuit shovel, an ulu, sled handle bars, wood fish nets, ice-breakers, ice sieves, tents, fox-skin stretchers, bone netting needles, fox traps, a thimble holder, a drying rack, a shovel, an adze, and a screwdriver (Jenness, 1991: 41-85).

On October 15th, 1913 Jenness described Inuit string figures for the first time. Also during that first winter, Jenness gathered information on Inuit stories and their grammar and language. In fact, he spent a great deal of time working on Inuit grammar. On February 13th, 1914, he

noted that he "spent the day indoors working at the Eskimo grammar." Again, this is all information and data that was to have been gathered by Beuchat. Despite this, or perhaps because of this, he managed to gather extensive data on the Alaskan Inuit, including a focus on their technology, hunting and fishing systems. He did more than this however. His focus on string figures, songs, language, and archaeology figures prominently in his collection through his journals and diary entries.

Looking at Jenness' trading periods, we see that between December 1914 to March 1915 he traded for food and clothes. After the loss of the *Karluk* the men at Bernard Harbour had inadequate food and clothing supplies for that first winter. By the second trading period we see that Jenness' emphasis was on hunting and cooking items. The abundance of harness toggles could be due to Jenness' own need; he often traveled with dog teams and would therefore need dog harnesses. This assumption is supported by Jenness himself when he noted on June 2nd, 1915 "I bought two hair-seal and one bearded-seal line for harness traces and pack-straps, etc" (Jenness, 1991: 448). On June 3rd, 1915 he stated that "I bought musk-ox toggle for the sled and fitted it so that it will be drawn Eskimo fashion,

which is more convenient for the mode of life I am living" (Jenness, 1991: 448-449).

Trading for clothes and other items was also important for both ethnological and practical reasons. On March 5th, 1915 Jenness wrote in his diary that he spent much of the day trading. On this date, as well as on the 3rd and 4th he managed to trade ammunition for clothing and footgear (Jenness, 1991: 677-680). There were numerous occasions when Jenness used the objects that he collected. For example, immediately after obtaining an Inuit lamp, he put it to good use to heat his tent (Jenness, 1928: 47). A comparison also shows that Jenness was beginning to focus more on games and the everyday living conditions of the Inuit during the second collecting period. During this time, Jenness collected dolls and toys.

Jenness also emphasized Inuit cultural and social situations. For example, on various occasions he described numerous séances. On May 24th, 1915, Jenness stated that "we had an interesting séance in our tent, with Taqtu (Icehouse) performing. She was inspired by a wolf or a dog, I don't know which, and hiding her face behind Ikpukkuag inserted two large canine teeth...in her mouth, which she protruded one from each corner and mumbles her oracles as best she could with these impediments. When

this was over she cunningly slipped them in one of their big boot legs unseen by everyone save myself, who was lying in the back of the tent. The object of the performance was to discover whether we could make the journey to lake Tahirjuaq." He also described Inuit dances in great detail, noting that "the sexes have almost equal status in this twilight land" (Jenness, 1928: 29). The important role that medicine men, or shamans, played in Inuit culture was also highlighted. "The medicine men were...the physicians, the prophets, and the priests of their little communities" (Jenness, 1928: 50). On many occasions, Jenness described the expertise that the Inuit had, and how this was linked to the environment in which they lived. On one hunting excursion, Jenness expressed awe at the Inuit's ability to locate a mother seal's birthing chamber (Jenness, 1928: 99-100). He noted, "a white man would have walked over its home and detected nothing" (Jenness, 1928: 100). Furthermore, Jenness noted that the Inuit found pleasure in his inability as a seal-hunter stating that they "scored another laugh at my expense" (Jenness, 1928: 101).

Jenness spent his second winter along the coast of the Dolphin and Union Strait in the Coronation Gulf. The CAE base-camp was set up in Bernard Harbour and Jenness would

often return to this location to bring supplies and his specimens that he had collected from the Inuit on Victoria Island. It was not until the 28th that any trading of import began (Jenness, 1991: 306). In this diary entry, Jenness made a specific list of the objects he had collected and what he gave to the Inuit in return. For example, he traded matches, used frying pans and Winchester cartridges for sealskin shoes, knives and pots.

In November, Jenness traveled across the strait to Victoria Island to make contact with the Inuit who had gathered there. Jenness stated (1928: 90), " I suggested to Ikpuuk that I might join his train to Victoria Island...the old man was delighted with the plan, and, having no children of his own, formally adopted me into his family, which consisted of himself and his wife Icehouse, Sculpin or Jennie, Icehouse's daughter by a former marriage, and an adopted nephew named Knife-blade." Jenness lived, traveled and collected among this family of Copper Inuit for the next six months. The group also consisted of a few other hunters and their families. Jenness was well aware that this was a unique opportunity. It was one that followed the mandate of the museum and it enabled him to fulfill the overall mandate of the expedition. He wrote (1991: 447), "it is better

ethnologically to spend a summer with the band I am with and watch their summer life than to run around the country, now meeting them, now alone. No one yet has spent a summer living the life of the Eskimos in their midst, so I have a unique opportunity, and still have a chance of seeing the 'blonds'". In his ethnography he wrote that (1928: 109), "as Ikpuck's adopted son I could observe all the details of Eskimo summer life, following its variations from day to day as no traveler had done before me. It was for this purpose, indeed, that I had cut myself adrift from the rest of the expedition until the winter, when the strait would freeze over again and allow me to return to Bernard Harbour." By separating himself from his CAE colleagues he had to learn to hunt, live, play and work with his new Inuit family. He increased his understanding of Inuktitut and was better able to participate in daily life. In fact, Jenness hunted and traveled with this group, ultimately sharing both the good and bad that happens in every family. It was this sharing that enriches Jenness' collection and made it truly an ethnographic one.

While living with his adoptive family, Jenness did very little trading for 'objects'. Nonetheless, this trip provided much information and data for his collection. It was during these months alone that he documented the many

Inuit rituals and hunting and fishing techniques that figure prominently in his ethnography.

On many occasions, Jenness described the important role that the environment held for the Inuit. In fact, the Copper Inuit depended on their environment for their sustenance and even based their movements on the migrations of the caribou. "The dispersal of the individual families completed one half of the strange cycle through which the Eskimos passed year after year (Jenness, 1928: 136). The yearly cycle determined when the various families would come together and when they would go their separate ways. In the winter months when hunting and fishing were hardest, the families would come together to pool their resources. In the summer months these groups would separate and "the tribe no longer existed; society had dissolved into its first element, the family" (Jenness, 1928: 137).

Like all relationships, his adoption affected both Jenness and the Inuit. The Inuit were active participants in the formation of the Jenness collection. Without them Jenness would not have had access to the objects and information that formed the collection. In return, Jenness provided the Inuit with objects that they could use. Both Jenness and the Inuit actively traded for items. In this way, it was a successful encounter. It can be assumed that

the many Inuit items attained by Jenness were either not needed by them, or had been made particularly for him. On the other hand, the Inuit were well aware that they should try to keep Jenness safe. Jenness himself mentioned this in his diary. In July, 1915, Jenness became ill and weak. He stated on July 24th, 1915 that "being weak and tired I stayed in my sleeping bag pretty well all day, while the others went fishing. The Eskimos are growing somewhat concerned...but they know that the welcome and presents they receive from us at the station this winter depend largely on my safe return" (Jenness, 1991: 486). He added on July 25th that "the Eskimos are speculating as to whether I am going to die and ask me if the folks at the station will be angry and hostile to them if I do" (Jenness, 1991: 487). Although I have stated that the relationship between Jenness and the Inuit was one of equal trade (both were looking for something in return), there was clearly a sense of fear from the Inuit in regards to Jenness and his illness. The Inuit did not wish to have the members of the CAE angry with them, as they feared what would happen if Jenness were to die.

Although there were some instances when Jenness' anthropological training was seen within the collection, in general it is clear that Jenness followed his own notion of

anthropology while in the field. Preston believes that (n.d.: 125) although Jenness received his training from Oxford, he did not entirely follow his professors' understanding of anthropology. In fact, both Jenness and his fellow oxford graduate Marius Barbeau "sought their own notions of humanity on the ground, studying people" (Preston, n.d.: 125). Jenness' work anticipated some of the recent anthropological trends regarding reflexivity, especially in terms of his role in salvage anthropology and the gathering of ethnographic data, as well as the dichotomy of researcher and subject. Although Jenness had not yet met Edward Sapir or Franz Boas, his work tended to fall more within their fields of interest than within British anthropological trends. Jenness was acutely aware of his presence in the 'field' and how he affected the Inuit. Speaking about the CAE and their role in the Arctic, he explained that "the barriers which have separated this country from the outside world for so many centuries have been swept away, and this last outpost of the Eskimo race is now thrown open to the invader" (Jenness, DATE: 31). In the conclusion of *The People of the Twilight* (1928: 246-251) Jenness continued to lament the effect that he had on the Copper Inuit. He noted that "even while we said our farewells the traders were all

heading eastward to the new land...White men have invaded it from every quarter, and the twilight of ignorance and superstition is yielding to the dawn of a greater knowledge." He asked himself and the other members of the CAE "were we the harbingers of a brighter dawn, or only messengers of ill-omen, portending disaster?" His collection served to represent the culture as it was when he worked among them, but he also helped to quicken the movement of other researchers, missionaries, and traders into the area.

Although Jenness was concerned about the effect he and the others were having on the Inuit, this effect was also partly the reason for being in the North and making his collection. Clearly, Jenness recognized the need to gather data about the Inuit before the influence of the 'white man' changed their culture forever. If he formed a collection that was unique and grand in nature, it could serve to represent the whole culture.

As we have seen, Jenness collected physical material from the Inuit, but he also collected their songs and folklore. His collection consists of those objects, but also includes his ethnography and journal entries. Jenness was trying to portray the Copper Inuit culture in its entirety. Although he followed his own set of rules in the

field, his work is clearly influenced by anthropological trends of the time. Sapir's mandate for the museum is also outlined within this collection. Jenness spent three years in the field. He amassed a comprehensive collection in all areas of anthropology and he documented extensively when he returned. Unlike Bernard, Jenness followed his scientific knowledge extensively. He was precise in his documentation and his work reveals a man who is thoughtful and specific. In spite of this, Jenness himself was aware that his collection was incomplete. In a letter to Stefansson (February 20th, 1919) he stated that,

I am conscious that there are many important data which I failed to obtain, partly through imperfections of my own, partly through the necessity of having to cover the whole field...I did my best, both for my own sake and for the cause of science, and because I would not bring discredit on an expedition which it was an honour to accompany (Jenness, 1991: 633).

Through his recordings of songs and myths and his observations of the Inuit within their own social lives, Jenness was better able to document the function and significance these songs and myths had to the Inuit. Malinowski was critical of the focus anthropologists placed on the collection of words and songs for their sake alone, rather than focusing on their function within the society

(1926: 111). In other words, anthropologists tended to document the story, myth or song itself, rather than the way in which these entered the lives and social activities of the people. Clearly, Jenness attempted to understand the significance these myths and traditions had to the Inuit. Living as an active member of an Inuit family enabled him to do this. Bernard, on the other hand, made no attempt at this understanding, nor was he interested to do so. Here again we see the significance that an analysis of how and why a collection was collected can have.

Objects are socially meaningful, both to members of the culture who made them and to the culture who collected them, although in different ways. Pearce has argued that this meaning is produced by a dual arrangement of mental and physical manifestations (1995: 14). Although Pearce deals specifically with objects, her ideas can be used to analyze a specific collection. So, for example, a group of objects can be seen as a distinct part of the physical world to which meaning is ascribed, making it a 'collection'. Objects can also be seen as signs and symbols, capable of being read like distinct messages. An object itself may have a specific meaning on its own, but when it is put together with other objects with some degree of intention, a collection is the outcome. This

intentionality can be read as we would a text since the meaning is embedded in both the intention of the collector and within the objects themselves. Finally, objects can be viewed as things to which meaning has been ascribed (1995: 16). This meaning is different for all involved. For example, the Copper Inuit made objects for their own use, be it functional, spiritual or social. Jenness collected these objects for the museum. He did attempt to understand the meaning of the objects to the Inuit, but by collecting them, they became part of his collection. This collection took on a different meaning from the original. As we have seen, historical factors are significant when observing the meanings of a collection. The factors that helped to create the Jenness collection also shaped its meaning. Cruikshank notes (1992: 4) that, "physical things and words wrenched from their social and cultural setting become part of another semiotic sphere that cannot be redressed by contextual padding." It is for this reason that collection studies must always focus on the intention of the collector and of the groups for which the collection was constructed. In other words, collections are not static or frozen time. They do not simply represent evidence of Inuit past. When Jenness formed his collection, he was living among the people. Objects that

were in use became part of this collection. In fact, living among the Inuit, Jenness needed practical things like clothes and hunting and fishing equipment. These things were not manifestations of the past, they were actively used by the Inuit. Here again, we see the difference between Bernard and Jenness. There is no doubt that Jenness worked from the idea that the Inuit would soon disappear, but he focused on how the Inuit were currently living, not on how they lived in the past. Bernard also did this, but his approach was different. He did not attempt to understand the meaning of the objects to the Inuit; he simply wished to collect them for sale.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Ethnographic collections can no longer be used as simple representations of 'traditional' aboriginal cultures. All collections can and should be used as records of cultural exchange and contact. By viewing collections as text and placing them within their own contexts, ethnographic collections can reveal the motivations of the producers, consumers and collectors of the objects.

The motivation for Bernard in the formation of his collection was monetary. His collection represents this in terms of both the quantity of similar objects as well as his search for the unique. His journal represents the trials and tribulations of his own situation and does not represent those of the Inuit. It is, in fact, a representation of a specific time and place that sheds little light on the circumstances of contact or the details of culture.

All collections are continuously being re-written and re-organized, based on new understandings and new contexts. It has been shown that Bernard's collection is quite different from Jenness' based on a number of criteria. The most obvious and the most important criteria were the collectors themselves. The fact that Jenness was a trained

anthropologist is clearly represented in his collection and through his responses to the difficulties he was facing. He was attempting to describe the Copper Inuit's culture as a whole entity by looking closely at its component parts. Bernard, on the other hand, did not attempt to describe the culture of the Copper Inuit as a total entity. Although he tried to maintain a scientific presence in his work, his collection is an inventory of disparate objects. There was little information regarding their usefulness to the Inuit. Again, this is not surprising given Bernard's background and his reason for creating the collection in the first place.

Bernard's work is exciting and, for the most part, unknown. His own story of struggle and survival is important and should be examined more closely. His collection, although a simple inventory lacking context, should continue to be researched and valued. Jenness, on the other hand, created a collection with context which enabled an understanding of the Inuit culture from which the collection came. This thesis is not a work that wishes to judge one collection good and one bad. Rather, the comparison model was useful only to show that collections are indeed different; that the collectors do determine the

format of a collection, and that all factors contribute to this formation.

Existing museum collections should continue to be a focal point of study. They can and should be read as records of contact among differing peoples. They can also tell us a great deal about the process of collecting and the story of the collector him or herself. In other words, museums document the culture of the collector as well as the collected. In fact, it has been argued here that to fully understand a collection, one must understand the factors that helped to create it. Not only are collections created, they are continuously re-created through different readings and understandings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ames, Michael
1992 *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes.*
Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Anonymous
1924 The Bernard Collection." Loyola College
Review June, Pp. 48-50.
- Anonymous
1931 "Sketch of Captain Bernard, Native of
Prince Edward Island." *The Patriot*, April
20
- Appadurai, Arjun
1986 *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in
Cultural Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.
- Barry, Mary
n.d. "Captain Joseph Bernard: Arctic Trader."
- Bernard, Joseph
1958 *Arctic Voyages of the Schooner Teddy
Bear.* Cordova, Alaska.
- Bernard, Joseph
1921 "Letter to Directors" Loyola College
Correspondences. May 16.
- Clifford, James
1997 *Routes: Travel and Translation in the
Late Twentieth Century.* Cambridge:
Harvard University Press.
- Cole, Douglas
1985 *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for
Northwest Coast Artifacts.* Vancouver: UBC
Press.
- Cole, Douglas
1991 "Tricks of the Trade: Some Reflections on
Anthropological Collecting." *Arctic
Anthropology* 28 (1): 48-52.

- Cruikshank, Julie
1992 "Oral Tradition and Material Culture: Multiplying meanings of 'Words' and 'Things'." *Anthropology Today* 8 (3): 5-9.
- Darnell, Regna
n.d. "The Sapir Years at the National Museum, Ottawa." CMC.
- Darnell, Regna
1990 *Edward Sapir: Linguist, Anthropologist, Humanist*. Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Darwin, Charles
1859 *On the Origin of Species*. New York: The Modern Library.
- Darwin, Charles
1871 *The Descent of Man*. London: London Murray.
- Directors (Loyola College)
1921 "Letter to Joseph Bernard. May 29. Loyola College Correspondence.
- Diubaldo, Richard
1978 *Stefansson and the Canadian Arctic*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Dyck, Ian
2001 "Founding the Anthropology Division at the National Museum of Canada: An intertwining of Science, Religion, and Politics." Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- Haddon, A.C.
1935 *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits. Volume 1 General Ethnography*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Hanson, Earl
1941 *Stefansson: Prophet of the North*. Harper And Brothers Publishers: New York.

- Harris, Marvin
1968 *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Culture*. New York: Crowell.
- Hearle, Anita and Sandra Rouse (eds.)
1998 *Cambridge and the Torres Strait: Centenary Essays on the 1898 Anthropological Expedition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Inventory
2000 "Bernard Collection Inventory". July 2000
Hull: CMC.
- Jenness, Diamond
1913 "Letter to Sapir" May 1 and May 13, CMC
Archives, Box 625fi.
- Jenness, Diamond
1923 "The Physical Characteristics of the Western and Copper Eskimos." In *Report of the Canadian Arctic Expedition: 1913-1916*. Vol XII Part B. Ottawa: F.A. Acland.
- Jenness, Diamond
1924 "Eskimo String Figures" in *Report of the Canadian Arctic Expedition: 1913-1916*. Vol XIII Part B. Ottawa: F.A. Acland.
- Jenness, Diamond
1928 *The People of the Twilight*. New York: Macmillan.
- Jenness, Diamond
1957 *Dawn In Arctic Alaska*. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.
- Jenness, Diamond
1991 *Arctic Odyssey: The Diary of Diamond Jenness*. Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization.

- Jenness, Diamond
1928 *The People of the Twilight*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Marcus, George and Michael Fischer
1986 *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Marrett, R.R., ed.
1908 *Anthropology and the Classics: Six Lectures Delivered Before the University of Oxford*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Marrett, R.R.
n.d. *Anthropology*. Williams and Norgate: London.
- McFeat, Tom
n.d. "The National Museum and Canadian Anthropology."
- McGhee, Richard and Warmes, Richard
1996 *Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History*. London: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- McGhee, Robert
1996 *Ancient People of the Arctic*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- McKinlay, William
1974 *Karluk: The Great Untold Story of Arctic Exploration*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- McLendon, Sally
1981 Preparing Museum Collections for Use as Primary Data in Ethnographic Research." P. *The Research potential of Anthropological Museum Collections*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol 376, Pp. 201-227.

- Moogk, Susan
1982-1984 "The Bernard Collection." Unpublished manuscript from Loyola College.
- Naroll, Raoul and Freda Naroll, eds.
1973 *Main Currents in Cultural Anthropology*.
Appleton-Century-Crofts: New York.
- Nicks, Trudy
1996 "Dr. Oronhyatekha's History Lessons: Reading Museum Collections as Texts." In Brown and Vibert (eds.), *Reading Beyond Words: Contexts for Native History*. Broadview Press Ltd.
- Niven, Jennifer
1914 *The Ice Master: The Doomed 1913 Voyage of the Karluk*. New York: Hyperion.
- Oakes, Jillian
1990 *Copper and Caribou Inuit Skin Clothing Production*. Hull: Canadian Museum Of Civilization.
- Parsons, Gerald
2002 "What is and Ethnographic Field Collection?"
[Http://www.loc.gov.folklife/ethno.html](http://www.loc.gov.folklife/ethno.html)
- Pearce, Susan
1992 *Museums, Objects and Collections*.
Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press
- Pearce, Susan
1993 *Interpreting Objects and Collections*.
London: Routledge Press
- Prakash, Gyan
1994 *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Preston, Richard
n.d. "C.Marius Barbeau and the History of Canadian Anthropology."

- Report #1
1986 Report and Recommendations of the Task Force Charged with Examining Federal Policy Concerning Museums." *Muse*, October 31, 1986.
- Sapir, Edward
1911 "An Anthropological Survey of Canada." *Science* 34: 789-793.
- Sapir, Edward
1913 "Letter to Jenness" February 28, CMC Archives, Box 625fi.
- Sapir, Edward
1913 "Letter to Jenness" March 6, CMC Archives, Box 625fi.
- Sapir, Edward
1929 "Letter to Harlan Smith" June 23. CMC Archives, Box 625fi.
- Stocking, George (ed.)
1973 *Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911: A Franz Boas Reader*. Basic Books, Inc.: New York.
- Urry, James
1993 *Before Social Anthropology: Essays on the History of British Anthropology*. Harwood Academic Publishers: Great Britain.
- Zaslow, Morris
1971 *The Opening of the Canadian North: 1870-1914*. McClelland and Stewart Limited: Toronto.
- Zaslow, Morris
1974 *Reading the Rocks: The Story of the Geological Survey of Canada: 1842-1972*. Toronto: Macmillan.