INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

**An Inquiry into the Status of the Racialized "Other" in the
Institution of Art in Canada**

by Jo-Sarah Bali B.F.A., B.A. (Hons.)

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
School of Canadian Studies

Carleton University
OTTAWA, Ontario

April 14, 1997

©copyright 1997
J.S.L. Bali

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

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.

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 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.

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.

0-612-22063-X

To my parents,

íde Áine Máire Kavanagh

and

Raizada Joghindra Singh Bali

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

An Inquiry into the Status of the Racialized
"Other" in the Institution of Art in Canada

submitted by Jo-Sarah Bali, B.A., B.F.A.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

.....
Thesis Co-Supervisor

.....
Thesis Co-Supervisor

.....
Director
School of Canadian Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

April 1997

Abstract

This thesis is an interdisciplinary study and analysis based on an inquiry into the representation of non-White visual artists in the contemporary Canadian art institution. It contains a brief history of issues of multiculturalism and diversity in cultural policy and museum practice which includes an examination of the contexts in which the works of non-White artists have been noted, discussed, reviewed, and highlighted in Canadian art periodicals. Key issues that arise are the notions of "authenticity", "representation", "Otherness", "identity", "multiculturalism", "Eurocentrism", and "racism".

I argue that racism and an ethnic hierarchy exists throughout the history of the Canadian art institution and continues to the present. I also argue that although curators of natural history museums have begun to address the problem of systemic racism, the representation of non-White artists in the contemporary art institution in Canada continues to function in a manner that supports racism and a hierarchy of ethnicities.

The sources in this thesis include publications on cultural policy by the Canadian government and Canadian cultural organizations, published texts on Canadian art, newspaper and magazine articles, including a five year survey of five Canadian periodicals, three of which are specifically focused on visual art and two that are interdisciplinary or general arts magazines. Other sources have been selected from recent cultural, race, museological, and art history writings and theoretical writings.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisors Katherine Arnup and Julian Smith. I am particularly indebted to Katherine for her immense support and assistance at the 11th hour.

I would also like to thank Mame Jackson and Ruth Phillips for their help in first year when I began putting together a proposal for this thesis. I also appreciate all the help I have had over the last few years from Cathy Schmeuck in Canadian Studies.

Thanks also to my friends, Victoria Angel, Tamara Cooper, Dawna Gallagher, and Julie Johnstone, for their constant support during my Carleton adventure.

Finally I would like to express thanks to my partner, Dominic, my sister Sue, and the rest of my family for reminding me how important it is to work for what I believe in.

Preface

The initial intent of this thesis was to compare special exhibitions with permanent collections of Canadian Contemporary Art. This focus has been modified primarily because of the enormous amount of research hours required to fully examine the permanent collections of major galleries and museums across Canada as well as to trace the ethnic and racial background of each artist and investigate how they identified themselves culturally, racially and politically. Although it is necessary to get a look at "the big picture," a project of that scope simply could not be accommodated within an M.A. thesis.

When I began to write this thesis I focused on the basis and limits of the institution of art, its system of classification, and its implications on the particularity of multiculturalism as a concept in Canada. I sought out theory which could identify and articulate these concerns more clearly. I have found since then that there are many writers, critics and theorists who are examining and challenging Western divisions and hierarchies of art. I am conscious that I add my own research and voice to the many others who oppose the limitations of modernist-cum-postmodernist colonial thinking that at worst erases and ignores, and at best mediates and belittles the work and socio-political importance of non-White artists.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Preface	vi
Table of Contents	vii
Introduction	1
Thesis Statement	7
Methodology	9
Chapter One: Multiculturalism, Power, and "Otherness"	15
Introduction	15
Multiculturalism	19
The Politics of Power	28
Cultural Policy and Arts Organizations	35
Conclusion(s)	43
Chapter Two: The Canadian "Canon"	45
Introduction	45
The Canadian Canon	49
Reviewing the Other: Reinforcing the Exclusionary Canon	59
Conclusion(s)	68
Chapter Three: The Role of the Museum	71
Introduction	71
The Role of the Museum	72
Into the Heart of Africa and Africville: maintaining primitivist notions in contemporary exhibitions	76
Collecting and Neglecting: Special Exhibitions versus Permanent Collections	80
"Minorities" in Museums	88
Conclusion(s)	92
Chapter Four: Theory in Practice	95
Introduction	95
Periodical Survey Results	96
Conclusion(s)	107
Appendix 1: Representation of non-White artists in shows	112
Appendix 2: Representation of non-White artists in feature articles	118

Appendix 3: Group to individual ratio	124
Appendix 4: Of non-White artist's shows percentage linked to Western or non-Western tradition	126
Appendix 5: Percentage of articles featuring non-White artists where ethnic/racial background is made relevant to the artist's production	128
Appendix 6: Statistical Charts (numbers and percentages of all five magazines)	130
Select Bibliography	141

Introduction

The epistemologies, disciplines, and histories that are at work within the production, display, review and classification of art in the Canadian art institution¹ are diverse, and, to a certain extent, in a constant state of flux. Although theories and practices change over time, the degree and method of change and the direction in which it turns is often a source of debate. Controversies surrounding the display of anthropological exhibits such as The Spirit Sings(1988) and Into the Heart of Africa(1989) have sparked some heated discussion regarding the representation of non-White, non-Western, non-European descended peoples in a museum context. Because of the prominence given the protests over these exhibitions as well as media coverage, the public debates surrounding any non-White presence in Canadian museums have centred around the anthropological and the ethnographic "artifacts" of African and North American Aboriginal peoples presented in "Natural History" museums or museums documenting the growth of "civilization". One of the results of the type of attention given to these particular exhibitions is the tripartition of the racialized population in Canada and in the Canadian cultural studies lexicon to "White," "Ethnic," and "Aboriginal" as opposed to the binary opposition of White and Black which surfaces in theory and criticism originating in the United States. The theory, politics and pop culture of the United States have influenced the Canadian perception of who is

¹ The Canadian art institution can, in the context of this thesis, be understood to include the various art organizations, academic and technical teaching institutions, museums and galleries, periodicals, theorists, critics, practitioners, etc. Both *Canadian* and *institution* are broad and flexible terms which fluctuate in meaning depending on the perspective of the reader. I will endeavour to be as clear as possible in my use of these terms.

considered "Other."² One of the results of the controversies highlighted by these exhibitions has been a more vocal challenge to the traditional Eurocentric perspective and a re-emphasis of the need to move from the model of a museum dialectic to a dialogic form of museum discourse.

The process of change allegedly taking place in collections of ethnographic "artifacts" housed in Natural History museums, has, to some degree, ignored the equally problematic division of art and artifact in the Western concept of an "art institution" and the absence of non-White artists' work in the "Fine Art" gallery. Questions regarding the status of the non-White artist who produces within her/his cultural specificity particularly in contemporary art, are either confused by White, European notions of "tradition", "primitivism" and concepts of ethnographic material culture, or, are ignored by curators who interpret or mediate meanings through white European-based cultural values in order to please white audiences.

To examine the inequities in the collection, display, and review of contemporary artwork produced by non-White Canadians it is necessary to review critiques of the history of Western art, Western history and philosophy, museology, anthropology,

² Simone De Beauvoir began to develop a commentary on the concept of "Othering" in The Second Sex (1959) to describe the position of women in relation to men. In his book, Orientalism (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), Edward Said uses the term based on ethnicity and geographic margins defined by the West. Henry Louis Gates Jr. defines the "Other" as "...that odd metaphorical negation of the European defined as African, Arabic, Chinese, Latin American, Yiddish or female" in "Race," Writing, and Difference (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985). I find these definitions too limited as "otherness" is a relative term which depends how one is identified or identifies one's self. For the purpose of this thesis the term "Other" will refer to any person whose cultural, racial, or ethnic identity is not white, European descended or who self identifies as non-white. Non-white will include anyone of mixed "race," including anyone who may have white and non-white ancestry. It is necessary to point out that within each social, ethnic and racialized group there are persons who are "Othered" or excluded based on such things as gender, sexuality, political or religious belief, language, skin colour, etc. Although this paper focuses on the issue of ethnicity and racialization, it should be assumed that many artists face multiple marginalization and "othering."

ethnography, and aesthetic theory. These critiques are provided largely by post-colonial³ social and cultural theorists and critics and are of key importance in our era. To thoroughly investigate the status of the racialized "Other" within the specific context of Canadian art it is also necessary to review and investigate the specificity of the understanding of Canadian diversity, Canadian cultural identit(ies) and Canadian multiculturalism as they have been discussed in relation to art in Canada.

The epistemologies and constructs of modernist thinking have traditionally been presented and accepted by many institutions as absolute truths. Although it is possible in some academic and theoretical environments to become aware of, and to question the validity of constructs such as art, or "race"⁴, it is apparent

³Post-colonial should not be confused with post-modern. In this thesis I am using the meaning provided in the Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory, Irena R. Makaryk, (ed.) which explains that post-colonial theory usually contains an element of anti-racism and anti-exploitation with recognition of the position of the "post-colonial subject." The entry also notes that "post-colonial ...[is] a word best seen as presenting an almost completely different state of consciousness from the antecedent enclosed." (155). I find the term post-colonialism to be misleading as there is residue of colonialism in former colonies. The term anti-colonialism would be more accurate.

⁴ According to the Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations, 2d ed., (New York: Routledge, 1988), E. Ellis Cashmore ed., the term "race" has had four particular meanings; 1) to denote subspecies i.e., the division of human kind into Negroid, Caucasoid, and Mongoloid. Apparently this type of classification of "races" is no longer considered useful as interbreeding over the last five centuries has increasingly "blurred" human genetic divisions. 2) "race" as a synonym for species, as in the "human race." 3) to denote ethnicity or nation, which is now considered obsolete and 4) the most common usage in our society is outlined as follows: "a 'race' can mean a group of people who are socially defined in a given society as belonging together because of physical markers such as skin pigmentation, hair texture, facial features, stature, and the like...Nearly all social scientists only use "race" in this fourth sense of a social group defined by somatic visibility....It is also important to note that not all societies recognize social races. In fact, the great majority of human societies have not used physical phenotypes as the basis of group distinctions. Where social races exist, there is invariably an attribution of social and behavioral importance to physical markers. Societies that recognize social races are invariably racist societies, in the sense that people, especially members of the dominant racial group, believe that physical phenotype is linked with intellectual, moral, and behavioral characteristics. Race and racism thus go hand in hand"(239) Noted

that in institutional practice White, Western, modernist history continues to survive as the dominating set of "truths" even when constructs are subject to reflection and criticism. The limits of modernist thinking have been critiqued to varying degrees under the general concept of "postmodernism". However, postmodernism, it can be argued is, in many respects, merely an extension or continuation of the modernist project. The classifications of race and ethnicity imposed during the "evolution" of modernist thought are criticized and challenged by post-colonialism. I will examine the difference between postmodernism and post-colonialism and the impact of critical theory on the art institution in chapter four.

In this thesis I will be examining and questioning racial, ethnic and cultural inequities in contemporary cultural thinking which are accepted as a linear process or gradual progression moving toward "tolerance" of "difference". The problem with the acceptance of a slowly progressing linear path is that it becomes understood that certain levels of racism are acceptable as long as White people are "moving along" in their thinking or are becoming more comfortable with *allowing* the "Other" to inhabit public and politicized space. The notion of *progress*, along with the dominant culture's *benevolent* gesture of slowly allowing the "Other" greater access to societal functions includes the subsequent assumption that the goal of multiculturalism is the inclusion of non-Whites into the existing system dominated by Whiteness.⁵ This notion is inherently racist. In a cultural

theorist Henry Louis Gates Jr. also maintains the importance of seeing "race" as a construct in "Race", Writing, and Difference...

⁵ It is difficult to define the meaning of "Whiteness." As the phrase 'social hierarchies of Whiteness' indicates the concept is relative to its environment. Although within the politics of racist thinking White is considered superior, certain ethnicities are privileged over others. In Canada many groups of people considered White have faced prejudice and discrimination, such as the Irish, the Dukhobors, Ukrainians, Italians,

context, the idea of inclusion, or more specifically assimilation, continues to work to the detriment of non-White people in general and specifically to the non-White artists' valid participation in the production of art in Canada. In this manner the hierarchies established by colonialism, imperialism and racism are allowed to remain intact.

The concerns that motivate any investigation into issues of race, ethnicity, and cultural identity as they exist, reside, "play", within the "institution of art" in Canada are complex. I have considered this complexity and given the necessary attention to the multi-faceted aspects of issues that surround this study.

Primarily, it is the systemic aspect of racism in the institution of art that requires intensive study. The canonized/traditional Western writings on the history of art, in Canada, as in much of the West, contain few representations or discussions of non-White artists' work. There is a need for more intense discussion of, and attention to, the conspicuous exclusion of non-White, and non-European art from art history. There must be more investigation into the erasure of non-White, and non-European artists from Contemporary Canadian art, Western modernist art, and the institutions that house, collect, and control the access of the public to such art.

As I stated earlier, the discussion around the classification of objects currently focuses on anthropological and ethnographic theories surrounding ancient or "traditional" Aboriginal or African objects apparently created before the "contamination" of the White man's influence. While the idea of

French, etc. For the purpose of this thesis Whiteness can be read to mean the pervasive dominance of a mass culture based on European cultures or heritage which places more value on Eurocentric histories, values, and beliefs than on any other, and in fact, usually functions as though other cultures merely exist as a distraction of a plethora of exoticism that can be pillaged for consumption.

"contamination" is problematic, if not racist, it is seldom addressed in anthropological displays and leaves contemporary artwork by non-White artists in a kind of aesthetic limbo, reinforced by museums and galleries, theorists and critics. I address the issue of the "authentic," which is a tool for the White mediation of the "Other," in Chapter Three.

There has been extensive commentary on such special exhibitions as The Spirit Sings, Into the Heart of Africa, Land Spirit Power, and Indigena. I will examine, analyze and refer to the commentary surrounding these exhibitions to frame the issues and to discuss the role of the museum. While the discussions surrounding such exhibitions are relevant and necessary, it is imperative to survey the production and presentation of contemporary art across Canada to investigate whether the "institution" is actually undergoing a paradigm shift toward including non-White artists and under what terms those artists are being included.

The choices for categorizations in a museum may seem arbitrary or may be particular to that environment. Systems of classification, however, are not arbitrary as they are based on the assumptions of a particular privileged group, which, in the case of Canada, focuses on White Western modernist history which has historically invalidated by process of erasure, all non-European histories. Therefore the practicality of categorization must be interrogated. I will examine the meaning of categories such as "Canadian", "ethnic", "multicultural," and the Canadian system of classification itself, both within public policy and cultural policy in Chapter One. Classification and categorization will be further discussed in Chapters Two and Three as they are relevant to the museum and cultural/social theory.

To a large extent the focus on the interaction of racialized and ethnic groups in Canadian societies is mediated at all levels

through the experience of the dominant White culture or consciousness. Public policy, institutional initiatives and media attention process the "problem" of race through an attempt to incorporate/integrate/assimilate non-Whites into the existing system of a culture dominated by "Whiteness".

Systemic, or institutionalized racism in the context of the collection, exhibition and representation of art in a Canadian context brings up a complex set of issues. One of the most obvious attributes is the hierarchy of objects and "art" within academia and museums which perpetuate the exclusion, erasure, and belittlement of art that does not conform to the aesthetic, philosophical, theoretical, critical and political experiences of dominant culture(s).

Thesis Statement

This thesis is based on the following statement: Although academic, practical, and political inquiries begin to address institutional accountability, they do not clearly connote a true *paradigm shift* in Western cultural theories and museum practices, art historical documentation and institutional education away from racist assumptions and hierarchizing in the collection of contemporary art and the creation of art history.

In Canada, as in the majority of Western countries, the value attributed to art and artists is founded on White, European, classist, racist, sexist, and heterosexist assumptions of knowledge and superiority which must be challenged and revised. The Western hierarchy of art (connoisseurship) has been traditionally accepted as legitimate and necessary means to separating "art" from "non-art" and "good" art from "bad" art. Collections formed under this hierarchy have been maintained to assure the survival of examples of the "greatness" of *human* aesthetic history. Although generally considered to be under reconsideration the division of art based on the art/artifact

split is one of the primary indicators of the problems that Eurocentric⁶ thinking has set up for itself in a "multi-cultural" society. For example, within the confines of the museum space as it has been produced traditionally, the average museum visitor, whether White or non-White, may accept the hierarchy of art up to the turn of the century as legitimate, never questioning whose history and whose "greatness" has been preserved.⁷ Through the classification of art and artifacts, the division of space informed by White, Eurocentric, modernist chronology and aesthetics, the non-White visitor may be lead to believe the culture/race/ethnic group(s) to which s/he identifies has contributed little or nothing to the History of Art, while the White visitor has her/his "knowledge" of White superiority ostensibly confirmed. Similarly, in examining contemporary collections, reviews, and public exhibitions of art, the questions as to whose history is being preserved and according to what criteria are crucial.

⁶ According to cultural theorists Ella Shohat and Robert Stam "Eurocentrism as a mode of thought might be seen as engaging in a number of mutually reinforcing tendencies or operations: 1. Eurocentric discourse projects a linear historical trajectory leading from classical Greece (constructed as 'pure,' 'Western,' and 'democratic') to imperial Rome and then to the metropolitan capitals of Europe and the U.S. It renders history as a sequence of empires: Pax Romana, Pax Hispanica, Pax Britannica, Pax Americana. In all cases, Europe, alone and unaided, is seen as the 'motor' for progressive historical change: it invents democracy, class society, feudalism, capitalism, the industrial revolution. 2. Eurocentrism attributes to the 'West' an inherent progress toward democratic institutions (Torquemada, Mussolini, and Hitler must be seen as aberrations within this logic of historical amnesia and selective legitimation). 3. Eurocentrism elides non-European democratic traditions, while obscuring the manipulations embedded in Western formal democracy and masking the West's part in subverting democracies abroad. 4. Eurocentrism minimizes the West's oppressive practices by regarding them as contingent, accidental, exceptional. Colonialism, slave-trading, and imperialism are not seen as fundamental catalysts of the West's disproportionate power. 5. Eurocentrism appropriates the cultural and material production of non-Europeans while denying both their achievements and its own appropriation, thus consolidating its sense of self and glorifying its own cultural anthropology..." Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 2-3.

⁷ See the section on James Clifford's analysis of the museum referred to in Chapter Three for the full discussion of this issue.

Museums validate the absence of non-White artists in the "History of Art" by collecting objects specifically to inform divided/separate histories. The absence of the non-White artists in a museum's contemporary art collection condones the assumption that non-White history is a lesser history and that Whiteness is autonomous. With this in mind, it is necessary to look critically at the relevance of "Special Exhibitions" which are organized to *highlight* artwork of various cultures located in Canada.

Methodology

This study is centred on the implications of the following questions:

- 1) If, in a Canadian cultural context, art is classified by a history that presupposes "Whiteness" as "normal" and categorizes "Others" by the way "Whiteness" perceives "Otherness" then, does all art produced outside "Whiteness" become exoticized? What is the role of multiculturalism in this context? To achieve a reflection or representation of Canadian diversity must art be mediated, separated, segregated, and homogenized according to the paradigms of the dominant White culture(s) or even the concept of White superiority/supremacy?⁸
- 2) If the art/artifact, "civilized" versus "primitive" paradigm of museum classification is currently under revision, why then do the problems that arise out of that paradigm continue to surface? If White dominant culture(s) continue to oversee the collection of objects that become the representation of history, is the institution then hiding behind a mask of self-reflexivity while

⁸ The term White Supremacy is not only applicable to the ideology adhered to by Ku Klux Klan members and Neo-Nazis. Within the social structures of Canadian society there is a tendency to privilege White culture(s) over non-whites and non-European based cultures and to assume that values, practices, beliefs, ideologies and knowledge based in white cultures are necessarily better, more civilized, and universally superior.

perpetuating racism?

3) Despite possible revisions of thought, the practice of dividing art by ethnography in museums continues to separate non-White from White history and maintains the perception of one history and lesser histories without acknowledging itself as White. Does this practice not state conspicuously that only White, European-Canadian artists' work has "risen above" its past to achieve a "universal" importance?

The concerns of this thesis are not limited to the study of the position of those people who fall into specific categorizations by ethnicity or the outdated "racial" categorizations. I am more interested in the shared position of "Other" in relation to the position of the dominance of "Whiteness" in Canadian culture, than the specificity of a term. Within Canadian society many groups are racialized⁹ as "Other." I have focused on those people who are victims of what is generally considered under the term "racism" with the understanding that groups of people who are "racialized" are included under the term. My aim has been to find out how racism, racialization, modernist/postmodernist thought, and colonial

⁹ Many groups are racialized outside of the outdated categories of Negroid, Caucasoid, and Mongoloid. For example people from India are not considered "White", although according to the old system of classification they are genetically Caucasian. Therefore, it is technically not "race"ism that is in effect, but social prejudice based on skin colour. Skin colour and appearance has been the prominent determining factor in the cultural identity of people of mixed "racial" ancestry. Cultural convention has traditionally assigned people's identity based on physical features such as skin colour, divided, oddly, into groups of "White" "Black" "Red" and "Yellow". On some occasions the categories of "Brown" and "Olive" skinned people have become part of the discussion, which is likely linked to the writings of Said, Spivak, Bhabba, and other writers who are categorized in this manner. Usually people whose identity could not be immediately identified and homogenized within an existing cultural or ethnic group were ignored and excluded from discussions. To a large extent this situation has been slow to change. For the most part non-white people are not afforded the heterogeneity that white people assume is "natural" to their cultural and personal development. This double standard will become apparent in the discussion of the periodical survey and traditional museum practices.

thinking functions within the art institution and how, and to what degree, non-White artists and their work are being discussed. My interest was to find out how non-White artists have been represented in the Canadian art institution and I have concluded with a periodical survey which provides an indication of how these issues are manifested in the present.

I have not conducted a cover to cover survey of representation in numbers or statistics in the analyses of multiculturalism, the Canadian canon, the role of the museum or in the periodical survey, although in the appendices some information of that type is available. I have focused on the status imposed on the non-White artist under the dominance of a culture which privileges one "race" or ethnicity or class over *all* others, and on how that dominance constructs a place for non-White artists, rather than a focus on the statistics based on the race or ethnicity of the writer or artist. Although statistical information has a purpose it is often misleading and can obscure the larger issues.

In Chapter One I examine the concepts of multiculturalism, diversity, and equity in the Canadian cultural context. I also examine what it means to be the "Other" in that context, in terms of Canadian cultural policy and Canadian arts organizations.

Chapter Two contains an analysis of the Canadian cultural canon and how the exclusionary canon has been formed and maintained in Canada and the Canadian arts institution.

In Chapter Three I review the role of the museum in perpetuating systemic racism which limits the participation of non-White artists in the Canadian art institution. I also look at the issues raised by controversial exhibitions in Canada which have displayed the material culture(s) of the racialized "Other" and analyze the implications of those shows in contemporary art exhibitions.

In Chapter Four I review and analyze the results of the

periodical survey in an attempt to bring an element of "reality" to the issues raised and discussed in the previous chapters. The survey is a general look at five periodicals dating from Spring 1990 to Spring 1995. These periodicals are Canadian Art, Parachute, "C" magazine, Fuse, and Parallélogramme¹⁰. They are elements of the Canadian Art Institution covering a broad scope of the visual arts in a coherent manner and are intended for presentation to a diverse audience. They represent both a dominant and regionally diverse perspective of the visual arts and general arts in Canada. The periodicals I have chosen to survey have presented themselves as national magazines or of national interest. They contain articles and reviews that span the country and they report on events from the East to West coasts. The reference to the larger or "feature"¹¹ articles and reviews for the past five years gives an indication of what is considered relevant in contemporary art in Canada by the institution and by non-White artists and provides supporting evidence to link the reality of the concerns and issues regarding the constructions of "art" and "race" to the theoretical writing about those issues.

The focus of the survey was an examination of articles on multiculturalism, racism, non-White artists, with overall attention to the diversity of artists and art in Canada. I have used the material gathered from the survey to illustrate the factors which establish the status of non-White artists in the contemporary art institution in Canada and to frame the ideas and

¹⁰ All five periodicals receive partial funding from the Canada Council, and National and/or provincial bodies. (Ontario or Quebec) Parallélogramme has recently been "revamped" and is now published under the name Mix.

¹¹ I have called an article a feature article if it is over two pages long and/or has been given prominence in the magazine. For example, most feature articles are between two and six pages in length. However an article may have one page of text and several photographs of the artist and his/her work but will be considered a feature article because it is listed on the cover indicating to readers it is of a certain importance.

theories which are attempting to achieve change.

I have examined the institution of art in Canada under the premise that race and ethnicity are constructs imposed during the "evolution" of modernist thought and have executed my examination to the particularity of multiculturalism in art as an institution in Canada with that in mind. I have specifically focused on artists who are identified by their race/ethnicity, and where race or racialization is considered relevant by the author/editor. Detailed findings of the survey are attached as appendices to the thesis text.

Despite the focus of this thesis, it should not be assumed that so-called "visible difference", such as skin colour or physical features are the sole criteria for discrimination and prejudice, stereotyping and control. Stereotypes and marginalization include anything that is considered difference or deviance from the constructed "norm". As I have identified earlier they can be based on a variety of characteristics, beliefs, practices, sexuality, etc.

In the United States and Britain there is an increasing number of writings which focuses on the "Other" in art institutions and museums. Yet in Canada where multiculturalism is an *official policy enshrined by an act of Parliament*, there is relatively little information available regarding diversity and museum practice especially regarding the collection and documentation of contemporary art. There has been relatively little study on the racialization of non-White artists and art production Canada. Because of this I view this inquiry as a preliminary study into the position or status of non-White artists and the representation of work by non-White artists in Canada.

In this thesis I have attempted to reconcile two traditionally disparate interests: academic theory and social agency. It has not been an easy task. For the most part the

issue of racism has not been sufficiently discussed in any aspect of society and within the context of the art institution there is much which needs attention, study, and resolution. This thesis is the beginning of what I am sure will become a life's work.

Chapter One: Multiculturalism, Power, and "Otherness"

Introduction

In recent years a variety of professionals in the Canadian cultural sector have become preoccupied with the issues surrounding the representation of "race" but have failed to fully invest in challenging existing practices and cultural assumptions that act as barriers to the participation of various non-White individuals and groups in publicly funded cultural activities and national cultural institutions. Governments, publicly funded institutions, and public organizations tend to focus their attention on vague, liberal based concepts such as Multiculturalism, Race Relations, and Equity programs. They produce documents and policies promoting "diversity"¹ which instead of creating a sense of tolerance and acceptance tend to reinforce the notion of the "norm" versus "ethnic" or "Us" versus "Them". Even a cursory study would reveal that concepts of Canadian identity, multiculturalism, identity politics, the divisions of art and artifact are subject to various interpretations and, while largely misunderstood by the general public, are continually used as superficial public relations rhetoric by governments, policy makers and the media.

The state's response to coping with the diversity of Canadian society has been to depend on legislative initiatives such as The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, provincial Human Rights Codes, and official multiculturalism under the

¹ In his essay "Diversity" in Critical Terms for Literary Study, 2nd ed., Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, eds. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995). Louis Menand calls the term a slogan of the multiculturalism movement and argues that within the context of multiculturalism, diversity is considered a fact that claims recognition. Menand states that "Criticism that ignores diversity, or that regards literature [or art] as something which, by its nature, 'overcomes' diversity, is suspect." (336) This is the position of post-colonialist versus the homogenizing or universalizing agenda of modernism. The imposition is that diversity and difference is superficial and generally insignificant. The insidious assertion is that assimilation is not only necessary but inevitable to overcome the "primitivism" and perversity of the "Other".

Multiculturalism Act. Multiculturalism is presented as a defining aspect of Canadian tolerance. It allows Canadian governments to present the nation as a cultural mosaic, a patchwork quilt, and a fully democratic meritocracy.

Attempts to define Canadian culture, Canadian identity, and the boundaries of multiculturalism, may at best spark heated public debates or at worst be ignored in favour of the sensationalizing of racist violence for the gratification of visual consumerism. In some cases fear of change and the ambiguous meaning of concepts like multiculturalism and racial equity are used to preface nostalgic laments for days when identity was simply based on clear (and racist) knowledge of one's "place". The key to the Canadian cultural conundrum is that during all the public and academic discussion and debate the unique qualities of Canada as a nation tend to be overlooked. The fact of the matter is, in a country as geographically, regionally, linguistically, culturally, ethnically, and demographically diverse as Canada there can be no simple answers, no simple truths.

The influence of critical theory and race relations policies from the United States in popular culture and the media further complicates the matter of multiculturalism in Canada. Although most U.S. based studies, theoretical frameworks, constructions and practices are useful for study and comparison, there is a significant difference in the perception of inclusion from the perspective of U.S. and Canadian social policy. For example, the U.S. is often defined as a melting pot while Canada is considered a mosaic.² For the most part, when implemented in the Canadian context it becomes apparent that certain policies are unique to

² Many articles and books that compare U.S. and Canadian cultural differences refer to the mosaic versus melting pot approach to difference. In The Illusion of Difference: Realities of Ethnicity in Canada and the United States (Ottawa: C.D. Howe Institute, 1994) the authors, Jeffrey G. Reitz and Raymond Breton, refer to this difference in several sections.

the specificity of U.S. political policies, social consciousness, and social histories. In the Canadian cultural sector, specifically in the institution of "art", there is a significant lack of attention and resolution regarding issues of "race", ethnicity, and racialization as they come into play in the production, display and collection of "Canadian art".

When words like oppression and marginalization³ are being used increasingly by many cultural, ethnic, and "racial" groups, White and non-White women, Aboriginal people, disabled people, gays, lesbians and bisexuals (the list increases as the awareness of the true nature of diversity increases) we are not looking at the "demands of ethnic groups"⁴ or "special interest groups" but at concerns raised by Canadians who feel alienated and disqualified from the "level playing field" of meritocracy based on specific criteria imposed by the traditions of a Eurocentric, White, and male oriented culture.

Louis Menand, in an essay on "Diversity", commented succinctly on the myth of meritocracy and the resistance to the inclusion of the "Other" into societies' institutions. Using the

³ The terms marginalization, marginality, margin have been used by a variety of theorists and critics in various contexts in the analysis of the use of language and literary texts. The term has gained popular use by many writers, theorists, and social activists. In the framework of the Canadian cultural mainstream marginalization is understood as the insidious institutional and systemic oppression of people(s) and their exclusion from the power structures which govern them. In Canada, the dominant culture marginalizes groups from the mainstream on point of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, ability, language, age, religion, region, and political belief. Marginalization in this sense is the limiting of access to employment, education, health care, housing and other essential and standard conditions of living in Canada. Marginalization removes or alters the level of "rights" for the marginalized from those that are expected by the mainstream.

⁴ Jack Kapica, "Canadians want mosaic to melt, survey finds: Respondents believe immigrants should adopt Canada's values", The Globe and Mail, December 14, 1993, as quoted in Neil Bissoondath's Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada (Toronto: Penguin books Ltd., 1994). Bissoondath, like many other writers and critics, makes no attempt to clarify the use of terms like racism or phrases like "special interest groups" or "Canadian values".

example of American educational institutions, he states:

People calling themselves meritocrats have complained that the integration of American higher education has been achieved in violation of the spirit of meritocracy; but they're mistaken. This is precisely the way, in meritocratic theory, higher education is supposed to look: a faithful mirror of social diversity.⁵

This quote is applicable to any institution, including the abstract concept of the Canadian art institution. Terms like marginalization and oppression are more than mere buzz words of social agency and discussions of the politics of exclusion. They are terms that identify the position(s) of groups of people who exist within a society but who are not represented, considered, or consulted in the creating of public policies, public services, laws, etc.

In the case of the art institution the "margins" are made up of those people who make up a significant portion of the public and yet find that their artwork is excluded because the institution was created in a culture which recognizes only a homogeneous representation of itself, the dominant heterosexual White male culture and upper classes. The margins are created by those who control the context for the discussion of difference. This system homogenizes and creates totalizing views of the "Other," and holds an insidious understanding of its power structure which only becomes explicit to the mainstream population when the issue of marginalization is acknowledged.

Marginalization within Canadian society is one of the issues multiculturalism was intended to support and resolve. Yet, twenty-five years after its official inception, the marginalization of many "minority" groups still exists and

⁵ Louis Menand, "Diversity" in Critical Terms for Literary Study 2nd ed., Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, eds., (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995).

multiculturalism has become an increasingly contentious issue. In Canada the contention arises partly out of the many issues included in the concepts and discussions of racism, race relations, cross-cultural relations, and notions of culture and diversity which are receiving much attention in the Canadian media. However, media coverage does not illustrate the complexity of cultural and cross-cultural interaction in Canada, as it focuses on and sensationalizes events of overt racism and violence which distort and often ignore the ways racism functions in society and its social structures.

Throughout the media there is an apparent interest in issues of racist attitudes: the wearing of turbans by Sikhs in the R.C.M.P. and the Canadian Legion, the controversy and allegations of racism at the *Writing Thru Race* conference in Vancouver, allegations of racism on many Canadian police forces, the various barricades and standoffs between First Nations and Whites. The list goes on.⁶ It is difficult to believe that Canadians could be under the impression that Canada is a truly tolerant nation accepting its diversity graciously and without conflict. However, this notion has been implied if not overtly stated, in many of the documents promoting culture in Canada and is largely accepted by many Canadians.⁷

In this chapter I have focused on multiculturalism as a concept and cultural policy in Canada as it pertains to visual arts.

Multiculturalism

Refusal to assimilate and join the status quo gives many in

⁶ The most complete list of the articles in the Canadian media regarding these issues has been compiled by Neil Bissoondath in Selling Illusion: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada, (Toronto: Penguin, 1994).

⁷ Jeffrey G. Reitz and Raymond Breton, "Forward" The Illusion of Difference: Realities of Ethnicity in Canada and the United States (Ottawa: C.D. Howe Institute, 1994).

the mainstream cause to question the aims and motivations of those who are coded as different, or the "Other." This includes the culturally perverse; those who do not belong to the accepted or assumed "norm" of control, which in Canada is assumed to be male, White, Anglo Saxon, Protestant, heterosexual, and usually middle class, although variations on the ideal are permitted depending on the environment. The refusal to conform frustrates the attempts to define the "Other" from within the power structure which asserts cultural homogeneity even when it officially "recognizes" difference.

While many cultural theorists and critics have come to discuss how colonization exists outside the physical occupation of land by imperialist nations, and outright legislated apartheid, few people in the general public acknowledge or understand such oppression. It remains difficult to achieve much public recognition of the institutionalized marginalization and systemic oppression of non-White people in Canada. As Daniel Francis pointed out in The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture,⁸ the dominant heterosexual, White, ancestrally European, cultural mainstream creates and maintains images of the "Other" for its consumption and control. The production and consumption of an "image" is not exclusive to aboriginal people; it is applicable to other racialized groups although it may manifest itself differently according to the social history and cultural stereotypes attributed to each group. There is also frustration at the lack of a specific mandate to confront racism. Although the Multiculturalism Act (1988) was an important step in cross-cultural relations in Canada it is not an Act that directly condemns racism.

⁸ Daniel Francis, "Marketing the Imaginary Indian," in The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture (Vancouver, B.C.: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1992), 173-190.

Multiculturalism in Canada: a variety of perspectives

With the introduction of multiculturalism in the early 1970's the Trudeau government attempted to create an image of Canada as a contentedly diverse nation of homogenous communities, which tolerated and even celebrated their differences. There may remain some doubt as to the true motivation of the Trudeau government's choice to move to official multiculturalism, as it has been a contentious issue ever since. In his book Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada⁹ Neil Bissoondath condemns multiculturalism as a concept which divides Canadians rather than uniting them. After quoting several disparaging comments about multiculturalism, Bissoondath states that the suspicion surrounding multiculturalism has a "ring of truth".¹⁰

Whether multiculturalism was a strategy to maintain power over Quebec and to keep the French marginalized¹¹ as a Canadian minority rather than a Quebec majority the position of non-Whites remains subordinate in either society. Despite multicultural policy, successive Canadian governments have focused on the binary opposition of French and English in Canada as the "founding cultures" (read the colonizing cultures), primarily because of Canadian Constitutional problems and the threat of Quebec separation. The presumed commitment to multiculturalism in its various forms has slowly become a lesser focus for Canadian governments and in the various interpretations made by

⁹ Neil Bissoondath Selling Illusion: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada, (Toronto: Penguin, 1994).

¹⁰ Ibid, 41.

¹¹ "Canada's official multiculturalism [does not] reflect only a desire to ensure that minorities retain their cultural identities. Politically, it is a byproduct of the French-English conflict. Some ethnic minorities saw the appointment in 1963 of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism as a step toward the establishment of official cultures in Canada; the "multiculturalism" movement was an effort to forestall this possibility." Reitz and Breton The Illusion of Difference, 10.

successive governments multicultural programs are perceived as having little effect in helping Canadians to transcend racism.

The binary French/English dichotomizing of Canadian identity aids the erasure of the contribution of First Nations to Canadian culture as well as those of many other "cultures" and ethnicities. In an article for This Magazine reviewing Bissoondath's book, writer Clifton Joseph points out that among the many points Bissoondath skips over or ignores, the contribution of many non-White people is apparent. Joseph states:

He doesn't consider the untenability of redefining the country in a flagrantly hierarchical manner-with French and English as the main menu based on their "traditional" struggle for supremacy of the new landscape's peoples, land and economy, and the "ethnics" in a provisionally subordinate second tier. Nor does he consider uncomfortable questions about the native populations, their broken treaties and rightful place in the Canadian polity. Also absent from his "overview" are the Eastern Europeans who settled and helped develop the Prairies; the successive waves of Black Loyalists who fought for the British Empire and Canada in the so-called "Revolutionary War" of 1776 and the War of 1812 under unfulfilled promises of freedom and land; the work army of Chinese whose bodies litter the spikes of the cross-country railroad's "national dream"; the many expired Italian lives, screeched in the building of Toronto's modern and award-winning subway system; and the many other "ethnics" who demand a greater than token place in the "Canadian Mosaic".¹²

The assumption that stands out from the dichotomy of French versus English is that anyone who speaks English will assimilate to the same values, beliefs and cultural practices as the dominant culture and the French will remain the lesser culture, accepting its "place" of dominance in Quebec. In The Illusion of Difference: Realities of Ethnicity in Canada and the United

¹² Clifton Joseph "On Your Mark! Get Set! Go Multi-culti!" This Magazine Vol. 28, No. 5, 1995, 24-28.

States¹³ the authors compare the status of French Canadians to that of African Americans in the United States. Although the struggle for equality within their respective societies has been different, the political push or influence on government of both groups has been significant. In Canada, however, the focus on non-White "ethnicities" has been overshadowed by the threat of Quebec separation. Notably within Quebec itself the issue of multiculturalism has been problematic. Henri Bouchard's exclusion of non-White people from his concept of "laine pur" French Canadians, and Jacques Parizeau's comment regarding the "ethnic vote" preventing the separation of Quebec from Canada after the referendum in October 1995 point to the complexity of issues, particularly the difficult position of non-White people in Canada to achieve acceptance as part of their society.¹⁴

Multiculturalism and Canadian cultural identity are concepts that spur much debate in the Canadian media. The popular understanding of the concepts, at least as represented in popular media, place multiculturalism and Canadian identity in direct opposition to each other. The dichotomy of Canadian and "Ethnic"¹⁵ is wholly constructed on colonial principles and has

¹³ Reitz and Breton, The Illusion of Difference. The comparison of African Americans and French Canadians occurs throughout the study. However, significant sections are in Chapters One and Five.

¹⁴ The comments were reported widely across the Canadian media, including The Globe and Mail, November 11, 1995, D1 and November 20, 1995, A15. An particularly interesting article from the Montreal Gazette, November 3, 1995 A10, reported that Parizeau's comments were endorsed by neo-Nazi hate groups. The most important point to take from this is the media's love for publishing sensationalist extremism and polarizing views whenever Multiculturalism or equity issues are covered.

¹⁵ In Critical Terms for Literary Study 2nd ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin (eds.) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), Werner Sollors states that "Ethnic", or "Ethnicity", like "Race" is a term which describes a "dissociative" position or identity defined in the negative. (288) The definition of an individual or group as negative in relation to the assumed norm creates boundaries of identity or "Us" versus "Them". Sollors further discusses the use of the term "'Race' ...as sometimes perceived to be more intense, "objective", or real than ethnicity...What is often called

so far prohibited the development of intercultural tolerance, never mind understanding and acceptance. "Ethnic" comes to mean "Other," outsider, and the reality of White ethnicities are blurred into silently accepted social hierarchies of "Whiteness" which are ignored or submerged when the discussion of racism arises. The notion of an "Us" versus "Them" is thus woven into the very fabric of the Canadian patchwork quilt.

The concept of multiculturalism has been widely interpreted in the Canada. Critics of multiculturalism have stated that multiculturalism does not bring "ethnic" groups into the accepted mainstream but relegates them to their own closed pocket of homogeneous identity outside the mainstream power institutions and thereby continues to officially marginalize them. It could also be argued that the current interpretation of multiculturalism essentializes difference, labels non-White people as "ethnic", and segregates them from the rights of power of the "founding cultures", therefore making the hierarchy of cultures more explicit.¹⁶

There is also the perception that, according to multiculturalism, individuals are forced to become "hyphenated Canadians" with fractured identities, unable to sever themselves

"race" in the modern United States is perhaps the country's most virulent ethnic factor. It is used to make distinctions on the basis of such generalized propositions as "black does not equal white" or "red does not equal white" which mark more dramatic fault lines in this specific cultural context than such oppositions as "Jew does not equal Gentile", which especially since the late 1940s, may simply be subsumed under the common United States category "white", but formed the crucial distinction in Nazi 'racial' theory" (289). According to The Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations 2nd ed., E. Ellis Cashmore (ed.) (New York: Routledge, 1988), the term ethnic, ethnicity comes from the Greek *ethnos* referring to "... a people or nation. In its contemporary form, ethnic still retains this basic meaning in the sense that it describes a group possessing some degree of coherence and solidarity composed of people who are, at least latently, aware of having common origins and interests. So, an ethnic group is not a mere aggregate of people or a sector of a population, but a self-conscious collection of people united, or closely related, by shared experiences." (97)

¹⁶ I will be examining the hierarchy of cultures in Canadian museums in Chapter Three.

from their ancestral roots to become "real" Canadians like Bissoondath whose roots are "portable".¹⁷ In this limited view people who do not identify with a specific "ethnic" identity have no valid identity and are also marginalized from current discussions. This is an extreme view that extends to the notion that to be White, male and middle class is to be considered void of ethnicity, without any "special interests" as a group, and to be categorically a willing oppressor and therefore adverse to social change. This view also excludes people of mixed ancestries who may identify differently depending on their environment, upbringing, or contact with people from their various ancestral backgrounds. It is certainly limiting individual potential by asserting that people must belong to a homogenous group, remaining static and one dimensional throughout their lives.

Proponents of multiculturalist policy credit it with bringing the voices of non-White cultures into the discussion of social, cultural and political discourses and insist that without multiculturalism marginalization would not be considered an issue. Contrary to this, if one follows Bissoondath's reasoning the dilemma for the individual is whether to compromise her/his ethnic identity to succeed in the mainstream and become "truly" Canadian or to maintain her/his ethnic identity and face discrimination. What Bissoondath is propounding, then, is that cultural retention determines, or should determine, levels of Canadian citizenship and that so called "ethnic" groups and individuals choose, by their level of cultural retention, acceptance or discrimination in Canadian society.¹⁸ Bissoondath

¹⁷ Bissoondath Selling Illusions, 82.

¹⁸ According to Reitz and Breton, Canadians have, as recently as ten years ago, been in favour of assimilation. In a quote of the 1987 Canadian Charter Study, "about 70 percent of the respondents agreed that immigrants often bring discrimination upon themselves by their own personal attitudes and habits." (70) The authors also state that in this context Canadians tend to

is asserting that to enter Canadian society and to move up the social ladder an individual must become less attached to her/his "ethnic" culture and should appear less "ethnic". Despite the aims of multiculturalism there remains the perception that to become Canadian a person must still assimilate to the mainstream culture. This perception is reinforced by the absence of non-White people in the upper echelons of societal structures.

Critics of the current approach to multiculturalism have referred to the Canadian ministry of multiculturalism (formerly a ministry, but now a portfolio under the Department of Canadian Heritage) as the "Ministry of Folkdance." This cynical reference is an expression of disappointment with the Ministry's past and current approach to promoting diversity through festivals and events that provide a superficial understanding of difference and are often directed at White audiences.

The attitude of most opponents of multiculturalism such as those referred to and quoted in this thesis has been that protection against discrimination and prejudice should be left to the courts to interpret violations of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, The Canadian Human Rights Code, and The Criminal Code, rather than government-sponsored Employment Equity programs and Provincial Human Rights legislation which prohibit discrimination on the grounds of "race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, marital status, family status, sexual orientation, disability, and conviction for which a pardon has been granted".¹⁹

What opponents of multiculturalism and equity programs fail to recognize or acknowledge are the problems of systemic and

deny that overt racial discrimination exists and believe that the disadvantages of "minorities" is based on individual merit rather than systemic or institutionalized discrimination.(70) Interestingly, despite the generalized desire for the "Other" to assimilate the majority of Canadians still tend to give their ethnicity some importance.

¹⁹ Canadian Human Rights Act:1:3.

institutionalized racism, more specifically the continued preference for the European descended cultures which is essentially White supremacist in attitude. The problem is that legislation in a free and democratic country cannot dictate attitudes which move insidiously throughout the structures that support and control the development of the nation's social conscience. The attempts by some governments to manage racial, cultural and ethnic inequities in Canada, although they have successfully begun to change the face of many areas of employment, are often perceived (incorrectly) by members of the dominant culture and classes as quota systems, token positions and anti-White-male hiring practices and could increase resentment against non-White Canadians, and other under-represented "target groups".

Employment equity programs, like Human Rights legislation, cannot prevent the insidiousness of racism and the neglect of non-White artists within cultural institutions, especially in relation to collecting, displaying/exhibiting, interpreting, and ascribing value to the processes and products of cultural activity in Canada. In Ontario the Harris government has repealed the employment equity law introduced by the former New Democratic Party government, claiming that the law was a quota system and that the government would introduce a new plan that would be based on merit.²⁰ Among the many articles covering the Harris government's attack on employment equity the issues seem to be similar to that of opposition to multiculturalism. The most offensive is that multiculturalism and employment equity were government (New Democratic Party) sanctioned discrimination against White males.²¹ The assumption is that any attempt to

²⁰ Dan Nolan, "Harris trashes Ontario's employment-equity law," Montreal Gazette July 20, 1995, A8.

²¹ Martin Loney, "Equity law has gone too far," Toronto Star May 24, 1995, A21.

redress the inequities suffered by "minorities" in Canada is seen as preferential treatment, while the regular assertion and celebration of the agenda of the dominant White culture is not.²²

The Politics of Power

Charles Taylor's essay Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition"²³ addresses issues which currently frame discussion and debates about multiculturalism through liberal perspectives of the discursive area of concepts of identity or identity politics. Taylor identifies the difference between what feminists would call formal and substantive equality. Formal equality governed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and provincial humans rights legislation guarantees that each citizen is viewed equally under the law regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, etc. Taylor refers to formal equality as "procedural" liberalism, which is of the individualist civil rights type vehemently defended in the United States. He states:

A liberal society must remain neutral on the good life, and restrict itself to ensuring that however they see things, citizens deal fairly with each other and the state deals equally with all.²⁴

Taylor acknowledges, however, that liberalism is, after all, an ideology, and therefore is not neutral. When turning to the

²² Notably, the only feature article on the issue of employment equity in a Canadian arts institution was Sue Findlay's "Painting by Numbers: Employment Equity & the Ontario College of Art" in Fuse Vol 13. No. 6, 1990, 25-37. The article focuses on the controversy at the Ontario College of Art, which in 1989, attempted to increase the number of women represented on the faculty. The article focuses on the exclusion of women and the fight to have an equity program followed through. A second phase was to address the under representation of "Natives, other visible minorities, and the disabled..."(26)

²³ Charles Taylor, Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition", (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992) 57.

²⁴ Ibid, 57.

concept of substantive equality Taylor begins to discuss the importance of granting equal dignity to the diversity of groups that make up a society. What Taylor refers to as "recognition" is essentially making an attempt to evenly distribute power in a society or in a more commonly known phrase "level the playing field". This is a significantly different approach than depending on the concept of meritocracy inherent in ideology of civil rights equality and procedural liberalism which claims to grant power to the individual in what Taylor calls a "difference blind"²⁵ manner.

Taylor's second type of liberalism and expression of the need for "minorities" to gain recognition acknowledges that a hierarchy exists even in a liberal democratic society despite Western liberalism's modernist utopian aims. Taylor states that "Nonrecognition or misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being."²⁶ Recognition is essential in a society which defines itself as multicultural. Taylor also notes that neither of the two liberalisms he analyzes is unproblematic. He states:

The reproach that the first makes to the second is just that it violates the principle of nondiscrimination. The reproach the second makes to the first is just that it negates identity by forcing people into a homogenous mould that is untrue to them.²⁷

Taylor's most important point is that "liberalism can't and shouldn't claim complete cultural neutrality"²⁸ The recognition of liberalism as a fighting creed is essential to the discussion of difference within a Western liberal society and it is an issue

²⁵ *ibid*, 43.

²⁶ *ibid*, 25.

²⁷ *ibid*, 43.

²⁸ *Ibid*, 62.

that those who address multiculturalism, whether for or against, must acknowledge. Reflecting on the practice of imposing one culture upon another Taylor notes:

Western liberal societies are thought to be supremely guilty in this regard, partly because of their colonial past, and partly because of their marginalization of segments of their populations that stem from other cultures. It is in this context that the reply "this is how we do things here" can seem crude and insensitive.²⁹

This statement clearly positions the dominant culture and its critics in Western societies. As Taylor points out this imposition forces a need for approval outside one's own community and the need for a perception of worth for a "minority" community within a society whether on a regional, national or even global scale.

When investigating the perception of such ideas in relation to education and the inclusion of non-Western, non-heterosexual, non-White males into the "canon" and curriculum of the university, Taylor is dismissive of current deconstructivist thought which, contrary to what Taylor and many other modernist rooted theorists tend to believe, does not necessitate the complete demolition of all modernist ideas but proposes a continuous consciousness that all "truths", ideas and ideologies are constructed and therefore biased. Taylor's acknowledgement of the homogenizing effect of categorizing cultures is significant, particularly in the event of Western postmodern cultures' appropriating of difference into the eclectic yet ethnocentrically exclusive standards and current canonical model. Most poignant in Taylor's essay is the conclusion that the essential moral question that must be realized is where "we" are in Western thought and what "our" ability is to view differences with tolerance and acceptance.

²⁹ *ibid*, 63.

Taylor's ideas have been linked to the visual arts by Stuart Richmond in an article published in the Journal of Aesthetic Education.³⁰ Richmond observes several problems with Taylor's theory and proposes a few alterations to the implementation of "official recognition". Richmond proposes that if Quebec has a right to recognition as a distinct society then Asian communities in British Columbia should have the same right.³¹ Taylor has left his analysis open to such conclusions by failing to note the differences between the claims of various cultures for recognition within Canadian society. Both Taylor and Richmond fail to recognize the difference between Canada's concept of "founding cultures" (which should by all rights include Native and Métis cultures) and what could be called "contributing cultures" such as those listed in the quotation from Clifton Joseph's response to Bissoondath.

In addition neither Taylor nor Richmond name or refer to clearly is the problem of racism and the traditions of racist or Eurocentric and White-supremacist thinking in the creation of policy, particularly in the discourses surrounding cultural policy in Canada. Taylor's use of Quebec as an example by which he can apply this theory is almost cowardly since for both Quebec and First Nations who claim to be "distinct societies" multiculturalism is not at the root of the debate, although the preservation of their respective cultures is.

With the aforementioned complexities in mind, Richmond's point that Taylor has failed to provide criteria³² for the granting of official recognition is increasingly in need of examination. Richmond suggests that the focus must remain on

³⁰ Stuart Richmond, "Liberalism, Multiculturalism and Art Education," Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol 29, No.3, (Fall 1995), 15-25.

³¹ *ibid*, 17-18.

³² *ibid*, 18.

guaranteeing individual rights to persons of all cultures and that there is a danger in guaranteeing the survival of specific cultures. While Richmond's difference of opinion with Taylor is valid he betrays a patronizing and primitivist attitude in the statements like the following:

It is unreasonable to expect life in a Western pluralistic democracy to resemble that in a particular ethnic community on its historical home ground. Democracy provides possibilities of life not available in *traditional cultures*, but these carry a certain cultural cost.³³

and:

Historical cultures are not always tolerant of one another, as we know from much recent experience in Bosnia and Rwanda. Particular world views can be insular and absolute, not to mention oppressive to women, who often have no voice in deciding their own fate. And while different cultures may have different moral understandings, in a multicultural society there must be some agreement on the bounds of permissible behaviour.³⁴

Richmond not only leaps from the rational concern of deciding the criteria for granting recognition, which would also lead to an examination of who would decide what groups would receive recognition, to the offensive assumption that all "traditional cultures" are undemocratic and thus less civilized than the West. Richmond refers to the non-democratic "Other" culture on more than one occasion. He also uses the term "historical" cultures as though it were a synonym for "Other" cultures. Do Western European and North American cultures have no history, particularly no history of intolerance? The statement that the "Other" is not always tolerant further betrays a disturbing attitude toward the (foreign) "Other." Why point out the

³³ *ibid*, 19.

³⁴ *ibid*.

examples of Bosnia and Rwanda when in Canada there are myriad examples of intolerance between ethnic and cultural communities? Richmond also fears that students of art may be encouraged to be critical of the traditions of Western cultures while passively accepting the traditions of non-Western cultures. He also uses the example of teaching from a feminist perspective (i.e. seeking justice and reviewing the oppression of women in art and life) as potentially complicating the possibility of viewing art from certain "Asian cultures"³⁵ in an objective manner because those cultures do not traditionally share the liberal notion of women's equality. This position neglects to observe, as many "traditional" modernists do, that the so-called objectivism of Western-modernist-White-male-dominated-heterosexual society has a political agenda of its own that is constantly influencing the observations of art theorists and critics.

Richmond also states:

Unfortunately, it has become fashionable for radical academics to denigrate liberal values while remaining silent about, or appearing to support, cultural practices inimical to the very freedoms that facilitate their own critically autonomous position in society.³⁶

Richmond suggests that support for the Nazis during World War Two and the death sentence imposed on author Salman Rushdie were supported by "particular cultural groups". This dictates a homogenization of thought and an inability for free will or political difference within a cultural group. Did all U.S. citizens support the Persian Gulf War? Do all Canadians oppose capital punishment or gun control?

Richmond ignores the fact that the support for the Nazis was clearly political rather than cultural and their policies were

³⁵ *ibid*, 21.

³⁶ *ibid*, 22.

opposed by many Germans. Were people of Jewish ancestry any less German? The call for the assassination of Rushdie was clearly also political while quasi-religious in nature and not shared by the entire Islamic "culture". Richmond spends most of his essay agreeing with Taylor's points supporting the liberal tenets regarding the need for granting equal worth and allowing for diversity. However, he falls into the trap of cultural relativist fear mongering that arises with many critics who imply the possibility of multiculturalism "going too far" where the demonized "Other" eventually takes over "our" society and imposes barbaric oppression and the dissolution of civilized democratic society. Richmond, like other critics of multiculturalism who come from a modernist position, refers to the importance of maintaining the value and appropriate aesthetic criteria³⁷ needed to maintain the *quality* of art yet he fails to define that criteria. I will come back to the issue of the definition of art and the cultural relativism of modernist thought in later sections.

The complex difficulties with liberal ideology and its contradictions are evident in the text of the Multiculturalism Act itself. Scott MacFarlane provides an excellent analysis of liberalism inherent in the Multiculturalism Act in the essay "The Haunt of Race."³⁸ The following quotation identifies his key points:

[L]iberal Canadian nationalism is dependent for legitimation on both historical and contemporary visions of Canada as culturally monolithic...
[T]he model of culture functioning in the Multiculturalism Act can be loosely termed anthropological in that it assumes that individuals and communities emerge from discrete cultural origins and

³⁷ *ibid*, 22-23.

³⁸ Scott McFarlane, "The Haunt of Race: Canada's Multiculturalism Act, the Politics of Incorporation, and Writing Thru Race," Fuse Vol.18, No.3, Spring 1995, 18-31.

possess both a recognizable history and autonomous set of cultural practices.³⁹

McFarlane also points out what he terms the two myths of liberalism which are the assumption that "European notions of democracy and rights legislation can be generalized and applied around the world...[which legitimizes]...colonial conquest and violence."⁴⁰ McFarlane states that the Multiculturalism Act, (and thus the Canadian interpretation of a multicultural society) is essentially assimilationist, because of its compartmentalization of people according to the doctrines of Eurocentrism and liberalism. The interpretation of multiculturalist thinking has had an effect on issues of funding. McFarlane states:

The question that hangs: If "our" cultural institutions cannot and should not try to represent "the people" through funding and programming that reflects a "Canadian" identity, upon what basis should they operate?⁴¹

This question leads us to question the structure and support of the art institution.

Cultural Policy and Arts Organizations

The Canadian cultural community has been slow to respond to pressure from "minority" groups, anti-racist organizations and artists to adjust their selection practices with respect to creating juries, boards of directors, hiring staff and curators, and purchasing artwork produced by non-White Canadian artists. Currently, boards of directors, curators and administrative staff in many arts and arts related organizations, such as artist-run centres/galleries, National museums, arts advocacy groups are

³⁹ *ibid*, 20.

⁴⁰ *ibid*, 22.

⁴¹ *ibid*, 26

predominantly White with little or limited representation of non-White artists. There is also a notable lack of representation at the policy-making level of government and in the selection of commission members. Although the public service has been encouraged to address issues of representation under Employment Equity programs, hiring freezes and budget cuts usually drive the focus away from issues of diversifying, thus limiting the impact of non-Euro-descended cultures and the influence of non-White people(s) on the structure itself and policy making in general.

Although most of Canada's National Arts institutions are currently looking into questions and issues regarding "race" and representation, significant changes to the collection and display of artwork by non-White artists has been slow. The failure of the institution to fully appreciate the issues surrounding the position of the racialized, non-White "Other" in the art institution in Canada is well illustrated by the controversy at the Association of National Non-Profit Artists' Centres' (ANNPAC) annual general meeting in Calgary in 1993 where eleven member centres and two regional associations withdrew their membership from ANNPAC because of a failure to carry through a commitment to a two year anti-racist initiative. Minquon Panchayat, a committee made up of non-White artists, was formed the previous year to help the association become more accessible to non-White artists. However, the inability to find a common ground at the "formal" section of the meeting prompted the artists of Minquon Panchayat to leave the meeting. ANNPAC began to deal with the issues by publishing articles in an issue of Parallélogramme.⁴²

Admittedly essays concerning the ethics of collecting art and artifacts from aboriginal cultures in relation to colonialism and imperialism have been published in catalogues, anthologies, and periodicals over the last decade. However, as the periodical

⁴² Parallélogramme, Vol.19, No.3, 1993.

survey will show there are recurring problems with the way in which these issues are dealt with. The issues of repatriating artifacts to their country, place or culture of origin are also being raised. It is becoming apparent that there has been some impact on institutions, with promise that the issues surrounding the "Other" can no longer be ignored. However, evidence of the continued struggle to overcome ignorance and racial inequity has been apparent in many areas of the arts over the last decade. Examples include: the boycott called by the Lubicon Lake Cree of the 1986 exhibit of Native Art/Artifacts in The Spirit Sings; the protests over performances of Showboat and Miss Saigon and Into the Heart of Africa; the 1994 controversy over the conference *Writing Thru Race: A Conference for First Nations Writers and Writers of Colour* sponsored by the Writers Union of Canada, which had funding revoked by the federal government under allegations of racism against Whites. These are but a few of the recent outcries of racial tension in the arts which have yet to be acknowledged or comprehensively addressed by government and arts organizations.

The Canadian Conference of the Arts, established in 1945, is a not-for-profit, non-governmental association, which contains Canada's most vocal advocates and lobbyists for a federal policy on Canadian Culture. The Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA) has published and distributed numerous support documents outlining its proposals for commitments by the state to the Canadian cultural sector; arts organizations, public institutions, artist-run-centres, public programs, and individual artists. These documents are essentially recommendations for a coherent Canadian cultural policy. The CCA has revised their recommendations with each government study and has devised proposals for the development of cultural policy.

Although the development of cultural policies occurs at many levels of government (federal, provincial, and municipal) and is

further developed within the specific policies of arts institutions and organization (collection, exhibition, program policies and mandates), it is clear that a broadly based federal policy on culture and the arts in Canada would be helpful in structuring and developing the arts by identifying the federal government's role and subsequently laying out the plan for the role of both provincial and municipal governments' commitment to the promotion, advocacy, funding and development of Canadian cultural activities. A coherent *inclusive* cultural policy would have serious political and social implications. A general and diversely informed definition of culture would have to be mindful of the current tendency to function as a White mediated concept of culture, values, and traditions. Also the implications of multicultural policy on the preservation and display of the material culture of various cultures which are representative of Canada's diversity could be addressed and clarified.

The issues surrounding the creation of a Canadian cultural policy have a history of lengthy discussions, commission reports, consultations and at times heated debates regarding the role and responsibility of the State in the arts in Canada. The discussions and recommendations by federal commissions, task forces, and committees generally focus on issues of funding, tax laws, copyright, and other "business" related concerns intending to enable artists to survive in this country and to support the impact of the arts on Canadian society. However, the main area of achievement for recommendations seems to be in the economic value of the arts. The creation of the Canada Council, artist-run-centres, and an increase in venues and programs across Canada since the Report of the Royal Commission of National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences (1951), more commonly known as the Massey Report, certainly influenced an increase in both public and state interest in the arts in Canada. The Massey Report referred to issues of "National Unity" guided by the idea

that a fully active and supported cultural community in Canada would have strong social and political, and very likely, economic impact. In effect, culture could be used as a means to accomplish an end.

The Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee (1982), more commonly known as the Applebaum-Hebert Report, makes clear that the committee did not make its recommendations in the hopes of solidifying "national identity" or a sense of national unity, but that positive social, political, and economic implications could follow after a concerted effort to encourage the production of art. Art would not be considered a means to an end but an end in itself. The Third Strategy, the CCA's published response to the Applebaum-Hebert, expresses elements that had been overlooked by the committee and asserts further recommendations and arguments for some kind of "vision" or "theme", i.e., commitment and political recognition for the role of the arts in Canadian society. The CCA is critical of the Applebaum-Hebert "Art for Art's Sake" attitude and, in its response to the quest for a definition of culture, states in The Third Strategy, "broadly speaking [culture] is the way human beings do what they do, as it relates to the whole life man".⁴³ (We can assume it would relate to the lives of women as well).

Although these reports and documents refer to the general well-being of Canadian artists and develop their perceptions in relation to a reciprocal relationship to the arts it is surprising, especially in the reports developed in the 1980's, that no specific discussion of the issues of race and representation in "High art" is addressed.

It is important to note that documents prior to 1971 and the national discussion of Multiculturalism, must be historically contextualized. Issues of racist inequity were barely present

⁴³ Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee Applebaum-Hebert, 1982, 11.

anywhere in the Canadian political agenda, despite the enormity of the civil rights movement in the United States. Notably, even with the passing of the Multiculturalism Act in Parliament in 1988, the issues of "race", representation, and racism in its various forms have seldom been addressed directly by any cultural policy or cultural organizations. It is disturbing that the Applebaum-Hebert which gives some commitment to gender equality and brief consideration of the position(s) of Aboriginal artists does not mention other non-White artists in the context of art at all. The report makes clear the need to increase the representation of women in all aspects of cultural production. However, with the absence of a discussion of race, "women" can be read to mean "White" women. The report also states that:

[N]ative artists must be recognized first and foremost as contemporary Canadian artists...and that federal policy should give special priority of promoting both traditional and contemporary creative work by artists of Indian and Inuit ancestry.⁴⁴

However, the report does not address the attitudes and practices that exclude many Native and other non-White artists from mainstream venues, juries and boards of directors. An example of this division is in the case of the arts in Canada where mainstream represents "White" culture as the "real", capital "C" culture, high culture or "aesthetic culture" and multiculturalism represents "ethnic", small "c", "folk" culture or "entertainment" culture.⁴⁵ None of the commission report's recommendations acknowledge specifically the issues of exclusion but refer vaguely to "diversity" and the importance of allowing plurality

⁴⁴ *ibid*, 11.

⁴⁵ Tom Henighan, The Presumption of Culture (Vancouver: Raincoast Books, 1996).

within the dominance of the "two official groups."⁴⁶ Surprisingly the CCA's responses to those reports also neglect this issue. It is difficult to believe that, in a discussion of arts policy, issues of racism and exclusion should be left untouched while platitudes and obsequious accounts of Canadian tolerance and freedom abound.⁴⁷

Perception plays a large part in the representation and misrepresentation of the concept of social equity or social agency. For example a non-White employee hired during a time when efforts are focused on employment equity may feel tokenized or may become an "object" of resentment where his/her skills and or qualifications for a job are questioned due to a lack of understanding of the aims of such programs and a failure to inform the public of those aims by a government, an employer or the media. This type of misunderstanding, resistance and misrepresentation of issues, more commonly known as a "backlash" against progressive programs, is pervasive through all aspects of society.

Interpreting "Multiculturalism" in the art institution

The interpretation of how multiculturalism should function in the art institution is, as mentioned earlier, diverse. In 1993 Parallélogramme reported that the Cultural Equity Coordinator at the Canada Council resigned "in despair over the Council's lack of commitment to First Nations Artists and artists of Colour, frustrated by the relatively low status assigned to

⁴⁶ Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee: Summary of Brief and Findings (1982), 10.

⁴⁷ An example:

Our traditions are built on fair play, tolerance, a respect for privacy and a philosophy of live and let live...We are participants in an exciting experiment that has developed ways for people of different cultures, temperaments and languages to live peacefully and profitably together. The Third Strategy CCA (1984).

the position and the program".⁴⁸ This illustrates that an individual institution's commitment to dealing with systemic or institutionalized racism and exclusivity seldom meets the expectations and sense of urgency of non-White artists.

One example of the paradox created by badly implemented multiculturalist thinking is in the funding programs or streams from institutions such as the Canada Council or Ontario Arts Council. Here multicultural policy can be criticized for the way in which national and provincial funding bodies can segregate artists "of colour"⁴⁹ by relegating or "ghettoizing" non-White artists into the smaller multicultural funding coffers without modifying the racism in the mainstream. When looking at the division of mainstream and multicultural funding one must ask who is deciding the criteria and who disperses the funds according to that criteria. Is work eligible only if it has a "multicultural" theme? Along with the difficulties of mediating non-White cultural practice the current implementation of multicultural funding maintains an atmosphere of division by "race", skin colour, or ethnicity. White remains the "norm" and non-White is "ethnic" and "Other". Apparently White European descended Canadians are not meant to consider themselves as part(s) of the Canadian ethno-cultural mosaic. Because of the lack of diversity in the mainstream the non-White artist is forced into a paradox when seeking funding. Does s/he risk discrimination and apply to

⁴⁸ Parellelogramme Vol.19, No.2, 1993.

⁴⁹ The phrase "person of colour" has become the catch phrase to describe non-white people. The term is problematic for several reasons: two of the most annoying are the assumption that persons who are non-white or identify as non-white must have a certain degree of skin pigmentation. Many people who identify as Native, Black, mixed race or any other non-white identity could in some cases "pass" for white; however, self-identification must supersede all assumptions or expectations imposed by the dominant group. The second reason is that the phrase "person of colour" is very close to the old use of "coloured" and does not adequately describe the reality of "otherness" for many people. I have attempted to use the combination of non-white, non-euro-descended to more adequately describe the various identities of the artists who are excluded and mediated by the dominant culture.

the mainstream funding, or does s/he focus on her/his ethnicity to increase the chances of funding? M. Norbese Philip extrapolates the issues of privilege and power from the controversy in her book Frontiers.⁵⁰ Philip is acutely aware of the dominant White culture's need to create "minor" nationalisms, a division usually termed "divide and conquer" which advocates and maintains a place for "minorities" within the structure that is defined by the dominant culture. The constant competition to hold on to fractions of the funding pie allocated to "ethnics" supports the assumed validity of the dominant culture because the large section of the pie is reserved for "universal" arts ventures. In this light, multiculturalism in arts funding illustrates the success of the notion of divide and conquer.

Conclusion(s)

It appears that in Canada neither formal human rights legislation nor substantive efforts such as multicultural policy and funding has succeeded in achieving a sense of equality for non-White Canadians in the art institution. Although the issue of representation has been addressed by non-White artists on a number of occasions as published in magazines such as Fuse and Parallélogramme by non-White artists.⁵¹ Efforts to create difference blindness or "colour blindness" are essentially a dictum of formal liberalism and are rooted in the assumption that difference can or will be ignored in the effort to create a monolithic Canadian Cultural Identity. Difference blindness is problematic and contrary to the aims of multiculturalism or

⁵⁰ M. Norbese Philip Frontiers: essays and writings on racism and culture Stratford: Mercury Press, 1992.

⁵¹ The results of the periodical survey show that the issues of "race" and representation of non-White artists as the "Other" is a frequent theme in both shows and to some extent in feature articles which focus on non-White artists.

cultural pluralism in a democratic society.

With each culture's need to survive it becomes clear that an increased effort is required to understand and alter Western concepts of fairness and to adjust the dominant culture's standard of judgement on other cultures. According to Reitz and Breton the public attitude toward multiculturalism has not been as negative as the media would have us believe.

A 1986 survey showed support for the government policy of multiculturalism: 59 percent did not agree that "Canada's policy promoting multiculturalism is a mistake" (Ponting 1986)...[In a 1974 study] respondents said that the purpose of the policy was to encourage cultural maintenance. Sixty percent thought the policy was permissive rather than supportive, and 13 percent thought it was assimilationist...Thus, Canadians may see a role for government, but a passive role rather than an active one. Clearly, more research is needed on this matter.⁵²

The authors are clear that there is very little evidence in this area, which has allowed the media and politicians to claim whatever they want to regarding the success or failure of multiculturalism. In reality, as shown by the quotations from public policy and publications by cultural organizations, there is little to link multiculturalism to either the decline or increase in systemic or overt racism since the 1970's. With the intentions of multicultural policy being as vague and elusive as they are, it is impossible to determine its success. However, social problems such as racism continue.

⁵² Reitz and Breton, The Illusion of Difference, 36.

Chapter Two: The Canadian "Canon"

Introduction

In this chapter I examine the notion of a Canadian cultural canon, in particular the visual arts canon.¹ I outline some of the issues and debate surrounding the reinforcement and preservation of Canadian "canons" in art history, particularly the presumption of homogeneity and the attempt to place Canadian artwork in an internationally relevant Eurocentric linear progression. I also look at the accepted criteria for Canadian art.

Despite the reality of regionalism in Canadian art production and the diversity of cultural traditions there has been a consistent effort by art historians, curators, theorists, and writers to build a coherent linear history of the Canadian tradition in art. The need to create a recognizable tradition of Canadian art is probably based on a desire to prove Canadian identity as separate from American or European artistic identities. There is still a tendency to assume that the styles that surface in the United States will eventually surface in a Canadian context, although on a smaller scale.² While there has been an attempt to maintain the relevance of Canadian art,

¹ By the term canon I am referring to the process of attributing value or recognition as outlined in Trevor Ross' essay "Canon" in Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory, ed. Irena R. Makaryk, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 515.

² The following quote from a recent report to the Canadian Postal Corporation reveals that the expectation that cultural "styles" or traditions will be repeated in similar Canadian cultural communities is mistaken. The researcher was directed to locate images of the Madonna and Child from African-Canadian communities. "An exhibition of historic and contemporary quilts from Black communities across North America at the Museum of Textiles in Toronto, for example, reveals the fact that while figurative imagery was frequently employed on American quilts, the Canadian counterparts are much simpler, using only geometric designs." Victoria Angel, Report to the Canada Post Corporation, 1995. The author notes that there is some evidence to suggest that official multiculturalism and the development of identity politics has influenced art production to become more "culturally distinctive".

contemporary Canadian artists promoted in Canadian art magazines seem to fit easily into the linear progression of art set out by American critics dating as far back as Clement Greenberg, who greatly influenced the production of late modernist art in New York.

The constructed Canadian tradition as currently documented and celebrated is Eurocentric, male dominated and based in the ideology of Western modernist thought. Documentation of Canadian art always begins at the point of colonization. The assumption is then that Canadian art is an extension of European art and therefore art that does not develop from that tradition is invalid. There are relatively few books which examine specifically Canadian culture or contemporary Canadian art. During my research I found very little material which dealt with the status of Canadian non-White contemporary artists. In this chapter I have focused my attention on several specifically Canadian works and I have examined them in some detail. My reason for this is that by working through each example I hope to show the way in which seemingly banal or accepted generalizations are in fact insidious or even overt acts of erasure against non-White Canadians and therefore reinforce the exclusionary canon. One may ask "Why are there no great non-White Canadian artists?" following Linda Nochlin's essay title "Why have there been no great women artists?"³ In Canada there has until very recently been an assumption that there have been no great non-White "Masters" of Canadian art. Although the exclusion of (White) women in art history is beginning to be investigated by feminist

³ This essay was published in Art and Sexual Politics, Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker editors (London: Collier MacMillan Publishers, 1971). The essay explained the relativism in the assumption that there have been no great women artists, despite the contributions of artists such as Artemesia Gentileschi and Angelica Kauffmann. Nochlin examines several explanations for the lack of female representation among the "Masters". Most relevant in this comparison is that the underrepresented artist, whether a white woman or any non-white artist, is dependent on the construction of the understanding of what art is rather than of what the artist is capable.

art historians, the position of non-White artists and the relevance of non-European cultures co-existing in Canada is seldom addressed.

In The Presumption of Culture⁴ Tom Henighan divides "culture" into two forms after acknowledging four distinct meanings of "culture" at large.⁵ He uses the terms "aesthetic culture" and "entertainment culture" to address the division of what is usually termed "high art" and "low art" which includes "folk art" and popular culture. Henighan explains that the term "aesthetic culture" is useful to describe the works of "Bach, Shakespeare, James Joyce, Balanchine, Margaret Atwood, the Group of Seven...not because their works are not entertaining but because they are relatively complex and part of specific historical or aesthetic traditions."⁶ He notes that these "complex" works require a certain level of "education, experience or development of taste before a good level of communication ensues."⁷ He uses the term "entertainment culture" to describe works assumed to appeal more immediately, his examples being the Beatles, *Star Wars*, and Bryan Adams.⁸ Henighan goes on to explain the importance of government support for Canadian culture to avoid our absorption into the American mass culture hegemony. He also claims that aesthetic culture in particular has the power to speak to everyone. As Henighan continues his argument he notes

⁴ Tom Henighan, The Presumption of Culture (Vancouver: Raincoast Books, 1996).

⁵ Henighan quotes The Task Force on Professional Training for the Cultural sector in Canada as follows: "[F]irst, one's personal knowledge, beliefs, values, et cetera; second, the anthropological sense of a cultural community; third, 'cultivated culture', i.e., what a person knows of his or her cultural tradition; and fourth, culture as art", 2.

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

that some people believe that there is no single, monolithic or "distinct" Canadian culture. He asks "What about *The Jack Pine* or *The Edge of the Maple Wood*; what about Surfacing, and The Diviners; what about, Glen Gould and Leonard Cohen, or Gordon Lightfoot, Peter Gzowski, Farley Mowat, Douglas Cardinal and Robert Lepage"⁹. Indeed, what about them? Henighan creates a single, monolithic Canadian culture by naming only White Anglophone artists. Therefore he is arguing that while White, anglophone-Canadian culture is universal, the cultural production of the "Other" is specific and relevant only to its own culture.

I would not argue that government sponsorship of Canadian Cultural production is unnecessary, nor would I argue against the division of culture into "aesthetic" and "entertainment" for the purpose of this discussion. It is also true that American cultural and economic imperialism is, in many ways, intimidating, if not an outright threat to Canadian cultural autonomy because of our smaller and more vulnerable market. However, I do take issue with Henighan's choice of who and what has cultural value. In his examples of the greatness of "aesthetic culture," both Western and Canadian, all of the subjects were White; and the majority were male and anglophone. In Henighan's mind, (as with many other modernists) cultural production that does not conform to Western traditions is not considered relevant or "high art". Henighan's list of Canadian cultural icons is limited by "race". What about, Buffy Ste. Marie, Céline Dion, Susan Aglukark, Carl Beam, Beth Brant, Thompson Highway, Michel Tremblay, Neil Bissoondath, Shyam Selvaduri, Evelyn Lau, Joy Kogawa...?

The exclusion of non-White people from the Canadian cultural canon is not the work of an individual it is systemic and institutionalized. Henighan's writing merely reflects an attitude that is widespread and is spread to Canadians through

⁹ *ibid*, 3.

the media, and through public, cultural, and educational institutions. As I have shown in the previous chapter, government policy as well as cultural organizations exclude non-White people on a regular basis. This chapter will focus on the concept of a Canadian Canon in the visual arts and how that canon of Whiteness was formed, documented as well as how it is maintained despite current discourse surrounding a paradigm shift.

The Canadian Canon

In an essay discussing the English language literary canon, John Guillory makes several observations that can be applied to "canons" in general and a few that can be interpreted to spur arguments regarding the production of Canadian art historical canons. In examining the creation and preservation of canons Guillory states:

In recent years many literary critics have become convinced that the selection of literary texts for "canonization" (the selection of what are conventionally called the "classics") operates in a way very like the formation of the biblical canon. These critics detect beneath the supposed objectivity of value judgements a political agenda: the exclusion of many groups of people from representation in the literary canon. The controversy erupting over this question has produced a great volume of polemical writing, so much in fact that one must say that the controversy is one of the more important events in the history of twentieth century criticism. It was certainly not the case before the last several decades that the question of canon-formation itself was controversial, even though critics have always argued about the relative merits of individual writers. The critics of canon-formation have based their case upon a disturbing and indisputable fact: If one were to glance at the entire list of "great" Western European authors- the canon-one would find very few women, even fewer writers who are non-White, and very few writers of

lower-class origin. This is simply a fact.¹⁰

Trevor Ross, in a comparable essay, notes that the creation of a canon, which in the general sense refers to group of works that are considered "standard", "authoritative", and "valued" within a culture, is difficult to analyze because canon formation is based on a process of critical consensus, meaning: a canon is formed through the continued acceptance and praise of works by successive generations. Ross points out that:

Above all, this consensus has rarely if ever embraced the values of a broad cultural diversity...canon formation has frequently been under the control of an official culture that valorizes only those works that in some way assert or reveal its dominant ideology.¹¹

Both Guillory and Ross observe two stances in the criticism of the canon. The first is the desire to revise the canon to reflect diversity or to create separate canons to reflect diversity. The second alternative is to reject the canon altogether as it is "inherently exclusive and elitist".¹² Attempts to revise the canon or expand it to be more inclusive are quite controversial in the Canadian art institution as the following section begins to make clear.

In a recent article for The Journal of Canadian Art History¹³ Joyce Zemans, a professor of Visual Arts at York University in Toronto and former head of the Canada Council, reviews the circumstances of the Sampson-Mathews Ltd. silkscreen project which was conceived by A.Y. Jackson and produced with the

¹⁰ John Guillory "Canon" in Critical Terms for Literary Study 2nd ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin eds. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

¹¹ Trevor Ross' "Canon" in Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory, Irena R. Makaryk, (ed.) (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 516.

¹² Ross, "Canon," 516.

¹³ Joyce Zemans, "Establishing the Canon: Nationhood and the National Gallery's first Reproduction Programme of Canadian Art", The Journal of Canadian Art History, Vol. 16, No. 2, 1995, 7-35.

aid of the National Gallery of Canada during and after World War II. As Zemans points out, "the silkscreen project was largely responsible for shaping "our" notion of Canadian painting and establishing the Group of Seven and landscape painting as the *sine qua non* of Canadian art."¹⁴ With the publication of reproductions the presence of the selected Canadian artists was known in virtually every public institution and in the private sector as well. The reproductions were also distributed internationally. Notably many of these reproductions are still hanging in Canadian schools and offices.

Zemans' essay notes that the promotion of Canadian art through the distribution of reproductions began with an earlier project in the 1920's which was intended to create a "nationwide consciousness of Canadian art"¹⁵ and, as Zemans argues was the original project which constructed our notion of Canadian art.¹⁶ The article clearly outlines the aims of the National Gallery to educate and perhaps excite Canadians as well as others with Canadian art. The involvement of artists such as A.Y. Jackson and Arthur Lismer is significant in that the promotion of their own work benefited them immensely, and, they continue to be immediately recognized as a necessary part of the Canadian canon in visual art. The projects were endorsed by the House of Commons (1930) and the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences (1951). Zemans notes that later projects, such as the Portfolio of Canadian Art (1926) published by Rous and Mann, which contained a collection of "prints suitable for framing" and the Christmas Card Project (1931) included Canadian artists who are still celebrated widely as quintessentially Canadian such as Peel, Morrice, and Kane.

¹⁴ *ibid*, 7.

¹⁵ *ibid*, 7.

¹⁶ *ibid*, 8.

The reproduction programmes focused on work by Canadian artists of European descent while non-Whites were represented only as "subjects" in the works of artists like Paul Kane whose work was, at the time, considered of some ethnographic significance.¹⁷

The self-promotion of Canadian artists and the National Gallery shows the early construction of the History of Canadian art. According to Zemans, the National Gallery's 1921-22 Annual Report stated that in regards to civic responsibility the gallery would:

...do everything possible for the art of its own country, by purchasing it, exhibiting it, and bringing its importance as a national asset and an influence for good before the people generally, and by creating and cultivating in them **correct artistic taste**.¹⁸

At the time of the reproduction programmes and up to the 1970's, the arts were considered a tool for promoting Canadian identity and national unity. According to Zemans painting in particular was "believed to have the capacity to mould public taste, to create proper moral values and identify the basic truths required to establish a sense of nationhood."¹⁹ In the promotion of the "legendary Canadian artists" the attachment to the Canadian landscape was emphasised and consideration of the position of non-White peoples was virtually non-existent as the following quote illustrates. Zemans refers to this statement written about Tom Thomson "He knew the works as the red indian knew them before him".²⁰ The work of First Nations artists and the challenge to the stereotyping and romanticization of First Nations peoples was ignored for another fifty or so years. It is

¹⁷ *ibid*, 14.

¹⁸ *ibid*, 11.

¹⁹ *ibid*.

²⁰ *ibid*, 18.

notable that the selection of works for the reproduction programmes were all by artists from Ontario and Quebec. Another major contributor to the creation of the Canadian visual arts canon was the radio programme Young Canada Listens co-produced by the C.B.C. and the National Gallery from 1945-47. These programmes worked in conjunction with the National Gallery's circulating exhibitions to form the concept of a Canadian Canon in visual art which survives to this day.

It must be noted that the notion of exclusion is not new or unique to the 1990's introduction of "politically correct"²¹ inclusion. Zemans points out that the exclusion of women artists was noted early in the programme. Zemans states:

It was only in response to the Young Canada Listens series that questions were raised about the lack of representation of women artists in an aesthetic construct in which ruggedness, vigour and drama (terms regularly employed by Lismer in his description of works included in the National Gallery series) were considered the highest praise.²²

Zemans also notes that:

Establishing the basic truths essential to the ritual of nation building, the Gallery established a Canadian art canon whose iconography would dominate the Canadian psyche

²¹ I am increasingly dismayed by the cynicism and dismissive attitude toward the inclusion of non-white peoples, women, people with disabilities, and other underrepresented people who had begun to achieve some form of recognition and "voice" in contemporary theory. More and more writers including Henighan, Bissoondath, and others quoted in this thesis tend to dismiss the inclusion of the "other" as a passing theoretical "fad" something that will pass as though it were merely based on some superficial pseudo-social justice rhetoric. While every ideology, movement, or theory tends to create a certain amount of rhetoric used in popular media the movement to become more inclusive and aware of the diversity of human experiences should not be reduced to a "fad". Whatever "political correctness" was first intended to achieve it has failed to change the attitudes of die-hard bigots and obtuse traditionalists. To put it plainly, if one's attitude has not changed the term used is almost irrelevant to the user. However, certain terms dictate certain attitudes and for that reason people of different backgrounds are asserting terms that they are more comfortable with or that they have "reclaimed".

²² Zemans, 26-7.

for more that half a century.²³

An example of this are the following two books which are commonly used in art education and are intended to reflect the Canadian art historical canon: Painting in Canada: A History by J. Russell Harper, and Contemporary Canadian Art by David Burnett and Marilyn Schiff. An examination of these two books reveals the history of exclusion or absence of non-White artists from the annals of art history and museums of fine art in Canada.

Harper's Painting in Canada: A History is a canon of sorts in itself. First published in 1967 in both English and French, the book provides an historical survey of painting in Canada from 1665 to 1960. The funding for the book came largely from the Canada Council and the author was responsible to an advisory board arranged by the Canada Council and University of Toronto Press. Notably the book has been reprinted five times, and revised, or as stated in the preface, "amended to incorporate both certain new attitudes in the field."²⁴ What those new attitudes are is unclear although it is apparent that changes in Canadian Cultural diversity and multi-cultural "attitudes" is not one of the concerns of any revision. There is little representation of non-White people in the book, except as subjects in the paintings of artists such as Paul Kane, who predominantly focused on First Nations people as subject matter, and one painting of a black woman by François Malepart de Beaucourt titled Portrait of a Negro Slave, who according to the author was Beaucourt's "coloured servant".²⁵ The author states that his intention was "to reflect the **bicultural** traditions of

²³ *ibid*, p 27.

²⁴ J. Russell Harper, vi. Painting in Canada: a history 2d ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

²⁵ *Ibid*, 59.

our national life in both text and illustration".²⁶ There are few surprises in Harper's book as it focuses on the history of painting in the European tradition. The artists are almost all White, male and of European decent. One exception that warrants comment was Zacharie Vincent whose Self Portrait (undated) was included in the illustrations. While the biographies of other artists included such information as place of birth and death and a few facts about the artist's life and city of work, Vincent's biography reads only:

Vincent, Zacharie (1812-96).b. Lorrette, near Quebec:
said to be the last of Huron Indians of pure blood:
Indian name 'Theolariolin'. Studied under Plamondon.²⁷

The biographies of the other three hundred or so artists, presumably of European descent, did not include such ethnographic commentary. This example illustrates the tradition and insidiousness of the difference in the treatment and perception of non-White artists in Canada.

Burnett and Schiff's Contemporary Canadian Art provides a general overview of a forty year span in mainstream visual art in Canada from the 1940's to 1983 and claims to have been intended to become a "standard reference"²⁸ in the area of contemporary art. The authors state their intent in the introduction as presenting "a guide to art for a broad audience"²⁹ Such an intention and achievement puts into question the relevance of such a survey to an understanding of contemporary Canadian art. The authors assume and accept that the content of their "history"

²⁶ *ibid*, vi.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 429.

²⁸ David Burnett and Marilyn Schiff Contemporary Canadian Art published for the Art Gallery of Ontario (Toronto, Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1983), 175.

²⁹ *ibid*.

is predetermined by Canadian art institutions and their collections. They have created a history without taking into account the how or why of its formation and without examining the impact the social history of the time had on the work collected. There is no questioning of the totalizing context the artwork and artists are placed in. Despite the fact that the book was published in 1983, in an era where the authors could not possibly be oblivious to discourses surrounding the role of art historians, the book lacks a critical analysis of its own production and purpose. The inclusion of a self-conscious, self-critical analysis of the construction of this general history would serve the reader greatly.

Sadly, the book does not approach the "flourishing" qualities of British art history Stephen Bann mentions in his essay "How Revolutionary is the New Art History?" Bann explores the role of a new art history and his anticipation of a "blurring of demarcations"³⁰ seems far removed from Burnett and Schiff's endeavour to create a concise view of contemporary art. In fact, Contemporary Canadian Art as an indication of contemporary art history writing will leave most readers wondering what the role of art history is in Canada except to dryly document mainstream gallery events and to catalogue Canada Council funded artists with brief biographies and standard semi-contextualizing commentaries.

In the chapter titled "A Broadening Scene : Toronto and London," the authors address artists Isowitz and de Niverville as "artists who have made successful careers in Toronto without any sense of belonging to a "mainstream".³¹ The authors then move on to explain that the "list of artists outside any such

³⁰ Stephen Bann, "How Revolutionary is the New Art History?" in A.L. Rees and F Borzello, eds. The New Art History (London: Camden Press, 1988).

³¹ Burnett and Schiff, 101.

'mainstream' is not only long, but deep in range and quality".³²

They also state:

The work of [Eric] Freifeld, a teacher at the Ontario College of Art for over thirty-five years, has never been - could never be - in the "mainstream" of anything. Yet his influence on successive generations of students has directly or implicitly become part of the constitution of art in Toronto.³³

This statement and its following commentary does not enter into what the authors view as a generally accepted criteria for "mainstream art". It leaves the reader aware that there are criteria of some sort and wondering who and how these criteria are determined. Also excluded from the survey are particular art forms such as installation art, performance art and interdisciplinary practices. Along with the choice of artists, this neglect of contemporary practices indicates a reliance on a traditional art history method and an uninspired portrayal of accepted canons of art.

The selection of artists in itself reveals a presupposed homogeneity in Canadian art and is easily divisible into sections from the Automatistes in Quebec through the Regina Five to the early "postmodernist" artists of the 1980's. The authors' commentary contains the assumption of a linear progression in the history of art by presenting a series of "truths" that track the development of late European based or Eurocentric modernism as the only history of art; thus the history of Canadian art is presented as a narrative that began with colonial art of the Europeans and continues along a tradition that excludes other traditions from the history of Canadian Art.

For the most part the authors use quotations from modernist artists and critics such as Clement Greenberg and Rosalind Krauss to place the works in a larger international context and to

³² *ibid.*

³³ *ibid.*

legitimize the constant comparison to European and U.S. art. Although it is important to note the relevance of such critics as Greenberg, who indeed had a tremendous effect on the production of artists like Jack Bush and Kenneth Lochhead, it would have been interesting to explore the international relevance or recognition of the artists who became involved in Greenbergian modernism outside of their Canadian context. It is implicit in the structuring of the book that the aim of the authors is to create a history of Canadian contemporary art that is comparable to, or at least compatible with the European and U.S. models.

The division of the chapters is presented by region and with the separation of painting and sculpture. Thus the ideas can be read to link or form a cohesive legacy of art history in Canada, even though through regional differences and the traditional focus on certain communities over others the "progression" of Canadian art has been fragmented. The omission of art practices such as the art of First Nations peoples and folk art that do not fit into the traditional concept of "high art" is made to appear merely pragmatic. The omission of First Nations peoples' artwork is rationalized by the claim that:

[t]o survey the arts of native peoples without being able to develop their relationship to the cultural roots and traditions of those peoples would be to do so not only superficially, but improperly.³⁴

This claim allows the authors to set the context of their constructed history in a seemingly simple, direct and chronological order, a linear progression, that is modernist and exclusionary under the same principles that condone racism. The claim of not being able to deal with First Nations artists' work without contextualizing them culturally and with ethnographic information is an issue that I will return to in the discussion of museums. For now it is important to note that the history

³⁴ *ibid*, 7.

presented by the book is essentially a modernist construct which assumes autonomy just as the self-referential modernist art object does. It is apparent that the authors have not made any attempt to broaden the scope of their art historical writing beyond the limitations of White, middle class, mostly male, descriptive commentary. The authors have not created a context for their presentation of contemporary art as they would in a critical discussion of the relevance of the works selected. Burnett and Schiff have attempted to give the works selected historical credibility by placing them in the context of late modernism.

This text, which continues to be used as an educational tool in many Canadian institutions, illustrates how canon formation continues in the Canadian visual art context under the traditions of Eurocentric modernist thinking. Another, more recent text, By a Lady by Maria Tippet, which attempts to fill in the spaces where Canadian women artists have been excluded from Canadian art history. However, as Susan Crean remarks in a review of the book

There's scarcely a mention here...of women of colour; only very late in the narrative do we find figures like Kenojuak and Joane Cardinal-Schubert offered token exposure. In this respect, Tippet follows the well-established exclusionary view of art history, rather than seizing the opportunity to chart unexplored terrain.³⁵

Reviewing the Other: Reinforcing the Exclusionary Canon

Culturally specific collections and special exhibitions speak of, and are often read as, authentic representations of a culture as unified, homogeneous, "traditional", or frozen in time. This perception continues to exist despite current theoretical discourses surrounding collection and display practices in museums.

³⁵ Susan Crean, in a review of By A Lady by Maria Tippet Viking/Penguin Books Canada in Canadian Art (Winter 1992), 79.

At the National Gallery in 1992, the exhibition of works by contemporary First Nations artists *Land Spirit Power* raised questions and concerns of the issue of art/artifact as well as content and context.³⁶ The exhibition itself was likely also a response to these same questions, as most gallery goers are aware the presence of works by contemporary First Nations artists was negligible. Discussions regarding the problems and difficulties in categorization which come to the surface with an exhibition like *Land Spirit Power* are relevant for many art critics as well as art historians, theorists and artists, especially in relation to traditional divisions of objects along the line of art/artifact. Cultural theorist James Clifford in "On Collecting and Culture" cites Susan Stewart's explanation of collecting art and artifacts to illustrate how critics and curators continue to perpetuate the elitist and racist tradition of the categorization of objects by racialized identity and Western, Eurocentric historical perspectives.³⁷

[Stewart] shows how collections, most notably museums- create the illusion of adequate representation of a world by first cutting objects out of specific contexts (whether cultural, historical, or intersubjective) and making them "stand for" abstract wholes...Next a scheme of classifications elaborated for storing or displaying the object so that the reality of the collection itself, its coherent order, overrides specific histories of the object's production and appropriation.³⁸

³⁶ An example is in an article by Scott Watson published in Canadian Art (Spring 1993) titled "Whose Nation?" which stated: "Two recent exhibitions at the National Gallery of Canada and the Canadian Museum of Civilization raised disturbing questions about First Nations art in the White mainstream." (34).

³⁷ Clifford refers to Susan Stewart's On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984) in his essay "On Collecting Art and Culture," The Predicament of Culture (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 219-220.

³⁸ James Clifford "On Collecting Art and Culture" The Predicament of Culture (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 220.

The following analysis of Globe and Mail art critic John Bentley Mays' reviews provides insight into the problematic assumptions of White, modernist, male-dominated, Eurocentric art theory and history, as well as its accompanying notion of a "level playing field". The issues raised by this analysis are key to the dominant view of an exclusionary monolithic Canadian cultural canon and provide an example of its inherent resistance to change. Mays reviews raise legitimate questions regarding the timeliness of the exhibit,³⁹ and the inclusion of works by First Nations artists in a gallery where the focus is conventionally a modernist collection based on a European art historical tradition. He also raises concerns regarding the criteria for the selection of artists from marginalized cultural groups. Mays' criticism of the National Gallery's exhibition *Land Spirit Power* as a "White guilt exhibition"⁴⁰ certainly deserves a response. However, his comment that the Canadian Museum of Civilization's *Indigena* was a "celebration" of "anti-White prejudice"⁴¹ is reprehensible. In addition Mays' overt condescension toward artists of non-White, non-European ancestry reveals that he has assumed answers to these questions prior to his inquiry.

What I'm asking for here is that old, elitist fantasy, an art scene that is no respecter of race, religion, gender or colour, and in which only quality of imagination and execution finally counts.⁴²

What Mays is actually asking for is a return to the

³⁹ *Land Spirit Power* did indeed take place at the same time as the 500th anniversary of Columbus' "discovery" of America, as did the exhibit *Indigena* at the Canadian Museum of Civilization in Hull.

⁴⁰ John Bentley Mays, "Breaking Traditions," The Globe and Mail October 10, 1992.

⁴¹ John Bentley Mays "Native artists seize the moment to display anger against history" The Globe and Mail May 16, 1992.

⁴² Ibid

assumption that mainstream art and art institutions are, like mainstream life, a level playing field, where art can be judged solely on its merit or "quality" through some sort of universal and objective criteria, created, mediated and moderated by the dominantly White European descended patriarchally based culture. It seems Mays would like the reader to believe that ideas of "conventional artistic quality" are not heavily laden with subjective biases. Such an assertion is grounded in the arrogant late modernist notion that works of art created with what critics like Clement Greenberg would have called a universal subject matter, i.e. paint on a flat canvas, *must* by its very nature transcend cultural differences and speak universally to all viewers.⁴³ This arrogance is obvious in Mays' introduction of the artists as "Canadians and Americans from Aboriginal backgrounds" in spite of the artists self-identification by nation and the fact that many First Nations peoples do not recognize Canadian/U.S. borders as legitimate.

Mays speaks from a point of privilege that is pervasive in most mainstream art criticism. His perspective is an example of the Eurocentric White-middle-class-male traditional perspective which plays on a fear of difference rather than engaging in a more challenging discourse on plurality, homogeneity and hegemony in art, ethnography, and anthropology. Mays' perspective subscribes to the traditional practice of the development and cultivation of a singular North American art identity through the assimilation and appropriation of artistic forms from non-White "primitive" artistic forms. Mays sees the absorption of artists into the mainstream as "liberating" them from their "pot-bound cultural roots" which "has always been modernity's great gift to

⁴³ Clement Greenberg, "Abstract, Representational and so forth" in Art and Culture (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961).

us all".⁴⁴

Mays only ascribes value to artwork in the exhibition which reflects (or can be read to reflect) a modernist influence of art as an autonomous self-referential object, as in the work of James Lavadour, Kay Walkingstick, or Truman Lowe. This lack of autonomy makes the work "unauthentic" "Native art", within the paradigm of classification to which Mays subscribes. This is the reason why Mays holds the view that a show of contemporary First Nations artists is inappropriate and merely a reflection of "White guilt." Mays grants value to artwork which, in his eyes, transcend their specific (i.e. "primitive") cultural roots, and join the mainstream in an art historical linear progression of modernism-postmodernism. Mays adheres to the modernist criteria for "good" art and praises the works of Carl Beam for its self-conscious materiality (reminiscent of Rauchenberg, an American modernist) rather than its political content. What is disturbing is Mays' recognition and dismissal of Beam's work in relation to its context. Mays disparagingly refers to the "aboriginal parade" and "parochial 'First Nations' circuit",⁴⁵ terms which reflect an extremely condescending attitude toward First Nations artists. If a First Nations circuit were to exist it would not be the creation of First Nations artists but that of the dominant White majority. The criticisms made by Mays reinforce the concept of a "vertical mosaic" where the relation of work to its creator's cultural background must diminish as the artist moves up the ladder of mainstream acceptance. This attitude supports the traditional hierarchical progression of work from low art (Nature) to high art (Culture). In Mays' eyes, for Beam's work to be associated with a show that links artists work through cultural similarities is to bring the work "down" to the level of

⁴⁴ Mays, "Breaking Traditions".

⁴⁵ *ibid.*

small "c" culture and artifact.

Mays' rejection of the art which he claims "rant"⁴⁶ such as in the work of Joane Cardinal-Schubert in the exhibit *Indigena* at the Museum of Civilization in 1992, is an attempt to negate the social relevance of the work which has strong political content and to invalidate and relegate it to the realm of "bad" art (a reinforcement of the Greenbergian modernist judgement of taste) or worse, (in the modernist paradigm) non-art. Mays' comments reveal the nature of his prejudices by projecting the canons of modernist-based sensibilities. He assumes that the inclusion of such work necessitates an adherence on the part of the artist or viewer to the values set by the traditional institutional collection practices and thus cannot allow a critique of that tradition. Mays reads an artwork's relationship to the questionable tenets of art and modernism or even postmodernism⁴⁷ as anti-White. In such a context the work could be read more realistically as anti-White supremacist or anti-colonialist. Mays' hesitates to reveal his bias that reinforces modernist work as "good" art, though not good "Native" art because of their readability in a Western-European tradition. Mays attributes the inclusion of diversity and plurality of artwork to the museum "giving in" to "ethnic" and "marginalized" peoples' demand for the occasional inclusion of "low art" in the publicly funded

⁴⁶ John Bentley Mays "Native artists".

⁴⁷ One of the most interesting issues raised by a feature article discovered in the periodical survey was the perception of postmodernism. In "Whose Nation" *Canadian Art* (Spring 1993) Scott Watson notes the different perspectives toward postmodernism by *Land Spirit Power* co-curators Diana Nemiroff, Charlott Townsend-Gault, and Robert Houle. Of Townsend-Gault he states, "[S]he proposes that the artists share a sense of investigation and exploration which positions them 'within the discourse of postmodern art.'" (36) Watson states that Nemiroff "credits 'the crisis of representation associated with postmodernism' for opening the institutional space to these works and these artists." (36) (my italics). Conversely, Watson reports that Robert Houle, a First Nations artist, "[S]ees postmodernism as a smokescreen - a way of talking about social change in a society where power relations are actually rigidifying, not breaking down." (38)

gallery. In his statement:

...whatever the museum has or has not intended here, the best work on display is a reminder, if one were needed, of the great powers of visual expression Europeans brought to these shores - a scepticism and irony foreign to the decorative traditions (if not narrative ones) possessed by Native Americans in the 15th century, a capricious memory and distrust of received ideas, and an openness to cultural contradiction.⁴⁸

Mays attributes "authentic" First Nations art to decorativeness and narrativity, and the realm of artifact. He places First Nations artwork which incorporates Western, European, or modernist approaches as unauthentic Native art, but "good" Art. As a result Mays himself is trapped in the now rejected tradition of viewing First Nations cultures as "frozen" in the traditions of a distant past and unable to transcend their own White mediated histories.

Mays' comments regarding the ironic juxtaposition of Western art history and Western perceived traditional First Nations imagery in his descriptions of the work of Alex Janvier which Mays calls "embarrassingly large instances of airport gift-shop 'Indian Art' (or tourist art),"⁴⁹ and Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun as "garish Surrealist salads of 'Indian' imagery...[which] manages, remarkably, to demean both Surrealism and aboriginal artisanship".⁵⁰ These works contain elements of irony which are comparable to postmodern works. They also bring forth a political consciousness of racist images of First Nations people and First Nations art. However, they are relegated to the realm of "bad" art by Mays' adherence to "conventional artistic quality".

⁴⁸ John Bentley Mays, "Breaking Traditions".

⁴⁹ James Clifford, "On Collecting Art and Culture".

⁵⁰ John Bentley Mays, "Breaking Traditions".

This so-called "bad" art is rejected for two reasons: its post-colonial consciousness, and its *function* in commenting on White-Native history and oppression (which is a collective as well as an individual experience) which cannot exist in Mays' delusion of a gender, race and colour blind *high art* context. It is again because of Mays' traditional, Western, linear and limited criteria for high art that the work is disparaged. The criteria relegated this type of art (art that has a social or overtly political content) to a culturally specific temporality associated with artifact and therefore the work is small "c" art, art as a document equalling artifact. It could be assumed that Mays does not mention the works of Dempsey Bob, Robert Davidson & Dorothy Grant, and Domingo Cisneros because of their "problematic" use of, and association with, the traditional artifact. It is also likely that Mays was bewildered by the inclusion of masks which are usually attributed to natural history exhibitions. But their inclusion in the exhibit *Land Spirit Power* is poignant yet ignored by Mays whose inability to address the issues raised is overridden by his attempt to maintain an elitist position of cultural superiority. Neither does Mays comment on the relevance of Domingo Cisneros' work which raised questions regarding artifacts, their history and cultural context. Mays' paternalistic and "noble" fear for the future well-being of the contemporary First Nations artists is hardly sincere. It is reminiscent of the racist notion of the "disappearing Indian"⁵¹ which laments the demise of *traditional*, "frozen in time," *primitive* First Nations cultures which pre-existed the influence of White, European culture.

⁵¹ "The disappearing Indian" was a shared concept many ethnographers and anthropologists in the Americas, including anthropologist Franz Boaz and his colleagues. They feared that "authentic" Native cultures would disintegrate after contact with the White man, assimilation of Natives to White culture and the dying off of Native peoples due to illnesses brought by Europeans as well as genocide by the conquering colonialists.

Mays' disdain for *Land Spirit Power* and *Indigena*, in spite of his appreciation for some of the works, is indicative of the Western-created and self-supporting dichotomy of Art versus Artifact. As long as the question as to where the line should be drawn between art and artifact is asked there is the assumption that there is an objective answer to be given. The fear, it would seem, is that First Nations art, along with other "primitive" or "ethnic" art will no longer fit in its "place." And that place is subordination.

In a pluralistic, multicultural society it would seem that the division of art and artifact in mainstream museums is in fact an ethical rather than solely theoretical conundrum. Mays speaks from a point of privilege that is apparent in most mainstream art criticism. His confidence in his historically derived position allows him to perpetuate the self-supporting tenets of modernist thinking.

On the European Aesthetic Canon

Tom Henighan states:

[G]reat art speaks to the heart of the human condition, and though it can be understood as part of history and as the expression of a certain individual in a certain place, it transcends its origins and touches the universal--otherwise it remains a mere document, a historical artifact of limited usefulness and interest. There is a canon of great artwork that rises above the interests of any class or groups, and if we fail to sustain contact with that canon, we destroy our culture.⁵²

Henighan promotes a sort of censorship by stating that artists, writers, and academics who:

[e]spouse ideological positions, have made us suspicious of the old notions of greatness in art; they have attacked the Western tradition of excellence, and cast doubt even on the language with which we have sought to express the powerful and cleansing idealism implicit in the artistic experience

⁵² Henighan, 3.

at its finest and purest.⁵³

Henighan's response to the demand for canon revision is extreme to the point of paranoia. His view is that change will compromise "quality" and that anyone who challenges the exclusivity of the Western cultural canon is a vulgar Marxist Hellbent on the destruction of "Art". Henighan necessitates the "overthrow [of] quality in the name of equality" and states that the aim of creating a more inclusive canon is based on a desire to

undermin[e] our distinctive national culture in favour of a factional culture based on interest groups and ideological positions rather than acknowledge those historical continuities that (despite the "sins" of history) hold us together.⁵⁴

In these three quotes Henighan has articulated a fear that appears to be common, the fear that self-examination will destroy the coherence and cohesion of Canadian, if not modern Western culture. The promotion of the idea that art or culture can exist outside of political experience is either incredibly naive or purposefully obtuse. As I will show in the next chapter, all art is selected under certain aesthetic biases and all art has some subjective content, otherwise it is mere decoration.

Conclusion(s)

It is apparent that the current interpretations of multiculturalism and the implementation of programs under the heading of multiculturalism are problematic, particularly when, as illustrated in the previous sections, critics and writers who are among the most widely read in Canada are resistant to altering the canon. Resistance to an honest examination of the systemic exclusion of non-White/non-European descended cultures

⁵³ *ibid*, 4.

⁵⁴ *ibid*, 4.

and the claim that allowing the inclusion of the "Other" will compromise quality is both arrogant and paranoid. The dominant group clearly fears their position is destined to change. In an area of study as subjective as the visual arts one cannot avoid talking in generalizations or perhaps referring to a notion of "universal" aesthetic taste, when making an aesthetic judgement. However, there must be a commitment to move out of the biases of European colonial thought and to re-examine the notion of aesthetic taste in a contemporary global community.

In the field of art criticism in Canada it would seem that the failure to modify canon formation is regressive. It represents a failure to acknowledge the reality of a diverse audience, both nationally and internationally, and the specific goals of a multicultural nation. Yet canon formation is in itself a dynamic subjective process, which, despite the resistance of some academics and critics, is in a state of constant flux. The institutions of art and cultural criticism must begin to acknowledge that White, Western European and European descended cultures cannot remain the sole purveyors of "taste".

Charles Taylor, when commenting on changing the Western canon, explains that the need to alter the canon is based in the need for cultural recognition and the idea of self-definition. He refers to the writings of Franz Fanon and states that "[D]ominant groups tend to entrench their hegemony by inculcating an image of inferiority in the subjugated". Self examination should lead art historians to an attempt to alter the function of art history from that of a static documentary tool to a dynamic one which interacts with art production. Art history at present is based upon the traditions of European art and aesthetic theory which alienates, invalidates and excludes the work of non-White artists and artists of non-European cultures who fail to, or refuse to work within the confines of the modernist tradition.

The question remains as to whether the Canadian canon of art can be revised by incorporating the current discourses surrounding the notion of the "Other" or whether it must be rejected altogether. Trevor Ross warns against the outright rejection of the canon stating:

The danger in [the]...wholesale rejection of the canon is that it assumes that criticism can do without evaluation, when in fact evaluation is implicit in all forms of interpretation. There is a danger as well in such relativistic arguments of underestimating the complexity of canon-formation; critics who reject the canon as elitist often muddle the question of value by confusing the quality or merit of a work, the attitudes it may express, the ideological functions it may have served in the past, and its relevance to our immediate concerns.⁵⁵

It is necessary to challenge the ethnocentric assumption that the "Other" must be mediated, categorized and finally accepted or rejected on a criteria that is specific to European cultural history. Changing the discipline of art history, allowing it to become more inclusive, would increase the possibility of a Canadian art history that is relevant to past and current art production.

⁵⁵ ROSS, 516.

Chapter Three: The Role of the Museum

Introduction

It is necessary to examine the construct of Western history as presented by canonized philosophers and historians and it is equally necessary to challenge the categorizations used by the authors of history and philosophy to exclude the "Other." In addition, an examination of the exhibitions *Into the Heart of Africa* and *Africville* will identify categorizations and perceptions of history which have existed unchallenged for so long, they may appear to be entirely logical and necessary, perhaps even "natural."¹

As argued in Chapter Two, the European aesthetic canon is biased against artwork that does not fit easily into the structures and notions of aesthetic "progress" inherent in modernist thinking. A brief examination of traditional Western categorizations which support the assumption that the Western perception of history is the only objective and universal recording of history must be presented in order to determine why the "Other" has been designated a separate and inferior status in the art institution. Western comments such as "When the Zulus produce a Tolstoy we will read him"² indicate the kind of bias and Eurocentric thinking that perpetuates the exclusion of the non-White, non-European "Other." Charles Taylor noted not only is there an *undervaluing* of the culture of an "Other" in this quotation but that there is a complete denial of the Zulus (and by implication Africans in general) as a recognizable culture at

¹ "The ways that museums sort objects along ethnic lines have become so naturalised -perhaps because of their very obtrusiveness- that they have been only partially interrogated, even in the current climate of reflexive analysis." Ruth Philips in "How Museums Marginalise: Naming Domains of Inclusion and Exclusion" The Cambridge Review February 1993, 7.

² This statement, which is both sexist and racist, was attributed to Saul Bellow and cited in Charles Taylor's Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition" (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 42.

all. Similarly, Hegel stated in the introduction to the Philosophy of History that "Africa... is not an historical part of the World; it has no movement or development to exhibit"³. Hegel made this statement in the pages following a section where he makes totalizing, generalizing and primitivist comments about Africans claiming that "Negroes" as a race are an entirely "sensual" people (rather than rational). Although Hegel wrote these "observations" in the late 19th century this attitude has prevailed up to the late 20th century and only recently has there been a change in the perception of non-White cultures in relation to White Western culture.

These attitudes towards non-Western cultures perceived as primitive, although challenged openly and criticized publicly, are however, still imbedded in museum practice and public perception. There is need for revision of this residual primitivism, which manifests itself as structural racism, and which exists even in museums that hold special exhibitions which showcase the "Other."

The Role of the Museum

Rather than making an effort to actively collect contemporary art of non-White artists for permanent collections and to exhibit that art in a non-primitivist, non-ethnographic context most museums and galleries engage in the practice of holding special exhibitions to feature the non-White "Other."

In Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge Eilean Hooper-Greenhill analyses and provides an analytical history of the development of the concept of the museum in its European context. The changes in notions of collecting and patronage over time have factored into the questioning of what "knowledge" is, as Western cultures tend to understand it, relate to how it is structured,

³ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Philosophy of History (New York: The Colonial Press, 1899), 99.

and how it has been developed through the organization and classification of objects.

The lack of examination and interrogation of the professional, cultural, and ideological practices of museums has meant both a failure to examine the basic underlying principles on which current museums and gallery practices rest, and a failure to construct a critical history of the museum field. The structure of rationality that informs the way in which museums come into being and are maintained, at present and in the past, has been taken as unproblematic and therefore very little has changed in the museum's structure and underlying Eurocentric bias.⁴

Hooper-Greenhill claims that there is currently a shift in the paradigm(s) of museums as (concrete?) evidence of "rational" knowledge. She reviews that history with the intention of problematizing the divisions and classifications of objects, noting that the "locations" of those objects should be viewed in the context of what they "enable and conceal."⁵ She also notes:

The endless debates over 'twentieth century collecting' or 'contemporary collecting'...show the difficulty that some museums have in conceptualising their 'functions' as other than in relation to the past.⁶

Hooper-Greenhill notes the beginning, nature and function of the "curio-cabinet" in the 16th century as more than merely representing a disordered curiosity but as an "ancestor of the contemporary museum."⁷ Hooper-Greenhill examines the various meanings of the cabinet outside of the "traditional histories,"

⁴ Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge (New York: Routledge, 1992), 4.

⁵ *ibid*, 7.

⁶ *ibid*, 22.

⁷ *ibid*, 85.

explaining its functions in relating theories of knowledge and as a "macrocosm becoming microcosm," specifically looking at the change in the Renaissance (similitude) to the Classical "gaze" and thus the modification of the attributed value, meaning, and locating of objects. Hooper-Greenhill also examines the "memory theatre" and ancient imprinting of memory as an articulatory practice "art of memory". She notes that the use of knowledge was transformed from the 16th to 17th century by a shift from merely memorizing existing knowledge to represent the world to knowledge becoming a tool for discovery of more knowledge. This points to the collection of objects for the purpose of scholarship as in the case of the "Repository of the Royal Society". Hooper-Greenhill points to Foucault's observation that:

the form and structure of language...[in its totality] ...was seen to be analogous to the form and structure of the world it represented...[t]hus all the languages of the world...made up the truth of the world by analogy.⁸

This structure then, Hooper-Greenhill observes, "became the organizing principle of the "encyclopedic project." She also notes the shift in the practices of collecting from the private to public. Since she has drawn heavily on Foucault's analysis of classification in The Order of Things Hooper-Greenhill's research provides an adequate field in which to examine the relevance of Foucault's analysis of the structures of knowledge, and places it in the light of actual practice(s) and historic developments and processes (and notions of collecting/connoisseurship/value) which can be assessed only in the context of fragments of historic writing. Hooper-Greenhill's examination does not solve the complexities of museum practices in the present as it is not a

⁸ Michel Foucault, The Order of Things (London: Tavistock Publications:1970), 25, quoted in Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge (New York: Routledge, 1992), 102.

claim to a direct cause-effect linear progression of the development of museum(s), but it indicates the interaction of relevant historical processes and their links to the present.

It is clear from Hooper-Greenhill's analysis that the development of the museum as we have come to know it is based on a colonialist/imperialist consciousness which biases the epistemologies that govern its development. However the material culture of non-White were read to inform or develop knowledge they were considered objects to be interpreted or mediated by the European scientist and/or curator. The idea that the "Other" must be studied and interpreted until their material culture "fits" into the White western concept of history is not unique to the natural history museum. The same colonial consciousness is present in the history of the visual arts museum and that consciousness must be examined and challenged.

The criticisms and objections to the colonial consciousness that has been present in the exhibition of non-White cultures spawned by exhibitions such as *The Spirit Sings* (1988) and *Into the Heart of Africa* (1989) are relevant to the investigation of the status of non-White artists in Canada because those exhibitions and the controversies reported and sensationalized by the media were the impetus for questioning the validity of Eurocentric thinking and curatorial practice in specifically Canadian exhibitions. The examination of the problems associated with curatorial practice in Natural History Museums as they relate to divisions by race and ethnicity should be, at least in part, comparable to those faced by art museums such as the National Gallery when exhibiting the contemporary artwork of non-White artists.

For example, James Clifford has made a strong analysis of the position created and maintained for non-White artists in his criticism of the Museum of Modern Art's (MOMA) 1984 exhibition "'Primitivism' in 20th-Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and

the Modern."⁹ Clifford asserts that MOMA's claim of an affinity is a construction based in the Modernist tendency to construct universally applicable aesthetic truths. Clifford claims that artwork from either the Tribal or the Modern are different on the grounds of intent and meaning so that the MOMA's attempt at developing coherence between the Tribal and the Modern is contrived solely on the similarity of forms within the works. Therefore the intent of the curator is in competition with the intent of the artist. This may not be unusual in curatorial practice, however, the context is different because of the cultural context of the environment of the object's creation and the White-dominated environment in which it is displayed. The superficial comparison based on form and the presentation of objects beside modernist objects in a museum devoted to the collection of White modernist art maintains the incorrect notion that the Tribal artist copies or makes "primitive" attempts to mimic the "Master" rather than putting forth the reality that Tribal aesthetics were appropriated by modernists in an attempt to capture simple "primitive" and "pure" form. The tribal object, when taken out of its own cultural context, is stripped of its own relevance and becomes relevant only as a support for the greatness of the White "Master". Despite the fact that either interpretation supports the notion of White European supremacy the analysis must be made at first on these terms as that is how they are laid out by the institution based on and supported by the White dominant culture.

Into the Heart of Africa and Africville: maintaining primitivist notions in contemporary exhibitions

Into the Heart of Africa opened at the Royal Ontario Museum

⁹ James Clifford, "Histories of the Tribal and the Modern" The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988).

in 1989. The exhibition contained artifacts taken from Africa by soldiers, missionaries and other colonialists during the 1900's. *Into the Heart of Africa* has been one of the most widely written about and referred to of all the major exhibitions along with the very controversial shows *Land Spirit Power* and *Indigena*.

The controversy of *Into the Heart of Africa* was based on the way that the history of the brutal colonization of Africa by Imperialist Britain (with the help of Canadians) was presented by the curator. Curators are often surprised after trying to accommodate the difference of the "Other" that their work has been rejected as racist. The exhibition failed to address adequately and meaningfully the role of Canadians in the brutal colonization of Africa by the British. The presentation of the artifacts was considered to be disturbingly uncritical of the history of oppression of which they have become symbols. Susan Crean reported that The Coalition for the Truth about Africa, an umbrella group made up of 30 community groups, charged that the exhibition was "conceptually and structurally racist."¹⁰ The exhibition has been reviewed as having too little explanation and critical examination of the role of missionaries, soldiers, and others who brought the artifacts back as trophies of their physical and spiritual conquests. The role of the museum is characterized interestingly by an understatement made by the curator: [For Africans] "the colonial experience was a totally negative one."¹¹ In a commentary on the controversy that arose during the exhibition one writer stated that the only problem with the show was

[it was] not successful in convincing that this sophis-

¹⁰ Susan Crean, "Taking the Missionary Position: Why *did* the Royal Ontario Museum impose a white perspective on an exhibition about Africa?" This Magazine Vol.24 No.6 (February 1991), 26.

¹¹ Jeanne Cannizzo quoted in an essay by Laurence Grant "Into the Heart of Africa" Muse Vol. 8, No. 2 (Summer 1990), 78.

ticated treatment of the colonial period of African history is an exploration of the ROM's past and its collections, rather than a "celebration of a hated past..." and that..."this is the only major criticism which can be levelled about this exhibit."¹²

The writer continues to perpetuate her primitivist commentary by stating:

The final irony in the exhibit concerns the meaning of collections in the establishment of museums during the late nineteenth century. The creeping pervasiveness of European imperialism had a profound impact upon both aboriginal cultures and the growth of large multidisciplinary museums like the ROM. While contributing to the disappearance of the former, it actually encouraged the growth of the latter through the acquisition of large collections. Ironically, it was through these collections that anthropologists in museums began to systematically document these societies as they would never be again.¹³

The justification by this writer of cultural relativist transgressions of this sort is in itself a regression to the myths of 19th-century and early 20th-century ethnographic thought which presented non-White cultures oppressed and regulated by White colonizers as disappearing and in danger of losing their authenticity. There is a certain arrogance in the above quotation as the subjugation of non-White peoples is almost rationalized by the consolation that cultures eradicated by colonialism were also documented thoroughly. There is more than irony here. The subtext of such comments is perpetuated in more than just the exhibition of 19th-century African artifacts. The subtext is that the "Other" is irrelevant until made relevant to the European. The "Other" must be made to "fit" into the European consciousness in a way that is non threatening so that

¹² Sandra Lucs, "Another look at...Into the Heart of Africa" Museum Quarterly Vol.18, No.3 (August 1990), 39.

¹³ *ibid.*

the superiority of the White Anglo-European is maintained. Whether one would consider such a subtext insidious or blatant, the result is that again a justification has been sought to allow the museum to continue to function as a White dominated mediator of non-White culture and cultural objects and again the museum's role and its basic systemically racist structure fails to be problematized.

The severity of the impact of *Into the Heart of Africa* has not been adequately documented by the arts or general media. Unknown to many, perhaps because of the essentially racist stereotyping and fear of the museum institution, the show *Africville*, which was put together under radically different circumstances than *Into the Heart of Africa*, had its travel schedule cut because of the controversy created by *Into the Heart of Africa*.¹⁴ The show *Africville* was put together with full consultation and involvement with the community it represented. While there was some consultation with the African-Canadian community in Toronto regarding *Into the Heart of Africa* that consultation did not constitute community involvement and the results are very apparent.

Africville was considered a successful representation of a history of an African Canadian community which was *physically* relocated and almost erased from Canadian history by White domination. The similarities of content are important as both shows were to represent a history which most White people would

¹⁴ Mary Sparling, Mount Saint Vincent University Art Gallery in Halifax, quoted in "Curators on Changing Roles and Social Responsibility" in *Muse* Vol. 9, No.2, Summer/Fall, October 1991, 22. which was a documentation of a round table discussion which included seven curators of Canadian Museums; Diana Nemiroff, National Gallery of Canada; Vicky Dickenson, National Museum of Science and Technology; Carol Mayer, University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology, Richard Dubé, Musée de la civilisation in Québec City; Lee-Ann Marin, freelance curator, and Laurence Grant, Hiram Walker Historical Museum in Windsor, Ontario. His full comment was "Initially, the Vancouver Museum was very keen on getting the *Africville* exhibit. Then when all the trouble came with *Into the Heart of Africa* and the museum cancelled it, attitudes at the Vancouver Museum towards the *Africville* exhibit also changed."

look back on with some sense of shame.

The question that must be posed then is whether the museum which is a White Anglo Saxon, European based institution which systemically represents the interests of the White Anglo Saxon dominant culture can represent non-White cultures adequately. Certainly an institution that excludes, ignores or is oblivious to the ideas, needs, and self-identity of a community or culture can no longer assume it can represent that culture or community. If the institution tries to do so it must openly acknowledge that its aim is to mediate the information and artifacts of another culture for the consumption of a White audience.

Collecting and Neglecting: Special Exhibitions versus Permanent Collections

The controversies that have arisen from special exhibitions focusing on non-White cultures in Canadian Museums have drawn attention to the problems of representation and the inability of the predominantly White Canadian cultural institution to adequately engage in and represent the complexity of issues that are inherent in the work of exhibiting non-White cultures.¹⁵ There is, to date, an inadequate representation of Canada's "racial" and ethnic diversity in Canadian Museums. In recent years the response to allegations of inadequate representation of non-White artists' work has been a series of "Special [read temporary]

¹⁵ An example of the protests surrounding a lack of representation discovered in the periodical survey is the 1991 formation of the Artists' Coalition for Local Colour, a group of "primarily South Asian artists and cultural workers" in Vancouver. An article in *Fuse* Vol. 15, No. 6, 1992, titled "Local Colour Protests" by Yasmin Jiwani states: "The coalition was incensed by the VAG's recent activities, most particularly the importation of a South Asian art exhibition from England, entitled *Fabled Territories*. Despite the fact that there are many South Asian artists in Vancouver, and that numerous works are being produced within the local artists of colour community [sic] that address issues of race, cultural identity and marginalization, the VAG made this decision to import a show that dealt with these very issues, from a British perspective." (13) The issue of importing artists is also relevant in the examination of feature articles in Chapter Four.

exhibitions" focusing on aboriginal artists and other select cultural "groups" within Canadian culture at large.

The result of these exhibitions has been an increased awareness for many people in the cultural sector and the general public that there are deep-rooted problems in the institution. For some the institutional and systemic racism and erasure of non-White peoples and their cultures has become an issue that can no longer be ignored. For others the structure of the museum is threatened and therefore its very survival is at risk. There are many subjective arguments surrounding "tradition", "quality", "aesthetic taste" and "culture." Despite the subjectivity of these terms, there are issues surrounding the controversies raised by special exhibitions and the aims of such projects from the point of view of the curators, the artists [where applicable], critics and the public that must be addressed.

An example of the relationship between the institution and political/cultural theory and "grassroots" organizations is the activism of the Lubicon Lake Cree and their call for a boycott of the exhibition The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples at the Glenbow Museum in Calgary, Alberta in 1988 because of a sponsorship for the exhibition by Shell, a company which was drilling for oil on land claimed by the Lubicon.¹⁶

Although there had been consultation with the various First Nations communities in the preparation of the exhibition the boycott created so much controversy that, according to Harrison, much confusion arose as to what the real issues were. As a result there was an interrogation into the practice of exhibiting First Nations artifacts that seems to have sent the Canadian

¹⁶ Julia D. Harrison the curator of the Ethnology Department at the Glenbow Museum who explained her perception of the events of the controversy in an article titled "Completing a Circle: *The Spirit Sings*," in Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada, Noel Dyck and James B. Waldram. eds. (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1993), 334-357.

Museum community reeling. The controversy surrounding the "Special Exhibition," Land Spirit Power, at the National Gallery of Canada which was held at the same time as Indigena at the Museum of Civilization in 1992 have been outlined in Chapter Two. Yet the timeliness of those exhibitions which was concurrent with the "celebration" of Columbus' "discovery" of the Americas is equally as compelling a set of political circumstances.

Julia Harrison's reference to Shelby Steele, an English professor at San José State University in California, makes an important statement about the circumstances of these controversial exhibitions. Steele states:

The human animal almost never pursues power without first convincing himself that he is 'entitled' to it, And this feeling of entitlement has its own precondition; to be entitled one must first believe in one's own innocence...By innocence I mean a feeling of essential goodness in relation to others and, therefore superiority to others...In this sense, *innocence is power*'¹⁷

Harrison adds that "seeing for innocence" can,

nurtur[e] misunderstanding and perpetuat[e] falsehoods among groups which are not necessarily even separated by skin colour or physical type. In all cases - save the temporary position of aboriginal peoples worldwide, who are in the throes of cultural and political resurgence and need to rally their people to believe in themselves and their cultures again - it is destructive.¹⁸

She later states

¹⁷ Shelby Steele, "I'm black, You're White, Who's Innocent?", Harper's 276(1657), 1988:45-53, quoted in Julia D. Harrison, "Completing a Circle: *The Spirit Sings*" in Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada Noel Dyck and James B. Waldrum eds. (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1993) 334.

¹⁸ Julia D. Harrison the curator of the Ethnology Department at the Glenbow Museum who explained her perception of the events of the controversy in an article titled "Completing a Circle: *The Spirit Sings*" in Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada Noel Dyck and James B. Waldrum eds. (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1993), 335.

While both sides viewed their actions as representing the principles of justice, equality, and fairness, it could be suggested that the Native community, the museum profession, and academic anthropologists were in fact "seeing for innocence," and in that process using others "as a means (to) their own goodness and superiority"¹⁹

Regardless of such speculations the impact of the controversies and the "sudden" interest in First Nations art in the Museum mainstream is apparent. Whether these exhibitions eventually led to the acceptance or re-placement of art by First Nations artists into the realm of mainstream "Art" is difficult to say. The qualifying of artwork, which was raised earlier by John Bentley Mays in his modernist critique, is confirmed when one looks at the work that has been collected at the National Gallery. The artwork on display by artists Carl Beam, Robert Houle, and Joane Cardinal-Schubert contain an aesthetic that can easily and superficially be assimilated into what could be considered a "postmodern" aesthetic.²⁰

The difficulty in moving the art of the "Other" from the natural history museum to the art gallery is that the practices of ethnographic exhibitions become more overtly political in the fine art museum. It is not unusual for gallery exhibitions to have some support literature available as well as some explanatory text included in the actual exhibit to contextualize the work and to claim or prove its relevance in art history.

¹⁹ Julia D. Harrison the curator of the Ethnology Department at the Glenbow Museum who explained her perception of the events of the controversy in an article titled "Completing a Circle: *The Spirit Sings*" in Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada Noel Dyck and James B. Waldram eds. (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1993), 335.

²⁰ Although there may not be a singular post modern aesthetic the above mentioned artists' works have a similar aesthetic "form" to the works of artists such as David Salle, and other "postmodern" artists. There could also be a link of form to modernists such as Rauchenberg. It is interesting that the superficial criteria for the integration of these works into the National Gallery's contemporary collection is similar to the criteria that brought "Tribal" art to be exhibited with the "Modern" at MOMA.

However, special exhibitions and the accompanying explanations of artists' cultural "difference" with ethnographic information alludes to the reality that non-White artists have not received the attention that White, European-Canadian artists receive on a regular basis. It is imperative to consider what artists' works are grouped for special exhibitions and which artists are given individual exhibitions.

The notion of representing diversity has been averted if not completely undermined by the focus on, and exoticization of, "Otherness" in special exhibitions in both national and provincial art galleries. Professionals in the area of museum and gallery practice appear to focus on the concerns of representing art and cultural objects from one culturally similar "group" at a time, thus creating a false sense of trends implying that art from a certain culture will necessarily have a similar aesthetic or style and a homogenous consciousness amongst all the artists of that culture. The show *Land Spirit Power* conveyed a consciousness amongst the artists which could be interpreted as the artists defining themselves in opposition to Whiteness. Essentially First Nations artists are validated only when recognized by White culture or when their art is influenced by European traditions.

Contemporary theory informs museum practice rather directly since the controversies surrounding exhibitions have made an impact to some degree in the public consciousness. Arjun Appadurai, in an examination of Western theory, notes three trajectories in Western thought in relation to the "Other" which are: essentializing, exoticizing and totalizing. All are criteria for removing or relegating the "Other" to the extreme where s/he becomes manageable and inferior in relation to the "superior" self(selves) of the Western theorist.

Appadurai proposes that while any essentializing, exoticizing or totalizing construct or concept may help in the

ordering and subsequent investigation of "Others" it must remain consciously evident that images of the "Other" are contrived for the purposes of Western theory alone and do not reflect a complete social reality to the "Other", i.e. they are stereotypes which have a racist or racializing purpose of which we are painfully aware. Although there may be an increased presence of works by First Nations artists within the Institution of art, the mediation of works through Whiteness or White European interpretations of value remain. As awareness of the traditionally racist categorization of works by non-White artists in the Western museum grows certain paradoxes are created by the sudden inclusion of non-White artists work which refers in content to its creator's ethnicity and place in society in an institution that never addresses difference.

Any attempt to rectify this difficulty creates the need to acknowledge content as a significant factor in the selection and presentation of art which brings up other political implications to be considered. For instance, are the works included because they are works which "fit" into the progression of art as outlined by Western art history, or are they included in the collection because they represent the "best" of contemporary "First Nations" art? Who decides whether the work is the best of First Nations art? The work is obviously mediated by the curator, but what of the cultural difference of the artist and the curator? Does the work inherently contain that culture or because of its "apparent" Western influence does it then become part of White, Western art history or is "postmodernism" the point at which White history and non-White histories can begin to merge? The suspicion must be, as it is in the museum, that the merging of histories would be largely on the terms of White, Western Modernism-cum-postmodernism as that institution is drawing the "Other" in to be more inclusive rather than modifying its foundation to be truly pluralistic.

The link between the Canadian Art Institution's shift of focus toward the concerns of artists grouped by assumptions of shared cultural histories, experiences, beliefs and values and the political activism of aboriginal peoples, and other non-White peoples is relevant. It is necessary to continually point out that Whiteness in general and Anglo-European ethnicity in particular is never "highlighted" or problematized. Obviously, Whiteness and White ethnicities constitute the vast majority of contemporary Canadian art collections. While special exhibitions are widely reviewed and critiqued because of the spectacle orchestrated by the museums that present them, permanent collections seem to have escaped consistent scrutiny by art critics, theorists and art historians. Therefore, the history of art, as preserved and created in permanent collections, also escapes scrutiny.

As James Clifford points out the context in the Western museum, regardless of efforts to contextualize works with ethnographic captions or explanations, remains solidly "on modernist terms".²¹ The inherent problems of displaying non-Western art with Western art under the auspices of 'affinities' is indicative of the tendencies for the absorption/assimilation of non-Euro/Western cultures into the fabric of modernism-cum-postmodernism. The costs of the elimination of distinction/difference and the need for a re-structuring of the understanding, interpretation and systems of art and its various institutions in Euro/Western international cultures are apparent.

In an essay which examines the practices of ethnographic writing of Franz Boas, Margaret Mead and other major ethnographic writers, Clifford states that, given the subjectivity or cultural relativism of ethnographic writing, the understanding and

²¹ James Clifford, "Histories of the Tribal and the Modern" The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), 193.

interpretation of the "Other" is, and should be, a constant negotiation and exchange of information that can never be allowed to be totalizing.²² Clifford's commentary on the "authentic voice" of ethnographic writing can be applied to the "authentic voice" of the museum text whether it is the ethnographic information placed in a show of material culture or the text in a gallery or exhibition catalogue. All such writing has a similar effect.

Recent discourse surrounding museum practice asserts the current theoretical attachment to the "dialogic" rather than the former "dialectic" approach to presenting ethnographic information. Either form can be stridently didactic. One theorist who has compared the differences of dialectic and dialogic approaches to bridging text and social reality, rejects both as

...unsatisfactory because of their claim that the cognitive and the social are both entities of equal logical (or ontological) standing, and that the entities can interact in a way that is analogous to a dialogue of a dialectic (literally "two readings").²³

Therefore, in creating certain structures for understanding, for example, ethnographic texts in Natural history exhibits or art exhibitions, accompanying texts printed by subtext classification must remain aware of the nature of rhetoric and place observation (and simplified order) cognitively and consciously within the (complex) continua of reality. Essentially if the art gallery is going to *assimilate* artwork of non-White artists then the ethnographic information which accompanies the work of temporary exhibitions must be dropped so

²² James Clifford, "On Ethnographic Authority" in The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), 30.

²³ Thornton, Robert J. "The Rhetoric of Ethnographic Holism" Rereading Cultural Anthropology, George E Marcus, ed. (London: Duke University Press, 1992), 16.

that issues of racial and ethnic identity do not "play" or influence the reading of the work. If the gallery is to *integrate* the work of non-White artists into the collection then there must be some consistency in presenting biographical information on the artist and the context in which the artwork was made.

"Minorities" in Museums

In an essay regarding the exhibition of "Minority" artists' works in the United States Peter Marzio cites public and professional apathy and disregard as key barriers to the presence of large "minority art" exhibitions in mainstream fine arts museums in the United States.²⁴ Marzio's term "minority art" should be read to encompass the various artistic processes and objects created by cultural, racial, and ethnic groups and communities who are underrepresented in mainstream fine arts museums. Marzio does not provide a definition of this term, an oversight or assumption of meaning that could be problematic in defining or devising programs to promote the presence of "minority art".

In explaining the difficulties of producing a "minority art" exhibition, in this case a show of contemporary American Hispanic Art, Marzio makes explicit some of the more far reaching problems which perpetuate "minority" exclusion from fine art and other museums and cultural organizations. Apparently the museum could not locate "a single individual who had both strong curatorial credentials and a catholic viewpoint on the subject".²⁵ Marzio does not comment on the problems of barriers to curatorial experience for racial and ethnic "minorities" that is likely part

²⁴ Peter C. Marzio, "Minorities and Fine-Arts Museums in the United States" Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991).

²⁵ *ibid*, 122.

of the explanation for this difficulty. He also notes that "[S]ince Hispanic art is not studied in many universities or reviewed in professional or mass-circulation periodicals, information about the artists and their works is not coherent or easy to locate."²⁶

It is not acceptable to cite this as a problem in curating a "minority" exhibition without addressing it in its proper context as a symptom of systemic and institutionalized racism. It is not the fault of the minority artist or the curator that art historians, educators, critics and media ignore and effectively devalue the importance of minority artwork. It should be made explicit that the role of such professionals is to seek to make its audiences aware of the diversity of art, just as museums are expected to do. Marzio also states that the curators had difficulty in assessing and locating the "best" Hispanic art for display in the exhibition. This raises questions as to what model the criteria for the "great works" was derived from. Was it the general modernist universal aesthetic criteria or was it based on the general aesthetic of the specific and diverse Hispanic community?

Marzio also notes debates surrounding whether non-Hispanics had the right to curate a Hispanic exhibition, questions of favouritism to certain organizations, and jurisdiction over cultural influence. His comments seem to be based in a desire to re-assure the Hispanic community of the good intentions and commitment of the museum rather than communicating and sharing the experience and responsibilities with them. Marzio notes that museums must provide educational and community service to all its constituents. However, it does not appear that the museum in this case was in any position to educate the Hispanic population, and so the question arises: Who was the museum educating? The

²⁶ *ibid.*

target audience would be predominantly non-Hispanic, not because of the demographics of the area but because of the position taken by the museum.

Notably, as Marzio states, "adding a new kind of exhibition to the program can be seen as confusing an institution's identity and taking funds away from an older, dedicated purpose". Marzio continues to give financial details which illustrate the costs incurred and presents them as being larger than "regular" (read White or culture blind) exhibitions. Once again non-White artists are described as special interest groups while the preservation of specifically White, European, male-dominated museums is considered unbiased and necessary for the universal good. Museums, curators, critics, and art historians need to review their perception of art to include the diversity of cultures producing "art" which, contrary to popular opinion, have long histories and have not mysteriously appeared as the dominant members of society begin to examine their collective history of exclusion and discrimination against the "Other."

Marzio also invokes concepts of "quality" and "masterpiece," relating the findings of a survey where Old Masters were found to be preferred over other art forms. This implies that quality and masterpiece are universal terms with universal meaning. Adding European as a prefix to Old Masters, is in effect, an effort to be "politically correct" without considering that Old Masters is a term used *only* in reference to European or European descended male artists, lest we forget the history of colonialism and sexism.²⁷

Marzio brings up issues in the display of "minority" artwork. He states "I found an attitude that puzzles me to this

²⁷ Feminist art historians Rozika Parker and Griselda Pollock note the sexism in the phrase 'Old Masters' which when changed to reflect the female gender becomes 'Old Mistresses' and has an entirely different meaning. The full analysis is in their book Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology (London: Pandora Press, 1981).

day: the belief that contemporary minority art needs a kind of anthropological or sociological interpretation."²⁸ This points to the differences of practices utilized when exhibiting the art of the "Other". By using ethnographic texts or commentary along with the artwork (a practice not used in "regular" White, European exhibitions) the museum perpetuates notions of the exoticized other and creates a sense of coherence or definition of a culture that is not a reality.

Marzio states that museums need to alter their goals to reach out to larger and more diverse audiences and although bigotry is evident as a barrier to exposing diverse art to its audiences, museums must address this responsibility. He also states the need to devote the same intellectual and commercial energies to "minority art" as is given the mainstream. Marzio expresses a desire to "expand the aesthetic boundaries and definitions of fine art" and asserts that "minority" exhibitions are "received like any other exhibition,"²⁹ an indication of the power of the museum to validate artwork and effectively influence the acceptance of "Others".

Recently there has been an increase in the number of exhibitions featuring non-White artists in Canada. However, the vast majority of those shows have been small scale, presented in parallel galleries and artist-run-centres.³⁰ Nevertheless, in the interest of Canadian Multiculturalism, the presence of the "Other" would seem to be growing in the Canadian art institution. However, as I stated in the introduction to this thesis the statistics that show that non-White artists are being shown more often are misleading. Any increase in numbers may give the impression that the status of non-White artists is changing in

²⁸ Marzio "Minorities and Fine-Arts Museums," 126.

²⁹ *ibid*, 127.

³⁰ See evidence from the periodical survey in Chapter Four.

Canada. Yet the periodical survey discussed in Chapter Four shows that it is a combination of the underlying systemic exclusion of non-White artists work and the subtext which accompanies their works when it is shown that must be examined.

Conclusion(s)

Christine Kreamer has stated that "History is a living part of people's sense of who they are and how they relate to other elements of civil society".³¹ Since the "curio cabinets" of the 16th-17th century, an underlying aspect of museums and collecting has been linked to social imperialism, colonialism, and the accumulation of knowledge, thereby giving authority, and defining (regardless of various intents) and representing the "Other", "collections have helped establish positions of authority, dominion, and social imperialism over the 'collected 'Other'' in the service of individual of state sovereignty".³² The main issues in the current collection and display of the material cultures of "Others" are outlined by Kreamer.

First, curators must be conscious of their own and the public's tendency to accept or establish essentialized categories and notions of "Others." Curators must make an effort to anticipate and address the preconceptions of their audiences(s) and continually question and challenge stereotypes and generalizations. They must also be aware and conscious of their various functions and seek to modify practices which fail to accommodate the shifts in societal values, consciousness, and "minority" input. It should no longer be the practice to paternally inform the public as though it were a monolithically

³¹ Kreamer, Christine Mullen, "Defining Communities Through Exhibiting and Collecting" Museums and Communities; The Politics of Public Culture (Washington, D.C.: The Smithsonian Institution Press), 1992, 367.

³² *ibid*, 368.

White and "passive recipient[t] of information".³³ There must also be a commitment to relating the past to the present. Totalizing representations of static, "dying" or "vanishing" cultures, and past and recent practices of historically freezing cultures, perpetuate assumptions of inferior/superior, primitive/modern dichotomies. Such exhibitions and underlying assumptions in museum display divorce the past from the present and the continuum of social relationships among peoples, ignoring the histories of social interaction, oppression, domination and survival. Museums reflect many societal notions and beliefs in the way that exhibitions are presented. Notably, "history is often seen as a series of discrete events" rather than interrelationships over time of individuals and groups.³⁴

Kreamer also points out the two-way problematic that arises from museum-community negotiations of exhibitions. These are apparent in ideas of insider/outsider and the complexity of defining the criteria of these terms. The perspectives of either of these positions may overlap, further complicating the issues. The aspects of authority and authenticity arise, as they so often do, posing questions as to who defines these terms and positions. In either respect the tendency to present idealized views of a culture remains. The presence of community-defined exhibitions at National Museums is relatively rare in Canada. There is, however, a need to encourage such exhibitions to counter or publicly respond to assumptions, representations, and generalizations, made regarding various communities.

Museums can, by acting after reflection, become vehicles for and representations of social change. Kreamer notes the example of African American museums in the U.S. which were created during the Black Consciousness Era. In such an example it is apparent

³³ *ibid.*

³⁴ *ibid.*, 374.

that the function of a museum can include, if not directly focus on, the complex shifts in social relationships and societal change. Museums must recognize that it is not the exclusively assigned role of communities to alter negative and totalizing assumptions and to promote positive change in public/social perceptions of "Othered" communities.

There is a real capacity for museums and museum displays to facilitate positive, communicative dialogue between all communities (not only those which are subject to ethnographic study) and to provoke and engage in dialogue reflecting the constant changes in social relationships. Museums must consider their influence in forming identities and the realities of multiple perceptions not only from the perspective of the public but also from within the institution itself.

As Kreamer observes, "Culture should not be treated as a fixed and static entity".³⁵ Neither should museums.

³⁵ Kreamer, Christine Mullen, "Defining Communities Trough Exhibiting and Collecting" Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture (Washington, D.C.: The Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992), 380.

Chapter Four: Theory in Practice

Introduction

In the introduction to Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media authors Ella Shohat and Robert Stam state:

... we [do not] believe in the inverted European narcissism that posits Europe as the source of all social evils in the world. Such an approach remains Eurocentric...such "victimology" reduces non-European life to a pathological response to Western penetration. It merely turns colonialist claims upside down. Rather than saying that "we" (that is, the West) have brought "them" civilization, it claims instead that everywhere "we" have brought diabolical evil, and everywhere "their" enfeebled societies have succumbed to "our" insidious influence....¹

This statement describes a paradox central to much liberal thought. Although it is established that many of the world's "Aboriginal" peoples were forcibly removed from their lands, repressed, controlled, and in some cases exterminated by colonial/imperial "settler nations," Western history remains deeply biased. The White mainstream's own sense of continued and unthreatened power lends support to colonial history based upon theories of self reflexivity. Yet, it is not productive to completely demonize any culture, even the dominant culture that subjugates those who are considered to be marginal or peripheral to its aims. Rather, it is necessary to recognize that each perspective is a result of the conflict created by one culture ignoring the relevance of the other. Steele's idea that each party may feel secure in its "seeing for innocence" presents a possibility for understanding and perhaps change.

The evidence outlined and discussed in the following pages is necessary for an examination of the question of how racism and hierarchy of ethnicity presents itself in the Canadian art

¹ Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media (London: Routledge, 1994), 3.

institution. Without such evidence discrimination remains mere speculation. In essence, it becomes easy to dismiss the issues of racial and ethnic prejudice as mythical, created by "special interest groups" who want a larger piece of the arts pie. As mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, the statistical information is not based on a comparison of non-White to White ratio. This is because the subject of representation often becomes confused in an attempt to ascertain the "correct" number of non-White people in any given area to arrive at equality. This attitude belittles the real issues behind the representation of non-White people in a White dominated culture. The aim of achieving equality is not to ensure the numerical representation of non-White artists but to eliminate the biases that govern that representation. In this context it is necessary to realize that if so-called "special interest groups" have a particular agenda, then so too, must the larger dominant group, and at some point those agendas must meet to create a genuinely diverse cultural community.

Periodical Survey Results

The results of the periodical survey support my thesis statement:

Although academic, practical and political inquiries have begun to address institutional accountability, they do not clearly connote a true paradigm shift in Western cultural theories and museum practices, art historical documentation and institutional education away from racist assumptions and hierarchizing in the collection of contemporary art and the creation of art history.

The so-called "paradigm shift" is relative to the experience of the person reviewing that shift. For the most part, the shift seems to be fairly superficial. The anticipated pluralism of modernism-cum-postmodernism is one of appropriated forms rather than an appreciation of, and move toward valuing, the cultures and contributions of non-White cultures and multicultural "sub-

cultures". While the art institution in Canada may have expressed a desire to become inclusive of the non-White "Other," this desire is limited to the revision of curatorial practices in ethnographic exhibits rather than in expanding the collection of contemporary art by non-White artists. In the last few years the National Gallery of Canada has held a gallery tour called the *Absence of Presence* in recognition of Black History Month. The tour's primary purpose seems to be to show visitors where the artwork of "Black" or African-Canadian artists isn't.²

1) Representation of non-White artists in shows: Appendix One

These pie charts illustrate that the representation of non-White artists in the five periodicals surveyed, with the exception of Fuse is minimal. Regardless of how the demographic to representation ratio may present itself, the issues that are not shown are *how* non-White artists are presented. For example, although Fuse contained the highest percentage of shows featuring non-White artists at 36 percent, compared to C Magazine at 12.5 percent, Parachute at 8.3 percent, Canadian Art at 8 percent, and Parallélogram at 7.3 percent, over sixty-seven percent of those shows were group shows. Also in Fuse ninety-two percent of the reviews of non-White artists' shows referred explicitly to the artists "racialized" or ethnic background and over fifty percent of the shows reviewed were organized around the issue of racism or "Otherness". These results show that there is a tendency to place the artwork of non-White artists within the genre of anti-racist art or politicized art of the "Other." Correspondingly, non-White artists tended to be viewed as groups rather than as individuals. These are just two of the homogenizing practices of

² I have taken this tour which was hosted by Maureen Flynn-Burhoe who has done an exceptional amount of research into the history of Canadians of African Ancestry from the Empire Loyalists to the present. Although the tour was educational in many respects the number of works by African-Canadian artists was almost non-existent.

the art institution.

Fuse is a multi-disciplinary arts magazine which devotes as much of its space to cultural/political writing as it does to reviewing art. While Fuse regularly published articles by non-White authors on a variety of topics, and as shown by Appendix Two, published the largest number of articles on non-White artists, there was a particular bias in the presentation of those artists. For example, in the feature articles in Fuse sixty percent of the articles focused on racism or racism in the arts, but less than half of the articles focused on non-White artists. This revealed that when non-White artists are featured, the focus is on racism as an issue. The artists work is then used as a support for illustrating an idea rather than viewed for its artistic merit. This also removes the focus away from the individual artists and their respective careers.

Parallélogramme is a publication of ANNPAC and the artist-run-movement. Notably, there is a significantly larger support for events which feature non-White artists in the artists-run-centres than any other venue in Canada. Like Fuse, considerable space in the magazine is devoted to cultural and political issues, although Parallélogramme pays significantly less attention to the issues of race and racism in the arts. In comparison to both Fuse and Parallélogramme, political content in the feature articles and reviews in Parachute, C Magazine, and Canadian Art, is limited. There was less writing of a politically controversial nature in these three publications. As a result there was an omission of the discussion of the impact of racial, ethnic, or identity politics on the art institution.³ This erasure of political content in reviews of artists' work

³ For any in-depth discussion of the controversies surrounding identity politics and the representation of the "Other" one is forced to turn to periodicals such as Muse. Muse is a Canadian magazine which focuses on issues of museums and museology has published many articles on those issues.

upholds the illusions of the traditional Western canon of homogeneity within the art institution, meritocracy, and "a level playing field." Similarly, it supports the assimilation of the "Other" into the arts institution rather than encouraging the appreciation of diversity.

While the survey revealed a greater interest for First Nations artists than for other non-White artists, the numbers, in comparison to those for White artists are still small. Noticeably, the same names seem to appear over and over again as though First Nations' artists are entitled or restricted to only a few accepted spokespeople or representatives. There is a sense of tokenizing when the same names appear repeatedly. This is also true for other under-represented non-White artists. What the pie charts do not show is that certain artists have shown repeatedly over several years. This creates a perception that there are many artists of a certain group being shown. For example, if the chart shows that 5% of total non-White artists are Asian Canadian, one might assume that number is adequate since it may be demographically on par. But when the same artist is selected by galleries to show in every "anti-racist" group show or is chosen constantly to represent Asian-Canadian artists, the public is not actually seeing a spectrum of art from the Asian-Canadian "community". An example of this is the representation of artists of Middle Eastern background in Parallélogramme. Artist/writer Jamilie Hassan appears as the standard representative of Middle-Eastern artists' perspectives of "Otherness" and racism by appearing repeatedly in articles which address those issues. This shows the tendency to tokenize or depend on one spokesperson to represent their "race", ethnicity, or community, which again assumes homogeneity within the culture(s) of the "Other."

2) Representation of non-White artists in feature articles:

Appendix Two

One of the issues that arose from the information in this series of pie charts was that in many instances when an editor wanted to publish an article regarding the position of non-White artists s/he sought out well known artists from outside of Canada. This was particularly true of Fuse which did several large examinations into the position of the South-Asian youth and "Otherness" in Britain.⁴ This tendency perpetuates the notion prevalent in the art institution that non-White artists of Canadian origin are few and far between, and that "Canadian" artists are White.

The presence of non-White artists in feature articles was almost negligible, particularly in Parachute where the number of articles on foreign non-White artists is three times that of non-White artists in Canada. In C Magazine the presence of foreign non-White artists, excluding First Nations, is almost twice the number of Canadian non-White artists. In Fuse, although close to half of the articles focus on non-White artists there is almost an equal division between, Canadian non-White artists (excluding First Nations) and foreign non-White artists. It appears that the magazines sought artists "of colour" from outside of Canada when they wished to address issues of "Otherness."⁵ This practice reinforces the idea that Canadian artists are White and Non-White artists production occurs only outside of Canada.

⁴ Two examples are: Sonali Fernando, "Hair of the Dog," Fuse Vol. 18, No. 1, 1994, and Aruna Srivastava and Shani Mootoo, "Fabled Territories: South Asian British photography expresses dislocation, hybrid identities, de-colonization," Fuse Vol. 15, No. 4, 1992, 36.

⁵ It is of particular interest that this tendency appeared in Fuse which published the article "Local Colour Protests," which highlighted a protest against the Vancouver Art Gallery for importing the show *Fabled Territories* featuring British South Asian artists.

Also, the survey indicated the contribution of the world's population of non-White artists is minimal. (See Appendices One and Two)

Parachute also virtually ignores the presence of First Nations artists. This illustrates how easily an element of the arts institution can erase the presence and contribution of the "Other" from the Canadian visual arts. Parachute also failed to address the issue of racism in the arts, and, only once in five years addressed the issue of multiculturalism.

A point of major importance is that articles which featured non-White artists tended to review a group of artists rather than showcase individuals. When non-White artists were shown as a group the tendency was to organize shows around issues of racism or "Otherness" which is the same situation as in the number of reviews of shows by non-White artists. This indicates that non-White artists are relegated to a position of opposition to Whiteness which severely limits the avenues for exposure open to them in the art institution.

3) Group and individual: Appendix Three

The survey of exhibitions revealed the tendency for exhibitions of non-White artists to be group shows. (See Appendix Three. All of the shows were temporary exhibitions, which as I have argued in Chapter Two, is not an acceptable solution to the underrepresentation of non-White artists in permanent collections. Many of these shows were organized around the concept of "Otherness" or anti-racism which, by creating a political genre for non-White artists limits their ability to show work which is not centred on that theme. Shows organized by non-White curators/artists had the same tendency to focus on these issues as shows organized by White curators. The problem with this tendency is that once again the gallery or museum is reinforcing the notion of the homogeneous "Other." The reading

that can be applied to this tendency is that the art institution in Canada still views the "Other" as an unchanging unit defined by its shared characteristics and incapable of the flexibility or dynamic nature of individuals and individuality. Again a non-White artist is forced to define him/herself not through his/her culture but through the White mainstream understanding of that culture, with its stereotypes and racist expectations. The artist is relegated to the issues imposed by Whiteness and the guilt of an effort to achieve "political correctness." The non-White artist is either promoted as fighting a cause with his/her work or producing vapid works that may be acceptable if they conform to the Western aesthetic.

4) Links to Western or non-Western traditions: Appendix Four

In the presentation of non-White artists' work there was an overwhelmingly tendency to locate their work in the context of Western art history. While some reference to the artist's "personal" culture may have been included, it was usually an offhand comment to show where the artists' personal point of departure in the nature of "form" may be, in relation to the modernist appropriation of "primitive" forms.⁶ The tendency has been to reinforce the idea that for a work to be "universally relevant" it must function within the aesthetic "norms" of the Western art world. The political content of many non-White artists' work was not necessarily addressed in the review, although it may be mentioned that a work may refer to the artists' identity as a non-White person or some similar subject.

There is a certain silent paradox that seems to be forming in the attempts by curators to have more non-White artists present which in turn may end up creating a specific niche for non-White artists in the Canadian art institution. There seems

⁶ See Chapter Three.

to be a large percentage of non-White artists whose work centred around the various concepts of identity politics. Yet, the aesthetic of those works fits into what might be termed the "postmodern" aesthetic; artwork with layered images, text, with a use of multi-media approaches. The political content of the work is often not discussed. This absence of discussion reflects the modernist's dictum of "art for art's sake." But that does not mean that political content is ignored, rather it means that political content defines the work as non-White art, but not necessarily "good" art outside of the marginalized anti-racist genre. It would seem that non-White artists' work can be legitimated in the Western art institution only by making it relevant to the "progression" of modernist-cum-postmodernist art history and production on the superficial basis of its aesthetic. Ironically, when a non-White artist's work has a function it is categorized as artifact, yet when it has no apparent purpose it is identified as mere decoration. The categorization of "Art" continues to remain elusive because of the perception and discrimination of the mediator who is usually White. In the end, however, the work is (in small numbers) present, with politics intact, in a gallery or museum. Yet if the politics of the work are ignored by the curator, the reviewer, the critic and the educator who remain guided by the interests of the dominant White culture, the majority of the audience may remain oblivious to its "true" or intended meaning and its importance as a work in its own right.

5) Relevance of the artist's background: Appendix Five

In the presentation of work by non-White artists whether in shows or in articles, there was an overwhelming tendency to focus on the ethnic or racial background of the artist. However, when a White artist's work was reviewed, unless that person represented a "Minority White ethnicity" such as being Jewish or

French Canadian, the artist's background was seldom referred to. Fuse magazine identified artists by racial or ethnic background in 92.5% of its articles on non-White artists, Canadian Art in 71%, Parallélogramme in 98%, C Magazine in 87%, and Parachute in 52%. The work of non-White artists is almost always linked to their ethnic/racial background in an effort to explain the work. The question is why is this identification considered necessary for non-White artists and much less necessary for White artists. There is no simple response to this question and certainly no conclusive answer. However, the existence of a racial/ethnic hierarchy and the history of exclusion, as well as the complexity of issues regarding racism and "Otherness" addressed in some art by non-White artists is probably one of the reasons curators and editors (who are usually White) may feel it necessary to mediate the work by explaining the "Other" to a predominantly White audience. It is interesting that Parachute had the lowest instance of "naming the Other" since in my view Parachute is the magazine which has the most theoretically and academically informed articles and reviews.

6) Number Charts: Appendix Six

The tendency to focus articles and reviews about non-White artists on issues of racism, exoticization and victimization can be read as an attempt to place non-White artists in a context that is non-threatening and one which relegates them to a place outside of the mainstream, on the periphery, or margin. One of the tendencies revealed by the periodical survey is that more non-White artists' work appeared in film and video reviews and features than in painting, sculpture, photography, or performance art articles.⁷ It is apparent that Fuse makes an strong effort

⁷ It is not surprising that more non-White artists are present in the category of film and video since video has been accepted as a more conducive medium for the presentation of a political messages. Since the 1970s video

to be a magazine of interest to a diverse audience, while Parachute virtually ignores the plurality of the Canadian art production. The remaining three art magazines show an unfortunate and unsurprising lack of representation of non-White artists and a similar lack of input by non-White writers.

There have been many conspicuous events organized around issues of "Otherness" by non-White film and videomakers. These include Paul Wong's exhibition Yellow Peril, a very successful examination of Asian Canadian film and video, In Visible Colours, an international film and video symposium (Vancouver 1990), and annual events organized by groups such as Desh Pardesh or the Euclid Theatre in Toronto. However, these events tended to perpetuate the tendency to group and homogenize the identities of artists by "race" and limit their work to themes of "Otherness," exoticization, and victimization. The question is, what does this reveal about the inquiry into the status of the non-White artist in the art institution in Canada?

Political content in art has often been considered as a marker of work that is inferior in quality. This bias aids the exclusion of non-White artists from the mainstream. Kwame Dawes, an American race theorist, notes, however, that the "voices of judgement" that condemn non-White artists as mediocre have in fact created a context for that art to be produced. He states:

What these voices of judgment may fail to admit is that they have created this problem. It is they who have introduced this discourse of mediocrity by encouraging mediocrity. It is they who have failed to recognize the potential for brilliance in such marginalized work.⁸

What Dawes is saying is that the centre defines the margin. The dominant culture, by way of mediating artwork, creating themes

has been a popular vehicle for political art. In the 1980s feminist artists such as Lisa Steele and Martha Rosler were notable video artists.

⁸ Kwame Dawes, "Cutting Your Nose to Spite Your Face: The challenges of diversity in the Canadian artistic community," Fuse Vol. 17, No. 3, 1994, 11-13.

and groupings according to racial and ethnic identity, curating shows to educate White audiences, and by reviewing those shows with cultural relativism, continues to dictate the form which the artwork of non-White artists may take.

Conclusion(s)

In a recent article published in the Ottawa Citizen Susan Riley asked the question "Why are our museums so bland?"¹ The article addresses the increasingly stagnant character of Canada's major museums and their apparent lack of challenging, thought provoking exhibitions. Riley quotes Ruth Phillips, a Carleton professor, and "soon-to-be director of the University of British Columbia's Museum of Anthropology as stating that museums are under intense pressure 'because they have a mandate to reflect the culture of the country in an official way. They don't see themselves as having the freedom to make waves.'"² It would be horrifying to think that the controversies of *Into the Heart of Africa*, *The Spirit Sings*, or any other controversial exhibition could allow museums to stop trying to overcome the lack of attention to non-White artists. We must remember that not all controversies are racially and ethnically related. Exhibitions such as of Jana Sterback's "Meat Dress for an Anorexic Albino" or Barnett Newman's "Voice of Fire" at the National Gallery are examples of this controversial stance. While the arena for art in Canadian society is limited by constraints such as funding cuts, museums cannot avoid controversy if they are to be a vital part of the art institution or the Canadian cultural community. As Zool Suleman states in the article "Organizing for a Different Memory: Artists of Colour and Strategies":

The point at which artists and arts institutions of the dominant culture part company with artists of colour is that artists of colour do not simply want to establish 'spaces' for the production and discussion of work, but rather to locate these 'spaces' within the very 'space' already occupied by the dominant arts structures. What artists of

¹ Susan Riley, "Why are our museums so bland?" The Ottawa Citizen Saturday December 7, 1996, D1.

² Ibid, D2.

colour are seeking is a sharing of an already limited 'space' - that occupied by the arts in Canadian society. It is thus understandable, though not forgivable, that those already occupying the 'space' are loathe to give it up.³

The questions posed in the introduction to this thesis are difficult to answer. While the evidence I have presented may be open to subjective interpretation I believe I have proven through my findings that there are definite biases and omissions in Canadian cultural policy, cultural organizations and in the minds of the "Cultural elite" that contribute to the systemic subjugation of non-White artists in Canada.

In this conclusion I will revisit the questions I have presented in the introduction to this thesis and which I have attempted to answer throughout. There is obvious difficulty in proving the existence of systemic racism or ethnic hierarchy. The problem with that type of discrimination or prejudicial selection is that it may be insidious. To the public who identify with the dominant cultural prejudice, it is invisible, because it is intrinsic to the power dynamic. Yet it is blatant to those who are marginalized.

- 1) If, in a Canadian cultural context, art is classified by a history that presupposes Whiteness as "normal" and categorizes "Others" by the way "Whiteness" perceives "Otherness" then, does all art produced outside Whiteness become exoticized? What is the role of multiculturalism in this context? To achieve a reflection or representation of Canadian diversity must art be mediated, separated, segregated, and homogenized according to the paradigms of the dominant White culture(s) or even the concept of White superiority/supremacy?

In essence, the art of the non-White "Other" is relegated to the area of exoticization. If and when it is displayed the exoticization or "Otherness" of the artists is often the focus of the reviewer or curator. The role of multiculturalism and the desire to reflect Canadian diversity are difficult to address.

³ This is an article from the periodical survey. It appeared in Parallelogram Vol. 18, No. 1, 1992, 16-24.

It appears multiculturalism has failed to create a level playing field in the eyes of most non-White Canadians, and particularly for non-White artists in the contemporary art institution. The concept of the two Founding Nations is very strongly entrenched in the history of Canadian art. The publication of Harper's seminal text Painting in Canada: A History took place in 1967, at the height of the nationalist centennial celebration. The history of art institutions in Canada and the aim to disperse and encourage interest in Canadian art, as shown by Zemans, is based on a certain perception of Canadian identity as White. Although the Canadian art institution as it exists is being pushed to be more inclusive, little has changed. It is unlikely that Canadian art museums will shed this tradition in the near future. It is not unreasonable to believe that the underlying divisions made apparent in the presentation of non-White artists work in the periodicals, connote the probability that underrepresented communities will have to create smaller more culturally specific museums to represent their interests and cultural production. This has happened in American cities such as New York and Chicago where African-American and Latino communities have worked to create spaces to celebrate their cultures as separate from the mainstream.

The idea of being inclusive means to draw what is outside into the existing structure. This construct assumes both a centre and a margin and will therefore inevitably be based in a European/Eurocentric history which is unlikely to be dropped. Attempts to make the institution inclusive, however, should not be discouraged and could make the art museum a more exciting place to be.

- 2) If the art/artifact, "civilized" versus "primitive" paradigm of museum classification is currently under revision, why then do the problems that arise out of that paradigm continue to surface? If white dominant culture(s) continue to oversee the collection of objects that become the representation of History, is the institution then hiding

behind a mask of self reflexivity while perpetuating racism? It is apparent from the controversies created by exhibitions such as The Spirit Sings that the issues are not always what they seem. The political aims of one group may be relevant but may not necessarily represent an entire community. The difficulty faced by the museum community in its desire to resolve the issues surrounding the representation of the "Other" is that there are no homogenous points of view amongst minority communities any more than there are among majority communities. The only way to avoid further conflicts of the type addressed in this thesis is to involve communities exhaustively in the production of exhibitions. The museum community must also reflect the diversity of the Canadian population. Art museums must re-examine their mandates and review their role in accommodating the needs of Canadians as well as the needs of the art institution.

- 3) Despite possible revisions of thought, the practice of dividing art by ethnography in museums continues to separate non-White from White history and maintains the perception of one History and lesser histories without acknowledging itself as White. Does this practice not state conspicuously that only White, European-Canadian artists' work has "risen above" its past to achieve a unique "universal" importance?

The evidence provided does show that there is still a division of art that connotes separate histories. The "place" assigned to the non-White artist remains as the "Other" who must be identified in relation to his/her White counterpart. The themes celebrated by the art institution centred on the non-White artist as immigrant, different, outsider, and victim. The articles and reviews in the periodicals are, as stated above, largely focused on art by non-White artists that address issues of victimization or exoticization.

My research and analysis has shown that to date there has been little significant change toward improving the position of non-White artists in Canada. The absence of these artists from the contemporary art institution remains. To remove evidence of

the tension created by the dynamic of "universal" White-liberal culture and the "culturally specific" non-White culture the art institution appropriates expression of difference identified by marginalized groups, through short term commitments to diversity such as special exhibitions. By doing so the traditional structure of the museum appears to be shifting to reconcile exclusion and relinquish and disperse its traditional European emphasis. In reality it maintains the dominance of White culture(s) by mediating the "Other" through cultural relativism and presenting non-White cultural production on its own terms. This is the absorption of the counter culture, the commodification of marginalization, which strips the margin of the expression of its uniqueness and maintains the status quo behind the façade of moving toward a more "cosmopolitan" society. The current exclusion sadly connotes that the Canadian art institution will continue to erase the presence of non-White artists except as influences in the perpetuation of a White, Euro-descended art production.

It appears that the institution, because of its history, its links to exclusionary cultural policy, and its roots in Eurocentric modernism, is caught between the need to conform to the attitudes of the dominant culture and serve its traditional purpose and its need to evolve as an institution into something more complex. The effort to keep political ideologies out of the art museum is in many ways naive and in some ways purposefully obtuse. All selections of art have a certain political bias. The preservation of a culture by the selection of certain artifacts over others is a political act. If the museum is to preserve the history of art it must also preserve the history of the politics of art and the politics of the art institution.

Appendix 1: Representation of non-White artists in shows

C Magazine

Representation of non-White artists in shows
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Canadian Art

Representation of non-White artists in shows
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Fuse

Representation of non-White artists in shows
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Parachute

Representation of non-White artists in shows
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Parallelogramme

Representation of non-White artists in shows
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

**Appendix 2: Representation of non-White artists in feature
articles**

C Magazine

Representation of non-White artists in feature articles

Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Canadian Art

Representation of non-White artists in feature articles
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Fuse

Representation of non-White artists in feature articles
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Parachute

Representation of non-White artists in feature articles
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Parallelogramme

Representation of non-White artists in feature articles
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

Appendix 3: Group to individual ratio

GROUP to INDIVIDUAL ratio from total non-White shows by magazine

**Appendix 4: Of non-White artist's shows percentage linked to
Western or non-Western tradition**

Of non-White artist's shows
percentage linked to Western or non-Western tradition

**Appendix 5: Percentage of articles featuring non-White artists
where ethnic/racial background is made relevant to the artist's
production**

Percentage of articles featuring non-White artists
where the artist's ethnic/racial background is made relevant to
the artist's production
Spring 1990 - Spring 1995

**Appendix 6: Statistical Charts (numbers and percentages of all
five magazines)**

Year	# of shows			Of non-White artist shows				GROUP	INDIVIDUAL
	listed	reviewed	artists shows	Contemporary	Contemporary "traditional"	Anthropological	Modernist		
Spring 1995	18	0	4	4	0	0	0	1	3
Winter 1995	43	7	1	1	0	0	0	11	0
Fall 1994	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summer 1994	8	8	2	1	1	0	0	0	2
Spring 1994	8	8	11	1	0	0	0	0	1
Winter 1994	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fall 1993	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summer 1993	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 1993	21	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winter 1992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fall 1992	10	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Summer 1992	12	12	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 1992	9	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Winter 1991	9	9	2	2	0	0	0	1	1
Fall 1991	13	13	2	2	0	0	0	2	0
Summer 1991	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 1991	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winter 1991	11	11	3	1	0	0	0	3	0
Fall 1990	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summer 1990	9	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Spring 1990	13	13	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
Column Totals	256	188	23	18	1	0	0	14	9

				# of shows	# of shows	# of shows	# of symposiums/conferences			
Middle Eastern	South American	Various non-	Foreign	political/social	orig. by Other	inst. explain	Racism	Multiculturalism	Racism in	Museum
Canadian	Canadian	White/white		justice content		"Other"			the arts	gallery roles
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	4	4	6	1	1	0	0	0	0

					# of shows	# of shows	# of shows	# of shows	# of shows				
visual arts	film/video	Western	non-Western	mention	artist	artist identity	identity is	org. issue	issue	First Nations	African Canadian	Asian Canadian	Southeast Asian Canadian
		Traction	Traction	background	defines work	theme	racism	"Otherness"					
41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
11	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	1
23	0	6	7	20	14	6	1	4	8	3	2	1	

-

[illegible]

1

Canadian Art

Year	# of shows	# of shows	# of non-White	Of non-White artist shows					GROUP
	listed	reviewed	artists shows	Contemporary	Contemporary "traditional"	Anthropological	Modernist		
Spring 1995	77	10	5		4	1	0		3
Winter 1994	56	9	7		5	1		1	2
Fall 1994	0	0	0		0		0	0	0
Summer 1994	19	12	2		1				1
Spring 1994	19	12	3		2	1	0		2
Winter 1993	20	13	1					1	0
Fall 1993	29	18	4		4				2
Summer 1993	20	10	0						0
Spring 1993	21	21	0						0
Winter 1992	19	10	1		1				0
Fall 1992	24	9	3		2	1			2
Summer 1992	24	10	1		1				1
Spring 1992	23	10	3		3				2
Winter 1991	22	9	1		1	0	0	0	0
Fall 1991	15	0	1		1				1
Summer 1991	21	7	3		3				3
Spring 1991	21	5	2		1	0	1		1
Winter 1990	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
Fall 1990	35	10	1		1	0	0	0	1
Summer 1990	21	7	1		1	0	0	0	0
Spring 1990	25	8	2		1		1		1
Column Totals	511	188	41	32	4	2	2	2	22

INDIVIDUAL	visual arts	film/video	Western Tradition	Western Tradition	# of shows mention artist background	# of shows artist identity defines work	# of shows identity is theme	# of shows org. racism	# of shows issue "otherness"	First Nations
2	5	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	
5	7	0	1	2	5	3	1	0	0	5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	1
1	3	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	1
1	1				1	1	0	0	0	1
2	4	0	4		2	3	2	0	0	2
1	1				1	1	1	0	0	
1	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	1
			1	1	1	1	1	0	0	3
1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
	2	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0
	1		1	1	2	2	2	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
1	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	1
18	37	1	14	11	29	30	18	1	1	19

African Canadian	Asian Canadian	Southeast Asian Canadian	Middle Eastern Canadian	South American Canadian	Various non-White/white	Foreign	# of shows political/social justice content	# of shows org. by other	# of shows inst. explain "other"
1	1	1				1	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
0	1				1	0	0	0	0
					0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0			1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2				1	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
2	8	1	1	1	4	7	1	5	4

Canadian Art

[illegible]

# of Articles on non-White artists							# of articles
Contemporary	Contemporary "traditional"	Anthropological	Modernist	First Nations	Alt Other	Foreign	political/social justice content
0	1	0	0				0
1							0
1	1				2	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0		1
	1			1	0		0
			1	0	1		0
	1			1			0
1				1			0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
1	1	0	0	1	1		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		2
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0
0	0	0	0	0	1		2
0	0	0	0	0	0		2
4	5	0	1	6	3	0	7

Year	# of shows	# of shows	# of non-White	Of non-White artist shows				GROUP	INDIVIDUAL	visual arts
	listed	reviewed	artists shows	Contemporary	Contemporary "traditional"	Anthropological	Modernist			
Vol. 18 No 1	6	6	4	4	0	0	0	3	1	2
Vol. 18 No 2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Vol 17 Nos 5&6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
May/June 1994	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vol. 17 No 3	5	5	3	3	0	0	0	1	2	2
Winter 1993-4	4	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Fall 1993	4	4	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Summer 1993	6	6	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
May/June 1993	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Vol. 16 No 3	7	7	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Winter 1992-3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Fall 1992	5	5	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	1
Vol. 15 No 6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summer 1992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 1992	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	2
Winter 1992	4	4	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Fall 1991	8	8	5	5	0	0	0	4	1	5
Vol. 14 No 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vol. 14 No 4	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Winter 1991	11	11	7	7	0	0	0	6	1	4
Fall 1990	9	8	5	1	0	0	0	3	2	3
Summer 1990	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vol. 13 No 5	7	7	1	1					1	
Vol. 13 No 3	6	6	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	1
Column Totals	111	108	40	38	0	0	0	27	13	24

film/video	Western	non-Western	# of shows mention artist background	# of shows artist identity defines work	# of shows identity is theme	# of shows org. issue racism	# of shows issue "Otherness"	First Nations	African Canadian	Asian Canadian	Southeastern Canadian
0	2	0	0	4	4	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	0
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	10
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	5	5	5	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
1	0	0	7	7	7	2	2		2	4	0
2	0	0	5	5	5	4	4	1	0	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	1
13	5	4	37	33	25	11	11	8	8	10	11

[illegible]

Fuse

# of Articles		# of Articles		# of articles	# of Articles on non-white artists				
Racism	Multiculturalism	Racism in arts	Multiculturalism in arts	feature	Contemporary	Contemporary "traditional"	Anthropological	Modernist	First Nations
0	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	8		1			
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
6	2	10	2	27	4	1	0	0	0

		# of articles
All Other	Foreign	political/social justice content
0	2	0
0		2
0	0	0
0	0	1
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
5	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	
0	0	1
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	3
0	0	0
0	0	1
0	1	1
0		1
1		1
0	0	1
0	1	1
5	4	15

Parachute

Year	# of shows	# of shows	# of non-White	Of non-White artist shows				GROUP	INDIVIDUAL	visual arts
	listed	reviewed	artists shows	Contemporary	Contemporary "traditional"	Anthropological	Modernist			
77 JFM 1995	15	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
75 JAS 1994	13	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
74 AMJ 1994	15	15	3	2	0	0	0	3	0	3
73 JFM 1994	14	14	3	2	1	0	0	0	3	3
72 OND 1993	18	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
71 JAS 1993	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70 AMJ 1993	15	15	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
69 JFM 1993	15	15	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
68 OND 1992	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
67 JAS 1992	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
66 AMJ 1992	15	15	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
65 JFM 1992	15	15	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	2
64 OND 1991	14	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
63 JAS 1991	13	13	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
62 AMJ 1991	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
61 JFM 1991	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 OND 1990	16	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
59 JAS 1990	14	14	4	4	0	0	0	2	2	3
58 AMJ 1990	14	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
57 JFM 1990	19	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
Column Totals	300	300	26	20	3	0	0	13	13	22

film/video	Western Tradition		non-Western Tradition		# of shows mention artist background	# of shows artist identity defines work	# of shows identity is theme	# of shows org. issue racism	# of shows issue "Otherness"	First Nations	African Canadian	Asian Canadian	Southasian Canadian
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	1	1	3	3	3	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
1	4	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
2	14	4	13	15	11	0	2	7	3	8	2	0	0

				# of shows	# of shows	# of shows	# of symposiums/conferences				
Middle Eastern	South American	Various non-	Foreign	political/social	org. by Other	inst. explain	Racism	Multiculturalism	Racism in	Museum	
Canadian	Canadian	White/White		justice content		'Other'			the arts	gallery roles	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	0	5	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0

Parachute

# of Articles		# of Articles		# of articles	# of Articles on non-White artists			
Racism	Multiculturalism	Racism in arts	Multiculturalism in arts	feature	Contemporary	Contemporary "traditional"	Anthropological	Modernist/ First Nations
0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	1

[illegible]

Paralellogramme

Year	# of shows listed	# of shows reviewed	# of non-White artists shows	Of non-White artist shows	Contemporary	Contemporary "traditional"	Anthropological	Modernist	GROUP	INDIVIDUAL
vol. 20#4SP#5	35	0	9	9	0	0	0	0	3	6
vol. 20#3W#4	27	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
vol. 20#2F#4	34	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	4	1
vol. 20#1S#4	30	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	2
vol. 19#4SP#4	34	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	1
Special issue	30	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	3
anti-racism arts										
vol. 19#2 F#3	43	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	3	3
Summer 1993	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
vol. 18#4SP#3	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
vol. 18#3W#2-3	39	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	4	3
vol. 18#2F#2	34	0	7	5	0	2	0	0	2	5
vol. 18#1S#2	31	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	1
vol. 17#4SP#2	30	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	4
vol. 17#3W#1-2	27	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	1
vol. 17#2F#1991	24	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
vol. 17#1S#1991	32	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	2
vol. 16#41991	191	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	1
vol. 16#3W#0-1	104	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	2
Spring 1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	588	0	43	41	0	2	0	0	20	23

visual arts	film/video	Western Tradition	non-Western Tradition	# of shows mention artist background	# of shows artist identity defines work	# of shows identity is theme	# of shows org. issue racism	# of shows issue "Otherness"	First Nations	African Canadian	Asian Canadian	Southeast Asian Canadian
7	2	9	0	9	9	9	5	4	3	3	4	0
3	0	2	1	3	3	3	0	3	1	0	2	0
4	1	2	3	5	4	4	0	5	1	0	2	0
3	0	3	0	3	2	2	0	2	1	0	1	0
3	1	4	0	4	4	4	2	0	1	1	1	0
2	2	4	0	0	4	4	0	0	1	2	1	0
4	2	6	0	6	6	6	1	1	2	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	2	7	0	7	7	7	0	0	4	0	0	0
7	0	7	1	7	7	7	0	7	5	0	0	0
3	0	1	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	0
4	1	5	0	5	5	5	0	4	4	0	1	0
2	1	3	1	3	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
3	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	1	1	1	1	0
2	1	3	0	3	2	2	1	1	1	0	2	0
4	0	4	0	4	4	3	0	3	2	1	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	7	36	4	42	38	40	4	22	21	4	8	0

Middle Eastern Canadian	South American Canadian	Various non-White/White	Foreign	# of shows political/social justice content	# of shows org. by Other	# of shows inst. explain "Other"	# of symposiums/conferences Racism	Multiculturalism	Racism in the arts	Museum/gallery roles
0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	4	0	3	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
1	0	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	2	7	3	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	5	5	33	12	0	0	0	1	0

Parallelogramme

# of Articles		# of Articles		# of articles		# of Articles on non-white artists				
Racism	Multiculturalism	Racism in arts	Multiculturalism in arts	feature	Contemporary	Traditional	Anthropological	Modernist	First nations	
0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	C
1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	C
2	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	C
1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	C
1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	C
1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	C
2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	C
1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	C
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
5	0	2	0	36	2	0	0	0	0	T

		# of articles	
All Other	Foreign	political/social	justice content
0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0
0	0	5	0
2	0	0	0
0	0	4	0
0	0	3	0
0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	2	0
1	0	2	0
0	0	2	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
1	0	10	0

Select Bibliography

- Angel, Victoria. Report to the Canada Post Corporation. 1995.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. The Second Sex. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953; reprint, New York: Vintage Books, 1989.
- Bowen, Lisa Balfour. "Native artists step out in National Gallery exhibit," Financial Post, October 19, 1992, S10.
- Berck, Brenda. "Tomorrow's Museums-For Whom? With Whom?" Muse, (Fall 1993), 8.
- Berlo, Janet Catherine. ed., The Early Years of Native American History: The Politics of Scholarship and Collecting. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press: 1992.
- Bissoondath, Neil. Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1994.
- Bolaria, B. Singh and Peter S. Li. Racial Oppression in Canada. 2d. ed. Toronto: Garamond Press, 1988.
- Burr, Catherine. "Ontario can't keep employment equity down," Globe and Mail, June 29, 1995, A17.
- Cameron, Duncan Ferguson. "Getting Out of Our Skin: Museums and a New Identity," Muse. Vol.10, No. 2 & 3, (Summer/Fall), 1992, 7 -10.
- Canadian House of Commons. Culture and Communications: The Ties that Bind. (1992)
- Canadian House of Commons. Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee: Summary of Briefs and Findings. (1982)
- Canadian House of Commons. Report of the Royal Commission of National Development in Arts, Letters, and Sciences. (1951)
- Canadian House of Commons. Report to the Federal Cultural Policy Review Commission. (1982)
- Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.
- Canadian Human Rights Act.
- Canadian Multiculturalism Act. (1988).
- Canadian Conference of the Arts. A Little Applebert (1983)

- _____. Blueprint for Our Cultural Future. (1993)
- _____. Strategy for Culture. (1980)
- _____. More Strategy for Culture. (1981)
- _____. Review of Federal Policies for the Arts in Canada (1944-1988)
- _____. The Third Strategy. (1984)
- Cashmore, E. Ellis. ed., Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations. 2d. ed. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Clifford, James. The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- _____. "Of Other Peoples: Beyond the "Salvage Paradigm" in The Politics of Representations: Discussions in Contemporary Culture ed. Hal Foster Seattle: Bay Press, 1987.
- Connor, Steven. Theory and Cultural Value. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992
- _____. Postmodern Culture: An Introduction to Theories of the Contemporary. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989
- Crean, Susan. "Taking the Missionary Position: Why *did* the Royal Ontario Museum impose a White perspective on an exhibition about Africa?," This Magazine, Vol. 24, No.6, (February 1991), 23-28.
- "Curators on Changing role and Social Responsibility," Muse, Vol.IX, No.2, (Summer/Fall 1991), 18-24.
- Dickenson Victoria. "A History of the National Museums from their Founding to the Present Day," Muse, Vol.10, No.2 & 3 (Summer/Fall 1992), 56-63.
- Dominguez, Virginia R. "Of Other Peoples: Beyond the "Salvage Paradigm" in The Politics of Representations: Discussions in Contemporary Culture. ed. Hal Foster. Seattle: Bay Press, 1987.
- Dorland, Michael. "A Thoroughly Hidden Country: Resentment, Canadian Nationalism , Canadian Culture," in Frenzy, Vol. 12 Nos. 1-2, 1988.
- Ferguson, Russel, Martha Gever, Trinh T. Minh-ha, and Cornel West

eds., Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Culture. New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art & Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1990.

Francis, Daniel. The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture. Vancouver, B.C.: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1993.

Freedman, Jim. "Bringing it all back home: A commentary on *Into the Heart of Africa*," Museum Quarterly, Vol. 18, No. 1, (Fall 1990), 39-43.

Fusco, Coco. "Managing the Other," in Kultura, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Fall 1990): 77-83.

Galt, Virginia. "Harris urged not to scrap job equity," The Globe and Mail, September 15, 1995, A8.

Gates, Henry Louis., Jr. "Race", Writing and Difference Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Gillmour, Alison. "Beautiful native art riddled with pain, anger," Winnipeg Free Press, July 3, 1993, B4.

Give Back: First Nations Perspectives on Cultural Practice. Vol. 1 No. 1, (December 1992).

Goa, David. "Spirit of Ukraine: 500 Years of Painting," Muse, Vol. 10. No. 1, (Spring 1992), 70-71.

Goforth, Les. "First Nations and Museums: A Native Perspective," Muse, Vol. 11, No. 1, (Spring 1993), 14-16.

Goldberg, David Theo. Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

_____. ed. Anatomy of Racism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.

Grant, Laurence, with Mary Smith and Pat Zimmer. "Cultural Pluralism in Three Ontario Community Museums," Muse, Vol. 9, No. 3, (Winter 1992), 54-56.

Grant, Laurence. "Into the Heart of Africa," Muse, Vol. VIII, No. 2, (Summer 1990), 78-80.

Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, eds., Cultural Studies. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Harbour. (Winter 1993-4) Vol. 3, No. 1.

- Harper, J. Russell. Painting in Canada: A History. 2d ed., Toronto: University of Toronto Press: 1966.
- Harrison, Julia D. "Completing a Circle: *The Spirit Sings*," in Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada, Noel Dyck and James B. Waldram eds., Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1993, 334-357.
- Harvey, David. The Condition of Postmodernity. Oxford, UK.: Blackwell Press, 1989
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. Philosophy of History. New York: The Colonial Press, 1899.
- Henighan, Tom. The Presumption of Culture. Vancouver: Raincoast Books, 1996.
- Hess, Thomas B. and Elizabeth C. Baker. eds., Art and Sexual Politics. London: Collier MacMillan Publishers, 1971.
- Hill, Tom and Trudy Nicks, "The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples," Muse, Vol. 10, No. 2 & 3, (Summer/Fall 1992), 81-84.
- Hiller, Susan. ed., The Myth of Primitivism: Perspectives of Art. London: Routledge, 1991.
- hooks, bell [Gloria Watkins]. Black Looks: Race and Representation. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1992.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge. London & New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Horn-Miller, Kahente. "The American Indian and the Problem of History," Muse, Vol.11, No.3, (Fall 1993), 44-46.
- Hume, Christopher. "Natives healing spirits the power of art," Toronto Star, April 25, 1992, H1.
- Hutcheon, Linda and Marion Richmond. eds., Other Solitudes: Canadian Multicultural Fictions. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Jager, Manfred. "Museum show document life in black town: Africville torn down in late '60s," Winnipeg Free Press, July 5, 1992, B17.
- Jospeh, Clifton. "On Your Mark! Get Set! Go Multi-culti!" This Magazine, Vol. 28, No. 5, 1995, 24-28.

- Kaplan, William. ed., Belonging: The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1993.
- Karp, Ivan and Steven D. Lavine. eds., Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.
- Kerridwen, Harvey. "Looking for Women in the Museum: Has Women's Studies Really 'Come a Long Way'?" Muse, Vol.11, No.4, (Winter 1994) 24-27.
- Kreamer, Chrisitne Mullen. "Defining Communities Through Exhibiting and Collecting," Museums and Communities; The Politics of Public Culture. Washington, D.C.: The Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.
- Lacy, Liam. "Uncommon Perceptions," The Globe and Mail, August 18, 1990, C1.
- Lemert, Charles. ed., Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings. Oxford: Westview Press, 1993.
- Linton, Jon. "Tomorrow's Museum Audiences: Key Challenges to Audience Development," Muse, Vol.11, No.2, 1993, 36-38.
- Lippard, Lucy R. Mixed Blessings: New Art in a Multicultural America. New York: Pantheon Books, 1990
- Lucs, Sandra. "Another look at...Into the Heart of Africa," Museum Quarterly, Vol. 18, No. 3, (August 1990), 35-39.
- Loney, Martin. "Equity law has gone too far," Toronto Star, May 24, 1995, A21.
- Lynch, Bernadette. "The Broken Pipe: Non-Native Museums and Native Culture, A Personal Perspective," Muse, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1993, 51-54.
- Maart, Rozena. "Consciousness, Knowledge and Morality: The Absence of the Knowledge of White Consciousness in Contemporary Feminist Theory" in A Reader in Feminist Ethics. ed. Debra Shogan, Canadian Scholars Press, 1993.
- Makaryk, Irena R. ed., Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Marcus, George E. ed., Rereading Cultural Anthropology. London: University Press, 1992.

- Mays, John Bentley. "Native artists seize the moment to display anger against history," The Globe and Mail, May 16, 1992.
- _____. "Breaking traditions," The Globe and Mail, October 10, 1992.
- _____. "Carving or Sculpture?: An AGO exhibit of Inuit carvings in an awkward inclusion among the concerns of an institution that devotes itself to Western art," The Globe and Mail, June 10, 1990.
- _____. "Painters of the lost art," The Globe and Mail, August 27, 1992.
- McFarlane, Scott. "The Haunt of Race: Canada's Multiculturalism Act, the Politics of Incorporation, and Writing Thru Race," Fuse, Vol. 18, No. 3, (Spring 1995), 18-31.
- McCarthy, Cameron and Warren Crichlow. Race, Identity and Representation in Education. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- McKague, Ormond. ed., Racism In Canada. Saskatoon, Sask.: Fifth House Publishers, 1991.
- McLennan, Heather. "The fight to regain a lost home," The Globe and Mail Aug 18, 1990, C10.
- McMaster, Gerald and Lee-Ann Martin. Indigena:Contemporary Native Perspectives. (catalogue) Vancouver/Toronto: Douglas McIntyre, & Hull, PQ.: Canadian Museum of Civilization 1992
- _____. The Cowboy/Indian Show. (catalogue) McMichael Canadian Art Collection, 1991.
- Menand, Louis. "Diversity" in Critical Terms for Literary Study. 2nd, ed., Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. eds., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Mesquita, Ivo. et. al. Cartographies. (catalogue) Winnipeg: Winnipeg Art Gallery Press, 1993.
- Nemiroff, Dianna, Robert Houle and Charlotte Townsend-Gault. Land Spirit Power. (catalogue) Ottawa: National Gallery of Canada, 1992.
- Nolan, Dan. "Harris trashes Ontario's employment-equity law," Montreal Gazette, July 20, 1995, A8.
- October: The Identity in Question. M.I.T. Press #61 (Summer 1992).

Parker, Rozsika and Griselda Pollock. Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology. London: Pandora Press, 1981.

Philip, M. Norbese. Frontiers: essays and writings on racism and culture. Stratford: The Mercury Press, 1992.

Phillips, Ruth B. "How Museums Marginalise: Naming Domains of Inclusion and Exclusion," The Cambridge Review. Vol. 114, No. 2320 (February 1993): 6-10.

_____. "The Public Relations Wrap: What we can learn from The Spirit Sings," Indian Art Quarterly. (Spring 1990): 14-21.

Portman, Jamie. "Indigenous artists express anger: Hull exhibition gives their view of the 'discovery' of the Americas," Montreal Gazette, May 2, 1992, A1.

Puhalo, Bishop Lazar. "The Museum as Transmitter of Understanding," Muse, Vol.11, No.1, (Spring 1993), 33-34.

Rees, A.L. and F. Borzello. eds., The New Art History. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press International, 1988.

Reitz, Jeffrey and Raymond Breton. The Illusion of Difference Realities of Ethnicity in Canada and the United States. Ottawa: Renouf Publishing, 1994

Richmond, Stuart. "Liberalism, Multiculturalism, and Art Education," Journal of Aesthetic Education. Vol. 29, No. 3, (Fall 1995), 15-25.

Riley, Susan. "Why are our museums so bland?" The Ottawa Citizen, December 7, 1996, D1 and D2.

Ross, Stephen David. Art and Its Significance: An Anthology of Aesthetic Theory. 2d ed. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.

Rudinow, Joel. "Race, Ethnicity, Expressive Authenticity: Can White People Sing the Blues?" The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 52:1 (Winter 1994), 127-137.

Said, Edward W. Orientalism. Toronto: Vintage Books edition. Random House, 1979.

Sarup, Madan. An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1989.

- Satzewich, Vic. ed., Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism and Racism in '90s Canada. Halifax, N.S. and Saskatoon Sask.: Fernwood Publishing, 1992.
- Shiner, Larry. "'Primitive Fakes,' 'Tourist Art,' and the Ideology of Authenticity," The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol.52, No.2, (Spring 1994), 225-234.
- Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam. Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Smart, Barry. Postmodernity: Key Ideas. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. The Post-Colonial Critic New York: Routledge, 1990.
- _____. In Other Worlds. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Taylor, Charles. Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition". Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- _____. The Malaise of Modernity. Concord, ON.: House of Anansi Press, 1991.
- Tippet, Maria. Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before Commission. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Tomlinson, John. Cultural Imperialism. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Tuer, Dot. "The Art of Nation Building: Constructing a 'National Identity' for Post-War Canada," Parallélogramme, Vol.17, No.4, 1992, 24-36.
- Wallis, Brian. ed., Art After Modernism: Rethinking Representation. New York: The New Museum of Contemporary Art, & Boston: David R. Godine, Publisher, Inc., 1984.
- _____. ed., Blasted Allegories: An Anthology of Writings by Contemporary Artists. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press & The New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1987.
- Waugh, Patricia. Postmodernism: A Reader. London: Edward Arnold, div. of Hodder and Stoughton, 1992.
- Weber, Terry. "Plight of aboriginals explored: Native reflections yield dark images," Winnipeg Free Press, June 26, 1993 B1.

Weizman, Sandra Morton. "Multiculturalism in Museums A Coat of Many Colours: A Case Study," Muse, Vol.10, No.1, (Spring 1992), 60-62.

Wellman, David T. Portraits of White Racism. 2d. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

West, Cornel. "The New Cultural Politics of Difference," in Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Culture. eds. Russel Ferguson, Martha Gever, Trinh T. Minh-ha, and Cornel West New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art & Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1990.

_____. Race Matters. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman. eds., Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Wollen, Peter. Raiding the Icebox: Reflections on Twentieth-Century Culture. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Wong, Paul. ed. Yellow Peril Reconsidered. (catalogue) Vancouver, BC.: On Edge, On the Cutting Edge, 1990

Young, Robert. White Mythologies: Writing History and the West. London: Routledge, 1990

Zemans, Joyce. "Establishing the Canon: Nationhood, Identity and the National Gallery's First Reproduction Programme of Canadian Art" The Journal of Canadian Art History Vol. XVI, No. 2, 1995, 7-35.

Periodical Survey

C Magazine (Winter 1990) issue 24, through (Spring 1995) issue 45.

Canadian Art (Spring 1990) through (Spring 1995)

Fuse (Spring 1990) Vol.13 No.4 through Vol.18 No.2 1995.

Parachute (April, May, June 1990) issue 58, through (April May June 1995) issue 78.

Parallélogramme (Summer 1990) Vol.16 No.1 through (Spring 1995) Vol.20 No.4