**NATION-BUILDING AND MONUMENTALIZATION IN THE
CONTEMPORARY CAPITAL:
THE CASE OF OTTAWA-HULL,
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE PEACEKEEPING MONUMENT
AND THE CANADIAN TRIBUTE TO HUMAN RIGHTS**

John Roberts, B.A.

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

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

c.1998, John Roberts

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.

0-612-36871-8

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an exploration of monument-building in Canada; an activity which is a reflection of the desire on the part of society to build national symbols. In an age of increasing globalization and cultural diversity, the need to build relevant symbols for national identity and social cohesiveness is growing. In this thesis, various functions of monuments are discussed, with particular reference given to the ideological role that they play in nation-building. The monumental heritage of the country and the symbolic landscape of Ottawa-Hull are explored around the central research question of how far the monumentalization to date characterizes the national society and what recent efforts have been made in this direction. To this end, the thesis narrows to consider two recent monument projects in the capital, *Reconciliation* or the Peacekeeping Monument and the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*. Discussion of these two examples will focus on the process of their production, using primarily interview material. A consideration of how each monument is interpreted or consumed will then follow using research from an on-street survey. The conclusion considers the contribution of such recent endeavours to the contemporary symbolic order.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

On a broad note, I would like to express gratitude to all of the people who have had some impact on my life which has led to the desire to undertake a thesis. For me this thesis has become to represent much more than its subject matter; it represents a step toward the desire to understand myself more fully and my role in the world. Despite the length of time it took to complete the work and the countless twists and turns associated along the way, I am thankful to have undertaken the process. I have learned to enjoy the passion of the mind as it attempts to understand the countless meanings associated with form in the world. This passion has awakened in me a love to learn which I trust will be sustained throughout my life. It has also stirred within me the need to understand one's country and why contributions need to be made to the ideal of nation if it is to grow and change in beneficial ways. On an emotional level, making sense of this thesis and its relevance to my life has stretched my heart in ways which will continue to unfold long after the completion of this work.

Specifically, I would like to thank my family and friends for giving me the space in which to explore the thesis process and its many facets. I thank Inayat Murphy for his interest and insight and the many breakfast discussions which helped to provide a sense of personal objectivity to the whole undertaking. Thanks goes out to Francis Ouimet for his proof reading work which often took time away from other matters including the garden. Avalon Gallien's guidance was a great reminder of the need to embrace whatever one does with interest, focus and passion if one is to see it to completion. I extend appreciation to the Carleton Geography Department in general and to the professors who

played a part in this thesis; John Tunbridge for his dedication and interest in the topic and ability to see “the wood beyond the trees”; Shelagh Squire for her careful attention to revision; and John Clarke for his statistical background and expertise. Appreciation is also extended to all those who took part in the interviews (their names are listed in the references). Their willingness to share their experiences with me made much of this research possible. Special thanks is also extended to Simon, the yellow Labrador and the time we shared on many of our walks through most of this process. The time shared was absolutely vital to the regenerating of spirit and for the cultivation of patience and perseverance. Simon will always be a reminder to me that guidance is offered from a variety of sources if one so chooses to recognize it.

For the reader, I hope that one is left with a sense of the importance that monuments play in society and why they have ignited the interest of so many who have undertaken to build them. These objects in the landscape which are so often taken-for-granted or forgotten, have interesting stories to tell and are a visible record of the efforts by people through time to make sense of and influence the world around them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acceptance Sheet	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xii
List of Plates	xiv
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: THE STUDY OF MONUMENTS	
INTRODUCTION	7
THEORETICAL ISSUES	8
Functional Aspects of Monuments	8
Culture and Symbol	9
Ideology	11
Landscape	12
NATION-BUILDING	15
Origins and Meanings	15

National History	18
Capital Landscapes	22
MONUMENTS AND DISSONANCE	24
Heritage Dissonance	24
Dissonance Case Studies	28
POSTMODERNISM	31
CONCLUSION	34

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION	35
METHOD	35
LINKS TO WIDER RESEARCH	46
STUDY AREA AND LIMITATIONS	48
SELECTION OF CASE STUDIES	50
CONCLUSION	52

CHAPTER THREE: MONUMENTS AND THE EXPERIENCE OF CANADIAN NATION-BUILDING

INTRODUCTION	53
EARLY IDENTITY	54
MATERIALIZING THE NATION	56

CHANGING FORMS AND STYLES	60
CHALLENGES TO THE NATIONAL HERITAGE	64
MATERIALIZING THE NEW HERITAGE	68
CONCLUSION	70

CHAPTER FOUR: THE CAPITAL LANDSCAPE OF OTTAWA-HULL

INTRODUCTION	71
TOWARD THE IDEAL	72
Early Beginnings	72
Hull and the Capital City	76
Capital Form	77
Changing Role of the National Capital Commission	78
Confederation Boulevard	80
THE MONUMENTAL LANDSCAPE	83
Historical Overview	84
Spatial and Thematic Coverage	96
CONCLUSION	104

CHAPTER FIVE: CASE STUDIES -- MONUMENTALIZATION OF THE CONTEMPORARY NATIONAL IDENTITY

INTRODUCTION	105

RELEVANCE TO NATIONAL HISTORY AND IDENTITY	106
REASONS FOR COMMEMORATION AND THE PROPONENT(S)	112
<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i>	112
<i>Reconciliation</i>	115
COMPETITION PROCESS	118
<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i>	114
<i>Reconciliation</i>	125
THE WINNING DESIGNS	134
<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i>	134
<i>Reconciliation</i>	147
PROMOTION	163
<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i>	163
<i>Reconciliation</i>	170
FURTHER THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	176
CONCLUSION	185
CHAPTER SIX: CONSUMPTION OF THE MONUMENTS	
INTRODUCTION	187

FORMAL COMMENTS	188
<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i>	188
<i>Reconciliation</i>	193
SURVEY RESULTS	199
<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i>	199
<i>Reconciliation</i>	216
INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS	238
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS	
SUMMARY	238
REVIEW OF THE PURPOSE OF THE THESIS	241
AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	245
RELEVANCE TO CONTEMPORARY GEOGRAPHICAL CONCERNS	248
SOURCES	250
APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER AND CONSENT FORM FOR MONUMENT INTERVIEWS	262
APPENDIX B: MONUMENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	265

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 2.0	Locations of public art in the greater Ottawa region, 1998.	49
Fig. 2.1	Approximate study boundaries in Ottawa-Hull, 1998.	49
Fig. 4.0	National Capital Region (NCR).	74
Fig. 4.1	Artistic rendition of Confederation Boulevard.	79
Fig. 4.2	Schematic illustration of main nodes and links on Confederation Boulevard.	82
Fig. 4.3	Confederation Boulevard in reference to major areas symbolic and tourist interest.	82
Fig. 4.4	Relative locations of monuments and selected sculpture along Confederation Boulevard in Ottawa-Hull, 1998.	98
Fig. 5.0	Site of <i>the Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> in reference to nearby buildings and to Confederation Boulevard, including it's related landscape features.	119
Fig. 5.1	Site of <i>Reconciliation</i> in reference to nearby buildings and to Confederation Boulevard, including it's related landscape features.	121
Fig. 5.2	Site plan for the <i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> .	135
Fig. 5.3	<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> ; sketches of the artist depicting various perspectives (a~e) on the monument.	136
Fig. 5.4	Map depicting the relationship between the <i>National War Memorial</i> and the <i>Tribute</i> .	138
Fig. 5.5	Site plan for <i>Reconciliation</i> .	148
Fig. 5.6	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; sketches by the designers depicting side views of the monument.	149

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.0	Selected characteristics of commemorative monuments and selected sculpture in Ottawa-Hull, 1998.	99
Table 6.0	Background characteristics of respondents and aggregate statistics to a survey relating to the <i>Tribute</i> .	200
Table 6.1	Chi square test results for selected variables from a survey on the <i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> .	201
Table 6.2	Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to identification of the monument (Identification), plaque reading (Inscriptions) and if they walked through the monument (Walked Through) for the <i>Tribute</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	204
Table 6.3	Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the perceived purpose of the <i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	209
Table 6.4	Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the opinion on the appearance of the <i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	212
Table 6.5	Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to participant's reasons for choice of appearance for the <i>Tribute</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	214
Table 6.6	Background characteristics of respondents and aggregate statistics to a survey relating to <i>Reconciliation</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	217
Table 6.7	Background characteristics of respondents and aggregate statistics to a survey relating to <i>Reconciliation</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	219
Table 6.8	Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to identification of the monument (Identification), plaque reading (Inscriptions) and if they walked through the monument (Walked Through) for <i>Reconciliation</i> in Ottawa- Hull, 1997.	220
Table 6.9	Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the perceived purpose of <i>Reconciliation</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	224

Table 6.10 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the opinion on the appearance of <i>Reconciliation</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	228

Table 6.11 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to participant's reasons for choice of appearance for <i>Reconciliation</i> in Ottawa-Hull, 1997.	230

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 4.0	<i>Boer War Memorial</i>	85
Plate 4.1	<i>National War Memorial</i>	85
Plate 4.2	<i>Can Loan Memorial</i>	90
Plate 4.3	<i>Flight</i>	90
Plate 4.4	<i>Terry Fox Memorial</i>	90
Plate 4.5	<i>Enclave</i> (Women's Memorial)	94
Plate 4.6	<i>Tissage/Shelter</i>	94
Plate 5.0	<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> ; main arch with the inscription of the first article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). View looking south on Elgin Street with the Knox Presbyterian Church in the background.	137
Plate 5.1	<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> ; concrete figures holding placards. View looking east with the old Teacher's College in the background.	138
Plate 5.2	<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> ; detail of concrete figures. View looking west toward the Barrister House building.	138
Plate 5.3	<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> ; view from inside the Tribute looking north to the <i>National War Memorial</i> .	140
Plate 5.4	<i>Canadian Tribute to Human Rights</i> ; Native language translation plaques of the UDHR, located on the concrete arch upon which the main granite arch rests.	144
Plate 5.5	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; frontal view from Mackenzie Ave. showing the converging walls.	150
Plate 5.6	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; side view of the monument with the sacred grove on the left. View is from Mackenzie Avenue.	150
Plate 5.7	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; ramp/path leading through the "battle scene". View is from Sussex Dr. with the National Gallery in background.	151

Plate 5.8	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; silhouette of the statues. View from the ceremonial space looking northwest toward the National Gallery.	151
Plate 5.9	Detail of the clay maquettes used for the statues in <i>Reconciliation</i> .	152
Plate 5.10	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; view from the main walls looking northward toward the sacred grove.	152
Plate 5.11	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; detail of the flagpole showing the lights on each side which resemble symbolic guns.	154
Plate 5.12	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; handrails aiming toward Parliament Hill. View is from Sussex Dr.	154
Plate 5.13	<i>Reconciliation</i> ; detail of the ceremonial mortar on the north wall. View is from the parade space looking south.	159

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps one of the most tangible imprints that a person or group can leave on the physical landscape is through what is known as the monument. By monument (memorials included), I refer to “any object whose sole function at present is to celebrate or perpetuate the memory of particular events, ideas, individuals or groups of persons” (Zelinsky, 1988:180). Monuments can vary in size, shape and material, but they are often built to last for a long time and are usually of sufficient height and visual appeal to be noticed by observers. Monuments are deeply social in their production process. Their meanings and form are often the result of intense discussion by those involved, and their subject matter is usually relevant to the broader society. Monuments “function as social magnets, crystalizations of social energy, one of the means civilization has devised to reinforce its cohesiveness and to give meaning and structure to life. Monuments are a way men transmit communal emotions, a medium of continuity and interaction between generations, not only in space but across time, for to be monumental is to be permanent” (Tranchenburg, 1976:150). As evidence of the important role that they play in society, monuments are usually located in central areas of cities or towns where people gather.

Monument-building is about making thoughts and ideas into concrete form. It is a process that reflects a strong faith on the part of those involved and one which deeply engages participants lives. “Faith in what”, one might ask ? For my purpose here, it is a faith in nation. And, as will be discussed in more detail later, nation refers to that set of

ideas that has the attention of the world so that nations are now seen by many as natural phenomena. In national capitals, monuments are usually integral to building efforts meant to inspire and reflect national ideals. Making permanent interpretations of events or ideas that concern the national society is a process that involves a distillation of thought and experience on the part of monument creators and involves at times intense discussion over meaning. The final result is thus often reflective of “goodwill rather than consensus” (Senie, 1992:4). And yet when one looks at the polished finish of monuments, projecting a seemingly impenetrable objectivity on events or people or both, this constructed nature is often lost. There is no plaque commemorating the intense negotiation of meaning and the ideas and motivations of those involved. We are left with a monument that at best offers to the viewer a reflection of “distortions, generalizations, [and] focalizations” (Paquet, 1993:275) of reality. What more can one expect from an object that must condense all the multitude of ideas and interpretations offered on the reality it marks? It is created by people whose personal experience and self-interest colours the attempt to comprehend reality. Since these permanent markers are meant to inform and shape public opinion, it is worth attempting to pierce these polished shells and to explore their rich history before their birth in the landscape.

In Canada, efforts to materialize the values and ideals of the nation in monument form date from the early nineteenth century. Most of the monumental heritage reflects a disproportionate share of British-oriented themes. This legacy reflects the fact that the height of monument-building occurred when the nation was still identifying itself primarily as a colony of the British Empire, between the late nineteenth

to early twentieth centuries. This identification provided a rich repository of material to help in the formation of a new country. As Canada emerged from this identity around the end of the Second World War, the era of large-scale commemoration began to decline. Yet, due to the permanence of monuments, we are left with this colonial heritage; this heritage serves as an effective instrument of distinction from the U.S. and a useful tourism asset, but no longer adequately defines Canadian reality. While the old British identity was transformed over time to recognize a plurality of cultures, how to portray this ideology has become a concern for the Canadian government.

Canada is regarded by Grimmond (1991) as the first post-modern country. Among other aspects, this situation entails an increasingly decentralized state and multicultural society, and a respect for a diversity of identities. Grimmond also argues that to hold the country together, new ideas of what it means to be Canadian should be put forward. As the capital of Canada, Ottawa-Hull must reflect a symbolic landscape, identified with by Canadian citizens. Here, in recognition of the central research question, consideration of the symbolic capital and monument-building will provide a glimpse at efforts to construct new symbols of Canadian national identity.

In this thesis, I will explore the broader efforts in building a capital that is representative of Canada and how this task has then specifically been carried out in the realm of monumentalization.

Chapter 1 relates monuments to the study of culture and cultural landscapes in geography, emphasizing the symbolic role that monuments play in society. As a symbol, monuments denote specific meanings and ideas about the society and are

therefore ideological in nature. Messages communicated through monuments and memorials are often the product of the state or of cultural groups interested in influencing public opinion over issues related to nationalism or about the national society. Accordingly, Chapter 1 also discusses ideology and the role of nationalism in monument-making and considers briefly other roles that monuments play in society, including city beautification and legibility and their economic heritage use when marketed as tourist experiences.

Chapter 2 considers methodology and links the research approaches used in the thesis (including interviews, street surveys and secondary sources) with work carried-out by other geographers and art historians who have studied monuments. This chapter will also discuss limitations of the research in terms of the kind of monument studied, the study area and choice of case studies.

Chapter 3 traces the evolution of Canadian identity and how this process was reflected in monument-building, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Changing attitudes towards large-scale commemoration and shifts in style are also discussed. I focus in particular on how monuments and other commemorations change in order to more accurately reflect the changing nature of Canadian identity.

Chapter 4 reviews the symbolic importance of capitals to national identity. As a capital city, Ottawa-Hull's built environment has received much attention through formal planning efforts aimed at trying to reflect the ideals and aspirations of Canadian identity. The capital thus provides a powerful backdrop for monuments and their messages. The chapter traces some of the efforts to build the capital's identity, including construction of

the ceremonial route; a concerted effort at landscape planning to link some of the most important national symbols. The monumental landscape of the capital is then considered, focusing on what has been produced to date, and how this production varies over time by theme, location and style. The main players involved and related commemoration policies will also be explored.

Building on this framework, I then focus in Chapter 5 and 6 on the production and consumption of two recent monuments, selected as case studies, the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* and *Reconciliation*, or as the latter is known less formally, the Peacekeeping Monument. Chapter 5 compares and contrasts the monuments chosen as the case studies and links the empirical research to the theoretical, social-cultural and historical frameworks developed earlier in the thesis. These two case studies are excellent examples of innovative attempts to monumentalize the new realities of Canadian identity. Both monuments seek to articulate facets of the national identity: the former through recognition of the primacy of human rights to Canadian society, the latter, as an expression of attempts that Canadians have to make to create and secure world peace. Both monuments appeal to a ‘minimalist’ approach to national identity by attempting to represent values that cut across competing identities (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

While monuments are intended as expressions of national values, it is vital to examine just what the intentions of their makers are and how these intentions are realized. This thesis attempts to discover whether or not these two monuments successfully reflect those intentions and values. The theme of each commemoration is

linked to Canadian identity and history; its location is related to the symbolic capital, and the motivations of each agency and how these translate into meaning for the monument in question are considered. The case studies further explore how each monument was produced, including the competition process, the initial reasons for commemoration and its symbolism and form.

How monuments are interpreted or consumed, however, will change as society evolves. In some instances they are so much a part of the general nature of society that they are almost unnoticeable. As Musil (1936:87) notes, "There is nothing in the world as invisible as monuments. Like a drop of water on an oilskin, attention runs down them without stopping for a moment." And yet they can fall out of favour quite quickly, for instance, during a revolution when there is a major change in the symbolic realm. Or they may just quietly reside in oblivion, their messages so out of date that they hold no more relevance for society (Lewis, 1991).

How a monument is interpreted is a complex affair which involves questions of personal identity as well as the changing nature of ideas surrounding the issues that monuments commemorate. In Chapter 6, I will note the contested nature of this monumental landscape as exemplified by the two case studies.

The final chapter summarizes the overall thesis findings and discusses potential areas for future research. Lastly, I will explore reasons as to why continuing study in the area of monuments is of importance for the field of cultural geography, and as a result, the attention given to it, expanded.

CHAPTER ONE: THE STUDY OF MONUMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Monuments must be seen as cultural products that function in the symbolic and material realm. The meaning inscribed in monuments results from the intentions of various groups to shape or pattern society in a particular way, usually for purposes of nation-building or lesser forms of social cohesion. Monuments are therefore ideological in nature in that they reflect the ideas of their producers. Monuments are part of the cultural landscape and are usually located in centres of power and/or near areas of social interaction. One of the most potent landscapes which monuments reinforce, and are in turn strengthened by, is in the national capital. These landscapes are meant to inspire awe through their careful attention to architecture and sculpture. A consideration of the capital landscape as one of the ultimate backdrops and reason for producing monuments is thus included.

The first part of the chapter deals with functional aspects of monuments then turns to consider in depth their place in culture and landscape as significant symbols involving the use of power and ideology. The discussion then considers the activity of nation-building and the particular role of nationalist ideology in relation to why monuments are built. The role of national history and heritage and capital landscapes are integral to the above and will form part of the discussion on nationalism. The latter half of the chapter reflects on the contentious nature of monument-building and interpretation and provides

a number of examples to illustrate this controversy. The chapter finishes with a brief consideration of the place of postmodernism as a reflection on reasons why the need to be more representative of diverse social elements has become a concern for the federal government and other interested groups.

THEORETICAL ISSUES

Functional Aspects of Monuments

Public monuments have long been used in order to decorate buildings, parks and squares, largely in a setting related to civic improvement by conveying ideas of beauty (Robinson, 1970). Related to this function is the strong belief that monuments contribute something special to the experience of the city. Monuments make places special by imbuing their surroundings with symbolism and a sense of history. They may allow one to remember, ponder or discuss meaning or simply offer an opportunity to consider more aesthetic attributes (Berlyne, 1974).

In addition to their symbolic and aesthetic attributes, monuments can help a city or town be more legible to its inhabitants. The stimuli that exist in an urban setting are vast, but there are particular physical elements within it which help people to navigate their way through it. For example, monuments can serve as landmarks by virtue of their height and often placement in very visible locations. Such is the case of the Arc de Triomphe in Paris, France. Monuments located near major roadways serve as markers to aid in traffic flows and help to designate symbolic space. This way, not only do they

serve as potential elements tools in city planning, but their visibility is also increased (Lynch, 1960). Moreover, in earlier periods, they were strategically placed near civic buildings and were made to represent ideals or persons or both related to the functioning of the building. In this way, the purpose of the building was made more clear to the public.

Monuments serving as functional objects represent one side of these cultural artifacts. Another side involves a consideration of what ideals and beliefs monuments and through their creators are trying to convey to society around them. Thus I now turn to consider their place in a wider context of culture and ideology.

Culture and Symbol

The fact that monuments are products of culture beckons us to take a brief look at the word “culture”, since it has been an area of contention in cultural geography for at least the last decade (Mitchell, 1995). The contention around culture is part of a wider debate where a number of cultural geographers have argued for a more theoretically informed sub-discipline and a broadening of the range in study topics and approaches (Price and Lewis, 1993). Earlier definitions approached culture as “an entity at a higher level than the individual, that is governed by a logic of its own and that it actively constrains human behaviour” (Jackson, 1989:18). This approach to culture, termed the superorganic, is most notably attributed to the influence of Carl Sauer and is argued to have limited the scope of inquiry of the cultural geography to looking at culture traits at

the expense of investigating the actions of individuals who make up culture (Jackson, 1989). As a result, artifacts produced by culture, such as barns, houses, graveyards, etc. were mapped and described in order to delineate the particular boundaries of culture groups who were responsible for differences in style and construction. This approach tended to focus more on the functional nature of artifacts rather than on the emphasis on the more symbolic dimension.

More recent approaches to cultural study have been forwarded by a number of geographers who have been influenced by other sources (including Marxism and contemporary cultural studies). For example, Cosgrove and Jackson (1987:99) present a view of culture characterized as “the medium by through which people transform the mundane phenomena of the material world into a world of significant symbols to which they give meaning and attach value.” Duncan (1990:15) quotes Raymond William’s (1982:13) formulation of culture as “the signifying system through which necessarily (though among other means) a social order is communicated, reproduced, experienced, and explored.”

These two definitions, which characterize culture as an active process involving the use of symbols, are reflective of a turn in cultural geography toward understanding the symbolic aspect of artifacts (Ley, 1988). A symbol can be defined as “any object, act, event, quality or relation which serves as a vehicle for a conception” (Geertz, 1966:5). Symbols serve a fundamental purpose in that they facilitate the process by which people make sense of the physical world. People develop a symbolic sense through their

interaction with the culture in which they participate. This symbolic sense is important for social order and yet also allows for personal idiosyncrasies (Kertzer, 1988). Beliefs and ideas that define a collective identity are represented through symbols in the various rituals, commemorations of events and people and the functions of institutions in a society (Breton, 1988). The fact that a symbol involves meaning raises a number of issues regarding power relations, how meanings are constructed and to what end, how they are contested by various groups in society, and what happens to symbols as their perception change over time (Kertzer, 1988).

Ideology

Kertzer (1988) argues that the production of symbols are tied to the distribution of societal resources. This involves the use of power, argued by Peet (1996:23), to entail “the creation and manipulation of social imaginary significations, that is, the making of a world of meanings.” Those who have the ability to change and create meaning are usually the dominant groups in society. The meaning of symbols is tied to ideology, which is defined as a “system (possessing its own logic and structure) of representations (images, myths, ideas or concepts) existing and playing a historical role within a given society” (Duby, 1985:152). Williams (1981) argues that ideologies reflective of the particular interests of dominant social groups work in a selective fashion by promoting particular ideas and meanings over others. These systems of ideas and beliefs “offer ordered, simplified versions of the world; they substitute a single certainty for a multiplicity of

ambiguity; they tender to individuals both an ordered view of the world and of their own place within the natural and social systems” (Baker, 1992:4).

The tangible symbolic realm can be found in concrete representations including the monument. The monument as many other visual cultural artifacts are signs or markers that convey societal messages which reflect the interests of their creators: “public art, in overt and covert ways, embodies the ideals and aspirations of its patron, be it a national government, a local community, an individual or a corporation” (Senie, 1992:101). The production of a monument is intimately tied to specific motivations where “personal ambitions as well as larger political and economic agendas often merge”, hence the link to ideology (Ibid.). These ambitions may be related for instance to the need for national unity, to perpetuate particular social and/or economic policies or to simply provide a more aesthetically pleasing environment for commercial consumption.

Landscape

Since monuments are situated in the physical world and are also cultural objects, they form part of what is referred to as the cultural landscape. Within cultural geography, much of this new work on the symbolic aspect of artifacts has been carried out relates to studies of cultural landscapes. The cultural landscape defined by Wagner and Mikesell (1962:11) refers to a “concrete and characteristic product of the complicated interplay between a given human community, embodying certain cultural preferences and potentials, and a particular set of physical circumstances.” Landscape study can be

approached through a variety of perspectives (Meining, 1979), one of which focuses on the role of thought and idea in their make-up. From this perspective “landscapes are ideological in that they can be used to endorse, legitimize, and/or challenge social and political control” (Kong, 1993:24).

Landscapes aid in the process of taining control over meanings through “the elite manipulation of the image-making capacity of the socialized subject at that cognitive level where thoughts are colored by mental pictures of reality” (Peet, 1996:23). This process is argued to be reinforced when a natural area is invested with markers with a particular social or historical message. Since nature is often taken for granted as part of our basic reality, these markers, located in this “natural background”, tend to blend in as well. Hence, despite the fact that landscapes are heavily laden with ideas and beliefs, they are often interpreted without critical inquiry (Duncan, 1990). This tendency enables landscapes to be particularly well suited to the imposition of certain cultural meanings on to people. Consequently, political and historical markers such as monuments, which are often long-lived, offer images of the past and future, thereby helping along a set of beliefs about how society should evolve (Kertzer, 1988) For Duncan (1990:123), the most important role for landscape in the social process is the “ideological, supporting a set of ideas and values, unquestioned assumptions about the way a society *is*, or should be organized.” As a result, much of the geographical research focuses on the need to expose the various beliefs and ideas that form the “ideological sediment” implicated in landscapes (Duncan, 1990:117).

An important aspect to be considered is the fact that dominant ideologies are in fact contested from time to time. This fact is central to Gramsci's (1985) concept of hegemony. Essentially this concept refers to the use of the power of persuasion as opposed to coercion by dominant groups in their effort to have subordinate groups accept their ideas and beliefs. And yet there never is a situation of total hegemony or acceptance of these ideas and beliefs. Rather than think of this process as entailing a straightforward assertion of the dominance of one group over another, we must see landscapes as having any number of competing ideologies present at any one time (Baker, 1992). As a result, dominant ideologies can be and are contested by subordinate groups. Moreover, dominant and subordinate groups should not be seen as homogeneous entities but as broad categories entailing fluid identities, that may espouse different and competing ideologies within each broad group (Jackson, 1989). I will return to this issue of contestation later when I discuss monuments and their production and consumption.

The themes that make up the messages of monuments can vary, but their use in nationalist politics is perhaps the most popular. One of the strongest areas in which ideology operates can be found in the nation-building process, where the idea of nationalism figures prominently. This connection between monuments and nationalism is well suited to my study, in that much of the research on monuments centres on their use as political resources.

NATION-BUILDING

Origins and meanings

Nuala Johnson (1996) argues that monuments are a useful, albeit underutilized resource in geography in the investigation of the nation-building process. The importance of nationalism in human culture is particularly evident in that the primary level of political organization in the world today is based on the concept of the nation-state. The literature on concepts such as nation, state and nationalism is vast and much of it stresses the difficulty in defining these terms (Eley and Suny, 1996). However, what is apparent is that there has been a shift in the way nations have been conceptualized. The nation is often presented in such a way that it is seen as a real object in space, bounded in time and territory, possessing a unique history and common people. In effect, they are conceived as natural entities. This unitary and essentialist approach to viewing the nation is common to nationalist ideology, but it is in contrast to more recent research which stresses the nation's imagined characteristics (Johnson, 1994). The nation according to Anderson (1983:6) refers to "an imagined political community and [is] imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign." The collective identity is imagined since not all members of a society will ever meet all the inhabitants of the nation-state in a lifetime. The belief in the existence of such an entity by its inhabitants is related to nationalism.

Nationalism as defined by Breton (1988:1) as an "ideology, a system of ideas that orients the social construction process and legitimates its outcome." Nationalism has its origins in eighteenth century European Enlightenment and Romanticist thought. Its

advent is said to have begun with the events leading to the partitions of Poland in 1772, 1793 and 1795, the American Declaration of Independence in 1776, and in the start of the second phase of the French Revolution in 1789 to 1792 (Smith and Hutchinson, 1994). A summation of the doctrine of nationalism by Smith and Hutchinson (1994:4) clearly indicates its emphasis on the principles of autonomy, unity and identity:

The people must be liberated-that is, free from any external constraint; they must determine their own destiny and be masters in their own house; they must control their own resources; they must obey their own "inner" voice. But that entailed fraternity. The people must be united; they must dissolve all internal divisions; they must be gathered together in a single historic territory, a homeland; and they must have legal equality and share a single public culture.

In practice, nationalism is said to have two broadly defined ideal types. Nationalistic ideology can stress either one and can move back and forth between the two through time. The first is known as ethnic or cultural nationalism. In this instance, the foundation of inclusion is based on characteristics related to language, genetic background and common ancestry. A collective feeling exists based on a sense of cultural distinctiveness. The creation of a political state further articulates the aspirations and beliefs of the collective. In this case, the boundaries of the nation are more in line with the actual boundaries of the culture (Breton, 1988).

The second ideal type is known as civic nationalism, whose basis of inclusion is based on political principles rather than ethnicity. The collective society is regarded as a political and rational construct. People are united in order to secure economic resources and to defend the boundaries of the state. The primary glue that holds the people together is common interest and not attachment to an ethnic identity per se (Ibid.).

It is important to note that, in order for nationalism to be fully realized as a process, a sovereign state must be created. (Anderson, 1986). The state is the “political apparatus that claims or exerts absolute sovereignty over a given territory and its inhabitants” (Zelinsky, 1988:4). The state as a means of social organization predates nationalism. The rise of the state dates back to the fifteenth century, when it became a means by which to provide security and to access and control economic resources related to the rise in the world economy (Eley and Suny, 1996). The rise of the nation-state is a rather recent phenomenon that has involved a gradual transformation of identification in its inhabitants from seeing themselves as subjects, to citizens with rights under the nation-state (Ibid.).

The nation-state may come about through the cultivation of a sense of distinct culture and territory, leading to a gradual creation of the state to further articulate the beliefs and ideals of the nation (ethnic nationalism). But often, states are created in a more utilitarian manner (civic nationalism) and the belief in a nation is poorly articulated or lacking in cohesion. In addition, the state may contain a number of nations that may or may not be politically motivated to form their own state, but, regardless, must be enveloped by a broader conception of identity associated with the state. In this case the state uses its resources to foster a sense of nation in order to secure its legitimacy. In order to maintain some level of cohesion and stability, the state embarks on the construction of a national identity. Ideally this identity will transcend the multitude of competing identities, such as religion and ethnicity, and, in place, leave a collective belief that people are part of a unique, single and cohesive society (Zelinsky, 1988).

This on-going process is termed nation-building and essentially involves the transfer of loyalty to the state. Somehow people must be indoctrinated into the feeling that they do indeed share something in common with others. The idea of the nation-state must be made tangible, "it must be personified before it can be seen, symbolized before it can be loved, imagined before it can be conceived" (Walzer, 1967:194). This process is carried out on a number of fronts including the actual building of infrastructure to secure economic resources, the creation of institutions involving education, defense, and the articulation of cultural ideals and beliefs.

Related to the development of national identity is the creation of a national history or past. In the past one can find the myths, ideals and beliefs of the culture and society, all of which make up raw material for the themes of national monuments. A vision or interpretation of history, therefore plays a strong part in the effort to create common bonds.

A consideration of national history and the related concept of heritage will help to place monuments in a context that emphasizes their use as containers of power through their ability to transmit ideas and beliefs about the national society. It will also make clear how the intentions of their makers are often formulated through attempts at consensus and are at times debated after their unveiling.

National History

The creation of the national past by the state or other interested groups is carried out in such a way that it supports the idea of the uniqueness of the collective society.

The role of public memory is central to this task. Bodnar (1994:76) defines public memory as “beliefs and ideas about the past that help a public or society understand both its present, and by implication, its future.” Memory sustains a sense of identity through time, but what is remembered is also related to the particular time and social context in which identity is operating. Rather than thinking of memory and identity as fixed objects, Gillis (1994) argues that both are subjective since society is constantly reworking memory in order to support its sense of identity. These national memories are thus selective in nature and “feature[s] fantasy, invention, mystery, error” (Lowenthal, 1994:49).

Another concept that is related to memory and identity is the contemporary idea of heritage. This term has grown from its original meaning of referring to one’s inheritance from deceased ancestors to that of referring to an ever-growing compendium of phenomena (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996). In short, heritage can be seen as encapsulating both physical and non-physical cultural production from the past. This may well include elements from the natural world. Heritage is primarily the tangible aspect of what is remembered, including monuments, and it is used in the nation-building process to “promote citizenship, to catalyze creativity, to attract foreign sympathy and to enhance all aspects of national life” (Lowenthal, 1994:45). A national heritage is what separates each nation from another and provides a tangible link to its past and future.

Heritage also refers to the growing commercial activity involving the selling of goods and services which have some heritage element associated with them. Much of this commodification activity is related to the tourist industry. While not the focus of this particular thesis, it should be noted that it is an important motivation in the creation of heritage.

The creation of heritage relates back to the role of public memory. Bodnar (1994) argues that one is presented in fact with two distinct forms of memory: the official and vernacular. The official memory is created or perpetuated by politicians and the social elite, whose main concern is to foster national unity and maintain the status quo. Vernacular or popular memory represents a variety of interest groups, whose conception of what to remember and how usually differs from those involved in the making of official memory. These people may have been directly affected by a war, for instance, and may wish to have remembered a version of events which is more related to the actual experience rather than a polished account deemed suitable for the national interest. Official memory tries to interpret events in the past and present in such a way as to limit controversy between its citizens in order to ensure national stability.

How this process is carried out is often through the commemorative activities of the state or by the social elite. Commemorative activity around the unveiling of monuments can involve much fanfare including official speeches by important people, street decoration and parades. The erection of a monument and the associated events around it entail the “practice of representation that enacts and gives social substance to

the discourse of collective memory” (Sherman, 1992:186) and serves “to anchor collective remembering ...in highly condensed, fixed, and tangible sites” (Savage, 1992:130-1). These activities are carried out by the state or by cultural leaders “to calm anxiety about change or political events, eliminate citizen indifference toward official concerns, promote exemplary patterns of citizen behaviour, and stress citizen duties over rights” (Bodnar, 1996:76). These efforts are a response to the need to ensure societal cohesion in light of alternative political views, citizen apathy toward the state, and social contradictions (Ibid.).

The pinnacle of monument-building on both sides of the Atlantic occurred during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and much of this activity was related to the rise in nationalism (Johnson, 1994,1995). The events surrounding the American Civil War and French Revolution were particularly fruitful in this regard. The First World War was responsible for the majority of monument commemorations in Canada and will be discussed more in more detail later. Sculpture depicting nationalist themes and individuals is particularly evident in Washington D.C., which has the highest concentration of public sculpture in that country (Goode, 1974).

War memorials are an integral part of most city landscapes and reflect the vital role that war plays in most national histories (Osborn, 1996; Mayo, 1988). Since they highlight such values as service and duty, and often involve collective participation, war and battles are particularly useful to national identity. As Renan (1990:19) points out, “suffering in common unifies more than joy does.”

Capital Landscapes

The efforts toward the building of a symbolic capital are an important element in the nation-building project. Capital cities often reflect state-derived attempts at constructing monumental architecture and sculpture, grand boulevards and parks in order to impress values and meanings onto the society and nation (Taylor et al, 1993). In this way, capital landscapes serve as ceremonial space for commemorative events such as national birthdays and cultural festivals. These events have been characterized as “spectacles and rituals.” A spectacle entails “fanfare and theatricality” and serves to impress upon participants and onlookers feelings of achievement and wonder. They are also rituals in that they are recurring activities carried out in a setting which is a place and time apart from the everyday (Kong and Yeoh, 1997). This aspect of rituals is said to contribute to the idea of liminality, where the usual dominant relations between social groups are suspended or suppressed and which is “potentially a period of scrutinization of the central values and axioms of the culture in which it occurs”(Turner 1974:156). Thus these activities lead to greater social cohesion and emphasize citizenship (Goheen, 1993).

In terms of nation-building and monuments, the capital setting could be argued to provide the ultimate back-drop for these symbolic devices. Not only does the setting contribute to their consumption, but the monuments themselves contribute to the overall experience of this “extraordinary” landscape.

Use of the landscape of the capital as a symbol to impress societal meanings has a long history. Duncan's (1990) study of the city of Kandy in early Sri Lanka is an example where monuments, architecture and ceremonial pathways were all used in an elaborate manner to impart meanings to the populace. However, it is argued by Rapoport (1993) that the ability of physical landscapes to impart high-level meanings may be difficult to achieve in the modern era, for a variety of reasons. Firstly, meaning can be imparted through other means including the written word in a much more efficient manner. In addition, communications technology, including television, makes the need to visit the capital less of a necessity, leading to its erosion as a place for collective gathering. Secondly, the planning of capitals usually involves more than one agency and must mediate among a number of interests, including those of the vernacular city, which may or may not be interested in sustaining a capital image. The result may be a capital that is unable to project a coherent image. As well, the typical city has such a profusion of signs and other objects used for practical everyday living that it takes away from the ability of symbolic elements to impart value. Finally, the values that are said to be shared in highly pluralistic societies such as democracy and equality typically are those that are not unique to any one national culture, thereby diminishing the capacity to impart a unique national identity.

Despite these arguments, efforts continue around the globe to construct such symbolic capitals. When we turn to the situation for Ottawa-Hull in Chapter 5, one can most certainly identify continuing efforts at building a national symbolic capital.

Moreover, these efforts are not just tied to the state but can also be seen in the on-going production of privately funded monuments in the capital by both local and out-of-town Canadians. This is evidence that people indeed see the capital as a symbolic resource. While many of the points mentioned earlier still hold, one must also consider that such landscapes are being increasingly produced for purposes of international tourism, and any defining feature that can be “sold” offers a competitive advantage over other places (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 1990).

As heritage, the experience of monuments can be sold to the consumer in a tourist situation (Ibid.). The potential for monuments to attract attention in this fashion leads of course to their ability to create distinctive places to visit and hopefully to garner tourist income accrued through accommodation and meals. Since monuments are usually particular in theme to the culture or society in which they are located, they serve as particularly interesting tourist destinations. Often monuments become signature elements in the selling of a city’s image. One only has to think of New York and the Statue of Liberty or the famous Mall in Washington, D.C.. For a more in-depth treatment of the role of public art and selling places, see Shamash (1992).

MONUMENTS AND DISSONANCE

Heritage Dissonance

While I have argued the fact that monuments are ideological in nature, it is relevant to note that they can be controversial both in their creation process and in their subsequent interpretation. The selection of themes and how they are articulated in the

monument make up a process of attempting to represent or interpret reality. This undertaking often results in a process characterized by the need for consensus, since, not only must the broader context of societal opinion and belief over content be taken into account, but it involves the personalities, ambitions and experience of those directly involved. Thus, monument-building can be illustrative of the constant interplay of differing ideologies at work in the construction of meaning. Yet the constructed meaning and all its ideological implications rests on the basic assumption that the monument is able to reflect these messages through its form, if, in fact, the people on the street interpret them the way they were meant to.

While not central to this thesis, the issue of consumption of monuments must be mentioned since much of the work in monuments centres on how they are received, and that reception is given significant attention in the case studies below. As well, it is hard to separate consumption from production since the way in which works are received is the main reason why monuments are built to begin with. Moreover, these concerns are often central in the minds of proponents and thus affect their production.

A central fact of heritage including monuments is that its interpretation is invariably contestable and at times it can become quite controversial. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) examine this controversy under the heading of “heritage dissonance.” Essentially, heritage dissonance refers to a “discordance or lack of agreement and consistency” (p. 20) in how heritage is viewed. Implicit in all heritage is that it must convey some meaning for the society. National heritage contains value-laden messages

for the collective society. However it is not so easily apparent if the messages or ideas that are meant to be imparted are received in the expected fashion.

Central to this heritage dissonance is the fact that identity itself varies over time and space. Human diversity entails many aspects, and there are a number of potential areas for identification ranging from class, religion, gender, language and so on. As well, identity can vary by scale; for instance, one can have local or regional identity, which may or may not be in line with present conceptions of national identity. All of these identities compete for the individual's sense of who and what he or she is. Consequently, there is a multitude of perspectives from which messages can be interpreted (Lowenthal, 1994; Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

Outside of content itself lies the controversy or dissonance over the aesthetic consumption or interpretation of monuments. This will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter but one point should be made here: if the style of the monument proves unintelligible to viewers, can one not expect that this in some way will affect his or her ability or motivation to consider the work further? This point is important in that monumental art has expanded to include more abstract expressions which have not always proven to be popular.

Since monuments are situated amongst a variety of competing stimuli in the city, it is worth exploring how this affects their consumption. Approaching the problem from an environmental psychology perspective, Degnore(1987) advances the idea that people perceive monuments as part of an evocative-provocative continuum. She postulates that the perception is a product of the complex relationships between the viewer, the

surroundings and the qualities of the artwork. Not only is the experience unique to the viewer, it also changes over time as the surroundings and the viewer continue to evolve.

The above considerations on interpretation point to the issue of just how difficult it may be to adequately convey intended messages in monuments. Moreover, the monument may refer to culturally specific events and persons which will limit its distinctive message for those outside the culture. Also, over time, people become accustomed to their surroundings and the monuments they contain. As a result, they often cease to take an active interest in noticing or questioning monuments. This process is referred to as the “leveling effect” that is part of the human response to visual stimuli (Degnore, 1987). This response to stimuli relates back to how symbolic artifacts in the landscape become “natural” despite their ideological content. This response however is less present in those such as the young or tourists, who have not been exposed enough to the work (Degnore, 1987). An interesting point about this aspect is that, while people become accustomed to monuments almost to the point of not seeing them, their perception can change dramatically if the meanings conveyed by the monuments are no longer valid to the beliefs and values of society. A recent example of this can be found in the widespread removal of statues of Communist leaders such as Lenin in the former Soviet republics and satellite countries after the fall of Communism. If one ever doubts the power of monuments due to their invisibility at times, one only has to see how in times of great social upheaval they are often treated as living entities, where statues are

decapitated, spat on or destroyed on the spot. In these instances, the power of the icon and its place in society are revealed (Lewis, 1991).

Dissonance Case Studies

At this point I will provide some tangible examples taken from cultural geography and art history of how controversial monument-making and interpretation can be. These studies emphasize the intensity of ideology as expressed by monuments and highlight the fact that building a national identity is a contested process.

Johnson (1994) highlights how parts of Ireland in the past have resisted the union with Britain and illustrates how dominant ideologies were contested. These rituals of resistance were inscribed in monuments erected in 1898 in celebration of the centenary of the Rebellion in 1798. As well, she documents how memory itself is contested and negotiated in space amongst those involved in this heroic and anti-Unionist interpretation of the past event. This same author, Johnson (1995), shows how local and popular memory can be divided in terms of who is commemorated. A monument to a prominent Irish political leader, Charles Stuart Parnell, was proposed in 1899. This figure aroused considerable debate over his commemoration, not only on political grounds but also in virtue of his recent adulterous affair. This debate over monuments in general was reflective of their role in “negotiating and contesting popular nationalist politics” (Johnson, 1995:59).

With reference to Scotland, Withers (1996) focuses on two recent commemorations and one from the past in order to focus on the more local and popular use of memory in the formation of communal identity. His study reinforces the ideas of Bodnar (1994) mentioned earlier in that memory should not be conceived as something always “shared and unproblematic.” For example, a movement to destroy a past monument to the Duke of Sutherland created considerable debate. This figure is associated with the Clearances, a process which brought radical change to land tenure and, subsequently, to nineteenth century Highland society. The debate highlighted conflicting ideas about how the past should be viewed and accentuated the dilemma about what should be done with monuments from the past when their validity for present society is questioned.

Radford (1992) reveals how the nationalist identity in the Confederate States was perpetuated rather than destroyed by the events of the Civil War. Civil War statuary, erected after the war in the South, is argued to be reflective of a romanticized version of the past favoured by elite elements. The monuments were commemorated as part of the “cult of the Lost Cause,” referring to the attempt of the Confederacy to create its own nation-state, thereby marginalizing dissenting social groups and viewpoints.

Work in art history also echoes the conflicting process by which monuments are created and perceived (Senie and Webster, 1992). Two examples, both from Washington, will highlight controversial interpretations of national identity. The first is the Washington Memorial, a 550-foot obelisk. The desire to commemorate Washington originated as early as 1783, when it was felt that an equestrian monument would be the

best way to mark the first great leader of the United States. However, this view fell into disfavour over controversy surrounding how to mark his accomplishments and his place in a nation supposedly founded on the idea of a people who had renounced the need for great leaders and instead upheld the virtues of the self-regulated and self-reliant individual. In 1848, the idea of the obelisk was approved but the controversy surrounding this commemoration decreased the momentum to finish the project, which was completed in 1885 (Savage, 1992).

The second example is taken from Fryd (1992), and is highly illustrative of how personal motivations and political agendas can affect an artist's design of a work. The statue of Freedom on top of the White House Dome was commissioned in 1855 and erected during the Civil War. The design went through a number of changes due to the direct influence of government officials, most notably the Secretary of War, Jefferson Davis. The first major change proposed by Davis was the reinterpretation of the original emphasis on Peace and Liberty. For example, the statue was placed on top of a globe which was meant to "reflect her protection of the American world" (Fryd, 1992:106). This idea is linked to the belief in an imperial America which would influence other nations about the superiority of Republican government and reflected Davis's position on the idea of acquiring Central American countries. In addition, changes were made to the headdress by the removal of a liberty cap for a helmet which alluded to the liberty of the "original America", a conception of the nation which did not include the yet-to-be-freed slaves in the Southern states. These changes reflected the wishes of Davis, a plantation owner in the South and eventual leader of the Confederacy.

The monument therefore reflects personal compromise on the part of the artist, resulting from the personal influence of officials operating with wider political motivations.

As a result of the producer's motivations and intentions and the effects that these have on meaning and form, it is well worth investigating the place of such intentions in any consideration of monument creation and how these are negotiated (Senie, 1992).

POSTMODERNISM

The last theoretical consideration I will explore is that of postmodernism. Ley (1994:466) offers this definition of postmodernism:

...a recent movement in philosophy, the arts and social sciences characterized by skeptics towards the grand claims and grand theory of the modern era, and their privileged vantage points, stressing in its place an openness to a range of voices in social inquiry, artistic experimentation and political empowerment.

Postmodernism is a term which encapsulates a variety of phenomena and meanings and varies according to the discipline and author (Ibid.). For my purposes I will discuss only a few salient aspects (see Hassan, 1985). Dear (1986) divides postmodernism into three main elements: method, epoch and style. The first two are of importance here and will be discussed in further detail. The first refers to the method of "deconstruction" which involves critical interpretation (Ley, 1994). Deconstruction is often applied to show the flaws in the universalizing "metanarratives" found in Western philosophical thought (Hassan, 1985). For instance, the enlightenment ideas around nationalism and the need to incorporate various particular identities such as ethnicity under a single homogenized public culture is a universal assertion whose validity is questioned by postmodernist

thought. As an example, separatist movements in the world are interpreted as signs of dissatisfaction with present modes of organization including federalism.

The result of the questioning of these universal beliefs and ideas is that it allows for a multiplicity of views to come forth. This aspect ties into postmodernism as epoch, Dear's second element, in that it can be seen as a description of the Western World in the final decades of the twentieth century (McLennan and Richmond, 1994). In essence, all viewpoints are purportedly valued, and this change has led to a situation where we see "the emergence as political forces of a number of groups that have traditionally been excluded from the political forum" (McLennan and Richmond, 1994:665). For example, women, gays, certain ethnic groups and others advance alternative ideas for mainstream society through the struggle for the recognition of rights previously denied.

The last component of Dear's approach to postmodernism relates to architectural style. Essentially, postmodern architecture is characterized as a focus on facade and the incorporation of a multiplicity of design elements and colours, often incorporating several former styles in one expression (Ley, 1994).

Related to the above emphasis on diversity and identity are changes to economic modes of production away from large-scale manufacturing to decentralized forms. This new form of production is indicative of "flexible accumulation" (Harvey, 1989) and offers a diversity of product in response to a marketplace increasingly segmented by various lifestyle choices. This emphasis on lifestyle has also resulted in efforts to increase the amenity value of cities through special attention to urban design, entertainment, and the environment. This focus on city amenity also serves to distinguish

cities as distinct places to attract investment and to keep residents. Heritage production can be linked as part of this effort to create distinct places by reinterpreting the past to be sold to various groups in ways sensitive and supportive of identity (Ashworth and Voogd, 1992).

Postmodernism is also characterized as a reaction to the globalizing forces in the world today, and this aspect has direct bearing on the issue of national identity. Some of these globalizing factors include global cultural media and communications and international trade and military organizations. Global culture is argued to be able to break through the boundaries of language and distance through technology and thereby threaten "to swamp the cultural networks and more local units including nations and ethnic communities" (Anderson, 1990:175). International trade organizations (e.g. GATT), multinational corporations, and military pacts (e.g. NATO) are also argued to limit the ability of the nation-state to act in a sovereign manner. The response to the onslaught of global culture is an increase in the actions of the state in protecting and enhancing its own unique idea of the national culture. This is related to the need to ensure national stability and to the competitive nature of national identities on the world scene. Heritage is used by the state as a means to bolster national identity in regard to these global influences.

As discussed in the next chapter, the relevance of postmodernism to this thesis is that Canada reflects some of the characteristics mentioned above. Our country is a multicultural society experiencing profound issues of identity and is increasingly becoming decentralized as powers are disseminated to the provinces. The attempts to

build a symbolic capital by state agencies is one way in which the government can assert an homogenizing influence on the diversity of Canadian society. The policy of multiculturalism is also indicative of efforts to bind together disparate elements in a way that is nationally distinctive.

CONCLUSION

Monuments are integral parts of most cities and towns as they serve to make cities more legible and aesthetically pleasing. They also form a part of the symbolic web of meanings in the society in which they are located. These meanings are often associated with nationalist ideology. Monuments and their associated commemorative activities are evidence of the actions of the state and of groups and individuals who are concerned with expressing a particular national memory. The meaning inscribed in these monuments is meant to serve as a vehicle of communication to citizens in an attempt to ensure societal cohesion. And yet this production is a process of negotiation of different interpretations around ideals and/or social memories. The final form is a product of this negotiation and of wider social constraints placed upon objects in public space.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter explored theoretical issues surrounding monuments, and laid the groundwork for the conceptual approach to the thesis. From this basis, this chapter outlines the major methodological concerns of the thesis. The first half of the chapter is devoted to a review of the approach and data sources for the study of the monumental landscape in Ottawa-Hull and subsequent case studies. The data sources for this thesis are then discussed in relation to other research in geography and other disciplines utilizing similar information and approaches. The second half of the chapter discusses the study area and limitations that have been set in regard to the kinds of monuments which will be explored. Finally, I consider briefly reasons for the choice in case studies.

METHOD

At a fundamental level, this thesis is an attempt to reconstruct different perceptions of reality. As such, it is part of that "torturous business of learning to see the world of individuals or groups as they see it" (Eyles, 1988:1). My approach in the thesis involves the use of primary sources such as interviews, field work and on-street surveys, as well as the analysis of secondary sources, including archival materials, newspapers, books and scholarly articles. As a result, the thesis employs a mix of

methods, reflecting the use of different approaches for different needs. This situation is not uncommon. As Schatzman and Strauss (1973:7) note: the “field researcher is a methodological pragmatist. He sees any method of inquiry as a system of strategies and operations designed --at any time-- for getting answers to certain questions about events that interest him.”

In regard to the description of the monumental landscape in chapter 5, information was collected from visiting monuments and recording text from their commemorative plaques and visual observations of form. Information regarding form, ownership, date of commemoration and initial proponent(s) was then tabulated, and the location of each monument was mapped. Three short interviews (less than one hour in length) were also conducted, with individuals in the commemorative departments of the cities of Hull and Ottawa, as well as at the NCC. The interviews consisted of closed questions primarily designed to ascertain the existence of a commemorative policy, the kinds of works carried out by the respective government bodies, and to obtain other general information on monuments.

The approach to the case studies was more complex. I first approached the case studies with an emphasis on the use of secondary sources to construct an account of the events and issues surrounding the monuments. Information included internal department memos and briefs, amateur videos and audio recordings, artist's statements, and minutes of meetings. In addition, other sources such as newspaper articles, scholarly journals, and commemorative booklets and pamphlets were consulted. The categories used to order the data were designed to cover the main aspects of monument production and

consumption and included the following criteria: reason for commemoration, the proponent, choice of site, competition process, the design, related promotion activities and general comments on how the work had been interpreted or received. I developed these categories in an effort to capture the issues relating to a) how the commemoration had come to be seen as symbolic of Canadian identity by its proponents, b) the efforts proponents took to transmit their ideas and beliefs, c) how these messages became inscribed in the monument and, d) how the messages were being interpreted or not.

How the categories above were initially derived, and their importance, needs some elaboration. Broadly speaking, except for consumption, all relate to major aspects during the building or production of a monument. The categories are borrowed from a number of sources including: monument competition design booklets (see NCC, 1992), the National Capital Commission's study on commemorative monuments (NCC, 1988) and the interview with Elizabeth Doherty, the project manager for *Reconciliation*. Their importance for a consideration of monuments is elaborated below; greater geographical awareness of this importance would be appropriate.

Reasoning for commemoration and the proponent

A consideration of the reasoning behind the commemoration highlights the importance and relevance of the monument to society. It also makes the connection to the proponent, and why they might be particularly interested in the commemoration. Who the proponent is will speak to the kind of interpretation or slant that may be placed on the social event or persons they wish to honour, and is reflective of particular ideological

concerns. The type of proponent involved is also relevant in the kinds of limitations that the proponent may encounter in the building process. For instance, private initiatives may need to undertake public fundraising to pay for the monument and the volunteer nature of the work may affect the time needed to complete the process. In addition, the limited resources will define the size of the work and the level of public promotion given to it. In contrast, public bodies usually have more money and human resources upon which to draw. Thus, there may be no need for public fundraising and the production process may be substantially shorter than private initiatives. However, public bodies are limited in regard to financing, in that there is a greater level of care expected in how finances are spent due to public accountability (see Carr et al, 1992).

Site

The location of the monument is another vital consideration. The placement of the monument will partly define who the monument's predominant audience will be and speaks to symbolic issues. Monuments are meant to be seen and experienced. A monument in a public space deemed to be locationally strategic by society will carry greater symbolic weight than if placed in an obscure city park. The placement of the monument, however, may be limited by policies in place by the concerned level of government on the kinds of public commemorations deemed acceptable. These limitations will have an effect on the overall message and appearance of the work if it is placed in these public locations.

Competition Process and Design

To initiate the process of building a monument, the proponent either commissions a sculpture directly or will undertake a design competition. Since the case studies in this thesis involved a design competition, I will only discuss the latter process further. The competition process allows a number of interested parties the opportunity to compete on a project. Thus, it serves the purpose of being equitable and objective. Competitions help to mediate the likelihood of a single vision being dumped onto an unwitting public, by virtue of the fact that designs must pass the discretion of an objective panel. This is especially crucial today due to the controversy over abstract art, which will be discussed briefly later (see Carr et al, 1992).

The main guide for designers who participate in a design competition is the competition guidelines. Of particular importance is the “spirit” or “intent” of the project which lays out the distilled ideas and intentions of the proponent(s); often arrived at through intense deliberation. A consideration of how the guidelines were negotiated is thus important for ascertaining proponent intention and how meanings were arrived at. In addition to the intent, there are also a number of other guidelines dealing with economic and physical aspects such as budgets, site characteristics, deadlines for submission etc. (see CTHR, 1985). The guidelines are thus an important piece of data in that they embody the ideological intent of the proponents. They are also valuable in that they may elaborate on why the site might have been chosen and its physical limitations, and may speak to the nature of the limitations placed on the wording or look of the design by the city or interested level of government.

From the guidelines, an artist must come up with a creative solution to the intent of the proponents. The jury selects from the designs submitted and elaborates on why it was selected. In addition, it may stipulate certain changes to the design that will have to be undertaken, if the designer wishes to build the monument. Moreover, alterations may be asked for by the proponents in order to meet specific physical needs or symbolic considerations or both. Attention on the part of the researcher to the winning design will make clear how the artist attempted to embody the intent of the proponents. In addition, sensitivity to the changes undertaken afterward allow one to consider how they affected the overall meaning of the initial design.

Promotion

The final stages of the production of a monument usually entail efforts to promote interest in the commemoration to the public. However, promotion can also be carried out throughout the process especially if fundraising is involved. These activities will vary by project, but one of the most relevant is the actual unveiling ceremony, discussed in the previous chapter. Most often, speeches are given by prominent people, and explain the importance of the commemoration event to society and how the monument embodies the reason for commemoration. Promotion activities and the kinds of messages proponents put forth through them are integral to the monument building process and thus are an invaluable source of information in regard to ascertaining proponent intentions.

Consumption

In regard to the consumption or interpretation of monuments, the comments I include in this thesis (both from published sources and the surveys) are based on observations made on the form of the monument and its symbolic content. These observations have been made after the monument has been completed. They are important to consider since they speak to the overall effectiveness of the work, and will give some sense of how the monument is seen by others in the future.

From the initial use of secondary sources, I discovered that the production of *Reconciliation* involved intense negotiation and would necessitate more in-depth research methods. The need for more research was also made clear by the fact that substantial areas for both monuments remained uncovered or unclear with regard to the meaning of what had been recorded by others. Since a number of individuals involved in the production of the two works still resided in Ottawa, it was decided that the interview approach would be a useful tool in pursuing these issues. As Burgess (1982:101) argues, the interview allows the researcher to “probe deeply to uncover new clues, to open new dimensions to the problem and to secure vivid, accurate, inclusive accounts from informants based on personal experience.” The categories used in the approach to secondary sources, outlined clearly above, also formed the general areas of questioning in the interviews (see Appendix A). Again, these categories were aimed at ascertaining motivations and beliefs and how these became inscribed in the monuments. The categories were also broad enough to allow for a relatively unstructured dialogue. This open dialogue was important for probing motivations, since “without allowing people

to speak freely we will never know what their real intentions are, and what the true meaning of their words might be" (Cottle, 1978:12). A total of nine interviews were conducted in a setting suggested by the participant, and varied in length from one to two hours. Participants were asked by telephone or electronic mail if they would be interested in participating, and, in order to obtain a sense of trust, were guaranteed anonymity if so desired. Where anonymity was desired by a participant, a pseudonym was used in the thesis; otherwise they are identified and listed in the sources. The conversations were recorded on microcassette and then transcribed and analyzed thematically to obtain information on the areas raised earlier and specifically, to detect the presence of any conflicting viewpoints. After the interviews, it became necessary to contact some of the participants by telephone or electronic mail again in order to clarify certain issues or to expand on meanings.

With this expanded perspective on events, I then revisited the archival material to better understand what I had previously read, and this in turn changed my perspective on the interview data. In regard to *Reconciliation*, NCC storage file 8812-051-04, proved to be quite valuable for information on the collaborative relationship between producers. For the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*, the availability of amateur video and audio tapes was made possible through the relationship that formed between George Wilkes, a founding member of the Tribute group, and myself during the interview process. The sources mentioned helped to uncover the politicized events around the unveiling and the mechanics of the competition process. The meanings uncovered by this interactive strategy between different sources were then linked to the

theoretical issues covered earlier. In essence, an account was developed of the motivations of the producers, the specific ideas and beliefs they wished to impart about Canadian identity and the nature of the process by which these ideas were imparted to the monument. The monument was also considered for the symbolic importance of its site and meaning in the capital landscape. Once I had finished constructing an account of the production process, I then undertook the street survey to delve into issues of consumption.

The choice of the inclusion of a street survey came late in the research process. The decision was made after it had become clear that the production of monuments could not be effectively analyzed without some reference to the interpretative or consumptive process. Thus, it should be stressed that this was designed as a small study aimed to gather preliminary results and findings in preparation for any future undertaking on how monuments are interpreted or consumed. The on-street survey was conducted in the winter of 1997 and involved a sample of sixty or more respondents, limited to people twelve years of age or older. The surveys lasted anywhere from two to five minutes, and involved participants answering eleven questions at the site pertaining to aesthetics, purpose and recognition of the work; as well participants were asked to answer questions pertaining to their sex, age, level of education, how often they pass by the site and the nationality they most strongly identify with (See Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire.) The survey included two open-ended questions pertaining to what respondents thought the purpose of the monument was and reasons for the score they gave to its aesthetic appearance. The general areas of questioning in the survey

attempted to reveal if issues over aesthetic consumption were present, if participants were aware of any of the messages being put forth by the proponent(s), the level of public recognition for the works and how personal background factors affected the response given. These considerations were meant to highlight the complicated nature of monument consumption.

The results from both the closed- and open-ended questions were coded and tabulated. Answers to the open-ended responses were coded by category (see Nachmias and Frankfort-Nachmias, 1992). Categories were developed by taking a sample of the responses and identifying the main themes present. As a result of the standardization involved, one will always lose some information, but the process was necessary in order to consider them for statistical analysis. However, some of the richness of the material from the original uncoded answers was also used as additional information for descriptive purposes.

The coded responses were then compiled and analyzed using the computer program "Student Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (SPSS) through cross-tabulations and the use of the chi square statistic. The use of cross-tabulations is a means to highlight relationships that might exist between sample groups. The chi square was chosen as a simple test of comparison and is suitable for nominal or frequency data which the survey results reflect. The chi square allows one to ascertain if two samples are in fact statistically different from one another. This process enables us to consider, for instance, if men and women perceive a monument differently, or if perception varies by age.

A limiting factor for the questionnaire was weather. Cold temperatures and wind most likely affected the length and depth of thought behind some of answers given. The cold weather conditions and limited time available also resulted in the adoption of an purposeful sample. In other words, I asked as many people as possible for their participation in the survey. This is not, therefore, a random sample.

A random sample must reflect two important considerations: firstly, individuals must have equal chance at participating, and secondly, the choice of one participant should not affect the chances of another to be selected (see Ebdon, 1985). The sample method employed suffers from the possibility of bias, in that there were instances where two or more people walking together were interviewed consecutively. Hence, each undoubtedly knew the another and potentially affected each other's responses. Although the survey is somewhat limited in its ability to infer or predict, it is quite reflective of the opinion of those who were willing to give it.

Another limitation involves sample size. The use of the chi square necessitates a large enough sample from a category in order to compare it to another (Ibid.). In many situations, therefore, comparisons could not be made due to the limited responses in some categories. These considerations aside, the survey gathered descriptive statistics for areas related to monument recognition, perception of aesthetics and understanding of purpose.

LINKS TO WIDER RESEARCH

The use of interviews and other secondary sources such as archival material is representative of qualitative or interpretative approaches toward the reconstruction of meaning. Qualitative methods have become increasingly popular in geographical research (Eyles and Smith, 1988). These methods stress the acquisition of “insider knowledge” when appropriate to better understand the personal meanings of those involved in the research issues (Ibid.). An example of the use of interviews in geographical research can be found in Withers (1996) who, in his account of the contested nature of memory around monuments in Scotland, utilizes personal interviews as well as secondary sources. An example from art history is provided by Young (1989), who interviewed the artist Nathan Rapoport, to build a picture of the events and personalities around the creation of his Warsaw Ghetto monument, erected in 1948.

A closing comment in regard to qualitative methods must point out the overall inevitability of subjectivity on the part of the researcher (Eyles and Smith, 1988). I have made efforts where possible to reduce this likelihood, for instance, by inviting interview participants to comment on quotes or points related to information provided in the thesis and by re-reading earlier documents when new contextual information was provided. However, there still remains my own personal biases and interests which undoubtedly will have some effect on the overall order and slant placed on events and issues. I raise this point not as an admission of failure, but rather as a general note of caution for the reader when considering attempts to represent perceptions of reality.

Most of the monument studies mentioned in Chapter 1 were historical in nature and thus make extensive use of archival and other secondary sources. For example, Savage (1994), in his work on the Washington Monument, draws on such sources as: Congressional reports and debates, personal letters and biographies of those involved in the monument's production and a wide mix of secondary material including newspaper accounts and journal articles. In Johnson's (1994; 1995) exploration of Irish monuments from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, she utilizes newspaper accounts and books from the period to highlight the role of these monuments in nationalist politics.

The use of a statistical survey or quantitative approach is one which does not seem to have precedence in geography in regard to monument interpretation. One example provided from social psychology is cited in Degnore (1987). Her work surveyed over 200 people at seven art works in New York City over an 18-month period. Her aim was to investigate factors relating to personal background characteristics, seating availability, density and type of place in how people experience artwork. Her study was primarily quantitative in method, and employed techniques for an analysis of variance and also involved the use of the chi square test.

Apart from possibly breaking new territory in geographical research, the inclusion of the survey in this thesis will also allow for some consideration of how well people understand the purpose of the work, and their feelings of aesthetics and levels of recognition; and will provide additional clues for further research.

LIMITATIONS AND STUDY AREA

In regard to the kind of monuments to be examined, only those which are free-standing, visually commanding and out of doors will be considered. In addition, I will exclude both buildings and fountains, which also perform commemorative functions. A further limitation however, is needed. Broadly speaking, monuments can be classified as public art, in that they are meant for public viewing and are located in public space (Robinette, 1976). Yet, monuments are a specific kind of public art in that they possess a distinctive memorializing or commemorative function. As I discuss in Chapter 4, one sees the emergence of public art in the 1960's with little or no commemorative function. And yet, these forms occupy many of the same sites where traditional monuments are found. Public sculptures reflect a diverse thematic focus (often abstract and contemplative), rather than serving as specific markers to past ideas, persons or events, and are meant to be consumed primarily as aesthetic and/or functional objects. For the purposes of this thesis, therefore, I will only consider forms of public art that have a clear commemorative function or display relevant social themes, namely of a national or local significance. In order to accentuate their primary aesthetic component compared to the monument, forms of public art other than monuments are referred to as public sculptures in this thesis. Reference will be made to them when appropriate, insofar as they may share broad attributes of message communication and continuity in time or space or both with monuments.

Figure 2.0 Locations of public art in the Ottawa-Hull region, 1998.

Adapted from: Carleton University Dept. of Geography.

Figure 2.1 Approximate study boundaries for monuments in Ottawa-Hull, 1998.

Adapted from: NCC, 1986:294.

The study boundaries for the thesis were derived from observations related to the locational concentration of public art in the area. Based on fieldwork and from information gathered from municipal departments, Figure 2.0 depicts the location of public art in the greater Ottawa-Hull area. It should be noted that Figure 2.0 is not representative of all public art in the area since one may come across the occasional example on private property. Despite this small limitation, the concentration of public art is well situated within walking distance of Confederation Boulevard, a symbolic route that physically links and serves as a backdrop for national institutions and areas of cultural and tourist importance. Thus, the study area for this thesis will be within one kilometre of the Boulevard (see Figure 2.1), a limit which is deemed to be within easy walking distance by the NCC to visit monuments (Nesbitt; Interviews, 1997).

SELECTION OF CASE STUDIES

The first reason for choosing these case studies is that both monuments represent two of the most significant monumental projects undertaken in the capital in the last fifty years. As a result, they represent major additions to the symbolic aspect of the capital, and are quite reflective of an attempt to be more inclusive of the plurality of Canadian culture through themes that are perceived to matter to most Canadians.

Secondly, both monuments have international significance in that they are claimed to be the first in the world dedicated to their subject matter. This elevates their importance as national heritage, and therefore, as potential symbols of national pride

and identity. Moreover, their unique status makes each work a valuable economic resource for heritage tourism.

Thirdly, these case studies offer insights into the building of monuments by both public and private proponents. *Reconciliation* was a project involving two organizations related to the state: the NCC and the Department of National Defence (DND). This case study offers an insight into the specific concerns of each organization in terms of what the monument should mean and how they should look. These different ideas do not overlap well in this particular case. In a sense, this incongruence highlights the fact that cultural production can be a complex undertaking; a dimension easily missed when one is confronted with the finished product.

The second case study, *The Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*, is an example of a monument produced from a loosely tied group of individuals from various social backgrounds with an aim to make a permanent commemoration to the ideal of human rights. In contrast to the organizations responsible for *Reconciliation*, this group had little or no idea as to what form the monument should take, but rather concentrated their efforts on raising adequate funds and interest for the project. However, the group espoused particular aims with regard to the purpose of the work, reflecting a strongly activist stance.

Lastly, these two commemorations are relatively recent undertakings, with the Tribute unveiled in 1990, and the Peacekeeping erected in 1992. This consideration is important in that it makes the availability of people to participate in the interviews more likely, and aids in the process of remembering.

CONCLUSION

The methodology and sources used in this thesis reflect both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Their use in academic research is well grounded (see Nachmias and Frankfort Nachmias, 1992; Eyles and Smith, 1988) and, as a result, helps to form a strong basis for the consideration of the issues explored in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

Now that I have discussed the methodology and sources of this thesis, it is appropriate to consider the process of nation-building and its changing evolution in Canada. Accordingly, the next chapter will discuss this process and how it was made manifest through monument-building. In addition, it will also highlight changes in the style and form of commemorative work in the latter part of the twentieth century.

CHAPTER THREE: MONUMENTS AND THE EXPERIENCE OF CANADIAN NATION-BUILDING

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will discuss how efforts at nation-building have been carried out in Canada through a consideration of the main sources of identification and how this changed over time. Particular reference will be given to how monuments and commemoration have been part of this nation-building process.

Since the birth of the Canadian state was more a result of political necessity than that of widespread nationalistic zeal, the creation of a collective identity behind which people could rally became that much more important. While Canada was created with two distinct cultures, the dominant Canadian identity failed to reflect this reality and instead focused on the creation of a distinctly British-oriented society. This core identity was based on the central founding myth involving the heritage of the Loyalists as then interpreted (Bell, 1970). Changes in Canadian society, primarily as a result of growing diversity, would bring to political prominence a variety of groups who had previously been excluded. Challenges to the conception of a single founding culture came from both the French and Native populations and would be further stretched to include other ethnic groups.

Early monument-building reflected the British orientation of the society. Since no other era would equal what was produced during this period, these monuments represent a disproportionate share of our monumental heritage today. Since they still figure

prominently in many towns and cities, and in effect are made to be permanent, monuments continue to reflect an identity out of step with present national beliefs. Present ideas value cultural diversity and aim for more explicit respect and tolerance for all groups. In recognition of this imbalance, there can be seen today a change in who and what is commemorated through monuments.

The use of monuments themselves began to decline around the 1950's as a result of changes in attitudes toward commemoration. In addition, the form of monuments incorporated more abstract designs because of influences in the art world. These forms proved to be less popular and in time changed to suit the demands of the public.

EARLY IDENTITY

The Loyalists were a group of diverse individuals who made their way to Canada from the United States between 1770 and 1814. These 100,000 Loyalists took their name from the simple fact that they rejected the American Revolution by remaining loyal to the King of England and the ideals of British society. What is paramount, is that the Loyalists were "anti-U.S. Yankees", espousing views that celebrated and retained British traditions. Consequently, this migration was crucial to the development of British society north of the border. Canada thus was formed as a result of a counter-revolution by virtue of maintaining and upholding ties to the mother country. The development of Canadian values as a result of this counter-revolution, argues Lipset (1990), made Canada more conservative than Americans. Canadians are argued to be more "class-aware, elitist, law-abiding, statist, collectivity-oriented and particularistic (group-

oriented) society", in opposition to the Americans, who propound ideals of individualism, egalitarianism and free enterprise (p.8).

By the turn of the twentieth century, the French in Quebec began to assert a different vision of what it might mean to be Canadian. The French, who had been defeated by the British in 1763, had their culture and language guaranteed by the Quebec Act in 1764 and had been accommodated within Confederation. Previously, the French expressed little concern for what occurred elsewhere in Canada, but by 1900 began to take interest in specific events. The Riel rebellion in Manitoba, which saw a small minority of Metis (French-Indian) crushed by Canadian troops and their leader hanged, became a source of identification for the French. They also began to advocate the protection of French-language rights outside Quebec. The Boer War in South Africa proved to be another point of contention between English and French Canada. French Canadians felt there was no need to send troops to a war that wasn't threatening the survival of the nation. Their nationalism stressed the uniqueness of a North American identity free from the trappings of a mother country (Morton, 1983). However, these sentiments ran counter to the English-speaking population, who were caught up in the greatness of the British Empire and the contributions Canada could make to it. Dissatisfaction with the way the country was evolving strengthened the resolve of the French to survive as a viable cultural entity.

The French threat to the British-oriented conception of society would not become a major problem until the 1960's. While Quebec's cultural and political leaders were advancing the views just described, the reality of the matter was that most of Quebec

society could be characterized as "rural, traditional and deferential" (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996:183). Quebec nationalism reflected a defensive nature, known as "la survivance" and tended to be focused on the past (Breton, 1988). This orientation, however, underwent considerable change in the early 1960's and will be discussed below.

Meanwhile the policy of assimilation into a British-style society proved successful. Waves of immigrants settling the West during the early half of the twentieth century had for the most part adopted the identity of being Canadian, even if it was fundamentally British in origin. Canadian institutions were accepted, and the threat of diverse cultures upsetting the order became less of a fear to the dominant British group. Eventually, the racial or ethnic component of Canadian nationalism diminished somewhat, allowing for a more pluralist conception of Canadian identity (Breton, 1984).

At this point, it is appropriate to relate how this early British orientation was reflected in early monument-making in the nation.

MATERIALIZING THE NATION

The Canadian state created a number of departments and agencies involved in the dissemination of Canadian values and beliefs. Amongst others, these included the National Archives (1872), National Broadcasting Corporation (1932), the National Film Board (1939) and the Canada Council (1957). In addition to these state agencies were efforts by individuals to foster values through such organizations as the Canadian Club, the Champlain Society and the Royal Canadian Geographical Society (see Osborne,

1996). In terms of monument-building and commemoration, the Canadian state created the Historic Sites and Monuments Board in 1919. The board selected sites deemed reflective of the national heritage and usually commemorated them using a bronze plaque. The board also commemorated important people and at times erected monuments. Quebec, in defense of its own version of history and heritage, created its own Monuments Board in 1922.

Prior to the 1920's, Canadian monument-building was limited mostly to the large urban centres, mainly because of the cost of such undertakings. The majority of these efforts were directed toward the erection of monuments depicting individuals and events pertaining to wars, but almost always reflected a distinctive British orientation. The first monument in Canada was erected in 1805 in Montreal and commemorated the death of Admiral Nelson of the British fleet in the battle at Trafalgar, which established British naval, hence imperial, hegemony in the nineteenth century. Located in the heart of the city, the monument featured a statue of Nelson atop a fifty-five-foot column of stone. The War of 1812 and the Fenian raids were two other military events that led to the erection of monuments. So too, were the Red River Rebellion of 1868 and the North West Rebellion of 1885 and the Boer War in 1899-01, all of which occurred before World War One (see Shipley, 1987).

One of the differences between this early era of commemoration and that which followed the 1950's is that, in earlier years, people took a keen interest in the process. When a particular event arose that garnered widespread interest, ad hoc committees were formed to assist in a variety of areas related to the erection of a monument. Such areas

included fundraising, site selection, finding an artist, and finalizing the text and wording of the monument. Usually, volunteer organizations such as the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, church committees and other social and cultural organizations, were the ones to initiate the process, but this did not mean that the involvement of the community stopped there (Shipley, 1987; du Toit et al, 1989). These events generated intense discussion in local newspapers. The form, site and content of the memorial were the result of people coming together and reaching more or less a consensus among different points of view. The day of unveiling and commemoration was often a grand affair and involved the participation of thousands. The work came into existence only if the public was willing to get involved. In short, the process of creating a monument often helped to bring a community closer together by initiating discussion around events and fostering community pride in the completion of such an achievement. Around the turn of the century, the presence of a monument in a town was often a sign of progress in the minds of many (Shipley, 1987).

The real impetus for monument-building in Canada came with the end of the First World War. This conflict involved one in twelve Canadians directly and led to the most casualties the country would ever see from a war (66,625 men and women in total). While the war ended in 1918, monument-building occurred across the country in small and large centres between the 1920's and 1930's. The cost of monuments, especially during the Depression, was one reason for the delay. All of these efforts at monument-building were financed by public subscription (except for the government memorials in Ottawa, St. John's and overseas). (Shipley, 1987).

This period of monument-building represents the apex of this kind of commemoration in Canada. The events of the First World War and their commemoration resulted in the erection of hundreds of monuments, which now reside in many of the parks and central areas of many towns and cities and provide an iconographic distinctiveness that sets them apart from their U.S. neighbours. The fact that Canada entered the war in response to the call of the mother country reflects the Imperial orientation of English Canadian identity at that time. But events of the war, such as the Battle of Vimy Ridge, highlighted the bravery and sacrifice of Canadians and led to the beginning of a new sense of identity. This changing identity reflected a coming of age for the nation and a decreasing orientation toward Britain. This generation of monuments therefore not only marks the events of this war, but it also symbolizes the beginning of a shift in identification for Canadians.

The events commemorated during this early period on both sides of the Atlantic “were largely for, but not of, the people” (Gillis, 1994:9). Ethnic minorities, women, workers and the young were not the usual subject of commemoration. Instead, one finds a proliferation of monuments dedicated to the elite males of society, with a preponderance toward celebrating military and political events related to the national perspective. One should note, however, that the war memorials so prevalent in the landscape feature most often ordinary soldiers who had no claim to individual recognition. This trend is reflective of a shift in recognition from famous generals and rulers to the contributions of the ranks, a commemorative change which occurred in Europe earlier (Mosse, 1975).

After 1930, a decline in commemoration through monuments occurred mostly because of changing artistic styles, a lack of monetary resources, and a desire for other forms of commemoration.

CHANGING FORMS AND STYLES

Prior to the 1930's, most public art in the United States and Canada could be characterized as figurative. The forms of representation strove to reflect the natural appearance of form in the world. However, during the 1930's, dissatisfaction with neo-classical representation, which took hold in the European art establishment, began to emerge. Part of this dissatisfaction was a growing desire to experiment with new forms and materials as part of artistic expression (Robinette, 1976). These desires were related to the emergence of Modernism, a movement which emphasized individual expression and minimalism. Under Modernism, the idea of a homogeneous public was no longer upheld, thus the idea that art in an attempt to "unify a coherent social group has become a relic of romantic history" (Hein, 1996:2). Under Modernism, sculpture became an expression of personal vision, and its success, more related to formal aesthetic concerns such as light and shadow. The manifestation of these ideas resulted in works characterized as abstract. This was in contrast to the earlier period, which featured artists depicting common values and ideas, while suspending their own private visions (Ibid.).

Abstract works offered artists a flexibility in form which was not possible using figuration. Moreover, in contrast to figurative art, which tried to reflect a common meaning, abstract art allowed for a multiplicity of readings. And because it points to no

common reference, its attention and interpretation are therefore focused on deciphering the artist's intentions (Young, 1989).

The role of figurative public art also diminished, partly because the relationship between classical architecture and sculpture was severed (Robinette, 1976; Senie, 1992). The new International style of architecture in North America with its glass-box-like appearance was not favourable to ornamentation. This architectural style became the dominant model for most architecture on the continent, despite the fluctuations in style that occurred in local settings (Senie, 1992). Important examples of specific variations exist in Washington D.C. and other American state capitals, where public buildings continued to be built in the classical style leading to the continuation of figurative public sculpture.

By mid-century, the dominant model of sculpture had moved from realistic to abstract expressions. Coinciding with this change in expression was a diminution of public art as a form for commemoration. The reality of two major world wars and the catastrophic loss of life associated with them brought into question how such events should be commemorated. While traditional monuments were still erected, the prevalence of living memorials, such as hospitals and parks, grew (Mayo, 1988). The art establishment wanted no part in a figurative representation, since this would only serve to elevate and perpetuate the heroic myth associated with such events (Young, 1989). The role of art for many artists had become one of questioning and challenging the traditional views and beliefs of society. Young (1989) notes how many European governments failed to use such abstract forms of art as commemorative devices since they would cast

doubt on the contributions of the nation. While figurative art continued in some places, including Ottawa-Hull and Washington D.C., abstract forms took root in galleries until a revival in public sculpture occurred in the 1960's.

The importance of this change in style is that it serves to complicate the definition of monuments. Monuments are primarily meant to engage the viewer as a means toward the consumption of shared values and ideals. Abstract art tries to break down the mimetic quality of memory in monuments by introducing a multiplicity of potential meanings through its visual attributes. It may still have a memorializing function, but it no longer aims to seek a consensus in its consumption. After the 1960's, public art in the form of sculpture and abstract monuments became prevalent in the landscapes, both in the U.S. and in Canada.

In Canada, new public sculpture emerged as part of beautification projects and as a result of federal public sector programs begun in 1964. In 1978, the federal government pulled out of these programs, leaving the provinces to set up their own. However, by the end of the 1980's most programs had been transferred to local cities (see McKnight, 1996). Part of this re-emergence of public art can be connected to ideas about art and its ability to enhance quality of life and generate economic benefits. In addition to the material benefits generated through the purchase of materials and wages, public art can be used to foster tourism.

The advent of abstract public art into the public realm during this time was not without controversy. A major consideration is that this kind of art, when removed from a controlled setting such as a gallery, now found itself in a unmediated environment, open

to interpretation by a diverse society. The traditional monument, which served as a reminder of events or people, could be readily expected to be understood by the population at large. Literal meaning through realistic representation and reference to worldly affairs ensured a common reference point for viewers. However, abstract art placed in the same areas that one would expect to find traditional monuments was more often a reflection of the artist's intention and left many who were not connected to the art world grasping for meaning.

In contrast to the earlier period of commemoration, where one saw whole communities becoming involved in the commemorative process, this period instead featured private commissioning of works on private property, albeit in public space. What was introduced to the public was the personal taste of the patron, often in an abstract form. The traditional themes of public art instead became the interests of the art patron. There was no community discussion around acceptable form and content. In many cases, the art was simply added to a site after construction of a building or park, which often left the piece at odds with its surroundings. In some instances, the offending work has resulted in such outcry that some have resorted to legal means to have it removed. An example of this is the Airman's Memorial, built in 1977 on University Avenue in Toronto. This privately initiated monument enraged citizens and artists alike and earned the title "Gumby Goes to Heaven" for its resemblance to a rubbery character from the child's cartoon "Gumby and Pokey." While it still remains, the incident contributed to the realization of the need for public art committees to oversee the selection and commissioning of works in Canada (Drainie, 1989).

Through the 1970's and 1980's, several changes began to appear, which would make abstract public art more acceptable to the public. Abstract art became much more site-specific through collaborations between the artist and builders. For abstract public sculpture, themes were now introduced to serve as a guide for the viewer on the meaning of the work. There was an emphasis placed on the ability of public art to be more functional in nature. Thus one finds art that, in addition to the possibility of contemplation, serves such functions as a place to sit, a source of light, a play area or ornamentation for commercial buildings, among others (Senie, 1992). There is also an emphasis on more active involvement or participation of the public in the experience of the monument. Among other means, this may include the use of more interpretive materials which directly engage the sensibilities of a person or a form which invites the viewer to walk through the work. The municipal public sector programs alluded to earlier also reflect a more sensitive approach to sculpture. They advocate far more collaboration between the public and the parties involved in the commissioning of public art, partly as a result of the often adverse public reaction to the earlier forms of abstract sculpture and monuments (McKnight, 1996). These expanded considerations for public art are reflected in the production of the case study monuments and will form part of the discussion in later chapters.

CHALLENGES TO THE NATIONAL HERITAGE

Over the course of the twentieth century, a series of transformations occurred within Quebec society. The process, collectively known as the Quiet Revolution, entailed

fundamental change at all levels of Quebec society. By the end of the 1960's, a once backward looking and rural Roman Catholic society had been replaced by an urbanized, industrialized and secular one. In addition, these changes brought about a different conception of collective identity for many French Canadians. French Canadians in Quebec increasingly began to refer to themselves as Quebecois instead of French Canadians; reflecting a change from thinking of themselves as a minority to a majority. The boundaries of the French collective also shrank from a conception incorporating all of Canada to one centred on the immediate confines of the province (Breton, 1988). Moreover, the provincial government moved toward greater assertiveness in using its powers for the advancement of Quebec society on all fronts. Clearly, the Canadian identity had failed to adequately incorporate the concerns of the French, leading to an "increasing conviction in Quebec that the province, not the confederation, was the logical national entity" (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996:183).

This change represented a major challenge to Canadian unity, leading to a fundamental revision of the Canadian heritage. The Bicultural and Bilingualism Commissions of 1965 and 1968 were responses to this challenge. The results of these efforts led to a conception of Canadian society based on the idea of two fundamental founding cultures: French and English. A policy of bilingualism was adopted as well as an effort to reflect this bicultural heritage through the commemoration of historical sites and persons. Also related to these changes was the adoption of new Canadian symbols. The Canadian flag, with its maple leaf motif adopted in 1965, the introduction of a formal national anthem in 1980, and the change to the metric system in 1972, can all be

seen as attempts to foster a new national identity, hopefully leading to greater identification for the French (Breton, 1984). The effects on the capital, Ottawa, involved physical and symbolic changes and will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Toward the end of the 1960's, Canada, like other industrialized nations, was undergoing radical changes in its beliefs and values as well as in its institutional structures. Breton (1986) summarizes much of this change in Canada as a result of increased non-British immigration, the continued move away from ties to Britain, an increasing U.S. cultural and economic presence, as well as the challenges posed by Quebec, the Native population and the women's movement. Blishen (1986) argues that Canadian society increasingly valued diversity, egalitarianism and the collective. In essence, while the individual was still valued, the reality was that Canada displayed a stratified multicultural society, with material and status inequality disadvantaging various groups, including many women and ethnic minorities.

In response, the Canadian government became increasingly interested in removing barriers inhibiting people from advancing in society and became involved in efforts to improve the conditions of disadvantaged groups. The highlight of state involvement was the entrenchment of group and individual rights in the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms in 1982. This charter allowed for affirmative action programs to help eliminate barriers and guarantee rights for all Canadians regardless of their sex, religion, race or ethnicity, age and mental or physical disability.

The incorporation of Quebec as a second-founding culture underwent further change as a result of Native demands for their recognition in Canadian society. Native

groups began to assert themselves in the late 1960's with the formation of national organizations such as the Assembly of First Nations. The British and French colonization of Canada had marginalized much of the Native population. At issue, then, are the recognition of treaty rights signed in the early days of British colonial rule, land claims settlement and more recently, calls for Native self-government (Kulschyski, 1995). Positive results have occurred with the federal government recognizing aboriginal and treaty rights in 1982 and the acknowledgment of the Metis as a distinct group. Natives, as the original occupants of the country, have also stressed their role in the development of Canada, leading to the increasing conception of Canada as a country founded on three distinct cultures.

The fundamental restructuring of Canadian identity in the late 1960's toward a bi-cultural heritage proved to be contentious. For those members of society who were not part of the two founding groups, there was concern over the lack of status and their place in society (Breton, 1988). In response, the government introduced in 1971 a policy of multiculturalism. Among one of its objectives was to "affirm symbolically that Canadian society was open to all cultural identities, indicating its recognition of them all, and the implications of cultural equality" (Breton, 1984:134). The policy of multiculturalism invited ethnic groups to celebrate and identify with their particular backgrounds. Changes to the policy in 1984 have placed greater emphasis on issues such as race relations and the elimination of discriminatory hiring practices rather than a preservation of culture. This is partly a result of the increased immigration to Canada from Third World nations.

In addition to calls for heritage recognition from Natives and members of other ethnic groups, there has been pressure from groups such as women, homosexuals and the handicapped in the same regard (see Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) for a discussion on the practicality and dissonance that may be associated with heritage recognition for these groups). The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms has served as a springboard for many of these groups in their efforts for equality and recognition. It should be mentioned that these particular identities are themselves problematic in that they cut across various other ethnic and cultural classifications. The cultural and ethnic identity may either overshadow the claims of these groups for heritage recognition or even be in direct confrontation with them.

MATERIALIZING THE NEW HERITAGE

The upheaval in the political realm that occurred in Canada is said by some to be reflective of Postmodernism. The breakdown of the idea of a unitary Canadian heritage is reflective of the fragmentation of identity seen in Postmodernism. The rise of groups advocating rights and recognition represents a paradigm shift (McLennan and Richmond, 1994:665). Similar to other nations, Canada has tried to assert a collective orientation for national identity through efforts such as the broadening of founding groups and its multicultural policy. The latter with the motto of "unity in diversity" is particularly important, since the percentage of Canadians who do not trace their origins to the three founding groups is increasing. Grimmond (1991) argues that, for many of these new

Canadians, there is very little for them to identify with as being distinctly Canadian. Thus a strong need is felt for symbols that can bridge these differences in identity.

The importance of materializing these beliefs in actual heritage selection or production or both has not been lost on the state. The inclusion of native and ethnic identities into the national heritage has resulted in a number of cultural agencies attempting to provide a more balanced representation of this reality. In addition, there has been a concerted effort to include a more equitable representation of women in national commemoration activities.

Much of this new activity relates to forms of heritage unrelated to actual monuments. For state agencies such as the HSMB, this new inclusive agenda has translated into more commemorations of ethnic groups, natives and women as well as a broadening of themes (Osborne, 1996). Osborne relates how this activity prior to 1970 reflects a heavy dominance of military, political and first settlement themes with an English-French and Celtic orientation. In addition, a clear imbalance exists between the number of women commemorated as important figures. Out of 527 persons classified as important by the HSMB, only thirty are women (Ibid.). After 1970, the activity of the board showed a marked increase in commemorations of ethnic minorities and a marked decline in the number of commemorations of political and military events. In essence, this activity reflected a changing mandate by government agencies to become more culturally diverse.

In terms of expecting a proliferation of new monuments, certain points must be made. First, it must be said that, because of the time, energy and cost associated with

this activity, most heritage reflecting diversity will be in other forms. Moreover, the decline in this form of commemoration in general since the Second World War further increases this likelihood. With this in mind, though, one can still expect to see a broadening of who and what is commemorated through a monument. The urge to commemorate through monuments not only resides with the state but among the public as well. In this sense, one can expect that particular groups may wish to erect a monument that highlights their contribution to the nation's history or which celebrates their identity or both.

CONCLUSION

Canadian society has always been diverse in nature, but in earlier periods, most of this plurality was subsumed under a British-oriented conception of Canada. This British orientation was first challenged by Quebec and later by Native groups, who were able, though not necessarily in mutual harmony, to reorient the conception of Canada as a nation comprised of three founding groups. This conception in turn was challenged by Canada's other ethnic groups in an attempt to garner recognition of their distinct contributions and national identities. The need to better reflect these heritage realities is an ongoing concern and is being dealt with by all levels of government and private groups in an effort to accommodate this plurality of identity. In Chapter 5, examples of this tendency to commemorate less traditional groups and perspectives through monuments will be discussed in relation to the building of the capital identity.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE CAPITAL LANDSCAPE OF OTTAWA-HULL

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, capital cities have garnered special attention from the state in order to symbolically reflect the virtues, accomplishments and aspirations of a particular society. Efforts to reify these ideas often involve the building of elaborate public buildings and public statuary in a planned setting and the performance of civic festivals and related ceremonies. Part of the reason national governments undertake such initiatives is the belief that the capital can serve as a tool for national unity. The potential of the symbolic capital to reinforce a more unitary view of society has become more important in contemporary plural society, where there are often conflicting cultural values (Taylor et. al. 1993). This belief has shaped contemporary Canadian thought as the following passage from a 1995-1996 government report indicates: "in an era of political uncertainty, Canadians--especially that growing number of Canadians who were born in another country--need a unifying capital that represents for them the institutions that underlie the common values of Canadian society" (National Capital Commission, 1995-96:11).

Ottawa-Hull has received much attention in the area of heritage planning. The idea supports the notion that, as a visitor to the capital, one should get a sense of what it is to be a Canadian by being able to recognize one's heritage in the landscape (Taylor et. al.

1993). Thus the capital has received much attention in relevant planning over the years, most of it through the efforts of the federal government itself.

The first part of this chapter will discuss the capital planning efforts carried out since the late 1890's and will concentrate on the later work of the National Capital Commission (NCC) as the principal agency involved in building a symbolic capital. A brief consideration of architecture, city form, and environmental appearance will provide a descriptive element before exploring the landscape of monuments in the second half of the chapter. This latter half of the chapter outlines the major historical periods of monument-building and focuses on the general thematic and spatial extent of the works presented. This approach will allow for a consideration of how well the present landscape of monuments reflects the new emphasis on inclusive heritage.

TOWARD THE IDEAL

In the case of both Ottawa and Hull, initial settlement occurred in the early nineteenth century. The abundance of forest, fertile soil and rivers contributed to an early focus on both farming and the logging industry. However, Ottawa and later Hull would eventually lose this identity to the capital function (Taylor, 1986).

Bytown, later changed to the name of Ottawa, was chosen ostensibly by Queen Victoria as the capital of Canada in 1857. The town, located farther away from the American border than suggested alternatives, provided a certain measure of security from invasion. More importantly, its position along the border of Upper and Lower

Canada facilitated an important balancing act between the rival interests of the French and the English populations (Knight, 1977).

The growth of the capital or "Crown" in Ottawa began to accelerate toward the end of the nineteenth century. The country was becoming larger in terms of its territorial breadth, and the civil service began to grow in order to accommodate the associated functions. Much of this growth would be contained in and around the Parliament buildings, built earlier on former military lands. At the same time, interest began to grow in Ottawa for the creation of a great city in accordance with its capital status.

Between 1899 and 1950, a number of plans and commissions were created by the government in order to create a "Washington of the North", a phrase first coined by Prime Minister Laurier at the turn of the century. Many of the earlier ideas were too grandiose in scale and could not be implemented because of a number of events. These included the First World War and the rebuilding of the centre block of Parliament, lost to fire in 1916. Moreover, the fact that the "Crown" was surrounded by the earlier city made such plans highly impractical on account of the cost of expropriation. However, all these plans shared a recognition that the capital should concentrate on the preservation of park land and natural aesthetics. Many of these ideas led to the creation of parks and clean-up efforts of various industrial areas along the Rideau canal and the Ottawa River front (Hillis, 1992; Degrace, 1985; Scott and Seasons, 1991).

Major work in the capital occurred under Prime Minister Mackenzie King who had a keen interest in planning issues. During his leadership from 1921-1930 and 1935-1948, expansion of government buildings occurred to the west and east along

Figure 4.0 National Capital Region (NCR)

Source: NCC, 1986

Wellington Street, as well as on the west side of Sussex Drive. These additions were meant to complement the look and feel of the neo-gothic Parliament buildings. In 1937, King also hired a prominent French planner, Jacques Greber, to develop a long-range strategy for the capital.

In 1950, delayed by the Second World War, Greber released his plan for the region. The Greber plan continued the emphasis on the greening of the capital by recommending further expansion of parks and the preservation of the natural environment. Among the more important recommendations were the decentralization of government functions within the city, the removal of rail lines into the core, the removal of non-governmental uses around Parliament Hill and the development of ceremonial routes terminating at Parliament Hill. Many of these proposals were put into place under the auspices of the NCC.

The NCC, created in 1959, was granted powers of expropriation as well as a large budget. Its creation followed the 1958 act of Parliament that attempted to bind Hull, Quebec, to the capital by formalizing a planning area known as the National Capital Region (NCR). The NCR currently embraces a region beyond Ottawa and Hull comprising 4662 square kilometres (Figure 4.0). While this planning area involves no real jurisdiction over land entirely within the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, the de facto ownership of 30 per cent of the land by the NCC greatly facilitates its objectives (Boal, 1993).

In addition to carrying out many of Greber's ideas, the NCC undertook rehabilitation of Sussex Drive in Lowertown in the 1960's. The initiative aimed to link

Parliament Hill to the Governor General's residence in a manner befitting the capital. The completed project, known as the Mile of History, formed part of the preparations for hosting celebrations for the Centennial of Confederation in 1967. Lowertown comprised the working-class French-Irish area of the original city and had over time declined in importance. This pioneering activity by the NCC helped jump-start private and city-led refurbishment across adjacent parts of Lowertown (Tunbridge 1986a, 1986b, 1987). As a result, by the 1980's the area had become the commercial focus of the tourist-historic city (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 1990).

Hull and the Capital City

The inclusion of Hull as part of the capital had been hinted at by Greber and in earlier plans, but, with the exception of Gatineau Park and the NCR, few results had materialized. However, by the end of the 1960's, this situation underwent a dramatic change as tensions between Quebec and English Canadian intensified.

In 1969, a first ministers' conference assessing the nature of the capital as a symbol of the two founding peoples recommended a major building program in the core of Hull. This redevelopment scheme involved construction of several large office complexes, waterfront parks and pedestrian and vehicular links between the two cities. The significance of the placement of these new office buildings is described by Holdsworth (1986:170) as symbolic and reflected the idea that "Ottawa was reaching to French Canada". In 1989, Hull became the home of the new Canadian Museum of Civilization, and in 1997, neighbouring Gatineau became the repository of much of the

nation's heritage with the construction of the new National Archives storage facility. Both of these developments further cement the Hull area to the capital identity.

Capital Form

While planning efforts to build a symbolic capital continue, a few general points can be made about present results. One of the most enduring realities of the core and the region as a whole is the pervasive importance of environmental aesthetics. The symbol of the natural environment to Canada as a whole is also an important consideration for the capital to reflect (Konrad, 1986). The federal ownership of much of the waterfront has managed to link many of the government buildings that hug the Ottawa River. This recognition of the natural environment is seen in the NCC's symbolic appropriation of the Ottawa River. The river serves as a thematic metaphor by alluding to "constant motion which symbolizes the continued evolution of the nation" and as a unifier between French and English Canada (Scott and Seasons, 1993:175; Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996:215).

While Ottawa originally tried to emulate Washington; its form is one reflective of a citadel, a situation more akin to Moscow and other cities than Washington (Taylor, 1989). Federal buildings and institutions essentially hug the riverfront. The city also differs architecturally from Washington, many of the capital buildings reflect Canada's British heritage, and, as an unplanned capital, there is no one style or expression comparable to the Neoclassicism of Washington D.C. The centre block of Parliament reflects the Gothic Revival, while more recent government buildings were executed in

Second Empire and Chateausque (a mixture between British and French styles). One unifying element in this mixture of official style is the common copper roofing that oxidizes into a characteristic green colour over time. What is striking is the distinctive presence that these buildings give to the "Crown" sector of the city. The "Town" and its height-controlled utilitarian office buildings and architecture, are juxtaposed against the backdrop of official style and natural beauty of the "Crown" (Holdsworth, 1986).

Changing role of the NCC

With the emergence of new planning authorities in the 1960's and 1970's, the NCC became less involved with regional planning efforts exemplified by the earlier Greber plan. Instead, it has focused on such projects as the rehabilitation of Lowertown West and the ongoing maintenance of its properties in the region. The organization also embraced a new mandate in 1986, that of a much more symbolically oriented approach compared to the physical planning of before.

Essentially, efforts are now concentrated on using the capital to "communicate Canada to Canadians" (NCC, 1988:18). Moreover, the capital "should convey a sense of national purpose, and should illustrate the values and aspirations that Canadians hold in common" (Ibid:18). An important emphasis is placed on culture through the display of important national treasures and cultural achievements, while providing a physical setting for events and ceremonies. The cultural function of the capital strives to serve as a model for bilingualism and now multiculturalism (Ibid.). Much of this activity is carried out through programs designed to display a variety of heritage at the Canadian Museum

Figure 4.1 Artistic rendition of Confederation Boulevard (core area)
Source: NCC, 1985.

of Civilization, a federally mandated institution working alongside the NCC. In order to ensure a coherent and organized approach, the NCC serves as a coordinating agency among the several other federal government departments involved in physical and cultural planning in the capital.

On a practical level, the communicative function is carried out through the multimedia National Capital Infocentre and website (www.capcom.ca), which distribute maps and brochures and information on tours and various festivals. The on-going physical development of the ceremonial route is an important undertaking in communicating the capital to citizens and visitors.

Confederation Boulevard

The development of a ceremonial route began in the 1980's and continues toward the expected completion date in the year 2000. In essence, the Boulevard, often termed "Canada's Discovery Route" (NCC, 1993), serves as a focus for national events, linking important sites and institutions and providing a physical setting for state visits and tours.

In order to distinguish the route in the eye of the observer the plan calls for the gradual introduction of uniform lighting, tree planting, flag standards and landscaping. From Figure 4.1, one can see the general nature of the route as it encircles the core area of the symbolic capital. The artist's rendition of the finished product shows how the route helps to reinforce the distinction of what can be considered symbolic space from the everyday "town" setting. The distinction is furthered by the characteristic green copper roofing found on many public buildings, the park-like setting and the general lack of grid-

type streets found in the symbolic core (Taylor, 1989). Monuments are accorded a particularly strong role in urban design considerations and in the communicative potential of the route. The Boulevard consists of nodes and links (see Figure 4.2). A node is a major entry point into the route and is reserved for large-scale monuments. These serve as markers or cairns to help vehicle and pedestrian traffic recognize a gateway to the Boulevard. Their purpose is to communicate the idea that one is entering or exiting symbolic space. A link is a distinguished street along the route. An existing example of an Ottawa monument serving as a marker would be the *National War Memorial* (discussed later). Sites for smaller-scale monuments exist throughout the Boulevard as part of the NCC's commemorative program.

As a focus of national symbolic content and message, the route increases the likelihood that nearby monuments will be charged with an added dimension of power. In other words, the awareness of their existence increases for the viewer as does the potential for interpretation. This is less likely to be the case if one encounters them in a more "everyday" setting. The Boulevard is a good example of how manipulation of physical space by state agencies can be used to create an appropriate environment for the transmission of ideas through a variety of mediums, including the monument.

The present route comprises several important segments (Figure 4.3). The Mile of History segment links Parliament Hill (a major focus for tourism excursions) on Wellington Street to the Governor General's residence on Sussex Drive. This route features many important buildings, such as the Royal Canadian Mint, the National War

Figure 4.2 Schematic illustration of main nodes and links on Confederation Boulevard.
Source: NCC, 1990:11.

Figure 4.3 Confederation Boulevard in reference to major areas of symbolic and tourist interest.
Adapted from: NCC, 1986:294.

Museum, the National Gallery and the Peacekeeping Monument. As well, it passes Lowertown, which, together with the Parliament complex, forms the heart of the tourist-historic city. To the west of Parliament the route crosses the Portage Bridge into Hull and follows Laurier Street to the Alexandra Bridge. The route connects to Mackenzie Avenue and comes back to Wellington Street. This portion of the route highlights Hull as a part of the capital identity. The route passes by the federal government buildings (Place de Portage) as well as the Canadian Museum of Civilization. The last portion of the route connects Laurier Avenue to Wellington Street via Elgin Street. This portion facilitates the Changing of the Guard ceremony that starts from Cartier Square Drill Hall on Laurier Avenue and finishes on Parliament Hill. It also highlights the prominent *National War Memorial* and Confederation Park.

Confederation Boulevard provides a structure to the experience of the symbolic capital, and as I have stated above, it undoubtedly helps to provide a strong background for capital monuments.

THE MONUMENTAL LANDSCAPE

While commemorative activity has declined in many cities, there have been sustained efforts by the federal government to create monuments of national interest in Ottawa-Hull. In addition, private groups from local, national and international sources have erected and continue to erect monuments in the capital which reflect issues of national, as well as sectional, interest. While monuments have always played a part in the building of the symbolic capital, it is only recently that coordinated plans have come from

both the federal and local governments to give direction to the content, site and form of monuments.

Historical Overview

There are a number of players who have been and continue to be involved in large-scale commemoration, including all the local and regional governments, federal agencies such as the NCC, the Department of Public Works (D.P.W) and the HSMB. Private groups and institutions such as the Roman Catholic Church have also been involved at various times.

1885 to the late 1940's

Most commemorative activity of this period was located on the grounds of Parliament Hill, where a number of important political figures, mostly former Prime Ministers and Queen Victoria, were honoured. These commemorations were sponsored by the federal government and carried out by the Department of Public Works (see Kemp, 1966; Guernsey, 1986). In addition to these monuments, a number of works initiated by the public and the City of Ottawa, were erected in city parks. These monuments elicited widespread public interest and were often raised as the result of local fundraising activities. A prime example is the monument to the Boer War erected in 1902 (Plate 4.0). This monument was erected partly through the efforts of local schoolchildren who collected over 30,000 pennies. The raising of a monument to the war in South Africa was a reflection of the positive public sentiment in the capital toward the British Empire at the time (Gwyn, 1984). Other commemorations included statues of

Plate 4.0 *Boer War Memorial.*

Source: NCC, 1985: 44

Plate 4.1 *National War Memorial*

Source: NCC, 1985: 39

important religious figures erected by the Roman Catholic Diocese on its properties at the University of Ottawa and at the Notre-Dame Basilica on Sussex Drive.

By far the most ambitious monument to be built in the capital during this period was the *National War Memorial*, also known as the “Great Response”, erected in 1939. The memorial was the last expression of government commemoration of the First World War.

The commission for the memorial was won by British artist Vernon March in 1927. His design was quite dramatic, calling for seventeen soldiers (later increased to twenty-three) representing the various branches of the forces underneath a victory arch topped by the allegorical figures of Peace and Freedom (see Plate 4.1). As mentioned in Chapter 1, commemoration of the war through glorification had become unpopular. Sensitive to this issue, March’s design endeavoured “to interpret and exemplify the spirit of Heroism (sic) and self-sacrifice, and at the same time to avoid any suggestion of glorifying the war” (Wayling, 1938:17).

The eventual unveiling of the work did not occur until 1939, as a result of the protracted issues concerning the placement of the memorial and March’s untimely death in 1930. Sydney March, the brother of Vernon, continued the work and aided in the erection of the monument after the site had finally been chosen. The site on Elgin Street offers a central location for the monument in close view of the Parliament buildings. The memorial would later form the centrepiece of a costly redesigned triangle in the middle of the street to be called Confederation Square.

The *National War Memorial* was unveiled by King George VI in front of over 100,000 people who had gathered in and around the square. The King linked the memorial with the sacrifices Canadians had made for peace and freedom, virtues which embodied the “very soul of the nation” (Vance, 1996:32). The nationalistic message of the monument and others across Canada helped to convey the feeling that the war was a coming of age for the nation. The sacrifices of Canadians embodied in the memorial remind Canadians today that “we are a distinct and special people, capable of heroic virtues, and that, as a nation, Canada possesses at its best the highest of human ideals” (Young, 1990:20). This being said, however, the monument itself at the time of unveiling may not have been perceived as overly nationalistic but rather as a reminder of the imperial ties to Britain, particularly with the imminence of World War Two. The formal name of the monument, the *Response*, is a reminder of the fact that many Canadians enthusiastically took up arms in defense of the British Empire, of which they felt they were part.

The *National War Memorial* remains the most visible monument in the landscape by virtue of its scale and careful siting. It is seen by thousands every day who travel down Elgin Street, it is featured on postcards and coins and it remains a main tourist attraction. Moreover, it serves as the setting for annual Remembrance Day ceremonies, spreading its symbolic message across the nation. Further reference will be made to this monument in relation to the upcoming case studies.

In summary, this period in commemoration represents a time where the local population took an active interest exemplified by the large crowds at unveilings and by

the overall enthusiasm over content, site and artistic form. Monuments of this period were executed in literal fashion through statues and often with the inclusion of allegorical figures (du Toit et. al., 1989).

1950's to the late 1960's

In most towns and cities this period was exemplified by a trend toward private commissions reflecting fewer of the broad community concerns and values than the previous period. As well, this fifteen year span saw a reduction of commemorations through large-scale monuments in general (du Toit et. al., 1987). In Ottawa-Hull there was a continuation of new projects mostly through a mix of private and government sponsorship, the continued interest appeared to be related to the symbolic significance offered by the capital. Of the seven monuments added, six reflected national themes. Two statues of former Prime Ministers were placed on Parliament Hill, while the remainder reflected particular groups in the Canadian Military. An interesting observation between war memorials of this period and the last, was the removal of the figurative soldier. Instead, these monuments reflect the use of granite walls, geometric forms, bas reliefs or cairns with plaques. In effect, the heroic element seen earlier was substantially reduced in these designs. An example of the latter is the *Canloan Memorial*, located at Sussex Drive and Stanley Street, which commemorates the participation of Canadian Officers in British units during the Second World War (Plate 4.2). It is unclear if these monuments reflect a conscious decision on the part of their proponents to avoid the heroic element in light of social attitudes towards glorification of war, or, if it was the result of the cost

of bronze sculpture. Many of these works involved a level of government money but they were also a result of soldier's contributions.

Late 1960's to mid-1980's

This phase featured a dramatic shift in the landscape of public art. As discussed in Chapter 4, public art returned with a vengeance to many cities in the late 1960's, but in an entirely different guise. This was the new age of the abstract art form, which is more self-referential in meaning and daring in material used, compared to traditional bronze sculpture. In the capital, abstract public art in the form of public sculpture was more the norm than commemorative monuments. Many of the early works were commissioned in Montreal for the World Expo held there in 1967, and were relocated to Ottawa after the Expo finished. An example of one of these works is *Flight* by Sorel Etrog, which was located on the Sparks Street Mall in 1968 (see Plate 4.3). Other works were the result of Federal art programs (see McKnight, 1996). Many of these public sculptures were placed in front of government buildings and in public parks on both sides of the Ottawa River. In Ottawa as in other cities, these non-traditional pieces generated a fair amount of controversy over their often poor location and abstract themes (Drainie, 1989).

During this period, traditional commemorative work continued to be commissioned. Despite the fact that there was a profusion of abstract art in the landscape, there remained a focus on the use of the statue form for much of the commemorative activity that took place. These works included two Prime Ministers, a statue of Lt. Col. By (founder of Bytown and head engineer for the building of the Rideau

Plate 4.2 *Can Loan Memorial*
Source: NCC, *Statues* : 74

Plate 4.3 *Flight*
Source: NCC, 1985: 23

Plate 4.4 *Terry Fox Memorial*
Source: NCC, 1985: 55

Canal) and a commemorative work honouring the heroic cross-country run of the young disabled athlete Terry Fox. The *Terry Fox Memorial*, originally located near Sussex Drive and Rideau Street, was moved and rededicated on July 1, 1998 to a site directly across from Parliament Hill, on the grounds of the NCC's information centre (see Plate 4.4). Terry Fox's dedication to his dream of raising money for cancer research made him one of the most popular Canadian heroes in the latter half of the twentieth century. While this monument can in part be seen as the heritage of the disabled community, it also speaks to the youth of the country and in general to all Canadians as to the power of human spirit in the face of incredible odds. Thus it is a work which can bridge various identities (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

The period of activity up to the present is quite important in that for the first time, commemorative policies were introduced at both the NCC and at the City of Ottawa. In the late 1980's, the NCC commissioned a study which looked at the broad nature of commemoration (NCC, 1988). Essentially, the writers of the report felt that more attention should be placed on large-scale commemoration by the agency as a means of developing Confederation Boulevard both aesthetically and symbolically. In keeping with the Commission's national mandate, it was proposed that any new monument sponsored by private groups on federal property reflect national content. Proposals for monuments of a local or regional nature would be referred to the appropriate level of government. A formal policy was adopted in 1994, which, in addition to setting out national criteria, clarifies what aspects proponents of commemoration would need to consider in terms of funding, choosing a site, artistic form and on-going maintenance (NCC, 1994).

The City of Ottawa created a similar policy in 1990 stipulating that all private commemorations on its property reflect the local character of the city (City of Ottawa, 1990). This policy was formulated in response to the city's controversial acceptance of a statue to Simon Bolivar, a South American political and military hero. Many felt that the monument was of little significance to the city's local heritage, while others felt that it strengthened Canada's and Ottawa's multicultural image (Yonsen, 1988).

These two policies are mechanisms meant to define what are in fact acceptable national or local themes or both for monumentalization. In both cases, proposals must be evaluated by committees within each level of government. At what point something can be said to be of national or local significance leads to the potential for disagreement, as the case of Simon Bolivar above illustrates. An example of a quashed monument commemoration is a proposal to erect a monument to the efforts of Canadians who served in the American military during the Vietnam war. This commemoration was deemed unsuitable since the Canadian government never officially sanctioned the war and the involvement of its citizens in it (Nesbitt; Interviews, 1997). The power to control what themes are allowed in public spaces is also enforced in regard to a commemoration's inscription. An example of control occurred when the initial inscription to the *Vietnamese Refugees Memorial* was changed following an overt political overtone aimed at the Vietnamese government and the treatment of its people (Dixon, 1997). This monument will be discussed below in relation to its commemoration and its placement in the capital.

Late 1980's to the present

Commemorative activity up to today has been quite active, with several large-scale projects undertaken by both public and private sponsors. Of all contributions made by the latter group, the most prominent is undoubtedly the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*, unveiled in 1990 on Elgin Street. This abstract piece is the largest commission sponsored by any private group in Ottawa-Hull. It will be discussed at length in the next chapter. In 1992, in celebration of Canada's 125th Anniversary, three new government-sponsored projects were added: *Tissage/Shelter* by the NCC in Rideau Falls Park; an equestrian monument in traditional bronze in honour of Queen Elizabeth II, the Head of State on Parliament Hill; and *Reconciliation*, located on Sussex Drive and co-sponsored by the NCC and the Department of National Defense (DND). *Tissage/Shelter* (Plate 4.5) is an abstract work incorporating an aluminum lattice structure representing a traditional aboriginal shelter. Embedded within this structure are glass face casts of Canadian citizens and bronze artifacts. The aboriginal shelter is reflective of the origins of the nation, which, taken together with the contemporary faces of Canadians evokes a continuum of history and a multicultural theme (see Mcknight, 1996). *Reconciliation* or, as it is more commonly referred to, the Peacekeeping Monument (to be discussed in the next chapter), represents a mix of both the literal and abstract and is the largest government-sponsored commission since the *National War Memorial*, erected in 1939.

The last major work of this current period is another war memorial entitled *Never Again* and erected in Hull. This monument was the idea of the local militia as early as 1939, but fundraising only began in earnest around 1984. The group had intended a cenotaph with figurative soldiers be built, but the proposal was turned down by the City

Plate 4.6

Tissage/Shelter
Photo by Author

Plate 4.5

Enclave (Women's Memorial)
Photo by Author

of Hull because of its perceived glorification of war. A more abstract piece celebrating peace and recognizing all those who suffered in war in order to secure it was realized in 1992, in part through the financial contribution from the City of Hull and local fundraising (Tardiff; Interviews, 1998). The work, located nearby the local armoury, now serves as the focus for Hull's local Remembrance Day ceremonies.

Except for the monument to Queen Elizabeth II, built on Parliament Hill in 1992, all of these large-scale projects contain elements that aim to make the works less didactic. They all try to elicit participation from the viewer in order to enrich their viewing experience. This is a result of the changes in the art world discussed earlier, which essentially attempted to make public art more meaningful and useful. The monuments built in the capital since the late 1980's are the only examples whose design incorporates this interactive element.

Since 1992, a number of privately led commemorations have been realized. Two examples include *Enclave*, or the Women's Memorial (Plate 4.6) as it more commonly entitled and a totem pole celebrating multiculturalism. The Women's Memorial was inspired by the killing of female students in Montreal's Ecole Polytechnique in 1989. The totem pole is significant in that it represents a spontaneous show of national spirit in a landscape dominated by the efforts of more formal government bodies. However, its placement on George Street, overlooking parked cars and situated somewhat away from Confederation Boulevard, greatly limits its exposure.

Two monuments that will be built in the year 1999 or 2000 in the National Capital Region are a Native war memorial co-sponsored by the Department of Indian

Affairs and the Assembly of First Nations (Aubry, 1996) and a monument highlighting the efforts of five Alberta women in securing the classification of women as “persons” under the law (Bohuslawsky, 1997). Both monuments are to be erected in 1999 or 2000. Known as the *Famous Five*, this work was initiated by a private group and is to be erected on the grounds of Parliament Hill. The choice of this very symbolic site was not without controversy, since, to date, it has been reserved for important political figures only (Ottawa Citizen, 1997). The Native war memorial will be situated in Confederation Park, near the *National War Memorial*.

Another monument that may be built in the early years of the next century is a commemoration to Lester Pearson (see Rogers, 1998). While the capital already has a monument to this Prime Minister on Parliament Hill, the site for this monument would be situated on the Quebec side near his burial place in Wakefield. The proposed granite sculpture would depict Pearson with the Nobel Peace prize he won in 1957 for his efforts in developing international peacekeeping (to be discussed later in the next chapter). The possible building of this monument would strengthen the presence of federal achievements in the province, but its location away from the central areas of the capital limits its exposure and may relegate it to obscurity.

Spatial and Thematic Coverage (refer to Table 4.0 and Figure 4.4)

The common thread of activity that has taken place in the national capital is its having been initiated or cosponsored by the federal government. As a result, most works were erected on federal land. Moreover, the government’s ownership and control of

much of the central area guarantees to some extent that the thematic focus will be on the nation. The NCC's commemorative policy represents a firm commitment to cater to national tourists. In addition to the policy, the Commission cooperates with local governments to ensure that the national story remains the focus of the Boulevard. It is important to note that, while the NCC boasts a commemorations policy that focuses uniquely on national criteria, it does not specify what should be commemorated per se, nor does it have a specific plan in place to redress what may be perceived to be a thematic imbalance. Subsequently, the policy recognizes the fact that commemoration is driven by the countless events and issues that capture the attention of Canadians and is thus highly variable. As a result it is open and flexible to the changing nature of Canadian society (Nesbitt; Interviews, 1997).

The overall majority of themes accumulated over time, involve the commemoration of important political persons and military events and figures related to the history of the nation. Together these categories account for 32 of the 49 monuments in the study area (see Table 4.0). Only two monuments depict multiculturalism or themes that pertain particularly to ethnicity (48,37) and both were built in the 1990's. One monument, despite being outside the study area, must be noted for its relevance to ethnicity. The aforementioned Vietnam Refugee's Memorial lies within the area of a sizable Vietnamese population in the city and represents an example of how monuments to particular identities could in the future be accommodated within the city of Ottawa (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

Table 4.0 Selected Characteristics of Commemorative Monuments and Selected Sculptures in Ottawa-Hull 1998

Location code *	Title of Work	Year	Style	Theme	Proponent
Commemorative Monuments					
1	San Martin	1976	Fig. bust	S. Amer. Pol Hero	Gov't of Argentina
2	Women's Memorial	1992	Caim	Gender Violence	Private
3	Can. Tribute to Human Rights	1990	Abstract	Human Rights	Private
4	Kwakiutl Totem	1971	Totem Pole	Confederation	Private
5	Boer War	1902	Fig. Statue	War Memorial	Private/ C. of Ott.
6	Northwest Rebellion	1888	Fig. Statue	War Memorial	Private/ C. of Ott.
7	Polish Home Army Tribute	1964	Caim	War Memorial	Private
8	Andrew Gault	1992	Fig. Statue	War Memorial	Private
9 -	National War Memorial	1939	Fig. Statue	War Memorial	Public Works
10	Wilfrid Laurier	1927	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
11	Mackenzie King	1968	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
12	John A. MacDonald	1895	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
13	Queen Elizabeth II	1992	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
14	Baldwin and Lafontaine	1914	Bas Relief	Political Figures	Public Works
15	D'Arcy McGee	1923	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
16	George Brown	1913	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
17	Alexander MacKenzie	1901	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
18	George Cartier	1885	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
19	John Diefenbaker	1986	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
20	Robert Borden	1957	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
21	Queen Victoria	1901	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
22	Lester Pearson	1990	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
23	Harper Memorial	1905	Fig. Statue	Political Figure	Public Works
24	Terry Fox Memorial	1983	Fig. Statue	Heroic Effort	RMOC
25	Loius St. Laurent	1976	Fig. Statue	Fig. Statue	Public Works
26	Justicia	1970	Fig. Statue	Justice	Public Works
27	Ivstitia	1970	Fig. Statue	Truth	Public Works
28	Arthur Doughty	1940	Fig. Statue	Civil Servant	Public Works
29	Canadian Phalanx	1972	Bas Relief	War Memorial	Public Works
30	Philomen Wright	1950	Fig. Statue	Founder of Hull	City of Hull
31	Never Again	1992	Abstract	War Memorial	Private/C. Hull
32	Atelier Tripod	1995	Abstract	Year of the Family	City of Hull
33	Pope John Paul II	1991	Caim	Religious Figure	City of Hull
34	Champlain	1915	Fig. Statue	Explorer	Private/C. Ott.
35	Commonwealth Airmen's Mem.	1959	Wall	War Memorial	HSMB**
36	Artillerymen's Memorial	1959	Wall	War Memorial	Private/Pub. Works
37	Shelter/Tissage	1992	Abstract	Canadian Unity	NCC
38	Sundial	1976	Sundial	Tribute to Canada	Private/Pub. Works
39	Iran Memorial	1980	Caim	Heroic Efforts	City of Ottawa
40	Korean War Memorial	1992	Caim	War Memorial	Private
41	Canloan Memorial	1961	Caim	War Memorial	Private/Pub. Works
42	Pacific Peoples	1946	Native Totem	Native Mythology	Private
43	Inuksuk	1997	Native Totem	Native Mythology	Private
44	Bishop Guiges	1889	Fig. Statue	Religious Figure	Roman Cath. Diocese
45	Archbishop Duhamel	1940's	Fig. Statue	Religious Figure	Roman Cath. Diocese
46	Reconciliation.	1992	Fig. Statue/Wall	Peacekeeping	NCC/DND
47	Colonel By	1971	Fig. Statue	Founder of Ott.	Private
48	Totem-George Street	1993	Native totem	Multiculturalism	Private
49	Simon Bolivar	1988	Fig. Statue	S. Amer. Pol. Hero	Gov't of Argentina
50	J. H. Tabaret	1889	Fig. Statue	Rel./Educ. Figure	Roman Cath. Diocese
Selected Sculpture					
A	The Hunt	1989	Fig. Statue	Native Hunting	Private
B	Totem-Victoria Island	1985	Native Totem	Native Mythology	Private
C	Boat Site	1984	Metal Sculpture	Ottawa River	NCC
D	Three Forms by the Sea	1984	Stone Forms	Ottawa River	NCC
E	Kolus	1986	Native Totem	Native Mythology	Private

* Please refer to figure 4.4 for the locations of the monuments and sculpture. In addition, these number codes correspond to the numerical references found in brackets in the text.

** Refers to the Historical Sites and Monuments Board

Monuments reflecting Native contribution total five (4,34,42,43,48), three of which are traditional totems poles, and the fourth, a figurative sculpture of an aboriginal at the base of the Champlain monument. This work was meant to commemorate the early explorations of Champlain, whose accomplishments would most certainly have been more difficult to realize had it not been for the guidance and help of the Native peoples (represented by the kneeling Native). This piece has come under recent criticism by members of Native groups, who see it as a reflection of a subservient relationship because of the Native's attire and physical position and who have therefore lobbied for its removal (*Ottawa Citizen*, 1997). This is a local example of how the meaning of a monument can become controversial. The future Native War Memorial in Confederation Park will represent an attempt to address the lack of recognition Natives received for their efforts in Canada's wars.

Monuments reflecting women and their contribution to the national society are few, but those that exist can be found on Parliament Hill in the forms of Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria. A third will be added when the *Famous Five* is installed on Parliament Hill in 2000. This statue is significant as a role model since it highlights the achievements of Canadian-born women in Canada, and its placement on the Hill can certainly be read as a statement intended to redress the lack of gender in monuments in Ottawa-Hull, and more specifically, Parliament Hill. As discussed earlier, the last major monument with a focus on women was *Enclave*. However, the work was built to give exposure to the issue of violence and gender, rather than to make an explicit attempt to position its meaning as national heritage. There are of course, other monuments in the

city which reflect female forms especially allegorically, the *National War Memorial* being the most prominent. But some argue that this allegorical representation fails to adequately reflect the lives of women and their contributions to society (Warner, 1985).

Referring to Figure 4.4, one can see that the spatial coverage of monuments along the Boulevard is uneven, with the greatest concentration of works being located on and around Parliament Hill (10-29). Other concentrated areas include the Mile of History segment, especially near Major's Hill Park, Rideau Falls Park, and Green's Island and the grounds of the Governor General residence. The most vacant areas remain in Hull and to the west of Parliament.

Monumentalization on Parliament Hill is reflective of the sustained efforts of the federal government to commemorate political and monarchical figures. Confederation Square (8,9) and Confederation Park (4-7) to the southeast of the Hill are two other areas that reflect a strong federal presence. Other locations that reflect government or private sponsorship or both include the grounds of Government House (42-43) and in Rideau Falls Park (35-8), located to the north of Green's Island. The grounds of Government House are particularly Native-oriented and partially reflect the personal intentions of the present Governor General to highlight Canada's third founding nation (Government House, 1997). These intentions are reflected in the following quote from a speech given on the theme of Native role models, by the current Governor General, the Honourable Romeo LeBlanc: "We owe the Aboriginal peoples a debt that is four centuries old. It is their turn to become full partners in developing an even greater Canada" (LeBlanc, 1996). The last major area of large-scale commemorative activity by the government is on

Sussex Drive where the *Reconciliation* (46) serves as a major marker or traffic node for the Boulevard.

Hull boasts a total of four monuments, all are removed from the Boulevard proper, but all being efforts of the city of Hull and private groups. These monuments commemorate the city's founding, the visit of Pope John Paul II, the International Year of the Family and the major wars. All of these works reflect national themes, thereby reinforcing the national focus of the Boulevard.

The lack of monumentalization on the part of the federal government in Quebec can partly be explained by the late inclusion of Hull in national capital planning. More important, however, is the fact that the heritage of Quebec has been promoted and protected since the early twentieth century by the provincial government. When the federal government built its large office complexes in Hull, this generated a fair amount of controversy since it involved the clearance of much of the early housing of the city. A Quebec provincial commission viewed the whole rebuilding of the core of Hull as "cultural and demographic aggression" and a "breach of Quebec's political sovereignty" (Boal, 1990:325). A federal intrusion into Hull with nationally focused monuments would indeed generate the potential for controversy, raising an important query for the future success of the NCC in attaining this end.

Commemorations on Ottawa-Carleton regional property include *Terry Fox* (24) on Wellington Avenue and Metcalfe Street and the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* on Elgin Street (3). Both of these monuments reflect national concerns. City of Ottawa commemorative activity on Green Island includes monuments to the Korean War

veterans of the Ottawa area (40) and the hostage taking in Iran in the late 1970's (39). Monuments to *Simon Bolivar* (49) and *San Martin* (1), both South American political and military heroes with no national content, are removed from the main areas of the Boulevard. The Women's Memorial (2), a controversial piece co-sponsored by the City of Ottawa and which can certainly be argued to have national significance, is also somewhat removed. Other local monuments include the religious figures found on Sussex Drive (44,45) and at the University of Ottawa (50). Founders of the cities of Hull and Ottawa are located on Promenade du Portage and in Major's Hill Park respectively. It is important to note that these local examples can have dual purpose in nature: not only do they give validation to the local heritage, but they can have also serve to enrich national content depending on the interpretation used.

In addition to the works already identified, I have chosen to include five pieces of public sculpture which reflect relevant thematic material. These examples include the *Hunt* (A), the Victoria Island *Totem* (B), and *Kolus* (D), and the all of which reflect Native art forms and themes. These sculptures, taken together with other monuments celebrating Native themes, contribute to the image of the capital as reflective of this founding group. *Boat Site* (B) and *Three Forms by the Sea* (C) reflect the role and importance of the Ottawa River.

CONCLUSION

The landscape of the capital represents a long-term commitment by a variety of actors to create an imaginary world of meanings related to what it means to be Canadian. Beautiful architecture, attention to environmental aesthetic, monument-building: these efforts and others are set against the natural splendour of the location with its rivers, hills and vegetation.

The monumental component of this image reflects a varied thematic collection with an historically acquired prevalence for political and military themes recorded through representative figuration. Moreover, it is not overly representative of heritage that speaks to the increasing diversity of Canadian society. This is due partly to the early period of monument-making, which emphasized broad national themes without particular reference to issues of gender and ethnicity and which accounts for many of the works in the capital. In later periods, we do see some examples that are more representative in this regard but these are much fewer in total. The ability to reverse this trend at least numerically, given the cost and time needed to construct new monuments, translates into a process that will take some time to complete. The monumental landscape may never reflect a balanced national story, which is itself always in flux, and, given the variability of commemoration activity, this situation will probably continue to exist in the future. Perhaps a more germane situation exists in the attempt to build monuments which are more inclusive in nature through a common theme rather than being reflective of particular groups. Thus the stage is set to consider the two case studies which attempt to bridge the problems of a plural culture.

CHAPTER FIVE: CASE STUDIES --

MONUMENTALIZATION OF THE CONTEMPORARY

NATIONAL IDENTITY

INTRODUCTION

After discussing the monumental landscape of the capital and its lack of inclusive coverage of the diversity of Canadian society, I turn now to the events surrounding the production of the two monuments: the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* and *Reconciliation*. These two case studies exemplify efforts by their proponents to create lasting national symbols in an effort to reinforce national unity and cohesiveness. This chapter will review the ideas and beliefs espoused by the monument makers and the steps taken to inscribe meaning in these cultural markers.

Discussion of the production or creation of the two monuments will be carried out in tandem. Specific areas of comparison and contrast between the two will be noted, and there will be comments throughout relating the works to theoretical issues raised in Chapter 2. The chapter is divided into six main sections. The first section relates each commemoration to its overall subject matter by emphasizing its relevance to national history and identity. After laying this contextual groundwork, I then discuss the initial reasons for commemoration in section two and describe who the proponents are and their intentions for the monuments. The third area of discussion explains the competition process, covering events in the production of the monuments up to the jury's choice of

design. This section includes the reasons given for the choice of the site, its symbolic attributes and locational importance to the capital setting. The fourth section contains a detailed discussion of the winning design, focusing on its form and symbolic content, as well as any changes brought to it by result of the jury or proponent. The fifth section highlights the promotional activities carried out by the proponents in order to generate interest and awareness in these monuments. The final section discusses some broad issues relating the monuments to nationalism, post modernism and the symbolic association between the two monuments in the capital landscape.

RELEVANCE TO NATIONAL HISTORY AND IDENTITY

While both of these projects reflect different producers and therefore carry different meanings, what they commemorate and what they bring to Canadian identity and nationalism have common linkages.

The first area of commonality is related to Canada's interest in human rights abroad, its peacekeeping efforts and its foreign policy. A central aspect of this policy has been a commitment to multilateralism through participation in international organizations such as the United Nations (UN). Part of this commitment can be seen in the early role that Canadians played in the development of UN human rights legislation and peacekeeping.

The first instance of early contribution is related to the scripting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) on December 10, 1948. This declaration, co-

authored by Canadian John Humphrey, was a response by the international community to the atrocities and wrongdoing that had taken place under the Nazi regime and others during the Second World War. The UDHR is a “declaration which represents a statement of principles or moral guidelines for the recognition and protection of fundamental human rights throughout the globe” (Kallen, 1995:1-2). Despite its non-legally binding nature, the UDHR has carried substantial moral weight and is still considered to be the primary focus of human rights discourse (Robertson, 1995).

Since the Second World War, Canada has taken on the role of a promoter of human rights, through the monitoring and observance of human rights abuses in the world. Examples of how Canada has carried out this role include attempting not to sell military equipment to countries that are known human rights abusers and by limiting aid to those countries (see Scharfe, 1994).

The development of peacekeeping missions is attributed to the work of former Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, who recommended deploying a multilateral international peace and police force to oversee tensions in the Sinai as a result of the invasion of the area by the French and British in 1956. For his efforts, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957, the first and only Canadian to receive this award. From this point on, peacekeeping became a widely recognized and popular activity of the Canadian military. Over 80,000 Canadians have served in peacekeeping missions and, to date, 104 have died as a result. No other country has served in more missions.

The second area of commonality between the two works lies in the idea that Canadian interest in international human rights and peacekeeping are two areas that are said to reflect the national consciousness. In her study of Canadian foreign policy, Scharfe's (1994) argues that the direction and focus of foreign policy are often reflective of a moralistic and humanitarian stance mirroring aspects of the national identity. Not only is this stance reflected in official pronouncements, but, more importantly, it is reflective of popular belief as the following findings from a national poll indicate:

The image of Canada as a moral, humane, peaceable, caring society is a very deeply embedded image, and is a very important aspect of the Canadian identity and one Canadians seem to take pride in. From this perspective, foreign policy initiatives that deal with aid to the Third World, alleviating hunger and poverty, seeking solutions to the nuclear arms race, speaking out against human rights violations, are thought of by the majority of Canadians as part of being Canadian, part of the national character (Decima, 1985).

Granatstein (1974) argues that part of this desire to help others is related to a strong missionary impulse embedded in the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs. Peacekeeping allowed for the sharing of that particular Canadian attribute "peace, order and good government" (p.512) to the less fortunate of the world and "carried a positive and moral imperative that appealed to idealistic and altruistic sentiments" (Sens, 1997:99).

Canada's identity in the world as a good international citizen is often seen as a result of our unique history and identity. Having to deal with tensions between the French and the English as well as accommodating a diverse population have resulted in patience and tolerance, attributes that are highly regarded in international activities such

as peacekeeping (Jockel, 1994). This experience allows Canada to claim a particular place in the international realm:

Our history and experience have equipped Canada for a unique role on the world stage. The inventor of peacekeeping, a pillar of the United Nations, a leader in international development, one of the most trusted nations in the world, Canada has been called the first international country. The envy of the world, our fortune reflects our wealth and freedom, and the character of Canadians (Clark, 1991:32).

One of the important motives for Canada's strong involvement on the world scene centres on the international recognition that it gives to a relatively small nation. By supporting and participating in multilateralism and in the UN through peacekeeping and other measures, Canada ensures that it has a strong voice on world issues. These efforts have contributed to the idea of Canada as a middle-power which allowed it to be seen as an important world actor by other nations and its own people (Sens, 1997). Support for the U.N. also serves to reinforce the image of Canada as a "good international citizen" (Jockel, 1994:15). Canadian foreign policy and its focus on multilateralism and internationalism can also be seen as a means to express a distinct Canadian identity that is different from that of the United States. In relation to peacekeeping, this activity was seen and still is, (though this is changing) as an area undertaken by Canada independently of the United States. While the U.S. could be seen as an aggressor (Cuba, Grenada, Vietnam), Canada puts forth a distinctly more peaceful and caring face in the world through its involvement in peacekeeping. Thus peacekeeping serves to reinforce a sense of identity through what we do in the world and connects well to our national experience. Moreover, Canadian peacekeeping involvement reinforces the notion of Americans as "other" and contributes as a counterweight against American dominance. As Hilmer

(1993:9) notes, “peacekeeping is seen as an independent, distinctly Canadian activity and our internationalism as an antidote to too much continentalism.”

Canada’s involvement in both human rights and peacekeeping provides ample reasoning for commemoration. However, the *Tribute* was not meant to commemorate the image of Canada as an international human rights leader, but rather was built as a means to remind ourselves that we often do not live up to that image. On the international scene, Canada has at times acted with interests in mind other than human rights. In these instances, human rights have been relegated to second place behind trade relations and military concerns (Berry and McChesney, 1988). At home, the Canadian government passed the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms in 1982. Despite previous forms of legislation including this one, Kallen (1995:34) argues that there “is no necessary connection between the existence of human rights legislation and the empirical facts of respect for or denial of human rights in a given country.” While commenting on the general public’s feeling that the country is not racist in nature, she provides a battery of examples to argue the opposite. What is important about the Charter is that it has allowed a number of groups to come forward to argue their case. She argues that the Charter has raised expectations of many individuals and groups since they see the written ideal as espoused by the government, but that, in turn, they are faced with an opposite reality leading to discontent and legal challenge. The most prevalent challenges originate from groups representing aboriginal, multicultural and Quebec interests. In addition, the Charter’s equality provision has fostered a number of court actions on behalf of women and disabled groups and the gay and lesbian communities. Thus, the *Tribute*

is seen by some to be a necessary tool by which to remind Canadian citizens and the government to live up to the ideal that is espoused. This commitment is particularly important given the fact that Canada represents a multiplicity of cultures that is only going to increase over time. Tensions arising from this fact are sure to raise controversy in a number of human rights areas.

The commemoration of peacekeeping was primarily related to the events in 1988, when the United Nations received the Nobel Peace prize in recognition of its efforts in the service of peace. The pride and commitment of the Canadian military in their peacekeeping role leads Granatstein and Bercuson (1991:251) to note that “when the 1988 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to UN peacekeepers, the Canadian armed services believed, with substantial justification, that the prize was really meant for them.” Apart from this fact, the reason for its commemoration has been tied as well to the positive portrayal it gives to the military (Granatstein and Hilmer, 1994). As Jockel (1994:18) notes, “Canadians are not only intensely aware and enormously proud of their unparalleled record in peacekeeping, but have come to see it as an important element contributing to their national identity.” The popularity of peacekeeping became very important to the military in light of the fall of the Soviet Union, diminishing the likelihood of a world war. The reality of the end of the Cold War led many to believe that Canada and other countries would soon benefit from a peace dividend as a result of the expected scaling back of military spending (Jockel, 1994). By the end of the 1980’s, peacekeeping began to be seen more and more by the military as a means to ensure its continued survival (Granatstein and Bercuson, 1991). The production of *Reconciliation*

could thus be seen as part of a larger need to express the purpose of the military to the public in order to secure resources during a period of severe cutbacks (Ibid; Dale, 1993).

An opportunity arose for increased exposure for the military and peacekeeping in 1990. In the town of Oka, a proposal to build a golf course on land considered sacred to nearby Natives, resulted in protracted resistance on the part of Mohawk Natives. The military was asked to intervene in the situation and to oversee the peaceful resolution of the conflict. This event enabled the country to see first-hand the professionalism of Canadian soldiers with peacekeeping experience in their handling of this divisive conflict. The military emerged from the event in a positive light and was able to convert many Canadians who might have felt doubt about the use of peacekeeping and the military in general (Granatstein and Bercuson, 1991).

Up to this point, I have discussed the wider context that surrounds each commemoration within the domain of national experience and identity. In both cases, there has been long-term Canadian involvement and instances where Canadians have played paramount roles in the early development of both peacekeeping and human rights. Consequently, both areas provide ample material for national heritage recognition.

REASONS FOR COMMEMORATION AND PROPONENT(S)

The Canadian Tribute to Human Rights

The idea of a monument to human rights was born in 1983 out of a failed attempt by representatives from the Canadian Polish Congress to change the name of

Daly Avenue in Ottawa, near the Polish Embassy, to Solidarnosc Avenue. This request was made to commemorate the peaceful labour rights activism in Poland, known as the Solidarity Movement. Due to local protest, the street name commemoration was denied by Ottawa City Council. This event proved fruitful, however, in that it brought together like-minded people who subsequently joined forces to come up with a more permanent and universal commemoration (*Ottawa Citizen*, Sept. 20, 1989). On December 10, 1983, International Human Rights Day, these individuals came together to form the Canadian Tribute to Human Rights Inc. (CTHR).

The two principal founding members were Hania Fedorowicz, a member of the Polish Congress, and George Wilkes, a retired public service employee and local political activist (see Eade, 1989). Around this nucleus were a transitional number of volunteers who gave time and energy to the project. From the outset, the project attracted individuals from a variety of social backgrounds where the issue of human rights was of personal concern. These included people interested in gay and lesbian, aboriginal, ethnocultural, francophone, labour and women's causes.

The diversity of group interests was welcomed by the principal founders and was central to the *Tribute's* intended message. In the words of Hania Fedorowicz, "the beauty of this project was its diversity, from the beginning (Fedorowicz; Interviews, 1998). We were never reductionist as I recall, but always trying to find the broadest denominator which could represent all of our specific issues, projects, [and] goals." The development of one particular idea, "until all rights are respected none are secure", was related to the need of finding commonalities and helped to "counteract the impulse of

some, to only heed their own narrow group interests” (Fedorowicz; Interviews, 1998). The diversity of those involved and the need to find similar ground among them, helped to show how a tribute to human rights could be accomplished through human solidarity. The idea of people from varied backgrounds working toward a consensus on an important issue reflects part of the symbolic vision for the monument’s purpose. For instance, the *Tribute* would be “both a powerful and empowering symbol. It suggests a new approach to power, sharing rather than dominance, power based on a recognition of rights, on empowerment of the person and the community” (CTHR, 1990a:7).

The organization also espoused a universal vision of human rights that was meant to speak beyond the strict confines of the country. Through its visual presence, the monument would play an educative role by reminding Canadians and people from around the world of the importance of human rights. The *Tribute* “will remind our leaders, sensitize our visitors, and teach our children that human rights are the cornerstone of human community and that until the rights of all are respected none are secure” (CTHR, 1990a:7). The creation of the monument was based on the belief that “public art can make a social statement and play a role in mobilizing citizens to awareness and action” (CTHR, 1996:8). In the words of George Wilkes, the monument would “provide a space for all to visit, I see it as a place of inspiration, I see it as a place of refreshment of spirit, for release of challenged emotions and ideas, a place for further meeting” (Wilkes in CTHRc, 1990). Organizers also hoped that it would become a rallying space for groups interested in human rights.

Much of the early work of the *Tribute* group centered on the expression of common ideas and beliefs. Following this process, the need to raise funds, find a site, and prepare for an artistic competition, engaged most of the group's efforts. As I will discuss later, the group's approach to these tasks mirrors their intentions and ideas set forth previously. At this point, though, I will consider the early phases of *Reconciliation*.

Reconciliation

The original proponent of the construction of *Reconciliation* was the Department of National Defence (DND). Prior to the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to the UN, ideas had been circulating within the department for some sort of commemoration to peacekeeping, but no firm proposals had yet surfaced. According to the military representative who served on the project, Colonel John Gardam, the granting of the award was a decisive factor for the military in the decision to erect a monument in the capital (Interviews, 1997). Originally, the idea involved one statue on a plinth to be erected on DND land. Within a short time of the decision being made by the DND, the NCC became involved in the process since part of its mandate involves overseeing commemorations on federally owned property (see NCC, 1988). Due to the importance of the commemoration to Canadian identity, the NCC expressed interest in becoming a major partner in the building of the monument. The two agencies consequently solidified the partnership through an agreement to build the monument together.

For the DND, the monument to peacekeeping provided an opportunity to commemorate the efforts of its peacekeepers. The monument would be "Canada's

answer to the Nobel Peace Prize” (Gardam; Interviews, 1997) and would be a visible commitment of Canada to the United Nations. In the view of the NCC Director of Programming at the time, Shirley Black, the Commission’s involvement and interest in the project rested on the belief that the story of peacekeeping involved ordinary Canadians and was not limited to the military. As discussed above, peacekeeping had become an integral part of Canadian identity. In addition, a survey of Canadians, conducted by the DND, continued to point to peacekeeping as a legitimate activity of the military and one worthy of spending federal dollars on, despite the economic climate of the late 1980’s and early 1990’s (see Crop, 1992). Moreover, most Canadians were well aware of peacekeeping through television images showing Canadians serving in war-torn countries. An important aspect to note about the popularity of peacekeeping is that this sentiment is present in both English and French Canada, thus elevating its symbolic status as a resource for achieving national unity (Jockel, 1994). Consequently, peacekeeping provided an exceptional opportunity for the NCC to carry out its mandate: communicating Canada to Canadians. The monument also reinforced the international dimension of the capital since it “symbolizes the very essence of the Canadian international role and our hope for the future” (NCC, 1991a:1).

The international theme is one of several areas that the NCC identified as being of central importance to the capital identity (NCC, 1991b). Along with national defence, Canadian foreign policy is a distinct function of the federal government. Given the level of regionalism in Canada and the powers given to the provinces, Canadians often identify more with their provincial capitals than with Ottawa. The NCC’s attempt to develop

the international dimension of the capital thus serves to focus attention on the importance and role of the federal government in everyday life. This consideration not only helps to legitimize the place of the federal government, but also aids in fostering unity by focusing attention on national pursuits. Peacekeeping is also relevant in expressing the ideals and values identified by the Commission as those the capital landscape should reflect. These include the pursuit of freedom, democracy, peace, order, good government and tolerance, all values ideally associated with a diverse society (NCC, 1991b).

On another level, peacekeeping as an activity with a broad consensus-building value provided the Commission with an opportunity to create a national symbol in concrete form within the overall framework of capital building. The comments of the NCC chairman, Marcel Beaudry, in 1992 echo this observation: “the National Capital Commission is committed to creating a capital that reflects the values that are close to the hearts of all Canadians. Clearly, peacekeeping is one of those values” (NCC, 1992:1).

From the discussion of initial reasons for the commemorations and subsequent site considerations, we now turn to the events leading up to the choice of designs. The next section explores the events involved including the creation of the competition guidelines. The drafting of guidelines entails the crystallization of ideas and beliefs on the part of proponents. Once these are formed the process then falls to the creative ability of the artist to make these ideals into concrete form.

COMPETITION PROCESS

The Canadian Tribute to Human Rights

Fundraising and Site

The first major task for the *Tribute* organization involved fundraising and acquiring a site. These considerations were meant to be carried out in a way that was reflective of a permanent monument of national significance. The raising of funds was carried out in a manner which would limit the involvement of any one donor in the project. The highest contribution could not exceed \$5,000, while the amount needed was considered to be close to \$800,000 (Wilkes; Interviews, 1997). This base of support was very important to the group as a means to encourage the public's interest and approval of the project (CTHR, 1984). Organizers felt it was vitally important that the project not be representative of one or two large sponsors but instead reflective of a diversity of individuals and organizations from across Canada. In order to maintain interest, the group was also able to attract high-profile individuals to the site during the fundraising campaign, which turned out to be a seven-year process. In 1985, a ceremony was held on the site with then Minister for Human Rights, marking the inception of the equality provisions in the Charter. In 1989, the site was also visited by Lech Walesa, then leader of the Polish Solidarity movement, and by Ed Broadbent, then head of the International Centre for Human Rights and Development. The cap on the donation level proved difficult for fundraising, but it ensured that a wide base of support could be realized. At the monument's unveiling, the organization boasted over 400 major donors representing

Fig. 5.0 Site of the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* in reference to nearby buildings and to Confederation Boulevard, including its related landscape features.

Adapted from: NCC, 1983: 71

a nation-wide base of support from government and private organizations. There were also hundreds of individual contributions (CTHR, 1990).

The selection of the site was primarily motivated by the group's desire for the monument to have maximum public access. The favoured site, Elgin Street and Lisgar Avenue, though less "capital" in its nature, met the group's desire for the monument to be a part of the everyday life of the city. During the time of site selection, the site on the corner of Elgin and Lisgar was on the southernmost leg of Confederation Boulevard. Though somewhat removed from the main symbolic core of the city, the site nevertheless would be a "gateway" to the Boulevard. Figure 5.0 depicts the site of the *Tribute* and its proximity to the Boulevard and nearby buildings. As a result, the site offered a good balance between being situated amongst everyday life and projecting a national orientation. In addition to its heavy pedestrian traffic, the site offered symbolic association to human rights through its proximity to nearby institutions, including the provincial courthouse, Knox Presbyterian Church, Barrister House, a lawyer's office complex, and the RMOC (CTHR, 1985). The RMOC debated the site designation in 1984 and decided to donate it to the group. This approval was conditional, however, based on the final design and text of the monument (RMOC, 1987:2034). Unfortunately, due to on-going design considerations in the planning stages of the Boulevard, this section was later deleted from the NCC's plan for the symbolic route. Its location, however, is still relatively close to the main tourist areas, including the headquarters of the RMOC, which

over time has become a focus for various festivals and events of a national nature, thereby ensuring continued exposure.

The geographical placement of the *Tribute* has been important in transforming this previously unpretentious city space into a symbolic political place. Firstly, its location helps to accentuate the role and place of social institutions in human rights discourse at a local, provincial and national level. This association can be seen as an effort “to remind and sensitize our leaders” as to the ramification of their actions (CTHR, 1990a:7). Similar to *Reconciliation*, the assertion of human rights and the importance of the federal Charter in relation to them, highlights the significance of the role of federal institutions in Canadian society. Secondly, the *Tribute’s* intention to become a site of political activism introduces into the capital landscape a symbol intended to question traditional ideas of official heritage. I will elaborate more on this when I discuss the unveiling activities below. In summary, the *Tribute* is meant to be perceived more as a symbol which necessitates careful thought about national society rather than an affirmation of naive ideas of what it means to be a Canadian citizen.

Competition Guidelines

It was decided that the best means by which to obtain a design would be through the running of a well-publicized national competition. From the interviews, Hania Fedorowicz related her view on the process by emphasizing that “this should be a public, open process, allowing broad competition and the best quality. We wanted it to be a national project, avoiding any taint of favours or insider connections.” The group had no

experience in building a monument, and no one on the ad-hoc design committee had any idea as to what it should look like (Wilkes; Interviews, 1997). The competition costs would surpass \$100,000 a rather large sum for the non-profit group, but an expense deemed necessary for the achievement of a truly national symbol (Ibid.). The interview participant who suggested the idea of running a competition, Tom Arnold, saw the process as a means of generating Canada-wide interest and also as a method to ensure an equal opportunity for artists to compete on the project. The latitude given to the artist was wide, but the work would have to embody the intent of the *Tribute*:

...the intent of Canada's Tribute to Human Rights is to mark through artistic, inspirational and tangible form the struggles and continuing efforts of the people of Canada and of all nations to obtain and preserve fundamental human rights as these have been accepted in such landmark documents as the United Declaration of Human Rights and the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms. Too it will celebrate our unwritten recognition that human rights underlie and give vital strength to the structure of human society and will demonstrate our respect for the dignity of each person and each community, our tolerance and cherishing of their difference and the bonds that unite us in human solidarity.

The Tribute will be dedicated to promoting awareness of fundamental human rights without espousing any particular political beliefs or position. It will provide the first symbolic focus on human rights and upon respect for the individual and minority groups (CTHR., 1985b:1-2).

The intention of the *Tribute* makes it clear that this would be no ordinary monument. It is neither meant to remind us of any one event, nor does it take any specific viewpoint. This non-confrontational stance is partly a condition of the group's approval as a non-profit organization. In order to receive the designation, the organization group had to register as an educational charity, preventing it from making any overt political message (Wilkes; Interviews, 1997). In addition, site donation was conditional upon the Region's review of the monument's final form and text. While it was legally bound to be non-confrontational, the group's position appeared to have been chosen quite

deliberately. In order to obtain the necessary funds from such a diverse array of organizations, a message was needed that could be broad enough to include all viewpoints (Fedorowicz; Interviews, 1998). As well, any reference that would connect the monument to any one group or event would limit its universal (and “timeless”) message.

In September 1986, a jury composed of prominent artists and critics approved the design of the Montreal-based architect-artist Melvin Charney, out of a total of 129 submissions (see CTHR, 1985). In the jury’s decision statement, the artist’s submission was noted “for its integration with buildings adjacent to the site, and ... his rich use of symbols conveying many levels of meaning” (CTHR, 1986).

The competition process was a statement to the dedication of these volunteers to produce a high-quality piece. The competition enabled the choice to be made fairly and objectively since the competition guidelines specified that the chosen jury design would be final. This sensitivity ensured that the personal intent of the group was not unfairly forced onto a public site. The consideration of running an open competition reflected a sensitive awareness of the negative public climate that pervaded public art projects during the early 1980’s. On the whole, one interview participant with a background in art and who helped in the early phases of the *Tribute* endeavour felt strongly that the competition process was carried out in a very “professional” manner despite the inexperience of the volunteers (Reid; Interviews, 1997).

Fig 5.1 Site of *Reconciliation* in reference to nearby buildings and to Confederation Boulevard, including its related landscape features.
Adapted from: NCC, 1983:102

Reconciliation

Site

Unlike the *Tribute*, this project from the start had substantial human and financial resources upon which to draw. Thus, this phase of the endeavour does not reflect a need for public fundraising, but it will discuss the site and the reasons for its selection by the two proponents. As I alluded to earlier, since this work reflects contention between those involved, the following section will describe the formulation of competition guidelines and how the competition process was carried out. The process of creating *Reconciliation* is important in that it highlights how dominant proponents engaged in creating a monument can be reflective of very different intentions and ideas.

As with the *Tribute*, one of the first considerations for the proponents was the need to locate a site for the commemoration. A number of locations along Confederation Boulevard were considered by the two proponents. One site, favoured by the military representative, was the location at Green Island near Ottawa City Hall. This site was attractive due to its proximity to the nearby *Airmen's Memorial* (see 35 on Figure 4.4). However, the final choice of both proponents was the site at St. Patrick Street and Sussex Drive (Figure 5.1). Of primary importance was the fact that the site was highly visible to both passing motorists and pedestrians due to its location near major streets. The site also allowed for ready pedestrian access, an important consideration for attracting participation in the monument. Moreover, the location was on the Mile of History segment of Confederation Boulevard, an attribute which increases overall tourist interest and use in the nearby area (Gardam, 1998; Interviews; Black; Interviews; 1998).

The choice of the site for a monument commemoration was fortuitous in that it complements the extensive work already done by the NCC in the surrounding area over the past three decades. Sussex Drive has been a major focus for the NCC, which has facilitated the growth of the tourist-historic city (see Ashworth and Tunbridge, 1990). The site for the monument was part of a carefully planned attempt, particularly in the last decade, to enhance connections with Hull and other somewhat removed national institutions. Broadly contemporaneous projects such as the completion of the pedestrian courtyard route from the Byward Market area to St. Patrick, and the construction of the National Gallery and Museum of Civilization, helped to enlarge the tourist-historic city toward Hull and gave more exposure to the National Mint and National War Museum. The latest addition to the area is the new American Embassy under construction adjacent to *Reconciliation*; counterpoised against the embassy building, the monument will acquire increased national symbolism. Following the selection of a site the two proponents entered into discussions related to the criteria for the monument competition.

Competition Guidelines

The DND, by virtue of its financial contribution and as originator of the idea, was the majority partner in project development. The relationship between the DND and the NCC, however, was mediated by the NCC's ownership of the site and the funds it provided. With the DND and the NCC together, the project grew in scope, both in size and intention, as well as in cost. The total cost of the monument is listed at \$2.8 million, of which DND contributed \$2.3 million (see NCC, 1992 for budget details). It is

important to note that, while the DND felt that it was the major financial contributor, the NCC project manager Elizabeth Doherty felt that it was a more equitable situation overall, when one considered the site value and full cost of human resources and promotion activities borne by the Commission (Interviews, 1997). This difference in perspective appears to be related to the different ways in which the organizations account for expenses. However, it must be noted that this area of cost is still contested by the proponents. The important aspect is that the perception on the part of the DND existed and framed part of the discussions that took place.

Another issue that permeated the discussions between the two proponents was the uncomfortable feeling on the part many of those involved to be associated with the military and a military commemoration. This observation was related by the project manager who came to the project after the design had been selected, but still felt that this feeling was present before her arrival. She attributes this feeling to the fact that many of those involved came from the generation who were old enough to understand the Vietnam War demonstrations in the late 1960's and early 1970's which resulted in a widespread backlash against the military in general. Though these demonstrations were focused in the U.S., Doherty's observations seem to reinforce the comments by Jack Granatstein in Mohamed (1998) that a tendency in Canada to downplay its military history and accomplishments can be attributed to the era of anti-Vietnam sentiment. Terry Copp, a university professor agrees and asserts that over the past few decades "a consensus developed in society in which things military weren't exactly evil, but they weren't the kinds of things people wanted to talk about" (Mohamed, 1998). The

uncomfortable feeling seemed to relax over time in general, in the view of Elizabeth Doherty, as the proponents settled into a working relationship (Doherty; Interviews, 1998). However, in the drafting of the competition guidelines and into the design stage, the tendency to want to downplay the military nature of peacekeeping by NCC participants can be observed.

The drafting of the competition guidelines involved intense deliberations over symbolic content that both proponents reported as being quite frustrating. For example, in the words of John Gardam: “you couldn’t believe the arguments we used to have”(Interviews, 1998). Part of the frustration between the two groups was related to the two very different organizational cultures they represented (Black; Interviews, 1997). Elizabeth Doherty saw the military culture as hierarchical and intensely focused on the task at hand. She also felt that the military was an organization with “a culture which doesn’t take easily to changes in direction” (Interviews, 1997). The issue of a change in direction came up often with the interplay between the DND and the NCC’s Programming Department. The NCC’s aim “was to be consultative and to get as many ideas” (Black; Interviews, 1998) on such areas as site improvements and symbolic content. Thus, discussions were carried out with a number of individuals representing various backgrounds from landscape designers to experts in Canadian studies. This procedure is described in the final report to be a “laborious, sequential process which discourages partners and increases project costs” (NCC, 1992).

The key point of difference between the two proponents was related to whom the commemoration was for. For the DND, the commemoration was essentially a monument

to commemorate the work of “our peacekeepers” (Gardam; Interviews, 1997). By contrast, the NCC, reflecting its national mandate aimed to create a work which spoke to all Canadians. The unifying element for Canadians was the “shared commitment” that all Canadians have for peacekeeping (NCC, 1991c:15). For example, Shirley Black (Interviews, 1997) felt that peacekeeping “was a mission for Canada” and, as a result the commemoration should be aimed at a wider audience.

There were also differences between the two organizations as to the basic aesthetic qualities that the monument design submissions should reflect. As part of the agreement between the two proponents, the DND insisted that the monument reflect realistic figurative sculpture (Gardam; Interviews, 1998). The stipulation was primarily motivated by the need for “a clarity of meaning” where peacekeepers could recognize its “authenticity” (Ibid.). The stipulation for realistic statues appears to have been strongly influenced by the dislike of abstract expressions of works by the DND employees. Apparently, an abstract work outside the main headquarters in Ottawa generated such widespread disapproval in the military that the DND was not about to commission a work with the potential for such dissonance (Ibid.). According to John Gardam, the work in question, which was removed to a location along the Transitway, was an “ugly looking piece of a thing and everybody casted [sic] derogatory terms as to what it meant. It meant something to the sculptor but to nobody else....There was no way we were going to have something like that.” There can often be public relations issues concerning public art for some government bodies in that they are accountable to the public. Thus, potential controversies over art work would not be welcome, especially when tied to cost. As a

result, public art commissioned by government can, at times, be more reflective of the safe and comfortable rather than the daring or avant-garde (McKnight, 1996).

The condition for figurative elements, however, may also be reflective of the popularity on the part of the military of traditional monuments which feature the use of statues. Even the hugely popular abstract *Vietnam Veterans Memorial* in Washington, D.C. couldn't escape the calls from some veterans groups for statues which were later added (Griswold, 1992). The more recent *Korean Veterans Monument* in the American capital is entirely figurative in nature (Johnson, 1990). As a partner in the process, but with much more experience in dealing with negative reactions to public art, the NCC felt that public understanding of the monument could have been accomplished without the strict stipulation for literal form (Black; Interviews, 1997). However, the NCC did insist that the competition guidelines address the need for submissions to include a level of symbolism, in addition to the literal imagery demanded by the DND.

In the interviews, participants also stressed the difficulty in coming to terms with what peacekeepers do and what might be the best way to show these activities to the public. Peacekeeping involves a wide range of activities that vary according to the mandate of the mission. These include not only activities involving the use of force to keep peace, but also work related to removing mines, overseeing elections, providing food and supplies and the general rebuilding of physical and social infrastructure. Which of these activities would be represented became a source of intense discussion between the two partners. Ideas raised by the NCC focused more on the humanitarian aspect of the work, an interpretation that was often reinforced by television documentaries. For

Shirley Black (Interviews, 1997), the monument offered a new opportunity to shed light on the activities of soldiers rarely represented in sculpture: "Ottawa already had a war memorial... we wanted this to be the other side of that." Thus, for example, there were calls for a peacekeeper holding a child, thereby extending parental comfort in a stressful situation. It was felt that this kind of image would strike an immediate association for most Canadians. Shirley Black stressed the need to remember that these discussions occurred at a time when peacekeeping was still essentially "keeping the peace." The conflicts in Somalia and Yugoslavia had not yet occurred, making the distinction between war and peacekeeping clear.

In opposition to these ideas was the DND's contention that peacekeeping was the focus of the monument and that it should reflect the main activities carried out by peacekeepers. These activities often involve the use of force and involve overseeing potential conflict. The peaceful side of peacekeeping is the goal but not the activity itself; as the military representative asserted, the monument was not to become "a circle of doves with olive branches."

The insistence on the part of the DND for a commemoration dedicated to its peacekeepers, with apparently less concern for the public, can perhaps be explained by the very different cultural symbols and community values and norms held by military members (Doorn, 1984). Similar to other military organizations, the Canadian military is often characterized as hierarchical, socially conservative, steeped in tradition and often self-absorbed (Theriault and Douglas, 1997). Thus, it is not surprising that group identity is strong and would be set apart from the general population. Over the course of the

project, the view of the DND toward more public considerations expanded to include a somewhat wider perspective (Doherty; Interviews, 1998). This change in perception can be seen in the promotional activities carried out in tandem between the proponents.

As a result of much discussion, the primary guidelines of the competition involved an emphasis on literal and symbolic imagery and a conception of peacekeeping as an activity rather than as a reference to any one event. The focus on peacekeeping as an activity gives primary recognition to the long-term commitment by Canadians to foster world peace. In addition, it was decided that the monument would not be a memorial. This position may be related to the fact that peacekeeping missions, especially those before 1992, when the monument was in development, were usually carried out when hostilities had calmed, and therefore, did not result in many deaths. In fact, many of the deaths that had occurred were accidental in nature rather than combat-oriented (Gardam, 1997). Thus, the focus of the work is on the living members of the Forces who have participated in peacekeeping activities. The essence of the competition guidelines read:

The PEACEKEEPING Monument is a tribute to the living, not a memorial to the dead. The intent of the monument is to recognize and celebrate through artistic, inspirational and tangible form Canada's past and present peacekeeping role in the world. In that sense it will represent a fundamental Canadian value: no missionary zeal to impose our way of life on others but an acceptance of the responsibility to assist them in determining their own futures by ensuring a non-violent climate in which to do so...The monument will appeal to those who seek a literal message and to those who are receptive to a more symbolic statement. (NCC, 1990:2)

The emphasis on the literal is further encapsulated by the first guideline:

It is essential that the monument be, or include, symbols which are easily recognizable by a broad spectrum of the population so that past and present members of the peacekeeping forces, as well as the general public are able to understand the Monument and identify with its underlying ideals and values. (Ibid.)

The discussion concerning form in *Reconciliation* stresses the importance that aesthetics play in monument-building. It is also a reminder of how abstract public sculpture and monuments with their often negative public reception can influence present designs. The desire for strong legibility in *Reconciliation* reflects not only a desire on the part of proponents for messages to be easily understood, but it also exemplifies a desire to circumvent possible negative public reaction. The two case studies represent two different approaches to dealing with issues of aesthetic consumption. Compared to that which governed the *Tribute*, the competition process for *Reconciliation* was limited in that it involved the selection of teams comprising both landscape architects and sculptors from across the country. This formula was decided upon so that adequate treatment could be given to both the sculptural element and to the complicated site issues demanded by its location on the Boulevard. In addition, a smaller competition meant lower costs for the project, an important consideration for government organizations spending public money (Doherty; Interviews, 1998). The total cost of the competition, including staff wages, was reported to have been over \$300,000 (NCC, 1992). In addition to the limited competition, the proponents stipulated that they would have final choice to accept or approve the decision of the jury. Thus, in contrast to the *Tribute*, the closed process and stipulation of literal symbolism by the DND in the peacekeeping monument competition is more reflective of the imposition of the intentions of its proponents on the public realm, albeit with a concern for public acceptability and cost.

The competition resulted in a total of eight submissions from registered teams. The jury unanimously decided that the submission known as "*Reconciliation*" met most

clearly the demands of the competition (NCC, 1991d). The team that made up this proposal included: Jack Harmon (sculptor), Richard Henriquez (architect and urban designer) and Cornelia Oberlander (landscape architect), all from British Columbia.

THE WINNING DESIGNS

The Canadian Tribute to Human Rights

Design

Melvin Charney has carried out a number of internationally renowned works, all of which incorporate some level of abstraction within them (Lambert et. al., 1991). Charney's work echoes the efforts of earlier artists after the First World War who questioned political and societal values and beliefs. One critic describes his work as "a constant commentary of the city, an acute, attentive and subtle reading of our society and a reflection on our environment in its physical and cultural expressions" (Latour, 1991:16). According to Fulford (1991:52), much of Charney's work deals with "social memory, metaphors of history and puzzles of culture." The use of metaphors permeates his work. In the words of Fulford again, "in his world, nothing stands for itself alone; everything is metaphor - even the blankest slab of modernist architecture" (Ibid.). Charney posits himself somewhere between the limitless expression of imagination and reality (Fulford, 1991). His design for the *Tribute* follows this metaphorical trend.

The north-facing *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* is rectilinear in shape and measures fifty metres in length and ten metres in height (see Figure 5.2 and Figure 5.3).

Fig. 5.2 Site Plan for the Canadian Tribute to Human Rights

Source: adapted from CTHR, 1985:15

Fig. 5.3 *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*; Sketches of the artist depicting various perspectives (a~e) on the monument.
Source: Lambert, 1991:178.

Plate 5.0 *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*; Main arch with the inscription of the first article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). View looking south on Elgin Street with the Knox Presbyterian Church in background.

Source: Lambert, 1991:179.

Plate 5.1 *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*; concrete figures holding placards. View looking east with the old Teacher's College in the background. Source: Lambert, 1991:181.

Plate 5.2 *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*; detail of concrete figures. View looking west toward the Barrister House building. Source: Lambert, 1991:181.

The monument is meant to be walked through as if it were a pathway; therefore the description will be read as if someone were advancing from the north of Elgin Street. As one approaches the front, there is a series of ascending stairs which lead to an open, flat concrete surface designed for ceremonies. This surface then leads to a pathway under a high, red Manitoba granite arch, which leans against the main concrete body of the *Tribute*. On either side of the arch in both official languages is a dedication to human rights; its significance will be explained at length later (see Plate 5.0). Walking underneath the arch, visitors are greeted on both sides by a series of three massive concrete columns depicting human forms (Plates 5.1 and 5.2). Three of the columns carry placards which read “dignity”, “rights” and “equality”, while the other three carry the French translations of these words. Then, making their way past the columns one is led toward the back and down a ramp which leads to the sidewalk on Lisgar Street.

An area of importance concerning the *Tribute* is the idea of a pathway. Charney took for his major inspiration a portion of a speech from Lech Walesa. The section reads: “we cherish the dignity and rights of every human being and every nation... to follow this path means to enhance the moral power of the all-embracing idea of human solidarity” (Charney, 1986:1). This section, Charney feels, should be a message that is accessible to all people on all levels. Thus, “the objective of the design, therefore, is to provide a universal and timeless message, and to do so in a way whereby the symbolization of this message can be readily deciphered and related to accessible references” (Ibid.). This objective is intended to be accomplished by rooting the *Tribute* in its surroundings.

Figure 5.4 Map depicting the relationship between the *National War Memorial* (B) and the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* (A).

Source: Lambert, 1991:180.

Plate 5.3 *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*; view from inside the *Tribute* looking north to the *National War Memorial*.

Source: :Lambert, 1991:180.

In the first instance, the *Tribute* is directly aligned with the National War Memorial located further north on Elgin Street about 500 metres away (Figure 5.4 and Plate 5.3). This visual relationship to the *War Memorial* contributes to the legibility of the city. The relation to the War Memorial also serves a much more fundamental purpose. In Charney's view, the idea of human rights does not readily avail itself to any known symbols, but the *War Memorial* has an attraction to it that is based on a shared experience of sacrifice. The *Tribute*, however, is about life and the desire to live with dignity and equal rights. Thus, the design sets the two monuments into an opposing relationship. The idea is to "beat the sword into the ploughshare" (Charney in CTHR, 1990b). In the *Tribute*, the archway is meant to reflect the arch of the *War Memorial*, but in the *Tribute*, visitors can walk through it and become part of the monument, whereas, people are relegated to a passive role when taking in the *War Memorial*. The idea of people participating in the monument is echoed by the columns, who can now be thought of as people affirming rights by carrying the large granite plaques over their heads. This relationship to the *War Memorial* also complements well the *Tribute* group's desire to foster human rights through non-violent means. The *War Memorial* reminds us that there are times when our rights have been fought for, but the *Tribute* "speak[s] to the broader efforts and sacrifices of people around the world to live in dignity under the protection of just laws" (CTHR, 1984:3818). While the clarity of the visual relationship to the *National War Memorial* from the *Tribute* is striking, this situation is not repeated when looking from the opposite vantage point. The visual axis is obscured by trees and signs along Elgin Street and is somewhat overpowered by the adjacent church. On a

practical level, this lack of clarity limits the visual relationship of the *Tribute* to an observer at the memorial. Symbolically, it also diminishes the association brought to the *National War Memorial* by the *Tribute*'s designer.

The *Tribute*'s design is also meant to interact symbolically with the nearby buildings (Plates 5.0-5.3). The arch of the *Tribute* echoes the arch of the historic Knox Church and the old Ottawa Teachers College (which is part of the RMOC headquarters) to the east. The columns of the *Tribute* are meant to reflect the basilica-like interior of Knox Church, located on the other side of Lisgar Street. Charney (1986) relates the importance of this association to the fact that codes of law and covenants in Roman times were often given validation in such places. Charney (1986) also views this row of columns on the *Tribute* as a representation of a path of redemption. The main granite arch which comprises the inscriptions and leans against the front, can also be seen to represent covenants. These "tablets" rest precariously on the main concrete body of the *Tribute*, thus suggesting the unstable nature of human rights in general and the need for their continued protection and fostering.

The work is predominantly concrete, but this material is strongly contrasted with the use of red granite on the front arch and on the individual plaques carried by the columnar figures. The concrete conveys the image of a work in progress, an effect that was deliberate on the part of the artist. As human rights are an on-going project, the monument reflects this reality through the use of this material (Charney, 1991). However, the use of concrete also conveys the idea of permanence and strength, thereby making an

association to the idea of human rights as the foundation of human society (Reid; Interviews, 1997).

This description of the design captures the essential elements of the official version given by Charney to the jury. It represents a sophisticated reading, but one that is not limited to him, since abstract art allows for a number of personal readings. Despite the design and its symbolic associations, abstract art is a controversial form, and this contention is reflective of the *Tribute*. Indeed, the nature of the design very nearly lost the group the site, which had been conditionally given to them by the RMOC earlier (RMOC, 1987). This controversy will be discussed in the next chapter.

Design Adjustments

The design underwent very few changes from the time that the winning proposal was accepted to the time when the monument was actually completed. The inscription on the monument was chosen to be the quote referred to earlier by Charney. This choice of inscription was changed however, when an unplanned meeting between one of the *Tribute* members and John Humphrey, co-author of the first declaration of the UDHR, took place in Montreal, where the design for the *Tribute* was being shown in a gallery. Humphrey cited the broader application of the UDHR message in comparison to the Lech Walesa quote and urged its adoption on the monument. With the point taken, the matter was discussed by the *Tribute* organizers and the text changed as a result (Wilkes-interviews, 1997). Thus, the *Tribute* prominently displays the first declaration of the UDHR which reads: "All Human Beings Are Born Free and Equal In Human Rights and

Plate 5.4 *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*; Native translation plaques located on the concrete arch on which the main granite facade rests.

Source: Author's collection.

Dignity” (Plate 5.0) This event was very fruitful, in that it reinforces the universal concern and outlook espoused by the *Tribute* group. The UDHR, as discussed previously, is a well-known declaration and is thus a good cross-cultural reference making the legibility of the *Tribute* that much greater.

The only other major change to the monument resulted from the relationship which formed between the *Tribute* organizers and local Algonkian Natives. Realizing that the *Tribute* rested on Algonkian land and was part of a larger land claim, the *Tribute* organizers approached the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) about taking part in the project. What emerged was a proposal to incorporate over seventy plaques on the *Tribute* displaying the translation of “Equality, Rights and Dignity” in aboriginal languages (see Plate 5.4). This proposal was tied to the efforts of the AFN to lobby for government support in preserving native languages. The *Tribute* group accepting the idea led to the designation of the concrete arch on the *Tribute* as referring to the House of Canada (Wilkes-interviews, 1997). This “house” is conceived as being solid, with its roots in the historical presence of Natives living in Canada long before the arrival of Europeans. The presence of the plaques “bears witness to the role of languages in the preservation of culture” (CTHR, 1997). One of these plaques will specifically mention that the *Tribute* rests on land claimed by the Algonkians. Thus, it refers symbolically to the struggle of language and culture rights on the part of native Canadians and provides recognition of the land claims issue. While one could argue that the plaques are no more significant than the French and English translations found on the front, it is the fact that one does not see these languages in an everyday setting that makes them stand out. In

effect, while espousing universality, the monument does reflect to some extent by virtue of language a heritage of the three founding groups of Canada. As an important aside, the native plaques may raise issues of legibility and significance for the viewer, in that the native translations are not referred to in the commemorative plaque.

In addition to the plaques and inscriptions above, there is a smaller commemorative plaque explaining the significance of the work four metres to the north of the site, under a tree facing the RMOC headquarters (see Figure 5.2). Its importance for the *Tribute* should not be underestimated in that it is the main reference in how to interpret the abstract work. It reads as follows:

The Canadian Tribute to Human Rights celebrates the desire of people to live in freedom and dignity and to share equal rights. Enter the tribute, a path traces a symbolic procession through a portal inscribed with the first words of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The tribute was conceived by a community of volunteers from across Canada engaged in the struggle for the rights of people. It was created by the artist Melvin Charney. Sparked in 1983 by the struggle of the Polish trade union Solidarnosc and dedicated on Sept. 30, 1990, in the presence of the Dalai Lama of Tibet, the Canadian Tribute to Human Rights is a reminder that until all rights are respected, none are secure.

The inscription on the plaque highlights the universality espoused by the group. This aspect can be seen in the decision to not make reference to any one group in the struggle to secure equal rights and through direct reference to the UDHR. As well, the last sentence of the plaque reiterates the need for collective action, since, the acquisition of rights for oneself or one's group does not end the greater goal of universal equal rights. The *Tribute's* national focus is made clear by the reference to the nation-wide volunteer effort and the visit by the Dalai Lama. The reference to volunteer effort also accentuates the idea of what can be done by private citizens through collective effort.

Reconciliation

Design

The winning submission featured two main elements: firstly, two walls that slowly converge into a point and which feature three peacekeepers on the top and a tall, blue communications tower; and, secondly, the inclusion of a sacred grove slightly removed from the main work (Fig. 5.5 and 5.6; Plates 5.5 and 5.6). The two main walls are symbolic of opposing sides in a conflict; the pathway between them is strewn with rubble reflecting the reality of war (Plate 5.7). Flowers sprout out amongst the debris as a reminder of hope in the face of destruction. The converging walls represent the process towards reconciliation, which, in its infancy, is overseen by three peacekeepers (Plate 5.8). One figure is a soldier representing the danger involved in these missions; another wears the UN blue beret and represents observation, while the third figure is a female signaller who represents the role and importance of communications during these operations (Plate 5.8). The figures are on the “high ground” between the two opposing sides. To the right lies the peaceful sacred grove (Plate 5.10), consisting of twelve trees (one for each province and territory), as well as an enclosed low-lying grassed area symbolizing the hoped for future of all those involved (NCC, 1991). At night, the communications tower becomes a source of light showering the figures and the site in a haze of blue. This colour echoes the distinctive “blue berets” associated with UN peacekeepers (see Fig. 5.6 for proposed location of the tower). The idea is for the participant to enter the work from the rear so that one follows a logical succession of events from conflict, represented by the debris and opposing walls, to the attainment of

Fig. 5.5 Site plan for Reconciliation
 Source: adapted from NCC/RMOC, 1993

Fig. 5.6 *Reconciliation*; sketches by the designers showing cross-sections of the monument. (A) depicts the monument from the south. The location of the proposed communication tower is represented by the dotted line. (B) depicts the monument from the north with the sacred grove in the foreground.

Source: Henriquez and Associates, 1992: 2-3.

Plate 5.5 *Reconciliation*; frontal view from Mackenzie Ave. showing the converging walls.
Source: author's collection.

Plate 5.6 *Reconciliation*; side view of the monument with the sacred grove on the left. View is from Mackenzie Ave.
Source: author's collection.

Plate 5.7 *Reconciliation*; ramp/path leading through the “battle scene”. View is from Sussex Dr. with the National Gallery in background.
Source: author’s collection.

Plate 5.8 *Reconciliation*; silhouette of the statues. View from the ceremonial space looking northwest toward the National Gallery.
Source: author’s collection.

Plate 5.9 Detail of the clay maquettes used for the statues in *Reconciliation*.
Source: Gardam, 1998: cover.

Plate 5.10 *Reconciliation*; view from the main walls looking northward toward the sacred grove. The National Gallery is to the left and the Notre Dame Basilica on the right.
Source: author's collection.

peace symbolized by the sacred grove. Thus, the work invites active participation by observers (see NCC/DND, 1990; Henriquez and Associates, 1992).

The jury chose the submission for its well-executed balance between the literal figures and the symbolic, represented by the rubble of war and the sacred grove. Both the public and peacekeeper would understand the design: “the peacekeepers will identify with action because it relates directly to their own experience. The public will recognize the images of actual events and strife-torn places they have seen on television” (NCC, 1992:2). Echoing the military interpretation of peacekeeping discussed previously, the jury felt the design reflected “the need for strength, action and command if one is to keep the peace, rather than expressing the calm end state of peace itself” (Ibid.).

The design also interacts directly with nearby buildings. The converging walls which resemble the bow of a ship point to the Grand Hall of the National Gallery, symbolizing peacekeeping as a force in the defence of culture (Plate 5.6). The walls are also broken into two sections, which allow for a direct line of sight to the Peace Tower on Parliament Hill (Fig. 5.5 and 5.6). Thus the monument makes a clear relationship to the government as well as a statement to peace (Henriquez and Associates, 1992).

On another level, the military nature of the monument complements some of the main institutions in Canadian society through its geographic placement (Fig. 5.1 and 5.5). These include “culture” represented by the National Gallery, “religion” exemplified by Notre Dame Basilica and “government” symbolized by Parliament Hill (Ibid., 1992). The role of the military in the maintenance of the idea of country is reflected in its emphasis on duty to country and nation over individual rights (Willet, 1993). It is the

Plate 5.11 *Reconciliation*; detail of the flagpole showing the lights on each side which double as symbolic guns.
Source: author's collection.

Plate 5.12 *Reconciliation*; handrails aiming toward Parliament Hill. View is from Sussex Drive.
Source: author's collection.

defender of the society and has a special relationship towards national identity. The sacred grove, designed by Cornelia Oberlander, also echoes the landscaping of the nearby National Gallery, which was also created by this same artist.

Changes to the design

The jury placed some conditions on the conceptual ideas of the winning design. The two most important conditions, related to the tower and to the sacred grove. The communications tower was deemed to be unworkable because of the maintenance it would require and because of poor legibility for the viewer, and thus had to be dropped in favour of some other means to achieve the height needed for the node (Gardam; Interviews, 1997). The jury also advocated that the sacred grove be reinforced in order to make it more integrated with the main focus of the monument (NCC/DND, 1990).

The removal of the blue tower was remedied by the inclusion of a Canadian flag pole and by the raising of the main walls by 60 cm at the point of convergence. The pole is located at the base of the stairs leading up to the monument and is designed to project a set of “guns” from a battleship on each side (Plate 5.11 and Fig. 5.6). The handrails from the stairs follow this symbolic allusion by incorporating gun sights, aimed directly at the Peace Tower, into their design (Plate 5.12). The design element of the flag pole and handrails attempt to make symbolic association to peace by aiming the sights toward this goal (Monnette, 1993).

The sacred grove was reinforced by raising the area and enclosing it in a wall in order to soften the concrete of the site and monument. This is an important consideration

to note since the original monument was meant to be clad in pink Manitoba granite. In order to reduce costs, the cladding was dropped in favour of polished concrete (Gardam; Interviews, 1998), thus increasing the amount of concrete on the overall site. The grove itself is comprised of a circular wall with rough uncut rock that shields a raised grass area that is meant to resemble an egg representing birth and life (Plate 5.10). This raised grass surface attempts to make the area more visible to the observer in an effort to create a cohesive experience. For some in the NCC, this design element was very important since it helped to mediate the perceived military nature of the monument, which had become more war-like with the inclusion of the “battle scene” represented by the debris between the two walls (Plate 5.7). It was hoped that the peace grove would alter the look and feel of the monument, which now reflected “a strong emphasis on war” (Black; Interviews, 1997).

A further modification was made to the grove after public comments were received at a preliminary opening on July 1, 1992. Many of those who attended expected to see the names of the dead peacekeepers on the walls of the monument. There were also calls by some former peacekeepers after the unveiling to include these names as well (Gardam; Interviews, 1997). However, since the interpretation of the monument by the DND rested on a commemoration of the activity of peacekeeping, these views were not accommodated directly. Instead, an inscription was placed as a result of these demands on the inner wall of the grove and reads “their names liveth for evermore”, a phrase borrowed from the Commonwealth War Graves Commission. The inclusion of this inscription on a section of the monument clearly removed from the focus of the work

could be read as a statement to the military's unwavering commitment to the original intention of the work: a commemoration to an activity as opposed to a memorial to the dead (see Fig. 5.5 for the location). Moreover, this inscription is not reinforced by any other mention of soldiers who died on peacekeeping missions. Thus, it could be argued that there is a question as to the effectiveness of the inscription on the sacred grove.

In addition to these changes, other modifications were carried out which reflected the individual needs of both the NCC and the DND. For example, the statues were made to ensure absolute accuracy in every aspect from dress to weapons, and one of the figures was made into a U.N. Military Observer (UNMO), in order to give representation to all three branches of the military (Plate 5.9); (Gardam; Interviews, 1997). Previously, all the figures on the monument had reflected the army branch of the military. In relation to the female communications officer, there was initial reservation expressed by the DND representative, since no female member has ever served as a peacekeeper in this capacity. Thus, there was a concern over the authenticity of this particular element of the work. However, rather than entertain the idea of its removal, the NCC insisted that it remain in order to reflect the changing make-up of the armed forces and of general societal expectations (Black; Interviews, 1998; Gardam; Interviews, 1997). Having decided to keep the female communications officer, the proponents then insisted that the statue be strengthened in order to accentuate her femininity, a characteristic that was not readily visible to the viewer because of the gear and the uniform worn by the statue (Gardam; Interviews, 1997).

Including military weapons on the figures was another area that proved contentious for some. Part of the NCC's concerns were centred on how an overtly military monument might be interpreted by some members of the public. The disagreement seemed to rest on the view of peacekeepers as "good guys" who carry out humanitarian works versus the idea of professional soldiers. In the view of the project manager, the military felt strongly that peacekeeping activities focused primarily on vigilant observation in often dangerous situations and that humanitarian works are secondary to these activities. As well, if the monument were to be legible to peacekeepers, it would have to include military attire and equipment including weapons. Weapons were primarily used for self defence, but they were important in that they conveyed the ability to enforce the peace (NCC, 1991c). In the end, the position of the military was deemed to be the "reasonable view of things" (Doherty; Interviews, 1998). The importance of this interpretation for the military should not be underestimated. It is, after all, mainly military personnel who carry out these missions, and the DND's primary objective was to erect a commemoration of its peacekeepers.

With respect to the figures and their interpretation by the public, it is worth noting that, prior to the installation of the statues, it was decided by the sculptor to change the placement of two of the figures. The figure carrying the machine gun was moved from above where the word "Reconciliation" was inscribed, to the opposite wall, where it now stands under the wording "In the Service of Peace." Thus, this new placement reinforces the idea that force is necessary at times to obtain peace. The unarmed UNMO that replaced the soldier reflects a much less obvious military presence.

Plate 5.13 *Reconciliation*; detail of the ceremonial mortar on the north wall. View is from the parade space looking south.
Source: author's collection.

Moreover, with his binoculars and physical stance, the statue reflects an objective appearance, an attribute which can be interpreted as serving to strengthen the symbolic association to the word “Reconciliation” (Gardam; Interviews, 1998).

In order to accommodate ceremonial functions at the site, a mortar was built by the proponents at the base of the wall which reads “In the Service of Peace” (Plate 5.13). The mortar serves as a place to receive flower wreaths in during official functions. The mortar thus reinforces the symbolism of the armed statue above, in that force is needed at times to secure peaceful ends. However, the placement of flowers in a deadly weapon can be read as a powerful symbolic gesture which asserts the need to secure peace over continued warfare and destruction (Doherty; Interviews, 1998).

Aside from the words “Reconciliation” and “In the Service of Peace”, the names of all the missions that Canada has participated in were inscribed on the main north wall, with room for another 100 years worth (see Figure 5.5 for location). In addition, as one enters the area of debris, marking the start of the interactive experience, the right wall shows a description of the monument and the keynote speech of Lester B. Pearson during the 1956 Suez Crisis, the event that led to his winning of the Nobel Peace Prize.

This text reads as follows:

In 1988, the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the United Nations peacekeepers. This monument, Reconciliation, is a tribute to Canada's commitment to world peace, and to all Canadian men and women who have served as peacekeepers. Members of Canada's Armed Forces, represented by their figures stand at the meeting place of two walls of destruction. Vigilant, impartial, they oversee the reconciliation of those in conflict. Behind them lies the destruction of war. Ahead lies a promise of peace, a grove, a symbol of life.

We need action not only to end the fighting but to make peace. My own government would be glad to recommend Canadian participation in such a United Nations force, a truly international peace and policing force - Lester B. Pearson Nov. 2 1956

The choice to include a reference to Pearson helped to mediate earlier calls by some to expand the meaning of the monument to include his achievements and, in addition, emphasized the unique role Canada played in creating the institution of peacekeeping (as noted in Chapter 4, there are now efforts underway to build a monument to Pearson on the Quebec side). The text clarifies the general reasoning for the monument and specifically highlights how the soldiers should be interpreted and the need to connect to the symbolism of the grove. The text thus carefully directs interpretation away from an overly militaristic reading. The speech from Pearson further reinforces the need to see peacekeeping in the light which the monument portrays, that is, the need for force to grasp peace.

The negotiation between the two proponents discussed earlier represents a tangible example of how the construction of meaning entails negotiation. The insistence upon a strong legible piece in the competition guidelines resulted in a work which reflected this desire. The NCC participant, Shirley Black (Interviews, 1997), felt that the military's objectives had clearly been met, while those of the NCC had been less so. This participant would have liked to have seen a stronger balance toward the military nature of the monument and a stronger emphasis on interpretation. It was felt that interpretative materials which discussed the perspective of people living in these areas of conflict and/or the shared commitment and support for the activity by ordinary Canadians would help to broaden the message of the monument. The interpretive elements did not proceed because of the costs involved (Gardam; Interviews, 1998). However, this present

situation does not preclude the potential for future interpretive initiatives by the NCC on the site. Outside of this consideration, it appears that the design accurately reflected the proponent's objectives: a story line was evident, which invited participation, and there was a good mix of the literal of the abstract (Doherty, 1997).

In fact, in the eyes of the project manager, the design was able to capture quite well the essence of what both proponents were looking for: the ability to work with different objectives on the part of proponents, and the strong creative ability to manifest an idea that melds these views. Despite the design changes that occurred afterward, the project manager felt that the finished work still reflected the essential characteristics of the original design. The strength of the design and its importance to the military perspective especially, is related by Elizabeth Doherty in the interviews:

There is a very nasty business going on with shattered homes and dreams... and [where] peacekeepers [are] above the fray, not taking sides, alert and keeping the opponents aside. That side isn't peaceful; it isn't about going in without your gear on because you can die and many people do die... [And] over here you've got the garden, the hope for the future. The hope that if you can do peacekeeping, you can bring back the dream that most people have of living in peace and safety. But it's off on the other side; its not central. It's part of the whole message.

This case study underlines how dominant ideas and beliefs are made up of different interpretations, and that the production of cultural symbols is not a clear manifestation of idea into form. From the initial idea to the finished form, *Reconciliation* is a monument which reflects the negotiation by individuals representing their own organizational agenda and their own ideas, beliefs and experiences. As I discussed earlier in relation to other monument case studies, this debate process is not uncommon.

In summary, the competition process of each monument resulted in two monuments reflecting very different styles. The *Tribute* is the result of an open competition and reflects a much more avant-garde expression compared to the literal symbolism of *Reconciliation*. In comparison, *Reconciliation* is the outcome of a limited competition, whose guidelines reflected intense negotiation on the part of the two patrons, who expressed very different ideas and intentions of how the monument should look and be interpreted. For the DND, this intent was focused on the creation of a monument that highlighted military contributions. This intent was not aimed at speaking to all Canadians, which was the mandate of the NCC. The NCC took the position that the less military the monument appeared the better, a consideration that reflects a concern for the potential dissonance around issues of war and glorification. The DND and its stipulation of figurative statues and literal symbols speaks of a desire to be non controversial, at least in respect to traditional ideas of how monuments should look.

Despite their differences in form, both monuments contain enough literal elements to be more or less readily identified to their theme.

PROMOTION

Canadian Tribute to Human Rights

This monument was unveiled on September 30, 1990. While the *Tribute* itself can be considered apolitical in its message, the unveiling of the monument was an explicitly political occasion. This commemorative event did not seek to gain a consensus

on national memory by affirming traditional narratives or myths. In its place were rousing speeches by a number of individuals who often spoke from among the assembled crowd of 2,000. The form of the *Tribute's* unveiling contrasts with the usual formal ceremony and separation of politicians and elite from the spectators, often seen in other traditional commemorative events. This kind of ceremony was a conscious choice made by the *Tribute* group, who wished to “orient the unveiling ceremony to public participation” (CTHRa, 1990:2), and was meant “to be representative of the project itself, original, community-based [and] people-powered” (Fedorowicz, 1998). These considerations would seem to reflect the ideal of the group mentioned earlier in regard to fostering power sharing rather than dominance.

The presence of the Dalai Lama at the unveiling and the failure of the Prime Minister to personally meet with the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize recipient gave the event a controversial edge. The Dalai Lama's outspoken views on the Chinese occupation of Tibet were unpopular with the Chinese government who as a result, advised against any formal recognition of the Dalai Lama by the Canadian government. The Canadian decision to not give formal recognition reinforced the controversy since the Chinese government was responsible for the Tianamen Square massacre in 1989 and, despite this event, the Canadian government still maintained diplomatic relations with China. This position led the president of the *Tribute* group, Hania Fedorowicz, to comment in her speech that “high finance and political expediency cannot be placed above human rights...I call on the Prime Minister not to embarrass our country by failing to personally

receive and to listen to this gentle ambassador of non-violence and of politics of the heart” (CTHR, 1990b).

The recognition given to the Native community through the language plaques on the *Tribute* was also reflected by the participation of local Natives in the unveiling. Activities included drumming and chanting, a sweet grass ceremony, a speech by Bill Commanda, an Algonkian elder, and the singing of *O Canada* by Native children. Commanda commented on a different historical past, one which features the long stewardship of the land by Natives long before the European visitors arrived and of a people who have “never surrendered” (CTHR, 1990b).

The central messages of the day centred on the universal nature of rights, the need for action and vigilance in securing rights and the need to go about this process in a non violent way. Special attention was focused on how much needed to be done in Canada itself. “We still have far to go in our own country...equality should not be a distant goal, we must achieve it quickly if we are to have pride in our country and in ourselves. We cannot allow bigotry or people’s rights to be trampled underfoot” (Trueman in CTHR, 1990b). The symbol of this work would be the monument which “marks the commitment of all Canadians to live in a society of dignity and justice” (Ibid.). But in order to do this “legal instruments are important but not enough... What is needed is a conscious and vigilant public which can show its solidarity and indignation when the rights of individuals, groups or nations are denied” (Fedorowicz in CTHR, 1990b).

The activist tone was also evident during the evening's dinner at the Canadian Museum of Civilization in Hull. The evening featured speeches by Ed Broadbent, Chai Ling (political leader of students at Tianamen Square), the Dalai Lama, John Humphrey and representatives from Native communities and from women's and disabled interest groups. The evening's theme continued the earlier events of the day, but, more importantly, it stressed the importance of non violent action. "No force can stop human desire for freedom and democracy" (Dalai Lama in CTHR, 1990c); and this message was reinforced by Chai Ling , who shared her experience from the events at Tianamen Square (CTHR, 1990c).

In addition to its efforts of soliciting national support and the high profile it received through its unveiling activities, the *Tribute* has managed to increase its recognition on a national level more recently, thereby increasing its exposure and contributing to its reception as a national symbol. An important aspect of the *Tribute* is that, in its inclusion of the first declaration of the UDHR, it can be immediately interpreted as national heritage in virtue of its Canadian co-authorship. This aspect easily elevates its symbolic import. As an example of official recognition, the NCC website for Ottawa tourism lists the *Tribute* (as well as *Reconciliation*) as both a cultural landmark and as a symbol of the international dimension of the capital (see www.capcan.ca).

Moreover, *Tribute* organizers pushed for the monument to be part of the official activities of the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the UDHR in Ottawa in 1998. Part of the festivities included a the screening of a video of the *Tribute* project and

a discussion by the artist of the work's role as a representation of the human rights struggle. This event in turn was strengthened by the distribution of over 25,000 pamphlets at downtown locations explaining the purpose and appearance of the work, including the meaning and translation of the Native plaques (Wilkes; Interviews, 1998). In September 1998, South African president Nelson Mandela, who can be argued to be one of the most well-known human rights defenders, helped to unveil a plaque near the front of the *Tribute*, in recognition of the efforts of John Humphrey. In addition, the monument will be featured on a postage stamp honouring this individual. These promotional activities will have a strong potential for elevating the recognition and understanding of the purpose for the *Tribute*. Why these events have come at such a late date is related to the realities of running a volunteer organization and financing issues. After the unveiling, there was little money available to distribute and design brochures, and the number of volunteers was insufficient to coordinate activities such as the visit by Nelson Mandela. The interest and resources from the community, though, have picked up again to make these new efforts possible. In the words of George Wilkes, "the project is still a community effort and it takes time for the roots to grow" (Interviews, 1998).

In addition to the events described above, the work is also featured in the NCC's monument guide, *Streetsmart*, and is listed at its tourist information centre as a "significant Canadian achievement." The *Tribute* group can also be reached via the internet (see CTHR, 1997), and its site explains the monument's symbolism and offers a number of photographs detailing its form and the unveiling of the work. The foray onto

the internet was part of an earlier plan which would have seen the creation of a "Living Tribute" (CTHR, 1996). This idea was developed by the past group president Steve Naor. The project would have involved the creation of a significant internet site devoted to educating children in grades seven to twelve about the history and philosophy behind human rights. Discussion of the *Tribute* would also be included in this project. Unfortunately, the proposal was dropped because of a lack of funds (Naor; Interviews, 1997).

The *Tribute* is meant to become a place of political gathering and demonstration. Making this space overtly political is not readily achieved by the inclusive nature of its inscription or form, but instead is activated by the unveiling ceremony and related activities and on-going demonstrations carried out on the site. While the group erected a monument to human rights which is meant to be politically neutral, one could certainly argue that the unveiling ceremonies were anything but non political in their message. They were plainly critical of the actions of the Canadian government and others at home and abroad. These events underscore the importance of such ceremonies in imbuing the monument with a sense of purpose and emotion, whether or not these are positively received by society. The presence of well-known individuals contributed to the moral weight and importance of the *Tribute's* message. Referring back to Bodnar's (1994) distinction between official and vernacular memory, the *Tribute's* unveiling is characteristic of the latter. The questioning of official actions by the Canadian government and others over human rights is an attempt to negotiate the meaning of these events in a manner reflective of a concern for human suffering and lived experience,

rather than for official concerns over trade or international relations. The encouragement of public participation is also reflective of this vernacular distinction. The activist and participatory unveiling helped to transmit how people should interpret the *Tribute*. A monument to human rights is fine, but what does it mean? For those present taking part in the unveiling, the messages related to various needs, such as a need for vigilance and awareness, a need for solidarity, in an effort to secure and maintain human rights despite the existence of different identities, a need to go about this process in a non violent manner, and a need to extend this concern for rights throughout the world. The monument would serve as a place for collective focus and dissent in the struggle for rights. These messages, however, were temporary in nature as the monument itself retains no physical inscription of these events and meanings. And yet, this interpretation as a space for activism lives on as it has been used for this purpose several times since its inception. The activist tone behind the project in general is an example of how dominant ideas are contested from time to time by alternative ideas. A tangible example from the unveiling ceremonies is the alternative vision which seeks to place rights ahead of trade and military considerations.

While the *Tribute* can be seen as an attempt to define Canadian society, there is also a universal or global aspect to the message that takes it beyond national boundaries. Respect for individual rights is universal despite nationality. In the unveiling, reference was made to the fact that Canadians must hold the government responsible for our international actions as part of respecting all rights. The promotional activities also made good use of international issues and individuals to promote the message. One could

therefore argue that despite its national significance, the *Tribute* is also designed to speak to anyone regardless of nationality and thus aims to get to the core of what it means to be human. The *Tribute* can be said to be multifaceted in what it can accommodate in meaning and, therefore, is reflective of one of the most important characteristics of symbols: the ability to be polyvocal. Kerzer (1994) argues that this ability is especially relevant in national societies where civic nationalism is the basis for identity.

As a symbol, one way in which the meaning of the work will change relates to how it is promoted. This aspect is especially important for the *Tribute*. In the group's desire to increase the *Tribute*'s symbolic importance to the nation, the activist meanings may lose focus as it becomes appropriated as official heritage. As I have discussed earlier, the *Tribute* will receive an additional plaque to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the UDHR, which will help associate the marker, and to a certain extent the *Tribute*, as a great Canadian achievement. The potential is there for the work to be looked at in a naive manner without any reference to the work as a place of activism. This potential is a statement to the broadness and manipulability of the message (polyvocality) and to the fact that its previous controversial nature is not seen as a detriment to its official recognition.

Reconciliation

In contrast to the *Tribute*, most if not all of the activities related to *Reconciliation* were carried out prior to and shortly after the unveiling. In addition, they were much more extensive thanks to a larger budget and to the ability of the proponents to utilize

opportunities with other government departments to coordinate activities with little additional cost. Another distinction between the two monuments lies in fact that the unveiling activities for *Reconciliation* reflected a much more traditional approach to national commemoration. Given that the proponents reflected government institutions, the “official” nature of the unveiling was not unexpected. The importance of the promotional activities for the proponents is related below in a communications brief:

It is not sufficient to build a monument: the Project goal is to ensure that the monument is recognized by Canadians as a symbol of our common commitment to Peacekeeping and our recognition of Canadian Peacekeepers (NCC, 1991:14).

The overall strategy of the NCC’s communication plan, “a national moment”, was to generate interest and support as well pride in the monument by the Canadian public and media. Specific target groups were the youth, the “military family” and the international community. The main messages involved in the strategy were multifaceted in that they would emphasize a) the existence of the monument as a commemoration to peacekeeping; b) the “shared commitment of all Canadians” toward this activity; c) the monument as a “symbol of pride” located in the capital; d) the monument as a “significant artistic expression” and as a “symbol of Canada’s commitment to the UN and to peacekeeping” (NCC, 1991:15). Secondary messages identified by the Commission which conform to the NCC’s mandate include the ideas of the Capital as the meeting place to celebrate national achievement, and as a repository of national symbols (Ibid.)

The communications strategy involved a wide variety of programming vehicles used by both proponents. For youth, a contest on peacekeeping ran in teen magazines,

and school kits were sent to secondary schools and to architectural programs enabling students to create their own monuments. The competition process and results were widely distributed to foster interest and would form “part of the historical record of a significant Canadian Commemoration” (NCC, 1991a:14). Similar to the *Tribute*, thousands of tourist brochures were produced, explaining the purpose and the symbolism behind the monument. A program also ran which involved the creation of peace parks in Canadian communities modeled on the sacred grove found in *Reconciliation*.

In 1992, the year of the dedication, museum programs on peacekeeping were offered by the Canadian War Museum and Museum of Caricature, and a temporary interpretive centre was set up by the NCC on Sussex Drive. In addition, the release of a book written by Colonel John Gardam describing peacekeeping missions was timed for release with the dedication (see Gardam, 1992). As well, a number of television documentaries were aired nation-wide just prior to the unveiling of the monument. A significant focus was placed on the contributions Canadians had made on these missions as well as on the personal stories of peacekeepers. Finally, a dollar coin was later minted in 1995 showing the three figures of the monument.

Reconciliation was officially unveiled to the public on October 8, 1992. The ceremony, broadcast on national television, featured the fly-over of military aircraft, a parade of former and current peacekeepers and the attendance of politicians including then Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and then Governor General Ramon Hnatyshyn. The following portion of the speech by the Governor General at the unveiling, reflects

an emphasis on shared experience, on the peaceful predisposition of the country's past and how these elements have a role to play in the future:

Canada was forged, not in the heat of battle, but in the light of reason, negotiation, and mutual respect. It is based on the belief that people can live together amicably, even when they have different ideas, experiences, and backgrounds. It has left us a legacy of preferring the peaceable solution, and we have been able to use our national experience as an international instrument of peace.

The monument being unveiled today will stand as a lasting tribute, for generations of Canadians and visitors alike, calling us to keep working for peace in diversity (Hnatyshyn, 1992:1).

This speech could be interpreted not only as a reference to peacekeeping, but also to the problems of contemporary Canada in trying to negotiate a national society among many different cultures. The speech is reflective of the view that Canada has a unique predisposition toward the "vocation of peacekeeping" and is a statement about how the nation's past is to be remembered. It is through events such as monument unveilings that official memory is transmitted and used to foster collective remembering, that citizen's attitudes are reinvigorated toward the importance of the state, and that positive interpretations of national issues that threaten group cohesiveness are offered (Bodnar, 1994).

The timing of the unveiling could not have been better, since the early 1990's was a time of great debate over national unity issues in Canada. For instance, the Meech Lake Accord had been defeated, and the Charlottetown Accord would be decided by Canadians in a referendum later in the fall of 1992. Both of these constitutional accords were designed to bring Quebec into the national framework through a redistribution and clarification of powers between the federal and provincial governments. These attempts

were made in an effort to head off the potential for separation by Quebec from the rest of the country.

The use of public acceptability and popularity of peacekeeping by the DND was quite evident during 1992. Peacekeeping was featured on many television commercials sponsored by the DND. These ads served to bolster national feeling and helped to increase the positive public image for the military (Dale, 1994). Moreover, a number of television specials featured peacekeeping, and the names of some Canadian military leaders such as General Lewis Mackenzie became well-known. In short, there was a heightened need for the use of Canadian symbols from experience, both at home and abroad. The unveiling of *Reconciliation* helped in the need to expand on national symbols.

The fact that *Reconciliation* was unveiled in the fall of 1992 does not immediately implicate the monument as a symbolic resource built for national unity per se. During discussions centering on monument building, all the interviewees denied that the issue of national unity was even present. While the issue of national unity might not have been present in the discussions, the monument's timely unveiling could no doubt be seen as a means to reinforce official efforts at securing a "yes" vote during the fall referendum. As discussed previously, these efforts included a heightened focus on the role of Canada in peacekeeping. The ability of the monument to be cast into the light of the national unity debate highlights the fact that the monument, much like the *Tribute*, can accommodate different interpretations (polyvocality).

Outside of the unveiling ceremony, the monument is re-inscribed with meaning on an annual basis through military commemorations on October 24, officially recognized as United Nations Day. By way of an inscription on the monument the ceremony re-invokes Canada's commitment to peacekeeping, and serves to officially recognize missions that have recently ended. The commemorations also provide an opportunity to recognize those who have died in all peacekeeping missions, a function which the monument does not reflect centrally, since it was never intended to be a memorial. On occasion, the monument is interpreted, as a memorial outside of official events. For example, on one of my visits to the monument, I found a carefully wrapped bouquet of flowers in recognition of the death of a peacekeeper during a mission in the early 1970's. This tribute was quite touching for me and speaks to the fact that recognition of the dead *is* an important purpose of the monument for some individuals.

The monument has also been used at various times by the media for stories on peacekeeping and by External Affairs, whose use of the monument is part of an effort to communicate the idea of Canada as a preeminent peacekeeper (Gardam; Interviews, 1998). In many instances, this use involves the visiting and laying of wreaths at the monument by foreign heads of state or by other high-ranking officials. This official recognition of the monument is quite important in that it serves to reinforce the idea that Canada is a "good international citizen" with peace-minded intentions. As discussed earlier, the conception of Canada as a major peacekeeper also helps to ensure that Canada is represented in world discussions on a variety of issues thanks to its peacekeeping contributions. Furthermore, the monument reinforces in the minds of

foreign dignitaries the idea that peacekeeping is a very “Canadian” activity through the textual reference to Pearson as the founder of the idea and through the impressive list of missions in which Canada has taken part. The ability of the monument to impart a sense of national distinctiveness for Canada is important for yet another reason: the association of peacekeeping with Canada reinforces the idea of a national identity that is different from that which exists in the United States, a subject discussed earlier. This message will have increased symbolic importance when the United States Embassy, located directly across from *Reconciliation*, is completed.

FURTHER THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Monument-building is above all an exercise in power. It is the use of societal resources to create a particular urban artifact for the purposes of disseminating ideas and beliefs about society. These messages are meant to be long-lasting through the physical insertion of a monument in a public space. In this sense, monuments can be seen as instruments that impose particular meanings representative of their proponents on the landscape and are meant to be seen and understood.

Both monuments were created with the intention of forging national symbols. Both were consciously located in the heart of the symbolic core of Ottawa-Hull in order to transmit their ideas and beliefs and, therefore, in the process, accentuate the capital image and their own exposure in it. In each case, the basis of national identification is related to aspects which stress politically common projects. As a result, they are both reflective of civic nationalism, in that they stress elements which serve to unify a diverse

population in contrast to stressing references to ethnic or other background traits. In this instance, the projects on a broad level relate to the need to advance and to protect the rights of all social groups and to the shared recognition of Canada's efforts in peacekeeping, which helps to (among other aspects) ensure other societies can enjoy their own fundamental rights in a peaceful setting. As described earlier, both commemorations share the same subject matter in that they tie into Canadian foreign policy.

As a symbol built to demonstrate Canadian identity and social cohesion, it could be argued that the *Tribute* stands for a conception of a post-modern society. In an era of many diverse identities, the monument's message of inclusion allows for the "particular, the multiple and the heterogeneous [to be] acknowledged and legitimized" (McLennan and Richmond, 1994:667). Specifically in regard to Canada, Grimmond (1991) argues that the Canadian value of appreciating tolerance and diversity could be represented through the symbolic elevation of the Canadian Charter of Human Rights. A commemoration of this sort, according to Grimmond, would help provide a suitable "glue" for the diversity of Canadian society. The theme of the *Tribute* recognizes the primacy of rights in society and specifically mentions the Charter on its main commemorative plaque. Thus the *Tribute* is a good example of heritage that stresses a common unifying theme. Through its assertion of equality and rights, it can immediately connect to any one group or individual. Of particular importance, given the increasing ethnic diversity of Canada, the *Tribute* serves as a tangible symbol for these groups and

reinforces official efforts to reflect the multicultural dimension of the capital, itself seen as a reflection of the wider national reality.

The form of the *Tribute* also allows for the inclusion and identification of all groups. This attribute can be specifically seen in the abstract columnar forms which are meant to reflect human beings. The abstraction refers to no particular identity, thus allowing one to graft one's own preference onto them, or the abstraction can be seen as an assertion of the commonality of all identities at a fundamental level. On another level, the *Tribute*, through its lack of a dedication to any particular group offers a space for any group to claim it as its own.

Though human rights are central to all Canadians and the issue of rights has a strong link to Canadian foreign policy and national identity, one may still argue that the *Tribute* will only be attractive to a certain number of people. Its form lacks any figuration, making interpretation an issue for some, but it has a interrogative quality to it. The form invites participation and its textual message of equality is so simple that raises further questions. Is it meant to reflect a statement about reality? What does it mean to have equal rights for everyone? How does one reconcile the rights of one against those of another? These questions are constantly being asked in the courts and in the street over issues of abortion, compensation over past wrongs, native self-government, minority rights and so on. And yet the simple, textual reference of the UDHR that attempts to accommodate all, may in fact, for some, lack the sufficient bite needed to rouse them about the issues that it alludes to.

This raises the point that while it may speak to all at a basic level regardless of identity, it will always mean more and less at times for others. Rights are often taken for granted especially if one hasn't been affected by some perceived injustice. Moreover, rights are constantly being negotiated in a society and they do not always evolve in a linear fashion. History is replete with examples where the rights of some or of the whole of society have been curtailed overnight. A Canadian example of this is the October Crisis of 1970 where the War Measures Act was implemented in order to deal with terrorism in Quebec. Thus there is a need to be vigilant of how rights are nurtured and protected. In a nation undergoing fundamental changes in demography and social values the relevance of rights will remain a central issue.

The *Tribute's* volunteer organization and methods also mirror aspects of the postmodern element discussed in Chapter 2. Volunteers represented a diverse array of identities, many of which were part of a minority. In this sense, the Tribute group mirrors elements of the postmodern era, in that one sees a number of new, non-elite groups coming into the political forum and voicing their opinion (McLennan and Richmond, 1994). While this situation often leads to a cacophony of voices from many identities, and interests, in the *Tribute* one sees a "coming together" of various groups under a common purpose. The collective effort involved subsuming particular agendas to the overall belief in the importance of rights for all groups. The universal approach had to be carried out in order to see the work finished, but, the need for such an approach can be said to highlight the complexity of the rights issue. Particular identities can lose sight of the fact that in their pursuit of their own rights they may step on the rights of others in

the process. It was important that the *Tribute* not be seen as advocating the rights of one group over that of another for everyone must live in the same society (Fedorowicz; Interviews, 1998). Where rights are in conflict, they must be negotiated through equitable compromise (Ibid.) As the *Tribute* group's internet site asserts, "in terms of heritage, it speaks, among other things, of the coexistence of peoples, and challenges us to remember that until all rights are respected, none are secure" (CTHR, 1997).

In contrast to the *Tribute*, the proponents of *Reconciliation* specifically attempt to unify Canadians through reference to traditional national narratives (see McLennen and Richmond, 1994). In this case, the narrative describes military accomplishment and the on-going commitment to the nation's interest and to the United Nations. Thus, the basis for unity is related to national pride through a recognition of the unique role that Canadians have played in the development of peacekeeping.

The selection of peacekeeping, as an example of official heritage in monumental form, reinforces a number of other military monuments in the capital by emphasizing the importance of military service to national identity and sovereignty. The effect in Ottawa's central core is quite strong in that two of the most visibly prominent sites in the capital feature the two largest monuments in the city, both dedicated to military themes. Perhaps this representation is not unsurprising, given that the military is one of the most fundamental institutions in our society and it reflects a strong commitment to the idea of "nation". Members of the military services may encounter death in the service of this country and, in joining the forces, give up many of their fundamental rights

in the service of this ideal. Accordingly, it could be argued that the predominance of this theme in the capital dedicated to this institution is recognition duly given.

As noted in the discussion about peacekeeping earlier in the chapter, this activity does mirror aspects of national identity, but it also serves a variety of other purposes more related to basic considerations such as national defence, a counter balance to US influence, and the maintenance of stable trading environments. It also has mythical qualities to it above those noted earlier, which are rarely if ever mentioned in official discourse on peacekeeping. As one military observer notes, “many Canadians have made an icon of peacekeeping without really understanding what it is. ...It has been noted that we often overrate its importance as a contribution to international security” (Henry, 1993:6). The same author notes how Pearson’s early contribution to the concept for an international force in Egypt followed an idea from British representatives, who could not forward the idea since they were one of the combatants. The task fell to Canada, which was not an aggressor, and Pearson “executed it in admirable fashion” (p.7).

Jockel (1994) argues that the myth exists in other areas, including the idea that peacekeeping was an activity carried out by Canadians primarily because of our inherent “neutrality” and the national conception as “peacebroker.” These ideas echo familiar ideas of Canada as a non militaristic country. Yet Granatstein (1992:231), quoted by Jockel (1994), argues that this appears not to be the case:

...Canadians were not asked to participate in any of the peacekeeping operations for their inherent neutralism or because our soldiers and airmen were the equivalent of a gendarmerie. Far from it we were wanted in Cyprus because we were a NATO power; we were needed in the Suez because, as a NATO ally with a tradition of overseas service in two world wars we had sophisticated technical capabilities, and we were a natural choice

[in Indochina] because we were a Western democracy. Neutralism or military weakness, in other words, had nothing at all to do with our acceptability as a peacekeeper
 And yet Canadians came to believe that they did....

The fact that the official Canadian peacekeeping heritage has mythical qualities to it is not uncommon for official national heritage. The material selected as official national heritage serves to unify the national society and, as such, will elevate some aspects while downplaying others (Lowenthal, 1994). The monument built to commemorate Canadian military achievement, and Canadian's shared pride in it, accentuates peacekeeping in a manner which elevates the mythology without questioning it. It thus perpetuates common ideas about peacekeeping and about Canada and, therefore, serves as an "emblem of civic virtue [which] aspires to the condition of unquestionable, universal validity" (Leger, 1995:2). Moreover, it could be suggested that the monument overplays the Canadian contribution to what is essentially an international activity. This is particularly important now that more countries are participating in these missions, following the freeing up of military resources from previous Cold War commitments.

The *Tribute* can also be argued to show a similar kind of universal assertion through its broad inscription to human rights and through the future plaque commemorating John Humphrey. The plaques could be read as a positive assertion of Canada's human rights record, despite the fact that Canada does not always place rights over issues of trade and the maintenance of international relations. But we must remember that this was not the goal of the organizers, who advocated a vigilant and informed perspective on rights. The only reference on the *Tribute's* site that questions

our country's actions is the line found on the commemorative plaque (located away from the main work) "until all rights are respected, none are secure." The observer's failure to read this line makes it likely that it would not be understood as work advocating a thoughtful approach to human rights. Again, the broad interpretations that the monument is capable of sustaining point to the importance of the political gatherings that take place at the *Tribute* in asserting the activist meaning.

The question, remains though, whether or not *Reconciliation* can be interpreted as a symbol that can be identified with by all Canadians, the original intention of the NCC. The monument's traditional literal form immediately places the primary source of identification on the military rather than on ordinary Canadians. The overly military feeling of the work may be the central aspect which minimizes the monument's ability to invite identification on the part of the observer with its subject matter, thereby limiting its ability to function as a symbol of common identity. It is a military commemoration foremost, and Granatstein's comments earlier in Mohamed (1998) concerning the general dislike of militarism in Canadian society further highlight this possibility. I will discuss this issue further in the next chapter, since the ultimate test of the communication possibilities lies in how monuments are in fact consumed.

My last point involves a more symbolic observation, where the two case studies and the *National War Memorial* all interact with each other in their appeal to national identity. Relating back to the discussion of the symbolism between the *National War Memorial* and *The Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*, the link made by the artist was

intended to be a statement on the value of non violent action and has been argued as a challenge to the notion of war and glorification (Leger, 1994). Rights are often the most abused in times of war and are often curtailed or limited by the state through the arm of the military. This challenge, however, is mediated by *Reconciliation*, which affirms the role of the military in the assertion and protection of rights during times of conflict (Ibid, 1994).

An observer can also read a tension between the two case studies, in that the *Tribute* affirms the importance of rights, while *Reconciliation* reflects a voluntary denial of rights on the part of soldiers to protect and to nurture the country. In these respects, there is a “discussion” between rights and duties that exists between the two monuments. Both of these elements are integral to society. This personal symbolic association for me was made as a result of the discussion by Gans (1994) on the nature of military duty and civilian life. *Reconciliation* affirms the need to recognize that rights are attached to personal responsibility and accountability to protect the society or culture in which one resides. Ultimately, it is society that allows these rights to exist and to be enjoyed. The *Tribute* asserts the recognition of rights as something which shouldn’t be trampled on and which should evolve, for these are the fruits of collective effort and vision: two sides of an equation that are fundamental to the existence of any society, and in particular, of democracy.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed the production of two monuments and has related this process to issues of symbolic construction and nation-building. The discussion of the *Tribute* highlights the idea of a commemoration built to symbolize the power of solidarity among diverse elements and of the need for a strong recognition of rights in Canadian society. How the monument was produced reflects many of the intentions of the organizers, for instance, the need to be inclusive and sensitive to other groups. *Reconciliation* is representative of diverse intentions which were shown to conflict during the process of coming to terms with the kind of messages that would be reflected in the monument and how it should look. The intentions ranged from a commemoration focused on military members to the ideas of the NCC, which tried to broaden the message to include all Canadians.

It must be said that despite the contention that existed in the production of *Reconciliation*, those I interviewed expressed a strong pride in working on the monument project and were satisfied with the outcome. In addition, Elizabeth Doherty related how this pride extended to many of the workers who actually constructed the monument. According to the project manager, there was a real feeling of all those involved that they were accomplishing something that mattered and was of importance to the country. In terms of the *Tribute*, there also exists a feeling of accomplishment and commitment, especially considering the fact that the project is on-going after 16 years since its inception. The importance of these feelings for both projects highlights the fact that

building a monument can be an activity that captivates those who participate in it, and is a strong sign that belief in the national society is an enduring phenomenon.

I will now turn from the specific considerations of production to issues relating to the interpretation or consumption of the two monuments. Of central concern will be a consideration of how well these two monuments are able to convey their messages and, as a result, their effectiveness as commemorations meant to unite Canadians.

CHAPTER 7: CONSUMPTION OF THE MONUMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Since the central stories and issues related to the production of the two monuments have been discussed above, it is now appropriate to consider briefly how each has been received. The first part of this chapter will discuss some of the formal comments which have been made about the monuments in the media, local government reports and scholarly journals. While most of these comments address aesthetic concerns, there are instances where references are made to other aspects, including symbolic meaning and the competition process. The second half of the chapter reports the results of on-street surveys conducted at each monument in the winter of 1997. I will first consider the *Tribute* and then will follow with the results for *Reconciliation*, making comparisons between the two during the discussion of the latter. The survey results will then be followed by a brief consideration of international dimensions to the consumption of the two monuments.

How a monument is perceived will be different for every person, and such perception will vary with a number of factors including age, cultural background, sex, education and so on. Meaning will also change or be affected by how the monument is promoted and the circumstances surrounding its production. Monuments may also fall into or out of relevance for the society and vice versa over time due to cultural changes.

Thus, any formal observations from the surveys will be more reflective of a snapshot in time, rather than an enduring characteristic (see Degnore, 1987).

FORMAL COMMENTS

The Canadian Tribute to Human Rights

The *Tribute's* form mixes the literal and abstract. Literal elements include the text and arch, while the columns which double as human beings are much more abstract in nature. Unfortunately, in the finished monument these figures appear more blocky and less human than originally envisaged (Arnold; Interviews, 1997). This is largely due to the limitations of working with concrete (Charney, 1998). Concrete, the predominant material used, is also somewhat novel for monuments and may be an issue for those expecting a more traditional piece. As discussed, bronze is still the predominant material in Ottawa-Hull's monuments. Adding to the abstraction is the fact that the work is a tribute to an idea and not a person or event. This point is important in that the piece has no immediate connection itself (beyond the visual connection made to the *National War Memorial*) to memory or shared experience that can ground the viewer or direct the interpretation. For this reason, the literal text of the declaration is very important. The text is neutral in that it refers to no group or person in particular and is readily understood. Yet how the text is interpreted and what it means will be a personal, individual experience.

The jury found Charney's explanation of the *Tribute* rich in symbolism related to human rights, but there is always the question of whether the monument will be read in this particular way. Indeed, one can probably expect that only a small number of people will undertake a concerted effort to consider these abstract dimensions (Reid; Interviews, 1997). As George Wilkes (1997) states in the interviews: "it is a hard piece to read and will perhaps resonate more with people who are going through some issue with human rights."

Formal discussions of the *Tribute*'s form are scarce, but a few comments have been made about its general appearance. As one might expect with any work of art, one can find both supporters and detractors. Dissent about the *Tribute* surfaced when the RMOC reviewed the final design in 1987 as part of the stipulation for donating the site. After reviewing the final design, the Council's initial decision was a recommendation to move the work since it was deemed by some, including former Regional Councilor, Bob Morrison, to be too overpowering in its location in front of the recently renovated, Gothic-style Ottawa Teacher's College. In addition, Morrison expressed concern over the look of the abstract sculpture and possible public controversy (Kelly, 1987). Underlining the different expectations of how public monuments should look are the comments of the Regional Chair at the time, Andrew Hayden, who: "does not like the piece of work.... He said:

this tribute is a protest along the lines of the Abbie Hoffmans and Eldridge Cleavers of the world. The kinds of tribute to human rights that would be appreciated would be those which bring ethereal beauty to works of art, like Martin Luther King and 'I have been to the mountain'; these raise the sights of human perception and hope (RMOC: 1987:2077).

The Region's decision was reconsidered in early 1987, and, as a result, the work was allowed to go ahead at the present site. One of the arguments put forth for its acceptance by several supporters was the equitable and open competition process that had resulted in the design (Ibid, :2075).

Ray Conlogue (1991), a Montreal arts commentator, makes specific comment in a newspaper article to Charney's work in general, which lacks the human figure: [he] "hampers himself by banning the human figure from his images. Can they be understood?" Conlogue goes on to comment on the *Tribute* specifically, where the human form does appear but "it is in the form of "Sonutube" stick-men with right-angled arms.... Their lifelessness to me encapsulates Charney's discomfort for the heroic and his propensity for irony". The downplaying of human emotion or achievement in the *Tribute* will no doubt prove to be difficult for some, as the aforementioned views of the Regional Chair make clear.

The *Tribute's* most celebrated aspect has been the connection to the *National War Memorial*, which sets both monuments into a polarity of ideals: peace versus war, and the active versus passive nature of the monument (Fig. 5.4 and Plate 5.3). The latter refers to the didactic nature of the *Memorial* versus the more interactive character of the *Tribute*. The relationship between the two monuments set up by Charney was described by Alvina Ruprecht, arts and cultural commentator for the CBC radio programme, CBO Morning, as follows: "he's transformed a monument to death into a monument to life.... Brilliant" (Trueman, 1990:85). It was also one of the deciding factors in the competition jury's decision to accept Melvin Charney's design (Reid, 1997). However, the reading of

the relationship between the two in the manner described above and by members of the *Tribute* group was distressing for one media commentator. Peter Trueman (1990:85), who co-hosted the unveiling event, felt that the interpretation seemed to imply that the war memorial is “on the wrong side of the tracks, morally.... It celebrates life not death.” He argued that within the context of its 1930s imagery the earlier work “was designed to remind us that human rights are never free. That price can be higher than we’d like to contemplate.” One could read the *Tribute* as a challenge to the *War Memorial*, in that it is a statement against war and glorification of the military. The artist, however, sees it in a broader light. The desire to protect rights in a pacifist way is one side of the spectrum, but there are those instances when one needs to fight to protect rights as well (Charney, 1998). Trueman also voiced some reservations about the monument’s architecture despite the fact that it was chosen unanimously by the jury. Trueman felt, though, that compared to other recent controversial Toronto sculptures, including the aforementioned “Gumby Goes to Heaven”, the *Tribute*’s imagery was “clean and pleasing” (p.85).

The open nature of the work, which invites participation and public use, was one of the more important points emphasized when the monument was being debated by the Regional government (RMOC, 1987:2076). As evidence of the utility of the work in this respect, one can easily find anywhere from ten to thirty people sitting and mingling around the work during lunch time on warm days. Furthermore, the *Tribute*’s open design facilitates its use for activist gatherings, a purpose planned for by the *Tribute* group.

The earliest protest occurred even before the *Tribute* was raised when people gathered there to hold a vigil to protest the massacre of people in Romania under the Ceausescu regime (CTHR, 1990a). It has also been the starting point for Gay Pride marches, the site of demonstrations by Ontario teachers protesting cuts to education, anti-poverty group protests, a past focus for women's vigils in recognition of violence against women, a place of protest by East Timorese supporters, and most recently the space for a commemoration marking the killing of Ukrainians by Stalin in the former Soviet Union. The latest use of the monument was a commemoration of the 205th anniversary of the decision to ban slavery in Upper Canada, an event sponsored by a local Black organization J'Nikira Dinqinesh. This organization has pledged to work toward increasing the exposure of the monument in the future, and one member also raised an interest in spreading the idea of the *Tribute* as a place that should be duplicated in every country (Wilkes; Interviews, 1998). The use of the monument indicates that it is being interpreted as a special place for collective gatherings related to human rights. This interpretation is quite important given that the meaning associated with the unveiling has now long since passed; participation in the causes mentioned re-inscribes an activist interpretation of its message, albeit in varied ways.

The formal comments summarized here point to the problems associated with creating abstract public art and aesthetic consumption. Given my earlier comments in Chapters 2 and 4, perhaps it is not unsurprising that the *Tribute* was given difficult treatment by some and lukewarm acceptance by others. As discussed earlier, abstract art is generally less popular than literal forms, which are much easier to understand and

interpret (see Degnore, 1987). Despite the artistic reservations, the *Tribute* is being used as a place of gathering and thus is fulfilling one of the purposes and hopes of *Tribute* organizers.

Reconciliation

In terms of aesthetics, a particularly sharp review is offered by Marc Monnette (1993), the initial NCC project manager who left in the early stages of the project to pursue work on Euro-Disney in France. His main criticisms revolve around the changes carried out to the sacred grove and the removal of the communications tower. He criticized the sacred grove on the grounds that it creates a wall between the viewer and the National Gallery and introduces a presence that takes away from the main work.

His second major criticism concerns the flag pole. The pole was an attempt to mediate for the lack of height, important for the fulfillment of the “marker” status of the site. The flag pole itself, however, cannot be lowered from the ground, necessitating that changes in flag be carried out by a truck with a ladder. This limitation is argued to be detrimental given the intense symbolic impact and tradition behind the national flag. In addition, the gun sights which are meant to point to the Peace Tower in fact do not, due to the poorly measured break in the main walls (Fig. 5.11). This flaw led Monnette (1994) to comment “perhaps Peace cannot be attained or even aimed for.”

Overall these shortcomings, and others, are argued by Monnette (1994:8) to result in a monument “that falls short of generating the necessary emotions that would elevate it to the rank of truly powerful monuments”. In discussion with Elizabeth Doherty, she

felt that this lack of emotion in the work may be related to its subject matter. Unlike the world wars, which had considerable impact on the psyche of the nation, peacekeeping is an activity which doesn't generate the same kind of emotions. Though peacekeepers have died during missions, the numbers are not reflective of the levels of personal sacrifice seen in earlier wars. Moreover, peacekeeping does not easily invoke images of military heroism. It is an activity which varies in its complexity and nature according to the mission at hand. Thus, the monument does not invoke strong images of military accomplishment and related emotion, as one might observe and feel in the *National War Memorial*. *Reconciliation* is meant as a reflection of the activity of peacekeeping, a somewhat more abstract idea than war itself.

In addition, simple climatic issues and financial limitations had an impact on the final design. An example of where climate played a part is provided by the raised grove. As discussed earlier, the high, enclosed wall and raised grass surface was deemed to be important by the NCC in order to tone down the military feeling of the main work, and to serve as a physical contrast to the predominance of concrete on the site. However, the high wall also serves a more practical purpose in that it protects the trees from damaging the salt spray of nearby cars. The project also reflects the interests of many stakeholders and leads Elizabeth Doherty to comment that the work is an example of a "great Canadian compromise." This observation is central to what I have been discussing about monument production in general, that it is a process that involves many viewpoints and is, as a result, a process reflective of intense debate and consensus building.

Another set of criticisms was leveled by Susan Riley (1995), a local newspaper columnist with the Ottawa Citizen newspaper. Her criticism focuses on the process by which the design was arrived at, on the small number of “invited artists” and the lack of public participation in choosing submissions. The final design reflects an “artistically safe and conceptually conservative” product which is a result of its “ nods to various political and geographical interests” and a fear of controversy over producing something that no one will like for \$2.8 million. As discussed previously, the limited competition was carried out due to concerns over site complexity, but Riley’s criticism points to the need to appear objective on the part of proponents in commissioning public art. Public consultation in the form advocated by Riley was never a consideration of the proponents. However, nearby businesses and institutions were canvassed for their views early in the process and a public representative who was familiar with public art issues was present in the discussions between the proponents (Gardam, 1997).

A particularly stinging comment by Riley is her feeling that the work has little to do with peace but appears “like another glorification of military valour”. This personal observation is the kind the NCC was hoping to avoid in its concern over the figures raised early in the process. Riley continues by comparing the results of the project to the abstract *Vietnam Veterans Memorial* (VVM), a successful and yet simple commemoration which is able to invoke awe and emotion. The comparison to the VVM however must be tempered in that it has a much different site than *Reconciliation*. The VVM is located in a grassy field on the Washington Mall and its builders did not have to deal with landscape design issues associated with a traffic circle. In addition, the

subject of the Vietnam War is integral to the American psyche and this explains much of the emotion surrounding the VVM (Wagner-Pacifini, R. and Schwartz, B., 1991). As discussed earlier, the Canadian experience with peacekeeping does not generate the same kind of emotions and issues.

The formal comments on *Reconciliation* offered by Monnette (1994) are very particular to someone with an insider's view on the production of the work, and I would argue that the observations about design abnormalities may not easily be picked up by the public in general. His comments on the general lack of emotion in the work do highlight, though, the problems that arise from having different stakeholders in the production process. The same observations can be read in the comments by Riley (1995) in her reference to the work's "safe" artistic appearance as a result of many different stakeholders.

In contrast to the above aesthetic comments, the way in which the military received the monument reflects more on consideration of its subject matter. The military press gave the monument high praise, but the comments generated were prior to the unveiling and related more to the idea of the commemoration:

Canadians can be justly proud of the enormous contribution to global peace and stability our peacekeepers have made since the end of the Second World War. That pride is reflected in the magnificent Peacekeeping Monument.....it is a fitting and perpetual tribute to dedication and excellence (Martinson, 1992:5).

While the above comments do not address the form of the monument per se, they do serve as an example of the view that elevates peacekeeping to an importance that has been questioned by others, including members of the military discussed earlier. Henry (1993), also criticizes peacekeeping and makes reference to the monument. His view is

reflective of the fact that not all military members see the focus on peacekeeping as beneficial to the Armed Forces in general, despite its broad public appeal. He argues that the focus on this activity by the government has taken away valuable resources away from the primary defence capabilities of the forces. Moreover, he argues that the focus on peacekeeping has limited the military's ability to engage in conflict due to the "peacekeeping mystique". One example given is the Gulf war in 1991: "the government, pressed by fear of casualties, members of the elite and the peace movement kept Canadians away from the fighting until the very end of the war." Henry (1993:10) links this position on the part of the government to the peacekeeping monument in the following manner:

the huge new peacekeeping monument in Ottawa might be taken as a symbol of Canada's weakening resolve to engage in conflict. It was significant that the words of the Governor-General at the unveiling seemed to relate Canada's development as a nation to peace and compromise, rather than war. This revisionism is reinforced by the inscription on the monument of the Korean and Gulf wars

The comments by Henry do not address the monument per se but do highlight the importance of the unveiling ceremonies and how their meaning can be interpreted. The above comments reflect an interpretation of the monument that was never intended by the DND, especially considering the effort of the DND representative to include weapons on the figures and to down-play the peace perspective favoured by the NCC. In addition, it must be noted that the inclusion of the Korean and Gulf wars was not an attempt at revisionism on the part of proponents. The DND added the conflicts due to their relevance as UN actions and in order to give a measure of recognition for the contributions of the Canadian Navy in both conflicts (Gardam; Interviews, 1998). The

importance of Henry's comments is that they point to the fact that not all military members may feel strongly about peacekeeping, and as a result, a monument commemorating it.

One final comment is from a personal observation made at the monument during the process of field work. As discussed previously in Chapter 2, monuments are cultural products of the society in which they are located and are highly vulnerable to changes in meaning when the symbolic order undergoes change (Lewis, 1991). One event which shook the symbolic meaning of peacekeeping was the Somali mission in 1992. This mission involved the torture and deaths of two Somalia teenagers at the hands of Canadian peacekeepers. The cause of the event has been linked to strains on the Canadian military's ability to meet the number of peacekeeping missions it was committed to at the time. The situation resulted in the deployment of a unit (now disbanded) considered unfit for the mission at hand. This event tarnished the image of the Canadian peacekeepers in Somalia, and the military in general, and led to a Royal Commission to explore events leading up to the incident (see Sens, 1997). These events had a direct impact on the meaning of the peacekeeping monument when someone defaced the work with the words "Somalia" and the name of one of the dead teenagers. This act was a symbolic act calling into question the popular image of peacekeeping in Canada.

In addition to the above example, the monument has subsequently been defaced again but this time with the slogan "end police oppression". The slogan is another example of how the work is being interpreted in a manner quite different to that intended

by its proponents. In this case, it would appear that the military figures are being identified with the presence of the state in the public realm in a negative way, but in which way is not clear.

SURVEY RESULTS

As described in Chapter 3, a short eleven-question survey was conducted at each site in the winter of 1997 in order to gauge public reception of the work (See Appendix B). The intention of this survey was to gather information on the following aspects: people's conception of the purpose behind the monument, their ability to recognize its name and if they had explored the work, and finally, people's perception of the monument's appearance. In addition, personal information about the sample group was collected. These variables included age, education, sex, and the number of times they had passed by the monument in the past year. The sample size of sixty-one for *Reconciliation* and sixty-two respondents for the *Tribute* allows for some general observations to be made and allows for the use of inferential, non-parametric statistics.

Canadian Tribute to Human Rights

The survey for the Canadian *Tribute* to Human Rights was undertaken on the west side of Elgin Street, near the front of the monument (see Figure 5.2). This location presented what I felt to be the best view of the monument, offering a full view of the

Table 6.0 Background characteristics of respondents and aggregate statistics to a survey relating to the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

Background Characteristics			Aggregate Statistics		
Sex	n	%	Read inscriptions	n	%
Male	32	51.6	Yes	37	59.6
Female	30	48.4	No	25	40.4
Age of respondent			Purpose of monument		
13-19	3	4.8	Educational ¹	18	29
20-34	21	33.9	General Human Rights ²	17	27.4
35-49	21	33.9	No Response	5	8.1
50-64	14	22.3	Physical ³	8	12.9
65+	3	4.8	Physical representation ⁴	6	9.7
			Other	8	12.9
Nationality			Walk Through		
Canadian	53	85.5	Yes	25	44.4
Other	9	14.5	No	37	59.6
Education			Opinion of appearance		
< Grade 9	2	3.2	Like a lot	4	6.5
Some high school	4	6.5	Like	24	38.7
Finished high school	9	14.5	Neutral	23	37.1
Some post-secondary	7	11.3	Dislike	7	11.3
Finished Post-secondary	40	64.5	Dislike a lot	4	6.4
No. Visits in Past Year			Identification of name		
First time	4	6.7	Yes	17	27.4
2-5	8	12.9	Partial	5	8
6-11	5	8.1	No	40	64.6
12+	45	72.3			
			Reason for choice of appearance		
Total	61	100	Emotion ⁵ Negative	5	8
			Positive Emotion	4	6.4
			Aesthetic ⁶ Negative	9	14.5
			Aesthetic Positive	12	19.4
			Negative ⁷ Physical	11	17.9
			Positive Physical	18	29
			No Response	3	4.8
			Total	62	100

¹ Refers to answers which reflect the use of verbs related to an educational type of action. For example: "it's to show the importance of human rights" or "it's to remind us of rights."

² Refers to answers generally related to human rights such as: "it's the equality monument."

³ Refers to responses which describe a physical purpose for the monument. These include examples such as "it's used for lunch", or "it reinforces the purpose of the courthouse."

⁴ Refers to response which describe the monument's purpose as a physical representation of rights, for example "it's meant to embody rights concretely" or "it's meant to reflect equality in permanent form"

⁵ The "emotion" category includes answers such as "it just doesn't feel right."

⁶ The "aesthetic" category refers to responses of a general nature on appearance.

⁷ The "physical" category refers to responses which list specific comments on physical attributes.

Table 6.1 Chi square test results for selected variables from a survey on the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997*

	Identification	Inscription	Walk Through	Appearance
Sex	Insignificant $\chi^2=.369$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99	Insignificant $\chi^2=.218$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.81	Significant $\chi^2=6.97$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.81	Insignificant $\chi^2=.99$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.81
Age	Insignificant $\chi^2=4.67$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99	Insignificant $\chi^2=1.22$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99	Insignificant $\chi^2=1.28$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99	NA
Education	Insignificant $\chi^2=2.13$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.81	Insignificant $\chi^2=.702$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.81	Insignificant $\chi^2=1.82$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.81	Insignificant $\chi^2=2.16$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99

* Missing variables are not included because of small frequency values

** NA refers to "Not Available" because of small frequency values

inscription of the UDHR. All interviews took place in this general vicinity to ensure a standard visual perspective for all participants.

Characteristics of the Sample (See Table 6.0)

As Table 6.0 shows the distribution between the sexes in the sample is nearly even at 32 males and 30 females. The distribution of age is shown to be well-balanced for the middle groups between 20 years to 64 years. Since the surveys were carried out during school hours, the likelihood of younger participants was reduced. In addition the very cold weather may have limited the number of elderly respondents. In terms of nationality, 85.5% of the sample were Canadian. This high percentage is probably a function of the time of year, outside the tourist season. This high percentage translates into a sample which should have little problem in understanding the literal text of the message. Similarly, being Canadian citizens, they will have had more opportunity to become aware of the *Tribute* through publicity and media coverage. The education level of participants was found to be skewed toward those who had completed post-secondary training: 64.5% of respondents were in that group. This result is primarily a function of the location to nearby workplaces including federal government offices, the Regional headquarters, provincial courthouse and others. The sample also indicated that most people had visited the site twelve times or more in the past year. Over 72.3% fell into this category. There were only four individuals who were at the site for the first time. The site is located near a busy sidewalk which leads to downtown shops and offices in one direction and in the other towards other commercial and also residential areas.

This central location accounts for the many repeat visitors and is a testament to the placement of the monument in the everyday life of the city.

Chi square was used on a reduced number of categories to facilitate the analysis or to substantiate statistical meaningful relationships between variables. A significance level of 95% for both case studies was deemed desirable for the indication of a statistically meaningful relationship (see Ebden, 1985). Nationality was not used for testing due to the small numbers of individuals in the non-Canadian category. Age was condensed into three groups, 13-34 years, 35-49 years and 50 and above; education into two groups, post-secondary and other; visits were collapsed into those who frequented the site area six times or more in a year, and those who passed by five times or less. Despite the use of the condensed categories many of the expected frequencies were too small to enable the use of chi square. In situations where it could be used, only one test result was found to be significant and will be discussed shortly. The results of these tests are shown in Table 6.1 and will be referred to throughout this chapter. In order to carry out the chi square tests a number of tables were created that portray cross-tabulations for frequencies between independent and dependent variables (please see Tables 6.2-6.5).

Recognition

To measure recognition and active participation in the work, I asked each respondent if they could name the monument, what they thought the purpose of it might be, if they had read the plaques and inscriptions, and if they had walked through it at

Table 6.2 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to identification of the monument (Identification), plaque reading (Inscriptions) and if they walked through the monument (Walked Through) for the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

	Identification				Inscription			Walked Through		
	Yes	Partial	No	n	Yes	No	n	Yes	No	n
Sex										
Male	11	2	19	32	20	12	32	18	14	32
Female	6	3	21	30	17	13	30	7	23	30
Total	17	5	40	62	37	25	62	25	37	62
Age										
13-19	0	0	3	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
20-34	2	3	16	21	14	7	21	7	14	21
35-49	7	1	13	21	11	10	21	10	11	21
50-64	7	1	6	14	9	5	14	5	9	14
65+	1	0	2	3	2	1	3	2	1	3
Total	17	5	40	62	37	25	62	25	27	62
Nationality										
Canadian	17	5	31	53	32	21	53	30	53	
Other	0	0	9	9	5	4	9	2	7	9
Total	17	5	40	62	37	25	62	25	27	62
Education										
< Grade 9	1	0	1	2	2	0	2	0	2	2
Some high school	0	0	4	4	1	3	4	1	3	4
Finished high school	2	0	7	9	4	5	9	3	6	9
Some post-secondary	2	0	5	7	4	3	7	2	5	7
Finished Post-secondary	13	5	22	40	26	14	40	19	21	40
Total	17	5	40	62	37	25	62	25	27	62
No. Visits in Past Year										
First time	0	0	4	4	1	3	4	0	4	4
2-5	1	0	7	8	2	6	8	1	7	8
6-11	2	0	3	5	4	1	5	3	2	5
12+	14	5	26	45	30	15	45	21	24	45
Total	17	5	40	62	37	25	62	25	27	62

any point. The frequency results are indicated in Table 6.2. Aggregate percentage results for each question are listed in Table 6.0 under the heading “Aggregate Statistics”.

As Table 6.0 indicates, in terms of identifying the name of the monument, 27.4% of the sample responded with the correct name (either the full title the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* or the Human Rights Monument were accepted as correct). Those who could identify a portion of the name, for instance the “rights monument”, accounted for 8%, while the remainder, 64.6% , had no idea (examples of responses other than “no” include “the law monument” or the “peace monument”). Of the sample who had visited six or more times in the last year, 29 respondents or 58% were unable to identify the *Tribute* correctly (Table 6.2). As one might expect 91% of the 11 infrequent visitors were unable to identify the proper name (Table 6.2). In addition, all nine of the non-Canadians were also unable to name the work. The results of this recognition suggest that the work is not widely known (at least formally), though this may be partly the result of the minimal promotion it had received up to the time of the survey. This situation may well change with the upcoming events mentioned earlier in regard to the fiftieth anniversary of human rights and the pamphlet distribution to follow.

For the use of chi square, the variable “identification” was reduced into two categories: those who knew the name or a portion of it and those who did not. The chi square results for sex fail to point to a statistically meaningful difference between how men and women were able to identify the work. At the 95% confidence level and with two degrees of freedom, the chi square test result (χ^2) was .369 while the chi square

critical value was 5.99 (Table 6.1). Therefore, we must accept the null hypothesis that there are no differences between how men and women identify the name of the monument. Age and education also proved to be insignificant. The result for age was 4.67, while the critical value at two degrees of freedom was 5.99. The result for education was 2.13, but the critical value needed for a statistically meaningful difference at one degree of freedom was 3.99.

Inscriptions

Of the sample population, 59.6% said that they had read the plaques and inscriptions while 40.4% had not (Table 6.0). The results for this question may be suspect in that the question did not refer to which plaque or inscription in particular. While the *Tribute* prominently displays the UDHR, there is a small plaque explaining its significance about four metres to the north of the site (Figure 6.2). My sense is that most interviewees interpreted my question as relating to the main inscription of the UDHR on the granite arch. The second issue involves where the interview was carried out. The *Tribute* is a large piece and in order to afford the best view for the participant, the survey was carried out facing the main arch. However, this being the seventh question asked, most respondents were able to glance at the main inscription beforehand, which may in fact have been their first time in so doing. The most important measure, then, is the fact that 40% of the sample in fact had not glanced at the inscription. Of those who visited the site six or more times in the last year, 34 persons or 64% had not read the inscription (Table 6.2). Keeping in mind that this is a well visited site this may point to the leveling

effect mentioned by Degnore (1987). This effect occurs when over time monuments and other phenomena become part of the visual background that is screened out by the mind to cope with the onslaught of sensory information.

The chi square test for sex and inscription was insignificant at the 95% confidence level. The chi square result was 2.18, with one degree of freedom, while the critical value needed was 3.84 (Table, 6.1). Therefore, we must accept the null hypothesis; the results between sexes maybe due to chance in the sampling process. The same must be said for age and education level, and inscriptions. The chi square result for the former was 1.22, with two degrees of freedom, while the critical value was 5.99. For education, the chi square observed was .702, with one degree of freedom while the critical value needed was 3.84.

Walk Through

In order to gauge levels of active participation, respondents were asked if they had ever walked through the *Tribute*. This aspect is important in that it was meant to invite participation and could be argued as central to how people interpret or judge the appearance of the work. Over 44% of the sample group had indeed walked through the work at some point (Table 6.0). What is of interest is that there was a noticeable difference between men and women in this regard. Clearly from Table 6.2 more men have walked through the monument than women. The chi square test of difference confirmed that the two results are in fact statistically different. At the 95% probability level, with one degree of freedom, the chi square observed was 6.97, while the chi square critical value was 3.84. Therefore, one must reject the null hypothesis of no difference.

with gender. This result may point to a feeling of a lack of safety on the part of women in terms of a decision to enter the work. On the other hand, women may not be as interested in experiencing the monument in this way. The *Tribute* is a work which is highly visible from the street, which may leave some people uncomfortable about the idea of appearing conspicuously on the monument in full view of passer-by. Chi square results for age and education were found to be insignificant (see Table 6.1).

Of those who visited the site twelve times or more there appears to be a relatively even split (Table 6.2). One might expect that the more one has passed by the site the more opportunity one would have to do this. This suggests that for some, despite the frequency with which they travel by the site, they are not interested in experiencing the work in this way. One might expect very different results had the survey been carried-out in warmer weather and during lunch where students from the nearby high school and workers from the RMOC come to eat occasionally. These individuals would have had more opportunity to interact directly with the monument. With this important limitation, chi square test results for age and education were found to be insignificant (see Table 6.1).

Purpose

This open-ended question involved participants answering what they felt to be the purpose of the monument (Table 6.3). Only five respondents failed to give any answer to this question, which means most were able to guess or reply with something despite having not read the plaques or correctly identifying the name of the work. Judging by the

Table 6.3 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the perceived purpose of the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

to Human Rights in Ottawa-Hull, 1997							
	Perceived Purpose of the Tribute						
	<u>Educ.</u>	<u>Gen. Human Rights</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Physical Purpose</u>	<u>Physical Rep. of Rights</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>N</u>
<u>Sex</u>							
Male	9	10	4	3	3	3	32
Female	9	7	1	5	3	5	30
Total	18	17	5	8	6	8	62
<u>Age</u>							
13-19	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
20-34	8	5	2	2	2	2	21
35-49	4	8	2	1	2	4	21
50-64	5	3	0	3	1	2	14
65+	1	0	1	1	0	0	3
Total	18	17	5	8	6	8	62
<u>Nationality</u>							
Canadian	15	16	5	5	6	6	53
Other	3	1	0	3	0	2	9
Total	18	17	5	8	6	8	62
<u>Education</u>							
< Grade 9	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Some high school	0	0	0	1	2	1	4
Finished high school	1	7	1	0	0	0	9
Some post-secondary	1	2	0	2	1	1	7
Finished Post-secondary	16	8	4	5	3	4	40
Total	18	17	5	8	6	8	62
<u>No. Visits in Past Year</u>							
First time	1	1	1	0	0	1	4
2-5	3	3	0	2	0	0	8
6-11	2	1	1	0	0	1	5
12+	12	12	3	6	6	6	45
Total	18	17	5	8	6	8	62

responses one can assume much of what was given was based on having read the main inscription. The largest group accounted for 29% of the sample and interpreted its purpose as educational in nature (Table 6.0). For instance: "its there to remind us of our rights" or "it highlights human rights". The second major group gave responses having do to with equal rights in some vague way (27.4%). This category included answers such as "equal rights", "show everyone is equal" or simply "liberty, justice and equality." Those who gave answers which were not easy to categorize are listed as "other" and account for 12.9% of the sample. These answers reflect the fact that people were linking the monument to specific issues or groups. For instance, four individuals related its purpose to equality for minorities and for women. For example: "it's meant to bring back equality for women in particular" or "Canada is so multicultural...it's reminds us that we need equality since this is what we believe in". One also mentioned its purpose as being for the cessation of violence against women. This observation was related to the fact that the respondent had seen women's vigils taking place there in the past. One middle-aged female thought it was meant to "infuriate those in power", while a young native Canadian man expressed that it "has no purpose since they don't go by it". From these two separate interviews, it would appear that the latter thought it was erected by the government while the former thought the reverse. Along the same lines a man thought the work was an example of "political pacification" but a goal worth striving for. The interpretation of equality as a work in progress was echoed by another respondent who thought "it speaks to an ideal of society which we would like to uphold but despite our intentions we are not making those steps". This observation is precisely the kind the

Tribute group was looking for in that it presents a view of human rights as a project for the collective society and one in need of further work. The *Tribute* is not a statement to a finished human rights agenda, but is partly meant to instill a vigilant attitude towards their promotion and protection. The need to mobilize collective energy espoused by the *Tribute* group was reflected by one woman who saw it as a means to “create a feeling of unity and sense of commitment in a concrete way”. The two other categories with the highest numbers are for those participants who gave a physical purpose for the monument (12.9%), or indicated that the work was meant to embody or symbolize rights (9.7%). Examples of the former includes “its a great spot for lunch” or “its closely tied to the courthouse. Its meant to signify its importance.” This last repines is evidence to the idea that monuments do in fact, lend a measure of legibility to the functions of nearby buildings. The former category includes such answers as “it’s a commemoration to human rights” or “its meant to represent the rights story”. On the whole, one can infer from the responses a strong recognition that the monument refers to human rights issues. Of those whose answers include the word “rights” or whose answer can be reasonably assumed to refer to rights in a related way, over 88% of the sample reflected this broad orientation for the work. This result speaks to the strong legible message on the *Tribute* making it widely understood by passers by, at least on a basic level.

An interesting aspect of these responses is the observation that the work was often mistaken as government art. This perspective is echoed by George Wilkes (1997), who described the need to remove some graffiti from the piece a few years ago. The graffiti asked “why does government art have to be so ugly?” This incident could be a

Table 6.4 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the opinion on the appearance of the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

Opinion on the appearance of the <i>Tribute</i>						
	Like a lot	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Dislike A lot	n
Sex						
Male	2	11	14	3	2	32
Female	2	13	9	4	2	30
Total	4	25	22	7	4	62
Age						
13-19	2	0	1	0	0	3
20-34	1	14	6	0	0	21
35-49	1	5	9	4	2	21
50-64	0	5	5	2	2	14
65+	0	1	1	1	1	4
Total	4	25	22	7	4	62
Nationality						
Canadian	4	22	19	4	4	53
Other	0	3	3	3	0	9
Total	4	25	22	7	4	62
Education						
< Grade 9	0	0	0	2	0	2
Some high school	1	2	1	0	0	4
Finished high school	1	4	3	1	0	9
Some post-secondary	0	4	1	2	0	7
Finished Post-secondary	2	15	17	2	4	40
Total	4	25	22	7	4	62
No. Visits in Past Year						
First time	0	1	1	2	0	4
2-5	0	5	0	1	0	8
6-11	0	3	2	0	0	5
12+	4	16	17	4	4	45
Total	4	25	22	7	4	62

result of its location near RMOC headquarters, or it could point to the fact that the *Tribute's* message of the UDHR can be misconstrued as a work advocating a government position. Considering the UN origin of the UDHR, this mistaken identity of the proponent of the work may come as no surprise. However it furthers the case made earlier that the work can easily reinforce the idea of official heritage when there is little reference to the other ideas put forth by its founders.

On the whole, the majority of respondents thought that its purpose was educational, but there is evidence that some people went beyond this general aspect and related the work to specific ideas about the state of human rights and the *Tribute* as a symbol of unity. More thoughtful and lengthy answers would probably have been yielded under more favourable climatic conditions. The central finding, though, is that the work's basic purpose is generally legible and in some varying measure understandable.

Appearance

This question involved participants ranking their aesthetic judgments about the work. There were five possible categories in which the responses could answer: like a lot, like, neutral, dislike and dislike a lot (Table 6.4). For the purposes of chi square testing these categories were reduced to three: positive, neutral and negative. Only two variables could be tested: sex and education, both of which were found to be insignificant (see Table 6.1). Approximately 45.2% of the sample population felt positive toward the work, while 17.7% of respondents felt negative (Table 6.0). The remainder of the respondents, a substantial 37.1%, felt neutral to the work. The large

Table 6.5 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the reason given for choice of appearance for the Canadian Tribute to Human Rights in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

	Response						No Response	n
	Emotion		Aesthetics		Physical			
	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive		
Sex								
Male	2	2	6	10	6	4	2	32
Female	3	2	3	2	5	14	1	30
Total	5	4	9	12	11	18	3	62
Age								
13-19	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
20-34	0	3	2	7	2	6	1	21
35-49	2	0	3	3	7	5	1	21
50-64	3	1	3	1	0	6	0	14
65+	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Total	5	4	9	12	11	18	3	62
Nationality								
Canadian	5	3	8	12	9	15	1	53
Other	0	1	1	0	2	3	2	9
Total	5	4	9	12	11	18	3	62
Education								
< Grade 9	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Some high school	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Finished high school	0	1	2	1	2	3	0	9
Some post-secondary	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	7
Finished Post-secondary	5	2	6	10	6	9	2	40
Total	5	4	9	12	11	18	3	62
No. Visits in Past Year								
First time	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	4
2-5	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	8
6-11	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	5
12+	4	3	8	11	7	10	2	45
Total	5	4	9	12	11	18	3	62
General Response								
Like a lot	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	4
Like	0	3	0	6	2			

neutral category indicates that many people are unmoved either way. This may be related to the general abstract nature of the work. As discussed earlier, abstract works require more time and thought, perhaps more than most were willing to give in the cold weather.

Reason given for choice of appearance

This open-ended question invited participants to reflect on why they had chosen the particular aesthetic category discussed previously. Most responses reflect a specific physical reason or concerned the general aesthetics of the work. However, nine individuals related an emotional reason rather than a distinctly physical one (Table 6.5). As one might expect, the reasons given varied widely and at times contradicted other respondent's observations. For instance, one participant commented how the *Tribute* "doesn't stand out", while another later participant described the work as "noticeable". Another example of contrast is provided by the following answer in regard to the *Tribute*. "It has a modern look, and is not cluttered...I like the statues and it's a good meeting place", whereas another individual commented that the monument "it's not inspiring...I like the plaques and inscriptions, but the concrete and the figures are not inspiring." The overriding concerns dealt with use of concrete and the inscriptions found on the figures and on the arch. Concrete was mentioned negatively fourteen times while the inscriptions and granite were positively related fifteen times. In Table 6.5 a cross-tabulation at the left bottom, shows the results between the reason given and the choice of appearance. The tabulation shows a close association between the direction of choice in question eight and the reason given for the choice in question nine. However this

association is not always the case. A few respondents gave reasons which seem to contradict their earlier answer. For instance, they may have felt negative about the work when ranking it, but described positive characteristics as to the reason for the choice. As Degnore (1987) found in her own study, one may feel negative or positive about a work, but when questioned why this is so, one may obtain results which indicate a negative reason, and this seems to contradict the overall judgment. Clearly, how people perceive a work is not a clear-cut matter and may be subject to the contradictions of emotion and intellect.

Overall, it would appear that the work is received generally as positive-neutral in terms of its appearance and is understood on a basic level. Consideration of the recognition levels will be deferred until *Reconciliation* is discussed in the following section. However, the seemingly low levels that were recorded may change as promotion activities expand. In regard to participation, people do interact with the monument and read its central message from time to time. The fact that gatherings take place on the monument is a sign that it is recognized by some as having an activist purpose. The public exposure it receives during these events will further the likelihood that it remains a viable and meaningful component of the social environment of the city. The discussion will now turn to consider the results for *Reconciliation*.

Reconciliation

The survey for the peacekeeping monument was conducted at the corner of Murray Street and Sussex Drive (see Figure 5.5). This position gave a rear view of the

Table 6.6 Background characteristics of respondents and aggregate results to a survey relating to *Reconciliation* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

Background characteristics			Aggregate Statistics		
Sex	n	%	Inscriptions	n	%
Male	31	51	Yes	20	32.8
Female	30	49	No	41	67.2
Age			Purpose		
13-19	3	4	Peacekeeping	18	29.5
20-34	18	29.5	General Military Comm	36	59
35-49	18	29.5	No Response	1	1.6
50-64	11	18	Negative Unrelated	2	3.3
65+	11	18	Positive Unrelated	4	6.6
Nationality			Walked Through		
Canadian	46	75	Yes	27	44.3
Other	15	25	No	34	55.7
Education			Appearance		
< Grade 9	0	0	Like a lot	15	24.6
Some high school	3	4.5	Like	25	41
Finished high school	3	4.5	Neutral	11	18
Some post-secondary	7	12	Dislike	9	14.8
Finished Post-secondary	48	79	Dislike a lot	1	1.6
No. Visits in Past Year			Identification		
First time	16	25.9	Yes	20	32.8
2-5	11	18	Partial	13	21.3
6-11	5	8.1	No	28	45.9
12+	29	47.5	Reason for Appearance		
Total	61	100	Negative Emotion	3	4.9
			Positive Emotion	6	9.8
			Aesthetic ² Negative	7	11.5
			Aesthetic Positive	14	23
			Physical ³ Negative	3	4.9
			Physical Positive	23	37.7
			No Response	5	8.2
			Total	61	100

1 Refers to general military commemoration. In this instance, answers do not give specific reference to peacekeeping but include responses such as "it's to honour the sacrifice of soldiers" or "it's a commemoration to W.W.II."

2 The category "aesthetic" refers to general comments on appearance. For example, the monument is "a good representation of what it be like to live in these areas".

monument in full sight of the figures, sacred grove and the debris between the converging walls. The site itself is in the middle of a traffic island but pedestrians can circumvent the site on either side. However, the monument's proximity to the National Gallery, National War Museum, the Royal Canadian Mint and the Canadian Museum of Civilization provide ready flow-through traffic on the way to these destinations.

Characteristics of the sample (see Table 6.6)

Sex and age were fairly evenly-distributed except for the latter, where the younger age group of thirteen- to nineteen- year olds accounted for only 4% of the sample. This result is comparable to the *Tribute*, and is the result of the same reason given previously, namely, that the survey was conducted during school hours. In terms of nationality, 75% identified themselves as Canadian. Since this site is situated close to tourist destinations such as the National Gallery, Major's Hill Park and the Byward Market, the number of non-Canadians is appreciable: 25%. This latter group also corresponds closely to the sixteen individuals who were first-time visitors to the site. Over half the sample were frequent visitors (more than six times per year). Similar to that of the *Tribute* was the high proportion of respondents with post-secondary education (79%), compared to the other categories.

In order to facilitate the use of chi square, these characteristics were again condensed into more manageable formats identical to the *Tribute* survey. Chi square results were obtainable in a number of cases and are reported in Table 6.7. Unfortunately, due to the small number of respondents there is only one chi square result

Table 6.7 Chi-square test results for selected variables from a survey of *Reconciliation* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997*

	Identification	Inscription	Walk Through	Appearance
Sex	Insignificant $\chi^2=3.81$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99	Insignificant $\chi^2=.049$, 1.D.F., Crit. Value-3.84	Insignificant $\chi^2=.013$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.84	Insignificant $\chi^2=.894$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99
Age	Insignificant $\chi^2=3.86$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99	Insignificant $\chi^2=9.21$, 2 D.F., Crit. Value-5.99	Significant $\chi^2=9.21$, 2D.F., Crit. Value-5.99	NA**
Education	NA	Insignificant $\chi^2=2.51$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.81	Insignificant $\chi^2=0.22$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.81	NA
Visits	Significant $\chi^2=4.51$, 1 D.F., Crit. Value-3.84	NA	NA	NA

* Missing variables are because of small frequency values

** NA refers to "Not Available" because of small frequency values

Table 6.8 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to identification of the monument (Identification), plaque reading (Inscriptions) and if they walked through the monument (Walked Through) for *Reconciliation* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

	Identification				Inscription			Walked Through		
	Yes	Partial	No	n	Yes	No	n	Yes	No	n
Sex										
Male	12	6	13	31	11	20	31	14	17	31
Female	8	7	15	30	9	21	30	13	17	30
Total	20	13	28	61	20	41	61	27	34	61
Age										
13-19	1	1	1	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
20-34	1	5	12	18	1	17	18	4	14	18
35-49	8	2	5	18	6	12	18	7	11	18
50-64	5	1	5	11	6	5	11	7	4	11
65+	5	4	2	11	6	5	11	8	3	11
Total	20	13	28	61	20	41	61	27	34	61
Nationality										
Canadian	18	10	18	41	18	28	41	25	2	27
Other	2	3	10	20	2	13	20	2	13	15
Total	20	13	28	61	20	41	61	27	34	61
Education										
< Grade 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some high school	1	0	2	3	1	2	3	2	1	3
Finished high school	0	2	1	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Some post-secondary	2	1	4	7	3	4	7	4	3	7
Finished Post-secondary	17	10	21	48	15	33	48	20	28	48
Total	20	13	28	61	20	41	61	27	34	61
No. Visits in Past Year										
First time	5	0	11	16	2	14	16	3	13	16
2-5	2	3	6	11	0	11	11	0	11	11
6-11	2	0	3	5	1	4	5	2	3	5
12+	11	10	8	29	17	12	29	22	7	29
Total	20	13	28	61	20	41	61	32	61	61

for the last three variables (purpose, appearance and reason given for choice of appearance).

Name Recognition

Of those sampled, 32.8% indicated that they knew the name of the monument and a further 21.3% knew a portion of the designation (Table 6.6). An example for the latter category is the reference to the work as “the peace monument”. The fact that over half (53%) have a good idea of the name suggests that promotional activities are having some effect on recognition levels. In addition, the fact that it occupies such a prominent site, located close to the National Gallery and Byward Market, increases the monument’s daily exposure and tourist appeal. These factors may explain why the percentages are higher than the *Tribute*’s recognition level of 38% (Table 6.0), a work with considerably less promotional history (at least at the time of the survey) and exposure. The cross-tabulations in Table 6.8 are fairly well-distributed, but there is still an interesting finding in terms of who visits the site often. A total of eleven people who frequent the site had no idea what the monument was named. As in the *Tribute*, this result may suggest evidence of non-interest or of the leveling effect in one’s surroundings. However, the chi square result suggests that the distribution is not a significantly different one than one would expect to occur. As one might expect, those who were non-Canadian and were first-time visitors were less likely to be able to identify the work (Table 6.8).

Chi square results for sex and age were found to be insignificant, but for the number of visits and the level of identification, a meaningful statistical difference was found to exist (Table 6.7). The chi square result of 4.51 was significant with one degree

of freedom and a critical value needed of 3.99. This result means that the two samples representing those who had visited the site frequently and those who did not, and their responses to the question, are statistically different and are not the result of chance. This result appears to be related to the basic assumption that the more one frequents an area the more one is likely to recognize the presence and name of nearby visual stimuli. The reverse can also be forwarded in that one is less likely to recognize a formal name to an urban object if one is an infrequent or first-time visitor.

Inscriptions

Unlike the position used at the *Tribute*, the position for this questionnaire did not allow for people to read any inscriptions on the work during the interview. This characteristic translates into results which should be more reflective of interest and knowledge in the work. From the sample, 67.2% responded that they had not read any of the inscriptions (Table 6.6). This figure is quite substantial and important in that the text guides the interpretation intended by the monument's proponents. Failure to read the text on the part of observers raises serious questions as to how the monument's military appearance is consumed. Again the results for the inscription reading are evenly distributed across sample characteristics, except in age and frequency of visit. In the age group of twenty to thirty-four year olds, 94% of all respondents reported that they had not read any inscriptions (Table 6.8). This group accounts for roughly 30% of the entire sample. The chi square result was significant in this case suggesting that there is a difference based on age in whether how the inscriptions are read (discussed below). In

the area of frequency of visit the chi square could not be used due to small frequencies for first-time visitors. However, judging by the cross-tabulation numbers the group most unevenly distributed is the first-time visitor category (Table 6.8). The fact that these first-time visitors responded negatively to having read the inscriptions is not surprising, given their limited exposure to the area.

Chi square results for three variables were obtained: sex, age and education (Table 6.7). The only positive result to be found was for age and if they had read the inscriptions. A strong chi square result of 9.21 was obtained (at two degrees of freedom and a critical value needed of 5.99). The age group of 13-34 year olds is the group clearly skewed toward the negative in relation to those who have read the textual information on the monument (see Table 7.8). This result may indicate less interest in reading the text by this age group, but this hypothesis would need further testing with a larger sample size.

Walk through

The second measure of participation is the number of respondents who reported that they had walked through the monument at some point. Roughly 44.3% reported doing so (Table 6.6). This result is comparable to the *Tribute* totals of 44.4% (Table 6.0). Again, both age and number of visits yielded significant chi square results. The same age group who were less likely to answer positively to reading the inscriptions was also less likely to walk through the work. The same is also true for infrequent visitors. Clearly more of the frequent visitors (more than twelve times) are walking through the work than

Table 6.9 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the perceived purpose of *Reconciliation* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

	Perceived Purpose					n
	Peace-keeping	General Military Comm.	No Response	Negative Unrelated	Positive Unrelated	
Sex						
Male	11	16	1	2	1	31
Female	7	20	0	0	3	30
Total	18	36	1	2	4	61
Age						
13-19	0	3	0	0	0	3
20-34	4	14	0	0	0	18
35-49	7	10	0	0	1	18
50-64	4	3	1	1	2	11
65+	3	6	0	1	1	11
Total	18	36	1	2	4	61
Nationality						
Canadian	17	22	1	2	4	41
Other	1	14	0	0	0	20
Total	18	36	1	2	4	61
Education						
< Grade 9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some high school	0	3	0	0	0	3
Finished high school	0	3	0	0	0	3
Some post-secondary	1	4	0	0	2	7
Finished Post-secondary	17	26	1	2	2	48
Total	18	36	1	2	4	61
No. Visits in Past Year						
First time	3	13	0	0	0	16
2-5	1	9	0	0	1	11
6-11	0	3	0	1	1	5
12+	14	11	1	1	2	11
Total	18	36	1	2	4	61

was found for the *Tribute*. The larger size of the site for *Reconciliation* may account for this difference between the two monuments. An interesting comparison to the *Tribute* was found in respect to the two sexes and their likelihood of entering the work or not. In the case of *Reconciliation* there is no disparity between the two groups as seen in the former work (Table 6.6). In addition to its location, the work is large and fairly open which makes it more conspicuous and may perhaps lead women to feel safer if walking through it.

Chi square testing for sex, age and education were conducted with the variable “walk-through”, but only one result proved significant (refer to Table 6.7). It was found that for the three age groups there exists a statistically meaningful difference in the level of people walking through the monument. A chi square result of 9.21 was obtained with two degrees of freedom and a critical value needed of 5.99. Again it would appear that the 13-34 age group represents the clearest area of difference in that more individuals were likely to have said they did not enter the work. As stated previously, this may indicate a particular ambivalence toward the monument, but more work needs to be carried out to test this hypothesis.

Purpose

The results from this question reveal that a fair proportion of respondents (29.5%) were aware of the monument’s purpose as a commemoration to peacekeeping (Table 6.6). As a result of the literal nature of the monument, it is perhaps unsurprising that the second largest category (59%) described its purpose as a general military

commemoration. Moreover, the remainder of respondents (9.9%) answered this question in more detail, but in their responses still reflected an awareness of the military nature of the work. Clearly, the intention on the part of DND to have a monument which would be clearly understood has been realized. Military in theme and representative in appearance, the monument can be seen as an archetype fulfilling traditional expectations of commemorative art. Many of the first monuments in the Western world were military in nature and employed the use of figurative art (Robinette, 1976). Thus, the literal image and theme offered by *Reconciliation* is well grounded in cultural memory. Some responses outside the two main categories were quite specific as to some of the potential motivations covered earlier in the case study. The following four examples reflect the vulnerability of the military in today's society and the monument as a reflection of efforts to deal with this uneasy situation. For instance, one participant described the purpose for reasons of public relations: "it's there to provide an awareness of the various functions of National Defence". This opinion was echoed by the following response by another individual: "its purpose is to raise an awareness of the Armed Forces and to boost morale". One respondent described the monument's purpose in the following way: "the military needs to get another statue since they haven't had one in fifty years". Another felt that the monument's "purpose is to justify military spending". In particular to the NCC, one participant was aware of the work that had been carried out on the site over the years by the Commission, and described as a result, how the purpose of the monuments was "to fill an empty site". These examples indicate that people are aware of part of the social context that surrounds such commemorations and exemplify

the fact that the intended messages are not always received in the expected manner. Rather than creating a sense of unity through the image of peacekeeping for instance, some of these individuals are interpreting the work in less exuberant ways which were never intended by either the NCC or the DND. On the whole, including direct references to peacekeeping and in cases where one could infer that peacekeeping is implied, the total recognition level for the purpose of the monument being related to peacekeeping in a broad manner measured 59%. The difference between the result for *Reconciliation* and the *Tribute's* (88%) is perhaps related to the literal text on the latter monument which was in full view of the respondents. However, for both monuments it can be argued that each work is understood fairly well on a basic level.

As a testament to the cross-cultural literal nature of war memorials, those of non-Canadian identity all responded that the monument was military in purpose (Table 6.9). This broad recognition of the military theme raises some interesting issues. Military commemoration is a sensitive issue in that many individuals have contentious interpretations about the nature of war and the military. For those unaware of the focus on peacekeeping as a generally well-received function of the military, there may also be negative interpretations. Willet (1993) argues that in Canada, there is a general anti-militaristic feeling present. This general attitude may translate into an interpretation of the monument as a glorification of the military. This view can be seen in the comments offered by Riley (1995) discussed earlier. In regard to international tourists, the personal experience of many with their own military history may evoke a less than a positive association to the monument.

Table 6.10 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the opinion of the appearance of *Reconciliation* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

Opinion on the monument						
	Like a lot	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Dislike a lot	n
Sex						
Male	5	14	7	4	1	31
Female	10	11	4	5	0	30
Total	15	25	11	9	1	61
Age						
13-19	1	2	0	0	0	3
20-34	3	9	3	3	0	18
35-49	6	4	6	1	1	18
50-64	3	3	1	4	0	11
65+	2	7	1	1	0	11
Total	15	25	11	9	1	61
Nationality						
Canadian	14	19	6	6	1	48
Other	1	6	5	3	0	15
Total	15	25	11	9	1	61
Education						
< Grade 9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some high school	1	1	0	0	1	3
Finished high school	0	3	0	0	0	3
Some post-secondary	0	1	3	3	0	7
Finished Post-secondary	14	20	8	6	0	48
Total	15	25	11	9	1	61
No. Visits in Past Year						
First time	2	6	6	2	0	16
2-5	3	5	2	1	0	11
6-11	1	1	2	1	0	5
12+	9	13	1	5	1	29
Total	15	25	11	9	1	31

The international aspect is more important for *Reconciliation*, given its location in a central tourist area and its promotion as heritage with an international message. How peacekeeping is viewed by outsiders is thus an important consideration. Do such individuals see Canada as a major player worthy of such praise? For those who do not take the time to read the inscriptions, the same kind of ambiguity around the military as an institution arises. What kind of image might the monument leave in the minds of these visitors? The international dimension of consumption for both monuments will be addressed more fully below.

Appearance

The results from this question in Table 6.6, indicated the monument is seen as aesthetically pleasing with 24.6% responding that they liked the work a lot, while another 41% were reported as liking the appearance. Thus, over 65.6% felt positively about the work, and compared to the *Tribute* level of 45% (Table 6.0), the results would seem to point to the general preference of the public toward representational art discussed earlier. Only 14.8% said they disliked the monument, and only one person (1.6%) reported disliking it a lot. The combined total of 16.48% for those who felt negative is slightly less than the *Tribute* at 21%. A large measure of difference between the two works can be found in the neutral category. For *Reconciliation*, 18 % of respondents were neutral to its appearance, whereas more than double this percentage (37%) felt the same for the *Tribute*. Again, this difference between the two works seems

Table 6.11 Cross-tabulation of survey results relating to the reason given for choice of appearance for *Reconciliation* in Ottawa-Hull, 1997

	Response						No Response	n
	Emotion		Aesthetics		Physical			
	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive		
Sex								
Male	1	3	6	6	0	12	3	31
Female	2	3	1	8	3	11	2	30
Total	3	6	7	14	3	23	5	61
Age								
13-19	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
20-34	2	2	0	5	1	7	1	18
35-49	0	2	3	3	0	7	3	18
50-64	0	1	2	2	2	4	0	11
65+	1	0	2	4	0	4	0	11
Total	3	6	7	14	3	23	5	61
Nationality								
Canadian	2	1	5	9	1	13	3	41
Other	1	5	2	5	2	10	2	20
Total	3	6	7	14	3	23	5	61
Education								
< Grade 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some high school	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
Finished high school	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
Some post-secondary	1	0	2	3	1	0	0	7
Finished Post-secondary	2	5	4	10	2	21	4	48
Total	3	6	7	14	3	23	5	61
No. Visits in Past Year								
First time	1	2	1	3	1	7	1	18
2-5	0	3	1	2	1	3	1	11
6-11	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	5
12+	2	1	3	8	1	11	3	29
Total	3	6	7	14	3	23	5	61
General Response								
Like a lot	0	3	0	4	0	8	0	15
Like	0	2	1	8	0	12	2	25
Neutral	0	1	2	2	0	3	3	11
Dislike	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	9
Dislike a lot	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	3	6	7	14	3	23	5	61

to indicate that people have an easier time making aesthetic choices in regard to literal works compared to abstract expressions.

The findings for aesthetic choice through the group characteristics are listed in Table 6.10. The responses to the choice were condensed to three categories to facilitate chi square testing: positive appearance, neutral and negative appearance. Only one outcome could be obtained which measured sex, but the result was insignificant (Table 6.7). This finding suggests that there is no significant difference in how males and females judged the appearance of the work.

Reason given for choice

Overall, I found the length of answers and their detail to be more in-depth than those for the *Tribute*, perhaps again suggesting that people are more comfortable in judging representative works. However, the cold was not as intense at this site compared to the *Tribute*. The results indicate general negative or positive associations to physical aspects and to the general aesthetic nature of the monument (Table 6.11). Nine of the individuals responded by relating to an emotional state, for example “just a feeling”, rather than by referring to any physical aspect. A sampling of these responses reflects the same level of variation, and at times contradiction, found in the *Tribute* case study. General patterns reveal references towards the openness, the war-like debris and to the figures. One older male related that “I like the graphic symbolism, the wedge on wedge, portrayal of conflict, the containing of destruction.” Another male commented on the active nature of the work: “you can walk through it, see debris, and it looks good in

snow". A comment from one older women relates a direct perception to the purpose of the war-scene and to the stance of the statues: " I like the ruins inside with figures, it reminds us what we could live through, and there is a sense of purpose with the figures". Another felt that the monument was "visually unappealing with its G.I Joe figures". One participant had more general negative comments: "it's not well done... it has no class, and it's a waste of money, and it blocks the view". There was one individual who particularly did not like the rear entrance to the monument with its war debris: the "entrance is not aesthetically pleasing." In regard to the military aura of the work, which was of concern to the NCC in its production, one again finds conflicting views. One respondent found that they "don't like the image... it's too militaristic and it doesn't reflect Canada and liberty". Another interpreted the work in a manner more in line with how the proponents would like it to be seen: "the monument is pacifist, it's not into glorification." Despite these contradictions, comments were still clearly weighed toward the positive.

One interesting finding is that there was no reference to the sacred grove. This finding may indicate that people do not necessarily identify the area as part of the monument. The grove, as one recalls, was meant to provide a balance to the overly military nature of the main monument. It is meant to reflect a story line from conflict to peace. Moreover, it was intended to provide a physical contrast to the cold and stark concrete. Its lack of recognition may partly be the result of the season making the presence of grass unknown to the viewer. On the other hand, the grove contains trees which keep their leaves all year, providing year round contrast to the white surface of the

concrete. A survey in the summer would settle this issue of physical recognition of the grove. Another point is that by occupying the entire node or space there is no definitive edge other than the street which might help to accentuate the fact that the grove is part of the monument. A broad expanse of grass encircling the entire work might help in this matter. This lack of comment on the grove in general may be the result of the location of the survey which does not feature the grove centrally. If people had been interviewed from the National Gallery side, this result may have been quite different.

In summary, the survey indicates that the monument is generally well received in regard to its aesthetics and is relatively well recognized. Moreover, its purpose, at least as some kind of military commemoration, is understood by both Canadians and international visitors. The results of the survey also indicate that people do occasionally walk through the work and, therefore experience it in a more direct fashion. However, the results indicate that many of those who walk through the work do not actually take the time to read the inscriptions.

INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS

One very tangible area that connects with issues addressed tangential in the thesis is the issue of tourist response. With the focus on tourism and the heritage industry in many countries today, there is clear use for any insights offered into how people view monuments, especially in order to minimize issues of heritage dissonance (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996). Though not central to the thesis focus, I will introduce some initial discussion on how each work may be consumed by international tourists. As noted

earlier, one of the reasons monuments are built today is to offer sites of attraction to tourists. Monuments which are illegible or ambiguous are clearly not effective if one is “selling” this experience for mainstream economic consumption.

In terms of international tourist recognition, the two case study monuments can be discussed briefly since both are featured as examples of the international dimension of the capital. *Reconciliation*, as noted previously, is located in a major tourist area. The monument is meant to be interpreted on a broad note as a reflection of Canadian identity. How do international visitors view peacekeeping, and do they share the same kind of views about the extent and importance of Canadian involvement supposedly felt by Canadians? A recent Angus Reid poll of 5700 adults in twenty countries (see Wilson-Smith, 1997) seems to indicate that while Canadians do in fact view Canada’s role as central to peacekeeping efforts (83% responded somewhat or substantial), this belief does not seem to be shared by other nations. For example, the results from respondents from other countries who expressed the belief that Canada figures prominently in peacekeeping range from a high of 57% in the U.K. to a low of 42% in Egypt. This may result in a view on the part of outsiders that the monument is an expression of self-aggrandizement or, at least, lead to a few scratching their heads. One area of central concern for *Reconciliation* raised earlier is how the military theme is interpreted by outsiders, especially for those who do not understand or take the time to read the text. One can expect a number of different views concerning its military look and what this brings to mind, especially given the range of experience many will have had with their own country’s military legacy.

short The *Tribute*, though not in a “capital” location, seems to reinforce the image that does exist in other nations, that Canada enjoys one of the highest levels of rights and freedoms in the world. For instance over 82% of Americans from the same survey as above felt that Canadians enjoyed more rights and freedoms than themselves. One reason given for this is the ability of Canadians to debate in a calm and rational manner without resort to bloodshed, especially in regard to the national unity debate. For these people, does the need for a monument make any practical sense? However, the survey indicates that Canada and its human rights record abroad is not always seen as a pristine actor in its relations with other countries. In addition, it is viewed as a nation which has treated its native population unfairly. The addition of the native translations on the *Tribute* thus serves a useful purpose perhaps in the image of a nation trying to deal with its native component through inclusion of their languages.

video This poll is indicative of some of the ways in which people may consume these two monuments from a perspective outside the culture from which they were produced. Again these considerations point to the variability in opinion and interpretation of the events and ideas expressed by monuments.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a sample assessment, through a variety of sources, of how each monument is being interpreted or consumed. On a practical level, each work appears to be operating at a level which does invite basic interaction on the part of the viewer. This may be for sightseeing, eating one’s lunch or resting, taking a

short cut to one's planned destination, taking the time to read and interpret the work or to sit back and consider its more aesthetic qualities. As a result, each work performs a variety of useful functions and contributes to the overall experience of the city.

On the level of meaning, the results of the surveys and the formal comments point to varied and contested interpretations that exist surrounding the significance of each work. In both monuments, one can see examples of individuals interpreting the work (sometimes mistakenly, as in the case of the *Tribute* as government art) in ways which were never intended and which at times undermine their basic message. These interpretations are evidence of the fact that dominant ideas are often questioned by people and reinterpreted through the very mediums whereby dominant values are disseminated (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

The monuments also reflect elements of aesthetic dissonance, but each work indicated an overall positive feeling on the part of survey respondents toward general appearance. Whatever negative physical attributes each monument has in this regard, (either too military or too abstract), these aspects do not seem to impede the ability of each work to transmit its basic purpose, or in the case of the *Tribute*, to be used as well as a space for activism.

What this chapter reveals, at the core, is that each work can reflect a multitude of meanings which will vary for each individual and which will change through time. The subject matter of the monument, its form and text, point to the suggested and intended interpretation, but the final reception can vary a great deal.

In regard to the statistical testing, in a number of cases positive results were found. As I have stated before, the chi square statistic only confirms that group responses are statistically different and does not allow one to infer as to why the results differ. In the *Tribute* study, it was found that the sexes and the level of physical interaction with the monument is statistically different. In *Reconciliation*, results show meaningful differences in how particular age groups responded to having read or not read the inscription, and their level of physical interaction in the monument. It was also found that the number of visits to the nearby site and the likelihood of identifying the name of the monument are statistically related. In many cases it found that background characteristics did not seem to play a meaningful role in the responses given. For example, education and inscriptions, the number of visits and appearance, and sex and appearance all proved insignificant. Intuitively speaking, one would expect that personal background characteristics would have an affect on the responses given. However, due to the small number of individuals in some categories, which more often than did not allow for any testing, I would reserve judgment until a larger sample size could be obtained allowing for the use of more powerful statistical tools. The results obtained do however, point to areas of future research of how personal background characteristics affect particular responses.

CONCLUSION

In overview, this thesis has explored the multidimensional purpose and role that monuments serve in the cultural landscape. Specifically, I have related monuments to the dissemination of nation-building ideas and beliefs in the context of Canadian society. In addition, I have explored the particular production process of two monument case studies in an effort to illustrate their constructed nature and meaning. The intensely negotiated process of building a monument and symbolic meaning is an aspect that is often hard to see in the finished work, which often purports to offer a certain objectivity and finality of interpretation on its subject matter. In regard to the monument's eventual interpretation or consumption, which was not central to this thesis, I have provided a somewhat more limited consideration.

In Chapter 1, I discussed how monuments serve a variety of functional roles in the city related to providing a positive urban experience and as a means of contributing to city legibility. From functional considerations, we moved to the more symbolic and ideological dimensions of monuments. Monuments form part of the corpus of cultural resources related to national heritage and history which is used to promote national distinctiveness and pride. The role of the capital landscape was then discussed as being central in this task. A number of monument case studies from cultural geography and art history were then introduced, which highlighted the fact the monument building and interpretation can be contested issues. Finally, a consideration of postmodernism contextualized why there has been an increase in nation-building uses of heritage and

why there is a growing need by state agencies to provide a more inclusive representation of Canadian society.

From a consideration of the theoretical, I then moved to a discussion of the methods, data sources and study limitations for the thesis in Chapter 2. This chapter grounded the research methods used in the thesis by linking it to other work carried out in the study of monuments in geography and art history.

Chapter 3 discussed the changing Canadian identity and how this process was reflected in national monument building. While it was shown that the conception of society had changed from a British orientation to one of encompassing greater cultural diversity, this change was not reflected in the monumental heritage. As a result, the monument component of heritage was argued to be out of step with the new ideas of Canadian society and culture. I then discussed efforts by the state to address this imbalance in other forms of heritage. Part of these efforts were seen in the national capital.

Consequently, Chapter 4 was an in-depth consideration of the broader efforts by Canadians to build a capital landscape, symbolic of the national culture. The monumental heritage of the capital was then assessed through an historical, spatial and thematic approach. It was found that the predominant themes were national in scope, but were primarily military and political in theme, and figurative in style.

From this broader capital perspective, I then narrowed the focus in Chapter 5 to consider two monument case studies in tandem, and the issues related to their process of production. The two were chosen primarily since they represented recent attempts to

bridge the diversity of Canadian backgrounds. There were several key areas of inquiry. Firstly, the discussion contextualized the relevance of the commemoration to the national society and also discussed who the proponent(s) were and their own specific goals for the monument. Both *Reconciliation* and the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights* were linked through a discussion of Canadian identity on the world scene. The two projects had different kinds of proponents, one private and the other public, and each reflected different needs involving respectively multilateral and bilateral negotiation. Secondly, I explored the reasons for the choice in site and its symbolic importance to the capital. Thirdly, the analysis then discussed the competition process including the negotiation that went on in the drafting of the guidelines for the artists. Fourthly, a detailed consideration of the winning designs and how they embody the ideas of the proponents were discussed. The last area of inquiry in the production phase, described the promotional efforts made by the proponents, and their importance in raising awareness of the monuments. Of central importance was the different character of the unveiling ceremonies seen in each commemoration. The unveiling ceremonies point to the purpose that they play in inscribing monuments with meaning and how they tie into the political problems of the day. The chapter then concluded by linking the monuments to specific issues related to postmodernism and heritage.

The final chapter addressed issues of consumption or interpretation by providing a consideration of some of the comments that have been made on the aesthetic form and subject matter of the monuments. The discussion then turned to consider the results of the on-street survey that asked questions pertaining to recognition, participation, purpose,

and aesthetic consumption. In each of the above areas, similarities and differences were found to exist between the two works. Recognition of the formal name was higher for *Reconciliation* and it also reflected a more positive ranking of its aesthetic appearance compared to the *Tribute*. In the area of inscription reading it was found that more people tend to read the wording on the *Tribute* compared to its counterpart. Both monuments share a strong recognition on the part of survey participants as to the basic purpose of each work and the level of people choosing to enter each monument is similar. Chi square results for personal background characteristics and the above variables were found to not be consistent between the two monuments.

REVIEW OF THE PURPOSE OF THE THESIS

At this point, it is appropriate to step back and consider the results of this thesis by linking the discussion back to the original goals of the research. The first goal was to explore the broad efforts in building a symbolic capital that is representative of the society. In regard to monument-building, it was found that despite the lack of a balanced monumental heritage, there are examples of monuments which celebrate themes which were not previously depicted. These include multiculturalism, aboriginal issues and women's contributions to society. While the representation of national identity and history through monuments, may be unequal or unbalanced, it was noted to be impractical to expect that this situation would ever be fully corrected. It is important to recognize that the overall symbolic image in the capital will draw upon a variety of heritage resources, including monuments in its effort to reflect a more inclusive national

identity. Specifically, the role of museums is important in this regard since heritage displays are more amenable to change and modification.

Despite the limitations of monument building, I would argue that the monumental heritage will likely continue to expand into the future. The NCC regularly receives submissions for monument commemorations and this is a sign that despite the overall decline in monument commemoration in Canada, the capital continues to be regarded as a special place or symbolic centre for this kind of heritage. This continued appeal for monuments in the capital ensures, to some extent, that monuments will continue to form part of the evolving symbolic image of the capital.

The second goal of this thesis was to consider two case studies in-depth and to ascertain if the intentions of the proponent(s) were successfully realized. Both monuments were built for the purpose of uniting a diverse population through their subject matter. However, it is important to remember that this intention was not as strong for DND as opposed to the NCC in regard to the building of *Reconciliation*. It was argued that the *Tribute*, through its artistic form and focus on human rights, was more conducive toward building common reference points for Canadian society, especially in regard to the plurality of cultures that exists. The proponents of the *Tribute* as well, do not attempt to achieve unity through the elevation of national myths related to popular images of Canada as a protector of human rights at home and abroad. In contrast, *Reconciliation* embodies the ideals of traditional military themes and the use of military figuration in its message for national unity. Moreover, it does to an extent elevate popular images of peacekeeping and Canada in its textual messages. While this might be a valid

approach, especially given the historical precedent of war-related themes for unifying nations, in the specific context of Canada at this time it would appear that military accomplishments are not a source for common identification by all Canadians. Despite the uncertainty surrounding the ability of *Reconciliation* to serve as a symbol for societal cohesion, the original intent of DND can be said to be successful in that a monument was produced which would serve foremost as a commemoration to its personnel.

It must also be said that in comparison to the *Tribute*, *Reconciliation* may be more open to the destabilizing influence of time on its meaning as the nature of peacekeeping has changed and may do so again. This issue of monuments and their durability versus the changing nature of society is one area that has resurfaced time and time again. To make an idea permanent is to distill experience and emotion into a form that can never quite accommodate all the various angles and nuances that are reflective even of their original sources. Once in form, these thoughtful expressions become calcified over time as society around them evolves and changes. This seems to reflect the tension between the need on the part of society to make permanent its ideals and yet to have public monuments which are timely and speak to the issues of the day. Moreover, the tendency to rewrite history will always prove to be a means of destabilizing the textual references and iconographic imagery of monuments. A recent letter in the Ottawa Citizen newspaper by Lodger (1998) highlights the tendency for historical revisionism in Canada, in light of the changing view on Louis Riel from an earlier conception as traitor to one of martyr. As a result, he questions the interpretation of events that the NorthWest

Rebellion memorial in Ottawa-Hull puts forth in this new context. The monument was built as a commemoration to two local soldiers killed at the hands of Riel's supporters during the Battle of Cut Knife Hill in 1885. Lodger in reference to the statue sarcastically states: "It was erected by our less enlightened predecessors, but it will have to be removed lest it offend". A concrete example of a monument outliving its surrounding social climate was also discussed earlier in regard to the Champlain monument and the dissonance concerning the meaning of the kneeling native.

How are those responsible for these works expected to deal with contention surrounding outdated iconography? As argued by public art critic Mark Lewis (1991), these works could serve as an example of earlier attitudes towards the issues that they commemorated, and thus perform an educational purpose. This approach could be carried out through guide books or with on-site interpretative plaques explaining different interpretations. A more radical approach would be the removal of the work, a course of action that has happened throughout time. This approach has been advocated for the Champlain monument native in Ottawa-Hull and in an international context was carried out in relation to many statues of Lenin throughout the former eastern European communist countries (Lewis, 1991). Lewis (1991) would rather that artists and society adopt a more avant garde approach to this problem. Specifically, public art would be much more temporary in nature allowing for a timely commemoration of events or persons but not permanent enough to outlive their social relevance. Ironically, he relates how this was the approach of Lenin during his tenure in power in the Soviet Union. Much

of the propaganda art of the period was constructed of plaster or wood and very little survives to this day.

How this temporary approach would be received by a public accustomed to permanent monuments, is a matter of potential controversy. There seems to be an innate need for the construction of permanent objects in human society for reasons of continuing posterity. Moreover, old buildings and cultural objects continue to capture the attention of many as the growth in heritage tourism attests. To build monuments which would not survive for a long period would therefore be a radical reversal in historical and social trends.

AREAS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

In regard to issues of production, a more comprehensive approach could be carried out through an increase in the number of participants in the interviews. In addition, a greater sensitivity to the creative process of artists and designers could be included. This latter point is important to consider given the fact that so much of what one sees in the monument is a result of the experience and beliefs of the artist. This area was not explored in depth in this thesis. In relation to the use of interviews, a brief discussion of potential pitfalls must be raised. While they are highly useful for obtaining information not readily available, problems can occur when making sense of opinion, especially when it conflicts, and in the ordering of events. In the process of sorting out information, the issue of subjectivity can arise which may result in factual errors if inadequate or delayed interview follow-up occurs. Systematic “follow up” proved

essential here to represent and contextualize certain points and quotations correctly. Despite the problem of subjectivity, the inclusion of interviews is absolutely vital to the process and a rewarding experience.

One area that needs to be explored further involves the issues of consumption or interpretation. As I have argued earlier, the production of a monument is only one aspect of the overall consideration of monuments: the issue of how the audience interprets the work is the central reason for the monument coming into existence. A more "in depth" and conclusive statistical analysis would need to include the following: a larger sample with closer consideration to how it is derived, a more favourable season in which to conduct interviews, the use of more powerful inferential statistics and an expanded set of questions. One of the major areas is to investigate further is how different personal characteristics affect interpretations of monuments. For instance, the role of ethnicity surely plays a role here and, given the plurality of cultures in Canada, offers a relevant area of research. The preliminary chi square findings also point to the need to ascertain the role of a person's sex in how people decide, for example, if they will walk through a monument, and what role age plays in the overall monument experience. In addition, one must ascertain the destination of participants in order to differentiate the tourist- or leisure-minded, from those on the way to work, since this aspect may affect the frame of mind in which they discuss the monument (Degnore, 1987). It would also be interesting to address the issue of whether people are reading into the monument any of the ulterior motives that may be present in the intentions of their producers. These preliminary results clearly show this to be the case, and offer, as a result, tangible evidence of some of the

more subtle ways people may choose to resist dominant ideas and values. One could delve into this area by asking people if they feel the commemoration adequately reflects social identity, or, if its subject matter is of relevance to the society at large. This line of inquiry would be particularly useful in studies associated with ideology and hegemony. Finally, one may want to test if people are making some of the symbolic associations that the monument's proponents and artists have tried to incorporate. With reference to the present cases, do people make the symbolic connection to the *War Memorial* in the *Tribute*; a feature that was deemed centrally as one of its positive attributes.

The results of such an expanded survey would also help to further the analysis as to why the chi square results found in the case studies explored here were often inconsistent. For example, why was age an important factor for the decision to read the inscriptions on *Reconciliation* while for the *Tribute*, no statistical meaningfulness for these two variable was found to exist? A larger sample would allow for smaller age cohorts which could then be more thoroughly tested and compared. Perhaps the relationship between age and inscription reading is related to the appearance of the work and different ideas of what is acceptable art between the age cohorts. At an intuitive level, one would expect that the appearance of the work would play a part in attracting attention to the monument in question thereby affecting inscription reading levels. The interrelationship between the variables suggested here may be found to be quite important in monument interpretation as discussed in Degnore (1987).

In addition to the questionnaire, one could employ the use of behavioral mapping (Degnore, 1987) to observe how people circulate on the site, what elements attract

attention and which do not, and how long they spend observing the monument. These observations would provide useful information in analyzing the data gathered through the surveys. It may address the issue of whether people regard features such as *Reconciliation's* sacred grove as part of the overall message of the monument.

Any study of this nature would also have to be sensitive to the location of the survey, since monuments are frequently large in form and occupy large sites, intentionally with numerous vantage points. As was discussed in Chapter 6, the location will affect the kind of responses given, especially in regard to aesthetic consumption, plaque reading and monument recognition. One may want to conduct the survey from a variety of locations on the site and then compare the results found.

RELEVANCE TO CONTEMPORARY GEOGRAPHICAL CONCERNS

In closing, this thesis has attempted to advance the scope of geographical inquiry into the cultural significance of monuments. Moreover, it has sought to convey some of the richness and complexity of research areas that a study of monuments can offer; a topic argued by Johnson (1995) as lacking adequate inquiry in the discipline of cultural geography. In an era of rapid globalization and increasing cultural diversity, the importance placed on heritage as a means to assert a national identity is growing. The process of deciding what is national heritage and if it reflects the diversity of the civic culture is an area involving intense debate. How this is played out in the national landscape has particular relevance to national capitals, which are deemed by many to be the sacred place of the national culture. Heritage, however, is also being used by other

agents at various geographical levels including the local and regional, which may reflect messages which are not in accordance with those at the national level (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996). A study of monuments and how they are implicated in the process of fostering national unity amidst the complexity described above, seems to be central to understanding how geographical identity is unfolding. Through an investigation of the processes of heritage promotion, resistance and renegotiation, monuments offer a tangible means to explore the complexity of human culture.

Baker, A. (1992) *Monuments and the National Identity of the United States*. In: A. Baker (ed.), *Monuments and the National Identity of the United States*. Cambridge, pp. 1-14.

Bell, D. (1979) The Loyalty Movement in the United States, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 69, 12-23.

Berlyne, D.E. (1971) *Aesthetics and Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Berry, V. and McCann, E. (1991) *The National Identity of the United States*. In: Matthews, R. and McCann, E. (eds), *The National Identity of the United States*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.

Blumen, R. (1971) *The National Identity of the United States*. In: Matthews, R. and McCann, E. (eds), *The National Identity of the United States*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.

Bowl, J.W. (1971) *The National Identity of the United States*. In: Matthews, R. and McCann, E. (eds), *The National Identity of the United States*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.

Bocher, J. (1971) *The National Identity of the United States*. In: Matthews, R. and McCann, E. (eds), *The National Identity of the United States*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.

Brown, R. (1971) *The National Identity of the United States*. In: Matthews, R. and McCann, E. (eds), *The National Identity of the United States*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.

Driedger, L. (1971) *The National Identity of the United States*. In: Matthews, R. and McCann, E. (eds), *The National Identity of the United States*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (1983) Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Verso Press, London
- Ashworth, G.J. and Tunbridge, J.E. (1990) The Tourist-Historic City, Belhaven Press, London
- Aubry, J. (1996) Aboriginal leaders to launch fund drive for war memorial, Ottawa Citizen, Nov. 4.
- Baker, A. (1992) Introduction: On Ideology and Landscape. In Baker, A. and Biger, G. (eds), Ideology and Landscape in Historical Perspective, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 1-14.
- Bell, D. (1970) The Loyalist Tradition in Canada, Journal of Canadian Studies, **5**, 22-33.
- Berlyne, D.E. (1971) Aesthetics and Psychobiology, Appleton-Century Crafts, New York
- Berry, V. and McChesney, A. (1988) Human Rights and Foreign Policy Making. In Mathews, Robert and Cranford Pratt (eds), Human Rights in Canadian Foreign Policy. McGill University Press, Kingston
- Blishen, B. (1986) Continuity and Change in Canadian Values. In Cairns, A. and Williams, C. (eds), Politics of Gender, Ethnicity, and Language in Canada, University of Toronto Press, Toronto
- Boal, F.W. (1993) One foot on each bank of the Ottawa, Canadian Geographer, **37**(4), 320-32
- Bodnar, J. (1994) Public Memory in an American City: Commemoration in Cleveland. In Gillis, J. (ed.), Commemorations: the Politics of National Identity, Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Breton, R. (1984) The Production and Allocation of Symbolic Resources: an Analysis of the Linguistic and Ethnocultural Fields in Canada, Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, **21**(2), 123-144.
- (1987) Symbolic Dimensions of Linguistic and Ethnocultural Realities. In Driedger, L. (ed), Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities, Copp Clark Pitman Ltd, Toronto

----- (1988) From Ethnic to Civic Nationalism: English Canada and Quebec, Ethnic and Racial Studies, **11(1)**, 85-102.

Buhuslawsky, M. (1997) Statue to honour women's rights pioneers, Ottawa Citizen, July 22, p.a1.

Burgess, R.G.(ed), (1982) Field Research, Allen and Unwin, London

Canadian Tribute to Human Rights Inc. (1984) Letter of intent to RMOC, Ottawa:Oct. 10.

----- (1985) Competition Booklet, Ottawa

----- (1986) Audio Tape of Jury Deliberations, Ottawa

----- (1990a) Souvenir Booklet, Ottawa.

----- (1990b) Video of Unveiling Ceremony, Ottawa

----- (1990c) Video of Unveiling After-Dinner Speeches, Ottawa

----- (1996) Schoolnet proposal, Ottawa.

----- (1997) Introduction to the Canadian Tribute to Human Rights, (WWW) <http://www.schoolnet.ca/FNPN/tribute/brochure.html> (July 3, 1998)

Carr, S. et. al. (1992) Public Space, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Charney, M. (1986) Comments to the Jury, Ottawa.

City of Ottawa (1990) Art in Public Places Policy Review, City of Ottawa, Ottawa

Clark, J. (1991) Our History makes Canada the First International Country, Canadian Speeches: Issues of the Day, **5(7)**, 32-37

Conlogue, R. (1991) An unerring instinct for in-your-face design, The Globe and Mail, Toronto, Nov. 30, E7

Cottle, T.J. (1978) Black Testimony, Wildwood Press, London

Cosgrove, D. and Jackson, P.(1987) New Directions in Cultural Geography, Area, **19**, 95-101

Crop Inc. (1992) The Canadian Armed Forces: perceptual and attitudes of Canadians, January 1992, Quebec (NCC Ref. 8812-051-04)

Dale, S. (1993) Guns and Poses, This Magazine, **26(7)**, 11-16

Dear, M. (1986) Postmodernism and Planning, Environment Planning D: Society and Space, **4**, 367-84

Decima Research Ltd. (1985) The Canadian Public and Foreign Policy Issues, Decima, #1299

Degnore, R. (1987) The experience of public art in urban settings. Phd dissertation, City University of New York.

Degrace, W. (1985) Canada's Capital 1900-1959: Five Town Planning Visions, Environments, **17(2)**, 43-57

Department of National Defence (1991) Letter to Jean Piggot from the General Chief of Defence Staff and Robert Foulter Deputy Minister, Ottawa, Dec. 6, 1991, (NCC, ref. 8812-051-04)

Drainie, B. (1989) Art Attack, Saturday Night, Jan., 1989, pp.44-51.

Duby, G. (1985) Ideology and History. In Constructing the Past: essays in historical methodology Le Goff, J. and P. Nora(eds), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Duncan, J. (1988) (Re)reading the Landscape, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, **6**, 117-126.

Duncan, J. (1990) The City as Text: the Politics of Landscape Interpretation in the Kandyan Kingdom, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

du Toit, Allsop, Hillier (1989) The Art of the Avenue: A University Avenue Public Art Study du Toit, Allsop, Hillier, Toronto

Ebdon, D. (1985) Statistics in Geography, Second edition, Basil Blackwell, Oxford

Eley, G. and Suny, R. (eds) (1996) Becoming National: a reader. Oxford University Press, Oxford

Eyles, J. (1988) Interpreting the geographical world. In Eyles, J. and Smith, D.(eds), Qualitative Methods in Human Geography, Polity Press, Cambridge

Foote, K. (1988) Object as Memory: the Material Foundations of Human Semiosis, Semiotica, **69(3/4)**, 243-268

- Freedman, A. (1986) Public Art vs. Art for Public Spaces, Canadian Art, Fall.
- Fryd, Vivien (1992) Political Compromise in Public Art; Thomas Crawford's Statue of Freedom. In Senie, H. and Webster, S.(eds), Critical Issues in Public Art, Harper Collins, New York
- Gans, Major A. (1994) Vocation or Job: a warrior's place in a rights-driven society. Canadian Defence Quarterly, **24(2)**, 10-14
- Gardam, Col. J. (1992) The Canadian Peacekeeper, The General Store Publishing House, Burnstown, Canada
- Geertz, C. (1964) Ideology as a Cultural System. In Apter, D. (ed), Ideology and Discontent, Free Press, New York
- Gillis, J. (1994) Memory and Identity: the History of a Relationship. In Gillis, J.(ed.), Commemorations: the Politics of National Identity, Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Goheen, P(1993) The Ritual of the Streets in Mid-19th-century Toronto, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, **11**, 127-145.
- Goode, J. (1974) The Outdoor Sculpture of Washington DC, Smithsonian Institute Press, Washington DC
- Gotlieb, A. (1970) Preface. In Gotlieb, A.(ed), Human Rights, Federalism and Minorities, Canadian Institute of International Affairs, Toronto
- Gramsci, A (1985) Selections from the Cultural Writings, Lawrence and Wishart, London
- Granatstien, J.L. (1974) Canada and Peacekeeping: Image and Reality, Canadian Forum, **54**, 505-516
- Granatstien, J.L and Bercuson, D (1991) War and Peacekeeping, Key Porter Books, Toronto
- Granatstein, J.L and Hillmer, N (1994) Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World to the 1990's, Copp Clark Longman, Toronto
- Grimmond, J. (1991) For Want of Glue, The Economist, **(June 29)**
- Griswold, C. (1992) The Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Washington Mall: Philosophical Thoughts on Political Iconography. In Senie, H. and Webster, S.(eds), Critical Issues in Public Art, Harper Collins, New York
- Guernsey, T. (1986) Statues of Parliament Hill, NCC, Ottawa
- Gwyn, S. (1984) The Private Capital, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto

Hassan, I. (1985) The Culture of Postmodernism, Theory, Culture and Society, **2(3)** 191-33

Hein, H. (1996) What is Public Art? Time, Place, and Meaning, Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, **54(1)**, 1-7

Henriquez and Associates (1992) The Canadian Peacekeeping Monument, Henriquez and Ass., Vancouver

Henry, A (1993) The Peacekeeping Legacy: Canada and the New World Order, Forum, **17(4)**, 6-12.

Hillis, K. (1992) A History of Commissions: Threads of an Ottawa Planning History, Urban History Review, **21(1)**, 46-59.

Hilmer, N. (1993) Minutes of the Proceedings and Evidence in Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs, Ottawa, pp. 30-9

Hnatyshyn, R. (1992) Speech on the occasion of the unveiling of the peacekeeping monument, Rideau Hall, Ottawa, Oct. 8

Holdsworth, D. (1986) Architectural Expressions of the Canadian National State, Canadian Geographer, **30(2)**, 167-171.

Hutchinson, J. and Smith, A. (eds). (1994) Nationalism, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Humphrey, J. (1970) The World Revolution and Human Rights. In Gotlieb, A. (ed.), Human Rights, Federalism and Minorities, Canadian Institute of International Affairs. Toronto

Jackson, J.B (1994) Discovering the Vernacular Landscape, Yale University Press, New Haven

Jackson, P. (1989) Maps of Meaning, Routledge Press, London

Jockel, J. (1994) Canada and International Peacekeeping, Centre for Strategic Studies, Washington

Johnson, N. (1994) Sculpting Heroic Histories: celebrating the centenary of the 1798 rebellion in Ireland, Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, **19**, 78-93

Johnson, N. (1995) Cast in Stone: Monuments, Geography, and Nationalism, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, **13**, 51-65

Johnson, J. (1990) Granite Platoon, Landscape Architecture, **80(1)**, 69-71

- Kallen, E. (1995) Ethnicity and Human Rights in Canada, Second Edition. Oxford University Press, Toronto
- Kertzer, D. (1988). Ritual, Politics and Power, Yale University Press, London
- Kong, L (1993) Negotiating Conceptions of "Sacred Space": a Case Study of Religious Buildings in Singapore, Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, **18**, 342-358
- King, A. (1993) Cultural Hegemony and Capital Cities. In Taylor, J., Lengelle, J. and Andrew, C.(eds), Capital Cities: International Perspectives, Carleton University Press, Ottawa
- Kong, L. and Yeoh, B. (1997) The Construction of National Identity Through the Production of Ritual and Spectacle: An Analysis of National Day Parades in Singapore, Political Geography, **16(3)**, 213-239
- Konrad, V. (1986) Focus: Nationalism in the Landscape of Canada and the United States, Canadian Geographer, **30(2)**, 167
- Kulchyski, P. (1995) Aboriginal Peoples and Hegemony in Canada, Journal of Canadian Studies, **30(1)**, 60-69.
- Lambert, P. (ed), (1991) Parables and Allegories: the work of Melvin Charney 1975-1990, Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal
- Leger, M. (1995) Touring the Ideological Landscape: Ottawa's Peacekeeping Monument. Unpublished paper given at the conference of the Canadian Association of Art Historians, Guelph, Ont.
- Lewis, M. (1991) What is to be done?, Parachute, **61(1)**, 28-36
- Ley, D. (1985) Cultural/Humanistic Geography, Progress in Geography, **9(3)**, 415-423
- Ley, D. (1994) Postmodernism. In Smith, D. and Johnson, R.J. and Gregory, D. (eds), Dictionary of Human Geography, Third edition. Basil Blackwell, Cambridge
- Lipset, S. (1990) Continental Divide, Routledge Press, New York
- Lodger, D. (1998) Canonizing of Louis Riel insults founders of our modern Canada, Ottawa Citizen, June 22, A10
- Lowenthal, D. (1994) Identity, Heritage, and History. In Gillis, J. (ed.), Commemorations: the Politics of National Identity, Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Lynch, K. (1960) Image of the City, MIT Press, Cambridge

- Mathews, R. and Pratt, C. (eds) (1988) Human Rights in Canadian Foreign Policy, McGill University Press, Kingston
- Mayo, J (1988) War Memorials as Political Memory, Geographical Review, **78**(1), 62-75
- McKnight, C. (1996) Public Art and Urban Spaces: the Place of Art in the Public Interest in the National Capital, Masters Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa
- McLennan, J. and Richmond, A. (1994) Multiculturalism in Crisis: a postmodern perspective on Canada, Ethnic and Racial Studies, **17**(4), 662-683
- Meining, D.W. (1979) The Beholding Eye. In Meining, D.W. and Jackson, J.B. (eds), Interpretations of the Ordinary Landscape, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Mitchell, D (1995) There's No Such Thing as Culture: Towards a Reconceptualization of the Idea of Culture in Geography, Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, **20**, 102-116
- Monette, M. (1993) The Peacekeeping Monument: an urban sacred space, Landscape Architectural Review, **5**, 5-8
- Mosse, G.L (1975) The Nationalization of the Masses, Howard Fertig, New York
- Muhamed, T. (1998) Killing Private Ryan: our dim view of war, Ottawa Citizen, Sept. 6, 1998, p.a1
- Musil, R. (1936) Denkmale. In Naclass zv Lebzeiter, Zurich, pp. 28-36
- Nachmias, D. and Nachmias-Frankfort, C. (1992) Research Methods in the Social Sciences, Fourth Edition, St. Martins Press, Bristol
- National Capital Commission (1985) Confederation Boulevard: A legacy in the making, NCC, Ottawa
- National Capital Commission (1986) International Survey of Capital Cities and Urban Centres: Synopsis, NCC, Ottawa
- (1988) Capital Commemoration, NCC, Ottawa
- (1989) Thematic strategies for Canada's Capital: a Summary of Principals and Recommendations, NCC, Ottawa
- (1990) Creating a National Symbol: the Peacekeeping Monument Competition, NCC/DND, Ottawa
- (1991a) Peacekeeping Monument Project Brief communication plan draft comments, NCC, Ottawa, Dec 5 (ref. 8812-051-04)

----- (1991b) Thematic Strategies: Action Plan Draft, NCC, Ottawa

----- (1991c) Peacekeeping Monument Project Brief: communication plan draft comments, NCC, Ottawa, May 29 (ref. 8812-051-04).

----- (1991d) The Peacekeeping Monument Competition, NCC/DND, Ottawa

----- (1992) Press Release by Marcel Beaudry on the unveiling of the Peacekeeping Monument, NCC, Ottawa, Oct. 6

----- (1994) Commemorations on Federal Lands, Corporate Administrative Policies and Procedures, NCC, Ottawa

----- (1995-96), Annual Report, NCC, Ottawa

----- (1998) The Peacekeeping Monument and the Canadian Tribute to Human Rights. In The International Capital. (WWW)<http://www/capcan.ca/english/about/cultural/international/index.html> (July, 3 1998)

Osborne, B. (1996) Figuring Space, Marking Time: contested identities in Canada, International Journal of Heritage Studies, **2(1-2)**, 23-40

Ottawa Citizen (1989) Seven years to culminate in Sept 30 Unveiling, Ottawa Citizen, Sept. 20, p.b3.

Ottawa Citizen (1993) Slain women's monument defaced, Ottawa Citizen, March 17, p. b3.

----- (1997) Worthy statue, but not on the Hill. Ottawa Citizen, Nov. 20, p.b4.

Porteous, J. (1988) Topocide: the annihilation of place. In Eyles, J. and Smith, D. (eds), Qualitative Methods in Human Geography, Polity Press, Cambridge

Price, M. and Lewis M. (1993) The Reinvention of Cultural Geography, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, **83(1)**, 1-17

Public Works (1966) Report from the Minister of Public Works to Parliament on Commemorative Statues to Canadian Prime Ministers and Commemoratives to other Eminent Canadians-Working Paper, Public Works, Ottawa

Radford, J.P. (1992) Identity and Tradition in the Post-Civil War South, Journal of Historical Geography, **18**, 91-103

Rapoport, A. (1993) On the Nature of Capitals and their Physical Expression. In Taylor, J., Lengelle, J. and Andrew, C. (eds), Capital Cities: International Perspectives, Carleton University Press, Ottawa

Renan, E. (1990) What is Nation. In Bhabha, H.(ed), Nation and Narration, Routledge and Kegan, London

RMOC (1987) Minutes of the Executive Report #1, RMOC, Ottawa, pp.2073-2078

RMOC (1990) Art in Public Spaces Policy, Ottawa: RMOC, 1990

RMOC (1997) Traffic projects and diversions in the core. (Map) Department of Transportation and Engineering.

Rile, S. (1995) Peace tribute at war with its neighbours, Ottawa Citizen, October 7, p.c.

Robertson, A.H. (1982) Human Rights in the World, Second Edition. St.Martins, New York

Robinette, M. (1976) Outdoor Sculpture: Object and Environment, Witney Library of Design, New York

Rogers, D. (1998) Gatineau group wants to raise Pearson statue, Ottawa Citizen, August 29, 1998, pp.c3

Savage, K.(1992) The Self-made Monument: George Washington and the Fight to Erect a National Memorial. In Critical Issues in Public Art. Senie, H. and Webster, S.(eds), Harper Collins, New York

Scott, R. and Seasons, M. (1991) Planning Canada's Capital: the Roles of Landscape, International Journal of Canadian Studies, 3(4), 167-177

Sens, A. (1997) Somalia and the changing nature of peacekeeping: implications for Canada. Government of Canada, Ottawa, pp.97-121

Senie, H. (1992) Defining National Values: American Monuments, Murals and Memorials in Critical Issues in Public Art, Senie, H. and Webster, S.(eds), Harper Collins, New York

----- (1992) Politics, Patronage, and the Public. In Critical Issues in Public Art, Senie, H. and Webster, S.(eds), Harper Collins, New York

Shamash, Diane (ed.) (1992) In Public: Seattle 1991, Seattle Arts Commission, Seattle

Sherman, D.J. (1994) Art, Commerce, and the Production of Memory in France after the World War One. In Gillis J.(ed), Commemorations: the Politics of National Identity, Princeton University Press, Princeton

Shipley, R (1987) To Mark Our Place, New Canada Publications, Toronto

Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A.L. (1973) Field Research, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

Taylor, J., Lengelle, J. and Andrew, C., (eds). (1993) Capital Cities: International Perspectives, Carleton University Press, Ottawa

Taylor, J. (1986) Ottawa: an Illustrated History, James Lorimer and Company, Toronto

Taylor, J. (1989) City Form and Capital Culture: Remaking Ottawa, Planning Perspectives, 4, 79-105

Theriault, G.C.E and Douglas, W.A.B. (1997) Arms and the Canadian: the future of the military profession, Canadian Defence Quarterly, Spring

Tomasevski, K. (1993) Development Aid and Human Rights Revisited, Pinter Publishers Ltd., London

Tranchenburg, M. (1976) The Statue of Liberty, Viking Press, New York

Trueman, P. (1989/90) Collective Hypocrisy, Ottawa Magazine, December/January.

Tunbridge, J.E.(1986a) Warehouse functions, insurance plans and inner city revitalization, Canadian Geographer, 30(2) , 146-54

----- (1986b).Clarence street, Ottawa: contemporary change in an inner city zone of discard, Urban History Review, 14(3), 247-57

----- (1987) Of heritage and many other things: merchants' location decisions in Ottawa's Lower Town West, Dept. of Geography discussion Paper 5, Carleton University, Ottawa

Tunbridge, J.E. and Ashworth, G.J. (1996) Dissonant Heritage, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester

Turner, V (1974) The Ritual Process, Penguin Books, Middlesex

Valpy, M (1991) Canadians Gung Ho on war, survey finds, Globe and Mail, March 20

Vance, J.(1996) The Great Response, The Beaver, Oct-Nov, 28-32

Vincent, R.J (1991) Human Rights and International Relations, Cambridge University Press, London

Wagner, P.L. and Mikesell, M. (eds) (1962) Readings in Cultural Geography, University of Chicago Press, London

Wagner-Pacifini, R. and Shwartz, B. (1991) The Vietnam Veteran's Memorial: Commemorating a Difficult Past, American Journal of Sociology, **97**, 376-420

Walzer, M. (1967) On the Role of Symbolism in Political Thought, Political Science Quarterly, **82**, 191-205

Warner, M. (1985) Monuments and Maidens: the Allegory of the Female Form, Picador Press, London

Wayling, T. (1938) Canada's National War Memorial, Macleans, Dec. 15.

Willet, T. (1993) The Canadian Military: A Design for Tomorrow, Canadian Defence Quarterly, **22(5)**, 42-48

Williams, R. (1981) Culture, Fontana, London

Willson-Smith, Anthony (1997) Special Report: Canada and the World, Macleans, **110**, 12-15, April 14

Winsor, H. (1991) War's Foes and Friends Claim Pearson's Legacy, The Globe and Mail, Feb. 11, p.a4

Withers, C. (1996) Place, Memory, Monument: Memorializing the Past in Contemporary Highland Scotland, Ecumene, **3(3)**, 325-344

Yonsen, D. (1988) Ottawa Rejects Bolivar Statue, Ottawa Citizen, August 4, p.c1

Young, A. (1989/90) We Throw the Torch: Canadian Memorials of the Great War and the Mythology of Heroic Sacrifice, Journal of Canadian Studies, **24(4)**, 5-28

Young, E. (1989) The Biography of a Memorial Icon: Nathan Rapoport's Warsaw Ghetto Monument, Representations, **26**, 69-106

Zelinsky, W. (1988) Nation into State: the shifting symbolic foundations of American nationalism, University of North Carolina Press, London

Interviews

Arnold, John (1997) A local artist who was involved in an advisory capacity with the *Tribute* project in the early phases.

Black, Shirley (1997-98) Retired. Former Director of National Programming, NCC. Mrs. Black was heavily involved in the Peacekeeping Monument project until the completion of the design competition.

Charney, Melvin (1998) Artist who designed the *Canadian Tribute to Human Rights*. The artist was not formerly interviewed. His comments on the *Tribute* and the relationship to the *War Memorial* were gathered during an information session at the monument in July of 1998.

Dixon, Dave (1997) Senior District Planner, City of Ottawa.

Doherty, Elizabeth (1997-98) Senior architect, Public Works and Government Services. Mrs. Doherty served as Project Manager of the Peacekeeping Monument after the design competition.

Fedorowicz, Hania (1997-98) Mrs. Fedorowicz was a founding member of the *Tribute* and has served on a number of positions throughout the life of the project.

Gardam Colonel (Ret.), John (1997-98) Col. Gardam served as the main representative for DND's involvement in the Peacekeeping Monument.

Monnette, Marc (1997) Senior Planner, NCC. Mr. Monnette served as the initial project manager of the Peacekeeping Monument.

Naor, Steve (1997) A former president of the *Tribute* project.

Nesbitt, Karen (1997) Program Coordinator for Thematic and Cultural Programs, NCC

Reid, Leslie (1997) Professor of Fine Arts at the University of Ottawa. Mrs. Reid served as a volunteer in the early phases of the *Tribute*.

Tardiff, Jacqueline (1997) Director for Cultural Programming, City of Hull

Wilkes, George (1997-98) Mr. Wilkes was a founding member of the *Tribute* and has served on a number of positions throughout the life of the project.

Appendix A

Dear Sir/Madame,

I am writing this letter in the hope that you might be interested in participating in my research study. My name is John Roberts and I am a Master of Arts candidate at Carleton University in the Department of Geography. I am presently working on my masters thesis which is related to the study of monuments in Ottawa, Canada. The interviews are aimed at providing information relating to the erection of both the Tribute to Human Rights monument and the Peacekeeping monument, known more formally as Reconciliation. As I understand, you have personally been involved to some extent with both or either of these projects. In this event, your assistance would help towards the completion of this project.

If you are willing to participate in this study please indicate this by circling the response below. In addition, please read and sign the Informed Consent Form attached. This form outlines in more what is involved. Please include this form with your response. I will contact you in order you agree upon a meeting place and time. Alternatively, a time will be set for a telephone interview. If the latter is preferred please include your telephone number and when you can be reached.

----Yes

---- No

John Roberts

Thank you for your time and patience.

Informed Consent Form

This form is designed to impart to you what participation in this study will involve, the nature of the research project, and the procedures that will be used. A signed consent form is required before participation in the study can proceed.

The aim of this research is to gather information concerning the erection of the Tribute to Human Rights and/or Reconciliation. It is hoped that through the use of interviews, information not readily available in the written record. The information will be used towards the completion of my Master's thesis. Participation will involve answering a number of questions relating to such issues as site, intent and form of the monument(s). The kind of questions one may be asked will be based on one's involvement with the project(s).

List of Potential Questions

Background

- What role did you play in relation to the creation of the monument?
- How long were you involved?
- Have you had previous experience in the area of public art?

Monument

- Why was a monument chosen in the first place? By whom?
- What kind of ideas were expressed by those involved about what the monument should mean?
- Were there different ideas about what the competition guidelines should contain?
- Were there ideas about how the monument should look?
- Were there any steps taken to include the public's opinion on how it should look or other aspects?
- What kind of views were expressed in response to the winning designs by those involved?
- What steps have been taken to promote public awareness of the monument?
- Were there different ideas about where the monument should be situated?
- Was the final site the preferred one?

Personal

- What does the monument mean to you?
- Did you approve the site?
- How did you feel it should look?

The duration of the interview will be approximately one hour in length, and will take place in a setting convenient to the respondent. Alternatively, the interview will be conducted by telephone at a time previously determined.

Due to the politics that surround the erection of public monuments one may feel uncomfortable answering particular questions. This may prove especially true where names are involved. In order to lessen the likelihood of discomfort the use of the participant's name will not be included in the final thesis if the participant so chooses. In addition, access to the information collected will be kept limited to the researcher and supervisor of the project and stored under lock and key. In any event, it must be clear that you retain the right to refuse to answer any question(s) and may choose to withdraw at any point.

In the event that information collected from this interview will be used, you will be contacted in order to verify the content. If you are interested, the final copy of the research will be made available to view.

In order to proceed with the study please provide your signature in the space provided. Please note: your signature verifies that you understand what is involved in the study and that you have chosen to participate. Your signature does not constitute any waiver of rights.

Participant

Researcher

Date

If you have any questions or comments in relation to this study, feel free to contact the following person(s) at the numbers listed.

Researcher(Geo.), John Roberts (613)xxx-xxxx
 Supervisor(Geo.), Prof. John Tunbridge (613) xxx-xxxx
 Departmental Chair(Geo.), Mike Smith (613) xxx-xxxx
 Ethics Committee Chair, Anne Burgess (613) xxx-xxxx

Appendix B

Monument Questionnaire

Hello, my name is John Roberts and I am a graduate student from Carleton University conducting research on people's impressions of monuments. Would you be willing to participate? This should take no longer the five to seven minutes.

Questions

1. In the past year how often have you passed by this monument?
  - 1 Twelve visits or more
  - 2 Eleven to six visits
  - 3 Between five and two visits
  - 4 First time
- 2 Have you ever walked through the monument?
  - 1 Yes
  - 2 No
- 3 Have you ever read any of the plaques or inscriptions on the monument?
  - 1 Yes
  - 2 No
- 4 On a scale of 1 to 5 how would you rate the appearance of the work?
  - 1 Like a lot
  - 2 Like
  - 3 Neutral
  - 4 Dislike
  - 5 Dislike a lot
- 5 Why?
- 6 Can you identify the name of the monument?
7. What do you think the purpose of the monument is?

Thank-you. Now in order to help me analyze the responses I would appreciate some general background information on yourself.

8. Under which age group do you belong?
- 1 12-19 years
  - 2 20-34 years
  - 3 35-49 years
  - 4 50-64 years
  - 5 65 +
9. Sex
- 1 Male
  - 2 Female
10. Which category includes the formal education you have completed.
- 1 Less than grade 9
  - 2 9-11 and some other
  - 3 9-13
  - 4 9-13 and some
  - 5 Post-secondary
11. Which nationality do you most strongly identify with?

Thank-you for time and enjoy your day.