From Indian to Indigenous:
Temporary Pavilion to Sovereign Display Territories

[This is an earlier, more complete draft of "From Indian to Indigenous: Temporary Pavilion to Sovereign Display Territories." *In Search of Expo 67*. Monika Kin Gagnon and Lesley Johnstone, eds. McGill-Queens University Press. 2020. 135-146.]

Expo 67: I was five years old, conscious of the hoopla, but we lived far from Montreal and could not afford the fare.[i] The World's Fair came to the Prairies mostly in black and white, on television and in the newspaper. The coincidental Canadian Centennial celebrations were more accessible. On Dominion Day eve,[ii] the 'pied piper of Canada' arrived in Edmonton. Bobby Gimby was a middle-aged white man who played a faux jewelled trumpet and wore a cape. A square flirting with hippyness but hedging his bets with a crew cut, Buddy Holly glasses, and a business suit. He embodied the ambivalent times. My sister and I were in the kid's choir at City Hall singing-a-long with Gimby to his popular "Ca-Na-Da song."[iii] As a nod to Francophones the montage includes a slice of "Frère Jacques." And 'Indians',[iv] of a sort, are evoked by the melody "one little, two little, three Canadians."[v] I assume the 'pied piper' was unaware that the original lyrics celebrate Native American genocide.[vi] Little Métis me sang along, an equally unconscious participant in the Indigenous haunting of Canada's Centennial. Looking back, the Native presence thoughtlessly summoned and displaced by "Ca-Na-Da" seems an artefact of a worldview in partial eclipse. And the Indians of Canada Pavilion appears as a beacon, a flash of creative sovereignty that countered settler colonial narratives with Indigenous truths. This paper describes the use of First Peoples as foils of progress in World's Fairs, and how the Pavilion disrupted this narrative in ways that Indigenous artists and curators continue to mature.

Expo 67 was an International and Universal Exposition. This category of World's Fair, paradoxically, showcases a host nation while overwhelming it with post-nationalist futurisms. International *and* Universal they oscillate celebrations of difference (International) with expressions of desire for a unified transcendence (Universal). While founded on patriotism and competition, international fairs also demonstrate that there is mutual advantage in sharing knowledge. And they often present near-socialist visions of co-operative globalism that exceed nation states. This performative dissonance is engineered to upset settled subjects and catalyze unpredictable novelty. World's Fairs are temporary no-places, a neutral ground onto which is gathered imaginative threads from every other place. These lines are then woven into the site's narrative. While sub-plots are multiple, central to every exposition's story is progress—things get better. Universal Expositions from 1939 onward encouraged visitors to identify with a transpersonal identity located in the future. The slogan of the 1939 Fair was "Building the World of Tomorrow." In 1958 it was "Universal Balance for a More Human World;" in '62, "*Man* in the Space Age;" and in '64, "Peace Through Understanding: *Man's* Achievement on a Shrinking Globe in an Expanding Universe."[vii] In 1967, the theme was "*Man* and His World." Uplifting ideas, unless you are designated the foil of 'Man'.

As proof of his reaching the "new world," Christopher Columbus returned to Spain with "savages" who entertained the court. These private shows of wealth and power continued for centuries. However, from 1870-1930 they became a public and lucrative industry. According to

genocide scholar Kurt Jonassohn, facing a steep decline in visitors, zoological gardens, and circuses, began exporting "exotic" humans to augment their animal displays.[viii] Attendance soared. Europeans were fascinated by the range of newly 'discovered,' conquered, and colonized peoples. And Americans wanted to glimpse real live Natives before they vanished. Human zoos were also part of World's Fairs of that era. The 1889 Paris Fair, for example, in addition to a "negro village," had 400 Indigenous people in various 'authentic' settings. Beginning as curiosities, human exhibits were soon retooled as educational ethnographic displays. In fact, they were more about empire than empiricism. They advocated racialist pseudo-science ontologies inspired by Darwin. Some even had enclosures of apes followed by cages with nude or semi-nude brown or black people who were gazed upon by white audiences. The purpose being not just to show difference, but to supposedly demonstrate white superiority. Human zoos did not end due to moral outrage, but because of the economic crash of the Great Depression. While the World's Fair of 1958 (Brussels) had a Congolese village, such displays were infrequently revived. There was less appetite for human zoos once film and radio documentaries could bring a semblance of the distant close, and improved travel enabled more colonists to tour the colonies.[ix]

Exhibitions of the ethnic and 'primitive' at World's Fairs are essential foils, or contrasts, to dramatically heighten displays of new technology and modes of being. The decontextualized staging of traditional cultures is meant to demonstrate where 'Man' has come from, show folks what life was like before they were Man. Adjacent examples of state-of-the-art technology reveal where the best of us currently are. And exhibitions of speculative fiction offer previews of the 'World of Tomorrow', where those of us who can achieve Maness will one day live. Man is an aspiration. Visitors wander between bewildering, rough otherness and ecstatic, smooth oneness. In the (Platonic) Republic of World's Fairs, the Indigenous is exotic, decorative, multiple, static, anachronistic, while 'Man'—the result of enlightened rationalism, intuitive play, competition, and technology—is unified, simplified, and transcendent. Call to mind Expo 67 hostesses in their jet-setting, stewardess-like uniforms, the 'space-age' furniture, streamlined fixtures, and futuristic buildings, especially Buckminster Fuller's geodesic dome. Will visitors choose regressive romanticism or the shape of things to come? What was once a forgone conclusion, during the 'Summer of Love' and the year of Timothy Leary's "turn on, tune in, drop out," became an open debate.

The subject of "Expo 67: *Man* and His World," is 'Man'—a post-race unity of beings (Man) with dominion over the planet (*His* World). 'Man' is not only the old stand-in for 'human' but is, in this context, an expression of 'Modern Man' discourse. Modern Man, explains Micheal Leja, is an anxious figure that emerged in academic and popular literature in Europe and the United States following the "War to End All Wars."[x] It reached a peak during the existential crisis that followed the Second World War, the collapse of colonial empires, and the birth of the United Nations. Arguable, it died with Expo 67. There are two strains. In the optimistic version, the one that post-war Fairs up to and including Expo 67 are premised on, Modern Man is people conceived as sharing a common humanity rather than being members of a race, nation, tribe or any other sort of division. Modern Man is a being-toward utopia. He[xi] struggles to free himself from irrationality, the cause of wars, poverty, and injustice. He endeavours, through good will and technology, to transcend nature—his own base instincts and the environment that fuels his future. The competing, darker version of 'Man' is fascinated with his own irrational nature, is pessimistic about mastering his passions, and is unsure if that is such a good idea anyway since

mastery of nature appears to lead to global catastrophe. He has lost faith in the belief that better technology necessarily leads to better civilisation. According to one of the early books in the genre, Carl Jung's *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (1931), man was in crisis because technology was advancing far ahead of his still primitive psychology's ability to adapt. Science had outstripped ethical and political development, producing nuclear-powered apes.

The architects of utopia design systems within their worldview and as a means to advance the privilege of their kind. Their plans emerge from and reinforce their temperamental preferences, and preserve and support their race, gender and class assumptions and aspirations. From a feminist perspective, Modern Man discourse, while claiming to represent humanity, obviously privileged men. 'Man' really did mean 'men'. And from a racialized point of view, 'Man' was 'white'. From an Indigenous perspective, Man-based utopias emerge from the minds of people who have divorced themselves from their original cultures; people who are free-floating signifiers untethered to their land, community, and traditional knowledge. Utopic thinking that privileges patriarchy, technology, materialism, and dominance over the environment and other people is antithetical to Indigenous ways of knowing and being. A being-toward utopia that is not established on humility and stewardship, not premised on sustainable relations among all beings, but instead centers on humans, hoarding, and hierarchies is disastrous for both environments and people. Such thinking, especially when expressed as universal, is a totalizing attitude that arises when a society mistakes technological advancement for moral superiority. Material success backed by a self-affirming ideology can lead people to believe that they transcend self-interestedness and know what is best for others. In this narrative, those who know who they are, who value land-based ways of knowing and being, and want to sustain their territories, are seen as obstacles on the road to self-improvement and a collective utopia. In the Canadian context, Modern Man is post-Indian. Natives are lacks to be filled, fixed or displaced by those with more complete and streamlined selves. If this sounds familiar, you might be recalling the words of Richard H. Pratt, founder of the Carlisle boarding school, "Kill the Indian and save the Man."[xii] Utopia is a worthy destination for those who design it, but the road there is crowded with suffering Indigenous people whose arrival is perpetually deferred.

Utopian desire was not confined to Montreal in 1967. Its Dionysian counterpart[xiii] roiled a few hours south at Woodstock, New York. The feeling didn't last. The 'Summer of Love' clouded over with the Stonewall Resistance (June 28); the Manson murders (Aug. 9); the occupation of Alcatraz (Nov. 20, 1969-June 11, 1970); deaths at the Altamont Free concert (Dec. 6); Kent State (May 4, 1970); the FLQ and the October crisis; 'race riots' in the United States and the war in Vietnam; the Women's movement, and so on. Pierre Burton called 1967 Canada's "last good year." Perhaps it was the last good year for him, for Modern Man. The optimistic strain of Modern Man utopianism rushed to the future in the hopes of out running its past. Expo designers hoped to preserve what they could of their patrimony by presenting wonderfully imagined futures—of which, of course, people like them would still be in charge—and hope for buy in. Dissenters would look retrograde in the face of such a shiny tomorrow. In the new future, however, these efforts were overwhelmed by a growing distrust of meta-narratives, and the rise of multiple social justice and environmental movements that demanded that progress be slowed so everyone could serve and be served by the struggle toward fair and sustainable futures.

Expo 67 was a coming-of-age party, an opportunity to show the world that Canada was no longer a colony, was not the United States, and Canadians were not simply "hewers of wood and drawers of water."[xiv] We were modern. Centennial celebrations, however, were more inward directed, a campaign to make the nation more visible and tangible to itself. The Centennial Commission funded music, books, and public art; theatre, concert, and film tours; and the Confederation train and Caravan travelling exhibitions. Federal, provincial, and civic governments co-sponsored the construction of parks, auditoriums, historic plaques, and monuments. There were also nation-building school activities; conferences; radio and television programs; newspaper and magazine articles; contests; local celebrations; merchandise; and even a new flag (1965). The Expo 67/Centennial project coaxed the diverse peoples of these vast territories toward a unified identity.[xv] And, initially, that identity was assumed to be white. The Expo posters, brochures, and guides, for example, picture prospective Fair attendees as exclusively Caucasian. The few non-white faces appear not as guests but as the sort of people white patrons could expect to entertain and serve them at the Fair.

Indigenous people also figure thinly in official Expo media.[xvi] This is unusual. The image of the Great White North projected to Europe from the 1870s through to the 1920s was of verdant availability, lands familiar but absent of history, cleared of 'Indians'. According to the posters, Canada was terra nullius ready to be filled by hard working, fair-skinned people. But following the flood of European economic migrants, the country, looking to settle into itself, rediscovered its First Peoples. Romanticised, pre-Treaty 'Indians' and their art—totem poles, Inuit carvings, and tipis—became integral to Canada's visual identity. The grafting of the Canadian sapling to Native roots helped the adolescent country seem more mature. First Nations and Inuit exotic difference also distinguished the nation from its European forbearers and southern neighbour. The decline of 'Indians' as a cultural marker of Canada in Expo's official media could be read as a desire to repress images associated with the old Dominion of Canada brand. However, given the renewed efforts to assimilate 'Indians'[xvii] at that time, this absence seems more like a reissue of the terra nullius theme. More generously, perhaps it was simply a failure of imagination at a moment of crisis. Expo content managers appear perplexed about how to represent Natives who were transforming from subjects to agents, from 'Indians' to Indigenous. They seem unsure about how to spin Indigenous resistance into a Canadian nationalist narrative. Associating museum 'Indians' with the refreshed Canada brand was not modern, and these new 'Indians' were too contemporary to be apprehended.

Many of the Indians of Canada Pavilion displays perpetuated a paternalistic and colonial attitude toward First Peoples. As Randal Rogers, points out, in a pamphlet explaining one of the displays, an anonymous author writes: "trees, shrubs, plants and rocks symbolize the Indian's harmony with nature…. With him it is the sun and the moon which regulate the passing of time. Any clock-regulated timetable is repugnant to him. The school bell startles him."[xviii] The text composes Native people as not only outside of contemporaneity but also modernity. They cannot adapt to technology. This 'Indian' is a monolithic representation designed to contain people from many First Nations into a comprehensive, yet incomprehensible, anti-modern 'him'. He is not Man; he is the reverse, the foil of Man. He is what Man must over-come. Among the "trees, shrubs, plants and rocks," Indians are not 'Man' but part of 'His World', part of the environment Man dominates. This is not simply a metaphoric device. On August 10 of the Expo year, an amendment to the constitution finally recognized the existence of Aboriginal Australians. Not

being named in the first constitution (1900) meant that they were not recognized as inhabitants of their own continent. The absent words un-named, dispossessed and disenfranchised them. They were un-recognized as humans. They were literally categorized, by default, as part of the landscape.

The Indians of Canada Pavilion was the first national Native exhibition to be produced by First Nations people. While not free from government influence, colonial display and gender conventions, it had enough sovereign Native management, content and innovation that Indigenous curators claim it as the birth of Indigenous curation.[xix] It is important to understand the event from an Indigenous point of view. A colonial gaze sees the Pavilion as 'Indians' learning to play the white man's curatorial game. An Indigenous perspective recognizes the gathering as a continuation of Native display culture, and as a political intervention announcing the stirrings of a collective new identity. Original inhabitants of Turtle Island held inter-National exhibitions of art, culture, technology, trade, power and status long before contact. The potlatch ban (1884) and the Indian Act's (1876) prohibitions on 'Indian' dances and gatherings, including powwow, were only lifted sixteen years before Expo. While these activities persisted in secret, they were difficult to revive in public given decades of criminalization and the shame instilled in children in Indian Residential Schools. Nevertheless, by the mid-60s, powwow resurged. The Indians of Canada Pavilion is part of this revival. It too gathered Native people—artists, curators, and hostesses—from many First Nations to share their cultures, publically embody their difference from Canada, and create new relationships and knowledge among themselves.

Indigenous has recently emerged as the preferred term for the original inhabitants of a territory. But the word is not just a polite synonym for previous labels. It signals a new type of consciousness, person and collective. Indigenous refers to First Peoples from around the globe that recognize they have greater sympathy with each other than they do with their colonizers. While 'Indian' and 'Aboriginal' were imperial impositions, Indigenous, though also a product of occupation, is authored by contemporary First Peoples. Indigenous is an inter-National set of relationships and discourses that includes but exceeds local, tribal affiliation. Indigenous people know about Native cultures beyond their own; they read books and articles and watch shows about other Indigenous peoples; they travel to those territories and confer with their knowledge keepers; they produce art and ideas that while inspired by their local cultures are not confined by them. Indigenous includes mobile, discursive and display spaces that are a part of and apart from dominant and local cultures. I will flesh this concept more fully in the conclusion, but introduce it here so we can better understand the innovations of the Pavilion. The Pavilion is Indigenous because it is contemporary. By contemporary I mean not just existing at the moment but also engaged in ideas and activities that are part of a shared international discourse that is related to but different from customary culture. Natives who are contemporary are Indigenous. Indigenous refers not to past peoples but to current states of Native political and creative consciousness and action.

While the Indians of Canada Pavilion continued First Nations display traditions and showed customary culture from numerous northern Turtle Island nations, there are sections that express a common Indigeneity; contemporary, political and collective consciousness. Numerous text and image panels showed how First Nations people (Inuit and Metis were not included) currently lived and suffered under colonization, broken Treaty promises and systemic racism. The

exhibition displaced the 'disappearing Indian' narrative with proof of persistence. It also provided evidence that this continuance was often miserable due to systematic oppression. The Pavilion's controlling narrative was not the assimilationist one of Native destruction followed by their re-emergence as 'Canadians', but a separatist story of Native endurance despite Canada. As curator Tom Hill (Seneca) explained in 1976: "The government really wanted a positive image in that pavilion and what they got was the truth. That's what really shocked them the most."[xx] It is important to remember that though called "Canada's Indian Pavilion" it was separate from the Canada Pavilion; it was a private Pavilion, [xxi] a temporary sovereign display territory.

In *Expo 67*, an account of the Fair written a year later, an anonymous author reflects on the Indians of Canada Pavilion:

> "The 65-foot totem pole is not the only thing that makes the visitor feel small. If he is a 'paleface', the tour of the pavilion is akin to running the gauntlet. The documents, drawings, works of art and photographs of contemporary conditions are accompanied by unkind comments about what the white man has done to the original Canadians."[xxii]

That the author does not dispute the presented facts but instead focuses on his abused feelings indicates the affective power of the exhibit. It was designed not only to educate but also to reshape attendee's experiential subject position. The narrator of the above passage, for example, is compelled to forgo neutrality. In that space he reckons himself not just as a viewer but a 'white man'. He is aware, too, that there are other than white ways to experience the Pavilion, but he cannot express them. Unlike a report, book or article that is read in private by an unseen body, the body in this Pavilion was made a visible, implicated participant. The "gauntlet" section included an arcing collage of contemporary Native faces. In that chamber, settlers become visible to themselves and others as white and a minority. By calling himself a "'pale face'," the writer positions himself within the 'cowboys and Indians' logic of the time, and critiques it—in so far as he registers his discomfort at being typecast in a binary that feels absurd now that he is its subject rather than author. Further discomfort comes from being subjected to the Indigenous gazes that surrounded him. He feels "small." He experiences the pressure of the display's specific address. He is exactly the sort of person the texts call into being—Canadian, which is not-Native. You can imagine how white Canadians might have felt in that space. They would have been subject to the gaze of people from other countries. Perhaps they would have felt a sense of responsibility, the need to compose a response—voiced or not—to explain their relation to the exhibit, to the continued colonial occupation of Native territories and inhumane treatment of First Nations people.

The Indians of Canada Pavilion offered a significant shift in Native display and reception. It would have been for most Canadians their first exposure to exhibit about First Nations people authored by members of those communities. That 'Indians' were in bad shape was not news. That 'they' did not consider themselves responsible for their plight and were not grateful for the gift of 'civilization', but in fact held Canada responsible for the loss of their land and culture and for their degraded state must have jolted many. That *Canada's* 'Indians' aired the country's dirty laundry at an international showcase embarrassed some. That 'Indians' not only had this sanctioned platform to prove their case to the world, but that they designed it so eloquently and convincingly, must also have had an impact. People must have rethought their assumptions about

'Indian' intelligence, complacency and capabilities, and settler colonial benevolence. The Pavilion was a wake-up call to settler complicity and responsibility.[xxiii]

According to the Canadian imaginary of a half-century ago, the country consisted of two founding—white, Christian—nations (Britain and France), newly reconciling. Recognizing that First Nations, Inuit, and Métis were foundational to the past, present and future of these lands, and that many do not consider themselves Canadian but as belonging to sovereign Indigenous nations, was only admissible to public consciousness two generations later. However, the internationalism of World Fairs required an expanded vision concerning race and ethnicity, and Canada's rebrand chose a tentative test drive of multiculturalism (rather than engage Indigenous people). It was an opportunity to distinguish the new world from the old and position Canada as a leader. While the manual for Expo's Canadian hostesses shows only Caucasian women, some of their 1,500 hostesses[xxiv] were of-colour, and fourteen Indigenous[xxv] "girls"[xxvi] were especially recruited to display Canadian enlightenment. While a tokenistic gesture,[xxvii] the physical fact of these confident young women, the many of-colour folks in other pavilions, as well as the numerous other-than-white visitors, must have encouraged many to widen their collective imaginary concerning the hue and shade range of humanity. Perhaps a few minoritized Canadians also recognized themselves in the living mosaic.

In 1967, the conceptual cement bonding the tiles of the Canadian cultural mosaic to these territories had yet to set. And attempts to pave Natives into or under this matrix were met with resistance. First Nations, Inuit, and Métis are prior to, and despite Canada. The mosaic, as it was conceived at that time, was not just a metaphor but an ideology, soon be Federal policy, designed to replace Indigenous rights and sovereignty with a status as just one minority culture among others. From an Indigenous point of view, official multiculturalism seemed like an attempt to re-set history, erase Treaty agreements and dismiss the special status of First Peoples. Multiculturalism wished us into history rather than futurity. It celebrated 'Indian' culture as a screen to hide third world living conditions of the folks who produced the culture. The Hawthorn-Tremblay report[xxviii] (1967) laid bare the depth of the deprivation. Natives were at the bottom of every measure of wellbeing. Indian Residential Schools still existed in 1967; the 60s Scoop—the removal of children from their families and (dis)placing them with non-Indigenous families—flourished; Métis were not yet recognized by the Constitution; Canada granted status 'Indians' the right to vote just seven years earlier, and Quebec was a year from do so. People still spoke of the 'Indian problem' and, its assimilationist solution, the infamous White Paper (1969), was being drafted.[xxix] This was the unsettled ground over which the mosaic was being laid. Indigenous political and cultural leaders were having none of this Bobby Gimby-style "Ca-Na-Da," one that tried to convert "one little, two little, three little Indians" into "Canadians." In 1967, the repressed content of Canadian consciousness simmered.

Myra Rutherford and Jim Millar argue that there is "little evidence that the Indian Pavilion, whatever *success de scandale* it enjoyed, had a lasting impact on public opinion or policymakers."[xxx] This seems a strange assessment. Expo logged 50 million visits, and many Canadians who did not see the Pavilion firsthand learned about it through the media.[xxxi] Clearly, it was an essential part of a larger rise in consciousness regarding First Nations, Inuit, and later, Métis, peoples. Proof of its radicality is the intensity of subsequent containment. Rogers[xxxii] explains that no later Expo has offered Native people such a relatively unfettered platform. When

it comes to representations of Indigenous people, Canadian involvement in World's Fairs has returned to apolitical, exotic and celebratory displays. Rutherford and Millar, however, suggest that the Pavilion did have an impact on Natives. This is difficult to measure. There is no account of how any Indigenous people attended, but the numbers are unlikely to be high. Outside of interested artists, curators and historians, the story of the Indians of Canada Pavilion, like that of the "Indian Group of Seven," were virtually unknown to the public, but also little known to Aboriginal people. Their stories were until very recently rarely taught. The Mackenzie Art Gallery's nationally touring exhibition "7: Professional Native Indian Artists Inc." (Michelle LaVallee, curator); LeeAnne Martin's Bob Boyer retrospective; and The National Gallery's Odijig, Morisseau, Beam, and Janvier retrospectives—all in the past four years—make history by *making* history. The Indians of Canada Pavilion was a beautiful wound, a display of Canada's irreconcilable Indigenous (dis)contents and some of their potential remedies. Its radical meanings once buried by neglect are being re-storied by contemporary Indigenous curators, art historians, and critical writers as a first step toward sovereign Indigenous display territories within colonial institutions.

Sovereign Indigenous display territories are exhibition spaces managed by Indigenous people. The most separatist forms are ceremonies held in a Native language, enacted by Native people on their territory. As discussed earlier, 'Indigenous' means engaged in contemporary discourses with other Native people and with non-Native ideas and forms. Sovereign Indigenous display territories can, therefore, occur as interventions in colonial institutions. Significantly, even in so thoroughly colonial a World's Fair as Chicago's Columbian Exposition of 1893, which celebrated Columbus' landing, there were moments of Native agency, intervention and resistance. Just outside the Fair walls, for example, some Inuit set up an "Esquimaux Village," "and won a lawsuit against their previous exposition for unfair labor treatment."[xxxiii] In addition, Emily Sanders explains that

> Native Americans also used the World's Fair as an opportunity to push back against inauthentic portrayals and to represent themselves. Simon Pokagon recited his speech at the Exposition entitled Red Man's Greeting, condemning the malicious treatment and wrongful perceptions of American Indians. Pokagon later formed a relationship with the mayor of Chicago, who helped him to lobby in Washington D.C. for compensation of misappropriated lands.[xxxiv]

Indigenous designates First Peoples everywhere as a self-conscious collective made possible by rapid and relatively inexpensive travel and electronic media, and the desire among Native elites to understand their construction under colonialism by comparing notes with similarly positioned peoples. An Indigenous person recognizes that First Peoples are united by mutual *negative* formation under homologous colonial conditions, and, *positively*, by sharing similar relationships to land and each other. Indigeneity is the activity of awakening to these facts and their deep meanings. indigeneity is collectively imagining futures that include us as central characters, rather than as part of the landscape.

I will conclude with a caution. If the meanings of Indigenous being and production primarily circulate in the dominant, non-Indigenous circuit, 'Indigenous' is in danger of becoming a species of "Man' ideology for Aboriginal folks. 'Indigenous' is an abstraction, a meta-fiction,

that if taken too seriously in one direction leads to cosmopolitanism. That is, the *feeling* of being at home everywhere, rather than the fact of being at home anywhere. Cosmopolitanism really means feeling at home only in the insulated bubbles reserved for similar meta-people: hotels, airports, galleries, museums, universities, conferences, the space of the 'professional', even the space of the flaneur plugged into an iPod while walking through Paris; the readers of the New Yorker or Flash Art—the bubble of English spoken in a non-English land; etc.

A danger for Aboriginal folks is if they begin to identify with this mobile invention, the Indigenous elite, and perform as one, they may weaken their base identity, affiliations and meanings. The Indigenous artist or curator is only Indigenous because he or she is first Native of a specific people and place. If a First Nations, Inuit, or Metis artist or curator were to be assimilated into the Art-World-Indigenous, the cosmopolitan Indigenous—rather than the Indigenous possibility produced by Indigenous discourse—they would surely feel a sense of elation that comes from being a free-radical; a small, mobile and intelligent unit flowing through an insulated circuit. Such a person plays with Indigenous signifiers but is unplugged from their symbolic, living and informing source: the people and places that generate their non-ironic heart.

The contemporary Art World is a complex system fuelled by capital and novelty, among other forces. Its agendas and meanings are rarely compatible with traditional Indigenous worldviews; however, in this cacophonous cultural moment, nearly every expression, including Indigenous ones, are permitted and can find a space (as long as someone is willing to pay for it). However, Indigenous presence in the current system is contingent not sovereign. First Nations, Inuit, and Metis artists and curators need to be wary that they are not swept into the Art World as a momentary novel bit, easily carried along then replaced by the next novel bit. Another path for 'Indigenous' is not like 'Man' discourse in that it is not primarily a subject of a globalized power system. While we are all contained within these larger systems, our consciousness can align itself with alternative ones. Such knowing leads to action and to the creating of alternative space for being other-wise.

---

[i] A version of this paper was delivered as an illustrated talk at *Revisioning the Indians of Canada Pavillion: Ahzhekewada (Let Us Look Back),* a conference for Indigenous curators, artists, critics, historians and scholars. It was a co-production of OCAD University and the Aboriginal Curatorial Collective. It was held at the OCAD, Toronto, Oct. 15-16, 2011.

[ii] Dominion Day, July 1, was renamed Canada Day in 1982.

[iii] http://www.pressreader.com/canada/edmonton-journal/20140630/281526519148358, accessed June 24, 2017.

[iv] In 1967, 'Indian' was the term used to indicate what we now call First Nations people in the northern territories of Turtle Island (Canada). It was sometimes used more generically to include Inuit people. I use it in single quotations when referencing how the word was used at the time. In every other case, I try to be more specific and indicate whether First Nations, Inuit, and/or Métis are the subject or if the subject is more generally Indigenous. Please see my thoughts later in the paper regarding the contemporary meanings and uses for the term Indigenous.

[v] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=18-oRTLIe3I, accessed June 24, 2017. Sung to the tune of American folk song,

"One Little Two Little Three Little Indians."

[vi] Jennings, Julianne. "The History of 'Ten Little Indians': How did the genocidal nursery rhyme come about?" *Indian Country Today*, Oct. 11, 2012. https://indiancountrymedianetwork.com/culture/social-issues/the-history-of-ten-little-indians/, accessed June 26, 2017. Another version of the lyrics is about African American deaths and stereotypes.

[vii] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World's_fair, accessed June 24, 2017.

[viii] Jonassohn, Kurt. "On A Neglected Aspect Of Western Racism." December 2000, Montreal Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies. http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/979954/1/A-MIGS__Occasional_Paper_Series__On_A_Neglected_Aspect_Of_Western_Racism.pdf

[ix] ibid. Jonassohn.

[x] Leja, Michael. Reframing *Abstract Expressionism: Subjectivity and Painting in the 1940s*. New haven: Yale University Press. 1993. 203-74.

[xi] I am using 'he' and 'his' in this section to reflect the gendered use of the Man discourse of the time.

[xii] Pratt, Richard H. *Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction* (1892), 46–59. Reprinted in Richard H. Pratt, "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites," *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880–1900* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 260–271. http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/4929/, accessed July 5, 2017.

[xiii] Woodstock might be seen as the opposite of Expo, a rejection of a Disneyesque utopia and desire for something in the Romantic tradition.

[xiv] The phrase, from the Bible (Joshua 9:21), is a familiar pejorative in Canada when critiquing the country's reliance on natural resources rather than manufacturing. It was first used in this context by Minister of Finance Leonard Tilley in 1879: "The time has arrived when we are to decide whether we will be simply hewers of wood and drawers of water…or will rise to the position, which, I believe Providence has destined us to occupy." http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/confederation/023001-4000.79-e.html, accessed June 29, 2017.

[xv] In addition to the fact that the country has a large land mass (nearly 10 million square km) and relatively few people (20 million in 1967), the historical and increasing divisions between French and English settlers, Indigenous struggle of autonomy, the huge numbers of migrants from all over the world, Canadians were reluctant nationalists. For example, Oh Canada was not proclaimed as the national anthem until 1980.

[xvi] I am referring here to the official media produced by Expo prior to the actual event. Once it opened, media in Canada and around the world took interest in the Indian's of Canada pavilion, Indigenous and of-colour hostesses, and other non-white aspects of the site. My suggestion is a before and after argument that the settler Canadian imaginary was altered by these displays of difference and that it helped enable the later push toward official multiculturalism.

[xvii] In the White Paper (1969), Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and Jean Chrétien, his Minister of Indian Affairs, proposed the elimination of the Indian Act and the finally assimilation of Indigenous peoples. It was met with strong opposition and helped spur increased Indigenous rights activism.

[xviii] Rodgers, Randal Arthur. *Man and His World: an Indian, a Secretary and a Queer Child. Expo 67 and the Nation in Canada*. MA thesis. Concordia University. 1999. 28.

[xix] *Revisioning the Indians of Canada Pavillion: Ahzhekewada (Let Us Look Back)* was a 2011 symposium co-produced by OCAD University and the Aboriginal Curatorial Collective, and held at the OCAD campus in Toronto, Oct. 15-16, 2011.

[xx] Phillips, Ruth; with Sherry Brydon. "'Arrow of Truth': The Indians of Canada Pavillion at Expo 67." *Museum Pieces: Toward the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*. McGill-Queens University Press: Montreal and Kingston. 2011. 27-47. Millar, Jim and Myra Rutherford. *"It's Our Country": First Nations' Participation in the Indian Pavilion at Expo 67*. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association / Revue de la Société historique du Canada*, vol. 17, n° 2. 2006. P. 27.

[xxi] Ibid., Rodgers, 21.

[xxii] *Expo 67*, Toronto: T. Nelson, 1968, 118. Cited in Millar, Jim and Myra Rutherford. *"It's Our Country": First Nations' Participation in the Indian Pavilion at Expo 67*. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association / Revue de la Société historique du Canada*, vol. 17, n° 2. 2006. 160.

[xxiii] Millar and Rutherford (2006, p. 166-8) review both Indigenous and mainstream reception.

[xxiv] http://expolounge.blogspot.ca/2006/09/expo-hostess.html, accessed June 24, 2017. I could not find a number for

the of-colour hostesses. There were also an unknown number of male hosts. A photo in this article, http://expo67.ncf.ca/expo_67_news_p31.html (accessed June 24, 2017) shows an unnamed Indigenous male host. For an image of some of the multi-racial hostesses, see: http://www.museemccord.qc.ca/app/uploads/2015/11/e000990933-2-1158x800.jpg

[xxv] I could not find official numbers, but an article by Rosemary Speirs, "Indians Migrating to Expo Pavilion," posted by the Canadian Press, Aug. 9, 1967, http://expo67.ncf.ca/expo_67_news_p31.html claims there were fourteen Native hostess, accessed June 15, 2017.

[xxvi] Kirkman, Emily. *Fashioning Identity: The Hostesses of Expo 67*. MA Art History thesis, Concordia University, Montreal, 2011. http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/15178/1/Kirkman_MA_F2011.pdf, accessed June 28, 2017.

[xxvii] Official multiculturalism was Federal policy in 1971.

[xxviii] https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1291832488245/1291832647702, accessed June 26, 2017. It is in this report that the concept of 'Indians' as having equal and additional rights as settler Canadians ("citizens plus") is established.

[xxix] "The 1969 White Paper (formally known as the "Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy, 1969") was a Canadian government policy paper that attempted to abolish previous legal documents pertaining to Indigenous peoples in Canada, including the Indian Act and treaties, and assimilate all "Indian" peoples under the Canadian state." http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/the-white-paper-1969/, accessed June 26, 2017.

[xxx] Millar, Jim and Myra Rutherford. *"It's Our Country": First Nations' Participation in the Indian Pavilion at Expo 67*. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association / Revue de la Société historique du Canada*, vol. 17, n° 2. 2006. 148-173.

[xxxi] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expo_67, accessed June 24, 2017.

[xxxii] In conversation, Sept., 2011.

[xxxiii] Sanders, Emily. "The Chicago World's Fair and American Indian Agency." *Cultural Survival*. Feb. 11, 2015. https://www.culturalsurvival.org/news/1893-chicago-worlds-fair-and-american-indian-agency

[xxxiv] ibid, Sanders.