Université de Montréal

Unsettling Expo 67: Developmentalism & Colonial Humanism At Montreal's World Exhibition

Par Romney Copeman

Département d'histoire

Faculté des arts et des sciences

Mémoire présenté en vue de l'obtention du grade de

Maître ès art (M.A.) en histoire

Juillet 2017

Résumé

Lors d'Expo 67, l'événement phare des célébrations du centenaire de la Confédération canadienne, trois différents sites exposant plusieurs aspects des héritages du colonialisme ont été inaugurés. Premier site à l'étude, le Pavillon des Indiens du Canada débordait des messages autochtones anticoloniaux, du vol des territoires aux critiques des pensionnats. Pourtant, le Pavillon du Canada, le deuxième site de l'étude, présentait un discours colonial qui incluait des représentations canadiennes et autochtones au sein d'un discours d'humanisme mondial. Au Pavillon Canadien, les représentations des peuples autochtones ont été utilisées en juxtaposition avec celles d'une société de colons présentée comme supérieure et mieux développée. Le troisième site à l'étude, l'auditorium Du Pont du Canada, a accueilli, lors des conférences Noranda et des Conférences internationales Maclean-Hunter, une cohorte internationale de délégués provenant d'une intelligentsia active à l'échelle mondiale. Les deux séries de conférences présentaient des discours néocoloniaux sur la meilleure façon de réorganiser les sociétés, les peuples et les cultures locales, nationales et internationales. Sur ces sites, les arguments coloniaux et néocoloniaux sur le « développement » s'opposaient à la rhétorique anticoloniale du pavillon des Indiens du Canada et des conférenciers tels que Karl Myrdal et Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier. L'analyse de ces trois sites à travers le prisme dichotomique colonial/anticolonial démontre qu'Expo 67 était un lieu de discours localisé de l'humanisme colonial et du développementalisme. Les pavillons et les intervenants ont intégré leur propre perception du colonialisme et du développement à un éventail plus large de discours interconnectés sur la valeur des êtres humains.

Mots-clés : Expo 67, anticolonialisme, colonialisme, néocolonialisme, autochtones, Canada, humanisme, développementalisme, mondialisation

Abstract

At Expo 67, Canada's Centennial Celebrations marquee event held in Montreal, three different sites grappled with the legacies of colonialism from multiple perspectives. The first site under study is the Indians of Canada Pavilion, which was replete with anticolonial messages about Canadian land theft to criticism of residential schools and Indian agents. At the opposite end of the Canada Complex stood the Canadian Pavilion, which retained a colonial discourse of reimagining Canadian and Indigenous representations within a wider discourse of global humanism. Canadian Pavilion representations of Indigenous peoples were continually used as a backdrop to a supposedly superior, more 'developed' settler society. The third site, the Du Pont of Canada Auditorium, played host to members of an international cohort of global intelligentsia during the Noranda Lectures and the Maclean-Hunter International Forum. The two speakers series featured articulations of western neocolonial ambitions on how best to reorganize local, national, and international societies, peoples, and cultures. At these three Expo 67 sites, colonial and neocolonial views on 'development' contrasted sharply with the anticolonial rhetoric of the Indians of Canada Pavilion and speakers such as Karl Gunnar Myrdal, Kushwant Singh, and Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier. Analysing the three sites along the colonial/anticolonial dichotomy demonstrates how Expo 67 served as a site of localized discourse of colonial humanism and developmentalism in which each participating pavilion and presenter added their own perception of colonialism and development to a wider array of interlocking discourses on the value of human beings in globalizing societies.

Keywords: Expo 67, anticolonialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, Indigenous peoples, Canada, humanism, developmentalism, globalization

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

MHIF – Maclean-Hunter International Forum

NL – Noranda Lectures

Acknowledgements

Sometimes what goes without saying must be said. La communauté des étudiants en histoire à l'Université de Montréal m'a apporté des leçons fondamentales quant à l'importance de sortir de sa petite communauté linguistique montréalaise. Parmi toutes les perspectives enrichissantes de mes collègues, celles de Mélissa Bureau Capuano, Jérémie Deschenes, David Cadieux, Yanick Turcotte et Benjamin Brouillet étaient particulièrement enrichissantes. It is empowering to know how many of us are beginning to listen to Indigenous voices as we take steps towards the various projects of decolonization outlined by Indigenous leaders across Turtle Island. *Mni Wiconi*.

Both Concordia University and Université de Montréal's history faculties and students provided fertile ground for intellectual and personal growth. At Concordia, I would like to thank Professors Gavin Taylor, Shannon McSheffrey, and particularly Peter Gossage, whose invaluable guidance and wisdom set me on my present path. At UdeM, I would like to thank Professors Michèle Dagenais, Denyse Baillargeon, and Thomas Wien for sharing their expertise and teachings. Above all, I would like to thank Professor David Meren, whose deep intellectual grooves bear the hallmarks of the best academia has to offer. It was a privilege to learn about the vast intellectual forest that was all too easy to get lost in as he pointed earnestly to a challenging and fruitful trail. Fortunately, Indigenous guides know the way out, and it is to all Indigenous survivors of colonialism, the authors, teachers, dreamers, and preachers, past, present, and future, that this work owes the most. Et surtout à la famille de Carmin et Marceline, je vous remercie pour avoir pris les premiers pas pour que je puisse voir le chemin. *Miigwetch!*

To my parents, Russell and Bev, for proving time and again that there are no limits to unconditional love, and to my siblings Alex and Emma, whose heartfelt support is immeasurable. And to my Bubby, Barbara Akerman, for her love and smile that lights up the room, and to my late Zaide, Max Akerman, for his humour and the many memories we all cherish. *Toda raba, Zaide*. Most importantly, I would like to thank my wife-to-be, Romina Nadeem, who guided and healed me with love, support, patience, and grace through a very challenging project and injurious winters. Romina, *meri pyaari*, your loving nature and sense of humour were always there when I needed them most. I dedicate this thesis to you and, of course, to Blueberry, my favourite fuzzy study buddy, who listened to countless drafts with rapt attention.

Preface

Expo 67 contained a myriad of national and international narratives. Exactly 50 years later, I have been fortunate enough to interact with people who visited and participated in Expo who live in Montréal. Expo lives on not just in the metaphysical space of cultural and political history but in the memories of Expo's visitors. Just as with any site, Expo 67, with its more than 50 million return visitors, has an abundance of memories attached to it. Most people I spoke with who remembered Expo had a physiological response to hearing the words 'Expo 67,' with many people smiling and opening up as the nostalgic feelings Expo inspired resurfaced some fifty years later. To study relatively recent, local history is to share a space among those who remember the events of the past.

Some Montrealers who were kind enough to share their memories recalled the Indians of Canada Pavilion, with the majority recalling feelings of wonder when the visually spectacular exhibition opened its doors. Expo 67 has an almost mythical, legendary status in Montréal, or, to use the words of Pierre Berton, "'Miracle" is the proper word.'[1] Though Expo 67 was indeed an incredible experience for those who remember it, the event, like any other event in history, was not completely enclosed from global and local tensions, some of which manifested onsite. To look back on these tensions is not to undermine the validity of the positive human memories I encountered, but to highlight how selective we are in what we retain and what memories may have missed. Most people I spoke with were surprised to find out that Canada's residential schools policy was criticized on the same site their resoundingly positive memories were formed.

Why should a young researcher unsettle the memories of Canada's and Montreal's biggest celebration? Conversations about national celebratory moments can be recontextualized into the history of colonialism, and this thesis outlines how Expo 67 was no exception. Recontextualizing memories is a necessary step towards reminding settler society of the longer arc of the history of invasion and dispossession that forms the basis of Canada's expansion since European arrival, a history whose finality has not yet come to pass. To decentre settler and nationalist histories with the inclusion of Indigenous perspectives, to grapple with decolonization through histories, education, and memories, is to recognize that the injustices Indigenous people are recounting today have always been recounted in some form or another. Though the Indians of Canada broke new ground with its anticolonial messaging, Indigenous resistance dates back to the first time an

[1] Pierre Berton, *1967: The Last Good Year*, (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Ltd., 1997), 256.

Indigenous North American thought aloud that constant and invasive incursions into Indigenous spaces were unjust. I set out to learn about how Indigenous people participated in Expo 67 and how they were represented at the Canadian Pavilion to see if colonial compulsions were present onsite, and sure enough, they were.

Expo 67 articulated universalist aspirations that were undercut by colonial compulsions. The exhibition occurred during an accelerated period of the kidnapping of Indigenous children and their confinement in residential schools. *Unsettling Expo 67* is but one of many contributions to the Canadian anticolonial literature being produced by a growing cohort of students who engage with anticolonialism and the articulations of Indigenous communities and decolonized peoples worldwide. Our collective hope is that enough settlers will begin to listen to Indigenous peoples' narratives and messages so that fundamental changes to the settler-Indigenous relationship can take place. If the global humanistic notions at Expo 67 are to be realized, then listening to Indigenous peoples is a necessary first step.

Introduction

Canadian Colonial Compulsions at Expo 67

'You can't reconcile anything when you don't know what's happening.'[1]
Former Indians of Canada Pavilion Commissioner General
Andrew Tanakohate Delisle, December 8th, 2016

On August 4th, 1967, Andrew Tanakohate Delisle, the Commissioner General of the Indians of Canada Pavilion, along with numerous Indigenous chiefs, received a number of high-profile Canadians at the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Expo 67 Commissioner General Pierre Dupuy, Governor General Roland Michener, and Indian Affairs and Northern Development Minister Arthur Laing were all in attendance for the Indians of Canada Day festivities. Minister Laing's temperament had surely changed from the displeasure he displayed only six months prior, when he had threatened to shut down the Indians of Canada Pavilion just before Expo opened as a response to the pavilion's overt anticolonial criticism of Canada.[2] At the Place des Nations, a crowd of 5,000 spectators witnessed nine different Indigenous chiefs each give one of the top Expo officials a headdress, including Commissioner General Dupuy. Each official was also given an Indigenous name, symbolizing their adoption into the different nations and the new responsibilities towards the nation that adoption entailed.[3] The Indians of Canada Day featured speeches about the importance of the role of Indigenous people in Canada at the height of Expo 67, the marquee event of Canada's Centennial Celebrations.

The 1967 International and Universal Exhibition, fondly labelled and remembered as Expo 67, was the crown jewel of an uplifting year that saw Canadians take part in festivities throughout the country. With Montreal, then Canada's glittering cosmopolitan centre of trade and diversity, playing host, Expo truly was a sight to remember. As the exhibition opened its doors to more than 50 million return visitors, Canadian nationalists sought to reconfigure

[1] Romney Copeman, 'Interview with Andrew Tanahokate Delisle,' transcript of an oral history interview conducted on December 8th, 2016, [unpublished], 1:27:00.
[2] See Peter McFarlane, *Brotherhood to Nationhood: George Manuel and the Making of the Modern Indian Movement*, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1993), 90, in Richard Gordon Kicksee, 'Scaled Down to Size: Contested Liberal Commonsense and the Negotiation of "Indian Participation" in the Canadian Centennial Celebrations and Expo '67, 1963-1967,' (M.A. Thesis: Queen's University, 1995), 184.
[3] Among the peoples represented were Mohawk, Blackfoot, Kwakwaka'wakw, Micmac, Dene, Innu, Squamish, Ojibway, and Haida. 'Nine Expo Bosses Honored With Titles, Headdresses,' *The Montreal Gazette*, August 5, 1967.

Canada's national image at the Canadian Pavilion and offer the exhibition's visitors, both Canadian and international, a new set of symbols to adopt. Meanwhile, Indigenous people gravitated to the Indians of Canada Pavilion in order to experience authentic narratives of Indigenous life, history, and cultures which were sorely lacking amongst the references to Indigenous people at the Canadian Pavilion. The two pavilions, with the Canadian Pavilion at the centre and the Indians of Canada Pavilion on the periphery of Expo's Canada Complex, stood in stark contrast to each other in their version of truth-telling, evidenced in the latter's portrayal of the colonial relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples.

While the Indians of Canada Day celebrations brought new names and new people into Indigenous communities through the adoption ceremony, the day was made possible because of the Indians of Canada Pavilion. The pavilion was designed by both Indigenous people and Bureau of Indian Affairs officials. The pavilion planners met with regional Indigenous leaders in Montreal, Nova Scotia, Edmonton, and Vancouver, and drew from consultations that had been held by the National Indian Council.[4] Though Bureau officials sought to retain as much influence as possible on the message, Indigenous people resisted attempts by the officials to water down their message of dissatisfaction with their historical and contemporary treatment by successive British and Canadian governments.[5] Clashes between Indigenous peoples and white Canadians took on new meaning as a ground-breaking pan-Indigenous narrative was presented at the pavilion. Pavilion Commissioner General Delisle recounted how Expo 67 marked a fundamental shift in how Indigenous people were viewed in Canada. He explained that 'people really got interested' and 'were really receptive.' Indigenous visitors and pavilion planners also began to understand themselves in relation to each other, as different Indigenous groups came together to work on the pavilion and learned about their common experience.[6] Diversity and commonalities among Indigenous groups became more apparent due to the shared experience of colonialism at the hands of successive Euro-American governments.

On the other side of the Canada Complex from the Indians of Canada Pavilion stood the Canadian Pavilion. The pavilion contained two modernist structures designed to represent

[4] Indians of Canada Pavilion, 'The Indians of Canada Pavilion Expo 67,' ([Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967?]), 3. The National Indian Council was formed in 1962 and included Andrew Tanahokate Delisle, who became the Commissioner General of the Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo.
[5] For a thoroughly researched account of confrontations during the planning stages, see Kicksee, 'Scaled Down To Size,' 1995.
[6] Copeman, 'Interview with Andrew Tanakohate Delisle,' 1:26:00.

different aspects of an emerging Canadian civic nationalism.[7] The People Tree, a 66-foot high structure with semi-transparent leaves tinted orange, red, and yellow to match Canada's coniferous forests in the fall, stood as an emblem of Canadian government attempts to reconfigure national identification through the visual representation of a multiethnic tree. Of the 1,500 colourful "leaves," 700 depicted Canadians in their every-day life. The tree would be lit from its interior at night, glowing and reinforcing its status as 'the centre of visual attention' at the pavilion.[8] Adjacent to the People Tree stood the Katimavik, an Inuktitut word for 'meeting place,' which resembled an inverted pyramid that provided visitors the opportunity to observe their surroundings from 200 feet in the air with a 360 degree view of Expo and downtown Montreal. The Katimavik's lowest point was just above the pavilion exhibition area. As one of the pavilion guide books, *Widening Horizons*, explained, 'Spreading outward and reaching up towards the sky, it suggests the constant expansion of Canada's horizons. It reflects Canada's devotion to the tenets of humanism.'[9] Another simple exhibition structure, a British Columbian fir tree stripped of its branches and needles with a billowing Canadian flag, adopted in 1965. The pavilion's exhibitions and modernist structures provided new symbolic referents for Canada, including Inuit linguistic appropriations, humanism and expansion, and a multi-ethnic nation.

A short walk from the Canada Complex on Notre-Dame Island stood St. Helens Island, the second of two islands in the confluence of the St. Lawrence river that housed the majority of Expo 67 pavilions. In the 372-seat Du Pont of Canada Auditorium, elite international conferenciers presented their visions on how best to manage technology and global economics and populations at the Maclean-Hunter International Forum and the Noranda Lectures. Men and women considered influential, including UN ambassadors, businessmen, statespeople, and academics, gave speeches on global challenges facing the international community to an elite audience invited by the conference organisers. In their descriptions of populations and the urgency of decreasing birth rates coupled with "modernizing" people around the globe, certain neocolonial strains were woven into speakers' discourses on global humanity. Along with the Canadian and Indians of Canada Pavilion, the Du Pont Auditorium formed a third site home to

[7] See José Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006).
[8] Robin Bush, *My Home, My Native Land: A People and Their Growth*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), 3.
[9] François Hébert, 'Katimavik,' in *Widening Horizons: Katimavik and Interdependence*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), 3.

discourses on colonialism and anticolonialism at Montreal's Universal and International Exhibition.

By presenting and engaging in a dialogue on North American and world populations, the pavilions and speakers series drew on models of 'developmentalism,' which ordered human beings and peoples on a hierarchy based on interchangeable principles related to development. As Gilbert Rist explains, developmentalism rested on religious beliefs in material progress as a means for human betterment imparted through the 'signs and rituals' of 'shows, fairs and exhibitions of every kind (especially "world fairs")' which 'sustain the idea that "progress is under way," and the opening of a school or a dam in a distant country means that people can be made to believe that a better life is just around the corner.'[10] Euro-American countries saw themselves as generally more advanced technologically, politically, and even culturally, which rested on a comparison to Third World regions and peoples whom they viewed as 'underdeveloped.' A particularly striking example is that of Aurelio Peccei, who proclaimed during his lecture that 'Stagnation and underdevelopment in many nations accompany this uncontrolled population growth,' linking the need to reduce the rate of population increase in the Third World with the ambitions of 'development.'[11] Peccei drew from a similar developmentalist narrative present in the Canadian Pavilion, whereby 'underdeveloped' peoples served as a backdrop to a more 'developed,' model society. Developmentalists sought to 'accelerate the passage of traditional societies through a necessary yet destabilizing process in which older values, ideas, and structures gave way to the liberal, capitalist, and democratic ways of life.'[12] Meanwhile, Indigenous peoples took part in reshaping their own role and identity within North America in an unprecedented medium at the Indians of Canada Pavilion, resoundingly rejecting the premise that the Canadian project of accelerating Indigenous development was wholly beneficial. Seen from this angle, Expo 67 was a particular site in a particular historical moment in which the self-actualization of Canadian nationalists, North American Indigenous peoples, and a global intellectual network of elites was taking place in order to renegotiate the terms of global, national, and local political struggles.

---

[10] Gilbert Rist, *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*, 4th ed., (London: Zed, 2014), 22. Rist does not mention Expo in particular, but applies the analysis to world fairs in general.
[11] Aurelio Peccei, 'Looking Ahead at Social and Economic Policy,' in *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, pp. 67-84, 74.
[12] Michael Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*, (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2011), 3.

Developmentalist ideology found fertile soil in Expo 67 due to its global focus, universalist pretentions, and its idealistic vision of global brotherhood. The universalization of mankind's accomplishments and challenges were best encapsulated by the overall Expo theme, 'Man and His World,' a reference to the 'cosmic humanism' of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. 'This central positioning of Man,' Kenneally and Sloan argue, 'and the idea that every visitor could simply step into the shoes of this idealized Everyman to survey the world, would serve as the event's ostensible unifying principle.'[13] The national and international achievements were promoted by the many pavilions based on their contribution to 'humanity 67,' as highlighted in a Canadian Pavilion guide book.[14] Visitors were given 'passports' instead of tickets, leading to the creation of a supranational space and all the possibilities of a newly-forming international society. The two islands that formed the majority of the Expo 67 site further reinforced the notion of a supranational space given that Notre-Dame Island, which housed the Canada Complex, was built in 1962 in the St. Lawrence River just south of downtown Montreal. An official Canadian Pavilion pamphlet characterized the island's new construction was reimagined as an 'unblemished metropolis' where 'there are no spirits crying for revenge, no monuments to the dead, no triumphal arches.'[15] The passports temporarily transformed the visitor into 'a citizen of the world, challenged to bear witness to the tremendous range of peoples and things on display, and consequently drawn into processes of cultural exchange.'[16]

Through a potentially inspiring set of transcendent, global humanist discourses presented to the visitor, the Euro-American version of a 'world-citizen' was characterized as a final developmental step which was achievable at Expo. However, Canadian ascension to the peak of Expo's international developmental hierarchy included an evacuation of Canada's history and its participation in the history of colonization. Thus Expo 67's ideal world citizen would evade acknowledging 'that western industrial growth had been achieved through a process of "underdevelopment" of the colonies in the colonial era, whereby the west had destroyed local industries and kept the economies of the non-western nations in a condition of stagnation for its

[13] Rhona Richman Kenneally and Johanne Sloan, eds., *Expo 67: Not Just a Souvenir* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 5.
[14] Term taken from Robin Bush, *My Home, My Native Land: A People and Their Growth*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), 26.
[15] Joseph Rudel-Tessier, 'Interdependence,' in *Widening Horizons*, 15.
[16] Kenneally and Sloan, eds., *Expo 67: Not Just A Souvenir*, 3-4.

own interests.'[17] The Indians of Canada Pavilion made such a project apparent in its anticolonial statements, refusing to indulge in the fantastical notion of a North American site void of history and reminding Euro-Canadian visitors in its first exhibit area that 'You have stolen our native land, our culture, our soul… and yet, our traditions deserved to be appreciated, and those derived from an age-old harmony with nature even merited being adopted by you.'[18]

In *Unsettling Expo 67*, I argue that Expo 67 served as a site of localized discourse of colonial humanism and developmentalism in which each participating pavilion and presenter added their own perception of colonialism and development to a wider array of interlocking discourses on the value of human beings. Specifically, I argue that the Indians of Canada Pavilion contained an anticolonial developmentalist discourse outside of Expo 67's general attempt at expressing technological and population changes as wholly beneficial to the planet. Meanwhile, only meters away, the Canadian Pavilion retained a colonial discourse of reifying Canadian and Indigenous representations, the latter of which were continually used as a backdrop to a supposedly superior, 'developed' settler society. Colonial discourses received both nourishment and criticism from a larger academic, political, and technocratic set of speeches that were presented in Expo 67's two major conferences, the Maclean-Hunter International Forum and the Noranda Lectures held at the Du Pont Auditorium. The three different sites on the grounds of Expo 67 represent different geographic focusses: Indigenous North Americans, North American settler-colonists, and a global network of intellectuals. In unpacking the colonial compulsions present at Expo 67, I seek to elucidate how Expo's themes of universality and humanism could not truly escape the settler-colonial ideological prism within which it was planned.

Unsettling Expo recounts the ways in which Canadian politicians, architects, artists, and administrators promoted discourses and a new set of symbols at Expo 67 and their relationship to ongoing practices of neocolonial globalization. Among the symbolic representations were Indigenous peoples, who themselves sought to reify what it meant to be an Indigenous person through the fostering of a pan-Indian identity, and Euro-American settler-colonists, who sought to reconfigure settler identity through the prism of Canadian nationalism. These two representations clashed at Expo as the Canadian state's goal of fostering a blossoming multi-

[17] Robert Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 50.
[18] Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, *The Memorial Album of the first category universal and international Exhibition held in Montreal from the twenty-seventh of April to the twenty-ninth of October nineteen hundred and sixty-seven*, (Toronto: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd: 1968), 118.

ethnic Canadian national identification could not override the fact that the state historically and continually invaded Indigenous lands. Indigenous people guarded their remaining lands from continued invasive extraction by teaching Canadians about Indigenous connectivity to nature and the spirit world. Furthermore, the representations of Indigenous peoples and settler-colonists were part of a wider global neocolonial narrative whose adherents and opponents took part in the Maclean-Hunter International Forum and the Noranda Lectures. In recounting the anticolonial, colonial and neocolonial discourses at Expo 67, I seek answers to the following questions: How were Indigenous people represented in both the Canadian and Indians of Canada Pavilions? How were Canadians represented in both pavilions? And what ideas were circulating at Expo 67 that informed the sets of representations of colonizing and decolonizing peoples?

As Commissioner General Dupuy fondly remarked, Expo 67 served to remind visitors that, though they may be 'confused by the turmoil of progress… there are ties of interdependence between them, a common destiny.'[19] Yet despite the Canadian humanistic rhetoric of Expo 67, the Centennial Celebrations were fraught with contradictions as Canada's policies of ethnic remodelling were enacted on both Canadians and Indigenous people, albeit in drastically different ways. The term 'Canadian' had been gaining in cultural currency throughout the country as the older English-Canadian favourite moniker 'British' was dropped. White Anglo-Canadians were leaving behind the overt identification with 'Britishness' that had come to be revered in many corridors of Canadian political and journalistic institutions in hopes of promoting civic nationalism. Civic nationalism allowed for a more inclusive identification than the ethnic nationalism it replaced.[20] This process of remaking Canada's national identity took centre stage at the Canadian Pavilion during Expo 67.

When the project of ethnic remodelling was applied to Indigenous people, Indigenous children were being forcibly removed from their parents' households and placed into a residential school system designed in the 1830s.[21] During the 1960s and 1970s in Canada, the 'Sixties Scoop' saw a drastic increase in the state-enforced removal and kidnapping of Indigenous children from their households in what the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation

[19] Pierre Dupuy, 'Preface,' *The [Expo 67] Memorial Album*, 7.
[20] See Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution*.
[21] See Helen May, Baljit Kaur, & Larry Prochner, *Empire, Education, and Indigenous Childhoods: Nineteenth-Century Missionary Infant Schools in Three British Colonies* (Farnham: Routledge, 2014), particularly chapters 1, 4, and 6.

Commission called 'cultural genocide.'[22] This made the incorporation of Indigenous cultures into the newly-woven Canadian ethnic mosaic only achievable by obfuscating Canadian colonial practices. Furthermore, the largest barrier in appropriating Indigenous peoples into the remodelled Canadian ethnic mosaic came from Indigenous people themselves.

Expo 67's a complex web of nationalistic and internationalist projects echoed a common refrain of contributing to the 'universal values' the exhibition was founded on. In promoting discourses of universality without the critical self-examination that Indigenous people asked white settlers to undergo, Expo planners engaged in discourses of 'whiteness.' As John Gabriel explains,

> The power of whiteness lies in a set of discursive techniques, including *exnomination*, that is the power not to be named; *naturalization*, through which whiteness establishes itself as the norm by defining 'others' and not itself; and *universalization*, where whiteness alone can make sense of a problem and its understanding becomes *the* understanding.[23]

Whiteness discourses replace white people's own roles in colonization with nationalistic histories. As Barnor Hesse explains, 'This hegemonic structure of "whiteness" forgets its contested antecedents, it forgets what 'others' remember; in effect this 'white amnesia' represses the historical context of racism because the threat of the 'racialised other' absorbs all attention.'[24] Seen in this light, Expo 67's universalist pretentions and combined with nationalistic histories gave the exhibition grounds a particular whiteness discourse.

In a wider historical context of North American Indigenous history, Indigenous participation at Expo 67 advanced a long-held tradition of negotiating anticolonial spaces in colonial projects. The differences between Indigenous colonial resistance before and at Expo 67 is that Expo contained a larger degree of Indigenous control over the messaging, a wide scope of that message, a longer duration of the message in a controlled environment, an unprecedentedly large audience, and the pan-Indigenous connections and research gathered by the pavilion planners. Euro-Canadian celebration organizers had envisioned Indigenous participation as a means to validate settler-colonial aspirations of nationalistic story-telling that included a limited and meticulously-structured role for Indigenous participants. Indigenous participants accepted the invitations and renegotiated the terms of their participation. H.V. Nelles recounted how Québec

[22] Truth and Reconcilation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, (Manitoba: TRC, 2015), 1.
[23] John Gabriel, *Whitewash: Racialized Politics and the Media*, (London: Routledge, 1998), 13.
[24] Barnor Hess, 'It's Your World: Discrepant M/Multiculturalisms,' *Social Identities*, 3:3, (1997), pp. 375-394, 87.

City's tercentenary celebrations were based on 'the dual propositions that history would make a nation and that history could best be understood in performance.'[25] These 'politics by other means' took place 'on a negotiated space of repressed differences.'[26] To Nelles, Indigenous peoples had been understood to be a 'primitive' backdrop for Quebecker identity and were caricaturized as 'show Indians' in Wild West Shows, while Indian Affairs administrators favoured imagery of 'diligent native schoolchildren, disciplined workers, and prudent farmers' at their exhibitions.[27] Johnathan Clapperton also demonstrated how Indigenous people participated in colonial celebrations with their own agendas and strategies, marking colonial celebrations with anticolonial politics.[28] Thus Indigenous people's participation in the exhibition was part of a wider historical tradition of renegotiating sites of colonial cultural celebrations to promote Indigenous identities and anticolonial ambitions.

When seen together, forcing children to undergo cultural genocide whilst promoting their cultural artifacts and symbols at an international exhibit on Canada's 100th birthday became a performative hallmark of Canadian colonial humanism. By Canadian colonial humanism, I mean the particular brand of humanism demonstrated by Canadian officials at Expo 67 that was inseparable from Canadian colonial ambitions of resource extraction in Indigenous territories. To exude characteristics of humanism within a colonial nation-state framework is not to erase the colonial ambitions of continued territorial consolidation, but to combine the two into a colonial humanism particular, though perhaps not unique, to Canada. As Gary Wilder demonstrated, the wider study of colonial humanism is applicable to a variety of colonial nation-states at various points in time. In his study of the French invasion in West Africa, Wilder explained that 'Colonial humanism was simultaneously universalizing and particularizing,' leading to an overarching narrative of inclusivity combined with subcategories of exclusivity.[29] As Patrick Wolfe argued in relation to Australian settler-colonialism:

> Though, in practice, Indigenous labour was indispensable to Europeans, settler-colonization is at base a winner-take-all project whose dominant feature is not exploitation but replacement. The logic of this project,

[25] H.V. Nelles, *The Art Of Nation-Building: Pageantry and Spectacle at Quebec's Tercentenary*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1999. 21.
[26] *Ibid*, 12, 13.
[27] *Ibid*, 173-74, 176-77.
[28] Jonathan Clapperton, "Naturalizing Race Relations: Conservation, Colonialism, and Spectacle at the Banff Indian Days," in *Canadian Historical Review*, 94:3 (2013): 349-379.
[29] Gary Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State: Négritude and Colonial Humanism between the Two World Wars*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 8.

> a sustained institutional tendency to eliminate the Indigenous population, informs a range of historical practices that might otherwise appear distinct – invasion is a structure not an event.[30]

Putting Expo 67 in the context of a colonial humanist project highlights the structure of invasion that forms the basis of the settler-colonial project of replacement. Re-examining Expo's colonial compulsions serve to highlight a specific time and place within the wider history and practice of Canadian colonialism.

Methodology and Sources

The point of departure for *Unsettling Expo 67* is to insert Expo 67 into the history of Canadian settler-colonialism and Indigenous resistance. Thus, secondary literature on decolonization, postcolonialism, development, race, and whiteness formed the basis of the analytical frameworks. From a geographic perspective, the chapters move from Indigenous peoples as resilient, distinct groups of human beings in the face of centuries of colonial invasion; to Canada's nationalistic reification as a colonial nation-state; and finally a set of conferences on globalization, technology, science, and progress. The chapters include a geographic scope from Indigenous peoples to settler society and finally to the intelligentsia of globalized modernity in hopes of capturing the wide expanse of anticolonial, colonial, and neocolonial ideologies present on the Expo site. The thesis rested on the initial hypothesis that Expo 67 could not wholly escape the racist project of cultural genocide enacted by successive British and Canadian governments on the Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island. Though a separate phenomenon, residential schools loomed large as the first year of research ended the summer of 2015, when the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission released its *Final Report*.[31]

The first step in the research phase was to consult Montreal's publicly-available archives. The City of Montréal archives proved fruitful, as knowledgeable archivists had readily-available documents of Montréal newspapers about Expo 67. The holdings at the Centre for Canadian Architecture and the McCord Museum contained interesting photographic material of Expo but little on the Indians of Canada Pavilion. McGill University's Canadian Architectural Collection contained helpful archival staff and a number of documents, including national pavilion pamphlets, which set the research in motion. The Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec

[30] Patrick Wolfe, *Settler-Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*, (London: Cassell, 1999), 163.
[31] Truth and Reconcilation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future*.

contained the only copy of the Expo 67 *Memorial Album* available to the public that I could find, an invaluable source. The use of available sources in Montreal served primarily to highlight what was retained of Expo in the host city.

Primary sources for chapter 1 relied on a wide range of sources, including a variety of newspaper articles from the municipal archives of the City of Montreal and an oral history interview conducted with Andrew Tanakohate Delisle in December of 2016. National Film Board films provided helpful visualizations of the interior and exterior of the pavilion. Among the works on the Indians of Canada Pavilion, those of Richard Gordon Kicksee and Judith Griffin stood out for their perspectives and source material. Kicksee's 'Scaled Down to Size' brought a rich source of archival material from Ottawa coupled with an enlightening contextual analysis of Indigenous participation in Centennial Celebrations.[32] Jane Griffith's 'One Little, Two Little, Three Canadians' contextualized the Indians of Canada Pavilion as an act of public pedagogy, which brought the pavilion into new light.[33] Myra Rutherdale and Jim Miller's '"It's Our Country"' also provided a helpful starting point and summary of available research on the pavilion.

Though the second and third chapters draw from a smaller variety of source material, it is more a reflection of the degree to which the source material was preserved, as information on the Indians of Canada Pavilion was far more scattered and limited. Chapter 2 relies almost entirely on three official Canadian Pavilion guide books purchasable onsite at the pavilion for $1 each. Meant to be read both during a pavilion visit as additional descriptors of the pavilion and as a memento for posterity, they contained enough discourse on universality and Indigenous and Canadian people that minimal additional consultation was necessary. Additional photographs were useful to describe the architecture of the Canadian Pavilion. Chapter 3 relies on two books that contained the speeches of the Noranda Lectures and the Maclean-Hunter International Forum. From among the 40 speeches, six formed the basis for the chapter, with additional speeches cited to demonstrate continuity within the speakers series.

Chapter 1 recounts Indigenous self-actualization and resistance to Canadian colonialism at the Indians of Canada Pavilion. The focus on Indigenous peoples highlights the nefarious effects of the modernization imperative of the Canadian colonial nation-state. As Expo 67 served to

[32] See Kicksee, 'Scaled Down to Size.'
[33] Jane Griffith, 'Jane Griffith, 'One Little, Two Little, Three Canadians: The Indians of Canada Pavilion and Public Pedagogy, Expo 67,' *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 49:2 (Spring 2015): 171-204.'

highlight global humanistic virtues, the fair was a site of colonial humanistic practices and theoretical foundations that manifested most prominently at the Canadian Pavilion. Chapter 2 chronicles the ways in which Canadian nationalism was reimagined as open and inclusive in order to incorporate Indigenous peoples while simultaneously relegating them to a lower-tier, premodern cultural grouping. The second chapter is focused on the inherent tension between performances of Canadian colonial humanism and the presence of Indigenous peoples, as Canadian identity would be recasted based on inclusivity and 'modern' determiners of productivity. The colonial humanistic project was articulated within global frameworks at the Maclean-Hunter International Forum and Noranda Lectures. Chapter 3 shifts the focus of the previous two chapters on North American colonialism into the global context of neocolonialism at the conferences in Expo's DuPont Auditorium. The final chapter widens the scope to demonstrate how Canadian colonialism was part of a broader pattern of global neocolonial projects focussing on modernization and development. What follows is an intricately-woven mosaic of neocolonial and anticolonial ambitions meant as pretexts to modifying the social and cultural practices of the majority of human beings on the planet.

Chapter I - *Le choc de l'Expo*:

Truth-telling and Indigenous Self-Representation

Oh God! Like the thunderbird of old I shall rise again out of the sea
I shall grab the instruments of the white man's success-his education
His skills- and with these new tools I shall build my race
Into the proudest segment of your society.[1]

On August 4th, 1967, the Indians of Canada Pavilion hostess Velma Robinson gave Bob MacGregor a tour of the pavilion for *Expodition*, the CBC daily radio report from the grounds of Expo 67. *Expodition* focussed on the Indians of Canada Pavilion in recognition of the Indians of Canada Day, a day of celebration of Indigenous cultures around Canada. MacGregor cited press coverage of how 'there might be a little bit of bitterness' in the pavilion's message. In response, Robinson recounted to MacGregor how Indigenous treaties 'have never been lived up to.' She brought further attention to the pavilion's criticism of residential schools, in which an Indigenous child 'doesn't learn anything about his history, his ancestors, or his traditions' and is forbidden to speak his own language. Though the Indians of Canada Pavilion did much to inscribe Indigenous narratives and presence into a nationalist and modernist celebration of humanity, MacGregor relegated Indigenous peoples to a 'pastness,' citing 'music of the type you might have heard if you wandered through the woods of Canada maybe 100 years ago' at the pavilion's entrance.[2] As Jane Griffith explains, MacGregor could not avoid 'imposing a binary between traditional and modern,' which MacGregor described as 'the incongruity of the two ways of life.'[3] Robinson summed up the principle message of the Indians of Canada Pavilion: 'listen to us, and perhaps, in listening to each other, we could live a better life in today's modern society.'[4]

While the Canadian Pavilion would bring Canadians together to revel in their accomplishments, the Indians of Canada Pavilion offered a different outlook. Indigenous art and

---

[1] Chief Dan George, 'Lament for Confederation,' delivered on July 1st, 1967 at Empire Stadium before a crowd of 32,000. See *Vancouver Sun*, 'This day in history: July 1, 1967,' printed July 2 2015. Accessed online. http://www.vancouversun.com/This+history+July+1967/6876736/story.html

[2] CBC Radio, 'Expo 67's Indians of Canada,' *Expodition*. 4 August, 1967. Host Bob MacGregor. Reporter Jim Robertson. Guest Velma Robinson. CBC Digital Archives. www.cbc.ca/archives/entry/expodition-expo-67s-indians-of-canada.

[3] Jane Griffith, 'One Little, Two Little, Three Canadians: The Indians of Canada Pavilion and Public Pedagogy, Expo 67,' *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 49:2 (Spring 2015): 171-204, p. 184; CBC Radio, 'Expo 67's Indians of Canada.'

[4] CBC Radio, 'Expo 67's Indians of Canada.'

artefacts were present at the Canadian Pavilion (chapter 2), the Indians of Canada Pavilion, the Man and the Polar Regions Pavilion, Habitat 67, and Man the Creator Pavilion.[5] This chapter explores how Indigenous participation at Expo 67 challenged public and governmental perceptions of Indigenous peoples in Canada on a global stage. The goal is to answer the following series of questions: how did Indigenous people participate in Expo 67? What were their messages, and how were they received? And finally, what obstacles did they face in promoting their own self-representation? I argue that Indigenous participants confronted stereotypes and challenged assumptions held by Canadians about Indigenous and Canadian history on an unprecedented scale. In doing so, Indigenous peoples resisted Canadian colonial compulsions and renegotiated the terms for which they would participate in the Centennial Celebrations. Despite the fact that the name of the pavilion presumed an Indigenous attachment to Canada, the resulting Indigenous-led discussions elevated Indigenous issues to a prominent national spotlight in the Canadian media by undermining simplistic notions of Indigenous dependency on the Canadian state.

The diversity of Indigenous approaches to decolonization at Expo 67 underlined the depth, complexity, and discord present in competing Indigenous narratives. Such an unprecedented presentation further exposed challenges integrating the voices of various Indigenous communities across the continent, and even exposed tensions within the community of Kahnawà:ke. However, the profound and varied Indigenous approaches to resisting Canadian colonialism were nonetheless united in a wider anticolonial project. Their resistance was a response to the evacuation of Indigenous-told stories in Canadian history, the mere telling of which signified a renegotiation of Indigenous peoples' relation to Canada and its national identity. Exactly how to tell these stories among a newly-formed network of Indigenous peoples was what made the Indians of Canada Pavilion planning so contentious.

In order to draw answers to these questions, the work of this chapter relies on an oral history interview with the former Commissioner General of the Indians of Canada Pavilion, Kahnawà:ke Mohawk and former Chief Andrew Tanahokate Delisle. A descendent of a long line of hereditary and later band council Chiefs, Chief Delisle carries his community of Kahnawà:ke

[5] See Sherry Brydon, 'The Representation of Inuit Art at Expo 67,' in *American Indian Art Magazine*, 37:2 (2012): 34-44.

and the teachings of his family with him.[6] Chief Delisle occupied an essential role as the Commissioner General of the pavilion as he continuously influenced Bureau of Indian Affairs agents to wrest greater Indigenous autonomy for the pavilion's narrative, as his namesake suggests.[7] In addition to his role during the creation of the pavilion, Chief Delisle remained onsite on a daily basis, attending events with foreign dignitaries and raising the profile of the Indigenous peoples of Canada. While the oral history interview highlights Delisle's experiential knowledge and testimony, additional sources serve to diversify the Indigenous perspectives and reception of the pavilion. These include George Manuel's *The Fourth World*, pavilion documents, two National Film Board films on Indigenous participation at Expo, and Montreal newspaper sources.[8] Figuring largely in media sources is Kahn-Tineta Horn, another Kanien'kehá:ka (Kahnawà:ke Mohawk) who combined media-savviness with a confrontational brand of anticolonial politics and who, along with Manuel, opposed Chief Delisle's own anticolonial methods.

The historiography regarding the Indians of Canada Pavilion includes authors from various fields, spanning history, art history, communications studies, education, and museology.[9] Rutherdale and Miller's '"It's Our Country"' argued that First Nations' participation at Expo 67 was 'unique and unprecedented.'[10] The authors cite a rejection of 'embracing the modern,' replaced by the emphasis on how Indigenous peoples 'had suffered enormously from non-Native

[6] Romney Copeman, *Interview with Andrew Tanahokate Delisle,* transcript of an oral history interview conducted on December 8th, 2016, [unpublished], 9:30-13:45. The interview transcript has been altered for the sake of this chapter and to adjust speech patterns to a written format, removing passing phrases such as 'you know,' 'at that time,' and 'that type of stuff.'

[7] 'Tanahokate' is Mohawk for 'riding the rough waters,' which Chief Delisle says is very much representative of his life. Copeman, 'Interview with Andrew Tanahokate Delisle,' 0:40.

[8] The Archives de Montréal compiled scans of dozens of articles on the Indians of Canada Pavilion, among other pavilions.

[9] Richard Gordon Kicksee, 'Scaled Down to Size: Contested Liberal Commonsense and the Negotiation of "Indian Participation" in the Canadian Centennial Celebrations and Expo '67, 1963-1967,' (M.A. Thesis: Queen's University, 1995); Sonja Macdonald, 'Expo 67, Canada's National Heterotopia: A Study of the Transformative Role of International Exhibitions in Modern Society,' (M.A. Thesis: Concordia University, 2003); Myra Rutherdale and J.R. Miller "'It's Our Country': First Nations' Participation in the Indian Pavilion at Expo 67," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 17:2 (2006): 148-73.; Ruth B. Phillips and Sherry Bryon, 'Show times: de-celebrating the Canadian nation, de-colonising the Canadian museum, 1967-92' in *Rethinking Settler Colonialism: History and Memory in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa*, ed. Annie E. Coombes. (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006); Griffith, 'One Little, Two Little, Three Canadians'; Ruth B. Phillips and Sherry Brydon, '"Arrow of Truth": The Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo 67,' in Ruth B. Phillips, *Museum Pieces: Towards the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*, (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens UP, 2011), pp. 27-48.

[10] J.R. Miller and Myra Rutherdale, 150.

Canadians' insensitivity, intolerance, and selfishness.'[11] In 'Scaled Down to Size,' Richard Gordon Kicksee focused on the pavilion planning phases as part of Indigenous participation in the Centennial Celebrations. Kicksee surmised that the Indians of Canada Pavilion's planning drew from three 'commonsenses:' paternalism, liberal benevolence, and Native nationalism. His research on the planning phases exposed the degree to which the Department of Indian Affairs sought to influence the content of the Indians of Canada Pavilion.[12] Jane Griffith approached the Indians of Canada Pavilion within the matrix of the 'thick layers of colonial education' that were the Centennial Celebrations and the wider Canadian settler pedagogical practices. By focusing on pedagogy, Griffith brilliantly 'shifts responsibility for not hearing its messages away from the display – that it *failed* – and towards non-Indigenous visitors, who were unwilling or unable to learn.'[13] Though perhaps overstated when it came to the inability of non-Indigenous visitors to learn from the pavilion, Griffith highlights the pedagogical and cultural contributions to Indigenous pedagogical resistance to wider Canadian colonial practices and pedagogies.[14]

Further inspiration for this chapter is drawn from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) and their final report in conversation with wider criticism of 'Canada-as-project' of liberal rule.[15] The presence, experiences, and messages of Indigenous people, in particular at the Indians of Canada Pavilion, was a testament to the enduring resistance to a broader program referred to as 'cultural genocide' by the (TRC).[16] Though the terminology of the Indians of Canada Pavilion did not match the modern usage of these terms, it is clear from the pavilion's

[11] *Ibid*, 169-70.
[12] Kicksee, 179.
[13] Griffith, 172.
[14] A key difference between Griffith's enriching analysis and my own is my inclusion of French-language media sources and my focus on Montreal's media. The sources she covered were predominantly if not exclusively in English.
[15] Truth and Reconcilation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, (Manitoba: TRC, 2015); McKay's formulation highlights the spread a rhetorical construction of the concept of 'Canada,' or 'Canada-as-project' of liberal rule projected onto North American lands as a means to acquire territory. In this sense, 'Canada' is first and foremost a cultural and linguistic construction, followed by a project of Canadian nationalists, a project resisted in turn resisted by a multitude of groups including Indigenous peoples and Quebec seperatists. Ian McKay, 'The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History,' in *Canadian Historical Review*, 81:4 (Dec 2000), pp. 617-651, 621.
[16] The TRC defines cultural genocide as 'The destruction of those structures and practices that allow the group to continue as a group. States that engage in cultural genocide set out to destroy the political and social institutions of the targeted group. Land is seized, and populations are forcibly transferred and their movement is restricted. Languages are banned. Spiritual leaders are persecuted, spiritual practices are forbidden, and objects of spiritual value are confiscated and destroyed. And, most significantly to the issue at hand, families are disrupted to prevent the transmission of cultural values and identity from one generation to the next.' Truth and Reconciliation Commission, *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future,* 1.

statements that the Canadian project of cultural genocide was having devastating consequences on Indigenous lives and cultures.

In this wider context, Indigenous representation emerged at Expo 67 in a relatively controlled environment as the Canadian government had sought to exert absolute power over Indigenous lives. Yet even under the enormous institutional weight of racist policies, residential schools, territorial dispossession, and the banning of spiritual practices, Indigenous peoples fought against for a space to promote their resistance to the network of institutions that sought to repress their bodies, minds, and spirits. They reclaimed their representation and narratives in front of the widest public in Canadian history at the Indians of Canada Pavilion. The messages in the pavilion were more than a testament to their anticolonial resistance; they were a veritable warning of an impending cultural, social, political, and spiritual revitalization that by 1967 was showing clear signs of acceleration.

The Inuit Presence

As post-war Canadian nationalists sought to consolidate their grip on Canada's northern territorial claims, they turned their colonial gaze toward Inuit peoples as potential repositories for Canadian nationalist symbolism.[17] The touristic appeal of Inuit peoples aided in this manner, as Inuit peoples were of major interest outside of Canada.[18] Miss Japan-Canada Friendship, who arrived in 1965 with a cordial message for Prime Minister Lester Pearson, requested a visit be arranged with Inuit people as a tourist attraction. As one journalist covering Expo explained, European and Asian were fascinated by Inuit peoples and understood them as a definitive representation of Canada. Any visit would be incomplete without connecting with Inuit art or people in what the reporter termed 'des civilisations qui passent.'[19] He explained the interest stemmed from the signing of treaties with 'les enfants des bois,' infantilizing peoples he claimed as Canadian nationals who had ostensibly abandoned their failing civilization for that of Canada. The Japanese cultural ambassador's visit demonstrated that even before Expo's opening, visiting

[17] See Leanne Pupchek, 'True North: Inuit Art and Canadian Nationalist Imaginings,' *American Review of Canadian Studies*, (Spring/Summer 2001), pp. 191-208, 197. Pupchek described how in connecting Canada with the 'Northland,' post-war Connecting Canada and the Northland, post-War 'international assumptions linking art with nationalism and linking an authentic "Folk" with a place converged with Canadian self-consciousness to catapult the art of the Inuit people into the image-making mechanisms of Canada's cultural producers,' p. 191.
[18] Germaine Bernier, 'Rêverie polaire sur L'Expo montréalaise,' *Le Devoir*, May 17, 1965.
[19] *Ibid*.

cultural diplomats sought a uniquely 'Canadian' experience by fostering a connection to Inuit peoples.

At Expo 67, Canadian cultural nationalists turned to the use of Inuit art for diplomatic purposes. Inuit art became part of Canadian cultural diplomacy as many art pieces were given to foreign dignitaries.[20] *Ookpik*, Expo's official mascot named after the Inuktitut word for 'owl,' and the large number of gift of Inuit art given to visiting Expo dignitaries demonstrate how Inuit art was present throughout Expo. The Canadian Pavilion's La Toundra restaurant, the Man and the Polar Regions Pavilion, Man and the Explorer Pavilion, and even Habitat 67 contained Inuit sculptures and prints.[21] By the admission of a 1967 Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIA), 'the Inuit had gone from 'an amusing curiosity' to 'a first-class and creative race' in just a short period. They had been 'saved from the fate of some little-known, recessive people who have been exhibited alive in the past, in such places as the Crystal Palace in London.'[22] This claim came despite the fact that an Inuit carver was asked to carve for live audiences at the Canadian Pavilion, where Kumukluk Saggiak was roped off from curious visitors.[23] Having encouraged Inuit people to take up carving for export, Indian Affairs and Northern Development not only congratulated themselves for the benevolent saving of Inuit people from being caged and displayed at international fairs, but built a psychological connection between Inuit carvings and national identity. However, the author of the report's congratulatory remarks towards Inuit artists also revealed a paternalistic vision of 'pre-modern' Inuit peoples. In this regard the departmental technocrats acted upon Indigenous people in order to induct them into a 'first class' as a race; such paternalistic and developmentalist arguments revealed the underlying assumptions of racial hierarchy in Indian Affairs.

Negotiating Indigenous Representations

While narratives of Indigenous peoples were also present at the Canadian Pavilion, it was at the Indians of Canada Pavilion that their messages were most clearly articulated to a total audience of 3 million visitors.[24] The paternalistic attitudes that were a hallmark of Canadian colonial policy were also present in the Pavilion's planning stage. In August of 1965, Indian

[20] Pupchek, 204. For more on this topic, see Mandeep Roshi Chadha, *Inuit Art as Cultural Diplomacy between Canada and India*, Master's Thesis, Concordia University, 2014.
[21] Brydon, 'The Representation of Inuit Art at Expo 67,' 36.
[22] Larmour, W. T. *The Art of the Canadian Eskimo*. (Ottawa: [Queen's Printer?], 1967). 16.
[23] David Millar, '*Aki'name*: On The Wall,' *National Film Board of Canada*, 1968, 18:30.
[24] Rutherdale & Miller, 165.

Affairs Branch officials decided to take control of the Expo 67 Indians of Canada Pavilion project after the National Indian Council had expressed interest in managing it. As Kicksee revealed, the planning process was fraught with contention, as Indian Affairs Branch had hoped that "a frank explanation" would show Indigenous peoples '"that we had no choice"' in taking control of the Indians of Canada Pavilion project.[25] The pavilion planners met with regional Indigenous leaders in Montreal, Nova Scotia, Edmonton, and Vancouver, and drew from consultations that had been held by the National Indian Council.[26] The participants' words echoed throughout the pavilion in the themes, images, and storyboards. During the consultation period, Chief Andrew Tanahokate Delisle explained that 'Notre point de vue sera réaliste objectif : ni exclusivement optimiste, ni uniquement pessimiste… Nous montrerons ce que l'Indien veut être ou pourrait être dans le Canada autant que ce qu'il a été dans le passé, avec ses qualités et ses défauts.'[27] He asserted that the pavilion 'sera une affirmation de la présence indienne dans le monde d'aujourd'hui.'[28] The excitement over the unique opportunity Indigenous people had to represent themselves to the widest audience in Canadian history was in evidence the pavilion's planning stage as interest and anticipation were growing.

In the meantime, Delisle worked to leverage his relationship with both Pearson and Montreal's mayor, Jean Drapeau, in the face of opposition from different Indian Affairs officials, utilizing his political network that had grown out of his time on the National Indian Council (NIC).[29] When he was asked by the federal government to be the head representative of the Indians of Canada Pavilion, he was not initially given the title of 'Commissioner-General' on the basis that it was reserved for heads of national pavilions. It was only after some protest by Delisle and others working on the pavilion that Prime Minister Lester Pearson stepped in and approved his use of the title.[30] While working on Expo 67's Indians of Canada Pavilion in the planning stages, Chief Delisle recalled departmental resistance to the storyline that had been produced, 'which was sort of telling the history as it is, not what we hoped it to be… the whole

[25] DIA, 1211-600/43-15 'Memorandum to the Deputy Minister Re: Indian Affairs Branch Participation in Canadian World Exhibition of 1967.' Robert Battle, Assitant Deputy Minister, (Indian Affairs), to C.M. Isbister, Deputy Minister; August 16, 1965, in Kicksee, 161.
[26] Indians of Canada Pavilion, 'The Indians of Canada Pavilion Expo 67,' ([Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967?]), 3.
[27] 'Un pavillon des Indiens à l'Exposition de 1967,' *La Presse*, Montréal, March 30, 1966.
[28] *Ibid*.
[29] Copeman, 4:15, 16:25. See also: Assembly of First Nations, 'A Discussion Paper: Leading to an Appropriate Structure for the Assembly of First Nations,' December 2002, revised March 2003, 12. Available online.
[30] Copeman, 32:05.

situation our people were in, we were going to tell that story, what's wrong with residential schools… and economic development.' He approached his position with a degree of skepticism, as he focused on 'questioning Canada, because I knew what they were doing to our people.'[31]

Chief Delisle was calculating in his decisions as to when to push back against Indian Affairs officials. His trademark remarks at the opening of meetings are 'the Creator put us here in this land to exist and to thrive, he gave us everything we needed in this land and he didn't tell an Indian agent to tell us what to do.' He stayed true to that statement on many occasions as Commissioner-General. He rejected the initial plans to have the RCMP provide security, preferring the hiring of a Kahnawà:ke peacekeeping force to provide security for the pavilion. Despite the fact that Canada and Quebec did not recognize the Kahnawà:ke peacekeepers as a police force, they were recognized as equals in the international community at Expo, a point of pride for the Commissioner-General.[32] Delisle's early fights for increasing the Indigenous presence and decreasing the settler grip on the pavilion had international reverberations at the world's fair as Indigenous people were being recognized by the international community in ways that the Canadian federal government patently avoided.

Despite Delisle's successes in negotiating greater Indigenous control over the pavilion, he and the pavilion planners were not immune to additional criticism from other Indigenous communities. An early case of Indigenous criticism came from the Union of Ontario Indians in early 1966. Claiming a lack of communication and a paternalistic attitude from the pavilion planners, Omar Peters of the union rejected the 'advisory role' they had been offered given that the pavilion planning had long been underway. R.F. Davy, the federal director of education services for the DIA, explained his department took over the planning 'reluctantly because it would have collapsed' had they not respected the 1965 deadline to present a Pavilion plan. Peters responded by criticizing the government authorities for their choices of Indigenous representatives; 'They'd always pick one who'd agree.'[33] Some Indigenous people across the country felt marginalized from the process and voiced their opinions, and in the process they attempted to renegotiate their participation in the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Dissent was brewing as Indigenous people leveled accusations at government officials and Indigenous participants in the pavilion planning phase.

[31] *Ibid*, 16:15, 25:00.
[32] *Ibid*, 54:50, 1:02:15.
[33] 'Indians Charge Expo Snub,' Toronto, *The Montreal Star*, Tuesday, February 22, 1966.

A further point of contention surrounded how Canadian government representatives chose the artefacts to be displayed in the pavilion. The decisions were based on the expertise of white museum curators, 'thus integrating within the Pavilion the judgements of Euro-Canadian ethnologists as to what constituted the most noteworthy and "authentic" Amerindian artifacts.'[34] Despite the bureaucratic leverage of non-Indigenous Canadian officials, outspoken members of their Indigenous consultation team were able to protest the process and modify the terms of Indigenous participation. George Manuel, a British Columbia Shuswap, and Indigenous rights advocate and community worker and later Chief of the NIB and President of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples, had been appointed to the Indian Affairs Branch's Indian Pavilion Advisory Committee (IAC) and officially accepted the role after seeking approval from British Columbia Indian organizations.[35] Manuel worked to renegotiate the role of the advisory committee so they could set their own agenda and determine committee procedure by threatening to reject the appointment of Dr. Gilbert Monture, a Haudenosaunee engineer who worked for the Department of Mines and Resources, as chairman. Monture later stepped down and Wallace Lebilois, the elected vice-chairman, took his place.

Manuel was able to use his negotiating skills with colonial officials to renegotiate the terms of Indigenous participation in the Indians of Canada Pavilion. His contribution was most notable when, after a white University of British Columbia professor selected Bill Reid, a master Haida carver, artist, and craftsman, to carve the totem pole, George Manuel refused to sign off and demanded tenders be called and the best pole chosen.[36] Reid eventually refused to work for the pavilion planners as he was concerned he was contributing to a 'Joe Francis' California style roadside diner teepee' for those who, unlike Reid, 'may care nothing for [their] reputation.' Reid further objected to the instructions of a totem pole that would be representative of Indigeneity overall, rather than each individual tribe: 'If you hire a Haida carver you get a Haida pole. If you hire a Kwakuitl carver you get a Kwakuitl pole…. If you want a bastard pole, draw your own conclusions.'[37] Manuel echoed Reid's frustrations and exclaimed that the UBC professor 'had never been exposed to Indian people and had never had the opportunity to become

[34] Kicksee, 173.
[35] George Manuel and Michael Posluns, *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*, (Don Mills: Collier-Macmillan Canada, 1974), 171. The committee included Andrew Tanahokate Delisle.
[36] *Ibid*, 171-74.
[37] Bill Reid, 'Letter From Bill Reid to Eric Mansfield,' April 12, 1966, in Kicksee, Appendix B.

knowledgeable about totem poles.'[38] His demand was granted; a call for tenders was issued, and Tony and Henry Hunt were chosen to carve the Pavilion's totem pole.[39]

While Manuel was an effective advocate for change when it came to Indigenous peoples in his native British Columbia, he recalled feeling sidelined when the initial design of the Indians of Canada Pavilion was revealed to him and the group of Expo Indigenous consultants. He recounted a meeting in which Indigenous artists, who had received no funding, were asked to present drawings of their concept for the design of the pavilion. Once the invited artists presented their work, Indian Affairs departmental officials began presenting their to-scale model of their proposed pavilion, complete with a colour slide show. After the hour-long presentation, Manuel felt 'manipulated… cheated and used.'[40] The combination of the federal presentation and the model, impressive as they were, as well as the $250,000 spent on them, was enough for Manuel to unleash a tirade at the meeting. He angrily told the officials:

> I should really blow this whole piece of conniving skyhigh … I object to [your project] because you framed us and manoeuvred us into agreeing with you. You have already spent money that was credited to us for our development, our presentation. You have deceived the Indian people. When you put up this building you will deceive the Canadian people.[41]

Manuel was approached and thanked by the artists who had remained silent throughout the proceedings. He argued forcefully for full disclosure and consultation and was unafraid of taking matters in his own hands. He characterized the Pavilion as being non-Indigenous by design, dismissing the entire Expo proceedings as a farcical attempt to portray Indigenous voices through departmental filters. He further argued that the Pavilion was representative of the amount of autonomy Indigenous people had in their own lives; 'scaled down to size.'[42] As Kicksee argued, the departmental approach 'designated Amerindians as contributors and Euro-Canadians as expert interpreters.'[43]

Chief Andrew Delisle recalls the contentious moments in the planning stages. From his point of view, George Manuel and other Indigenous peoples were uncomfortable with him having been chosen by the government to be the top Indigenous official working on the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Furthermore, Delisle explained that 'everybody wants to be the boss, and I felt that, I'm

[38] Manuel, 174.
[39] Kicksee, 174-7.
[40] Manuel, 173.
[41] Manuel, 173-4.
[42] *Ibid*, 177.
[43] Kicksee, 173.

the boss…. You get competition like that.' He drew from the Mohawk confrontational culture, which he understood as the reason the people of Kahnawà:ke 'always had trouble with the other Indians. They figured we were too aggressive.'[44] Delisle emphasized that had an open nomination process been held for his position, it would have led to further infighting.

George Manuel would not be the only person to challenge Chief Delisle's decision-making. His most contentious decision came in April 1966 when he granted the Canadian Centennial Commission rights to a 92-acre island just upstream from Expo 67 to be used as a national gathering place for visiting Indigenous people. Chief Peter Diome of Kahnawà:ke argued that Chief Delisle had no such right to grant permission for use of Tekakwitha Island, and that had a vote been brought to the Kahnawà:ke council it surely would have been defeated. He stressed that the island was not donated by the reserve, but by Delisle, who had no right to act on his own authority. Calling the island "stolen," Chief Diome stated that the continued perpetuation of injustices towards Indigenous people by the Canadian government was essentially nothing new.[45] Kahn-Tineta Horn issued a statement on behalf of a 19-member group called the Caughnawaga Defence Committee and charged that '[t]he conspiracy to destroy Indians and rob them of their few possessions has now commenced' and warned of impending 'riots and violent demonstrations during Expo 67 if any attempt is made to rob us of our sacred birth right by collusion by Indians in the pay of the government and white people who covet our sole possession – our land.'[46] The issue was all the more contentious given the recent construction of the Saint-Lawrence Seaway in the 1950s, which led to the federal government expropriating a large tract of Kahnawà:ke in the 'most significant of government surrenders of Mohawk land in terms of both the sheer area involved and the long-term destructive impact on the Canada-Kahnawà:ke relationship.' The resulting shift in relationship was exemplified by a Kahnawà:ke council use of the term 'invaded' to describe the expropriations and destructions of Mohawk homes and lands.[47] A 1957 Mohawk Council of Kahnawà:ke resolution explained in a message

[44] Copeman, 37:40-40:00, 41:10.
[45] David Tafler, 'Indians Say Expo Island "'Stolen,'" *The Montreal Gazette*, April 22, 1966.
[46] The statement was issued by Kahn-Tineta Horn. Quoted in 'Caughnawaga Indians Warn "We'll go on the Warpath,"' *The Montreal Star*, April 21, 1966.
[47] Gerald R. Alfred, *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism,* (Toronto: Oxford UP, 1995), 158, 160.

that would undermine Expo's colonial humanist message a decade later: 'Humanity blushes at the events of this period of Colonial History and Dictatorship, and Usurpation.'[48]

Expo 67 officials distanced themselves from the Tekakwitha controversy, citing the jurisdiction of the Centennial Commission over the dispute. The Commission announced that the project had been well-received by the Micmacs, Crees, Haidas and Hurons as a 'significant and historic step towards unity among Canada's diverse tribes.'[49] And some First Nations even called the gesture 'an historic moment for Indians in Canada.'[50] While Chief Delisle had lost some credibility in his community of Kahnawà:ke over the affair,[51] it is also apparent that he gained credibility among visiting Indigenous groups and Centennial officials. Chief Delisle's actions were contentious and possibly due to a miscalculation of the reactions of his community, but they were also demonstrative of a shifting priority from local ties towards a wider network of Indigenous people that inter-Indigenous gatherings at Expo had encouraged. The event highlights a particular intersection of power politics, land, and Indigenous authority that was altered by the new alliances that were forming at and because of Expo 67.

The most direct confrontations, however, came from a member of Chief Delisle's community of Kahnawà:ke. Kahn-Tineta Horn was an outspoken advocate for Indigenous peoples by her early twenties. Horn directly challenged Indigenous leaders who worked with Canadian officials, drawing a clearly-demarcated line between different Indigenous responses to colonialism. In September 1966, she joined the audience of a Canadian Television Network taping of 'Trouble In The Longhouse,' which featured a panel discussion on the Indians of Canada Pavilion and questions from the audience. She accused the pavilion managers of spending one million dollars of Indigenous welfare funds on the Pavilion, which Branch officials denied.[52] She called the Pavilion 'a boastful show of wealth and vanity, foreign to our Indian philosophy.'[53] In confronting the Expo officials, Horn made it clear that Indigenous representations would be contested so long as there was any involvement by Canadian officials in the process. She did so publicly at highly-mediatized events for maximum effect during the planning of the Indians of

[48] Mohawk Council of Kahnawà:ke, 'Resolution #312,' in *Band Council Resolutions, 1955-Present*, pp. 56-57. Quoted in Alfred, 161.
[49] Tafler.
[50] 'Centennial Expo Project: Indian Island Unites Tribes,' *The Montreal Star*, Montreal, April 20, 1966, in Kicksee, 183.
[51] Kicksee, 183-84.
[52] *Ibid*.
[53] Canadian Press wirecopy document found in DIA, file 121-600/43-14. [Not dated], in Kicksee, 183.

Canada Pavilion. Once the Pavilion opened to the public, her assertive approach to direct action would not falter.

The matrix of political allegiances among Indigenous people that was peculiar to Expo 67 reshaped and accelerated the confrontations among Indigenous peoples in the 1960s. As a fellow Mohawk from Kahnawà:ke, Chief Delisle faced opposition from Horn on numerous occasions. Much like Horn's characterization of her opponents as allies of white capitalists interested in Indigenous land, Chief Delisle subsequently recalled Kahn-Tineta Horn as beholden to the interests of two investors who 'used her as a front' to develop Nun's Island, which is claimed by Kahnawà:ke Mohawks as part of their territory.[54] As he explained, 'it's an issue because when the chiefs from across the country came down to her place, when I went she was trying to convince them of that type of thing, so it was something that irked me because she gave me a lot of trouble in Kahnawà:ke.' Delisle was asked by Expo officials if they should invest Expo money in Horn's project to build a restaurant over the rapids at Expo 67, which he discouraged.[55]

A few months before the opening of Expo 67, the Indians of Canada Pavilion held an inauguration ceremony for the totem pole in what was a highly orchestrated media event complete with ritual dances from Nootka and Kwakwaka'wakw participants. The 66-foot totem pole carved specifically for the pavilion by Kwakwaka'wakw carvers Henry and Tony Hunt stood behind the mural to the left of the main entrance. Expo 67 Commissioner General Pierre Dupuy was present along with Delisle, the Pavilion's Commissioner-General, Huron Chief Max Gros-Louis, Mohawk Chief John Gaspé, and Indian and Northern Affairs Minister Arthur Laing. Dupuy spoke of the Indians of Canada as 'l'âme de notre peuple … Et d'autre part je suis fier de constater comment ils symbolisent bien le grand effort canadien qu'est l'Exposition universelle de Montréal.' Chief Delisle's remarks paid tribute to the Indigenous people as being an integral part of Canada's soul. Minister Laing highlighted Indigenous indecisiveness, as white Canadians 'reproche[nt] aux Indiens de ne pas savoir ce qu'ils veulent.' However, he linked the supposed inability to decide what Indigenous people were after to white Canadians' indecisiveness as well, pointing out that 'les Blancs aussi sont perplexes' at how to solve the challenges faced by Indigenous peoples. Laing noted that white people needed to examine their own conscience in

[54] Copeman, 21:00.
[55] *Ibid*, 21:00, 23:00. Chief Delisle described her associates: 'When they come to my house, her with the guys, and the guy says 'here, take my car and go and park it around the Seaway,' what the hell is going on here, in front of my wife… they had no qualms of doing something like that.'

order to do better in managing Indigenous affairs, and to listen to Indigenous peoples more.[56] The paradox of listening more and managing better would become increasingly apparent as Indigenous peoples expressed their desire to both be heard and to autonomously manage their own affairs throughout the Indians of Canada Pavilion.

The Indians of Canada Pavilion

The pavilion was located in the Canadian compound of St. Helen's Island, an area which included the Canadian, Ontario, Quebec, Western Canada, and Eastern Canada pavilions as well. The Christian and United Nations pavilions further divided the Indians of Canada Pavilion from the other Canadian pavilions. As Rutherdale and Miller explain, '[w]hether intentionally or not, the site symbolized the place of First Nations in 1960s Canada: of but not in the country.'[57] The distance would render a psychological cleavage between the pavilions as visitors moved from one to the next. However, it also provided Chief Delisle with an unprecedented opportunity for an Indigenous person to network with the Secretary General of the United Nations. Chief Delisle recalls how Secretary General U Thant 'was always coming to visit, we would talk about a lot of things that were happening.'[58] Raising Indigenous issues to the highest officer of the United Nations was certainly an unforeseen consequence of the Indians of Canada Pavilion's location. Nevertheless, given how pavilions were grouped 'according to their origins,'[59] the placing of the Indians of Canada Pavilion at the outskirts of the Canada Complex demonstrated an intention to create a distance, both metaphorically and literally, between the Canadian Pavilion and the Indians of Canada Pavilion.

The pavilion's main focal point was a large, 100-foot teepee-shaped tower, standing atop a central, hexagonal edifice with a wooden exterior. Mohawk steelworkers worked on the Pavilion's construction.[60] A small lake surrounded the eastern half of the pavilion, complete with overturned canoes pulled ashore. A large Haida mural entitled *West Coast*, designed and painted by Tseshaht artist George Clutesi, greeted visitors as they approached the pavilion's main

[56] Andé Luchaire, 'Inauguration du mât-totem de l'Expo : ''Les Indiens sont l'âme du Canada'' – M. Dupuis,' *La Presse*, February 11, 1967.
[57] Rutherdale & Miller, '"It''s Our Country,"' 158. See also Sonja Macdonald, "Expo 67," 130, 136.
[58] Copeman, 47:15. The interview transcript has been altered for the sake of this chapter and to adjust speech patterns to a written format, removing passing phrases such as 'you know,' 'at that time,' and 'that type of stuff.'
[59] Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, *The Memorial Album of the first category universal and international Exhibition held in Montreal from the twenty-seventh of April to the twenty-ninth of October nineteen hundred and sixty-seven*, (Toronto: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd: 1968), 9.
[60] Kicksee, 180

entrance from the North. There were nine murals surrounding the exterior of the pavilion, all designed and painted by various Indigenous artists.[61] The pavilion's 'storyline,' a general feature of Expo pavilions that guided visitors through pavilion displays, was 'intended to represent the Indians' answers to the question: "What do you want to tell the people of Canada and the world when they come to Expo in 1967?"'[62] The storyline followed Indigenous people throughout history, beginning with the pre-European contact era followed by three stages of colonization of Indigenous lands and peoples.

The Indians of Canada Pavilion's reception area display housed an introduction to the art of 'six major cultures' of Indigenous peoples.[63] According to the pavilion's presentation, Indigenous groups were identifiable through geographic determiners rather than based on linguistic, cultural, and kinship relationships. The exhibit area was introduced with a biting critique of Euro-Canadian settlers: 'You have stolen our native land, our culture, our soul… and yet, our traditions deserved to be appreciated, and those derived from an age-old harmony with nature even merited being adopted by you.'[64]

The second section, The Ancestral Land, was dark with a looped soundtrack of wolves, loons, crickets, and running water. A poem by Ojibwe poet Duke Redbird recounted the spiritual connection between hunter, hunted, and the Great Spirit.[65] These themes were based on the initial storyline concept: 'In the beginning, there was the land – the forest, the rivers, and the lakes,' and animals. The subsequent section, The Awakening of the People, explained that 'Within their horizon they were the total of mankind – all were created by the Great Spirit and the spirit was in all living things.'[66] The storyline described a time of 'harmony and order,' of 'respect and reverence' among life. The pre-European stage was characterized as idyllic, an Indigenous societal apex without any need of development.

The harmonious order was followed by a striking comparison between Indigenous people and Europeans, without actually naming the latter; 'Only a fool would... kill trees to make a way in

[61] According to Delisle, George Clutesi's large mural was not on schedule to be completed in time, and had to be finished by pavilion workers who filled in the lines for the artist. Copeman, 'Interview,' 1:04:30.
[62] Robert Marjoribanks, 'Introduction' in 'The Indians of Canada Pavilion Expo 67,' [Pavilion Leaflet], 1966, p. 3.
[63] Kicksee, 'Scaled Down to Size,' 3.
[64] Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, *The Memorial Album*, 118.
[65] Duke Redbird, [Untitled Poem], in Marty Dunn, *Red on White: The Biography of Duke Redbird* (Toronto: New Press, 1971), 68. Quoted in Kicksee, 'Scaled Down to Size,' 4.
[66] Indians of Canada Pavilion, 'The Indians of Canada Pavilion Expo 67,' ([Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967?]). 4-5.

the forest.' What began as a peaceful, harmonious, and spiritual landscape served as a backdrop to the eventual arrival of those who would desecrate the land. In the pre-contact space, only the number of animals that were absolutely necessary would be killed, with tribute paid to the Great Spirit, and no parts being wasted, for 'Why would a man heap up carcasses to rot?'[67] Spiritual brotherhood among men and rights and duties to 'share with his brother' were a way of life. By contrasting their spiritual environmentalism with the desecration that subsequently befell the land, Indigenous people were reformulating the Canadian narrative of developmentalism to highlight their contributions to European newcomers. However, the avoidance of overtly naming the Euro-Canadians demonstrated the force of colonial pressures, which were either exerted by Canadian officials in the planning stages or internalized by the Indigenous planners themselves.

The second section of the exhibition provided visitors with a glimpse of Indigenous peoples' more disparaging views on the arrival of Europeans. The storyline reclaimed Indigenous representation from European settlers and dissected the doctrine of discovery, as it explained 'These were the so-called "savages" whom the Europeans met when they "discovered" North America.'[68] An illuminated display of steel-headed tomahawks was placed curiously next to the heading 'When the White Man came we welcomed him with love,' followed by 'We sheltered him, fed him, led him through the forest. The great explorers of Canada travelled in Indian canoes, wore Indian snow-shoes, ate Indian food, lived in Indian houses. They could not have lived without Indian friends.'[69] Pavilion designers included information they gathered in consultation with Indigenous peoples, such as Wallace Labillois, who explained that

> When the White Man came, he was welcomed and received with open arms. Even after the forest and his wildlife was plundered, the Indian never lost his faith in the White Man. Even to this day he calls him brother, a fellow human being. We must show this everlasting faith.[70]

Indigenous people spoke through the Indians of Canada Pavilion to highlight their material, technological, and social contribution to early Canadian settler society, while rejecting colonial labels such as 'savage' and 'discovery.' They spoke through the Indians of Canada Pavilion to highlight their technological contribution to Canadian society as they criticized the desecration of their lands, and as follows, the desecration of their spiritual connections to the land that

---

[67] *Ibid*.
[68] Indians of Canada Pavilion. 'The Indians of Canada Pavilion Expo 67,' ([Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967?]), 6.
[69] Kicksee, 4, and Michel Régnier, 'Indian Memento: Indians of Canada Pavilion – Expo 67' (Nation Film Board of Canada, 1967), online, http://www.nfb.ca/film/indian_memento/, 8:45-9:15.
[70] 'Indians of Canada Pavilion Expo 67,' [Leaflet], 6-7.

accompanied Euro-Canadian 'development.' Such rejections also undermined the logic of Euro-Canadian developmentalism, which saw in Indigenous people an initial, pre-civilized state.

Among artistic reproductions of treaties and dramatizations of wars of conquest were headings such as 'Wars and peace treaties deprived us of our land' and 'Many Indians feel our fathers were betrayed.'[71] Contact with Christianity was also criticized as 'early missionaries thought us pagans. They imposed upon us their own stories of God, of heaven and hell, of sin and salvation.'[72] A four-foot carving of an upright Delaware spirit bear was illuminated by a projection of light in the shape of a cross, with the bear standing in the cross's nexus.[73] As Russell Moses, Deputy Commissioner-General of the Pavilion, bluntly explained, 'The Christian religion destroyed the Indian way of life.'[74] Another placard provided a response to such treatment: 'But we spoke with God – the Great Spirit – in our own way. We lived with each other in love and honoured the holy Spirit in all living things,' followed by 'we wanted to live our own life on our own land.'[75] Next to a map of Indigenous territories across North America was a placard explaining:

> The reserve is the home of our spirits… a place where we can be Indian, speak our own language, and keep the things we value from our past. It is the place to which our spirits are always returning for shelter and comfort. It is our last grip on the land. Many of our people fear that, if the reserve should disappear, the Indian would disappear with it.[76]

The subsequent section featured Indigenous peoples at work, from men in suits to women behind a telephone switchboard to construction workers and miners.[77] Indigenous peoples adaptations were central, as 'The winds of change begin to produce their effects... Old wisdom and modern science are two open doors to the future.'[78] The placards made additional critical observations of how 'too many Indians are poor, sick, cold and hungry' to problematize any positive messages of successful integration into Canadian economic life.[79] Indigenous adaptations were contextualized as positive aspects of Indigenous resilience to the destructive forces of colonialism. The message was simultaneously empowering and critical of the continued lack of economic justice for

[71] Kicksee, 4, and Régnier, *Indian Memento*, 9:30, 10:00. The quote hung above the Royal Proclamation of 1763.
[72] Régnier, 'Indian Memento,' 10:25.
[73] Kicksee, 'Scaled Down to Size,' 4-5, Rutherdale & Miller, '"It's Our Country,' 161.
[74] Bill Bantey, 'Expo 67 : One's Own Stone' *The Montreal Gazette*, 9 March, 1967.
[75] Régnier, 'Indian Memento,' 10:45- 11:20.
[76] Kicksee, 191, and Régnier, 11:30-12:00.
[77] Régnier, 12:20-13:00.
[78] Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, 121.
[79] Rutherdale and Miller, '"It's Our Country,'" 161.

Indigenous peoples and was designed to simultaneously uplift Indigenous spirits and to criticize structural disenfranchisement.

The next section of the Indians of Canada Pavilion featured information about residential schools. Called 'the white man's school,' it was described as 'an alien land for an Indian child.' Images of children looking concerned, participating in classrooms, and lining up for the school bus were presented.[80] Though the Canadian Pavilion did not display Indigenous children in residential schools, the Australian pavilion did, highlighting the government's aim to accelerate the 'full integration of all aborigines into the community.' The Australian Pavilion enacted similar Indigenous policies as Canada, including abusive residential schools, forced relocations, and territorial conquest. Australian colonial policy was expressed candidly at Expo, citing 'the problem… in its simplest form, is that of assimilation,' a problem that multiple Australian government levels were 'attacking… constructively and vigorously, with mounting expenditure and effort on aboriginal welfare and development.'[81] The Australian 'problem' centered around what white Australia should do with its Indigenous population similar to Canada's attempt to 'kill the Indian in the child' through residential schools as an act of ethnic cleansing. As Patrick Wolfe describes, Indigenous peoples were subject to Australian colonial policies to eliminate their culture because they were seen as 'residues' of an antiquated form of human community by anthropologists and the Australian state.[82]

Underneath cartoon drawings of Dick and Jane was an explanation that 'An Indian child begins school by learning a foreign tongue.' Statistics were shown citing the 61,395 students enrolled in schools and 2,143 in vocational schools in 1966, comprising more than a quarter of the 200,000 estimated Indigenous people.[83] Residential schools 'disrupted families and communities. They prevented elders from teaching children long-valued cultural and spiritual traditions and practices. They helped kill languages.'[84] Even as Expo 67 was promulgating a global humanistic consciousness and Canada was celebrating its grandiosity, a 'dramatic increase in the apprehension of Aboriginal children from the 1960s onwards' in what was known as the

[80] Régnier, 13:05-13:30.
[81] Australian Pavilion, *Australian Panorama: Expo Souvenir Edition*, (Sydney: Paramac Printing 1967), 15.
[82] Patrick Wolfe, *Settler-Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*, (London: Cassell, 1999), 45.
[83] Régnier, 13:55-14:00; H.B. Hawthorn, ed., *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies*, vol. 2 (Ottawa: Queens Printer, 1967), 23.
[84] Truth and Reconciliation Commission, *They Came for the Children: Canada, Aboriginal Peoples, and Residential Schools*, (Manitoba: TRC, 2012), 1.

'Sixties Scoop,' which 'was in some measure simply a transferring of children from one form of institution, the residential school, to another, the child-welfare agency.' The TRC explains that by 1960 'the federal government estimated that 50% of the children in residential schools were there for child-welfare reasons.'[85]

The pavilion statistic was striking to Delisle, who recalls: 'Our people were aware of it … individual[ly], but they didn't know that it was that broad [of a] problem.'[86] Delisle understood the information to be ground-breaking not just for white Canadians, who likely had little or no knowledge of the scope of the issue, but even for Indigenous peoples to recognize that their experiences at residential schools were not isolated. Throughout the pavilion, and especially in this last section, Indigenous people were presenting visitors with the project of cultural genocide being performed in Canadians' name, as children were removed from parents classified as unfit to raise their children due to their economic disenfranchisement. The Sixties Scoop highlighted the Canadian states mobilization of economic data and resources to determine an economic and developmental threshold many Indigenous families could not cross in order to raise their own children, a process the Indians of Canada Pavilion brought to the forefront.

At the Indians of Canada Pavilion, twenty-four Indigenous pavilion hostesses were chosen to present the storyline to pavilion visitors. Kicksee argued that they were selected and trained 'to become models of the "true Indian" within the Pavilion.'[87] The pavilion officials who selected idealized young Indigenous women were exclusively men, some white and others Indigenous. Yves Thériault, the novelist-turned head of Cultural Affairs wing of the DIA, advocated training the hostesses to create 'a damned respectful image of the Canadian Indian… we should spend a great deal of attention towards making these hostesses the very embodiment of what an Indian can be.'[88] The hostesses were given classes in makeup, grooming, posture, walking, how to deal with hecklers, and 'an intensive course in Indian culture, its past, present and future in Canada.'[89] Much like the Inuit carvers at the Canadian Pavilion, 'each hostess was intended to be a living part of the display' at the Indians of Canada Pavilion. The objectifying selection process

[85] TRC, *Final Report*, 71.
[86] Copeman, 'Interview with Andrew Tanahokate Delisle, 1:19:40-1:20:00. Delisle himself was quite surprised by the figure when presented with it, remarking that 'I wasn't too familiar with that. It seems like a lot.'
[87] Kicksee, 175.
[88] DIA, file 121-600/43-15. "Indian Affairs Participation To Expo '67: Preliminary Project and Cost Estimates." August, 1965, in Kicksee, 175.
[89] Joyce Goodman, 'Indian Girls Train As Hostesses For Indians of Canada Pavilion,' *The Montreal Star*, Thursday, April 6, 1967.

'idealized the emergence of a sophisticated, integrated "Indian" woman who closely resembled an idealized version of her Euro-Canadian sisters.'[90]

Despite the omnipresent male gaze in some media interviews, the hostesses took advantage of the particular interest in them. They gave interviews and advocated for Indigenous peoples' rights. Janice Mathias, an Okanagan, described how reserves were insufficient for securing Indigenous futures.[91] Janet Morris, a Micmac, had the opportunity to give a presentation at Westmount Public School; she also 'appeared at a Richelieu Club function as guest of honor and suffered few anxieties,' which she enjoyed. The hostesses were invited to model furs by The Hudson's Bay Company in a fashion show.[92] Within the matrix of colonial gazes was the opportunity for the hostesses to inscribe an Indigenous presence, exercise an Indigenous agency, and speak on behalf of a wider Indigenous community. However, some hostesses could not adapt to life in the city and did not stay for the entirety of their training.[93]

Delisle faced similar pressures of representing Indigenous peoples according to the instructions of Expo officials, yet he understood his position as occupying a liminal space, putting him in a diplomatic no-man's land where he could draw from either culture's diplomatic protocols. He recalls the pressure of dressing in traditional regalia at such events, yet he preferred to project a different image and opted for formal suits to 'show that we were that advanced and not what everyone was saying.'[94] He also resisted the requests to put greater emphasis on Indigenous dances and performances, as he disagreed that those ceremonies were more representative of Indigenous people's lives than was 'all the fighting.'[95] When Canadian officials refused to pay for his formal-event tuxedo, 'I sort of threaten them to pay for it. They bought the cheapest kind anyway.' He used the argument that as a representative of the Indigenous people of Canada, he deserved the funds so long as Canadian international aid went to Africa, whose dignitaries had arrived at Expo 67 in limousines.[96] Delisle's determination to

[90] Kicksee, 175-76. Of 220 applicants, more than half were rejected 'based on a girl's photograph and ratio of weight to height.' DIA, file 121-600/40-13-1. 'Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Indian Advisory Council for the Indians of Canada Pavilion – Expo 67, in Kicksee, 176.
[91] Ivan Rioux-Sabourin, 'L'hotesse de la semaine – L'Indienne du Canada,' *La Patrie*, 13 August, 1967.
[92] Joyce Goodman, 'Indian Girls Train As Hostesses For Indians of Canada Pavilion,' *The Montreal Star*, Thursday, April 6, 1967.
[93] Copeman, 1:04:00.
[94] *Ibid*,' 27:55.
[95] *Ibid*, 19:15. The contemporary issues Chief Delisle worked on were related to hunting and fishing rights, as well as pay equity for Indigenous miners.
[96] *Ibid,* 31:10.

wear a tuxedo instead of Indigenous regalia reconfigured Canadian colonial imagery, denying Canadian officials' requests to perform the Canadian version of a stereotypical Indigenous person in front of the diplomatic community.

Unlike other pavilions whose Cold War alliances dictated diplomatic protocol, Delisle was not beholden to the nationalist posturing in the Cold War era, and designated the pavilion as 'a neutral place' where 'anyone could come.' He hosted Cuban representatives, who 'at that point in time which were the enemies of everybody.' Chief Delisle even sat the Cubans near the Americans when he and Pavilion officials hosted a dinner with Expo dignitaries.[97] Delisle renegotiated what first appeared as minute details in the Indigenous-settler relationship; yet with each additional small victory of a tuxedo and larger victories came the basis for restructuring the settler-Indigenous relationship on Indigenous terms. As one of the most public national Indigenous representative at the time, Delisle could force the hand of DIA officials to be at least treated equally, and at best treated as a representative of autonomous Indigenous communities.

Overall, the pavilion provided a stark contrast to the positive messages that abounded at Expo, messages steeped in a view of man's material, social, political, and economical progress and development. Rutherdale and Miller describe the pavilion as 'an ambivalent blend of traditional culture and modern adaptation to a world dominated by other cultural groups.'[98] Sherry Brydon remarked that unlike the positive economic views of other pavilions, the Indians of Canada Pavilion focused on 'the displacement of native peoples and the destruction of native economies by European and North American settlers.'[99] To Richard Gordon Kicksee, the 'strategic' language of the pavilion was meant to homogenize Indigenous perspectives and avoid placing the blame, as the passive voice was used throughout the pavilion; 'things "just happened."'[100]

The Indians of Canada Pavilion was at once both ground-breaking and reserved. Giant leaps were made in public presentation of Indigenous history by Indigenous peoples and contributed greatly by bringing decolonization to the forefront of visitors' minds. The Pavilion stood as a testament to the enduring survival and resistance of Indigenous peoples throughout Canada while exposing the legacy of Canadian colonialism and the country's ongoing colonial practices. The Canadian federal government had negotiated Indigenous participation at Expo from a position of

[97] *Ibid*,' 25:10. He recalls the Americans being 'pissed' with a laugh.
[98] Rutherdale and Miller, 154.
[99] Sherry Brydon, 'The Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo 67,' in *American Indian Art Magazine*, 37:2, (2012): 54-63, p. 55.
[100] Kicksee, 187.

strength based on the financial resources and wide communication and interpersonal networks throughout the country. Faced with such force, Indigenous people resisted the government's colonizing influence in various ways at Expo and throughout its planning, negotiating with colonial officials of the Department of Indian Affairs to create a space where they could transmit their own messages.[101] Even still, the Indians of Canada Pavilion, with its empowering messages of Indigenous resistance to colonial policies, retained major elements of Indigenous self-representation despite countless attempts at watering down the message. How those messages were received, however, was another matter entirely.

Reception and Criticism

One month before the Indians of Canada Pavilion opened to the public, Indian Affairs Minister Arthur Laing was given a tour along with media representatives. His visit highlighted what Kicksee argued was present throughout Indigenous participation in Centennial Celebrations: 'moments of paternalism, liberal benevolence, and Native nationalism.'[102] Laing responded quite negatively to the latter and, in what amounts to a panicked response to Indigenous anticolonial messaging, reportedly threatened to '"shut the place down"' due to the controversial messages contained within.[103] Indigenous officials fought against any alterations or delays in the Pavilion.[104] At a subsequent internal debate among DIA officials, an official suggested publishing press releases to distance the DIA from the Pavilion's message in order to highlight 'that the portrayal is from the Indian point of view.'[105] Another official suggested that the Pavilion's message would be weakened by the vastness of Expo 67, and that any negative press generated would be met with 'a kind of backlash of rationalization in the public's mind. They will say, "Things aren't that bad, they don't appreciate what we (as taxpayers) are doing for

[101] In this regard, I disagree with Rutherdale & Miller's assertion that the pavilion contained a 'sort of ambivalence that manifested itself throughout the Indian Pavilion' about the effects of colonization. I favour the view that the principle arguments against colonization revolved around how Indigenous people were treated, while any nod to positive exchanges revolved around technology. Rutherdale & Miller, 161.
[102] Kicksee, 8.
[103] See Peter McFarlane, *Brotherhood to Nationhood: George Manuel and the Making of the Modern Indian Movement*, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1993), 90, in Kicksee, 184. Once the fair ended, Minister Laing offered the city of Montreal ownership of the Indians of Canada Pavilion on the condition that it remain unaltered for five years. See also 'Pour au moins cinq ans le pavillon des Indiens ne devra pas être modifié,' *Montréal-Matin*, 30 November, 1967.
[104] Kicksee, 184.
[105] DIA, file 121-600/43-14-2. 'Memorandum from D.A. Webster to Wilfred Churchman,' April 12, 1967, in Kicksee, 185.

them.'"[106] Laing's paternalistic, knee-jerk response was smoothed over by the liberal benevolent attitudes of public relations specialists in the DIA in the face of an unprecedented Indigenous medium.

Despite initial resistance from the Minister of Indian Affairs, the Pavilion was opened to the public on Expo 67's opening day of April 27th, 1967. Like Laing, Reverend Appolinaire Plamondon, did not hide his distaste for the Indians of Canada Pavilion. The Catholic Oblate missionary left his home near Fort Alexander, Manitoba, to accompany four Indigenous youth who were slated to perform at Expo in an eleven-person band. Plamondon had started the band 'to give the Indian boys something to do to maintain their self-respect' given that '[w]ithout this sort of thing, there would be very little for them to do on the reservation and they would just sit around.'[107] However, Rev. Plamondon's support for Indigenous people did not extend to the messages in the Indians of Canada Pavilion. In fact, he outright denied their veracity, claiming 'The pavilion represents the views of the handful of people who designed it, but not those of the majority of Canadian Indians… Most Indians aren't so bitter – they're happy with what is being done for them by the Government and by missionaries.' He took further umbrage with Pavilion claims that 'war and treaties deprived us of our land,' which he believed 'distort the real mood of the Indians…. They never wanted the whole country. What would 200,000 Indians have done with all of Canada?' His position as a Catholic missionary with twenty-six years' experience in Indigenous communities had led him to the conclusion that Indigenous people consulted and involved in the Pavilion were simply incorrect about their own views. The priest believed he knew better, and did not hesitate to speak on behalf of Indigenous people. And to provide the paternalistic finishing touches, he added that Indigenous people's desire for their lands and sovereignty was ludicrous.

Plamondon's position as self-appointed speaker for Indigenous peoples nation-wide was as problematic as his assertions were inaccurate. Meanwhile, Buffy Sainte-Marie, one of the most prolific and successful North American Indigenous musicians, performers, and advocates, came to Expo 67 after performing at Place-des-Arts to visit and perform at the pavilion.[108] With the successful release of her third album in 1966, which featured the anticolonial ballad 'My

[106] *Ibid*. 'Letter from D.A. William Fox to Wilfred Churchman,' April 13, 1967, in Kicksee, 185.
[107] George Radwanski, 'Pavilion Misrepresents Outlook of Most Indians Says Missionary,' *The Montreal Gazette*, Tuesday, July 11, 1967.
[108] *Ibid*; Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, 121.

Country, 'Tis of Thy People You're Dying,' Sainte-Marie had been establishing herself as a preeminent Indigenous musician of the era.[109] At twenty-four years old, the Cree singer-songwriter had begun to fuse the '60s-era folk revival with Indigenous themes. She expressed joy that the Pavilion was shocking to its visitors, calling it more of a school than a performance, matching Jane Griffith's analysis of the pavilion as 'a pedagogical act of resistance to the Centennial year's colonial pedagogies.'[110] In fact, Sainte-Marie wished the Pavilion had gone further in expressing its anticolonial message, wishing the pavilion had been 'more forcible' and even more shocking to white people than it already was.[111] Finding within the pavilion the opportunity for introspection, she further explained that she was part of the new generation of Indigenous peoples who were actually partial to shocking white people.[112] Despite the fact that the Pavilion did not go far enough for the prolific performer, she recognized its importance not just as a tool of public education but as a discussion of Indigenous identity and worried that 'too many of our people think we have to beg when all they have to do is demand what is rightfully theirs.'[113]

Sainte-Marie's social activism and introspection provided a unique perspective of the variety of ways the Indians of Canada Pavilion impacted Indigenous peoples. Her tours of North America expanded the network of Indigenous activism, and her experiences at the Indians of Canada Pavilion contributed to her introspective path towards a deeper understanding of what it meant for her to be an Indigenous person. Her fearlessness shown through as she advocated for all history books for students burnt and new ones written that included Indigenous perspectives. She worried that 'l'Indien en vient à penser que c'est le Blanc qui l'a créé,' emphasizing a dire need for self-representation and re-education for whites and Indigenous peoples alike.[114]

In a letter to the editor of *The Montréal Star*, Frank Chevalier of Montreal wrote to his community to implore them to visit the 'Red Indian Pavilion.' He cited useless expenditures on the war in Vietnam which could instead 'be put aside to help the Indian regain his dignity and

[109] Buffy Sainte-Marie, 'My Country, 'Tis of Thy People You're Dying,' on *Little Wheel Spin and Spin*, Vanguard Records, 1966.
[110] Gilles Racine, 'Le pavillon des Indiens est une école non un spectacle – (Buffy Sainte-Marie)' *La Presse*, Montréal, Mardi, 13 juin, 1967; Griffith, 171.
[111] Helen Rochester, "'Head Is White, Heart Is Cree' Singer Seeks Sure Self," *Montreal Star* (13 June 1967), 9, in Rutherdale & Miller, 166.
[112] Racine, 'Le pavillon des Indiens est une école non un spectacle – (Buffy Sainte-Marie).'
[113] Rochester, 9, in Rutherdale & Miller, 166.
[114] Racine.

stand on his own feet,' favouring Canadian government divestment from military industries relating to the US invasion effort. Chevalier advocated for schools to be established 'by Indians for Indians.' He also criticized assimilationism, and invited Canadians to 'make [a new start] in 1967.'[115] Chevalier's views were well received enough to prompt a response from Jeffrey Gabriel, a Haudenosaunee reader who thanked Chevalier for his uplifting words. He wrote that 'It not often that we have a White Man speaking up for the Indians, most of them are either unaware of the Indian situation in Canada today, or are too ashamed to admit knowledge of it' and expressed hope for more encouragement 'from our White Brothers… We are Indians, and cannot be changed to be something else.'[116] Gabriel's expressions were similar to the Indians of Canada Pavilion's overall message of fighting for recognition and increased autonomy against colonial assimilationist policies. Chevalier sought to divest capital investments in war abroad in order to solve the issues relating to Indigenous poverty at home, a plan that resonated positively with Gabriel, fostering positive exchanges among a Haudenosaunee reader and a white settler.

The pavilion did have a profound effect on its visitors, who responded to its messages and engaged in critical considerations of their roles as white people in a colonial system. Aside from Frank Chevalier, journalist André Luchaire of *La Presse* was profoundly moved by the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Luchaire called the Pavilion 'le choc de l'Expo,' marking the Pavilion as one that stood out among many fascinating sites at the World's Exhibition.[117] Luchaire recognized the plight of Indigenous peoples who suffered under 'un processus historique d'extinction plus ou moins délibéré d'une culture humaine, langue, traditions, philosophie de la vie, et même d'un groupement humain méritant mieux que le destin amer que les Blancs leur ont infligé.'[118] Luchaire even went so far as to relate the federal government's ongoing colonial practices to the history of colonization of Indigenous peoples as the government 'semble avoir hérité [le paternalisme] comme partie intégrante de la succession française lors du Traité de Paris.' His avid criticism of Canadians and the Canadian federal government regarding the Indians of Canada Pavilion stood out among his peers.

Luchaire believed that Indigenous organization on a national scale would be the result of so many Indigenous participants and messages present at the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Yet most

[115] Frank Chevalier, 'Letters to the Editor: Pavilion of North American Indians Proclaims True and Touching Message,' *The Montreal Star*, Montreal, Saturday, May 20, 1967.
[116] Jeffrey Gabriel, 'The Message of The Canadian Indian Pavilion' *The Montreal Gazette*, Monday, June 5, 1967.
[117] André Luchaire, 'Le Pavillon des Indiens, le choc de l'Expo,' *La Presse*, 26 June, 1967.
[118] *Ibid*, 'Les Indiens du Canada: race qui cherche sa voix,' *La Presse*, 3 August, 1967.

striking was his conclusion that 'Les Blancs' had left it up to Indigenous people to resolve the ignorance that white people had of their history, and it would be soon time for white people to democratically solve the future problems of Indigenous peoples.[119] Luchaire's profound interest in the Indians of Canada Pavilion shaped his desire to contribute to solutions based on consultation with Indigenous peoples. He further credited Indigenous peoples for educating whites about their own historical roles in the history and legacy of colonization. In doing so, he joined Indigenous people's struggles for decolonization from the perspective of a white settler.

While Indigenous peoples and white Canadians confronted Canada's colonial mentality when visiting the Pavilion, Delisle spent much of his energy at Expo 67 asserting Indigenous peoples historic rights to the Canadian public and the international community. The pavilion was an ideal site for Indigenous representatives to show solidarity, or, in some cases, expose cleavages in Indigenous unity. The relationship between Delisle and Kahn-Tineta Horn had gone from tense during the pavilion planning stages to downright confrontational when a major Indigenous figure from the United States came to visit. On 18 May 1967, Kahn-Tineta Horn arrived nearly unannounced at the Indians of Canada Pavilion accompanied with John Belindo, the director of the largest North American Indigenous organization, the National Congress of American Indians. Horn had invited Belindo up to Kahnawà:ke and Montreal to tour the Pavilion with her, strengthening her position as a well-connected Indigenous advocate. The press was notified that Kahn-Tineta Horn was not only accompanying Belindo to see the Indians of Canada Pavilion, but that she had designed the pavilion herself, a far cry from her previous assertion that the Pavilion was a colossal waste of resources. Needless to say, the press core was, 'to put it mildly, baffled.' Chief Delisle explained his role in the pavilion planning to the press and could not hide his displeasure at being surprised by the arrival of Belindo and Horn with only an hour's notice. And when it came to Ms. Horn, he told reporters 'I think I shall treat Kahn-Tineta the way we Indians sometimes treat children when they are naughty – we pretend that they don't exist.'[120]

As Belindo arrived into an internal Kahnawà:ke power struggle of which he was blissfully unaware, Delisle ignored Horn and greeted Belindo before touring the pavilion.[121] Despite being impressed with the Pavilion, Belindo remarked that, 'Canadian Indians may be 50 to 75 years

[119] *Ibid*, 'Le Pavillon des Indiens, le choc de l'Expo.'
[120] Wouter De Wet, 'Chief Versus Princess: Feud Erupts Over Indian Pavilion,' *The Montreal Star*, Friday, May 19 1967.
[121] *Ibid*. De Wet recounted Delisle withdrawing from pictures as soon as Horn entered them, and at one point Horn 'managed to move to swiftly for Mr. [D]elisle to withdraw.'

behind us in our relations with the federal government.'[122] By the end of the tour, Chief Delisle shook John Belindo's hand, and did not offer the same gesture to Kahn-Tineta Horn. The event demonstrated the tension amongst Indigenous peoples even as they proudly displayed Indigenous narratives. Belindo's presence brought Indigenous advocates into contact with a wider, continental network of Indigenous peoples resisting colonialism through national organizations.

Another foreign dignitary's visit that stood out above all was Queen Elizabeth II's. On 3 July 1967 she arrived at the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Perhaps it was mere coincidence, but there were plumbing issues at the Pavilion that day. Chief Delisle recalls how it is unclear if this was intentionally planned or a happenstance, but the larger reception area for book-signing in the basement was unusable for those who had a sense of smell. Despite the plumbing issues, the Queen began her visit in good spirits, until about halfway through 'as we went along, I could tell her face [was] frowning.' She eventually voiced her displeasure by exclaiming that Indigenous people were not the only people with problems. To this, the Commissioner-General replied 'your majesty, we want to do something about it,' emphasizing the pavilion's messages as a one aspect of a larger anticolonial strategy.[123] Chief Delisle recounts how he did not feel as though he were the Queen's subject, and did not believe that the Queen is the one who would solve Indigenous problems. Indigenous people would have to rely on themselves, and as Delisle recalled: 'I didn't see it at that time, [but] it was an awakening to the general public of… the Indian people, [and] I think it was the first movement that Indigenous people started saying "hey it's true, we've got to do something about these things."' To Delisle, it was clear that the messages of the Indians of Canada pavilion resonated enough to shake Queens and awaken Indigenous advocates.

The Indians of Canada pavilion generated interest and controversy due to the Indigenous narratives. Chief Delisle recalled how people, including scholars, generally enjoyed the pavilion while also being surprised at the history. Just about everybody enjoyed it 'except the original civil servants there that were charge of the government, they didn't want to see that [chuckling].'[124] The multiple ways in which the Pavilion messages were received and interpreted had as much to do with who was receiving the message as it did the message itself. But the majority of Montreal newspaper articles, and particularly those written in French, shed light on a vibrant discussion and awakening of settler society to the historical and contemporary challenges

[122] "Pavilion Praised," *Montreal Star* (19 May 1967), 47, in Rutherdale & Miller, 166.
[123] *Ibid,* 30:00, 42:30.
[124] *Ibid*, 1:32:00, 1:10:00.

faced by Indigenous peoples. Nonetheless, not all Indigenous people were satisfied with the result as they had envisioned a more robust and confrontational message of decolonization free from any DIA involvement. As these challenges came to light, the surfacing of settler guilt set off a public discussion of a process Paulette Regan refers to as 'unsettling the settler within,' in which 'colonial forms of denial, guilt, and empathy act as barriers to transformative socio-political change.'[125] Regan describes such responses as potentially a 'backlash of settler denial or, conversely, generate an empathetic response that, though well intentioned, is still colonial in nature.'[126] Such empathetic responses, therefore, are not necessarily a driving force for decolonization, as winning over the hearts and minds of settlers is but one small metaphysical contribution to reconfiguring the colonial relationship. Even still, as new seeds of Indigenous empowerment were beginning to germinate at Expo 67, fewer moments offered more opportunities for them to bloom than the Indians of Canada Day.

The Indians of Canada Day, August 4th, 1967

The Indians of Canada Day was planned publicly, yet the reasoning for behind the choice of date remained a secret until Chief Delisle decided to finally share it fifty years later. Each pavilion had their day to make a presentation at Expo's Place des Nations. Chief Delisle wanted to make a statement with the date chosen, and he chose August 4th, the day before the 270th anniversary of the Lachine Massacre, which the Haudenosaunee term a raid. Through a slight chuckle, he explained that he 'couldn't choose a big celebratory day for Indian people because we didn't have any at that point in time,' so he opted for a day in which Haudenosaunee warriors planned to raze Lachine after continued French incursions into their territory.[127] A more dire warning about the perils of poor Indigenous-settler relations could not have been made! There is no evidence that anyone was aware of this fact at the time. Though the majority of the day was

[125] Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010). Specifically, Regan asks 'How can we, as non-Indigenous people, unsettle ourselves to name and then transform the settler – the colonizer who lurks within – not just in words but by our actions, as we confront the history of colonization, violence, racism, and injustice that remains part of the [Indian Residential Schools] legacy today? To me, this is the crux of the matter… [C]olonial forms of denial, guilt, and empathy act as barriers to transformative socio-political change. To my mind, Canadians are still on a misguided, obsessive, and mythical quest to assuage colonizer guilt by solving the Indian problem. In this way, we avoid looking too closely at ourselves and the collective responsibility we bear for the colonial status quo. The significant challenge that lies before us is to turn the mirror back upon ourselves and to answer the provocative question posed by historian Roger Epp regarding reconciliation in Canada: How do we solve the settler problem?' Regan, 11.
[126] Regan, 12.
[127] Copeman, 35:30.

rained out and had to be held indoors, the Indians of Canada Day still brought Indigenous people successfully into the spotlight. Expo Commissioner General Pierre Dupuy was in attendance, as were most high-ranking Expo officials, Minister Laing, Governor General Roland Michener, and numerous Indigenous Chiefs. Extensive media coverage for 'the most ambitious special day yet planned for Expo' chronicled the speeches and the arrival of Indigenous people from across Canada and the United States.'[128]

The visiting Governor General and his entourage took the opportunity to attend the Indians of Canada Pavilion. A member of the party reacted strongly; they exclaimed that 'I am not proud when I come in here,' a sentiment that 'was echoed time and time again by white Canadians visiting the beautifully designed pavilion.' The 'angry spirit' of the Pavilion was present during the Indians of Canada Day, 'a very festive occasion.'[129] Replete with dances, songs, and performances, the crowd of 5,000 witnessed nine different Indigenous nations each give one of the top Expo officials, including Commissioner General Pierre Dupuy, a headdress symbolizing their adoption into the different nations.[130] Each official was also given an Indigenous name.[131] As Johnathan Clapperton demonstrated, Indigenous people could promote anticolonial resistance in the midst of government-orchestrated celebrations of nationhood by criticizing Canada's Indian policy and publicly conducting adoption ceremonies of non-Indigenous allies.[132]

More than any other white settler, Michener evoked a complex web of colonial power mixed with Indigenous empowerment by speaking highly of Indigenous peoples and their emerging leadership in his official speech and casual dialogue throughout the day. He exclaimed that

> the new pride and resolve among our Indian people is being matched by a developing social consciousness in our country towards Canada's native people, not only Indians, but Eskimos and people of partly native descent as well…. None of us should ever forget that Canada cannot expect to achieve true greatness while any of its earliest people still live in the shadows.[133]

Michener, as the Crown's representative in Canada, sought to change the paternalistic model of Canadian colonialism to shift from a monologue to a 'gentle dialogue,' and hoped to build a relationship with Indigenous people built on principles of equality. He attributed these

[128] John Gray, 'Rain was bitter blow,' *The Montreal Star*, August 5, 1967.
[129] Sandra Dolan, 'Indians Make A Point On Their Day,' *The Gazette*, August 5, 1967.
[130] Represented nations included Mohawk, Blackfoot, Kwakwaka'wakw, Micmac, Dene, Innu, Squamish, Ojibway, and Haida.
[131] 'Nine Expo Bosses Honored With Titles, Headdresses,' *The Montreal Gazette*, August 5, 1967.
[132] Jonathan Clapperton, "Naturalizing Race Relations: Conservation, Colonialism, and Spectacle at the Banff Indian Days," in *Canadian Historical Review*, 94:3 (2013): 349-379.
[133] Dolan, 'Indians Make A Point On Their Day.'

aspirations to the increased understanding of white Canadians of their social responsibilities towards Indigenous peoples.[134] Michener was pleased with the rapid development of Indigenous leadership, and he underlined the need for all Canadians to pay attention and support Indigenous peoples.[135] He addressed Canadians directly, reaffirming the Indians of Canada Pavilion's messages that Indigenous societies had been greatly damaged by the arrival of Europeans, leading to a lack of independence and serious health problems among Indigenous peoples. He attributed this solely to the presence of whites.[136] And finally, Michener declared that:

> 'Cette race, qui paraissait s'éteindre au début de ce siècle manifeste depuis quelque temps un 'début de ralliement' et en 1967 l'on peut parler d'une véritable résurrection (émergence) des Indiens du Canada, désormais prêts à jouer pleinement leur rôle dans la vie canadienne… On y remarque un sentiment nouveau d'unité et de motivation communes… que le reste du Canada doit reconnaitre.

Pierre Dupuy added to the positive messages of the Governor General. Calling Indigenous people 'les vrais Canadiens d'origine ancienne, les Canadiens par excellence,' he admitted that 'Vous aviez votre propre civilisation, qui se serait développée et aurait progressé, si elle n'avait été mise en contact avec une race et une civilisation différentes.' Dupuy grappled with settler guilt in the midst of praising Indigenous peoples, saying 'Il est un peut (*sic*) tard pour s'excuser d'avoir changé le cours de votre évolution historique, mais nous reconnaissons plus que jamais, l'importance de votre contribution et vous remercions.'[137] Despite the empowering words from Expo officials, the Indians of Canada Day did not represent official government policy so much as it did represent an orchestrated public relations exercise. Michener could empower Indigenous people through his words, as could Pierre Dupuy, and Canadian colonial policy could remain the same. Without fundamental changes to the colonial relationship, the words expressed could only be positive were they considered empowering by Indigenous peoples. Even if no concrete policy changes were proposed to alleviate the institutional weight of colonialism, Indigenous people were being recognized and empowered more than ever before.

When it came time for Russell Moses, Deputy Commissioner General of the Indians of Canada Pavilion, to take part in the theatrics of the Indians of Canada Day, he drew from a cross-section between Indigenous empowerment and Canadian nationalism, reclaiming Canadian identity in an Indigenized version. Drawing from Indigenous affinity to the British Crown due to

[134] 'Le gouverneur général invite les Indiens à un "dialogue amical,"' *La Presse*, August 5, 1967.
[135] 'Le chef Delisle: les Indiens entendent demeurer Canadiens,' *Le Devoir*, August 6, 1967.
[136] 'Le gouverneur général invite les Indiens à un "dialogue amical."'
[137] *Ibid.*

the treaties signed, Moses explained of Indigenous pride at being 'the first Canadians,' a sentiment which Chief Delisle echoed.[138] Speaking on behalf of the wider Indigenous community, Chief Delisle highlighted the willingness of Indigenous people 'de rester canadien, en pensée et en acte.'[139] Promising to build on the existing contributions to Canadian society, the two Indians of Canada Pavilion commissioners left their audience with pledges of allegiance to Canada as Indigenous people.[140] By adopting Canadian identity and melding it with their Indigenous identity, the two Indigenous speakers drew from one of the approaches to decolonization. They were comfortable enough to express their identity as Canadians after having satisfied their urge to renegotiate the colonial relationship. By this logic, the Pavilion allowed for an expanded Indigenous-Canadian identity to take shape given that new terms had been presented to the Canadian public by Indigenous peoples.

Conclusion

As with any community or network of communities, Indigenous people did not always agree with one another on how best to confront and resist colonialism. Expo 67 provided an opportunity to showcase Indigenous identity and messages on the largest platform in Canadian history, and it follows that an overarching homogenizing narrative like that of the Pavilion would have its detractors given the different approaches that draw from the spectrum of decolonization theory and practice. As Taiaiake Alfred explains,

> '[T]he Mohawks of Kahnawà:ke were unique in the militancy and aggressiveness embedded in the character of our political culture, and to a certain degree in other aspects of our society… Each crisis heightens the expectation of an eventual resolution of the community's long-standing grievances against the state, and brings out internal contradictions which are yet to be resolved within the community itself.' [141]

While Expo 67 was not a crisis per se, the Mohawk character described by Alfred is echoed by Chief Delisle, as he recounts 'I believed that I was a different breed because… breed I say way of doing things, because I'm from Kahnawà:ke, and we're always independent and we never followed the government and we always did our things ourselves.'[142] Delisle was not the only Mohawk who drew from a confrontational style in order to renegotiate the dynamic with colonial

[138] Dolan.
[139] 'Le chef Delisle: les Indiens entendent demeurer Canadiens' *Le Devoir*, August 6, 1967.
[140] Dolan.
[141] Alfred, 1, 2.
[142] Copeman, 9:40.

officials in their favour. Several prominent Indigenous advocates figured in this regard and they made their voices heard throughout the proceedings through media interviews, meeting proceedings, and direct confrontations.

Some Indigenous people, exemplified by George Manuel and Kahn-Tineta Horn, wanted total Indigenous control over every aspect of the Pavilion's design and messaging. They viewed Indian Affairs officials with complete skepticism and rejected the approach of Chief Delisle. They drew from the notion that decolonization was an Indigenous-only endeavour, and that any paternalistic decisions made by Canadian officials would violate the principle of Indigenous self-representation and messaging. As we shall see after a careful analysis of Indigenous representation at the Canadian Pavilion, the pitfalls of Indigenous representation at the hands of the Canadian government are substantially more pronounced than at the Indians of Canada Pavilion.

The Indians of Canada Pavilion broke new ground in many aspects. Never before had so many different Indigenous groups been asked to contribute to such a large-scale project, indeed the largest public display of Indigenous history, life, and culture in Canadian history. The inclusion of so many Indigenous groups from across Canada produced a semiotics of unity that was most obvious in the pavilion itself, and perhaps least obvious in the controversies surrounding its planning and presentation. Competing factions within the Indian Advisory Council and even Andrew Tanahokate Delisle's own community of Kahnawà:ke challenged and criticized the ways in which Delisle and the Expo Task Force made decisions. Rutherdale and Miller have alleged that the issues brought up by the Indians of Canada may have had little impact.[143] Speculation aside, Andrew Tanahokate Delisle, who in 1969 became the first Indigenous person to be awarded the Order of Canada, noted only a year later that he had been receiving mail from university students, professors, and other Canadians, who 'wanted to know how they could help the Indians' cause.' Yet Chief Delisle was aware that the impact of socio-cultural change in Canadians' understanding of Indigenous people could only get Indigenous people so far: 'I know we got the ordinary public but I don't think we made much of an impression on the politicians.' [144]

[143] Rutherdale & Miller, 173.
[144] 'Rush Is On To Open 15 Pavilions,' *The Montreal Gazette*, May 23, 1968.

'Do you think the Indians of Canada Pavilion was radical? Would you use that term?' I asked the Mohawk elder in a conversation in which Expo came alive through his memories, coloured by almost five decades of hindsight. 'No, I don't think so,' he replied. 'Well you gotta ask other people that. I thought it was something that was necessary and it was informative and it was something that needed to be said. *If other people say it's radical, that's the problem that we have. People think that history is radical*.'[145]

The stakes of the debate among Indigenous people were so high not only because of the damage wrought by colonial policies and the importance of self-affirming Indigenous narratives, but additionally because of the continuing perpetuation of a colonial system and its institutional powers. Indigenous people argued for Indigenous self-representation not only because they wished for control over their own public image, but because that public image had constantly been under attack by colonial policies of Indigenous public representations.[146] Expo 67 was a site of the continuing Indigenous battle for self-representation after centuries of racist and tokenizing representations, some of which continued to be taught in residential schools to Indigenous peoples and in the wider Canadian pedagogical curriculum. Those same damaging representations were even present at Expo 67, an examination of which highlights Expo 67 as a sight of competing Indigenous and Euro-Canadian representations.

Though the impact of the pavilion on Indigenous people was substantial, the Expo's official memorial album described the pavilion as 'akin to running the gauntlet' for the '"paleface"' visitors.[147] The Expo album solidified the legacy of settler discomfort at facing the backlash from Canadian colonial policies. The official Expo 67 guide book emphasized 'the problems with which [Indigenous people] are faced by involvement in a modern technological society,' as well as 'their will to preserve the traditional moral and spiritual values of their forefathers.'[148] The guide book brought the pavilion narrative more in line with Canadian notions of

[145] Copeman, 1:20:25. Emphasis added.
[146] As Justice Murray Sinclair, the TRC chairman, eloquently put it: 'This is a Canadian problem. Because at the same time that aboriginal people were being demeaned in the schools and their culture and language were being taken away from them and they were being told that they were inferior, they were pagans, that they were heathens and savages and that they were unworthy of being respected — that very same message was being given to the non-aboriginal children in the public schools as well.' Mark Kennedy, 'Teachings about aboriginals "simply wrong", says Murray Sinclair,' *Ottawa Citizen*, May 24, 2015, updated May 29, 2015, accessed January 17th, 2017, http://ottawacitizen.com/news/politics/teachings-about-aboriginals-simply-wrong-says-murray-sinclair.
[147] Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, *Expo 67: The Memorial Album*, (Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons: 1968), 118.
[148] Charles C. Milne, ed., *Expo 67: Official Guide*, (Toronto: Maclean-Hunter, 1967), 183.

developmentalism. These last descriptions of the Indians of Canada Pavilion emanated from Expo 67 officials as they confronted anticolonial messages on a scale they had likely never witnessed before. In comparison to the Canadian Pavilion, which more closely resembled the Canadian state's narrative, Indigenous peoples were utilized as a backdrop in a wider Euro-Canadian developmentalist narrative. While such narratives formulated the basis of Expo 67, they would produce racist stereotypes when intersected with settler-colonial polities like Canada. As Canadian nationalists sought self-definition at the same exhibition that Indigenous people did, they would recycle an old formula of comparing Canada to Indigenous peoples, resisting the narrative of the Indians of Canada Pavilion by supplanting the empowering messages with ones of self-inflicted inferiority. By taking a closer look at narratives of the Canadian Pavilion, the stark contrasts of different Indigenous representations reveal a deep connection to the colonial compulsions of the history and practice of colonization that Expo was designed to repudiate.

Chapter II - *Humanity 1967*:
Colonial Humanism at the Canadian Pavilion

'As a people who feel a bond with the whole human race, we prize the economic, political and cultural links which unite us to the rest of the world. Hence, a major section of the Canadian Pavilion is devoted to that part of man which is universal…Canada's concept of Man and his World is simple and free of affectation.'[1]

On a cold, wintery day in 1967, Kumukluk Saggiak and Elijah Pudlat stood in the freezing wind and blustering snow on the south shore of the St. Lawrence River. The two Inuit artists were watching ice floes float downstream, chatting in Inuktitut. The watchful eye of a film camera observed them in this unusual place for a daytime chat over 2,000 km away from their homes in Cape Dorset, forming the opening scenes for a National Film Board promotional film. Just across the shore was a vague outline of an inverted pyramid-like structure on the horizon, barely visible through the snowfall. The next scene is of a Canadian flag, officially adopted by Canada's Parliament only two years prior to Canada's Centennial celebrations. Billowing atop a wooden pole made of British Columbian fir, the flag stood in front of the Katimavik, its modernistic shape form clearly visible as the camera is transported to the pavilion grounds.[2] The Katimavik, an Inuktitut word for 'meeting place,' was one of two modernist structures built at the Canadian Pavilion of the 1967 International and Universal Exhibition (Expo 67). The Inuktitut word was reimagined into an inverted pyramid-shaped structure with its lowest point just above the Canadian Pavilion's main exhibition area. It provided visitors the opportunity to observe their surroundings from 200 feet in the air with a 360 degree view of Expo and downtown Montreal, newly-minted with several modernist skyscrapers from the early 1960s construction boom. The Inuit carvers were chosen by officials at the Canadian Pavilion to carve their people's story into the walls of the Canadian Pavilion, further inscribing an Indigenous presence onto the marquee celebration of Canada's 100th birthday.

---

[1] François Hébert, 'Katimavik,' in *Widening Horizons: Katimavik and Interdependence*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), 3.

[2] Michel Régnier, 'Indian Memento: Indians of Canada Pavilion – Expo 67' (Nation Film Board of Canada, 1967), online, http://www.nfb.ca/film/indian_memento/. 0:00-1:00.

Nearby, the People Tree, a 66-foot high structure with semi-transparent leaves tinted orange, red, and yellow to match Canada's coniferous forests in the fall, standing as an emblem of Canadian government attempts to reconfigure national identification through the visual representation of a multiethnic tree. Of the 1,500 colourful "leaves," 700 depicted Canadians in their every-day life. The tree would be lit from its interior at night, glowing and reinforcing its status as 'the centre of visual attention' at the pavilion.[3] In another of the official pavilion guide books, *My Home, My Native Land*, one of the Canadian Pavilion's contributing designers cited the prophecy of French Jesuit missionary Barthélemy Vimont, who in 1642 'predicted that the humble foundation would become a great tree which would spread all over.' To the author, Expo 67 stood as a testament to Canadian success, as Vimont's 'prophecy is fulfilled.'[4] The organic wood, formerly a living organism, of the flag pole propped up the newly-adopted flag; nearby, a modern construction of a People Tree worthy of the Canadian imagination captured the seasonal coniferous foliage in a state of modernist permanence, where their colourful beauty merged with images of Canadians. The metaphor of the People Tree, made of images, steel, and fabric, was presented as an organic representation of the spread of the Canadian nation, while a nearby uprooted, stripped, and dead tree's branches and needles were replaced by the Canadian flag. Bush focused on the modern People Tree as the metaphoric realization of Vimont's prophecy, with the flag pole representing the extension of Canadian lands from Montreal to the Pacific coast.

Expo 67 was interwoven within historical processes that preceded the Centennial Celebrations by several generations. The exhibition site was envisioned as a supranational space, where visitors were given 'passports' as tickets that they could have stamped at the pavilions they visited. This imagined, new space formed the basis of a rhetorical evacuation of historical conflicts, and yet was understood to be a monument to mankind's historical and future trajectory. I argue that particular notions of human population and cultural identity were fashioned with a colonial humanist logic of the Canadian Pavilion through descriptions of Indigenous and Euro-Canadian peoples. Specifically, Indigenous/settler contrasts served to highlight the presumed-superiority of white settlers, making settler identity central and Indigenous peoples peripheral. Meanwhile, Canadian cultural nationalists grappled with ascendant Quebec nationalism by

[3] Robin Bush, *My Home, My Native Land: A People and Their Growth*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), 3.
[4] Norbert Lacoste, 'The People Tree,' in *My Home, My Native Land*, 26.

balancing the appropriation of Francophones with criticism of the separatist movement. The descriptions were reinforced by a teleological framework for nation-building of the Canadian Pavilion and its explanatory guide books. Drawing from Gary Wilder's analysis of the French imperial nation-state, Canadian colonial humanism at Expo was 'simultaneously universalizing and particularizing' and was 'doubled and contradictory [so] that immanent possibilities for criticism and transformation were possible.'[5] While the Indians of Canada Pavilion analyzed in Chapter 1 demonstrated the harsh criticism of Canadian colonialism at Expo, the Canadian Pavilion and its explanatory guide books articulated a continuation of the nationalist project that depicted Canada as an international model for human development.

The Canadian Pavilion provided the Canadian federal government with the opportunity to tell Canada's national story to the widest audience Canada had ever hosted, including over 60 major foreign dignitaries.[6] As Jane Griffith explains, the pavilion's colonial discourse 'was one example of what the Indians of Canada Pavilion was up against, helping to explain some of visitors' inability to learn from its public pedagogy.'[7] The 125 exhibits described 'how the nation has developed, the factors that shape the lives of Canadians, and what Canadians are like.'[8] Three explanatory guide books contain descriptions of the Canadian Pavilion and the country itself: *Change Comes to Canada* recounts the challenges Canada faces; *My Home, My Native Land* focuses on the Canadian population; and *Widening Horizons* considers Canada's role in the international community.[9] It is these three seminal pavilion documents that will be the focus of this chapter. The official Canadian Pavilion guide books were designed to elaborate and describe the pavilion exhibition areas, which ranged from 'The Land of Canada, The People of Canada, The Growth of Canada, The Challenges to Canadians and Canada and the World,' with the Katimavik relating to Expo's theme, Man and His World.[10] Averaging 30 pages long, the guide books were sold on-site for $1.00 to the travelers and local Montrealers who sought a deeper

[5] Gary Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State: Negritude and Colonial Humanism Between the Two World Wars*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 22.
[6] Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, *Expo 67: The Memorial Album*, (Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons: 1968), 109.
[7] Jane Griffith, 'One Little, Two Little, Three Canadians: The Indians of Canada Pavilion and Public Pedagogy, Expo 67,' *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 49:2 (Spring 2015), 187.
[8] Charles C. Milne, ed., *Expo 67: Official Guide*, (Toronto: Maclean-Hunter, 1967), 89.
[9] Bush; François Hébert, 'Katimavik,' and Joseph Rudel-Tessier, 'Interdependence,' in *Widening Horizons: Katimavik and Interdependence*, 1967; Lister Sinclair. *Change Comes To Canada: A Personal Glance*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967).
[10] *Ibid*.

understanding of the pavilion and the country, or simply wanted a souvenir from the host nation's pavilion.

In grappling with Canadian colonial humanism at Expo 67, I define 'Canada' similarly to Ian McKay's terms in conjunction with literature developmentalism and colonialism. As a 'simultaneously as an *extensive* projection of liberal rule across a large territory and an *intensive* process of subjectification, whereby liberal assumptions are internalized and normalized within the dominion's subjects,' "Canada" becomes more a rhetorical device resting on countless suppositions masked as objective realities rather than cultural constructs.[11] To add to McKay's formulation, I further argue that the Canadian Pavilion rested on a colonial logic that predated, and was further compounded by, capitalism, liberalism, and their projects of rule. Liberal and capitalist notions of 'development' and 'modernity' combined with a new cultural policy to produce a new Canadian national identification that recycled old colonial dynamics of power and conquest. I seek to validate this argument through a careful analysis of three official pavilion explanatory guide books focusing on four themes: (1) the promotion of a set of dichotomous Euro-Canadian/Indigenous representations, with some francophone particularities among the former; (2) the rhetorical construction of the concept of 'Canada,' or 'Canada-as-project' of colonial liberal rule projected onto North American lands as a means to acquire territory; (3) a Canadian nationalist history within a developmentalist narrative of progress and modernization; and (4), connecting these three previous discourses on Canada to a wider project of globalized modernity, global humanism, and individual transformation.[12]

As Expo 67 was underway, Canadian cultural policy was undergoing a fundamental shift as the post-War period brought profound political and demographic changes. The old British moniker, so prevalent in English Canada's lexicon, began to fade a set of new terms entered the fore.[13] Among them was a reworked definition of 'Canadian.' At Expo, the federal government's new approach to describing Canada's populace bore the evidence of a disjointed narrative of unity in diversity when defining the diverse elements of the population.[14] A newly-revitalised cultural approach to identity construction was built on the concept of civic nationalism, 'the

[11] Ian McKay, 'The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History,' in *Canadian Historical Review*, 81:4 (Dec 2000), pp. 617-651, 624.
[12] The term 'Canada-as-project' is borrowed from Ian McKay, 'The Liberal Order Framework,' 621.
[13] See José Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006).
[14] See Sonja Macdonald, 'Expo 67 Canada's National Heterotopia: A Study of the Transformative Role of International Exhibitions in Modern Society,' (M.A. thesis, Carleton University, 2003).

dominance of appeals to universal values rather than to ethnic origin.'[15] While Indigenous peoples were each represented in an overtly paternalistic fashion, Francophone nationalists and separatists figured largely as obstructions to the national unity the Centennial Celebrations were founded on. In this context, French-Canadians and Québécois were both celebrated and appropriated into Canada's national story at the Canadian pavilion as a means to differentiate Canada from the United States and the mono-ethnic nationalisms of Europe. Arguments for Canadian particularity required a careful balancing act of which group of peoples would be displayed as proof of national differentiation and ethnic pluralism depending on which nation Canada was being compared to.

Contradictions were inherent to assessments of the Canadian populace. These contradictions are analyzed in this chapter to deconstruct how nationalist terminology contained a myriad of overlapping strategies to foster national sentimentalism and attachment to North American lands. Eva Mackey describes the institutionalization of cultural pluralism in Canada 'as a key feature of the mythology of identity of the dominant white Anglophone majority,' forming part of 'the cultural politics of pluralism as it is articulated in colonial and national projects, and in the subjectivities of people who conceive of themselves as 'mainstream' or simply "*Canadian*-Canadians."'[16] As Mackey explains, these cultural mythologies are the top-down projection of 'the nationalism of dominant peoples' and in Canada are institutionalized 'as a key feature of the mythology of identity of the dominant white Anglophone majority,' a Canadian articulation of whiteness. What sets Canada apart as a white settler-colony is its 'official national culture which is not "*homogeneous* in its whiteness" but rather replete with images of Aboriginal people and people of colour,' resting on notions of cultural difference as inherent definitional aspects of the nation emanating from state policy as 'a flexible strategy developed to manage diverse populations' to create 'national subjectivities.'[17] In essence, promoters of Canadian colonial humanism at Expo 67 articulated a Canadian whiteness that totalized the Canadian population into Anglophone elites' vision of the nation, projecting their hegemonic reach into the identity of a multiethnic population.

[15] Igartua, 4.
[16] Eva Mackey, *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*, (London: Routledge, 1999), 3.
[17] *Ibid*, 3, 8, 13.

The ambitious cultural policy's success depended heavily on turning a blind eye to much of Canada's Indigenous policy. A simplified narrative of Indigenous peoples in Canada's history coupled with the presence of Indigenous artefacts was all that remained available at the Canadian Pavilion, in contrast with the complex anticolonial narrative at the Indians of Canada Pavilion. As Patrick Wolfe explains,

> The primary object of settler-colonization is the land itself rather than the surplus value to be derived from mixing native labour with it…. settler-colonization is at base a winner-take-all project whose dominant feature is not exploitation but replacement. The logic of this project, a sustained institutional tendency to eliminate the Indigenous population, informs a range of historical practices that might otherwise appear distinct – *invasion is a structure not an event*.[18]

By this logic, Expo 67 featured as a continuation of the structure of European settler-colonial invasion. As expressions of humanism were being made in the Canadian Pavilion guide books, they were a result of a structured invasion that privileged white Anglophone nationalism as the apex of Canada's evolution. By deconstructing the identitarian, territorial, and developmentalist suppositions in the Canadian Pavilion guide books, I seek to expose the unsettling undercurrent prevalent in white discourses of domination over the North American population and landscape, the hallmark of Canadian colonial humanism at Expo 67.

Euro-Canadian Identity & Indigenous Culture

While the Indians of Canada Pavilion served as the principle site of Indigenous messages, the Canadian Pavilion was replete with Indigenous representations amidst a narrative of national expansion and white European superiority. Arts and artefacts were included in what Ian McKay calls Canada's 'Quest of the Folk,' a nationalist project whereby academics utilized cultural artefacts to produce a quaint narrative of pre-modernity.[19] The 'Quest of the Folk' made art and artefacts into examples of national continuity through changing patterns of production and political organizations. By drawing on supposedly 'traditional' art forms (which had been heavily influenced by Indian and Northern Affairs representatives), the Canadian Pavilion drew from 'a mythological past to rhetorically bind a clutch of diverse and divergent geographic and

[18] Patrick Wolfe, *Settler-Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*, (London: Cassell, 1999), 163. Emphasis added.
[19] Ian McKay, *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-century Nova Scotia*, (Montreal: McGill-Queens UP, 1994), in Leanne Pupchek, 'True North: Inuit Art and Canadian Nationalist Imaginings,' *American Review of Canadian Studies*, (Spring/Summer 2001), pp. 191-208, 197.

political units together as a concrete expression of the country.'[20] As Patrick Wolfe described, 'Colonialism does not appropriate a historical indigeneity; it replaces it with a conveniently mythical one of its own construction.'[21] In the case of Inuit art and carvings, both brought in and made on-site at the Canadian Pavilion, Expo planners attempted to meld Indigeneity and Canadiana, creating a new, hybrid art form that was promoted as distinctly Canadian.

The Canadian Pavilion featured Indigenous artwork carved by Inuit artists Kumukluk Saggiak and Elijah Pudlat of Cape Dorset, who were tasked with carving a series of vast plaster murals that lined the Canadian Pavilion's Katimavik. The carvers told the story of Inuit peoples, in particular the changes between pre- and post-contact Inuit life. By carving 'all these pictures the Hudlunan [white people] will see… what life is like' in the North.[22] They were asked to construct an igloo for Expo visitors, an attempt that went unsuccessful as they were provided materials 'that were white like snow, but they were not snow.' Saggiak remarked that 'the igloos of our people in the old days were made perfectly.'[23] The Cape Dorset duo was tasked with manipulating materials they were unfamiliar with to produce an igloo to add to the range of Indigenous artefacts throughout Expo, adding modern materials to Indigenous art forms.

While the Canadian Pavilion sought to include Inuit peoples in Canadian nationhood, Saggiak and Pudlat sought to tell their people's story. Their interactions with Expo officials were cause for discomfort, as Saggiak exclaimed that it was 'hard to talk to a white companion' given the language barrier.[24] He carved soapstone in front of Expo visitors, becoming part of the display himself in a roped-off corner of the Canadian Pavilion.[25] His presence as an outsider from the North gave Canadians the opportunity to study people they believed lived in their territory, yet Saggiak and Pudlat had explicitly stated that they came to Montréal to tell a story of the Inuit people with no adherence to Canadian nationalism. Their carvings stood in the Katimavik restaurant La Toundra rather than the section devoted to Canadian art. La Toundra, 'the fanciest of the pavilion's three restaurants,' served classic Canadian dishes 'such as grilled *muktuk,*' appropriating Inuit cuisine alongside the Inuit mural.[26] As Leanne Pupchek argues, romanticizations of "Indian" and "Eskimo" by Canadian cultural producers 'contributed to a

[20] Pupchek, 206.
[21] Wolfe, 208.
[22] Millar, 'Aki'name,' 2:45.
[23] *Ibid*, 18:15.
[24] *Ibid*, 3:30.
[25] *Ibid*, 18:30.
[26] Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, 109.

program aimed at the gradual rhetorical extermination of the Aboriginal peoples that began in the 1800s.'[27] To the Inuit carvers, the murals represented their people's story, and to the Canadian Pavilion planners, they represented the extension of Canadian folkloric arts and culture to its northernmost reaches. Their presence captured the complexity of the different understandings of what their participation meant to Expo, as their voices layered their participation with meaning beyond what the Hudlunan described.[28]

Representations of Inuit art were part of the myriad of cultures represented at the Canadian Pavilion, yet a more simplistic set of descriptions of the peoples of Canada were found in the pavilion guide books. In *My Home, My Native Land*, Robin Bush presented the story for the 'Growth' section of the Canadian Pavilion he designed, which followed directly after the 'Land' section in the first pavilion exhibit area underneath the Katimavik. As a metaphor for Canada's diverse population, the People Tree provided the opportunity for reflection on the peoples of Canada. Indigenous people were treated as narrative devices to teleologically project Canada's territorial suppositions into the realm of 'prehistory.' The guide book projected Canada as a nation through Indigenous peoples, replicating the process of colonization whereby Indigenous peoples, like it or not, were a part of the nation that lay claim to their territories. By claiming Indigenous people anachronistically represented a nation-state before such a structure existed suggested that Indigenous people such as Saggiak and Pudlat misunderstood themselves and their role in pre-contact history.

Describing the introductory section for Growth in the two-part guide book *My Home, My Native Land*, Bush explained the purpose of the display: to recount 'the origins and history of the Canadian Nation.' Citing the 'scarcely ten generations' since 'the first recording of accepted facts,' Bush solidified the disregard for Indigenous knowledge and history and supplanted them with a colonial history favouring white settlement. By this Eurocentric logic, Canada's time began when Europeans arrived, separating Canada from the land before European arrival. Furthermore, while relegating Indigenous history to 'prehistory,' which he condemned as replete with 'romance,' 'mythology,' and 'legends,' he remarked on the curious links between Indigenous people and 'the people of Central and South America, the Mongols, Vikings and Irish

[27] Pupchek, 193.
[28] See also Sherry Brydon, 'The Representation of Inuit Art at Expo 67,' in *American Indian Art Magazine* (Spring 2012), 31-43.

Monks.'[29] Such broad strokes of comparisons, across chasmic distances and periods, demonstrate a profoundly homogenizing point of view of different peoples. 'History' as referred to in this context is synonymous with 'written history,' yet by evacuating oral history from 'recorded facts,' Bush posited that 'history' in North America began with the arrival of white Europeans.[30] By connecting contemporary difficulties with the challenges faced by early colonizers in the past, Lacoste invokes ongoing struggles marked by historical continuity irrespective of the struggles' differences in order to solidify national continuity.

Bush plainly divided Indigenous peoples into four geographic groupings. He promoted the view that Indigenous peoples were *of* the landscape, forgoing cultural and linguistic ties for a simpler yet less accurate geographic descriptor. Beginning with the Inuit, Bush remarked positively on their adaptations and survival skills in such a hostile climate, as well as the 'simplicity and elegance' of their artifacts and the 'mystical relationship' between man and animal expressed in their carvings. Inuit carvings featured prominently in the Canadian Pavilion, and had received a growing interest since Canada's colonial gaze turned northward after the Second World War. The North represented Canada's final frontier; 'existent in all regions of Canada, [it] preserves our pioneering spirit.'[31] Canadians at Expo were reminded that their historical relationship as colonial explorers and pioneers was still being cultivated further into Indigenous peoples' territory.

The next category of Indigenous peoples under the colonial gaze were North West Coast Indians, 'the people of the Potlatch,' a Chinook term for 'to give,' referring to Pacific Northwest Indigenous peoples who engaged in the ritual of gift exchange, story-telling, and intra-community discussions. By describing Northwestern Indigenous art forms as among the 'most striking and powerful primitive' art forms worldwide, Bush utilized the colonial gaze to grace Pacific Coast Indigenous peoples with a paternalistic, backhanded compliment. Bush also claimed that these varied Indigenous groups, which include the Haida, Coast Salish, and Gitxsan (among many others), were 'ultimately dispersed by the abolition of the Potlatch in the mid-19th

[29] Bush, 7-8.
[30] For an in-depth discussion of Indigenous oral history as a source of historical knowledge, see Adele Perry, 'The Colonial Archive on Trial: Possession, Dispossession, and History in *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia'* in Antoinette Burton, ed., *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*, (Durham: Duke UP, 2006), 325-350.
[31] Bush, 8, 23.

Century,' despite their continued existence in their native territory to this day.[32] Indigenous peoples of the Western plains and Sub-arctic were put into another category, the Athabaskan hunters of the buffalo. After mentioning their 'less dramatic' art forms compared to west coast Indigenous peoples, Bush remarks on how European introduction of the horse led to improve hunting capabilities.[33] By his analysis, the blame for the reduction in buffalo numbers rested squarely on Indigenous overhunting, which was disconnected by omission from the reality of European and settler colonial expansion into the plains, accompanied by settler overhunting. In this case, the negative results of colonization were either supplanted by simplistic assertions of Indigenous culpability or omitted entirely from the pavilion guide book.

Following the loosely-categorized Plains and Sub-arctic Indigenous groups were the eastern peoples, 'the Algonquins, the Hurons and the Iroquois.'[34] Save a nod to Iroquoian 'sophisticated form of political organisation,' little is mentioned of these groups.[35] Most notable is the use of the past tense in every commentary on Indigenous peoples, a discursive technique to erase Indigenous presence in contemporary Canada. Furthermore, Indigenous peoples become the backdrop for colonial expansion's demographic and technological advances. To minimize settler guilt, Bush declared that although 'our prehistory' was full of conflicts and violence, these were not 'a primary effect' of white explorers' arrival but 'a later by-product' of British and French expansion, the fur trade decline, and Indigenous-European alliances.[36] By claiming dominion over the history of Indigenous-white contact and all that came before, Bush gave nationalist history its totalizing power and dominion over events that occurred on a landscape the nation-state claimed for itself. The landscape and peoples were embedded with a history that Bush claimed for Canada, reinforcing the colonial compulsion of knowing and owning the landscape and its histories.

After Robin Bush introduced Growth, Norbert Lacoste contributed the second part of *My Home, My Native Land* with a more detailed description of the People Tree. He asserted that

[32] *Ibid*, 9. The potlatch was first outlawed in 1884 and removed from the Canadian penal code in 1951. The unsuccessful outlawing of the potlatch by the Canadian government served to establish Canadian legal hegemony in the region, while government agents encouraged Indigenous peoples to abandon what were seen as primitive practices in order to join the market economy and the civilizing benefits of menial wage labour.
[33] *Ibid*.
[34] *Ibid*.
[35] For a detailed explanation of how the Iroquois Confederacy greatly inspired the American Constitution, see Bruce E. Johansson, *Forgotten Founders: Benjamin Franklin, the Iroquois and the Rationale for the American Revolution*, (Ipswitch: Gambit Publishers, 1982).
[36] Bush, 9-10.

Canadians have 'overcome nature's problems' and must turn to resolving their 'human problems.' And in doing so, one must look only so far as the People Tree's roots for inspiration:

> Why not invoke the courage of those who preceded us on this inhospitable soil and who, despite technically poor methods and all other handicaps, managed to survive? Explorers, trappers, missionaries, navigators, settlers, how can we fully appreciate their lives of effort and hardship which today allow us to be masters of this vast land?[37]

In this view the original act of colonization should be replicated in managing Canada's diverse population.

Integrating Indigenous people into the nationalistic story-telling at the Canadian Pavilion largely served to obfuscate the reality of the settler-colonial relationship. As the decades of overt assimilationist programs continued to wear on, 'Eskimos and Indians' would be 'officially recognized' as cultures in this period.[38] Even this recognition, however, had insidious potential, as Glen Coulthard argues:

> [I]nstead of ushering in an era of peaceful coexistence grounded on the ideal of *reciprocity* or *mutual* recognition, the politics of recognition in its contemporary liberal form promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonialist, racist, patriarchal state power that Indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend.

Expo 67 marked an early phase in what Coulthard calls 'the asymmetrical exchange of mediated forms of state recognition and accommodation,' as simply naming and acknowledging Indigenous peoples did nothing to relinquish colonial power exerted on their lands through dispossession and bodies through residential schools.[39] Recognition has masked the ways in which Canadian cultural policy towards Indigenous peoples was built on cultural appropriation on the one hand, and cultural genocide on the other. Canadian Pavilion guide books illustrated how Indigenous peoples were mischaracterized and demeaned as a means to minimize settler guilt and perpetuate Indigenous dispossession. In addition to the patriarchal representations of Indigenous peoples, they were also utilized as evidence of Canada's long history in North America as they were recruited into an anachronistic nation of which Indigenous peoples were the first participants.

In *Change Comes to Canada*, the first time Sinclair fully acknowledged the presence of Indigenous peoples their existence was subsumed to their role in the nationalist narrative. The

---

[37] *Ibid*, 21.
[38] *Ibid*, 23.
[39] Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: The Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 3, 15.

first mention of Indigenous peoples links them directly to having inspired the routes European settlers would follow. Rather than commend Indigenous peoples for establishing the routes, Sinclair comments that the logic of their routes was dictated by natural phenomena rather than any significant planning. The density of the forest made waterways and areas previously stricken by forest fires the only plausible routes.[40] Sinclair mentions some of these fires are deliberately set by Indigenous peoples, without any explication as to why.[41] Thus the reader of *Change Comes to Canada* is introduced to Indigenous peoples as guides for European colonial expansion known for sporadically setting forest fires. The nomenclature was limited to 'Indians,' as a differentiation of which nation or people was of minimal importance to Sinclair.

In *Widening Horizons*, Lacoste described several Katimavik sculptures of masks from around the world. One of the masks described is a Haida mask of the Canadian Pacific coast, 'an object of pure fantasy' used by a 'sorcerer.'[42] As with just about every Indigenous culture that would be named at Expo 67, use of the past tense to describe their beliefs relegated them to an era come and gone, further marginalizing the present-day Haida people even while appropriating their cultural practices and existence into the fabric of the Canadian Pavilion. Indigenous people were celebrated because of their contributions to Canada's history, a history in which at the Canadian Pavilion of Expo 67 appeared closer to a public relations exercise than an actual engagement with the facts of European colonization.

If the guide books were for the most part paternalistic in their descriptions of Indigenous peoples, their definition of Euro-Canadians was certainly more nuanced and complex. Early in *My Home, My Native Land*, Donald Crowdis refers to the 'just-discovered' land of Canada, invoking white supremacist logic: lands discovered by Europeans belonged to whichever European crown funded the expedition.[43] In this case, 'just-discovered' refers to just discovered by *Europeans*, as colonial logic rendered Indigenous peoples incapable of discovering the lands that they had lived on and that sustained them for thousands of years. While Indigenous peoples were being described in contrast to a white settler identity, the two identities are so inextricably linked as to be nearly impossible to define without juxtaposition. Once Indigenous peoples were

[40] Sinclair, 13.
[41] *Ibid*.
[42] Hébert, 12-13.
[43] Bush, 5.

defined and categorized, they were relegated to a pastness relevant only because of its teleological successor: the arrival of white Europeans.

While white explorers displaced Indigenous peoples in nationalist histories of primordial Canadian nation-building, at Expo a curious mingling of Indigenous and European historical narratology was shaped from a profoundly Eurocentric perspective. Writing in Indigenous peoples required a reshaping of nationalist mythology. This process is best illustrated by Norbert Lacoste and his description of the symbol of the People Tree. By drawing from the standard point of comparison with 'Canadian Indians' who symbolized their tribe in the totem pole, Lacoste reinforced the notion that white settler identity was substantially dependent on Indigeneity as a point of comparison.[44] As Patrick Wolfe explains, 'Colonialism does not appropriate a historical indigeneity; it replaces it with a conveniently mythical one of its own construction.' Indigeneity becomes the counterpart to a European referent, 'the unstated subject at the apex of evolutionism's global hierarchy, that transparent paragon in relation to which all difference was default.'[45] Furthermore, Lacoste was either unaware or disinterested in the fact that only Pacific coastal Indigenous peoples built totem poles, not all 'Canadian Indians.'

As Expo 67 was an international event, preoccupations abounded among nations to set their own apart. Canadians sought to 'express themselves and present their image to their brothers of Man and his World.' Remarking on the world's familiarity with Canadian mountains, forests, lakes, and prairies, Lacoste pondered on how the international community views Canadians themselves, asking '[h]ow can justice be rendered to our people whose ethnic origins are so varied, whose cultures differ, and who stretch across a continent?' Old, young, businessmen, labourers, speakers of English, French, Italian, Eskimo or Polish, all are to be part of the new Canadian pluralistic identity to be displayed at Man and His World.[46] Bush accorded no distinctive status to any one linguistic group, exalting Canada's diversity as exceptional. The unity and diversity of white Europeans in Canada was further exalted by François Hébert. Hébert warmly praised the spiritual and political bonds with 'the lands of our fathers, to France, to England, to Scotland, to Ireland.' Even the United States was exalted, as were the 'two heritages.'[47] Canadian history was described as beacon of hope in which harmonious relations

[44] *Ibid*, 19.
[45] Wolfe, 208, 47.
[46] Bush, 19.
[47] Hébert, 25.

between European ethnic groups served as a lesson to the wider world. While subsuming Irish people into the Canadian identity for the first time within the pamphlets, Hébert made no mention of the discrimination faced historically by the Irish community.[48] This matches the pattern of whitewashing Canadian-Indigenous contact history and appropriating ethno-cultural communities into a universal Canadian identity without engaging with the troubling history of ethnic strife.

While Hébert and Bush focussed more on Canada's ethnic composition, Sinclair centred Canadian history on a narrative of Anglo-Franco relations.[49] The focus contrasted with the message of a hegemonic Canadian identification, as the English/French duality remained alongside Canadian attempts to promote Canada's ethnic diversity even while delineating settler/Indigenous difference. The relationship between the descendants of two European colonising powers loomed large in contemporary nationalist circles, both Canadian and Québécois, in the midst of the Quiet Revolution. Quebec society was undergoing a profound cultural shift in identity politics, refashioning the ethnolinguistic identification with *Canadiens français* into a civic identity in Quebec. Furthermore, the newly-emerging *Québécois* nationalistic identity drew greater significance from the landscape. By turning from a linguistic delineation (*Canadien français*) to a territorial one (*Québécois*), Québec nationalists fostered territorial assumptions that mirrored the settler-colonial ambitions of English Canada.[50]

According to Lacoste, Canada's place in the world is to serve as a model of cooperation amidst a presumably problematic racial diversity. Canada would become a model for the international community if it could 'solve the problems of its cultural duality,' and be able to 'offer to the world an example of happy solution to a problem which crops up in many countries composed of different races and cultures.' Metaphorically, Bush understood Canada was 'a land of compromise – a marble cake rather than a comfortable beige.'[51] While the marble cake marked an acceptance of a visual diversity based on colourism, it did not outweigh its counterpart, a 'comfortable' light-skinned ethnic homogeneity.

---

[48] *Ibid*. For example, see Dan Horner, 'Solemn Processions and Terrifying Violence: Spectacle, Authority, and Citizenship during the Lachine Canal Strike of 1843,' in *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine* 38: 2 (Spring 2010), pp. 36-47.
[49] Sinclair, 4-6.
[50] For a more in-depth discussion on such topics, see Jocelyn Létourneau, 'Le « Québec moderne ». Un chapitre du grand récit collectif des Québécois,' in *Revue francaise de science politique*, n. 5, (1992), 765-785, and André Lecours, 'Ethnic and Civic Nationalism: Towards a New Dimension,' in *Space and Polity*, 4:2, (2000), 153-166.
[51] Bush, 22, 4.

The lauding of the dominant view of top-down problem solving with regard to ethnic diversity supplanted the opportunity for a deeper discussion of the role of Anglo-Canadian imperialism and racism that had left such deep wounds in francophone Quebec. How to manage popular demonstrations displaced any thought of examining the issues raised during the Quiet Revolution beyond accepting bilingualism exclusively when considered 'practicable and beneficial.' This would not be done for the French-speakers themselves, but to reinforce Canada as 'free, understanding and tolerant,' to achieve a goal 'that all men who love Canada have at heart,' rather than correct historic injustices and marginalization of Francophones. Amid the nationalistic tumult, according to Bush the French and English conflicts were apparently 'resolved,' as 'small rebellion' is mentioned without any dates, names, places, or context.[52] In this case, the characterization of English-French relations is one of former challenges being overcome due to English Canada's ability to 'tolerate' difference, matching what Ian McKay called 'bargains with liberal hegemony.'[53]

Unsurprisingly, one of the crucial racial identifiers of Canada's cultural policy in the 1960s, that of the "two founding races," found its way into the Canadian Pavilion narrative. The phrase, referring to French and British settlers, was in evidence in the section '*Our Two Heritages.*'[54] Lacoste cited an end to French rule and a choice to no longer remain British or become Americans as a 'collective wish' explained by Canada's 'bicultural character.' This came despite the fact that identification with Britishness and Canada as a British Dominion remained quite strong until the Postwar period,[55] and that Confederation was by no means a collectively-articulated project. Yet the inclusion of French people was not all positive: 'The Canada tree finds itself seriously threatened' by the threat of Quebec separation, which would in turn separate the Atlantic provinces from the rest of Canada. In this case, Canada's cultural duality is evoked as a central problem, the resolution of which 'will offer to the world an example of happy solution to a problem which crops up in many countries composed of different races and cultures.'[56] The *Partis-pris*, a prominent Québec nationalist publication, considered the appropriation of French to formulate a bilingual national character at Expo as 'the coloniser's

[52] *Ibid*, 23, 11.
[53] McKay, 'Liberal Order Framework,' 639.
[54] Bush, 22-23.
[55] See Igartua.
[56] Bush, 22.

new game, "celle de jouer au Français."'[57] In this context, a distinct Québécois identification resisted attempts to be woven into the fabric of the Canadian nation, with similarities to what John Gabriel called 'subaltern whiteness… which has always remained prey to dominant, white, racialized discourse.'[58] Bush particularized bilingual and bicultural Canada and held it up as a potential global model while simultaneously grappling with a rising tide of Quebec separatism.

Instrumentalizing French as a distinguishing character of the Canadian identity allowed for the cooptation of differences to particularize the Canadian identity and distinguish it from the United States in much the same way Indigenous peoples were instrumentalized to distinguish Canada from Europe. Canadian statehood was 'first a compromise between the first two groups of inhabitants which, among other things, in future distinguishes us from the Americans.'[59] Fear of being subsumed by America took on another form: the threat of the production of U.S. television networks, which were apparently 'raping Canadian culture.' And what's more, 'To judge from the television ratings, most Canadians relax and enjoy it,' (!).[60] Sinclair described in violent and gendered terms the implication of U.S. penetration into Canadian households, threatening Canadian identity via a cultural invasion from the United States. As Eva Mackey explains,

> 'The construction of Canada as a gendered body, victimised by external and more powerful others, creates a fiction of a homogeneous and unified body, an image that elides the way the Canadian nation can victimise internal 'others'…. It appropriates the identity of marginalisation and victimisation to create national innocence, locating the oppressors safely outside the body politic of the nation…'[61]

In this sense, Sinclair both presented a hegemonic notion of Canadian culture and centralized that culture as the victim of the United States. By claiming Canadian victimhood, Sinclair inverted the Canadian settler-colonial dynamic to that of a US. cultural invasion.

Non-Indigenous ethnic groups were also given credit for contributing to Canada's identity. They added to the 'pluralist character of the Canadian culture' and gave it its 'novelty.' Each ethnic group was credited for being aware that it is 'building a country,' this time characterized

---

[57] Eva-Marie Kröller, 'Expo 67: Canada's Camelot?' in *Canadian Literature,* Issue 152/153, (Spring/Summer 1997), pp 36-51, 48, and 'Colonialisme quotidian: centre bilingual centre,' in *Parti-pris* 4 (mai-aout 1967), 195-96.
[58] John Gabriel, *Whitewash: Racialized Politics and the Media*, (London: Routledge, 1998), 184. Gabriel's analysis of subaltern whiteness focusses on the Irish experience, although it is particularly applicable to the white Francophone Québec experience.
[59] Bush, 22.
[60] Sinclair, 17.
[61] Mackey, 12.

as mostly 'unexplored.'[62] Lacoste furthered the colonial gaze by projecting Canada's power towards its 'northern frontier' which 'preserves our pioneering spirit.' Patrick Wolfe describes the concept of the frontier in settler-colonialism as 'a performative representation' which 'helped the invasion to occur.' Furthermore, the frontier line renders 'expropriation a past event rather than an ongoing practice' by inserting a partition into settler historical consciousness.[63] Thus Lacoste integrated Canada's varied ethnic groups into the rhetoric of pioneering exploration, a common settler-colonial trope.

New ideas, new people, and new frontiers make for a Canadian feeling of being connected to 'almost all peoples of the earth' and happily welcome them to 'our corner of Man and his World.' A policy of 'opening our doors to the world' ran in tandem with 'seeking self-definition.'[64] Immigrants were invited to come to Canada to take part in a colonial nation-building project, aiding in colonizing the 'unexplored' north while contributing to Canada's pluralist character. However, immigrants were not being invited to actively participate in reshaping cultural, economic, or policy; their identity was utilized by state agents to reshape national character and set Canada apart from other nations, a process John Porter described two years before Expo in *The Vertical Mosaic*. Porter's ground-breaking study of unequal class and power relations in Canada underlined how both English-speakers and French-speakers had opposing views on immigration. Though both favoured European immigrants, British-Canadians 'favoured keeping the ethnic minorities "apart" as a means to perpetuate their political and economic hegemony.'[65] While doubtless an improvement from complete marginalization, Canadian officials sought to subsume immigrant identities into their project of white colonial expansion.

The explanation of ethnic diversity would follow a similar pattern of being relevant only in the way it strengthens the nation. Ethnic diversity was attributed to an interest in the 'vast stretches of our country and the sparse population' while migrants left 'over-populated lands' to live and work in Canada.[66] Canada was easing its strict immigration policy historically based on racial discrimination just as a narrative of tolerance, open doors, and plurality became part of

[62] Bush, 23.
[63] Wolfe, 165.
[64] Bush, 23.
[65] Jack Jedwab and Vic Satzewich, 'Introductory Essay: *The Vertical Mosaic* 50 Years Later,' xviii-xix, in John Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*, 50th anniversary ed., (Toronto: Toronto UP, 2015), xviii.
[66] Bush, 23.

Canadian national identity at Expo.[67] These intersections between the nation and a multiethnic population were a by-product of a colonial humanist discourse, presenting the reification of the Canadian national identification at the Canadian Pavilion. And, most essentially, '[f]or more than 400 years, despite the diversity of ethnic origins and cultures, we are all self-acknowledged Canadians.'[68] This statement is critical to the hegemonic national identification that surpasses all others, applied as a cultural policy at a transformative event where Pavilion representatives feel powerful enough to speak homogeneously of and for the 21 million of people inhabiting northern North America and how they identify as Canadian. Though the colonial logic of the Canadian Pavilion was powerfully articulated when defining Canadians in 1967, there was a second principle component to establishing Canadian dominance: the acquisition of territory. In this regard, the planners of the Canadian Pavilion dreamed up a powerful set of territorial discourses.

Land, Territory, and Canada's National Project

At the entrance of the Canadian Pavilion, visitors were greeted with a display area entitled 'The Lands of Canada.' The Canadian Pavilion guide books provided a further study of the lands and territory that the country laid claim to. The seemingly simple act of observing the lands of Canada actually served to transform the lands into part of Canada's territory psychologically, that is to say, in the minds of the observers. The important distinction between 'land' and 'territory' is one of possessory qualities, or the fact that a geographic entity (the land) can be claimed as belonging to a nation-state (the territory). Lauren Benton explored 'a prominent and seductive narrative about the progressive rationalization of space in an increasingly interconnected world' of European empires where 'geographic descriptions encoded ideas about law and sovereignty.' Furthermore, the creation of maps and the 'progressive rationalization of space' contributed to 'intraimperial efforts to consolidate authority and erase the presence and counterclaims of indigenous peoples.'[69] According to James Scott, such 'state simplifications, the basic givens of modern statecraft,' acted as 'rather like abridged maps… that, when allied

[67] Anti-Asian immigration legislation was passed in 1923 after lobbying by British Columbia. The policies of racial exclusion were shared by Laurier and King governments alike. See Marilyn Lake & Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008), 164-65, 317-18, and John Price, *Orienting Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011), 20, 23.
[68] Bush, 20.
[69] Lauren Benton, *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400-1900*, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010), 9, 11.

with state power, would enable much of the reality they depicted to be remade,' which then gave 'its categories the force of law.'[70] This colonial gaze over lands combined with a range of existing strategies, which included the spreading of population through settlement, the passing of laws, policing, the introduction of private property, etc., to exert territorial influence. Expressions of these strategies encompass 'territoriality,' the set of assumptions that convert land to territory.

As Canadians were being asked to rethink the way they see themselves and their country, Oscar Brand provided them with a more musical approach to celebrating Canada. His song *Something to Sing About (This Land of Ours)* was played on repeat at the Canadian Pavilion in a section dedicated to photographs of Canadian landscapes. Lyrics to the song were also printed in *My Home, My Native Land.*[71] The folk song demonstrated how the Canadian colonial gaze was marketed to Canadians by way of mainstream musical cultures. The lyrics link Vancouver Island to the Maritimes, with landscapes mentioned in between. The land is described as 'young' and 'ours,' imbuing the landscape as a colonial possession while divorcing geophysical time and pre-contact cultures from the land entirely with the suggestion of youth. In *Something to Sing About*, the land itself is more a consequence of the nation, as the nation defined the land and made it a recognizable whole worthy of musical praise.

At the Canadian Pavilion, lands were unquestionably described as territorial possessions of Canada, reinforced by sociocultural and economic connections despite the low population density over the land mass, with enormous stretches void of Canadian settlers. By instilling an emotional connection between Canadian citizens and Canadian lands, the Canadian Pavilion projected and reinforced state power over lands with a population density of 2.1 people/km^2. The land was marketed to Canadians as the bedrock of national identity, as Sinclair described the countryside as 'a green space to grow the soul in.'[72] In this case, lands became a repository for leisure from a busy urban life, nourishing the Canadian soul. Yet Sinclair also grappled with the consolidation of the vast lands as usable territory, which he called the 'challenge of resources' and the 'challenge of distance' as outlined in *Change Comes to Canada* and featured in the Canadian Pavilion's 'The Challenges to Canada' display area.[73] Within the narrative of possession lay a semi-hidden unease: the small population density spread out over the enormous

[70] James Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, (New Haven: Yale UP, 1998), 3.
[71] Bush, 7.
[72] Sinclair, 29.
[73] *Ibid*, 7-26.

landmass could not fully possess the territory without a significant psychological attachment to vast stretches of uninhabited lands. Such unease is a result of settler-colonialism; as Marie-Louise Pratt explains, 'the esthetic qualities of the landscape constitute the social and material value of the discovery to the explorers' home culture, at the same time as its esthetic deficiencies suggest a need for social and material intervention by the home culture.' The process, she explains, is part of the 'monarch-of-all-I-survey scene,' which 'would seem to involve particularly explicit interaction between esthetics and ideology, in what one might call a rhetoric of presence.'[74] These rhetorical devices were replicated in the guide books and at the Canadian Pavilion exhibitions, as Canada was described as 'a fine country but it could do with a little judicious editing.'[75] By masking the unease with a need for change and intervention, the expansive territory was rhetorically reconstituted into a challenge that could be overcome by increased population settlement and infrastructural development.

Sinclair also observed North American lands as a challenge from a historical perspective. He saw the Great Plains as initially being 'a barrier,' to subsequent appreciation of a subdued landscape over time, as said plains become 'a bridge' once a pathway to the west was charted. Furthermore, Sinclair reinforced a historical continuity of European expansion and the conquering of geographic features, as oceans underwent the same transition from barrier to bridge.[76] Another author characterized Canada's lands as an immense, varied landscape, requiring an entire lifetime to attain 'the intimacy necessary to true feeling for the land.' A general uneasiness is attributed to the vastness of the territory combined with its sparse population, 'a panic of lonely emptiness' incapable of being conquered. This challenging landscape remains one of the major conflicts in Canada, 'against the harsh environment [and] vast distances.'[77]

Expressions of the continuing advancement of the Canadian nation-state in its claims for exclusive sovereignty over North American lands were abundant in the guide books. During the Centennial year, the Department of Mines, Energy and Resources was surveying all of Canada on an unprecedented scale. The goal of the project was to fill in the 'white spaces' in the existing maps. The metaphor indicates that unless known and studied by the federal government, unless

[74] Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, (London: Routledge, 1992), 201.
[75] Sinclair, 3.
[76] *Ibid*, 13.
[77] Bush, 3-4, 11.

mapped and analyzed, these 'white spaces' remain empty, void of meaning, and useless. The map of the Centennial Project was to scale the lands of Canada down to four miles per inch, 'and is very good for general reconnaissance purposes.' The colonial gaze of land prospectors is highly valorized as they are described as 'one of the glamorous characters of the Canadian wilderness,' no longer simply a 'solitary explorer' but now 'backed up by sophisticated apparatus, aircraft, and teams of experts working with maps and computers.'[78] Their new, scientific methods of charting the landscape include a host of technological innovations and state experts in order to reinforce Canadian claims over vast swathes of North America. The reformulation of land in maps acted 'as both a technology in the service of empire and a metaphor for the colonial project of mastery through the accumulation and control of knowledge,' turning enormous swaths of land into visually knowable national territory.[79] The Canadian gaze would become far more methodical and detailed in conjunction with the technological innovations available as the powers of the state over Indigenous lands would be strengthened and celebrated at Expo 67.

Canadians could validate their own attachment to the lands by focusing on the resources within their territory, as resources concretised the feelings of ownership and underlined their practicality. Furthermore, Sinclair pointed out that nobody knows the origins of the term 'Canada' were unknown. This offers his readers the perfect metaphor for the meaning of Canada as a nation-state: 'everybody is free to find a private meaning of his own.' By eliminating the appropriation of the Iroquoian term for village, *kanata*, Canadian history's early contact period was left a vacuum to be filled by Canadian imaginings. 'Canada is an idea,' he wrote, 'a dream, a feeling, above all, a sense of home… the idea of Canada still has a power to bind our hearts.'[80] These initial passages serve to structure the readers' emotional attachment to Canada without providing any substantial indication of what Canada actually *is* beyond a concept, an empty glass within which readers are invited to fill with their own beliefs. The glass itself, the Canadian state, was obscured by the reduction of Canada to a psychological construct, an emotional connection to a metaphysical entity whose settler past has been overlooked. What remains to be seen, however, is how the existence of lands and resources and the development of a set of territorial assumptions would build the foundation for another aspect of settler-colonial logic: the

[78] Sinclair, 7-8.
[79] Benton, 10.
[80] Sinclair, 3.

fetishizing of technological and material progress, which rested on the representation of Indigenous peoples as 'underdeveloped.' By focusing on technology and progress at the Canadian Pavilion, the logic of colonial humanism can be unpacked from the celebratory narrative at Canada's autoethnography at Expo 67.

Modernization and Development

Developmentalism relies on a particular reading of the history of economics and technology in which one society or social group, often Indigenous and typified as 'primitive' and frozen in pre-historic time, benefits from the acquisition of superior technology from a colonizing society, often white Europeans. The process corresponds to what Patrick Wolfe called 'the evolutionist narrative' of white anthropologists in western academia, a narrative with 'a temporal syntax; it was sequential, cumulative and end-driven.' Evolutionism favoured a transition from semi-nomadism to pastoralism, then agricultural settlement and finally urban commerce, producing a 'systematization into the cumulative narrative that global imperialism presupposes was new.'[81] Nation-states are cast as the social organization best-suited to manage economic and technological progress and are thus considered superior to any other sociopolitical form of organization. 'Despite differences of culture or history,' modernizers presumed, societies 'would eventually converge on common forms.'[82] Gilbert Rist extrapolated a pseudo-religious aspect of developmentalism from the narratology of development, particularly articulated at world fairs of which Expo 67 was one.[83] Development was marketed for the good of the 'underdeveloped,' as 'the reality of colonialism made its mark even on the most generous-seeming practices.' In this sense, development 'took on a transitive meaning (an action performed by one agent upon another) which corresponded to a principle of social organization, while "underdevelopment" became a "naturally occurring (that is, seemingly causeless) state of things."'[84] Through the ordering of societies based on their technological, material, economic, and social progress, developmentalism is by nature a comparative ideological framework in which the 'developed' define development and progress through their own cultural lens.

---

[81] Wolfe, 45.
[82] Michael Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*, (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2011), 3.
[83] Gilbert Rist, *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*, 4th ed., (London: Zed, 2014), 22. Rist does not mention Expo in particular, but applies the analysis to world fairs in general.
[84] *Ibid*, 46, 73. [An italics emphasis was removed].

The Canadian Pavilion reinforced developmentalist assertions by charting Canada's history teleologically from a pre-European contact and technologically backward Indigenous continent to a successful Euro-Canadian nation-state, becoming 'one of the great technological nations of the world.' Sinclair expressed continuity with Alexis de Tocqueville's remarks in 1831 on North America pioneering communities as '"an Ark of Civilisation."' He adds to Tocqueville's argument, stating that even the 'humblest settler brought with him a book or two, often the Bible.'[85] The "civilizing influence" of the Bible would have major repercussions on Indigenous lives, nowhere more so than in residential schools. The imagery of a wash of civilization flooding the North American landscape through the noble pioneering settlers is too tempting to give credence to the human cost of colonization. Furthermore, Canadians inherited the landscape upon which the first settlers and pioneers built cities, made Nature retreat, and have no interest in turning back into 'noble savages.'[86] Thus civilization was defined as being attained in North America only as a result of the arrival of Europeans.

One of the introductory displays in the Canadian Pavilion was on the production of energy. This was so 'because energy is civilization.'[87] Attaining the hallmark of a civilized society was a prize to be championed, so much so that when visitors arrived at the Pavilion, they would be introduced to Canada's energy production, the basis for a civilized society according to the logic of the Pavilion. Civilization, however, could not be attained without the requisite material progress of industrial society. This hierarchy of values, ever-present throughout Canadian history and particularly present at the Canadian Pavilion, was designed to bolster nationalist sentiment as Canadians could remark on their own contributions to civilization.

Once Canadian specificity returned to the forefront, it was to emphasise the continuing struggles of man against nature, often expressed with gendered notions of man *conquering* nature. According to the logic of the pavilion, it is this struggle that is argued to be the principle one in Canadian history, more so than man against man. Masculine conquest of nature was displayed as 'pioneers struggled through the northern forests,' becoming traders, settlers, and eventually connecting settlements to the Canadian state.[88] Such gendered articulations of 'interiors waiting to be opened up' and frontier expansion as 'fertilizing penetration' were

[85] Sinclair, 26-27, 29.
[86] *Ibid*, 29-30.
[87] *Ibid*, 20.
[88] *Ibid*, 14.

common settler-colonial tropes which typified the dominant settler as a white, middle class male.[89] As Eva-Marie Kröller described: '[i]deologically enhanced by Diefenbaker's rhetoric of the "northern vision," the North… seemed a richly promising land beckoning beyond.' The conquering of nature was a common trope at Expo, as its 'initial concept and much of its realization left many of the traditional hierarchies intact: Montreal's representation as the gateway to a world conquered by man was only the most obvious of these.'[90] The geographic challenges were overcome with advancing telecommunications and transportation technology, as less-developed early pioneering whites were laying the groundwork for eventual national expansion. This reading of history puts the nation at the centre of all actions, an important developmentalist temporal division of pre- and post-nationhood that reinforces national development as a climactic event from which all previous struggles lead to and from which future successes emanate from. What's more, the articulations of development in settler-colonial societies were intimately related to the expansion of the frontier and colonial territory, as exemplified in the preceding passages.

In *Change Comes to Canada*, Sinclair linked the contemporary movement of goods and ideas to past European and Indigenous exploration, giving a greater meaning for the Canadian nation and clearing the way for further northern expansion.[91] By conquering the landscape by water, land, and air, Canadian capitalist power stretched across vast distances along railroads, Canada's first 'backbone of steel.'[92] The nation's anatomic configuration begins to take shape, beginning with laying a skeleton of steel where, as insinuated by the metaphor, there had previously been no organic matter. The railroad, which by 1966 transported 18 million tons of wheat, is characterized as having resolved 'one of the greatest logistic problems in transportation that man has ever faced.'[93] Technological change facilitates the progression of settler-colonial development, allowing for industrial expansion deeper into North America. Settlement of the West is characterized as 'controlled and orderly,' relying on migrants who followed the initial steel backbone.[94] The project of western expansion was state-managed and relied on what James Scott termed 'high-modernist ideology,' defined as 'a strong… version of the self-confidence

[89] Wolfe, 164. See also footnote 167 of Wolfe, 164.
[90] Kröller, 38.
[91] Sinclair, 14.
[92] Quotation from Sinclair, 15.
[93] *Ibid*, 25.
[94] Bush, 12.

about scientific and technical progress, the expansion of production, the growing satisfaction of human needs, the mastery of nature (including human nature), and, above all, the rational design of social order commensurate with the scientific understanding of natural laws.' High-modernist ideology was separate from "scientific progress" in that it was a belief system that utilized science and technology and combined it with an 'uncritical, unskeptical, and thus unscientifically optimistic about the possibilities for the comprehensive planning of human settlement and production.'[95] The end result of high-modernist planning was a tidy narrative of economic development and progress on productive lands as railroad technology overcame the challenges presented by a massive territory, forming the beginnings of national industrial expansion into the West propelled by Eastern industrial might.

Technological exchange between white European settlers and North American Indigenous peoples was characterized as wholly unilateral at the Canadian Pavilion. According to the guide books, the history of the transfer of goods in North America followed Europeans who provided technology to Indigenous peoples without any mention of initial European dependence on Indigenous technology. For example, 'Indians' were mentioned as having lived without horses, which were brought to the American mainland by Spanish Conquistadores. This happy fact, according to Sinclair, led to three hundred years of 'Indians of the bison herds' to become 'rich and powerful and successful because they also became horsemen.'[96] When the authors of the guide books recount the fur trade, a commercial activity wholly reliant on Indigenous canoes, snowshoes, navigation, labour, and hunting and trapping techniques, the numerous and essential occurrences of technological transfer were simply omitted. In fact, the fur trade was attributed to the increasing conflict, of which 'Canada was a by-product.'[97] The fur trade brought Indigenous peoples into the global economy through their trading furs, canoes, snowshoes, and labour with Europeans, and while the fur trade did fuel competition among white settlers and some Indigenous groups, it also served as one of the best examples of whites relying on Indigenous peoples and their knowledge and practices in North American history. The act of omission coupled with the discourse on nationhood allowed for white European settlers to be the central driving force in their own ascendancy, whereas the Indigenous role figured as a backdrop to the larger nation-building narrative. Thus technological transfer retained characteristics of white

[95] Scott, 4.
[96] Sinclair, 13-14.
[97] Bush, 11.

supremacist logic in that Indigenous peoples were represented as recipients of the superior goods Europeans had to offer, without contributing whatsoever to the technological development of the new arrivals as they built their nation.

As the technological changes facilitated greater European settler expansion, the guide book authors drew on developmentalism rhetoric in order to fashion settler expansion as a 'civilizing' process. Sinclair, for example, explicitly devalues non-industrial culture when mentioning 'Eskimos' who 'went from the stone age to the air age without any intermediate steps.'[98] 'Stone age' in this context implies a primitive level of development on a societal and technological level, relegating Inuit peoples to a static pastness only comparable to Europe's ancient history. Crucially, the temporal references of different technological 'ages' throughout the course of Eurasian and Mediterranean history provided white Euro-Canadians a framework for interpreting the Inuit and Innu peoples, references that served to relegate Indigenous people as pertaining to a certain 'pastness.' By skipping developmental stages from the Stone Age to 'the air age,' Sinclair underlined the progress northern Indigenous peoples have made simply by coming into contact with Europeans in a "civilizing process," which Scott interprets as a 'domestication, a kind of social gardening devised to make the countryside, its products, and its inhabitants more readily identifiable and accessible to the center.' Combining high-modernist ideology with settler-colonial expansionist projects encompassed '[t]he transformation of peripheral nonstate spaces into state spaces by the modern, developmentalist nation-state, [which] is ubiquitous and, for the inhabitants of such spaces, frequently traumatic.'[99] In Sinclair's assertions were the markings of the high-modernist idealism combined with the civilizing mission of national expansion. In this context the Inuit were simply 'modernizing,' rather than losing foundational elements to their cultural dynamisms.

The Canadian Pavilion drew from developmentalism by affirming its own economic power and technological contributions. At Expo 67, developmentalism served to reinforce nationalistic pride among its citizenry and reassure them of their elevated stature. Canada participated in the developmentalist competition as white nations pitted their economic and technological prowess against each other. As a picture of a technologically advanced white citizenry began to emerge, Indigenous peoples were used as a backdrop, a point comparison designed to delegitimize their

[98] Sinclair, 22.
[99] Scott, 184, 187.

ties to their own lands and to make white Canada appear more powerful and feel more valuable. In shifting away from the previous colonial semantics of colonizer/colonized, the developed/underdeveloped dichotomy 'introduced the idea of a continuity of substance' whereby through hard work and perseverance, 'underdeveloped' regions and peoples could presumably attain the status of 'developed.'[100] White colonial humanists promoted the host of technological and societal changes they brought from Europe for the common, universal benefit of all North Americans. In doing so, they provided an incomplete, unilateral view of technological and societal exchanges. While unpacking developmentalist assertions at the Canadian Pavilion exposes certain nefarious aspects of national story-telling at Expo, it is vital to emphasize that these problematic portrayals of development, technological transfer, and Indigenous peoples rhetorically 'accelerated' Indigenous political, technological, and social progression into 'modernity.' In focusing on technology, supposedly-universal benefits could be exacted from changes that impacted peoples in vastly different ways. As we have seen how factors motivating increased settler-colonial expansion were frequently couched in economic and developmentalist terms by constantly referring to national, technological, and economic development as *universally* beneficial, it would follow that all who oppose increased mining, pipeline-building, drilling, clear-cutting, and other ecocidal measures were opposing the nation itself.

Humanity 67: Universality and the Making of Global Humanists

Expo 67, with its emphasis on global humanism and interdependence, was a ubiquitous site of universality and high-modernity. An underlying assumption of Euro-Canadian modernizers was the universal applicability of their project. Indigenous peoples fit uncomfortably into this narrative, as cracks in the universal benefits of changes became more and more evident the closer one observed (two minutes in the Indians of Canada Pavilion would have sufficed!). Behind the rhetoric of territorial acquisition, development, and progress, lay a counter-narrative, unexpressed yet present within the subtext of the pavilion's narrative of modernization: it required 'unmodern' landscapes and peoples. These regions and human beings were seen as 'behind' in an evolutionary sense, which, according to the modernizing state agents, justified interventions to produce 'a concentrated population, within easy range, producing a steady supply of easily transportable, storable grain and tribute and providing a surplus of manpower for

[100] Rist, 74.

security, war, and public works.'[101] Yet despite the particularities of underdeveloped peoples, Canadian territorial acquisition, national expansion, and modernization, the Canadian Pavilion connected these themes to individual transformations and a deeper connection to global humanity, finding in a disjointed narrative of progress notions of the universal applicability of 'Canada-as-project.'

The Canadian Pavilion, along with the three explanatory guide books, encouraged individual transformation along nationalistic, humanistic, and universalistic lines, forming a complex web of identifications promoted as concentric circles. Canada's economic, political and cultural ties brought the privileges of global relationships with 'our fellow-men.' Bush described 'our contribution to humanity 1967' as offering a Canadian response to the challenges faced by other countries, as Canada represented 'a tree planted within man and his world,' building on the metaphor of the People Tree and the international reaches of its branches.[102] Intersections between discourses on universal benefits and capitalist development were further evident in the description of trade, as Sinclair elaborated: 'The language of trade is universal. Trade among men is the beginning of peaceful exchanges for common benefit.'[103] As the history of Indigenous-European contact attests to, trade is not a guaranteed first step towards greater peace. The 'universal' benefits can only be understood as wholly beneficial if the history of colonization is evacuated from the narrative. These types of rhetoric devices, argues John Gabriel, are related to *whiteness*:

> 'The power of whiteness lies in a set of discursive techniques, including *exnomination*, that is the power not to be named; *naturalization*, through which whiteness establishes itself as the norm by defining 'others' and not itself; and *universalization*, where whiteness alone can make sense of a problem and its understanding becomes *the* understanding.'[104]

The brand of humanism advocated for by white Canadian elites at the Canadian Pavilion was largely based on Canadian national mythologies and the obfuscation colonial history to produce a digestible narrative of universally-applicable principles that defined Canadians. These principles were then lauded as a model for the growth of greater international cooperation and global humanistic idealism.

---

[101] Scott, 186.
[102] Bush, 25-26.
[103] Sinclair, 12.
[104] Gabriel, 13.

Canadian colonial humanism combined a set of principles including the espousal of universal values and the appropriation of Indigenous art and imagery in order to recast Canada as a model among nations through a variety of whiteness discourses. A central tenet of whiteness is to replace white people's own role in historical accounts with whitewashed histories coded as universal doctrines. Such historical accounts 'are made through the selective construction and representation of 'tradition' in the public sphere.'[105] 'This hegemonic structure of "whiteness,"' Hesse explains, 'forgets its contested antecedents, it forgets what 'others' remember; in effect this 'white amnesia' represses the historical context of racism because the threat of the 'racialised other' absorbs all attention.'[106] Hébert followed this pattern by describing Canada's approach to Man and His World as 'simple and free of affectation,' denying any attempt at nation-building and claiming to represent an unadulterated truth.[107] Expo 67 served as a particular site given its construction on a newly-built island (Ile Notre-Dame) and another, modified island (Ile Ste-Hélène) in the St. Lawrence River, which led Rudel-Tessier to reimagine the site as an 'unblemished metropolis' where 'there are no spirits crying for revenge, no monuments to the dead, no triumphal arches.'[108] He presented the Canadian nationalist narrative of Expo 67 as a natural, logical outgrowth of a learned historical trajectory. The narrative matches a 'hegemonologue,' or 'a knowing hegemonic Western voice that, owing to its universalist pretensions, speaks its knowledges to the exclusion of all others.'[109]

The *Widening Horizons* guide book connected Canadians to the wider human community through economic, political and cultural links, thereby justifying the dedication of major portions of Canadian Pavilion 'to that part of man which is universal.' The Katimavik was described as a symbol for 'humanity, its evolution, its achievements,' appropriating a symbol from the Inuit, situated in the northern extremity of North America societies, to promote a Canadian cultural policy of pluralistic grandeur. Canadian contributions to 'mankind' were understood to be growing in importance, while the Katimavik represented 'the constant expansion of Canada's horizons' and its 'devotion to the tenets of humanism.'[110] By linking Inuit symbolism of the Katimavik to Canada's nation, culture, people, and universal values, Canadians could envision

[105] *Ibid*, 39.
[106] Barnor Hess, 'It's Your World: Discrepant M/Multiculturalisms,' *Social Identities*, 3:3, (1997), pp. 375-394, 87.
[107] Hébert, 3.
[108] Rudel-Tessier, 15.
[109] J. Marshal Beier, *International Relations in Uncommon Places : Indigeneity, Cosmology, and the Limits of International Theory*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 2.
[110] Hébert, 3.

their dominion over Canadian territories stretching up to Inuit territories. Leanne Pupchek explains how '[t]he use of Inuit imagery as a resource for Canadian identity emerged out of the need to define a New World center to create community stability.'[111] Appropriating Indigenous terminology into white Canadian settler-colonial identity allowed Canadians to observe Indigenous peoples through a lens Canadians themselves created, replacing particular Indigenous cultural expressions with a narrative of global humanism. The changing geographic scope, from a local 'meeting place' for Inuit people to a global meeting place at Expo, reinforced the appropriation of Inuit symbols in Canadian global humanist discourse.

Rudel-Tessier's principle argument in *Widening Horizons* revolved around the notion of 'interdependence' resulting from globalized modernity. The Katimavik represented Canada's tribute to interdependence at Expo 67, 'a modest declaration of our fellowship with mankind.'[112] He related the progression of civilization to the imperative of interdependence amongst nations, peoples, and individuals. 'Is it not because of this very reason,' he asked, 'that they also dreamed of subjugating other nations in order to share their artistic and scientific legacies?'[113] Rudel-Tessier incorporated the dreams of territorial conquest and control over wealth as based on the very same doctrine of interdependence. Thus the initial description of interdependence did not distinguish unequal power relations and universalized projects of territorial and global conquest, a somewhat surprising omission during a period of major global decolonization after 1945. Once interdependence and global conquest were linked, Rudel-Tessier remarked on man's realization 'that we were not born to destroy' and that 'we cannot with a clear conscience continue to wage war, let alone do it with a lightness of heart.' While post-1945 humanism undercut the older imperialistic attitudes of the glory of war, global conquest was still being defended for its universal values and the good intentions of a civilizing mission. The Canadian Pavilion articulated colonial humanist imaginings of a space separate from any history that stood as a particular model of interdependence and cooperative, peaceful civilization.

Rudel-Tessier also promoted the Canadian 'interdependence' model as a means to conceptualize Canada's national history, resulting in the obscuring of unequal power relations that formed the basis of the Canadian state and its conquest for North American lands. Describing the Canadian Pavilion as a 'symbol of a land shaped by many peoples who achieved

[111] Pupchek, 205.
[112] Rudel-Tessier, 27-28.
[113] *Ibid*, 15-16.

a modus vivendi a century ago,' Confederation became the embodiment of interdependence, which 'no longer appears as a utopian daydream.' Comparing Canadian Confederation to the innumerable failed political constitutions, Rudel-Tessier valorizes the successful compromises that have allowed Canada to remain a united country despite unfulfilled hopes. The successes are listed as 'the reconciliation of two adversaries, the sharing of political power among them, the minority speaking as an equal to the majority,' and, most significantly, 'the surrender by peoples of a land as large as the whole of Europe to the doctrine of universal interdependence.'[114] The totalizing narrative of state acquisition of territory and population was described without any appearance of resistance whatsoever, reinforcing the concept of Canadian egalitarian principles while concealing the existence of structural inequality.

Canada's role in the world included material contributions to other nations, fostering a teleological narrative of progression from national interdependence to a globalized version. The 'sharing of resources' was continued at the United Nations As an extension of Canadian history, as Canadians 'recognized that our generosity would eventually serve our own interests, [and] we helped our indigent brothers.' The impoverishment of certain nations was viewed as an opportunity for Canada to demonstrate its own generosity by sharing in its economic and technological wealth. What's more, Rudel-Tessier sees the benefits of investment abroad as widening the global economy, opening markets to global trade where there was little or none. The acquisition of foreign products require the selling of 'our wood, our paper, our metals, our petroleum, our snowmobiles,' leading to development for the benefit of all.[115] Undoubtedly, as an industrialized economy with access to vast stretches of territory, Canada was in a privileged position to contribute to the international community. Such contributions formed the apex of a teleological narrative of progress and development, ending in the contemporary stage of globalized modernity.

The peaceful nature of Canadian life and history was an integral notion of the Canadian model of interdependence. Though Paulette Regan traces the origins of the Canadian peacemaker myth to Eastern Canada's early settler-Indigenous treaties, the myth emerged during nineteenth-century public discourse surrounding western expansion and Indigenous treaty-making. The Canadian statist benevolence towards Indigenous peoples informed the peacemaker myth, which

[114] *Ibid*, 16-17.
[115] Hébert, 25-26.

'lies at the heart of the settler problem,' and became an essential part of the narrative of Canadian differentiation form American expansion through violent conquest, despite the militarized police force and tactics of the North-West Mounted Police.[116] The steady advancement of post-Confederation territorial acquisition with few military conflicts and occasional territorial disputes was argued to be a peaceful process of 'abiding by the rules of interdependence from which [Canadians] derive hope and prosperity.' This peaceful national story was told in relation to violent conflicts that have erupted in other countries, cementing Canadian exceptionalism in an international context. Canada was described as a model nation for the international community to emulate: 'Mankind needs such examples if it is to be convinced that peace is attainable and that the forward step towards interdependence can be achieved through conciliation... When the seed of peace has been sown, nurtured and cherished, it flowers into universal brotherhood.' As a 'ray of hope,' Rudel-Tessier believed Canada deserving to ascend to its rightful place as a leader among nations, as 'Canada needs the world, and the world needs Peace.'[117] The process of territorial acquisition was only peaceful in the sense that there were few large-scale military campaigns, but surely the process of Indigenous territorial dispossession can never be understood as peaceful in its own right.[118]

Rudel-Tessier established Canadian prominence as a global example for peace as a result of the growth of global interdependence, connecting the relationship between peace, justice, and law in a wider arc of western history. He claimed that 'peace thrives only… where there is respect for law and order,' making nation-states harbingers of an order based on 'the great precept of universal interdependence.'[119] Western conceptions of law and order, in this case emanating from the Canadian state, were prerequisites to the establishment of peace. Relationships in early societies were characterized by the growth of peace and love, which in turn contributed to community-building and banished 'the temptation to return to primitive anarchy.' The lessons of history were further called upon, which suggested 'that laws alone, imposed laws, have served the cause of peace.' Western constitutionalism was upheld as the ultimate contribution to sustaining peace. By stating interdependence's universal applicability

[116] Paulette Regan, 'Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada,' (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 87, 89.
[117] Rudel-Tessier, 17-18.
[118] See, for example, James Daschuk, *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Aboriginal Life*, (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2013).
[119] Rudel-Tessier, 18.

and denying any unequal relations of power that undermine its egalitarian principles, interdependence obscures the realities of colonialism in favour of a colonial humanism. In what was a rare admission of unequal power relations, in this regard the state 'imposed' laws. Rudel-Tessier argued for faith in and 'through renunciation of individual rights in favour of collective obedience to the laws of interdependence' to achieve the ultimate humanistic goal: the realization of 'One World,' a perfect unity among man, nation, and planet.[120] The correlation between Canadian history and a model for 'perfect unity among man' could not have been made without a determined effort to excise colonial history and enduring colonial practices.

Conclusion: The Making of Canadian Colonial Humanists

By casting off Canadian citizens' lack of self-confidence in their national identity, Expo was to mark a transitionary moment in nationalist imaginings in order to remake Canadians along the lines of a refashioned Canadian identification. As Sinclair noted, the excitement of the exhibition was palpable: 'Look around Expo, and see for yourself how we're getting over it!' Previous debates and timid self-expression of national sentiments were to take a back seat to the changing times marked by Canada's hosting of Expo 67 and the new air of international solidarity and universal brotherhood. Sinclair described Expo 67 as a beacon of hope for those seeking to solidify their sense of nationalistic communitarianism. He asked the readers to consider what change meant to them, and offered his own interpretation: 'In the new knowledge of our times, we hope to find deeper insights into the nature of Man and His World.' Learning was described as one of the components most essential in the changing times, to be able to know and to feel more through newly acquired knowledge; 'in short, we can learn to be more alive, and more human.'[121] Self-improvement through learning was a key component to the Canadian Pavilion, as visitors were to learn more about themselves and their nation in order to be socialized into a new, modern Canadian. Final messages of personal empowerment summarized the transformative moment that visitors at Expo should find themselves in, as 'the real possibilities are in you; the things you remember and look forward to, the things that make your life worth living.'[122]

[120] *Ibid*, 21, 23.
[121] Sinclair, 6, 27.
[122] *Ibid*, 31.

As visitors reached the top of the People Tree, feeling as though the wind had filled their sails, an impression struck: that of 'greatness and smallness,' great in the sense of the immense territory under Canada's possession, and small in the sense of its population of 21 million. Canadians 'dominate' nature at times with their 'prodigious technical facilities' yet nature 'crushes' them with its size; 'a great country and a small people' with a duty 'to encourage its growth.' Bush turned to Donald Crowdis to romanticize the relationship between Canadian citizens, 'held together by the tenuous bonds of nationhood and a common love of liberty.'[123] The People Tree's leaves represented a 'type of Canadian' that could not be detached from the branches, as the trunk and roots carry 'both our diversity and our unity' to nourish the people and make them part of the same organic whole. The youthful nature of tree-climbing added to the metaphoric process of national renewal as Canadians were encouraged to climb to the top, as '[t]he Canadian, even if the rigors of his climate force him to be a realist, is in the depths of his heart an idealist. So to the top we go!' The repetition of the 'childhood experience' helped Canadians 'uncover our young nation.'[124] Such reflections were fraught with contradictions. The national project of settler expansion becomes a duty, the domination of nature and submission to its power becomes the great national conquest, and Expo 67 is the time and place to reconfigure Canadian national priorities in line with the continuing process of colonial expansion, leaving time for national renewal and rediscovering Canada.

'Universal interdependence' was used both to model Canada's role internationally and to shape its own history. The Katimavik built the metaphor into the physical space of the pavilion as a site that would bring people from around the world together under Canadian nationalist pretexts. The reality of Expo 67, a popular international destination in 1967, helped the metaphor concretise. Canadian colonial humanists could not resist extending that metaphor back throughout Canada's history before applying it as a universal doctrine for the future of humanity. By connecting Canada's territorial wealth with its obligation to the international community, Canadian colonial humanists reiterated their claims of North American lands. By further fostering a deeper, personal connection to the lands, they simultaneously reinforced colonial ambitions and exposed the settler-colonial need for reassurance.

[123] Bush, 20, 5.
[124] *Ibid*, 19-20.

Through the prism of nationalism, the Canadian Pavilion represented Canada's stepping stone to the wider, global humanistic notions of Expo 67. The pavilion visitors were invited to make a transformative identification with Canada; however, there remained firm barriers to Canadian humanistic principles, exemplified by the occasional rhetoric extirpation and paternalistic treatment of Indigenous peoples in pavilion documents. Furthermore, the narrative of a Canada based on universal values did not match the reality of Canadian cultural policies. As Canadians were instructed, '[w]e link our human communities, our regional groups, our industrial enterprises, our cultural and religious associations which help establish ties among us in endeavoring to *respect our differences*.'[125] However, the same set of policies that integrated Indigenous artefacts at the Canadian Pavilion to celebrate Indigenous peoples in public, while in private Aboriginal children were undergoing 'aggressive assimilation' at state-created, Church-run residential schools, facts not lost on the Indigenous planners of the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Instead, the narrative was informed by a logic of white supremacy, an approach to self-definition in which white narratives of history and values predominated and displaced all others. Meanwhile, the denial of 'whiteness' was integral to shrouding doctrines of universality around what in this case was an Anglo-Saxon dominant narrative of Canadian nationhood. The very term 'Canadian' was being given greater cultural currency, even as identifications with Britishness were being extirpated. 'Canadian' became a sociolinguistic repository for a particular white Anglophone identity, shaped by erasing unpalatable elements of Canada's history so that Canadians could adopt and enjoy a moral high ground whose existence depended on the concealing of its white settler colonial origins. These were the colonial compulsions of the Canadian Pavilion at Expo 67. What remains to be seen is to what degree Canadian colonial compulsions were connected to global intellectual and political projects of colonization, and Expo 67 provided ample examples at the conferences held in the DuPont Auditorium only a short walk away from the Canadian Pavilion.

[125] *Ibid*, 21. Emphasis mine.

Chapter III - *Man's New Dimension*: Postcolonial & Neocolonial Developmentalism At Expo Speakers Series

There is the problem in Britain of Commonwealth immigration, an embarrassing flood of coloured commonwealth immigrants, with equal rights… There are the very unpopular hostilities in Rhodesia, and let it not be forgotten that the Rhodesians, and the South Africans, both predominantly white, have the only really stable governments in Africa.[1]

Beyond the public relations campaigns of the Canadian and international community in Expo 67's national pavilions lay a set of discursive views on the urgency to reconfigure global and local politics and ideologies. On Isle Notre-Dame, the 372-seat DuPont of Canada Auditorium hosted to two lectures series attended by invitation only to explore the philosophical and scientific content of Expo's thematic pavilions.[2] The Maclean-Hunter International Forum (MHIF) and Noranda Lectures (NL) at Expo 67 delved deeper into the universal exhibition's theme, 'Man and His World' as presenters from around the world offered their analysis of contemporary global scientific, technological, and political issues and advancements. The 'great men of science and culture' were chosen to present 'the results of their research on the frontiers of human knowledge.'[3] The speeches were delivered to 'specially invited audiences,' making the conferences a pedagogical presentation to elite Canadians and other invitees.[4] As such, he highlighted the presenters as the intellectual foundation for Man and His World. Both speakers series fit within the same ideological prism that was present throughout Expo: 'development.' While the Canadian Pavilion drew from colonial ideology in its treatment of Indigenous peoples,

---

[1] Stormont Mancroft, 'Sharing the Common-Wealth,' in *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, by The Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. (Montréal : Exposition universelle et internationale de 1967, 1967), 89.
[2] Charles C. Milne, ed., *Expo 67: Official Guide*, (Toronto: Maclean-Hunter, 1967), 38. The thematic pavilions included Mand and His Health, Man in the Community, Man the Creator, Man the Explorer, Man the Producer, and Man the Provider.
[3] Guy Dozois, 'Man and His World,' in *The Memorial Album of the first category universal and international Exhibition held in Montreal from the twenty-seventh of April to the twenty-ninth of October nineteen hundred and sixty-seven*, (Toronto: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd: 1968), 57.
[4] Milne, 38.

the DuPont Auditorium provided the intellectual framework for both colonial and postcolonial development projects.

By providing narratives of the universal applicability of economic and personal development projects, the Expo 67 conferences featured several speakers who articulated developmentalist theories and projects rooted in older notions of global power dynamics. Decolonization had radically altered the global political landscape, yet latent colonial theories of western superiority proved resilient and enduring. In 1965, Kwame Nkrumah popularized the term 'neocolonialism,' whereby Euro-American investor nations in alliance with 'a consortium of financial interests which are not specifically identifiable with any particular State' undermine formal, often newly-acquired national sovereignty by exerting control over the national economy and state apparatus.[5]

The speakers who drew from neocolonialism include Aurelia Peccei, an Italian businessman and industrialist whose 'Looking Ahead at Social and Economic Developments in a Changing World' offered a global program of economic planning based on the knowledge of western nations; Stormont Mancroft, a British politician, businessman, and military veteran who served in Winston Churchill's cabinet member and whose 'Sharing the Common-Wealth' speech included disparaging remarks about immigrants to Britain, black African states, and concern over decolonized states' political ambitions; Raymond Aron, a French academic, philosopher, and journalist whose 'L'avenir des relations entre Europe et Amérique' highlighted his concern that U.S. ascendency weakened Europe's position at the helm of world affairs; and John K. Galbraith, a Harvard Professor of Economics and former advisor to President Kennedy, whose speech 'Economics and the Urban Society' argued that it was economic injustice and not racial injustice that was at the heart of contemporary civil rights protests. The four speakers drew from neocolonial views by presuming white nations and leaders had all of the solutions to ensure global 'development' accelerated to meet the needs of a growing world population without the need to consult openly with the 'underdeveloped.'

The postcolonial approach to development traded neocolonial arguments of backwardness for those of redistributive justice for victims of historical colonial exploitation that had damaged postcolonial nations' abilities to become competitive in globalizing industrial markets. They also

[5] Kwame Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1965), x, and Robert Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 50.

sought to undermine the European and United States development model as quintessential for human development. Those who drew from postcolonial views on development argued for a multi-polar international approach to development projects with particular emphasis on integrating local and national knowledge outside of the west. Khushwant Singh, an author and former Indian diplomatic envoy to Canada and who also served as a UNESCO envoy, highlighted the importance of the west moving beyond the ethnic stereotyping of 'Orientals' he endured while a diplomat in Canada in his speech 'Orient pearl in the world oyster.' Karl Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish economist who served for a decade as the Executive Secretary of the UN Economic Commission for Europe, argued against the contemporary strategies of western developmentalists and articulated views akin to Third World socialism. In his speech 'An economist's view of a sane world,' he criticized the liberal capitalist elites in all countries who sought to concentrate wealth in their hands under the guise of 'development.' However, Myrdal did include colonial compulsions to reduce the birthrate in underdeveloped countries, demonstrating how neocolonial arguments intermingled with postcolonial projects. Lastly, Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier, a Senegalese lawyer, diplomat and politician who directed the U.N. Institute for Research and Planning, argued for a framework for global development in his speech 'International Cooperation – Man's New Dimension.' D'Arboussier engaged with the legacy of colonialism and called for men to recognized their new dimension, one build on international cooperation that would engage with and rid the legacy of colonialism.

In this chapter, I seek to provide an answer to the following questions: how did neocolonialism affect the intellectual community of speakers at Expo 67? How were decolonised nations and peoples represented during the speakers series? And what anticolonial projects were proposed to run counter to neocolonial globalization? I argue that the concept of 'development' at Expo 67 was interrelated with a wider neocolonial ideology circulating among investor nations and their intellectual, diplomatic, and economic liberal elites. The need to follow a Euro-American model was most clearly articulated when western unity was promoted and a neocolonial gaze was cast towards the Third World. Presenters such as Singh, Myrdal, and D'Arboussier did argue for an alternative approach to global society rooted in postcolonial perspectives. I further argue that what emerges from a critique of these two major Expo 67 speakers series grounded in theories of modernization and postcolonial/decolonization theory is that Expo 67 served as a site for transnational discourse on how to better manage global and

national populations to bring them more in line with the Euro-American projects of modernity and development.

The lecturers analysed in this chapter were selected based on their references to decolonised nations and regions as well as the programmes they advocated for global or localized development. The chapter is divided into two sections: arguments that drew from neocolonial views and those that drew from postcolonial views. The first section elucidates the neocolonial influence on Euro-American modernization and development projects. In this case the neocolonial views are shrouded in the notion of 'universal' planning, while openly expressed when applying the neocolonial gaze of Aurelio Peccei, John K. Galbraith and Stormont Mancroft as they discussed colonised and decolonised peoples. The second section focusses on the critiques of neocolonial developmentalist programmes from postcolonial perspectives and highlights an alternative developmentalist programme steeped in postcolonial arguments and understandings.

The speeches were subsequently compiled and published in 1967 (MHIF) and 1968 (NL) so they could be disseminated to libraries and readers beyond the auditorium. The number speakers from Europe and former European settler-colonies formed the vast majority of the speakers; out of a total of 40 speakers, 33 hailed from Europe, North America and Australia, with four representing Asia, two from Africa, and one from Central America. The concentration of white speakers marginalized African, Asian, and Hispanic American voices while asserting an intellectual, political, and scientific dominance within Europe and its former white settler colonies. This resulted in a substantially limited scope of how to shape global and local societies as a mechanism to achieving humanity's true potential, privileging European and North American views.

While the speakers at the MHIF and even some of their speech titles were chosen by the Canadian Business Development Bureau, the NL presenters were chosen by a committee presided over by the Vice-Rector of Université de Montréal, Professor Lucien Piché. The purpose of the Noranda Lectures delivered each week during Expo, was to 'venture into deeper analysis for the benefit of specialists' than the rest of Expo.[6] Metaphorically, the Noranda Mines company had turned the 'native copper and gold' in Canada to 'jewels of the mind,' transmuting

[6] Dupuy, 'Preface,' in *The [Expo 67] Memorial Album,* 7.

Canadian landscapes and resources into precious elements of the Canadian intellectual psyche.[7] As G.B. Foster, Vice-President of Noranda Mines Ltd., explained, 'we believe that educated Canadians are better Canadians,' to which Canada's director of External Affairs, Paul Martin Sr., added: 'man must adopt new ideas and concepts to survive and develop the human personality more fully in a rapidly changing world.'[8] The ideas presented at the MHIF were thought to have 'significant effect in the future development of government, business and social planning' worldwide. Despite the focus on global development, the presentations were also charged with another major component of Expo 67: to mold individual human beings into more consciously global thinkers. The Canadian Business Development Bureau chose the MHIF speakers on the basis of their understanding of and approach to international challenges 'in the crusade for human betterment,' merging Expo's central intellectual presentations to Canadian and global projects of development.[9]

'Development' and 'modernization' became common ideological parlance in the post-War era because of their global economic focus and universalist pretentions, making it a perfect fit for the themes of universality at Expo 67. Within neocolonial developmentalist currents was a reliance on an incomplete reading of the history of economics and technology, one in which colonized peoples benefit from the acquisition of superior technology from the colonizing power without any detrimental effects of colonization on local economies, peoples, traditions, and cultures. These projects, which were in plain evidence in the Canadian Pavilion (chapter 2), emanated from Europe and the United States, but were both renegotiated via the inclusion of postcolonial perspectives and arguments, mainly by speakers representing decolonized nations and first articulated at the 1955 Bandung Conference, which 'marked the beginning of collective demands by the Third World in the fields of politics (decolonization) and "development."'[10] As Michael Latham explains, U.S. social scientists, government officials, and political commentators argued that 'the irrepressible force of modernization made traditional societies tenuous and transitory' that would 'eventually converge on common forms.' The promoters of a global project of modernization 'identified that universal end point with their own society.' In their projections,

[7] Helen S. Hogg, 'Introduction,' in *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67*, (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968), xi.
[8] Paul Martin Sr., 'Les conférences,' in *The Noranda Lectures*, 5-6, 5.
[9] 'Preface,' *Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, v, vii.
[10] Michael Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*, (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2011), 82.

'that their society stood at history's leading edge and that they possessed the power to transform a world struggling in its wake,' they 'reduced crucial political problems to matters of mere administration and technical expertise.'[11] By situating all cultures, political institutions, and peoples on the same timeline, neocolonial developmentalists asserted their vision as the only rational option, one that should be imposed around the world. Such a widespread, global project had required an enormous mobilization of resources; for one speaker at the DuPont Auditorium at Expo 67, a profound restructuring of global institutions was required to meet these goals.

'Universal Planning' & Western Interdependence

The most notable proponent of unilateral exchange at the MHIF was Aurelio Peccei, whose speech 'Looking Ahead at Social and Economic Developments in a Changing World' presented the need for a global, 'universal' planning institution to coordinate the modernization projects underway sporadically around the world.[12] Peccei explained the need for 'universal planning' to solve the major challenges of the times. He argued that this degree of planning was a result of the progress that had 'endowed us with abundant means of all kinds and a vast array of powerful tools, plus the know-how for using them.' He noted the concentration of this know-how and tools in 'Western or westernized' nations could be put to use around the globe in consideration of all of the problems of the world. He stated that these are the nations 'to which we belong,' which indicates that he was addressing what he saw as a homogenized audience and their shared western identity, which he grounded in their status as the most productive members of humanity. Peccei sought to 'prospect the future' to ascertain how 'the peoples of the Western civilization' should lead and, in cooperation with other peoples, decide upon mankind's objectives over the succeeding years.[13] Despite the rhetoric of cooperation, Peccei clearly articulated who should sit at the head of the table.

Peccei believed the west should lead the way despite the fact that decolonizing peoples had been fully executing their own plan to reduce western hegemony and political rule over their territory and people. Peccei's plan lagged due to 'the minds and habits of men, particularly those who should guide the others but are unable to catch up with the times.'[14] In this context, Peccei

[11] *Ibid*, 3, 4.
[12] Aurelio Peccei, 'Looking Ahead at Social and Economic Policy,' in *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, 67-84.
[13] *Ibid*, 70, 73.
[14] *Ibid*, 81.

argued westerners needed to educate themselves so they may better pursue their duty to humanity by educating others. As Stormont Mancroft, another MHIF presenter, explained, the western political leaders needed "'to take [western politicians] by the scruff of the neck and to bring them kicking and screaming into the twentieth century.'"[15] For the west to accomplish the mammoth task of recreating the world in its own likeness, it would first and foremost require degree of western cooperation that was lacking to Mancroft and Peccei.

One of the wider goals at Expo 67 was to promote the concept of 'interdependence' among nations, or the creation of a world-system of mutual cooperation.[16] The concept belied the political realities of the political and ideological fractures of the Cold War, which were reproduced at the speakers series. The principle bloc under focus here is the rise of a network of a global capitalist class along the old lines of European empires. The 'interdependence' theory included a push for western unity in order to confront the global issues of poverty and 'underdevelopment.' Adapting the concept of developed/underdeveloped, which originated in U.S. President Truman's inaugural address in 1949, gave modernizers a new binary of transition that the old imperial colonizer/colonized did not. Thereby '"*development*" *took on a transitive meaning* (an action performed by one agent upon another),' which further '*introduced the idea of a continuity of substance,* so that now the two terms of the binomial differed only relatively.'[17] This new, shared historical trajectory allowed for the United States to build an anticolonial program modeled on a digestible semantic and ideological shift away from colonialism, although the ideological differences did not so much as cleave as they did adapt.[18] Combined with U.S. economic, scientific, and technological ascendancy, post-1945 U.S. foreign policy concerned some Europeans of a divergence between Europe and the United States, which they saw as a

[15] Mancroft, 'Sharing the Common-Wealth,' in *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, 89. The quote is from then-British Prime Minister Harold Wilson.
[16] Dupuy, *The [Expo 67] Memorial Album*, 7. The concept is also promulgated at the Canadian Pavilion, forming the conceptual basis of the Katimavik structure, one of three main Canadian Pavilion exhibition areas. Julien Hébert and Joseph Rudel-Tessier, *Widening Horizons: Katimavik and Interdependence*, (Montreal: Queen's Printer, 1967).
[17] Gilbert Rist, *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*, 4th ed., (London: Zed, 2014) 11, 73-74.
[18] Speaking at the MHIF, Raymond Aron recognized the allure of the U.S. to decolonized nations, perhaps recognizing the U.S. as 'champions de l'anticolonialisme hier' who now took a firm interest in quelling the revolutionary movements of Africa and Asia. He remarked that reactions to the Vietnam War was representative of Europe and the United States' changing relationship, as while the Korean War had given the feeling of a united western alliance, there was considerably less enthusiasm for U.S. unilateral actions Vietnam War, describing the war as 'Désintéressée, absurde ou monstrueuse, ou encore tout cela à la fois,' and further indicated the U.S. interest in Vietnam made the U.S. appear to be the new imperialist, neocolonial power. Raymond Aron, 'L'avenir des relations entre Europe et Amérique,' in *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, 165, 171.

threat to world order and a principle barrier to a holistic, planetary developmental framework. Europeans responded in many ways, including by promoting development as an idealistic, shared Euro-American responsibility.

According to Aurelio Peccei, the best opportunity for the model of Euro-American development to gain fruition was to unify the west for development aims. Peccei underlined the need for U.S. involved in European economic integration, technological integration, and 'a profound societal and structural modernization of the old continent.' This would be a first step towards 'technico-scientific interdependence and a joint science policy' between Europe and the U.S., developing a stronger North Atlantic community.[19] Peccei worried that the technological gap threatened western unity and that it recreated the disparities between the West and 'underdeveloped' nations. The inequality among the west and the rest was 'at the root of the seething rebellion and turmoil growing among the peoples of the world.' As problematic as this disparity was, it paled in comparison to the 'inevitable catastrophe' Euro-American developmental disparity would bring about. This would happen should as the west broke into 'two divergent societies, no longer recognizing in each other their kin and an indispensable complement for their glorious civilization to survive.'[20] The Third World developmental laggards were used as a negative point of comparison to where Europe would be were the U.S. to continue advance alone. This meant that the fracturing trans-Atlantic white kinship relations could completely destabilize the world order, undoubtedly a terrifying possibility to the minds of men who sought to reorder the world according to their likeness. The fact that the unity was expressed as a kinship network reinforced the inequalities that colonialism had structured.

Contrasting with Peccei's view of the mutually-beneficial relationship between the two regions, Raymond Aron spoke of the 'américanisation' of Europe as problematic in his speech 'L'avenir des relations entre Europe et Amérique.'[21] The so-called 'brain drain' caused further discomfort to Aron, who was concerned the flight of scientists, engineers, and researchers to the U.S., which undermined Europe's ability to flourish. Despite the 'universal' attributes of 'modern civilisation,' Aron believed there were some elements that were distinctly American and more easily resisted by other English-speaking societies. His concern represented the global shift in the centre of imperialistic power, which he sought to resist as he argued for the

[19] Peccei, 80.
[20] *Ibid*, 79.
[21] Aron, 177.

unification of Europe and the United States to form a single bloc. This would alleviate what he perceived as 'la dépendance et l'infériorité des nations européennes séparément ou collectivement, par rapport aux États-Unis.'[22] Aron sought to assert the need for Europe to catch up to North America to avoid Europe losing its international prestige and ability to hold significant influence in global affairs. As he explained, 'Il n'y a de véritable amitié qu'entre égaux : la proposition est aussi vielle que la pensée occidentale.' According to Aron, Europeans were particularly sensitive to inequality when they felt inferior. He argued that the American ascendancy was so drastically altering to the European conception of their place in the world that it was affecting their mental health, resulting in 'les tensions psychologiques et la mise en cause de certaines modalités du libéralisme.' He reinforced the fear of disunity as a result of inequality: 'c'est une vielle formule que la liberté favorise les forts et pénalise les faibles.'[23] Aron reserved this logical argument for the relationship between the United States and Europe, yet the logic was utilized to favour European equality with the U.S., not equality among the west and the rest.

Aron's vision of a unified East and West was based on his desire to return Europe to its global position as a world leader with its broader alliance with its powerful, former settler-colonies. Aron believed it emotionally taxing if Europe was not part of the elite that could develop the rest of the world, calling it 'indispensable à la santé morale' if the U.S. surpassed Europe, even going so far as to call European dependency 'humiliante.'[24] This crucial detail exemplifies his concern of losing the status afforded to Europe as an imperial centre, which Aron seeks to preserve and maintain the old concentration of global imperial power of colonial European history. The emotional effects of being second to the United States, the loss of independence, the feeling of inferiority motivated the European speakers to regain their lost superiority. Here the urge to develop was wielded to re-establish the same power structure Europe enjoyed at the height of its imperialist reign. For Peccei and Aron, the neocolonial dynamic applied to Europe from the United States was a nightmare scenario; undoubtedly, they were concerned that Europe would become 'underdeveloped,' relegating them to a similar status through which they viewed the rest of the world. Their profound concerns of relative European decline are particularly understandable in light of the neocolonial gaze of the MHIF and NL speakers towards the 'underdeveloped,' a gaze they sought to avoid from the U.S. towards themselves.

[22] *Ibid*, 174-75, 177.
[23] *Ibid*, 175, 173.
[24] *Ibid*, 176. Emphasis mine.

The Neocolonial Gaze on the 'Underdeveloped'

Once a framework for global development and the alliance of Euro-Americans could be mapped out, the next phase would be to execute the plans for 'developing' the majority of human lives, countries, and territory considered 'underdeveloped.' If there was any nobility behind the project of global development and modernization, it certainly was not in evidence when observing the paternalistic and racist attitudes prevalent among those who sought to impose a western ideological worldview and set of practices on disparate populations around the globe. This process was facilitated by the racist undercurrents of the neocolonial gaze, a prime example of which was Carl J. Friedrich's explanation of China, Africa, and other regions being 'rather unideological in its thinking until the beginning of this century.'[25] In this case, Friedrich, athe German-American Professor at Harvard University and President of the International Political Science Association, promoted 'ideology' as quasi-synonymous with western modernity, eliminating any possibility of a plurality of different cultural ideologies. Thus the contact between Asia and Africa with European modernity becomes the birth of ideology outside of Europe, filling an ideological vacuum and providing the precursor to projects of development.

The international neocolonial gaze often found its starting point in domestic politics and race relations. In his speech on 'Economics and the Urban Society,' Galbraith posited that given how the costs of the Vietnam War appeared infinite, they made 'the needs of the neglected democracy of Watts and Harlem look more modest.' To Galbraith, the Vietnam War lowered the bar of human decency and recontextualized the protests in Watts and Harlem, undermining African-American suffering on the basis that Vietnamese suffering was substantially worse. Galbraith expressed that the United States was 'attempting to buy democracy for the Vietnamese,' boiling an escalating conflict down to an expensive gift of a western liberal political system.[26] This transactional approach to quelling dissent was replicated in Galbraith's view of the domestic disputes that were spreading throughout the U.S. during the civil rights era. He blamed the civil rights disputes on the 'social conception' of cities which were greatest in regions 'inhabited by Negroes and other racially distinct groups.' He argued that the racial component was only relevant in that it 'gives them a certain cohesion in their reaction,' while 'would be an error to

[25] Carl J. Friedrich, 'Man and His Government,' in *Noranda Lectures*, 115.
[26] John K Galbraith, 'Economics and the Urban Society,' in *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, 122.

associate the present turmoil in American cities simply with the existence of a Negro or Spanish-speaking minority or with the problem of their civil rights.'[27]

While Galbraith criticised white politicians and advocated for reform with the intention of ameliorating the lives in racialized U.S. cities, he remained part of a community of academics and politicians that believed the primary reason for rising racial tensions was in fact architectural and administrative, a result of physical structures rather than how white racism effected the treatment of racialized communities. In doing so, he argued for a restructuring of contemporary the administrative and urban landscape in true high-modernist fashion, which Scott explains as 'best conceived as a strong… version of the self-confidence about scientific and technical progress, the expansion of production, the growing satisfaction of human needs, the mastery of nature (including human nature), and, above all, the rational design of social order commensurate with the scientific understanding of natural laws.'[28] High-modernist ideology influenced the thinking of both domestic and global 'rational planners,' who when faced with racialized and decolonized people saw the opportunity to affect the changes they believed themselves capable of bringing. The neocolonial nature of such interventions is not a given, but a result of ignoring the voices of the peoples who were to be reordered and modernized, similar to Galbraith's dismissal of the civil rights protests being a result of civil rights violations. As Galbraith's contemporaries Stokely Carmichael and Charkes V. Hamilton explained, 'black people in [the United States] form a colony, and it is not in the interest of the colonial power to liberate them… Politically, decisions which affect black lives have always been made by white people – the "white power structure."'[29] The colonial dynamic of institutionalized racism was present in the promotion of intervention by white academics, politicians, bureaucrats, and technocrats in racialized communities without proper consultation and serious engagement with how racialized communities saw themselves and their own challenges in relation to the wider world.

None of the speakers were so overtly paternalistic towards racialized peoples as Stormont Mancroft. In his speech 'Sharing the Common-Wealth' argued that 'the only really stable governments in Africa' happened to be predominantly white, referring to Rhodesia and South

[27] *Ibid*, 112.
[28] James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, (New Haven: Yale UP, 1998), 4.
[29] Stokely Carmichael & Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), 5, 6-7. His seminal work fashioned the term 'internal colonialism,' which sparked a vibrant academic discussion. See Robert Blauner, 'Internal Colonialism and Ghetto Revolt,' *Social Problems,* 16:4 (Spring, 1969), pp. 393-408.

Africa. However, they did not uphold the same status as Canada, given Canada's adoption of British democratic traditions. Some of the contributions people of colour were making to the Commonwealth and Britain were characterized as 'embarrassing,' from 'an embarrassing exposure of Commonwealth weakness' by 'the behaviour of Dr. Nkrumah' to 'an embarrassing flood of coloured commonwealth immigrants, with equal rights.'[30] Kwame Nkrumah, who by 1967 was deposed as the first president of an independent Ghana, and his allies had always insisted that 'imperialism represented a greater danger to the postcolonial world than communism.' Nkrumah and his allies in the Non-Aligned States movement 'also challenged the ideological vision of the United States… their diverse visions of development did not fit easily into the more rigid U.S. conceptions of modernization.'[31] As per the concern for changes in Britain's ethnic composition, Mancroft's discomfort demonstrated a worldview of strictly-regulated migration of people of colour, one in which migration was limited to preserve the skin colour composition in Britain. The concern of migration from the Commonwealth countries was a fundamental tenant held by those who utilized international relations to keep their nations white. Furthermore, Mancroft's racial worldview was informed by both the existence of domestic migrants and the politics and confrontations in the British Commonwealth.

In Aurelio Peccei's case, he drew from neocolonial developmentalist views even as he sought to aid 'developing' peoples. He saw Third World populations as overcome with 'the loss of a sense of purpose' and being denied self-fulfillment by a 'world establishment busy at things that shatter their traditional cultures and values, and investing immensely more in brainwashing and arming them than in helping them out of ignorance and backwardness.' According to Peccei, improperly managed developmental projects had brought cultural destruction rather than the sought-after cures of ignorance and backwardness. He sought a 'more wholesome civilization and a truer humanism [that] can be pursued only by developing the potential of all cultures,' yet remained concerned about the technological and scientific 'hinterland which requires to be organized.'[32] In this analogy, a hinterland is acted upon by the most developed among the developed nations, so that they may in turn pass on their knowledge and skills to the global hinterland. This paternalistic outlook mixed a concern for local cultures with a sense of their lower order on a hegemonic developmental timeline.

[30] Mancroft, 89.
[31] Latham, 67.
[32] Peccei, 80-81.

Peccei had outlined a universal plan for the betterment of mankind and dedicated a substantial portion of his speech to the topic of 'the tragedy of excessive human proliferation' in what he referred to as 'underdeveloped' nations. Peccei believed that the rate of population increase made universal planning inevitable and necessary to combat the '[s]tagnation and underdevelopment' associated with 'uncontrolled population growth.'[33] These issues were exclusively associated with decolonized countries and never with former colonial powers. Their presence at Expo's MHIF is no surprise given the growth of transnational networks of scientists, politicians, and activists who believed themselves part of a "'global family.'" International and nongovernmental organizations were in place with a principle aim to reduce fertility worldwide, as 'they created a new kind of global governance, in which proponents tried to control the population of the world without having to answer to anyone in particular.'[34]

Peccei outlined the need for a reduction in the birth rate in overpopulated nations. His views shifted from neocolonial to downright authoritarian as he stated, 'If we act wisely and without delay, we still have a chance to obtain birth control as a parent's decision, before it will have to be imposed by edict.' The rhetoric of a controllable population growth was neocolonial in nature by virtue of putting the decision-making process for acceptable human reproduction squarely in the hands of former colonial powers. Here neocolonial developmentalism was being employed as the problems of the world are concentrated in non-western areas that required the benevolent planning skills of the West to further develop the population. As Peccei remarked,

> Peoples living south of the Tropic of Cancer are multiplying themselves three times as fast as their northern brethren; all investments made in their countries will serve, in a very large measure, to counterbalance population growth and only marginally, if not all, to produce economic growth. Urbanization will increase everywhere. In underdeveloped countries one may vision towns swarming with masses of the rural proletariat abandoning the countryside.

The 'rural proletarian masses' will swarm towns in underdeveloped nations if western-led planning is not enforced. He stated that the potential for a shared downward spiral among every race and culture should lead to their cooperation.[35] Though Karl Gunnar Myrdal took a more conciliatory approach rooted, as is shown later in this chapter, in engaging with postcolonial

[33] *Ibid*, 74-78.
[34] Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population*, (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2008), 6, 7.
[35] Peccei, 73-74.

critique, he also advocated for a marked decrease in the birthrate in underdeveloped countries by spreading birth control.[36]

Such statements were shared by Linus Pauling of the NL in his 'Science and the World of the Future,' in which he 'reached the firm conclusion that five hundred million people is far too large a population for India.' Pauling promoted the Indian population reduction strategy of Dr. Sripati Chandrasekar, India's minister of health and family planning and chair of the International Association for Voluntary Sterilization.[37] The organization developed from sponsorships by an 'old eugenics lobby' that targeted economically marginalized people worldwide.[38] What is not shared is the responsibility of leadership, securely in white Euro-American hands due to their technical and political mastery as outlined in his approach to 'universal planning.' Americans were disproportionately represented in the organizations, provided a majority of the funding, and had 'played a leading role in institutionalizing both the science of demography and the political strategy of family planning.'[39]

While Peccei had advocated for strengthening the western alliance for the sake of global stability, Stormont Mancroft was less concerned with the unification of Europe as he was with tempering the demands of the Asian and African members of the Commonwealth of Nations. He remarked on the shifts in the British Empire, referring to an article in the *Journal of International Affairs* on how the Empire had transformed into the Commonwealth.[40] Old political structures of unequal power relations proved adaptive, yet Britain had gone from proud and sentimental towards the Empire to disillusionment with the Commonwealth. He recognized that the Commonwealth 'majority is firmly Afro-Asian' and exerted significant pressure on the British at meetings, a 'very significant change' from business-as-usual imperialism. He called this tension 'a most unhappy friction all over the world, a friction of colour,' an unhappiness that should be shared by all colours. These passages demonstrate how Afro-Asian countries utilized the institutional legacy of Empire to further their aims, essentially flipping the script of Empire as Britain nervously sought to preserve its legacy. Despite the international misgivings at Britain's

[36] Myrdal, 22-23.
[37] Linus Pauling, 'Science and the World of the Future,' in *Noranda Lectures*, 201.
[38] Connelly, 207-09.
[39] *Ibid*, 11.
[40] Mancroft, 93, 91.

colonial rule, Mancroft believed Britain should not have to apologize for, although they 'made mistakes,' what they 'tried to do was nearly right.'[41]

Rather than validate the concerns expressed by Africans and Asians, Mancroft saw them as rather ungrateful. He was both impressed and worried by their demands of favourable economic terms in the Commonwealth. He cited the late Prime Minister of Nigeria Abubakar Tafawa Balewa (by title, not by name), who had been assassinated only a year earlier, and his wish to join the Commonwealth to seek investment and favourable economic terms.[42] Mancroft undermined the likelihood of such favourable treatment, as the Commonwealth did not exist to completely bridge the colour divide economically. Asian and African members were using the Commonwealth appropriate the British empire's legacy as a means to access favourable economic terms for development, and Mancroft believed they would be disappointed. After having 'done our best to bring these people to independence' he sought to distance Britain from their affairs, leaving their developmental evolution up to them. Mancroft even went so far as to blame the empire as 'the reason for Britain's difficulties today.'[43] Mancroft characterized the victories of decolonization movements as rational decisions made by Europeans to relinquish an antiquated and costly system, concealing decolonized peoples' agency in the process and putting Europe at the centre of the effects of decolonization.

Mancroft saw British institutions as model of societal development and the retention of these institutions as a degree of development. He cited British anxiety over what degree British institutions, monarchical or otherwise, African and Asian nations would keep, comparing them unfavourably with Canada's high degree of retention of British institutions. Mancroft drew from neocolonial developmentalism in that the number of British institutions kept as a metric for advancement, turning to white nations as leaders in this regard. British institutions were 'not for export to these emergent countries' as they favoured undemocratic systems. In one single passage, Mancroft managed to order societies based on their understanding of western science, demeaned the lower order for what he perceived as weakness, and make British people victims of these underdeveloped societies:

> Most [countries] were lacking, at the time the British took over, in almost all the skills required to run a modern state. The loyalty of their armies was doubtful, their civil service was embryonic, and they had few

[41] *Ibid*, 88, 90-91.
[42] *Ibid*, 93.
[43] *Ibid*, 89-90.

> people acquainted even with the simple science of those days. Eighteenth century India, for instance, for all her ancient customs and civilisation, suffered from all those weaknesses. And British Africa suffered from them very much more seriously, which is why the British are suffering in Africa today.[44]

Seen in this light, the MHIF and NL were an opportunity for developed nations to demonstrate their contribution to their former colonial subjects, while decolonized countries were judged based on how much or how little they had caught up. It was an opportunity for Mancroft to air his grievances, belittle entire nations and their peoples, and make British 'suffering in Africa' the centre of emotional significance.

Mancroft hoped to aid the Third World but was wary of their ability to improve. As inspiring as Expo 67 was to him, 'with its tremendous impetus and its tremendous enthusiasm with great hope for the future,' he warned not to hope for too much. He had argued for the adoption of British institutions as a means to develop societies, and was worried 'when grown men fear the light.'[45] By this logic, he had shown the path towards development based on the British model but was unconvinced of the abilities of decolonized nations to adopt British ways. Peccei spoke similarly, as he claimed that the success of his model for universal planning 'will depend greatly on when it will be started. And this in its turn depends on the political will of the stronger nations.'[46] The universal benefits of planning for global humanity's sake were being exalted in tandem with technological and social cleavages between Western civilization and the rest of the globe. According to Peccei, these cleavages meant that the West had to imbue universal planning with its hallmarks so that other regions would follow, as the West acts as Earth's guiding light towards development.

Neocolonial developmentalism was ingrained into MHIF and NL speeches through the prism of western cultural, political, and economic superiority. The speakers who advocated for neocolonial approaches to development thought of the west as a generally superior society with a duty to lead the rest of the world down the path chosen for them. One author described the legacy of nineteenth-century on the subsequent geopolitical landscape as the 'global extension of bourgeois hegemony,' beginning with Europeans characterizing Europe as 'the unstated subject at the apex of evolutionism's global hierarchy, that transparent paragon in relation to which all

[44] *Ibid*, 89-91.
[45] *Ibid*, 95.
[46] Peccei, 83.

difference was default.'[47] While the Euro-American developmentalist programme would be propagated by postcolonial states, it would not be immune to the larger neocolonial frameworks that structured global politics and economics. Thus, postcolonial politicians and academics who actually listened to them advocated for an approach to development based postcolonial theories. However, they still retained the modernizing imperative to restructure the Third World in order to be more competitive in an increasingly globalized economy according to their own developmental timeline.

Decolonizing Western Knowledge

When Khushwant Singh first arrived in Canada as a diplomat for the newly-independent state of India, he submerged himself in Canadian life and culture. For six months, he recounted, 'little notice' was taken in Canada of his diplomatic efforts, as 'drooping heads made me conscious of how little my audiences were taking from me.' He had far more success when he dipped into his diplomatic entertainment funds as he 'let liquor flow like the waters of the holy Ganga.'[48] He also speculated as to why he had even been chosen to speak, as perhaps 'they expect me to add a bit of oriental pepper to the salt of Western wisdom that they have amassed,' or they 'want to add some colour to the scene.' He bemused that it perhaps was because he looked 'as inscrutable as an Oriental ought to look.' He remarked on the pressure exuded from being 'the only Oriental' speaking among the twenty-eight presenters at the NL. Singh highlighted his markers of differentiation 'to clear up the notion anyone might have that we Indians are any different from any other people. We are not – neither as a nation nor as individuals. There is nothing very mysterious about us…' He fought against the stereotyping that 'Orientals' dealt with, remarking that the 'stereotype has clouded our minds for too long. The stereotype is seldom truthful: more often it is a palpable lie.'[49] Singh's challenge was a result of the limited number of speakers chosen to represent vast geographies, which he connected to the general disinterest in Indian affairs during his time as an Indian diplomat in Canada. He understood that the individual interactions tinted by racial stereotypes affected large western conceptions of international relations. Fortunately, he was not alone in his attempts in flavouring western knowledge with that of the postcolonial world.

---

[47] Patrick Wolfe, *Settler-Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*, (London: Cassell, 1999), 48, 47.
[48] Kushwant Singh, 'Orient Pearl in the World Oyster,' in *The Noranda Lectures*, 49.
[49] *Ibid*, 50-52.

Of the critics of neocolonialism and imperialism, none were so outspoken at the MHIF and NL as Karl Gunnar Myrdal. Myrdal's distrust of western elites was profound. He was concerned that the post-1945 era saw the continuation of 'the tradition of colonial regimes allying ourselves with the privileged classes' in the Third World, who were in turn 'intent upon preserving the social and economic *status quo*' that colonial regimes had created. Combined with the 'careless use of poor countries as pawns in the Great Power rivalry,' Myrdal considered that these facts justified the accusations of 'a new form of colonialism and imperialism' being imposed on the Third World. Myrdal accused promoters of development programs of a 'careless application of Western economic theories and models that are not adequate to reality in underdeveloped countries,' which inhibited development because of the 'disregard levels and modes of living, and attitudes and institutions.'[50] These neocolonial impositions of western development were not new; in fact, as Karl Löwith explained in his NL presentation, 19th-century Russian author Leo Tolstoy believed in the that 'Europe was not only going to destroy herself, but was also going to corrupt India, Africa, China, and Japan by spreading and enforcing her progressive civilization.'[51] Unlike the neocolonial developmentalists, Myrdal and Löwith engaged with the legacy of colonialism. Above all, they were unconvinced that western superiority was self-evident.

Myrdal's distrust of the neocolonial developmental logic was related to his distrust of the high-modernist governmentality. 'Real power to decide,' he explained, 'tends to become monopolized by small groups of individuals in strategic positions.' Myrdal's criticism of western ignorance was nothing short of scathing, accusing westerners as living 'in a fool's paradise' regarding problems of 'underdeveloped' countries. The Swedish economist lambasted a general ignorance about foreign countries and international relations, saving his most biting criticism for the rationalism that motivated administrators, technocrats, and politicians in their choices. He was most critical of the myth that national governments made decisions based 'opportunistic interest in nurturing that idea of its superior knowledge.'[52] His skepticism matches what James Scott pointed out in his criticism of high-modernists, namely that their conceptions of societies 'did not successfully represent the actual activity of the society they depicted, nor were they

[50] Karl Gunnar Myrdal, 'An economist's view of a sane world,' in *Noranda Lectures*, 24-26.
[51] Karl Löwith, 'Progress: a Fatality,' in *Noranda Lectures*, 90.
[52] Myrdal, 21, 24.

intended to; they represented only that slice of it that interested the official observer.'[53] Their perception was due to a neocolonial belief that the 'western model' could be implanted anywhere on Earth, based on their understanding that 'the capitalist mode of production creates abstract space.'[54] This 'abstract space,' as Chakrabarty calls it, contained the majority of humanity spread across the majority of the world, but was looked upon by other NL presenters as 'unideological' and therefore vacuous.[55] Combining 'abstract space' with the 'use state power to bring about huge, utopian changes in people's work habits, living patterns, moral conduct, and worldview,' adds to Myrdal's perspective on the 'international upper class of rich countries, to which your country [Canada] and my country belong,' acts and talks as if they were alone on the Earth.[56] Through Myrdal's dissection of power, he exposed an internationally-focussed, tight-knit class of capitalists and political administrators whose main interests were to reinforce an existing global dynamic of wealth inequality by erasing local cultural practices to expand the reaches of industrial capitalism and consumerism.

According to Myrdal, the modern development of the welfare state had particularly maladapted society to questions of foreign policy and development. Though greater understanding of the domestic population was a product of the welfare state, it made the rest of the world appear 'to the ordinary man like a dark destiny beyond control by peaceful means,' leading to foreign policies becoming 'an outlet for the pent-up hostility and aggressiveness which we have because of the way we have been educated.' This 'cheap way to patriotism' was combined with the military-industrial complex and governmental dependence on rhetoric and propaganda, which was convincing to the domestic population 'but seldom anybody abroad.'[57] By this view, the welfare state was responsible for popular notions of how government should and could function, which was then used as a regional point of comparison with decolonized states. Thus the logic of developing these states was understood as a result of a lack of proper technocratic and administrative government.

Myrdal described the terminological significance of 'developing countries,' which had a temporal implication of a successful transition towards development. Such 'biases are

[53] Scott, 3.
[54] Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, 2nd ed., (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2008), xvi.
[55] Friedrich, 115.
[56] Scott, 5, Myrdal, 26. See also Chakrabarty, 6.
[57] Myrdal, 21-22.

opportunistic,' he explained, as they were self-reassuring that development projects in 'the underdeveloped world' were, in fact, successfully recreating western patterns of development. Myrdal traced the self-assuredness of the success of development from the west to the rest of the world, noting that the governing elites shared in the bias.[58] This process was analyzed with greater depth by Karl Löwith in his NL speech entitled 'Progress: a Fatality.' He explained in true developmentalist terms that 'once progress has been experienced, something is set in motion that cannot be stopped. *The demand for progress becomes itself progressive*.'[59] Löwith explained development as a snowball effect, leading to 'a sort of race between actual progress and the progressive demand for it… The more progress is achieved, the more will be demanded and called for.' This made progress 'insatiable,' a never-ending cycle of what Hartmut Rosa termed the 'social acceleration' as a characteristic of late modernity.[60] Unlike Myrdal, Löwith completely rejected the notion of a beneficent development altogether, whether it was rooted in postcolonial critiques or not. Nonetheless, Myrdal engaged in the deconstruction and critique of western self-righteous knowledge, he did so in the midst of offering his model of how development could occur in the decolonized world by engaging with postcolonial critiques.

Programmes of Postcolonial Developmental

Myrdal grounded his approach to postcolonial development in the successes of the modern welfare state. He cited the positive impact on economic growth as a result of egalitarian reforms, which undermined liberal economic theories of non-intervention. He argued that 'there should be a much broader stream of capital and technology steadily flowing from the rich to the poor countries; and much of it should be given away without ever being repaid.' In doing so, he rejected the premise that development should be based on loans: 'We live in illusions if we believe that we can finance development of underdeveloped countries by repayable loans.'[61] Furthermore, Myrdal cited the stagnation of monetary aid, which began to be replaced by a system of credit against the warning of economists and the president of the World Bank, resulting in 'a rapid increase of the burden of debt service to be paid out of the poor countries' meagre export returns.' Myrdal grounded his analysis in consultation, citing an Indian statesman

[58] *Ibid*, 24
[59] Löwith, 87.
[60] *Ibid*, and Hartmut Rosa, *Accélération. Une critique sociale du temps*, trans. D. Renault (Paris : La Découverte, 2010).
[61] Myrdal, 18, 23, 26.

who explained to him that 'Equality between unequals is inequality,' and arguing for a "'double standard morality" in regard to commercial policies' and import tariffs for Third World goods. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was created to serve global development, yet 'rich countries have been dragging their feet' when it came to trading concessions to economic disadvantaged nations. Myrdal foresaw the replacement of western models with a new 'institutional approach' which considers the 'modes and levels of living, attitudes, and institutions' of nations undergoing development projects.[62] In doing so, he combined the ethics of redistribution with the postcolonial impulse of global institutional adjustments based on consultation with postcolonial states.

Myrdal's dissection of neocolonial programs of 'aid' was further validated by Kushwant Singh, who had a comparatively positive vision of the advancements of his native India. Despite the considerable pace at which development was progressing in 'your country,' as he explained to the audience, 'We are… impressed with our own achievements,' particularly in trebling the literacy rate up to 30% and increasing the average Indian lifespan from 27 to 48. In keeping grounded in postcolonial views, he compared India's development since independence not to the relative development of industrialized nations over the same period, but with 'the preceding two hundred years of British rule.' By dislocating the Indian developmental timeline from a comparative western timeline to a comparative postcolonial timeline, Singh affirmed the progress and success independence had brought the nation. Despite their progress, explained Singh, the goals of 'self-sufficiency and regaining the glory that once was ours' were on the distant horizon, impeded by the caste system, corruption, famine, lack of medical care, and illiteracy. This led India, 'to our shame, to take round the begging bowl to affluent nations, including Canada.' And yet, there were certain advantages to being Indian rather than part of the west: despite India's inability of 'catching up,' they were 'more at peace with life and with ourselves.'[63] Singh's India focusses less on the material world and more on the internal struggles of life, in which he believed Indians to have the upper hand over their western counterparts. Singh re-centered the notion of development along Indian lines, thereby dislocating the universalizing notion of neocolonial development in which his nation would be in a lower order.

[62] *Ibid*, 22, 20, 24.
[63] Singh, 51-52.

While Myrdal and Singh drew their postcolonial alternatives to development mainly from a critique of the neocolonial developmental framework, Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier put his faith in the United Nations as the mechanism towards building international cooperation and peaceful coexistence as a stepping stone towards an egalitarian programme of global development. A former Minister of Justice in Sénégal and UNESCO Deputy Director, he viewed the organization as a beacon of hope for global humanism, based on the Charter of San Francisco and the unforeseeable successes the UN achieved since 1945. The UN brought the 'universalization of political life' and formed 'the foundation of international cooperation.' Cooperation at the national and international level became necessary 'to the accomplishment of man's destiny,' and the UN offered the forum for the latter. As a 'meeting place for international cooperation,' the UN was exalted as a first step in the final stage of egalitarian developmentalism. The organization, according to D'Arboussier, was the harbinger of international cooperation. He quoted Firedrich Nietzche's vision of a united Europe, 'One Europe… and I see it coming, slowly and hesitantly… the Europe of the future.'[64] European unity was a final stage According to Nietzche's developmentalist aims. D'Arboussier saw this as a regional identity that is one step closer towards the final stage of global humanistic unity, a yearning for a world beyond the exploitative colonial past. D'Arboussier understood the significance of the West in relation to its temporary status as a bloc, as he envisioned the continental blocs as the penultimate developmental stage. Thus a continental community needed only to recognize itself as one region among many continental blocs.

In keeping with Expo 67's emphasis on personal development, D'Arboussier outlined the importance of individual learning for the sake of international cooperation. Speaking of human culture, he argued that each nation, regardless of 'however backward' they may be, has something to give the world, simultaneously affirming the value of all peoples while placing them within a developmentalist timeline. If humankind could begin to understand this, then 'every people, every human being will be convinced that international cooperation enlarges the frontiers of his state and widens the limits of his own personality.'[65] He drew from global human history to emphasize a postcolonial developmentalist progression that was culminating in its final stage even as he spoke at the MHIF. The goal was to achieve 'the noble task of the men of this

[64] Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier, 'International Cooperation – Man's New Dimension,' in *Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, 31-33.
[65] *Ibid*, 34-35.

century,' which was to understand contemporary international political paradigm on a developmentalist timeline as a result of 'man's new world dimension.'

According to D'Arboussier international cooperation relied on 'the trend towards the universalization of all problems and all institutions' as a result of human solidarity and technological advancement. As man continues to develop technologically, he will have more control over his fate; such is the history of man. He commented on the need for the 'rebuilding of [man's] spiritual and social life,' an area where very little progress had been made. He explained that despite the challenges at visualizing a world in which nations and peoples can truly cooperate, 'we have it in our power to build an image of ourselves as we shall be in the world of the future.'[66] Drawing on principles of international egalitarianism, he described how 'Each people, each nation, each continent, creating works of cooperation in and around itself, must envisage them in the new perspective of that world-wide dimension of man.' To D'Arboussier, the economic, political, cultural, scientific, and artistic obstacles to international cooperation could be overcome by 'the sovereignty of the mind, which operates on a place of universality.'[67] According to this logic, the first step towards forming such a complex, global humanistic identity is to formulate the concept at an individual level. It is this first mental leap, once spread, that will lead to the end of all other barriers. He remarked that while people must remain aware of human diversity and differences, humanity must cultivate their awareness of their unity, a process that he believed to be underway.[68]

D'Arboussier broke down areas of development needed throughout the entire world more so than just in one region. He argued that despite humanity's material advancement, there remained a dire need of developing the legal, cultural, and economic domains in 'harmony with these sweeping changes' and 'its conquests of power.'[69] While individual personal development was a necessary first step, societal development could be accelerated by the work of the United Nations, which would prevail in its mission to bring about absolute international cooperation via the fostering of peaceful coexistence. In conjunction with the creation of more public and private institutions to promote peaceful coexistence, he encouraged youth travel and exchanges and assembling intellectual, workers, and women 'in order to stimulate due interest in every act of

[66] *Ibid*, 26-28.
[67] *Ibid*, 30, 33.
[68] *Ibid*, 31.
[69] *Ibid*, 27.

international cooperation.'[70] D'Arboussier undermined the current world order in a large way by highlighting the narrow vision of development being promulgated. He recounted how a statement from Louis Armand, an engineer and humanist, resembled the voices of decolonized peoples:

> "[A]dvances rapidly assume a character of universality even if they have been invented by an enterprise for its own special needs. Organization, on the other hand, is specific, and cannot be transposed from one country to another… To perfect a system of organization is a very different task from that of setting up an installation; and it is also a very much more difficult one."[71]

D'Arboussier emphasized the need for technological exchange combined with organizational flexibility for developing nations. He recognized the need for a circulation of people and ideas to build a coalition concerned with a more egalitarian vision of development rooted in postcolonial views.

For D'Arboussier, the cultivation of individual humanistic principles would lead to greater unity across national boundaries. However, he did recognize that there were still barriers to international cooperation. The two major barriers he listed were the ideological differences between the West and the East and the technological division between the North and South.[72] D'Arboussier brought to light the legacy of European colonialism in Africa, yet saw in decolonization a new beginning filled with hope. Emphasizing his African identity, he recounted Africa's struggles as finally coming to an end as Africa emerges from 'the long night that has enveloped it.' This coincides with many African nations winning their independence throughout the continent, as colonial powers were retreating from popular African uprisings. Having waited so long, D'Arboussier exclaimed:

> [W]e are certain that the dawn of international cooperation will be followed by the rising sun of brotherhood, that sun which an African proverb says cannot be hidden with the palm of the hand and which will transform our mankind, now torn to pieces, into the seamless coat of future generations that will stretch to the ends of the earth.[73]

His yearning for international cooperation is informed by his connection to African struggles. African political affairs were for the most part back in African hands, and with that in mind D'Arboussier turned to international cooperation as the ideal step forwards towards

[70] *Ibid*, 30, 35-6.
[71] Louis Armand, quoted by D'Arboussier, 34.
[72] *Ibid*, 34.
[73] *Ibid*, 36-7.

development. His approach was less combative and critical of the colonizing powers as, despite the fact that he did reference the legacy of colonial rule in Africa, he focussed more on moving forward together as equals.

D'Arboussier articulated postcolonial arguments for development through the merits of technological development coupled with the political development of international cooperation. He regarded this new dimension as 'that of the world and the conquest of time,' as man has reached the peak of his development in international cooperation. The peak is a result of man's political evolution from clan to tribe, from tribe to nation, from nation to the modern state, and finally to international cooperation. According to D'Arboussier these increasingly large and complex political structures, 'appropriate to each stage of this evolution,' led to increasingly large-scale conflicts as a means to preserve internal social cohesion. Thus a 'considerable step forward had indeed been taken, but the world was so dominated by the idea of aggression that the idea of peaceful coexistence was actually put forward out of fear of aggression.' D'Arboussier believed that such defensive attitudes should be turned viewed from a positive point of view; rather than prevent aggression, humanity should promote 'peaceful coexistence.' Peaceful coexistence was an attribute to the final developmental stage of a globalized network or peoples and nations working together. 'The causes of [international] cooperation,' he explained, 'lie in the trend towards the universalization of all problems and all institutions; the reasons for it are human solidarity, on the one hand, and the need for technical mastery, on the other….' With the 'universalization of all problems' and the addition of international cooperation, man could begin experiencing his 'new world dimension, with different aspects corresponding to the great movements that have completely changed the material, political and cultural life and the ideologies of mankind.'[74] Among the speakers who engaged with postcolonial views, he envisioned a new spirit of cooperation at Expo 67 resulting from the cultivation of personal attachments to humanism.

Conclusion

By integrating the legacy of colonialism into their analyses, Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier, Khushwant Singh, and Karl Gunnar Myrdal undermined the basis of western imperialist attitudes and contributed to the decolonization of western knowledge. Anticolonial politics reverberated in

[74] *Ibid*, 28, 30-31.

their speeches as the postcolonial realities of 1967 were present in their criticism of the West coupled with their promotion of worldwide development. By bringing decolonized countries and the legacy of colonialism into focus, the three speakers highlighted of the challenges of development through an acknowledgement of their contemporary, postcolonial stage. The distinguishing feature of their postcolonial approach to developmentalism was a multi-directional paradigm of that international cooperation, as states would learn work with each other to achieve global unity on terms negotiated with the historically disenfranchised. Their analysis of development included components of global cooperation without regional hegemony, as the circulation of ideas and people between decolonized countries and former colonial powers pointed to a multilateral dynamic of exchange. However, their worldview did retain the hierarchical nature of developmentalism in ordering societies. What set them apart from the speakers that advocated for a neocolonial developmental framework is that they avoided the pitfalls of the neocolonial developmentalist programme by not elevating one nation or people above the rest as a model for a developed society.

Despite their geographic and professional diversities, Myrdal, Singh and D'Arboussier were united by their understanding of the legacy of colonial rule and the circulation of people and ideas. They contrasted with those advocating neocolonial developmentalism because they focused on the economic, technological, and scientific inequalities as a result of colonial legacies rather than some presumably innate western superiority. They advocated for capital for development from the industrialized nations as imperative to the success of development in decolonised nations on the basis of its concentration in the west as a result of colonialism, with Karl Gunnar Myrdal going so far as to argue for large-scale socialistic redistribution rather than loans. Throughout their speeches are references to the change independence has brought decolonized nations and the ensuing challenges, combining the technocratic and administrative approaches that neocolonial developmentalists utilized with a deeper sensitivity and nuance regarding the necessary social and cultural changes for modernization. They argued for development as a process in which decolonized peoples would renegotiate the terms neocolonial developmentalists had to offer.

While development projects began in earnest once Africa and Asia began to decolonize after the Second World War, representatives of decolonized nations reminded the attendees of the MHIF and NL that although colonization was understood to be of the past, its legacy informed

the negotiations on how international development should operate.[75] However, it is important to note that, like neocolonial developmentalists, they did seek to radically alter the habits, customs, and worldview of decolonized peoples in order to build a functioning state. Where they differ from neocolonial approaches to development is how they approached negotiations for a system of international development. Like most sites at Expo 67, the postcolonial developmentalist speakers affirmed humanistic values and attributed their growth as a necessary component to a fairer, more equitable global process of development in 'the spirit of internationalism which Expo 67 captured so successfully.'[76] Taken together, the speeches range from the postcolonial the humanistic self-actualization of Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier as a precursor to a more equitable international developmental regime to Karl Gunnar Myrdal's more radical vision of global wealth redistribution. By weaving these separate narratives at Expo 67's speakers series together, the approaches and complexity of development in conjunction with postcolonial views become evident in their approach compared to their neocolonial developmentalist counterparts.

Universalizing particularities of 'man' and 'development' were present throughout the Expo discourses. What set these particular notions of universal man and his development apart most were the ways in which the speakers engaged with Third World peoples; Peccei and particularly Mancroft alluded to them as static recipients of development as part of a territory that needed to be acted upon. The difference between the neocolonial and postcolonial developmentalist positions is the former's centralization of development among western and western-backed capitalists, rather than the latter's view favouring multi-regional, decentralized development in which decolonized countries play a larger role determining their economic paths. While neocolonial projects of development reinforced and global racial inequalities, postcolonial development programmes were promoted as an alternative by those wishing to develop all peoples to a level in which they can contribute to global humanity *on their own terms*.

In the postcolonial view, so-called 'underdevelopment' was a temporary result of colonialism's structured inequality, rather than a supposed lower ordered state of being. Underlying postcolonial developmentalism is a critique of global structural inequalities as a legacy of the colonial era that found their way into the numerous, overlapping, and competing narratives of what constituted development at Expo 67. In order to achieve the final, more

[75] For a larger discussion on colonial development, see Latham, Rist.
[76] Hogg, xi.

egalitarian postcolonial developmental stage, structural inequalities must be removed so that all nations and peoples can participate in the fruits of modernity and are free to negotiate to what degree they do so without an unequal power dynamic of neocolonial capitalism. Expo 67 was, like any other celebration, a product of its time, and this chapter served to outline that Expo 67 was a particular site that mixed neocolonial worldviews with those of the postcolonial world. Ultimately, 'man's new dimension' as an individual in a globalized world emerged from a complex narrative of global humanism which could be advocated for from a neocolonial or postcolonial perspective in the midst of a Canadian national celebration.

The Canadians who celebrated modernization and development at the Canadian Pavilion drew from a global network of intellectuals, academics, and politicians. The intellectual elites invited to the Noranda Lectures and the Maclean-Hunter International Forum were varied enough that both anticolonial rhetoric and neocolonial rhetoric were presented. Though Expo 67 was a generally celebratory event, the two speakers series were a window into global and transnational discourse on modernization and development. Ultimately, though the Canadian Pavilion rhetoric featured numerous colonial compulsions which matched the neocolonial views of Aurelio Peccei and Stormont Mancroft, the postcolonial arguments of Myrdal, Singh, and D'Arboussier offered a framework of mutual recognition and international cooperation. The speakers' postcolonial views coupled with the decolonial views of the Indians of Canada Pavilion prove that Expo 67 held narratives that ran counter to the Canadian Pavilion's colonial compulsions.

Conclusion - Our Two Masks:
Colonial Humanism and the Legacy of Expo 67

If you look at the common thread it's that we all believe in the Creator and we're all trying to live in peace and harmony. It's only when Man comes in and makes his own rules and regulations, that's when it comes, everything, down.… I think society… it has its own problems. My thinking is that if they listen to us, they will resolve a lot of their problems better.[1]

We can accomplish this as friends and partners as we have at times in the past. Or we can do it as adversaries, in anguish. Our path toward decolonization is clear. It is up to Canadians to choose theirs.[2]

Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Arthur Laing donned two different masks at two different Expo 67 events. At the Indians of Canada Pavilion's totem pole ceremony in February of 1967, Laing proclaimed that people should examine their conscience, and that 'C'est l'intention… du gouvernement canadien de s'efforcer de mieux connaitre ce que sont et ce que veulent les Indiens.'[3] In front of journalists and the company of Andrew Tanakohate Delisle, Laing proudly displayed his humanist mask, which exemplified the tolerant and even introspective view of a Canadian official who hoped to better understand Indigenous people. A few months later, during his tour of the Indians of Canada Pavilion a month before Expo opened, it is clear that Minister Laing was not prepared to follow up on trying to understand Indigenous peoples better. Minister Laing wanted to '"shut the place down,"' as he found himself unprepared to really listen to Indigenous anticolonial narratives.[4] His humanist mask cast aside by colonial compulsions, he instead donned the mask of a colonizer, whose allegiance to the Canadian state he represented outweighed the good intentions he had expressed only a few

[1] Romney Copeman, 'Interview with Andrew Tanahokate Delise,' December 8th, 2016, 1:27:00.
[2] Manuel, Arthur and Ronald M. Derrickson, *Unsettling Canada: A National Wake-up Call*, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2015), 227.
[3] Andé Luchaire, 'Inauguration du mât-totem de l'Expo : ''Les Indiens sont l'âme du Canada'' – M. Dupuis,' *La Presse*, February 11, 1967.
[4] See Peter McFarlane, *Brotherhood to Nationhood: George Manuel and the Making of the Modern Indian Movement*, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1993), 90, in Kicksee, 184. Once the fair ended, Minister Laing offered the city of Montreal ownership of the Indians of Canada Pavilion on the condition that it remain unaltered for five years. See also 'Pour au moins cinq ans le pavillon des Indiens ne devra pas être modifié,' *Montréal-Matin*, 30 November, 1967.

months prior. Perhaps he had grown accustomed to viewing Indigenous peoples as they were represented in Lister Sinclair's Canadian Pavilion guide book, *Change Comes to Canada*, as people who sporadically set forest fires for no apparent reason, rather than human beings who were profoundly critical of Canadian colonial projects.[5] How could Laing celebrate Indigenous cultures in Canada at Expo 67 while Indigenous children across Canada were being kidnapped from their families to be forced into residential schools, where they suffered immeasurably? How could a Canadian cultural policy simultaneously celebrate Indigenous people in public, while in private Indigenous children were undergoing 'aggressive assimilation' at Church-run residential schools?

The Indians of Canada subverted the colonial imagery of Indigenous people by reclaiming Indigenous representation. The pavilion also provided the opportunity to criticize settlers and settler society's developmentalist programs, proclaiming that 'Only a fool would... kill trees to make a way in the forest.' The pavilion's narrative arc of Indigenous history began with the pre-contact period, in which Indigenous people lived on their lands harmoniously. The pavilion told the story of European arrival from Indigenous perspectives, 'the so-called "savages" whom the Europeans met when they "discovered" North America,' chronicling the decline of Indigenous autonomy in conjunction with colonial expansion.[6] The prominent Indigenous activist and musician Buffy Sainte-Marie was pleased that the pavilion was generally shocking to visitors as she upheld the value of the anticolonial pedagogy the pavilion expressed.[7] In this story, Indigenous people proved resilient, as 'The winds of change begin to produce their effects... Old wisdom and modern science are two open doors to the future.'[8] Grappling with cultural adaptation was a familiar theme not just at the Indians of Canada Pavilion, but on a personal level for Delisle. Delisle recalled being pressured to dress in traditional regalia at formal Expo events, but instead he chose formal suits 'to show that we were that advanced and not what everyone was saying.'[9] Delisle worked against the colonial compulsions to perform an

[5] Lister Sinclair. *Change Comes To Canada: A Personal Glance*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), 13.
[6] Indians of Canada Pavilion. 'The Indians of Canada Pavilion Expo 67,' ([Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967?]), 6.
[7] Helen Rochester, "'Head Is White, Heart Is Cree' Singer Seeks Sure Self," *Montreal Star* (13 June 1967), 9, in Rutherdale and J.R. Miller "'It's Our Country': First Nations' Participation in the Indian Pavilion at Expo 67," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 17:2 (2006): 166.
[8] Expo Bureau of International Exhibits, *The Memorial Album of the first category universal and international Exhibition held in Montreal from the twenty-seventh of April to the twenty-ninth of October nineteen hundred and sixty-seven*, (Toronto: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd: 1968), 121.
[9] Copeman, 'Interview with Andrew Tanakohate Delisle,' 27:55.

Indigeneity upon request from Canadian officials, preferring to demonstrate how Indigenous people adapted to their surroundings without losing any aspects of their identity.

Indigenous peoples used Expo 67 as an opportunity to tell their story. Given the diversity of Indigenous experiences, critics such as Kahn-Tineta Horn and George Manuel had argued that the pavilion did not go far enough in criticizing federal government policies. Nonetheless, the pavilion contained the most widely-visited site containing Indigenous narratives in contemporary Canadian history. Though the Indians of Canada Pavilion may not be the catalyst that spurred the anticolonial activism that it preceded, it certainly was a result of the growing Indigenous activist community that was sweeping North America in the 1960s.[10] Horn visited the pavilion and brought John Belindo, the head of the National Congress of American Indians, who remarked that 'Canadian Indians may be 50 to 75 years behind us in our relations with the [U.S.] federal government.'[11] While Delisle was able to present the Indians of Canada Pavilion to Belindo and Queen Elizabeth, he also had the opportunity to visit frequently with United Nations Secretary General U Thant at the adjacent United Nations Pavilion.[12] Within the dynamic of growing Indigenous activism, from Howard Cardinal's Red Paper to the current Idle No More movement, the Indians of Canada Pavilion stands as a testament to the resiliency of Indigenous people in the face of Canadian colonial projects.[13]

At the other end of the Canada Complex from the Indians of Canada Pavilion, the Canadian Pavilion was given the difficult task of narrativizing Canadian history without engaging with colonial history beyond self-congratulatory anecdotes of the rise of a nation. Within this narrative, Indigenous people played an important symbolic role as a point of comparison for white settler society. There were inherent contradictions of celebrating Inuit art and the Inuit-inspired Katimavik structure with the static concept of Indigenous art as inherently 'primitive.'[14] If the Katimavik represented Inuit peoples while the structure was claimed as an inherently

[10] See Paul Smith and Robert Allen Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*, (New York: New Press, 1996).
[11] "Pavilion Praised," *Montreal Star* (19 May 1967), 47, in Rutherdale & Miller, 166.
[12] Copeman, 30:00, 42:30, 47:15.
[13] For a history of this period, see Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: The Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).
[14] Robin Bush, *My Home, My Native Land: A People and Their Growth*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), 9.

modernist model of interdependence, then Canadian modernity at Expo 67 rested on the appropriation of Inuit concepts.[15]

Indigeneity was simultaneously celebrated and criticized. Indigenous peoples were narrated into Canadian history in a set of contradictory terms: they were part of 'prehistory,' replete with 'romance,' 'mythology,' and 'legends,'[16] yet the prehistory was part of 'our [Canadian] prehistory,' anachronistically making Indigenous people carriers of a colonial nation-state thousands of years before its formation.[17] Though Indigenous narratives of their own history were discounted, their presence was appropriated into a mythological construction of a Canada that stretched back beyond European arrival. Given that '[c]olonialism does not appropriate a historical indigeneity; it replaces it with a conveniently mythical one of its own construction,' the Canadian Pavilion was part of the larger process of Indigenous appropriation into a settler-colonial mythical history while evacuating Indigenous narratives.[18]

Expo 67 could not escape Canadian and international colonial dynamics. Despite the intentions of the exhibition's organizers to promote interdependence and humanism, so long as Indigenous peoples were being continually treated as colonial subjects any attempts to integrate them into a celebration of universality and humanism could only serve to expose the limitations of Expo's humanistic endeavour. The Indians of Canada Pavilion was not simply the trump card that gets in the way of a humanist nation-building project; it was a demonstration of the human costs of that very same project.

The Canadian Pavilion was not an anomaly in its colonial compulsions at Expo 67. Prominent intellectuals were invited to Expo 67 to nourish the minds of Canada's chosen elites at the Noranda Lectures and the Maclean-Hunter International Forum. Aurelio Peccei provided a neocolonial framework for global development akin to Canadian colonial policy towards Indigenous people. Peccei had such faith in western high modernist ideology that he predicted it likely that birth control would have to be imposed by edict in the Third World to avoid 'towns swarming with masses of the rural proletariat abandoning the countryside.'[19] Stormont

[15] See François Hébert and Joseph Rudel-Tessier, *Widening Horizons: Katimavik and Interdependence*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967).
[16] Robin Bush, *My Home, My Native Land*, 7-8.
[17] Bush, 9.
[18] Patrick Wolfe, *Settler-Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*, (London: Cassell, 1999), 208.
[19] Aurelio Peccei, 'Looking Ahead at Social and Economic Policy,' in *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), 73-74.

Mancroft's concern over the 'embarrassing flood of coloured commonwealth immigrants' and his expression of admiration for the notoriously brutal and racist nation of South Africa (which, in fact, had been banned from participating in Expo 67 due to its *apartheid* policies) reinforced the racial elements to neocolonial projects of development. Raymond Aron called for a unity between Europe and the United States for fear of Europe being relegated to the status it had relegated the nations it had colonized. White racial fears and colonial compulsions to lead the world towards western developmental aims were either oblivious to the neocolonial strains within their discourse, or they were indifferent.

Yet among all the presenters at the Noranda Lectures and the Maclean-Hunter International Forum, two stood out for their engagement with decolonization: Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier and Karl Gunnar Myrdal. Myrdal saw in the neocolonial system of development the 'opportunistic interest in nurturing that idea of its superior knowledge.' He highlighted 'the tradition of colonial regimes allying ourselves with the privileged classes' in the Third World, who were 'intent upon preserving the social and economic *status quo*' that colonial regimes had created. Myrdal criticized contemporary programs of international development as a 'careless application of Western economic theories and models that are not adequate to reality in underdeveloped countries,' which inhibited development because they 'disregard levels and modes of living, and attitudes and institutions.'[20] Myrdal advocated for reforming the western development model if it was to be exported and adopted by other countries, leaving behind an inflexible set of economic and technocratic principles. Myrdal's neocolonial critique and postcolonial advocacy matched what D'Arboussier called 'Man's new dimension' in which humanity could adopt free neocolonial ambitions. D'Arboussier's arguments were founded on the need for introspection and recognition of man's common and interrelated destiny in order to begin true international cooperation that decolonization had made possible. International cooperation at the United Nations led to the 'universalization of political life,' which in turn should have convinced 'every people, every human being… that international cooperation enlarges the frontiers of his state and widens the limits of his own personality.'[21] Though Myrdal and D'Arboussier's analyses were based on the international system of states, their desires to integrate local knowledges, practices,

[20] Karl Gunnar Myrdal, 'An economist's view of a sane world,' in *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67*, (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968), 24-26.
[21] Gabriel-Marie D'Arboussier, 'International Cooperation – Man's New Dimension,' in *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, 32, 35.

customs, and priorities in what amounted to a postcolonial developmental program were echoed by Indigenous peoples' desires to bear the fruits of modernity free of the weight of Canadian paternalistic colonial decision-making.

The two speakers series demonstrated that despite the existence of neocolonial arguments circulating amongst the academic, political, and technocratic global elite, the decolonization movements that swept much of Africa and Asia by 1967 gave rise to the articulation of postcolonial development projects. Myrdal and D'Arboussier promoted a set of policies and ideas that could have influenced Canadian policy towards Indigenous people were Canadian colonial compulsions not so powerful. Instead, ideas similar those of Aurelio Peccei of simply acting in what he presumed to be the best interests of global humanity by reducing the birth rate in the Third World had closer similarities to Canada's treatment of Indigenous peoples. The racial fears underpinning the specter of a rising population in Third World countries also has a Canadian history in the forced sterilization of Indigenous peoples in the 1970s.[22]

To unravel the colonial mentalities behind Man and His World is to bear witness to the resiliency and persistence of colonialism in Canada. Even during a humanist celebration, colonial mentalities proved inescapable to the speakers series planners and the authors of the Canadian Pavilion guide books. The integration of the Indians of Canada Pavilion, which was made possible due largely to the lobbying of Indigenous peoples, interrupted the attempt to portray a Man and His World 'free of affectation' as the Canadian Pavilion had proposed.[23] Though Canadian officials speaking at the Indians of Canada Day donned their humanist mask in the public forum, colonial policy did not fundamentally change.

The multi-ethnic humanistic messages of the Canadian Pavilion promoted a set of multicultural symbols before the adoption of multiculturalism as an official government policy. The early multiculturalist imagery was particularly evident in the multi-ethnic images embedded in the leaves of the People Tree. But when the Canadian Pavilion's early multiculturalist leanings are compared with the narrative at the Indians of Canada Pavilion, the question arises as to how early multiculturalism was developing alongside the aggressive assimilationist and cultural genocide policies in the 1960s. Seen from this light, the Indians of Canada Pavilion does not

[22] See Karen Stote, *An Act of Genocide: Colonialism and the Sterilization of Aboriginal Women*, (Black Point: Fernwood Publishing, 2015). For a global perspective on population control, see Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population*, (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2008).
[23] François Hébert, *Widening Horizons*, 3.

disprove early multiculturalism, but rather it disrupts how multiculturalism reinforces a dominant and uncritical narrative of the rise of a 'multicultural' Canada.

The humanistic imagery and statements at the Canadian Pavilion coexisted alongside the paternalistic treatment of Indigenous people in the Canadian Pavilion guide books. The central argument of this thesis is that only by writing in the missing components of Canada's history and unpalatable Indigenous and cultural policy while demystifying its paradoxical colonial humanistic assumptions can we understand the nuances of Canada's cultural policy at Expo. By seeking to appropriate Indigenous peoples into Canadian history without engaging with their narratives, Canadian nationalists relegated them to either contributors to the Canadian nation, barriers to technological progress, or nearly-forgotten relics of the past. As Eva Mackey explains, 'officially endorsed versions of multiculturalism abduct the cultures of minority groups, pressing them into the service of nation building without promoting genuine respect and autonomy.'[24] This process was also particularly evident at the Katimavik, or 'meeting place' in Inuktitut, which demonstrated the appropriation of Inuit culture, albeit reconfigured into a massive modernist structure, as a means to psychologically extend Canadian sovereignty into the northern reaches of North America.

The Indians of Canada Pavilion stood as a major precursor to the Indigenous nationalism that emerged in the following years. As Glen Coulthard explains,

> the expression of Indigenous anticolonial nationalism that emerged forced colonial power to modify itself from a structure that was once primarily reinforced by policies, techniques, and ideologies explicitly oriented around the genocidal exclusion/assimilation double, to one that is now reproduced through a seemingly more conciliatory set of discourses and institutional practices that emphasize our *recognition* and *accommodation*. Regardless of this modification, however, the relationship between Indigenous peoples and the state has remained *colonial* to its foundation.[25]

The resiliency of Canadian colonialism is unquestionably attributable to an unwillingness to compromise with Canada's colonial compulsions, most notable in Canadian access to resources in Indigenous territory. It will always remain ludicrous to those who take Indigenous people seriously why Canadians' needs are so great that they must be fulfilled with a territory as expansive as 3.7 people per km^2, or why Canadians are afraid to relinquish their claims on more than 0.2% of the lands north of the 49^{th} parallel.

[24] Eva Mackey, *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*, (London: Routledge, 1999), i.
[25] Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*, 6.

Today's Canadian colonial humanist mask is deeply embedded in the myth of 'multiculturalism.' Given that Expo 67's humanistic leanings included colonial compulsions, it should come as no surprise that 'colonial relations of power are no longer reproduced primarily through overtly coercive means, but rather through the asymmetrical exchange of mediated forms of state recognition and accommodation.'[26] Our two masks, the humanist mask that minister Laing wore as he smiled and shook hands and the colonial mask he wore when he threatened to shut down the Indians of Canada Pavilion, are given new life when the sunny promises of reconciliation come without fundamental changes to Canada's colonial relationship with Indigenous peoples. Our two masks seem so different, and yet they cover the same surface. They are interchangeable when settler society continues its colonial advancement, as either one is donned in order to carve a path of least resistance. Indigenous people have proclaimed humanist messages free of affectation and resisted colonial advancements for far too long before settler society began examining our two masks.

Though the average visitor who remembers their visit to Expo 67 may not have any memory of witnessing the colonial compulsions at Expo 67, *Unsettling Expo 67* should not conflict with their memories but recontextualize them into the history and ongoing realities of Canadian colonialism. To many, Expo 67 has a personal connection to a simpler time, what Pierre Berton called 'the last good year,' before Canadian unity was fractured.[27] But the unity Canadians have imagined has always contained fractures, if not veritable fissures, and no amount of avoiding the rough terrain will negate its existence. If Canadians could take off their humanist mask and examine it more closely with the help of Indigenous peoples' perspectives, histories, stories, and guidance, perhaps they would be just as shocked at the colonial compulsions they contain as visitors were when they examined the Indians of Canada Pavilion.

As visitors exited the pavilion, they were invited to rest and reflect:

> Sit now by the fire and rest, my brother. We will talk of the time to come. You have followed our long trail through many years from the days of our fathers. In a moment, we will begin our journey again. But as we rest, let us look into the fire for a vision of the days ahead. Some of my people see in the dark coals a world where the Indian is a half-remembered thing and the ways of the old men are forgotten. But I see another vision. I see an Indian, tall and strong in the pride of his heritage. He stands with your sons, a man among men. He is different, as you and I are different, and perhaps it will always be so. But, in the Indian way, we have many gifts to share. Our skills and strengths – yours and mine. The ancient wisdom of our fathers – yours and mine. The love of God, the Great Spirit – yours and mine. We will meet again in the time to come

[26] Coulthard, 15.
[27] Pierre Berton, *1967: The Last Good Year*, (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Ltd., 1997).

and perhaps, now and then, we will share a day's journey. But the trail we walk is our own, and we bear our own burdens. That is our right. When we reach the level ground we will camp together, you and I, as brothers. Until that time, walk with us in your heart.[28]

[28] Indians of Canada Pavilion, 'Farewell Message,' quoted in Kicksee, Appendix C.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Audio and Film Recordings

Copeman, Romney. *Interview with Andrew Tanahokate Delisle,* transcript of an oral history interview conducted on December 8th, 2016.

CBC Radio. "Expo 67's Indians of Canada." *Expodition*. 4 August, 1967. Host Bob MacGregor. Reporter Jim Robertson. Guest Velma Robinson. CBC Digital Archives. www.cbc.ca/archives/entry/expodition-expo-67s-indians-of-canada.

Millar, David. '*Aki'name*: On The Wall.' *National Film Board of Canada*, 1968. https://www.nfb.ca/film/aki_name/

Régnier, Michel. "Indian Memento: Indians of Canada Pavilion – Expo 67." *National Film Board of Canada*, 18:12, 1967. http://www.nfb.ca/film/indian_memento.

Conferences & Speeches

Aron, Raymond. 'L'avenir des relations entre Europe et Amérique.' In *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, by Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. Montréal : Exposition universelle et internationale de 1967, 1967.

D'Arboussier, Gabriel-Marie. 'International Cooperation – Man's New Direction.' In *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, by Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. Montréal : Exposition universelle et internationale de 1967, 1967.

Dupuy, Pierre. 'Introduction.' In *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum,* by Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. Montréal : Exposition universelle et internationale de 1967, 1967.

Friedrich, Carl J. 'Man and His Government.' In *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968.

Galbraith, John K. 'Economics and the Urban Society.' In *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, by Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. Montréal: Exposition universelle et internationale de 1967, 1967.

George, Dan. 'Lament for Confederation,' July 1st, 1967. In 'This day in history: July 1, 1967,' *Vancouver Sun*. July 2 2015. Accessed online. http://www.vancouversun.com/This+history+July+1967/6876736/story.html

Hogg, Helen S. 'Introduction.' In *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968.

Löwith, Karl. 'Progress: a Fatality.' In *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968.

Mancroft, Stormont, 'Sharing the Common-Wealth.' In *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, by Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. Montréal : Exposition universelle et internationale de 1967, 1967.

Martin, Paul (Sr.). 'Les conferences.' In *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968.

Myrdal, Karl Gunnar. 'An economist's view of a sane world.' In *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968.

Pauling, Linus. 'Science and the World of the Future.' In *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968.

Peccei, Aurelio 'Looking Ahead at Social and Economic Policy.' In *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, by Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. Montréal : Exposition universelle et internationale de 1967, 1967.

Singh, Kushwant. 'Orient Pearl in the World Oyster.' In *Man and His World: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 1968.

Expo Publications and Pamphlets

Australian Pavilion. *Australian Panorama: Expo Souvenir Edition*. Sydney: Paramac Printing 1967.

Bush, Robin & Norbert Lacoste. *My Home, My Native Land: A People and Their Growth*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967.

Dupuy, Pierre. "Preface." In *The Memorial Album of the first category universal and international Exhibition held in Montreal from the twenty-seventh of April to the twenty-ninth of October nineteen hundred and sixty-seven*. [Toronto?]: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd: 1968.

Expo Bureau of International Exhibits. *Expo 67: The Memorial Album*. Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons: 1968.

Hébert, Julien and Joseph Rudel-Tessier. *Widening Horizons: Katimavik and Interdependence*. Montreal: Queen's Printer, 1967.

Indians of Canada Pavilion. 'The Indians of Canada Pavilion Expo 67.' [Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967?].

Milne, Charles C. ed.. *Expo 67: Official Guide*. Toronto: Maclean-Hunter, 1967.

'Preface.' In *The Maclean-Hunter International Forum*, by Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. Montréal : Exposition universelle et internationale de 1967, 1967.

Sinclair, Lister. *Change Comes To Canada: A Personal Glance*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967.

Monographs

Berton, Pierre. *1967: The Last Good Year*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada Ltd., 1997.

Hawthorn, H.B. ed. *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies*. Vol. 2. Ottawa: Queens Printer, 1967.

Jedwab, Jack & Vic Satzewich. 'Introductory Essay: *The Vertical Mosaic* 50 Years Later.' In John Porter. *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. 50th anniversary ed.. Toronto: Toronto UP, 2015.

Larmour, W. T. *The Art of the Canadian Eskimo*. Ottawa: [Queen's Printer?], 1967.

Manuel, George and Michael Posluns. *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*. Don Mills: Collier-Macmillan Canada.

Newspaper Articles

Bantey, Bill. 'Expo 67: One's Own Stone.' *The Montreal Gazette*, 9 March, 1967.

Bernier, Germaine. 'Rêverie polaire sur L'Expo montréalaise.' *Le Devoir*, 17 May, 1965.

Chevalier, Frank. 'Letters to the Editor: Pavilion of North American Indians Proclaims True and Touching Message.' *The Montreal Star*, 20 May, 1967.

De Wet, Wouter. 'Chief Versus Princess: Feud Erupts Over Indian Pavilion.' *The Montreal Star*, 19 May, 1967.

Dolan, Sandra. 'Indians Make A Point On Their Day.' *The Montreal Gazette*, 5 August, 1967.

Gabriel, Jeffrey. 'The Message of The Canadian Indian Pavilion.' *The Montreal Gazette*, 5 June, 1967.

Goodman, Joyce. 'Indian Girls Train As Hostesses For Indians of Canada Pavilion.' *The Montreal Star*, 6 April, 1967.

Gray, John. 'Rain was bitter blow.' *The Montreal Star*, 5 August, 1967.

'Indians Charge Expo Snub.' *The Montreal Star*, 22 February, 1966.

'Le chef Delisle: les Indiens entendent demeurer Canadiens.' *Le Devoir*, 6 August, 1967.

'Le gouverneur général invite les Indiens à un "dialogue amical"' *La Presse*, Montréal, 5 August 1967.

Luchaire, André. 'Inauguration du mât-totem de l'Expo : ''Les Indiens sont l'âme du Canada'' – M. Dupuis.' *La Presse*, 11 February, 1967.

---. ‘Le Pavillon des Indiens, le choc de l’Expo.’ *La Presse*, 26 June, 1967.

---. ‘Les Indiens du Canada: race qui cherche sa voix.’ *La Presse*, 3 August, 1967.

‘Nine Expo Bosses Honored With Titles, Headdresses.’ *The Montreal Gazette*, 5 August, 1967.

‘Pour au moins cinq ans le pavillon des Indiens ne devra pas être modifié.’ *Montréal-Matin*, 30 November, 1967.

Racine, Gilles. ‘Le pavillon des Indiens est une école non un spectacle – (Buffy Sainte-Marie)’ *La Presse*, 13 June, 1967.

Radwanski, George. ‘Pavilion Misrepresents Outlook of Most Indians Says Missionary.’ *The Montreal Gazette*, 11 July, 1967.

Rioux-Sabourin, Ivan. ‘L’hotesse de la semaine – L’Indienne du Canada.’ *La Patrie*, 13 August, 1967.

‘Rush Is On To Open 15 Pavilions.’ *The Montreal Gazette*, 23 May, 1968.

Tafler, David. ‘Indians Say Expo Island “‘Stolen.’” *The Montreal Gazette*, 22 April, 1966.

‘Un pavillon des Indiens à l’Exposition de 1967.’ *La Presse*. 30 March, 1966.

Secondary Sources

Journal Articles

Brydon, Sherry. ‘The Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo 67.’ In *American Indian Art Magazine* 37:2 (2012): 54-63.

Clapperton, Jonathan. “Naturalizing Race Relations: Conservation, Colonialism, and Spectacle at the Banff Indian Days.” In *Canadian Historical Review*, 94:3 (2013): 349-379.

Griffith, Jane. ‘One Little, Two Little, Three Canadians: The Indians of Canada Pavilion and Public Pedagogy, Expo 67,’ *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 49:2 (Spring 2015): 171-204

Hess, Barnor. ‘It's Your World: Discrepant M/Multiculturalisms.’ *Social Identities* 3:3 (1997), 375-394.

Kröller, Eva-Marie. ‘Expo 67: Canada’s Camelot?’ in *Canadian Literature* Spring/Summer 152/153 (Spring/Summer 1997), 36-51.

McKay, Ian. ‘The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History.’ *Canadian Historical Review*, 81:4 (Dec 2000), pp. 617-651.

Pupchek, Leanne. 'True North: Inuit Art and Canadian Nationalist Imaginings.' *American Review of Canadian Studies*, (Spring/Summer 2001), pp. 191-208.

Rutherdale, Myra and J.R. Miller. '"It's Our Country": First Nations' Participation in the Indian Pavilion at Expo 67.' *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 17:2 (2006): 148-73.

Monographs

Alfred, Taiaiake [Gerald R.]. *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahnawà:ke Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism.* Toronto: Oxford UP, 1995.

Beier, J. Marshal. *International Relations in Uncommon Places : Indigeneity, Cosmology, and the Limits of International Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Benton, Lauren. *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010.

Carmichael, Stokely & Charles V. Hamilton. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*, New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2008.

Connelly, Matthew. *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2008.

Coulthard, Glen. *Red Skin, White Masks: The Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Gabriel, John. *Whitewash: Racialized Politics and the Media*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Igartua, José. *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006.

Kicksee, Richard Gordon. 'Scaled Down to Size: Contested Liberal Commonsense and the Negotiation of "Indian Participation" in the Canadian Centennial Celebrations and Expo '67, 1963-1967.' M.A. Thesis, Queen's University, 1995.

Latham, Michael. *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2011.

Mackey, Eva. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Manuel, Arthur and Ronald M. Derrickson. *Unsettling Canada: A National Wake-up Call*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2015.

McKay, Ian. *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-century Nova Scotia*. Montreal: McGill-Queens UP, 1994.

Nkrumah, Kwame. *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1965.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Regan, Paulette. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010.

Rist, Gilbert. *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*. 4th ed. London: Zed, 2014.

Scott, James C.. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.

Truth and Reconcilation Commission of Canada. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, (Manitoba: TRC, 2015).

---. *They Came for the Children: Canada, Aboriginal Peoples, and Residential Schools*. Manitoba: TRC, 2012.

Wilder, Gary. *The French Imperial Nation-State: Negritude and Colonial Humanism Between the Two World Wars*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Wolfe, Patrick. *Settler-Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Cassell, 1999.

Young, Robert. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Newspaper Articles

Kennedy, Mark. 'Teachings about aboriginals "simply wrong", says Murray Sinclair.' *Ottawa Citizen*, 24 May 24, 2015. Updated May 29, 2015. Accessed online January 17th, 2017.

Works Consulted

'Colonialisme quotidian: centre bilingual centre.' *Parti-pris* 4 (mai-aout 1967), 195-96.

Blauner, Robert. 'Internal Colonialism and Ghetto Revolt.' *Social Problems* 16:4 (Spring, 1969): 393-408.

Brydon, Sherry. 'The Representation of Inuit Art at Expo 67.' *American Indian Art Magazine*, 37:2, 2012. 34-44.

Daschuk, James. *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Aboriginal Life*. Regina: University of Regina Press, 2013.

Horner, Dan. 'Solemn Processions and Terrifying Violence: Spectacle, Authority, and Citizenship during the Lachine Canal Strike of 1843.' *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine* 38: 2 (Spring 2010), 36-47.

Johansson, Bruce E. *Forgotten Founders: Benjamin Franklin, the Iroquois and the Rationale for the American Revolution*. Ipswitch: Gambit Publishers, 1982.

Lake, Marilyn & Henry Reynolds. *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008.

Lecours, André. 'Ethnic and Civic Nationalism: Towards a New Dimension.' *Space and Polity*, 4:2 (2000), 153-166.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 'Le « Québec moderne ». Un chapitre du grand récit collectif des Québécois.' *Revue francaise de science politique*, 5 (1992), 765-785.

Macdonald, Sonja. 'Expo 67 Canada's National Heterotopia: A Study of the Transformative Role of International Exhibitions in Modern Society.' M.A. thesis, Carleton University, 2003.

Perry, Adele. 'The Colonial Archive on Trial: Possession, Dispossession, and History in *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia.'* In Antoinette Burton, ed., *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*. Durham: Duke UP, 2006, 325-350.

Phillips, Ruth B. 'Show times: de-celebrating the Canadian nation, de-colonising the Canadian museum, 1967-92.' In *Rethinking Settler Colonialism: History and Memory in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa*, ed. Annie E. Coombes. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006.

Phillips, Ruth B. and Sherry Brydon. '"Arrow of Truth": The Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo 67.' In Ruth B. Phillips, *Museum Pieces: Towards the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*. Montreal: McGill-Queens UP, 2011. pp. 27-48.

Price, John. *Orienting Canada: Race, Empire, and the Transpacific*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.

Rosa, Hartmut. *Accélération. Une critique sociale du temps*, trans. D. Renault. Paris: La Découverte, 2010.

Sainte-Marie, Buffy. 'My Country, 'Tis of Thy People You're Dying.' *Little Wheel Spin and Spin*, Vanguard Records, 1966.

Annex: Andrew Tanahokate Delisle Oral Testimony

AD: I can go till 12, I have something going on.

RC: Ok at 12, ok great

AD: At the last minute

RC: So today is Dec. 8th, and, uh, I am very fortunate, my name is Romney Copeman, I am very fortunate to be sitting here with Mr. Andrew Delisle, who has agreed to take part in this interview on Expo 67 and Indigenous participation in Expo 67 which is my project for my Master's degree. Um, so I thought I would start with sort of general biographical questions. So, uh, where were you born, were you born here in Kahnawake?

AD: Okay, my name is Andrew Tanahokate Delisle, Tanahokate means 'shooting the rapids' or 'riding the rough waters' to use that term, which is what I did most of my life, riding rough waters. And uh, I was born in Kahnawake, August 23rd, 1933, I've lived here most of my life [1:00] except for three winters where I went to school, residential school, boarding school really, came back here and went to Loyola for High School, went to the first year college, but quit, got married, had three children, and I um, been here ever since. I worked here as a youth councillor and I became elected to the council in 1969… 1960. I've been in politics ever since. I also was negotiating for the James Bay Cree and for the Innu when they started their negotiations and stayed on after I retired from council in 1982, I continued to be involved in politics, national and international, and I'm still involved, so, now I'm uh, here, voluntarily running a charity for people with dire needs. My finances come from tobacco some tobacco companies that are located in Kahnawake, and we, I've been doing that as a, my time, to, pass it, but in it, pass my time, which is very interesting. I keep in contact with the people and I'm still involved in politics with all kinds of new ideas and whatever.

RC: Right. Great. That's very interesting. It's uh… it sounds like a great, very full, fully experienced life for sure. Um, and so you spent most of your time here in Kahnawake, is that right?

AD: That's right.

RC: Okay.

AD: Well when I was president, I was president of the Indians of Quebec Association, which an association that was formed in 1963, 65, encompassing all the Indians of Quebec. I became the President of that organization and that's what um, I sort of, you know, became involved internationally in the sense that what I was chosen to at Expo 67 I guess, so because of my involvement with more than just Kahnawake but with the people across the Province and across

the country. So that's, you know, that's, I was involved in lots of other things. I was chairman of the Indian Rights Committee, I was chairman of the revision of the Indian Act Committee at one point in time, and as I mentioned I was negotiating for the James Bay Agreement, and then I was engaged by the Innu to start their negotiations which sort of dropped off after a while for different reasons. And um, that's what I've been doing. Been here working out of Kahnawake as my headquarters, even though I had an office in Ottawa, at one point in time I had an office in Quebec City. I was, here was my headquarters.

RC: Right, and uh, and so these organizations, like they were precursors to the, um, AFN [Assembly of First Nations]?

ATD: That's right. What happens is that in 1960 I got involved with Indigenous people across the country right after I got elected and we formed the National Indian Council, so that's an organization, and that eventually developed into the National Indian Brotherhood which eventually developed into the Assembly of First Nations. So it was this National Indian Council which was the original, although there were other organizations but they were very loose-knit. There was the National Indian Brotherhood of Canada, and there was one of the groups that I was really interested in and worked with was the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia, which was a group of Indian leaders but they were all fisherman at that time so they formed a local, a union and that's what they used to finance their political work, which was an interesting idea which, you know, rather than getting from government funding so I, I looked at all these things and that's some of the things that helped me in my political situation.

RC: Right, great. Um, good. So, I guess that answers one of my follow up questions, which was were you involved in Indigenous issues – um is Indigenous, is that a word you are comfortable with?

ATD: Yeah, I, I, I don't mind saying that, I think I introduced it to… the people were saying Aboriginal you know, or that type of thing, and I said No, the real thing is that we're Indigenous you know, and uh, I remember two years ago, well just before the prior election, I went to open the Liberal meeting you know, they ask elder (?), and I introduced that topic, they were using the Aborignal people and I said no no, we're Indigenous, Aboriginal is from the original, but we're really the basic people. You know I've been using this, and I drew it out and I gave them a copy of it, that's uh, Indigenous. [Drawing] This is our roots in North America, and then Indigenous we grow, and then remain our, we, we, we unite with other Indian people, Indian-Indian, then Indian-French, Indian-English, Indian-Black, Indian-White, uh, Red, Indian-Yellow, you know, and this root grows the tree, but us, we retain the Indigenous principle, so that makes a big difference of anybody saying you're Aboriginal or you have Aboriginal rights, it's not a question of that, it's a question of being Indigenous and having rights period, about the identification of it. So that's, that's why I use that term, then I uh, then it sort of caught on I recall because there are some people who are sort of the head of the AFN that were sort of… that were at that meeting, and they heard that, and ever since then they started using the term Indigenous, and Indian

Affairs they convinced them too to use that, you know, not, not, we're not, we're not Indians, we're Indigenous people. I, I, I think that that's what happened because I always worked on that.

RC: Mhm, okay great. Yeah 'cause for, for us, I mean there's a lot, like you know uh, a lot of sort of terms and people use different ones and I always like to make sure with the person I'm speaking with, you know, what term, if any term, because I know there's sort of a diversity of views on, on whether or not a term can be applied, I mean some people… um, so, so that's great, thanks for that. And when you brought the term Indigenous to the federal government, was that recent?

8:15

ATD: … brought term indigenous in

-People across country started, National Council of Elders.

RC: Trying to double-check, find it inspiring, you brought change..

9:30

ATD: One of the things I'd like to add is that I believed that I was a different breed because… breed I say way of doing things, because I'm from Kahnawake, and we're always independent and we never followed the government and we always did our things ourselves, which is different than a lot of other areas of the country. I brought that with me whatever I did. If I talk about my history, I don't want anybody interfering, and say well this book says this, this book says that, it's my history I'm telling it and that's the one I'm telling, so take it or leave it, you know what I'm saying? That's the attitude that I've always had and I'm just telling you that, when you're going to talk to me, that's the way I'm going to talk. Not this book, well this book said this and guy said this and this guy said that and its all. Like I told the court recently, I said you're going to bring that up, you're saying this is what it is but you're already contradicting yourself because it's already changed, you know, whatever has been written in the past. I'm just giving you and explanation….

RC: No, yeah, that's great, and I very much agree with you in the sense that… so, in my field, in history, we focus obviously on these books and all these things and oral history is really, I think, an important way of just sort of, highlighting how these books are so incomplete, like this. For me, a lot of these studies are sort of theoretical, but that creates this massive distance, and when we look at the lived experiences of the people that lived through it, I think that carries substantially more weight than anything I'm going to find in books overall which is one of the reasons I was so happy that you agreed to sit down with me and discuss, because I think that in history if we're just going to be writing about these times and not speaking to the people who were involved then we're really making the mistake of, sort of… uh…

ATD: I just wanted to show you to prove what I was saying [shows ancestry]. I check my ancestry, and I can go back further to 1746, my first… and I can go back, beyond further than that, and then I can find out what this guy did, what he passed on to this guy, what he passed on right down to the present day. So when I talk about what my family passed on to me, it's not dreaming, because I know where it started or it even started before that, and then it continues here with the new elective system that came in. And … here, my great-great-great-great grandfather, Gadaluje, was traditional chief, this is Bear Clan Band they used to call it at that point. I was really a descendent from the original, traditional, and then changed into Indian Act and this is my uncle, my grandmother's brother, he was the first Indigenous Dr. in Canada, Dr. John Patton. He became the Chief at one point in time. And then I have uncles and cousins that became Chief, Peter Delisle, 1915… right down the line and I have relatives that are coming to my… my father was a Chief too, and my grandfather was also on the council, my father was with him, and he became chief, my father became chief, and my cousins and my grandfather, right down the line until I became Chief in 1960. So I'm just telling you this, that's my whole principle is that when I'm talking, I'm going to say I know what I'm talking about because I've been involved in all the revolution, and my parents tell me, tell me, tell me, so I've come to the point that somebody says well Indians were established, we're living in Mohawk territory, this is your only territory, I said no no no, it's not our only territory. Why did we make a Confederacy to join up with 5 other nations? Because we could use the whole nation, not only where we're living, you know, people got a different idea of what it is. And we have no boundaries… our boundaries, as far as we're concerned, if I was using this land and I went further West and I ran into some people that talked a different language, that's the boundary. Not somebody, a non-India said that this is the boundary. [Chuckling] Okay now I just wanted to tell you when you talking that's what I'm thinking.

15:30

RC: I wish I knew more going in, vs. historical archives, need for oral history.

-Break it down into 3 different periods – Buildup, during, aftermath

-I believe it was in 1965 that the Indians of Canada Pavilion was determined to be part of the project, is that right?

RC: Do you remember when you were invited?

ATD: Well I was invited right from the beginning actually.... I was pretty well known to the Prime Minister at the time… I had been involved in politics on a friendly basis, that was Pearson, had established a core of people to write story line, Marjoribanks, I became involved, it started off a little rocky because people were removed by the govt., replaced. 'I said I would normally get the approval of the Indian people across Canada, who I already knew, I belonged to a national organization, we had meetings regularly. So that sort of happened, and they appointed two assistants to me, one from the West Rich Kelley, and then one from the West, James…

Jameson… memory issues on names. And we started working on it and going through story was what the story was, and at first the people we were working with at Indian Affairs were not too keen on the story line, which was sort of telling the history as it is, not what we hoped it to be, you know, and the whole situation our people were in, we were going to tell that story, you know, what's wrong with residential schools, we even mentioned those at that time and education, and economic development and all that type of stuff so we had a little bit of a problem with that. I'm just going ahead. Lester Pearson and Jean Drapeau were friends of mine also, and they said go ahead and do it, so I was pretty happy with that. That's the way it went. So the storyline and everything that was in there was based on that idea, we're going to tell the world as it is, not what... I know that they wanted us to do Indian dancing you know and all that stuff, a big show and colour and everything like that. We did a little of that but not that much, I didn't believe that showed what's happening, that was only an icing on the cake when we did that the rest was all fighting. Cause I'd been involved in politics before, from 59-66, really, at that point in time, Indian people were having a hard time, I spent most of my time in courts fighting for the right to hunt and fish at that time. These were the issues… I'm hunting and I shot a moose [arrest]// Iron ore mine in Seven Islands, Indian people were only allowed to go a certain level of advancement in the company and we took Mulroney to court….

20:45-Kahn-Tineta Horn: Then, when we went to speak to the people to get their authorization, we always… we had a lot of people questioning but not too much, they pretty well agreed, and it was just certain individuals, like from here, in my competition with being chief… and there was a group of people that were behind this individual, Kahn-Tineta Horn… she became involved with my business when we started forming the organization in Maniotba in the 1960s, and she was sponsored by a guy from Montreal by the name of Colin Gravener, and another guy by the name of Garmaize… intention to get a hold of Nun's Island… used her as a front… anyway she tried to use her every way to downgrade me… it's an issue because when the chiefs from across the country came down to her place, when I went she was trying to convince them of that type of thing, so it was something that irked me because she gave me a lot of trouble in Kahnawake, but I knew all along it was these guys that were behind it. When they come to my house, her with the guys, and the guy says 'here, take my car and go and park it around the Seaway,' what the hell is going on here, in front of my wife… they had no qualms of doing something like that… She was trying to build a restaurant hanging over the rapids with Expo 67 money…The govt. would ask me what do you think of this/that, I said tell her to go, that type of situation, that was the only thing that was an obstacle to what we were doing. But in the mean time we were organizing the artists and the people who were going to be involved. It was pretty well the government that decided the kind of things that would be put in the exhibit because they had to release them from the museums and everything… red tape, so we didn't mind, the artefacts and that type of thing. There was so much that we could have shown because there was tons of artefacts, because there was tons and tons of artefacts, you had to make your selection. So that was that, and then the involvement of the people across the country, everyone wanted to be involved, B.C. choose who's going to make the totem pole… to make a selection… you had to make a selection, you

can't let it drag on. It's a point in time in our history where we were so indoctrinated by the government that we couldn't make a fast decision, we had a delay, and I said well no we can't delay it, we have to make a decision… But I was fortunate to get the cooperation at the time of Pearson, and Jean Drapeau and Dupuis. They were really supporting me, go ahead and do it, in spite of the fact that it was counter to every other exhibition which was showing the glory of each community [chuckling]. My influence was a little bit… questioning Canada, because I knew what they were doing to our people, and then, United States… coming to the pavilion, and I said no, this is a neutral place, anyone could come, so I would play host to the Cubans at that point in time which were the enemies of everybody… for that matter, just cutting in when we have our own day to provide a big supper for dignitaries, I had it here at the gold club here, Kanawake golf club, and I invited the Cubans, and the Americans were mad like crazy, jumping up and down, and I don't know whether it happened intentionally, but we sort of had them sitting close together… and they used to come to the pavilion, and the Russians… so I didn't say anything, that's what they wanted to do. That internal stuff was going on because even the Russians were friendly, they came here and they stayed in the summer and they made a garden on my property, one or two of them on their day off, and when they were leaving they cried, they had to go back, that type of thing,.. all the other parties were big parties. At that point in time, it was a good time for me to make contacts all over because within the Canadian system, we're friendly, there was no hassle between the Liberal and Conservative, the Liberal and the Union Nationale, which you couldn't do after that, you now, they were all on one side. So when we had a party it was all together, there were no barriers… I wish it was like that now…. We were invited to all the events and the fairs…. I think they wanted me to dress in native costume all the time but I didn't want to because I was always saying well, I put a suit o… I wanted to show that we were that advanced and not what everyone was saying… I wanted to project that image. I don't think they liked it that much, the powers that be… I did it anyways, when it was time for the Indian days, I did dress up and that type of things so… it was enjoyable in the sense that I was invited every place, I didn't look out of place, that's the point, maybe I shouldn't have let it bother me, but.. centre of attention, which is not necessarily… my idea is everyone is equal, so let's work together, not pay attention to any special group. Excepting, that's when they started the Beaver Club… we were invited there to dress in costume, they were all dressed in costume there, and old trapper… not trapper but Hudson Bay costume… at those parties everyone was together, Liberals were sitting talking, having a good time, eventually it went along the years came, the Liberals were sitting in one corner, the Conservatives..... what are you sitting with them for, that type of attitude.

Anyway, at the Expo events that were happening, they were happy occasions as far as we were concerned. We did get a lot of visitors and when the Queen came, that was something, an event, incidents happen, I don't know that it was purposely or done something that… our sewage system stopped working…

RC: Oh no, at the Pavilion?

ATD: At the Pavilion, the scent was… I don't know if was done on purpose. We were going to take her downstairs, we had a nice room, sign books and everything, and we couldn't use it. Coming back to the planning, well the people came back and forth from across the country to visit Indigenous people, I think they really enjoyed it, a lot more people wanted to come because they would be part of it… Just an example of control of funds, I had to go to the parties, I had a suit on, all the other dignitaries had tuxedos, so I asked the government to get me one, they didn't want to pay for it so I had to sort of threaten them to pay for it. [RC chuckles] They bought the cheapest kind anyway [chuckling]. Funny thing, I said holy shit, I said here's the Indigenous people of Canada representing them, and I can't get any assistance, here comes the African ambassador who comes from a poor country, and we're sending money over there, and he drives up in a limosine, a big show for everybody. So I used that type of argument to [chuckling] sell the point, they gotta do something about that type of situation… And then they didn't want me to use the term Commissioner General, because CG was only a head of a country. Our people said no, we had a group of people, it's our country, so the government themselves, the powers, administration didn't want me to be called Commissioner, but then Pearson came along, and Drapeau… so… Commissioner General [chuckles].

RC: So Pearson was okay with the idea?

ATD: Yeah. He was really supporting what we were doing… I met him a couple of times, and he was one of the people who told me 'Andrew you guys are always one step ahead of us' [RC laughs], I don't know how you do it! That was the first time I was told, and the second time I was told was by the AG of QC, Claude Wagner, when I said I was going to make my own police force in Kahnawake… Those are some of the stuff that happened with that. It was… I'm not sorry I was part of it, I wished it was continued the way it was at that time, most of the people that I had met, like Haide Salassie, the King of Algeria, whatever the hell got assassinated….. I always think of that, I'm the only one left [laughs]… at that time it was Linden Johnson, what happened was someone got into that, when we were having our Indian Day, they were flying the American or Canadian flag and someone cut a whole in the middle of the U.S. flag, that wasn't the place for that… I figured it was some of the people that were working, you know, in the Pavilion, workers for the site that didn't like the Americans. And when we had our celebration, August the 4th, it rained like hell, we were supposed to have it outside, big banquet with buffalo meat, we had to cancel it and bring it into St. Helen's Restaurant.

35:30

RC: What was the organization like for the Indians of Canada Day? You said Pearson was really supportive of all of these projects. Whose idea was it to have an Indians of Canada Day, do you recall?

ATD: Well, everybody had their day, and I selected it. It was the anniversary of the Massacre of Lachine. [Chuckling] I couldn't choose a big celebratory day for Indian people because we didn't have any at that point in time.

RC: Pardon my ignorance.., Lachine Massacre?

ATD: In 17… something, anyway, the government did something to our people, then we retaliated, we sent a group of people from here, mostly Senecas came around, and went and massacred Lachine, they killed a lot of people and took a lot of prisoners and burned Lachine down, that's just across the river. They call it a massacre, but we call it a retaliatory raid.

RC: That day was picked specifically to…

ATD: Yeah I picked it. They were wondering why, I didn't tell anybody.

RC: Very interesting, not in books, secrets.

-Qs brought up, so many answered

-George Manuel was involved in the planning, brings up disagreements with the Expo Task Force & the bureau. What was his involvement in the process?

ATD: It was… from my perspective is that they were mad because they didn't have too much influence, their hands on everything, normally, everybody wants to be the boss, type of thing, and I felt that, I'm the boss, you're going to do what I ask to do, but as I said before, that's why I explained, our attitude here is different, I'm not going to wait for 15 people to decide what's going to happen and then it's going back and forth for six months… maybe I shouldn't say it but I will. The Mohawks, the [people of Kahnawake] always had trouble with the other Indians. They figured we were too aggressive… We're not going to have a big meeting, when we're being attacked by the French or English, we're not going to call a big meeting of the whole nation, should we fight back? Mohawks are known to fight back, that attitude tht we have. You're touching on something that was pretty touchy at that time. I think it wasn't the Indigenous people that said okay Andrew that was going to be the commissioner, it was the government, like Pearson and all these, and let's see what the other guys say. So that's what happened… I agreed that if they would have put the word out that they needed somebody, they would have fight with each other, so that's what happened. The same thing happened with James Bay, I was negotiating, oh man, they tell lies about it, the truth… [RC: they being who?] The Cree. They had it all upside down. I was pretty picky on them… [Cree negotiations]. Anyway, this thing, I tried to keep this as friendly as possible, I was friendly with a lot of the other Indigenous people, the majority says go ahead but, George… maybe I wanted to be a leader too. But you get competition like that so someone would say something.

RC: Large ramble… very interesting, diversity of experience

ATD: You see the big thing about it, is that I didn't see it at that time, it was an awakening to the general public of what the Indian people, I think it was the first movement that Indigenous people started saying hey it's true, we gotta do something about these things. Like when the Queen came, I took her around the pavilion. It started off smiling and as we went along, I could tell her face frowning and eventually she said you know we have problems all over, not only you, and I said your majesty, we want to do something about it.

RC: Queen's visit, mentions McGill pic, could I look at some of the picture some time? Another time? What did you see as the significance of the Queen being at the IoCP?

ATD: For me, again, I never was so strong about getting the Queen to resolve the problems. The original agreements… for the other Indigenous people, the Queen was the Queen, she's the one that signed the treaties, she's the one we got to talk to. They acted like… her subjects, and I never did that, never felt like that. I thought of that to, I'm not going to bend down, kiss her hand, bow I hesitated to do… not a double bow... you gotta handle it a different way [she won't fix things]. To get any action on it… you know, politics, like anything else, at least my interpretation, is passing the buck. It goes up, goes up… and when you get to the guy who made the promises okay I'll look after it, you get back there, he's gone, somebody else replaced him, that's the same thing that's happening with our politics right now. Same thing happened with us in 1990 when we were negotiating with the Army, they always changed the Major every time… I understand that, that's why the best thing is to do things yourself. It was a visit, everybody was pretty happy, oh the Queen, did you meet the Queen, I did meet a lot of people. Action speaks louder than words. That's the way I think about it.

RC: Other major dignitaries?

ATD: U Thant, Sec Gen of UN – Pavilion next door to mine, he as always coming to visit, we would talk about a lot of things that were happening, that was one that we were definitely talking to all the time. Others were… book writer, black guy. Geez… anyway we talked a lot, he was asking a lot of questions… he was one of the activists. [Sighs]… old time singers, still around in Vegas… Israeli general from the 6-day war, he was an agriculturalist, can't remember his name….

RC: Hard to sort out.

ATD: Want some coffee?

RC: I'll have water…

50:00

ATD: I've been keeping busy, I took over a project that was… we had a vision statement here in Kahnawake, and we made a survey about what people wanted to see in 2029. Nobody did anything about it… last year I said I'm going to do something about it, so I took it and I started

meeting with all the people. It's a vision statement that, what I see in the future. [Shows in Mohawk language writing]

RC: I've always wanted to learn at least one Indigenous language here… travelling, European languages…

ATD: [presents English copy]

RC: [Reading]: I've always found that a lot of things I've read from Indigenous people I found very powerful. It's sort of very direct and profound in a lot of ways. I've always enjoyed reading it. It can be quite a change from the stuff I normally read which is a bit dryer, but this is very empowering in a lot of ways.

ATD: These things, I wrote it in, and this and others, that's what makes us a people, who we are. Kawanagowa, they call it the Great Law of Peace, but the real translation is the Great Way of Living. We didn't have any laws. An example of that, when you're living and you're not doing something right, they say 'don't do it!' they say 'I'll show you how to do it.' Here is an affirmation of our good way of living. It's a statement of how we get along with nature, with everybody… it's a long, you start with the little plants and big trees and the little rivers and the big rivers and the old mountains and the animals and the sky and the moon. They say we're friends and we'll work together, respect each other. And how do you apply it, you heard of the two-row Wampum? That's how you apply it, that's how you apply the relationship. And the way to do it is with peace and peace, but with strong beliefs and a good mind. One of the things I want to do is… what's a Mohawk? What is he, what is she? What's the responsibilities? You'll get 10, 15 thousand different… well I'm a Mohawk because I collect welfare and for nothing, I get a free education, I don't pay taxes. That type of material, but it goes beyond that, and we ask people and my point is that before we can do anything, we have to find out who we are first. Like I said, my opening thing is when I go to meetings, the Creator put us here in this land to exist and to thrive, he gave us everything we needed in this land and he didn't tell an Indian agent to tell us what to do.

55:00- Wendy arrives.

RC: I think it's wonderful!

ATD: What's that?

RC: .. the statement, the whole process of personal renewal, I admire your work and the work that you're doing for your community, it gives me some ideas.

ATD: I find the solutions for our people is from our ancestral ways of doing things. Like this here [vision statement], we know who we are, and who's the people that do it, the family and the clans, it's all run by the family and the clans. We apply that to education, we apply that to social existence, the reason why I say that is now the problems in the North, you read about the

problems… they took every responsibility away from the family. So now they leave it to the school teacher, they leave it to the social worker, they leave it to the welfare officer, they leave it to the police to run their affairs. And you can't do anything, you can't even talk to your children harshly, they call the social worker, oh you're not supposed to do that. And that's our ancestral ways, we're disciplined but we're free. If a kid was playing with a knife, they didn't take it away from him, they said, come here I'll show you how to use that knife. That type of thinking… and that's the only way we can do anything to resolve our problem, now and in the future. It's not going to be easy, but… my community is 9,000, it's not that large, it's one of the largest, it's still able to control that type of teaching. So what I'm doing is I'm meeting all the groups, everybody, we have in our Indigenous communities like in Kahnawake we have let's say the council and the traditional, and the council is sometimes divided in two, the traditional is divided in two, so that makes four. And then you have all the Churches that have different preachings, Catholic, Protestant, Pentacostal, Bahai, we have that all here. So they all tell you what kind of person you are. We can't continue that, we have to say this is what we are and that's we're doing, we'll do. When you know what, who you are, you don't have to worry about Catholic, Protestant, you deal with them because they're other people who have a different way of honouring the Creator. So it's not like we've been taught that they're against us or they taught us to be Christians against pagans. In our basic system as Kanigehaga Mohawks, we don't have that type of stuff and that's what I'm trying to revive. Sharing, we never taxed people, we shared in the past. I went hunting, my family caught a moose, I came back, I took the best part of the moose, I distributed it to the community. The next time it was the other guy's turn, he took the best part of the moose, same thing. So it was a sharing, it wasn't a tax, it was a sharing mentality type of thing. I try and push it as much as I can. And I really believe that if you ask a Cree what is he, if you ask a Blackfoot what is he, a lot of them wouldn't be able to answer, what is it, I'm a Blackfoot because the government says I'm an Indian. [Chuckles] We gotta change that thinking across the country. Anyway… I only got 22 more years to do it, I plan to finish when I'm 105. I'm glad I… the last time you spoke to me I was a little bit… not feeling that well, you know, my health, but now I'm healthy so I can speak more. Before I couldn't, I had a hesitancy to, for some reason or other.

1:00:45

RC: How much time did you spend there?

ATD: Every day.

RC: How did you feel when you first visited the Indians of Canada Pavilion?

ATD: There from beginning, gradual… When it was finished, it was really something enjoyable…. All the pieces fit in to place, it was good, you had the story, welcome… I was happy to see that what we were going to present was something that people were going to understand…. [vs technology].

RC: Do you have any memories of being at the Canadian Pavilion?

ATD: Yeah, it was next door to ours too. It was… we were surrounded by the Can/Ont/East/Mar pavilion, famous restaurant at the Maritime Pavilion…. The Canadian Pavilion was Canadian, the same thing as the other people. One of the things I wanted to tell you was that when I started organizing, they had intention of having the RCMP as the police in our Pavilion. The Ontario had the OPP, Western had the RCMP, I said no, we have our own, so I brought my own peacekeepers in there… that was something I feel proud of because even though Canada didn't recognize them and Quebec didn't recognize them, the international community recognized them in the sense that they were allowed to be at the same level as all their unit. That was something I was proud that we were able to do that. Of course I brought people from across the country to work there and then we had selected hostesses from across the country. It was a little bit difficult because people came from way out, not familiar with city life. It was quite a strain to, well I left it to other people to control that. We had to send a couple back home because they couldn't take the city… You come to the artwork…?.... the artists we had a lot of trouble, we had to finish his work, we had him draw the outline on paper, then we put that and we had other people fill in.

RC: In the front, big mural?

ATD: Yeah.

RC: Project, Canadian Pavilion, Indigenous participation, Katimavik, meeting place, soapstone, Aki'Name

ATD: Yeah I recall seeing that, because I know that, you know that they did have their own pavilion, so that's where they showcased in the Canadian Pavilion, the Inuit people. At that point in time don't forget they were still considered not to be citizens of Quebec or Canada… it was only in 1965 or 67. Indians of QC Association invited the Inuit to come down, we're going to help them…

… so busy, invited to various occasions, [couldn't skip]

One of the things though at the Canadian Pavilion… they invited my to meet Prience Grayson and Princess Rainier, I gave the guy a lacrosse stick and the girl a little doll. That was the only thing other than the receptions that they had there.

RC: Do you recall the reaction of the people, the general visitor and Indigenous people as well?

ATD: The general population was pretty happy to see that, of course they came in with high expectations of seeing a lot of the Indian dancing and powwow. But most of the people came, they were surprised at the history, they didn't know that that was happening. We had a lot of scholars come in to check it out because that invitation to what life was really like and that type of thing. We normally got a good reaction, I don't know where the book went, people signing, leaving a few remarks. When we left there, I wasn't a person that keeps my own records. As I told you before, someone loaded all the stuff on the trucks and only half of it reached Ottawa.

There are people that were pretty happy with it, Indigenosu people came along and they were pretty happy that something was happening, they were being shown, they come from across the country, there was one group that came from the Maritimes, they came by canoe. Micmacs…

1:10

It was a good reaction as far as I was concerned, everybody… except the original civil servants that were charge of the government, they didn't want to see that. [Chuckles]

RC: I had read that Arthur Laing was not very happy with the Pavilion, the content, setup. Do you recall dealing with Mr. Laing?

ATD: Well yeah… from my observation, every time the Conservative government came in, they were really against Indigenous people right across the board, they felt it was a burden, that's the feeling I got from them. Even John Diefenbaker, a lot of Indian people from the West liked him, but when you see the actions, a lot of the actions were not positive towards us. I'm surprised you asked me… the thing that I remember with Arthur Laing was walking in his office and he's got a table or a desk like this, and he was sitting at the end and he had his two heels sitting on the table with his behind up in the air when we walked in, holy shit… [RC chuckles] You know what I'm saying? That's how I remember Arthur Laing.

RC: And so were you with him when he first visited?

ATD: I don't even remember him visiting.

RC: Account before Expo, media there, he seemed not super enthusiastic. Maybe his absence says…

ATD: After he resigned, I met him a couple of times, he was the friendliest person in the world, he attended the powwows… he changed… whether he was doing his own personal thinking as opposed to government thinking when he was Minister… his own bureaucratic… don't forget, Indian Affairs was completely different from the rest of the government, the way they behaved and acted. They were only supposed to be servants but they thought they were chiefs.

RC: Yeah for sure, there's a long history, a lot of work that's been done on Indian Affairs thatdefinitely is important for Canadians tounderstant the attitudes that were involved in that wing of the federal government.

ATD: They got away with a lot because people couldn't see them as opposed to seeing the rest of the government in non-Indain communities.

1:14:00 [ATD phone rings]

ATD: When I start travelling up North and I noticed that like holy shit they're taking advantage of the Indians like you wouldn't believe.

RC: General public understand of govt. vs. understanding of Indian Affairs. That's one area where Canadians have to wake for and recognize that history.

ATD: A lot of those people that worked for Indian Affairs that went up North and made a lot of money, talking about Inuit people there, carvings, they would bring it back and sell it for, holy jeez, and then I found out they were doing the same thing with Indian arts and crafts, they'd buy it from there and come back and sell it and make a fortune, buy it for peanuts. I know firsthand because I checked it out because I eventually went into the craft business.. In 1979 I went to Switzerland and I found the Indian people were there were selling all kinds of things made in Japan, I came back here, I said I'm going to stop that, so I started making… I found out that the government was making money off the Indian people there. And Laign… I had the Mohawk way of… if something's not right, you disregard it and pretend it doesn't exist, so that's what happened with me and Arthur Laing.

RC: Voyageur canoe pagent, from Edmonton, to Expo, arrived in late summer, do you recall that?

ATD: No it was not associated with the Indiegneous Pavilion, it was associated from the Western Pavilion.

RC: Interesting that the Mic Macs from one direction vs. Pagent, white Canadians.

ATD:: One of the problem that we had in that regard… is that a lot of people came, and in the end they wanted us to pay for their… you know… couldn't do that, they show up there… they couldn't even buy me a tuxedo [laughs] .

You know how much I was paid? 20,000. I think the other people were paid quite a bit more than that.

RC: I could look that up, and maybe we could send them a back-dated bill from 50 years ago. [Reads quote]: The white Man's school, an alien land for an Indian child. An Indian child begins school by learning a foreign tongue, and that Indian enrolment in in 1966 was 61,395, so what is your response to this kind of demonstration, do you think this was new information for people, were they aware of these kinds of schools, the res. School system at all?

ATD: No. Our people were aware of it but not in… individual, but they didn't know that it was that broad, problem, to use that term. But it's true, that's what it was, learn another language, the enrollment was 61,000, I wasn't to familiar with that. It seems like a lot. Where were they taken from?

RC: Indian Memento, I used these in a talk at Vanier CEGEP. Tabled report on TRC after my 1st year…. Turtle Island… Do you think the Indias of Can Pav was radical, would you use that term?

ATD: No, I don't think so. Well you gotta ask other people that. I thought it was something that was necessary and it was informative and ti was something that needed to be said. If other people say it's radical, that;s the problem that we have. People think that history is radical.

RC: History isn't radical, that's good. How would you compare the current level interest in Indigenous issues around the country to 1967. Do you see a big change in these last 50 years?

ATD: Yeah there was a big change, very big change, people really got interested and started finding out what was at that point in time because our people got more vocal, communications improved… people were surprised like you were saying, geez, the residential schools… Indians don't dance anymore, they don't live in teepees… although you still have that. But it changed, for me, it changed, the people [were] pretty receptive until 1990. 1990 people start saying what the hell are these guys doing, that was a change in the thinking, more and more… they didn't like, society doesn't like anything that knocks them the wrong way. And there was a reaction as far as we're concerned. Since then I've had a couple of craft stores here and in Quebec City, and after 90 we didn't get as many people coming to get crafts. But no, I think there is a change, the more they become aware, the more they become interested. It's up to us to do something about it. We used to do that, the government's going to do that or the public's going to come. No we have to do that, like I'm saying… this thing [vision statement]. I was reading Nelson Mandela, he said the problem is you people want your enemies to always be your enemies. That's what's wrong with society. We're not enemies anymore so hey, let's work together. A lot of people think we're enemies because we're defending our rights… so that's what's happening now. The change has come about right now because we are communicating with each other more and more. Before people didn't realize that a Blackfoot thinks different from a… whether it's a matrilineal society or a patrilineal society. And everybody thought we were all the same, and now we're finding out that we're not all the same, and we're finding that out too. For me, the thing is that in spite of the differences we have a common thread. That's what we're looking for, what's the common thread that we're looking for. Like in any society, I mentioned before, we're affected by, here in K, we have Christians, United Church, Anglican, Bhai, Jehova's witness, Laterday Saints, and then we have the longhouses and we have all that. If you look at the common thread

RC: Would you call what the IoCP represented, was that the first step towards reconciliation?

ATD: I think so yeah, that's what I was saying before, they didn't know, you can't reconcile anything when you don't know what's happening. So this was the first exposure of what was happening. And at that point in time, like I said, people wanted to do something about it and all these other things happen because of the way society progresses, somebody wants to build a dam, we don't want a dam, so they oppose it, and oh he's my enemy because he's trying to oppose it. When of the things….

[Phone rings]

RC: Wrap up. Another interview, will write chapter, get all the ideas on to the page and come back to you for a second.