



Epistemological Tensions: Indigenous Cultural Production in the Age of *Delgamuukw*

Leo Cocar

The *Delgamuukw* case presents a dynamic shift within Canada's colonial history, becoming one of the first instances in which the settler-colonial state formally recognized the validity of an alternative epistemology within the society of the colonized. The case called attention not only to the well-established issue of Canada's foundational history as a nation-state founded on the occupation of unceded Indigenous land, but also highlighted the fundamental shortcomings of Western epistemology in addressing Indigenous intellectual claims. The case was taken up by *Gitksan* and *Witsuwit'en* chiefs who sought claim to their hereditary territories in British Columbia.¹ The *Gitksan* and *Witsuwit'en* were attempting to gain the right to apply their own systems of knowledge and governance to their unceded territory seized by the Canadian government. To further contextualize the *Delgamuukw* case, it is important to place it within a series of previous legal disputes, such as *Calder* (1973), *Guerin* (1983), and *Sparrow* (1990), which attempted to define the limits and exactitudes of state-recognized Indigenous territory.² However, aside from indicating renewed legal interest in re-asserting these aforementioned rights to self-governance, the *Delgamuukw* case marks a shift from these prior cases due to the court's decision to allow oral histories to be used as legally recognized records in the Canadian court of law.

From an academic perspective, recognizing the existence of a plurality of epistemologies has long been in discursive circulation. The proceedings that transpired during the *Delgamuukw* case that point towards an existing Indigenous epistemology are important in that they entail a formal recognition of territorial self-governance despite being rooted within the

colonial state itself. Charlotte Townsend-Gault, a professor at the University of British Columbia (UBC), writes in her introduction to *Art Claims in the Age of Delgamuukw* that the acceptance of orally transmitted knowledge in the 1997 court case demonstrates that legitimate evidence may in fact arise out of another, non-colonial, epistemology.³ To elaborate on the term "legitimate," I am referring to the tendency of colonial powers to categorize the knowledge systems of the oppressed as inferior, primitive, or simply wrong. The effect of this recognition of differing epistemological legitimacies extends beyond the law, and, as I will demonstrate, affects art and visual cultural production as well. Just as the law is subject to different systems of value, art too is subject to interpretation through the lens of multiple systems of value. By referring to the writings and works of Indigenous artists, I aim to argue that interpreting Indigenous art objects through a settler-colonial epistemological lens does not allow for nuanced understanding; rather, it often results in misunderstanding. Indigenous art objects, and by extension, their consumption through settler-colonial frameworks of categorization, are tied closely to Indigenous struggles over fundamental territorial rights. Throughout this essay I seek to highlight the irresolvable nature of the forced application of settler-colonial epistemologies onto matters concerning Indigenous knowledge, primarily by drawing parallels between ongoing legal troubles surrounding Indigenous struggles for sovereignty and Indigenous art discourses.

Historical discourses drawn from mainstream settler-colonial viewpoints surrounding Indigenous cultural production are, by their nature, politically charged and contested by Indigenous modes of knowledge. In "How to Decorate a House,"

former UBC Museum of Anthropology (MOA) director Michael Ames notes that in the Western scholarly tradition, researchers often claim property rights not only over the knowledge they produce, but also the subject matter from which they derive their knowledge.⁴ As I will discuss later on in my essay, many Indigenous art objects have multiple functions—hereditary land claims being among these—that demonstrate the importance of these objects in asserting Indigenous sovereignty. Here, when referring to Indigenous sovereignty, I am discussing the historical right of Indigenous people for self-governance on their historical and ancestral territories, a right that has been violently and forcefully suppressed in the wake of colonialism.

Thus, my argument is realized in the *Delgamuukw* case, wherein the Canadian legal system partially addresses the discordancy in addressing Indigenous land claims through Western systems, both epistemological and visual. Attempting to translate Indigenous modes of knowledge and cultural production through these lenses often produces harmful misunderstandings and misconceptions. Instead of looking at them as objects to be "read" or analyzed, Indigenous artistic and cultural material can be seen to function as repositories of knowledge and markers of territorial rights. Therefore, the denial of the legitimacy of Indigenous value systems directly impedes the ability of these peoples to assert claims of sovereignty and cultural identity in the face of culturally hegemonic, Western paradigms of knowledge.

"Instead of looking at them as objects to be 'read' or analyzed, Indigenous artistic and cultural material can be seen to function as repositories of knowledge and markers of territorial rights."

Furthermore, Western anthropological practices often apply values to Indigenous material culture that do not necessarily exist in the object's community of production, such as an emphasis on object conservation, collection, and aesthetic values rooted in the so-called timeless or universal.

Through the examination of three works of Indigenous cultural material, I will tie settler-colonial anthropological practices to the impasse that arises with attempting to resolve Indigenous issues of sovereignty exclusively through the framework of settler-colonial law. I will begin my analysis with the Memorial Pole located in the Great Hall of the MOA at UBC. The Memorial Pole, also known as the pole of *Skim-Sim* and *Will-a-daugh*, once stood outside of the house of Weerhae, a chief of the Laxsel Clan of the *Gitanyow*.⁵ The pole is unpainted and stands at eleven and a half metres tall. It is carved in both shallow and deep relief, with

motifs including the Wild Woman of the Woods holding a child, a Thunderbird, and children playing the stick game *Lahal*.⁶ An excerpt from the pole's plaque at the MOA is important in contextualizing the Indigenous art object as a physical manifestation of a land claim. The quote, dated to 1958 and attributed to Wolf Clan Chief Whee-kha, also known as Ernest Smith, relays to the viewer a brief history of the pole. The first paragraph immediately highlights a discrepancy between settler-colonial and Indigenous values, which contributes to the problematic issue of viewing Indigenous art through a Western lens. "When a pole decays, or at the death of a chief, a new pole is always erected in the same place."⁷ This pole's life cycle of natural decay takes an antithetical stance to the Western value of preservation. However, in this context, it is important to note that the Kitwancool chiefs gave permission to the MOA to conserve the pole in exchange for a replacement pole, as well as a written document recording Kitwancool laws.⁸ This example of cooperation between the colonizer and the colonized (in terms of the sanctioned replication of cultural material) is historically unique but points towards a potential mode of discursive resolution, should the colonizer recognize the legitimacy of alternative cultural practices.

Thus, the question arises: what of the poles acquired by other institutions? In some cases, poles removed and installed in a different context without the permission of their original communities would impede the agency of Indigenous peoples to

maintain control over their own material culture and the meanings they hold and evoke. Further, if a pole is to be read as a land claim, Indigenous rights to sovereign territorial rule would be forfeited by their removal as well. Despite the efforts of institutions such as the MOA to move towards a post-colonial anthropological practice, misguided and ultimately damaging readings of totem poles predate the acquisitions of the 1950s. According to Daisy Sewid-Smith, poles were incorrectly read by early European colonists as pagan idols, who consequently destroyed them, despite the fact that the poles were not actually being utilized by their communities as idols.⁹ As illustrated by the Wolf Clan chief, totem poles function as physical repositories of knowledge; he states that poles define territorial rights of the people in their village "so that each new generation will know what they own."¹⁰ As a result, the totem eludes specific categorization through a



Courtesy of UBC Museum of Anthropology, Vancouver, Canada, A6554.

Western lens, through the way in which the totem pole navigates multiple spheres at once. That is to say, the pole simultaneously functions as a claim to territory, a claim to lineage as well as a repository of knowledge. To remove a totem pole is to directly oppose these claims and histories.

To further elaborate on the multi-faceted aspects of Indigenous artistic and cultural material, I will address a concept that is often difficult to categorize within a Western framework, which is the potentiality of certain Indigenous objects to function as living beings or entities. Gii-dahl-guud-sliiay, also known as Terri-Lynn Williams-Davidson, addresses this discrepancy between institutional categorization and object function. In a text called *Material Culture in Flux: Law and Policy of Repatriation of Cultural Property*, Williams-Davidson notes that Western views often indicate a belief that mankind can exert control over inanimate objects both manmade and natural (e.g., natural resources).¹¹ Evidently, this set of categories cannot entail Indigenous material culture which, according to many First Nations, can often be seen to possess their own spirit. Further, she notes that many ceremonial objects possess the spirits of the past, present, and future, and thus these objects function as a conduit of knowledge.¹² Aside from this innate spiritual power possessed by Indigenous art and cultural material, imagery can have a two-way effect, and convey spiritual power upon a user.

To explore this concept of the living, spiritually charged object, I will focus on another object from the MOA's collection;

specifically, a *huxhwukwaml* transformation mask from Village Island. Like much Indigenous cultural material from the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, contextual clues or details regarding the mask are fairly scarce in regard to its origin of production and perhaps more importantly, the terms of its institutional acquisition. Despite this lacuna of information, the mask has been noted to have been used in a potlatch by a *Hamatsa* dancer, thus speaking to its use within a community context.¹³ The mask is a large, wooden raven mask representing one of the servants of *baxbakwalanuxsiwe*, the cannibal at the north end of the world. The motif of the *baxbakwalanuxsiwe*, also known as the Cannibal Spirit, is important here as the aforementioned deity is to come alive during the *Hamatsa* dance and possess the initiate dancer, speaking to the living nature of this example of cultural material.¹⁴ The head portion of the mask, rendered primarily in white, is covered with cedar that hangs over the wearer, forming a sort of mane. Red pigment outlines the beak, eyes, and nostrils, with black defining the top half of the mask. One of the most interesting features of the mask is the incorporation of a twine pulley system that allows the *Hamatsa* dancer to animate it. Thus it is evident that the mask's design is governed not only by aesthetics, but also by its function as a conduit of the divine.

We can read the mask as further highlighting discrepancies between colonial and Indigenous systems of knowledge, in that it can appear "living" to a *Hamatsa* dancer while at the same time inanimate to a non-Indigenous anthropologist. As an object, the

mask is seen as both "living" by Indigenous cultures and "inanimate" by the West. These dual narratives surrounding how the work is viewed serve as a reminder of colonization's ability to disrupt one's cultural identity by controlling or manipulating the way meaning is conveyed through such cultural materials. This mask, like other Indigenous cultural material, serves purposes beyond standard colonial conventions regarding the "Artifact" or "Art Object." Like the totem pole, the mask, specifically in the context of a potlatch, conveys social status, origin stories, as well as territorial claims and privileges.¹⁵ Furthermore, while being utilized in a potlatch, the mask allows the wearer to become spiritually charged and to embody the mythological figure or animal that the mask represents. The owners of these objects control their display, and as such the dissemination of the mask's intellectual properties. The mask's archival entry at the MOA notes that it was last potlatched in 1920, which would position it in the midst of the potlatch ban (1885–1951).¹⁶ The MOA digital archive does not clarify if the mask

ceremonial regalia, and its use in communal traditions, allows for the transmission of knowledge throughout Indigenous nations. Thus, the non-Indigenous acquisition of such regalia denies any cultural and material wealth symbolized by the ownership of the works in Indigenous communities. In addition, since much of Indigenous cultural material functions as a way of disseminating knowledge and meaning, these object acquisitions become a form of psychic robbery as well. As spiritually charged entities, the masks "activate" during the potlatch, allowing stories, histories, and knowledge to come to life. It should be noted that the colonial project is not one firmly rooted in the past, but rather continuing in the twenty-first century. For this reason, I will now turn to the work of the Coast Salish artist Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun in order to investigate how Indigenous world views operate in the twenty-first century settler-colonial state.

Yuxweluptun is a contemporary artist who posits himself as a protector of Indigenous history, addressing in his art the

"[...] since much of Indigenous cultural material functions as a way of disseminating knowledge and meaning, these object acquisitions become a form of psychic robbery."

was confiscated during the various colonial seizures of potlatch regalia. However, simply contextualizing the object through its uses and historic positioning is crucial to approaching the object as both a living spirit and a mode of conveying historical land claims.

The potlatch ban is evidently a mechanism of colonial control, and its effects can be felt materially and immaterially. To elaborate on the importance of the potlatch ban to the colonizer, it should be noted that these confiscations have a twofold function. Firstly, they deny the colonized the right of ownership to their own material culture. Secondly, when a large majority of Indigenous knowledge systems rely on dissemination through cultural material, seizure of these entities hinders the circulation of Indigenous knowledge and cultural heritage. By removing said material from their communities of origin, the colonizer subverts the ability of Indigenous peoples to construct their own narrative.

These types of Indigenous intellectual and cultural production, which are not based on text, have been previously addressed by Indigenous scholars, such as the *Qwiqwasutinux* educator Daisy Sewid-Smith. She notes how visual icons of Northwest Coast art are not seen as belonging to an individual artist's subjective creative production, but rather as the cultural claim of their people as a whole.¹⁷ According to Sewid-Smith,

issues of British Columbia's occupation of unceded territory in a way the two previous traditional objects do not. Much writing has been done on Yuxweluptun's practice, but I will focus on contextualizing his art practice within the ongoing struggle for Indigenous sovereignty; that is, a struggle over land rights and the environmental destruction of hereditary Indigenous territory. Yuxweluptun engages in dialogues centered on colonial issues through a myriad of mediums. For example, his digital piece *Inherent Visions, Inherent Rights* (1992) allows the viewer to take part in a ceremony through a virtual reality setup. Through its digitized medium, this piece ruptures a binary that is often externally imposed on Indigenous art, specifically that of "traditional" versus "contemporary." To further elaborate on this dichotomy, Yuxweluptun once remarked that he has to pry the anthropologists off his leg.¹⁸ By this he is referring to the tendency within Western art historical and discursive practices to isolate Indigenous cultural production exclusively within the space of the anthropological—the historical past—rather than acknowledging the transitory nature of Indigenous art practices. Within art institutions that abide by anthropological trends in knowledge collection or presentation, an Indigenous work is often firmly grounded in the sphere of the contemporary or the traditional, but never in between. With this in mind, I will turn my attention to

Yuxweluptun's painting *The Impending Nisga'a Deal. Last Stand. Chump Change* (1996) to examine how the artist breaches these conventions in his practice.

The subject matter of Yuxweluptun's paintings, as well as his formal style, aims to tackle issues of Indigenous sovereignty. He often uses ovoid shapes, found in art of the Northwest Coast, to form a style he terms "ovoidism."¹⁹ His work is in dialogue with Western traditions of art making, as his canvases exhibit Surrealist-like formal elements including quasi-naturalistic figuration and non-local colour. However, it would be erroneous to read this dialogue as merely influential and non-critical. Like the majority of modernist painters, from Primitivists to Cubists, Surrealists also turned to a problematic conception of the "Other" in furthering their artistic practices. Early twentieth-century artists bemoaned the soullessness of modernity and turned their gaze to the so-called "primitive" people living on the fringes of the industrializing, modernizing world. Infamous examples of these views can be seen in the practices of early twentieth-century painters such as Paul Gauguin, who turned to what he perceived to be the untouched beauty of Tahiti and its native population. Inspired by psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud's theory of the unconscious, the Surrealists sought to liberate humanity by tapping into the unconscious and accessing a state where the two contradictory states of dream and real life merge.²⁰ Thus, to them, Indigenous artworks from the Northwest Coast seemed to more or less fit this ideological bill. The Surrealists' turn to the "Other's" modes of cultural production prompted artists such as Kurt Seligmann to visit British Columbia's coast in 1938. There, Seligmann led multiple Surrealists on expeditions to collect Indigenous objects—including Max Ernst, who later acquired an entire Kwakwaka'wakw totem pole from the Brooklyn Museum.²¹ As I will elaborate further on, the Surrealist gaze, despite recognizing the alternative functions of Indigenous cultural material, still examined it in an unreflexive and static manner. Consequently, the Surrealists failed to recognize the specificity and context of much of the visual language entailed in these works. As seen in the example of Ernst's pole acquisition, the politics and problems behind the processes of collecting were largely ignored.

Though European artists were arguably utilizing these Indigenous forms in a problematic way, a text from 1950 documents Surrealism founder André Breton's recognition that Indigenous objects function differently through non-European epistemologies, specifically transformation masks like the Hamatsa dancer's mask. In Breton's paper "Note on the Transformation Masks of the Pacific Northwest Coast," he observes that the transformative, dualistic nature of the mask is lost on many collectors and viewers of Kwakwaka'wakw and Haida transformation masks. Breton continues, "[The Kwakwaka'wakw] embrace one of the greatest human achievements by realizing a transformation not only in thought but in action."²² Therefore, Yuxweluptun "reclaims" his right to his own cultural practices by taking up the visual language

of Surrealist artists, thus reverting the static, appropriative colonial gaze. Firstly, Yuxweluptun co-opts Surrealist aesthetics such as dreamlike landscapes, seemingly disjointed symbolic elements, and non-local colours.²³ By pairing Western painterly techniques of figuration, symbolism, spatial depth, and oil painting with Indigenous iconography and formal language, Yuxweluptun's work enters a space of stylistic ambivalence.

Despite the painting's important function of reversing the colonial gaze, the central focus of my analysis of Yuxweluptun's *The Impending Nisga'a Deal. Last Stand. Chump Change* revolves around the allegorical nature of the painting's content and contemporary issues of Indigenous sovereignty. As I discussed in the last paragraph, Yuxweluptun uses "ovoidism" as a general formal style. Three figures displaying Northwest Coast mask-like faces stand on a bright landscape. The environment itself is bathed in Indigenous faces, possessing the hallmark ovoid, abstracted facial features that can be found on any number of Northwest Coast Indigenous masks. In short, a naturalistic rendering of a landscape has been almost completely skewed. Near the centre, water spews from one figure's mouth, while another figure painted in a distinctly fleshy "European" tinge walks towards the foreground while toting a briefcase. The title alludes to the 1998 Nisga'a treaty where the Nisga'a peoples were returned two thousand kilometres of land as well as the rights to govern their own resources on said territory.²⁴ Although the Nisga'a Nation is not located on the Northwest Coast, Yuxweluptun is of Coast Salish descent and his body of work addresses territorial disputes throughout British Columbia and Canada.

The deal, which was met by opposition from the Liberal Party, engages with a concept discussed by Yuxweluptun in a text for *Land, Spirit, Power: First Nations at the National Gallery of Canada*, in which he states that "all the money in the bank cannot buy or magically bring back a dead bio system."²⁵ This justified cynicism towards federal and provincial recognition is referenced in the title of Yuxweluptun's painting. The words "chump change" suggest that irreversible biological damage has already been done to the territory, despite the subsequent land transfer. Tania Willard, of the Secwepemc Nation, has noted ongoing efforts by the Canadian government to convince First Nations groups to set aside issues of sovereignty in order to exploit their lands for resources, in exchange for economic gain.²⁶ In the same text Yuxweluptun describes how his art practice allows him a degree of freedom to engage in artistic criticality, even without being awarded official recognition in the ability to engage in Indigenous self-government.

Regardless, it is Yuxweluptun's engagement with the landscape genre as a whole that is most important in conveying the critical engagements with issues of land and territory that preoccupy the artist's practice. Scott Watson, director of the Belkin Art Gallery at UBC, paraphrasing literary critic Northrop Frye, wrote that "the first duty of the Canadian artist [...] is to



establish psychic ownership of the land."²⁷ In this respect, psychic ownership can be defined as the control over the discourses about a given territory. He then notes how contestation over the erasure of Indigenous land claims, cultures and economies becomes the central focus in early Canadian painting, a theme that can be seen in the works of the Group of Seven, an early twentieth century collective of painters.²⁸ These seven artists presented viewers with an 'untouched' Canadian landscape, free from all and any Indigenous presence.²⁹ Yuxweluptun positions himself within this tradition by reclaiming the landscape. Instead of presenting an idealized landscape, whether it be the Group of Seven's uninhabited landscape or a theoretical, idealized landscape governed by Indigenous peoples, Yuxweluptun takes on an oppositional stance and displays the landscape in all its destruction. For him, land is more important than monetary gain; land represents power.³⁰ Yuxweluptun describes his works in terms of history painting. As theorized by Willard, such descriptions imbue his work with the concept of history as the spoils of the conqueror.³¹ That is to say, if history is written in the interests of the hegemonic power, by claiming his works as 'historical,' Yuxweluptun is in fact resisting the psychic histories posited by artists like The Group of Seven. By depicting the ravaged colonial landscape, Yuxweluptun simultaneously psychically reclaims Indigenous territory while exposing its very exploitation.

Indigenous art objects evade categorization into Western

anthropological binaries of 'animate' versus 'inanimate' and 'display' versus 'use.' These traditions of cultural production contain nuances that extend well beyond standard settler-colonial definitions of 'art.' However, in the context of the post-*Delgamuukw* period, Indigenous cultural material and ongoing contemporary art production can be seen to function as a claim for the historical cultural production and territorial rights of Indigenous people. *Delgamuukw* recognized the legitimacy of non-Western epistemologies, and the failures in resolving claims for Indigenous sovereignty merely through Western legal frameworks. Such juridical resolutions do not constitute adequate justice for Indigenous communities. It is for this reason that Indigenous art objects cannot be analyzed through Western lenses that privilege aesthetic or creative value. To do so is to decontextualize the cultural entity, suppressing the ability of Indigenous peoples to access their own culture, knowledge and territory. As Indigenous peoples attempt to move past the damage of colonialist mindsets and practices, Indigenous control over discourses surrounding their cultural objects is important, especially in relation to the larger struggle for sovereignty. As Patrick Walker notes, what is central to the struggle of Indigenous issues of sovereignty—if not survival itself—is the ability for Indigenous peoples to maintain control over their own cultural material.³²

Notes

¹ Daly, Richard. *Our Box Was Full: An Ethnography for the Delgamuukw Plaintiffs* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004). 18.

² Townsend-Gault, Charlotte. "Introduction," *Native Art of the Northwest Coast: A History of Changing Ideas* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013). 865.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ames, Michael. "How to Decorate a House: The Renegotiation of Cultural Representations at the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology," *Museum Anthropology* 22, no. 3 (December 1999). 41.

⁵ Museum of Anthropology, *Memorial Totem Pole*, accessed March 22, 2017, <http://collectiononline.moa.ubc.ca/search/item?keywords=gitanow&row=1>

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Hawker, Ronald. *Tales of Ghosts: First Nations Art in British Columbia, 1922–61* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002). 165.

⁸ Duff, Wilson. *Histories, Territories and Laws of the Kitwancool* (Victoria: Royal British Columbia Museum, 1959). 3.

⁹ Sewid-Smith, Daisy. "Interpreting Cultural Symbols of the People from the Shore," *Native Art of the Northwest Coast: A History of Changing Ideas* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013). 19.

¹⁰ Ibid. 12.

¹¹ Gii-dahl-sliaay (Terri-Lynn Williams), "Cultural Perpetuation: Repatriation of First Nations Cultural Property," *UBC Law Review* (1995 special edition). 184.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Museum of Anthropology, *Memorial Totem Pole*.

¹⁴ Mauze, Marie. "Two Kwakwaka'wakw Museums: Heritage and Politics." *Ethnohistory* 50, no. 3 (2003). 516.

¹⁵ Joseph, Robert. "Behind the Mask," *Down from the Shimmering Sky: Masks of the Northwest Coast* (Vancouver: Vancouver Art Gallery, 1998). 19.

¹⁶ Lutz, John. "After the Fur Trade: The Aboriginal Labouring Class of British Columbia, 1849–1890," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 3, no. 1 (1992). 28.

¹⁷ Sewid-Smith. 23.

¹⁸ Willard, Tania, et al. *Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun: Unceded Territories*. Figure 1, Berkeley; Vancouver. 2016. 58.

¹⁹ Yuxweluptun, Lawrence Paul. "The Manifesto of Ovoidism," *Colour Zone Catalogue* (Winnipeg: Plug in Editions, 2003), <http://lawrencepaulyuxweluptun.com/assets/Manifesto.pdf>

²⁰ Mauze, Marie. 270

²¹ Mauze, Marie. "Surrealists and the New York Avant-Garde, 1920–60," *Native Art of the Northwest Coast: A History of Changing Ideas* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013). 272.

²² Breton, André. "Note on the Transformation Masks of the Pacific Northwest Coast," *Native Art of the Northwest Coast: A History of Changing Ideas* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013).

²³ Alcalay, Ammiel. "Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun," *Bomb Magazine* 136, July 15, 2016, <https://bombmagazine.org/articles/lawrence-paul-yuxweluptun/>

²⁴ Union of B.C Indian Chiefs, *Nisga'a Agreement Plain Language Summary*, (Vancouver: BC Union of Indian Chiefs, 1999). 2.

²⁵ Yuxweluptun, Lawrence Paul.

"Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun," *Land, Spirit, Power: First Nations at the National Gallery of Canada* (Ottawa: National Gallery of Canada, 1992). 122.

²⁶ Willard, Tania, et al. 23.

²⁷ Watson, Scott. "The Modernist Past of Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun," *Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun: Born to Live and Die on Your Colonialist Reservations* (Vancouver: Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery, 1995). 61.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ O'Brian, John. *Beyond Wilderness: The Group of Seven, Canadian Identity, and Contemporary Art* (Montreal: MQUP, 2007). 17.

³⁰ Yuxweluptun, Lawrence Paul. "Lawrence Paul Yuxweluptun," 122.

³¹ Willard, Tania, et al. 21.

³² Walker, Patrick and Clarine Ostrove. "The Aboriginal Right to Cultural Property," *Material Culture in Flux: Law and Policy of Repatriation of Cultural Property UBC Law Review* (1995 special edition). 14.