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Abstract

Focusing on the uses of interactive and immersive technologies in Canadian exhibits from 1967 to the present, this dissertation investigates how embodied rites of cultural citizenship summon subjects to interface with nation and heritage in supposedly postcolonial and multicultural frameworks. The technologies I examine encompass the diverse processes and materials that render abstract notions of nation, heritage and citizenship into tangible archives that we encounter directly through our bodies. The first chapter centres on Iris Häussler’s immersive installation, *He Named Her Amber*, staged in Toronto’s historic Grange manor in 2008. This work elucidates the processes through which settler colonial history is rebranded through neoliberal Creative City discourses, and the audience is affectively positioned as naturalized settler who, unlike displaced Indigenous communities, is endowed with the right to occupy the home. Following this, the National Gallery of Canada’s introduction of the audio guide for its monumental 1967 Centennial exhibit provides the historical context from which to investigate the celebration and consecration of Canada’s technological modernity. This chapter analyzes how the construction of an interactive art-historical audio-scape facilitated the citizen’s entrance into national modernity through technological access and participation. The next chapter surveys the implementation of digital touchscreens at UBC’s Museum of Anthropology, arguing that the expanded haptic interface is drafted as both material and rhetorical apparatus to strategically proclaim inclusive, multicultural paradigms. Concurrently, this interface reveals the very limits of interaction, and the paradoxes of the liberal public sphere. Lastly, the dissertation turns to the visitor-generated projections at Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump (a UNESCO World Heritage Site in Alberta) in order to illustrate how motion-sensored, phantasmagoric projections work to locate but also unsettle the visitor’s body within official national—and “universal”—heritage frameworks. Here, I demonstrate how cultural citizenship is
secured through the substantiating buttresses of heritage and archaeology, which emplace the visitor within an “ancient” landscape and narratology of nation which depends on inscription as much as erasure. Ultimately, this dissertation argues that these technological overtures of nation facilitate the everyday, quotidian encounters with violence which seduce subjects into—and out of—narratives of belonging.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Museums have traditionally been places that variously sanction the body’s agency; visitors are routinely discouraged from raising their voices, straying from predesignated paths, and most of all, making physical contact with displayed objects. Increasingly, however, there have been shifts towards interactive and immersive techniques which encourage visitors to take self-directed, idiosyncratic journeys towards edification; encourage them to touch, engage and enfold their bodies within the display. In other words, visitors are to a greater extent offered passages into archives once deemed inviolable, and guided to believe that they are breaching boundaries once deemed impermeable. This dissertation examines the social, cultural, historical, and political implications of these museological shifts, which I contend employ a host of affective techniques to engineer “new” forms of cultural citizenships that work to perform multicultural inclusion while denying the fact of settler coloniality. Specifically, I examine the uses of interactive and immersive technologies in Canadian exhibits from 1967 to the present, and critically assess how such technologies are employed in various museological settings to beckon citizens to interface with heritage and forms of citizenship. Focusing on a number of seemingly mundane technological maneuvers (touching a button, swiping a screen, acquiescing to an authorial voice, wending a path through the museum), I construct an argument regarding the ways that violence is domesticated and woven into the everyday. Effectively effacing colonial histories of exploitation, our quotidian encounters with museum technologies instead appeal to our dreams of access, agency, and belonging.
In my usage, technology refers to the diverse materials and processes that render intangible notions of heritage, nation and citizenship into palpable archives that we encounter through our bodies. This research argues that technology determines the shape and scope of our cultural citizenship through the ways that it choreographs our bodily, imaginal, and affective positionalities. Further, I use technologies of immersion to designate both interactive and immersive, as well as material and immaterial, technologies that encourage embodied rites of museological encounter within supposedly postcolonial and multicultural frameworks. The distinction between interactive and immersive is one that I will parse in further detail in the next chapter; for now, I will say that technologies of immersion is an umbrella term which allows me to draw attention to the phenomenal ways that the visitor is summoned and enfolded within the exhibit through corporal appeals that often signal discourses of inclusion and access. Material technologies in this study refer specifically to audio guides, motion-sensored projections, expanded digital screens and haptic interfaces. The immaterial, meanwhile, pertain to cultural technologies that are more carefully dissolved into the museum script. As demonstrated in Chapter 3, immaterial technologies include a meticulously devised immersive narrative which choreographs the audience’s affective and multi-sensory involvement without necessarily relying on a digital or analog interface. Both material and immaterial technologies of immersion are deployed by museums to intensify the affective resonance of the colonial archive (objects, spaces, and histories) by blurring the traditional boundaries between itself and its audience.

In its broadest sense, my project claims that the material "afterlife" of the colonial archive is organized in such a way that it continues to produce, inscribe and move bodies in postcoloniality. The focus on technology allows an opening through which to explore how bodies encounter the colonial “afterlife” variously transformed, renewed, or amended through technological implements
that endorse participation. I argue that archives are far from inert relics of colonialism and its aftermath, but are instead agentive things which hail the subject through overtures gathered around control, access, and proprioception (the grounding sense of the body’s position in and movement through space). Understanding the enduring structures of settler coloniality entails examining: the various ways in which colonial legacies are unassumingly bequeathed to us, what we do with its tactile archives, and how these histories continue to live on in and through our own bodies. Central to this investigation are the ways that settler colonialism, working equally through mechanisms of commemoration and denial/forgetting, continue to be contested and/or recuperated through the generally lauded frameworks of multiculturalism, the Creative City, and World Heritage. While this research is motivated by expansive questions coalescing around the roles of immersive techniques in imagining and performing narratives of nation, it is situated within specifically delineated spatial and temporal parameters which I hope will be generative rather than constrictive.

This project’s underlying concern is with tracing the possible correlations between Canada's introduction of official multiculturalism and the current profusion of interactive and immersive paradigms employed in museums, inasmuch as the latter might be conceptualized as incorporative mechanisms. Accordingly, I focus on the period between the late 1960s and the present. The 1960s in Canada were marked by turmoil as much as exuberance, where fundamental economic, political, and social shifts acutely signalled the modernization of the nation. The 1968 election of Pierre Trudeau saw a move towards his Third Option, an economic diversification plan which aimed to reduce Canada’s dependency on the United States, enhance its relations with other global partners, and ultimately increase self-reliance and strengthen national identity (Hart; Bothwell). Social fractures during this decade, including the swelling tides around French nationalism, struggles for Indigenous sovereignty, the women’s movement, student protests, labour
strikes, etc., were tied to decolonizing currents rippling across the globe. In Canada, there were a number of attempts to ameliorate these fractures through managerial technologies and projects. The Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission was established as an attempt to quell the crisis of separatism and corral disenfranchised French Canadians into the nationalist fold. The demand for international labour also led to the adoption of the less overtly discriminatory immigration Points System in 1967. In addition, there were a host of government initiatives aimed at increasing citizenship participation among marginalized groups (Loney; Druick, *Projecting*). The decade also provided the socio-political context for the official adoption of multicultural policies by the federal government in 1971,¹ and thus serves as a crucial juncture of state multiculturalism as we understand it today.

There were also other incorporative technologies used to beckon national subjects. The Canadian Centennial’s panoply of commemorative initiatives are particularly revealing of not only the many ways that the modern nation came to be imagined and performed, but also how the modern citizen was sensorially located and trained. Expo 67’s expanded cinematic experiments developed and intensified technologies of embodied spectatorship whose influences can still be perceived today.² Janine Marchessault makes an argument that the National Film Board of Canada’s *Labyrinth* project—one of the most popular Expo pavilions utilizing multi- and expanded screen formats—provided a “the sensory training ground for the new global citizen, where simultaneous information inputs create not confusion which numbs the senses but a new ‘oceanic consciousness’” (“Multi” 47). Here, Marchessault distils a relationship between the expanded

---

¹ The Multiculturalism Policy of Canada was announced by Trudeau in the House of Commons in 1971, but later enshrined in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act by the Progressive Conservatives under the leadership of Brian Mulroney in 1988.

² Most significantly, the National Film Board’s Expo 67 expanded and multi-screen experiments led directly to the development of IMAX (Achland; Griffiths, *Shivers*).
technological sensorium with the pluralist idealism so vehemently espoused by Trudeau’s Liberals. It was of course also during this time that Marshall McLuhan theorized the sensory extension of man in the electric age (*Understanding*); his technological humanism represented this era’s upheld faith in the democratic potential of technology to realize human potential.³ Technological lures which relied on immersion to appeal to bodies in effect extended the technological sensorium in a manner evoking a global commons or planetary citizenship. The utopic sense of an “expanded global public sphere” (Marchessault and Lord 9) that undergirds many of the screen experiments traced to the 1960s can especially be witnessed in the implementation of digital touchscreens at the University of British Columbia’s Museum of Anthropology (Chapter 5). We might surmise that these novel forms of embodied spectatorship, in positioning the bodily carriage in specific ways, engendered novel corporeal postures as well as affective models of planetary being (vis-à-vis the body’s location within national narratives). In the chapters to follow, my study explicates in closer detail the mechanisms of this mesmeric cultivation of the citizen—or the processes through which this subject is simultaneously disciplined and seduced.

The cultivation of the modern citizen requires the emergence of a self-crafted national identity as well. In this regard, Centennial had direct, material impact on the role of museums in commemorative nationalism, and the construction of heritage as the self-actualized, coherent chronology of nation. Before the Centennial,

...most Canadians thought of museums (if they thought of them at all) as dim and dusty places full of ancient bric-a-brac... The astounding success of Expo 67 changed all that. In the glittering pavilions and displays of many nations, Canadians were amazed to see that the achievements of our own society and the unique

³ See Kroker for more on McLuhan’s technological humanism.
character of our country were second to none. They saw that the techniques of
museology could be used to demonstrate our many-sided character and our place in
the human family, in nature, in space and time. Nothing could have been less like a
musty attic than Expo. It was beautiful in its total effect and in all its details, exciting
as a funfair, a midway of invention and delight, leaving an afterglow in memory
that changed our minds about our own possibilities.” (National Museums of Canada
4)

Indeed, Lester B. Pearson’s Liberals looked to “harness” the energy and excitement generated by
Centennial, and to channel this momentum into a sustainable and robust nationalism (Ord 230).
The National Museums Act, introduced during the Centennial year, and officially passed in 1968,
was a significant element of a larger initiative to install a “permanent national celebration” (Ord
institutions under the single National Museums of Canada Corporation,4 whose stated purpose was
to “demonstrate the products of nature and the works of man, with special but not exclusive
reference to Canada, so as to promote interest therein through Canada and to disseminate
knowledge thereof” (“National Museums Act” s. 5.1). This was the first concerted effort to craft a
singular national banner under which these federal cultural institutions could be guided and
administered.

Since this time, museums in Canada—and in general the West—have continued to be
pressured by shifting socio-political currents, including the struggles of decolonization erupting in
the 1960s, to introduce considerable changes which have ranged from minor shifts to major

4 The National Museums of Canada Corporation brought together the National Gallery, the National Museum of
Natural Sciences, the National Museum of Man, and the National Museum of Science and Technology under one
administration (the National Museums of Canada Corporation). It was disbanded with the Museums Act of 1990.
overhauls in their institutional mandates. In Canada, the stated aims of 1972’s National Museum Policy centred on “democracy and decentralization” and seemed a move away from long-established dictates of the elite institution. Perhaps the most significant call to change came in the form of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples assembled in the aftermath of a controversial exhibit, The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada’s First Peoples, staged in Calgary’s Glenbow Museum in conjunction with the 1988 Winter Olympics. Along with its problematic presentation of Aboriginal objects (Whitelaw, “Land”), the exhibit’s major sponsor, Shell Oil, was also involved in a land dispute with the Lubicon Cree, who called for a boycott of the exhibit.\(^5\) The Task Force, jointly comprised of representatives from the Assembly of First Nations and the Canadian Museums Association, published a report in 1992 after two years of consultations which provided a set of guidelines for equal partnerships between the two groups in the future. The report included recommendations regarding: enhanced museum access and training for Aboriginal peoples, increased involvement of Aboriginal peoples in the interpretation of their culture and history, as well as the repatriation of sacred artefacts and human remains.

Beyond Canada, new museology also emerged in the late 1970s as a progressive theoretical and practical movement challenging the traditional museum’s roles and functions in a rapidly changing world. Although its aims, outcomes, and successes have been variegated, new museology can be described in a most general—and idealistic—sense as the move away from elitist, authorial institutional mandates towards increased access, the prioritization of audiences rather than collections, and the adoption of reflexive interpretive strategies to address issues of representation.\(^6\) Deirdre Stam summarizes that new museology was the ostensible appeal for “change, relevance,


\(^6\) For more on new museology, consult especially Vergo; Macdonald; Witcomb.
curatorial reorientation and redistribution of power” (267). Technologies also played a considerable role in these reformatory practices, with interactive and immersive exhibits more ubiquitously deployed to amend museums’ colonial genealogies, particularly by heralding the institutions’ newfound prioritization of user-centred experience, diversity and inclusivity. Chapter 5 will go into further detail regarding how claims for institutional inclusion, access, and power redistribution are played out through new digital infrastructures. It is important to remark here that moves—at least outwardly—towards decolonizing methods cannot be entirely disentangled from museums’ increasing prioritization of the market, and the resulting imperative to solicit new and diverse audiences (Witcomb; Ross).

This research examines how participatory techniques, employed since the late 1960s to signal hospitable and democratic curatorial paradigms, reveal something much more complicated than a progressive narrative of decolonization. This period of change in Canadian museums has been explicated by Ruth B. Phillips, who has also taken the 1960s as the launching point to consider the evolution of museum practices, and in particular towards indigenization, which she defines as “the incorporation into the mainstream museum world of concepts, protocols, and processes that originate in Aboriginal societies” (Museum 10). As Phillips notes, this period between the 1960s and 2000s cannot be summed up as an “uninterrupted vector of progress towards decolonization,” and should instead be viewed instead as “an uneven line whose dips and rises mirror swings from liberalism to reaction in Canadian politics” (Museum 26). History is far from a linear chronology from violence to liberation, but is instead full of aporiac moments that effectively trouble our investments in the onward march of progress. The individual case studies I present underscore different aspects regarding how modern technological citizenship evolves through succeeding iterations and transformations from its jubilation in the 1960s. However, I present these arguments
nonchronologically in order to challenge the progress narrative, and to reflect the fact that history is always haunted by ruptures and returns, as well as uncanny shadows and spectres.

Starting my case studies with the Art Gallery of Ontario’s 2008-2010 installation He Named Her Amber (Chapter 3) allows me to identify settler coloniality as the central focus of this study, while Chapter 4 extends back to 1967’s Centennial exhibit at the National Art Gallery to provide a genealogy of the emergence of the modern nation and technologized citizenship. Following this, Chapter 5 turns to the Museum of Anthropology’s use of interactive digital infrastructures (built in the late 2000s) which have been lauded as an example of successful collaborative efforts between the museum and Indigenous stakeholder communities. While an improvement on more explicitly colonial practices of before, these touchscreens at the same time suggest that multicultural forms of inclusion can be adroitly mobilized to ensure the institution’s own growth and vitality. The focus of Chapter 6 is Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, which was constructed in the mid to late 1970s through processes considered, especially at the time, progressive and collaborative. However, this site also significantly reveals that the multicultural and supposedly postcolonial nation continues to be haunted by enduring spectres of colonial history and present-day violence.

Presenting an exhaustive account of Canada is far from the objective my project feigns to achieve. For example, I do not attend to Francophone, Maritimes, or Northern institutions, among others. In terms of media, I chose a contemporary artistic installation (Chapter 3), an exhibit presenting a national art historical thesis (Chapter 4), an interactive digital portal into a world culture museum’s collection (Chapter 5), and an interpretive centre set within a World Heritage landscape (Chapter 6). My case studies also draw on an array of material and non-material technologies. Some technologies target specific senses (hearing, sight), while others make more phenomenologically full-bodied appeals. Further, this project brings into play diverse institutional
settings. Some focus on history and culture and others on art, although critics have pointed out that these are more alike than not (Duncan and Wallach; Candlin, Art). Two of the institutions are state funded (National Gallery of Canada, Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump), while the two others rely on public and private funds (Art Gallery of Ontario, Museum of Anthropology). These examples merely indicate that a variety of actors—whether state (including various levels of government), corporate, or individual benefactors—can be invested in imagining nation, though their interests might diverge and conflict as much as they overlap. Ultimately, this project is not attempting to present an argument that is beholden to a singular institutional apparatus, technique, or a sensory mode of reception. Rather, I hope that, taken together, the range of the following case studies help to illuminate a richer and more complex landscape that would not have been possible had I just chosen a singularity of focus.

Each case study is concerned with the conceptualization of nation and national identity, even though some do so less explicitly than others. The National Gallery of Canada’s Centennial exhibit (Chapter 4), told through canonic art history, deals most explicitly with nation. Häussler's installation at the Grange manor (Chapter 3), in contrast, pinpoints the shadows of official national narratives by rehearsing the anxieties around multiculturalist tenets of hospitality and inclusion. Meanwhile, the gaze of the Museum of Anthropology’s Multiversity Galleries (Chapter 5) is pointed both within and without, focusing on Indigenous material cultures, but protracting this focus through displays on world cultures. Lastly, although Head-Smashed-In (Chapter 6) is a UNESCO World Heritage site, the regional history of the Blackfoot serves as the central axis of its heritage discourse. As will be shown, this universal heritage paradigm ultimately legitimates a national framework while evading continuing histories of settler colonial violence.
The parameters of my research do not subscribe to a methodological nationalism which reifies the natural essence and taken-for-granted boundaries of nation (Billig; Chernilo), nor do they mean to deny notions of movement, circulation, and flows prioritized by recent transnational approaches. Instead, I take up Ian McKay’s approach to Canada not as an essentialist “vacant lot” but as liberal project, or “a political and socially-specific solution to a series of historical problems” (“Liberal” 622). My interest in the relatively distinct geo-political container of "Canada" lies not so much in the fidelity to obstinate boundaries, as in the fact that Canada-as-project provides a landscape through which to track specific circulations of affective narratives and structures of feeling which galvanize national forms of identification. In establishing these spatial and temporal parameters, this project makes the case that national boundaries are neither obsolete nor completely transcended. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, for example, argue that nation and globalization are not incompatible; further, national projects are increasingly dilatant and global in scope, having to take into account interests and structures beyond their own immediate borders (Empire 60). Moreover, I posit that it is the uncertainties wrought by the dissolution of (many) traditional borders in the globalized present that perhaps lead to the urgency with which the nation performs itself as narratively resolved.

1.1 Methodology

This project entails three interconnected parts: textual and discursive analysis of policy and theoretical texts; archival research in the museums; and the phenomenological (auto)ethnography

---

7See Isabel Hofmeyr on transnational methods' recognition of the fact that historical processes are not just situated in different places but in fact "constructed in the movement between places, sites, and regions" (Bayly et al. 1444). Transnational approaches are thus guided by the concept that historical processes are not merely located in different places but constructed precisely in movement.
drawn from my own experience in the exhibit spaces. This approach draws from critical discourse analysis, which Jan Blommaert conceives as the inquiry into “power effects”—or “what power does”—and also the conditions that allow power to circulate and be reproduced (1-2). Blommaert’s approach is Foucauldian; discourse is tied not merely to the linguistic, but encompasses all meaningful activity connected with “social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use” (3). I also engage a triangulation of cultural theory, historical inquiry and ethnography in an interdisciplinary approach that aims to dispute disciplinary quarantines and make available a wider array of tools and ingresses with which to think through the complex configurations of belonging and exclusion. My engagements with archives, exhibit spaces and theory are also interlaced with an attentiveness to the role of embodiment. All three are, after all, material texts received in and through the body—that contingent and idiosyncratic vessel nonetheless grounded in larger socio-political entanglements. To this, Vivian Sobchack adds that embodied experiences are neither pure nor direct, but instead "mediated and qualified" by various cultural and historical technologies (4). Taking the cue from Dwight Conquergood's notion of ethnography as the "sensuous way of knowledge" (180), it is necessary to foreground the very fact of my own body as researcher in each of these approaches. I relied on journaling as a method of recording my own experience within the museum, and approached this process as the means to transform personal experience into knowledge production. The use of journaling and collecting observational fieldnotes in museums and archives also allowed me to explore the tensions between the intended meanings of hegemonic museum narratives and personal and idiosyncratic engagements with these texts.

I similarly approached the phenomenal experience of my time in the archives. Throughout 2012-2013, I conducted archival research at the Art Gallery of Ontario, the National Gallery of Canada and the Museum of Anthropology. Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump is the only site to not
have a designated archives, although one can doubtlessly argue that its landscape—engraved with the deep grooves of history and also official (UNESCO) World Heritage designation—is itself palimpsest and archive. In all of these spaces, I was attuned to the connections between textual and phenomenal research. Likewise, I was interested in the fact that embodied and immersive encounters occur in public-facing exhibit spaces as well as more discreet archival backrooms. Carolyn Steedman’s work on the crucial role of intimacy in archival research has been especially instructive in helping me to think through my experience in the archive. According to her, intimacy is not about the access to and uncovering of historical “truth.” Rather, intimacy has more to do with the fact that researchers directly alter history in their very grasping towards it (“Intimacy” 28). In lieu of silences and lost objects, the researcher is also sometimes lucky enough to experience other “deep pleasures” including those of connection, understanding, and recognition wrought through patient archival endeavours (28). Steedman’s work also considers the pleasures and perils of making contact and working with vulnerable—and sometimes dangerous—materials in the archive. In my own work, I approach the archive in many ways analogously to the exhibit space; both can be generously depicted as interactive openings that draw on the idea of the body’s encounter with auratic historical objects, and they also tempt through the offer of “access”—however provisional—to some other looming, inviolable thing. Like museums, archives present a host of implicit and explicit reminders of the materiality of our bodies in contrast to the immaculacy of its space. We are careful to not track in dirt or other unwanted materials, to keep our voices at a whisper, to turn pages softly, and to wear gloves to make sure the oils from our fingers do not

8 Steedman responds to Derrida’s rather broad and figurative notion of archive fever, which are largely to do with issues of (state) power and possession, by proposing the “etiology of Archive Fever Proper” that would consider the real dangers posed by breathing in various hazardous by-products including dust, and even anthrax (“Something” 1172).
blemish and ruin precious artefacts. In other words, although archives might concede spaces for the researcher, she is reminded at every turn that her fleshy presence must intervene as minimally as possible on the auratic and sacrosanct.

This research is guided by the interest in exploring the ways in which affect, more than just theory, can also be approached as methodology. Put another way, how might affect function as a way of knowing or means through which we might arrive at knowledge, but also as the production of certain kinds of embodied knowledge? My choices of case studies were more often than not guided by my own initial emotional and affective responses to these exhibits and/or sites. This is especially the case with Iris Häussler's He Named Her Amber (Chapter 3) and Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump (Chapter 6). Both investigations were instructed from the start by my desire to probe the ways in which I felt significantly moved and/or provoked by my initial encounters with these sites. Even so, I subsequently made an attempt to attune and calibrate these case studies with others that would allow me to approach my topic through the examination of a variegated range of senses, technologies, techniques, and geographical/institutional settings. I realize that such an admission of being significantly escorted by personally felt resonances and “intensities” are far from unproblematic, for it risks falling victim to the neoliberal manipulation of affect, and perhaps also deemphasizes the utter violence of colonialism by focusing on allurement and pleasure. However, I believe firmly that my query benefits from direct confrontations with modes of seduction; examining how the body is moved therefore becomes a point-blank avenue through which to investigate the ways that affect circulates and produces knowledges, identifications, and subjectivities. This approach necessarily includes thinking critically about the researcher’s own fraught relationship with the site and subject of research, and the ways that she can be beguiled and ensnared by the very things she critiques.
Affect, in this case, is not merely the object of rational analysis and translation; it can also be that which guides us through the museological landscape, just as it guides the body through affiliations and exclusions within imagined communities. Here, I draw inspiration from Dierdra Reber's urging to reconceptualize affect in terms of the way it functions as episteme, or a way of knowing. Reber argues that thinking about how the body is controlled by modern forms of power is inadequate; we must also consider how these "narratives of control" are written through the language and soma of sensation, feeling, emotion themselves (92). This begins to suggest the ways that one might formulate affect less as object of inquiry and more as fleshy medium of transfer. Similarly, one might think about approaching theory not (just) in terms of its truth claims, but in terms of what reading it does to the body, what kinds of affective undulations are produced by textual encounters, and also how these responses in turn guide the researcher into bodies of knowledge and their attendant subject-positions. Moreover, this entails considering how one might use a museum exhibit as a means to enter a body of theory, and likewise using theory as a sensuous opening into the topography of the museum.

This research is influenced by a diverse colloquium of methodologies which focus on embodiment and materiality as central to knowledge production and being in the world. Approaches to haptic methodologies, including Mark Peterson’s sensuous ethnographies and Laura Marks’s haptic criticism have been influential in attuning me to the role of my own corporal responses in research.⁹ Similarly, I drew from Joy Parr’s idea of sensuous history, which looks beyond discursive history to interrogate the ways that knowledge is passed on through “visceral knowledge, which we carry corporeally” (720).¹⁰ Sobchack's existential phenomenology, grounded

---

⁹ Paterson, “Haptic”; Marks, Skin; Marks, Touch have been especially useful.
¹⁰ Parr relies on Michael Polanyi’s concept of tacit knowledge—based on his idea that our bodies hold more knowledge than can be captured and translated through discourse.
in the "carnal, fleshy, objective foundations of subjective consciousness as it engages and is
transformed by and in the world" (2), further provides a gainful framework to consider how the
researcher might begin from the very "fleshy" particularities of personal experience to postulate
potential structures and meanings of lived experience. It is also beneficial to place Sobchack's
carnal phenomenology into conversation with Sara Ahmed's suggestion of the manners in which
affective economies generate the imperative to think "through the skin" ("Collective" 45), as well
as with Laura Marks's insistence on the fleshy of the medium itself—an organ whose epidermis,
much like our own, functions as the sensate surface which retains the traces of scopic/filmic
encounters. I was also informed by physical cultural studies, an approach whose primary
problematic centers on the ways in which moving bodies (those of the research subject, the
researcher, and the relationship between them) activate culture, and generate the research field
itself. Giardina and Newman make the case that within a physical cultural studies approach to
embodied research, the researcher must examine how she, like the research subject, is entrenched
within neoliberalism's biopolitical discourses—particularly those guarded by "subject formations,
surveillance, normalization, governmentality, and value judgments" (531). To pretend to be able
to stand outside these techniques of captivation would be dishonest, when in fact, the researcher's
embodied presence is implicated in—and in fact co-creates—the research scene.

Embrowed in this concern about the fact of the body—particularly with regard to how it is
moved—is also the significant matter of the positionality of the body. It is therefore crucial to
weigh the usefulness of autoethnographic approaches. Autoethnography performs cultural analysis
through the methodological move of turning the ethnographic gaze "inward," while grounding such
enquiries in larger social contexts (Denzin; Chang; Ellis). Although there are multiple manners in
which this can be carried out, I find the conceptualization of autoethnography as the "researchers’
reflective ruminations on their fieldwork encounters” (Butz and Besio 1660) particularly valuable. This, alongside critical autoethnography methods which encourage researchers to interrogate structures of power and privilege within which they are complicit (Madison; Boylorn and Orbe), prod me to scrutinize my own positionality as a settler researcher. To do so complies with Paulette Regan’s conviction that the settler’s responsibility is not “to assuage colonizer guilt by solving the Indian problem” but instead “to turn the mirror back upon ourselves” and engage in a self-reflexive and discomforting decolonial praxis (11). This can indeed be precarious ground upon which to tread, because while it is necessary to foreground my own positionality, I wish to do so without merely reaffirming a settler perspective, and/or succumbing entirely to solipsism. Nonetheless, I am guided by the ethos that the autoethnographic situating of the researcher provides a viable option when “excluding or obscuring the personal in research” becomes “uncomfortable, even untenable” (Jones et al 21).

I was born in the United States to a Chinese-Malaysian family, but spent my early childhood in Kota Kinabalu, a city on the island of Borneo. Just after my eight birthday, our family immigrated to Toronto, Canada, traipsing a Commonwealth passage similar to so many before us, and so many since. In my new school in the multicultural heart of Toronto’s Chinatown, amongst many faces not unlike my own, I spent grades three and four in English as a Second Language classes, where I was not only implicitly schooled in how to soften my Malaysian-inflected spoken tongue, but also inducted into the everyday, “banal” trials of citizenship (Billig) that seemed to me—having come from a former colony where vestiges of British rule were still evident—utterly strange and yet not strange at all. Our British Canadian ESL teacher taught us to salute Queen Victoria on her birthday, observe minutes of silence during Remembrance Day, and sing Christmas carols that harkened to romantic sylvan landscapes. I also recall that part of our enculturation
involved tours to many heritage house museums around the city, including the Gibson House, Colborne Lodge, Campbell House, and Mackenzie House—which along with the Grange manor, (the subject of Chapter 3), have been appropriately described as Toronto’s “lost colonial village reunited” (J. Goddard 3). Admittedly, these introduced rituals and pilgrimages were far from unpleasant; entering my strange new cultural milieu, I found it comforting to be right away drafted into very specific sets of bodily postures and affective orientations. These assuaged me with, in Benedict Anderson’s vocabulary, a sense of community and simultaneity.

However, it was only natural that as this first blush fades and one grows increasingly more attuned to the various strains and tensions enfolded within “belonging.” Almost three decades after my family’s arrival in this country, I still do not hold Canadian citizenship, even though for most intents and purposes I consider this country my “home.” My U.S. passport, paired with the fact of my longterm Canadian residency, often comes across as an inconsistency which elicits puzzlement and/or suspicion at border crossings. This small practicality reflects, in a larger sense, how “citizenship” and “belonging” for so many others is cast through a certain contingency, impermanence, and alienability. The category of “stranger,” as Sara Ahmed reminds us, is not a faraway body we fail to recognize, but a proximate one we always already recognize as other (Strange). This figure is one that, rather than threatening community, actually coheres it. Exclusion, in other words, is part and parcel of the mechanisms of national inclusion.

It is perhaps more than understandable that anyone who has had any residency on the limen be drawn to ideas regarding belonging and exclusion, and compelled by modes of seduction. My “confession” of this abridged biography—itself performative—is as much an acknowledgement of my authorial bias as a declaration of ambivalence and uncertainty. My positionality undoubtedly shapes and colours the way I read and walk through a museological space. Perhaps it allows me to
see the gaps and contradictions that some others might miss; at the same time, my privilege blinds me to a host of violences of which I myself am structurally implicated. Astonishingly, it was not until I was in graduate school that I was encouraged to think critically of how my own privilege has been enabled through a long history of colonial violence, and that I am thus complicit in continued forms of Indigenous dispossession. This is the very problem that Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua confront in their essay “Decolonizing Antiracism,” which argues that even a well-intentioned politics (i.e. Canadian anti-racism) needs to recognize its compliance with liberal pluralist frameworks which cast Indigenous peoples as just another “‘interest group’ whose ‘claims’ must be measured against the needs of other ‘groups’ of citizens” (240), and in this way, utterly decenters the need for decolonisation (248).

The settler of colour’s positionality is a complicated issue that some have begun to tackle. Sunera Thobani, for example, poses the powerful indictment of immigrant complicity: “Can a citizenship conceived in, and maintained by, a genocidal violence leave untainted any group which comes to be included in its orbit, no matter how severe the forms of their own previous exclusions or how tenuous their subsequent inclusion?” (95). Thobani’s rhetorical question puts forth that citizenship is violent from its inception, for it is founded on the exclusion and attempted elimination of Aboriginal peoples (82). Malissa Phung is more hesitant to adopt monolithic designations of “settler,” arguing that collapsing all non-Indigenous Canadians into a catch-all category risks subsuming vastly diverging histories and lived experiences between white settlers and settlers of colour (296). Speaking to Corey Snelgrove and Jeff Corntassel about this issue of whether or not “all settlers are created equal” (Snelgrove et al 6), Rita Dhamoon rightly argues that settler colonialism does not rest on the particularities of individual circumstance or intention. Rather, “settler” identifies non-Indigenous peoples as inextricably bound—however unwittingly—by a
“structural relationship” to Indigenous dispossession and imperialistic nationalism (Snelgrove et al 14). Added issues of class and cultural privilege afforded to a settler of colour who is also an academic only makes this situation more charged. Postcolonial critics remind us that the site of ideological production are neither neutral nor effaceable, and that it is therefore imperative to locate and specify a corporal-politics within the academy (Dirlik; Rajan). It must be noted that “confessions” by such subjects regarding their tenuous positions within Western academe and established (colonial) bodies of knowledge are not without their own complications.11 Nonetheless, such turns inward to locate and negotiate a corporal-politics within the academy and beyond is an inherently fraught but ultimately necessary project.

1.2 Chapters

In the chapter following this, I present a theoretical context for this study. The first half of this chapter provides an affective genealogy of the tensions that make up modern cultural citizenship, where “modern” imbricates the complex nexus of postcolonial challenges to modernity, with forms of belonging rooted in settler coloniality and reinvigorated through advanced capital. 2.1 examines the role of affect in national belonging, and also argues that Benedict Anderson’s concept of the imagined community, while a useful launching point, inadequately captures the forms of exclusion produced through the modern colonial nation. Following this, 2.2 begins by allowing that affect can be used to challenge liberal forms of belonging. Increasingly, however, affect also functions as neoliberal apparatus which organizes

11 These issues are addressed in the 1990 collection The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues edited by Sarah Harasym. See especially “The Post-colonial Critic,” an interview with Gayatri Spivak (Bhatnagar et al.).
life around: the “expediencies” of culture (Yúdice); desire and consumption; and ameliorative fantasies about the “the good life” (Berlant; Miller, Cultural) through discourses like official multiculturalism, the Creative City, etc. Lastly, the second half of this chapter, beginning with 2.3, locates the relationship between affect and national belonging within the museum. I put forth that the museological setting presents us with a microcosm of the relations I have explicated. More crucially, the museum is a site where elusive notions of heritage and belonging are converted into material archives that we confront through interactive and immersive technologies which summon us corporeally.

The third chapter of this study centres on Iris Häussler’s immersive installation, *He Named Her Amber*, staged at the Art Gallery of Ontario’s historic Grange manor in 2008-2010, after the gallery’s major renovation project. Unsuspecting visitors were invited to enter a “haptic conceptual” narrative (Häussler, “Haptic”) revolving around a fictional excavation of the Grange grounds for numerous mysterious artefacts believed to have been left behind by a young Irish immigrant who served as a scullery maid at the Grange in the early to mid-1800s. 3.1 provides historical context and contends that the staging of the installation in the historic Grange manor is not without significance. Built in 1818, and heralded as a National Historic Site of Canada, the manor stands as a revered architectural remnant of the city’s early British settlement, while its official chronology elides the history of the Mississauga peoples who were actively dispossessed of their land upon the arrival of the British. Transformed into a historic house museum in 1973, the Grange currently traffics in colonial nostalgia maintained and revived through the city’s exuberant turn towards the creative cultural economy. While the two might initially seem antithetical, this chapter tracks the ways in which neoliberal Creative City discourses preserve settler colonial history while dexterously reframing it through the deployment of culture and heritage as economic
resource. Taking settling as an axial figure, 3.2 traces the relationship between audience participation and “home”-making on the one hand, and settler coloniality and an emergent Creative Citizenship on the other. Finally, I argue in 3.3 that the installation’s enlistment of a participatory archaeological tour presents a compelling case as to how interactivity and immersion are fundamental in narratives of belonging, and how recruitments of cultural citizens often centre upon the “participation” of the audience’s body. Amber produces and demands significant emotional investment; citizenship is imagined through a host of corporeal and affective trials and rituals which begin as soon as the visitor is invited to plunge full-body into the immersive narrative. Audience members to the installation are in this way positioned as scientists, detectives, and voyeurs tasked with deciphering the clues that will allow them to construct a narrative of the nation and its internal "others."

Launching my case studies with this installation allows me to frame this project through the central problematic of settler colonialism. Opening with the Grange manor likewise permits me to foreground the significance of home, that imperative zone of intimacy which Ann Laura Stoler describes as so revealing of the “affectively charged, both tender and taut” relations of empire (Carnal xxii). Starting “at home” also allows me to interrogate the architectural and rhetorical framework from which much of our imagined belongings seem to emanate. In foregrounding the constructedness of home, we can thus highlight the crucial roles of gender, class, and race in buttressing as well as attenuating certain national imaginaries, and also illustrate how the regulation of these categories within the domestic domain contributes to the reproduction of power relations and strict boundaries of identity. It is far from an accident, indeed, that the constructed object of fascination in Häussler’s installation is to be found “hidden” in the dark of the scullery.
From the "fictional" tour presented in *Amber*, Chapter 4 turns to the austerity of the "official" art historical narrative staged at the National Gallery of Canada (NGC) in 1967. This chapter focuses on the NGC's introduction of Acoutstiguides—user controlled, portable audio guides—for the gallery’s momentous Centennial Exhibition, *Three Hundred Years of Canadian Art*. Significantly, this also marked the inaugural use of such technologies in any Canadian museum. The socio-political landscape of 1960s Canada (4.1) alongside the nexus of Canadian cultural theory offered by thinkers like George Grant and Marshall McLuhan (4.2) provide an important context for this chapter’s investigation into how the construction of a national art history and its supplementary interactive audio-scape served as a crucial iteration of the citizen’s entrance into liberal modernity as facilitated through technological access and participation. By supplementing the archive with an aural landscape that promised narrative accessibility, and enlivening national history through the endowment of private, personal soundscapes, the audio guides in a sense function as Benedict Anderson's "imagined sound"—or the cultural technology of language which “connects us affectively" by producing “a ghostly intimation of simultaneity across homogeneous, empty time” (144-145). In 4.3, I argue that the exhibit grants its audience access (which Anderson referred to as "horizontal" communion) not necessarily by allowing individuals to alter the contents of the venerated archive, but instead inviting them to merely receive its narrative through multisensory channels. It must also be noted that this granting of archival access—provisional as it is—can also be conceptualized as a process of initiation, whereby the subject is expected to comport to the rules of the museological and national fields into which she enters. The model of cultural citizenship proffered through this exhibition paradigm occurs through the audience’s snug insertion into narrative coherence, and their bodily orientation towards heritage as edifying and uplifting. The privilege of access, in this sense, must be seen as contingent upon a
pre-existing condition of restriction and exclusion. Through the multisensory summons into the nation’s aesthetic chronology, audience members become the privileged heirs of a longstanding colonial history to be carried forward into the dawn of modernity. The subject is furthermore constructed as a rational, striving body making their way through a symbolic nationscape much like the settler forefathers who trudged through the thicket of the Canadian wilderness.

Following this, Chapter 5 examines the incorporation of digital touchscreens at the University of British Columbia’s Museum of Anthropology (MOA), and argues that this is illustrative of how interactive technologies are often employed in attempts to divest the museum of its colonial inheritances and rebrand it as inclusive, antihierarchal and postcolonial. Installed in MOA’s “Multiversity Galleries” during the museum’s recent major renovation and renewal project, the interactive kiosks enable user-friendly wayfinding and offer an accessible interface as the means through which visitors can traverse the once teeming disorder of the older Visible Storage galleries. The touchscreens are also meant to be emblematic of the museums’ postcolonial strategies that welcome previously disenfranchised Indigenous stakeholder communities to share in curatorial authority, and partake in collaborative knowledge exchanges. In 5.1, I make the case that the haptic interface or “portal” can be usefully read alongside the utopic postulations of 1960s expanded cinema, which gestured towards notions of an expanded—global or “cosmic”—commons rendered through interconnected and extended bodily sensoria. Following this, 5.2 provides a brief history of touch in museums, and goes on to explore the many contradictions of tactile encounter facilitated through the MOA CAT interface. In its current incarnation within MOA, expanded screen architectures and haptic interfaces can be enlisted as both material and rhetorical apparatuses to strategically proclaim hospitable multicultural paradigms. At the same time, I argue in 5.3 that both expansion and touch, which proffer to audiences fantasies of inclusion,
agency and control, in fact reveal the paradoxes and limits of the liberal public sphere. This chapter puts forth that the dream of a postcolonial global commons exists in tension alongside lingering colonial narratives of citizenship and agency achieved through overcoming landscapes of primordial “wilderness,” here rendered as navigable digital vistas that one is invited to ultimately conquer. Interactivity grants the user the fantasy of control and agency connected to the regulation of affect; this fantasy is one that can serve as panacea for feelings of inertia and disenfranchisement. The touchscreen allows the user to overcome the cacophony of display (and the symbolic “wild”) through a technological prowess. In this way, these digital portals also work to construct and validate a particular kind of civic participant—one hooked up and plugged in, with mind and body primed to eschew national colonial history for a projected planetary belonging instead.

Lastly, Chapter 6 shifts its attention to the visitor-generated projections at Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump (HSIBJ) in Fort Macleod, Alberta, in order to demonstrate how these technologies work to locate and secure the visitor within official national—and universal—heritage frameworks. HSIBJ is a designated UNESCO World Heritage Site, but is also tied to particular regional Blackfoot and settler-colonial histories. 6.1 provides a background on the HSIBJ and its Interpretive Centre, playing especial attention to the latter’s use of motion-sensored projections. In contrast to the previous two case studies, HSIBJ is organized as a more deeply immersive space. The Interpretive Centre’s direct location within the cliff of the jump (in situ archaeology), as well as its reliance on mimetic appeals to realism (especially through the use of replicas) function to plunge the visitor inside the "live" archaeological scene and an evocatively powerful “ancient” heritage landscape. 6.2 explains how this sitebeckons its audience through proprioception, the awareness of the body’s position in and movement through space. Extending beyond the physiological sensation of one’s own body, I argue that proprioception works alongside other
substantiating frameworks of archaeology, regional history and global heritage to provide a firm gravitational ground upon which the visitor is situated and their subjectivity confirmed. Proprioceptive grounding, in other words, locates a body within a specific scene—and narratology—of nation. However, a counter-reading of the archaeological method can work to unsettle a presumed historical narrative, for it can put forth the unearthing or unsettling of linear time. In addition, I interrogate the means through which a heritage landscape is discursive and affectively produced; a terrain of Treaty land is rendered and displayed through the archaeological imperative, subsequently serving as the contextual _terra firma_ upon which a national-cum-global subject is located and defined. At the same time, the “spirit” of place is reattached to the land such that visitors are effectively awed by the monumentality of the scene, and their diminutiveness within it. Lastly, phantasmagoric technologies, elaborated in 6.3, are an entry point to think about how contact zones continue to be haunted by spectres of coloniality, and how these spectral refractions potentially challenge monolithic narratives. Phantasmagoria here provides an avenue to explore how the settler nation is founded on perpetual acts of disavowals and elisions which work to expunge colonial violence from public memory. I posit that, significantly, acts of forgetting are not incommensurate to acts of remembering and commemoration. Heritage depends on inscription as much as erasure; likewise, heritage landscapes are simultaneously composed of overlapping strata of lauded as well as repressed histories.
Chapter 2

Theoretical Context

What follows constitutes an interpretive review of the bourgeoning areas of convergence between postcoloniality, national belonging and immersive technologies, whereby affect provides an important connective thread. Given the historical, geographical and technological parameters of my project, exhaustive historiographies for affect, postcolonial theory, and technology will be eschewed for a more concentrated examination of the areas where these usefully intersect. In 2.1, I examine how nation and subject—and, fundamentally, their relationship to one another—are secured through affective and imaginational investments. I take into consideration how the ontological security of the imagined community is significantly challenged through exclusion, postcolonial anxiety and other failures of affective technologies. The following section, 2.2, elaborates on how affective theories can help to challenge obstinate preconceived notions of modern liberal subjectivities and forms of belonging. At the same time, I contend that affect, especially under neoliberal multiculturalism, can be employed as an apparatus for discipline or manipulation in the interpellation of the subject. Finally, 2.3 turns its focus to the museological landscape in order to explore how the affective technologization of subjectivity is materialized through interactive and immersive exhibits that captivate and beckon their audience through the body.

Postcolonial is an understandably contentious term. Ella Shohat writes that among one of its many problems is the term’s “problematic temporality” (“Notes” 103), which inaccurately
denotes the conclusion of colonialism. The term refers to the material conditions (social, economic, political) in the fraught aftermath of the dismantling of overt or direct colonial regimes, though as Stuart Hall (“When”) points out, it is a designation attended by a host of emerging concerns including the growth of new nationalisms, uneven development, economic exploitation, and neocolonialism. My usage of the term, therefore, is meant to encompass the many contradictions and enduring inequalities that characterize our globalised, neoliberal and settler colonial contemporaneity. This project also makes the case that postcolonial transformation—especially expressed through the rhetoric of official multiculturalism—plays a fundamental part in the modernization of nation. Together, postcolonial multiculturalism and technologized modernity forms a nexus that indicates the various processes through which the “direct rule” of the state has transformed—or softened—into continuing hegemonic structures now reproduced through seduction, complicity and Gramscian notions of consent (Young).

It is important to note that even this more complex, nonlinear composite of post/neo/coloniality has itself overlooked the continued dispossession of Indigenous peoples by settlers of all stripes. In recent years, the theorization of settler colonialism has not only productively augmented postcolonial and anti-racist critiques; in many ways, it has also notably challenged their suppositions. For instance, Bonita Lawrence and Enuska Dua indict Canadian antiracism for its failure to account for Indigenous struggles for sovereignty, which the authors see as a perpetuation of coloniality. Alongside white and Euro Canadians, the term settler also implicates groups marginalized in other ways by mainstream society, including new immigrants.

12 Others have also weighed in on postcolonialism’s problem of the prefix, including Hall “When”; McClintock “The Myth.”
and people of colour. The quickly growing field of settler colonial studies\(^{13}\) sets out to delineate the fundamental differences between the settler phenomenon and other forms of colonialism.\(^{14}\) One important distinguishing factor is that settlers “come to stay” (Wolfe “Settler Colonialism”; Asch; Veracini, *Settler*). As Lorenzo Veracini writes, “…settlers, by definition, stay,” while “colonial sojourners—administrators, missionaries, military personnel, entrepreneurs, and adventurers—return” (*Settler* 6). Related to this idea is Patrick Wolfe’s influential argument that settler colonization should be recognized as *structure* rather than *event*, whereby the *logic of elimination* functions as "an organizing principal of settler colonial society rather than a one-off (and superseded) occurrence" (Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism” 388). In other words, settler colonialism centres on an enduring framework of violence rather than a singular act of invasion that can be easily relegated to the distant past.

Drawing on Raymond Williams, Patrick Wolfe contends that settler colonialism operates through “distinctive structures of feeling” and “affective predispositions” that reach beyond the “formal instrumentalities of statecraft, law-making, economic accumulation, and policy formation” (“Settler Complex” 2-3). In settler states such as Canada, the "softening" of overt colonial power involves to a great extent the diversion of physical and legislative violence towards a more diffused programme of social and cultural assaults whose new directive, as Adam Barker points out, becomes that of "winning over the hearts and minds" of the oppressed (326). This transformation of overt colonial power finds an expedient vehicle in state multicultural discourses structured around celebratory notions of benevolent inclusion. Following Stuart Hall, Gunew indicates that

\[^{13}\text{It needs to be noted that some critics are wary of the institutionalization of settler colonialism over Indigenous studies (Snelgrove et al.), and equally alert to the fact that the theory can draw upon a “settler framework” and thus decenter Indigenous resistance (Macoun and Strakosch 427).}\]

\[^{14}\text{See especially Wolfe, *Settler*; Veracini, *Settler*.}\]
the “mechanism” of colonialism “covertly structures” multiculturalism (*Haunted* 37). In Canada, neocolonial mechanisms are cloaked under the official banner of multiculturalism, which relies on the fetishisation of “differences” and the use of compensatory symbolic distractions to mask ongoing violences perpetrated by the state against Indigenous populations and other disenfranchised racialised “others” (Bannerji; Gunew, *Haunted*). As a number of critics point out, liberal multiculturalism’s amelioristic appeals are far from the answer to the ongoing—and still largely unacknowledged—violence of present day settler colonization (Veracini, “Isopolitics”). Wolfe also sees multicultural policy and its more subtly assimilative projects as merely reinforcing white privilege while attempting to relegate Indigeneity into “just another tile in the multicultural mosaic” (“Settler Complex” 6-7). In direct opposition to assimilative discourses, some critics insist that there need to be actual, substantive challenges to the state through reclamations of Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination (Corntassel; Tuck and Yang; Snelgrove et al.; Veracini, “Defending”).

The diversion of overt force into tactics of seduction or entreatment, taken alongside critics’ affirmations that liberal multiculturalism is largely a discourse of emotion and feeling, directs us towards the crucial role of affect within these arenas. Affect has been variously defined and debated, but it can generally be corralled around the non-representational, corporeal and transpersonal. Many critics use it as a catch-all phrase to designate the turn towards a prioritization of emotion, feeling, and sensation (Illouz; Leys), while others argue that affect—felt sensation—precedes emotion (which is translated affect). For example, Silvan Tomkins locates affect as the biological drives and effects that give rise to recognizable emotion; Teresa Brennan defines affect

---

15 Refer to Wendy Brown’s work on tolerance/aversion (*Regulating*), Paul Gilroy on melancholia (*Postcolonial*), Martha Nussbaum on love and patriotism (“Patriotism”), and Sara Ahmed on happiness as well as other affects (“Multiculturalism”; *Cultural*).
as somatic sensation—or “the things that one feels” (Transmission 23); Brian Massumi speaks of it as “unqualified” force or “intensity” (91). In these accounts, affect is the sensation that is felt before it can be discursively registered and translated. Interestingly, Sara Ahmed uses emotion and affect interchangeably in an attempt to counter the distinction between the two, and to point out that even supposedly “pure” or “direct” sensations are always-already mediated by discourse (Cultural 40). Affect theorists also make the case that we cannot begin to grasp late-capitalist postmodernity without considering the fundamental role that affect plays in shaping our encounters within, as well as our perceptions of, this world (Clough and Halley; Massumi; Reber; Thrift). Brian Massumi goes as far as to say that affect has supplanted ideology as the primary global “mode of power” through which the world is structured and experienced (42). The development of new—especially digital—technologies open up creative possibilities of embodiment and affective experience (Hansen); at the same time, technologies that allow for the rationalization and mobilization of affect can also be expended for political manipulation (Thrift). Within discussions specifically grounded in post/neocoloniality, affect is also important because it centers on the notion of relationality. In this regard, Ben Anderson’s description of affect as the “transpersonal capacity” of the body “to be affected (through an affection) and to affect (as the result of modifications)” (“Becoming” 735) echoes Massumi’s supposition that, “when you affect something, you are at the same time opening yourself up to being affected in turn” (212). Affective relationality and reciprocality thus begin to help us to think about the ways that subjectivities are constructed and lived in postcoloniality, and they do so by elucidating the body as: “open”/vulnerable, mobile/globalised, transpersonal/interrelated. As Steve Pile argues, affect stresses that bodies are both inextricably bound to one another in in/ethical relations, as well as ensnared in more comprehensive and protracted webs of power. In these ways, affect can help to
direct attention to the ways that “postcolonial” bodies come together in waves of adherences and repulsions, and not just through the surface of individual bodies, but also the shape of collectives.  

2.1 The Imagined Community and Beyond

While there are growing numbers of theorists in recent years who have begun to prod the relationship between affect and nationalism (Baldacchino; Grabham; Patton; Sapountzis; Sullivan), Benedict Anderson’s highly influential *Imagined Communities* remains especially notable for the way it prioritizes the role of imagination in the constitution of national belonging. Anderson writes that the nation is an “imagined political community,” composed by members who are able to collapse great spatial and even temporal expanses by narrating a collective belonging and communion. Anderson’s elucidation posits affect as directly engendered through imagination; this imagined community is one in which its members invest “such deep attachments” and wherein they form bonds of “profound emotional legitimacy” (4). Crucially, this “profound emotional legitimacy” is produced through the affective labour required to not only dream up the nation, but more importantly, dream up one's place within this narrative geography. Anderson provides the examples of map, census, and museum as the objects and technologies through which nations are congealed and their boundaries anxiously policed. With regard to Canada, we can think of the ways that technology has been endowed with the material and symbolic capacities to settle, bind and mould the vast land (as in the Canadian Pacific Railway), as well as construct a national consciousness and mythos (as in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and National Film Board). Nations, Anderson suggests, require artefactual technologies around which anonymous bodies can

---

intimately collect and narrate their communion. The imagined community also points significantly to the relationship between nation and feeling—particularly the ways in which citizenship and belonging are imagined through a host of bodily, emotional trials and rituals. In hindsight, Anderson's model is significant for what we can recognise as its litany of omissions—including any considerations that might pose serious challenges to the supposedly univocal, homogenous and simultaneous imagined community. Nonetheless, it provides a provocative prelude to think about the roles of affect and materiality in the nation's imagining.

The affective attachment towards the imagined community can be expounded through the concept of cultural citizenship, which denotes forms of belonging that exceed citizenship as more narrowly defined through a citizen’s rights and obligations. Jan Pakulski uses cultural citizenship to refer to the notion of citizenship extended beyond the civil, political and social (73)—as famously laid out by Thomas Humphrey Marshall—and centered instead on the "symbolic and ideational" realms (80). Meanwhile, following Foucault's idea of "subject-ification" laid out in his essay "The Subject and Power," Aihwa Ong defines cultural citizenship as the processes of "being-made and self-making within webs of power linked to the nation-state and civil society" (738). In Ong's model, cultural citizenship is the result of the "often ambivalent and contested" relationship between the citizen and hegemonic state, a relationship characterized both by the submission to and the exercise of power (738). While I find these applications helpful to extend citizenship beyond the political and legislative, I find even more convincing accounts cultural citizenship which centre on techniques of postural alignments and affective affiliations. In this regard,

---

17 In posing the question “Whose Imagined Community?” Partha Chatterjee critiques Anderson’s concept of nationalism as a totalizing narrative that fails to take into account the specific histories of postcolonial nations; “[i]f nationalisms in the rest of the world have to choose their imagined community from certain modular forms already made available to them by Europe and the Americas, what do they have left to imagine?” (5). I also elaborate on Homi Bhabha’s critique of Anderson later on in this section.
conceptualizations of citizenship as everyday, quotidian rituals (Billig; Connerton), emotional labours (Hardt), and embodied performance (Hurley; D. Taylor, Archive) are especially fruitful. Such approaches beneficially extend citizenship not just towards social and cultural, but also imaginational and affective practice.

In addition, critics like Tony Bennett and Toby Miller have elucidated the instrumental applications of art, culture, and creativity in the practice of cultural citizenship. Bennett makes a case for how art has been conscripted in liberal forms of governing since the 19th century, when it was mobilized as a tool for the moral reformation of working class men (“Acting” 1413). Now, art and culture policies increasingly target communities, under the banner that social fractures can be soothed through creative practices that streamline schematics of belonging, and promote neoliberal ideals of self-reliance and self-regulation (1420-1). Miller’s account of cultural citizenship more explicitly clarifies the relationship between neoliberal capital, consumption, and affect, offering these as the nexus that constructs subjectivities in advanced capitalism. While noting their interrelations, Miller firstly makes the effort to distinguish cultural citizenship (“the right to know and speak”) from political (“the right to reside and vote”) and economic (“the right to work and prosper”) citizenships (Cultural 35). In his 1993 The Well-Tempered Self, Miller famously makes the claim that the modern capitalist state demands that the “ideal citizen” be of two seemingly divided subjectivities: “the selfless, active citizen who cares for others and favours a political regime that compensates for losses in the financial domain; and the selfish, active consumer who favors a financial regime that compensates for losses in the political domain” (130). These split loyalties—between disciplined citizenship and voracious consumption—can be explained by the fact that politics requires the former, while economics the latter. A later treatise of Miller’s specifies that the mechanisms of cultural citizenship can be tracked by examining how consumption is used
to manage and contain the “crisis of belonging” (*Cultural* 1). Miller notes how popular cultural forms (especially television) are seductively presented as the panacea to heal “wounds” arising from the ailments of advanced global capitalism (such as the international division of labour) (*Cultural* 14). Popular cultural forms, he argues, guide us into subjective positions by choreographing desires and providing discernable modalities of conduct and feeling.

Raymond Williams’s concept of *structure of feeling* also provides useful hints as to the role of affective imagination in forms of belonging. He defines *structure of feeling* as “meanings and values as they are actively lived and felt” within a given period (131), elaborating that this designation takes into account larger systematic ideologies, but perhaps more significantly, refer to the more minute, “affective elements” of “impulse, restraint, and tone.” This is analogous to Susan Stewart’s notion of narrative as “structure of desire.” According to Stewart, narrative is inherently nostalgic because it “both invents and distances its object and thereby inscribes again and again the gap between signifier and signified that is the place of generation for the symbolic” (*Longing* ix). In other words, *invention* and *distantiation* comprise a self-sustaining cycle wherein the lost object is compulsively inscribed as well as compulsively absenced. Williams’s and Stewart’s concepts shift our focus away from nation as object and essence, suggesting the ways that it congeals instead through social and cultural practice, but also through the affective dimensions of fantasy and projection.\(^\text{18}\) Anderson indirectly echoes this idea in his argument that there is nothing which “connects us affectively to the dead more than language,” or the “imagined sound” which produces “a ghostly intimation of simultaneity across homogeneous, empty time” (144-5). This “imagined sound,” whether manifested as everyday spoken language or a

---

\(^{18}\) Jacqueline Rose offers a parallel take on the relationship between national belonging, fantasy and “proffered desire” (124).
materialized audio-scape of nation (Chapter 4), is the cultural technology that works to cohere a collective body. Nation is thus “absent” save for its members’ affective investments, which are no less materially urgent; thus, the imagined community illuminates the ways in which narrative begets yearning, as yearning begets narrative.

Imaginational constructions of objects that lie beyond the boundaries of the nation also contribute to our understanding of the formation of national identities. As Mary Louise Pratt argues, writing about the other has always been a fundamental part of colonial projects, for it creates the “domestic subject” of empire at the same time that it gives these subjects a foothold in the world outside. These narratives of the world “beyond,” much like the creative exertions which allow Anderson’s citizens to imagine themselves in communion with a brethren of virtual strangers, work by pulling together the distant strands of empire. Victorian travel writing projected the phantasmagoric world-beyond back into the confines of the metropole, while it simultaneously projected back out into the world a secure, unitary Western subject caught in the throes of its own yearning. Edward Said’s Orientalist does something similar; the Orient of his imperial drama functions as a “closed field, a theatrical stage affixed to Europe,” constructed for and by European subjects. In its capacity for self-perpetuation, Orientalism comes to embody an imaginary geography that legitimates its own vocabulary. What these considerations do not account for are the ways that ambivalences around liberal multiculturalist initiatives, resulting significantly from advanced capital’s need for cheap global labour, have been amplified through post-9/11 panics around threats to security. Now, the “other” is increasingly recognised as an unwanted body who has entered the domestic sphere. In other words, strangers beyond become the strangers within.

---

19 An interesting component to this tale of amor patriae, of course, is that such amorous inventions ultimately yield a relationship with an invented other, under whose demand the narrator-fabulist must, as Anderson remind us, ultimately be ready and willing to die.
(Ahmed, *Strange*); they function as the proximal bodies necessary to the task of defining and maintaining a nation’s internal boundaries.

The preceding survey of the imagined nation—and, synchronously, its other—sets a crucial stage for further considerations of affective un/belongings through a postcolonial lens. The work of postcolonial critics such Sara Ahmed, and Homi Bhabha more explicitly, point out the limits of Anderson’s imagined community as “simultaneity across homogeneous, empty time,” and posit ways in which the parameters of this picture might be widened (if not completely fractured) to make room for the imperatives of transnational identities, globalised circulations of bodies and capital, and neocolonial forms of exploitation. Serving not so much to detract as to amend the notion of imagined community, Ahmed’s work on *affective economies*\(^{20}\) examines affect’s role in the formation or “surfacing” of collective bodies, and conversely, the role of collectives in provoking and producing affective attachments. Emotions—which in Ahmed’s case are not distinguished from affects—are far from “a private matter” (“Affective” 117); they are neither merely psychological states, nor do they reside positively in discreet bodies. Instead, they circulate *between* bodies and signs, adhering some subjects to one another and in so doing so cohering the very effects of collectives. Drawing on Marx’s theorization of how surplus accumulates through the movement of $M-C-M'$ (the transformation of money into commodity and back into money with added value), Ahmed suggests that emotions are produced through their very circulation between subjects/objects, and much like capital, they accumulate affective value as they continue to move between signs, bodies and objects. It is also due to their “nonresidence” on these entities, which Ahmed explains as “the failure of emotions to be located in a body, object, or figures,” that makes these affects particularly binding, and allows them “(re)produce or generate the effects that they

do” (“Affective” 124). Hate, for instance, does not reside within a subject/object, but functions as a form of capital that “circulates between signifiers in relationships of difference and displacement” (121). Such economies of affect insist on the fallacy of resolutely “intimate” constructions of belonging, as well as individual agency in narrating collective attachments. The power of affect is not determined by the narrator’s private investments within “structures of desire,” but is instead facilitated or even engineered by larger state and corporate infrastructures of power.

Certainly in Canada, tales of communion and belonging need to be audited in context with the acutely bad affects that circumscribe many individuals’ and groups’ transactions with nation. Taiaiake Alfred, for example, diagnoses the relationship between Indigenous peoples and the settler state as one founded on an ongoing crisis of cultural dislocation, “social suffering” and deep psychological trauma (“Colonialism” 42). Other critics also examine the many ways in which individuals are made to feel excluded from oppressively monolithic and homogenous delimitations of nation (Ahmed and Fortier; Mukherjee), and others still point to the fact that citizenship, in the context of Canada, is built around insidiously normalized forms of racism (Hage; Caldwell; Leah). Hate, essentialism, and consumption (and the false equation of capital with political agency) are just some of the compensatory solutions endowed with the potential to mollify these anxieties and alienations.

A further critique of the imagined community comes through the introduction of postcolonial anxiety into this narrative. According to Bhabha, it becomes increasingly impossible to speak about an overly coherent and unitary national imaginary without taking into consideration the “social pathologies” that rupture these imaginaries in the present day. These pathologies—or postcolonial anxiety—are the “affective experience of social marginality” which has become the earmark of postcoloniality (and postmodernity) (172), whose subjects inevitably inherit the
violence of colonial history, and the continuing effects of “subjugation, domination, diaspora, displacement” (172). The product of such disquietude can be represented by Frederic Jameson’s radically decentered postmodern subject. While Jameson himself has infamously insisted that postmodernity is characterized by the “waning of affect” and the liberation from most forms of feeling—including anxiety—for the reason that “there is no longer a self present to do the feeling” (64), Bhabha nonetheless utilizes Jameson’s figure of the fragmented, schizophrenic subject in order to bolster his own argument surrounding postcolonial anxiety. For Bhabha, the “communities” purported by Raymond Williams and Benedict Anderson to be knowable and imaginable become, in the flows of postmodernity and its radical socio-cultural transformations, utterly unknowable and unimaginable. The ontological “crisis” of the once supposedly knowable community and the increasingly ineffectual bourgeois ego results in a disorientation which Bhabha argues simply “cannot be envisaged without fear and trembling” (273). In this way, he rather forcefully inserts anxiety into Jameson’s delineation of schizophrenia, lingering on the breaking point of the subject and the collective, where communities of belonging fall beyond ontological and cognitive grasp.

2.2 Postcolonial Affect

There is an understandable concern, among a number of theorists concerned with affect, that referring to a psychoanalytic framework is a reversion to Western bias. Deleuze and Guattari, for example, critique what they term the “analytic imperialism” of social analysis wedded to the Oedipus complex which fails to see the nuclear family as pregnable by historical and political forces (25). One of the few theorists to directly denounce the continuing reliance on psychoanalysis in postcolonial considerations of affect theory is Sneja Gunew (“Subaltern”), who makes the case
that such credence merely lends itself to the reproduction of universalizing (read: Eurocentric) categories of affect. The crucial project of “decolonizing affect theory,” which Gunew points out is in its fledgling stages and still needs to be amply developed, is thus one which critically assesses how affect can be engaged outside the bounds of Western psychoanalysis. While the onerous weight of psychoanalysis can undoubtedly be felt upon both affective as well as postcolonial theories, there is, nonetheless, a considerable body of literature—ranging from Frantz Fanon to more recently, Jan Campbell, Anne Anlin Cheng, and Ranjana Khanna—that attempt to work through this psychoanalytic inheritance, but through critical queer, feminist and/or postcolonial lenses.

In particular, Ranjana Khanna engages psychoanalysis directly at what she argues to be its incontrovertibly masculinist and colonialist roots, while making the case that psychoanalysis can still, in a sense, be turned against itself to serve as an interventionist reading strategy that “makes apparent the psychical strife of colonial and postcolonial modernity” (x). Khanna thus proposes colonial melancholy as the analytical mechanism to examine the “affect of colonialism,” which borrows directly from Freud’s figure of the inassimilable and reframes it to refer to the “spectral remainder” of colonial violence which continues to structure neocoloniality (12). Also drawing on a critical re-visioning of psychoanalysis, Cheng poses a question that Freud himself fails to: “What is the subjectivity of the melancholic object?” (13). For Cheng, melancholia (the constitution of the ego through loss and incorporation) is the central figure that reveals the process by which “dominant, standard, white national” bodies are produced through the “exclusion-yet-retention of racialized others” (10); in the same way, the racialized other is also melancholic object and melancholic subject—“both the one lost and the one losing” (17). Cheng’s use of psychoanalytic theory proves significant in considerations of affective relationality especially because of the way
it stresses that the *intrasubjective* and *intersubjective* (personal and social) are a “mutually supportive system” (28), where one is often articulated through the other.

Across many vast landscapes of affect theory, perhaps the one rare point of concordance amongst many recent theorists working in the field hinges on the materiality of affect, and the tensions between linguistic and bodily experiences. For many of these thinkers, affect resides beyond cognition and representation. Rei Terada, for one, argues that affect is the physiological sensation whose component is the interpreted psychological or emotional experience. Brian Massumi also points out that the primary difference between affect and emotion is the fact that the latter has been channelled into “semantically and semiotically formed progressions” and “narrativizable action-reaction circuits” (28). In this sense, affect is *unqualified* intensity which has not undergone “sociolinguistic fixing” nor been transformed into subjective content (28). The key point here is that in these accounts, affect, unlike feeling or emotion, is the excess not (yet) constrained through linguistic representations, nor subjugated by the subjective interpretation. Likewise, Teresa Brennan defines affects as “material, physiological things” (6). She distinguishes affects from feelings by stating that, while the latter are sensations which have found a proper discursive outlet and are therefore comprised of the words one *feels with*, the former, by distinction, are the very things the body *feels*. The linguistic inaccessibility of affect—which finds interesting resonances in Massumi’s diagnosis of the lack of theoretical vocabulary available to affect—is theorized as fundamentally tied to materiality and physiology. It is thusly possible to make the case that affect grounds the linguistically inaccessible in the materiality of the body and bodily processes (Pellegrini and Puar). Affect in this sense proves the primacy of the body in receiving sensations before these sensations are perceived and processed, an idea reflected in Massumi’s pithy statement that “the skin is faster than the word” (25).
In proclaiming the primacy of the material body, theories of affect subsequently challenge subjective capacities to discursively contain or “qualify” bodily intensities. Affect theory in general puts an emphasis not so much on what affects are, but what they do. The limit of the theory, at least with regard to thinking about collective bodies, is in the relative neglect of the ways in which bodies of difference are formed in relation to one another, and the work of affect in these processes. This is an area that the work of theorists like Cheng and Ahmed can at least begin to redress. Ahmed’s work in particular delves into the function of affects and emotions in “surfacing” individual bodies and creating boundaries between these bodies. “Emotions do things,” Ahmed insists, “they align individuals with communities...through the very intensity of their attachments” (“Affective” 119). Her reminder to think “through the skin” rather than through any solipsistic insistence on bodily integrity per se (Strange 45), might guide us to postulate an affective postcolonial ethico-politics which recognizes that the contours of bodies and “subjects” only come to be formed through their encounters with surfaces of other bodies and “objects.” A reorganization of social experience in postmodernity demands that we turn our attention to the skin, a “border that feels” (Ahmed, Strange 45). This selvage-organ is crucial for various reasons; it can often be a site of violence because it is the body’s edge that comes up against the world, and hence the means through which differences between bodies are formed, and consequently felt. This process of inter-embodiment, Ahmed argues, is a process that involves incorporation as much as expulsion. Importantly, skin is also aligned with surfaces and optics, revealing that the visual is apposite to the sensual. The skin is an organ which calls attention to the ways that we are impelled by the commodified spectacles of consumerist society (Debord), and thusly attune to the world/others by skimming enchanted façades. The complicity of visual and sensual, shallowness and depth, evokes a haptic economy of the surface which Laura Marks (Skin) implies when she writes of the traceable
“textures” accumulated on the screen through successive encounters between postcolonial/hybrid and dominant cultures. That is analogous to Marx’s notion of the accumulation of capital and particularly Ahmed’s reworking of Marx to consider the role of affective economies in materializing bodies that identify with or against other bodies.

2.2.1 Affect as Apparatus

We have looked at the ways in which affect and postcolonial theory, in their sometimes haphazard, sometimes tumultuous comings-together, can point us towards yet untreaded paths. Beyond looking at affect in its more hopeful theoretical capacities to challenge preconceptions of subjectivity and belonging, a significant part of this unfolding discussion must also involve examining how affect also functions as apparatus, or that especially attractive and malleable tool for state and corporate projects. If we accept the model of Canadian official state multiculturalism as a means of “living with difference” (Ahmed, *Strange* 95)—a description that more often than not forebodes the violence of this managerial project—affect becomes all the more crucial in the task of interrogating what it really means to live as proximate bodies, saddled with the myriad responsibilities of thinking and living through our skins.

Neoliberal multiculturalism cannot be said to be the first in utilizing affect in its disciplinary projects. Ann Laura Stoler (*Carnal*; “Intimations”) has cogently argued that colonial rule from as early as the nineteenth century had zeroed in on affect and the body as sites necessitating discipline and regulation. Often, this meant penetrating intimate domains in order to restructure them through social and urban planning, labour regimes, and medical protocols; policing affective relationships between colonized subjects; and moulding various structures of feeling, or “habits of the heart and mind” (*Carnal* 2-3). Colonial regimes understood that empire was, to a significant extent, secured
and/or threatened by what was going on behind closed doors, and within intimate spheres. As such, affect became a crucial terrain upon which to transact matters of discipline. In neoliberal multiculturalism, affect is employed more as a means of seduction, and through attempts to allocate bodies in distinct subjective positions—or what Sunera Thobani distinguishes as exalted national subjects and their necessary others. Here, affect comes to function valuably as apparatus, or a resource to be rationalized and exercised. Following this, the definition of official multiculturalism as “management of difference” (Mackey) needs to be extended by looking at the ways in which it also functions as the management of affect (or affective relations) between bodies of “difference.”

The complicities between neoliberalism and affect can be demystified by approaching the former not (just) as theory or epoch, but more crucially as technique and apparatus. This follows the elucidations of neoliberalism as a "set of specific practices" or “practice action” (Richard and Rudnyckyj 60), as "mobile technology" (Ong), and as a "mode of governmentality" that operates on interests, desires, and aspirations (Read 29). Like neocolonialism, neoliberalism casts aside overt means of discipline, relying increasingly on non-rational means of seduction to corral bodies into pliant subjects. As David Harvey pinpoints, the increasing ability of market logic to encroach on and conduct all areas of social, cultural, political, familial, and psychological life rests on it doing so through appeals to our “intuitions and instincts, to our values and desires” (Harvey 5). This is demonstrated in nation-states’ deployment of soft power in lieu of overt coercion “to shape the preferences of others,” particularly in global diplomatic situations (Nye 5). Unsurprisingly, soft power functions most effectively through the deliberate wielding of culture—not to mention the exploitation of modern communication technologies (Hayden)—to massage public opinion and strategically project values and ideologies (like American democracy and liberty). This reliance on culture as resource to seduce and produce consent more often than not reveals itself as apologia for
forms of cultural imperialism (Mirrlees 206). Conceptualizing neoliberalism accordingly as a set of colluding technologies that often rely on affective strategies of suture emphasizes that affect itself must be probed for its productive capacity to not only create neoliberal subjects, but also the durability of their attachments to other subjects.\textsuperscript{21}

It has been argued that one cannot fully comprehend contemporary forms of power without looking at the ways in which affect is produced, manipulated, and circulated. As Brad Evans and Julian Reid state, “[p]ower…only appeals if it can meaningfully tap into our raw emotions” (92). Nigel Thrift maintains that neglecting the role of affect in our current world would be detrimental for the reason that “systematic knowledges of the creation and mobilisation of affect” by corporate and state powers have become a fundamental part of our contemporary everyday landscapes (58). These powers are now finding ways to engineer new “bodies of knowledges” around “complex affective states of becoming” (Thrift 58); this can be witnessed, for example, in the way that aesthetics become instrumentalized. George Yúdice makes a similar argument in his critique of the complicity between neoliberal capitalism and multiculturalism through the figure of culture as resource. Under neoliberalism, the body and its minutest registers—including invisible pre-linguistic/psychological states—can be envisaged as intelligible resources to be potentially co-opted by state and corporate interests.\textsuperscript{22} Corporate personhood is produced through a highly specialized emotions industry or emotional capitalism, which Eva Illouz defines as the intertwining of economic and emotional discourses, whereby emotions become increasingly rationalized and

\textsuperscript{21} Here I am referring to Richard and Rudnyckyj's notion of how affect creates neoliberalism's "new subjects" and their relations to one another (62), as well as Ahmed's examination of how affect surfaces bodies, and also aligns communities and produces these communities' "others" (“Affective”; “Collective”)
\textsuperscript{22} The AGO received 21\% ($14,686,000) of its 2013-2014 revenue from private and corporate donations, bequests and memberships for a total of, as compared to government grants which totalled 33\% (22,528,000) (“Art Gallery of Ontario”). Currently, the Gallery has three corporate Signature Partners: AIMIA, American Express, and RBC. Although exact amounts are confidential, Signature Partners typically make multi-year commitments in the six-figure range.
commodified by economic relations (5). As examples, Illouz lists the ways that: the internet is managing our emotional identities and relationships; psychology and self-help are recruited to produce corporate personhood; and discourses geared towards the "management of self" are dissolving boundaries between the supposed public and emotional private spheres. Thrift gives other examples of the ways that affect is increasingly employed for political ends. He mentions the “mediatisation” of politics (which relies largely on the performance of emotion); the engineering of urban spaces to produce affective (and consequently political) responses; and the infiltration of the body’s previously inaccessible bodily registers through, for instance, biomedical technologies (65-67). Instead of applying overt means of discipline, neoliberal multiculturalism relies on Thrift’s “regimes of feeling” (68) to coordinate bodies through the recourse to compensation, pleasure and affective suture.

Another crucial element to consider here is the way in which neoliberalism relies on the careful coordination of affective relations in order to conceal its own logic of profiteering and exploitation. Elisabeth R. Anker provides the example of how melodrama, as the formalistic mode and rationale in much contemporary political discourse, is utilized to reinforce state violence. Melodrama and its overwhelming affect, she argues, allow for public feelings of discontent and unfreedom to be channelled into moral rectitude and justifications for the state’s quest for power. There seems initially to be an unconciliated gap between, on the one hand, the extreme rationality of technological culture and the alienation produced through advanced global capitalism, and on the other, the affective potency through which this society is lubricated and operates. Upon closer scrutiny, however, it is possible to see that neoliberalism offers intensities of sensation within conscripted zones of consumption and “communion” in order to help subjects alleviate the bad affects it begets in the first place (disaffection, subjection, atomization, precarity, etc.). This reflects
Nikolas Rose’s vivisection of the role of governing in advanced liberal societies, and its reliance on therapeutic technologies (Governing; Powers). He writes, “to govern is to cut experience in certain ways, to distribute attractions and repulsions, passions and fears across it, to bring new facets and forces, new intensities and relations into being” (Powers 31). The therapeutic management—or “care”—of the soul plays out through the management of consumption practices. Other critics have also postulated that market-driven humanistic appeals to the soul (Flew) and discourses of freedom or “the good life,” (Miller, Cultural 7) are the expedient lubricants of a neoliberal logic organized around consumption and rationalized desire. In a related manner, Teresa Brennan illuminates the fundamental relationship between the foundational fantasy and capitalist consumption. She writes that the ego’s belief in itself as the origin of agency and meaning leads to a subject-object split (Exhausting). This belief that we are separate from the natural world in turn results in the commodification and exploitation of nature—like Marx’s exploited labour—for our own gratification (98). We can also see a similar logic at work in the “new” Creative Cities, which are playgrounds of consumption peddled through evangelisms about self-actualization, “organic” communities and “authentic” experience (Florida, Rise). The fantasy of the “good life” and its ill-fated pursuit—which Lauren Berlant terms cruel optimism—effectively dissimulates various socio-economic and political inequalities produced through neoliberalism. Similarly, Evans and Reid argue that a growing discourse around resilience has worked to normalize the anxiety, insecurity, and trauma which have become the inescapable mode of experience in neoliberal societies (92). While naturalizing the new normal of permanent insecurity, resilience is also peddled as a positive, enriching element that will enable individuals “to demonstrate their capacities to live with danger” (2). These arguments indicate the multifold ways that the neoliberal
administration of affect induces compliant consumers, proficient workers and steadfast subjects, through the oftentimes depthless vigours directed at the level of the somatic.

2.3 Technologies of Immersion

Following an attempt at an affective genealogy of postcolonial subjectivity, I now turn to the museum, an acute microcosm of multiculturalism’s representational technologies, and where many of the narratives discussed in the preceding passages are brought to bear directly upon the body. More than just an architectural frame, the museum is also a technology that generates a host of seductions that cohere or detach us from other bodies and ideological structures located “beyond” the body. My focus here is on how abstract notions of belonging are translated through technologies of immersion and the materiality of affect.

According to Susan Stewart, an important element of the “structure of desire” is its yearning to materialize a certain vision of the world. She goes on to argue, “we can see the many narratives that dream of the inanimate-made-animate as symptomatic of all narrative’s desire to invent a realizable world, a world which ‘works’” (Longing xii). The museum is one such example of the narrative of nation made lushly manifest, and of nostalgic yearning channelled into productive compensation. David Preziosi writes that the national museum is grounded on an “inherently mythological structure”—which he terms the facticity of fictions (“Myths” 59)—wherein artifacts are staged to construct and, in essence, to prove the mythological “identity, mentality, spirit, soul or style of a nation or people” (62). Carol Duncan and Alan Wallach’s examination of the universal survey museum—defined as the large municipal or national museums or public galleries devoted to the triumphal display of “monumental art through the ages” (451)—puts forth a corresponding argument that the role of such “ceremonial monuments” is to give flesh to the elusive idea of the
state. According to Duncan and Wallach, the museum acts as that hegemonic “site of symbolic transaction” in the enactment of citizenship; it inserts itself as intermediary in the state’s offer of “spiritual wealth” in exchange for which the visitor must pledge their affective attachment to the state (457). The “fleshness” of the narrative (nation made animate) within universal survey museums serves not merely a descriptive function in the flagrant display of state authority (equated with Western civilization); the materialized power of the state also performatively enacts the very rites of affective citizenship which go on to galvanize and bolster the national narrative.

On the topic of materiality, the substantiation of the body—or lack thereof—within the museum has always been a more fraught matter. Most art historical, political economic or ideological examinations of museums stop short of naming the body in their accounts. Museums themselves have traditionally evaded the body as well, or else given it consideration solely as something to be constrained and disciplined. The disciplinary measures consolidated around the faculties of the body include, most notably: the ways that visitors are guided through the museum and told what/how to touch, what not to touch, when to speak, when to be silent, where/how to look, which paths to tread, how far of a distance to maintain between self and object, etc. The dilemma of corporality is one that Jeffrey David Feldman takes up in his examination of the “lost body problem.” He argues that it is through the consideration of the multi-sensorial body, and most significantly, its erasure through the museum’s emphatically visual regimes, that we can begin to address colonial histories. Taking up Mary Louise Pratt’s and James Clifford’s deployments of the contact zone as generative postcolonial topography, Feldman points to the difference between the latter and what he terms contact points. He argues that while the contact zone more often functions as social metaphor that deemphasizes embodiment, contact points are the “sensual products of unequal encounter that materialize in the contact zone” (247). Turning our attentions to contact
points, Feldman argues, would allow us to not only accommodate the “sensory complexity” (247) of wide-ranging, polyphonic histories, but also properly acknowledge histories of colonial and genocidal violence which have so often targeted (the elimination of) the body.

While Feldman is primarily interested in corporality as recorded—and elided—in the objects on display, my interest is with the form of tactile contact that he surprisingly does not attend to: the direct collisions between visitor and display. While such contact is increasingly ubiquitous in museums today, the obstacles inherent in our colonial inheritances have not been resolved by the tamping down of visual regimes. The body can just as easily be guided towards “proper” edicts of empathy and recognition, as it is towards displacement, denial and the perpetuation of violence. Further, while it is tempting to think that inclusions of corporal within museological encounters aim to accommodate the bodily experiences of those who have been objects of historical colonial violence, I argue that such crafted sensorial entreaties often cater to and centre upon the visitor’s own quest for entertainment and seduction.

The museum serves as a landscape upon which the body of the visitor comes explicitly into contact with social and political structures of power that have been translated into tangible, apprehensible forms via material archives. As both terrain and technology, the museum allows us to consider how subjects are produced in, and move through, that fraught space between the crush of hegemonic frameworks and the potential for agentive movement. Museums are also compelling because they are potential sites of aporia, wherein bodies weave counter or shadow scripts through official narratives. The museums’ capacities to enact both subjects’ subjugations to as well as negotiations of power brings to mind Chandra P. Mohanty’s investment in a “politics of engagement” over a “politics of transcendence” (469). The former, by stressing (self-)location as the conduit that “forces and enables specific modes of reading and knowing the dominant” (469),
offers an understanding of the body in relation to the hegemonic discourses within which it is necessarily entangled, but nevertheless can haphazardly manoeuvre.

Stephen Greenblatt organizes the museum’s aesthetic appeals into two principal, and sometimes overlapping, categories of *resonance* and *wonder*, where the former is said to evoke social and cultural contexts beyond the exhibit/museum “to a larger world” (42), while the latter hinges more on the mystery and power generated through the charismatic object and modes of “intense…enchanted looking” (49). Beyond this model, it is also possible to identify other ways in which affective experiences are roused and/or choreographed within the museum. When we enter a museological space, we perhaps unwittingly carry with us various urges: to find our place in and be guided through weighty, grand narratives; to be enclosed and sheltered by a surround; to be sensorially, limbically extended; to be edified, uplifted, touched or moved; to commune. One of the most significant functions of the museum is that it serves as a public theatre for the coordination and rehearsal of private feelings, whether this be trauma, love, curiosity, empathy, fascination, indifference, aversion, etc. Tony Bennett also traces the function of the museum in the management and regulation of “public manners” (*Birth* 99). Within its walls, visitors are encouraged to perform rituals which confirm our relationship to the state (Duncan and Wallach), and which often involve the public enactment of certain emotional trials with other members of the imagined community. The circulation and coordination of affective economies within the grounds of the institution—or the public orchestration of *feeling together*—might also work to recuperate the state from colonial attribution, which the museum does by circumscribing the very parameters within which historical traumas can be encountered and officially mourned, denounced and erased, or else veiled through aesthetic-symbolic diversions.
We can further explore how certain kinds of museological “contact” are engineered such that some bodies are forced to come up against others within predetermined parameters, and how these collisions can act as a kind of disciplining of subjectivities. It is the supposed “public”-ness of the museum that makes it an especially apt landscape for the training of national subjects. Colin Mooers, following Nancy Fraser, points out that the tyranny of the public sphere, especially under Canadian state multiculturalism, hinges on its imposition of an “abstract generality”—determined by hegemonic categories of gender, race and class—while simultaneously partaking in celebrations of fetishized “difference” (11-12). The disciplinary aspect of public spheres in fact goes back to the Western museum’s ancestor, the Greek agora, an idealized communal gathering place which was in fact very much dictated by the spoken and unspoken rules of bodily behaviour and comportment (Sennett). Many Canadian state museums are also structured around the heralded notion of multicultural inclusion, which can in itself a disciplinary strategy seeking to incorporate others into the hegemonic text for purposes of compensation as well as surveillance. It can be argued that incorporation depends on a Foucauldian logic of positive power whereby otherness, rather than hidden or suppressed, is superintended by its circulation through necessarily public discursive channels.

It is also through the museum that the colonial project of nation-building passes into a material, and in some cases virtual, archive that becomes a sensuous interface which visitors/citizens/citizens-in-the-making are encouraged to extend their limbs into and to press their bodies up against. Museums, in this sense, instruct us about modes of belonging through both symbolic and material registers. Here, Anderson’s imagined community of nation as well as Said’s imaginative geography of empire—both variations of the same “structure of desire”—become
brick-and-mortar, flesh-and-bone *things*. Such material archives deserve theoretical attention because, as Stoler (“Imperial”) argues, imperial formations persist in their material “debris,”

This is not a turn to ruins as memorialized and large-scale monumental “leftovers” or relics—although these come into our purview as well—but rather to what people are “left with”: to what remains, to the aftershocks of empire, to the material and social afterlife of structures, sensibilities, and things. (194)

In the museum, colonial “afterlife” is transformed into tangible things that are preserved, surveyed, read, scanned, heard and held. Focusing on the archive does not entail nostalgic and elegiac returns to a haunting but ultimately bloodless past; it is instead a recognition that (neo)colonial discourses continue to be naturalized as well as (re)invigorated. Museological encounters begin to tell us of the manifold ways that bodies come up against other inanimate bodies, and the impressions that these “bodily others” leave upon the skin. Such considerations are necessary in further explorations into how, through affect, subjectivities are shaped (constructed, trained, disciplined), and nations imagined.

The transformation of the archive can be seen as facilitated by a host of material and immaterial technologies. A Foucauldian approach allows us to conceive of technology as *technique*, comprising not just objects, but rationalized knowledge, practices and activities. Within a Canadian historical context, R. Douglas Francis offers us the thesis of technology as *imperative*, arguing that technology has been seen as an inevitably dominating influence not just in the settling and taming of the land, but in fundamentally moulding Canadian identity either for the better or worse. Broadly surmised, technology is both the *content* of nation, as well as its *medium* of transfer—or, in other words, the channel through which ideational and material manifestations of national belonging circulate and congeal. In the museum, technology is embroiled in extenuating
webs of power, continuing to play an essential role in the ways that Canadians imagine the nation, themselves, as well as others. However, rather than binding physical space, its museological function can perhaps be seen as focusing on overcoming cognitive (and affective) dissonances.

2.3.1 Interactivity and Immersion

While deeply enmeshed, interactivity and immersion are not identical. Alison Griffiths defines the interactive as any “activity that extends an invitation to the spectator to insert their bodies or minds into the activity and affect an outcome via the...experience” (Shivers 3). This elucidation gets to the idea that interactive texts, in the most generous sense, are conceived as relatively open and flexible; they invite the audience to make direct contact, and to do so as creative agents (“users”) rather than merely passive receivers. An interactive text is heralded as a considerably hospitable text which calls for participation, although participation can take diverse forms. For example, Margaret Morse usefully distinguishes between “cognitive” versus “corporeal” participation, describing the latter as involving bodily actions like “touching, moving, speaking, gesturing” (19). Andrea Witcomb also discerns between physical and conceptual interactivity in museums, including daydreaming and empathy in the latter category (131). Interactive texts ultimately present narrative time and/or space as navigable, while endowing the audience with the ability to locate herself as subject within its fold.

Whereas interactivity might “surface” the user’s body by confirming its agency to navigate a text, immersion makes it more likely that this same body might become submerged or engulfed. For Oliver Grau, immersion is characterized by a sense of totality, where the text becomes a 360 degree “space of illusion” that enfolds the viewer and collapses the gulf between viewer and work (Grau, Virtual 13). Because it encourages intense affective involvement and the capability of its
audience to “surrender” to the diegesis, immersion is often criticized for supposedly dampening the audience’s critical faculties (Grau, Virtual 3). Marie-Laure Ryan, however, argues that this can be too pat of a summation, and that immersion can actually demand deep, imaginative engagements with a text (15). With both interactive and immersive works, space is expanded and the frame between audience and work diffuses such that there is—at least an illusion of—a more “direct” or transparent relationality between the two. More than extending space, immersive more so then interactive texts also create mimetic worlds into which the audience can be transported (Grau, Virtual; M. Ryan). Grau aptly likens the simulated cosmos generated through new media to William Gibson’s description of cybernetic space as a matrix of “collective hallucination” (Virtual 16). It is this mimetic capacity, or the “maximization of realism” (14), that achieves the sense of presence. Whereas interactivity places an emphasis on the audience’s ability to alter the text, immersion gives the illusion that one is in fact placing their body directly within the text.

One could indeed argue that all technologies are in a sense interactive and, equally, that all have the potential to be immersive. If this is true, what distinguishes the technologies I focus on here? The meticulous histories of interactive and immersive art forms presented by Grau and Griffiths trace these back to scopic technologies like medieval cathedrals, Renaissance landscape murals, and nineteenth-century panoramas.23 Even if we restrict ourselves to its uses within the modern museum, immersion also has a considerably longer history than the one I present in this study.24 Suffice it to say, I am not attempting to trace a comprehensive genealogy here, although I situate the technologies of immersion within a specific context of multicultural or post-colonial

---

23 For more on the long and fascinating history of interactive and immersive forms in Western art, see Grau, “Into”; Grau, Virtual; Griffiths, Shivers; Griffiths, “Wonder.”
24 Fred Turner’s The Democratic Surround, for example, examines immersive “multi-image, multi-sound-source media environments” (3) in American museums during the 1940s and 1950s—including Edward Steichen’s Family of Man exhibit—which emerged out of collaborations between exiled Bauhaus artists and the Committee for National Morale, whose members most famously included Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson and Gordon Allport.
museum reform. The technologies that fall into my purview are those specifically employed in Canadian exhibit paradigms since the late 1960s, and done so in the interest of moving beyond Enlightenment models of distantiated, rational looking to instead compel the visitor to draw closer—even in some cases to enter—the exhibit. While mindful of Grau’s and Griffiths’s histories, I want to argue that the more recent incorporations of these technologies within museum spaces deserve attention, for the fact that such deployments often work to strategically signal the turn towards museological mandates that are inclusive, multicultural, and in a word: postcolonial. I am moreover less interested in the didactic purposes of interactive and immersive strategies than in their in/capacities to generate affect. Related to this is the notion that while these techniques are far from new—for the fetish of newness itself is the reproduction a neoliberal logic—they significantly engender the experience of newness and novelty. For what else signals change/reform in our highly experiential regime more expediently than the false promises of incessant novelty?

These technologies upon which I focus often exploit multisensory engagement to intimate the user/subject's ability to be an active participant in the construction of the museological text, and really: the national narrative. Further, these technologies often do their work through affective registers, where instead of the cold detachment of other forms of spectatorship, visitors are encouraged to feel, to be moved, to even "surrender" to the museological scene. Such apparatuses invite subjects to submerge themselves through technologically enhanced orifices, within the national archive through which one is seduced by: the sublimity of nation, the promise of communion, and the technological extensions of one's own limbs through the assemblage of archive with skin.

Interactive and immersive forms manifest ideals about democratic participatory citizenship predicated on the conviction that the text is open, mouldable, and ultimately, hospitable. Hospitality
applies to the manners in which the viewer is no longer kept without, but instead summoned within the text, often through deliberately widened technological apertures. Griffiths offers the example of how the 19th century panorama brought audiences right into the centre of the landscape (Shivers 39). This deliberate grafting of perspective within the representational plane—essentially the axial positioning of the audience’s body—presents space as penetrable and democratic. This is accomplished through the manufacture of a virtual space “that stretches in imagination far beyond the confines of the canvas” (M. Ryan 3), wherein the somatic pleasures of mobility and embodied looking are made possible. Hospitality can also indicate the reformatory considerations of ways to include subjects traditionally marginalized by museums. This idea is echoed in James Clifford's application of Mary Louise Pratt's contact zone to the museum, where the concept refers to inclusionist, collaborative paradigms that extend and distribute authority to community stakeholders (Routes). Indeed, interactive models accord with new museological attempts to move away from the alienating “single, linear narrative” of traditional museums by allowing audiences to carve out their own individual paths (Witcomb 128). This gives us a clearer sense of the pragmatic and symbolic applications of immersion and interactivity with regards to citizenship and belonging. Interactive technologies grant a formalistic and aesthetic impression of civic engagement, albeit in the circumscribed context of the museum. They append and reform the archive, announce its flexibility and mouldability, and beckon the user to be co-creators of a previously invulnerable text.

As expected, the promise of agency and nonhierarchy through direct participation is less straightforward than it would seem. Aside from the understandable charges laid by those who see so-called participatory strategies as ploys to allow museums to compete with mass entertainment
forms (Stickler; Hughes), it is moreover difficult to separate immersion from its contemporary but also historical entanglements with more problematic forms of consumption. The phantasmagoric lure of the 19th century Parisian arcades, which Walter Benjamin scrutinized at the dawn of the age of mass consumption, finds itself almost thoroughly replicated in Richard Florida’s enthused ennoblement of the “experiential life” of the global Creative City. The latter, replete with “scene of scenes” (Rise 183) and “street-level smorgasbord” (184) enough to captivate the 21st century Creative Citizen, offers the familiar spectacle of consumption, though with the fetish of the apparitional commodity form transposed into Creative City rhapsodies about the “organic” community. In this regard, we might argue that advanced capitalism strategically extends models of embodiment as curative to a perceived era of disembodiment and disenchantment, proffering yet another anaesthetizing—and ultimately superficial—fix to distract us all.

Marie-Laure Ryan writes of interactivity as that which "transposes the ideal of an endlessly self-renewable text from the level of the signified to the level of the signifier" (5). This definition is significant because it provides a distinction between a general conception of interactivity as incidental byproduct, and a more narrowly delineated idea of interactivity as a programmed mode of reception. This leads to another critique of interactivity, especially incarnated in new media formats, as manipulative and “totalitarian” (Manovitch). For Lev Manovitch, classical and modern art always already invited interactive engagement; by deterministically presenting its audience with preprogrammed informational paths in the form of (hyper)links, new media forms paradoxically objectify the “processes of filling-in, hypothesis forming, recall and identification” that we would otherwise be able to work out for ourselves (n.p.). In a related sense, immersive media can also be

25 See H. Jenkins (“Convergence”; “Quentin”) on the tensioned overlaps between emergent participatory cultures and the corporate interests surrounding issues of media convergence.
seen to impose a tyranny of the total view, which engulfs the audience and extinguishes possibilities for contingent readings. We might relate this to the fact that the technologies and exhibits relayed in this study all create proxy aesthetic, sensual/sensate nation-scapes within which the audience (citizen) is located and guided through. In these proxy landscapes, we are more likely to witness the everyday, banal, bodily consolidations of nation through the technological apparatus’s inducement and administration of bodily sensoria. Put another way, it is cultural citizenship wrought through technologies of immersion.
Chapter 3

*He Named her Amber at the Grange Manor*

When the Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO) reopened its doors in 2008 after a highly touted expansion and renovation project (Transformation AGO), visitors to the gallery were given a chance to partake in tours through the Grange, the historic manor attached to the rear of the main gallery and once the home of the original AGO in the mid-1800s. Here, they were told the captivating tale of Mary O’Shea, a young Irish immigrant who worked as a scullery maid at the Grange household when she arrived in Canada sometime in the 1820s. Visitors were then invited to witness the rather extraordinary archaeological excavation of the Grange for mysterious waxen objects believed to have been both handcrafted and then surreptitiously hidden by Mary throughout the property, usually behind walls, or underneath floorboards. Descending into the Grange’s cavernous basement and led through the kitchen, cold cellar, and other shadowed pockets of the manor otherwise obscured from public view, visitors were shown objects ranging in size from small marbled-sized globules of rolled up wax (fig. 1), to a large arm-length conical structure formed through wax being poured into a hole dug deep in the earth. Even more curious was the fact that Mary’s objects all contained within them peculiar fragments such as the limbs of porcelain dolls, baby teeth, animal bones, as well as bits of hair, nails, and blood believed to have been Mary’s. Visitors were left to puzzle over who this beguiling Mary O’Shea was. What was the tenor of life she left behind in Ireland? What great tragedy prompted her mysterious and compulsive productions? At the very end of the tour, tiny slips of paper were distributed by the docents; only if the unsuspecting visitors read through a lengthy treatise on the excavation would they have then
finally come across the quiet disclosure that the entire thing was in fact a carefully choreographed fiction, conceived of and manifested by artist Iris Häussler, under the auspices of the AGO.


Commissioned for the occasion of the AGO’s post-renovation opening, Häussler’s installation, *He Named Her Amber*, puts into sharp relief the key problems of multiculturalism that I will explore: namely, the subsumption of otherness and compensatory symbolic archival inclusions. Beginning the thesis with this work highlights, from the start, issues of gender, race, class at play within discourses of neoliberal multiculturalism. This chapter argues that official
multiculturalism, with its attendant discourses of diversity, inclusion and recognition, often obfuscates the complicities between settler colonialism and newer forms of neoliberal power. I investigate the ways in which settler colonialism is rebranded through Creative City neologisms, with the latter’s focus on creative economies, the “health” of cities and citizens casting an appealing veneer over the former. Settler colonialism and Creative City discourses are both fundamentally economies of elision which construct colonial narratives that advance neoliberal development. Settler belonging depends equally on centuries-long processes of Indigenous dispossession and the denial of inconvenient histories; in a kindred way, Creative City discourses enact the erasure of vulnerable bodies and precariat labours which sustain creative economies.

Häussler’s immersive installation, located precisely at the crossroads of settler coloniality and Creative City discourses, proves especially pertinent in this discussion; from it, questions inevitably arise regarding exactly which bodies are allowed to settle, to make home, and to be accommodated within a settler nation. While *Amber* brings to light an element of what Sigfried Giedion refers to as “anonymous history” by turning its gaze upon the experience of an Irish scullery maid in the mid-nineteenth century, it also reenacts another kind of erasure: that of the history of the displaced Mississauga peoples who once inhabited the land on which the Grange was constructed. By summoning its audience to enter into an interactive archive set within the Grange, a living museum located in the heart of the city’s colonial imaginary, the installation invites these subjects to make themselves *at home* in the symbolically-laden domestic theatre, and in doing so, participate in the continuing tending-to and settlement of nation. *Amber* also offers a compelling

26 For more on Indigenous dispossession and elision under settler colonialism, refer especially to Patrick Wolfe’s *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology* (1999), Veracini’s *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (2010), and Scott Lauria Morgensen’s *Spaces Between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization* (2011).
example of how cultural citizenship plays out upon the body. As James Clifford argues, imagined communities “require constant, often violent, maintenance” (*Routes* 9). In their way, visitors contribute to the “maintenance” of nation by partaking in the installation’s participatory paradigm, which asks them to weave themselves through the historical narrative, solve the mystery of the other, and in effect, piece together a topography of nation. The installation’s employment of interactivity and immersion is therefore revealing of how certain creative labours are privileged over others, and how some bodies’ territorial occupancies are legitimated over others.

The first portion of the chapter, 3.1, briefly sets up the historical context of the Grange Manor, and the role it plays in the present day Art Gallery of Ontario. The narrative link here is highlighted not merely for the purpose of establishing an historical chronology, but in order to draw attention to the ways in which the newly “transformed” AGO still draws upon the auratic reservoir of the city’s colonial history, which itself undergoes a renascence through commemorative Creative City discourses. Following this, 3.2 extends the previous link between the historic Grange and the contemporary AGO to ideas of cultural citizenship in the contemporary Creative City. This section examines domestication as a technology of citizenship, arguing that both settler colonial and Creative City forms of accommodation are sustained through the dispossession and erasure of marginalised subjects. Here, the current exploitation of precarious work/workers is also placed into context with enduring forms of settler coloniality. This backdrop provides the context through which we can interrogate the ways that Häussler's installation sets the body in the *mise-en-scene* of home or nation. The chapter concludes by looking at how some of the theoretical concerns hatched earlier in the chapter play out "on the ground" and upon the body of the audience member as she weaves herself through its haptic narrative. 3.3 explores the installation's methods of seduction through the bodily and affective trials of citizenship, and argues that the installation
functions as a performative archive whose disciplinary mechanisms work to invite some bodies into a collective imaginary, while keeping others out.

It bears mentioning that this chapter is not an indictment of artistic intentions, but rather a critical examination of the problematic discourses mobilized in and through the installation narrative. The crux of this argument rests on the notion that, while Häussler’s brilliant ploy can perhaps be read as contributing a critical, self-reflexive lens to the politics of representation, this possibility is considerably dampened by the fact that large portions of its audience walk away oblivious to the artist’s reveal. Without this denouement, the installation is taken solely at the level of authoritative museological truth, and in this way reinscribes a problematic settler script, and its fetishization of marginal bodies on display. Further, the Amber narrative is one ultimately riveted on the working classes’ struggles of arrival, making home, and the promise of the new land. Even with a “reveal,” the installation’s identification with the experience of the new immigrant, taken alongside its silence on Aboriginal history, reveals a taken-for-granted settler perspective that requires interrogation.

3.1 The Grange Manor

The significance of the Grange as historical locus can firstly be explored through the central figure of home in the national imaginary. In Erin Manning’s description of the correlation between home and nation, she writes that "the home provides not only a tangible example of how we perpetuate the vocabulary of the nation in our daily utterances, it offers also a visceral instance of our desire for attachment and belonging" (Ephemeral xvii). For her, home becomes "an extension of the nation" (xvii). In popular manifestations, the very idea of homeland, in emphasizing the centrality of home as trope in our national imaginary, speaks to the gravitational force of territory.
which supposedly structures our very acts of imagining. That many fantasies of nation are based on its intimate correlation with home fails to account for how both nation and home are simultaneously the seat of our allegiances as well as alienations. Looking at this through the lens of gender and postcolonialism, for example, critics have offered convincing arguments about the falsities of the supposedly hospitable multicultural nation, and the many ways that home and nation often serve as sites of violence, oppression, and alienation.27

This chapter, which takes the home as its departure point, is not grounded in the desire to establish or fetishize the domestic lens and an origin story, so much as to make transparent the lens that already exists. Starting this thesis “at home” in the Grange allows us to highlight and interrogate the architectural framework and rhetorical locus from which much of our imagined belongings seemingly emanate. The setting of home also allows us to investigate colonial power through the intimate, which Ann Laura Stoler describes as “relations affectively charged, both tender and taut, of certain kinds of proximities grounded in uneasy attachments, encumbering affections, and abrupt departures” (Carnal xxii). Looking critically from and at home also brings to light multiculturalism’s deep-seated contradictions and anxieties, particularly manifested in Häussler’s exhibit as the unheimlich of home (Bowlby) and the unhomely spectres which ground our understandings of settler colonial belonging. Settling, in this sense, must also be examined in parallel to feelings of unsettledness, or the corollary sense of something “other” about the spaces we inhabit and histories we inherit. Ashok Mathur’s notion of the “geographic palimpsest” usefully acknowledges that settler landscapes, far from the fiction of terra nullius, are deeply imprinted with the historical “tracings and markings that, however obscured or willfully ignored, can never be erased” (3). Even—and perhaps especially—commemorative heritage landscapes which extol

27 See Bannerji; Thobani; Gunew, Haunted.
official colonial chronologies continue to be haunted by such resonant spectres and repressed histories. The fascination with the figure of the hidden and uncovered body in the *Amber* narrative alludes in many ways to even more troubling “unearthings” of colonial history, including the discovery (by non-Indigenous) of ancient and/or sacred Indigenous sites around the Greater Toronto Area in just the last two decades. These sites include: the Moatfield ossuary, Staines Road ossuary, Teston Road ossuary, Tabor Hill, Baby Point, among others. Significantly, such discoveries often happen during large-scale development projects (Linden 134).

Regarding the matter of suppressed and/or repressed histories, we need look no further than the displacement of the Mississauga peoples who used to inhabit the land upon which the Grange now sits. The Toronto Purchase of 1787, negotiated between the Crown and the Mississaugas, saw the transfer of Mississauga land along the north shore of Lake Ontario to the Crown in exchange for 1,700 pounds in cash and goods (Benn 59). The Purchase is mired by many controversies, namely surrounding complaints by the Mississauga of ambiguous terms, and false promises by the British (L. Johnson 234). Historians point out that the Mississauga felt pressured to the land cessions for a number of reasons. Expanding European settlement, the felling of surrounding forests and subsequent dwindling of game made it increasingly impossible for the Mississauga to live off the land (Benn 59). This coincided with the successful strategy of the British to encourage Mississauga dependence on European trade goods (D. Smith; L. Johnson). Compared to the Iroquois, who had occupied the region before the Mississauga migrated to southern Ontario from the Canadian Shield around 1700 (Benn 53), the latter were a dispersed, relatively small

---

28 As Victoria Freeman notes, the Indigenous history of Toronto is highly complex and politically contentious. Recent archeological evidence illustrate that Indigenous groups’ presence in this region reaches back thousands of years. Closer to the Mississaugas’ migration south from the Canadian Shield in the early eighteenth century (Benn 53), the area was home to the Haudenosaunee (Six Nations Iroquois) and Wendats (Hurons), who had left the region before the founding of York. For more on this history, refer to Freeman; D. Smith; Benn; L. Johnson; Surtees.
population lacking central organization (D. Smith 71-2). As we will also see in Chapter 6 with the signing of Treaty 7, the Crown’s ability to spur these surrenders hinged significantly on the Indigenous tribes’ misunderstandings of European terms of land ownership (D. Smith; Synderman). The Toronto Purchase was declared invalid in 1794, but later reconfirmed in a treaty of 1805. A number of land cessions followed from the Toronto Purchase, with the Mississauga growing increasingly disillusioned by relations with the settlers. By the early decades of the nineteenth century, the Mississauga population had radically declined due to contagious disease (Riendeau 127). They were relocated to Credit River in the 1820s, and then finally driven out of the Toronto region altogether in 1847, when they were relegated to a small portion of the Grand River Reserve. Victoria Freeman brings attention to the disavowal of Indigenous presence in most settler accounts of Toronto’s history. She argues that, when it comes to presenting histories of the city’s founding, historians in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries systematically disregarded the relevance of the British settlement of the region in 1793, instead focusing on 1834’s Act of Incorporation and its establishment of the City of Toronto as the City’s real entrance into modernity (Freeman 28). For Freeman, this exculpatory inscription of the 1834 Incorporation as the City’s “founding moment” effectively erases Indigenous history, reframes the forced displacement of the Mississaugas as a “natural and inevitable phenomenon” (24), and thus naturalizes the settler’s “native” claim to this land and history.

Unsurprisingly, this historical amnesia to which Freeman refers is also reflected in the written histories of the Grange. The presence of the Mississauga upon this land mere decades before the Grange was built is all but absent from official accounts of the manor, which focus on the Boulton family’s acquisition of the property, and the subsequent construction of the manor. As a physical site, the Grange is granted historical significance. Built in 1818, it is heralded as Toronto's
oldest brick residence and in 1970, declared a National Historic Site of Canada (Rieger 71), a designation that speaks to how the manor stands as an architectural relic of the region’s earliest British settlers. Popular historian John Goddard argues perhaps too wistfully that, more than any other heritage house museum in Toronto, the Grange evokes the period when the city was presided over by “a tiny, colonial elite connected by blood and marriage” (104). The track of forested land upon which the Grange now sits was once part of a sprawling one-hundred acres granted by Governor Simcoe in 1798 to Solicitor General Robert I. D. Gray, then the recently appointed solicitor general of Upper Canada. Crown grants had been offered as *douceurs* to government officials as part of a plan devised by Simcoe to establish the fledgling capital of Upper Canada and entice settlement on this “virgin land” (Firth 132). These Park Lots were located along a stretch just north of what is now Queen Street (then Lot Street). When Gray died aboard the *Speedy*, a boat which sank in Lake Ontario in 1804 (132), his many accrued debts eventuated in the sale of his undeveloped Park Lot Thirteen by his executor to D’Arcy Boulton Jr. Like many of the elite families in Upper Canada at this time, the Boultons played a prominent role in the Family Compact, a local colonial aristocracy comprised mainly of the professional classes and top British administrators who clung obstinately to British values and standards (Gray 17). Boulton Jr.’s father, D’Arcy Boulton Sr., was York’s new solicitor general, and among the city’s first wave of settlers, propelled from the States to the Township of York by his allegiance to the Loyalist cause, as well as the promise of land and an eventual position as solicitor-general. In 1802, Boulton Sr. had petitioned for Crown land and was granted the maximum allowed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council: two hundred acres for himself and, additionally, two hundred acres for each of his five children (Lownsbourough 25). This wealth allowed D’Arcy Boulton Jr., years later, to acquire Gray’s property upon which he erected the Grange.
When D'Arcy Boulton Jr., a lawyer and merchant with a budding interest in architecture, purchased Robert I. D. Gray's one-hundred acre property for £350 in 1808 (Gray 17), he set his sights on building a home there for him and his new wife, Sarah Anne Robinson.\(^{29}\) Construction began immediately after purchase, and a decade later, the Grange stood in completion, its grand Neo-Georgian style the aesthetic manifestation of the Boultons' devotion to British culture and values. It was not until the early years of the twentieth century that the Grange property was bequeathed by Harriette Mann Dixon—the wife of William Henry, eldest surviving son of D'Arcy Jr—for the establishment of the Art Museum of Toronto, which was to be the city's first gallery (Gray 57). Dixon was convinced to do so by Edmund Walker, a man who played a pivotal role in establishing other venerable cultural institutions in Toronto and Ottawa, including the National Gallery of Canada, the Royal Ontario Museum, and the Mendelssohn Choice, among others (Gray 59). In 1911, six acres of land and the Grange houses were officially deeded by Harriette Dixon's executors to the Art Museum of Toronto (Lownsbrough 142), and in 1966, the museum was renamed the Art Gallery of Ontario. In this way, the venerated colonial homestead was transformed into an elite provincial institution tasked with bequeathing art and cultural heritage to its public.

The AGO underwent numerous expansions and renovations throughout the twentieth century. In 1967 the Volunteer Committee of the AGO spearheaded the Grange’s restoration and in 1973 it opened as a living museum (Litvak 1). From 2005-2008, the gallery underwent its largest change yet. Transformation AGO was a major expansion and revitalization project which cost $276 million.\(^{30}\) The Transformation expanded the gallery space by twenty percent, with 190,000 square

\(^{29}\) The Robinsons were also one of the most prominent loyalist families in Ontario (Lownsbrough 43).

\(^{30}\) Transformation AGO actually lasted close to a decade, with initial plans spearheaded in 2000 by then gallery director and CEO Matthew Teitelbaum, business mogul and donor Kenneth Thomson and architect Frank Gehry (“Transformation”). The “transformed” gallery opened its doors to the public in November of 2008.
feet of space renovated, and 97,000 square feet of new space added. Transformation AGO also ambitiously branded itself as a curatorial overhaul, promising to offer the public “new art, new building, new future, new ideas” (“Transformation”). One example of this overhaul is the reinstallation of the gallery’s Canadian Wing, which underwent a massive rehang under the direction of Curator of Canadian Art Gerald McMaster, who promulgated the AGO’s new interest in decentering established colonial narratives of history and truth (McMaster, “Art”). McMaster has described this postcolonial approach as cracking open the two-hundred-and-fifty-year container of “official” Canadian history traditionally confined to Confederation and Cartier (McMaster, “Our”).

During Transformation AGO, which saw much of the older gallery modified or radically reconstructed by architect Frank Gehry, only the structure of the Grange manor remained unaltered. Gehry’s renovated facade spans the front of the building along Dundas Street, a gleaming glass membrane buttressed by a timber skeleton that covers over the AGO’s older cement structure. The rear of the gallery is clad in a blue titanium and glass carapace; here, overlooking Grange Park, the once grand manor sits modestly framed by Gehry’s towering structure ahead. This postmodern framing of colonial history divulges colonial continuity and containment. Today, the Grange remains the architectural and symbolic relic of not only the gallery’s founding, but also the city’s settlement. This solemnization of colonial genealogy simultaneously disclaims the preceding histories of the land, and the Mississauga peoples who inhabited it before the arrival of the British.

31 One specific example of the expansion of curatorial vision is the addition of the projectile points exhibit in *A Thousand Points for a Thousand Generations*, located in the Ancient Memory gallery at the front of the Canadian wing. The inclusion of these “ancient” artifacts is a recognition of Indigenous ancestors and heritage; arguably however, it also allows the colonial narrative’s ambit to muscularly unfurl beyond its previous container and lay claim—as the gallery boasts—on an expanded chronology of eleven thousand years (McMaster, “Art”).
The facts of Indigenous presence on—and eventual dispossession of—the land become, at best, peripheral shadows muted by more clamorous official histories.

In order to better understand the spectral trails of colonial narratives and the histories they continue to subsume, it is necessary to think about the present discourses and modes of power that allow these colonial "spectres" to continue to linger and circulate. Particularly useful in this consideration is the issue of how habituated colonial spectres still resonate within Creative City policies and paradigms and, specifically, how the Grange's historical ambience is rejuvenated through the city's more recent endeavors to establish itself as a bonafide Creative City. Developed by Charles Landry and his planning consultancy firm Comedia in the 1980s, but later expertly marketed by urban theorist Richard Florida under whom it attracted devout advocates in North America, Creative City theses are presented as post-Fordist how-to manifestos for cities wanting to thrive in the new creative economy. Florida argues that, in order to compete in the new global arena, cities must make themselves attractive to the creative social class—a growing contingent of individuals working in the creative and knowledge industries who are increasingly driven by a litany of "lifestyle" factors including the arts and culture, as well as communities that are diverse, open, and tolerant. A number of critics have pointed out that Creative Cities continue to be riven by racial and class divides which ensure that only distinct sectors—mainly the upwardly mobile professional classes—can benefit. Meanwhile, as Catungal and Leslie note, Creative Cities increasingly rely on cosmetic appeals to ethnic and cultural “difference” in the form of policy-sanctioned urban spectacles which become marketing ploys for economic revitalization.

32 See especially Blackwell; McCann; Peck.
33 The authors cite Toronto’s annual Caribana as an example of how the “normalisation of racialized performances” becomes part and parcel of neoliberal entrepreneurial strategies.
It is important to note that Transformation AGO occurred exactly under the guiding ethos of Florida's Creative City. Toronto's infatuation with Florida's ideas is robustly evidenced in Toronto's Culture Plan for the Creative City, a municipal cultural policy document produced in 2003, which laid out a ten year blueprint for two stated goals: to establish Toronto as an "international cultural capital," and to "define culture’s role at the centre of the economic and social development of the city" (City of Toronto 8). A central element in the Culture Plan was Toronto's so-called "Cultural Renaissance," which was funded by $233 million provided through the SuperBuild program, a cost-sharing deal struck between the federal and provincial governments to invest in the infrastructural development of Toronto's biggest cultural institutions. This initiative was behind the renovations and expansions of the Ontario College of Art and Design, the Gardiner Museum of Ceramic Art and Roy Thomson Hall, as well as the construction of new buildings for the Four Seasons Centre for the Performing Arts (the Canadian Opera House), the National Ballet School, the Royal Conservatory of Music, the Toronto International Film Festival Lightbox, and the Young Centre for the Performing Arts. Of all the SuperBuild projects, however, none received more attention as the architectural overhauls of the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) and the AGO, led by "starchitects" Daniel Libeskind and Frank Gehry, respectively. These projects also received the most generous SuperBuild grants, with the AGO coming in at second with $48 million (B. Jenkins 175). As Barbara Jenkins notes, this branded "Cultural Renaissance" aimed not only to boost civic pride, but also to elevate the city's status as global economic and cultural capital, and promote nationalism.34

---

34 Barbara Jenkins places Cultural Renaissance in context with capitalist development projects intended to revitalize fledging economies around the globe. She also makes the argument that all three levels of government—municipal, provincial, federal—are heavily invested in not merely the economic, but also political implications of Toronto’s creative makeover.
The Art Gallery of Ontario plays a crucial part in Toronto's bid to establish itself as Creative City. The institution is fascinating because it singularly reveals the many concomitant discourses at play within Creative City projects. While it receives funding from all three levels of government, the AGO is a private institution backed significantly by private as well as corporate members and partners. The gallery also beckons an urban, multicultural, and international audience largely by presenting itself as guided by increasingly inclusive curatorial mandates, many of which are at least influence by a postmodern aesthetic ethos of flexibility, playfulness, and interactivity. In this way, it can be contrasted to state institutions like the National Gallery of Canada (to be discussed in the following chapter), which are beholden to more rigid nationalist directives and can thus be seen as more inviolable archives. More than just the allegiance to irreverent postmodern aesthetics, what these curatorial shifts are really meant to demonstrate is the gallery's "serious" commitment to interrogating the colonial lineage of Canadian as well as Western art history. This approach is one of new museology, a movement whose most productive outcomes included the interrogation of role of power and the politics of representation within traditional museum paradigms (Macdonald; Witcomb). By deploying strategies that promote multiple entry points, nonlinearity and polyvocality, the AGO (especially after recent overhauls like the rehang of the J.S. McLean Centre for Canadian Art in 2002 and Transformation AGO in 2008) lauds itself through the signalled curatorial interruption of the colonial umbra cast over most Western galleries and museums.

Toronto's “cultural renaissance" exposes the fact that the Creative City’s exuberance over the new does not preclude venerations of the old. As Toronto's Cultural Plan declares, "heritage

---

35 Anne Whitelaw traces the nationalist drives of the NGC to its founding, when it was motivated both internally, by artists desiring to forge a Canadian canon, and externally, by imposed federal cultural policies, to present a strong national identity (“Land” 38). For a further discussion on the different curatorial approaches of the AGO and the National Gallery of Canada, see for example Lisus and Ericson.
36 See McMaster, “Our.”
buildings and landscapes are the physical foundation of the Creative City” (City of Toronto 21). The plan frames commemorative projects as having the potential to both attract tourism dollars, as well as instil civic pride by allowing Torontonians the privileged feeling that their city is "not like any other place in the world" (21). Cultural heritage thus operates as what George Yúdice refers to as expedient resource to be exploited for particular ends. The marriage of heritage and the creative economy is packaged in the Culture Plan as "that new harmony," an ideal "balance between creation and destruction, between change and stability" that "healthy cities" must strive to strike (20). The notion of “change and stability” hints exactly at the complicities between settler coloniality and the new creative economy. The Culture Plan further puts forth that "Toronto has ghostly layers of history and prehistory beneath its streets waiting to be rediscovered, and stories to tell that are utterly unique: it also has the means to make them known. Taken all together, Toronto has remarkable powers to bring the Creative City into glittering focus" (10). Like Marx’s commodity, shorn from the material relations which produce it, the Creative City takes on the qualities of a phantasmal apparition, efficiently severed from the actual labours and bodies which continue to uphold it. Heritage—made up specifically of aesthetically and politically convenient histories—is envisaged abstractly here as the instrument through which the Creative City can be brought “into glittering focus." This speaks to not only the Grange's peaceable residence within the Creative City, but also how the manor provides a crucial colonial genealogy to bring the Creative City to fruition.

The resonance of colonial genealogies within the Creative City is also echoed in a number of spatial and architectural configurations. First is the inscription of the creative “hub” along University Avenue, particularly between Bloor and King Streets. The Culture Plan brands this stretch, which includes the AGO as well as six other major institutions receiving “Cultural
Renaissance” funding, as the city’s “Cultural Corridor” and “Avenue of the Arts” (City of Toronto 19). According to the Culture Plan, the concentration of cultural institutions and research facilities along this Avenue confirms its role as a thriving motor of the city’s creative economy. John Paul Catungal and Deborah Leslie, however, offer a critical reading of this Avenue of the Arts, arguing that its various public monuments and venerated institutions (statues of Queen Victoria and King Edward VII, Royal Ontario Museum, just to name a few) rehearse an elite, nationalist and imperialist history (702-3). The authors’ argument indeed further demonstrates how colonial understandings of city and nation have more than a snug place within the city’s new creative economy—one that lauds itself as being multicultural and inclusive. One can go so far to say that this venerated heritage landscape points to the colonial artery flowing through the heart of the Creative City.

Another telling spatial configuration is the four-storey glass facade inside the gallery’s south wing, which offers an indicative bird’s eye view of Grange Park and surrounding areas of the city. The neighborhood, which was once the geographic and emblematic nucleus of the city’s early colonial aristocracy, has since seen successive waves of immigrants, including Jewish, Chinese, Italian, and Portuguese communities around Kensington Market and Chinatown. Upon more stringent inspection, this seemingly picturesque mosaic scene acutely lays bare just some of the fraught hierarchies between diversity as lived fact and multiculturalism as managerial policy. Both are necessary to the Creative City, though arguably one serves more as fodder while the other is gilded as political expedient. Such a vista should prompt us to inquire into exactly which subjects can be accommodated on Native land, and who can be granted such a view from “on high”?
3.2 Settler Colonialism and the Creative City

While the two are not identical, complicities between settler colonialism and creative citizenship deserve to be further explicated. What follows is an argument regarding the ways in which Creative City ideals of diversity and "new" economies of knowledge coexist within longstanding settler colonial logics of exploitation and displacement. In fact, one is nestled within the other, anatomically disclosing an Ouroboros cyclicality rather than linearity and progress. Creative City appeals emerge out of settler colonialism, but are also deployed as the stratagem through which the city’s colonial bedrock is divested of its more nefarious shadows, and cosmeticized alongside happier appeals to liberal multiculturalism. In settler societies, overt colonial power is often softened at the level of official discourse through strategic patinas of inclusion and hospitality. This is illustrated, for example, in the fact that Toronto, which Pierre Berton in the 1960s described as the "town of quiet homes and quiet Sundays, of smug, satisfied Anglo-Saxons" (New 19) within a few decades becomes the very same city to triumphantly adopt "Diversity Our Strength" as its official motto.37

3.2.1 The Creative Citizen

Settler colonial and neoliberal Creative City discourses converge to locate a subject that Sunera Thobani (2007) would label an "exalted" citizen, one whose national belonging is defined against those cast as “other.” This figure can also be configured as the Creative Citizen: someone privileged through settler logic as a subject who can tame and transform the landscape, and also an

37 This slogan adorns the city’s Coat of Arms, created in 1997 during the amalgamation of former municipalities and boroughs including Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, Toronto, and East York. The Coat of Arms is merely symbolic and ceremonial (“Coat of Arms”).
industrious member of the Creative Class tasked with reinvigorating the economic culture-scape of the city. Creative Citizenship refers to a mode of belonging within the Creative City framework, wherein the notion of civic participation mostly revolves around one's capacity to contribute to the new creative economy both as producer and consumer. This is an economic framework couched in discourses that rhetorically validate individuality, creative capacity and self-actualization. Grundya and Boudreau use this term to emphasize the relationship between creative practices and new forms of governmentality which eschew governing through external forces, and instead rely more on the individual's capacities to self-govern. Central to their thesis is that creativity and self-expression are being used in government projects concerned with "social cohesion," "community renewal" and "global competitiveness" (351). Under the dictates of the creative economy, cultural participation is also cast as the moral imperative or "therapeutic" technology of responsible citizenship (Grundya & Boudreau; N. Rose). This idea of participation as moral duty of the Creative Citizen implicitly structures He Named Her Amber, which is organized around the audience’s agency—and emotional prerogative—in the fetishistic unveiling of the other's difference and supposed pathology.

Creative citizenship's valorization of creativity and self-expression through arts and culture, couched in older humanist terms, are representative of what Terry Flew diagnoses as new humanism. This new humanism, according to Flew, "align[s] social consciousness and cultural awareness with enhanced economic productivity in the context of globalization and multicultural societies" (167-8). Creativity and self-expression, in the knowledge economy, become potential resources that need to be governed and managed (Yúdice; Flew; White & Hunt; Grundya and Boudreau). Toronto's Culture Plan demonstrates this in its numerous recourses to humanist language through the appeal to arts funding: "this plan calls for reinvestment, integration of diverse
communities, openness to youth and invitations to the rest of the world to share our feast. Most of all, it calls on the City to advocate on behalf of inspiration, beauty, ideas and dreams" (City of Toronto 33). There are also multiple references to the "soul." Arts funding is seen as providing Toronto with not only "material rewards;" it can also "give a great city an image of its soul" (4). Again, this time within the context of how the influx of immigrants to the city can be transformed into powerful economic resource, the Culture Plan states, that "arts, culture, and heritage can be the future of Toronto's heart and soul" (7). This rather curious but revealing melange speaks to Nikolas Rose's thesis regarding how the subjective experience of individuals—often centred around "the soul"—have become the increasing targets of political discourse as well as state and corporate power. Vague appeals to the spirit and soul of the creative citizen are also apparent indicators of the deployment of affect to indicate the fantasy of the “good life” (Berlant), while strategically guising socio-economic and political inequalities.

Implicit in these new humanist appeals, of course, is that the promise of self-actualization through culture and the arts can only be granted to the privileged Creative Class. Marginalised groups—immobile, non-creative, non-professional that they are—do not figure in these fantasies at all, except as potential to be directed and transformed into eventual cultural and economic resource. Their story—like that of Mary O'Shea in the Amber narrative—exists merely as backdrop for the self-actualization of a very particular kind of protagonist—the Creative Citizen. This is not to argue that the Creative Class do not themselves become a target for disciplinary managerial discourses (Grundya and Boudreau 2008), but in fact to stress that it is precisely because they and their creative capacities are seen as resource to be mined by a new economic infrastructure that values certain kinds of labour over others, that Creative Citizenship becomes the mode valorised over others. Through a set of symbolic and structural erasures in line with settler colonial world
views, Creative City mechanisms function through a biopolitic logic, which Ben Anderson describes as hinging upon the rationalization of distinguishing between "valued life that is productive" and "devalued life that threatens" (“Affect” 30). Importantly, this logic can be seen in Amber, which symbolically harkens to Foucault's make live, let die model of biopolitics (“Society”). The installation narrative rehearses the spectacle of the other’s (Mary’s) death, while simultaneously empowering the audience through a host of archival seductions to take position at the centre of the narrative. It might be subsequently argued that while outwardly heralding openness, diversity and hospitality, Creative City apparatuses also throw into relief the very mechanisms that crystallize a justificatory framework for settler privilege. Put another way, these mechanisms become the processes through which the experience of the Creative Citizen is transformed into cardinal perspective. This is further achieved through a proprietorial discourse wherein the experience of some, and their access to and/or ownership of flexible paradigms of work and play, are facilitated through the disempowerment and disavowal of others.

Participation, a central figure in all rites of citizenship, emerges in a distinct form within Creative Citizenship. It can encompass the many “labours” of maintenance: settling the home (house-keeping), making the Creative City (modes of consumption), and partaking in symbolic-rhetorical structures of democratic citizenship (civic modes of engagement). Crucially, participation in this context entails the paradoxical acts of making and keeping of home (one’s own), but also the annulment of home (the other’s), which are both integral to the reproduction of capital, bodies, gendered hierarchies, and economies of desire.
3.2.2 Accommodation

Both settler colonial narratives and Creative City discourses can be elucidated as discourses revolving around the making and unmaking of home, whereby the accommodation of some is facilitated through the marginalization and/or psychic disavowal of others. This is can be first explored through the role of home and settling or domestication as settler colonial technology. In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels describe capitalism’s inevitable capillary outgrowth, “[t]he need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the entire surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere” (223). Particularly interesting in this description is that Marx and Engels' use of the terms *settling* and *nestling* points to the domestic and domesticating cadence of settler colonialism. It is, after all, the inflection on the figure of *home* and the activity of *home-making* through the displacement and/or annihilation of indigenous populations that distinguishes settler colonialism from colonialism. As Patrick Wolfe points out, settler invasion should be seen as perpetuating *structure* rather than singular *event*, because settlers “come to stay” (Wolfe, *Settler 2*). Perhaps settler colonizers, to a higher frequency than their more itinerant colleagues, found themselves preoccupied with the everyday minutiae of tending to home, and thus more invested in securing the story of home through conceiving of a landscape that could be actively *made* to accommodate.

Pausing on the activity of home-making might help to shed some light on the relationship between home and settling/settler-colonialism. Domestication here both refers to the taming of the "Wild" as well as the frenzied activity of home-making, and making-home. The activities involved in making and keeping a home—cleaning, tending, maintaining, manicuring, protecting and securing—all hint at the desire to settle (as in: to fix, to appoint, to resolve in definite and resolute terms) a home as well as one's place within that home. Anne McClintock's provocative delineation
of housework as a "semiotics of boundary maintenance" sheds light on the manner in which the boundaries of the home need to be fastidiously tended to (170). She writes that "cleaning is not inherently meaningful; it creates meaning through the demarcation of boundaries" (170). This points to the fact that landscapes of belonging are not primordial givens; settler colonialism requires a naturalization of conquest and displacement (Morgensen, *Spaces* 39), whereby latecoming peoples can inscribe their autochthony by declaring their physical, political, economic, and symbolic occupancy on Indigenous land. Accordingly, with regard to more intimate spheres, the settler home also needs to be perpetually “made” through the frenzied production and maintenance of categories of race, gender, and class.

The kindred projects of accommodation and displacement becomes all the more apparent when we examine the significance of The Grange, and the way in which it manifests the survival of settler colonial legacies in advanced creative economies. Notably, the current popularized vision of the Grange—especially in its role as heralded historic home—centres very much on the idea of home-making and making-home. The Grange's function as living museum relies on its (first) function as a domestic space. Tours through the manor open to the public centre around domestic spaces and labours (baking bread in the kitchen, etc.). There are also periodic reminders of the Grange as (originary) home—in the form of renovations, anniversaries, the Centennial celebration, etc.—which serve as the commemorative reinscriptions of colonial history through the performative rituals of domesticity. Taken in the context of the Grange's significant position in Toronto's colonial historical landscape, this constant articulation of home through everyday performance and commemorative reproduction can be seen as part of the ongoing and necessary project of practicing the idea of home as settled and history as claimed. In other words, the performance of home and home-making is structured at least partially around an ontological
clinging, or the desire to make things permanent. In this regard, settling becomes akin with staying; where to stay is to be held within shelter, to dwell, to remain, to hold out.

Of course, the significance of the Grange is not merely figural. The installation also succinctly demonstrates how the Creative City draws on culture and heritage as resources to rehabilitate citizenship through neoliberal axioms consolidated around affective and experiential intensity (Peck, “Struggling” 745). In his hugely popular The Rise of the Creative Class, published in 2002, Florida sounds the clarion call for cities to court potential creative denizens through appeals to their affective life—including their desire for play, pleasure, excitement and "authentic" community. He argues that the emergent creative economy can be traced in the shift from the consumption of goods to the consumption of experience. What Florida describes as the "experiential lifestyle" (Rise 168) becomes a robustly self-sustaining loop of productivity and consumption, wherein affectively stimulating cultural and recreational experiences engender an individual's creative capacities, which in turn feeds back into the knowledge economy which sees Creativity as exploitable resource. Thus, urban planners and policy-makers would be wise to create communities replete with "abundant high-quality experiences" (Florida, Cities 36). So-called "spontaneous" and "authentic" landscapes and experiences are seen as those that can be manufactured through the engineering and rationalization of affect. The explicit example in Toronto are the large scale, corporate sponsored arts and cultures events including the Toronto International Film Festival, Nuit Blanche, and Luminato, which transform the city into immersive urban landscapes that are as much pleasure gardens as they are culture factories.38 Lauren Berlant’s concept of cruel optimism helps us to better understand such attachments to “compromised

38 I am drawing here on Hito Steyerl’s concept of the culture factory, which include institutions like galleries and museums which count as their productive output the constant stream of “images, jargon, lifestyles, and values…exhibition value, speculation value, and cult value…entertainment plus gravitas…aura minus distance.”
conditions of possibility” (24). Borne out of states of socio-economic precarity produced through neoliberalism, *cruel optimism* drives us to desire the very things that impede or oppress us, that are “obstacles to [our] flourishing” (1). Similarly, Creative Citizens are yoked to manufactured economies of affective intensities—fantasies of the “good life,” in Berlant’s account (1)—accorded through systems that are ultimately organized to exploit.

3.2.3 Dispossession

Stephen Turner’s idea of *settler dreaming* puts forth that, because settler belonging “is not given but made,” it necessarily involves not just the acquisition of a physical house, but also converting this real estate into an emotionally resonant “homeland,” in a process that involves implanting a new history onto another’s territory (116-117). As he writes, “collective memory of settlement is not passive or received but active—an activity and a process of settlement. It is a constant processing of settlement in the sense of an intentional, purposeful, needful remembering” (117-8). Understanding how imagination functions as a tangible force which often acts through varying degrees of violence is vital to comprehending the complex material work of settler colonialism. Other thinkers contend with a similar theme as well. Jacqueline Rose urges us to consider how fantasy, far from being a private matter, has a crucial hand in actively “forging” nations and their collectives (125), while Eyal Weizman argues that a nation’s social, economic, political power can be tracked in the ways that they physically “solidify” into homes and settlements (6). Taken together, these ideas point towards the fact that settler dreaming can be exercised to corroborate belonging, especially upon stolen land. Moreover, this imaginational work has the capacity to solidify into brick and mortar structures that reveal hierarchies of citizenship.
Part and parcel of this dream work is the acquirement of privilege that does not recognize itself as privilege, and power that does not recognize itself as power. The work of settlement and accommodation also involves the violent dispossession, eviction and erasure of Indigenous populations. In settler colonial societies, Aboriginal presence and agency is displaced by the same political, social and imaginative orders that make way for settler belonging and patrimony over Native land (Morgensen, “Settler” 117). Similar to the elimination of Indigenous populations is the work of (literal and symbolic) landscaping, which W.J.T. Mitchell describes as the “dreamwork” of imperialism (10). Settlement involves, in large part, reimagining the inhabited land as *terra nullius*. Carole Pateman writes that this designation signals overlapping meanings, all convenient for the invader; “the territory is empty, vacant, deserted, uninhabited, vacuum domicilium; it belongs to no one, is territoire sans maître; it is waste, uncultivated, virgin, desert, wilderness” (Pateman 36). *Terra nullius* allows the settler to deem the land to be uncultivated wild, and thus impose the “right to husbandry” (36). Such eliminative “dreamwork” can be witnessed in the heritage narrative adopted by the Grange. By eliminating the history of the Mississauga, performative inscriptions of the Grange as “primordial” heritage landscape strives to ensure that colonial settlement is where the collective chronology commences. Significantly revealing is the decision made in the late 1960s to restore the manor to “a gentleman’s house” reflective of the specific period between 1834 to 1840, so to best facilitate “the visitor’s appreciation of life as it was lived by upper-class families in early Canada” (Litvak 5). Jennifer Rieger describes this seemingly arbitrary decision as “ultimately a kind of fiction—a work of installation art in its own right” (70). Of course, if we recall the commemorative significance of 1834—the year that the Township of York was incorporated as the City of Toronto—it becomes easier to contextualize the restoration within a larger rubric of colonial veneration. Like D’Arcy Boulton Jr. who forged his
own *tabula rasa* by clearing the forest to build his stately brick manor, the commemorative rehearsal of the Grange's colonial history acts as a narrative cure which erases all that proceeded settlement. The act of landscaping—which is ultimately an act of re-membering an (imaginary) cartography—becomes a means of re-imagining an existing territory as *terra nullius* in order to accommodate the new settlers.

Moreover, while settler colonialism hinges on the “organizing principal” of Native elimination (Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism” 388), displacement within Creative City paradigms is more often guised through benevolent hospitality and the celebration of difference. Public discourses and policies lauding "livability" as a point of pride in creative cities effectively obscure the reality that many marginalized communities—the working class, ethnic minorities, etc.—are often displaced through processes of urban renewal and gentrification (Catungal and Leslie; Levin and Solga; McCann). It is necessary to acknowledge that, with advanced global capitalism turning evermore towards economies based on human creativity and knowledge, there are undoubtedly increasing numbers of cultural workers who are exploited (Banks; Hesmondalgh and Baker). More and more, they form a precariat class engaged in temporary, casual, part time, freelance, and contract-work (Standing) which sustain so-called “healthy” and “robust” economies. However, this is invariably complicated by the fact that the precariat are complicit in other pervasive forms of power and exploitation as well. These “new” vulnerable labours and labourers need to be contextualized within the inveterately rooted structures of settler colonialism.

Within Creative City paradigms, diversity and difference often function as commodified and fetishized spectacle, with performances of ethnic and cultural difference increasingly deployed to entice young urban professionals to particular neighborhoods through “ethnic packaging” (Hackworth and Rekers), and to increase the vibrancy and competitive viability of the Creative
City (Catungal and Leslie). George Yúdice also puts forth that, hyperbolic appeals to diversity and inclusion allow ethnic and cultural difference to be used as “life-giving” resources for the professional-managerial elite (20). Not surprisingly, the visibility of these spectacles of difference run concurrent to a deliberate blindness directed towards the labours performed by the masses of racialized, underclassed, and gendered bodies who stoke the hearth of the settler Creative City. These disposable and vulnerable workers are often migrant women of colour invisibly carrying out the emotional and affective labours which sustain the Creative City. Overwhelmingly hired in the reproductive, care and hospitality sectors, they are tasked with being the nation’s caregivers' while they themselves are excluded from citizenship. In this way, creative cities are nourished by—and thus continue to perpetuate—expanding circuits of global displacement and exploitation. However, racialized and gendered divisions of labour are more or less effectively concealed through self-congratulatory policies which evangelize diversity, “healthful” cities, and new humanistic economies of therapeutic experience.

3.3 *He Named Her Amber: Archival Seductions and the Choreography of Citizenship*

Forging ahead from theoretical explorations of cultural citizenship and the historical framework of its emplacement, I now turn finally to Häussler's *He Named Her Amber* in order to investigate the ways that settler colonial and Creative City frameworks are mediated, extended and intensified through the installation’s immersive strategies and affective seductions. While earlier sections set the contextual "scene" of nation/home, what follows is an exploration of how the figure

---

39 Citizenship and Immigration Canada statistics reveal that the number of temporary foreign workers have more than tripled in the last decade, jumping from 19,000 in 2003, to over 64,000 in 2012 (“Facts and Figures”).
40 See Agnew; Bakan and Stasiulis, *Negotiating*; Bakan and Stasiulis, *Not One*; Liladrie; Walia
of Mary O'Shea is positioned as a gendered, racialized, and classed subject within the architecture of nation/home, and how she thus delineates the very limits and boundaries of this terrain. Just as importantly, this section investigates how the audience’s own rites of citizenship are forged through the ways that we move through the installation and weave our bodies through its immersive narrative. The argument put forth is that we engage in the embodied rituals of *settler dreaming* by corporeally and imaginatively aligning ourselves with the archive’s presented overtures.

To celebrate the auspicious reopening of the gallery after Transformation AGO in 2008, Curator of Contemporary Art, David Moos earlier approached Häussler, among other artists, to create a work for the occasion (Mackay). During the grand reopening, the gallery’s visitors were ushered unsuspectingly into the *Amber* experience, believing that they were simply partaking in a current incarnation of the Grange’s standard historic tour presented by the AGO throughout the years. Little did they know, of course, that they were stepping into an installation, described by the artist as “haptic conceptual” (Häussler, “Haptic”). She later elaborates on this approach with specific reference to *Amber,*

My work was designed to be experienced as historic fact in order to allow a personal and unfiltered involvement, and a participatory sense of discovery that would not otherwise have been possible. It is this immersive environment that empowers the visitor to make creative leaps.

Häussler’s proficient appropriation of the Grange’s ready store of historic ambience allowed her to construct a startlingly visceral space of archival intimacy. In a project proposal for *Amber,* Häussler explains that her piece, following in the tradition of the *Gesamtkunstwerk* (total work of art), seeks

---

41 The AGO also commissioned other artists from Canada and the U.S., including Shary Boyle, Willie Cole, Kent Monkman, Frank Stella and Kara Walker.
42 From the “Excavation Notes” containing the “reveal,” sent by the artist to participants who had taken the tour.
to submerge the audience in a multi-sensory experience, staged throughout the entire historic site, which integrates “smell and taste, feel and touch, vision and sound and the vertigo of discovery” (Häussler, “Final”). I want to argue that this installation’s principal mode of inciting its audience—that is, through a deployment of technologies of immersion—is significant. Immersion, as Oliver Grau demonstrates, creates realistic 360 degree landscapes that establish in the viewer an evocative sense of “presence,” or of “being there” (Virtual 14). In the same way, the Amber audience is ushered into the midst of a lushly realized narrative, and encouraged to physically, symbolically and affectively take up occupancy—and settle—within the home. Such a summons of accommodation, through which the audience is literally invited inside the bosom of domestic space, is particular startling when placed in context alongside the wilful displacement and dispossession of the Mississauga peoples by settler colonizers throughout the city’s history.

The installation’s interest in and capacity to emotionally and corporally evoke its audience align with the Creative City’s prioritizations of economies of affect mentioned earlier. The audience’s liaison with the captivating technologies of narrative immersion even harkens to Michael Billig’s concept of banal nationalism, which references the ways in which national identity emerges in the everyday "embodied habits of social life" (8-9), including the various mundane and unconscious ways that we thread our bodies through a material landscape. While the installation is organized around the audience’s consumption of the other as spectacle of difference, it is useful to point to the conceptualization of spectacle as social relation rather than inherently separate and estranged images (Debord); like immersion, spectacle can implicate the body through urgent proximity and even engulfment. In Amber, citizenship occurs precisely through technologies of immersion which summon the body, choreographing it within an intimate domestic topography that invokes—both intentionally and not—an imagined community.
Amber’s immersive paradigm encapsulates the central summoning techniques that hail its audience through promises of access, control, and proprioceptive grounding, which is what I experienced on my own tours through the installation. Firstly, the installation draws on the notion of access. Häussler's installation expertly alludes to the idea that its audience has been bestowed an exclusive invitation into Mary’s private drama—and perhaps, by extension, the history of Canada’s early immigrant working class.43 Those of us who catch on to Häussler’s artistic subterfuge are permitted an arguably metanarrative experience whereby we are “let in on” the artist/AGO’s secret; even those who miss the ultimate “reveal” receive the installation at face-value as an “unveiled” historical narrative to which they are granted exclusive access. In either case, this experience—like that in many galleries and museums in general—feeds upon and reproduces strata of cultural capital and privilege. It is this privileged entrée endowed through intimate disclosure which binds the visitor into a sacred covenant with the national narrative, via the institutional/authorial gaze. This process of affective citizenship is one whereby the gallery not only grants the audience access to Mary’s secrets, but also provides the optic through which to read and decipher these secrets.

The installation moreover extends to us the fantasy of control. It is we as audience members, afterall, who are spurred to stitch together Mary's story. In and of themselves, the clues Mary leaves are merely inert matter, shorn of meaning; they await the active participant to assert a self-determining agency to render them meaningful. We as the audience are thus encouraged to become active participants—detectives, excavators and omniscient narrators who delight in our ecstatic voyeurisms, our power to bestow meaning. The role of control in affective and cultural

43 Although fictional, Mary’s story is based on Häussler’s historical research into gendered immigration from Ireland to satisfy the new colony’s demand for domestic servants during the nineteenth century. For more on this history, see Barber; McLean and Barber.
citizenship revolves around not only the subject being permitted access to the archive, but more importantly, that we have a hand in shaping its narrative sequencing and determining its ultimate significance.

Thirdly, *Amber* operates through the seductive proposal of proprioceptive grounding. **Proprioception** refers to one’s general awareness of the body’s position in and movement through space, sensed through tactile (surface) and kinesthetic (internal) “events” (Paterson, *Senses* 20-1). Within the present context, proprioception speaks to the visitor’s awareness of their place within the immersive installation narrative, while also referring to the larger terrains of imagined citizenship for which the installation acts as proxy. Citizenship, with regards to proprioceptive grounding, hinges on the idea that the body is attended by the ontological security offered through a narrative scaffolding which holds us, gravitates us, and guides us through this landscape. Participating in the immersive world of *He Named Her Amber*, we abet in the location of Mary’s subject within the specific *mise-en-scene* of nation. As audience, we are also subtly incited to feel secured within nation’s intimate sphere. In the process of being hailed as cultural citizens, we are proffered a number of reassurances, one being that, under the chaotic immersive paradigm and all its attendant narrative enigmas and irresolvable bodily anxieties, lies the authoritative hand/eye of the institution which will shepherd us into an established—or more significantly settled—narrative-historical context.

### 3.3.1 Agency and Detritus

Material archives deserve theoretical attention because, as Ann Laura Stoler argues, the "aftershocks of empire" persist in their material “debris” ("Imperial" 194). *Amber* allows us to examine the ways in which narratives are reproduced and circulated, in order to better grasp how
colonial projections of home and heritage are carried forth in Creative City discourses. At play within the installation is an interesting tension between detritus—signalling end of life—and institutional transformation and renewal. It is hardly a coincidence that Amber was staged for the public during Transformation AGO, the gallery’s full throttle campaign to announce its continuing cultural relevance and, in a sense, economic survivalism. The inclusion of Häussler installation in the “transformed” AGO is telling of the fact that the institution’s program of revitalization benefitted from, and perhaps even necessitated, an auxiliary return to beginnings. The strategic embedding of the installation within the overarching framework of Transformation AGO reveals how an institutional makeover hardly requires complete historical jettison; on the contrary, the dexterous recourse to archival topographies allow the gallery to signal its own institutional durability. The Grange's many unfoldings—Indigenous land to colonial home, house to museum/gallery, and colonial remnant to Creative City resource—reveal how colonial detritus survives and transforms in its "afterlife" to continue to play a role in prevailing narratives of nation, culture and heritage. As with the reproduction of colonial narratives through contemporary (settler colonial) modes of commemoration described above, ideas around detritus/afterlife and continuation are central here, though this time manifested in circulations of the "affective economy" of objects and bodies (Ahmed, “Affective”). Amber reveals the ways in which colonial detritus—the affective residues left on objects—continue to produce subjects and others, as well as the relations between them.

Amber is mobilized through a narrative of fortuitous “discovery” in which the figuring of historical detritus and the transference of fetish and desire play a central role. On my tours, audience members are told that Mary's waxen artefacts had only been uncovered because, unbeknownst to her, Mary had a faithful sentinel who kept track of her movement throughout the house. Henry
Whyte, a butler at the Grange during Mary’s time, not only kept an eye on Mary, but also diligently recorded her activities on a hand drawn map, marking with an “x” all the spots where he observed her secreting away her waxen objects. The guides reveal to us that, almost a century later, and by mere good fortune, this very map found its way (back) into the hands of the AGO through one of Whyte’s heirs, just as the gallery was undergoing renovations. Guided by the butler’s map, the AGO’s excavation team went about scavenging the Grange property, eventually coming across Mary’s objects. Thus, this map functions in many ways like the imperial map of Anne McClintock’s description—that technology of knowledge and possession that guides the colonizing eye through the thicket of dark and wild, translating it into “pure, scientific form” (27-8). Whyte’s project hinges on the mapping of the female body—a "pathological" one at that—an unknown terrain to be scanned and rendered known. He is positioned in contradistinction to Mary; his gaze is white, male, "sane" and almost scientific in its fastidious surveillance. Häussler’s chronicle of this map’s sequence of heirs is also particularly revealing; in being passed from Whyte to his nephew, and eventually from the nephew to the AGO, it masks Häussler’s own role and instead articulates a structure of patriarchal possession and patrimony at work within the core of the *Amber* narrative.

Adding another feather to what can be deemed a project of patrimonial assertion, we are told that it was Whyte who, on his hand drawn map, curiously bestowed Mary with the codename “Amber”—hence the installation title *He Named Her Amber*. No real explanation was given as to why he did this; we might surmise that he resorted to the cipher to conceal his own voyeuristic fascination with Mary. The naming of Mary as “Amber” stands as a gesture of symbolic ownership on behalf of Whyte, who functions as the AGO’s discursive surrogate. This secondary moniker also signals Mary’s entrance into an economy of desire, whereby her narrative presence is
conferred by Whyte, just as the value of the objects is appointed by the authority of the AGO. The implication here is that patrimony guides this other (back) into the disciplinary architecture of a dominant national narrative, and preserves her for scopic intervention. Mary therefore becomes the object of fascination symbolically embalmed in amber—and literally embalmed in beeswax—preserved at the height of visibility and access, her body disclosed, her secret divulged.

Mary’s “discovered” objects are framed in part as archaeological waste—the refuse of time, and perhaps product of pathology—which merely needed the passing of both generation and hand in order to be placed under a museological narrative and reordered with new significance. In the gallery’s hands, via Henry Whyte, Mary’s objects are recovered into narrative and meaning. The installation thus enacts the objects’ transformation from detritus to valued object, and more importantly, signals the gallery’s fundamental role in this chronology; only when framed within the authority of archaeological discourse and placed under the institutional gaze does cultural waste become a valued collection of objects worthy of display and acknowledgement. The performative archaeological framework set in motion here functions through a logic of allochronism, which Johannes Fabian uses to refer to the "existential, rhetoric, political" strategies of distancing which place the referents of anthropology outside history, in a time other than that of the anthropologist (31-32). While the Amber narrative is constructed exactly through this discourse of spatial and temporal distancing, it centers just as much on Mary's “recovery” through the institution—the process whereby her mute body is dredged up from Fabian's allochronistic time of the other and deposited into the present where she can be surveilled, and woven into further museological fantasies.

What is furthermore striking here is the AGO’s purportedly passive role in the acquisition or uncovering of these objects; unlike more familiar tales of museum collections wrought through
imperialist enterprises actively going out to seek booty, this one tells of anthropological objects
miraculously turning up within the museum without any necessary initiation on the institution’s
part. Baring striking resemblance to fetishized commodities which “appear as autonomous figures
endowed with a life of their own” (Marx, Capital 165), Mary’s objects surface like enchanted
talismans within the museum, their social and material provenances necessarily obscured. Susan
Stewart sheds further light on this myth of serendipitous discovery and (in)active seizure when she
writes of how collecting enacts the erasure of labour; “one ‘finds’ the elements of the collection
much as the prelapsarian Adam and Eve could find the satisfaction of their needs without a
necessary articulation of desire. The collector constructs a narrative of luck which replaces the
narrative of production” (Longing 165). To this, one can add that such narratives of luck also
distract from the violence of appropriation and seizure. The figuring of artefacts as detritus or waste
therefore allows the museum to dilute the imperial compulsion to actively pursue, seize and collect,
and instead posit an innocent model of acquisition through serendipity and accidental discovery.

James Clifford (“Collecting”) writes of the museum as the site where desire and fetish are
transformed into “proper” collecting through Western notions of taste, restraint, and property. In
the museum, desire becomes appropriately channelled and its excess expunged, so that the subject
(upheld by the institution) does not risk cleaving to the object, but remains a distantiated authority
for whom collected objects can act as the mediating field of property between self and an ordered
universe. Amber adds something significant to Clifford’s thesis; by producing a museological
encounter wherein fetish and desire do play a crucial role, the installation facilitates not a
renunciation, but in fact a transference of fetishistic accumulation onto the body of the other. In
other words, the compulsion to collect is transferred onto Mary; meanwhile, the AGO is presented
as a neutral site of the archaeological excavation, and also the irreproachable scientific-rational
vehicle to house its uncovered spoils. These implied motivations behind Mary’s drive to collect—tellingly shrouded in gendered discourse and hinting at the abject—are stacked against the AGO’s curatorial paradigm, which, by comparison, is cast as appropriately sterile and restrained. Thus, while they provide the canvas through which the participants’ scopophilic desires are reinvigorated, Mary’s furtive and feverish accumulations at the same time are used to guise the institution’s own fetish for looking and accumulating, and to signal the AGO’s rational and ordered program of collection and exhibition. In this way, the installation invites us to peer with fascination into the fetishistic display and to brush thrillingly close to the pathological and abject—all the while claiming the inculpability of the museum.

3.3.2 Benevolent Inclusions

Amber speaks to the ways that, within the AGO’s multiculturalist paradigm, archival inclusion can function as a strategy of control. The installation capitalizes on the performative gestures of archaeological discourse to produce a self-confessing object while guising the very means through which this confession is discursively enabled. The aesthetic-scientific choreographies which construct Mary as an explicitly gendered, racialized and classed body also present her as a spectacle constantly in the process of being uncovered; the audience is tantalized with allusions to the secrets that this body is forever just on the verge of divulging. The onus is on Mary to disclose her otherness as well as the reasons behind her compulsive making and collecting. This, alongside the narrative of innocent discovery involving the AGO coming across Mary's objects by pure happenstance, divert the pathologies of the neocolonial archive, whose modus

---

44 Tour participants, gently goaded by the docents, eagerly conjured up a slew of fantastical tales to explain Mary’s obsessive activity, including witchcraft and madness wrought by heartbreak (P. Goddard, Peter; Hegert; Mackay).
operandi is the active rather passive ingestion and incorporation of the other. In the case of *Amber*, the other is compulsively constructed in order to then be collapsed securely back into the folds of a long standing colonial text. This allows the archive to continue to swell, but with active seizure or pillage conveniently eschewed for a more innocuous programme of incidental discovery and benevolent multicultural inclusion.

Another method through which the archive attempts to divert the notion of seizure and active appropriation is by adopting multiculturalism’s well-rehearsed strategies—particularly the seemingly benevolent inclusion of the other within the national archive. A number of criticisms levelled at the official multiculturalism of settler-colonial nations like Canada within the last three decades have pointed to its tendency to compensate for the lack of actual political power afforded to these nations’ many disenfranchised groups with overabundant symbolic distractions (Ahmed, *Strange*; Gunew; Thobani). As illustrated by Häussler’s installation at the AGO, such strategies are more than merely compensatory; they also involve the hailing of otherness for the purposes of surveillance and discipline. By enacting the archaeological extraction of the “hidden” other from darkness into light, the installation reveals a Foucauldian logic of positive power at play; here, otherness is literally mined from its secret recesses—or more specifically from beneath the floorboards of a house—and superintended by means of its circulation through the necessary discursive channels. The seemingly benevolent invitations into canonic archives can themselves be technologies of “internment and reservation,” especially when they are overly aesthetic subsumptions which succeed in eliding the political (Rickard 87). Colonization via inclusion, argue Constance Classen and David Howes, is the “regulation of artifactual bodies by the regimen of the museum”—a process whereby displayed objects are forcibly interpellated into Western taxonomic and aesthetic orders of the collector/institution (209). For Classen and Howes, the “model of an
ideal colonial empire” (210) is thus manifested in the collection of objects lined up quietly along a shelf or behind a sterile slab of glass.

Just as multiculturalism functions to mark bodies deemed divergent while simultaneously unmarking those of the unspoken “norm,” so too does the *Amber* narrative reveal its inclination in highlighting specific bodies of difference. On display are two bodies in particular: Mary O’Shea and Dr. Chantal Lee, the head archaeologist and “site coordinator” who, like Mary, is a fictional construct. While both subjects are physically absent, their narrative presence is nonetheless lushly filled in through the artefactual and embodied “dressing” of the scene which participants are made to believe they inhabit. Though Mary is the presumed focus of the excavation-tour, there is a crucial parallel tale of archaeologist Dr. Lee, who, as it is revealed to us, is herself an immigrant, though of Korean descent. During the tour, we are hastily ushered into Dr. Lee’s abandoned office, after being told conspiratorially by our guides that she has conveniently “just” stepped out. Thus, this space becomes part of the tour for those of us who eagerly believe we are merely detouring from the main narrative into another treasure trove of curiosities. As it turns out, Dr. Lee’s office is as meticulously crafted as Mary’s world. It is a dimly lit, windowless and stuffy room, located in the Grange basement nearby the kitchen and pantry—all inconspicuous spaces that would have only been seen and traversed by the servants in the manor’s early days. During Häussler’s installation, of course, these hidden quarters are splayed open and indiscreetly summon the gazes of curious onlookers. Amidst the litany of books, photographs, maps, floorplans, and scientific paraphernalia scattered about the office, I notice that there are also strewn objects which appear to be the archaeologist’s own personal belongings; these include stained coffee mugs, rumpled pyjamas and even an unmade cot tucked away in a small corner of the room (fig. 2). These are all meant to suggest to onlookers that Dr. Lee is so consumed with the mystery of Mary O’Shea that she decided
to permanently encamp herself at the site of the excavation. Perhaps because they are not granted the safe remove of temporal distance, these objects and the geography they mark evoke an ambience of “private” clutter so provocatively as to almost make me avert my eyes.

But this intricate *mise-en-scene* effectively directs the gaze, and Mary and Dr. Lee both become the surfaces upon which our voyeurisms are trained. The audience, for our part, become part of the surveillance technology, a mobile army of free-floating eyes, ears, and hands scouring the constructed landscape and the bodies displayed, scanning these contours for secrets to uncover.

Fig. 2. Dr. Lee’s cot. "He Named Her Amber." Jan. 2009. *Iris Häussler.* Web. 30 Jan. 2015.

This just begins to show how sensuous encounters with archives can effectively marshal bodies into Benedict Anderson’s imagined community. More crucially, such practices also produce the "exalted" national subject, one who is fetishized as citizen over and above the other, and seduced
into reproducing the “master narrative of the nation” (Thobani 4). *Amber* reveals the corporeal and emotional rituals that go into imagining and practicing nation; by training our eyes upon the splayed body of the other, those of us making our way through this performative narrative of "archival detritus" enter into a scopophilic covenant with the "master narrative" which hails us in as its "exalted" subjects.

The scrupulously staged archival scene effectively choreographs the visitors towards narratives we are meant to see and feel, but just as importantly, directs us away from those we were meant not to. The highly elaborate *mise-en-scene* marking the spaces into which Mary and Dr. Lee's bodies are confined work to guilefully obscure the biographies of Häussler and also that of curator David Moos—an especially impressive feat given that this erasure occurs in the gallery, a space otherwise given to venerations of the artist. Although *Amber* contains some self-referential hints that it is an art installation rather than truth, its "haptic conceptual" approach rests on the audience believing they are entering into a factual, historical narrative. The installation is very revealing of how, when it comes to the materialization of such archives and the national imaginaries which these archives figure, notions of truth and fiction are of smaller consequence than the affective labour invested in bringing these archives to life. The audience, in other words, encounter Mary’s story through their very bodies; we are haptically seduced into believing. In this sense, the apparent absence of artist, curator, and institution also stands as a testament to their authorial power. Unhindered by biographical culpability or spatial circumscription, Häussler and Moos possessed precisely the resources to masterfully divert the gaze upon Mary and Dr. Lee’s bodies. Reminiscent of the ways in which symbolic multiculturalist representation paves over the lack of real agency, Mary and Dr. Lee’s absence as agents and authors is enabled by—at the same time that it also enables—their proliferating aesthetic presence within the archive.
3.3.3 Incorporation and Accumulation

Closely allied to multiculturalism’s managerial imperative to enfold the other by marking their difference is Irit Rogoff’s notion of plenitude. Rogoff describes the Western museum’s plenitude, or additive model, as its “untroubled ability to add others without losing a bit of the self” (66). This process, whereby “change” and “reform” in museums occur without loss, and without the institution having to interrupt its longstanding colonial processes, slips easily in line with a neoliberal or advanced capitalist logic of endless accumulation. At the same time, it also fits into a multiculturalist paradigm that functions through incorporative technologies and the "fantasy of unity" (Day 4). Through the plenitude model, the archive continues to swell, ingesting the other so that this other can be disciplined by implementations of violent visibility. Amber, in its mobilization of certain tropes around difference, presents one particularly compelling example of how the AGO puts otherness on display in order to fold it back into the dominant text. The installation’s archaeological unfolding is particularly useful in this regard, for it regales a fantasied tale of the institution “discovering” an otherness already snugly tucked within an existing colonial scaffolding which remains unruptured.

It is no coincidence that Amber’s drama of fabricated intimacies burst forth beyond the white cube of the modernist gallery, and was staged in the umbilically-attached, domestic landscape of the Grange. The installation’s expedient choreography of multiculturalist inclusion hinged in large part on its doubly fortuitous location within the gallery’s intimate limb; its situation afforded the narrative legitimation both on the level of official or public archival “truth,” as well as private, domestic authenticity.

That empire and the intimate are faithful bedfellows is hardly a novel supposition; Ann Laura Stoler makes the case that, since the 19th century, the consolidation of the “macrodynamics
of colonial rule” has crucially depended upon “interventions in the microenvironments of both subjugated and colonizing populations” (“Intimations” 2). The energy expended by colonial powers in attempts to police affective relationships, penetrate intimate pockets of “darkness,” and restructure these domains through social and urban planning, labour regimes, and medical protocols divulge the fact that empire has, to a significant extent, always been secured and/or threatened by what was going on behind closed doors. While in many ways a continuation of these earlier disciplinary practices, what is significant in the multiculturalist institution's “turning-in” to private spaces, as expressed through *Amber*, is that the latter centers on the frenzied production and highly elaborate performance of the intimate domain, which becomes the grounds on which to compulsively *exercise* as well as *exorcise* difference. *Amber* illustrates how multiculturalist incursions into intimate domains are about more than just invasion and discipline. These also entail the triumphal production of space, and subsequently, the population of this space with hierarchies of bodies and subjects. One aspect of this installation which makes it particularly effective and quixotic is its dramatization of the fiction of inclusion as affective and immersive spectacle; here, private space—like the other’s body—was constructed primarily for public access. In *Amber*, the discreet landscape is narrated into existence to be subsequently yielded; the seductive rhetorics of secrecy and intimacy merely heighten the pleasure of this invasion. It goes without saying that Creative Citizenship is that peculiar mode of seduction which entices us to witness with fascination the spectacle of Mary’s precarious labours and vulnerable citizenship, while at the same time turning a blind eye to the host of others just beyond the gallery’s doors.

The AGO’s new interest in polyphonic expansions of Canadian Art presents itself as the supposed subversion of the traditional dominant narrative through the insertion of women and First Nations artists, and in general, the questioning of the commonly understood definitions of art and
its reception (McMaster, “Art”). One by-product of this ever-expanding archive of Canadian Art is that it finds itself decreasingly bound by historical confinement and representational boundaries. As *Amber* illustrates, the existing colonial archive, rather than being interrupted by postcolonial critiques, merely continues its prerogative to accumulate and expand, fervently lapping up those in its wake. Aside from the so-called “benevolent” inclusion of historically silenced minority voices, one must also note the AGO’s incorporation of “new ways of seeing” and viewer-friendly means of consuming art, as well as its new prioritizations of more reflexive critiques and interventions, all of which have now become institutionalized and sutured into the brick and mortar of the institution itself. Such seeming curatorial shifts, placed alongside Rogoff’s remark on the ways in which dominant Western museological frameworks continue to expand and adapt without undergoing real alteration, affirms how neocolonial techniques are becoming increasingly more flexible and adaptable. By resorting to a ready arsenal of postmodern techniques—including intertextual quotation, interdisciplinarity, self-reflexivity, and the collapsing of past/present—and appropriating oppositional models of interpretation, it can be argued that institutions like the AGO leave little room for counter-narratives to emerge beyond the official dictates of the institution, and are now therefore more able to disempower dissent. Under the guise of benign inclusivity, or unity through diversity, previously excluded voices are thus voraciously folded into the bulging archive, their assimilation serving in many ways to bolster neoliberal and neocolonial narratives.

### 3.4 Conclusion

If *The Grange* offers us a departure point to think about how the home might function as a portal through which we enter explorations of cultural citizenship, it is important that we look also at the potential for home to destabilize, disorient, unground, and upheave. *He Named Her Amber*
begins to gesture towards the notion that home as an origin story—or seat of psychological, material, and ontological security—can and should be problematized. In this regard, it might be particularly useful to heed Manning's suggestion to conceptualize home as "rhizomatic" rather than "arboreal," in other words, to view home through the notion of multiplicity rather than a rooted structure (*Ephemeral* xx). Doing so, Manning argues, would interrogate the arboreal structures of constructions such as the nation-state "as the dichotomous, hierarchized systems they are" (xx). It is likewise imperative to challenge the hegemony of the single story.

As this chapter has demonstrated, technologies of immersion are those that recruit bodies through the promise of access, control and proprioceptive grounding, all of which work to stabilize identity, while also guiding the body into particular vistas that vivify particular embodied frames of reference. *Amber* displays for us Mary O'Shea’s vulnerable citizenship, but its narrative silences at the same time overlook the precarity of others. Moreover, while the installation constructs Mary as other (and object of our voyeuristic fascinations), we are also meant to ultimately identify with her struggle of settling and making home on the new land. Unsurprisingly, these immersive technologies centre on domestication. This can be witnessed in way that the *Amber* audience is extended an invitation to insinuate themselves into the colonial home in order to inherit its vaunted lineage, and also through Creative City rhetorics which promote the creative workers’ rights to actively exercise a belonging and attachment to place (Florida, *Who’s* 165), with little regard for the histories casually elided through their new entitlements. I have also hitherto argued that the technology of domestication trades in the currency of “transformation”—as in the AGO’s recently declared prioritization of diversity, which works in tandem with tenets of liberal multiculturalism. To be sure, processes of “transformation” can oftentimes be more accurately transcribed as the *naturalization* of longstanding narratives of violence and exploitation. As Scott Morgensen writes,
“[s]ettler colonialism is naturalized whenever conquest or displacement of Native peoples is ignored or appears necessary or complete, and whenever subjects are defined by settler desires to possess Native land, history, or culture” (Spaces 39). Hasty declarations of change and reform do not, therefore, preclude the habituation of settler coloniality and the persistent calcification of its technologies; instead, these can even allow for economies of coloniality to be adroitly recast through the Creative City appeals to the “good life.” With these ideas in mind, it is now worth reaching further back into the genealogy of modern technological citizenship, to a period marked by the consecration of the same narratives whose supposed “transformations” this chapter has explored.
Chapter 4

Acoustiguides at the National Gallery of Canada’s Centennial Exhibit

To commemorate the Centennial of Confederation in 1967, the National Gallery of Canada (NGC) in Ottawa organized the largest and most comprehensive exhibition of Canadian art to date. *Three Hundred Years of Canadian Art* showed at the NGC from May 12 to 17 September 17.\(^{45}\) The collection included close to four hundred paintings, sculptures, as well as graphic and decorative arts, tracing a line from the French colonial period to the nation's hundredth birthday. Adding to the significance of the NGC's retrospective was that it marked the first time an interactive technology was used in a Canadian gallery.\(^{46}\) The Acoustiguides (fig. 3) were individual, hand-held, portable tape playback machines which contained a recorded tour of the major works on display, narrated by exhibit curator R. H. (Robert Hamilton) Hubbard. Although the exhibit's introduction of the audio guide passed with modest fanfare, this chapter argues that it serves as a crucial—even if nascent—iteration of cultural citizenship, and indicates the nation’s entrance into liberal modernity through technological access and participation.

In order to fully grasp the relevance of the exhibit and its use of an interactive technology, it is necessary to situate the exhibit in the context of 1960s Canada, and more specifically, the Centenary. To do this, section 4.1 briefly delineates the socio-political landscape of the tumultuous decade, as well as the rousing yet also ameliorating techno-spectacles of the Centennial celebrations. 4.2 then postulates that Centenary's technological ovation to nationhood can be read

\(^{45}\) The exhibit was later pared down and shown in the newly renovated and renamed Art Gallery of Ontario in Toronto that same year.

\(^{46}\) As claimed by Maureen Johnson's article in the *Ottawa Citizen* at the time.
alongside the work of thinkers like George Grant and Marshall McLuhan, who compose a foundational group of Canadian cultural theorists concerned with the aesthetic and/or moral implications of emerging technologies and the rapidly shifting terrain of communications. Their ideas are riveting less because they lend a taken-for-granted theoretical frame, I argue, but more because their work—like NGC’s exhibit—function as evocative signposts of their time. Emerging
from the historical era in question, there is a resonant immediacy to these ideas which delimits the contours of the modern nation, while capturing the affective dissonances associated with its modes of belonging. At the same time, it must be stated that the “canon” produced by these lauded theorists is just as important for the generative gaps they leave behind; as such, they serve as the necessary points of departure for subsequent thinking about technological citizenship. The last section, 4.3, returns more attentively to the NGC’s *Three Hundred Years* exhibit in order to explore the role of the audio guide in facilitating rites of cultural citizenship. I argue here that the constructed visual-aural landscape beckons the audience through the promise of control, access, and communion as panacea to exclusion and alienation. This participatory art historical landscape evokes George Grant’s rendering of technological society as a “comprehended promised land” (*Technology* 28), and with it, the mythic “wild” conquered in the settlement of the nation. By summoning the audience into its folds, the exhibit also coaxes into existence a particular *subject* of nation, whose body is urged to maneuver through the linear narrative of nation, and perform the gestural and ambulatory articulation of progress.

Running as an undercurrent throughout this chapter is Ian McKay’s “liberal order framework” thesis, which conceptualizes Canada as a “category” or “a historically specific project of rule, rather than either an essence we must defend or an empty homogeneous space we must possess” (621). Such an analysis seeks to denaturalize the “politico-economic logic” of liberalism, and asks us to think through the ways in which it is/was established and secured, through acts that often involved violence. McKay’s framework provides an integral lens in this examination of how nation is congealed through technological intervention, and how bodies are ushered into its fabric—whether through exclusion or strategic inclusions—and in the process, defined as *within* or *without*
the discourse of modernity. Ultimately, this project is also one that reveals its own tensions and fissures.

4.1 1960s Canada

On July 1, 1967, actor and activist Chief Dan George of the Tsleil-Waututh Nation took to the stage in Vancouver's Empire Stadium to partake in the "Centennial Birthday Party." Here, in front of a jubilant crowd of 32,000 gathered, he delivered an impassioned soliloquy which opened with the following lines: "How long have I known you, Oh Canada? A hundred years? Yes, a hundred years. And many, many seelanum more. And today, when you celebrate your hundred years, Oh Canada, I am sad for all the Indian people throughout the land." As one newspaper at the time reported, George's "Lament for Confederation"—an unflinching indictment of the colonial state—left the crowd "incredulous and silent" (Bolton). George's "lament" evidenced the amplifying struggle for Aboriginal rights that perhaps found its footing in the 1960s alongside other global decolonizing movements, but would surely continue well beyond it (B. Palmer). While his speech might have seemed in stark contrast to the other exuberant salutes that took place at Empire Stadium and all throughout the country that day and year, it was in fact one moment among many during the 1960s which revealed the deep fissures within official narratives of nation.\textsuperscript{47} Many of the decade's tensions collected around rapidly transforming ideas of nation; while some in the country were anxiously clinging to British legacy, others were demonstrating their opposition to a system increasingly recognized as outmoded, or downright oppressive and colonial. In Quebec, the \textit{maîtres chez nous} ("masters in our own house") rallying cry behind the Quiet Revolution and the

\textsuperscript{47} For more on the significant changes and turmoil of the 1960s in Canada, see Kuffert; Miedema; B. Palmer; Palaeologu.
election of the Liberals under Jean Lesage seemed to capture the bourgeoning movement for self-determination which was steadily gaining in strength and urgency. This discontent was further intensified with the founding of the Fédération de Libération du Québec (FLQ) in 1963, and the 1968 publication of Pierre Vallières's incendiary *Nègres blancs d'Amérique.* Added to this already heady mix were the unrests and anxieties not unfamiliar to other parts of the West in that period: the women's movement, labour strikes, as well as rapidly changing demographics caused by an upsurge in the youth population, and substantial increases in numbers of non-European immigrants.

The coalescing tensions and pressures during this period drove the federalists in Canada to "a new phase of constitutional wrangling" (Kuffert 221). In 1963, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was formed to find ways to conciliate the disquieted Francophone community back into the folds of nation. The growing demand for global labour in the late 1950s also eventuated in the introduction of 1967’s immigration points system, which was commended as a departure from the overtly discriminatory policy based on race and nationality, in favour of one which appraised potential newcomers based on the supposedly "objective" criteria of education and skills (Hawkins; Li).

The crisis in Quebec in particular also led to a number of state measures to rehabilitate the nation's symbolic landscape and, as Miedema states, to reinvigorate the potency of nation for the growing number of the discontented. Included among these symbolic overhauls was the creation of the new Canadian maple leaf flag in 1965, and the replacement of "God Save the Queen" with "O Canada" as national anthem.

---

48 Importantly, the B & B Commission is seen as the precursor to the adoption of official multiculturalism. For more on this, see Haque, “Multiculturalism.”

49 See Haque for a more critical assessment of the reasons behind this new immigration policy.

50 Although “O Canada” did not officially become the national anthem until 1980, moves were already well under way during the 1960s to replace “God Save the Queen” (“National Anthem”).
In the midst of this turbulence, Centennial appeared as the serendipitous opportunity for many Canadians to at least momentarily forget their grievances and to galvanize around the performative revelry of nation. Among the numerous projects organized to mark the country's milestone, many focused on the crucial role of technology in fostering national unity and participation. Two CBC-commissioned projects, Gordon Lightfoot's song "Canadian Railroad Trilogy" and Glenn Gould's experimental radio documentary "The Idea of North"51 serve as examples that highlight the centrality of technology as both means of receiving the nation, as well as object of the nation's imagination. The symbolic importance of the rail was also the focus of another project: the Confederation Train, which served as a mobile exhibit of Canadian history, and included interactive displays on board in fifteen cars. The train received 2.5 million visitors as it journeyed across the country, making 63 stops along the way (Aykroyd 124). For communities located outside of the main rail lines, there were also the eight "Confederation Caravans"—each consisting of eight tractor-trailers which travelled on highways throughout the country to reach over 6 million visitors. Additionally, there was the Centennial Canoe Pageant, which included ten canoes, each constructed in the likeness of the voyageurs52 north canoes and aptly named after early explorers like John Cabot and Samuel de Champlain. The canoes made their way from Rocky Mountain House in Alberta to Montreal, tracing along the way the "original water trails" traversed by those early explorers and fur traders (Canada 6). Taken together, these projects did more than simply laud the role of technology in the manifestation of nation; they also provided, through

51 Broadcast on the CBC in December of 1967, “The Idea of North” was part one of what would become Gould’s Solitude Trilogy.
52 Voyageurs were individuals—mostly French Canadians—engaged in the fur trade during the 18th and 19th centuries.
physical and symbolic transport, the means through which the mythos of settler-colonial nationhood could be affectively and haptically (re)lived.

There were further examples of Centennial projects which emphasized the role of technology as both object of national imagination as well as medium of symbolic transfer. The opening of two large science and technology museums, the Centennial Science Centre of Science and Technology\textsuperscript{53} in Toronto and the Canada Science and Technology Museum in Ottawa, ensconced innovation and progress as foundational myths in the story of the nation. Established under the recommendation of the Massey Commission's Report in 1951 (Babaian), the latter opened in the nation's capital in November of 1967. This museum's stated goal to study the role of science and technology in the "Transformation of Canada" ("Vision") reinforces the national mythos regarding the principal role of technology in the constitution of modern Canada. In the same year, the National Film Board of Canada (NFB) launched its groundbreaking Challenge for Change/Société Nouvelle (CC/SN) documentary program, which would go on to produce around 145 French and English films in its thirteen years (Baker et al.). Capitalizing on newly invented portable filmmaking technologies like the Sony Portapak, introduced to the market in 1967, NFB filmmakers travelled through the country to engage with various communities in collaborative, process-oriented documentary projects. The program was guided by the philosophy that access to technology, especially for underrepresented and marginalized groups, could lead to citizenship education and social change. This program was mobilized by the conviction that participatory technologies and public communication channels have the potential to corral disparate bodies into a coherent democratic community.

\textsuperscript{53} The opening of the renamed Ontario Science Centre was delayed until 1969.
Of all the Centenary events, none was grander or more successful than the International and Universal Exposition (Expo 67). Held between April 27 and October 29 in Montreal, Expo 67 was attended by over 50 million visitors from around the world. Among Expo 67’s greatest achievement was its introduction of multi-screen and large-format films which were the direct precursors to IMAX technology (Achland; Griffiths, Shivers). While Centennial events as a whole worked to project a vision of Canada as a thoroughly modern nation, nowhere was this more evident than the Montreal fairgrounds. Expo’s theme "Terre des Hommes/Man and His World"—drawn from the title of a 1939 book by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry—and its themed pavilions (including: Man the Explorer, Man the Producer, Man the Creator, Man the Provider, Man in the Community) were the broad declarations of tolerance, pluralism and universalism. Kenneally and Sloan write that this convergence on universal "Man" was an attempt to extend the World Fairs’ traditional cynosure beyond that of individual nations, and instead articulate the "needs and desires of all humankind" (6). This affirmation of universal citizenship, however, must not be seen as separate from the view that Expo was offered as a conciliatory gesture towards Quebec. As Alexander Wilson points out, the award of Expo 67 was meant as a stimulus to urge the province to relinquish its “infantile” ethnic concerns and finally join the continentalist advance towards a "technological society" (164). Not in the least bit surprising then, is that the universalizing tendencies of Expo 67 occurred alongside a host of Centennial celebrations—namely the NGC’s Three Hundred Years exhibit—which were distinctly and unabashedly nationalistic in scope. The proclamation of universal humanism in fact gave flourish to the nation by serving as an extendible model of accommodation through which the latter was able to retain its foothold. In other words, rather than slackening the boundaries of nation, a planetary paradigm can be the binding substance that actively reaffirms them.
Centennial celebrations did not merely function as the palliative salve aimed at quelling internal fractions; they also seduced through the technologized projection of nation. The Centennial’s techno-pageantry performed the heralding of nation in such a way that emphasized the crucial role of technology—and the interactive and participatory paradigms they espouse—in the very rites and rituals of citizenship. Deserving of further attention here is the collusion of technology and the body. Expo 67 presents the most explicit example of how technology structured vision and spectatorship, though other Centennial projects also point to the panoply of ways that Canadians were encouraged to construct and consume nation through technology. The NGC’s employment of Acoustiguides for its Centennial exhibit presents an interesting distillation of many of these ideas, including the notion of technology as binding thread but also common horizon. Operating through a distinct sensory register than that of Expo 67, the Acoustiguides allow the audience to tune in “directly” to the sonic frequencies of nation. Of course, the underlying imperatives here (of capturing, and receiving the nation through a technologized lens) were not new, but the speed and intensity with which these technologies were employed are revealing of the nation’s accelerated public coming-of-age. These technologies were employed to locate, seduce, and effectively marshal subjects into modernity, which McKay defines not necessary as an era, but the “lived experience…of rapid change and its social consequences” (“Introduction” x). Viewed in this light, the technological harbingers of Canada’s entrance onto a modern, international stage during the late 1960s worked in the service of constructing and/or validating a particular kind of civic participant. This is a subject "plugged in"—ideologically but also viscerally—to the apparatus of nation, and primed to receive its overtures.
4.2 Technological Citizenship

The undeniable relationship between nation and technology, crystallized by the technological landmarks showcased during Canada's Centennial, has been amply illustrated through the work of Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan, George Grant, as well as the many others who followed.\(^{54}\) These thinkers are noted for the ways in which they place technology front and centre in the story of Canada. Many—perhaps most notably Grant, Kroker, and even McLuhan, though the latter exerted considerably less energy on the matter of national identity—put forth that there is something unique about the Canadian experience with technology, forged out of the foundational relation to the intractable landscape. These thinkers make the case that the very idea and mythology of Canada was consecrated through the "technological transcendence" of geographical and physical obstacles (Charland 201), and that Canada has very much been materially and symbolically constituted through technology's collision with nature. In particular, much focus has been placed on the capacity of communication lines which span the width of nation—especially rail and radio—to bridge physical expanses, and just as crucially, to construct a unified consciousness. The intractability of the landscape points directly to why these communication lines remain central in much of Canadian technological discourse. As Robert E. Babe argues, “to communicate is to make common, either across space or through time” (Canadian 4). To communicate, in other words, is to make nation in the act of stitching the unruly expanse of land into a legible and traversable imperial web through various connective tissues. Within this scene, technology as mediation and rationalized technique plays a crucial role.

Three key theorists who continue to shape our thinking around nation and technology are Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan and George Grant. In his book, Technology and the Canadian

\(^{54}\) See especially Kroker; Angus; Charland; R. D. Francis.
Mind, Arthur Kroker presents the argument that their towering spectres give shape to much subsequent discourse around technology which have preoccupied a considerable tract of Canadian cultural theory. Kroker states, in particular, that these three theorists present diverging and yet equally crucial lenses to the role of technology in the national landscape: Grant offers a conservative nationalist critique of technological dependency, McLuhan a liberal technological humanism, and Innis a realist approach focused on political struggle. Similarly, Mookerjea et al. make the case that, while these figures do not necessarily comprise a sacred and inviolable "point of clear origin" in Canadian cultural theory, their influential works do provide a pivotal entry point into explorations of the relationships between communication technologies and national identity (11). Taking this into consideration, I argue that the work of Innis, McLuhan, and Grant provides a useful launching point from which to embark on the theoretical mapping of the crucial role of technology in national identity. Innis was a trailblazer in the areas of political economy and communications theory in the first half of the twentieth century. His works were of direct influence on Grant and McLuhan, the latter of whom was Innis's colleague and sometimes collaborator at the University of Toronto. Both Grant and McLuhan, coming shortly at the heels of Innis, were the two most prominent voices in Canada in the area of technology during the 1960s. These thinkers prove especially significant within the parameters of the late 1960s, a particularly frenzied era in the production and performance of technologized nationhood; their contemporaneity offers a crucial theoretical lens and affective “immediacy” through which to read the technological iterations of nation during this time. That they have since come to be regarded as a canonic nucleus within Canadian cultural theory reflects, in an interesting way, the hegemonic idea of nation being articulated through the fervour of the 1960s.
Of the three, Innis’s and Grant’s works confront most directly the meeting of technology with the land. Innis, in his doctoral research, *A History of the Canadian Pacific Railway*, produced an exhaustive study of the ways in which the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) physically shaped the nation, and in effect, how western civilization left its indelible mark upon the land. He argued that European settlement and civilisation in North America was determined by the physical landscape, and that the CPR was the manifestation of the ability to overcome geographic obstacles. George Grant is perhaps even more explicit about the drive behind the technological transformation of the land in his theorization of the North American primal, which he defines in his essay, "In Defense of North America," as stemming from the confrontation of the "alien yet conquerable" landscape of North America with the Calvinist Protestantism of the early English settlers (*Technology* 19). This decisive encounter provides the originary myth which explains the technological impulse propelling Canadians’ most resonant ideas of national identity and belonging. Grant contextualizes this North American primal against the European primal, which by contrast is rooted in the "chief tension" arising from the intertwining of Greek tradition and Christianity (18). The latter is also differentiated from the North American primal in that it is grounded in the notion of an autochthonous relationship to the land. Grant elaborates that the North American primal is generated through—and also generates—a particular relationship to land:

All of us who came made some break in that coming. The break was not only the giving up of the old and the settled, but the entering into the majestic continent which could not be ours in the way that the old had been. It could not be ours in the old way because the making of it ours did not go back before the beginning of conscious memory...none of us can be called autochthonous, because in all there is some consciousness of making the land our own. It could not be ours also because
the very intractability, immensity and extremes of the new land required that its meeting with mastering Europeans be a battle of subjugation. (17)

This account provides an affective analogue to Innis’s political economy. Grant’s passage, like much of his other writing, reads as a threnody that reveals a resoundingly solipsistic moral imperative expressed through a consolidating settler perspective. This is also a fascinating passage for the way in which it elegiacally construes the forging of North America as an alienating “break” from “the old and the settled” and a necessary estrangement with “the extremes of the new land.” Because the land did not—and could never—belong to the new settlers, their identity had to be moulded in wilful opposition to the land, which was subsequently seen as needing to be continually conquered by the will of man. This inhospitable land thus serves an important symbolic function in the national imaginary; its wildness is that which needs to be perpetually (re)established, in order that it can provide an embryonic “wild” against which the will to technology (the rational-scientific imperative to tame and subjugate) can be emphasized through juxtaposition.

The outer world was not the only terrain fundamentally altered by the will to technology. A notion that comes up repeatedly through much of these thinkers’ works is that technology fundamentally structures our psyches and determines the way we think and relate to others. For Grant, technology is neither a neutral nor separate entity with which we are able to choose how we wish to interact—an external "playground" or "orchard where we can always pick variegated fruit;" instead, technology "moulds us in what we are, not only at the heart of our animality in the propagation and continuance of our species, but in our actions and thoughts and imaginings" (Technology 15). While Grant was perhaps the most pessimistic in his understanding of the colonizing potential of technology, other thinkers shared his idea that technology had the force to shape consciousness for better or worse.
The Toronto School of Communication, an influential colloquium of interdisciplinary scholars at the University of Toronto whose core included Innis, McLuhan, and Eric Havelock, were joined by their intersecting interests on the ways that communication technologies shaped our psychology (de Kerckhove) as well as the “social and cultural infrastructure of societies” (Marchessault, *Marshall* 108). Innis, in as early as his 1923 history of the CPR, was already putting forth the idea that technology, far from being something externally located, was in fact "the necessary condition and lasting consequence of Canadian existence" (Kroker 94). While McLuhan is probably the most eminent of the group for his general postulations regarding the psychic/psychological impact of electronic technologies, he also traced the psychological impact resulting from the technological incursions into the landscape. In his posthumously published essay, "Canada and Counter-Environment," one of his rare undertakings of the Canadian question, McLuhan argues that the North American inheritance of the "war on empty wilderness" from its settler ancestors continues to shape the Canadian spirit. A century of life on the frontier produced a population defined by their antagonistic relations with the brutality of nature, relations that resulted in the forging of a particular type in whom was necessitated “initiative amidst solitude” (75). “Like Wordsworth and Thoreau,” McLuhan further states, "North Americans spend their time scanning the environmental mystery, taking spins in the country instead of spinning thoughts at home" (79). What we can glean from these theorists is that Canadians are invariably marked—in body and psyche—by the technologically conquest of the land. The colonization of the Indigenous inhabitants of this land, meanwhile, was not a matter that elicited equivalent consideration.

Aside from determining external and internal landscapes, technology has also come to be the often invisible lens through which Canadians see the "character" of the nation as well as each other. As Arthur Kroker argues, "Canadian identity is, and always has been, fully integral to the
question of technology” (12). It is important to think about the functions served by the demonstration of Canadian identity through technology. Technological mediation allows the articulation not only of romantic settler-colonial attachment to idyllic landscapes, but also a determined will that is forged from the direct confrontation with the wild. This is a fortitude which conceives its own survival as indelibly linked to an overcoming of the landscape and its perilous indeterminacy. We can see this in, for example, Grant's assertion that the "almost indomitable" land incites a certain kind of (liberal) subject and societal character; "[t]he intense seasons of the continental heartland needed a people who whatever else were not flaccid. And these people not only forced commodities from the land, but built public and private institutions of freedom and flexibility and endurance" (24). Canadian myths of origin centre not merely on the wildness of the landscape in and for itself; rather, wildness serves as the verdant and receptive ground upon which to emphasize the exercise of over-determined technological will.

4.2.1 Will to Technology

While the preceding section considered the ways in which technology shapes both external and internal landscapes, what follows is an attempt to examine more extensively the generative capacity of technology to (re)produce bodies within the folds of nation, and the role of technology in situating us in an historical narrative through rhetorics of seduction. Not only is technology interjected into our affective, imaginative relationships with nation, but it in fact plays a primary role in generating and conducting these relationships in the first place. Integral to this inquiry is an examination of how, emboldened by origin myths centering on the confrontation of nature with technological prowess, Canadians carry forth the embodiment and reproduction of the will to technology.
A few years before Chief Dan George's delivered his indictment of the colonial state during its one hundredth birthday, another George had already sounded his ominous "lament." George Grant's *Lament for a Nation*, published in 1965, centred on what the philosopher saw as the inevitable casualties strewn across the path towards unbridled technological advancement. In his famous treatise, Grant mourns the sundering of ties to the European tradition of contemplation inherited from the Greeks, and condemns what he observes to be the willing surrender of Canadian sovereignty and keen embroilment in America's imperial injustices in Vietnam. The technological imperative, against which Grant warned, springs from the "crucible of pioneering of Protestant liberalism" that produced "those uncomptemplative, and unflinching wills" which in turn become the driving force of a technological society (*Technology* 25). The wellspring of the will to technology is the liberal faith in not merely the creative *capacity* but also *necessity* to conquer the landscape, overcome requisite obstacles, and create the world anew. Any excavation of such an imperative would be incomplete without an examination of the idealism that compels us towards this technological striving. Namely, Grant points to the relationship between our mastery of the human and non-human world and the perhaps paradoxical liberal discourse of "freedom" and "values" with which this mastery becomes inextricably entwined. Arguably, Grant begins to posit a significant affective dimension to the technological will in his explanation that "[w]hat makes the drive to technology so strong is that it is carried on by men who still identify what they are doing with the liberation of mankind" (*Technology* 27). He also maintains that it is Canadians' "belief in progress through technique" which is "the central cause of motion in their souls" (*Technology* 64). In other words, the drive towards technological mastery and imperial expansion is rarely articulated through the naked language of capitalist accumulation and power; rather, its efficacy and potency lies in its alignment with individual freedom and unrestrained human potential.
Given its underlying ethos, Grant sees the will to technology as manifested in the imperial desire to conquer and transform the world through the scientific-rational conquering of chance—or the "desire to make the future by mastery, and the closing down of all thinking which transcends calculation" (Technology 40). Unsurprisingly, this process involves the overcoming of the cruel indifference of the external world—both in terms of body and nature. North Americans according to Grant are, after all, the heirs of a Calvinist conviction that righteousness can be achieved by both body and nature having been brought to submission. In this view, human freedom is actuated not only through its severance from nature, but also in the form of technologically determined incursion into nature as separate and external terrain. Further, the will to technology as way of knowing determines the tenacious warrant with which the external terrain is dominated; Grant writes, "the technological society is not for most North Americans, at least at the level of consciousness, a 'terra incognita' into which we must move with hesitation, moderation and in wonder, but a comprehended promised land which we have discovered by the use of calculating reason and which we can ever more completely inherit by the continued use of calculation" (Technology 28).

Furthermore, Grant observes that the rise of the homogenisation under American technological imperialism—which he diagnoses as the threat of continentalism—results in the rationalization and instrumentalization of culture, as well as what can be characterized as the tragic clamping down of the sense of wonder and awe with which one can engage with the world. To return to the passage of Grant's quoted in the preceding paragraph, the will to technology creates a "comprehended promised land," a space stripped of wonder and replaced by an unrelenting drive towards technological advancement. It can be argued that, alongside this loss of wonder, is the proliferation of further myths regarding freedom and progress, as well as the reproduction of liberal
capitalist faith in the individual human capacity "to shape the world as we see it" (Technology 114).

4.2.2 Absent Nation

The charges laid by Grant regarding the dominance of the technological are partially reflected in the work of compatriot thinkers who conceptualize Canada as a nation that, while lacking in national “content,” is manifested through channels of technological mediation instead. For example, Maurice Charland makes the argument that what he terms technological nationalism does not create a nation, so much as it ultimately reveals the absence of one. Technological nationalism is coined by Charland to illustrate anglophone Canada's faith in the power of technology to construct a nation or polis through the development of communication lines. Canada's preoccupation with establishing merely the channels for communication, rather than any content to occupy those channels, results in an "absent nation" that is vulnerable to "the power and seduction of the American cultural industry or, indeed, of the technological experience" (198). Basing this argument on the CPR, which he argues acts as a common carrier that delivers others’ content, his critique points out that it is the medium of transfer rather than the actual content/freight which becomes most substantive.

Infrequent as it was, much of McLuhan’s grappling with the Canadian experience seems to converge on the experience of being caught between two empires and having to observe America’s “spectacular light show from afar” (Marchessault, Marshall 81). In his argument concerning Canada as "counter-environment," McLuhan makes the rhetorical claim that Canada could be the "psychic theme park" for the U.S., "something like a Hollywood set that simultaneously links the past with the present, a city with the wilderness" ("Canada," 73). Referencing the installation of the United States' Distant Early Warning system (DEW line) in the Canadian north, McLuhan
likewise makes an argument regarding Canada as an "anti-environment" whose function is to reflect the more powerful and realized presence (i.e. America) back to itself, and to provide a neutral setting for the working through of "other people's fantasies" (73). Rather than providing "substance or community" for the construction of a polis, as Charland would put it, technological nationalism constitutes nation merely as reflective surface, or "common carrier" of foreign signals and content (198). A similar idea of nation as predicated primarily on the marvel of form is echoed in the observation of some critics regarding the "empty" images projected through the technological dynamo of Expo 67 (Fulford; Highmore). In his excavation of Expo 67's phantasmagoric visual regimes, Ben Highmore makes the observation that the seductive power of the National Film Board's Labyrinth pavilion can be traced to the technological medium rather than any content in itself; "the dreamwork of the pavilion was designed to allow for new perception, and like many of the other pavilions the dream was fashioned from banal elements (the residues of the workaday world)" (138). These observations of Canada as empty carrier and/or as articulated through the banality of images indirectly point towards the idea of the nation as achieved through the triumph of form or mediation. Put more iconically, it is McLuhan's medium trumping content. Intimated in this configuration is that the corporal alignment with nation through technological spectacles does not hinge on what one is meant to look at, but rather: how one must look, and how one must position the body in order to do so.

For Charland and McLuhan, the "emptiness" of nation is the product of Canada's ambivalent oscillation between the ballast of British tradition— from which it is inherently alienated— and the inevitable lure of American futurity. However, to leave the notion of supposed "emptiness" and "absence" simply at the matter of undecidability would be to ignore a crucial element in this equation: that of technological will(ing). The "absent nation" as the result of an
unimpeded technological drive can be revealingly contextualized against colonial constructions of
the continent as *terra nullius*. In the latter, *emptying* and *absenting* (distinctly verbs) occur through
physical, juridical and imaginational apparatuses which work to "clear" the land and transform it
into an amenable ground for the flowering of European civilization. On the one hand, the absent
nation can be viewed as an unfortunate and unintended symptom according to Charland. Under the
lens of settler colonialism, however, it is the product of an active and willful imperial landscaping,
reminiscent of what Patrick Wolfe terms the *logic of elimination* which propels settlers’ violent
incursions into Indigenous land and communities to claim it as their own. In an interesting
reverberation of Charland and McLuhan's arguments regarding the "empty nation" as predicated
through *form* over *content*, Wolfe’s efforts to distinguish between colonialism and settler
colonialism puts forth the latter as *structure* rather than *event*. By this he means that elimination
becomes the "organizing principal of settler colonial society rather than a one-off (and superseded)
ocurrence" that can be consigned to a distant past ("Settler Colonialism" 388). In Wolfe’s view,
the logic of elimination is one that needs to be perpetually (re)enacted—at a structural, but also
individual level—in order to naturalize European settlement and render its mechanisms invisible.

The "absent nation," while expressive of a certain ambivalence with regards to Canada’s
technological sovereignty, also serves to highlight a dynamic of colonial exertion, such that the
terrain of "nation" is established precisely as a backdrop for the exercise of will. Further, the
absence of content—guised paradoxically through nationalism as inherent “essence”—reveals the
power of the structure and the self-sustaining exercise of formal seductions carried ever forward
and onward. Close inspection of the "absent nation" is important in the context of this research *not*
because the latter is motivated by mournful clarions to replenish an impotent nation/alism, but
instead because the absent nation concept hints revealing at the ways that national narratives are mobilized less through content, and more through form, medium and structures of feeling.

4.2.3 Sensory Extension

One of McLuhan's most influential ideas centres on the sensory extension of man through technology. This notion is especially explored in Understanding Media (published in 1964), where he examines the ways that various media—ranging from the printed word, clothing, the light bulb, and television, to name but a few—function as the prosthetic means through which our bodies and their sensory capacities are extended out into the world. He writes, "[t]oday, after more than a century of electric technology, we have extended our central nervous system itself in a global embrace, abolishing both space and time as far as our planet is concerned" (19). Here, McLuhan's humanism is in bold display; the “extension” of man takes for granted the ontological category of “man,” and moreover, gives credence to the notion that man’s body (and its sensory amplitude) can undergo hypnotic externalisation and be mirrored forth in cosmic perpetuity. Admittedly, the preeminence of the humanist subject is slightly tempered in McLuhan’s suggestion that while electronic media extend our central nervous system out into world, they also facilitate the process through which we in turn become reshaped by these technologies which "incorporate the whole of mankind in us" (20). Arthur Kroker's slightly more ominous elucidation of McLuhan's technological sensorium emphasizes that it is "artificial amplification, and transferral, of human consciousness and sensory organs to the technical apparatus, which now…returns to take its due on the human body" (72). McLuhan himself indicates that the simulation of consciousness through electronic media is the "final phase of the extensions of man" (19). Such ideas point even more accurately to McLuhan’s technological humanism, which Kroker regards as still firmly embedded.
in liberal ideology. In stark contrast to Grant’s conception of technology as force of domination and subjugation, McLuhan believes not only that human freedom and creative can be unleashed through new media, but furthermore, that true human potential is to be achieved not “outside’ the technological experience, but...'inside' the field of technology” (Kroker 64).

It might be tempting to refer to McLuhan's employment of the Narcissus myth in order to fixate on its presumed testimony to ecstatic embodiment through limbic and sensory extension. However, what McLuhan means to emphasize in his allusion to Narcissus is not simply that the extended and exteriorized man falls hopelessly in love with his own replicated image, but that this very exteriorization in fact reveals a state of narcosis—and the failure of recognition—wrought through the traumatic amputation of the self. McLuhan prefaces his account of the myth by pointing out that Narcissus comes from narcosis, or numbness.

The youth Narcissus mistook his own reflection in the water for another person. This extension of himself by mirror numbed his perceptions until he became the servomechanism of his own extended or repeated image. The nymph Echo tried to win his love with fragments of his own speech, but in vain. He was numb. He had adapted to his extension of himself and had become a closed system. 

(Understanding 51)

It is not infatuation with the repeated image so much as the stupor induced through this repetition that is inflected in McLuhan's recounting. Moreover, McLuhan takes erroneous readings of the myth as arguing for (merely) narcissistic infatuation as further proof of the "intensely technological and, therefore, narcotic culture" that tends towards it (51-2). For him, bodily and sensory extensions necessarily involve narcosis or numbness, because the "amplification" of a sense through extension/amputation produces a shock which the body then seeks to alleviate through a denial of
recognition. Extension and amputation are in fact coterminal, for both stem from and (re)produce a state of hypnosis. Therefore, to conceive of extension as merely ecstatic embodiment would almost miss entirely McLuhan’s point regarding auto-amputation as the body’s attempt to bring an overstressed and overstimulated system to equilibrium.

McLuhan’s argument regarding the technological extension/amputation of our limbs and nervous systems becomes particularly useful when placed alongside questions of national identity and belonging. The solipsistic preoccupation with the image of self finds itself mirrored in the exuberance over Centennial’s techno-pageantry of nation. This was especially apparent in the refraction of nation through the sublime spectacles of Expo 67. Interestingly, Expo was known to be “McLuhan’s Fair;” as Donald Theall writes, the pavilions were based on McLuhan’s works, and his writings were also displayed throughout the fairgrounds (126). This projection of McLuhan—the man, the ideas—throughout Expo is the whimsically near-literal manifestation of his extension/amputation thesis. However, as Pierre Berton’s nostalgic recounting of the nation’s “golden year” (1967) makes clear, Canadians in general were collectively basking in their own images, projected at home and abroad. This enthrallment in confronting the exteriorized body was also seen in considerably less frenetic participatory models such as the one provided by the NGC’s Centennial exhibit. To be transfixed by the pyrotechnics of nation—especially one heralding its own entrance into universal modernity—is in many ways also to be hypnotised by one’s own epidermal diffusion out into McLuhan’s "global embrace" (Understanding 19). Keeping in mind McLuhan’s thesis that extension and amputation (and its attendant hypnosis) cannot so easily be pried apart, one can surmise that such ecstatic declarations of technological amplification function simultaneously as the intended cures for an overstressed system, and the narcissistic-narcotic yen to confirm the uncertain body.
4.2.4 Participation, Communion and Agency

The techno-displays of nation during Centennial intimate that, coming at the heels of sensory solipsism, national communion is not as much a non-sequitur as one might have initially figured. To apply McLuhan's idea of bodily extension to the enlarged sphere of a *body politic* would entail drawing attention to the channels which facilitate this relationship or transfer. More precisely, these channels can be delineated as those of participation and communion, or the affective and incorporative bonds of citizenship. Just as we are seduced by the ability of technologies to extend our bodily capacities, so too are we lured by the promise of participation and communion.

The 1960s saw a noted rise in what Zoe Druick ("Participatory") terms "participatory media" funded by the federal government, of which the National Film Board's Challenge for Change/Société Nouvelle programme (CC/SN) was a prime example. CC/SN modeled itself as an open and democratic film and video project whereby the documentary subjects—and even in some cases the larger community of which these subjects are a part—were invited to be active participants in various stages of the filmmaking process. Druick writes that "[t]he participatory aspect of the projects was not limited to those making the films, but was also conceptualized as an invitation to an imagined spectator" ("Participatory" 126). The subjects and community members involved in CC/SN films like Colin Low's *The Children of Fogo Island* (1967), *Billy Crane Moves Away* (1967), Willie Dunn's *The Ballad of Crowfoot* (1968), etc., were invited to contribute to the pre-production, filming and editing stages of the projects. In this way, the CFC/SN films were promoted as "exercises in citizen building" which offered democratic platforms where subjects-citizens could actively work alongside the NFB in the joint project of nation-building (Druick, *Projecting* 150). Importantly, the CFC/SN was also tied to larger government initiatives in the
1960s which sought to promote citizenship through participation. Druick provides the example of the Company of Young Canadians (CYC). Launched in 1966 by Lester B. Pearson, CYC was an organization aimed at Canadian youth which sought to promote social change and economic development through various community-based projects. Druick argues that the driving engine behind the CYC was the belief that "increased participation in the affairs of government would alleviate feelings of alienation" among the disenchanted youth (*Projecting* 136). Martin Loney also writes of the marked increase in government funding during the 1960s and early 1970s in citizenship participation initiatives for youth, aboriginal and underprivileged groups, which he argues formed part of a general “conservatizing” project to integrate these groups and consolidate state power (454). In these initiatives, participatory became a means for the state to channel and ameliorate certain productive energies before they turned into unwieldy dissent.

Such state-led initiatives put into emphasis the ways in which subjects were beckoned through the promise of participation and engagement, which were offered as palliating responses to the growing sense of disenchantment and alienation in the 1960s. A return to the Grantian elegy in "Canadian Fate and Imperialism" is useful in delving further into the figure of alienation. While his essay is, on the one hand, a searing indictment of what the author claims as Canada's proximate complicity in the "sheer evil" perpetrated in the Vietnam War by the United States, what makes this treatise especially fascinating is its rhetorical performance of disengagement with the author’s imagined community. As Grant writes; "to know that citizenship is an impossibility is to be cut off from one of the highest forms of life" (*Technology* 77). Grant's "lament" regarding the domineering force of technological will must be set directly against the deep alienation he felt as a result of the

55 For more diverse positions regarding the CC/SN program, see Waugh et al's anthology *Challenge for Change: Activist Documentary at the National Film Board of Canada* (McGill-Queens University Press, 2010). Much of this collection argues that CC/SN was a successful New Left activist endeavor.
disjunction wedged between his desire for national fealty, and what he deemed to be his nation’s increasing proclivity towards an American imperialism that he could not bring himself to endorse. For Grant, Canada's compliance to America's blind and unrelenting drive towards technological supremacy led to the former's implication in the atrocities of Vietnam. Canada could not sit on the sidelines and claim innocence; afterall, unlike Nazi Germany or Communist Russia, America represented the apogee of Western civilization rather than its aberration. Thus, if Canada partakes in the profits of empire, so too must it claim culpability in its moral failings. Grant's lament also delineates a general malaise in the face of the sheer magnitude of the will to technology; one might think about how solipsism leads to alienation, civic ineffectuality, and the sense of one's solitary voice drowning in the multitude of the technological "dy

Although both have since come to comprise a canon in Canadian cultural theory, Grant and McLuhan are perhaps less compelling as criterial authorities than they are as thinkers who manage to eloquently capture a vital and polarizing period in the ongoing saga of nationhood, an era when ideas around belonging, cohesion and technological citizenship were being wrestled with on such a public—domestic as well as global—stage. In this regard, the “liveness” and urgency of their theorizing becomes particularly significant. Their ideas lead us into the next section, which returns to the NGC’s Centennial exhibit, and demonstrates how the will to technology, the absent nation, sensory extension and participation take more distinct aesthetic form, and become materially and viscerally cogent. This section considers how interactive technologies, the useful proxy for participatory democratic forms, are employed as potential curatives for the fomenting disenchantments of the body politic.
4.3 *Three Hundred Years of Canadian Art*: Summoning Citizenship

"These works and others now become part of the vast panorama of Canada which the Ottawa gallery has spread out for thousands of visitors. The purpose: to provide a long, retrospective look at Canada."

-Kritzwiser, “In Splendid Company” A11

With all the fanfare surrounding Expo 67 in Montreal, widely acknowledged as one of the most popular and well-attended World Expositions, another Centennial event occurred that received little attention in comparison. The National Gallery of Canada’s exhibit, *Three Hundred Years of Canadian Art* ran from May 12th to September 17th of that year. In his sweeping intellectual history of the gallery, Douglas Ord surmises that while the exhibit was embraced by critics who were swept up by “nationalistic fervour,” its rather insular scope nonetheless failed to garner much attention from the public (223). Not surprisingly, the critical and scholarly interest in *Three Hundred Years* also pales in comparison to that around Expo 67.⁵⁶

Despite this, the exhibit deserves attention for a number of reasons. Firstly, it remains, as the NGC boasts, the "largest and most inclusive" showing of Canadian art assembled to date ("Our History").⁵⁷ This retrospective was the most sustained and ambitious attempt to craft and disseminate a narrative of nation through the assemblage of a symbolic landscape. The exhibit's authoritative scope also ensured its continuing influence beyond the initial showing. *Three

---

⁵⁶ The growing list of critical works about Expo 67 include: Hurley; Jansson; Kenneally and Sloan; Kröller; as well as the forthcoming *Reimagining Cinema: Multiscreen and Split Images at Expo 67* (ed. Marchessault and Gagnon).

⁵⁷ The government provided funding through the Centennial Commission’s Visual Arts Program to aid museums and galleries in organizing exhibits to celebrate the nation’s milestone (Aykroyd 138). This resulted in a spate of retrospective exhibits in 1967, including: “Group of Seven works” at Tom Thomson Gallery (Owen Sound, ON), “Ten Decades of Canadian Art” at the Rothman Art Gallery (Stratford, ON), and “One Hundred Years of Canadian painting” in the Canadian pavilion at Expo. Previous to this, there were also other attempts to construct comprehensive nationalist art historical narratives, like the NGC’s “Canadian West Coast Art, Native and Modern” in 1927 and the Tate Gallery’s “A Century of Canadian Art” in 1938 (Jessup, “Hard”).
"Hundred Years" became the basis of the NGC's slide library on the history of Canadian art, comprised of approximately two thousand educational slides, and accessible to educational institutions around the country.\(^{58}\) This exhibit can be viewed as an articulation of a bourgeoning narrative of nation that was, at the same time, already calcifying as authoritative National Art History.

Secondly, in contrast to Expo 67’s “fantasy of modernity,” wherein nation was protracted through utopic visions of the “future-tense city” (Marchessault, “Multi” 31), NGC’s exhibit serves as a commemorative project intent on establishing a prehistory culminating with the crowing of the modern nation. The “project” of nation, which McKay’s reconnaissance reminds us is never an easy feat, simultaneously involves the envisioning of its future trajectory as well as the anxious work of genealogical justification. Both are, in a sense, complimentary chimeras cohered through a linear narrative of progress. *Three Hundred Years* hinges on the notion of anteriority, such that the mechanisms of the active, present-tense nation *in the making* occur precisely through the reminiscent fantasy of nation as already *made*. The exhibit, which chief curator Robert H. Hubbard described as "all-inclusive" and ideologically neutral,\(^{59}\) manifests a vision of nation as emerging from a distinctly colonial framework. It is divided into four sections arranged chronologically through three floors of the gallery: the French colonial period (late 1660s to mid-1700s), the English colonial period (mid 1700-1867), Post-Confederation (later 19th century), and culminating in the Twentieth Century, the most robust section comprising roughly half the works (Harper). The curatorial thesis, as emphasized through Hubbard’s audio guide narrative, is that Canada’s colonial

---

\(^{58}\) From a letter written by J.W. Borcoman (Director of Education at NGC in 1967) to an exhibit artist, Lillian Freiman.

\(^{59}\) Said Dr. Hubbard of the collection: "There's no message. We wanted to avoid that” (qtd. in Kritzwiser A11). He further states, "everything was chosen for its esthetic importance. We want everyone to draw their own conclusions from what they see.”
lineage directly matures into the nation’s definitive modern movements, which include Painters Eleven, Les Automatistes, and most emblematically, the Group of Seven (Hubbard, *Three*). It also bears mentioning that the seeming incongruity of a *Centenary* exhibit structured around a *three hundred year* chronology in fact reveals a national imaginary articulated just as much through Confederation as through an underlying colonial rubric based on European contact.

Thirdly, the exhibit is also important because it marked the first time an interactive technology was used in a Canadian museum or gallery. A decade before its Canadian introduction, the Acoustiguide Corporation invented the first audio interpretative device, used to deliver a guided tour of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Hyde Park home narrated by his widow Eleanor Roosevelt. The first use of the audio guide/Acoustiguide in a major blockbuster exhibit was the Tutankhamen exhibit in the 1960s, where the invention of portable audiocassette technology allowed the audio guide to be easily handled by museum audiences (J. Fisher 26). The introduction of the Acoustiguide for the NGC during the Centennial marked an orientation towards interactive and participatory paradigms that were one of the most prevalent figures of the 1960s in Canada. The soundscape created by NGC’s Acoustiguides also presents an interesting phenomenological counterpoint to Expo. While Expo—and especially the National Film Board of Canada's *Labyrinth* pavilion—encouraged the sublimation of self through the phantasmagoric appeal of the overpowering spectacle (Highmore), the NGC’s use of the Acoustiguide contributed to a much different experience based on intimacy, autonomy through controlled access, and the regulation of

---

60 The Canadian Museum of Science and Technology (originally named the National Museum of Science and Technology) opened this year; it has also boasted the use of interactive technologies since its inception.
61 Acoustiguide was an American company that, in 2005, merged with the Israeli owned Espro Information Technologies. The Espro Acoustiguide group has offices all over the world, and remains one of the top two providers of interactive mobile museum technologies around the world today (Tallon xix).
62 See Zoë Druick's discussion of the National Film Board and participatory media as the "representative semantic figure of the decade" ("Participatory" 120).
affect. In the latter, there is no overpowering object threatening to engulf the body. Rather, the body is guided through a meticulous tour of nation—whose visual spectacality is supplemented by a corresponding soundscape—and thus judiciously grounded as its rational subject (read: citizen).

In pondering the significance of *Three Hundred Years*, perhaps there is a much too easy tendency on the researcher's part to overemphasize the importance of beginnings, or commencements. However, in designating something a "beginning," we unintentionally assign to it a power that it might otherwise not possess. In her consideration of Derrida's *archive fever*, Carolyn Steedman reminds us that beginnings are not given, but in fact created; "[n]othing starts in the Archive, nothing, ever at all, although things certainly end up there" ("Something" 1175). Part and parcel of the urge to archive is the need to locate—or more precisely, to possess—the beginning, or if that is not possible, to write a story that provides an origin. This is especially the case in settler nations, where a miraculous and innocuous origin can be constructed to legitimize the state's existence through what Jonathan Bordo might describe as the (re)inaugurating "rupturing event" (231). Of course, the "fever" for beginnings can be attributed to the State as much as to the researcher embarking on a hunt for justificatory frameworks. With this in mind, my weighing of the NGC's Centennial exhibit and its significance lies less in the interest of its various firsts—the first Centennial, the first prolonged attempt to chronicle the whole of Canadian art history, the first use of an interactive technology in a Canadian museum. Instead, I contend that this was a particularly interesting event in a discreet time in a larger historical continuum, a moment when notions of Canadian identity were being rigorously tested and carved out. This exhibit is also significant because it compels us to think about the Centennial urge to configure and narrativize the "beginning" of the nation. In other words, the exhibit and its employment of audio guide technology put into emphasis how the rehearsals of "beginnings" are themselves performative.
exchanges that might involve both official state pageantry as well as the more intimate heralding of bodies (subjects of nations) through interactive interfaces.

When I conducted archival research at the NGC, first in the spring of 2012 and later in the fall of 2013, I was struck by my surroundings. The NGC's archives sits at the back of the gallery, with floor-to-ceiling windows on one side, overlooking the Ottawa River and the Alexandra Bridge. This area has a concentration of monumental testaments to national history, including the National Archives, the Parliament, and the Chateau Laurier. Directly across the river is Gatineau, Quebec, where the national museum and the NGC's human history correlate, the Canadian Museum of History, is located. Also visible from this vantage point is Roxy Paine's towering sculpture, One Hundred Foot Line. Not far from that, right atop Nepean Point, stands Hamilton MacCarthy's 1915 imposing statue of French explorer Samuel de Champlain holding his famous astrolabe, with an accompanying bronze plaque declaring him “The first great Canadian.” During my hours here, thinking about nationhood while absentmindedly gazing out the window, I often felt that I had been thrown in some picturesque mise-en-scène of nation. Beholding Champlain, I remembered having read that his sculpture was not so long ago adorned with the figure of a kneeling Indigenous scout, before protests successfully led to this figure’s removal in 1996 (Lauzon). I could hardly help but become cognizant of the fact that I was being intentionally situated within an aestheticized, commemorative historical narrative of nation, where it still remained possible for me to discern vestiges of coloniality “reformed.” There is indeed something uncanny about that moment when one realises that she is being heralded by nation. This can perhaps be summed up by my feeling that I could have easily surrendered to being set in an undoubtedly manufactured and yet on some level deeply bewitching scene—bewitching because it plies its audience with ready assurances that she too can be located as inheritor or recipient of the spoils of nation.
It was these provocations that propelled me to think about how to delve deeper into the phenomenal aspects of the Acoustiguide, and how it would be possible to historically imagine the ways that this technology would have beckoned visitors by certain affective appeals. In Jonathan Sterne's exploration of the excavation of "audible pasts" made possible through the advent of sound reproduction technologies, he presents the caveat that while these technologies allow us to construct an audible history, we do so through what amounts to partial assemblages of traces of material detritus. He writes, "[w]e can listen to recorded traces of past history, but we cannot presume to know exactly what it was like to hear at a particular time or place in the past" (Audible 19). The proceeding section draws from this supposition, to consider how the Acoustiguide only provides some provisional clues about how bodies would have moved through the exhibit, at which points along the path they might have lingered, or how they might have responded to the exhibit's technological appeals. It was also in the NGC archives that I began to give more careful consideration to Don Idhe's provocation that one should attempt to listen phenomenologically. Idhe writes that this approach "is more than an intense and concentrated attention to sound and listening, it is also to be aware in the process of the pervasiveness of certain 'beliefs' that intrude into my attempt to listen 'to the things themselves'" (Idhe 49). Perhaps the soft twinges of guilt I felt each time I turned a page and caused the crinkling of onionskins to disrupt the utter silence of the archive was telling me something about discipline and seduction, about how the body falls in line.

From here, I began to mull over whether there were some possible material and phenomenal linkages that brought me, as researcher in 2013, relatively closer to the experience of the exhibit visitor nearly half a century ago. I listened to a cassette copy of the audio tour on an old SONY Sports Walkman, a relatively rudimentary technology not much different from the machines the Centennial visitors would have used, except for the fact that mine allowed me to rewind and
fast forward through the tape, while those early Acoustiguide only allowed users to press the start and stop buttons, and to adjust the volume of the emanating narrative. My device was also less bulky than the original contraptions, which visitors had to strap around their shoulders and carry through the exhibit spaces. Like the 1967 user, I bore this technology upon my body; I carried it. The headset made contact with my ear, forming an aural enclosure. Not having any other parallel physical access to the exhibit, I used this audio tour to plunge me into the curatorial narrative. When I pressed play, the voice that greeted me was not just any anonymous authorial figure, but the commanding baritone of Dr. Hubbard. "I will be your guide on this tour of Canadian art" is the booming assertion that commences the fifty-minute tour. Hubbard is the authorial presence who captains the trek through physical, historic, and symbolic terrains; to listen to his voice and to succeed in following its benevolent commands is to be led through the symbolic thicket of the wilderness, the labyrinthine exhibit space, as well as the rather nascent terrain of national art history all at once.

4.3.1 Control and the Will to Technology

In the NGC's Centennial exhibit, the visitor makes their way through the topography of nation which simultaneously propels the feet, eyes, and ears. Through the use of the audio guide in particular, the exhibit embroils the visitor through three seductions of interactivity: control, access, and communion. The first of these, the myth of control, revolves around a notion that the engine of cultural citizenship is churned in part through a conviction in empowerment, engagement and exertion. The mode of participation enabled through the exhibit’s visual-aural landscape can recall a certain imperial fortitude, or a will to technology that belies its ideological lineages. It would not be entirely far-fetched to argue that many contemporary museum experiences—especially those
based on the rehearsals of cultural citizenship for certain privileged national subjects facilitated through participatory technologies—harken back to the imperial resolve that led the nation's earliest settler-colonizers to trudge through the "wilderness," conquering its anarchy through an overdetermined technological prowess. This is particularly the case with Three Hundred Years, whose thesis centres on the imaginary and symbolic manufacture of nation through the technologized conquering of land.

The construction of landscape through technology—technological will—is nothing new in the aesthetic history of Canada, though two examples warrant attention here. Firstly is the role of the "soldier-topographer" in the pre-Confederation period. Soldier-topographers were British engineers and artillery officers whose training in the medium of water colour allowed them to render and record the topography of the new colony before the invention of photography (Hubbard, Development; Kritzwiser). Importantly, the work of these artists—a group that included George Heriot, William Henry Bartlett, and Thomas Davies, all represented in Three Hundred Years—were "widely published" to satisfy the European curiosity about the colonies (Hubbard, Development 48). The second example, as examined in more detail by Lynda Jessup (“Group”), is the free rail access provided to members of the Group of Seven during the early part of the twentieth century. By granting cross-country passage to these artists, the CPR enabled the production of images that have since become deeply embedded in the psyches of Canadians as the quintessential visual repertoire of nation. As the rail hurtled west, it created an imperial communications artery for the transfer of both material as well as symbolic inventory across the vast stretch of land. To refer again to McLuhan's point regarding technology as limbic and sensory extension, the rail was just as importantly an eye cutting through the land; it was a scopic penetration westward, towards the psychic frontier of nation.
The mastery of the landscape—or, as Grant would perhaps describe it, the liberal faith in the individual human capacity "to shape the world as we want it" (Technology 114)—becomes manifested in the physical and moral architecture of the NGC exhibit. This occurs through the incorporation of many of these landscape “views” into an iconic national art narrative, and also by the rigorous figuration of the Group of Seven—the quintessence of Canadian artistic identity—as intrinsically tied to the land. Jessup diagnoses this tendency when she writes of the mythologisation of the Canadian artist as “bushwhacker,” or “a premodern man seeking, in the imagined premodern environment of the Canadian wilderness, the physical and emotional intensity identified with authentic experience” (“Bushwhackers” 132). This brandishing of Canadian identity as founded on a heroic confrontation with the “wild” is evidenced in Hubbard’s audio tour description of the Group’s forefather, Tom Thomson, whose artistic legacy is inseverable from his fabled relationship to the land. Describing Thomson’s famous painting, “The Jack Pine” (1917), Hubbard emphasizes that the self-taught artist was also a guide and fisherman in Algonquin, and someone who “knew the north, from personal experience” (Hubbard, Three). Hubbard’s subsequent recounting of Thomson’s death by drowning in 1917—in a setting not unlike the very one depicted in this painting—seems to be offered as part parable, part sacrificial narrative; while Thomson was ultimately unable to survive his passage through the wild, he nonetheless demonstrates a constitutional affiliation with the land that his descendants must inherit, and yet ultimately surpass.

Beholden to this logic, the Three Hundred Years narrative clarifies that a primordial romance with the land must necessarily be rendered through technological will. The exhibit in fact resembles that which Grant termed the "rationalised kingdom of man," created through our ill-advised faith in technological progress (Technology 25). The landscape of nation presented here is one in which the “wild” has been brought into the national gallery where it is tamed through
chronology, stitched into narrative, and enlivened through a corresponding soundscape. Here, in
other words, wilderness is transformed—*rationalized*—in miniature. Further, the Acoustiguide
provides this national thesis with an extra-sensorial resonance through which the visitor can relive
the colonial drama of overcoming the indeterminacy of the wild through a fantasy of control. In
the museum, visitors trudge through the "wild" unknown—now produced under various curatorial
tutelages—while relishing in their power to transform its very "wildness" through the cunning push
of a button, and turn of a dial.

The sense of viewer agency engendered here centres largely on the exhibit’s promised all-
encompassing breadth. As culled from the aforementioned comment by a journalist who wrote that
the exhibit offered a "vast panorama of Canada" (Kritzwiser A11), *Three Hundred Years* was
touted as a comprehensive chronicle of nation. Lieven de Cauter’s configuration of the panorama
as a spatial or temporal horizon which cannot be thought separately from capitalist and colonial
modes of consumption is illuminating here. The Centennial landscape encourages a panoramic
gaze—whereby the primacy of perspectival agency is foregrounded against “a surrounding nature”
available to be exploited as “raw material” (de Cauter 16). By moving swiftly through the space-
time of nation, the visitor sees, hears, and *feels* Canada come into being through the narrative of
progress. The conceit of such narratives rests on the implication that subjects granted the privilege
of bearing witness to the triumphal tale of progress themselves emerge as modern. Marshall
Berman’s broad configuration of modernism as “any attempt by modern men and women to
become subjects as well as objects of modernization” sheds light on the experience of modernity
as centred on an onerous pursuit of agency (5). He describes this ordeal as that of subjects
“mak[ing] their way through the maelstrom” (16). Berman was not alone in his use of this particular
imagery; navigating the turmoil of the modern experience is also an exordial figure in McLuhan’s
Taking a cue from Edgar Allan Poe’s homonymously titled story, McLuhan conceptualizes his methodology as “a descent into the maelstrom” (v). Based on a belief in the futility of resistance, McLuhan’s treatise instead calls for submersion in the very “whirlpool” of modernity, seeing this as the necessary ritual through which cognitive and sensorial dissonances could be reorganized such that they eventually provide a “thread…out of the Labyrinth” (v). It must also be noted that McLuhan’s method fascinatingly resembles the panoramic mode, in that it is presented as the “attempt to set the reader at the center of the revolving picture created by these affairs where he may observe the action that is in progress” (v). The instrumentalization of the vista—variably conceived of as Berman’s “maelstrom” or McLuhan’s “whirpool” and “revolving picture”—also calls to mind Mary Louise Pratt’s diagnosis of the promontory trope recurrent in much of Romantic and Victorian travel literature. The promontory, according to Pratt, allows an omniscient subject who presides over, and "deictically order[s]," the scene below (201). In the settler colonial context, this distanced mastery over the rendered scene is an imaginational mechanism that, far from innocent, is fundamentally tied to the erasure of Indigenous presence. This idea is inextricably tied to Veracini’s view that settler colonialism establishes "first consciousness" through the double disavowals of both indigenous presence, as well as its own foundational violence (Veracini, “On” 4).

Significantly, the panoramic sweep of Three Hundred Years is manifested not through sight alone, but through the confluence of image and sound. Sound functions as more than just a supplement to vision; as an enclosing surround, the acoustic element challenges the limiting frontal perspective of vision. It floods the scene, and the diegetic plane stretches, deepens, and becomes more lushly layered. Even so, the NGC’s Centennial audioscape sits in tension with McLuhan’s romantic account of acoustic space. Emerging out of Innis’s time-biased vs. space-biased dialectic,
McLuhan’s *acoustic space* harkens back to the phenomenology of supposed preliterate cultures in order to describe the immersive qualities of the electric age. Unlike its visual correlate, this auditory realm is without centre or focus; it is instead omnidirectional, nonsequential, and constantly in flux (McLuhan and Carpenter 67). The audioscape accompanying *Three Hundred Years* differs markedly from this notion of acoustic space because the former is the aural-realization of a rational and linear art historical narrative wherein citizenship is induced through *overcoming*. The body beckoned here is implicitly one that is hooked up, plugged in to a linear imagined community, and further cohered atop its *sonic* promontory. It must be said, therefore, that immersion in a scene does not always have to do with the surrender of one’s jurisdiction over her own body. In *Three Hundred Years*, the aesthetic surround plays directly into our fantasies of control, for it presents itself as a compass *laid out*, and made available for easy and facile access. As gallery visitors position themselves—or *are* positioned—within the constructed vistas of nation-as-panorama, they can imagine themselves as those enterprising early settlers, who hacked their way through the undergrowth of nation.

4.3.2 Access and Reception

The fantasy of control granted the visitor through the exhibit's employment of the Acoustiguide can be encapsulated in this visitor's ability to push the start/stop button, and to adjust the volume setting. The visitor is able to control the pace of their journey through the grand narrative of National Art History. It is safe to say, accordingly, that "control" within this context occurs in a minor key, and is fleeting at best. Rather, it is access and reception which prove to be the more paramount and plausible entreaties within the covenant of citizenship. The *trial*—and *trail*—of citizenship here is organized around the body of the visitor being placed within and
guided through an aestheticized commemorative landscape of nation, and invited to bear witness to its coming of age.

Unlike audio tours which run through closed-circuit broadcast system and allow users to wander through the gallery at their will and “tune in” to fragments of corresponding commentaries via radio signal, the linear tour employed in *Three Hundred Year* manages to censor its users’ itinerant wandering. Once they pressed “play,” they are to an extent beholden to the guiding voice emanating from the tape deck, which explicitly shepherds them through the exhibit chronology. Throughout a good part of the approximately fifty-minute audio guide, curator and narrator Dr. Robert H. Hubbard offers the listener detailed instructions as to which path they should follow as they listen along to his narration. Hubbard peppers his tour with numerous reminders to the listener to pause the player so that they might linger on particular works before proceeding to the next tour marker. He provides narrative links to cohere the exhibit framework, as when he suggests to the visitor looking at David Milne's "Trees in Spring" (c. 1916) that they should peak down over the gallery railing in order to see how the line of abstraction extended from Milne to contemporary painting: "you'll be able to look down to the floor below and see how far the tendency towards abstraction has gone in contemporary art. And then you can glance back at Milne's work and see its origins" (Hubbard, *Three*). At another point, he also offers suggestions regarding how the listener might position their body while absorbing the art and his commentary:

...in completing our survey of 300 years of Canadian art, we're going to be discussing a number of works here...I'd suggest you sit on one of the benches near that centre of the room—providing, of course, that they're not already full—because from that vantage point, most of the paintings I'll talk about can be clearly seen. (Hubbard, *Three*)
What makes these aural directional cues fascinating is that they function like signposts which render the terrain legible. Moreover, they attempt to position the listener as receiver of this national discourse and heir to its history. The exhibit is an inherently modernist project which presents a cumulative history of progress; the visitor, by cutting a circumscribed path through the space-time of nation with the aid of the Acoustiguide, thus re-enacts its chronology, and becomes a fellow citizen of modernity.

The notion that both citizen and nation are mutually constituted by the body being guided through an emblematic panorama can be further parsed through an inspection of the figural witness. Jonathan Bordo's analysis of the "specular witness" in works by Tom Thomson and the Group of Seven is especially helpful here. Bordo describes the "dual role" of this important figure-function in settler colonial landscapes; the witness "exalts a picture that testifies to an unpicturable condition—the wilderness sublime—while simultaneously legitimating, as a landscape picture, terrain violently seized, dispossessed of its indigenous inhabitants, and reconstituted as territory" (227). The witness function ultimately hinges upon acts of erasure and possession, particularly as landscape testimony necessitates a "rupturing event" whereby the re/presentation of “wilderness” functions both as a disavowal of what came before, and an inauguration of history “enshrined as visual testament” (231). The process through which landscape declares the "zero degree of history" (231) sheds light upon how the colonial framework of Three Hundred Years—which begins with the French occupation, and reaches its pinnacle in mid-twentieth century modernity—rehearses the commencement of nation through a strategic denial of all that preceded it. Revealingly, the only aboriginal work referenced through the entirety of Hubbard’s audio guide is a passing mention of an unidentified totem pole, which is only acknowledged as a landmark to guide the listener on to the next tour marker. Within this landscape, the visitor serves as the pivotal specular witness, by in
fact (re)witnessing the scene of symbolic conquest in the panoply of landscape paintings by artists such as Thomas Davies, Cornelius Krieghoff, the Group of Seven, etc., and also by receiving the curatorial narrative of nation stitched together by Hubbard and the gallery. Bordo further makes the case that such acts of witnessing require the absenting of the human spectator, or else its substitution by a nonhuman proxy: “the crossing of the threshold from witnessed to unwitnessed is marked by the erasure of the figural traces of human presence from the contents of the representation and the substitution of that witness figure, for example, by the nonhuman figure of a solitary tree” (231-2). Tom Thomson’s iconic The Jack Pine is exemplar; in this painting, the pine tree declares its looming custodianship of the unfolded vista without needing to tarnish the latter’s immaculacy through the admission of human presence.

These arguments add a compelling aesthetic dimension to Ian McKay’s assertions regarding the “politico-economic logic” of the liberal order framework (“Liberal” 621). McKay’s description of the “project” of Canada as “an attempt to plant and nurture, in somewhat unlikely soil, the philosophical assumptions, and the related political and economic practices, of a liberal order” (624) essentially discloses the very mechanisms of landscape/ing. Because liberalism did not exist as a “consensus viewpoint,” McKay conveys that the arduous task of establishing it as such from the late 19th century onwards required acts of “symbolic or actual violence” (632). This in turn helps us to understand why the settler nation’s elected aesthetic genealogy lingers so compulsively on tracts of “uncultivated” wild. The representation of these verdant landscapes is akin to the sculpting of the land and the simultaneous erasure of its tillage, a logic that Carole Pateman locates back to the settler’s proclaimed “right to husbandry” over terra nullius (36). McKay also puts forward that the liberal order works to install a faith in the “epistemological and ontological primacy” of the individual (624). This heroic individual—an abstract, “purified and
The “rationalised” entity rather than an actual human being (626)—resembles Bordo’s solitary pine tree; both have been implanted and naturalized within the mythic space-time of nation as absentee overseer.

In *Three Hundred Years*, sound functions as invitation, resonating its intimate appeals through sonic pulsations against the ear. The body “receives” nation by engaging in what Paul Connerton describes as the commemorative "re-enactments of the past" (72), whereby nation is consecrated through seemingly minute, everyday bodily commitments. This process also entails that "culturally specific postures" of citizenship become archived within the body (73). The visitor’s entrance into the landscape of nation occurs most provocatively through the bodily enablement of acoustic access. It is tempting to perceive of this process as *auscultation*, a diagnostic practice involving listening, either through an instrument or unaided, to the sounds generated by the body’s internal organs. This rests on the assumption of nation as the entity to be splayed opened and ascertained. However, a more accurate conception might be that the Acoustiguides provide channels through which the soundscape of nation enters the body, and the body receives. This particular organization of acoustic reception can even be apprehended as a “diagnostics” for the citizen rather than the nation, for it is employed to stabilize and naturalize the modern subject-of-nation. This proves especially the case when one remembers that deployments of participatory paradigms especially proliferated in the 1960s, a period in Canadian history when state-led initiatives were put in place to quell dissent, or at least choreograph its more threatening energies through managerial projects of inclusion (Loney; Druick). It indeed intriguing to think of the ways that an interactive soundscape of nation might function as a curative means of entry into the otherwise inviolable archive, which engages the body and appeases some of its potentially unruly energies.
The privilege granted to the NGC’s *Three Hundred Years* visitor revolves primarily around the notion of *access* to a dreamscape already unveiled. By re-witnessing and re-living the conquering of the wilderness, this visitor is ultimately bestowed an invitation to bear witness to the modern nation as it ripens into fullness at the cusp of its second century. In these ways, access and bodily reception become the vital methods of summoning the subject-of-nation; in return, the opened body assumes the form of another landscape where the nation unfurls itself, where modernity *takes place*.

4.3.3 Communion

In the case of the Acoustiguide, access and reception do not enable members of an imagined community to *speak together*, so much as they elucidate the capacity for these members to *tap into* and *inherit* a common audiovisual topography of nation. Nevertheless, the promise of communion remains a crucial mode of enticement. By fleshing out and materializing an audible narrative of nation, the Acoustiguide was meant to function, in a sense, as Benedict Anderson’s "imagined sound," or language as a cultural technology that connects members of a nation affectively by “a ghostly intimation of simultaneity across homogeneous, empty time” (Anderson 144-145). In order for there to exist that “deep, horizontal comradeship” (7), which for Anderson is an imperative of the imagined community, the archive needs to present itself as accessible and penetrable. The subversion of the hierarchical verticality that stands in the way of idealised notions of community requires that bodies be invited not just to saddle up alongside inviolable archives, but allowed to *enter into* them. Thus, the Acoustiguide functions through the endowment of an intimate soundscape which *enfolds* its receiver. This soundscape becomes a point of entry: the sensuous and flexible opening through which visitors are invited to conjoin with the official national imaginary.
For Anderson, *simultaneity* is designated as *unisonance*, a shared chorus which stands as an "echoed physical realization of the imagined community" (Anderson 145). The Acoustiguide rests on the tacit invitation for the visitor's body to merge with a national narrative by providing a sonic accompaniment that follows them as they tread the landscape. In this way, it serves as a theatre of communion which facilitates a kind of ecstatic embodiment, whereby the synchronization of national history with one's ambulatory passage through the exhibit renders this journey epic, and deepens its affective and symbolic resonance.

Although sound helps to guide these bodies in imagining communion, the technological experience itself is riven with contradictions. Firstly, communion figured through the user's agentive access to the national archive is funnelled through a seemingly private and autonomous experience of engaging with the Acoustiguide. The user submerges themselves into the national text through Dr. Hubbard's tour, but does so through discreet sound bubbles. Hence, the Acoustiguide experience highlights the somewhat paradoxical relation produced when we put on headphones. Schönhammer describes this individual listening experience (through the use of the Walkman, for example) as the temporary cessation of "being-in-the-world" (136), such that contact and connection with the acoustic realm received through one's headset entails the concurrent "loss of contact" (135) with one's immediate physical world. Secondly, there is also the matter of the listener becoming beholden to an authorial voice, as Charland has explored in his critique of the hollow promise of technological nationalism. Charland provides the example of national radio (the CBC), which he argues forms a community of listeners who are a passive “audience, subject to a voice" (Charland 205). In *Three Hundred Years*, interactivity and participation are considerably delimited by the commanding presence of the state gallery, and Dr. Hubbard, its synecdochic voice. Rather than being allowed to pursue divergent informational paths, visitors here are corporeally
ushered into a synchronous imagined community. In this way, communion is structured through entrance into an imagined relationship with the archive, under the tutelage of an aural chaperone.

These minute contradictions ultimately reflect the larger inconsistencies of fellowship and belonging as articulated within a modern liberal humanist framework. As Adele Perry points out, “the new nation forged in the crucible of the liberal order project would be one where settler men would gain their constituent status through the layered exclusion of women, Indigenous people, and racialized migrants” (289). Similarly, the contention that modernity must be performed through the appropriated “alien” (Myers 16) is epitomized in the ways that the Canadian “whitestream” continuously assigns itself as diametrically opposed to aboriginality (Denis 83). Modernity, in other words, is a perpetual drama of exclusion—or histrionics of so-called “inclusion”—wherein even proximal others prove necessary so that modernity might have something to appropriate and define itself against. If, as Perry states, exclusions can be “constituent,” it is also conceivable that inclusions might serve to prohibit and estrange. Nowhere is this more apparent than in George Grant’s alienation, borne of the realized disjuncture between self and the civilization/society to which one is supposed to owe allegiance. Grant’s particular alienation, with its Protestant, Red Tory inflections, might seem a curious cynosure given other, more urgent, exclusions. Placed in context with the “lamentations” of Chief Dan George as well as countless other marginalized subjects, however, it crucially throws light upon the sweeping extent of liberalism’s limitations. In turn, this might help us to recognize not only how Canada’s liberal project is plagued by both “external” antagonisms as well as deep-seated “internal” schisms, but also that this order perhaps
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63 Denis provides as an example 1969’s White Paper on Indian Policy, a “thoroughly liberal and modern policy” federal government policy which essentially sought to assimilate First Nations (153)
congeals precisely in and through its attempts to supersede and/or reorganize these variegated tensions.

4.4 Conclusion

_Three Hundred Years_, like many other aesthetic-symbolic gestures which coalesced around Canada’s Centennial, was an attempt to project a presupposed and stable nation amidst a time of social discontent and existential turmoil. It presented a peaceable colonial narrative of a nation three centuries in the making, with all the violences of this making rendered invisible. This, along with the fact that the exhibit appeared hermetically shielded from other major developments in the art world—including most crucially the radical pronouncements of performance and body art—makes it appear temporally aberrant. However, that which is left unspoken is perhaps most revealing of the _all too timely_ urge to contain the ruptures and fissures ripening under the seemingly stalwart corpus of nation. Moreover, the exhibit’s art historical chronology not only provided a genealogical justification for the colonial status quo, but also worked to secure a coherent subject-of-nation within the landscape of modernity. Its construction of a nominally interactive soundscape of nation reveals the ways in which body-technology encounters are often mobilized around a politics of recognition and discourse of hospitality. Interestingly, while relying on interactivity to proffer the myth of nation as open and mouldable text, such models of cultural citizenship often mobilize around reception rather than participation, and are enabled through a corporally seductive and narratively accessible, though ultimately _unalterable_, archive. Afterall, the user's agency lies not in any ability to change the contents of the archive, but merely in determining the pace and direction of its narrative detours and digressions. As shown in the NGC’s exhibit, citizens come into being—or are "exalted," to use Sunera Thobani’s term—precisely through their bodily
orientation towards official national heritage as edifying and uplifting. It is through their snug insertion into narrative linearity that these citizens become the privileged heirs of a longstanding colonial history which continues to labour—sometimes covertly, other times less so—to contain their many internal ruptures and limitations.
Chapter 5  

Touchscreens at the Museum of Anthropology

We begin with a simple image of a museum artefact. It is a screen, placed roughly four feet off the ground, and tilted at a slight angle so to both catch the eye of the passerby and provide its immediate user with easy visual and tactile access. Its countenance is dusted with a barely visible patina of fingerprints, which forms a silent but telling archive of various visitors’ haptic urges. These marks are an unlikely testimony of cominged presences, or a ghostly imprint of a fleshy commons. This object, of course, is the touchscreen, an apparatus increasingly pervasive in many avenues of modern life, but perhaps especially conspicuous in the museum. In this setting, the fact that it solicits rather than censors the outreached hand is one reason that sets the touchscreen quite apart from neighbouring objects in view. The other reason is that, here in the museum, the touchscreen is often seen as merely a medium for interpretation, rather than an artefact deserving of contemplation and investigation in and of itself. As this chapter argues, directing one’s attention to the touchscreen—and the affective, corporeal, political encounters it elicits and ministers—allows us to delve into museological themes through a particularly cogent, tactile means.

This chapter takes as its artefactual locus the touchscreens at the University of British Columbia’s Museum of Anthropology (MOA). These interactive Computer Access Terminals (MOA CAT) (fig. 4) were installed in 2008 under the aegis of providing increased user-friendly access to museum collections. Aside from promoting visitor experience, these interfaces can also be seen to serve as the public petition to those who have been traditionally disenfranchised and excluded—namely Indigenous stakeholder communities—regarding the museum’s more recent willingness to participate in more collaborative exchanges. Interactivity and mutual exchange, as
encapsulated by the MOA CAT, are multifariously refracted in a host of other infrastructural expansions at the museum during its major renovation project, “A Partnership of Peoples” (2006-2010). These include a major architectural overhaul, and the concurrent development of an online collaborative research platform, the Reciprocal Research Network (RRN). These projects serve to demonstrate MOA’s willingness to contribute to ongoing critical discussions that have beleaguered Western museum practices in recent decades. The touchscreens in particular are not only technologies through which critical or new museological prioritizations of democratized access are *figuratively* communicated; they are also meant to function as the material interfaces that facilitate reciprocal exchanges. Simultaneously an inviting surface that beckons, yet also a tangible limit that
the body brushes up against, this chapter asserts that the touchscreen confesses the paradoxes of the liberal public sphere.

The chapter begins by investigating the figure of expansion on a number of different scales: (new) museology, the museum, and the digital screen. 5.1 delineates the correspondence between the frame as material device and rhetoric apparatus. I argue that the supposedly democratic premise of MOA CAT can be usefully read alongside the utopic postulations of 1960s and 1970s expanded cinema experiments, which saw the collapse of the material screen frame as the potential hypostatization of a universal commons and cosmic citizenship. Paradoxically, I investigate how MOA’s “expanded” participatory paradigms also ensure institutional revitalization, at the same time that they continue to sustain liberal projects of exclusion and strategic inclusion. Following this, 5.2 turns to touch. This section provides a brief history of the deployment of touch in museological settings, before advancing towards the many contradictions of tactile encounter facilitated through the MOA CAT interface. I argue that technological deployments of touch proffer agency and control by facilitating contact between the visitor and the once inviolable archive. However, because they often centre on the mere *illusion* of contact, tactile technologies simultaneously mark the very boundary beyond which the body cannot penetrate. In this way, the choreography of touch through the haptic interface alludes to the ambivalences and limitations of the liberal public sphere, which is the chief focus of the last section. Drawing on Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s concept of the multitude, 5.3 examines how the “fleshy” commons might be facilitated through an actual haptic interface. This section contends that colonial history continues to haunt dreams of an inclusive postcolonial commons.
5.1 Expansion

We can locate a number of broad stroke contextual factors which influenced MOA’s renewal project and subsequent building of digital infrastructures to promote collaboration and knowledge sharing. Many of these point particularly to the 1970s and 1980s, during the development of official multiculturalism. In 1988, the Progressive Conservative Party under Brian Mulroney enacted the Bill C-93, “An act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada” (Canadian Multiculturalism Act), which furnished Pierre Trudeau’s original 1971 official policy with a legislative framework. The Act promises that the Government of Canada will “encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be both respectful and inclusive of Canada’s multicultural character.” Given that the Act was offered as a largely symbolic cure for various social, economic and political demands (Mackey; Henry), it is unsurprising the role that was hoisted on public museums to rehearse this new era of inclusion for the populace. As Ruth B. Phillips notes, Canadian museums were seen as having a direct role in “publicly explaining, validating, and communicating” the diversity of cultures which comprise the nation (Museum 251).

Concurrent to the advancement of multicultural policies were the shifting grounds of museology underway since the 1970s. Many of these changes can, at least loosely, be corralled under new museology, which followed the postcolonial and postmodern turn in the humanities, and interrogated the elite authority of cultural institutions and their hegemonic paradigms of display, representation, and knowledge production. In its broadest sense, new museology

64 Ironically, the Canadian Multiculturalism Act was finally passed in 1988, the same year that the Glenbow Museum in Calgary staged the controversial The Spirit Sings, in conjunction with the Winter Olympics.
65 Between 1993 and 2008, both the administration of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act as well as the funding for museums and other cultural institutions fell under the responsibility of the Department of Canadian Heritage. In 2008, responsibility for multiculturalism was transferred over to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.
articulates museums’ slow and arduous move away from being seen primarily as dusty storehouses of exclusive Culture, towards becoming institutions that promote more inclusive paradigms while appealing to diverse publics. In his anthology The New Museology (1989), Peter Vergo is hesitant to pinpoint specifics of the strategically unwieldy term, although he does offer that it both recognizes and attempts to redress the “widespread dissatisfaction” with tenets of traditional museology concerned with museum “methods” rather than their potential social functions and purposes (Vergo 3). In her later assessment of Vergo’s treatment of the term, Sharon Macdonald writes that, overall, new museology began to conceive of “the museum and the meaning of its contexts not as fixed and bounded, but as contextual and contingent” (3). Macdonald’s own consideration of the term also locates Vergo’s text within the wider context of 1980s theoretical debates around the politics of representation, particularly influenced by postcolonial and feminist critiques, which led to calls for the pluralization of museologies, and the adoption of self-reflexive practices. New museology thus captures the initial stages of an ongoing transition, with museums directing attention away from collections towards visitor experience, education/edutainment, and participation. At the same time, new museological approaches coincide with the growing recognition that museums need to find new ways to reflect and appeal to the diversity and complexity of contemporary audiences (Macdonald; Witcomb). These curatorial and philosophical shifts continue to unfold—though not necessarily in a linear fashion (Phillips, Museum 26)—in institutions like MOA today.

As Amy Lonetree points out, noted shifts in relations between museums and Indigenous groups from the 1970s onwards were not the mere outcome of “academic epiphanies” by non-
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66 Sharon Macdonald identifies contesting understandings of new museology. For example, she indicates her own critical distance from the “orthodoxies” of new museology’s “first wave,” including the latter’s prioritization of “the supremacy of the visitor” (2).
Native scholars and museum workers, but instead, the result of committed Indigenous activism (18). In Canada, the pressures to rectify museology from its distinct colonial lineage grew out of significant controversies that erupted in the late 1980s around two exhibits: the Glenbow’s *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada’s First Peoples* (1988), and the Royal Ontario Museum’s *Into the Heart of Africa* (1989).67 The protests, boycotts, and contentious public debates that followed in the aftermath of these exhibits—and in particular *The Spirit Sings*—led to the creation of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, jointly organized by the Canadian Museum Association and the Assembly of First Nations. After two years of consultations, the Task Force published a report in 1992 which recommended, among other things: increased museum access and training for First Nations communities, greater involvement of First Nations peoples in the interpretation of their own history and culture, as well as the improved efforts to repatriate culturally significant objects to originating communities (Task Force 7-9). The Museum of Anthropology was one of the initial institutions to support the Task Force recommendations, and has in place a repatriation policy guided by Task Force protocols.

While perhaps not an immediate backdrop, the currents set in motion during these decades provided an impactful wind to the sail of the Museum of Anthropology’s renovation project in 2006-2010. Throughout the extensive expansion and renewal project, dubbed “A Partnership of Peoples,” the museum carried out a panoply of changes, including symbolic retooling, architectural extension, and the development of digital infrastructures. Symbolic retooling involved a considerable exercise of rebranding on primarily two fronts. First of all, the Museum looked to broaden its scope to become a “museum of world arts and culture.” The official adoption of the acronymous MOA—and the deemphasizing of “anthropology” and “museum” from its name—
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67 For more on the controversy surrounding these exhibits, see Tator et al; Vogel.
also allowed the museum to place some desired distance between itself and the historical baggage encumbering both terms. In a similar move, the museum’s Visible Storage gallery was renamed Multiversity Galleries: Ways of Knowing, a moniker meant to signal the museum’s newly charged interest in emphasizing, as MOA director Anthony Shelton puts it, “the idea that there is never just one way of knowing and seeing the world” (Mayer and Shelton 3). The pluralizing of “Galleries,” in this sense, begs to be interpreted as MOA making apparent their willingness to engage in dialogue regarding the ways that dominant colonial paradigms should be dislodged in order that the museum can reimagine itself as an agora accommodating of multiple viewpoints and identities. While such modifications can be optimistically taken as evidence of MOA’s progressive transformation, another interpretation might see such declarations of increased accessibility as the institution’s dexterous response to the continuing pressures from First Nations communities throughout many decades. The truth is likely a murky melange of both.

Under the Renewal Project, three quarters of the MOA building was renovated, and the museum also nearly doubled its size by adding another 41,800 square feet to its existing 79,900 square feet (“About The Museum”). There was also the addition of the Audain Gallery, an over five thousand feet space devoted to temporary, large scale exhibits, and an entire new wing, The Centre for Cultural Research. It is important to place MOA’s expansion and renovation in context
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68 MOA director Anthony Shelton said of this rebranding: “[w]e wanted to be very different from that. We wanted to be contemporary, we wanted to be relevant, we wanted to be part of a kind of urban cool” (qtd. in Lederman)
69 Two incidents in the museum’s recent history deserve attention here: first, the protests of the 1997 APEC held at MOA (Phillips, “APEC”), and second, a conference organized by the Union of the UB Indian Chiefs in 2000, during which MOA was condemned for its role in disrupting knowledge transfers in First Nations communities (Phillips, “Re-placing”).
70 Jonathan Clapperton makes a case that certain broad-stroke postcolonial critiques overlook the fact that some Northwest Coast First Nations groups, and in particular the Stó:lō, played an active role in MOA since the institution’s early days.
71 This wing houses, among other things, the Community Research Suite, containing an oral history language lab, a community lounge, a research laboratory designed especially for the handling of cultural sensitive materials, and special storing facilities for families and originating communities (“Museum of Anthropology Annual Report”).
with the spate of other monumental renewal projects being undertaken in Canadian institutions around this time. One might surmise that the controversies of the 1980s and ensuing institutional critiques led indirectly to the revitalization of museums rather than their diminution. Within a Canadian context, Ruth B. Phillips refers to the period marked by revivalist tendencies of Canadian museums in the early twenty-first century as the “second museum age.” This is a period marked not only by the creation of new museums, but also the “unprecedented investment of public and private funds” for the expansion of older institutions such as the National War Museum, the Royal Ontario Museum, the Art Gallery of Ontario, and the Museum of Anthropology (Phillips, “Replacing” 83). Debates continue to gather around whether or not museums have finally become outmoded institutions. Amidst this clamor, however, lies the less considered indication that the museum’s adoption of reparative and self-reflexive practices, far from being inimical, are actually the precondition to institutional growth and revitalization. In other words, they serve as the postcolonial glean which feeds the engine of expansion.

A third integral aspect of the “A Partnership of Peoples” Renewal Project was the development of an online research infrastructure. Co-developed with the Musqueam Indian Band, the Stó:lō Nation, and U’mista Cultural Society, and funded by Canadian Foundation for Innovation, the Reciprocal Research Network (RRN) is a digital research portal connecting over twenty international research and cultural institutions which hold Northwest Coast collections.  
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72 Falk & Dierking also estimate that, internationally, museum attendance has tripled in the last two decades, and the number of institutions doubled (14).
73 These debates regarding the role of museums in a changing world has been approached from various angles, including: cultural and political relevancy (Janes); the continued blurring high and low cultures (Moore); digitization and the “dematerialization” of objects (Frey and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett; Usherwood et al.), etc.
The RRN functions as a digital commons which brings together academics, researchers, curators, and stakeholder communities from around the globe. Through this portal, groups are granted remote access to over 480,000 objects from holding institutions; they can create virtual communities with other participants, share information about objects, contribute to online discussions, and work on individual or collaborative research projects.

Crucially, RRN is built around promoting access and shared knowledge. The problem of access had earlier been pointed out in 1992’s Task Force on Museums and First Peoples as an issue which direly needed to be addressed by Canadian museums, with the chief concern having to do with the fact that First Nations stakeholder communities had limited ingress into museum archives, and no agency regarding the representation and interpretation of their own cultures. The RRN addresses this obstacle by bringing numerous geographically dispersed peoples and collections together through one virtual portal, in order that First Nations’ communities are able to have better access to their own cultural heritage. This process calls to mind Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s proposal of “researching back” as a way to challenge traditional research methodologies which are entrenched with a long history of colonial violence (7). The RRN is meant to subvert the one-way transfer of knowledge that characterizes colonial research by encouraging multivocal and collaborative approaches to research production. For example, object information provided by holding institutions can be supplemented and augmented by the knowledge of community members who are part of the network. On each item page, standard classification data from holding institutions is followed by “Ask a question” and “Shared Knowledge” sections, where members can pose questions to the RRN community or contribute any further information they might have.

_____________________
regarding an object, respectively. Hence, although standard classificatory methods seem to be prioritised, the RRN provides an aggregate ground whereby institutional rubrics might at least be more fully fleshed out—even if not fractured—by community members and researchers who enter into a collaborative dialogue.

Aside from improving access and involving originating communities in the interpretation of museum collections, the RRN also opens up a conversation regarding the contentious issue of repatriation. Both current MOA director Anthony Shelton and former director Ruth B. Phillips refer with pride to a First Nations advisor’s remark that the RRN potentially facilitates a kind of “virtual repatriation” (Mayer and Shelton; Phillips, “Re-placing”). Phillips, however, allows for more caution, stating that, while it is not meant to replace the need for actual repatriation of objects, the RRN has the potential to “restore connections to the collections that remain in museums, reopening channels of knowledge that were closed off by the massive collecting projects of the first museum age and to which community members have a moral right” (“Replacing” 108). This view is echoed by other individuals behind the RRN, who see the network as “providing a space for reconnecting people, tangible and intangible cultural heritage, language, and the land” (Rowley et al.). In its ideal conceptualization and realization, the RRN is seen as a space of reciprocity, a virtual commons that facilitates both figurative and literal encounters of mutuality and exchange. The RRN thus becomes a vessel for, and also indicator of, the museum’s extended prioritizations of community collaboration and its willingness to reconcile Western museum paradigms with Indigenous worldviews.

The symbiosis between physical/digital expansion and ideological rejuvenation can be further deduced in the specific case of MOA’s overhaul of its Visible Storage gallery and, later, the implementation of the digital touchscreen. A significant element of the Renewal Project centred
on the reconceptualization of the role and function of Visible Storage, a system which MOA is widely acknowledged to have developed (Ames, “Visible Storage”; Stubbs-Lee). From as early as the museum’s opening in 1976, UBC researchers, students, and faculty—and later the general public—have had access to research collections through the Visible Storage gallery. Under the tutelage of its first director Michael M. Ames, the museum’s earliest iteration of Visible Storage was mobilized under the philosophy of making as much of the collection available to the public as possible. The underlying “democratic” premise here was that, once unburdened from traditional curatorial and didactic frames, collections would speak for themselves. Nonetheless, there were obstacles to the Visible Storage gallery since its early days, least among them the very practical concern that museum collections were slowly but surely outgrowing museum space. Another issue was that, although only less light sensitive objects were displayed in the original Visible Storage, the gallery still had to implement dim lighting conditions to protect objects. Leading up to the renovation, Shelton admitted that the museum heard from First Nations communities who complained that the “dark” and “dingy” conditions of the gallery robbed displayed objects of their dignity (qtd. in Lederman). Moreover, given the limitations of space, object interpretation failed to be a priority, although the museum did have at hand printed data books available for visitors’ perusal if they wanted information about the panoply of objects on display. Composed of computer printout pages held in plastic covered binder sheets, these data books had been in use for more than two decades, and had long shown signs of wear and tear. An additional shortcoming was that, while the general public found them rather difficult to peruse, the data books also failed to be particularly informative tools for researchers (Ames, Cannibal 91).

Opened in January 2010, the refurbished and newly designated Multiversity Galleries provides an opportunity for MOA to retrieve even more of its global collections from the vaults.
The new Multiversity Galleries holds over 10,000 objects from MOA’s “worldwide collections” in its 15,000 square feet space (Mayer and Shelton). Reimagined as a more interactive space, the galleries include a Presentation Circle, a multi-media space where school groups are often received, and where “touchables” (museum handling objects) are brought out. Placed throughout this space are also four research rooms: for textiles, ceramics, ethnology, and culturally sensitive materials. Various activities occur in these research rooms which adhere to the Multiversity Galleries’ general mandate to promote access and transparency; workshops are held, artefacts processed, and handling objects brought out for research. The galleries’ numerous objects are either openly displayed in wall cases or, in the case of particularly fragile or light-sensitive objects, laid out in large storage cabinets with horizontal glass-topped drawers that visitors can pull out to further investigate should they so desire. These changes signal the museum’s interest in reimagining its space as one that takes into account cultural diversity, as well as invites access, collaboration and participation.

Within the Multiversity Galleries, the MOA CAT are interactive kiosks which allow visitors to access information about the museum’s entire collection through multimedia formats. The MOA CAT were conceived by museum professionals during renovations as a means to replace the museum’s data books with a more enticing, user-friendly system. Each terminal corresponds directly to the specific gallery in which they are situated, though visitors are also able to access the entire Multiversity Galleries collection from each terminal. Beyond the walls of the museum, users can also access an online version of MOA CAT. True to the touted credo of the “multiversity,” MOA CAT allow the visitor to search for objects by a variety of criteria. On the portal page, the “Location” option allows the visitor to search for particular objects by exploring the gallery space rendered onscreen through digital animation. The “Explore Our Collection” tab allows the visitor to navigate museum collections through numerous categories like “places,” “cultures,” “people,”
“categories,” “subjects,” or “timeline” as well as a keyword or objet number search. A third option on the portal page is the “Explore the Globe” tab, where the visitor can use a customised version of Google Earth to pinpoint specific areas of the world where objects originated.

The MOA CAT—as well as the RRN—can be located genealogically alongside the socio-political currents of preceding decades which led to shifting understandings of the role of museums as engines of culture and history. While they are “virtual” portals, both are also the very tangible technologies emerging from a host of contesting and/or colluding factors: Indigenous protest and struggle, ameliorative multicultural policies, and the need for museums to reinvent themselves. Collectively, these factors led to the recognition—whether in good or bad faith—of the need for more collaborative and “democratic” approaches that would at least demonstrate some attempt to wrest some power from elite institutions and place it within closer reach of stakeholder communities and other museum publics.

5.1.1 Expanded Screens

Making a case for how the screen functions as an “immaterial architecture,” Anne Friedberg analyzes how the “expansion of material built space” occurs through the “‘virtual window’ of the film, television, or computer screen” (151). MOA enacts this architectural expansion through the development of both an online research infrastructure and the tactile digital interface, which become the “virtual windows” that extend the ambit of the museum beyond its physical walls. The touchscreen in particular can furthermore be construed as one material correlate to new museological tenets of access, inclusion and participation. Put another way, by digitally mimicking the dissolution of its own boundaries, the haptic interface materializes the hospitality of the inclusive commons. I further contend that this inclusive haptic interface can be productively
deciphered in context with the utopic postulations of 1960s expanded cinema, which gestured towards notions of an expanded—global or “cosmic”—commons facilitated through the disintegration of the screen’s boundaries and its extension of the bodily sensoria. The literature on expanded cinema in fact provides a valuable surrogate framework by which to illuminate the relationship between MOA CAT’s formal elements and its corporeal incitements. Further, expanded cinema provides a crucial material-aesthetic launching point from which we will later go on to consider global citizenship as facilitated through virtual agency and control.

When Stan VanDerBeek first coined the term expanded cinema in his 1966 manifesto “Culture: Intercom,” it was an anticipatory, utopian-tinged harbinger of “a new world/new technology/a new art” (15) that might succeed in coalescing a global humanity through the pedagogical appeal of an affective common language. His proposed “movie-drome” was an immersive spherical cinematic space inside which audience members would lie on their backs and direct their gaze skywards as thousands of projected images passed through on the screen above. By allowing audience members to piece together their own narrative or meaning from this sensory onslaught, the movie-drome was a proposed manifestation of Marshall McLuhan’s “global theatre,” which gave precedence to the agency of the spectator-turned-actor (McLuhan, “At” 50). Like VanDerBeek, McLuhan recognized in new technologies (such as the computer) the potential for humans to “bypass languages in favor of a general cosmic consciousness” and “universal understanding and unity” (Understanding 84). VanDerBeek’s model is also strikingly prescient in its envisioning of connectivity as achievable through two means; not only would each dome be

75 Arthur Kroker points to McLuhan’s Catholicism to explain the latter’s relative disinterest in questions of nationalism, especially in comparison to George Grant and Harold Innis. McLuhan eschews “particularistic” political ideas (Kroker 82) and instead sets his sights almost exclusively on issues of cosmic consciousness, considering how a “new universal community” might be recovered through new technologies (63). Kroker argues that is a distinctly Catholic project.
hooked up remotely to others through a “worldwide” system, VanDerBeek also hoped that his movie-drome would facilitate a moving-image experience that would succeed in tapping into the “‘emotional denominator’ of all men” (VanDerBeek 17). When Gene Youngblood took up expanded cinema a few years later, he used it to designate a number of groundbreaking audio-visual experiments of the 1960s which defied traditional cinematic practices, including: multi-screen or large-format projection, experimental film, live performance, etc. He makes the case that our understanding of “man” and “cinema” should be reconceptualised such that they reflect the evolution of both beyond their fleshy, material containers; “[j]ust as the term ‘man’ is coming to mean man/plant/machine, so the definition of cinema must be expanded to include videotronics, computer science, atomic light” (Youngblood 135). Taking his cue from McLuhan, his contemporary and friend, Youngblood conceptualizes this cinema as the means through which the body’s sensory, cognitive and communicative capacities can be further extended through the technological apparatus, which was fast encroaching upon bodily boundaries and melding with our limbs. “Expanded cinema isn't a movie at all,” he proclaimed, “like life it's a process of becoming, man's ongoing historical drive to manifest his consciousness outside of his mind, in front of his eyes” (Youngblood 41). For Youngblood, expanded cinema signalled not just the birth of innovative filmmaking forms; it reflected shifts in the organization of the body and the extension of consciousness itself. This is where McLuhan’s influence becomes perhaps most evident. Despite such postulations by expanded cinema’s proponents and kindred spirits regarding the new technologies’ radical interventions upon the bodily sensoria, it is their humanism that remains at the core. The techno-delirium they seem initially to educe is in fact shadowed by an almost immutably humanist utopia wherein the body never breaks, but instead maintains its gravitational axis, and further, distends infinitely into the cosmos.
A number of critics of late have audited the migration of the moving image into contemporary galleries and museums starting from the postwar period. In general, critics argue that these moves were compelled by an avant-garde desire to challenge institutionalized rubrics of exhibition and claim for film an aesthetic autonomy hitherto possessed only by forms like painting and sculpture (Uroskie 12). My current emphasis on museological employments of the expanded format is quite different; I want to suggest that it can allow us to explore the ways in which increasingly flexible—and, at their best, interrogative—filmic encounters facilitated through more novel technological apparatuses can be exploited within museums in order to test, verify or dispute the viability of long-established exhibit paradigms. This is accomplished especially through the introduction of responsive interfaces to challenge established models of reception as one-way transfer. Of course, there is a didacticism to MOA CAT that seems rather at odds with the experimental nature of 1960s expanded cinema; afterall, the “expanded” medium in the Multiversity Galleries is used in the service of edification, wayfinding, and guiding our expectations rather than rupturing them. However, current museum touchscreens also usefully testify to the commercialization, diffusion, and banalization of the more radical lexicon of earlier screen experiments. Expanded cinema as it was originally conceptualized had a number of qualities that make it especially pertinent to a discussion of MOA’s tactile screen interfaces; it centred on ideals of audience agency, idiosyncratic (anti-hegemonic) constructions of meaning, a global language of affect, and a connected global commons. Crucially, expanded cinema also suggested a direct correlation between utopian ideology and material form; new technologies were seen as having the potential to bring about revolutionary change by obliterating the traditional screen frame. Further, expanded cinema can in fact offer a useful, though perhaps cursory, analogue
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through which we can begin to conceptualize the expansion of various media in relation to the MOA CAT, including that of screen and body. It does so, moreover, by providing an historical context within which to begin to understand current multifaceted mutations of the screen surface—whether its fragmentation, enlargement, miniaturization, multiplication or dissolution/banalization. Veritably, the issues surrounding expanded cinema at its inception during the 1960s and 1970s can be found carried forth in parallel reconfigurations of spectatorships elicited through emerging new media technologies of the last few decades (Jeong; Marchessault and Lord). We can think of “expansion” here in terms of a bleeding, both of the apparatus frame beyond itself, and of the boundary between audience and work into one another, such that the hard edge becomes—at least momentarily—obscured.

The user’s cutaneous contact with the MOA CAT extends both the limit of the touchscreen and the user’s own body so that both surfaces, each responding to the other, become slightly unfixed, porous. The frame also expands beyond the screen-body network to encompass the Multiversity Galleries, which is the less permeable reference-scape wherein the MOA CAT exists only as compensation for our haptic urges. What the MOA CAT inherits from expanded cinema is that the physical medium—the expanded frame—both galvanizes and substantiates the underlying dream of an interconnected global commons. MOA CAT’s geo-locational function (which explicates the artefactual lineages of a Melanesian spear from the Admiralty Islands, a Bassa mask from Liberia, or a Siksika beaded textile from Ponoka, AB., etc.), as well as the transnational networks enabled through the RRN link a specific embodied positionality (that of the visitor in front of the touchscreen) with what is in effect a planetary contextualization (that of hypertext mappings of artefacts’ global origins). These evoke the dispersed networks of bodies interconnected through the digital sinews of a common global citizenship. In contrast to the
National Gallery of Canada’s Centennial exhibit, the MOA CAT expresses a mode of relation extended beyond the rubric of nation—of a kind that Youngblood and McLuhan might have had in mind. Further, it is conceivable that, in its imbroglio with the expanded screen, the contours of the receiving/transmitting body also shifts beyond any hermetic configuration. This is a process that Charis Thompson terms *ontological choreography*, or the emergence of the “self” through the intricate coordination of disparate “ontological orders” of discourses and technologies (8). When applied to the museological terrain, this “ontological entwining” (182) seems to resist the fabulations of a unitary self, in that it posits subjectivity as formed through the user’s contact with digital networks and interfaces.

To locate the MOA CAT, if not directly within, then alongside the lexicon of expansion, also allows us to think about how traditional configurations of the viewer/screen dichotomy as delimited by rigid enclosures should be replaced by an understanding that encounters between audience and work encompass a much wider and more flexible range of haptic occurrences. Such a notion corresponds to Alexander R. Galloway’s conceptualization of interfaces not merely as objects or even boundaries, but rather, as “autonomous zones of activity” which prohibit as much as they enable (vii). To this end, a more crucial understanding of expansion with regard to the MAO CAT touchscreen requires that we consider the ways in which the interface itself shifts and swells in the expansion of various b/orders—digital screen, body, and museum. The common distinction between digital technologies as *tool* (used to produce works) or as *media* (used to “store and deliver” works) (Paul 3) falls short of accounting for how these technologies are also *procedure*. Conceiving of technology as *procedure* encourages critical appraisals of the very ways in which they might be used—as in the case of interpretive interactives in museums—in the process of experience and reception. Put another way, we might think of the methodology and rationale of
use. Galloway argues, for example, that interfacing technologies are significant less as objects, and more as “ethic” or “practice” which introduce a particular “structure of action, a recipe for moving procedurally towards a certain state of affairs” (120). The touchscreen is the technologized articulation of the “middle process”—that enlarging, collusive plain between user and work which acts as a common, porous boundary mediating bodies. This interface is shifts and mutates during haptic encounters between audience and work; this flexibility is a declaration of its own capacity to accommodate increasing varieties of bodies and modalities of engagement. The blurring of the screen’s enclosures challenges Friedberg’s description of the frame as the “ontological cut” which separates “the material surface of the wall and the view contained within its aperture” (Friedberg 5). In the Multiversity Galleries, the frame is not so much a definitive edge or “cut” which delineates interiority from exteriority; rather, it takes on the generative structure of a wound that facilitates the bleed. Just as the screen extends out onto skin, so too does skin extend onto screen. Here, the frame bleeds in the direction of its own undoing, its line unspooling towards the immersive—which Friedberg refers to as the “unframed” (11) encounter. This dynamic, fleshy interface enfolds the body; it is here that the body feels and is felt most intensely.

5.1.2 Frame as Apparatus

Now that some initial ground has been established regarding the manner in which expansion plays itself out through institutional growth, architectural rejuvenation and the constitution of the haptic interface, it is necessary to clarify the significance of these extended mediums insofar as they reveal the museum’s dexterity in employing the frame as apparatus. Alongside the touchscreen, another event illustrates the complications of this rhetoric of inclusion via expansion: that of the museum’s allocation of a totem pole by artist Joe David (Nuu-chah-nulth). Carved of
cedar and standing seven metres high, the “Welcome Figure” is a testament against the logging of the David’s ancestral home of Meares Island. It was also made in response to a similar pole carved many years ago by the artist’s great-great-great grandfather. According to MOA CAT, the original totem was a recorded statement of an earlier ancestor who had lived during the time of initial European contact, and delivered a warning to his community about the potential threats posed by the early settlers. Carved in 1984, David’s pole was raised during an anti-logging protest at the Provincial Parliament that same year. Three years later, it was acquired by MOA and placed outside of the museum where it greeted visitors by the entrance. In 2012, the figure was finally moved inside to the Great Hall, where it sits today. The inclusion of an object of protest into a museum narrative enacts the lateral transfer of this object from the narrative’s periphery into its main artery (the Great Hall). It is possible to read this movability of the totem as signifying both the museum’s capacity to execute the authorial frame, and more specifically, its ability to assimilate and/or mollify certain antagonistic discourses by ushering them under an expansionist liberal scaffolding.

Donald Preziosi’s argument that the museum is “one of the most central and indispensable framing institutions of our modernity” (“Brain” 96) is apparent in MOA’s ability to configure itself as architectural framework and lens. In the Welcome Plaza, works by two Musqueam artists, Joe Becker and Susan Point, preface my ensuing museological trek by drawing attention to the fact that MOA sits on traditional Musqueam land. After purchasing my ticket, I make my way to the main space of the museum through the Ramp, a passageway lined with carvings by Haida, Kwakwaka’wakw, and Musqueam artists. At the other end of the Ramp is the Great Hall, the most breathtaking space in the entire museum (fig. 5). This space also showcases monumental works by
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various artists from the Northwest Coast nations. Nineteenth century totems and house posts mingle with contemporary carvings by Debra Sparrow, Robyn Sparrow, and Bill Reid, communicating through juxtaposition the tension between vestigial remnants of a salvage paradigm and the continuing vitality of First Nations communities and their art practices. The Great Hall, as the most significant and awe-inspiring space in the museum, functions as a lens through which to read the rest of the museum. Like the Welcome Plaza, it contextualizes one’s museological encounter with a prefatory insistence on the importance of the Northwest Coast cultures. Particularly interesting, then, is also the way in which the Great Hall frames the surrounding natural landscape. One end of the Great Hall is lined by glass walls that tower fifteen meters high, so that from inside the museum, one can look out onto the outdoor exhibit space. MOA director Anthony Shelton’s description of this particular vantage point is as follows,
In the museum's Great Hall, massive and magnificent First Nations sculptures stand against a soaring glass wall that opens onto a panorama of forested islands and snow-capped mountains bordering the Salish Sea. Outside, eagles glide and ravens caw under a sky whose subtle, constantly changing colours and tones form a backdrop for the stories and performances choreographed in the museum's exhibition galleries. (Mayer and Shelton 1)

Demonstrated here is MOA’s masterful ability to encase nature aesthetically as well as rhetorically. Through the museological lens, nature is rendered discernible, and further becomes the “backdrop” upon which certain scientific and colonial dramas are staged. The adroitness of the institutional frame—which one might argue also applies to the enframing of Northwest Coast nations as initiatory optic—works not by distancing or making invisible, but by demonstrating a managerial prowess in articulating a tutelary proximity to the displayed.

The expansion of the museum’s framing apparatus occurs through the broadening of the archival boundaries in order to interrogate traditionally exclusionary and/or assimilative museum practices. The introduction of new media in museums was in part compelled in the 1990s by shifts in curatorial practice from a traditional museology centred on crafting “a single story about a set of objects” towards the facilitation of more process-oriented, participatory engagements inclusive of diverse audiences (Cook 28). The mutual influence of technological development and post-structuralist ideas about polyphony and diversity is evident in the Multiversity Galleries and the design of the MOA CAT. Community collaborations with First Nations groups during “A Partnership of Peoples” led to the decision to adopt some “indigenous criteria” in the display and classification of objects (Mayer and Shelton 3). Another notable result of community collaborations is the inclusion of indigenous languages in the MOA CAT. During consultations,
community members expressed the importance of having objects listed by their proper names, along with the correct diacritics, in the catalogues (Stevenson).

In a more problematic sense, the expansion of the museum and its invigoration as framing apparatus can also be located alongside Rogoff’s notion of “plenitude,” which she uses to designate the process through which museums, being forced in some way to address cultural difference and/or historical traumas, resort to compensatory strategies of incorporation to facilitate “change without loss, without alteration, without remapping” (Rogoff 66). This is not unlike LyndaJessup’s delineation of soft versus hard inclusion. Where the former denotes temporary insertions of works—usually to bolster national art historical narratives—the latter demonstrates actual commitment in subverting longstanding colonial paradigms through the permanent incorporations of Aboriginal works (Jessup, “Hard” xv). Taken together, Jessup’s and Rogoff’s ideas allow us to think about how, rather than disrupting existing colonial narratives, the incorporation of Aboriginal works and voices are sometimes symptomatic of the colonial museum’s assimilative and accumulative drives, an insatiate hunger that laps up difference without having to undergo actual, structural change in the process.

In her essay, “The Settler Contract,” Carole Pateman pinpoints the deficiency of nominal forms of inclusion within a polity that is fundamentally based on the conquest and exploitation of Indigenous peoples (rather than their mere exclusion). Multicultural inclusion and its assimilative strategies, Pateman would argue, simply cannot be tasked to remedy the structural ills that lie at the heart of the settler social contract. The inadequacy of formal inclusions is also put forth in the work of critics who scrutinize museums specifically. Robin Boast produces an indictment of the ways that certain museums’ projects of supposedly postcolonial collaborations in the age of new museology might in fact be neocolonial in the sense that they effectively gloss over inherent power
asymmetries within such encounters. In this way, community collaborations could potentially be the mechanisms which ultimately uphold longstanding tenets of colonial accumulation and patrimony. In her analysis of the inclusion of Aboriginal art in the National Gallery of Canada, Anne Whitelaw (“Placing”) observes that incorporation ultimately leaves Canadian history untroubled, and does little to challenge resounding dominant Western paradigms. Jolene Rickard likewise remains suspicious of certain incorporative strategies, cautioning that the insertion of “Indigenous worldviews” can sometimes become the means of “internment and reservation” (87). In a similar vein, “new ways of seeing” and viewer-friendly means of consuming art, as well as reflexive critiques and “interventions” have now become institutionalized and sutured into the brick and mortar of the museum itself. Such seeming curatorial shifts, placed alongside Andrea Fraser’s remark on the ways in which institutional frameworks continue to expand without undergoing real alteration, belie how neoliberal paradigms are simply becoming more flexible, rather than weaker. By resorting to an arsenal of postmodern and poststructuralist motifs—including intertextuality, self-reflexivity, polyphony—and appropriating oppositional models of contingency and flexibility, it can be argued that such strategies in effect disempower dissent. Under the guise of benign inclusivity, or unity through diversity, previously excluded voices are thus voraciously folded into the bulging archive, their assimilation serving in many ways to sustain neocolonial frameworks.

To revisit Joe David’s “Welcome Figure,” the totem offers allusions to the various symbolic and literal recuperative procedures through which anti-colonial subjectivities might be woven into the mosaic fabric. This is reminiscent of Ian McKay’s idea that “strategic political compromises” are part and parcel of the liberal order framework. As Michel Ducharme and Jean Francois Constant elaborate from a Gramscian perspective of consent, such concessions are more than merely exercises of “good will;” they also work to consolidate and stabilize hegemonic structures of power.
(16). This also suggests the ways in which dissent can be strategically maneuvered and processed through the expert framing mechanism of the institution. McKay’s point is that the liberal order centres on the “containment” of the aliberal bodies and logics that occupy “the edges of a liberal dominion” (640). The successive installations of the Welcome Figure illustrate the various “partial and strategic inclusions” (Perry 289) which are part and parcel of the liberal project. These inclusions are executed through a managerial apparatus that, even if it does not appropriate or collapse the other altogether, is able to expertly maneuver this other between periphery and centre. It can therefore be argued that, through the museum’s incorporative technologies, contestation can be effectively sutured into the commons, in such a way that this epidermal flexibility ultimately transforms loss into expansion, vulnerability into preservation, and protest into consolidation.

5.2 Touch

Expansion also draws attention to that collusive plane where both viewer/image, and visitor/exhibit, collide. It is within this interface that both sides—at least momentarily—lose their boundaries, and sensually engage. Another way in which to think about the spaces of collusion is through the instances of touch forged within the museum. Both material as well as figurative instances of touch occur throughout MOA. In the broadest sense, touch transpires through the museum’s well-advertised collaborative efforts to interface established Western museum paradigms with Indigenous knowledges and worldviews. As pointed out earlier in the discussion of the architectural framing of the museum’s surroundings as scenic panorama, tactile encounter can also be read in the symbolic meeting of Nature with Technology. At the other end of the spectrum, touch is facilitated in its most minute and literal sense through the MOA CAT
touchscreens found in the Multiversity Galleries. The touchscreen, by extending the visitor’s sensorial limbs, emphasizes this visitor’s ability to weave together a museological narrative through a sequence of minute gestures of digital taps and swipes. The following section considers the implications, risks, and potentials of touch as material and discursive apparatus. Further, it argues that, even though they seem to invite embodied relations that challenge rationalist paradigms, mandated curatorial models of tactile encounter and engagement within the contemporary ethnological/natural history museum can still be hegemonic. This especially the case if such encounters merely regurgitate vestigial notions of contact as inherently one-sided and continue to prioritize touching subjects over touched objects.

5.2.1 Museums & Touch

Writing of narrative’s function in structuring and ordering desire, Susan Stewart gives us an image of a figure who serves as the quintessence of the “ideal” museum explorer: “the subject invented by disinterested desire, Hercules the scholar as opposed to Hercules tempted, is a kind of ideal picture of evolved, upright, man—vision and hearing directed towards the horizon and hence a spatialization of progress and self-consciousness” (“Prologue” 23). The museological landscape indeed takes its cue from Stewart’s notion of “disinterested desire;” here, the spatial and ideological chasms between subject and object are made explicit through techniques of distanitation, and visual discipline. In close conjunction to Stewart’s “evolved, upright” museum patron, Jeffrey David Feldman’s examination of museums’ “lost body problem” and James Clifford’s discussion of fetish
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and collecting shed crucial light on how corporalities are disciplined and suppressed in the museum setting. Feldman puts forth that museums’ continued prioritisation of a visual regime and erasure of complex, multi-sensorial experience render them unable to adequately confront histories of genocidal and/or colonial violence which often target the body. Meanwhile, Clifford examines how, within the Western museum, fetish and obsession over the desired object are guised through dictates of “proper” (read: Western, imperial) collecting, and transformed through discourses of taste, restraint, edification, and spiritual uplift. With fetish thusly reordered as “rule-governed possession” (“Collecting” 219), the collecting subject (upheld by the institution) does not have to risk cleaving to the object, instead remaining a passionless authority for whom collected objects act as the mediating field of property between self and an ordered universe.

Technological developments and the financial pressures facing museums have in recent years played a considerable role in encouraging the adoption of more user-friendly, and crowd-pleasing interactive and immersive displays. Even so, the consideration of touch as a curatorial priority in most museums presents enough of an anomaly that such exhibits still elicit considerable attention, and are often hastily touted as evidencing remedial shifts towards more democratic museum practices. The influence of postcolonial politics and theory since the 1960s have played a significant role in challenging the right of Western museums to remain gatekeepers of culture and meaning. This has led to, among other things, the recognition of diversity in the museum-going publics, and the need for the museum to at least grant some countenance to the fact that audiences must be allowed agency to construct their own meanings from the displayed assemblage of material cultures. Such a logic also holds that, rather than maintaining a sterile distance between visitor and display, interactivity and immersion instead allow them to become variably enfolded within the exhibit, and to navigate their own ways through it—as perhaps McLuhan’s techno-citizen through
the maelstrom of modernity. By seeming to do away with the rational distance as aesthetic and moral prerogative, the position of *participant* becomes heralded over that of mere *spectator*. Interactivity through the more specific figure of touch goes even further to suggest a blurring of material boundaries between visitor and displayed object through the re-prioritization of the haptic interface and its potentialities.

It is far from the case, however, that such moves towards increased participatory and tactile models should merely be taken at face value. Several museum scholars contend that, rather than signalling a genuine shift towards critical or reflexive curatorial practices, the implementation of interactivity through touch is often utilized for strategic purposes—either to “brand” science as entertainment (Hughes), to make “access visible” for funding reasons, or to proclaim the absence of physical barriers for visitors who are differently-abled (Candlin, “Dubious” 138). Fiona Candlin’s work offers the most nuanced approach regarding the complicated history of touch in public museums. Firstly, she debunks the notion that tactile access to museum collections is a distinctly new phenomenon, pointing out that such forms of access were encouraged as far back as the eighteenth century, though back then, the visitor’s class and status determined whether or not they were allowed to touch objects. Even today, she argues, the situation cannot be painted with a single brushstroke; touch within museums can be variously “forbidden, permitted, or celebrated” (Candlin, *Art 2*). In her examination of what she terms the “rational museum,” Candlin further writes that, rather than being complete divergences from precursory Enlightenment models, paradigms of touch in contemporary museums are instead exactly linked to the pursuit of empirical discovery, and the rationalized understanding of self and the external world. As such, she advises against the pitting of the “visual, rational and modern knowledge” approach against the
“multisensory, non-rational and premodern” one, instead insisting that tactile engagement can be (and often is) a “route to rational understanding” (“Touch” 278).

The issue at hand has, therefore, less to do with identifying instances of touch as new phenomena, and more with how discourses of touch as newness, enabled through more recently developed digital interfaces, are employed to rectify the colonial and rebrand museological encounters as postcolonial, interactive and democratic. It is moreover important to recognize the ways in which touch can work in conjunction with the museum’s existing disciplinary paradigms, especially when one considers how touch and other bodily faculties are regulated and choreographed. It is hard to ignore, for instance, the multifarious ways that visitors are guided through the museum and told what/how to touch, what not to touch, when to speak, when to be silent, where/how to look, which paths to tread, how far a distance to keep between self and object, etc. Implementations of interactive technologies can also become the compensatory outlet for visitors to sublimate variously prohibited bodily urges; Candlin asserts that the anomalous presence of interactive features within the museum serves as the “palliative strategy primarily designed to pacify a badly behaved public” (“Touch” 279). In the museum, the visitor’s unpredictable penchant to reach out and test both the authenticity of the displayed object as well as the deftness of their own limbs is carefully corralled into designated interactive or “touch” zones. While they oftentimes succeed in at least projecting the image of reflexive or progressive curatorial practices, these provisional “touching” zones ultimately work to choreograph desire and mitigate the unruly hand.
5.2.2 Touch : Limit

Vivian Sobchack extends a convincing proposition to view flesh as a way in which we sense and make sense, and to extrapolate from this an understanding of how touch constructs and facilitates an embodied relation to the world. Such a phenomenological alignment would necessarily entail foregoing hasty resolutions that regard touch as inherently good or bad object, and instead see it as method for particular ends. Even in the single example of the MOA CAT, touch works in contradictory ways, sometimes enabling, other times prohibiting; sometimes facilitating the touching body’s fantasy of control and agency, other times indicating the very limits of this possibility. At first encounter, the touchscreen has a host of seductions; it is visually appealing, user-friendly and organized in such a way as to provide easy access to the artefacts that remain far from grasp. Through a series of taps and swipes upon the surrogate surface, the user is able to coax a series of confidences (i.e. information) that the object behind glass itself does not divulge. Similarly tantalizing is that, unlike the panes of the vitrine, the surface of the touchscreen is animate and receptive. Barring any technical glitches, it registers the gestures of the outreached hand, and responds accordingly. It is designed, in other words, as an invitation. If one’s journey through the museum prior to the encounter with the touchscreen might be likened to the endurance of a series of haptic evasions, whereby sensual contact is withheld, encountering the yawning glow of the interactive screen is by contrast a relief. The MOA CAT is a tactile expanse where bodies are invited to collide. It is an interface designed around an anticipated encounter with the insinuating body; it has the expectancy of this reception written through code onto the very surface of its skin. Both screen and epidermis become responsive surfaces, designed to receive the touch of the other, and in turn to leave their ghostly traces upon the other’s skin.
There are, undoubtedly, ambivalences which mark this surface, as Seung-Hoon Jeong explains by pointing out that the interface “both provokes and frustrates the real contact” (16). Much like the audio guide of the previous chapter, the sensuousness of this haptic frame also becomes a lush materialization of the boundary beyond which it is impossible to pass. By providing the display with corollary aural narratives, audio guides forever belie the point beyond which the unknown simply cannot be known. Similarly, interactive touchscreens, while allowing visitors an element of tactile engagement, at the same time emphasize through distinction the glassed or roped off boundary straddling visitor and displayed object. The haptic interface functions like a limen we are encouraged to prod, to extend our limbs towards and dig our fingers into. However, the “threshold activity” of touch (S. Stewart, “Prologue” 35) is not entirely about making cutaneous contact with the object. Instead, touch hinges on the act of gesturing itself, the reaching-out and intending-towards which brings the body immediately against the boundary. Just as the tactile gesture might re-establish the very boundary hindering contact, so too can the touchscreen function by marking the very limits of knowing.

This idea is brought to the fore in instances where certain culturally sensitive materials in the museum’s collection are simultaneously displayed yet concealed. A number of objects used in Coast Salish Spirit Dance were deemed culturally sensitive and not appropriate for display. Interestingly, some of these objects are nonetheless placed behind a screen in a display case which is lit like a shadow box, so that only outlines of the objects can be apprehended. Images of most Ktunaxa objects were similarly removed from display after elders in the community informed MOA that these were not meant for public consumption. While images of these objects have been made visually unavailable, the MOA CAT still contains object records—which in most cases include detailed physical descriptions of the objects. This assignment of a digital footprint
intentionally marks an absence—or makes this absence manifestly present. Even when confronted with the limits of knowing and possessing, MOA executes a managerial facility similar to that we saw with the incorporative maneuvering of Joe David’s “Welcome Figure” totem. Both examples of conspicuous in/exclusion reveal that MOA is able to put to sidestep certain ethical quandaries while at the same time demonstrating an expert ability to conciliate the contradictions between Western museum paradigms and Indigenous worldviews.

5.2.3 Touch : Control

While museums continue to center on rational means of perception, they have recently also availed themselves to curatorial strategies which cater more unabashedly to non-rational bodily engagements (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, “Performing”), often through the use of new media technologies. Mark Hansen argues that instead of enacting a recourse to ocularcentrism and disembodiment, our imbroglios with new media technologies actually allow for new forms of affective embodiment. Meanwhile, Nigel Thrift would refer to this trend more grimly as the increasing organization of social-political experience around "regimes of affect" (68). Immersive experiences in museums would seem to revolve around the production of affective excess, especially feelings in the visitor of being overwhelmed, being moved, becoming "unmoored" in the sense that the visitor is encouraged to "lose" themselves to the choreographed sensory deluge of exhibit spaces. In this way, the contemporary museum visitor shares in the experience of Benjamin's flâneur adrift in the Parisian arcades, a figure caught in the throes of phantasmagoria, or the illusory seductions produced by a bourgeoning mass consumerist culture. Susan Buck-Morss further deciphers Benjamin's phantasmagoria as "technoaesthetics”—a host of technologically
produced stimuli which anaestheticize the synaesthetic system not through the numbing of sensation, but rather through overstimulation (22).

Significantly, such feelings of excess engendered in phantasmagoric milieus such as Benjamin’s arcade or MOA’s Multiversity Galleries are produced and attended through technological orchestration. What can be elucidated as the initial “unmooring” of the self and the momentary surrender of subjective coordinates through bodily submersion in the museum’s phantasmal enticements to escapism, in fact facilitates the reconstitution of a privileged subject buttressed by coherent museological narratives. This occurs because much of one’s experience in the museum revolves around the body being brought forth from initial confusion and discordance, and subsequently guided through chronologies of discovery, rational overcoming and conquest. In other words, our supposedly sensory inundation and unmooring happens not just haphazardly alongside by precisely in and through technological interventions. The technology of the archive guides us out of the wilderness of its own construction. Hand held maps, projected images, audio guides, and touchscreens are just some of the ways in which our limbs and our sensory capacities are taken hold of and explicitly marshaled through the museological terrain. The Multiversity Galleries thusly illustrate this delicate balance of various ostensible oppositions. Designed through the considered production of multisensory experience, it is an immersive space which encourages the visitor’s submission to sensory plenitude. On the other hand, the Galleries also provide an experience of interactivity which grants the visitor the very fantasy of control. It is possible to argue that this semblance of control transpires through the figure/figuration of touch, which operates inferentially through the regulation of affect, the power of (re)animation, and the provision of navigational agency.
Unlike the cosmic consciousness or affective universal language espoused by VanDerBeek and Youngblood’s expanded cinema premise, the MOA CAT—especially as it exists within a didactic anthropological museum framework, seems more so modeled around citizenship through rational-scientific overcoming. Low on affect (as well as noise and disturbance) and high on information, the MOA CAT works through dispassion. In this way, it mirrors Clifford’s observation that institutional collecting is translated as a de-fetishized act. Touch in this sense does not facilitate affective surrender; rather, it is the means through which the visitor can seek out and sequence information flows. Touch affords complete visual apprehension otherwise withheld from the user; by tapping on the digital rendering of object on the touchscreen, the user can zoom in on this object, and survey it from different angles and perspectives. The interface sutures the visitor into the advantaged position of the touching and knowing subject, in telling contrast to the displayed body/object, which is constructed through the emphases on its immobility and penetrability. This tension between the visiting, consuming subject and the displayed, consumed object is illustrated in the Multiversity Galleries, where the former serves as the privileged individual buoyed by technological implements and urged into the role of curator-ethnographer. It is this subject who has the capability to reach towards the object, and not the other way around.

Museums have long stood, at least emblematically, as hushed temples occupied with petrified bodies erected behind glass. Wandering these reverent halls as if drawn by some strange compulsion to linger upon iterations of death, the visitor is distinguished from the sepulchral figures on display by being granted mobility, as well as an ability to inscribe meaning. Donna Haraway conceives of the museum as the transformative space wherein the subject is birthed into subjectivity through the sacrifice of the silenced and taxidermied other. She argues that the museum’s “central moral truth” hinges on the way it conjoins life (that of the speaking,
narrativizing male subject) and death (that of the silent other upon whom the gaze is turned); “[i]t is in the craft of killing that life is constructed” (23). Interactive digital technologies merely exacerbate this tensioned dichotomy of life/death. For Alison Griffiths, interactive and immersive displays articulate “our deepest desires to keep [death] at bay” at the same time that they allow us, through the engagement with hyperreal scenarios, to draw “ever closer to crossing over into the other world without actually making the journey” (Shivers 7). While they might serve as tools through which the user distinguishes animate self from inanimate object, and exercises a sort of arbitration of death, interactive technologies also imbibe the user with the power of (re)animation. These technologies entitle the user with the capability to breathe life into supposedly immobile, inert raw materials, thusly transforming it to a meaningful ethnographic objects.

It is easy to underestimate the role of touch in this equation. Technologized touch proffered by haptic interfaces makes it likelier that the “dead” bodies displayed silently behind slabs of glass can be roused again to life. Through a series of discreet taps on the MOA CAT’s touchscreen overlay, the object’s digitally animated proxy can be made to perform a host of gymnastics: it can be urged to divulge information regarding its maker and geographic origins, pictorially maneuvered to provide optimal views for the spectator, and placed within ethnological contexts such that it discloses and reaffirms certain dominant taxonomies and genealogies. The user who interacts with the touch-responsive interface easily becomes infatuated with the discernible effects of their participation in the museum text. Proof of their agency materializes through the unfurled narrative trail initiated through the simple touch of the fingertip. The push of a button can instigate a causal ballet of informational flows which envelopes the user in the textual folds of museological archive. Just as pressing “play” on the National Gallery of Canada’s Acoustiguide commenced a narrative which placed the user on an audio promontory of an immersive nation-scape, gently tapping on an
object on the MOA CAT touchscreen makes it come “alive” in the sense that it is compelled to transact an obliging pliancy which merely serves as witness to the user’s own exercise of agency. Seduced by her/his own apparent “transitivity and motility of touch”—a touch that magically brings the dead object to life (S. Stewart, “Prologue” 33)—the subject thusly constructs fantasies of herself as self- (and other-) determining.

The MOA CAT can therefore be seen as panacea for the loss of control that the visitor might encounter in the phantasmagoric space of the museum. The outreached hand’s contact with the touch interface is framed by the desire to clarify this disorder, to distil it into discernable threads and navigable paths. The interface guides the visitor from preliminary disorientation—generated through the cacophonous overload of crowding bodies, exhibits, artifacts, text, images, and information—through a vigilantly orchestrated encounter with the exhibit at the touch of the finger. In this way, the introduction of the MOA CAT interface to the renovated Multiversity Galleries—a move that serves as a tactile summation of a general shift towards more user-friendly models of both digital and ambulatory wayfinding—turns the once teeming disorder of Visible Storage into an increasingly traversable wilderness.

It is feasible to adduce from the capacity for digital navigation through the MOA CAT a thesis regarding the technological overtures of cultural citizenship. Such a thesis would put forth, first of all, some similitude between the landscape of nation and the digital touch-scape of the MOA CAT. The National Gallery of Canada’s Centennial art historical narrative, sutured through a settler colonial relation to ideas about wilderness and landscape, has here been refitted through new museological and postcolonial discourses. Further, MOA’s role as provincial institution ensues a shift from the delimiting boundaries of nation and settler identity to a focus on the history and material culture of the First Nations peoples of British Columbia. At the same time, MOA also sees
itself as a “world arts and cultures” museum, and apparatuses like the MOA CAT and RRN highlight how this regional focus is protracted through more porous globalized digital frameworks. Despite such amendments, some familiar scenic and perspectival features of nation—particularly of nation as panorama—have been reconstituted in MOA CAT through bits and bytes. Similar to the NGC’s Centennial panorama, MOA CAT dissolves, or at least softens, the discursive frame of nation so that the latter becomes a phantasmal “surround” with the potential to submerge the subject. One could argue, in this way, that the audience’s immersion in the haptic interface bears some relationality to the citizen’s acquiescence to the incitements of the nation-scape. Drawing on Vivian Sobchack’s idea of the “irreducible ensemble” of “body and consciousness, objectivity and subjectivity,” Alison Griffiths explains that panoramas invite an “embodied” form of spectatorship (Shivers 37). This points especially to the significance of the panoramic mode—that its offered wide-angle comprehensibility, or “lateral sweep” of landscape (Griffiths, Shivers 82) is only possible in and through the implied presence of an omniscient eye presiding over the scene. This is not unlike some theorists’ understanding of the crucial role of the body in emerging digital interfaces. While Oliver Grau’s work examines the ways in which virtual reality technologies now allow the viewer to enter into the picture (3), Mark Hansen argues more vehemently against the supposedly disembodied form of new media when he writes that every frame, far from being autonomous, in fact requires a “the framing function of the human body” (8), or an embodied perspective which receives and (re)creates the digital image (11). With digital media, Hansen points out, the function of the “embodied viewer-participant” is “not to filter a universe of preconstituted images, but actually to enframe something (digital information) that is originally formless” (11). MOA CAT’s panorama of the nation-scape, therefore, is not merely an available
expanses, but one that serves as an invitation to the body. Further, its digital landscape is enabled only through the invisible, omniscient body always-already etched into its folds.

Unlike the traditional panoramic mode which encourages complete bodily inundation, MOA CAT pairs immersion with low affect, and controlled wayfinding. The MOA CAT allow the user to navigate various digital vistas (from the gallery floorplan to the web-mapped globe)— through the use of Google Maps and geo-location. These location-sensitive terminals situate the visitor by giving them solid footing in this disorienting space. There are multiple perspectives available, through user interfaces like Google Earth and a three-dimensional animated bird’s-eye view of the gallery. These function as scopic plateaus that provide spatial panoramas on various scales. In this way, the touchscreen facilitates the user’s navigation of the virtual landscape by erecting a digital promontory, with "digital" here calling to mind both a computer-mediated lay of the land, as well as perspectival grasping through bodily appendages. Additionally, the landscape writ through the MOA CAT interface is one interwoven through hyperlinks, the “prototypical form of interactive textuality” (M. Ryan 5). Hyperlinks/hypertext hint at the possibility of totalizing narratives broken asunder through supposedly idiosyncratic and improvisatory paths. These digressionary routes offer the illusion that the user might steer their own course through the digitally charted wilderness. At work here is the notion that, aside from instances where an explicit visual-spatial panoramic interface is available (through Google Earth or the animated bird’s-eye view of the galleries) the “sweeping” scope is only enabled through the visitor’s own sequential stitching together of the landscape through disparate bodily/digital gestures. While the NGC’s Centennial exhibit granted the eye and ear the entirety of the scene at once, the MOA CAT’s panorama of national as well as global citizenship is initiated through a nonlinear succession of tactile utterances, executed in fragments.
Returning to citizenship as interpreted through settler colonial critique, we are reminded that wayfinding was a fundamental part of the settler identity forged through the brutal conquer and conversion of the “wilderness” of the New World. MOA CAT should therefore be conceived as symptomatic of our technological consummation of the primordial battle with the “alien and yet conquerable land” inherited from that resolute/dogged breed of Calvinist forebears (Grant, *Technology* 19). This interactive interface enacts the user’s agentive navigation through a landscape whose very “wildness” in breadth and scope has been rendered through a perspectival over-determination, as well as spatial and temporal grids which carve, from an anarchic landscape, a genealogical justification of nation.

5.3 A Fleshy Commons

In the MOA CAT, lingering colonial narratives of citizenship and agency achieved through overcoming landscapes of primordial “wilderness” exist in tension alongside the dream of a postcolonial global commons. I have argued that this latter tendency of the haptic interface can be indirectly traced to the utopic postulations of 1960s and 1970s expanded cinema, which gestured towards notions of an expanded—global or “cosmic”—commons enabled through reimagining the parameters of both spectatorship and the sensoria. The underlying utopian-humanist spirit of expanded cinema projects and their implied faith in cosmic humanity through a reinvigorated corporeal-sensorial paradigm intersects with the declarations of global citizenship proffered by MOA’s model of interactivity. With VanDerBeek, the idea of humanity-in-common (and in-common-*affect*) is to be manifested through an imagery-based “culture-intercom” that would tap into a global language of self-realization and understanding. Referring to VanDerBeek, Youngblood too speaks of the potential for experiences engendered in multi-image environments
to tap into “a tribal language that expresses not ideas but a collective group consciousness” (387). What is particularly unique about these treatises is that way in which they postulate a utopian planetary or cosmic intentionality through the sensory sublime. Youngblood especially does this when he draws on Freud’s oceanic feeling to describe the sensorial as the potential through which the body-mind can be unfurled beyond its limits into the cosmos (Youngblood 92). While the MOA digital touchscreen might not exactly achieve the oceanic sublime that characterizes engagements with Youngblood or VanDerBeek’s expanded screen environments, what it does seem to inherit from this discourse is the blurring of the screen’s traditional boundaries, and the articulation of a global citizenship—that is, a citizenship always in relation to an expanded commons.

Marchessault and Lord point to the political dimension of expanded cinema when they make the case that the digital must be seen “not simply as a technology but also as an experience of space and time tied to capitalism” (14). Indeed, such an argument emphasizes the political undercurrents in Youngblood’s own undertaking, which considered the ways that the 1960s screen experiments could accommodate dreams of radical sociopolitical change. Grounding the aesthetic in the political, more specifically, would place expanded cinema in dialogue with the notion of an “expanded global public sphere,” such as that encapsulated by Hardt and Negri’s concept of the multitude (Marchessault & Lord 9). The multitude is an especially useful concept here because it allows us to think particularly about the role of flesh in the improvisatory compositions of affective political affiliations, and, ultimately, the ambivalences of the commons.

5.3.1 A Haptic Commons

In Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire, their follow-up to Empire, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri turn their attention to the multitude: the radically heterogeneous,
distributed networks of workers, migrants, activists, and social forces from around the globe. The multitude is expectantly characterized as the “living alternative that grows within Empire” (xiii), which works directly within imperial sovereignty in order to imagine and construct an alternative beyond it. Most interesting for my current discussion is the way in which Hardt and Negri theorize the multitude as flesh. In opposition to a body ruled through the coordinated force of sovereign power, the multitude is a non-hierarchal network moving like “a singular flesh that refuses the organic unity of the body” (162). Foregoing homogenous or centralized social formations, Hardt and Negri insist instead that flesh is "common, living substance" (192) that joins together singularities while preserving internal differences. Significantly, their conceptualization also captures flesh as "pure potential, and unformed life force" (192). In other words, it is a living, breathing (inorganic) skin in the process of becoming as we speak. While the authors tend for the most part to be optimistic about the eventual revolutionary form of the multitude, particularly evocative is that they also implicitly present us with a pregnant pause, an anticipatory interval where we wait to see exactly what shape the new social flesh will form.

This notion of flesh, which Hardt and Negri employ to designate the dissolution of traditional compositions of social and individual bodies, can allow us to explore how emerging anti-hierarchal networks challenge established imperial formations, or subject/object binaries. In this sense, it can be gainfully placed in conversation with Erin Manning’s argument regarding how touch creates “relational matrices” (Politics xiii), wherein the act of intending-towards occasions a sensual potentiality which has the power to transfigure a landscape through the generation or accentuation of new affiliative webs. Manning continues that, “[a]t its most political, to reach towards is to create a concept for unthinking the individual as a discrete entity. Sensing bodies in movement are not individual bodies; their individuations are always collective” (xviii). As she
further argues, these collectives form “skinscapes,” which are the connective webs forged through the creative and expressive extensions of the body beyond its own boundaries (112). It is possible to see how both the MOA CAT and the Reciprocal Research Network are attempts to capture the optimism evoked by Manning’s “skinscapes” or Hardt and Negri’s flesh of the multitude. At their most ideal, the user’s encounter with these interfaces allows both for the screen to expand in a cosmic embrace, and for bodies to reach out/beyond their own limits and become entangled within more expansive networks of reciprocal exchange. Touch can thus be figured as a way of being in common through the shared flesh of the interface.

Both MOA CAT and the RRN are material artefacts which reveal the museum’s desire to conceive of itself as an inclusive commons. By providing a single-access portal to various institutions around the world holding Northwest Coast collections, and creating an online networked infrastructure for researchers and community stakeholders, the RRN attempts to rearrange traditional museological hierarchies and makes inferences to a global community of knowledge co-producers. The MOA CAT similarly hints at a correspondence between the expansion of the physical interface and an inclusive commons that, rather than prioritizing authoritative colonial frameworks, instead lays out multiple entry points into the archive for diverse, “postcolonial” audiences. Not only is there a diffusion of the digital frame through the haptic interlay, the MOA CAT’s utilization of geo-location also clarifies the connective tissues which unfurl the threads of national narratives beyond their hermetic context. More than just expedient metaphors, both the MOA CAT screen and the RRN draw upon the rhetoric of an expanded commons to construct “new” physical architectures of technological citizenship, while also referring to the social practice of reciprocal exchange to dispute colonial models of acquisition and expropriation. These digital infrastructures help to conjecture a global subjectivity, wherein
the user is located as subject of nation in relation to an expanded—though ultimately navigable—world.

Hardt and Negri conceive of multitude as the “new circuits of cooperation and collaboration” forged by globalization, which rearrange or challenge the established hierarchies and hegemonies that structure Empire (xiii). The authors’ tracking of emergent alliances resembles Leela Gandhi’s consideration of the radical potential of friendship to challenge imperialism’s “craving for the hygiene of oppositionality” (4). Gandhi’s exhumation of affective allegiances seeks to argue that imperial binaries can be at least partially loosened by the remapping of old and new intimacies. The correlate to an imperial world slightly undone by such intimacies is of course the radical topographies which can emerge through these new latticeworks of resistive affiliations. Ultimately, Gandhi’s excavation of “affective communities” emphasizes the necessary thinking around of established fractures within imperial landscapes; but in doing so, it also opens up the possibility of imagining “new and better forms of community and relationality” (6). This might involve alternate ways of being in relation to other bodies, or on a more macro level, the realignment of sensory relations. Laura Marks undertakes a similar project by exploring new sensory possibilities in her work on intercultural cinema, which she notes is produced in increasingly hybrid “power-inflected spaces of diaspora, (post- or neo-) colonialism, and cultural apartheid” (Skin 1). The crux of Marks’s argument is that these cultural entanglements in globalised metropoli are “generating new forms of sense experience and new ways of embodying our relation to the world” (23). This argument is significant because, beyond—or perhaps beneath—Gandhi’s redrawing of socio-political alliances, Marks posits that affective webs generated through socio-politics also correspond to material realignments of the body (and screen) at the level of skin tissue, image grain and video pixel. Put differently, while Gandhi’s focus is on the affective relations
between bodies, Marks explores how this dynamic plays out on the stratum of skin. Interestingly, Hardt and Negri’s delineation of the emergent networks of the multitude as “a kind of social flesh, a flesh that is not a body, a flesh that is common, living substance” (192) ties Gandhi and Marks closer together still.

5.3.2 Ambivalences of Flesh

While Hardt and Negri remain for the most part steadfastly optimistic about the radical potential of the multitude to spur global democracy, they simultaneously suggest the impossibility of determining what shape the “new social flesh” will take (159). Conceiving of democracy on a global scale must necessarily be a conjecturing of possibility. As such, the characterization of the multitude as “amorphous flesh that as yet forms no body” (159) emphasizes the imminent potential which awaits in embryonic form. Flesh is essential because it points to the fact that networks of social bodies are moving, dynamic, and designated with possibility. This very sense of possibility, as the authors note, also results in indeterminacy and ambivalence; the workings of the amassing flesh could lead to “liberation” and the generation of a new world through global distributed networks, but just as easily be enlisted by capital and shepherded into “a new regime of exploitation and control” (212). In a corresponding sense, the MOA CAT and RRN might bear testimony to a subversively malleable and tactile commons; however, by encouraging largely simulated and perhaps compensatory rites of reciprocity, they are at the same time in danger of serving as a proxy—or precisely “virtual”—agora in lieu of a real radically altered/able museum infrastructure.

Conceiving of the interface as a digital commons whose sole function is to foster egalitarian intercourse would be as incomplete a project as an apprehension of the public sphere that fails to take into account the many inequalities which mark this space. Colin Mooers argues that the
“abstract generality” of the public sphere under liberal multiculturalism hides a litany of unspoken assumptions about the dominant subjectivities of its most secure occupants, while conveniently effacing its various structural power imbalances. Analogously, Iris Marion Young critiques the many blind spots inherent in conceptualizations of supposedly “homogenous” publics, and Adele Perry likewise points out that the liberal subject is implicitly “coded” as European and male (Perry 277). Similar contradictions can also be found to persist within the more microcosmic museum setting, and its legislated channels of “reciprocity.” Aiming his criticism squarely at MOA and its “recent apologetic for the museum as a postcolonial institution,” Robin Boast argues that current tendencies to characterize museums as contact zones often fail to account for the fact that these spaces are rife with power asymmetries (60). He cautions that a view of the contact zone as merely a space for dialogical exchange egregiously ignores the many appropriative strategies employed by museums which in fact reveal themselves to be neocolonial. Accordingly, choreographing “new” pathways of postcolonial collaboration and knowledge exchange cannot be entirely severed from the benefit of ensuring that the Museum remains at the axial centre of these (re)connections, and that it prevails as arbiter of such transfers.

If we accept that touch—broadly surmised as the breaching of established boundaries and hierarchies on various scales—plays a significant role in at least articulating our desire to be in common, then the opening figure of the fingerprint-marked surface of the MOA CAT becomes both the remarkable and the mundane testament to this fleshy consortium. The impetus to linger upon this surface and otherwise argue for its particular significance is encouraged in the work of theorists like Laura Marks and Sara Ahmed, both of whom evoke the case for what can be characterised as surface or epidermal archaeologies. Marks’s project revolves around probing the diasporan histories etched onto the “skin” of film (Skin). Meanwhile, Ahmed’s interest is on the
ways in which collective bodies form through the “impressions made by bodily others” (“Collective” 27). In both cases, the skin is a medium that retains memories of former encounters. With MOA CAT, the idea of the collective can be seen, even though just faintly, in the intermingling of bodily traces upon on the skin of the screen. It is the cumulative residues of surface compounds—whether oil, dirt, or sweat from the fingers—left upon the surface of the glass, which make unintentional and peculiar allusions to a ghosted commons, or a chimerical assemblage of bodies. Whereas in other parts of the museum, they might be viewed as harmful for causing staining, discolouration and corrosion, the gladly received impressions upon the digital interface divulge the hospitality of the screen. They are the hopeful imprints left of visitors’ myriad gestural encounters with the interface; in touching, we are touching a surface that others before us have touched, and others after us will as well. These imprints also serve as a reminder of Marks’s point that investigating the “skin of film”—ghosted as it is with traces of preceding audiences and viewings—allows us to begin to identify disjunctions between “official history” and “private memory” (Skin 60). Significantly then, these marks upon the skin belie the screen’s capacity to enframe—and give place to—various potentially discordant agencies upon a single surface area.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that much can be gleaned from the summoning techniques of interactive technologies. The body beckoned by the MOA touchscreen is one habituated to a host of seductions which appeal to the visitor’s sense of agency and perspectival stability. The visitor to the Multiversity Galleries is not made subject to an immersive landscape which utterly engulfs her sensorial faculties, but instead heralded as a temperate subject who presides omnisciently over the scene, perched atop a digital promontory. It has been posited that, in her trek
through the museological terrain, this visitor is not encouraged to identify as a subject of historical violence or of resistance. In contrast, she is already a body “plugged in,” poised to receive rationalized knowledge and rectified history, and through this, inherit a utopic “post”colonial citizenship.

The MOA CAT and RRN are the Museum’s attempts to realign colonial structures of power and knowledge by establishing a commons. This is undertaken through the figurative but also material apparatuses of expansion and touch, with the former employed to signal the transformation of the colonial archive into an inclusive public sphere, and the latter encouraging us to imagine the feasibility of self-directed, democratic pathways through this archive. I have argued, however, that MOA’s haptic interfaces are given to ambivalent efforts (global/national, utopian/colonial, surrender/control), and that allusions to a commons can in fact reveal the ways that liberalism is able to effectively appropriate dissent and contestation. A belief that proxy channels of participation through digital infrastructures can replace reconfigurations of structural power—or that “virtual” repatriation can satisfy the need for the actual deaccessioning of objects—ultimately entrenches the longstanding faith in institutions as custodians of culture and history. In this sense, collaborative efforts from Indigenous stakeholder communities can be seen as yet another resource to be mined in the bolstering of hegemonic knowledge capital, just as the incorporation of Indigenous works and voices can be viewed as symptomatic of the colonial museum’s insatiate hunger to assimilate difference without having to undergo actual change in the process.

To imagine an alternative to what Irit Rogoff identifies as the perpetually flexible accumulative strategies of the museum would require that the institution directly acknowledge trauma and loss, rather than finding endless new ways to compensate for it (69). In a point that is especially pertinent to settler states, Rogoff moreover maintains that it is not enough to merely
represent “that which has been lost, marginalized, or vilified;” museums must also confront the ways that histories of violence have affected dominant cultures which have “perpetrated these elisions and remained seemingly inviolate in their wake” (64). It would therefore be necessary to recognize that history and power cannot be pacified into inert shadows through the heralded adoptions of new technologies employed to revive a landscape forged through colonial wounds. Like Hardt and Negri’s growing flesh of multitude, the colonial archive is given to contemporary vicissitudes, whether by reanimation through virtual interlays, or enlivenment through the pressure of our own bodies. But ultimately the scars remain, and they need to be directly multifariously contended with.
Chapter 6

Projections at Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump

About twenty kilometres northwest of Fort Macleod, a small town in southeastern Alberta, there lies a transitional geography where the Rocky Mountains softly descend into the recumbent prairie lands. Onto this seemingly unassuming stretch of relative flat inflected with occasional protuberances to the west, hundreds of thousands of tourists flock every year. They come from varying distances around the country and the globe to visit Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump (HSIBJ), a site anointed a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1981. Based on archaeological evidence, the site is nearly 6000 years old, and “one of the oldest, most extensive, and best preserved sites” of its kind in North America (“Head-Smashed-In”), and a “remarkable testimony of prehistoric life” (Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, “Information”). The site provides crucial clues to the culture of the early Plains peoples before their lives were inextricably altered by contact with the earliest European settlers and the decimation of the herds. As early as 6000 years ago, Blackfoot hunters contrived sophisticated methods to drive herds of buffalo over the cliffs, where these animals would plummet to their deaths or else be killed by hunters waiting below. Today, visitors make the trek to HSIBJ from all around to witness this past come “alive.” Aside from learning about the buffalo jump at the Interpretive Centre, visitors can also witness Blackfoot drum and dance performances during the summer months, embark on tours through the ancient drive

79 It is believed that the site was only named Head-Smashed-In less than two centuries ago, after a young Peigan Blackfoot whose curiosity led him to an unfortunate end. During one hunt, the young man hid under the precipice to watch the buffalo plummet to their deaths. As the story goes, it was a particularly successful hunt that day, and there were so many falling bodies that they eventually crushed him against the big rock. His people named the location Estipah-Sikikini-Kots, which in Blackfoot means “where he got his head smashed in” (Brink, Imagining).

80 Bison were hunted at HSIBJ at least around 6000 years ago, though some estimates suggest the site was used 10,000 years ago (Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, “Buffalo” 3).
lanes led by Blackfoot guides, construct their own tipis, and partake in simulated archeological
digs. 81

At the opening of the HSIBJ Interpretive Centre on July 23, 1987, the Duke and Duchess of York, Prince Andrew and Sarah Ferguson, were invited to officiate the occasion in front of a crowd of around five thousand (Brink & Dawe, “1987” 9). Much of the press at the time drew attention to the fact that it was the couple’s first wedding anniversary; their presence at the site was as feted as the opening of the site itself. A journalist reporting on the scene for The Globe and Mail that day recounts, “a crowd of several thousand exuberant tourists standing near where the brave was killed shouted ‘Happy Anniversary’ to the couple and then listened as elders Harold Shade and Joseph Crowshoe, replete in huge, feathered, ceremonial headdresses blessed the site in Blackfoot and English” (M. Fisher A4). The Duke and Duchess were then gifted with a sixty pound stuffed buffalo head and coats made of nutria, a South African Rodent (Lee). The opening festivities also included a three day First Nations dance ceremony, and a “makeshift village” with dozens of tipis (Brink and Dawe, “1987” 9).

This curious, seemingly anomalous scene on the Canadian prairies begins to hint at the many entangled layers implicated in HSIBJ, some of whose tensions and intricacies are not likely to surface in the official World Heritage narrative. The story of HSIBJ is far from a straightforward—and stainless—chronology that confirms First Nations “pre”history as rescued through colonial contact and ultimately redeemed through national and global heritage designations. A helpful configuration of this complex site is provided by Ashok Mathur’s designation of settler landscapes as “geographic palimpsest[s]” that are indelibly marked by historical spectres which, “however obscured or willfully ignored, can never be erased” (3). The

81 The latter two activities are targeted towards young visitors (Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, “2015”).
HSIBJ site is in fact constituted through many overlapping components, some of which, within the official delineations of heritage, are more conspicuous than others. There is, of course, the vast history of the Plains peoples which is literally embedded deep in the interior of the earth itself, and which the primary interpretive lens of archaeology, by investigating the most attainable layers, only provides us a fleeting glimpse. There is also the undeniable impact of colonization in the shaping of this region, from the work of the first European settlers and the establishment of the numbered treaties, to more present incursions by state and corporate interests. This history is further complicated and enriched by the contemporary presence of the Blackfoot peoples who continue to make their home in this part of southern Alberta. They not only inhabit land scarred by colonial spectres carried forth from the earlier days of contact, but still contend with the ever-present trials of colonial injustice and violence that official commemorations of First Nations “pre”history do not ameliorate.

This chapter explores how various filaments accumulate to form a tapestried landscape within which the HSIBJ visitor is situated, and how this emplacement works through specific haptic invitations directed towards the visitor’s body. Of especial interest here is HSIBJ’s Interpretive Centre’s use of visitor-generated projections, which function as ephemeral shadows cast upon the “hard” surface of a simulated “pre”historical nation-scape. These projections encourage a corporal engagement with the phantasmagoria of history through proprioception. The generative paradox here lies in the body being located or secured within a substantiating framework of national—and global—heritage manifested through elusive shadows and spectres. Immediately following this section, 6.1 provides a background to the HSIBJ site and takes the reader on a tour of the Interpretive Centre, paying particular attention to the role of user-generated projections. These projections provide the lead-in to the next section, 6.2, which explores the role of proprioception.
(the sense of the body’s position in and through space) in the formation of an embodied cultural citizenship. Here, I also consider the ways in which discourses of archaeology and heritage function as the stabilizing colonial contexts within which a subject-of-nation is located and confirmed. While this section focuses on a gravitational pull of imagining belonging within landscape, 6.3 looks at how this gravity might be unsettled through the spectral shadows of nation. Phantasmagoria here provides an avenue to explore how the settler nation is founded on perpetual acts of disavowals and elisions which work to expunge colonial violence from public memory. I argue that, significantly, such acts of forgetting are not incommensurate with the memorializing mechanisms of heritage.

Before proceeding, I want to point out that social-political palimpsest of HSIBJ is also marked by yet another lamina: that left by the bodies of visitors whose itinerant journeys in, out, and through this landscape are not innocent, but indelibly mark this landscape as well. I include in this group researchers like myself—outsiders who have an undeniably fraught relationship with this site. I have noticed a small but noteworthy trend among non-Indigenous writers whose well-intentioned treatises on HSIBJ ultimately employ the site as a backdrop for the stagings of personal and/or professional self-realizations. HSIBJ’s head archaeologist, Jack Brink, produced a book, Imagining Head-Smashed-In, which reads in part like a bildungsroman centred on the “young and idealistic” (275) archaeologist-scientist who enters the Blackfoot community, makes the necessary well-intentioned missteps, subsequently learns from these mistakes and is eventually accepted into the Blackfoot community (he is given a Blackfoot name by elder Joseph Crowshoe).82 In a similar manner, Daniel Francis’s The Imaginary Indian regales the author’s transformative encounter with

82 Neil Asher Silberman’s observations that the Archaeologist as Hero trope aids in the moral legitimization of exploration and the expropriation of others’ lands and artefacts (251) is particularly illuminating in this regard.
“the Indian:” “[a]fter a long afternoon learning about the buffalo, I left Head-Smashed-In dimly aware that I had changed my mind about something. It had been an encounter…with an idea, my own idea about what an Indian was. If I thought I had known before, I didn’t think I knew anymore. And perhaps that is where this book began. How had I come to believe in an Imaginary Indian?” (19).

While I have no wish to replicate this problematic narrative of the researcher entering a community, recovering its “spoils” and becoming triumphantly self-actualized at the close of the journey, I also understand that inherent power dynamics will tend to tip the scales in my direction. As I mentioned in the introduction to this dissertation, the writer’s autoethnographic disclosure becomes particularly necessary when the alternative—of omitting the personal—proves problematic and “untenable” (Jones et al. 21). Autoethnographic approaches, which entail “searching for understanding of others (culture/society) through self” (Chang 49), are not interjected in order to overpower or even distract from other narratives, but to necessarily confront the fact that the researcher’s biography inevitably shapes the political scope of any narrative produced. I am merely a writer feeling my way through a complex and entangled settler imbroglio in which I am admittedly implicated. My initial experience at HSIBJ affected me deeply and acutely; I became intellectual engaged the more I thought about this site, but undoubtedly, it was my body that “moved” first. In proceeding with this chapter, my goal is to not take this affective experience for granted, but to instead probe from it larger, stickier webs of meaning. My positionality as a settler of colour, an academic from central Canada, and a stranger to the historical and topographical landscape of Southern Alberta undoubtedly frames and colours the manner in which I encounter HSIBJ, as well as the academic exegesis I produce herewith. With respect to this region of the continent, I am in every sense an outsider. My first encounter with HSIBJ was
incidental; I was another tourist, knowing utterly nothing of the regional history, just “passing through” in the summer of 2010. Yet, it is important to note that what can be viewed as my geographic and cultural estrangement does not preclude my being directly addressed as part of the imagined audience of HSIBJ, beckoned by both a national narrative as well as the discourse of universal patrimony and stewardship espoused by UNESCO. This “disjuncture” only begins to shed light on some of the problematic ways that the official narrative of HSIBJ targets itself towards a supposedly universal audience while often eschewing the Indigenous relationship with, and understanding of, the site—unless in instances where the latter can buttress or lend credence to the dominant heritage discourse. In this chapter, my phenomenal experience of HSIBJ provides a provisional, discreet threshold from which to explore larger questions at play, including: exactly which bodies and subjects are summoned into citizenship, granted access to heritage, and bestowed the privilege to be “moved”?

6.1 Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump

Part of the risk of a project that considers, among other things, the significance of Head-Smashed-In is that it involves the inherently fraught task of choosing a point where this history commences. This is an issue I attempted to grapple with earlier, especially in Chapter 3’s discussion of He Named Her Amber. How does one really “begin” a history? Undoubtedly, the designation of any beginning determines the hue, scope, and direction of the story one embarks to tell. Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel warn that, while it serves as a necessary framework, there is also a “danger in allowing colonization to be the only story of Indigenous lives,” because doing so would cast the entire narrative under “the Settler’s power” and thus ensure “a view of the world that is but an outcome or perspective on that power” (601). However, a pre-contact world is irretrievable—
especially for a settler researcher. Alternately, following the thread provided by the Head-Smashed-In archaeologists would allow us to “begin” as far back as approximately six thousand years ago. Doing so might also establish that we recount a specifically lensed narrative which hinges on the tangibility of material “evidence” and the consolidation of said evidence into a national-cum-global thesis about the redemptive power of heritage. Such a narrative conveniently eschews the traumatic memory of a settler nation borne of “foundational violence” (Veracini, Settler 75). This chapter is not interested in merely recounting HSIBJ’s archaeological chronology, nor does it wish to ignore the fact that archaeology itself is not a neutral tool, but one laden with discourses of power and ideology (L. Smith, Archaeological). However, I contend that acts of digging and delving can serve as useful methodological provocations. What follows is an attempt at a contingent, haphazard “excavation”; from the scene of HSIBJ’s opening in 1987, we venture deeper to another commemoration in 1977, and from there, delve further still to the signing of Treaty 7 in 1877. These evoked historical scenes are not presented as inert tableaux; in aggregate, they reveal a dynamic undulating landscape marked by flows, elisions, presences, latencies, and resonances. Further, I do not look to ultimately assemble a chronology from the materials found, but instead find value in their very simultaneity and juxtaposition.

The opening image\(^{83}\) of the Duke and Duchess out on the prairies in the summer of 1987 serves as an invitation to think about how certain layers that make up the collective palimpsest are more visibly evidenced than others. This visit from the royal couple, who were far from the first representatives of the British Crown to make their way to the Western Plains, was merely one particularly picturesque moment in a long entrenched colonial history of the region. A decade

---

\(^{83}\) There is a literal image—a photograph of the Duke and Duchess’ visit—memorialized in a plaque by the entrance of HSIBJ.
before his brother Andrew was invited to officiate the opening of HSIBJ, Prince Charles arrived for his own visit to Southern Alberta. The latter arrived at Blackfoot Crossing\textsuperscript{84} in July of 1977, for a ceremonial re-enactment of the Treaty 7 signing on the occasion of its Centennial. Much fanfare surrounded this event as well, with a huge pow wow organized by the Blood tribe to welcome the Prince, and thousands in attendance to witness the re-enactment, which included a peace pipe ceremony between Prince Charles and the chiefs (Lancashire 9). However, despite the Canadian government’s efforts to keep the ceremonies free from all explicit protests and “anti-royalty demonstrations” (Lancashire 9), it has been noted that the seven chiefs in attendance found the opportunity to voice their grievances regarding the failure of the government to uphold their treaty promises, and the fact that their people continue live in poverty in the surrounding reserves (Price ix).

Treaty 7 was one of the eleven Post-Confederation treaties signed between the British Crown and First Nations in various regions of Canada between 1871 and 1921. Signed in 1877, Treaty 7 signatories included the Blackfoot Confederacy: Siksika (Blackfoot), Kainai (Blood), Piikani (Peigan), and also the Nakoda (Stoney) and Tsuu T’ina (Sarcee) First Nations. The Treaty ceded to the Crown 50,000 square miles of land in the area now known as southern Alberta, in return for designated reserve lands, annuity payments, education, medical care, ammunition, farming supplies, and the continued hunting and trapping rights on the surrendered territories. Such provisions were necessary for the survival of the Blackfoot peoples, whose primarily source of subsistence—the buffalo—was already fast on the decline soon after the arrival of the first European settlers (Carr-Stewart and Preston 2). Similar to the Toronto Purchase discussed in

\textsuperscript{84} This site is located roughly 200 kilometers northeast of HSIBJ. Blackfoot Crossing Historical Park officially opened in 2007. It is a national historic site and currently being recommended for UNESCO World Heritage status.
Chapter 3, misunderstandings between the Europeans and Indigenous signatories served greatly in the former’s favour. Importantly, the testimony of community elders collected by researchers in recent decades assert that Treaty 7 was seen by these tribes as a peace treaty rather than an agreement to surrender territory (J. L. Taylor; Treaty 7 Elders). John Leonard Taylor writes that land cession was in fact not the focus of talks leading up the signing of the treaty; “the lack of emphasis in the negotiations on the surrender by the Indians of their territory is in sharp contrast to the prominence and explicit detail of the surrender clauses of the treaty texts” (41). The explicit statement of land cession in the written document of Treaty 7, which calls for the tribes to “cede, release, surrender and yield up to the Government of the Dominion of Canada…all their rights, titles and privileges whatsoever” (qtd in J. L. Taylor 41), had not been reflected in the talks themselves, which had instead focused on all that the tribes would receive. Reiterating this discrepancy is the fact that, as Chief Roy Whitney points out, notions like “surrender” and “cede” would not have even been translatable to the First Nations elders (Treaty 7 Elders, “Preface” xi).

Treaties and their pervasive effects are far from a distant memory for Indigenous peoples of this country. Speaking of the many public struggles between First Nations and the state which erupted in the 1970s and 1980s, including specifically the Oldman River Dam conflict in southern Alberta, Piikani activist Devalon Small Legs refers back to Treaty 7 as the inciting incident that started the “swindle” (qtd. in Girvan 142). Moreover, Robinder Kaur Sehdev makes the important argument that all people living in this country, including non-Indigenous people of colour, are “treaty citizens.” This is because “our belonging to this land is made possible by treaty”, and as such, we must accept responsibility for the ways in which our settling and home-making render us
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complicit with the colonial project (265). While readily inheriting the exalted heritage of nation, we often fail to acknowledge that we are heirs to its histories of violence as well. This is directly apparent in the way that HSIBJ is inscribed as our taken-for-granted “inheritance” as national and global citizens. Part of the territory ceded to the Crown in Treaty 7 includes the tract of land where Head-Smashed-In sits. The signing of this treaty not only ensured that there could be no outright disputes over future ownership of this region (Susemihl 64), but it also paved the way for the facile subsumption of this land and its history under national and international heritage mechanisms.

A century after the signing of Treaty 7, the site received a series of official designations based on its archaeological significance; it was declared a National Historic Site in 1968, a Provincial Historic Site in 1979, and eventually a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1981. William J. Byrne, who had excavated the Plains region of Alberta that included the HSIBJ site, first tried to rally support to build a learning centre at Head-Smashed-In in the early 1970s, shortly after he was appointed director of the newly formed Archaeological Survey of Alberta. However, this initial attempt met with lukewarm reception, as the provincial government was expressly reluctant to spend taxpayers’ money "on the preservation and interpretation of what was then thought of as Indian history" (Brink, Imagining 260). The resolute Byrne went on to initiate the UNESCO nomination process for the site, and it was only in 1982, after the designation was granted by the World Heritage Committee, that the province finally granted approval and funding of ten million dollars towards the development of an interpretive centre. It is thus crucial to bear in mind that it is from the ceding of Indigenous land in the 1870s—on terms that many First Nations continue to see as unjust, and having been enacted in bad faith—that this path towards the crowing of

---

85 Refer also to Asch’s argument that Treaties should force Canadian settlers to confront issues of the illegitimacy of our sovereignty and jurisdiction.
national/universal heritage was initiated. Today, the site is owned and managed by the Government of Alberta.

6.1.1 A Building in a Cliff

The HSIBJ Interpretive Centre is, by all accounts, an impressive feat of architecture. Built by Robert LeBlond’s firm, LeBlond Partnership, and recognized with a Governor General of Canada Medal for Architecture in 1990, its most distinguishing feature is its aesthetic harmony with the surrounding landscape. UNESCO’s requirement that the building be as unobtrusive as possible led eventually to a “buried” concept devised by the architects (Johns 24). The nearly 3,000 square metre, seven story high structure is built directly in the sandstone cliffs on the southern edge of Porcupine Hills. Its protrusions are barely visible; only ten percent of the building exterior can actually be seen (Brink, Imagining 263), and the visible parts of the structure are also stained with “horizontal grooves” to “simulate the natural bedding planes of the sandstone” (264). Jack Brink, an archaeologist who directed excavations at the site for a decade and was one of the primary individuals responsible for the development of the Interpretive Centre, writes that this unobtrusive architecture appropriately communicates to the visitor “the nature of the vast, open prairies in which these remarkable events transpired” (262). An architectural critique also referred to the “self-effacing” nature of the structure, which is commended for “emphasiz[ing] the quietness and raw unspoiled beauty of the land” and paying homage to “the cultural and spiritual significance of a site” (Johns 24).

Upon entering the Interpretive Centre, a cool and dark reprieve from the scorching sun outside, I am provided instructions on how to move through the structure’s levels, in order to receive the most “comprehensive” experience of the site. There is also a scale model of the building
located near the entrance which instructs the visitor as to how they should make their way through the space. These various guides unambiguously discourage desultory drifting, instead setting forth the path the body should follow in order to receive, as Stuart Hall would call it, the “preferred” reading of the site (“Encoding”). The centrality of archaeology is everywhere reflected in the layout of the Interpretation Centre, which is organized like a narrative that begins at the top floor and proceeds downwards. Each of the floors depicts an aspect of the lives of the Blackfoot peoples: ecology, lifestyle, the hunt (technology), and contact. The final level, dedicated to the archaeology of HSIBJ, serves as a crowning tribute to the scientific lens through which the entire structure has been organized.

Before I make my way through the descending chronology, I am first encouraged to head into a theatre to watch a fifteen minute film, *Pis’kun: the Buffalo Jump*. Through the use of dramatic re-enactment, this film serves as a visual primer of the entire series of events surrounding a jump, including its preparation and aftermath. After the film presentation, we are advised to proceed up to the top of the building, and from the upper foyer, embark on the Cliff Top Trails. The viewpoint atop the cliff affords a dramatic promontory of the surrounding prairies, rivers and the soft blue ridges of the distant Rockies in the southwest. These cinematic and scenic “views” offered the visitor construct a perspectival positioning; they function as two panoramic preludes which imbue the unfolding drama of HSIBJ with a sweeping historic and geographic breadth.

Napi’s World (Level 1), the first level, focuses on the ecology of the northwest Plains. This is the smallest and least clamorous of the five indoor levels, its sparseness a fitting transition from the openness of the outdoor trails to the more densely packed levels to follow. Flanked on one side by a large mural of the Plains, this floor explores the geography, vegetation, and climate of the region, but also places these alongside the Blackfoot account of the origin of the world. This latter
account is told through the figure of “Napi,” or Old Man, a trickster hero of the Blackfoot responsible for creating the world. A monitor mounted on the wall presents a short animated creation story narrated by an elder in Blackfoot. The information displayed on the mounted panels offer scientific descriptions on such topics as the behaviour and herd structure of the buffalo, the vegetation of southeastern Alberta, and the land formations around Head-Smashed-In. Juxtaposed alongside this are the more ephemeral visitor-generated projections. Triggered by motion-sensor whenever a visitor comes within proximity, these projects are cast variously upon the painted Plains scene, a panel alongside the printed text, and on one of the erratics (boulders transported by glaciers).

Brink explains that these projections were seen as a way to illustrate a “parallel” narrative of Blackfoot cosmology which could be presented alongside archaeological and scientific research. He recounts a particularly illuminating consultation session in 1981 with two members of the Band Council of the Peigan Indians, William Big Bull and Nelbert Little Moustache, which led him to the realization that the “alternate reality” of the Blackfoot could be woven in with the rest of the HSIBJ narrative;

This reality was distinct from the one gleaned from the archaeological and anthropological textbooks, and excavated from the earth below the jump; rather, it existed in parallel to the more scientific sources of information, and it remained largely untapped by the individuals in government who had controlled the development and interpretation of other historic sites. (Brink, “Blackfoot” 24)

Interviews with members of the Blackfoot community were conducted in subsequent years, and planners devised a way to display the information and stories gathered in a manner that would allow these to enrich the main narrative structure of the Interpretive Centre while simultaneously
remaining distinguished from scientific data. As Brink describes, “it seemed inappropriate to put Napi stories, part of oral history, onto display panels alongside text based upon anthropological and archaeological information” (“Blackfoot” 32). It was therefore decided that this knowledge would be presented as Napi stories, projected alongside the scientific research presented on the panels. It was also decided that these projections would be used only on the first three levels, because these “deal with the environmental and cultural conditions prior to contact with Europeans,” and were thus seen as providing the “most appropriate settings for the traditional Napi stories” (Brink, “Blackfoot” 33). A particularly illustrative example is the juxtaposition of panel text and projected text in the section on erratics. Cast upon one of the erratics is the following text,

Napi came across a big rock hiding out in the rain, snow and hot sun. He had pity on the rock and covered it with his buffalo robe. Then a big storm came up and Napi was cold, so he went back and took his robe from the rock. The rock became angry and started chasing Napi. Pieces of the big rock chipped off as it rolled after Napi.

That is how the strange rocks got onto the Plains.

Directly above this projection is the panel which offers the rather blunt scientific translation, “Napi’s rolling rock is what we call an erratic.” This panel proceeds to render “myth” into science, at the same time providing scientific discourse with a mythic auxiliary. We see this reflected in other instances as well.

The Plains mural from Napi’s World extends down towards the ensuing floor, Napi’s People (Level 2). Below a soaring eagle is text that tells of how, after the earth was constructed, Napi made people out of mud, “‘You must be people’ Napi said, as he covered the mud and went away. When he returned, Napi told the mud forms to rise and walk, and they did. So Napi told them he was their maker: The Old Man. This is how people came to be.” This level advances by
exploring the culture and lifestyle of the Plains people. It displays information about the organization of everyday life through rhythms of the seasons, including panels on: which plants were collected in the summer, the kinds of preparatory labours of the fall, and how the people survived through the long winter months, etc. Also included are panels on the familial and band structures of the Plains people. The projected texts on a collection of boulders placed in the centre of the exhibit floor (fig. 6) switch fluidly from the perspective of Napi to the Plains people recounting Napi legends. This fluidity of perspective gives the impression of a collective voice, and also emphasizes the importance of oral transmission in Blackfoot culture. On one boulder, the text is in Napi’s voice as he offers advice and warning to his people, “I’ve given you so many gifts and I’ve shown you how to use them...But you still have to do your job.” On others, first person
plural marks the voice of Napi’s people explaining how the times of year were named, “We name the months by our Calendar of moons,” and “We call fall ‘When the Leaves are Yellow’, or sometimes ‘Time of the First Frost.’” This illuminates how, as people slowly begin to populate Napi’s world, they also make it their home by inscribing this landscape with their own meanings, symbols, and narratives.

The next floor down, The Buffalo Hunt (Level 3), concentrates on the intricacies of the hunt, and the significance of the buffalo in the lives of the Plains peoples. Not only did the buffalo provided families with sustenance for the upcoming year, their bodies were also used for hides and a variety of other tools and technologies. The panels on this level provide information on the religious ceremonies leading up to a hunt, the Plains people’s understanding of buffalo psychology, the construction of the drive lanes, the different tools and weapons used in the hunt, and the many different uses of the buffalo after it was killed, etc. Unlike the previous two levels, this one is richly displayed with artefacts—most of which are reproductions of sacred objects which cannot be displayed. Also in contrast to the first two floors, there is only a single projection here. Cast again upon an erratic, this text explains how, one winter, when “all the buffalo had gone away,” the iniskim (sacred buffalo stone) revealed its power to a woman in song. This woman took this knowledge back to her people, thus inaugurating the tradition of the hunt. The use of projected text, here as in previous instances, evokes the idea of afterlife; these projections are the glimmering residues of what has passed, yet still lives on.

The penultimate Cultures in Contact (Level 4) primarily examines the arrival of the Europeans, the subsequent demise of the buffalo hunts, and other transitions that the settlers’ arrival wrought upon the lives of the Plains people. There are no projections here at all; like the previous level, it is artifact rich. On display are a pile buffalo skulls, archaeological fragments from the site,
the Treaty book, and the material culture of the first Europeans in the area—including items that were traded with the Plains peoples. While the first three levels focus more on telling the story from the perspective of the Plains peoples, this one, centred generally on themes of death, transition, and renewal/survival, begins to shift towards the archaeologist’s frame of view, and the contemporaneity which it is meant to signal. A section on “Uncovering Times Past” displays the following unattributed quote: “The human past must not be forgotten, but studied and understood, so that we enrich our own future; this is the goal of archaeology.” Here, archaeology is suggested as the vehicle through which Head-Smashed-In has been unearthed, a vehicle which can also ensure that this heritage continues to “enrich our own future.”

By explicating the role archaeology at Head-Smashed-In, Uncovering the Past (Level 5) more explicitly presents an archaeological frame through which to read the narrative of the Interpretive Centre. This final floor is larger than previous sections, and is brimmed with displays of objects and information, all of which appear more contemporary and sophisticatedly presented. The flickering shadows of Napi’s projections have here transformed—calcified into tangible, material proof. There are a host of tactile and interactive implements, for example, that position users as archaeologists charged with the task of scrutinizing the artifacts on display, including among others, rudimentary touchscreens technologies, and a video microscope. Visitors can also head into the Archaeological Theatre to watch a film that explores the science of constructing the past. By slipping their bodies into these interactive technologies, the visitor is encouraged to corporally inhabit the perspective of the archaeologist; they thusly proceed from Napi’s myths towards scientific reason and acumen.

The pièce de résistance of the interpretive centre is the display of three buffalo about to leap over a soaring, ten metre high cliff (fig. 7). This striking display can be viewed from other levels,
but the final ground level offers the most dramatic perspective. This cliff upon which the buffalo are perched is a replica of the nearby Calderwood Jump; below it is a realistic archaeological dig that has been reproduced with such exactitude that Brink claims to have often heard visitors mistaking it for the real thing, and inquiring about when archaeologists would return to continue their work (*Imagining* 267). Standing in front of it, one cannot help but feel the immense power of the scene, of both history and archaeology suspended in time. Here, archaeology reveals itself as more than an invisible and neutral methodology or lens; it is also an artefact on display, magnificently captured in flight and preserved in time.

The overall narrative of HSIBJ, as materialized through the Interpretive Centre, is that knowledge about the Plains peoples—their way of life and cosmology—is only truly accessible through archaeology. Knowledge contributions from the Blackfoot elders and communities merely provide clues to facilitate or actuate the logic of archaeological discovery, or else supplement the
latter through narrative addendums. Brink insists that Napi’s stories are presented as an “alternate” though equally valid interpretive tool based on “nonwestern thought” (Brink, “Blackfoot” 32). Nevertheless, the distinctions between these two lenses are noticeably emphasized through juxtaposition, such that there emerges an “official” archaeological discourse set alongside its figurative and physical “shadows.” As much as the site is focused on the “preservation” of Blackfoot history, it also serves as an ovation to the feats of archaeology. Archaeology is placed on a mantel as a science that can “recover” that which has been “lost” through the violent colonial incursions from the latter part of the 1800s onwards. The ways of life that were irrevocably altered through the British settlement of the prairies can only be “recovered” as remnants of a distant past—one which now serves to reify a national narrative. Crucially, the strenuous task of exogenous settlers to locate themselves in the early histories of this region is somewhat cured by the ability to claim the “rescue” of this ancient history through archaeological technique.

6.2 Proprioceptive Emplacement

As Juhani Pallasmaa writes, “an architectural space frames, halts, strengthens and focuses our thoughts, and prevents them from getting lost…The geometry of thought echoes the geometry of the room.” Pallasmaa (44-5). The spatial and architectonic composition of HSIBJ is integral to the ways in which visitors perceive and experience heritage. It provides context and gravity, placing the visitor within a specific landscape, history, and implicit narrative about nation so that one is likely not to “lose” their place. Architecture in a sense provides a binding myth through which notions of legacy, inheritance and historical continuity substantiate a subjective position. One way that this occurs is through architecture’s atunement of the visitor’s sense of proprioception—the internal perception of the body’s position in and movement through space. First coined by British
physiologist Sir Charles Sherrington in his 1906 publication *The Integrative Action of the Nervous System*, proprioception is the awareness of the position of the body and its limbs in space. For James Gibson, an American psychologist who contributed significantly to the development of the concept following Sherrington, proprioception is the “awareness of the axis of the body” (Gibson, “On the Difference”), and thus integral to one’s sense of balance and equilibrium. It is distinguished as an *interoceptive* rather than *exteroceptive* sense because it originates from within the body rather than through external stimuli such as smell, sight, taste, etc. (Paterson, *Senses* 20). Also included in the category of interoceptive senses are kinaesthesia (the sense of movement) and the vestibular system (the sense of balance), both of which are closely related to proprioception. Mark Paterson refers to the three as *somatic* or *haptic* senses which, as he argues, work synergistically and cannot be neatly disentangled from each other. He further goes on to complicate the segregation of interoceptive versus exteroceptive senses, relying instead on the term *somatic* to account for “the multiplicity and the interaction between different internally felt and outwardly orientated senses” (“Haptic” 768). All three are senses that, as Paterson describes, exceeds the surface of the skin; through them, touch can be conceived of as extending beyond “cutaneous skin sensations” to encompass “internally felt bodily sensations” (“Haptic” 768).

While it is not my intention to suggest that these senses can be viewed entirely in isolation, proprioception remains the central focus here, because it provides a bodily way to conceptualize identity as inextricably bound to one’s posture and the body’s location in space. In this regard, Vivian Sobchack’s description of proprioception as a “grounding sense” is especially resonant. Sobchack writes that this sense allows us to feel “ourselves as positioned and embodied in worldly space” as it “provide[s] us our body image” not through objective vision, but through “the invisible and subjective lived feeling of our material being” (*Carnal* 192). In other words, *sense of self*
materializes or is corroborated through the sensation of the body being implanted within the world. Drawing on neurologist Oliver Sacks's work,86 Sobchack also writes that proprioception, by affording the internal confirmation of one’s subjectivity—also described as “living one’s body from within” (192)—enables the “fundamental, organic mooring of identity” (194).

Such a conceptualization also emphasizes that proprioception is not solipsistic, but involves the integral relation of the body with the world, the internal and the external. As Gibson explains in “A Theory of Direct Visual Perception,” any “awareness of the body” is “never wholly without some awareness of the environment” (78). In this same essay, he recognizes that vision is not merely about sensing the external world, but also about enabling a bodily sense, or “awareness of self” (78). We can relate this to a number of more contemporary theorists whose works explore the ways in which cinematic or new media experiences unfold within the body (Sobchack; Marks; Shaviro; J. Barker; Crary; Massumi). Such thinkers suggest crucial ways through which we might continue to reconsider: the reach of "external" plastic media, the expanding depth of emerging spectatorships, and the porosity of bodily organs. In a similar line of thinking that challenges the inside/outside dichotomy, Brian Massumi writes that proprioception “translates the exertions and ease of the body’s encounters with objects into a muscular memory of relationality” (59). In this way, we might conceive of proprioception as a means through which we not only sense our own bodies, but also receive the world.

We begin to notice here that proprioception might venture beyond the sensory capacities of the body, to conjure more extensive modes of subjective coherence engendered through the sense of postural emplacements—including, namely, cultural citizenship. The sense of the body’s

86 Oliver Sacks's *The Man Who Mistook His Wife for a Hat and Other Clinical Tales* describes Sacks's patient, “The Disembodied Lady” who suffers from a form of neurological damage which causes her to lose most of her proprioceptive sense.
position in space can be intertwined with the sense of the body’s position within the well-rehearsed, canonical narratives of nation, attended by official discourses of history and heritage. Michael Billig’s concept of Western nationalism as reproduced through everyday, banal practices and the “continual ‘flagging’” of nationhood proves germane in this regard. Billig writes that national identity “involves being situated physically, legally, socially, as well as emotionally: typically, it means being situated within a homeland, which itself is situated within the world of nations” (8). This current chapter hopes to confirm the notion that citizenship involves the location of the physical, material body within nation, and that this proprioceptive emplacement is fundamental to the various affective and ideological modes of capture on which cultural citizenship depends.

Banal nationalism further brings to mind Marcel Mauss’ *techniques of the body* as well as the notion of *habitus*, as developed by Mauss and Pierre Bourdieu. Mauss defines bodily techniques as “the ways in which from society to society men know how to use their bodies” (70). He offers as examples habits of sitting, eating, and even the placement of limbs while walking (72), all of which articulate the trained postures that bind us to a larger social body. In other words, we are initiated into the folds of a collective social fabric through the “education of…composure” (86). In a similar way, habitus indicates the “systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures” (Bourdieu 53). Habitus refers to the accumulated embodied conditionings—skills, habits, dispositions, sensibilities, etc.—that have a specific social genealogy, in that they are borne of a subject’s education, class, social standing, etc. Most often, however, habitus manifests unconsciously and is taken to be “natural.” Like techniques of the body, habitus does not stem from the level of the individual but is more accurately characterized as collective or “social idiosyncrasy” (Mauss. 72). Taken together, banal nationalism, bodily techniques and habitus offer us compelling ways to think about how power is transferred.
and reproduced through embodied and oftentimes naturalized habits of being in the world which are crucially situated within distinct milieus. These milieus are then, in turn, reconfirmed through the habituation of practice. Participating in our social-political milieus through embodied, habitual practice can ground us as national or global citizens, in this way securing our flimsy bodies with the weight of contextual gravity. There is, further, the sense that heritage can be settling, in that it secures or reconfirms an overarching settler colonial narrative. Settlers can claim the depth and profundity of HSIBJ’s “ancient” history as inscribed through UNESCO world heritage discourse, and in this way absolve some anxiety about their own latecoming status, while diluting the “foundational violence” (Veracini, Settler 75) upon which settler occupancy is premised.

Within the context of this chapter, proprioception allows us to think about the ways that cultural citizenship coalesces around (the sense of) the body’s immersion in the phantasmagoric palimpsest of nation. This “scene” of nation is transposed in concentrated form in the museum, which functions as the microcosmic intensification of a landscape inscribed through spectral patinas. More importantly, museums can be seen to distil the sometimes nebulous corporeal appeals of nation by hailing the body through a series of more precise technological accommodations—in this case, HSIBJ’s motion-sensored projections—which captivate the body through a particular sensory regime. As Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett suggests, the “sensory curriculum” of museums is changing such that they now appeal “less to the eyes than to the viscera” (“Performing” 220). Museums, she goes on to say, increasingly “offer the pleasures of disorientation, vertigo, somatic awareness, anti-gravitational experiences and proprioceptive self-awareness” (220). At issue in my argument is not only the “pleasures” offered through the proprioceptive register; just as importantly, I maintain that the proprioception sense is used for edificatory and structuring purposes as well. Specifically, the body’s awareness of its positionality—of being held or captured
in space—functions to cultivate the body’s postural and affective alignment in trials of citizenship. Napi’s projections, appearing in the first levels and gradually disappearing as one descends towards the Interpretive Centre’s final archaeological denouement, seem to verify the body’s trek through the “antecedent” or “incipient” stages of nation.

The proprioceptive sense reveals a lot about the body’s relation to heritage landscapes, or commemorated archives of place. More provocatively, perhaps, it suggests ways in which cultural citizenship is engendered not only through visual regimes—or, for that matter, merely the exteroceptive senses—but also embroils one’s flesh, muscles, and ligaments. Thinking about proprioception allows us to consider how often abstract notions of heritage and history are translated into discreet, site-specific archives which beckon audiences through minute bodily transactions. In the same way, proprioception is useful in investigations of how certain museum technologies—which accommodate the “viscera,” as Kirshenblatt-Gimblett puts it, and shepherd the body—work to locate and herald a subject into the narrative of nation.

Proprioception also facilitates a series of confirmations. It is not only the self that is sensed and located through proprioceptive awareness of the body’s location, but also the world beyond the body that is simultaneously corroborated in this process. The body is confirmed from within and without by the technology of the archive which recognizes it and accommodates its presence. Crucially, the visitor who encounters this technology is able to see and feel themselves located and recognized. HSIBJ Interpretive Centre’s motion-sensor projections act as externalized proprioceptors—the sensory receptors which recognize bodily position. They sense and respond to the body’s movements through the historical-archaeological narrative. Furthermore, regarding the confirmation of the world “beyond” the body, Michael Taussig draws on Walter Benjamin when he writes of the ways that we confirm architecture—and the city—not just visually, but through
proprioception, which acts as a “distracted” tactility (Taussig 149). This is not unlike Billig’s argument that “homelands, and the world of national homelands” are only reproduced in and through people’s affective and corporeal investments in a relationship with this imagined entity (8). In other words, it is only through the host of material and embodied practices of location/ing that the ideological or apparitional form of nation might be affirmed. It is also important to call attention to the fact it is not nation per se, so much as archaeology, history, and world heritage which act as the explicit contextualizing framework at HSIBJ. Nation is the unspoken corollary which emerges almost surreptitiously through these other intersecting discourses. The archaeological thesis, sanctified through global (UNESCO) recognition, in fact serves as the evidentiary vindication of an intelligible national genealogy.

There is, moreover, the matter of bodily discipline. Sarah Leigh Foster describes the “unconscious” functioning of proprioceptors, those “spinal-level reflexes that primarily assist in maintaining posture and balance,” and also “the learning and remembering of physical activities” (47). This concept of “posture and balance”—the indoctrination of musculature—is reminiscent of Richard Sennett’s writings on the training of the citizen’s body within the ancient agora. The agora was, in theory, open to all; however, Sennett explains that it served as an exclusionary space as well. Most activities, including ceremonies and political events, were inaccessible to the “slaves and foreigners (metics)” on whose labour the city’s economy paradoxically depended (52). Further, this inceptive public sphere was also ruled by bodily regimes of discipline such as the principle of Orthos (upright) which dictated that citizens walk swiftly and purposefully, as well as hold eye contact when standing still, etc. (55). These rules of comportment were meant to train “upright” citizens who were vigilantly sensate to their own proprioceptive bearings within the public theatre. Mauss, in an analogous manner, also wrote of the prohibitive nature of (Western) body technique,
which “is above all a retarding mechanism” which inhibits “disorderly movements” as well as regulates emotion seen as characteristic of the so-called primitive cultures (86).

Corresponding to the way that archaeology and heritage serve as proxy frameworks through which nation is confirmed at HSIBJ, it must be noted that visitors are not explicitly cultivated as citizen, but rather hailed implicitly as archaeologists and inheritors/stewards of global heritage. These visitors are beckoned through conflating discourses of rationality, progress and modernity. Within HSIBJ, they are expected to comply with behaviours familiar in most museum settings: it is understood they will maintain a level of silent reverence; keep their hands at their sides unless the circumstance might indicate otherwise; and follow a carefully laid out path in order to properly receive the museological narrative and its intended meanings. This, again, does not happen explicitly, but subtly, as if through osmosis. As a designated UNESCO World Heritage Site, the rules of comportment and posture at HSIBJ are only intensified. The surrounding landscape has been recognized as sacred and needing to be protected and preserved. The path that visitors are thus encouraged to tread through these grounds is all the more circumscribed. From the narrow winding paths in the upper and lower trails, visitors are invited to merely glance at the wonder of the surrounding landscape, while keeping all limbs within the delineated zones. These constricted paths are not unlike the severe manner in which national subjectivity is sutured; tracing the landscape enacts the carving of a single story through a palimpsestic, conglomerate landscape. In this perambulatory tracing of the landscape—a process whereby one “settles” oneself amidst the scene—colonial history is also actively relegated to the distant past through the anachronizing glean of Heritage. The visitor who moves through the HSIBJ becomes a subject who, like a triumphant prospector-archaeologist, stands above the fray of history as “postcolonial” citizen.
Importantly, this disciplinary grounding of the body must also be put in context with the ways in which the body is uprooted, or moved by its particular location in a sublime landscape that threatens to engulf the body. In this case, it is both the immensity of the landscape, as well as the monumentality of National History and Global Heritage that can be overpowering. Being moved by the surrounding landscape of HSIBJ, and in effect feeling the weight of historical inheritance, is a fundamental part of the visitor’s experience of the site. As Jack Brink points out, HSIBJ experience isn’t contained within the walls of the Interpretive Centre; visitors must also venture onto the outdoor paths (fig. 8), because “this is where the story unfolded, and there can be no substitute for getting connected to the land that ancient hunters once trod, land that echoed with the bellowing of wounded animals” (Imagining 267). Feelings of being moved accompany feelings of being immersed within a haptic text of nation and heritage, where designated “pre”history unfolds in an utterly visceral and encompassing way.

Other commentators have also expressed their awe at encountering this landscape. Popular historian Daniel Francis describes HSIBJ as a “holy” site, “a place where the warm wind seems to be the earth breathing, a place where personal identity dissolves temporarily, where you can feel the connectedness of lives back through time to be a reality” (18). Echoing this sentiment, though in more measured parlance of an architectural critique, Barry Johns describes the effect of walking along the upper cliffs as an experience of “precariousness, for, aside from a continuous handrail to hold you at the edge, there’s no sense of protection” (24). The escarpment along the upper tail grants a promontory from which one can scan the startling breadth of the prairies and the Rockies to the southwest. This vantage atop the cliff does not evoke, as one might expect from previous chapters’ investigations, feelings of ascendance or mastery, or the authorial supremacy that Mary Louise Pratt diagnoses in her examination of the “monarch-of-all-I-survey” trope. The sensation
here at HSIBJ, in contrast, can be of bodily contingency, or of the body moved and also unsettled by the power and immense “spirit” of the land. We might conclude that the precariousness Johns describes is of the body/subject becoming unmoored, losing—rather than securing—its place.

6.2.1 Heritage and Archaeology

Donald Preziosi argues that the target ideological function of the modern museum is in constructing the modern citizen, “a new social subject, an emplotted agent; a person with a history or life narrative, a cursus or curriculum vitae that must be tended carefully” (“Brain” 105). According to him, museums achieve this by providing both the “raw materials” of art and culture, as well as the framing technology which gives meaning to these materials. I argue that, in the case of HSIBJ, heritage and archaeology are the central narratives which “emplot” the visitor by
bestowing her with a proprioceptive frame. Both act as the ballast for national identity; they grant the stabilizing contexts of nation within which the body and subjectivity can be located, felt, and confirmed. Both also produce a more diffuse terrestrial sense—that of being of and in a conscripted time-space of the “world.” Alongside nation, the “preferred” or dominant reading of HSIBJ would seem to align subjectivities to the sense of planetary belonging and global citizenship. This is enabled through archaeology which, as previously mentioned, provides the HSIBJ with its structuring optic. Even with the proffered “parallel” Napi narrative, archaeology is ultimately the lens through which HSIBJ is read and interpreted. James Opp states that the centrality of archaeology in the interpretation narrative is “fitting” (255), and that “at its centre, Head-Smashed-In is an archaeological site with a historical narrative of plains Aboriginal life grafted on top” (259).

At the time of its UNESCO nomination, HSIBJ was presented not as a “cultural landscape” but an archaeological site (Dailoo and Pannekoek 35); consultations with the Blackfoot community were only sought out years later, during the planning of the Interpretive Centre.

The thematic framework of the Interpretive Centre, manifested physically and symbolically, further emphasizes the idea that archaeology in fact rescues this site from destruction, and transforms it into (World) Heritage. The Interpretive Centre is dug into the earth; the visitor descends into the depths of this geological and narrative space much as an archaeologist would. The interactive elements on site, including most notably the microscopes and touchscreens, also subtly suture the visitor into the role of archaeologist. Hence, archaeology provides both form and content for the visitor at HSIBJ. It is not only the implicit lens through which exhibited elements of Blackfoot society, including ecology, society, etc., are interpreted; as the focus of the final level of the centre, archaeology also serves as the narrative denouement of the heritage experience. Significantly, the archaeological frame functions as a medium through which citizens become
modern. HSIBJ archaeologists Jack Brink and Bob Dawe reveal as much in their statement that prioritizing the interpretation of archaeology for a general audience will eventually beget a “sympathetic and understanding public who agrees that studying the past is an indispensable part of modern society” (Brink and Dawe, “1987” 17).

Since the shift towards post-processual archaeology in the 1980s, researchers have challenged the pretense of archaeology as neutral or objective, arguing that the discipline springs out of (and is thus undeniably shaped by) colonial and Eurocentric worldviews. Some also illuminate the ways in which archaeology has, since its earliest days, been inextricably bound to nationalist endeavors. At the same time, Laurajane Smith alleges that archaeology nonetheless presents itself as an “impartial” science “concerned with seeking the truth about the past for the benefit of all humankind” (Archaeological i). Smith argues that probing the construction—and naturalization—of archaeology as discourse and practice will allow us to better comprehend the ways in which this discipline often comes to a head with Indigenous communities over issues of heritage, repatriation, and land claims. Smith’s examination of archaeology’s complicity with forms of management and discipline is also useful here. In a more general sense, she puts forth that “archaeology becomes mobilized as a ‘technology of government’ in the regulation or governance of social problems that intersect with claims about the meaning of the past and its heritage” (3).  

87 Gathercole and Lowenthal; Layton; L. Smith, Archaeological; Smith and Wobst; Trigger.
88 Benedict Anderson; Boswell and Evans; Meskell, Archaeology; Kohl and Fawcett.
89 Here, Smith is drawing on Rose and Miller’s “technology of government,” which the authors ascribe to practices and mechanisms which transform “a desire to know the nation and its subjects in fine detail into an essential resource of political rule” (Rose and Miller 186). Smith also provides as a more specific example the implementation of New Archaeology, which emerged in the United States in the 1960s, with the aim to establish the discipline as a logical “science” (Archaeological 6). Its proponents were increasingly concerned with presenting their findings as well as proving the relevance of this knowledge to the general public (6). Smith connects this new “rational archaeology” to liberal governance, arguing that “the discourse of rationality and objectivity, and the scientific values that informed it, found synergy with and ‘made sense’ in the context of the 1960s and 1970s liberal forms of governance” (6). Smith directs these comments to Australia and America, but it can also be applied to liberalism in Canada during this period.
Like archaeology, heritage is not an objective or neutral entity. In fact, the rhetoric of archaeology and heritage are in many ways mutually-sustaining. Denis Byrne writes that the originating conceptualizations of heritage followed directly at the heels of the development of archaeology, with early proponents believing that specific policies and legislation around heritage designation were the only means to safeguard the archaeological record from the threat posed by industrialization (270). At HSIBJ, archaeology is also presented as the means through which (Blackfoot) heritage is extricated—or “rescued”—from historical obscurity and amnesia.

This discourse of rescue and recovery is apocryphal for a number of reasons. As Deborah Kirshenblatt-Gimblett points out, for one, the language of “conservation, preservation, restoration, reclamation, recovery, re-creation, recuperation, revitalization, and regeneration” (Destination 149) guises the fact that heritage actually revolves around the production of something new rather than the discovery of something already existing. Heritage becomes a resource to resuscitate “dying economies and dead sites” by transforming them through display and exhibition (7). Moreover, the concept of rescue is rather ironic when placed in context with the long history of disregard for Indigenous culture, theft of land, disinterring of human remains, and desecration of various sacred Indigenous sites across the country which have carried out from the earliest days of colonial settlement through to current state and corporate development projects. The most recent example of “neoliberal settler colonialism” is Enbridge’s proposed Northern Gateway pipeline, to be built between Bruderheim, AB to Kitimat, BC (Preston). Other examples include Oka, Ipperwash, the Gustafen Lake Standoff, the Grand River dispute, among many others. It is thus imperative to complicate heritage’s veneer of purported altruism and global responsibility, and recognize the ways in which the state acts as both the threat and strategic “rescuer” of heritage.
The rescue paradigm is revealing of the Eurocentric and colonial roots of heritage, especially as articulated by the UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention), an international treaty adopted in November of 1972. There are currently around one thousand World Heritage sites inscribed internationally, with seventeen located in Canada. Designated sites are judged in general by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee to be possessing of “outstanding universal value” (“Criteria”), though there are a list of more specific selection criteria through which potential sites are adjudicated. Critics have pointed to the fact that the World Heritage List reveals a Eurocentrism in the understanding of what constitutes “valuable” heritage, evidenced in the fact that Italy, Spain, and France have the largest concentrations of recognized World Heritage Sites. Falser and Juneja maintain that heritage is ultimately a child of the Enlightenment; “it circulated under the aegis of colonialism across the globe where it was harnessed to the civilizing programme of the colonial state and at the same time appropriated by the agenda of nation building to wrest locality from the global constellation of empire” (1). Others also put forth that world heritage—the “cult of preservation”—emerges from the crosshairs of nationalism and colonialism during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Lowenthal) and that, crucially, it serves as a kind of managerial infrastructure to protect against the ravages of precisely the mechanism of modernity of which it is a product (De Cesari).

Another fundamental aspect of world heritage is global patrimony. According to UNESCO, designated sites “belong to all the people of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they
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90 See Byrne; Choay; Cleere; De Cesari; Gathercole; Falser and Juneja; Labadi; Smith and Akagawa; among others.
91 A growing number of critics have argued that it is crucial to look beyond Eurocentric understandings of heritage as limited to large architectural monuments, and instead turn our attentions to the “intangible” of heritage (L. Smith, Archaeology; L. Smith, Uses; Smith and Akagawa; D. Taylor, Archive; D. Taylor, “Performance”).
are located” (“World”). Current Director General of UNESCO, Irina Bokova, reiterates that “each site is anchored in a unique cultural and natural context, while being woven into the wider history of humanity and the world, as motifs in the tapestry of a common, irreplaceable heritage” (UNESCO, World 6). One can see that this discourse of global patrimony, especially when placed alongside the ownership and managerial rights of HSIBJ by the provincial government, almost completely elides the Blackfoot peoples and their dispossession of this land through Treaty 7. In this latter case, global patrimony can be seen as an astute obfuscation of a paternalistic logic at play. Global patrimony rhetoric subtly justifies the divestment of Indigenous stakeholders’ control over the heritage site, at the same time that it also conveniently obscures the real authority of the member state (Canada). As Richard Handler notes, world heritage works in tandem with nationalism; the rationale of “we are a nation because we have a culture” invokes heritage as the spirit or essence through which nation is able to exist (210). Heritage thus “preserves” the site not as living, breathing entity, but as something re-visioned as property of the member state. As an illustration, there remain tensions between the Blackfoot and government views of the purpose of the site, which Geneviève Susemihl observes to collect around conflicting ideas of archaeology and heritage (67). While Blackfoot descendants engage with HSIBJ as both a site of sacred significance as well as a locus for current community practices,92 some government officials have expressed unease over the fact that the site should function as a “Blackfoot cultural center” rather than a World Heritage site (Susemihl 67). According to Brink and other archaeologists involved in the development of the project, the HSIBJ Interpretive Centre serves mainly as a site for public
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92 The site still functions as an important gathering place for descendant communities (Sponholz 58), and has hosted weddings, funerals and other sacred ceremonies for the Blackfoot (Brink, Imagining 290).
education, and especially for disseminating archaeology to a wider general audience.\footnote{The project has been described as “archaeological investigations…cast into the public eye” (Brink and Dawe, “Preliminary” 145), and in a recent essay, Brink refers to similar projects as “attempts at bringing the past to the public with the help of native people” (“Blackfoot” 41).}

Tony Bennett calls attention to how the linear paths we tread in museums disclose the potency of evolutionary narratives; “locomotion—and sequential locomotion—is required as the visitor is faced with an itinerary in the form of an order of things which reveals itself only to those who, step by step, retrace its evolutionary development” (Birth 43). In the case of settler states, aboriginal history can be used to craft an exultant tale about linear progress through the strategic placement and sequencing of modernity’s “antecedents.” This (pre)history then serves as the necessary mythology and cultural capital through which the nation can claim recognition under a Western-colonial paradigm of heritage. Like archaeology, we can examine how world heritage functions as a corroborating framework which locates subjects as citizens of an interconnected globe. More than this, it coheres a fantasy of nation, at the same time that it secures a subject as heir to its history. It does so by providing historical depth and gravity which, significantly, pave over some of the very history that it purports to consecrate. Heritage as articulated through the inscription of HSIBJ is not just about recording, celebrating Blackfoot history for its own sake; importantly, it allows the validation of the nation state’s “universal value” and self-mythologization. At the same time, such aggrandizements through colonized cultures are meant to demonstrate the nation’s own virtue and moral rectitude. Its function resembles Sunera Thobani’s description of citizenship as a process of exaltation, which “ennobles and elevates the national community” (9) and is the process through which the citizen is produced as “belonging to a higher order of humanity” (248). In the same way that exaltation “conceals the colonial violence that marks the origin of the national subject” (10), so too might heritage inscription be seen as a way to
unmark a landscape of its colonial scars, and reinscribe it through a triumphal narrative of patrimony and inheritance. In Thobani’s conception, interestingly, exaltation also offers the subject of nation proprioceptive grounding, for it “endows ontological coherence and cohesion to the subject in its nationality, grounding an abstract humanity into particular governable forms” (9). She describes the way in which certain privileged subjects are seduced into citizenship through various state mechanisms which reflect supposedly innate qualities of compassion and caring “back onto the subject as a measure of its own human worthiness” (9), thus corroborating this subject’s innocence in the drama of settler-colonialism. Exaltation is the means through which the citizen is encouraged to “unify and stabilize” their identity through nationality (9). Extending this argument slightly, we can argue that heritage provides a physical testament to the righteousness of Canadian citizenship. Officially commemorated landscapes, monuments, and memorials are the sedimented proof which project back to us not only the intrinsic goodness of our own self, but also of our indelible bond with nation.

6.3 Spectres & Haunting

The previous section has examined proprioceptive emplacement as the means through which a subject is located, and in a sense, stabilized. This might appear to posit that the ground of nation itself is a stable and given one. However, what follows is an attempt to challenge this very assumption through an exploration of the ways in which this supposedly firm ground of nation within which the body is emplaced is in fact a phantasmal fabric woven through a host of colonial spectres. This section first examines the usefulness of haunting as method, then subsequently examines how the spectral is made materially manifest through phantasmagoric technologies. Following this, it concludes by considering the ways in which the settler colonial nation is
constructed as much through inscription as through disavowal. Before continuing, however, there are two significant caveats. First of all, the interest in examining how nation exists as fantasy bears in mind the imperative argument posed by indigenous thinkers that such deconstructions often work to delegitimize the struggle for Indigenous sovereignty (Lawrence and Dua; Sunseri). Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua argue that postcolonial critiques of nation conflict with Indigenous struggles for sovereignty; “for nations that have for centuries been targeted for physical and cultural extermination, and have faced further fragmentation through identity legislation, the post-colonial emphasis on deconstructing nationhood simply furthers Indigenous de-nationalisation” (248). The “nation” that is the target of my critique is undeniably Western; it is the reified entity practiced and authenticated through everyday and oftentimes invisible bodily gestures. Such a critique stems neither from the dismissal of the Indigenous forms of nationhood “that have existed prior to and/or outside of” European modernity and contact (Sunseri 20), nor from the denial of the need for ongoing struggles for Indigenous sovereignty. Instead, this project is firmly grounded in the desire to interrogate the pervasive forms of the Western settler colonial nation which stand as impediments to First Nations sovereignty and other potential decolonized forms of belonging.

Secondly, this research acknowledges that there is a danger in talking about “ghosts,” in that it risks the disavowal of the contemporaneity and agency of Indigenous cultures, and more specifically, the agency of the Blackfoot who play an integral role at HSIBJ. This current explication/excavation of the spectral does not intend to reproduce settler-colonial narratives which either deny Indigenous presence or else relegate it to an anachronistic time-space through nostalgic-salvage discourses. In the latter case, Indigenous peoples are constructed to appear as abstracted spectralized apparitions, or as Veracini describes, “elusive, insubstantial…reduced to reminiscence” (Settler 86). In this research, “spectres” are not figural descriptives of the bygone;
instead, they refer to the spectres that dominant colonial history attempts so tirelessly to repress, but which continue to trouble the supposedly stable and homogenous notions of nationhood. Equally, the spectral figure evokes the traumatic shadows stirred up in encounters between settlers and the violent reality of settler colonialism.

This chapter follows the provocation of Avery Gordon, who theorizes haunting as “a constituent element of modern social life” (7). Gordon proposes haunting as a trope which, rather than signalling absence or disavowal, acknowledges that the spectral is “a seething presence” refusing to be laid to rest (8). In a similar vein, Ann Laura Stoler urges that imperial ruins are not be gazed at nostalgically as inert monuments, but instead discerned as urgent “social topographies” which have durable impact on the lives of many today (“Imperial” 31). Following these provocations, it is vital to explore the ways in which Canada’s settler colonial history, far from a bloodless archive, endurably resonates and “haunts” our current faith in modernity as unbridled progress. Any potential for decolonized citizenship must involve critical reappraisals of which histories a settler colonial nation choses to valorize as official “heritage” and which ghosts it in turn surreptitiously disinherits. Ashok Mathur poses the question, “how can we possibly come into being if we refuse the hauntings of the past, favouring official tellings of history that inscribe a singularity, a unity that belies the fragmented and disharmonious realities that are at once far more honest as much as they are contradictory and fractious?” (7). To not shy away from, but instead confront directly the aforementioned “ghosts” of national history is to endeavour, as Sherene Razack (“Gendered”) suggests, a process of unmapping which involves the teasing apart of often unspoken assumptions about identity and space. *Unmapping* is thus the attempt to perform a critical genealogy of nation as ghostly palimpsest, in order to denaturalize and unsettle.
6.3.1 Phantasmagoria

There is, undoubtedly, something in the very flickering materiality of Napi’s projections that varies from the resoluteness of the scientific text printed on the mounted panels. In contrast to the text on the display panels, there is an ephemerality in the projected texts. These flickering projections are activated when a body is in the vicinity; in the latter’s absence, they eventually vanish. The material vulnerability of the text also reveals itself in the fact that the body can intervene in the projections, as when the visitor stands between the light source and surface, blocking the light stream so that one’s own shadow is projected. The apparitional form of these projections engenders a unique mode of corporeal engagement which is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, the fact that the projections work through motion-sensor (and gesture recognition) invites a proprioceptive sensitivity whereby the visitor becomes more attuned to their particular location within space. These projections are initiated through a moving body; this body is required to step into the frame, in order to encounter the technology, prompt the exchange, and receive the transmission. The “surfacing” of text is the indication that one’s presence has in some way been registered and acknowledged. Fascinatingly, proprioceptive recognition can insinuate cultural citizenships organized around the body’s willing entrance into, and emplacement within, a theatre of heritage. Secondly, there is a way in which these projections transform the landscape upon which they are cast. Aside from one instance, Napi’s legends are only projected onto the surfaces of “nature”—whether these be the sky in the rendered Plains scenery, or more often, the large boulders scattered throughout the first three floors of the Interpretive Centre. These words, a glimmering patina on the landscape of nation, complicate citizenship by evoking the shadows of this scenery, and with it, the spectres of colonial history which are never far from the surface.
The spectral projections of Napi’s stories are not without precedent. The history of phantasmagoric technologies is a history of proto-cinematic configurations of ghostly, exotic “others” often projected for the thrill and fascination of metropole Western audiences. Phantasmagoria was the name originally given to the optical illusions created by magic lantern, first exhibited in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Europe (Castle). Its pioneers were Paul de Philipsthal, and more importantly, Etienne-Gaspard Robertson, a Belgian doctor and inventor. This technology was based on a modified version of the magic lantern, which had been around since as early as the 1600s, and included a light source (usually a candle), magnified by a concave mirror, which projected an image placed at the focal point in the aperture. In Robertson’s phantasmagoric shows, which were often Gothic in tone and theme, images of ghosts, skeletons, and goblins were projected onto walls, usually from behind the audience, by a projector sitting atop wheels. This allowed the projectionist to wheel the contraption from side to side, and backwards and forwards to produce the awe-inspiring effect of spectres rushing towards the audience. Needless to say, audiences of that time—yet unlearned in the ways of proto-cinematic manipulations—found these “spectre shows” thrilling and altogether terrifying. Intimately related to these phantasmagoric displays is the early ethnographic tradition of travelling lecture shows, wherein images of colonized lands and peoples were collected and brought back to the metropole and displayed for audiences eager to consume images of exoticized others (Griffiths, Wondrous). Writing of the “views” of the world offered through eighteenth century panoramas, world fairs and early travelogues, Tom Gunning argues that the accessibility of distant lands and foreign bodies through the spectacle “forms a cornerstone of the modern worldview in which technology can render any distant thing somehow available to us” (28). Taking into consideration its lineage, phantasmagoria provides a compelling figure wherein notions of materiality and virtuality,
technology and affect, spectacle and seduction, revealingly coalesce. Ben Highmore argues that phantasmagoria is so useful because it takes into account the social and political aspects of modern industrial capitalism while also drawing our attentions to the formal and phenomenal techniques of the latter’s spectacular apparitions (132-3).

In The Arcades Project, Walter Benjamin refers to museums—much like other bourgeois palaces of consumption—as the “dream houses of the collective” (L1, 3). Following his lead, Kevin Hetherington locates phantasmagoric social relations in the museum’s production, circulation and transformation of commodity forms (173). Hetherington pinpoints, for instance, the processes through which museums “singularize” artefacts by disposing them of their exchange value, while imbuing them with value, rarity, aura, etc. (176). There is scant existing literature that directly examines the role and function of phantasmagoria within museums; where it does exist, one is most likely to find considerations of the illusory mode of consumption whereby audiences are wont succumb to the chicaneries of the spectral commodity form. Largely missing from this literature is the role of phantasmagoric technologies in imagining the supposedly “post” or neocolonial nation, and the ways in which a settler nation rehearses its own self-conceived hauntings. Not surprisingly, phantasmagoria’s imperial lineage assures its afterlife in Western museological paradigms; perhaps more interestingly, neoliberal-cum-multicultural museums also draw from phantasmagoric modes of symbolic production and representation to proclaim their supposedly reformed and inclusive curatorial mandates as disencumbered from older tenets of imperial collecting and display. Phantasmagoria in the museum can refer to the production and consumption of projected images—spectral shadows upon the wall which comprise narratives about the nation’s imagined other, or alterity in general. This perhaps gives further pause to the etymology of phantasmagoria—a term comprised of the [Fr.] phantasm, for ghost, and the [Gr.] agorie, for assembly, or place of assembly.
Marina Warner writes that phantasmagoric technologies “brought into being models of interior thought” and conjured things that did not exist “except in that enchanted condition: the enigma of appearances” (15). Interestingly, phantasmagoric projections at HSIBJ conjure the “spirit” of Napi’s stories and Blackfoot cosmology as apposite to the scientific discourses alongside which they are placed; while Napi’s stories are shown as distinct from scientific data, the mythos of the former at the same time reaffirms the value of the latter. In this sense, the projections illustrate the argument put forth by Tom Gunning (“Phantasmagoria”) that phantasmagoria occurs precisely in the interstices between science and superstition, or reason and sensual experience. One might say that the effectiveness of HSIBJ’s projections owes largely to the uncanny tensions evoked through the intended framing of the “enchanted” within the realm of reason. Moreover, phantasmagoria can be conceptualized as the means through which the neo-colonial archive performs its benevolent hospitality by drawing on methods not dissimilar to those of our 18th century projectionists—namely, the spectralization and the spectacularization of the other. The museum’s active production of images of difference, and its compulsive projection of these ghostly shadows upon its walls, reveal something about the ephemerality and impermanence of the included others within the dominant archive. In other words, as opposed to the “hard” inclusion that would structurally challenge the museum’s mandates (Jessup, “Hard”), this is a conditional and imperilled inclusion hinging on the flaunted flexibility and cunning of the archival apparatus.

While it can be argued to work alongside disciplinary mechanisms of inclusion, phantasmagoria can also function as aporia—by revealing the archive’s self-annihilating drive (which Derrida calls its “fever”) and highlighting an embedded element that haunts and unsettles it from within. The projections at HSIBJ, for instance, allow us to think not just about the stories that nation tells itself; it also hints at the productive uncanny—the hallucinations or “fevers” that
unintentionally spill forth, or are regurgitated, in its phantasmagoric projections. Configuring the function (or disruption) of phantasmagoria in the neocolonial archive can be made even more fruitful, perhaps, by putting Derrida’s archive fever in conversation with Homi Bhabha’s notion of how time lag disrupts the hegemony of the monolithic, homogenous imagined community. Time lag, as Bhabha explains it, is that “process of re-inscription and negotiation—the insertion or intervention of something that takes on new meaning—[which] happens in the temporal break in-between the sign” (Bhabha 191). Bhabha writes that this disruptive enunciative moment interrupts and “displaces the narrative of the Western nation which Benedict Anderson so perceptively describes as being written in homogeneous, serial time” (27). Time lag interposes a drastic break within hegemonic chronology and challenges the concept of the national imaginary as formed through the concordant, homogenous and simultaneous “imagined voices” of nation. By this function, time lag effectively interjects the haunting shadows of repressed histories—the archive’s Unheimlich—back into the narrative of nation. This is a process much like the “return” of flickering, translucent shadows projected back into the metropole, or onto the walls of the museum.

Aside from Bhabha, a handful of theorists in recent years have begun to explore haunting as a means of contending with the repressed spectres of postcolonial and/or globalized modernity (Cheah; O’Riley). John Harries seems to draw directly from Bhabha’s figure of time lag when he describes the “postcolonial uncanny,” that “condition...in which the familiar ‘homely’ space of the nation is haunted by the ghost of an ‘other’ whose presence has been (often violently) repressed, yet who returns to disrupt the temporality and territoriality of the national imaginary” (415). Similarly, Michael F. O’Riley examines the aesthetics of haunting, which he writes is prevalent in much of postcolonial literature and especially theory. Haunting becomes such a significant rhetorical tool because of its particularly affective dimension, which “creates a sense of the
imminently important, present, and disruptive” (1), and is a means through which to explore a colonial nation’s repressed histories and silenced others. Other critics have also set their sights specifically on haunted Canadian landscapes (Darias-Beautell; Edwards; Goldman; Goldman and Saul; Gunew; Martin; Northey; Sugars and Turcotte), in order to examine how complacent conceptualizations of the multicultural nation continue to be haunted by a settler colonial history which goes largely unrecognized. Much of this latter work emerges out of postcolonial approaches to literature, with thinkers considering the ways in which subjugated subaltern histories go on to trouble national narratives. A special themed issue of University of Toronto Quarterly also focuses on the ways in which the dominant “Anglo-national imaginary” leaves itself vulnerable for spectral incursions (Findlay 664) and argues that doing a ghostly reconnaissance of nation can begin to challenge previous colonial presumptions about Canada as a unpopulated, empty land for the taking (Goldman & Saul 647). It is of little surprise that such audits should emerge from settler-colonial nations, especially when these landscapes are riven by furtive lineages of violence which are part and parcel of these nations’ founding myths. A focus on the postcolonial uncanny or the aesthetics of haunting thus draws attention to that unremitting spectral presence beyond the acknowledged collective narrative.

6.3.2 Forgetting

From the time of the first influx of settlers from Britain and eastern parts of the country, the Canadian West existed in the settler imagination as an empty frontier to be written and invented. The project of settlement involved the material and symbolic cultivation of the land whereby Indigenous presence was staunchly suppressed and repressed. Behind this inscription was the endeavor to naturalize white European settlers as the first inhabitants and heirs to the land. This is
exemplified by the rise of the nativist movement in Western Canada during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (H. Palmer; Stasiulis and Jhappan; Valverde). Nativism, which Howard Palmer defines as “the amalgam of ethnic prejudice and nationalism” (6), proved especially popular in Alberta, where, ironically, prior to the 1940s, those actually born in this province comprised a rather miniscule percentage of the settler population. This tenuous hold on the demographic of the West merely provided the impetus for British and eastern-Canadian settlers’ antipathy towards other newcomers from continental European and Asian countries (H. Palmer 13). Valverde makes a more pointed argument that this thriving proprietor relation to the newly settled West allowed the Anglo-citizens to envision themselves as “native” to the land (107). It was also the necessary means through which the foreign institutions of British law, religion and state could be not just transplanted, but ultimately naturalized. Thus, between the time of Treaty and World War I, these early settlers from Britain or eastern Canada implanted the colonial framework of Anglo-citizenship which others had to follow (H. Palmer 14), and which subsequently enacted the erasure of Indigenous and French-Canadian presence (Valverde 107). A similar notion is reflected in Keith D. Smith’s study of how the Canadian West was transformed through liberalism and its surveillance technologies between the signing of Treaty 7 and the late 1920s. No doubt taking up Ian McKay’s call for a historical “reconnaissance” of the liberal project of nation, Smith argues that the westward expansion involved a wholesale liberal reshaping of the landscape and the subsequent eradication of Indigenous ways of life. This liberal project brought with it the “attendant structures” (“Liberal” 11) of capitalism, scientific reason, modernity and progress. Most important is the fact that, despite its supposed willing embrace of the other, Smith writes that liberalism in practice depended on homogenization, exclusion, and surveillance. This can be witnessed, he writes, in the institution of the reservation system. Surveillance of the everyday lives of First
Nations peoples on the reserves was a way to ensure that they “complied with [the] culturally defined frame of normality” which included whiteness, Protestantism, and Britishness (K. Smith 18). The construction of a nativist founding myth through the invention of whiteness, the normalization of colonial societal frameworks, and the use of liberalist disciplinary mechanisms became the coordinated efforts to secure an insecure people’s place within the new settlement. This rewriting of the landscape required a more covert, compendium project of physical and symbolic erasure of Indigenous culture, peoples, and their autochthonous relation to these lands.

Unsurprisingly, this history of the Plains does not find a place within the official heritage narrative of HSIBJ. In the Interpretation Centre, mention of colonial incursions into the region are limited to the first European explorers who witnessed the last days of the buffalo, and could provide testimony—mostly through personal written records—as to the fast vanishing ways of life of the Blackfoot. HSIBJ serves in this manner to highlight the fact that the construction of nation does not centre solely on commemorative remembering, but instead on the triangulation of: 

- *commendation* (of “heritage”),
- *invention* (of a dominant and invisible whiteness) and
- *forgetting* (of colonial trauma).

A number of thinkers have argued that settler colonialism’s *modus operandi* has been the disavowal of its “foundational violence” (Veracini, *Settler* 75). Razack specifies that “white settler mythologies” depend on “the disavowal of conquest, genocide, slavery, and the exploitation of the labour of peoples of colour” (Razack, “When” 2). Just as Indigenous presence is nullified through being relegated to a past, Razack contends that so too does white settler nationhood exclude non-European immigrants by designating them as “late arrivals” who come “to the shores of North America long after much of the development has occurred” (3). Razack’s point here echoes Patrick Wolfe’s thesis that settler colonization is a *structure* rather than a discreet *event*, and specifically,
that elimination functions as “organizing principal” rather than “a one-off (and superseded) occurrence” (Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism” 388). Similarly, erasure plays a structuring role in settler mythologies of the Canadian nation; the act of forgetting constructs a white settler nation in contradistinction to Indigenous and immigrant presences, which are respectively designated as the “pre-“ and “post-“ of the national project. In this sense, these two groups are constructed as either a challenge to be overcome, or else a redundancy in the manifestation of the modern nation. The act of forgetting therefore legitimizes and reasserts white European propriety over land and history as the axial “organizing principal” from which all else unfolds.

Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel write that “contemporary settlers” follow in their forefather’s footsteps “not by attempting to eradicate the physical signs of Indigenous peoples as human bodies, but by trying to eradicate their existence as peoples through the erasure of the histories and geographies that provide the foundation for Indigenous cultural identities and sense of self” (598). However, there is more to this violence than utter eradication and erasure. Contemporary heritage discourses, especially within a multiculturalist paradigm, reveal that wilful disavowals work alongside strategic summonings and imperative nostalgias. The official commemorated heritage which inscribes HSIBJ and the surrounding region of Southern Alberta is one that, unsurprisingly, covers over the colonial wounds of this landscape. Performative commemorations reveal little about other histories which run parallel to the overtly ceremonious: these are narratives composed of ellipses, or the hidden “scars” that mark the topography of this region and the psyche of those who remain. Notably, two sets of related events provide a wider and more resonant understanding of the political undercurrents surrounding HSIBJ’s development.

On May 18th of 1976, a year before Prince Charles’s visit to Blackfoot Crossing to mark the centenary of Treaty 7, the community was rocked by the suicide of Nelson Small Legs Jr., a
young Piikani activist and Southern Alberta director of the American Indian Movement. In his public suicide note, Small Legs Jr. demanded an investigation into the Department of Indian Affairs, and delivered an unequivocal indictment of the colonial state: “I give my life in protest to the Canadian government for its treatment of the Indian people for the past 100 years” (qtd. in J. Ryan 84). This tragic event, all but forgotten now, attracted attention and outrage nationwide. It captured the plight of the Indigenous peoples under the Canadian government, but unfortunately did not result in drastic changes. The years following Small Legs Jr.’s suicide were marked by protests in southern Alberta, most significantly over the building of the Oldman River Dam. In the same year that HSIBJ opened, construction had just begun on the dam, which was to provide water for irrigation in the drought-prone regions of southern Alberta. The project met with much resistance for many years from a number of landowner, environmental and Indigenous groups. Small Legs Jr.’s father, chief Nelson Small Legs Sr., led a blockade in 1978 to deny Alberta Environment and irrigation lobbyists access to reserve land to conduct surveys (Glenn 30). Members of the Piikani Band were opposed to what they believed was the illegal expropriation of reserve land back in 1922 for original irrigation headworks. Despite the protests, construction proceeded and the dam was completed in 1992. These two events are symbolic of a tumultuous period marked by Indigenous struggles for sovereignty all around the country, but also concentrated in the region of southern Alberta. These struggles, which more often than not coalesced around the theft and destruction of Indigenous land and resources by the state, cannot be sequestered from the celebratory heritage narrative of preservation and commemoration which have since been anointed as official epitaphs of this landscape.

---

94 For more on the events leading up to Nelson Small Legs Jr.’s suicide, see J. Ryan.
The inscription of World Heritage is the enshrining of a single story of place, a process whereby other stories deemed discordant to the main narrative are brushed aside or else obliterated. As Stephen Turner argues, “settler dreaming” is the active invention of one’s autochthonal relation to the land through imagining of the concept of “homeland” as well as the “history to support it” (117). Forgetting is not just about the absence or absenting of memory; it simultaneously involves an insertion of an exonerative narrative, typically through the whitewashing of official history. Other critics have explored this through Canada’s mythology of “racelessness.” By forgetting Indigenous presence, as Razack states, white settlers are able to imagine themselves as the “original inhabitants” of the land and “the group most entitled to the fruits of citizenship” (Razack, “When” 2). These wilful acts of disavowal further enable the construction of nationhood as ultimately innocent (Thobani; Backhouse). Discourses of an innocent nation is predicated on both virginal, uninhabited space—terra nullius—as well as, more recently, the moral expediencies of official multiculturalist discourses. Turner reminds us that this process of “settler dreaming” is vulnerable to the many threats of competing narratives from Indigenous peoples and newer immigrants; as such, a “national memory infrastructure is needed to manage the threat, and contain memory, so that the past doesn’t leak” (118). Heritage designation becomes exactly such an infrastructure which sets in stone a certain mythology—the chronology of a late-coming people etched avariciously into the earth—while deftly silencing a multitude of other histories.

95 See Backhouse; Shick and St. Denis; Razack, Race)
6.4 Conclusion

A question we must ask now is: what if, instead of abstract ideas of national and global heritage, we are to conceive of citizenship as also the proprioceptive emplacement within a more honest contextual inheritance that owns up to a very evident history of violence and oppression? This is a history we have played a part in ourselves—even if, as Thobani points out, just by virtue of our citizenship. It needs to be said that, just as we should be urged to trouble the “givenness” of the settler colonial nation by looking at its “ghosts” or spectral elisions and silences, so too is it necessary to unsettle the supposedly “authorial” presence of the researcher who pieces this story together. My positionality as a settler-of-colour also importantly calls to mind the responsibility and complicity of newer Canadians immigrants in the national colonial project (Cannon; Wong). In foregrounding my own contingency as researcher, it is hoped that I have offered merely one way in which to begin to approach the entangled layers of nation, (world) heritage, Indigeneity and settler-coloniality which make up the historical palimpsest of HSIBJ. This landscape in particular is a reminder of Sehdev’s argument that the legacy of treaty and is not an inert “historical artifact” which is the product of “European notions of rights and freedoms” but instead “a process of making and keeping good relations” (273). In other words, it remains a contentious living inheritance, and our collective responsibility.
Chapter 7

Conclusion: The Ambivalent Twilight of Multiculturalism

Throughout this research, I have investigated the ways that exhibits’ uses of interactive and immersive technologies generate affective encounters which in/effectively recruit bodies and subjects into narratives of nation. My focus has been on technologies of immersion employed in Canadian exhibits which attempt to encompass audiences into their fold, including: participatory narratives, the audio guide, the expanded cinematic frame, and the haptic interface. Iris Häussler’s *He Named Her Amber*, staged at the Art Gallery of Ontario’s historic Grange manor in 2008, enlisted an immersive narrative to corporeally, emotionally, and politically position its audience as naturalized settler. I made a case that recruitments of cultural citizens often centre on bodily trials, through the deployment of immaterial technologies of immersion which enable benevolent inclusion, the yielding of difference, and the confession and performance of otherness. I also examined the ways in which settler colonial history is rebranded through neoliberal Creative City discourses which gloss over the historical displacement of the Mississauga peoples from the Toronto region, and instead advance the settler’s right to occupy the home. Following this, the introduction of the audio guide in the National Gallery of Canada’s 1967 Centennial exhibit provided the historical context through which I pinpointed the celebration and hallowing of the nation’s technological modernity. Here, I analyzed how the construction of an interactive, national art historical audio-scape—the materialization of Benedict Anderson’s binding “imagined sound” of nation—served a crucial, even if nascent, iteration of the citizen’s entrance into modernity as facilitated through technological access and participation. The model of cultural citizenship proffered through this exhibit paradigm occurred through the privilege of access; the audience was
granted admittance into the austere official archive, and guided to receive its narrative as edifying and uplifting. The following chapter focused on the use of digital touchscreens at UBC’s Museum of Anthropology and argued that the expanded screen and haptic interface are drafted as both material and rhetorical apparatuses which strategically proclaim inclusive, multicultural paradigms. The navigable digital vista also allows visitors the fantasy of agency, by providing the tools through which the cacophony of the museum display (and the symbolic “wild”) can and must be cognitively overcome. At the same time, I put forth that MOA CAT as expanded digital interface also reveals the very paradoxes and limits of the liberal public sphere. Lastly, the dissertation examined visitor-generated projections at Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, in order to establish the ways that motion-sensored projections and other phantasmagoric technologies work to locate but also unsettle the visitor’s body within official national—and “universal”—heritage frameworks. I demonstrated how proprioceptive grounding is provided through the buttress of heritage and archaeology, two substantiating frameworks which securely emplace the visitor within an “ancient” landscape and authenticating narratology of nation. Moreover, the chapter put forth that phantasmagoria facilitates our understanding of the ways in which heritage depends on inscription as much as erasure, production and well as repression.

This dissertation has proposed that museums facilitate our practices of cultural citizenship through ritualized encounters with heritage, history and technology; they are thus terrains that allow us to track the multiple ways in which affective bonds, which cleave us to some idea of “nation,” congeal through the minutiae of the body. By purporting to challenge the work/audience, screen/viewer, and institution/public dichotomies, museum technologies bring to light the techniques which choreograph bodies into relation with dominant ideologies. Throughout this dissertation, I investigated the many ways that cultural citizenship is enabled through the visitor’s
tactile, embodied encounters with national history, and how subjects are seduced into—and simultaneously out of—narratives of belonging. This study has approached technology as the processes and materials which translate abstract notions of heritage, citizenship and nation into tangible archives that we encounter through exchanges centred on the primacy of our bodies. Conceptualized in this way, technology plays a significant role in determining the shape and scope of our cultural citizenships, through the manners in which it choreographs bodily postures and affective affiliations.

A many number of Canadian cultural theorists have examined the ways that technology has been central in establishing the nation physically, but just as importantly, symbolically, imaginatively, and affectively. The CPR, CBC and NFB are material technologies that have played and continue to play crucial roles in the dissemination of common symbols which enable people to feel-together (Charland; Druick); but technology also applies in the immaterial sense, as through George Grant’s Nietzschian-inflected notion of technology as the will to mastery (Kroker 28). Both perform a husbandry that transforms the “wild” into an amenable space, and produce subjects who become heirs to a modern nation wrought through a consecrated mythology. The technologies of immersion I have examined are no different. These are the often more discreet technologies that mediate our passages within a museum, and also compose the very spaces of encounter between bodies and archives. Such technologies mould the way we think, but they do so by guiding our corporality, musculatures, and emotional experience. They enable us to establish and tame an imaginational and symbolic landscape, in a way reminiscent of Stephen Turner’s settler dreaming, the process whereby land is first emptied of its original histories and peoples, and subsequently turned into a settler homeland through constant “intentional, purposeful, needful remembering” (“Settler” 117-8). In much of what I have explicated, the body is seduced, primed, and located
within a specific landscape through immersion, which as Oliver Grau elucidates, facilitates a sense of “presence” and “being there” (*Virtual 7*). Immersive techniques do this by creating a “totality” of vision which dissolves the boundaries between audience and work of art (13). It has been my argument that this process is akin to that of domestication and accommodation, of securing the audience’s perspectival axis within the colonial home (Grange), national chronology (NGC), digital commons (MOA), and heritage landscape (Head-Smashed-In). Importantly, this suture often occurs at the expense of acknowledging longstanding colonial histories of violence towards Indigenous peoples, and the erasure of their histories. In museums, technologies of immersion likewise foster feelings of access, control, and proprioceptive assurance; they allow the audience privileged invitation into a nationscape, grant an agency through which the audience can navigate this terrain, and further, furnish them a coherent and anchoring sense of belonging by establishing history and heritage as imperishable givens.

Because affective resonance formed a central problematic in my investigation, I wanted to be substantially guided to (and through) my case studies by the affective intensities generated through my own encounters with interactive and immersive technologies. Admittedly, this study did not seek out more technologically spectacular examples of virtual and augmented realities. Even the touchscreen, which was somewhat of a novelty when I began this project, is now inescapably ubiquitous in most spheres of everyday life. There are a number of reasons for my choices, including the fact that I wanted to focus primarily on commonplace, “banal” techniques of seduction that extend the operations of domestic “homeliness.” Aside from the increasingly popular uses of mobile museum apps developed for larger cultural institutions like the Art Gallery of Ontario and the Royal Ontario Museum, more cutting edge or “sophisticated” iterations of such technologies are not as yet extensively available. The audio guide that I analyze is the prototype
for mobile apps—in terms of the personal, handheld mobility and the sense of proximity to “the real” that such guides evoke. Moreover, arguments regarding the circular or recurrent genealogies of immersive techniques (Grau; Griffiths, *Shivers*) productively challenge the fetishized discourse of the new, and rather nulled my desire to chase after the latest new media phenomena. Focusing on more spectacular arrays of “newness” would have eclipsed the endurance of technics or *technés* of belonging that I hoped to emphasize as underpinning inherently tenacious forms of settler colonial domestication.

Further, the dearth of affect in some of my case studies poses interesting questions about the chasm between intention and manifestation. For instance, the touchscreen is significant for all the things that it *implies* (about contact between subject/display; the potential of the digital interface, etc.) rather than what it is able to actually manifest at this point—due in large part to technological and financial limitations. Even with such limitations, these technologies reveal something quite provocative about the importance of imagination and fantasy in narratives of belonging. Inasmuch as national allegiances are nurtured through phantasmal projections, so too do interactivity and immersion rely on tenacious leaps of faith. Cultural citizenship could, in this sense, entail entering into a covenant with the larger narrative—whether nation, museum, art chronologies, etc.—to *suspend disbelief*, and to fill in the necessary chasms of meaning and presence through a technological imperative. Throughout this study, I was at no time relieved of the grating suspicion that I had ultimately embarked on a search for something that could not be found. This tension between incompletion and promise at the nexus of national and technological

96 MOA CAT stands in contrast to more ambitious projects in development like the EU-funded CHESS (Cultural Heritage Experiences through Socio-personal interactions and Storytelling) project, which pairs interactive adaptive storytelling and augmented reality technologies with visitor profiling to create personalized immersive experiences for museum visitors (*CHESS*).
modernity reveals an aporia in the formation of the neo-colonial subject. Given this, a cold comfort remains in the conviction that immersive technologies are, if nothing else, useful agent provocateurs that disclose an impasse at the heart of our longings to be sensorially extended and enclosed within the covenant of the imagined community.

The field of technological developments is far from the only one riven by constant flows and fluctuations. I maintained that the late 1960s serves as the heralded coming out of the modern nation. The period’s jubilance both obscured and worked to ameliorate the socio-political tumults lying not far from the surface; it would lead directly to the state’s official inception of multiculturalism in the opening of the next decade. It seems appropriate, then, that we should now conclude the present study at a juncture in history characterized by so many as the discernible exhaustion of liberal multiculturalism in the Global North. The last few years have witnessed the shift towards more staunchly “integrationist” movements in Europe, Australia and the United States from those who argue that multiculturalism has allowed extremisms to take root. German Chancellor Angela Merkel publically declared the failure of multiculturalism in 2010; in the following year, UK Prime Minister David Cameron echoed the notion that multiculturalism must be abandoned. In its place, Cameron suggested that a “muscular liberalism” be taken up instead (Cameron). These shifts are, not incidentally, collected around an Islamophobia revealing of the fractures and limits of a liberal paradigm of inclusion originally meant to accommodate only European immigrants (Kymlicka) yet now confronted with the supposedly “unassimilable” other. Similar trends can be seen in Canada as well, particularly under Stephen Harper’s Conservatives.

97 On the “post-multiculturalism” debate, refer for example to Basham and Vaughan-Williams; Joppke; McGhee; Prashad; Ossewaarde; Titley. For a discussion that focuses more on the Canadian context, see Arat-Koc. For an argument that Western state multiculturalism is, for the most part, not on the decline, refer to Banting and Kymlicka.
More notable shifts can be witnessed, for example, in the increased militarization of the nation, the 2009 changes to the immigration system to a more assimilationist model (Blake), and the renewed interest in Canada’s imperial incursions into the Arctic, reminiscent of John Diefenbaker’s Northern Vision of the late 1950s. These shifts also include the Conservatives’ brazen symbolic reclamations of coherent national identity, as in the $25 million rebranding of the Canadian Museum of History (from the earlier Canadian Museum of Civilization), which includes a new mandate that paves the path for the foregoing of social history to be replaced by an aggressive and singular vision of nationalism (Frenette). Significantly, this major overhaul is planned to be completed in time for the 150th anniversary of Confederation in 2017. Many have noted that this rebranding, alongside other commemorative events planned in the lead up to the Sesquicentennial which aim to emphasize Canada’s military history and its ties to the monarchy, are the ideologically transparent measures to rewrite history under the Conservative banner.98

It is productive to think through what this ambivalent twilight of multiculturalism does to the argument I have herewith put forth. Multiculturalism’s vicissitudes can be tracked like the lifespan of any artifact; it is a materiality that is constructed, put into play, and given to transformations and exhaustions. The vaunted Canadian model of multiculturalism—which seemed to confirm Canada’s status as a nation among nations, and promised itself as an exportable resource which could serve as a viable “model” for other countries (Kymlicka)—now faces a self-produced crisis. While it has always been contested by critics from multiple sides of the spectrum, its denunciations have only grown more vociferous in recent years. The question now remains: what happens to progressive critiques of multicultural policies when even the outward and provisional façade of inclusion is fast disintegrating into brazenly tyrannical forms of unity? In a

98 See, for example Abu-Laban; Finkel; Frenette; McKay “The Empire”;
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recent keynote address, Ian McKay traces the outlines of a “new political order” among whose most defining characteristics are the increase in market-driven inequalities, racial exclusion, the decline in parliamentary democracy, weakening of civil liberties, and an unabashed authoritarianism (“Empire”). It remains to be seen how forms of seduction, and in particular with regards to technologies of immersion, will be continue to survive and transform in this imminent sea change. Perhaps it will bear the earmarks of an already arrived precarity as sketched out by Kathleen Stewart, who writes of the latter as an emergent form that “accrete[s], accrue[s], and wear[s] out,” taking the shape of “a composition, a recognition, a sensibility, some collection of materialities or laws of movements” (518).

While pondering the shape of these inevitable transformations and accretions, it is important to be simultaneously reminded of Ruth B. Phillips’s admonition that we not conceive of history is an “uninterrupted vector of progress,” but instead a slippery thing of “dips and rises” (Museum 26). In thinking about history’s uncanny returns, I was brought back to 2001, seven years before Transformation AGO and He Named Her Amber. During this year, the Grange held an exhibit to mark its centenary. In House Guests: Contemporary Artists in the Grange, curators invited seven contemporary Canadian artists to dialogue with the historical space of the manor (Bradley and MacKay). Staged as part of this exhibit was Rebecca Belmore's Wild, which in many ways served as a marked counterpoint to Häussler’s installation. For her piece, Belmore took over the manor's master bedroom and “installed” herself in the Victorian four poster bed which she redressed with beaver fur and long black hair (fig. 9). For the length of the performance, Belmore would wander around the room, sleep, or simply sit in repose upon the bed. There is a significant architectural realignment at work here from Amber; whereas Häussler presented the object/other of the national imaginary as located in the basement and scullery (the darkened annals of archival
space-time which, importantly, enables the fetish of recovery), Belmore positions herself in the Master(s) bedroom upstairs. An artist of Anishinabe ancestry, Belmore's occupation of the room was meant to evoke the occluded histories of the Mississauga peoples, and was her way of posing the question, "Where is my history?" (Belmore, 83). Her marking of her own body as a cardinal point within the master narrative also functions as the spatial, symbolic reinstallation of First Nations history within a settler-colonized land. Narratively and structurally speaking, my case studies all lead up to this: the final materialization of the body (that of the artist, no less) whom the viewer/visitor simply cannot avoid, and whose presence unsettles colonial narratives in a rather startling way. Unlike the previous examples, this exhibit, while immersive, does not privilege the spectator’s perspectival positioning within the scene, but instead significantly troubles spectator/spectatee and guest/host dichotomies. It therefore puts forth a model of inhospitable
hospitality, or cultural citizenship based not on incorporation or ventriloquy, but reoriented around ongoing and inherently fraught negotiations with decolonized and decolonizing forms of belonging.

Belmore’s installation haunted me throughout the entire process of conceiving of and writing this dissertation; it served as a spectre that not only pointed towards a counter-argument but in doing so, also generatively guided the eventual shape of this project. I tried initially to include it within the present parameters, but eventually realized that it deserved to be the focus of another project altogether. While this current project has focused on institutional techniques of recruitment, Belmore’s work symbolizes a refusal of accommodation. Unlike Mary O’Shea in *Amber*, Belmore is a figure of resistance. Hers is a body in languorous repose, but also a decidedly recalcitrant presence who challenges notions of the passive body on display. She brings to mind the archetypal “inconvenient” bodies—bodies conceived as such because of their refusal to be absenced—that are only recognized by hegemonic voices when they are seen impediments to corporate development projects and/or state narratives of stainless progress. This can be seen throughout settler history, but more recently, we recognize this recalcitrant figure in the dozens of protesters rounded up by the RCMP during the Kinder Morgan pipeline protests in Burnaby Mountain, B.C.99 We see her every time a large-scale development project is interrupted by the “discovery” of an ancient ossuary. We see her in the mounting numbers of missing and murdered Indigenous women that Harper’s government continually refuses to acknowledge through a national public inquiry.100 In a fascinating and important manner, Belmore’s performative occupation forces us to confront the limits of interactivity and the pretense of the hospitable archive. While the audience in *Amber* was

99 Among those arrested was Grand Chief Stewart Phillip, head of the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs (Keller).
100 Boutilier; Chase and Galloway; Kennedy.
provided a script—narrative and corporal—which guided them through the diegesis, *Wild* leaves its audience unattended and unguarded. We are not told how to encounter the displayed body; rather, we contend with its presence, its liveness. The audience here is not given residence at the centre of the narrative, but must instead negotiate their way haphazard alongside the artist’s body which already declares its occupation of the scene. Thus, Belmore’s claimed presence in the master bedroom is one that works to surreptitiously disrupt the colonial narrative.

Taking Belmore’s *Wild* as a central point of reference, my next project will investigate the tensions and gaps generated through this present study. I want to sharpen my focus on contemporary artists’ engagements with “haunted” heritage landscapes, which are palimpsest terrains marked by coinciding strata of officially extolled and occluded histories which continue to surface in our everyday encounters with these geographies. These artists’ myriad encounters with and articulations of haunting will be not only a way of reactivating and interrogating “repressed” histories; they also serve as the compelling summons to audiences to confront these histories directly with their bodies. This next project will examine audiences’ phenomenological engagements with haptic and immersive texts of public history, but extend beyond the impervious architecture and authority of the museum in order to posit how public memory, heritage, and citizenships are constructed within more expansive and diffused heritage landscapes. Taking from the current investigation the idea that heritage discourses are passed on through the body, I am drawn to further exploring the ways that the viewer’s body “houses” and transforms the ghostly resonances of colonial nationhood, and the ways this body is moved or unsettled by such affective encounters. It will be useful to turn towards artistic interventions on heritage sites and their colonial legacies, in order to consider how persistent decolonial re-imaginings of material archives can be employed to subvert or unsettle established narratives. These artistic interventions posit that
“heritage” is not static, but rather a malleable archive whose generations and circulations can—and must—be tracked. This project will also endeavour to envisage how landscape and body might function as archives which, rather than capture, instead evoke the transience of haunted topographies.
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