THE MUSEUM THAT QUEEN’S GAVE AWAY:

Rediscovering the Queen’s Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology
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Introduction

On October 26th 1954, a Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology opened in the Old Arts Building (modern Theological Hall), the home of Queen’s Theological College. The Museum had been conceived of and executed by Dr. A. Douglas Tushingham, a Biblical Archaeologist and scholar of Old Testament criticism, who came to work at the College as a new professor. The Museum only remained open for a little over one year until Dr. Tushingham, who had left Queen’s to accept a job with the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), requested the items. Upon his request, Queen’s agreed to dismantle the museum and transfer the materials to the ROM, where the items remain today. This paper intends to reveal how the Museum came into being, what its function at Queen’s was, and the context surrounding the sudden and tragic loss of such a culturally and educationally significant collection. The research collected has come from a variety of news sources, online publications, and archival material kindly provided by Queen’s University Archives and the Royal Ontario Museum’s Registration Department.

The Proposition

Dr. A. Douglas Tushingham began his career studying Oriental Language and Theology at the University of Toronto, where he graduated in 1936 with a BA. He went on to complete his Bachelor of Divinity with the University of Chicago in 1941, and then returned in 1946 after military service to complete a PhD. His experience in archaeological field work began in 1950-51 when he had the opportunity to work with the American Schools of Oriental Research.

---

1 “Archaeology Museum Opened During Theology Conference,” Queen’s Journal (Volume 82 No. 11), October 29th 1954, pg 1 and 4. Accessed October 2019 through Queen’s University Online Archives.
3 A.D Tushingham (Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology) to Elias Andrews (Principal, Queen’s Theological College), October 17th, 1955 [Queen’s Archives, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
(ASOR) as a Special Fellow. With ASOR, Tushingham was able to work on a group of Tells near modern Jericho, and also at the site of biblical Dhiban, artifacts from both of which would come to form the basis of the museum at Queen’s.\(^5\)

Dr. Tushingham continued to work in Near Eastern Archaeology, and quickly became an Annual Professor with the American School in Jerusalem (currently known as the Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem). In this position, Tushingham was able to return to both Jericho and Dhiban. In Jericho he acted as Assistant Director to Kathleen Kenyon of the British Institute of Archaeology for the dig seasons lasting from 1951-1953. At the Dhiban site, Tushingham participated in the second campaigns in 1952,\(^6\) and led the third campaign which ran October 1952 to May of 1953 (with breaks), becoming Director of ASOR’s American School in Jerusalem during the July 1952 – June 1953 season.\(^7\) Both of these digs were considered very significant to the Director of the Department of Antiquities in Jordan, who published accounts of the findings in their Annual Report. The Jericho dig in particular was considered, “…of great importance for the training of students in the field technique of Near Eastern Archaeology, and should receive all possible support.”\(^8\)

Despite Tushingham’s clear passion for archaeology, the intensity of life in Jerusalem and the responsibility of a family to look out for eventually led to a desire to return to Canada; both for the benefit of his own work and so that his daughter could receive a Canadian

---

\(^5\) “Passages: Professor A. Douglas Tushingham”, 392.
education. It must then have come as somewhat of a relief when, in late April – early May of 1952, the Principal of Queen’s Theological College, H.A. Kent, reached out to Dr. Tushingham to inquire if he would be interested in taking up the Chair of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis. In order to take this position, Tushingham turned down offers from various American Universities, as well as the renewal of his Directorship with ASOR’s American School in Jerusalem.

Excited as he may have been, however, Tushingham could not start the position until the summer of 1953, when his Directorship of ASOR’s American School in Jerusalem ended. In the meantime, the process of confirming the position was not without difficulties. In order to hold the position with Queen’s Theological College, Dr. Tushingham had to get officially ordained as a minister. Unfortunately, a series of letters regarding the process of getting ordained never made it to Tushingham in Jerusalem. By the time Tushingham became aware of the missed messages in July of 1953, it was too late to be ordained that summer, and the examining committees had determined that he would have to wait until next spring.

Despite the issues with getting ordained, and other concerns such as the significantly decreased salary from ASOR Director to Associate Professor at Theological College, Dr. Tushingham still seemed excited to come to Queen’s, and had plans to introduce experiential learning to bible study by establishing the Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology. The first

---

9 A.D. Tushingham (ASOR-J) to H. A. Kent (Queen’s Theological College), May 11th 1952 [Queen’s Archives, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”].
10 A.D. Tushingham (ASOR) to H. A. Kent (Queen’s), June 10th 1952 [Queen’s Archives, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
11 Canadian Pacific Telegraph from A. D. Tushingham to H. A. Kent (Principal, Queen’s Theological College), May 3rd, 1952 [Queen’s Archives, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
12 A.D. Tushingham (from Genova, Italy) to Prof. H. MacLean Gilmour (Queen’s Theological College), July 26th 1953 [Queen’s Archives, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
extant mention of the museum was made by Dr. Tushingham to H.A. Kent in a letter on June 10th, 1952, which stated:

As director of the American School for the coming year, I have the privilege of bringing home with me the whole consignment of archaeological materials which is the School’s share from the excavations which it carries out while I am in charge. I can say now, with reasonable confidence, that this collection will include Neolithic, Early and Middle Bronze, and Iron Age materials from the famous site of Jericho, and Moabite, Nabatean, Roman, and Byzantine materials from our excavation at Dhiban (the site of Biblical Dibon). These objects together with my own private collection would form an excellent foundation for a Biblical or Near Eastern Museum at Queen’s […] and I would find it invaluable in my teaching…¹³

In the same letter, Tushingham proposed the idea of himself teaching biblical archaeology courses and emphasised the significance of the collection to biblical study and to the understanding of the development of civilized town life. It is clear that what Queen’s accepted, possibly unknowingly, was not just a collection of artifacts, but an opportunity to create an immeasurably beneficial educational tool and cultural experience, that both students and citizens in Kingston could enjoy.

**A Year in the Making**

Dr. Tushingham’s contract with Queen’s Theological College may have started in September 1ˢᵗ, 1953, but the Museum would not open until October of 1954, as there was much

---

¹³ A.D. Tushingham (ASOR) to H. A. Kent (Queen’s), June 10th 1952 [Queen’s Archives, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
to be done before Tushingham even arrived in Kingston to ensure the Museum was properly set up. To begin, all legal provisions needed to be assured, so that Queen’s could even possess the archaeological material. According to the policy of the Jordanian Department of Antiquities in the 1950s, organizations, such as ASOR, who undergo sanctioned archaeological field work, were consigned a small division of the findings.\textsuperscript{14} It was through this policy that the Jericho and Dhiban materials would be available to the Director of ASOR’s American School. It is important to note that Dr. Tushingham’s statement in his June 10\textsuperscript{th}, 1952 letter, cited above, in which he states “As director of the American School for the coming year, I have the privilege of bringing home with me the whole consignment of archaeological materials…” , he is speaking in terms of ASOR’s ownership, represented through his Directorship of the American School. The material of the Queen’s Museum, aside from what came from Dr. Tushingham’s private collections, were never owned by the man, nor by Queen’s; both were just temporary guardians.

Dr. Tushingham’s suggestion to bring the material to Queen’s was wholly dependent upon two factors: approval from the Board of the American Schools of Oriental Research, and Queen’s University becoming a Corporate Member of ASOR, as Tushingham explained to Principal Kent in the beginning of talks to open the Museum.\textsuperscript{15} While the Jordanian Department of Antiquities had consigned the materials to ASOR, they could not be sold or given away, as the archaeological material was indeed a part of Jordanian cultural heritage. By becoming a Corporate Sponsor of ASOR, Queen’s would be housing the material, on behalf of ASOR, as an affiliated institution.


\textsuperscript{15} A.D. Tushingham (ASOR) to H. A. Kent (Queen’s), June 10th 1952 [Queen’s Archives, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
The Corporate Sponsorship cost $100 a year and came with a variety of educational resources which would bolster both the College and the University, in addition to permitting the existence of the Museum. With the sponsorship, Queen’s would now have access to ASOR’s publications, including The Bulletin, The Biblical Archaeologist, monthly newsletters, and the ASOR Annuals.\textsuperscript{16} Even more, the membership gave professors access to lecture slides and other teaching collections for use in the classroom, and gave students of Queen’s the opportunity to participate in archaeological digs and apply for scholarships with ASOR’s American School.\textsuperscript{17} Aside from the $100 yearly fee, the only other requirement of Queen’s, in return for all these educational resources, was the election of a representative to attend the regular meetings of the Corporate Members.\textsuperscript{18}

Principal of Queen’s Theological College, H.A. Kent, officially applied to become an ASOR Corporate Member on November 21\textsuperscript{st}, 1952, in a letter to Carl H. Kraeling, the current president of the American Schools of Oriental Research.\textsuperscript{19} The ASOR Board of Trustees met in New York on December 28\textsuperscript{th}, 1952, and voted to accept Queen’s into Corporate Membership, to start July 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1953.\textsuperscript{20} Dr. Tushingham was named as the Queen’s representative, despite not being officially on staff yet.\textsuperscript{21} With these formalities handled the legality of the Museum was no

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Carl H. Kraeling (President, ASOR) to H. A. Kent (Acting Principal, Queen’s Theological College) November 19th 1952 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 37, File “American Schools of Oriental Research”]
\item \textsuperscript{17} A.D. Tushingham (ASOR) to H. A. Kent (Queen’s), June 10th 1952 [Queen’s Archives, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
\item \textsuperscript{18} Carl H. Kraeling (President, ASOR) to H. A. Kent (Acting Principal, Queen’s Theological College), January 3rd 1953 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 37, File “American Schools of Oriental Research”]
\item \textsuperscript{19} H. A. Kent (Acting Principal, Queen’s Theological College) to Carl. H. Kraeling (President, ASOR), November 21st 1952 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 37, File “American Schools of Oriental Research”]
\item \textsuperscript{20} Carl H. Kraeling (President, ASOR) to H. A. Kent (Acting Principal, Queen’s Theological College), January 3rd 1953 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 37, File “American Schools of Oriental Research”]
\item \textsuperscript{21} H. A. Kent (Acting Principal, Queen’s Theological College) to Carl H. Kraeling (President, ASOR), January 7th 1953 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 37, File “American Schools of Oriental Research”]
\end{itemize}
longer in question, and the next focus would be on getting the materials from Jerusalem to Kingston.

On March 20th, 1953, Dr. Tushingham wrote to the new Principal of Queen’s Theological College, S.M. Gilmour, to inform him that, while the ASOR Board had approved the transfer of the archaeological material, the shipment costs had to be covered entirely by those setting up the Museum. Acknowledging that he could not expect Queen’s to aid in shipping the material that would come from his private collections, Tushingham inquired if Queen’s would be able to cover the cost of shipping the Jericho and Dhiban materials, which he estimated would cost between $100-$150. Principal Gilmour and The Executive Board of the College accepted responsibility for these costs. At the time, it was decided the material would be packed in suitcases and travel with Dr. Tushingham and his family’s luggage when they left Jerusalem. In June, Tushingham wrote again to Gilmour and requested to have the material sent directly to Kingston, rather than bring it to Toronto with himself, only to move it again to Kingston when he came weeks later. Principal Gilmour agreed to this proposal, and the material was sent to Queen’s ahead of Dr. Tushingham, where it remained untouched until his arrival in late July – early August of 1953.

From the moment the materials arrived in Kingston, the media was abuzz with the acquisition. Part of the excitement can be attributed to the publishing of an almost 20-page

---

22 A.D. Tushingham to S. M. Gilmour (Principal, Queen’s Theological), March 20th 1953 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
23 Ibid.
24 S. M. Gilmour to A.D. Tushingham, April 18th 1953 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
25 A.D. Tushingham to S. M. Gilmour (Principal, Queen’s Theological), March 20th 1953 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
26 A.D. Tushingham to S.M. Gilmour, June 8th 1953 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
27 S.M. Gilmour to A.D. Tushingham, June 17th 1953 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
feature in The National Geographic Magazine, in December of 1953, covering the Jericho excavation by the British School of Archaeology and the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. The article emphasised the significance the excavations at Jericho held for the understanding of biblical archaeology and for the development of human civilization. Of the 20 detailed photos of the town life, the large team, and the excavation site, one photo in particular would have garnered interest at Queen’s (Fig. 1).

Figure 1- Kathleen Kenyon and Cecil Western comparing skulls at the London Institute of Archaeology [photo from The National Geographic Magazine, Volume CIV No. 6 (Dec 1953)]

The three skulls depicted above are a few of the seven plastered human skulls discovered during the dig, which garnered the most media attention to the excavation. The skull shown in the front right of the picture came to Queen’s as part of the collection. The plastered skull became a focal point of promotional talks given by Dr. Tushingham, such as the talk hosted in

28 Kathleen Kenyon and A.D. Tushingham, “Jericho Gives Up Its Secrets”, The National Geographic Magazine, Volume CIV No. 6 (December 1953). Published by the National Geographic Society (Washington DC)
Convocation Hall to the Royal Canadian Institution on January 9th, 1954, and was featured prominently as the show piece of the Museum. Interestingly, this image, as well an article by the Queen’s Review in the September-October 1954 issue, suggests that the skull, at least, was sent to London for repairs, before being sent to Dr. Tushingham for transport to Kingston, an important aspect of this item’s provenance that has been neglected in many publications.

In addition to National Geographic, other major news organizations, such as The Globe and Mail, were publishing articles about the materials and Queen’s University’s possession of part of the collection. At around the same time, other universities and institutions were also showing an increased interest in Near Eastern and biblical archaeology, which was exemplified by the excitement and commotion surrounding McGill’s acquisition of part of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which also attracted immense media attention. Post World War Two, Canada was turning its eyes towards the Near East, and Queen’s had a piece of it right there in Kingston.

In the year since arriving at Queen’s, Dr. Tushingham and others worked to get the Museum ready for its official opening on October 26th, 1954. Most of the costs were covered by a grant of $1000, which was given by the J.P. Bickell Foundation, to aid in setting up the Museum. The physical set up and organization of the Museum was undertaken by Dr. Tushingham and a Queen’s student, Frances K. Smith. Smith seemed to be given a great amount of responsibility in this project, and both Tushingham and Principal Gilmour relied upon her.

---

29 “Excavators Find No Trace of Wall Joshua Smashed”, The Globe and Mail (January 11th 1954), pg. 9 [Accessed through ProQuest Historical Newspapers, October 2019]
31 “Excavators Find No Trace of Wall Joshua Smashed”, The Globe and Mail (January 11th 1954), pg. 9 [Accessed through ProQuest Historical Newspapers, October 2019]
opinion as to when the Museum would be ready for its grand opening.33 Dr. Tushingham described Smith’s work as “invaluable”, and argued for her to receive compensation of $150 for all her efforts towards the Museum.34

Even before it opened, the Museum was already providing a significant learning experience for those involved with it. Tushingham noted that, through working on the Museum, “Mrs. Smith has come to have a great personal interest in the work itself...”.35 The interest in curatorship must indeed have been sparked for Smith, as she went on to work at the newly founded Agnes Etherington Art Center on Queen’s campus. Smith rose through the ranks over the years, eventually retiring as Curator Emeritus in 1980, having had a profound effect on the development of the gallery.36

After the $1000 donation from the Bickell Foundation, Queen’s itself had only needed to pay for the aforementioned shipping costs, the purchase of display cases, and the payment of staff such as Frances Smith for setting up the Museum. The total of all these costs was a sum of less than $500, which Dr. Tushingham described to W.E.L. Smith (The Acting Principal of Theological College), as a bargain for such an exquisite Museum.37

The Museum Opens

The author was unable to find any extant photos which show the Museum clearly or in full; however, based on descriptions, the following is the author’s best account of how the

33 S.M Gilmour to A.D. Tushingham, 30 September 1954 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
34 A.D Tushingham to Prof W.E.L Smith (Acting Principal, Queen’s Theological College), 23 November 1954 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
35 Ibid.
36 “Flags Lowered for Frances Smith”, The Queen’s Gazette, Friday April 12th 2013.
37 A.D Tushingham to Prof W.E.L Smith (Acting Principal, Queen’s Theological College), 23 November 1954 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
Queen’s Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology looked. The Museum was located in Convocation Hall at the west end of the Old Arts Building (room 215 in modern Theological Hall). Of the seven display cases, five were made of walnut, bronze, and glass, and were shipped from Toronto. It is unknown what the other two cases looked like. The seven cases were organized chronologically, according to the objects’ respective cultural phases, such as Neolithic, Chalcolithic, Bronze Age, etc. According to an article in the Queen’s Journal, covering the opening of the Museum, some of the most prominent material in each of the display cases were as follows: In Case One there were pre-pottery Neolithic tools, weapons, utensils, as well as pottery and jewelry from 3200 BC, and the aforementioned plastered human skull. It is worth noting, however, that while the article in the Queen’s Journal allocates the plastered skull to case one, on the same page, in the one image of the Museum opening found (pictured below), the skull appears to be on a pedestal labeled ‘three’. Thus, the described organization of all these cases must be understood with some margin for error.

38 “Archaeology Museum Opened During Theology Conference,” Queen’s Journal Volume 82 No. 11 (October 29th 1954), pp. 1 and 4 [Accessed through Queen’s University online Archives, October 2019].
39 A.D Tushingham to Prof W.E.L Smith (Acting Principal, Queen’s Theological College), 23 November 1954 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
40 “Archaeology Museum Opened During Theology Conference,” Queen’s Journal Volume 82 No. 11 (October 29th 1954), pp. 1 and 4 [Accessed through Queen’s University online Archives, October 2019].
Case Two contained mainly polished pottery. Case Three also contained pottery, in addition to bronze weapons and utensils, as well as some charred wheat from 1600 BC. Case Four held material from the Canaanite peoples. Case Five included Philistine ware, and material from the Moabites such as juglets, lamps, and jewelry. In Case Six there was Palestinian pottery which imitated the style of Greek and Rome, with some Byzantine jewelry, and photographs of the Scroll of Isaiah (part of the Dead Sea Scrolls). Finally, Case Seven contained pottery, seals, and both Palestinian and Roman imperial coins— which were described to be “of particular interest to students of the Bible…”.  

Now fully organized, the Museum was ready to be opened to the public. Principal Gilmour planned to formally open the Museum on October 26th, 1954, to coincide with the 62nd
Annual conference of the Theological Alumni Association.\textsuperscript{42} Dr. Tushingham wrote a brochure for the Museum to be handed out to Alumni,\textsuperscript{43} however, the author has been unable to locate any copies of such a brochure in any Queen’s archives. A call was put out to Queen’s Alumni, through the November 2019 issue of the Queen’s Alumni Review, to see if anyone has a copy of this brochure, or other images of the Museum; at the time of this publication, no replies have been forwarded to the author.

The opening of the Museum did not go off without any hitches. In the weeks leading up to the opening, Theological College Principal, and a main proponent for the Museum, S.M. Gilmour, was struggling with mental illness in a relatively intolerant time. Consistently having to go on leave for varying periods of time, Gilmour was unable to give the Museum his full support as Principal.\textsuperscript{44} In late September of 1954, Gilmour’s plans for the Alumni Association meeting, when the Museum would have its grand opening, were going poorly due to last minute challenges. Gilmour ended up completely throwing out the final program, due to mental anguish and last-minute cancellations.\textsuperscript{45}

Finally, on October 15\textsuperscript{th}, with less than two weeks to the Museum’s opening, Gilmour suffered a mental breakdown, and was put on leave of absence, missing the grand opening of the Museum he had helped set up.\textsuperscript{46} Queen’s University Principal, W.A. Mackintosh, was left to formally open the Museum in Gilmour’s stead.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{42} S.M Gilmour to A.D. Tushingham, 30 September 1954 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{47} “Archaeology Museum Opened During Theology Conference,” Queen’s Journal Volume 82 No. 11 (October 29th 1954), pp. 1 and 4 [Accessed through Queen’s University online Archives, October 2019].
Museum, the Theological College Board agreed to extend Gilmour’s leave for the foreseeable future. Gilmour’s loss left Dr. Tushingham and Dr. Donald Mathers, another young hire Gilmour supported, to pick up the extra teaching load;\(^{48}\) taking time away from the Museum Tushingham had put so much effort and enthusiasm into creating.

The Queen’s Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology would continue to operate for over a year, but Gilmour’s absence, coupled with the already present and growing issues within Theological College, did not bode well for the new Museum’s survival. Before his breakdown, Gilmour had brought up the possibility of Tushingham teaching a course in Biblical Archaeology with Queen’s University based on the Museum collection,\(^{49}\) but this, and any other plans Tushingham may have had for the Museum, must have felt out of reach amid the unstable environment in Theological College.

**The Museum Closes**

Before Dr. Tushingham came to Queen’s, or there was even a thought of opening a Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology, Queen’s Theological College was dealing with both internal and external issues that threatened its very existence. In January of 1952, Theological College Principal, H.A. Kent, received a letter from W.A. Mackintosh, the Principal of Queen’s University, implying that the Old Arts Building was very large a space for a college with only 15-16 students in all three years of Theology,\(^{50}\) and suggesting that Theological College should move to the smaller Summerhill building nearby, opening up the larger space for the ever

\(^{49}\) S.M Gilmour to A.D. Tushingham, 30 September 1954 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
\(^{50}\) George Rawlyk and Kevin Quinn, “Student Life in the Kent Years” in The Redeemed of the Lord Say So: a History of Queen’s Theological College 1912-1972, 113.
expanding University.\textsuperscript{51} Kent vehemently rejected this suggestion, citing to Mackintosh that, according to the Queen’s Incorporation Act, Theological College had “Inalienable Rights” to the Old Arts Building.\textsuperscript{52} It is worth noting that, while Theological College no longer exists, the Queen’s School of Religion is still housed in Theological Hall (the Old Arts Building).

Despite rejecting Mackintosh’s proposal, it was undeniable that Theological College was struggling with admissions. To make things more unstable, Principal H.A. Kent, who had been a stalwart of the College for over 25 years, would be retiring in January of 1952, leaving the College in a very unstable position.\textsuperscript{53} Principal Gilmour’s accession as his successor was not without its issues. Despite his already long term of employment at the College, as a younger man among his colleagues, with many new ideas for what he believed should be central to Theological College’s curriculum, Gilmour often butted heads with co-workers.\textsuperscript{54} The tension among the staff of Theological College, led to many issues and disputes, leaving Gilmour feeling undermined and paranoid, which could not have helped someone who had previously suffered mental breakdowns which often left him unable to fulfil his duties.\textsuperscript{55}

Despite being a proponent for Dr. Tushingham’s hire, and supportive of the Museum, promoting Tushingham’s achievements at a presentation to the Board of Management,\textsuperscript{56} the Museum was not Gilmour’s main focus. Instead, Gilmour was invested in creating a Summer School of Theology for Christian Ministers at Theological College.\textsuperscript{57} It was the board’s denial of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{51} George Rawlyk and Kevin Quinn, “The Kent Years: 1926-1952” in \textit{The Redeemed of the Lord Say So: a History of Queen’s Theological College 1912-1972}, 108.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Rawlyk and Quinn, “The Gilmour Interlude: 1952-1955”, 148.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 151.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 149.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
this plan, which Gilmour had invested so much time and energy into, which led the man to experiencing his nervous breakdown on October 15th, 1954, just before the Museum opening.\textsuperscript{58}

The Board of Management, who were busy picking up the pieces of a crumbling Theological College and working with outraged students who swore not to return to the school if Gilmour remained Principal,\textsuperscript{59} were understandably unable to give Tushingham’s Museum the dedication and support it required to thrive. Despite Tushingham incorporating the Museum collection into classes as much as he could,\textsuperscript{60} he was taking on an additional teaching load, and in the 1954-1955 academic year, he was teaching more Hebrew than anything else.\textsuperscript{61}

There was no help to be found for the Museum with Queen’s University either. Queen’s other main museum, The Miller Museum (also known as the General Museum), was planning to rid itself of all ethnological material, to become solely the Geological Museum it is today. While the physical transfer of the materials out of Miller Hall did not occur until 1957, it can be assumed they would not be looking to take on any extra objects,\textsuperscript{62} nor was the excitement once felt at Queen’s for general archaeological museums as strong as it had been the previous year. This indifferent mood was likely a result of the efforts being put instead towards the soon to be opened Agnes Etherington Art Center (AEAC), which would become a major hub for student outreach activities.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 149-150.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 156.
\textsuperscript{60} A.D. Tushingham (ROM) to Alan Smith (Esq., Secretary, The J.P. Bickell Foundation Committee), October 5th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum- Queen’s University File]
\textsuperscript{61} Queen’s University Calendar of the Faculty of Arts, 1954-55
\textsuperscript{62} Frances K. Smith to Tushingham, 15 Dec 1970 Inuit collection research files, Agnes Etherington Art Centre [Transcribed by Alicia Boutiller January 2014, provided to the author by the Agnes Etherington Art Center 2019]
The lack of support provided to the Near Eastern Museum by Queen’s, did not mean that it was not appreciated by those who attended. Local adult groups\textsuperscript{64} and school children\textsuperscript{65} organized to have tours, and local media outlets, such as radio shows, promoted the new museum.\textsuperscript{66} The issue was not enjoyment, but rather attendance. Unlike the Miller Museum, or other Kingston museums, Tushingham, while later arguing in favour of the transfer to the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto, suggested that the Queen’s Near Eastern Museum was located in a fairly inaccessible spot, and thus did not garner as much foot traffic tucked away in the back of the Old Arts Building as it may have done elsewhere.\textsuperscript{67}

The final event which secured the fate of the Near Eastern Museum came in the form of a letter to S.M. Gilmour, January 11\textsuperscript{th}, 1955. The letter was from Dr. Sidney Smith, with the Royal Ontario Museums, expressing interest in Dr. Tushingham for the position of Head of the Royal Ontario Museum of Art and Archaeology, one of the six separate Royal Ontario Museums that existed at the time.\textsuperscript{68} Gilmour, having always supported Dr. Tushingham and acknowledging that his abilities would have greater impact at the ROM, gave his blessing for Dr. Smith to offer the position to Tushingham.\textsuperscript{69}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{64} Helen M. Otten (Program Convener St. George’s A.Y.P.A Kingston) to Dr. W. A. Mackintosh (Principal, Queen’s University), Feb 19. 1954 [Queen’s University Principals Office, Coll 1251, Box 16, file “Museums”]
\textsuperscript{65} A.D. Tushingham (ROM) to Alan Smith (Esq., Secretary, The J.P. Bickell Foundation Committee), October 5th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department- Queen’s University File]
\textsuperscript{66} W.A. Mackintosh to Mrs. Aitken, Nov 10, 1954 (C.C to Professor A. D. Tushingham) [Queen’s University Principals Office, Coll 1251, Box 16, file “Museums”]
\textsuperscript{67} A.D. Tushingham (ROM) to A.H. Detweiler (President, American School of Oriental Research), October 5th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum- Queen’s University File]
\textsuperscript{68} President Sidney Smith to S.M. Gilmour (Queen’s Theological College Principal) January 11th 1955 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
\textsuperscript{69} W.E.L. Smith (Acting-Principal) to Dr. Sidney Smith (President, University of Toronto), 14 January 1955 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]
\end{flushright}
Despite the possibility of being considered for Principal of Queen’s Theological College, Dr. Tushingham officially resigned from Queen’s in February of 1955.\textsuperscript{70} It was announced by Dr. Smith on April 4\textsuper{th}, 1955, that Dr. Tushingham would take over as Head of the Ontario Museum of Archaeology for the upcoming year.\textsuperscript{71} For a time, the Queen’s Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology existed at Queen’s without Dr. Tushingham, and without even an archaeologist on staff with any department at Queen’s to look after it.

Likely suspecting that the Museum, and its collections, would not be able to sustain itself without him, Dr. Tushingham began the process of trying to get the archaeological material transferred to the ROM in October of 1955. Tushingham wrote to all parties who had a hand in the Museum, to get their approval, before making any formal plans to move the collection. This process included writing to the Bickell Foundation, to explain that their generous $1000 grant had not been for nothing. Tushingham assured the members of the Bickell Foundation that while the Museum was short lived, it had been utilized greatly in its time, but that without him present at Queen’s the collection would likely fall into disuse and disrepair, and therefore would be better off at the ROM.\textsuperscript{72} Tushingham also wrote to Henry Detweiler, the President of ASOR, to similarly assure him that it would be best for the archaeological material to be sent to the ROM, if not for its own protection, then for the sake of Tushingham being able to finally properly


\textsuperscript{71} “Named to Posts in Archaeology, Orient Language”, The Globe and Mail (April 5th 1955), pg. 4 [Accessed through ProQuest Historical Newspapers, October 2019].

\textsuperscript{72} A.D. Tushingham (ROM) to Alan Smith (Esq., Secretary, The J.P. Bickell Foundation Committee), October 5th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department- Queen’s University File]
catalogue and publish all the findings from the Dhiban excavation, which would be most difficult if the materials were in another city.\textsuperscript{73}

Queen’s University and Theological College needed no assurances or convincingly made arguments to encourage them to agree to this arrangement. Preoccupied with internal matters, and thinking mainly of surviving in the present, rather than the educational opportunities of the future, both principals were more than willing to let the collections go, citing that, “… there is nothing in the collection in which the University is interested…”\textsuperscript{74} The only concerns of the Queen’s principals lay in making sure the transfer had the approval of the Bickell Foundation as well as the ASOR Board, and receiving a reimbursement from the ROM for the money Queen’s fronted to establish the Museum.\textsuperscript{75}

Due to the onset of cold weather, which would make transferring the material difficult, especially with the delicacy of the glass cases, Tushingham argued that the transfer needed to occur quickly.\textsuperscript{76} In order to get started right away, the transfer was first filed with the ROM as a temporary loan, so that work could continue despite not yet having official approval from the ASOR Board. The issue facing the ROM in acquiring the collection was the same one which faced Theological College back in 1953— the ROM was not officially an ASOR Corporate Member. This issue seemed to cause minor dispute between Detweiler and Tushingham, because the division of the ROM which Tushingham led was in no financial state to commit to the $100 a

\textsuperscript{73} A.D. Tushingham (ROM) to A.H. Detweiler (President, American School of Oriental Research), October 5th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department- Queen’s University File]

\textsuperscript{74} Elias Andrews (Queen’s Theological College, Principal) to Dr. W.A Mackintosh (Queen’s University Principal), October 19th 1955 [Queen’s University Principals Office, Coll 1251, Box 16, file “Museums”]

\textsuperscript{75} Elias Andrews (Queen’s Theological College, Principal) to Dr. A. D. Tushingham (Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology), October 19th 1955 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 57, file “Tushingham”]

\textsuperscript{76} A.D. Tushingham (ROM) to A.H. Detweiler (President, American School of Oriental Research), October 5th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department- Queen’s University File]
year membership fee, and because The University of Toronto (the ROM’s financial support and final court of appeal on decisions) was already a corporate member of ASOR, paying double fees each year. Tushingham thus felt the Art and Archaeology Department should not need a corporate membership, and suggested instead that the consignment be made through the University of Toronto if it would clear up any legal matters.

The Board of the American Schools of Oriental Research did not immediately reply, but Tushingham continued to move forward with organizing the transfer in the meantime. It was arranged that on November 1st, 1955, two men from the ROM, Mr. James Gooding and Mr. Henri Perrin, would travel to Kingston to pack up the archaeological material for shipment. The material was insured by the ROM for $2500 and transferred via truck (refer to appendix C for a photocopy of the original shipment form). The bronze cases from the Museum were split up, one sent to the Napanee Museum and three to Dundas Museum.

The material arrived at the ROM and was accessed in two groups: the Jericho material, and the Dhiban material. The Jericho material was given accession code 955.165.1-87; ‘955’ representing the year of accession (1955), ‘165’ indicating that it was the 165th acquisition group that year, and ‘1-87’ corresponding to the individual item number within that accession group. The Dhiban material is a more complex matter. For unknown reasons, the Dhiban material’s

---

77 A.D. Tushingham (ROM) to A.H. Detweiler (President, American School of Oriental Research), December 14th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department- Queen’s University File]
78 Despite the official title of ‘Curator of the Modern European Department’, the Bulletin published by this department is titled ‘Bulletin of the Division of Art and Archaeology’, and Tushingham’s position is referred to as ‘Head of the Division of Art and Archaeology’. It is unclear when and why this change occurred.
79 Elias Andrews (Queen’s Theological College, Principal) to A.D Tushingham (ROM, Head of the Division of Art and Archaeology), October 27th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department- Queen’s University File]
80 Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology MEMO, no date, [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department-Queen’s University File]
81 Ibid.
relation to Queen’s became confused or lost during its accession. The code that the materials from Queen’s were accessed under was 955.231. However, 955.321 remained an open series for Dhiban material over the years, according to the current Collections Technician, Cheryl Copson, whom the author met with to discuss these matters. It is thus unclear which items now in the 955.231 group came from Queen’s. One could, however, reasonably assume the earliest numbers in the accession sequence were more likely to have come from Queen’s.

On May 10th, 1956, after the items were already in the ROM’s possession, Dr. Tushingham once again reached out to the ASOR President, A.H. Detweiler, to inquire into the Board’s decision. Detweiler was able to give Tushingham the good news that a majority of the Board had voted to approve the transfer through the University of Toronto, as Tushingham had suggested. With this matter settled, the ROM canceled the temporary loan status, changing the acquisition to a full gift (see appendix C for loan form). The ROM was also finally able to provide Queen’s College with its reimbursement for the cost of the Museum, which came to $483.43, the invoice for which Theological College Principal, Elias Andrews, signed on May 23rd, 1956. The conclusion of Queen’s involvement with this impressive collection was cemented by the cancellation of Queen’s University’s Corporate Membership with ASOR on

---

82 A.D. Tushingham (ROM, Head of the Division of Art and Archaeology) to A.H. Detweiler (President, American School of Oriental Research), May 10th 1956 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department - Queen’s University File]
83 A.H. Detweiler (President, American School of Oriental Research) to A.D Tushingham (ROM, Head of the Division of Art and Archaeology), May 22nd 1956 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department - Queen’s University File]
85 Elias Andrews (Queen’s Theological College, Principal) to A.D Tushingham (ROM, Head of the Division of Art and Archaeology), October 27th 1955 [Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department - Queen’s University File]
August 7th, 1956,\textsuperscript{86} which assured that Queen’s could not change their mind and request the collection back.

As for Dr. Tushingham, he went on to do impressive work at the ROM and was able to return to Jerusalem to continue his career in archaeology. In 1956, Tushingham returned to the Jericho site, to once again excavate under the joint expedition with his colleague, Kathleen Kenyon, of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{87} This dig was sponsored by the Canadian newspaper The Globe and Mail, and was covered in the media from start to finish.\textsuperscript{88} Additionally, with the University of Toronto, Dr. Tushingham was finally able to teach the Biblical Archaeology course he had so desired to at Queen’s.\textsuperscript{89} This once again proved that, what Queen’s gave away, others were only too happy to receive.

**Remnants Today**

For however willing Queen’s was to give away the collections from Jericho and Dhiban, the ROM was even more willing to have them. After everything had been accessed, the materials were immediately included in various exhibitions. Thanks to both Cheryl Copson and Stephanie Allen at the ROM, the author was provided with a full list of the Jericho material, including images, which confirmed which galleries and exhibitions the material went on to be a part of (see Appendix D). These exhibitions included travelling displays with ROM Outreaches.

\textsuperscript{86} Elias Andrews (Principal, Queen’s Theological College) to American Schools of Oriental Research in New Haven, August 7th 1956 [Theological College, Coll 1012, Box 37, File “American Schools of Oriental Research”]
\textsuperscript{87} Royal Ontario Museum Annual Report No. 7 (1956-57), 2.
\textsuperscript{88} “Globe and Mail Sponsors Expedition To Study Secrets of Ancient Jericho”, The Globe and Mail (December 9th 1955), pg. 1 [Accessed through ProQuest Historical Newspapers, October 2019].
\textsuperscript{89} University of Toronto Bulletin for the Staff, October 1956, pg 3.
Services, such as *The Land of the Bible, From Abraham to Akiba*, and *Artefacts of the Levant Collection*. ⁹⁰

One can even view some of the materials that once resided at Queen’s, on display currently in the Wirth Gallery of the Near East. Among those on display, is the famous plastered human skull (Fig. 3). The head, which the author must express is far more striking when viewed in person than could ever come across in this photo, was also the first of the items to be photographed and uploaded to the ROM’s Online Collections, available to view on their website. ⁹¹ The rest of the Jericho and Dhiban items remain in storage, although the author was lucky enough to be allowed access to some of these as well. Holding and looking at these beautiful items during, what was at the time, the day before the 65th anniversary of the Queen’s Museum’s opening, was a unique privilege that made it painfully clear just how much Queen’s missed out on when this collection was given away.

---

⁹⁰ “External Report – World Cultures: West Asian”, Royal Ontario Museum [Provided through Royal Ontario Museum Registration Department]
Conclusions

The short life of the Queen’s Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology is a tragic example of a bright young man, at the start of his career, who tried his best to bring something special to the Queen’s campus that simply could not be appreciated properly in its time. The internal struggles at Theological College, lack of enthusiasm for experiential learning, and focus on other cultural institutions such as the Agnes Etherington Art Center, might have contributed to why Dr. Tushingham chose to leave Queen’s, but they do not explain why neither Theological College nor the University had the foresight to fight to keep this collection. Within a decade, archaeology at Queen’s would revive with the Classics Department hiring the first of many new archaeologists,\(^\text{92}\) and the Art History Department would be created.\(^\text{93}\) Within two decades the Art

---

\(^{92}\) S.E. Smethurst, *Classics at Queen’s: A Brief History* (Queen’s University: Department of Classics, 1992), 56.

Conservation graduate program would be established. All of these non-theological units could have made great use of the archaeological artifacts.

Rather than putting in the time and effort to keep this Museum, which Queen’s still had rights to as a Corporate Member of ASOR, the University gave it away. It would not be until 2001, when the Department of Classics and the Art Conservation Department jointly acquired the Diniacopoulos Collection, that students of art and archaeology were able to benefit from the type of experiential learning that Tushingham had tried to establish decades before. One can only imagine how much further these departments may have come with their collections and curricula, let alone the cultural benefits and prestige the University could have experienced, if Queen’s only had the forethought to keep such a beneficial collection of artifacts.

It is my hope that by rediscovering this Museum, and the journey these artifacts went through, such an egregious error in judgement might never again deprive students the chance to enhance their learning experience here at Queen’s. As such a prominent institution, it is the responsibility of Queen’s to act as a proponent for education and cultural experience, and to treat all items of cultural heritage with the respect and appreciation they deserve. As a student of Classics and Art History at Queen’s in 2019, I feel deprived and cheated to have missed out on such a wonderful opportunity as the Queen’s Museum of Near Eastern Archaeology, due to the apathy of a short-sighted few. I was lucky to be able to view some of these items at the Royal Ontario Museum, and to become close to the collection through my study. I only hope that through this paper others may also get to know and appreciate this wonderful collection.

---

94 Ibid.
After completing the first draft of this paper, it was the general consensus of all those involved that the idea of turning the collection into an online exhibit through Queen’s Library would be the best way to conclude, or rather, give new life, to the artifacts and their story. I believe Tushingham would be glad that his museum could once again be used for experiential learning in art and archaeology classes, which, whether at ASOR’s American School in Jerusalem or in a Biblical study class at Queen’s Theological College, was clearly valued by Dr. Tushingham as an invaluable tool for education. We hope to have the online exhibit, featuring images of the Dhiban and Jericho artifacts, which are not yet even included in the ROM’s online collections, up and running by late April 2020.

Addendum, 2020/07/07:

The aforementioned virtual exhibition launched in May 2020, hosted by Queen’s Library Virtual Exhibits, and is viewable at the following link: https://virtual-exhibits.library.queensu.ca/museum-of-near-eastern-archaeology/.
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