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Tawaw. As a member of Peepeekisis Nehiyaw Nation located on Treaty Four territory in Saskatchewan, I would like to acknowledge that I am a guest on Treaty One territory. This territory is the Treaty land base of the Aniishanabe and Ininew, the only two original signatories to the Treaty. I acknowledge that the forks of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers have long been the gathering place for numerous Indigenous Peoples and that this history stretches back to time immemorial. I also acknowledge that today many nations reside within this treaty area, including the Saulteaux, Anishanabe, Ininew, Dene, Ojibway-Ininew, Dakota, Lakota, Inuit, and many more and that this diversity has created a unique Indigenous culture within Winnipeg. I also wish to acknowledge that this area is historically essential to the Metis, as recognized by the MMF, and that they claim close ties to it. It has been a privilege to study and write my thesis within this territory, and I would like to thank its Peoples for making me welcome. I acknowledge that as an outsider I should never speak for the Peoples of this territory and do not claim to; instead, I hope that the work this thesis is meant to do, the changes it is intended to create, and the reconciliation it is meant to birth will benefit all Indigenous Peoples no matter where they reside.
Abstract

When I was five, my family moved to a farming community in Germany. My mother regularly wrote home to her parents, telling them about our lives and sending them gifts, which they put in their modern curiosity cabinet. This is a very reasonable situation and one which happens all the time. Nevertheless, what if foreigners who moved to Germany were only ever allowed to read my mother’s letters as the complete and acceptable truth for the entire German nation and its people. Would one deem this an accurate history? Would it be enough to analyze German culture, religion, and society? Would looking at the gifts be enough to determine their use without talking to a German? One would most likely answer no to such questions. I chose this narrative because it mirrors the trust adventures, academics, and so forth have put in the archival records written about Indigenous Peoples and their ways.

Europeans writing about the Peoples they encountered did not speak the local languages, nor did they understand the cultural practices. Therefore, everything they wrote was interpreted through a strictly European lens, which in turn means that their writings were utterly biased and their interpretations often misconstrued. Nonetheless, many scripts have ended up in archival institutions. In kanata, this form of literature has continued without much interruption, and many such writings continue to be archived.

This thesis will analyze the history of archiving in kanata using a decolonizing lens. It will analyze four archival institutions who are doing it right and four crucial documents, although not the only crucial documents, relevant to decolonizing, indigenizing, and reconciling the archival field in kanata with Indigenous Peoples. Finally, through the use of a case study, it will demonstrate the modern problems surrounding the archiving of Indigenous knowledge not produced by Indigenous Peoples nor housed with any community engagement. The point of this
thesis is to call out archivists responsible for the continuing oppression of Indigenous Peoples and provide them with ways of rethinking the archival protocols and practices they put onto Indigenous knowledge contained within archival records.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Each one of us gains knowledge throughout our lives. At first, it is small things like using a spoon, but as we grow and age the knowledge, we learn increases in complexity, such as learning to drive and follow the rules of the road. For the majority of people in society, knowledge is only ever restricted by a person’s willingness to learn. This reality, however, is a privilege not all members within ‘canadian’ society share.¹

Most Indigenous Peoples are used to knowledge restrictions. Sometimes we are restricted from certain levels of knowledge within our communities because of specific protocols, for instance, age or gender restrictions. These restrictions are not meant to impede us but rather ensure we learn what is necessary for our life at the moment and not overload ourselves with what one might consider, unnecessary knowledge. This acceptance of cultural knowledge restrictions for Indigenous Peoples does not, however, mean that we agree with the withholding of knowledge by organizations or governments as freedom of knowledge is a right all ‘canadians’ should have.

Indigenous Peoples have always fought for their rights. Before European contact, that might have meant going to war over necessary resources, and after contact, this included the signing of treaties to secure land for our continued way of life as well as peaceful relations. In more recent times, this has included the protection of water rights, land rights, the duty to consult, and much more; however, there has never been a fight to protect our knowledge rights, and this is ultimately the purpose behind this thesis.

¹ canada nor canadian will be capitalized throughout this piece of work unless it is located within a quote or a proper title such as the name of an institution or job title. I do not capitalize such words as an act of activism against the government, peoples, and notions that have and continue to oppress Indigenous Peoples within the artificial boundaries of canada. I do, however, capitalize similar nation-states such as the U.S., Australia, and New Zealand as I am not Indigenous to those nations and do not believe it right for me to make such a political statement outside of my own territory without the explicit consent of the Indigenous Peoples of those nations.
kanata, specifically its government, has a long history of keeping secrets from Indigenous Peoples, perhaps the most commonly known of these was Indian Residential Schools and the purposes behind them. However, this is just one of many secrets that are beginning to come to light, but that nonetheless has had devastating effects for many Indigenous communities and Peoples. Although the government and many other institutions are responsible for the keeping of many of these secrets, it is the numerous archival repositories and archivists that I accuse of being one of Indigenous Peoples’ biggest oppressors.

Archival institutions and archivists have long played a role in telling the story of nations, and here in kanata, it is no different. Archival repositories across the country have acquired many collections since opening their doors, and there is probably not one archival institution in this nation that does not hold at least one collection which contains Indigenous knowledge. This notion is essential to remember because, for many years now, Indigenous Peoples have been attempting to reacquaint themselves with all the knowledge they lost since contact, and when that knowledge is no longer held in the community, the one place it most likely is held is in an archive. By failing to search their collections and turn over any information they might have to make this Indigenous goal easier, many archivists have decided, consciously or not, to keep Indigenous Peoples oppressed.

This thesis will demonstrate such oppression throughout; however, it will take several forms. Chapter two will provide a short history of archiving in kanata, specifically in regards to Library and Archives Canada (LAC), after which it will analyze the statements of the men who have headed this organization using a decolonizing lens, finally, it will provide modern-day examples of this oppression within specific archival repositories. Here it is essential to remind you, the reader, that oppression is not always overt; rather, oppression can be sneaky, sly, quiet,
almost unnoticeable, and even friendly. I remind you of this because certain aspects of chapter three are surprising and hopeful.

Chapter three is less depressing perhaps but overrun with definitions and explanations; however necessary they may be. This chapter is also full of hope and positivity. It provides fantastic examples, both from kanata as well as from other nations, of doing archiving right. These examples are exciting and uplifting, but once you realize how easily these brilliant ideas could be implemented, you will also realize that ‘canadian’ archival institutions and archivists are choosing to do nothing, which is just another form of oppression.

Chapter four is complicated. It tells a story of a man, who I honestly believe to be a good man, who ultimately took what was not his to take and then gave it away when it was not his to give away, to academics, both of whom I respect a great deal, whose hearts and even academic thinking was in the right place but failed to be the truest of allies at a moment when they should have been. It is about an institution that already has a sketchy history when it comes to Indigenous records failing to meet the bar a second time, and it is about that same institution trying to look like a leader in indigenization and decolonization when it cannot even be bothered with community engagement. Oppression, in its many forms, rings loud throughout this thesis.

Whether we call it oppression or a lack of funding and resources or staff shortage does not matter. What matters is that archives are holding knowledge that does not belong to them; they are providing access to knowledge that might not be for everyone; and doing so without community consultation. Even if it is knowledge everyone can access too often Indigenous Peoples do not since they do not even know it is there. ‘canadian’ archivists are lagging in doing it right when it comes to Indigenous knowledge in an archive. We have the evidence that change is working and community engagement is beneficial. The only thing left is for us to get off our
asses and implement what others have already worked so hard to sort out. It is time ‘canadian’
archivists stop being complacent in their role as oppressors; YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE
AND EVERYTHING TO GAIN!
Chapter Two: History and its Problems

Introduction:

Every organization has a history; sometimes that history is complex and fraught with problems, and sometimes that history is simple. The history of Library and Archives Canada, also known and from here on in referred to as LAC, is no exception. LAC’s history is as complex as that of the nation for which it is responsible for the safeguarding of records—kanata. Just as kanata’s history is complicated in large part by the independent and yet intertwined colonization of its land by two nation-states, so too is the history of LAC. When multiple factors complicate history, it is often best to explain it in story format.

Archiving in kanata: Its History

However, unlike most stories that are linear in progression this one will instead be two-fold, meet somewhere in the ‘middle,’ and not be entirely accurate as no one definitive history exists for LAC and sources are often contradictory. Our first story begins in New France, a place which had a relatively short history. It started with the exploration of the Gulf of Saint Lawrence by Jacques Cartier in 1534 and ended with the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1763.2 During the majority of this time, 190 years, in fact, New France did not have an archival repository on Turtle Island and instead records created on Turtle Island were shipped back to France and housed in both state and religious archival institutions there. However, in 1724, New France named its first archivist, Gilles Hocquart, after which it proposed its first archive in 1731.3 Gilles Hocquart and the proposed archive are not well known, unfortunately, and therefore little else can be written—hence the end of our first story.

Our second story begins, like the birth of any institution, with a significant push. The collapse of New France did not put an end to the establishing and caring of kanata’s first settler archive and its records. In 1824, ninety-three years after the proposal of the first archive, the Quebec Literary and Historical Society was created and founded “with the enthusiastic vice-regal patronage of Lord Dalhousie,” governor of Lower kanata at the time. Its affiliates understood their only objective to be a historical inquiry, that is to say, the restoration and the publishing of records on ‘canadian’ history. To find and transcribe such documents, they traveled to Paris, London, and New York. Quebec’s Literary and Historical Society had considered the establishment of an archival organization by the ‘canadian’ government paramount because, as the society’s handbill clearly stated, “it [an archival repository] will raise us in the moral and intellectual scale of nations. It will cherish our noblest feelings of honor and patriotism, by showing that the more men become acquainted with the history of their country, the more they prize and respect both their country and themselves.” This is a theory that kanata till this day argues as it desperately attempts to create a secure and solidified ‘canadian’ identity.

It is possible, considering Lord Dalhousie’s influence with the Quebec Literary and Historical Society, that he was also responsible for the creation of the Public Records of Nova Scotia; however, there is no direct evidence to support this theory. What we do know is that in 1857 Thomas B. Akins was named the first archivist and Commissioner of Public Records of

---

4 Note: Memory systems existed on Turtle Island long before settlers arrived and continue to serve an important role in Indigenous communities and for Indigenous Peoples. This is not being disputed at all in this thesis. Moreover, this section is referring strictly to settler archives and their roles in history.
Nova Scotia, kanata’s first archival institution outside of Quebec. Thomas B. Akins and kanata’s first archival institution outside of Quebec are little-known, but we do know replication of said archive would eventually happen on a national scale.

Quebec’s society and the Nova Scotia repository were not the only organizations feeling the need to ensure the nation’s history and by extension, create ‘canadian’ identity and pride. As a result, more than fifty preeminent writers and academics, as well as the Canadian Library Committee, endorsed an application to develop an archive via the Minister of Agriculture. It was to be an archive where the accumulation, preservation, arrangement, and availability of the records would benefit academics as evidential support for their written arguments. The request was accepted, and in 1872 the ‘canadian’ Parliament decided to put $4000.00, the equivalent of just over 82,000.00 USD in 2018, towards its establishment. They also named Douglas Brymner the first Dominion Archivist and put him in charge of overseeing and creating a national records repository as well as undertaking routine archival duties.

As the first Dominion Archivist, Douglas Brymner did not waste any time and quickly embraced his new role. He soon disclosed the extent of his plan which entailed components inspired by three British organizations, namely the British Museum, the Public Record Office, and the Historical Manuscripts Commission, which was to be combined and makeup kanata’s national archive. Arguably, his most significant contribution to the archival profession and its

---

future archivists was that he created the guidelines, objectives, and approaches. Between 1881 and 1883 Brymer was in Britain and Paris where he was affected by European archival organizations. In 1882, he had begun to stress the significance of recording ‘all’ facets of ‘canadian’ culture, dismissing any gearing towards a political life. In an Archives Report in 1882, he wrote: “the special object of the office … is to obtain from all sources, private as well as public, such documents as may throw light on social, commercial, municipal as well as purely political theory.” Brymner aimed to establish a repository that expressed something other than the long-established archival role as an organized political body. His enthusiasm to this regard was probably never better stated than when he declared “in so far as regards the history of British North America, every document relating to it should be found in the Archives Office, even such as at first sight may appear to have with it only a remote connection.”

He desired the archives to serve as an information storehouse that acquired information from an assortment of authorities that generated a booming knowledge repository that ‘mirrored’ ‘canadian’ culture and life. Afterward, in a statement for the American Historical Association, he penned “my ambition aims at the establishment of a great storehouse of the history of the colony and colonists in their political, ecclesiastical, industrial, domestic, in a word every aspect of their lives. It may be a dream, but it is a noble dream.” Brymner strived to see his dream become a reality until 1902 when he left this world.

After Brymner’s death in 1902, the position of Dominion Archivist went to Sir Arthur George Doughty in 1903. However, he declined the offer and appears to have somewhat been

13 Wilfred Smith, “‘Total Archives:’ The Canadian Experience,” in Canadian archival studies and the rediscovery of provenance, ed. Tom Nesmith (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1993), 137.
15 Wilfred Smith, “‘Total Archives:’ The Canadian Experience,” in Canadian archival studies and the rediscovery of provenance, ed. Tom Nesmith (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1993), 137.
forced to accept it by 1904 after which he held said position until 1935. Under his management, the Public Archives of Canada attempted to pinpoint and keep a record of relevant archival material in different areas of kanata. Across the world, one of the most cited remarks stated by Doughty involved the fundamental importance of preserving and managing proper and full records in an organized national archive. Doughty stated: “of all national assets, archives are the most precious, they are the gifts of one generation to another, and the extent of our care of them marks the extent of our civilization. As a rule, the papers of a given generation are seldom required after their reception and primary use; but when all personal touch with that period has ceased, then these records assume a startling importance, for they replace hands that have vanished and lips that are sealed.”

Terry Cook has thoroughly examined this statement by focusing on “Doughty’s notion of ‘care’ and his concept of archives as a ‘gift’ to the future.” Cook points out that “words such as culture and power are not neutral, but then, neither are Doughty’s descriptions of archives as precious ‘assets’ or the most excellent gift across generations of our ‘civilization.’” Once Doughty’s stint came to an end, Gustave Lanctot was appointed Dominion Archivist.

Gustave Lanctot was Dominion Archivist between 1937 and 1948. According to E.A. Kelly, Lanctot suffered a “major professional embarrassment … at the end of an otherwise distinguished career” and suggests that this might be the reason, or at least one of the reasons, behind “Lanctot’s pursuit of [Jacques] Cartier’s remains;” but ends acknowledging that the

---

17 Jennifer Anderson, “Public archives represent a democratic vision where all are welcome, ideas circulate, and information is analyzed and diffused for educational purposes,” Policy Options (2018): 3.
19 Ibid, 179.
Lanctot Papers contained no evidence to back up this statement. Lanctot’s fascination with Jacques Cartier might be the most exciting aspect both, before and after, his stint as the head of kanata’s national archive because it provides further insight into how this long line of men viewed record-keeping and its relation to kanata. For example, “Lanctot was involved between 1932 and 1934 in the arrangements for the commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of Cartier’s voyage; he [Lanctot] called for a national celebration in remembrance of the coming to Canada of civilization.” This statement leaves much to be analyzed, which will be done further into this chapter.

After Lanctot’s eleven-year stint William Kaye Lamb was immediately appointed and held the position for twenty years, from 1948-68. He was an essential part of the growth of the Public Archives of Canada. His vigorous policy of documentary acquisition and his enhanced records management practices hugely boosted the worth of the National Archives as a research institution. He supervised the building of the archive facility, which had its grand opening in 1967 and set up the first of four archival repositories. Lamb was undoubtedly busy during his career as Dominion Archivist and without question was directly responsible for much of what we currently recognize as LAC.

Until 1970 the role of National Archivist sat officially empty. However, Wilfred I. Smith did oversee the everyday operations as he held the title of Acting National Archivist until

21 Public Archives of Canada, Gustave Lanctot Papers, MG30 D95, vol. 9, see document entitled “Memorandum – 1934 will mark the fourth centenary of Canada’s discovery by Jacques Cartier at Gaspe in 1534.”
23 Library and Archives Canada, “Wilfred I. Smith fonds,”; Normand Laplante, “Before Mr. Lamb and Mr. Smith went to Ottawa,” LAC.
formally appointed to the position, at which he remained until 1984. Smith appears to have been well-loved and in fact, “participated in, led, and in many ways inspired a period of extraordinary change in archival services in Canada.” Some of these changes include the introduction of “a more modern team approach to administration, recruiting a capable management group, delegating, and broadening participation in the acquisition of private materials, and empowering staff. The archival record increased many times over, seeking to mirror all aspects of Canadian society.” Although Smith made significant changes within the archival field; he is held personally responsible for the acquisition of private material, that would provide a more ‘all-inclusive’ depiction of ‘canadian’ society, leaving him open to scrutiny.

In 1985 Jean-Pierre Wallot took over as National Archivist and remained so until 1997.

Wallot came to his new appointment with a need for change and

in consultation with the Minister, department officials, and senior Archives staff formulated three well-defined objectives to be achieved during his term of office. The priority was to convince the government to scrap the old 1912 Archives Act and replace it with modern legislation. This change would more genuinely reflect the roles and responsibilities of a national archival institution at the end of the twentieth century. His second objective was the construction of a proper archival repository. Dr. Wallot’s third objective was to make the institution a leader in dealing with the problems associated with preserving the so-called “new archival media.

Dr. Wallot left a hard act for his predecessors to follow, but in 1999, Ian E. Wilson became the first National Archivist to follow such a legacy.

25 Ibid.
Wilson held the title of National Archivist until 2004 when the title changed from National Archivist to Librarian and Archivist of Canada which he held until 2009. During his time as National Archivist Wilson “focused on developing the country’s documentary heritage in all media and on providing suitable access to citizens, exploring the extensive use of web-based services … He [also] worked diligently to make archives accessible and interesting to a wide range of audiences.” The archival and research communities have Wilson to thank for moving them from the analog to the digital and making their lives simpler although, some would argue, not entirely. Wilson does appear to have been genuinely concerned about archives and those who ran them. He stated, upon his appointment, that he looked “forward to working with the leadership team to ensure that archives throughout the world can achieve their full potential, and to protect their interests locally, nationally and internationally.” This researcher; however, questions whose ‘interests’ Wilson was genuinely concerned with protecting—he was the head of a federal government archive after all.

Since Ian E. Wilson’s retirement Daniel J. Caron served as Librarian and Archivist of Canada from April 25, 2009 until May 15, 2013. There is little written about Caron’s time as Librarian and Archivist of Canada; however, it is clear that he was intensely focused “on digital

recordkeeping at LAC.” 34 This intense focus reflects the digital change that was taking place throughout the western world at the time. In the archival world, this change to digital has and continues to be seen as the way in which archivists and the institutions they serve may enable greater client access to records. Caron also held to this notion which is clearly demonstrated in a speech he made in 2010. Caron, in relation to providing better access stated, “in my opinion, your presence today signals your genuine interest in continuing to develop ways of working together in order to provide Canadians with best access to the best possible representation of their documentary heritage preserved in the best possible manner.” 35 The interesting parts of this statement, in my opinion, are the words “best access to the best possible representation of their documentary heritage preserved in the best possible manner.” These words demonstrate Caron’s disconnect with the realities between archives and Indigenous Peoples.

After Caron came Guy Berthiaume who was appointed on April 14, 2014. 36 Since Berthiaume has only just vacated the role as kanata’s head librarian and archivist there is not a lot written about him. However, this researcher did once question Guy Berthiaume as to whether he thought LAC had made satisfactory progress in implementing UNDRIP’s principles, and my recollection is that he replied that it was simply too hard to accomplish. 37 Considering the unbelievable achievements of Berthiaume’s predecessors his answer to my question begs the question is he serious or just lazy?

The archive carries on and presently acts as both a cultural archive and a state record office, amassing material of all media formats. In fact, “over the years, research, publications, and contributions at conferences have earned LAC archivists countless international awards and accolades, and made Canada a world leader in a profession that many consider as being one of democracy’s cornerstones.” In 2004, the archive was merged with the national library and formally renamed Library and Archives Canada. Leslie Weir was appointed as the Librarian and Archivist of Canada on August 30, 2019. Only time will tell if she will walk a different path than her male predecessors. This short history hopefully has demonstrated a few of the flaws within the archival field, but what if one applied a decolonizing lens to the statements and actions of these prestigious gatekeepers of the nations records.

**Looking at their statements with a decolonizing lens:**

I grew up loving history. My dad read us history, talked to us about history, and took us to historical sites. He always made it personal speaking about the hundreds of men that left our community to fight in the Great Wars, and how proud he was to follow his dad, his uncle, and his grandfather by joining the military at the age of sixteen. He ensured that we understood that it was not just the men of our community that played historical roles but the women too. He would put my sister and I to bed with stories of how our cousin was the first Indigenous woman to graduate from the law school at the University of Manitoba, how our aunty had become the first Indigenous psychiatric nurse, to his knowledge, in Regina, Saskatchewan, and how our great-grandmothers had never seen a doctor but had had the knowledge and wisdom to heal themselves as well as their communities from what the earth provided. My dad used always to say there are

---

three sides to every story - yours, the other person’s, and somewhere in the middle is usually the truth.

However, I remember the first time I found a picture of a Nehiyaw man in a history book in my school’s library, and I remember thinking that is my dad’s nose. However, as I read, it became evident that nothing in the text was actually about the man himself instead it was about how the British had put down some ‘savage’ uprising because it had been necessary to protect the realm or some such nonsense. There was no two-sided story here, let alone a three-sided one. I remember thinking, ‘where was the Indigenous voice?’

I soon discovered that it was not only Indigenous voices missing from ‘canadian’ textbooks and history classes; it was overwhelmingly the voice of any marginalized group. I did not have the luxury of growing up at a time when decolonization was even a discussion at least not within mainstream society. I did not grow up formally learning about any women’s movement, African American movement, or anything of the sort. My elementary and high school history books were full of white men who advanced white society for other white men. In the university where I did my undergrad most of the history courses centered around white men. If one wanted to learn about white women, then one had to take a course on white women. There was only one professor in my entire history department that offered courses about Indigenous Peoples, but even these Peoples were not from Turtle Island. Is this what decolonization looks like?

No, it is not. I do not have a story of decolonization, but what I do have is a story that depicts how decolonization might look in kanata if we replace the actors. I spent seven of my formative years living in a small farming village in West Germany. Here along with many other students, I learned about World War II. I learned the horrible truths, I was shown the hard
realities by visiting historical sites, and I was never allowed to deny its existence. Instead, I was asked to take responsibility, own, and make amends for the great injustices done to those harmed by Hitler and his policies. At the same time, I learned that not all Germans were Hitler sympathizers and that many had to choose between killing Jews, as well as others marginalized by Hitler’s policies, or watching their families die. I have never denied the Holocaust or hated a German citizen for the roles their ancestors or family members played as I learned every side of this horrific truth rather than merely one. This example, in my opinion, demonstrates what decolonization looks like.

However, I remember moving back to kanata and driving from Ottawa to Petawawa, Ontario in our German car with our German license plates and hearing people call us Nazis when we would stop for gas or food. I also remember asking my mother why they were calling us Nazis and her explaining that they were ignorant of the truths surrounding Germany and WWII. This statement was reiterated in every history class I took in kanata. That was until one professor during my undergrad asked the class to raise their hand if they thought Germany as a nation was entirely responsible for WWI and WWII, almost every hand in the class went up, and as she spent the next hour and a half setting the class perspective right I thought finally someone who knows the truth.

Because of this and other situations, I have never seen history as one-sided; instead, I applied my dad’s logic that every story has three sides, yours, the other person’s, and somewhere in the middle is usually the truth. This experience and way of viewing history have led me to be extremely critical of the records I look at and even more so of the secondary sources I utilize. However, it has also impacted how I view and interpret archival practices and policies as well as the academics who create such practices and policies via the creation of new theories.
The study of archival history, specifically Library and Archives Canada’s, is not what most researchers would define as exhilarating; instead like most major institutions their history most likely seems long, straightforward, unexciting, and something that must merely be written. However, should it merely be written or should researchers pick through it with a fine-toothed comb? Well, if we are ever going to decolonize and indigenize the biggest archival repository in this nation than we better start picking it apart because it is not going to change just because a few hope it will.

Academia is one of the few work environments where theory and practice do not always intersect, and archives can be even worse when it comes to practically applying any new theory. This is partly because no matter how many Mary Jane McCullum, Adele Perry, Greg Bak, and Raymond Frogner’s, all academics I respect, are out there writing decolonizing and indigenizing literature with the use of Indigenous methodologies, there are still professors, archivists, and institutions saying ‘but this is the way things have always taken place.’ These voices are not loud, but if you listen carefully and look without your blinders on they are there, going strong and throwing walls up at every turn. If you are thinking: I research using Indigenous methodology, I am a decolonizing researcher; or I aid in indigenization, yet do not hear the whispers condemning me behind my back or do not feel the hardness of the wall while doing my work, then the reality is you are probably not doing enough. You are not pushing hard enough, not being loud enough to really make a difference; no one views you as a threat. While I thank you for your efforts I also ask that you get out of the way for those of us loud enough to be heard, strong enough to bring down the walls built by those that snicker behind our backs while at the same time placating us with words, awards, and job offers that turn our efforts into
tokenism all the while providing our oppressors with badges of honor in decolonization and indigenization.

Methodology is one of the areas where one hears snickers, and hits walls. Most academics enjoy the methodology they have chosen to practice while conducting research, but arguably decolonizing methodology can be much harder to practice because, for the most part, it does not mix well with institutional notions. For this reason and others, I did not define my methodology until recently, and I do not think after finishing all my degrees I ever will again, but the LAC records and history needs a decolonizing lens. Therefore, I chose to apply decolonizing methodology, which, to me, requires exposing the position and function of methodologies in research. It is also about renouncing it; altering the character of its object to re-position those who have been targets of inquiry into inquirers, authorities, philosophers, knowers, and communicators.40 In the end, it means that we stop looking to Europe as a leader we can learn from and instead change research to ask what Europe has done to humankind and the environment.41 I thought that the way to do this might be to take statements made throughout kanata’s archival history and analyze them through a decolonizing lens and provide one - obviously, mine - Indigenous interpretation of what such statements are saying. So, here we go.

The Quebec Literary and Historical Society’s public handbill stated, “it will raise us in the moral and intellectual scale of nations. It will cherish our noblest feelings of honor and patriotism, by showing that the more men become acquainted with the history of their country, the more they prize and respect both their country and themselves.”42 This is a statement that has been made again and again in kanata as academics and politicians have desperately attempted to
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provide this nation with a common identity citizens can be proud of, but it has never completely taken hold because it is not conducive to the realities of kanata’s history.

The first aspect of this quote that should be analyzed is the words “it will raise us in the moral and intellectual scale of nations.”\(^3\) The use of the word, ‘us’ is not an all-encompassing ‘us;’ instead, it is referring to a group of distinct people that the society recognized as their equals; specifically, white, Anglo-French, upper-class males; and if we wanted to stretch this definition, we could stretch it to include middle and lower class men as well. At no point, however, should we be so naïve as to think that this includes Indigenous Peoples. It did not even include white women. We can state this and know it is an entirely accurate statement because at this time Indigenous Peoples, even men, in kanata were not recognized as citizens, as evidenced by the fact that they were not given absolute voting rights until the 1960s.\(^4\) The society and its members were not concerned with a collection of historical records that would tell an accurate history of kanata. What they wanted were records that would tell a historical narrative that appealed to the white population and bound them together with a sense of unity ultimately making any further genocidal actions, wars, thefts, and so on, on the part of the government and regular members of white society acceptable and done for the ‘greater good.’

Another aspect that is important to examine in this statement is the word, patriotism. Patriotism is a funny word; it carries a positive meaning; it defines intentions, actions, and even a person themselves, but what does it mean? Charles de Gaulle defined patriotism as “when the love of your people comes first.”\(^5\) This is an exciting notion because it begs the question of what makes us belong to a group of people? The answer to this question depends on your culture. If I

\(^3\) Ibid.
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applied this to Nehiyaw culture, I would say that a person, no matter color, religion, gender, and so on, is Nehiyaw once the community has accepted them and they begin to embrace the teachings and practices. In European culture, what makes you belong to a specific group of people is your religion, your ancestry (ultimately the color of your skin), and even your ruler. Therefore, if we apply De Gaull’s definition to the society’s statement, then we can unequivocally say that they were not including or even thinking about Indigenous Peoples as their equals or even as peoples. If these historians, professional or otherwise, had indeed acquainted themselves with the history and social memory traditions of ‘their country’ they should have felt shame and disgust for the rich histories, cultures, and social memory traditions they had and were continuing to destroy. Based on these facts, the only interpretation available is that only white European-based knowledge about men, written by men was of any historical value. Unfortunately, to some degree, this statement still rings loud and clear in the archival world. For example, every time a collection is accepted containing Indigenous knowledge, and not a single archivist reaches out to the community; they are ultimately stating that the white man knows best and will get it right.

Eurocentric thinking is typical of this point in ‘canadian’ history; in fact, it is still quite common for people who willfully choose to ignore the realities of their environment. However, the reason that it needs emphasizing here is that in many ways this legacy has, and in some cases, continues to affect the nation’s archival repositories. This legacy is witnessable if we examine the statements of the Dominion of Canada’s first archivist, Brymner. Brymner stated, “...in so far as regards the history of British North America, every document relating to it should be found in the Archives Office, even such as at first sight may appear to have with it only a remote
connection.” Had Brymner looked within the confines of his borders, he would have found an abundance of social memory traditions and systems. The fact is he did not, because his of patriarchal Eurocentric thinking and the belief that he did not need anything but similar patriarchal European archival examples to educate himself with blinded him. Brymner even had a European-based social memory tradition within his grasp in kanata and yet did not pursue it and did not fight to dissuade the government from aiding in the destruction of said records.

This form of thinking is visible by the fact that archival institutions did not hold collections of minority groups until sometime in the 1970s.

The records Brymner wished to have collected further demonstrate Eurocentrism. If one looks at records from this period, it becomes quite evident that he was not concerned with “all sources … as may throw light on social, commercial, municipal, as well as purely political history.” Even records that were collected that held, for example, Indigenous knowledge, was not written by an Indigenous person. Instead they were written by a white settler usually for a particular audience and with a specific goal in mind—these were not unbiased. Brymner built kanata’s first archive the only way he knew how from a Eurocentric viewpoint that favored and glorified specific sectors of settler society. This reality does not mean that either the archives today nor its archivists should carry on his legacy.

Whether consciously or not Brymner’s predecessor, Sir Doughty, did carry on Brymner’s legacy. Doughty stated:

> of all national assets, archives are the most precious, they are the gifts of one generation to another, and the extent of our care of them marks the extent of our
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civilization. As a rule, the papers of a given generation are seldom required after their reception and primary use; but when all personal touch with that period has ceased, then these records assume a startling importance, for they replace hands that have vanished and lips that are sealed.50

Based on this statement, it quickly becomes clear that the world Doughty lived in only equated civilization with the European form of archiving. Although not acknowledged, Indigenous memory transfer had been taking place long before first contact; the difference was that Indigenous Peoples were not writing their information down in the same manner as Europeans. Instead, they painted hides, etched cravings into rocks, transferred other aspects of social memory while performing tasks or while sitting around the fire on long, cold winter nights. No matter what one chooses to call it, either way, it is still the preservation of wisdom from one generation to the next, and it is debatable as to which form is more successful.

The measure of this success is perhaps never more accurately measured than by the number of persons from the next generation who seek out said knowledge. Very few people would argue with the fact that the world’s youth are rarely inclined to learn their culture and all that entails, instead they are more so occupied with the here and now. It is not until later in life, after they begin to have their children that they become concerned with traditional knowledge and the history of who they are and what that means. Doughty clearly stated this notion when he said “as a rule, the papers of a given generation are seldom required after their reception and primary use; but when all personal touch with that period has ceased, then these records assume a startling importance, for they replace hands that have vanished and lips that are sealed.”51 The part that is disturbing here is that Doughty had to be aware of the vanishing Indigenous hands and lips already sealed. What did he think was happening with their social memory traditions?
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Social memory, I would argue, is far more successful at reaching those it needs to even before they realize they need it. However, it is also far more vulnerable to destruction by genocidal policies and practices such as those issued by the very government Doughty was so concerned with enshrining in the national archive.

Lamb appears to have been more concerned with the research side of archives, and this is witnessed by the fact that his aggressive program of documentary acquisition and his improved records management systems vastly enhanced the value of the National Archives as a research institution. As a researcher, I tip my hat to Lamb’s accomplishments; however, as an Indigenous archivist, I have to wonder what his efforts might have aided in doing to Indigenous communities. Did his efforts to make LAC a world-renown research center put Indigenous communities further at risk to the invasion of researchers who did not practice reciprocal knowledge transfer? Did the increased organization of records at LAC open a floodgate of academics, who now had access to records that contained Indigenous knowledge, into communities that often felt like they had little to no say in who came into their communities, gained their knowledge, and then left to elevate their academic and maybe even social prestige?

These questions are papers unto themselves, and these questions cannot be answered here with 100% accuracy. However, the fact that these are even questions asked should demonstrate that Lamb failed to consider what impacts his efforts might have for the Indigenous populations. Like so many before and after him, he viewed ownership from strictly a European viewpoint; and that meant no matter how much Indigenous knowledge was contained in the records, it did not matter because European men had ultimately produced them, and therefore aspects such as accuracy, protocols, and impact did not matter.
Thanks, in large part to his last two predecessors Smith was able to leave a legacy where “the archival records increased many times over,” all the while “seeking to mirror all aspects of Canadian society.” The first problem with Smith’s desire is that kanata has long been attempting to create a unified societal image but has continually failed to accomplish this goal.

Some of the reasons this has failed are that there are far too many distinct groups of Peoples in kanata, which has often led to these groups living in either the same area of a city or creating culturally similar towns and villages. By congregating together, these Peoples tend to strengthen their culture, language, and traditions, which makes it incredibly tricky for kanata’s melting pot notion to take effect. Some groups, like Indigenous Peoples, are physically and socially isolated by the government which in turn means that they are either not accepted by mainstream society or they do not feel as if they belong to said society. The point here is that it would have been hard for Smith to ensure LAC represented ‘all’ of ‘canadian’ society unless and of course, he meant the white, European part of society and then this is not a complete nor accurate picture of ‘canadian’ society.

While the majority of LAC leaders worked to advance the repository itself and by extension, the national pride and identity of the nation whose records it holds; one leader directed his attention outwards. Wilson stated in his acceptance speech that he looked “forward to working with the leadership team to ensure that archives throughout the world can achieve their full potential, and to protect their interests locally, nationally and internationally.” Perhaps in a non-colonized country, this is not such a big deal and it may even be welcomed; however, in a colonized nation like kanata one must ask precisely whose interests Wilson was concerned with.

protecting and why? As the head of a federal institution, Wilson was no doubt focussed on
protecting the nation’s administrative records, but most likely, more broadly, he was concerned
with any records that would tell kanata’s story. By this point, the national archive had been
collecting a more diverse set of records; however, we still do not witness any Indigenous
community engagement leaving Indigenous knowledge accessible in an all too vulnerable
manner.

The present-day has done little to rectify this concern, and it is easy to see why LAC
archivists have yet to make any changes that would be seen as reciprocal or profession changing
and that blame, at least in this researcher’s opinion, lies with their boss and the head of LAC,
Guy Berthiaume. During the 2017-2018 academic school year, Guy Berthiaume came to the
University of Manitoba to give a talk after which there was a question and answer period. I asked
Mr. Berthiaume if he thought LAC had made satisfactory progress in implementing the United
Nation’s Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People’s principles, and he replied that it was
simply too hard to accomplish.54 Mr. Berthiaume allowed his true colors to shine through at that
moment. He might as well have said that kanata’s national archive has always been and will
continue to be an institution devoted to colonization, marginalization, and oppression.

Since Eurocentric thought was prevalent in much of kanata before and during the national
archives’ early collecting phases, it should not surprise us that value was only seen in European
knowledge. Whether that knowledge belonged to that white person or not was never even
questioned. It went unquestioned because after all archival theory did and still does state that
ownership belongs to the person who wrote the record, held the record, or donated the record. In
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kanata, this notion is based on ‘canadian’ law and particularly on ‘canadian’ IP law. Ownership does not take into account whose culture, spirituality, or community it concerns because our definition of ownership is one of British interpretation which derives from British common law, something that is gradually changing in some archival repositories but not in enough or fast enough for this archivist. Where the changes are most evident is in the creation of theory such as the Protocols for Native American Archival Materials, the emerging literature concerning their implementation as well as the change from donor to stewardship agreements. However, many problems still exist, and this is more often than not because institutions and archivists choose only to participate in decolonization, indigenization, or reconciliation partially.

**Current Problems of Eurocentrism:**

Often it is difficult to pinpoint one aspect of a situation that if removed, might make a world of difference, but this is not the case with archiving in kanata. The one problem that needs dealing with in the ‘canadian’ context that could have a considerable impact on archival repositories, policies, and practices is Eurocentrism. This chapter has already discussed Eurocentrism’s long history within kanata’s archival field, but it has not discussed the current reality of this way of thinking and viewing the world that currently dominates the archival profession across the nation. We will consider the following examples because they serve very different mandates and yet are big enough to be recognized as leaders should they choose too: LAC and the Archives of Manitoba.

A country’s national archive should stand as an example worth following to the rest of the archival repositories in its nation. LAC has and has had many well educated, critical thinking people within its ranks over the centuries. This reality is demonstrated through news reports such

---

as one from the Ottawa Citizen which stated that “over the years, research, publications, and contributions at conferences have earned LAC archivists’ countless international awards and accolades, and made Canada a world leader in a profession that many consider to be one of democracy’s cornerstones.”

There is no doubt that LAC’s archivists have contributed in meaningful ways to the worldwide theory part of the archival profession, but does one’s contributions truly matter if fellow archivists scrutinizing your repository argue that you have done little to nothing to make the changes your research, publications, and conference contributions speak to? Now do not get me wrong LAC has tried to change, but in my opinion, they have never fully embraced any of the changes they have attempted to implement.

For example, LAC’s Project Naming which it did in collaboration with the Nunavut Sivunusivut, and the Nunavut government starting in 2002. This project could have changed the way archiving, with regards to Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous knowledge, was done in kanata and yet LAC failed to reach the bar. Their webpage for the project highlights the benefits both sides received stating “the initiative not only enriches LAC records for present and future generations but also helps members of communities connect with their past and create intergenerational bridges.”

History tells me that I should be happy it was at least a reciprocating relationship but read that statement, and I doubt you will argue it is an equal relationship. LAC is gaining far more than they are reciprocating. For instance, LAC is gaining invaluable knowledge and knowledge that might have been lost in a generation or two, and it cost them next to nothing to scan the photos and put them on thumb drives or whatever digital form these records took to go north. LAC did not send its archivists north to gather this knowledge and thereby completely
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neglected the relationship-building process, and LAC did not ask whether the communities would like the originals instead only trusted them with digital copies. Again, no relationship building after all trust is part of a relationship. The second part of LAC’s statement says that the project “helps members of communities connect with their past and create intergenerational bridges.”

Sorry, but this statement is similar to patting a child on the head for a job well done after they had cleaned up when in reality they accomplished nothing besides a bigger mess. Was LAC under the impression that the Indigenous Peoples had no connection to their past or the people in it? The Indigenous Peoples had a connection after all they were able to identify people in the photographs and provide narratives to them as well. So, really if the gains of this project were a contest, LAC won hands down because the Indigenous Peoples got the short end of the stick and the big government archive which could not even be bothered to form a real relationship with the communities walked away with an abundance of knowledge.

Another thing to be questioned, at least here, about LAC is whether it is genuinely positive to have one’s profession, especially on colonized land, referred to as “one of democracy’s cornerstones”? According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, democracy has been defined as a “government by the people especially: rule of the majority; a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections; [and finally as] a political unit that has a democratic government.” There is no doubt that this topic could be a book; however, for the sake of this thesis lets be honest and acknowledge that the democratic government that has and continues to rule kanata has never been a government which has cared
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about Indigenous Peoples. Instead, it has continued in very public as well as secretive ways to continue the original policies of colonialism. As an archivist, I am ashamed to think that I belong to a profession others view as holding up a government that practices such policies against the very Peoples from whom it has benefitted economically and territorially. So too should the archivists at LAC who carry on such practices by failing to meet the needs of the Indigenous communities who provide them with precious knowledge ultimately elevating their status as international renown archivists who work at an internationally renowned repository.

These failings are further demonstrated by things like their April 2019 Indigenous Heritage Action Plan which makes it quite clear that LAC chooses to remain willfully ignorant of the realities it claims to champion. The purpose and principle part of any action plan is crucial, that is why it is the first thing written and the first part of the document. In LAC’s action plan their purpose and principle section states they are “committed to playing a significant role in reconciliation between the Government of Canada and First Nations, Inuit and the Métis Nation based on a renewed nation-to-nation or government-to-government relationship, particularly with regard to human rights.”62 This researcher questions how a federal institution can claim they want to play “a significant role in reconciliation” when their action plan arrives four years after the TRC’s Calls to Action were put forth but I suppose better later than never. The second aspect of this statement that verifies that LAC is disconnected is their statement that this reconciliation will be “based on a renewed nation-to-nation or government-to-government relationship.”63 First the ‘canadian’ government has never held a true nation-to-nation relationship with any Indigenous nation therefore there is nothing to renew; furthermore, they are oblivious to what is actually, meant by nation-to-nation relationship because it is not something that their government
or any colonial government truly wants or will let ever happen. Finally, let’s discuss their statement concerning reconciliation and human rights. How in April 2019 can LAC even make such a statement when even at the end of the federal election in October the same year still thousands of First Nations homes and community centers were still under boil water advisories. Is water not a human right? It is this researcher’s opinion that before LAC goes any further they might want to reconsider where the government they intend to support through this process actually stands in regards to things like nation-to-nation relationships, human rights, UNDRIP, which the Trudeau government still claims cannot be implemented, Treaty Rights, and so on because they currently are either blind to their government’s bullshit or wish to uphold its lies, injustices, and so forth.

Neither of these examples demonstrates anything other than Eurocentric, colonial, close-minded ways of thinking and in archiving that translates to ways of doing. So, LAC’s archivists may get up at conferences and talk a good talk, and it is even possible that a few of them are writing decolonizing theory or embracing archival reconciliation. However, none of that matters if when push comes to shove the nation’s federal archival institution, and by extension, its archivists fail to rise to the challenge of leadership by example. We cannot continue to do things only halfway and pat ourselves on the back for a job well done—IT HAS TO STOP!

LAC is not the only archival repository struggling with Eurocentrism. In Manitoba one might, and many have argued that the Archives of Manitoba (AM), which houses both government and private records as well as the Hudson Bay Company Archives (HBCA), struggles to change its Eurocentric way of thinking specifically in regards to meaningful community engagement. That is not to say they haven’t had the opportunities because they have. One of those opportunities came in the form of HBCA’s Names and Knowledge Initiative. This
initiative put images of predominantly Inuk Peoples online and asked the public to identify the people, places, or events. Good idea, except for the fact that this involves no community engagement; like LAC, HBCA was receiving invaluable knowledge without reciprocating to the communities providing the knowledge. As if this was not bad enough HBCA had to be stopped by an Indigenous ally from making complete fools of themselves in 2018 when many of the communities which held the knowledge of the people, places, and events in the photographs were forced south due to natural disasters. Some at the archive thought this would be the opportune time to approach communities and ask for their assistance—SERIOUSLY?

When marginalized communities who have experienced isolation, discrimination, racism, and so much more are forcibly removed from their lands due to wildfires, flooding, or any other disaster it is not the time to engage in knowledge transfer, it is, however, time to build relationships. Instead of HBCA thinking about what they could gain they should have gone out purchased water, toothbrushes, toothpaste, and other necessities of life and given them to the communities. The AM should have asked how to help, the AM should have done almost anything else besides what they thought to do. This privileged, Eurocentric thinking and ways of doing things are partially responsible for the lack of relationship that exists between archives and Indigenous Peoples. Perhaps if HBCA or the province had Indigenous staff, it would aid in breaking down this Eurocentric way of thinking and operating.

Would Indigenous staff truly make a difference in this repository? No, not unless there was a whole lot of us. I do not state this out of ignorance as I am one of the recipients of the 30k entrance award that the AM and NCTR jointly funded. I am grateful for the opportunity, and I learned a lot during my time at the AM. Nonetheless, it does not change the fact that I

experienced the Archives’ choice to remain willfully ignorant instead of taking the necessary steps to implement any of the principles, calls to action or protocols created by Indigenous Peoples or listen to the Indigenous voices around them. For example, while processing Indigenous records, the archive chose not to reach out to the Indigenous community. They asked me to reach out via email and offered to make a telephone call. However, anyone who has ever dealt with Indigenous communities will tell you (and this archive is aware) that these two forms of outreach, although common, accepted, and respectable within settler society, are considered unusual, rejected, and disreputable to and within Indigenous communities. Others, as well as myself, have informed this archive that the security guards alone impede Indigenous Peoples accessing said archive. Their management’s response was, “oh, I never thought about it.” Maybe it is just me, but I do not think you have to be a rocket scientist to see and understand why people in uniforms with authority might hinder the Indigenous populous from accessing the AM.

Furthermore, by failing to change how they deal with Indigenous records and communities, the Archives of Manitoba might as well publicly state that they do not care to work outside a Eurocentric form of archival practice and that they consider Indigenous insight and aid non-beneficial to the archive. In reality, such consultation could only serve to strengthen their representations of the records’ contexts and the repository’s relationships with Aboriginal Peoples, most of whom, if they are aware of the provincial archive, have little or nothing good to say about it. Just as LAC should stand as an example or leader among ‘canadian archives’, so too should the Archives of Manitoba be an example of leadership to Manitoba’s archival repositories. How can the archival community hope to be free of Eurocentric practices if those it should look to for guidance continue to uphold such practices?
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Conclusion:

Eurocentrism is just one of the problems running through archival repositories and academia the nation over. It is arguably the most significant problem, and it must stop for without its demise genuine community engagement cannot and will not take place. Is there anywhere in the world where archival repositories and academic researchers are building reciprocal relationships with Indigenous communities by allowing Indigenous Peoples a say in the management and access of records long since archived? Is there an archival repository that believes in repatriation and working with Indigenous Peoples to provide a holistic perspective? Are there archivists who are doing it, right? Chapter three will attempt to answer these questions.
Chapter Three: Transforming Eurocentrism in the Archives

Introduction:

Transforming any institution is difficult, but it is especially tricky if the institution is part of a colonial power system that has and continues to benefit from oppressive policies and procedures. This reality does not mean it cannot happen; merely that those in charge and working in such institutions have to want and reach for such a change. This chapter will consider how archival repositories have ‘transformed’ or engaged with the topics of decolonization and indigenization. The evaluated archival institutions are from areas where there are significant Indigenous populations, including kanata, the United States, Australia, and Scandinavia. Firstly, this chapter will define decolonization and indigenization; then, it will discuss how the four archival examples have met these standards. Secondly, it will briefly provide some history and explanation of the Jointet-Orentlicher Principles, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, kanata’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Calls to Action, as well as the First Nations Principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession. Finally, it will discuss how the discussed archival repository examples have benefited from these documents, either realistically or hypothetically as I only have evidence that the canadian example has directly used these documents. It is impossible to discuss such topics if one does not understand them or at the very least, understand how the author plans to utilize them. Therefore, let us begin by defining decolonization and indigenization as they will be used in this chapter as well as the rest of this thesis.

Decolonization:

Decolonization is a word that gets thrown around a lot, but what does it mean? According to Linda Tuhiwai Smith, decolonization was previously understood as the legal mechanism of
relinquishing the tools of government; however, it is now perceived as a continuing movement comprised of the political, cultural, linguistic, and cognitive dismantling of colonial control.⁶⁶ What does this mean? Well, simply put decolonization strengthens Indigenous beliefs about life, it brings back culture and its respective ways, it supplants Western perceptions of the historical narrative with Indigenous views of past events, and, last but not least decolonization is about changing the manner in which Indigenous Peoples see themselves and the manner Settler/Immigrant Peoples see Indigenous Peoples.

To this aim, in kanata, decolonization calls for Settler/Immigrant communities to acknowledge and recognize the truth of kanata’s colonial history, acknowledge how such a historical narrative has crippled Indigenous Peoples, and how it maintains the oppression of Indigenous Peoples. Decolonization asks settlers/immigrants, governments, institutions, and organizations to establish the room and backing for Indigenous Peoples to salvage all that has and continues to be stolen from them. How does decolonization translate into action in the archival field?

Firstly, it should be recognized that these examples are not as easily found in archival repositories as one might think; nonetheless, there are examples of decolonization if one looks closely. Our first two examples are from Turtle Island. The first one recognizes the archival work being done at the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation in kanata. The Centre’s archivists work hard to supplant colonial perceptions of the ‘canadian’ narrative by collecting and displaying Indigenous narratives in the forms of textual, audio, and visual records as well as material objects. All of which give voice to the Indigenous history of Turtle Island from Indigenous Peoples’ perspectives, a concept not implemented by any other ‘canadian’ archive.

before the NCTR. Our second example from Turtle Island comes to us via the Plateau Peoples Web Portal. The Plateau Peoples Web Portal integrated Indigenous ways of knowing and doing into their project, ultimately changing how the Indigenous communities they partner with see themselves as well as how Settler/Immigrant Peoples see Indigenous Peoples.67 This statement is not meant to imply that Indigenous Peoples see themselves in a negative light. In fact, I would argue the opposite and claim that no matter what nation we are from, we are typically prouder of our heritage than most citizens from internationally recognized nation-states. Instead, this statement should be understood in the context that for far too long Indigenous Peoples, contrary to their own opinions, only saw themselves portrayed in institutions as uncivilized or exotic. The web portal not only allows the tribes to see themselves portrayed in a manner they recognize and agree with, but it allows them to ensure they are correctly portrayed to the non-Indigenous population.

Turtle Island’s archival community is relatively new to the implementation of decolonization; however, our museums have been involved in the practice for some time. Even this reality lags behind nations where curators and archivists have been working for a long time to decolonize their history and thereby have become good at it. This notion is demonstrated in one of Australia’s current projects entitled, For Country, For Nation, a traveling museum installation, which is an excellent example of decolonization.68 The exhibition “will take visitors through six non-linear thematic sections, which relate military service stories from the perspective of Australian First Nations people. Many of these stories are presented in first-person voice. Developed in collaboration with respected Aboriginal consultant curator Amanda Jane

Reynolds, collaboration occurred with individuals, artists, families, communities and key Elders and Knowledge Holders. Community collaboration was at the heart of this exhibition’s development, with the aim of raising awareness about the valuable and selfless military contributions of Australian First Nations people.” As an Indigenous person, who has served and whose family has a long history of military service, let me say kudos to the team responsible for this narrative as it is truly unique. Typically, the role of Indigenous Peoples in any colonial war effort is downplayed by focusing on a single hero, such as Tommy Prince, or specific aspects, such as Nehiyaw code talkers. Never is the sacrifice of Indigenous Peoples as a whole recounted in a manner in which they are recognized as heroes who fought and died for nations, ideas, and peoples who did not even recognize them as human beings. As previously stated Australia far exceeds Turtle Island when it comes to decolonization at least where archives and museums are concerned. What about places such as Scandinavia which is regularly seen as world leaders in concepts such as equality, education, LGBTQ rights, environmentalism, and so much more.

Scandinavia might be a world leader in many things; however, when it comes to decolonization, they more or less represent the middle ground between what is happening on Turtle Island and in Australia. For instance, September 13, 2007, marked the conclusion of the two-and-a-half year Jojkarkivprojektet, which aimed to recollect, digitise and make accessible to a Sa’mi public all known joik recordings scattered in archives throughout the Nordic peninsula. Sta’lka, the project was taken up as a collaborative effort between the Juoigiid Searvi, A’jtte Museum and Siida Museum, Inari, Finland, with financial support from a number of local and international institutions including the European Union, the Norwegian and Swedish Sa’mi Parliaments, and the Sa’mi Council. Central to the project was the aim of repatriating a Sa’mi musical heritage to today’s Sa’mi community.
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Repatriation might not seem like a huge deal today as many museums engage in the practice. However, archival repatriation is not standard by any means, and the fact that it is happening in Scandinavia should be applauded as I do not believe there is any more significant decolonizing step an archival repository can take. This practice not only brings back culture, but it also supplants the all too common Western perception that Indigenous Peoples do not know how to care for their cultural heirlooms, an idea that could not be farther from the truth.

Archives are changing, even if slowly, and decolonization is just one instance in which this change is visible. The question is whether similar changes are happening where the idea of indigenization is concerned? In order to answer this question, we will examine the same four nations.

**Indigenization:**

According to an online dictionary, indigenization is defined as making indigenous or subject to native influence. This definition is not sufficiently precise for most people. A more accurate definition might state something to the effect that indigenization acknowledges the legitimacy of Indigenous beliefs about life and knowledge, pinpoints favorable circumstances for indigeneity to be articulated or integrates Indigenous ways of knowing and doing. However, what do these statements mean? Well firstly, indigenization necessitates non-Indigenous people to be cognizant of Indigenous worldviews and to appreciate that those worldviews are comparable to alternative notions. Indigenization is about integrating Indigenous knowledge and viewpoints into the education system from primary school to post-secondary institutions, for example. However, it must be recognized that there is not a single Indigenous way of seeing the world; rather, each Indigenous nation will have their views. There may be resemblances, but it is

---

a commonly made inference that we are all the same, and this is not the case. As a result, when
an association, for example, the provincial board in charge of the primary and secondary school
curriculum, pledges to indigenize their educational programs they must confer with the
Indigenous nations on whose land the schools rest for advice on how to integrate those
communities’ Indigenous knowledge and ways into the educational programs.

The Alberta education and training division is an excellent example of this. In 2018 when
the province decided to indigenize their curriculum they reached out to members from various
Indigenous nations across the province in order that a working group might be established to
create an indigenized curriculum that appeased both parties.\(^72\) They then worked closely with the
National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation to develop a website that specifically addressed the
province’s and its Indigenous Peoples’ history of Indian Residential Schools.\(^73\) The Alberta
education and training division’s work is an excellent example of what it takes to indigenize.
After all, indigenization, if done right, requires the cooperation of Indigenous Peoples,
Settler/Immigrant communities, governments, organizations, and institutions.

The Plateau Peoples Web Portal out of the U.S. understands that in order to indigenize
genuine community engagement is necessary. The project has integrated Indigenous ways of
knowing and doing by “[ensuring] that tribal cultural protocols are upheld during all stages of the
project.”\(^74\) This notion is crucial if institutions are ever going to indigenize in any meaningful
manner. Real indigenization requires the building of relationships with tribes, acknowledging
that each tribe has its own set of cultural protocols that should be followed and the critical fact
that one set of cultural protocols cannot and should never be applied to all Indigenous records in
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a blanketing fashion. Furthermore, by integrating such knowledge and forming such relationships the institution through the Plateau Peoples Web Portal is recognizing and acknowledging that standard European based ways of doing things do not always translate to the right way of doing things.

As great as these changes are in both kanata and the U.S., they are nonetheless baby steps when compared to Australian institutions. Australian ‘archivists’ are light years ahead of us here on Turtle Island and in many ways, should be regarded as leaders in doing it right. Shannon Faulkhead is just one Indigenous ‘archivist’ who is changing how archival repositories interact with Indigenous communities. Faulkhead along with a team of talented academics have created the Monash Country Lines Archive (MCLA) which “is a collaborative Monash University project between the Monash Indigenous Centre (MIC), Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Information Technology with a team of Monash researchers, digital animators and post-graduate students from the Monash Indigenous Centre, Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Information Technology. The Monash Country Line Archive demands intellectual engagement in regards to issues associated with how best to construct a living archive that is a decolonised space in which communities are happy to see their material stored. It also provides an exciting place for scholars to work and share knowledge.”75 MCLA has been indigenizing by “[providing] a method of preservation that is immediately accessible for both remote and urban communities, and allows for the cross-generational transfer of knowledge by working with Indigenous communities across Australia to help preserve languages, stories and narratives.”76 Not only has this team recognized the importance of Indigenous beliefs, culture, and their ways of knowing but they have made an

archive far more accessible to Indigenous Peoples than any other archive I know of. By ensuring records are “immediately accessible,” this archive ensures that there is no backlog and that Indigenous communities are not forced to wait ridiculous amounts of time before accessing information that pertains to them. The 3D aspect of this archive not only makes it fun but also enables users who cannot access the physical archive to view the records no matter their format in a way that allows them to engage as if they were physically present something a traditional photograph cannot do. Unlike Australia, who is crushing it by using the digital to decolonize and indigenize in kanata this digital divide is a real issue. Finally, the fact that this archive utilizes animation means that it is far more likely to be used by community members who might find it challenging to engage with a traditional European archive which typically uses academic or archival language both of which are not always easy to engage with and in fact might only serve to complicate the archival experience further.

Once again, Scandinavian sits between the accomplishments of Turtle Island and Australia. The Scandinavian project engaged with the Sa’mi community, in fact, “the project was taken up as a collaborative effort between the Juoigiid Searvi [Joikers’ Association], A´jtte Museum and Siida Museum, Inari, Finland, with financial support from a number of local and international institutions including the European Union, the Norwegian and Swedish Sa´mi Parliaments, and the Sa´mi Council.” Although there was engagement with the Sa´mi, it would have been better if that engagement did not only happen with organizations but also at the community level. The project did; however, pinpoint a favorable circumstance for indigeneity to be articulated which is demonstrated by the fact that the
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project not only had the potential to illuminate moments of a musical past to which Sa’mi might not have had access, but also to inspire musical creativity for a Sa’mi future. In these ways, the project highlighted a wider movement in efforts to digitise musical archives across the globe in response to demands for access by source communities, the increasing sense of responsibility by archivists to these communities, and the growing recognition of the potential of these recordings for [cultural] revival.81

I have since learned that the Sa’mi, academic and general, population does not view this project as successful as the wider academic community which is unfortunate and means that real community engagement must take place with the people rather than the leaders.82 However, the project is still an excellent example of the first attempt at indigenization in an area that is typically further complicated by modern laws.

Now that we have discussed decolonization and indigenization as well as looked at examples, it is time to get into the meatier portion of this chapter. However, before we get into the documents that the majority of scholars and others recognize as groundbreaking where Indigenous rights are concerned; I think it is essential to take a moment and acknowledge the Indigenous leadership that was making many of the same arguments long before it became cool to support Indigenous rights. Perhaps the most famous of these Indigenous leaders was Vine Deloria, who in 1978 created an apparent demand for action concerning Indigenous Peoples “Right To Know” which constituted comprehensive guidelines for areas to concentrate and deal with, particularly concerning “tribal archives, Indigenous information, and traditional knowledge.”83 In virtually every one of the seven features of Deloria’s “to-do list,” the archives and activists dedicated to this grassroots crusade demonstrated the “will to act” and assisted significantly in guaranteeing Indigenous communities had access to essential records,
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inventoried relevant collections, and obtained archival education. Even though vital achievements have happened, essential things still need to take place concerning archival policies and procedures and the backing of Indigenous repositories by colonial archival institutions. The realization of this effort rests upon the cooperation and advancement of these objectives between both Indigenous and non-Indigenous archivists. For only as we work in a united manner toward shared objectives can we guarantee that Deloria’s “Right to Know” survives and continues decolonizing and indigenizing archives.

Several specific documents are typically referenced when decolonizing and indigenizing any institutions and archives are no different. We will be analyzing four documents throughout the rest of this chapter that are repeatedly referenced in the archival community when it comes to Indigenous records. They include The Joinet/Orentlicher Principles, The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, kanata’s Truth and Reconciliation Commissions Calls to Action, and The First Nations Principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession.

**The Joinet/Orentlicher Principles (JOP):**

The first document we will examine is The Joinet/Orentlicher Principles (JOP). JOP is the primary standards ratified by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights correlating to the safeguarding and furtherance of human rights. This safeguarding and furtherance are via some physical action to oppose impunity, and that focuses on various facets in conjunction with those relating to the collection, preservation, and access to records about disputes of human rights abuses and infringements along with the management and preservation of records.

---


springing from truth and reconciliation commissions. JOP aims attention at “Combating Impunity: General Obligations; The Right to Know; The Right to Justice; and The Right to Reparations/Guarantees of Non-Recurrence.” JOP also evaluates for the safeguarding of archives, assesses for promoting access, partnership between repositories, and judicial systems and extrajudicial representatives of inquiry, particular standards correlating to records consisting of names and to explicit measures pertaining to the administration of archival institutions during the restoration to democracy and, hopefully at the same time, peace. Louis Joinet created these principles.

However, in 2004, Diane Orentlicher was selected for the job of revising Louis Joinet’s first set of principles. Noticed in the preface of the amended principles is the fact that recent happenings on the global stage had required the creation of new principles that could be ratified on the national stage. Not many years later, another set of principles arrived on the world stage.

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP):

This set of principles became known as The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples or UNDRIP. UNDRIP is a universal document that was ratified through the United Nations on September 13, 2007, to recognize the rights that “constitute the minimum standards for the survival, dignity, and well-being of the indigenous peoples of the world.” UNDRIP safeguards mutual rights that may not be discussed in other human rights documents.
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that stress personal rights, as well as protects the personal rights of Indigenous Peoples. UNDRIP is the result of twenty-five years of serious discussion between the national representatives belonging to the United Nations and various groups of Indigenous Peoples from around the world.92 The most significant initial aspect to take away from this document is that it was created in consultation with Indigenous Peoples.

UNDRIP’s first article declares that “Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law.”93 UNDRIP continues stating it backs Indigenous Peoples’ rights to take comfort in and involve themselves in their communities and customs, their systems of belief, and their languages, and to create and strengthen their economies and their political systems.

UNDRIP also endorses Indigenous Peoples’ right to sovereignty, which encompasses the right “to freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development.”94 Article 5 of UNDRIP further safeguards their right “to maintain and strengthen their distinct political, legal, economic, social, and cultural institutions.”95 UNDRIP, as previously stated, does not veto the rights of Indigenous Peoples incorporated in their treaties and other documents of concurrence with the distinctive colonial powers currently holding power over them. It “instructs,” for whatever value that holds, these colonizers to honor and reinforce such accords. However, the reality is that the UN can demand all it wants; it has no power to enforce nation-states into implementing or upholding UNDRIP.
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Even though the ratification of UNDRIP was a historical occurrence for Indigenous Peoples around the world and kanata, it is sadly not a legally binding international law nor treaty, Brenda Gunn uses the term “soft law” to refer to UNDRIP.96 Regardless of this reality, the intention and particular passages of UNDRIP can alternatively aid as an aspirational strategy mechanism to guide, support, and inform numerous areas of practice, including the development, administration, and conservancy of archives, libraries, and museums. The thing to remember about UNDRIP is that it is an aspirational document, and the only thing holding us back from implementing it is our imaginations.

More and more people are arguing this. People like Native American attorney, tribal judge, and law professor, Walter Echo-Hawk, who stated that UNDRIP is “planting the seeds of change.”97 Actually, Echo-Hawk explains that even though the Declaration is non-binding, UNDRIP “can provide guidance and persuasive authority to spark social, cultural, and political transformations, which often run deeper into the fabric of a nation than superficial legal change;” concluding that this “social movement must demand progress before substantial changes are made to embrace the UN standards.”98 Although it might appear that Echo-Hawk is explicitly referring to the activists and advocates, most often seen on television, he called on those working in archives, libraries, and museums to work as supporters and put requirements for change into action by making use of distinct UNDRIP articles attributed to cultural heritage.

The central function of UNDRIP, which is the acknowledgment of Indigenous Peoples’ rights and traditional understanding, can direct archival repositories and those who work therein. Because kanata, as a nation-state, has not taken direct action to realize the Declaration, it is thus
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up to each archive, archivist, and archival program to implement their policies and procedures, with community engagement. Therefore, in order to accomplish the particular objectives proposed in Vine Deloria’s article, “The Right to Know,” and Echo-Hawk’s present-day appeal to put the Declaration into action “to heal the historical injuries inherited from the misdeeds of Manifest Destiny,” archivists should combine particular distinguishing objectives into our work with Indigenous communities and archives. These include: reproducing, at the very least, and making available Indigenous records for Indigenous communities; founding Indigenous knowledge transfer hubs at archival institutions; pervading Indigenous ways of knowing into the administration and conservancy of Indigenous collections; expanding capital for Indigenous archives, libraries, and museums; establishing library and information science training for Indigenous representatives; and supplying digitization skills for Indigenous cultural resource centers. Together, these goals provide clear guidance of how to put into action the crucial tenants of the Declaration that demand life-changing actions with the ultimate objective of decolonizing the places where Indigenous records are stored via healing, reconciliation, and restorative justice. However, UNDRIP is not the only document to plead for healing, reconciliation, and restorative justice. kanata’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Calls to Action also speak to these aspects.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Calls to Action

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Calls to Action (TRC’s Calls to Action) were outlined in the Final Report by the Commission and were meant to demonstrate the starting point of a guide to the future goal of reconciliation for kanata to pursue. The 94 Calls to Action encompass an assortment of aspects of life in kanata – including areas such as justice, women,
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youth, health, education, business, and more. The two most important out of these Calls, in my opinion are Calls 69 and 70. These refer to Indigenous Peoples’ “inalienable right to know the truth about what happened and why, with regard to human rights violations committed against them in the residential schools.”

The First Nations Principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession

The First Nations Principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) are a set of guidelines that institute how Indigenous knowledge should be collected, preserved, utilized, or shared in kanata. OCAP is the existing model for how to organize knowledge transfer with Indigenous Peoples, First Nations specifically, in kanata. The abbreviation OCAP stands for ownership, control, access, and possession, and declares that First Nations Peoples in kanata have authority over information accumulation practices in their communities and that they possess and govern the use of such knowledge.

Now that all the definitions and descriptions have been covered it is time to get into how such policies have directly impacted archival repositories. Of the four repositories previously discussed in this chapter, I only have direct evidence that the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation has been directly impacted by these four crucial documents and therefore will only discuss this relationship. Although I speculate that these documents have impacted these other projects without direct evidence, I do not feel comfortable making such connections.

The National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation:

kanata’s National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation (NCTR) is a direct result of the nation’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, itself created by Residential School Survivors,
and works very hard to try and integrate the JOP, UNDRIP, TRC’s Calls to Action, and OCAP at every turn and in various ways. For example, JOP states in principle 1.1., the right to know, that this right “involves an obligation on the part of the State to undertake measures, such as securing archives and other evidence, to preserve collective memory from extinction and so to guard against the development of revisionist arguments.” 104 Although this principle calls on the state to ensure the security of “archives and other evidence,” at least in kanata, the state has done little besides meet the minimum requirements; whereas, the NCTR’s archivists work tirelessly in this area. They do this by ensuring the preservation of not only church and government records but more importantly, the records of Survivors of kanata’s genocidal history. They also aid Indigenous communities wishing to preserve such histories with archival advice, training, as well as financial aid. 105

Some might argue that UNDRIP does not directly correlate to archival repositories; however, I have always argued that you only need to think outside the box, and UNDRIP applies to everything. The NCTR thinks outside the box when it works to implement the articles contained in UNDRIP. For instance, article 11.1 states, “Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This article includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature.” 106 While article 15.1 says, “Indigenous peoples have the right to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories, and aspirations which shall be appropriately reflected in education and public information.” 107 The NCTR works with
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Indigenous Peoples to ensure that the right protocols and cultural ceremonies are taking place, especially where material objects are concerned. This application is not done with a broad paintbrush; instead, the archivists work to figure out precisely which material objects belong to which Indigenous groups and then work to develop a relationship that ensures the correct protocols are applied to the objects. For instance, the center has several material objects from British Columbia and seeing as no one at the center is Indigenous to that particular area we waited for the return of the Survivors Circle in order that an archivist could sit down and present each piece to an elder from the area and ask the critical questions. Of course, I realize this is not perfect, and I would prefer to discuss each piece with its respectful community, but some pieces were donated with little to no metadata making such a task almost impossible at the moment. The NCTR is presently implementing a new database which will aid in rectifying this concern.

The NCTR relies heavily on the TRC’s Calls to Action, specifically call 70, in which the TRC called “upon the federal government to provide funding to the Canadian Association of Archivists to undertake, in collaboration with Aboriginal peoples, a national review of archival policies and best practices…” The NCTR works in collaboration with Indigenous Peoples regarding archival policies and best practices in the sense that we have a Survivors Circle we may ask for guidance. As archivists, we have also made changes we thought would benefit Indigenous Peoples such as our donation agreement. The Centre’s donation agreement is not traditional, and donors can choose to retain copyright, access, and at all times they retain ownership—we are merely the protectors for as long as the donor wishes us to be.
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concept is a considerable change in archival policy and practice, and one I am proud to be part of. This step, unlike standard European based archival policies and practices, keeps ownership of knowledge with the peoples who own it and makes the archivists responsible to the Indigenous population as we should be since our profession has long been in the business of oppressing them.

The NCTR also attempts to implement OCAP wherever possible. For example, when it comes to researchers requesting records, it is not as quickly done as at any other archive. At the center, a researcher must complete a document which contains several specific questions such as whether they have contacted community or not prior to their application going to a board which will then decide if access should be granted. However, if a community or donor has explicitly stated that researchers may not have access to a specific record, then those are the wishes that will be followed.112 This process is not perfect and far from uncomplicated; however, it is a step in the right direction, and hopefully, it keeps moving forward and more and more OCAP principles are put into place.

Conclusion:

Change is never easy no matter on what level it takes place but change often brings enormous amounts of good with it; therefore, why should change in archival policy and procedures be any different. This chapter defined and explained decolonization, indigenization, the Joinet-Orentlicher Principles, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, kanata’s Truth and Reconciliation Commissions Calls to Action, and the First Nations Principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession. With the aid of these definitions and explanations, I genuinely hope that I was able to demonstrate via the four repository examples that change in any archival repository is possible if only archivists and their managers would
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attempt the scary and uneasy first step. Although the four examples demonstrate that success is possible and quite beneficial even if an archival institution made a change to decolonize, indigenize, or implement any of the recommendations in any of the four documents and their first attempt fail, however unlikely, the worst that could happen is that they would have to go back to the drawing board. As centers that safeguard knowledge, we cannot afford to sit by any longer and do nothing we must adapt and overcome our colonial past and its practices. What are the consequences of not changing? Are the impacts possibly as devastating as I hypothesize?
Chapter Four: The Gary Butikofer Papers

Introduction:

There are many instances where kanata lags behind many other first world countries. For example, kanata has yet to recognize the benefit of the four-day workweek or break its elementary and high schools free of their industrial age system, and so on. These lags are unfortunate and even sad, but the fact that kanata has failed to implement them has not had colossal community impacts. However, one area kanata does lag behind in, and that does need immediate addressing, because it has had and continues to have devastating and dangerous community impacts, concerns the areas of archival policy and practice. The reasons behind this are many and include that ‘canadian’ archival policy has changed little since its creation, it remains hugely colonial in structure, interpretation, and meaning but most importantly it needs to change because the ‘canadian’ archival world is lying to themselves, their clients, and the world by continuing to uphold the colonial practices, views, and beliefs that benefit, like all colonial structures, do, one part of the state’s population while suppressing and oppressing the lands fastest-growing population—Indigenous Peoples.113

The fact that archival policies and practices are still colonial is interesting since almost every major colonial institution, in kanata, has or is preaching reconciliation, indigenization, or decolonization and many have been since as early as 2012. Curriculum writers have been busy re-writing the provinces’ curriculums, universities have implemented various policies, such as mandatory entrance courses on Indigenous subject matter, and cultural repositories have been changing the stories they tell the public.114 Even amongst all this change, whether it be

international, national, or local, many ‘canadian’ archival institutions have still failed to reach the bar. Many are not even reaching for the bar, ensuring that the gap between the respect they give non-Indigenous records compared to Indigenous records remains noticeable to those of us that know where to look.

So, where does one need to look to be able to see this injustice? Well, let us explore this via an illustration. Let us assume that I have a relationship with you. This relationship allows me unrestricted access to even the most intimate moments of your life. For example, these might include the fifteen quiet minutes between a couple just before or after they are married, the birth of a child, or perhaps some religious ceremony not open to the public. Now imagine that for the next thirty years, I use this exclusive access to keep a detailed journal about everything and anything I deem essential after which I move away, and we never speak again. During this time apart, I decided to donate copies of those journals to a repository. By now the question you should be asking yourself is how one person can legally write about another and archive it for future generations without so much as a letter of notice to the ‘subject?’ If you this question has not crossed your mind, well then, we have more significant problems to discuss. If, however, you are asking yourself this vital question well then, a straightforward word is all that is required to answer your question, and that word is ownership. In archiving, we typically define ownership as the state, relation, or fact of being a person who holds or has mastery over something. Most likely, you have been appalled by the notion described in this paragraph, or you should be. However, did it ever occur to you that this same practice has and continues to happen to Indigenous Peoples and archivists have and continue to be complacent in this practice whether

they chose to admit or not. The Gary Butikofer collection at the Centre for Rupert’s Land Studies at the University of Winnipeg is an excellent example of this reality. However, before we can discuss the problems with this collection and its care, we need to understand how they came about and who wrote them.

The man behind the act of pen to paper:

Let us begin by getting to know the man responsible for putting pen to paper and creating the physical collection, Mr. Gary Butikofer. Mr. Butikofer is a Mennonite man who served as a Mennonite missionary “with the Northern Light Gospel Mission based in Red Lake, Ontario.”

However, Mr. Butikofer has the soul of a traveler and according to Dr. Jennifer Brown, between the years 1970-1990, he “spent considerable time visiting the communities of Pikangikum, Pauingassi, and Little Grand Rapids.” This fact is significant because the distance is no small feat; Red Lake is one-hundred kilometers southeast of Pikangikum which is one-hundred and one kilometers southeast of Little Grand Rapids and one-hundred and three kilometers southeast of Pauingassi. These distances might seem insignificant today; however, consider the fact that these communities were only fly-in or ice road accessible during Mr. Butikofer’s time and remain so even today.
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Mr. Butikofer was a dedicated missionary to travel such distances by such expensive and dangerous means. However, it is not the only area where he demonstrated this sort of dedication. He also did so in his ability to learn Anishinaabemowin, the general term for the three Anishinaabe dialects, as well as through his opinions about missionaries learning the language, which translated into teachings, on the subject for those who would read his writings. Mr. Butikofer not only learned the local language he also believed that it was vital that he and others do so. He believed it so necessary he stated that “the missionary who is satisfied with interpreters, or who learns either just a smattering of the language or a selected vocabulary which he feels is important, is in for being misunderstood.” Mr. Butikofer was not the ‘typical’ missionary so often read about by historians and other academics. To the contrary, unlike many missionaries before and after him, Mr. Butikofer believed that information “important in Indian thought ought to be considered important” by the missionaries too. This thinking was revolutionary for his day and, in many ways, still is. Many in Mr. Butikofer’s position would have only tried to ‘kill’ these sorts of notions held by Indigenous Peoples. Mr. Butikofer continues such ideas throughout his writing, and it quickly becomes apparent that he does not carry the same views as many of his missionary counterparts. He states that “it is unfortunate that the rank and file of missionaries who acquaint themselves in some degree with an aboriginal tongue seem to aim for a vocabulary that will enable them to preach right away, rather than striving for insight into native thought.” It is unfortunate that more missionaries, particularly the first ones, did not have Mr. Butikofer’s sense; perhaps it would have made a world of difference in the experiences of both groups, and maybe something positive could have developed rather than the, all too often, negative experiences that did occur.
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Mr. Butikofer, like so many of his missionary colleagues, was also a teacher and according to Dr. Brown “for most of those years he taught school in Poplar Hill, Ontario.” Although not formally trained as an educator Mr. Butikofer’s writings do demonstrate his love of learning as well as his heart and passion for history and cultural anthropology. It is most likely that this passion is at least partially responsible for his writings since the enormous undertaking of writing three massive and thorough journals could only have taken place as a project of passion rather than one of necessity.

However, all the passion in the world is of no use if one cannot understand the words spoken. It is here that Mr. Butikofer’s position as an educator most likely aided him in his research via his relationships with his students. The dependence Mr. Butikofer had on his teacher-student relations is demonstrated in the oral interviews he conducted while writing the first two of his three journals. Although Mr. Butikofer was reasonably fluent in Anishinaabemowin, he nonetheless must have recognized the limits of his abilities as he conducted most of his interviews with the use of translators. These translators were often the teenagers within the communities as most of the communities were only beginning to learn English. Just in case there is any doubt as to this statement remember that until sometime in the 1970s these communities were still living a semi-nomadic life. Earning the majority of their income from the trap line. Even today their Anishinaabemowin form is older and higher than their relatives to the south. However, we must acknowledge that even with his fluency and the aid of interpreters, certain words and concepts in English cannot be translated into any
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Indigenous languages. Because of this, there is a reasonably good chance that there were times when each party truly believed they understood the context of the conversation and were not actually on the same page. For example, most European languages have specific titles to define a person’s relationship to his family and ultimately trace his lineage. However, in a lot of Indigenous languages, such titles do not exist, and even when they do it often does not coincide with European thought, family structure, or language. To illustrate, in Nehiyaw culture, a woman’s children will address her and her sister as mother and vice versa where her sister’s children are concerned. The children will recognize themselves as brothers and sisters rather than cousins. Such differences could have led to miscommunications, which in turn could have led to the recording of misinformation unintentionally.

**How the records Arrived at the Centre for Rupert Land Studies:**

So far, we know how the Butikofer collection was written and why, but we do not know how a copy of the collection ended up in Winnipeg? Well, first of all, it was not planned nor expected. Secondly, it was all because of the passion of two researchers, namely Dr. Jennifer Brown and Dr. Maureen Matthews, had and continue to have for the Anishinaabe communities residing along the Berens river system. So, let me tell you the story.

At the time, Dr.’s Brown and Matthews were in the process of making a radio documentary for CBC entitled, “Fairwind’s Drum” which also aired on community radio stations. In the process of creating this documentary, their research led them to look through some of Dr. Alfred Irving Hallowell’s photo albums, currently housed at the American Philosophical Society. While viewing the photo albums, it became known that these albums had been loaned to a Mr. Gary Butikofer and there was a letter describing how Mr. Butikofer
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knew the people in the photographs and his interest in the albums. With their interest piqued Dr. Brown managed to contact Mr. Butikofer and after some time asked if she and Dr. Matthews could pay him a visit which they eventually did. During this visit and through many hours of conversation, Mr. Butikofer revealed that he had these extensive notes regarding his missionary time in the Little North. Realizing they had stumbled onto something truly unique Dr.’s Brown and Matthews asked Mr. Butikofer if they could copy all 1200 pages at the closest copying store. Mr. Butikofer agreed and was happy to have them copied seeing as both researchers had told him they were returning to Poplar Hill and Pauingassi soon.

Soon after making copies of the records, both Dr. Brown and Dr. Matthews returned north of the border to Winnipeg. The records were housed at the Centre for Rupert’s Land Studies at the University of Winnipeg, presumably because at this time Dr. Brown was the director of the Centre. Next, a team was formed to transcribe said records. The transcribed version remains at the Centre under the care of the current director of the centre, Dr. Roland Bohr.

The problems with where the records are:

It should come as no surprise that not all archival repositories are equal. Some are extremely well established, and some are relatively new. Some receive regular funding from government entities, and some rely solely on grant money. Some are run by archivists, who hold professional degrees; while others rely solely on the passion of volunteers, who know little to nothing about the practice and policies of professional archiving.
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Moreover, then there are repositories like the Centre for Rupert Land Studies at the University of Winnipeg. This center, according to its website,

facilitates scholarly research and publishing concerning the human history of the Hudson Bay watershed, known in the period from 1670-1870 as Rupert’s Land. The Centre for Rupert’s Land Studies also functions as a clearinghouse to assist researchers with similar interests to be in touch with each other, to communicate about their research projects and findings, and to assist researchers from out of town by putting them in touch with qualified local assistants or by providing a congenial meeting spot when visiting Winnipeg. The center also hosts biennial colloquiums, publishes The Rupert’s Land Newsletter, promotes awareness of the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives in Winnipeg, and co-publishes, with McGill-Queen’s University Press, a series of documentary volumes on aspects of the history of Rupert’s Land.133

So, even by its definition, the center is not an archival repository, library, museum, or any other sort of cultural repository. However, it does hold the Gary Butikofer collection as well as many rare books. The fact that the center does not recognize itself as a cultural repository lends itself to being just one of the problems with them safeguarding the Garry Butikofer collection. The problem is that the center does not practice many of the necessary policies and practices that ensure the proper and long term preservation of records.

Perhaps the fact that the center does not recognize itself as a cultural repository is at least one of the reasons that the center’s last two directors, Dr. Jennifer Brown and Dr. Roland Bohr, are not trained archivists but rather Dr. Brown is an anthropologist, and Dr. Bohr is a historian. Both historians and anthropologists utilize archives in their research and thereby have a working knowledge of some basic archival repository practices and policies. However, their academic training does not provide them with the necessary skills and knowledge required to process, preserve, and make accessible records properly. Begging the question of how long the Gary Butikofer collection will survive.

Because the center’s staff are not archivally trained, there is no donor contract for the Gary Butikofer collection. Instead, researchers are required to contact Mr. Butikofer and receive permission from him directly. This situation, at times, has been difficult due to his age, medical conditions, and the fact that he does not live in the country. A donor contract would, at the very least, give the center some say in the preservation and use of the records. The other problem the center faces without a donor contract is what will happen when Mr. Butikofer eventually passes away. In the center’s current predicament, it does not hold ownership or even stewardship over the Gary Butikofer collection.

The problems no matter where the records are held:

There have always been problems with the Butikofer collection, but those problems are relatively easy to rectify. Whereas the issues discussed in the following four paragraphs will require traits such as humility and an acknowledgment of arrogance on the part of those in charge of preserving the collection, traits not easily demonstrated in the academic world.

In this researcher’s opinion, the first aspect in need of rectifying is the fact that Mr. Butikofer is currently holding the originals in the United States. It should come as no surprise that this fact creates a problem of jurisdiction because no two countries have the same laws. This reality means that archival concepts such as ownership, access, privacy, and even copyright might be significantly different. Because of this and the fact that the communities which Mr. Butikofer wrote about are physically located within the artificial borders of Kanata, those responsible for the preservation of such records should ensure the acquisition of not only the records but anything else belonging to these communities that might end up in a U.S. archive or museum after Mr. Butikofer’s death or at the very least arrange that such items will be

transferred to a ‘canadian’ cultural institution upon his death and not a U.S. one. The point here is that the original records should be in a ‘canadian’ institution.

The next problem with this collection that needs rectifying is the fact that there is at least one photocopy version floating around somewhere and as far as this researcher is aware that set is still with Dr. Brown. As previously mentioned when Dr. Brown and Dr. Matthews were given access to this collection by Mr. Butikofer they took the originals and went to a copying store where they copied the originals, after which they returned the originals to Mr. Butikofer and the copied version accompanied them back across the ‘canadian’ border. However, after Dr. Brown’s retirement in 2011 it is most likely that these copies followed her back across the border to the United States where she currently resides, seeing as there is no mention of them in the scope and content of her collection currently held at the University of Manitoba. Typically this step is not taken when gathering records. However, because they are possibly in the U.S. means that the concerns of the previous paragraph apply to this version as well, and in order to ensure the safety of the knowledge and more importantly the communities from which it came they need to be returned sooner rather than later.

Community unaware of the collection’s existence:

The third problem with this collection is that to this researcher’s knowledge, and via my conversations with Dr. Bohr, the communities mentioned in the Butikofer collection are unaware of the collection’s existence. Hold on! These communities would have seen him writing, would not have they? They must know the records exist! There is no doubt that the peoples written

about in the Butikofer collection knew he was writing; that they would have seen with their own eyes. This aspect is not the issue.

The concern is that there is no evidence to suggest that Mr. Butikofer ever discussed placing his journals in any repository with the peoples. Dr. Matthews suggests that although Mr. Butikofer was aware of the journals’ value, he had never given any real thought to their preservation until she and Dr. Brown asked to photocopy them and store them at the Centre for Rupert’s Land Studies. Moreover, even if Mr. Butikofer had attempted to discuss the idea of placing the journals in a repository while he still resided in the Little North, it would have been impossible for him to articulate what an archival repository is and does properly. He could not have communicated this notion as there is no word in any Indigenous language, to my knowledge, for archive, archiving, or archival. Not to mention the fact these communities were only beginning to learn English and relying on teenagers as translators if necessary.

For the reasons mentioned above, it is safe to assume that even though the communities knew Mr. Butikofer was writing in his journals during his time among them, they nonetheless probably do not know what was written. They are most likely also ignorant of the fact that three copies, as far as this researcher is aware, are currently located in three different places, under the care of three different persons, as well as in two different nation-states. Ultimately, this lack of awareness leaves the community vulnerable to misinformed published research material and further revokes any control or ownership they may have over their knowledge.

**No community engagement:**

The communities lack of awareness leads to a more significant and far more concerning situation. That problem is that there has been no community engagement since the arrival of the record at the Centre for Rupert’s Land Studies. This situation is extremely problematic for
several reasons, 1) because the University of Winnipeg which houses the Centre, has been the institutional leader in Manitoba when it comes to indigenizing and decolonizing. 2) because the knowledge contained in the records is not Mr. Butikofer’s knowledge but rather that of the communities he visited. 3) it leaves the communities vulnerable to those who would utilize such knowledge without confirming its accuracy. 4) It continues to ensure that ownership is viewed in a strictly colonial manner.

The fact that there has been absolutely no community engagement combined with the overwhelmingly public knowledge that the University of Winnipeg prides itself on being Manitoba’s post-secondary institutional leader in decolonization and indigenization, unfortunately, sets the example, although not purposely, that community engagement is a not a necessary part of decolonization nor indigenization, and nothing could be farther from the truth. If the University of Winnipeg truly wishes to set a provincial or national example of how to do it right; it needs to acknowledge that it has a collection in its midst that it has failed to protect both physically and culturally. After which it needs to ensure that it reaches out to the proper communities to ensure that not only are they aware of the collection’s existence but that said communities are consulted and left to make the necessary decisions around what should happen with the knowledge contained in the records.

The reason that community consultation is so essential where these records are concerned is that the majority of the knowledge contained within the records does not belong to Mr. Butikofer. Yes, he owns the paper, the ink, the words, and the illustrations but the knowledge he utilized to create the physical collection is not his to claim instead it is the knowledge of the Anishinaabe Peoples, both present and past, that he lived and traveled among. If we recognize this elementary fact, it should immediately become clear that by giving Mr. Butikofer sole credit
for the collection’s creation and sole authority in deciding access we are willingly carrying on the practice of colonization and cultural genocide.

If you find the accusation of carrying on colonization and cultural genocide harsh consider the fact that this collection has been used by various researchers, none of whom have been forced to travel to the Little North to build a reciprocating relationship with one or all of these communities. Researchers have long used archival records in this manner, and archivists have long failed to advocate on behalf of marginalized groups or forced researchers to build such a relationship. If you think it is not the job of archivists to force such a relationship, I challenge you to think of archival policy where archivists do ‘force’ researchers to but apply for access to the proper governing body when access and privacy regulations have been set in place for the protection of individuals. For example, in Manitoba, a researcher wishing to gain access to the information covered under access and privacy regulations must first apply, which means filling out an application form and filing it. However, they may also be required to “provide suitable identification” should “the public body” consider the “verification of the applicant’s identity or that of a third party necessary in order to respond to the application.” Furthermore, some fees may or may not have to be paid.137 Considering that archivists already uphold rules regarding access and privacy, it should not be challenging to implement protocols surrounding records containing Indigenous knowledge such as those that require researchers to engage in community engagement. We need to view them as we do governmental departments and view them as having the same authority over the knowledge they are responsible for. The main point is that requiring researchers to forge community relationships protects communities from being written

about without the recorded knowledge first being confirmed or denied by the community themselves.

Perhaps the most crucial thing community engagement forces us to do is acknowledge that the knowledge contained in many collections does not belong to the author, but rather it belongs to Indigenous Peoples. If we acknowledge that the information contained within belongs to Indigenous Peoples than it is not difficult to surmise that they also hold ownership over such knowledge. By acknowledging that Indigenous Peoples hold ownership over the knowledge contained within colonial records we put the power of control back into communities that for far too long have been studied like animals in a cage, receiving little to no acknowledgment for their contributions to history, literature, art, science, and so much more.

**Conclusion:**

Archival policy and practice in kanata needs to change where Indigenous records and Indigenous knowledge contained in colonial records are concerned, and the Garry Butikofer collection demonstrates this. There are undoubtedly issues with the Garry Butikofer collection as well as other collections. However, if we sincerely wish to be part of decolonization, indigenization, and reconciliation; then we must recognize that we already possess the necessary skills, knowledge, and means to be the change we wish to see in the world and acknowledge that the only thing stopping us is ourselves. The next time you are processing a collection that contains Indigenous knowledge or was created by an Indigenous organization, community, or person—STOP—think about how you can develop community engagement and then go and do it! If you do not know where to start or want to talk, please call or email me. I am always happy to help.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

So, to recap: this thesis has argued that Eurocentric thinking is still alive in well in archival repositories across kanata. It has also argued that the archivists who refuse or idly sit by and allow such thinking to permeate our policies and practices are continuing to uphold oppression thereby making themselves the oppressors of Indigenous knowledge and by extension Indigenous Peoples. Chapter two provided a history of archiving in kanata and demonstrated Eurocentric thinking through predominantly the voices of archival leaders. It also analyzed these voices and ways of thinking through a decolonizing lens proving that those in charge of the national archive have continued to support their government’s regimes of genocide, segregation, oppression, and assimilation. Archivists have continued these practices by failing to make any serious change to archival policy and practice that would benefit anyone other than those deemed privileged enough. Finally, chapter two provided modern-day examples that demonstrated that the kanata archival profession continues its practices of oppression towards Indigenous Peoples knowledge by highlighting some recent experiences both others, as well as myself, have had.

Chapter three defined the notions of decolonization and indigenization as I understand them and have used them. It then provided international as well as national examples of archival institutions and archivists who have stepped up to the plate, acknowledged that the colonial practices we so strictly adhere to in kanata are oppressive, unfair, and downright wrong and then worked to implement something new. Not only did these examples demonstrate that we can choose to archive in another manner but that it is possible to engage with Indigenous communities in a manner that puts ownership back into the hands of the very Peoples who own the knowledge. These examples further should have demonstrated the advantages that community engagement can bring to an archival institution through accurate metadata as well as
description and context. This chapter went on to provide some historical context to crucial documents meant to impact Indigenous Peoples and their lives. These documents included the Jointed/Orentlicher Principles, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, kanata’s Truth and Reconciliation Commissions Calls to Action, and the First Nations Principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession. Finally, chapter three analyzed the work currently being done at kanata’s National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation. Although I acknowledge and recognize that this work is ongoing and by no means perfect the staff at the Centre are nonetheless trying to make changes that will benefit Indigenous communities by working with Indigenous Peoples and listening to what those voices have to say.

    Last but not least chapter four looked at and analyzed a records collection currently held at the Centre for Rupert’s Land Studies—the Garry Butikofer Papers. I not only looked at how they were created, where they came from, and how they got to the University of Winnipeg; I also analyzed the problems surrounding the collection. Chapter four, and the entire thesis, is littered with ideas of how we might rectify the wrongs I see in the archival field.

    I have to admit that writing this thesis has at times, made me angry, and that has been difficult for me to control. Therefore, I end this thesis with some sentiments that I know many young Indigenous scholars are feeling but not yet strong enough to say. I am not sorry if this piece of writing makes you uncomfortable, upset, hurt, or any other emotion you might feel. Perhaps the words written were harsh at times, and definitely, the mood was frustrated and annoyed but recently I have come to the realization that by sugar coating the realities of the topics in my writing all I am doing is making it easier for non-Indigenous Peoples to swallow and that is not my job. Therefore, I have decided that from here on in a spade is a spade and I will call it as I see it in the hopes that my ugly and hard truth might make headway where
traditional academic papers with their flowery language have failed. So, if I call you an oppressor and if that pisses you off then, by all means, prove me wrong cause I would like nothing better than to withdraw every accusation I ever make.
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