searching for a strengthened national heritage in the face of the growth of fascist ideologies in Europe. The resiliency of Indians in the face of great adversity served as a valuable lesson to an American public still reeling from the Depression and confronted with another world war (Rushing 1992, 217). The displays at the 1939 International and the MoMA exhibition gave native art a legitimacy, positioned it as a significant component of America's distinct national heritage, and revived the demand for antiquities. As Oliver La Farge, an expert in Indian art, said at the time, "The America out of which they [the art works] came is 20,000 years old" (Rushing 1992, 220).

Meanwhile, imitation crafts continued to plague Indian producers. Letters in the IACB records noted that Indians of the Northwest and Alaska faced strong competition from Japanese imitations, and argued for the use of trademarks or of a strict law to protect Native American designs. The IACB responded that sales of imitations could not be prevented under free enterprise.[5] It lacked the power to fine offenders, unable even by 1954 to stop the resumption of the sale of imitations as souvenirs by the National Park Service. In 1958 a national distribution centre or clearing house for products was proposed. The IACB replied that it was difficult to obtain products, commenting that "the only feasible method would be to work out contracts with the traders in various areas making them agents for the co-op market. To attempt to compete with them would be deadly." By 1959 there were complaints by employees about the deterioration of products due to commercialization. With few exceptions, such as the Santa Fe Indian Market, private enterprise continues today to control the marketing of Indian arts and crafts.[6]

For decades the IACB and others placed the perpetuation of traditional methods and products above the welfare of producers. Poverty persists today on Indian reservations where craft production is a substantial portion of residents' annual income (Abeita 2001, 79-80). A large percentage of the billion-dollar sales annually of "Indian" products is fabricated by non-Indians and imported into the United States.

The National Museum of Canada and Incipient Nationalism

At the turn of the nineteenth century, with a population of less than 5.5 million, Canada continued to allow the export of ethnological materials to the United States and Europe. While committed individuals and optimistic groups sought support for the country's heritage, there appeared to be "no consciousness of a Canadian history ... [as the] philosophy of colonialism still hung heavily over Canada" (Key 1973, 119-20). Quebec-born and Oxford-trained ethnologist Marius Barbeau worked at the National Museum of Canada from 1911 to 1948, and was one such committed individual.[7] In accordance with the pattern of British influence in Canada, his publication record was prodigious in both scholarly and popular venues. As "a collector of cultural inventories," Barbeau researched languages, myths, and songs of

various Native groups, with particular emphasis on those on Canada's west coast. He is well known for his long-term studies on Québécois oral and material culture (Flood 2001, 253; Knight 1996, 137-38; Preston 1976, 132).

As with McCord (Willmott, this volume), crucial aspects of Barbeau's colourful and lengthy career intersect with Canada's incipient nationalism, first expressed after the First World War and blossoming mid-century. Barbeau co-curated a ground-breaking exhibition *Canadian West Coast Art – Native and Modern,* initiated in 1927 by the National Gallery in Ottawa, and touring to McGill and the University of Toronto (Cole 1985, 285; Hawker 2001, 40; Nemiroff 1992, 21). Co-curated with Eric Brown, a former art critic from England and then director of the National Gallery, the exhibit was created to advertise the recently nationalized Canadian National Railway. Barbeau arranged for six non-Native painters in 1925 to travel to the Skeena River area to promote what was called the Totem Pole Restoration project, ostensibly undertaken to "protect" the poles in the villages (Cole 1985, 271-77; Francis 1992, 35; Morrison 1991, 94-95). The project was financed with collaboration and support of both the railroad and the National Museum, and was closely tied to tourism promotion (Berlo and Phillips 1998, 198). Tourists travelling by rail through the Skeena River Valley could comfortably view totem poles in their original locations. By 1927, Indian Affairs had vetoed the sale of totem poles adjacent to tourist destinations, but those located in remote regions could be sold to Canadian museums. If these institutions could not afford them, they could be sold abroad. Even Barbeau concurred with the government's position (Cole 1985, 278).

During the tour of *Canadian West Coast Art,* the Toronto *Globe* praised its experimental nature, noting that "history in Canadian art was made tonight ... [the exhibition demonstrates] what a tremendous influence the vanishing civilization of the West Coast Indian is having on the minds of Canadian artists" (Morrison 1991, 71). In the catalogue essay, Barbeau remarked, "This aboriginal art ... is truly Canadian in its inspiration. It has sprung up wholly from the soil and the sea within our national boundaries" (McLoughlin 1999, 87; Townsend-Gault 1993, 94). The Ottawa *Evening Citizen* elaborated on the curators' thesis that "the idea underlying the show was that the artistic work of the western Indian has so much character and life to it, so much which modern artists find inspiring, and so much which is distinctively Canadian and which might well be used to help form the basis of a national art, that the promoters of the exhibition ... through the paintings of modern artists, show the reaction it had on white painters." Barbeau commented that "they do not believe in traditions any longer ... they do not ... believe in themselves ... but nevertheless, their art is the finest inspiration on the American Continent" (Morrison 1991, 64-65, 72).

A *Globe* reviewer noted that "perhaps the white leaders of today can do something to perpetuate the Indians' art, even though done by 'mass

production.'"(Morrison 1991, 71). Eric Brown lamented the disappearance of the arts due to "civilization" but also suggested that remnants could survive as an invaluable mine of decorative design, available to the Canadian artist. Harlan Smith, Barbeau's associate, while supporting the ban on export of totem poles, published a large *Album of Prehistoric Canadian Art,* and urged manufacturers to adopt Native designs (Cole 1985, 271, 285). Brown was convinced that the National Gallery could create the "spiritual cement of a national will" and unify the country (Morrison 1991, 29), while Barbeau promoted multiculturalism at the museum as a model for Canadian cultural identity (Hawker 2001, 55). However, the curators' vision was not shared by bureaucrats and politicians in Ottawa. Despite the recommendations of the lengthy 1932 Miers-Markham Report on the state of Canadian museums, the resources for the role that Brown and Barbeau imagined such institutions could play for the nation's identity were not forthcoming (Key 1973, 164-65).

The Massey-Lévesque Report of 1951 concluded that "Canada would never acquire a museum service worthy of her position as a leading nation until she spends as much on her museums as the leading cities of north-west Europe or the United States" (Key 1973, 141). At that time the NMC was part of the National Parks Service of the Department of Resources and Development, and had an annual budget of less than $180,000. One spokesperson complained that the American Museum of Natural History employed more scientists in its insect and spider division than the total number of employees at the NMC (Flood 2001, 274). Despite these attitudes, Barbeau continued to promote Native and folk arts as exemplars of a Canadian national identity. In 1956 he helped organize the exhibition *National Asset – Native Design,* which was funded by the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association. He advocated for the appropriation of Native designs for "architecture ... furniture ... textiles ... metals, industrial design, fine art and to wherever craftsmanship can add distinction and value to the products of Canada" (Canadian Pulp and Paper Association 1956).

It was not until after 1960 that museums in both the United States and Canada enjoyed unprecedented growth, due to increased tourism (Key 1973, 176). Prime Minister Lester Pearson sought to promote national unity through cultural organizations by bringing together different cultural agencies under the secretary of state. The creation of a National Museum Corporation in 1972 brought the national museums to prominence in an unprecedented way (Grant 1991, 12). The corporation initiated production of its Mercury Series, publishing monographs in five areas: archaeology, ethnology, folk culture, history, and communications. Despite these developments Canada did not have a national-scale social science survey of First Nations conditions until the Hawthorn-Tremblay Report was published in 1966-67 (Hawthorn 1966, 1967; Weaver 1993).This late date is a dramatic contrast to the much earlier survey by Lewis Cass, commissioned in the United States in 1820.