

**WHERE DO WE KEEP OUR PAST? WORKING TOWARDS AN INDIGENOUS
MUSEUM AND PRESERVING NUNAVUT'S ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE**

by

Krista Zawadski

B.A. Hons., Carleton University, 2012

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

(Anthropology)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

October 2016

© Krista Zawadski, 2016

Abstract

In Nunavut at present there exist only a small number of visitor's centres and only one museum, which has rather limited capacities. This means that very few residents of Nunavut have access to a comprehensive museum, especially one that holds Inuit cultural material—unless they travel outside of the territory. There is an opportunity, therefore, to look at how a well-developed Nunavut museum could affect Inuit social well-being by exposing people to their own cultural material as well as how this could affect other social realms such as education and cultural revitalization. Through research on existing cultural centres in Canada and the United States I demonstrate the importance of access to museums for cultural well-being, cultural preservation and revitalization. Employing qualitative research methods in the study of existing cultural centres in Canada I explore the question of what museum and heritage centre models work best for indigenous and isolated communities. This research shows that there is enormous potential for significant positive cultural impacts in Nunavut with the development of a museum to call our own.

Preface

This Master's thesis is an original work based on anthropological fieldwork conducted by the author from August 2014 to January 2015. I am entirely responsible for the research and writing of this thesis. My supervisor, Dr. Susan Rowley, and committee member, Dr. Michael Blake, reviewed several drafts of the thesis and provided content and editorial suggestions.

Ethics approval obtained from: the University of British Columbia Behavioural Research Ethics Board, certificate number H14-00266; the Nunavut Research Institute, scientific research license 03 015 14N-A; and, the Aurora Research Institute, scientific research license no. 15541.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Preface	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	v
List of Abbreviations	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Dedication	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Field Research Methodology	9
Chapter 3: Background Information and Context	12
Chapter 4: Indigenous Museums	24
4.1 Arctic Museum and Heritage Centre Models	27
4.1.1 Avataq Cultural Institute	28
4.1.2 Kitikmeot Heritage Society	30
4.1.3 The Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre.....	33
4.2 Similarities and Differences: ACI, KHS and PWNHC	35
Chapter 5: Knowledge Interpretation	38
Chapter 6: Conclusion	45
Bibliography	52
Appendices	57
Appendix A Heritage Centres, Visitor Centres and Museums in Nunavut	57
Appendix B Interview Guides in English and Inuktitut	60

List of Tables

Table 1: Heritage Centres, Visitor Centres and Museums in Nunavut	58
---	----

List of Abbreviations

ACI: Avataq Cultural Institute

CMH: Canadian Museum of History

CMN: Canadian Museum of Nature

GN: Government of Nunavut

GNWT: Government of the Northwest Territories

IHT: Inuit Heritage Trust

KHS: Kitikmeot Heritage Society

KRG: Kativik Regional Government

NAC: Nunavut Arctic College

NAGPRA: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

NHC: Nunavut Heritage Centre

NLCA: Nunavut Land Claims Agreement

NTI: Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.

PWNHC: Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre

QC: Qikiqtaaluk Corporation

SI: Smithsonian Institution

Acknowledgements

I offer my gratitude to the faculty, staff and fellow students at the University of British Columbia Department of Anthropology, who have inspired me to work hard and set my expectations high.

A thank you is due to my graduate committee members, including Michael Blake. A special thank you to my thesis advisor, Susan Rowley, for her guidance, support and encouragement to pursue graduate studies.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Joseph Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarship Program), Financial Assistance for Nunavut Students (Government of Nunavut), Northern Scientific Training Program (Canadian Polar Commission), Inuit Heritage Trust (Nunavut Heritage Leadership Program), Indspire (Building Brighter Futures: Bursaries and Scholarship Award), Aboriginal Graduate Fellowship (University of British Columbia), and Royal Bank of Canada (Aboriginal Student Award).

I also extend gratitude to all participants in my research, including college students, elders, friends, museum professionals and colleagues. And, a very special thank you to my father and mother for their endless support, guidance and perspectives. They have taught me that education is one of the most important goals one can pursue. A final thank you to my husband, Ezra, for his boundless support and motivation.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my children, Sukuluk and Mitiarjuk. Your unconditional love and joy gave me the motivation to complete this work. I hope my accomplishment will provide inspiration for you to pursue your own goals.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Michael Ames makes a strong statement when he writes, “museums are cannibalistic in appropriating other peoples’ material for their own study and interpretation, and they confine their representation to glass box display cases. There is a glass box for everyone” (Ames 1992, 3). This begs the question: what happens when museums are created and operated by one’s own culture? Further, what if we created – and interpreted – our own glass boxes? To answer that Christina Kreps points out, “while indigenous [sic] curatorial practices are unique cultural expressions that deserve documentation and preservation in their own right, they can also be heuristic, awakening us to some of the assumptions and values embedded in our own practices” (Kreps 1998, 3). Indeed, my research shows that if we create our own glass boxes a heuristic awakening occurs for the people involved in the interpretation of cultural material. My argument supporting Inuit’s access to the Nunavut collection and the creation of the Nunavut Heritage Centre (NHC) focuses on the complementary relationship between tangible and intangible heritage and access to both of these as central and significant to the cultural revitalization efforts by Inuit in Nunavut.

Museums and heritage centres have the ability to provide and promote opportunities of experiential activities that enable people to learn something of themselves, especially within Indigenous cultures. The prospect of heuristic activities through museums and heritage centres is of particular importance in Nunavut because there is no territorial museum, and Nunavut’s cultural heritage collections are scattered outside the territory. Inuit in Nunavut have little opportunity to make use of collections to explore, learn about or display our culture as we see fit. As an Inuk from Nunavut, I am particularly cognizant of the lack of opportunity to visit museum facilities, belongings¹ and collections. As my research demonstrates, strengthening connections

to collections validates the importance of establishing a territorial museum in Nunavut.

Currently, almost all ethnographic and archaeological collections are stored outside of Nunavut, yet Article 33 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA) calls for the urgent creation of such a facility (Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated 1993). This has not come to fruition thus far. Repeatedly the Government of Nunavut (GN) has been chastised by Nunavummiut and members of the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut for not fulfilling its promiseⁱⁱ to create the NHC, especially when there has been a push from Indigenous and Northern Affairs for the GN to undertake this project (see Section 4.3.1. Indigenous and Northern Affairs 2004). Furthermore, the Prince of Wales Heritage Centre (PWNHC) is eager to repatriate Nunavut's artifacts to Nunavut to free up space within its own facility (CBC News, "Priceless Inuit Artifacts Still in NWT"), and Nunavut governing bodies are also eager to repatriate the artifacts (Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, "Inuit Heritage Trust Disappointed").

If given the option to develop and create a museum that differs from a historically standard museum of display and storage, what would Inuit choose? Taking into consideration the time that has passed since the early 2000s when the original feasibility study was written for the proposed Nunavut Heritage Centre (NHC), is the recommended standard provincial/territorial museumⁱⁱⁱ the right option? What do Inuit want out of a territorial museum in Nunavut, and is an Indigenous museum approach, which has been developed by other Indigenous peoples, better suited for Nunavut? In this thesis, I demonstrate the need for discussion with Inuit in Nunavut about the type of museum model, including different options for access to museum collections as well as approaches to how collections are used, that best suits Inuit needs and desires in Nunavut today. Further, I argue for transparency about the decisions made by Nunavut's leaders regarding our cultural heritage.

Museums and heritage centres are intrinsically connected to the discipline of anthropology and, accordingly, have a history that correlates with the discipline (Ames 1992; Clifford 1988; Kreps 2003). Museums developed out of the miscellaneous collections of objects, essentially as *cabinets of curiosities*, and “thus from the beginning the museum assumed the character of a repository” (Collier and Tschopik 1954, 768). While collecting cultural material, anthropologists (and collectors) were also gathering knowledge about the cultures from which they were collecting, entwining anthropology and museums in a relationship that still persists today.

Like anthropology, museums and museology have considerably changed since their origins. Contestation, especially among Indigenous peoples, still surrounds museums and museum practices of display, curation and preservation. However, museology has been striving to move away from *othering* and encasing cultures in glass boxes. Museums and their staff^v have had the opportunity to share knowledge, build capacity amongst Indigenous peoples, co-manage collections and co-curate exhibitions with Indigenous peoples in cultural revival efforts and movements. Michael Ames (1999) discusses how the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia has taken steps towards changing its practices of curation and conservation to better reflect the wishes of source communities. Other museums have also made efforts to move away from museums’ colonial history, and Indigenous communities are increasingly creating their own museums and heritage centres. Two early examples of these, which I visited and may provide insight for how Inuit and *Nunavummiut* - the people of Nunavut^v – might want to develop their museum, include the U'mista Cultural Society in Alert Bay, BC and the Wanuskewin Heritage Park near Saskatoon, SK. Indigenous peoples around the world have used museums and museum collections to promote cultural awareness and sensitivity

within museums and to learn or re-learn cultural knowledge that had been lost or forgotten.

Museums and heritage centres are socially and politically constructed institutions that have the ability to initiate, practice and influence social change among cultures and sub-cultures, especially through heuristic opportunities and activities (Clifford 1997; Kaplan 1996; Lonetree 2012; Phillips 2011). Karen Wright Fraser, a Gwich'in woman from Inuvik, NT, had no prior knowledge of traditional Gwich'in clothing until she saw a traditional Gwich'in garment in a book (Wright Fraser 2001, 99). She took it upon herself to travel to the Canadian Museum of History (CMH) in Gatineau, QC to look at and study Gwich'in garments and learn how to sew them. She took elders with her who were able to recollect memories and stories from their culture that had not been forgotten or lost but had been tucked away in the deep recesses of their memory (Wright Fraser 2001, 100). In a similar instance in 2009, a delegation of twenty-one people from the Haida Nation traveled to the Pitt Rivers Museum and British Museum in the United Kingdom to study Haida belongings. One participant shared his experience:

Having access to ancient works of art, most of which I have never even seen in photos opened up my eyes to the breadth and quality of work that would have been in our villages. Having the opportunity to study the masterful carvings and paintings of our ancestors gave me an insight into our art that I could never have gotten from studying pictures. (Jaalen Edenshaw, quoted in Krmpotich and Peers 2013, 171)

These experiences of visiting and working with museum collections were powerful for Wright Fraser (2001) and the Haida Nation delegation (Krmpotich and Peers 2013) as they regained knowledge and revitalized their heritage, as well as built new knowledge about art techniques that had been used in the past. These are just two examples of the transformation that can occur when interacting with one's own cultural material and heritage.

Today, as source communities demand change in museums and museologists (Clavir 1996, 100), many museums are moving away from places of storage, conservation and display. They are becoming places where Indigenous people are active players in collaborative research,

Indigenous curation and public ethical discussion and debate. Furthermore, museums today are no longer solely object-centered; instead, they actively make efforts to preserve living cultures and intangible heritage (Kreps 2008, 202). Increasingly, this work is carried out both with and by Indigenous peoples. As elaborated upon later, some have defined this shift as an Indigenous museum approach (see Clavir 1996; Kreps 2008; Mead 1983). Even so, not all museums can fit into this category of active collaboration with Indigenous people – and therefore, in this work I do not include many museums that are not actively working towards fostering a supportive relationship with source communities^{vi}. Instead, I will focus on the museums that *are* making efforts to work with source communities in meaningful ways and who are making changes in the field of museology.

One may look at heritage as mainly tangible heritage and material-based, but as David Lowenthal (1985, 384) states, “preserving material objects is not the only way to conserve a heritage.” Tangible and intangible heritage go hand-in-hand in terms of preservation, promotion and protection. In Nunavut’s case, there has been more focus placed on intangible heritage, such as performance art and music, mainly because there is no territorial museum to house the many belongings that are outside the territory, but also because, among the 25 communities in Nunavut, there are only a handful of local and regional heritage centres, many of which have limited capacities, such as visitor’s centres (see Appendix A for a listing of these centres). The presence of a territorial museum and local or regional heritage centres could have a significant impact on the revitalization of Inuit culture and language within Nunavut communities. Having physical access to cultural material is not merely about examining and learning about a tangible object. The tangible object often encourages knowledge and language not necessarily present in

the object itself to be explored or remembered by members of a culture (Kreps 2003, 50), including art, performance art, music, clothing and fashion and storywork (Archibald 2008).

Working with museum collections for language and cultural revitalization is beneficial for both the source community and the museum, specifically because it opens up access for the community to the museum collection and archival material. Many participants in this type of collaboration express the gratitude and life-changing experience they have when they physically see and touch (or even smell, taste or hear) objects from their culture that are held in museums:

I'm thinking that coming to Germany to examine these objects will make it easier for us to explain our culture to our young people and to our children. We will be able to tell them things with no reservations. Our work will make it easier to prepare teaching material about our culture for our younger generations, our children, our grandchildren, to our peers and even our own parents and grandparents. With this work, our roots and culture will come closer to us (Andy Paukan, as quoted in Fienup-Riordan 2000, 254).

In 2014, during a short visit to my home community of Rankin Inlet, NU, I had an object I was curious about – a kakpik, an engraved, ivory needle case – and my mother suggested I ask Bernadette Henrie, an elder, about it. She had spent her childhood living an Inuit lifestyle in camps on the land prior to moving into a settlement in the 1950s. I brought the kakpik to Bernadette's house, and we spoke for a little bit about it. She examined the object and was very confused about the kakpik, and she repeated that she wasn't sure what it was and that she couldn't tell me anything about it. When I told her the name of the object in Inuktitut, our language, she exclaimed "Ah! Kakpik. I know what that is!" Memories of her childhood came flooding back (Bernadette Henrie 2014, pers. comm.). She spoke very rapidly about the kakpik, excited to speak about her father having made and also used the object in his lifetime. She also spoke about the associated objects that went with it that create an entire sewing kit. Not only did the kakpik prompt memories and knowledge, but it also served as a mnemonic device for the language associated with sewing. It is these types of visceral experiences that establish access to

collections and museums as powerful spaces that can prompt commentary and dialogue, as well as knowledge generation and sharing.

Having access to and control of one's own cultural history is important to Indigenous peoples around the world^{vii} (Battiste and Youngblood Henderson 2000; Smith 2012). Amy Lonetree believes there is a potential for museums to encourage and support cultural revitalization, nation building and healing for Indigenous peoples (2012, 171). I am in agreement with the above statement and in this thesis, I will explore the potential for cultural revitalization among Inuit through an Indigenous museum approach when given access to our own cultural material in museums and heritage centres. The key elements of my research consist of a literature review, visits to and site studies of museums and heritage centres in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Northwest Territories, Nunavut, Nunavik, and Washington, D.C. and qualitative interviews with local community members and heritage workers in Canada's Arctic.

In this paper, I begin with a description of the methods employed in my research. I used a combination of Indigenous and traditional anthropological qualitative methods and methodology. I also used Indigenous epistemology to guide analysis of the knowledge I gained from fieldwork, including positioning myself in my research as an Inuk anthropologist and being cognizant and reflexive of my influence in the knowledge generated and shared.

Next, I provide background information to contextualize the issue surrounding the current state of the proposed NHC. This review spans the period of time from the ratification of the NLCA in 1993 to the present. I have created a timeline of decisions about the proposed NHC through correspondence with heritage workers in Nunavut along with press releases and transcriptions of the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut sessions.

I then explore Indigenous museums as a model and the Indigenization of museums. I also

describe three museum models that are currently in operation in the Canadian Arctic: the Avataq Cultural Institute (ACI) in Nunavik, the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (PWNHC) in Yellowknife, NT and the Kitikmeot Heritage Society (KHS) in Cambridge Bay, NU. I briefly describe the structure of each organization, how they operate in isolated locations and how they encourage or do not encourage an Indigenous museum approach.

Next, I provide insights from the knowledge shared with me while doing field research at the three locations described above (the ACI, the PWNHC and the KHS). Finally, using these sources, I address the question of whether or not the current museum model for the proposed NHC is the one that is best suited for Nunavut and for Nunavummiut.

Chapter 2: Field Research Methodology

The research methods used in this project were developed using Indigenous methodology and epistemology and modified anthropological qualitative research methods. Throughout the development of my methods, I was cognizant of the cultural differences that I perceive from my own personal knowledge and experience and allowed them to guide the design of the research.

A literature review of relevant museum and Arctic literature was completed prior to field research. I focused on existing literature on Indigenous methodology and epistemology, Indigenous theory and decolonization theory as well as works that focused on the indigenization of museums. The literature review prepared me for conducting interviews as well as my subsequent data analysis. During my research, I reviewed reports, newspaper articles, government documents and grey literature about the development of the NHC to build my understanding of the history of the project.

A short, plain-language summary describing the research project was sent to the participants who were interviewed during field research. This was also sent to anyone contacted via email or phone but not interviewed in person. Interviews at selected locations where museums or heritage centres are located were conducted in August 2014 and January 2015. These interviews comprise the core data collected for this research project. Nineteen interviews were conducted with individuals. Two group discussions occurred with a total of seventeen Nunavut Arctic College students and two instructors, and a focus group occurred with five elders in Cambridge Bay, NU. Notes were taken throughout the interviews, group discussions and focus group^{viii}.

I developed a core interview guide that I used to guide the interviews in an organic way (see Appendix B). As an option for museum and heritage centre professionals as well as potential

elders and community members who were knowledgeable about technical museum aspects, I added questions to help focus the discussion on more museum-specific details. The interviews with community members and elders were less structured and less formal so as to promote more organic group discussions and encourage a friendly atmosphere. The reason behind this is simple: as an Inuk myself, I would like the participants who are Inuit to feel affiliation with me and realize that I too am working towards the betterment and development of the museum and heritage sector in Nunavut. Furthermore, I felt it was more culturally appropriate to create a jovial and informal atmosphere since Inuit are generally quite shy. The intention of interviewing museum or heritage centre workers was to gain knowledge about the institution specifically, whereas the intention of the interviews with elders and community members was to explore participants' perspective on the role heritage centres have in their communities in reference to Inuit cultural preservation and identity development among community members.

Participants were given the option to have the interviews occur in either English or Inuktitut. In the focus group with the elders from Cambridge Bay, NU, the discussion was carried out in a mixture of Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun^{ix}. All informational material provided to participants, including a plain-language summary of the research project and interview questions, were made available in Inuktitut, Inuinnaqtun and English.

Like Nathalie Piquemal (2001, 72), I used both oral and written consent in my research:

Three years ago, I was granted both oral and written permission to study narratives, storytelling, and traditional ways of learning as they applied to a specific Native community in Alberta. The elders of the school involved in my research gave me oral approval; the director of the school gave me written consent. Even though the written authorization may be regarded as official, the acquisition of the elders' permission constituted the first and most important step of my research. The oral approval may be defined as cultural approval, whereas the written one constitutes, in this case, what I would call institutional approval. The former conforms to the protocol of the community, whereas the latter is in accordance with the ethical protocol demanded by my university.

In accordance with cultural sensitivity towards Inuit communities, I opted for oral consent from community members, college students and elders. I felt this approach would lessen the contention people might feel towards researchers, especially among those participants that might feel dissonance towards researchers due to the colonial history of research. Furthermore, as mentioned above, I wanted the participants to feel connected to me as an Inuk. I asked all professional heritage workers within museums, heritage centres and institutions to sign a written consent form to participate in my research.

Chapter 3: Background Information and Context

Nunavut was created in 1993 by the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA) between the Government of Canada and the Inuit of Nunavut. The NLCA entitled the people of Nunavut to form a separate government from the Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT), “where [Inuit] self-government aspirations are expressed through public government... due to the fact that the Nunavut government represents all the people residing in the territory”^x (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2015). Eventually ratified on April 1, 1999, the treaty officially split Nunavut off from the former Northwest Territories. Nunavut, the eastern portion of the former territory, comprises a total landmass of 1,936,113 million square kilometers—an area equal to approximately 1/5th of Canada (Statistics Canada, “Land and Freshwater Area”). Iqaluit became the new capital of Nunavut while Yellowknife remained the capital of the reduced Northwest Territories.

In 2015, the population of Nunavut was 36,900 (Statistics Canada, “Population by Year”) with approximately 84 percent of the population being Inuit. One of the official languages in Nunavut is Inuktitut (the others are Innuinaqtun, English and French), and the majority of Inuit speak Inuktitut at some level. English and Inuktitut are the languages primarily taught in school and spoken at home. There are 25 communities in Nunavut. No highways lead into Nunavut, and there are no roads between communities. Traditional hunting and travel routes over land, sea and ice are used between communities. Intercommunity travel also occurs via aircraft. Imported supplies, including fuel, building supplies such as timber and food arrive either by annual sealift in the summer or via aircraft throughout the year. This impacts almost every aspect of life in Nunavut because it dramatically increases the cost of everything, which, ultimately, impacts socioeconomic aspects of livelihood.

All 25 communities in Nunavut have Nunavut Arctic College (NAC) locations offering basic adult education programs. There are three main NAC campuses that offer more specific programs, such as teacher education and nursing. There is no university in Nunavut; therefore, students have to travel outside the territory to receive a university education.

The isolation of communities in Nunavut poses many challenges for residents and non-residents alike. Building infrastructure is an issue, and the housing crisis in Nunavut attests to this (Murphy, “New Nunavut Facebook Group Seeks Action”). The overcrowding experienced in many homes in Nunavut has led to physical ailments such as colds, flu, poor sleep, anxiety and stress (Tester 2006, ii). Furthermore, the housing crisis in Nunavut has been linked to a number of social problems, such as unemployment, violence, suicide and various forms of abuse (Tester 2006 and 2009; Van Dusen, “Nunavut Housing Crisis”). The housing crisis in Nunavut can also be linked to issues of identity crisis among Inuit youth and adults (Collignon 2001).

There is a lack of infrastructure for high speed Internet in Nunavut – a problem that significantly impacts the type of work and communication that can be done in Nunavut (Strategic Networks Group: The Broadband Economists 2012; Imaituk Inc. 2011). For example, it is difficult to carry out any research that is dependent on access to high-speed Internet, such as web-based classrooms or streaming videos. The slow speed of the Internet limits the utility of accessing museum collections via the Internet, such as the virtual museum exhibit, called *The Virtual Museum of Nunavut* (Government of Nunavut 2010) created and hosted by the GN and featuring objects from the Nunavut collection housed at the PWNHC. This also applies to more comprehensive websites that include high-resolution images and videos, such as the Inuvialuit Living History website (Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre nd.). Nevertheless, there is a trend towards digitizing objects and collections in museums and archives, such as the initiative by the

Smithsonian Institution to digitize their massive collection: “Our collective past, as it resides within the Smithsonian, is physical; yet increasingly, the way we create and communicate is virtual” (2010, 3). With slow-speed Internet in Nunavut these types of digital initiatives are under-utilized and perhaps unappealing for organizations to develop. The lack of high-speed Internet creates a digital divide between rural and urban Canada and the rich and the poor in today’s digital era.

The high cost of building in Nunavut is a major reason why there is an absence of many of the institutions such as universities and museums that exist outside the territory. Furthermore, the high cost of maintaining buildings and the cost of operating and delivering programs is a challenge that surely plays a large part in the limited infrastructure in Nunavut dedicated to the operation of institutions such as museums and heritage centres. It should be noted that Nunavut is the only territory or province in Canada that does not have a territorial or provincial museum, despite already having a substantial museum collection. This collection is currently housed outside of Nunavut at three locations: the PWNHC in Yellowknife, NT, the CMH in Gatineau, QC and the Canadian Museum of Nature (CMN) in Ottawa, ON. The collection is currently being further dispersed as the art collection, including Inuit fine art such as prints, and stone carvings and sculptures, that is currently housed at the PWNHC in Yellowknife is in the process of being transferred to the Winnipeg Art Gallery (see below).

In the NLCA, Article 33: Archaeology outlines the importance of the archaeological record in representing the “use and occupancy of lands and resources through time” (Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated 1993). The archaeological record “is of spiritual, cultural, religious and educational importance to Inuit. Accordingly, the identification, protection and conservation of archaeological sites and specimens and the interpretation of the archaeological record is of

primary importance to Inuit and their involvement is both desirable and necessary” (Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated 1993). Article 33 also mandated the creation of the Inuit Heritage Trust (IHT) to oversee the implementation of Article 33 and co-manage heritage aspects in Nunavut with the GN, such as the archaeology permitting process. IHT also ensures Inuit interests are represented in matters pertaining to heritage in Nunavut, which includes place names, ethnographic, archaeological and archival matters.

A point of note in Article 33 is a short list of institutions called “Designated Agencies” that can hold/house archaeological and ethnographic objects for Nunavut. These Designated Agencies include the Canadian Museum of History, the National Archives of Canada, the Canadian Parks Service, Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, the Permanent Committee on Geographical Names, the Department of Communications, the Secretary of State, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre. Article 33 also stipulates that Nunavut has the authority to ask for objects that are from Nunavut from such named institutions, and “such request shall not be refused unless:

- The Trust is unable to maintain the object without risk of damage or destruction, including provision for climate control and security;
- The Trust is unable to provide access to the object commensurate with scientific or public interest;
- The agency is unable to lend the object because of a term or condition of its original acquisition from a non-governmental source;
- The Canadian Museum of Civilization, the National Archives of Canada, the Canadian Parks Service or territorial government agency requires the object;
 - For its own active display or research, or,
 - On account of the unique characteristics of the object;
 - The condition of the object prohibits its movement; or
 - The object has been previously lent to, and is in the possession of, a party other than a federal or territorial government agency” (Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. 1993).

Considering what the NLCA states in Article 33 there is opportunity, however slight it might seem based on the criteria in which requests can be denied, to augment and enrich the

Nunavut collection if the proposed NHC were created by incorporating belongings from the Designated Agencies outlined in Article 33.

Section 33.2.4 of the NLCA states, “There is an urgent need to establish facilities in the Nunavut Settlement Area for the conservation and management of a representative portion of the archaeological record.” This is of particular importance because it established the principle – in effect a premise – that efforts would be made to create a museum in Nunavut. So far, such efforts have not achieved this goal. Unfulfilled promises are an indication of poor leadership. Furthermore, the longer the Nunavut collection is outside of Nunavut and beyond Inuit authority, the more knowledge about and generated by the collection is kept from being explored and shared by Nunavummiut. Working towards fulfilling this obligation to create a museum is an underlying motivation for my research.

Timeline of the Proposed NHC

The history of the proposed NHC begins with the division between the GN and GNWT. In a collaborative effort between the newly formed GN and the GNWT the process of division of the museum collection took approximately three years (Barb Cameron 2015, pers. comm.; Doug Stenton 2015, pers. comm.). Representatives from both parties took part in a series of negotiations to divide the collection. The PWNHC Curator of Collections Joanne Bird (2015, pers. comm.) described how the division of the collection was carried out. In August 2000, the GNWT Minister of Education, Culture and Employment and the GN Minister of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth signed a Division of Cultural and Historical Collections Agreement. This established the process and timeline for negotiating the division of the museum and archives collections at the PWNHC. By July 2002, the working group created to carry out the agreement released a report of what was to be divided between the two territories (Joanne Bird 2015, pers.

comm.). There were a handful of working group meetings during this time along with telephone conference calls and other correspondence.

The (then) Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth (now Department of Heritage) (GN) and the staff at the PWNHC developed the criteria for splitting the collection where there might be overlap, such as art: “We identified some items that we would like to have (that were part of) the history of arts and crafts across the whole former NWT... (and we wanted) to retain (a particular) collection from the 1930s as part of the history of arts and crafts” (Joanne Bird 2015, pers. comm.). Additionally, the PWNHC also had to consider the original donors’ wishes, as they were legally advised to contact donors and ask them whether or not they would like the objects or collections they donated to remain in the NWT (Joanne Bird 2015, pers. comm.). Overall the process took both governments’ wishes into consideration in how they wanted to divide the collection, and they came to an agreement that both sides found acceptable.

In total, the PWNHC had 207,653 ethnographic and archaeological objects in the main collection and an additional 4,000 objects in the education collection. Of the total number of objects in the entire main collection, 140,910 ethnographic and archaeological objects belong to the GN, and the remaining 66,743 objects belong to the GNWT. Since division the GN has been paying approximately \$1 million annually to the PWNHC to store the ethnographic and archaeological objects from the Nunavut collection (Nunatsiaq Online, “MLAs Urge Action”). The Nunavut collection occupies a fairly large area within the PWNHC storage area, and the PWNHC is interested in regaining this storage capacity for its own use.

There was an early push towards creating the NHC. In 2001, LORD Cultural Resources Planning & Management Inc. and Consilium Consulting Group were commissioned to undertake a feasibility study in Nunavut communities to resolve a number of issues regarding the proposed

NHC. These included the potential location of the NHC, cultural programming within the proposed NHC, an inventory of the objects within the collection at the PWNHC and an estimate of storage space required for a new facility. Furthermore, an analysis of existing facilities was carried out within the proposed location communities including existing cultural, tourism and education facilities. An evaluation of construction costs for each proposed community was provided for the three phases of the study using a sites options appraisal matrix, along with attendance, revenue and expense projections. The feasibility study final report and the final proposed NHC model and site were based on community consultation in eight communities: Rankin Inlet, Arviat, Baker Lake, Iglulik, Pond Inlet, Iqaluit, Pelly Bay and Cambridge Bay. A record of the community consultations is included in the report as appendices, including comments made during the consultations by community members.

In the feasibility study final report, four options were proposed: (1) a Centralized Full-Service Facility “similar in scope of services and activities to the PWNHC” (see endnote ii) (LORD 2002, F-2); (2) a Centralized Service Centre consisting of collection and archival storage, administration services and collection-based research facilities; (3) a Central Service Centre with Regional Programming/Exhibit Centres expanding on the second option by offering regional programming and educational options through regional exhibitions; and (4) a Decentralized Network of Culture Partners that would be built upon the Central Service Centre (LORD 2002, E4-5) also expanding on the second model but offering territorial-wide programming and exhibits through partnerships with existing facilities, such as the Nunavut Arctic College, local and regional heritage and visitor’s centres, performance facilities and youth and elder’s facilities. Options 1, 3 and 4 would reach people throughout Nunavut through

outreach programs or dedicated facilities in all communities. Option 2 would have very limited exhibit space and public access to collections.

A few years later, in 2005, the Trilateral Working Group was established, comprised of IHT, the GN and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI), to take on the responsibility to establish the proposed NHC. The GN's *Pinasuaqtavut 2004-2009* report identified the establishment of a territorial heritage centre as a priority (Government of Nunavut n.d.a., 18). Furthermore, a background briefing note stated "in the spirit of Aajiiqatigiiniq"^{xi} the Trilateral Working Group would create a capital plan to financing the estimated \$55 million project (Government of Nunavut, *et al* 2006). At the time, the GN demonstrated its commitment to the project by committing \$10 million from the funds in the Northern Strategy^{xii}.

The location of the proposed NHC was discussed and deliberated by the Trilateral Working Group. All eight communities had expressed interest in having the NHC in their community, and each one was examined in detail. Suggested eligibility criteria were established and deliberated for each community, including the following: accessibility to residents of Nunavut, accessibility to visitors to Nunavut, accessibility to researchers, service to communities, synergy with related programs or activities, ability to meet broader community needs, possibility of building on existing resources and infrastructure, operation efficiency, capital costs, operating costs and economic and social impact (LORD 2002, 15). In 2006, Iqaluit was chosen as the site for the proposed NHC (Dickens, "Heritage Centre Lands in Iqaluit"), and by 2012, the proposed NHC was envisioned as a 6,700 square metre heritage centre including archival space, studios and an auditorium for performance art programming and events.

The proposed NHC has been dropped from the GN capital plan since 2010, when it was stated that the GN could not afford the project (CBC News, "Nunavut Heritage Centre Put on

Hold”). Other options do not seem to have been revisited or explored, “such as a \$20 million storage facility with a small display area, which can then be expanded over time. According to some partners, this would be a much better option as opposed to simply abandoning all commitments to Article 33 of the NLCA” (Suluk, quoted in Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. October 11, 2011). There is opportunity today to re-visit the proposed NHC to examine other museum and heritage centre models and re-explore capital investment and funding opportunities.

Following the release of the 2002 feasibility report by LORD and Consilium, there was optimism that construction of the proposed NHC would be subsequently underway. A news report released by the Northern News Services in 2005 (Geens, “Nunavut Heritage Centre in the Works”) stated that funding options were currently being sought to begin building the proposed NHC: “The good news is, planning for a Nunavut Heritage Centre has now entered a new phase. Within four months, the Trilateral Working Group... will put forward a strategy on how to pay for the museum. Its estimated cost is \$60 million.” By 2012, the estimated cost of the proposed NHC had risen to \$120 million (Nunatsiaq News Online, “MLAs Urge Action”).

The following is a timeline that outlines the chronology of events that influenced the interruption and breakdown of the proposed NHC. The timeline provides an overview of the history of the proposed NHC, which has not been published or provided elsewhere. This is important as it gives a clear indication of the chronology of decisions and events of the proposed NHC of which Inuit and Nunavummiut may not be fully aware:

- In 2005, \$10 million was allocated from the Northern Strategy fund through the Government of Canada, and the GN was optimistic enough in 2009 to promise construction would begin by 2013 (CBC News, “Nunavut Heritage Centre Put on Hold”).

- In 2006, Iqaluit was chosen as the location for the proposed NHC (Dickens, “Heritage Centre Lands in Iqaluit”).
- By 2008, ministers in the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut had begun questioning the status of the development of the proposed NHC (Legislative Assembly of Nunavut 2008).
- In 2010, the PWNHC began work with the objects in the Nunavut collection for the transfer from the NWT to Nunavut (McEachern, “GNWT and Nunavut Preparing Artifacts”)
- In 2011, the GN announced it could not afford the development of the proposed NHC and was therefore putting the project on hold (CBC News, “Nunavut Heritage Centre Put on Hold”). In response to this, NTI’s Board of Directors passed the following resolution (Nunavut Tunngavik Inc., “Annual General Meeting”): “NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Members call upon the Crown to respect and implement immediately section 33.2.4 of the NLCA, and the Governments of Canada and Nunavut to allocate, without delay, adequate funding for a facility to be built in the near future, with a capacity to being expanded over time; and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Members recommend that, without diminishing Crown responsibilities owed to Inuit, the Governments seek private sources of funding, if needed, to help complete the above project.”
- In 2012, ministers in the Legislative Assembly questioned the GN about the reallocation of funds that were allotted to the development of the proposed NHC (Nunatsiaq Online, “MLAs Urge Action”). Nunavut leaders stressed the importance of bringing back objects, pointing out that local heritage centres would have more opportunity to exhibit objects within the community from the Nunavut collection.
- In 2015, the Qikiqtaaluk Corporation (QC) announced a desire to build a heritage facility to repatriate, store and “showcase Nunavut history” with the objects from the Nunavut

collection (CBC News, “Inuit Artifacts May Be Relocated”). Speaking with Sheldon Nimchuk (2016, pers. comm.), Director of Project Development & Partnerships, the QC hoped the GN and other Inuit organizations would contribute funds towards the cost of the construction of the proposed heritage centre. It was not indicated whether they planned to build the original proposed NHC or an alternative NHC model.

- In November 2015, the Winnipeg Art Gallery and the Premier of Nunavut announced approximately 8,000 art pieces from the Nunavut collection would be housed at the Winnipeg Art Gallery on long-term loan for five years with the support of both the GN and the Manitoba Government. This announcement was part of a five-year memorandum of understanding between the GN and the Manitoba Government to strengthen ties between Manitoba and Nunavut including other areas such as health care and clean energy (Metro News, “Nunavut to Lend Winnipeg Art Gallery”). Both governments have committed \$500,000 towards the project (CBC News, “Nunavut’s Art Collection Heading to Winnipeg Art Gallery”).
- On August 7, 2015 the GN sent a request for proposal in search of a heated, secured warehouse approximately 2,300-2,700 square feet (Government of Nunavut 2015). This RFP closed on August 29, 2015. The request for proposal was intended to find a space to house the collection from the PWNHC.
- On August 2, 2016 the Canadian Government announced a \$15 million commitment to the development of the Inuit Art Gallery, an extension of the Winnipeg Art Gallery (Government of Canada, “Government of Canada Supports the Winnipeg Art Gallery”).
- On August 4, 2016 the Premier of Nunavut announced the transfer of approximately 140,000 ethnographic, archaeological and archival museum pieces from the PWNHC Nunavut

collection to be housed at the CMN in Ottawa. The collection will be on a long-term five-year loan (Government of Nunavut, “Nunavut Transfers Territorial Museum”). This is the remainder of the PWNHC Nunavut collection and is separate from the current agreement between the GN and the CMN regarding the Nunavut fossil collection. There is no indication of any arrangements being made for access to these collections for Inuit or researchers.

Despite the fact that many Inuit leaders, including long-time leader in the heritage field and IHT board member Luke Suluk (Dickens 2006; CBC News, “Nunavut Heritage Centre Put on Hold”; Nunavut Tunngavik Inc., “Inuit Heritage Trust Disappointed”), stress the importance of bringing the collection to Nunavut to ensure access to the objects, the GN continues to put the project on hold. It is, of course, very costly to build a museum facility; however, there is a responsibility to not only implement the NLCA but also to encourage the preservation, revitalization and strength of Inuit culture through access to the Nunavut collection *within* Nunavut.

During the community consultations conducted during the feasibility study led by LORD and Consilium, comments by community members were recorded. One particular comment from Rankin Inlet stands out: “there is a need for a true Heritage Centre – not just a museum – a *living centre*” (LORD 2002, B-2). Not only is there a desire for a museum, there is a desire for a particular *kind* of museum, one that represents Inuit from our own perspective and interpretation of our own culture. This comment has been repeated to me in many discussions I have had in Nunavut, including with my mother, Inuit educator and photographer Maggie Putulik (2014, pers. comm.). It strongly resonates that there is a desire to have agency in the development of the proposed NHC. This leads to the question of whether the *kind* of museum Nunavummiut desire is represented in the proposed NHC.

Chapter 4: Indigenous Museums

The focus of this and the next chapter is to explore the different types of museum models that are presently used, specifically in remote locations, and to determine, which model, if any, is most appropriate for Nunavut. To begin, it is necessary to define the concept of an *Indigenous museum*^{xiii}.

According to Mead (1983, 98, 99), Indigenous museums are first and foremost communal spaces and places of education where people can study and practice techniques to re-create belongings from their own culture (Mead 1983, 99). Additionally, the concept of prolonging the life of belongings is primarily a Western concept, whereas in some Indigenous cultures belongings are often left to deteriorate as new ones are made and belongings are thus re-created (Clavir 2002; Mead 1983, 100). Furthermore, there is often a good deal of variation across Indigenous cultures in the way belongings are cared for, and which, collectively, may differ greatly from Western museological and curatorial practices (Kreps 2008, 193). Recognizing these differences in the approaches to curatorial and museological practices between western and Indigenous museums and heritage centres is a step towards the decolonization of museums.

Western museums are most often located in urban settings requiring employees to have specialized education, such as university degrees, whereas Indigenous people and communities might find it more productive or desirable to both teach and learn in more practical traditions, such as the transmission of oral knowledge (Mead 1983, 101). Indigenous education strongly rests on the transmission of traditional knowledge, which does not necessarily require a formal education in the Western sense. Instead, the emphasis is placed on the transmission of knowledge itself, especially where oral history is a significant aspect of Indigenous cultures. This fact means that Indigenous museums often operate in a different manner than Western museums.

Nick Stanley questions whether the term “Indigenous museums” is an oxymoron or a misplaced concept (2007, 2). The concept does appear to be a bit of an oxymoron based on the history of museums and Indigenous peoples and the contestation that exists between the two. However, the term *Indigenous* represents a source of authority and power for Indigenous peoples. Coupling *Indigenous* with *museums* represents the empowerment of Indigenous peoples within the museum setting, including museum practices of storage, display, interpretation of objects and curation. Indigenous museums are not simply museums that house Indigenous artifacts or displays Indigenous belongings. They are not simply museums that interpret and represent Indigenous cultures. They are places that are owned and operated by Indigenous communities, where belongings are interpreted and curated by Indigenous people, and Indigenous values and beliefs guide the goals and purpose of the museums.

The term *Indigenous museums* may eventually become an empty term, according to Stanley (2007, 16), especially if more museums are making room in their institutions for the inclusion and incorporation of Indigenous museum professionals and Indigenous museum curation. However, as I argue below, I think that “Indigenous museums” will not become an empty term – a perspective that derives in part from both my own anthropological standpoint, and even more importantly, from my perspective as an Indigenous person who works in and studies museums. I feel it will continue to have meaning in the future and have increasing significance for Indigenous peoples as more museums and heritage centres are created, such as the proposed NHC.

During the 1990s and 2000s, “the incorporation of traditional methods of care for culturally sensitive materials [was] a new approach for museums and a deviation from standard collections care practices” (Flynn and Hull-Walski 2001, 31). Kreps states that “nearly all

cultures keep objects of special value, and many have created elaborate methods for storing, conserving, classifying, displaying, and transmitting knowledge about them;” prior to the 1990’s this concept of *Indigenous curation* escaped the attention of Western museologists and curators (1998, 3). Furthermore, she continues that in the post-NAGPRA era, value and attention to traditional care of belongings has become representative of the shifting power relations between Western museums and Indigenous communities. Western museum methods of caring for belongings should not be abandoned but should open up opportunities for dialogue to exchange knowledge and practices (Kreps 1998, 3). It is examples like the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia that epitomize the movement towards including communities’ voices in the museum, whether it is through conservation or in the way belongings are interpreted (Ames 1999).

Since there are larger numbers of Indigenous people entering mainstream museums as visitors, staff and academic professionals, the museum has become a site of cross-cultural encounters and creative dialogue (Kreps 2011, 468): “more and more, museum visitors today are experiencing the voices of living people belonging to an indigenous [sic] culture, not just voices from the past or from the academic knowledge of nonindigenous curators” (Clavir 1996, 100). The fundamental differences between a standard museum of display and glass boxes and an Indigenous museum is in the museum practices themselves. There is room, however, to find common ground between western and Indigenous views of curation, preservation and conservation when it serves both parties (Clavir 1996, 104).

Inuit have participated in developing an Indigenous museum approach. Mary P. Kumarluk (2014, pers. comm.), Inuk museum curator at the Daniel Weetaluktuk Museum in Inukjuak, Nunavik, has received training from the Avataq Cultural Institute in various aspects of

museum work. Although she is not specialized in any one area, she works to curate in a way that she finds culturally appropriate. By helping visitors to understand the differences between Inuit culture prior to contact with the Western world and post- contact, Kumarluk is creating a method of Indigenous curation. For example, the Daniel Weetaluktuk Museum is dome-shaped, like an iglu. On the second floor Kumarluk has placed one soapstone lamp on each side of the display area as it would have been in a real iglu. She has curated the museum by separating “male” and “female” belongings as well as separating belongings by seasonal use. She had also hoped to separate pre- and post-contact belongings, but because of lack of display space, she has not been able to do so. However, she has been able to illustrate some aspects of post-contact Inuit cultural heritage; for example, the snow blind made out of white canvas and how it is important to acknowledge that it was not something that was used in Inuit culture during pre-contact times.

For a number of decades there has been a “push back” from Indigenous peoples around the globe to have the right to control, maintain and disseminate our cultural heritage as we see fit. This sentiment is included in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples^{xiv}. The U’mista Cultural Society at Alert Bay, BC is an exemplary case of Indigenous curation and repatriation of not only physical belongings but also the repatriation of cultural knowledge, Indigenous voice, representation and interpretation of cultural heritage in the museum setting. It is also a beacon and talisman of decolonization efforts across the globe, especially considering the repatriation of objects was completed relatively early in the history of North American repatriation activities (U’mista Cultural Society, n.d.).

4.1 Arctic Museum and Heritage Centre Models

In this section, I describe and present three models of museums and heritage centres in the Canadian Arctic that exemplify different forms of heritage preservation and representation in

isolated landscapes. Each model offers a different approach on how to curate and manage collections, respond to community needs and requests and represent Indigenous peoples.

4.1.1 Avataq Cultural Institute

The Avataq Cultural Institute (ACI) is a non-profit organization founded in 1980 to protect and promote language and culture in Nunavik. It was created as a response to elders' wishes expressed in the Nunavik Elder's Conference, which is held every two years. Its head office is in Inukjuak, Nunavik, with an administrative office and museum storage facility^{xv} in Montreal, QC. Elders and the board of directors are elected members from Nunavik that direct the mandate of the ACI.

The ACI's programs and services include an Inuktitut promotion and preservation program, a genealogy program, a Nunavik museums program that manages any museum-related work, a Nunavik Inuit art collection, an archaeology department, an artists' support program, a documentation and archives centre, local cultural committees, traditional skills courses as well as research and publication services.

The ACI works in collaboration with local community cultural committees, which are run by the Kativik Regional Government^{xvi} (KRG). The objective of local community cultural committees is to allow each community the opportunity to develop and operate its own heritage programs through the ACI and other organizations such as the KRG. Some of the projects that these committees have been able to complete are qarmaq (subterranean dwelling) building projects, sealskin tent making, qajaq building, kamik making and other sewing projects, as well as language revitalization workshops.

In the past, the ACI had been able to salvage collections from the Saputik Museum in Puvirnituq and St. Edmond's Anglican Church in Kuujjuarapik, both of which were community

museums that had shut down. Despite a desire to have local heritage centres in each community to house and display museum belongings, the ACI runs one museum out of Inukjuak, the Daniel Weetaluktuk Museum (Daniel Gendron 2014, pers. comm.; Louis Gagnon 2014, pers. comm.).

The Daniel Weetaluktuk Museum has one permanent exhibit, *Takunnatauninga ilirsusivut takunnagusitigut/Our Culture as We See it*, which is described as:

The goal of this new exhibition is to make it easier to understand and appreciate the cultural and artistic heritage of the *Inukjuamiut*. It offers an original perspective on self-representation by delivering a vision of how the *Inukjuamiut* see themselves. One of the major elements intensifying the experience of a visit to this exhibit is the life-like reconstruction of the interior of an igloo, which is silhouetted under the dome of the mezzanine. (Avataq Cultural Institute, n.d.)

The permanent exhibit at the Daniel Weetaluktuk Museum is a creative concept that illustrates the importance that ACI places on Inuit agency in the presentation of their own culture. Although the museum is standard museum of display and glass boxed, it still provides an Indigenous approach to museology by offering an opportunity for self-representation.

Since the capacity of the museum is only 30 people, local daycares and schools - elementary, secondary and adult schools - have to coordinate when they are able to visit the museum. They did not have a specific number of visitors each year, but other than the school visits and tourists, there seemed to be very few visitors from the community. When I spoke to people in the community and asked if they had visited the museum, most responded that they had not been there in several years, and many hadn't seen the new exhibit spaces since they had been revamped in 2005. The main reason for not visiting the museum was a lack of interest, and the small space of the museum made it difficult to offer new or creative exhibits for people to see.

The ACI has an archaeology department, which is responsible for archaeology in Nunavik. The elders of Nunavik direct the Archaeology Department with a mandate to identify, study, protect and preserve the archaeological heritage of Nunavik. The ACI has a history of

working closely with communities, Inuit, universities and territorial and provincial governments on archaeology projects and has held numerous summer field schools that include all of these entities. I would like to draw attention to young Inuit's participation in field schools. Not only does the ACI conduct field schools almost every summer with Nunavik students, they have also brought students to Montreal to visit the collection's storage facility and other museums to provide a very hands-on approach to collections that demonstrates that there is more to archaeology than just digging (Daniel Gendron 2014, pers. comm.).

The ACI has rented space specifically for the storage of the archaeology and art collections to clean, catalogue, analyse and house all the artifacts that are excavated in Nunavik, which they call *the reserve*. Daniel Gendron (2014, pers. comm.), the archaeologist and Director of the Archaeology Department at ACI at the time of fieldwork, clarified that Inuit from Nunavik can view objects in the reserve because the ACI understands there is no museum in Nunavik for people to look in the collections and utilize the collection for their own purposes.

The ACI also has a Genealogy Department, an Art Department that promotes art in Nunavik through their Aumaaggavik Arts Secretariat and a Library and Archives. It is clear the ACI comprehensively addresses areas of cultural heritage preservation, promotion and representation.

4.1.2 Kitikmeot Heritage Society

The Kitikmeot Heritage Society (KHS) was incorporated in 1995 and is located in Cambridge Bay, NU. It is a charitable organization run by volunteers, executive staff and a board of directors. The KHS operates a local community heritage centre out of the May Hakongak Centre that combines a public library, cultural centre, art gallery and archives. The mandate of the KHS focuses on the local Innuinait – the Inuit of Coronation Gulf – culture and language,

along with a commitment to the Kitikmeot region as a whole to preserve and promote culture, history and language in the region.

Since the time of its establishment, the KHS has worked towards developing educational cultural materials, documenting oral history and gathering old photographs and archives (Brendan Griebel 2015, pers. comm.). The legacy of the KHS has had an impact on the community, including its current Executive Director, Pamela Gross (2015, pers. comm.), an Inuk woman from Cambridge Bay and Hay River, NT:

I remember being a kid in the old library and there were all these old photographs that were behind the front desk. They were so fascinating, and I just loved looking at them. I knew they were photos of Cambridge Bay or photos of when they lived out on the land in various places like Bay Chimo, Bathurst, Perry River. I just remember seeing family groups or groups of people. I haven't seen these photos since; I don't know what happened to them. But they had names written on them so that everybody could look at them and learn about their ancestors. They were very hands on. I remember that aspect. It was around that time, I think, when Kim Crockett [founder and president of the KHS] started getting together with the founders about a place where people can go and come together in the library and have more of a bigger centre for cultural learning and western learning intertwined into one.

The KHS organizes and runs a number of projects throughout the year, such as culture camps, where they take a group of Inuit onto the land to participate in activities as a form of cultural and language revitalization; sewing classes in the schools that incorporate language lessons; traditional skin preparation and sewing, including fish and bird sewing; qulliq^{xvii} (soapstone lamp) making; and qajaq (kayak) making.

The KHS houses a small archives section in their facility, which includes old photographs, Inuit art and rare books. They also house a small number of artifacts, including replicas of artifacts that they had commissioned. There is a qajaq on display that was the product of a qajaq making project in the community, along with mannequins that are wearing the traditional clothing of the Innuinait, clothing that was sewn by elders-in-residence. There is an

exhibit area that displays artifacts with full-length panels of information on the Innuinait, along with a small area with television screens that show films.

There are hundreds of visits from school students that go through the KHS each year, partly due to its location, being physically in the same building as the elementary school and partly because the centre is a combined space of a community library and the KHS. Due to this combined capacity, the students are often attracted to the library facilities, such as Internet access. As a side-product, they often visit the facilities in the heritage centre, including a sealskin tent-shaped space that plays films with Inuit content.

The KHS, unlike the ACI, does not have the capacity – funding-wise and physical space - to employ full-time specialists such as archaeologists, archivists, genealogists, museum curators and conservationists. Instead, the KHS works in collaboration with these types of professionals to run their programs, such as archaeologists and archaeology students from universities. Furthermore, the KHS works with other Inuit organizations to run programs, such as with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, which is the regional Inuit.

Something unique to the KHS is that they employ five community elders-in-residence, who come to work at the KHS for half-days four times a week. The elders have taught sewing lessons in the school and have participated in culture camps that are held out on the land. Some have traveled to London, England to visit the British Museum's Innuinait collection. The opportunities that arise from this relationship extend out in many ways. The elders have the opportunity to share their knowledge with the community and with KHS through various outlets, and the KHS is able to document and preserve the knowledge shared by the elders. Engaging with other elders in various contexts, such as culture camps, creates a particular framework and environment for cultural knowledge – both tangible and intangible – to be stimulated, shared and

disseminated. Furthermore, the KHS has had the opportunity to provide materials to the elders to create traditional clothing, tools and other cultural material, which might not otherwise be available to them or the community. For example, in 2015 a ton of soapstone was shipped to Cambridge Bay to put on a qulliq making workshop. Elders passed on knowledge about the qulliq, which is a quintessential cultural object seldom used today but a very symbolic icon of Inuit culture.

Gross (2015, pers. comm.) describes the KHS as “an Indigenous space inside a modern facility... Cultures change and we’re an Indigenous centre in a modern community, and we have to display who we are in the best of our abilities.” The KHS is making an impact in the community of Cambridge Bay, where a majority of their programming is hosted by and catered to the community.

4.1.3 The Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre

The PWNHC was opened on April 3, 1979 as a territorial museum for the NWT. Its mandate is to house, display and represent the cultural and natural heritage of the territory. Its facilities include a museum that displays NWT history and heritage, an art exhibition area in the mezzanine, an auditorium, an aviation gallery and the NWT Archives, storage and education resources. The PWNHC is administered by the GNWT Culture and Heritage Division of the Department of Education, Culture and Employment. The mandate of the PWNHC derives from the *Northwest Territories Archives Act*, the *Northwest Territories Historical Resources Act* and the *Northwest Territories Archaeological Sites Act and Regulations* and falls under the *Cultural Places Program*. This program is responsible for the NWT archaeological sites, official geographical and community names, territorial historic sites and Aboriginal on-the-land graves.

As a GNWT subdivision, the PWNHC offers a number of programs and services that are available to the public and to professionals. The NWT archaeology program at the PWNHC employs two full-time territorial archaeologists and a geographic names section with a GIS Officer to oversee place names and mapping in the NWT and a Cultural Places Officer as well. There is a conservation section in the museum and an artifact photography area. The NWT Arts Council and NWT Archives are also located at the PWNHC.

The PWNHC also has a modest education department with one staff member to oversee and operate all education programs. There are 4,000 objects accessioned to the education program alone, which is outside of the main NWT museum collection. The education department runs school programs throughout the school year, including museum tours, as well as develops and manages online resources. NWT schools are able to access Edukits on a request basis to use in the classroom. They also have the option to access traveling exhibits that are sent throughout the NWT. Furthermore, objects from the education collection can be requested for loan. Heritage fairs are also coordinated with the NWT Heritage Fairs Society to engage youth and encourage research beyond the use of books and the Internet, specifically topic areas related to youth.

The PWNHC receives a large number of visitors each year, approximately 59,000 in the 2015-16 fiscal year alone, according to Thomas Andrews, NWT Territorial Archaeologist (2016, pers. comm.). The PWNHC receives school groups throughout the year from across the NWT that take advantage of the educational programming the PWNHC has to offer. A fair number of tourists to Yellowknife also visit the museum.

The PWNHC offers opportunities to have Indigenous involvement in the museum and encourages Indigenous involvement throughout their programming. The PWNHC has programs for Indigenous groups to visit and study the collection, and have completed projects with

Indigenous peoples to re-create some objects, including a Dogrib birchbark canoe that they documented on film. They also have a small number of staff that work there, including Karen Wright-Fraser, whom I quote in this thesis.

The PWNHC is an example of a standard territorial museum model (see endnote *ii*) that is mandated to represent the different cultures in the NWT, along with the history of the NWT as a whole. It does not favour or over-represent one Indigenous group in the NWT, nor does it focus on one particular aspect of the history of the NWT. The PWNHC attempts to work with all the communities in the NWT through a community liaison officer, and encourages all schools to participate in their education programs.

4.2 Similarities and Differences: ACI, KHS and PWNHC

There are fundamental differences in each of the three models mentioned, which influences their potential as an Indigenous museum. The biggest difference between the three models is who is represented: Inuit are the only focus of the ACI and KHS, whereas the PWNHC represents several, very different cultural groups. This difference, however, does not affect their potential as an Indigenous museum since all cultures represented are Indigenous.

Unlike the PWNHC, which has permanent funding from the GNWT, the ACI and KHS do not have permanent funding sources and this limits their programming and staffing (Robert Frechette 2014, pers. comm.; Daniel Gendron 2014, pers. comm.; Pamela Gross 2015, pers. comm.). The lack of permanent funding means these institutions rely heavily on project-based funding to operate and provide programs.

The KHS is a relatively small organization compared to the ACI and the PWNHC, which influences how comprehensive the organization can be. For example, the ACI and the PWNHC have a number of different departments with dedicated staff, such as genealogy and GIS,

whereas the KHS does not have the capacity to develop those areas extensively and has only three (and sometimes fewer) full-time staff.

The geographic area of the communities and territory that the ACI and PWNHC represent and directly work with is much larger than that represented by the KHS. In Nunavik, there are 14 communities that the ACI works for and with; in the NWT, there are 32 municipalities and cities that the PWNHC represents and works with and in the Kitikmeot region, the KHS works with three communities – but specifically with Cambridge Bay.

The ACI and the KHS are non-government organizations that have more opportunity to conduct research than the PWNHC. For example, the ACI and the KHS have conducted archaeology field schools every summer for a number of years (Griebel, 2013; Daniel Gendron 2014, pers. comm.), whereas the PWNHC may not conduct these types of archaeology field schools regularly. However, the PWNHC has greater opportunity to provide consistent and diverse programming, particularly through educational programs such as school tours of the museum and Edukits.

The one model most likely to support the concept of Indigenous museums is the KHS. The KHS has a board of directors that is majority Inuit and is operated by an Inuk woman. They offer several projects each year that supports and enhances Inuit culture and language, including working with elementary school students. Further, they have a continuous presence of elders to share traditional knowledge by having them work part-time at the KHS.

The model that is more suitable for communities to access and use collections is the PWNHC model. Not only is it centralized in one location it is also accessible for other communities to travel to Yellowknife by highway or airplanes. Furthermore, the PWNHC has a

large facility that is capable of housing and conserving belongings. In other words, it is a true museum.

The model most suited for Nunavut is the ACI model because like Nunavut, Nunavik is accessible only through commercial airlines, boats and winter travel over land. The network approach that ACI implements would most likely work well in Nunavut. It works with the local community committees to run local programs and allows Inuit access to the collection when they are in Montreal. However, to make the ACI model an Indigenous model would need for more Indigenous staff.

The three museum models examined in this chapter demonstrate the various ways in which museum and heritage centre models have developed in response to unique regions in the Canadian Arctic. The three models have demonstrated that although they have a very similar objective – to represent Arctic cultural heritage and promote the preservation of Arctic cultures – there are different ways in which that can be accomplished based on what is available in terms of direct connection with communities, resources, funding and, ultimately, space.

Chapter 5: Knowledge Interpretation

One of the most critical aspects of an Indigenous museum approach is access to collections, and having collections physically closer to source communities makes access much easier. Access to collections could include - to name a few examples - working with community members to make new belongings, designing exhibitions, transmission of oral history through use of belongings, or examining clothing to learn or re-learn sewing techniques.

Inuit in Nunavik want artifacts from archaeological excavations to remain in the community so that they can have access to them, but there are no museum facilities to house them. People do not necessarily object to the removal of artifacts from the ground in Nunavik but have an aversion to the removal of artifacts from the communities during archaeological fieldwork (Daniel Gendron 2014, pers. comm.). While the artifacts are displayed in the community immediately during an archaeological dig or field school, soon after the work is completed they are sent to the ACI office in Montreal, QC to be processed, catalogued and stored at the ACI reserve. To ensure that Inuit from Nunavik have access to artifacts and other belongings, such as art, the ACI has arranged with the facility owners for visitors to access the building (Daniel Gendron 2014, pers. comm.).

The ACI model has found a way to combine a number of elements to ensure accessibility to museum collections for Nunavik Inuit. Furthermore, ACI's history of archaeological work in Nunavik, including Inuit participation in archaeology projects, has promoted archaeology among Inuit. One of the earliest Inuit professional archaeologists in Canada is from Nunavik: Daniel Weetaluktuk (1951-1982). Weetaluktuk contributed to the development of Inuit archaeology in Nunavik and has left a legacy for Inuit youth in Nunavik to become interested in and to engage with archaeology. The archaeology that ACI does with Inuit youth in Nunavik is influenced by

Weetaluktuk's work as the ACI wants to encourage furthering education among the youth: "my purpose in getting (youth) involved in our projects is not to make all of them archaeologists or geomorphologists or historians. The purpose is to make them understand that going to school is important" (Daniel Gendron 2014, pers. comm.).

An example of an Indigenous museum approach to archaeology is the ACI and KHS work with Inuit youth to build local capacity and cultural knowledge building. The KHS had a number of archaeology projects in the 2000s around Cambridge Bay, NU (Griebel 2013). These projects provided opportunities to the local Inuit youth from the community, including Pamela Gross, and the region to participate in more than one archaeology season. Gross' experience in archaeology and work in the KHS is a powerful example of how heritage centres in communities can make a significant impact on an individual. Her early childhood memories of the KHS coupled with her experiences in cultural programs on the land truly demonstrate the importance of accessibility to heritage centres, cultural programming and collections. Gross' description of her experience in the heritage field and the impact it has had on her life personally and professionally resonates with the positive experiences described by Haida youth (Krpmotich and Peers 2013), the Yup'ik elders (Fienup-Riordan 2000) and Wright Fraser (2001).

My own personal experiences in heritage work in Nunavut, and accordingly my own culture, is similar to Pamela Gross', which has made a substantial impact on the direction my life has taken. When I was 18 years old I had just completed the Inuit studies program, Nunavut Sivuniksavut, in Ottawa and was camping with my family at our traditional campgrounds. We visited Qatiktalik (or Cape Fullerton), the first RNWMP (now RCMP) post established in the Eastern Arctic in 1903. While taking a break from walking through the site I came across seed beads on the surface, which made a huge impression on me. I was astounded that I could see and

touch artifacts that have been sitting on the surface for almost 100 years, which made me feel as though I could somehow connect with those people from the past through a form of contagious magic. Although somewhat romanticized, my experience had a major influence on my pursuit of education and a career in the field of heritage and museums. My research suggests others can be similarly inspired.

Along the same thread as promoting education among youth by making archaeology accessible to them, there is importance in Inuit's accessibility to museums and museum collections. By making museums and museum collections accessible to Inuit, particularly youth, many new opportunities open up. For Mary P. Kumarluk, it was a very powerful experience to work at the Daniel Weetaluktuk Museum, as documented in one of my journal entries:

Mary talked about being stuck in between two worlds, learning the traditional cultural way of life for Inuit as a child and then the *qablunaaq*^{xviii} way of life in school. She felt she was not able to do anything *Inuk* at school when she was a child, including speaking Inuktitut. She felt confused about her identity for a long time, but when she started working at the museum she learned a great deal about Inuit culture. Now, instead of feeling like she is stuck between two worlds she is confident that she is an *Inuk*, and a large part of that is from working in a museum and learning about our culture through objects. She's very proud of it. (Krista Zawadski, July 28, 2014 journal entry)

In 2014 Kumarluk spoke at length about her pride in Inuit culture. She pointed out a display area with a male hunter mannequin dressed in traditional clothing and holding a harpoon waiting for a seal at an *aglu* (seal breathing hole) and stated: "... (the mannequin) is sometimes visited by young men who are interested in what it is doing. They come by the museum to learn about hunting seal based on the positioning of the hunter, as well as to study the tools he is using" (Mary P. Kumarluk 2014, pers. comm.)

For Pamela Gross (2015, pers. comm.), having a heritage centre in her community makes a big impact in the community: "Cultural centres play a role in preserving, protecting and promoting culture and language, but a lot of activities are done at home, so it becomes more of a

compliment in those cases.” Providing cultural programs at the KHS that parallel what is being taught in the homes of Inuit in the community is a natural approach for the KHS because not only are you preserving Inuit culture and language, but you are also promoting it in different contexts: “KHS plays an important role in the community in a lot of different ways. Doing cultural programming is one of the most influential ways we can do this, and we can engage people in the community to take part and they're always happy and keep on learning new cultural skills” (Pamela Gross 2015, pers. comm.). Normalizing cultural activities in different contexts, including the home and in workspaces, impacts the dissemination of culture and language.

Running cultural and language programs in the community with the use of tangible heritage promotes knowledge sharing about the actual creation of objects as well as the stories behind them. In the process of creating tangible objects, stories and memories are often remembered by elders, who might share them with younger generations: “Making things, even small things like tools, might spark a lot of memories, and a lot of that comes from elders sharing how life was. That type of knowledge: inter-generational knowledge and tradition passed down; it's still being passed down through (cultural) programming” (Pamela Gross 2015, pers. comm.).

Karen Wright Fraser, Community Liaison Coordinator at the PWNHC, took it upon herself to learn how to make a traditional Gwich'in tunic prior to working at the PWNHC, one that she saw in a book when she was 32 years old and was thrilled to see that her culture did, in fact, have traditional clothing. Up until that point in her life she did not believe the Gwich'in had traditional dress. Her story is a powerful one that resonates with many people affected by colonialism, including the people that I interviewed and interacted with during my fieldwork. I feel Wright Fraser's story sums up what access to heritage centres and museum collections can do for a person and a community:

When I saw the tunic in the book I thought “Oh my god, they made a big mistake because we don't have those.” The photo said the tunic was bought by an explorer... I started to cry. I was happy. I was mad. I started to grieve. Everything all at once, all these emotions. I was thinking, how beautiful it was. I didn't even know our Gwich'in people had traditional clothing. In Inuvik I (had) never seen a picture or heard a story that Gwich'in had traditional clothing. I was thinking "how come I didn't know this?" and I was maybe 32 (years old) when I saw that picture.

I wrote Judy Thompson so that I can re-create this (tunic). When I was about 10 or 12, I sure needed to see this picture (of the tunic) so that I could feel good about my people. And about myself. And where I come from. Instead of seeing only alcoholism (in my community). I wrote to her with this idea. She said yes and we did this. It took four and a half years. Forty women later we made five outfits, it felt good. We brought elders to the Smithsonian (Institution) to see traditional outfits... Then (when we got back home) we'd do workshops with women, and work on our own (outfits) at home and then get back together (at the workshop). We would go to different communities and do these workshops. We had to re-learn (sewing) techniques that we didn't know (about) that we saw in the old outfits. We'd look into a book to re-learn it, with Dorothy Burnham. She would envision it, unfold it in her mind and draw it out. That's how we re-learned it. (Karen Wright Fraser 2015, pers. comm.)

Wright Fraser's story demonstrates the importance of access to museum collections where the discovery of traditional clothing in the collection not only generated interest in sewing traditional garments in her community but also played an instrumental part in the revitalization of knowledge that was lost in her community. Furthermore, the fact that she spoke of learning about her cultural heritage as “re-learning”, essentially “re-search” (see comment *xxii*), demonstrates the importance of traditional knowledge and connection she felt with this knowledge. Wright Fraser's success story in using a museum collection to revitalize her culture is a prime example of an Indigenous museum approach that the GN can learn from when eventually creating the NHC.

The knowledge that was collected during the fieldwork for this thesis presented me with several similar sentiments. First, almost everyone I spoke with about heritage centres, museums and museum collections expressed the issue of space, or the lack of space specifically. Second, all the participants I spoke with, including general conversations I had with individuals outside

my research, expressed the desire to have a museum or heritage centre in Nunavut that will house the Nunavut collection and offer programs and opportunities to access the collection. Third, when I engaged with youth, as well as some adults, the knowledge I was able to share with them about tangible Inuit cultural heritage sparked an interest in them, which speaks to the influence cultural material has on education. Last but not least, there is a significant gap in the knowledge among Inuit about traditional cultural material, partly due to increasing globalization but mostly due to a lack of interaction with Inuit cultural material that is no longer in use (or not used often) in everyday life, such as ivory needle cases or sealskin dog harnesses.

When I spoke with Nunavut Arctic College (NAC) students^{xix} from across Nunavut in Cambridge Bay, they spoke eloquently and thoughtfully about access to museums and museum collections. I passed around a bone needle case that had a bone needle inside. One student pointed out that having objects in a glass case is like looking at a photo where you can only see parts of the object (Shannon 2015, pers. comm.), whereas, when she looked at the object I passed around she had the unique opportunity of examining it closely and from different angles and used other senses to examine it, such as touch and smell. She stressed that “Inuit are taught to be respectful of objects, and I feel Inuit would know how to be careful of objects in museums when they are handling them” (Shannon 2015, pers. comm.). Her introspection towards Inuit knowledge of how to handle objects is in line with Indigenous curation that Kreps speaks about (1998; 2008; 2011). We have an opportunity in Nunavut to explore this knowledge for the care of museum belongings and incorporate it into the development of Inuit curation: “museologists may also find inspiration in indigenous [sic] knowledge concerning the care and treatment of cultural material and concepts of cultural heritage protection” (Kreps 2003, 8).

One of the students at the NAC stated that labels for belongings are sometimes confusing,

which demonstrates the lack of knowledge some people may have about our own cultural material. In my own experience, I have seen the lack or loss of knowledge many Inuit may have about material culture that we no longer use regularly. Our belongings have become unfamiliar to us. At the same time, some non-Inuit academics have become more knowledgeable about those belongings than Inuit ourselves, which I feel truly exemplifies the gap between knowledge that is gained from the accessibility of resources – such as education, museum collections and other opportunities to engage with Inuit material culture - and its dissemination. What impact would access to more cultural material, archives, historical documents and cultural knowledge - such as one would get from a visit to a museum or by researching a museum collection – have on Inuit, specifically Inuit youth? How would we choose to interact with, use and exhibit such collections?

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Identity is seen as the totality of images that a group has of itself, its past, present, and future. The role of the museum is to put a population in a position to visualize, be aware of, and name these images, which are manifested at the material and non-material levels of everyday life (Kreps 2003, 10).

Museums influence how people see Indigenous peoples, including how we see ourselves:

Museums are a major factor in forming public perceptions of nature, value, and contemporary vitality of Indigenous cultures. Indigenous peoples and many others rightly believe that museum collections and displays should be used to strengthen respect for their identity and cultures, rather than to justify colonialism, ethnocide, or dispossession (Battiste and Henderson 2000, 156).

As I have argued in this paper, it is important that Inuit in Nunavut have access to a museum to strengthen our identity, culture and language and stake claim over our tangible heritage that currently resides outside of our territory. It is also important that our museum collections that are being housed outside of Nunavut be brought home so that access to them may be made much easier for more Inuit.

In Nunavut museums and heritage centres should be *for* and *by* Inuit, rather than *about* objects or belongings themselves: “People’s relationship to objects are more important than the physical traits of the objects themselves” (Kramer 2014, 3). We need to break away from modernist paradigms of the preservation of cultural heritage where the premise of the concept of heritage is “lodged in material things” (Kreps 2008, 203) and develop an Indigenous museum approach that entwines tangible and intangible heritage. Much like what Eileen Hooper-Greenhill calls a “post-museum” (2000), where intangible heritage will receive greater attention, “curatorial authority is shared among the museum, community members, and other stakeholders whose voices and perspectives contribute to the production of knowledge and culture in the museum through partnerships that celebrate diversity” (Kreps 2008, 202). The wealth of

knowledge encapsulated in intangible heritage is exceedingly important in maintaining the cultural diversity of all cultures, especially in the face of globalization.

It is up to leaders in Nunavut, including those from the government and Inuit organizations, to ensure a territorial heritage centre is developed that best represents the wishes and needs of Inuit and Nunavummiut. What does the current lack of a territorial heritage centre in Nunavut, which suggests a lack of importance placed on our tangible and intangible heritage, say about the state of our culture? What about our political state in Nunavut? If our leaders truly support Inuit culture and Inuit way of life, it is vitally important that we ensure the fulfillment of Article 33 and create a territorial museum and heritage centre in Nunavut. Not only should the leaders in NTI and the GN be held accountable to fulfilling Article 33, the Federal Government also needs to be held accountable for its obligation to enact the NLCA in its entirety.

The museum and heritage centre models presented in this research are examples of institutions that can and should promote cultural heritage in Canada, specifically in isolated places. Further, they provide examples of heritage work – work that is very important to the social lives of Inuit and Nunavummiut, as well as to the preservation and continuation of Inuit culture and language – that is possible if a territorial museum or heritage centre is established in Nunavut. We, as Inuit and Nunavummiut, need to have the opportunity to engage with our own tangible heritage in order to foster the dissemination of traditional knowledge and language immersed in the intangible heritage of our own culture. It is not my place to support any one of the models at this point, as more Inuit would need to have a say in such a decision. However, whatever physical model is decided upon and created, an Indigenous museum approach to the *inua* – the soul - and operation of the museum is strongly recommended. This would mean incorporating Inuit values and beliefs into the care of the belongings, as well as ensuring it is

Inuit who are the primary interpreters of our own heritage. Further, it would mean Inuit have access and authority over the collection and dissemination of knowledge surrounding our intangible and tangible heritage.

Based on the literature and the data collected during my research, I recommend that the Government of Nunavut, Inuit Heritage Trust and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. develop an Indigenous museum that deviates from the standard territorial museum model put forth in the proposed Nunavut Heritage Centre as outlined in LORD (2002). The transition from a collection of dispossessed objects in a museum to belongings in an Indigenous museum is a positive step towards decolonization. It is my hope that the Nunavut collection no longer be distant, dispossessed and deterritorialized artifacts and objects but instead belong to Inuit at home in our territory within a museum guided by and contributing to Inuit values and ways of knowing.

Speaking with Nunavummiut, including my own mother and grandmother, there is often a concern about ensuring the vitality of our language and heritage, as well as knowledge of material culture and intangible cultural heritage. Vicki Aitaok (2015, pers. comm.) captures the importance of tangible cultural heritage: “Artifacts can live forever, and people don’t.” As we use our traditional cultural materials less and less with the rise of globalization and the incorporation of more non-Inuit technologies, we are faced with the diminishment or loss of both knowledge and language about those cultural materials. Having a territorial museum in Nunavut to house, re-search^{xx} and disseminate knowledge around our material culture is exceedingly important in facilitating the preservation of intangible cultural heritage and knowledge.

Brenda (2015, pers. comm.), a Nunavut Arctic College student stated, “It is great to feel a connection to ancestors, especially when you could touch (cultural material).” My mother, Maggie Putulik (2016, pers. comm.), further exemplifies the power of seeing our own cultural

heritage in person and the effect it had on her when she saw an *amauti* that she had only ever seen in photos but wished to see in person:

I always wanted to see Nivisinaaq's amauti [a well-known garment among Inuit women today] to see what the colours of the beads were. Rosie Oolooyuk told me once that different Inuit groups used different coloured beads, and being an Aivilingmiut I always wondered what our colours were. Knowing Nivisinaaq was Aivilingmiut I wondered what coloured beads she used and how many of each. I've only ever seen her amauti in black and white photos in books. Rhoda Karetak saw that amauti when they were filming *Inuit Piqutingit* and wrote down the number of beads of each colour. That was good enough for me, to be able to gain that knowledge about it.

While at the Mystic Seaport Museum I was reading the museum labels and I got caught in that moment, 100 years ago! Suuqlu tallima avati ukiuq tikikaalaktualu (it seemed like 100 years ago was all of a sudden present)! It just hit me. I thought "whoa, uakalanga (wow)!" I didn't know whether to cry or laugh. There was so much mixed emotions. Brian said "Maggie, come look at this amauti." I even forgot about the amauti itself until he reminded me and I bee-lined to the glass case. When I saw it, uakallaalukanniq (even more wow)!

A picture is very deceiving. Whenever I looked at that picture of Nivisinaaq I used to think she's tall, she must have been a tall person. When I saw the amauti I realized it was so small. It clashed in my mind, I thought she was a tall person but her amauti was an extra small amauti.

There is no description to that feeling of seeing the amauti. As soon as we left the museum I called my mother. I wanted her to feel the same way I did.

Putulik (2016, pers. comm.) later recollected how she felt after seeing the amauti, which is housed very far from where it was created and worn by Nivisinaaq: "I felt privileged to finally see it, but at the same time I thought about how her descendants have no (easy) access to see the amauti, and I felt bad that they cannot see it themselves." Putulik's comments resonates strongly with the reality that Nunavut does not currently have the museum facilities to provide more Inuit with such privileges.

The experience of the elders who partook in the film *Inuit Piqutingit* (2006), is very similar to Putulik's experience seeing Nivisinaaq's amauti, as well as similar to experiences of Yup'ik elders (Fienup-Riordan 2000) and Innuinait elders (Mary Avalaaq 2015, pers. comm.).

The similar experiences of these people exemplifies that the age of a person is not a factor in the significant impact access to museums and museum collections can have on a person or ultimately the communities from where people come. Rhoda Karetak further exemplifies the wishes of Inuit to have more opportunities to utilize museum collections and the effect that visiting museums can have on a person to gain more knowledge: “(The objects) were beautifully made. I cannot even describe everything. It would be nice if people would go to museums. If we had a museum that was closer it would be better. If you have time, go to a museum. Our trip expanded our minds and made us happier” (quoted from Isuma Productions 2006, *Inuit Piqutingit*).

Over and over, it has been shown in my research and the experiences of others that access to museums and museum collections can enhance peoples’ connection with their culture and heritage. This has been true for Inuit as demonstrated by the many voices in this thesis. Yet, we have often had to travel far for such experiences. It is my hope that this thesis has demonstrated that it is very important to fulfill Article 33 of the NLCA and establish an Inuit-made Nunavut Heritage Centre. With an Indigenous museum approach, the Nunavut Heritage Centre could revitalize and enrich our Inuit heritage and language and allow us to “re-search, re-write and re-story ourselves” (Absolon 2011, 21). It would be a place where we empower ourselves through a museum and choose how to interact with, learn about, interpret, represent and revitalize our culture. Having access to a museum close-to-home that is guided and operated with Inuit values would allow us to connect with our rich heritage of the past and further our possibilities for how we represent ourselves in the future.

ⁱ I feel the terms *artifacts*, *objects* and *belongings* in the museum setting should not be used interchangeably, especially in the context of Indigenous museums and heritage centres. The

terms *artifacts* and *objects* are more clinical terms that denote a disposed quality, whereas *belonging* signifies something that is possessed and personal. Furthermore, as exemplified by the museum exhibit “*cəsnaʔəm*: the city before the city”, the three-sided exhibit in Vancouver, BC, the use of the term *belonging* was used to signal “the ongoing connection” to the those “things that truly belong to our ancestors” (Wilson 2015, 24). Further, the use of the term *belonging*, especially in the museum setting, is a political statement that helps to thwart the alienation and dispossession that has occurred to those belongings.

ⁱⁱ The GN website states “on November 26, 2002, as a result of the creation of Nunavut, the Governments of Nunavut and the Northwest Territories reached an agreement to divide the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre's museum and archives collections. These priceless collections will be delivered to Nunavut from Yellowknife as soon as Nunavut has its own heritage centre” (Government of Nunavut 2010).

ⁱⁱⁱ As defined in the Nunavut Heritage Centre Feasibility Study – Final Report (LORD 2002), a *standard territorial museum* is defined as a “*Full Service Centre*, consisting of collection storage and care facilities, central curatorial and administrative services, collection research facilities, facilities for the development, production and distribution of traveling exhibits, teaching kids and outreach materials, including virtual access services. The center would work with educational, cultural and tourism partners at the central government level and in each community to provide heritage programming throughout Nunavut” (14). The Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre is an example of a standard territorial museum.

^{iv} Throughout this Master’s thesis the term “museums” is used to refer to the institutions and the people in the institutions collectively.

^v The difference between Inuit and Nunavummiut is that Nunavummiut include all people of Nunavut, whereas Inuit are exclusively self-identified Inuit.

^{vi} It should be noted that Kreps points out that many museums and heritage centres already have Indigenous approaches to curation, community-based programs, including language practice, performances, festivals and ceremonial gatherings on a regular basis or as an integral part of their purpose and function (2008, 201).

^{vii} This is exemplified in the Inuvialuit Living History Project (Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre nd.). A small group of Inuvialuit elders from the NWT traveled to the Smithsonian Institution (SI) in Washington, D.C. to look at the objects in the MacFarlane Collection in 2009. This collection consists of over 300 objects that were collected in the 1860s. While at the National Museum of Natural History (SI), one of the elders described it as a “living collection” and discussed how it would inspire the re-creation and revitalization of traditional knowledge (Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre nd.). Along with the knowledge gained at the museum, belongings were made available on-line as a form of digital repatriation that would allow a limitless number of people access to the objects visually. For more information see <http://www.inuvialuitlivinghistory.ca/collection>.

^{viii} Audio recording was done with 18 of the 19 individual interviews, and no audio recording was done with the group discussions. The elders in the focus group did not want to be audio recorded, nor did one participant I interviewed.

^{ix} Inuinnaqtun is a dialect of Inuktitut and is primarily spoken in two western Nunavut communities and one northern NWT community. I speak the Aivilingmiut dialect of Inuktitut from my own upbringing on the west coast of Hudson Bay.

^x The reasoning behind this is that the population of Nunavut in 1999 was approximately 85 percent Inuit. This majority of the population would thus make the Government of Nunavut strongly representative of Inuit.

^{xi} Aajiiqatigiinniġ: Decision making through discussion and consensus (Government of Nunavut n.d.b). This is one of the tenants of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, a guiding principle of the Government of Nunavut.

^{xii} For more information on the Northern Strategy please see <http://www.northernstrategy.gc.ca>.

^{xiii} For the purposes of this thesis, I do not specifically differentiate between different types of museums, such as the differences between art, natural history, science and technology and history museums. Instead, I simply refer to these as *museums*. On a similar thread, I do not focus on the differences between a visitor's centre and a heritage centre, despite there being differences.

^{xiv} The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples recognizes the importance of "the right to practice and revitalize cultural traditions and customs" (United Nations 2008, 6). Outlined in Articles 11, 12, 13, 15 and 31 the United Nations recognizes the importance of cultural heritage to Indigenous peoples, including "the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions" (12). Pertaining to this thesis, what is particularly important is the right to access cultural heritage (Article 12) and the right to control and disseminate cultural heritage within our Indigenous cultures Article 31).

^{xv} The storage facility the ACI has in place is called "qarmaq", which is the word for the subterranean dwellings Inuit used during winter months, and was chosen by Inuit in Nunavik (Daniel Gendron 2016, pers. comm.). The qarmaq is located at the Centre des collections de Montréal and is administered by the Société des directeurs de musées de Montréal.

^{xvi} The Kativik Regional Government (KRG) was established from the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement in 1978. The KRG is responsible to provide regional services to Nunavik, such as policing and civil security, airport management, regional economic development and park development and management. See <http://www.krg.ca/en/general-information-krg> for a more comprehensive list of the KRGs services and role in Nunavik.

^{xvii} The qulliq is a traditional stone lamp that was used to heat the iglu, cook food and dry clothing.

^{xviii} The term qablunaaq is an Inuktitut word for people of Euro-Western ancestry.

^{xix} The Nunavut Arctic College students who participated in group discussions agreed to be cited by first name only.

^{xx} I am utilizing the term *re-search*, meaning "to look again" as used in Absolon (2011, 21), as an attempt to step away from colonial paradigms of research and to take a decolonizing approach step away from the colonial baggage of the term "research".

Bibliography

- Ames, Michael. 1992. *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- . 1999. "How to Decorate a House: The Renegotiation of Cultural Representations at the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology." In *Museum Anthropology*, 22(3): 41-51.
- Archibald, Jo-Ann. 2008. *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Avataq Cultural Institute. n.d. Accessed July 7, 2016, <http://www.avataq.qc.ca/en/Home>
- Battiste, Marie Ann and James (Sa'ke'j) Youngblood Henderson. 2000. *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Company.
- CBC News, "Nunavut Heritage Centre Put on Hold", *CBC News*, November 1, 2011, accessed Feb. 2, 2016 <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/nunavut-heritage-centre-put-on-hold-1.1123119>
- , "Priceless Inuit artifacts still in N.W.T. for lack of Nunavut museum", *CBC News*, August 12, 2013, accessed November 8, 2013, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/priceless-inuit-artifacts-still-in-n-w-t-for-lack-of-nunavut-museum-1.1349562>
- , "Inuit Artifacts May Be Relocated From Yellowknife to Iqaluit", *CBC News*, Jan. 16, 2015, accessed Feb. 2, 2016, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/inuit-artifacts-may-be-relocated-from-yellowknife-to-iqaluit-1.2912413>
- , "Nunavut's Art Collection Heading to Winnipeg Art Gallery", *CBC News*, November 20, 2015, accessed Feb. 2, 2016, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/nunavut-art-collection-heads-to-winnipeg-1.3327717>
- Clavir, Miriam. 1996. "Reflections on Changes in Museums and the Conservation of Collections from Indigenous Peoples." In *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, 35(2): 99-107.
- . 2002. *Preserving What is Valued*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- . 2015. "Preserving The Physical Object in Changing Cultural Contexts". In *Museum Transformations*, edited by Ruth B Phillips and Annie Coombs. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Clifford, James. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Literature, Ethnography and Art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,
- . 1997. "Museums as Contact Zones." In *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Pp. 188-219. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Collier, Donald and Harry Tschopik, Jr. 1954. "The Role of Museums in American Anthropology." In *American Anthropologist*, 56(5): 768-779.
- Collignon, B. 2001. "Sense of place and cultural identities: Inuit domestic spaces in transition/Espirit des lieux et modeles culturels. La mutation des espaces domestiques en arctique inuit." In *Annales de Geographie*, 620: 383-404.
- Dickens, Jillian, "Heritage Centre Lands in Iqaluit", *Northern News Services*, Feb. 20, 2006, accessed January 27, 2016, http://www.nnsl.com/frames/newspapers/2006-02/feb20_06her.html
- Fienup-Riordan, Ann. 2000. *Hunting Tradition in a Changing World: Yup'ik Lives in Alaska Today*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Flynn Gillian A. and Deborah Hull-Walski. 2001. "Merging Traditional Indigenous Curation Methods with Modern Museum Standards of Care". In *Museum Anthropology*, 25(1):31-40.
- Geens, Jennifer, "Nunavut Heritage Centre in the Works", *Northern News Services*, April 4, 2005, accessed January 27, 2016, http://www.nnsl.com/frames/newspapers/2005-04/apr4_05her.html
- Government of Northwest Territories. 2016. "Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre". Accessed January 20, 2015, <http://www.pwnhc.ca>
- Government of Nunavut. n.d.a. "Pinnasuaqtavut 2004-2009". Accessed April 28, 2016, <http://www.nunavuteconomicforum.ca/public/files/library/POLITICA/PINASUAQ.PDF>
- . n.d.b. "Inuit Societal Values Poster". Accessed April 28, 2016, <http://www.gov.nu.ca/information/inuit-societal-values>
- . 2010. "Welcome to the Virtual Museum of Nunavut." Accessed November 25, 2013, <http://www.ch.gov.nu.ca/en/museum.aspx>
- . 2015. Request for Proposal. "Warehouse Space for Lease - Iqaluit: Culture & Heritage Archives & Museum Collections. RFP# 2015-48". Iqaluit, NU.
- Government of Nunavut, *et al.* 2006. *Backgrounder: Nunavut Heritage Centre*. Accessed April 28, 2016, <http://www.news.gov.nu.ca/2006/february/feb17b.pdf>
- Graburn, Nelson. 1998. "Weirs in the River of Time: The Development of Historical Consciousness among Canadian Inuit." In *Museum Anthropology* 22(1):18-32.
- Griebel, Brendan, "Recharting the Courses of History: Mapping Concepts of Community, Archaeology, and Inuit Qaujimajatuqanit in the Canadian Territory of Nunavut" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2013).

Hooper-Greenhill, Eileen. 2000. *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. New York and London: Routledge.

Imaituk Inc. 2011 “Arctic Communications Infrastructure Assessment Report: A Matter of Survival: Arctic Communications Infrastructure in the 21st Century”. Prepared for Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Government of Canada. Accessed February 12, 2016 <http://www.aciareport.ca>

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. 2004. “2001-2004 Annual Report – The Implementation of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement”. Accessed November 8, 2015, <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100030977/1100100030980>

---. 2015. “Fact Sheet: Aboriginal Self-Government”. Accessed January 27, 2016 <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100016293/1100100016294>

Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre. n.d. Inuvialuit Pitqusiit Inuuniarutait: Inuvialuit Living History. Accessed June 6, 2014. <http://www.inuvialuitlivinghistory.ca>

Isuma Productions. (2006) “Inuit Piqutingit (What Belongs to Inuit).” Accessed February 6, 2016. <http://www.isuma.tv/isuma-productions/inuit-piqutingit>

Kaplan, Flora. 1996. *Museums & the Making of “Ourselves”: The Role of Objects in National Identity*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Kramer, Jennifer. 2015. “Mobius Museology: Curating and Critiquing the Multiversity Galleries at the UBC Museum of Anthropology”. In *Museum Transformations*, edited by Ruth B Phillips and Annie Coombs. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kreps, Christina. 1998. “Introduction: Indigenous Curation.” In *Museum Anthropology* 22(1): 3-4.

---. 2003. *Liberating Culture: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Museums, Curation and Heritage Preservation*. London and New York: Routledge.

---. 2008. “Indigenous Curation, Museums, and Intangible Cultural Heritage.” In *Intangible Heritage*, edited by Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagagawa. New York and London: Routledge.

---. 2011. “Non-Western Models of Museums and Curation in Cross-cultural Perspective.” In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Sharon MacDonald, 457-472. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Krmpotich, Cara and Laura Peers. 2013. *This is Our Life: Haida Material Heritage and Changing Museum Practice*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Legislative Assembly of Nunavut. 2008. *Fourth Session: Second Assembly Report*. Accessed January 28, 2016, http://www.assembly.nu.ca/sites/default/files/Hansard_20080527.pdf

Lowenthal, David. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Lonetree, Amy. 2012. *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

LORD Cultural Resources Planning and Management Inc. and Consilium, Nunavut. 2002. *Nunavut Heritage Centre Feasibility Study – Final Report*.

McEachern, “GNWT and Nunavut Preparing for Artifact Transfer: 60 Per Cent of Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre Artifacts Will Go”, *Northern News Services*, Oct. 7, 2010, accessed Feb. 2, 2016, http://www.nnsi.com/frames/newspapers/2010-10/oct8_10art.html

Mead, Sidney Moko. 1983. “Indigenous Models of Museums in Oceania.” In *Museum*, 35(3): 98–101.

Metro News, “Nunavut to Lend Winnipeg Art Gallery 7,000 Inuit art pieces”, *Metro News*, November 19, 2015, accessed February 12, 2016. <http://www.metronews.ca/news/winnipeg/2015/11/19/nunavut-to-lend-winnipeg-art-gallery-7-000-inuit-art-pieces.html>

Murphy, David, “New Nunavut Facebook Group Seeks Action on Homelessness, Housing”, *Nunatsiaq Online*, July 23, 2013, accessed July 17, 2016.

Nunatsiaq News Online, “MLAs Urge Action on Stalled Nunavut Heritage Centre”, November 2, 2012, accessed November 8, 2013, http://www.nunatsiaqonline.ca/stories/article/65674mlas_urge_action_on_nunavut_heritage_centre/

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. 1993. *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*. Accessed November 8, 2013, <http://nlca.tunngavik.com>

---. 2011. “Annual General Meeting Resolution#: RSA 11-11-04 Inuit Heritage Centre”. Accessed February 11, 2016 <http://www.tunngavik.com/files/2011/11/rsa-11-11-04-heritage-centre.pdf>

---. “Inuit Heritage Trust Disappointed by Lack of Government Commitment to Nunavut Heritage Centre”, October 11, 2011, accessed <https://www.tunngavik.com/files/2011/10/iht-press-release-response-to-gn-heritage-center-announcement.pdf>

Philips, Ruth B. 2011. *Museum Pieces: Toward the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

Piquemal, Nathalie. 2001. “Free and informed consent in research involving Native American communities”. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 25(1), 65-79.

Smith, Linda Tuhawai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Smithsonian Institution. 2010. "Creating a Digital Smithsonian: Digitization Strategic Plan". Accessed February 12, 2016, https://www.si.edu/Content/Pdf/About/2010_SI_Digitization_Plan.pdf

Stanley, Nick, ed. 2007. *The Future of Indigenous Museums: Perspectives from the Southwest Pacific*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, Incorporated.

Statistics Canada. "Population by Year, by Province and Territory." Last Modified September 29, 2015, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/demo02a-eng.htm>

---. "Land and Freshwater Area, By Province and Territory." Last Modified February 1, 2005, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/phys01-eng.htm>

Strategic Networks Group: The Broadband Economists. 2012. "An Assessment of Socioeconomic Impact of Internet Connectivity in Nunavut. Prepared for the Nunavut Broadband Development Corporation." Accessed February 12, 2016, http://www.qfile.ca/p/42424/Workspaces/web_docs/An%20assessment%20of%20the%20socioeconomic%20impact%20of%20Internet%20connectivity%20in%20Nunavut%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf

Tester, Frank. 2006. "Iglutaq (In My Room): The Implications of Homelessness for Inuit." Accessed April 28, 2016, <http://www.tunngavik.com/documents/publications/2006-04-00-Iglutaq-The-Implications-of-Homelessness-for-Inuit.pdf>

---. 2009. "Iglutaasaavut (Our New Homes): Neither 'New' nor 'Ours' Housing Challenges of the Nunavut Territorial Government." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes*. 43(2): 137-158.

Van Dusen, John, "Nunavut Housing Crisis: 'Dire Straits' in Igloolik", *CBC News*, September 30, 2015, accessed January 27, 2016, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/igloolik-social-housing-dire-straits-1.3248953>

Wilson, Jordan, "sq̇qip – Gathered Together" (MA thesis, University of British Columbia 2015).

Wright Fraser, Karen. 2001. "My People Did This: The Re-Making of Gwich'in Garment". In *Fascinating Challenges: Studying Material Culture with Dorothy Burnham*. Thompson, Judy *et al*, eds. Gatineau, QC: Mercury Series: Canadian Museum of Civilization.

Appendices

Appendix A Heritage Centres, Visitor Centres and Museums in Nunavut

Table 1: Heritage Centres, Visitor Centres and Museums in Nunavut (adapted from Graburn 1998)

Name	Location	Founded	Run By	Emphasis
<i>Kivalliq</i>				
Margaret Aniksak Visitors Center	Arviat		Local Hamlet	Local history, local traditional culture
Mikilaaq Centre	Arviat		Roman Catholic Church	Archives, photos
Vera Akumalik Visitors Centre	Baker Lake		Local Hamlet	Historic, natural history, re-creation of 1940's HBC post
Qamani'tuaq Fine Arts	Baker Lake	Closed		Fine Art
Baker Lake Inuit Heritage Centre	Baker Lake	1995	Local Hamlet	Local oral history, local traditional culture
Piqqusilirivvik Cultural Learning Centre	Baker Lake		Nunavut Arctic College	Education, cultural programming
Ukkusiksalik National Park	Nauyasat	2014	Parks Canada	Ukkusiksalik National Park information
Matchbox Gallery	Rankin Inlet	1987	Local society	Art workshop and gift shop
Kivalliq Regional Visitor Centre	Rankin Inlet	1999	Nunavut Tourism	Maps and tourism information
<i>North Baffin</i>				
Qimatuligvik Heritage Centre & Gift Shop	Arctic Bay	2006	Local Hamlet	Created with Parks Canada, including Sirmilik National Park, gift shop and art gallery
Nattinnak Centre	Pond Inlet	1996	GN, Parks Canada, Pond Inlet Library and Archives Society	Library and archives, tourism, knowledge dissemination, small exhibit space with local historic pieces
Pond Inlet Library and Archives Society	Pond Inlet	2005	Non-profit society	Library and archives

Name	Location	Founded	Run By	Emphasis
Igloodik Cultural Centre	Iglulik	1972	Inummariit Society	Iglu-shaped museum, local Inuit historical material culture
Inummariit Society	Iglulik	1972	Oblate Catholic Church, local community leaders	Preserve Inuit traditions, text ("Inummariit Collection")
Inullariit Society of Igloodik	Iglulik	1993	Local committee	Oral history, local culture camps, traditional knowledge
Piqqusilirivvik Cultural Learning Centre	Iglulik		Nunavut Arctic College	Education, cultural programming
<i>South Baffin</i>				
Piqqusilirivvik Cultural Learning Centre	Clyde River		Nunavut Arctic College	Education, cultural programming
Art Centre	Cape Dorset	1958	Co-operative	Art production, print shop, sales room
Ilisaqsivik Society	Clyde River	1997	Community-based society	Community wellness, health.
Ittaq Heritage and Research Centre	Clyde River	2005	Community-based society	Research, knowledge development, cultural programming
Nunatta Sunakkutangit	Iqaluit	1968	Non-profit	Art objects, rotating exhibits
Mallikjuaq Park Visitor Centre	Pangnirtuuq	1986	Parks Canada	Nature, prehistory, traditional culture, arts and crafts
Angmarlik Interpretive Centre	Pangnirtuuq	1988	Government of Nunavut	19th Century and traditional Inuit materials, library, audio-visuals and language materials
Unikkarvik Visitor Centre	Iqaluit	1989	Nunavut Tourism	Tourist Information, videos, souvenirs, contemporary arts
Katannilik Park	Kimmirut	1993	Nunavut Parks	Katannilik Territorial Park information
Qikiqtarjuaq Gathering Centre	Qikiqtarjuaq	2014	Parks Canada	Auyuittuq National Park information, visitor's centre
<i>Kitikmeot</i>				
Kugluktuk Visitor Heritage Centre	Kugluktuk	2014	Local Hamlet	Local history, tourism and arts and crafts store.

Name	Location	Founded	Run By	Emphasis
Nattilik Heritage Society	Gjoa Haven	2013	Local heritage society	Local Nattilik history, local whaling history
Kitikmeot Heritage Society	Cambridge Bay	1996	Local heritage society	
Arctic Coast Visitor Centre	Cambridge Bay	1991	Nunavut Tourism	Inuit artworks and it provides visitors with tour guides, maps and cultural information.
<i>Arts & Crafts Centres</i>				
Taluq Designs	Taloyoak	1995	Nunavut Development Corporation	Inuit fine art, retail
Ivalu	Rankin Inlet	1992	Nunavut Development Corporation	Inuit fine art, retail
Jessie Oonark Centre	Baker Lake	1992	Nunavut Development Corporation	Inuit fine art, retail
Kiluk	Arviat	1996	Nunavut Development Corporation	Inuit fine art, retail
Baker Lake Fine Arts and Crafts	Baker Lake	Closed		

Appendix B Interview Guides in English and Inuktitut

Purpose:

I am conducting interviews as part of research for my Master's thesis at the University of British Columbia. The purpose of the project is to gain information and knowledge on the topics of museums and heritage centres in Inuit communities. A report will be submitted as a Master's thesis to the Department of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia. A copy will be made available to all participants either electronically or as a hard copy. You are being asked to participate because we think you have valuable reflections to share on this topic.

If you agree to be interviewed you will be asked about your ideas or thoughts about current heritage centres in your community and the role you feel it plays in preserving or reviving Inuit culture. The interview itself will last one to two hours, although the whole process may take up to two and a half hours to complete. I will record your interview by audio recording.

The purpose of the interview is to have a conversation with you about the topics, so feel free to add any information that you feel is important that I may not have asked. I will focus on the following themes and will give you examples of questions I will ask:

- Your personal heritage centre and museum experience; I will ask questions like "What was your experience like while visiting museums?"
- Exploring community engagement; I will ask questions like "what are some ways that you think the community can engage with or work with heritage centres?"
- Access to Inuit heritage, and I will ask questions like "how would you like to access Inuit heritage and cultural material in museums?"
- And, the proposed Nunavut Heritage Centre, and I will ask questions like "what would you like to see in the proposed Nunavut Heritage Centre?"

Heritage Centre and Museum Experience

- 1) Have you visited heritage centres, visitor's centres or museums in your community? In Nunavut? In Canada?
- 2) What was your experience like while visiting these places?
 - a. Did you like the centre? What did you like about it?
 - b. Did you not like the centre? What didn't you like about it?
 - c. What was your impression on the display of cultural material?
 - d. Would you recommend it for other visitor's to attend? Why?
- 3) Are there any specific museums or heritage centres that you've visited that you found engaging?
- 4) What can we learn from those experiences in museums and heritage centres that we can bring forth to the development of heritage centres in your community? In Nunavut?
- 5) If you haven't visited any heritage centres, visitor's centres or museums, why haven't you?
- 6) What do you think the role is of heritage centres, visitor's centres and museums in a community?

Exploring Community Engagement

- 7) If there is a visitor/heritage centre in your community:
 - a. Do community members work and/or manage the visitor/heritage centre?
 - i. Who are the managers of the visitor/heritage centre?
 - b. Do local community members visit it?
 - c. Does the community support the centre?

- d. What impact do you think it has on the community?
 - i. Does it bring in tourists?
 - ii. Does it work with the community to create exhibits?
 - iii. Does it work with the community to offer space for programs, i.e. sewing programs, story-telling time, pre-natal classes, hunting lessons, etc? Do these programs offer traditional knowledge to visitors?
 - iv. Does the centre offer community members any sort of training in heritage work?
 - v. Does it promote the heritage sector in terms of offering jobs, volunteer opportunities or training?
 - e. Does the centre provide local traditional knowledge to its visitors, through exhibits, training, programs, bringing in expertise (i.e. elders)?
 - f. What do you think lacks in the visitor/heritage centre in your community?
 - g. How do you think the visitor/heritage centre in your community could improve itself to promote community involvement?
- 8) Does the heritage centre support and participate community activities or programs? How does it support the community? How does it participate in community activities or programs?
- 9) What programs has it run in the past?
- 10) Does the heritage centre offer programs in multi-media projects? For example, community-led/run film making on traditional activities.

Perceptions of where the visitor/heritage centre in the community should go in the future

- 11) What services would you like the heritage centre to provide?
- 12) What programs would you like the heritage centre to provide?

Access to Inuit Heritage

- 13) If you had the opportunity to access Inuit heritage (cultural material), how would you like to access it?
- 14) If and when the proposed NHC is created, what types of opportunities would you like to have to access the material?
- 15) How much access do you think Inuit should be granted to the material at the proposed NHC?
- 16) How do you think would be the best way or an innovative way to ensure access is given to people across Nunavut to the material at the NHC?

Nunavut Heritage Centre (NHC) Specific Questions

- 17) Do you know any background information about the proposed NHC? If yes, what do you know about the proposed NHC?
- 18) Would you like to see the proposed NHC come to fruition?
- 19) If there was a Nunavut Heritage Centre in Nunavut, would you visit it?
- 20) What would you like to see in the proposed NHC?
 - a. Is there anything specific you'd like to see at the proposed NHC? i.e. Shoofly's amauti.
 - b. Are there exhibits you'd like to see? i.e. Amundson's expedition, Fifth Thule Expedition exhibit, Thule exhibit.
- 21) What would you *not* like to see in the proposed NHC?
- 22) What are your expectations of a territorial museum?
 - a. Inuit focus?

- b. Non-Inuit focus?
- c. Traditional focus? Contemporary focus?
- d. Community involvement? Nunavut-wide involvement?
- e. Elder involvement?
- f. Traditional knowledge incorporated into exhibits?
- g. Would you like to see traditional knowledge programs? What types of programs would you like to see in the proposed NHC facility? i.e. sewing classes, iglu-building, qajaq building, tool making, hunting skills, etc.

Museum Specific (for museum people only)

- 23) What is the background and purpose of the name of your institution?
- 24) Are there any Indigenous/Aboriginal/Native museums that you know of that are groundbreaking in their structure/programs?
- 25) Are you familiar with the recent trend of Indigenizing museums? What are your thoughts on this trend/move in museology?
- 26) Do you think the proposed NHC could incorporate Indigenization of the NHC? If so, how?

- 19. ወይንም ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት?
- 20. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት?
 - a. ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት? ስራ ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት.
 - b. ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት? ስራ ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት.
- 21. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት?
- 22. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት?
 - a. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት?
 - b. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት?
 - c. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት? ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት?
 - d. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት? ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት?
 - e. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት?
 - f. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት? ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት?
 - g. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት? ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት? ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት, ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት, ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት, ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት, ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት.

ጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት

- 23. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት?
 - 24. ሰው ለሌላ ሰው ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት? ሰው ሰው ለማድረግ ማለት?
- ጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት?
- ጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት ማድረግ ለጥቅም ስራ ለማድረግ ማለት?