

Paul C. Thistle PAU THI Y26

Whose Heritage?: Resolving the Conflict

The purpose of this paper is to continue the examination of conflict arising between museums and Native people, focussing specifically on how conflict situations can and have been resolved.

The first paper illustrated that conflict has arisen in all of the major areas of museum--specific responsibility and in the cross-cultural dimension. It was argued that acquisitions have often been made in a manner which is immoral and sometimes even illegal, that access, and the "respect" paid, to the collections are less than satisfactory, and that the extra-cultural control over their material culture heritage has negative political implications in terms of the colonialized status of Native people.

The stewardship of museums over the collections has also come under attack, not only from Native people but from professionals in the field. Research has been criticized for being done in an insensitive, arbitrary manner, and [for bringing little or no beneficial return to the people]. In fact, many Native people feel that much of the research done has been irrelevant or actually inimical to their real needs and interests. Misrepresentation, misunderstanding, mockery, and even racist are terms which have been applied to the treatment of Native people within the exhibition/education mandate of museums. [There has been criticism about such failings as poor exhibit design, neglect of the concept of culture change and the failure to portray Native materials in their correct historical context].

Perhaps underlying the above are the problems inherent in the cross-cultural nature of the conflict. There appears to be a double standard operating in many museums vis-a-vis Native people and their material culture. As well, there appears to be differing perceptions of the metaphysics involved, -- different ideas as to what constitutes appropriate "respect."

Finally, the ostrich response by museums to the criticisms and the conflict has tended to worsen relationships with Native groups.

Although the problems outlined above are serious ones, and although the literature tends to deal with the more "newsworthy" clashes of interest, there are cases which illustrate that museums

and Native people have indeed been able, not only to resolve differences, but to extend their cooperative relations to the mutual benefit of all. It will become apparent that these solutions are not arrived at simply by reversing the criticisms. Solutions for Native people are not necessarily solutions acceptable to the aims and functions of museums, nor vice versa. Solutions must therefore be sought in new directions, since the approaches of the two parties often tend to be diametric vectors.

Quite recently, after two years of negotiations, the National Museum has returned a number of artifacts (many of them sacred) to the Blackfoot people of Gliochen^{Alberta}, who have established a museum at their Old Sun Community College (Warden 1979). The artifacts are on "permanent loan" as long as the Blackfoot provide the facility and a trained staff to operate it. The agreement does not, however, allow for the artifacts to be used in ceremonies. Nevertheless, Denis Alsford, Curator of Collections for the Ethnology Division, of the National Museum, has stated that "...the (National) museum would probably be ^{be prepared to consider and would probably be} sympathetic to requests for the supervised use of sacred objects on special occasions." (Warden 1979).

Although this case illustrates that the return of artifacts is one solution to the conflict, it also points up the difficulties which could arise in this situation. As mentioned in the first paper, one of the major reasons for demanding return of artifacts in the first place is not so they can be merely stored or displayed, but so they can actually be used in ongoing religious ceremonies. The stipulation that artifacts not be used in this manner would seem to be crucial in maintaining what some would say was colonial control over the artifacts. Here, museum and Native approaches to "uses" of the artifacts may turn out to be incompatible and further conflict may be in the offing.

Another typical example of the paternalistic bent to the relations with Native people is reported by G. Fraser (1978). The products of Inuit artistic endeavours have been almost totally siphoned off to the south ever since modern production began in the late 1940's. Recently, The Inuits' "growing sense of lost contact with their artistic heritage" has piqued the Quebec government to sponsor an exhibition (note the singular) of sculpture in Povungnituk. Although on the surface this appears to be an admirable concession

good
K.A.
-a definite
problem
area!

or consent as the
museum would have
any artifacts
w/ any group

by non-Natives, it merely reinforces the fact that the Inuit no longer have even minimal control over their artistic heritage, as does an artist in the south for example, who can see his/her work in a museum, or at least know who has purchased the work. Inuit artists have no such opportunities except those which are smugly provided by non-Native institutions. *do not the Inuit have access to the info thru cooperatives?*

Nevertheless, both of the above cases are marked by a positive effect on the respective communities. Pride, joy, relief, rediscovery and "spiritual uplift" are all experienced through the return of artifacts.

The resistance of museums to give up their Native collections to those who request their return is illustrated by the case of the Six Nations, Hodenosaunee who struggled over ninety years, through two court cases and unfulfilled 1971 state legislation to reclaim sacred wampum belts from the New York State Museum in Albany (Hill 1977:45). It is important to note that, even after all their struggle and conflict, the eventual success of their efforts has brought about a significant change in attitude toward museums among the Hodenosaunee. They are now engaged in a unique relationship with the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society. The museum staff works with an Iroquois "advisory committee" to negotiate return of sacred objects, to plan exhibits and education programs that present a positive, accurate image of Native people and which involves the Indian community in museum activities (such as construction and installation of exhibits and work/study programs in all phases of museum operations) (Hill 1977:44, 46). *Good idea*

The Hodenosaunee now have direct access to the workings of the museum and can take a hand in its direction and in establishing priorities. These relations have proven quite successful, allowing the Iroquois to re-educate and re-orient their people as well as helping the museum to make intelligent, sensitive decisions about the use of their collections (Hill 1977:46). For example, sacred masks have been removed from display and a short term loan program established to allow religious teachers to borrow the collections for use in traditional ceremonies (Hill 1977:45).

Oddly enough, many of the more successful relationships between museums and Native people have occurred in the Pacific Coast area where, historically, response to Native concerns has been

overwhelmingly negative (eg. British Columbia's refusal to deal with outstanding land claims since entering Confederation in 1871.)

B. Efrat and M. Mitchell (1974) report on the collaborative efforts between the Hesquiat people of Vancouver Island and the British Columbia Provincial Museum. The keys to the success of this cooperative relationship seem to be that the impetus and control of the project emanate from the Hesquiat themselves. It was they who approached the B.C.P.M. for help in salvaging burial grounds which were being desecrated and vandalized. It was the Hesquiat Cultural Committee who negotiated favourable contracts concerning control over access to the community, nature of the research, data disposition, royalties, publicity, hiring, hereditary rights, and recompense for services rendered as informants. In sum, the Hesquiat have maintained complete control over the project even to the extent of giving permission for Efrat and Mitchell to publish their article describing the Hesquiat Project (Efrat and Mitchell 1974:405-407).

This type of control of course has some fairly serious implications for scholarship. Not all researchers would wish to submit themselves to what amounts to be censorship. Negotiation is crucial here. Both parties must be fully aware of their mutually agreed upon limitations and responsibilities.

As well, the responsibility for the actual work on the project is gradually being turned over to the Hesquiat as their own people become more and more knowledgeable. The project field work is also being done in a way which conforms to the social usages of the community, for example, by "thanking with wealth" which is still an important norm among the Hesquiat. Thus, the researchers do not have to rely on the "mythical friendship" supposed to exist between informant and field worker. In addition, this serves to more equitably distribute research grant dollars among the people as recommended by such critics as Vine Deloria and Harold Cardinal (Efrat and Mitchell 1974:406).

The results of the collaboration have not only allowed researchers to continue working on a fascinating culture without stepping on toes or being harrassed and diverted by protests, but the Hesquiat

themselves have gained a significant measure of "psychological satisfaction" from their participation in the preservation of their culture. Such a result is of paramount importance to Native people as a whole, who are a group characterized by others as being "degraded", "demoralized" and "decultured".

Another example of successful cooperation between museums and Native people is reported by J. and D. Demmert (1972). Deteriorating and vandalized totem poles in Alaska have been salvaged by the Alaska State Museum under agreement with the Southeast Alaska Indian Arts Council. The catalyst for this relationship was the policy established by the U. S. Forest Service significantly setting out that the poles continued to belong to the Indians. This was despite the fact that neither traditional ownership nor ownership in non-Native terms were traceable. The solution to this "ownership" problem, a bothersome one in much of museum/Native conflict, was to vest title to those untraceable poles in the Arts Council. Of course, clans which could establish their ownership could reclaim their ancestral property.

As the salvage project continued to develop, more Indian people were employed in the actual work. According to the Demmerts (1972:24) such consultation and participation gave not only a "new dimension of validity" to the museum's efforts, but also "confirmed the Indians' interest in the preservation of their past" and it enhanced their identity, an identity which is no longer seen as a liability as it had been prior to the project (Demmert 1972:24)

One of the major success stories of museum/Native collaboration is the Ozette archaeological project on the Olympic Peninsula in Washington state. Ozette is one of the most important archaeological sites ever to be located on the Pacific Coast. Often called the "Pompeii of the New World", Ozette was a site occupied seasonally for over two thousand years until it was inundated by a land slide. The mud has resulted in almost ideal preservation and has allowed the excavation of such details as [leaves still green after hundreds of years] (Daugherty and Kirk 1974).

M. Budger (1978:51) has stated

Ozette is not only unique for its archaeological perfection. In an area where the native population is suspicious of the proddings of anthropologists and archaeolo-

gists, Daugherty (chief archaeologist) and the Makah nation have developed a relationship of trust."

One might suppose that an important element of this trusting relationship is the sensitive manner in which the site's skeletal material is being treated. "Daugherty and crew won't discuss the skeletons that they found out of deference to the Makah, who still remember the names of people lost to the coast's perennial mudslides. (Budger 1978:52). One might compare this approach with the publicity over the burials discovered in Selkirk in 1975. For some Native people it was the undignified publicity^{itself} which was the problem.

Again, the key to successful relations seems to be that the Makah have been the ones to initiate and control the project. They have retained permanent ownership of all artifacts found (Quimby and Nason 1972:50) and are participating in every aspect of the project. For example, they are being hired as excavators and lab technicians (Daugherty and Kirk 1976:72), the tribal elders are being consulted in attempts to identify artifacts and their uses, crew members and Phd students studying the basketry on the site take lessons from the Makah women (Daugherty and Kirk 1974:37). The Makah have also built a museum and cultural centre at near-by Neah Bay, a reservation community, where the artifacts will be preserved, studied and exhibited.

In addition, a special program for six undergraduate students has been set up at the Burke Museum at the University of Washington to train Makah people as curators. G. Quimby and J. D. Nason (1977) report that this project has been highly successful because it was recognized initially that there was a need to be highly flexible given the widely divergent educational backgrounds of those Makah participating. The Makah band itself was given much of the final decision making power (Quimby and Nason 1977:51). Quimby and Nason (1977:52) conclude

The Makah Cultural and Reserach Center will permit these important collections to remain in the geographic and cultural context from which they came and within the proper jurisdiction of the people for whom the artifacts have the most meaning. It will also serve to inform others of this important heritage. The museum's development will encourage the continued preservation of not only these specimens, but of traditional arts and skills as well, thus encouraging the knowledge and pride of the Makah in their own rich heritage.

As Daugherty and Kirk (1976:74) have maintained, the function of the museum to make the past a part of the present has been eminently successful here and especially so for the Makah. It has been successful as a result of meaningful consultation of, and participation and ultimate control by, the Makah. The pride and commitment of the people in their efforts is more than just apparent, it pervades the entire project and present-day community. How different from those cases which have developed into ^{the} Conflict and distrust examined in the first paper! V.G.

From the above cases, therefore, in the wide view at least, solutions to conflict are founded upon consultation, cooperation and control of and by Native people. Some further more specific recommendations will be discussed below.

One of the most common recommendations to emerge has been to involve the younger generation of Native people in training and working with museums (see A.I.H.S. 1971:192, Strynadka 1970:33, Biddle 1977:40). The advantages for Native people here are two-fold: one, with the increased contact with the older generation it is hoped that gaps can be bridged and tighter integration accomplished in a return to more traditional learning patterns arising out of "respect" for the elderly. Secondly, it is hoped that such participation by the people will create a new pride and identity for all (see Pettipas and Kelly 1977:45). ~~For museums~~

For museums, the advantages are that community responses to workers who are their own young people should be better than to outsiders. The work should proceed more smoothly as a result. There are however concomitant difficulties in that such "insiders" after being educated "outside" are often grouped as "outsiders". The community ^{often} perceives the educated to be acculturated and no longer "one of us".

There have been some successful attempts at this ^{type of} strategy however. As one example, the Smithsonian Department of Anthropology since 1973 has created internship position for Native Americans and has made plans to offer courses at universities and museums close to where they are needed (Biddle 1977:40). Of course, such "special" programs take money and "special" considerations, but as John White, a participant at the Convocation of American Indian Scholars has stated,

But it seems to me, that if there were really concern and

respect for a people, there would be some way for money to be made available for the training of Indian people in museology, for the creation of tribal museum facilities, and for actually purchasing objects illegally taken, so that they could be restored to the people who owned it (sic) (A.I.H.S. 1971:207).

In general, more cooperation with Native people and more opportunities for Native people within the field have been widely recommended.

In the United States, however, a recent Supreme Court decision on "reverse discrimination" has endangered such "special" considerations for minority groups. However, as Alan Jabbour, Director of the Folk Division at the Library of Congress has stated,

Programs specifically for Native Americans or any ethnic group do not short change other people. They can only contribute to the greater strength of the nation (Biddle 1977:42).

It seems only logical if equality of result is to be obtained, i.e. an equal proportion of Native people in the field, that such minority groups will require preferential treatment in order that more may enter the field in which they are seriously under-represented at present.

Based on a foundation of consultation, cooperation and control the other criticisms of museum functions dealt with in the first paper can now be addressed.

With regard to collections, D. Finster (1975:47) takes the approach that

...in cases where sacred objects have been acquired by museums under questionable circumstances, one must recognize that an ethical obligation exists for the museum to return them. Where knowledge and desire to use the objects still exist, an ethical obligation rests on museums to make them available for use, however they were acquired.

On the other hand Finster (1975:47-8) argues that where objects have been properly transferred to museums according to tribal custom, that Native people have a reciprocal obligation to recognize the validity and binding nature of such transfers. There are cases cited by Finster (1975:42) in which the collector has actually validated ^{the traditional} status of "keeper" of sacred items. Such a tack does however raise other questions as to the desirability of outsiders interceding in cultural processes. For example, anthropologists

24 Feb
Bureau
Nat'l
Museum

on the Pacific Coast have been criticized for sponsoring potlatches. If acceptable to both sides, however, this type of strategy seems to be an ideal solution.

To avoid criticisms concerning acquisitions it has been recommended by P. J. Boylan (1977:108), the National Indian Education Association (Nason et al 1973:24) and I.C.O.M. Ethnographic Committee (1973:ii) that museums reevaluate and develop new and stringent collections policies and ethical guidelines. Refusal to accept anything which is inadequately documented (Zelle 1971:19, Bostick 1974:28, A.A.M. Committee on Ethics 1978:27), or to which valid title cannot be obtained (Boylan 1977:108), or which cannot be properly cared for (A.A.M. 1978:27) should be strict museum policy. If museums were to approach more closely their own established ideals, then criticisms concerning their collection could be easily diffused.

Aside from the obvious duty of museums to take better care of the collections they already have in terms of storage, stewardship, study and documentation (Reynolds 1970:2), perhaps some attention is warranted to Native concerns about the metaphysical well-being of the artifacts. For example, Finster (1975:42) reports that in response to Iroquois concerns the National Museum has enlisted the aid of medico-religious practitioners to assist in the renewal and feeding of false face society masks in the collection.

Concerns about the integrity of collections arising out of the financial difficulties and alleged unethical dealings of museums are now beginning to be dealt with. New York's Attorney General has ordered the dismissal of the curator responsible for the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation (Dockstader) and is overseeing a general overhaul of the organization and one of all time's greatest inventory of this massive collection (Ferretti 1976). The museum now has also undertaken no longer to deaccession museum objects to dealers and collectors.

Again, it seems as if the major difficulty in the museum field can be overcome merely by adhering to its own stated principles and by not applying a double standard when dealing with Native materials.

There have been a number of recommendations made which, along with the commitment to include Native people in the processes of consultation, cooperation and control, would go a long way toward

solving the conflict in the museum responsibility for research. Native people have been asking for this type of participation for years (see Rogers 1977/8:39). Freeman (1977:71) maintains that this lack of real participation by Native people has been one of the major failings of researchers. Rogers (1977/8:39) maintains that informal consultation rather than outside regulation (although we have seen it to be a catalyst in the Alaska totem pole case) or formal relationships is much more functional. The latter tends to result in the participants posturing and polarizing their positions as they attempt to make political points.

One can, however, be cynical about the entire consultative process. As Freeman (1977:74) asserts, it might merely make local residents "party to the crime". One might also question the interpretation and impact of "consultation". Institutions are notorious for "consulting" the people concerned while proceeding to ignore their advice.

Meaningful consultation is crucial. As G. Swinton (1976:6) points out, the new National Museum policy background statement does correctly recognize that Native people are "experts" in their own right (different in kind only). Swinton, in accord with LaRoque (1975:14), maintains that Native scholars and thinkers as well as Native standards, ways of knowing and priorities must be incorporated if future research is to be successful, or even tolerated at all.

Even such sensitive research matters as are involved in archaeological excavations of burials have been concluded successfully when the Native people have been consulted as recommended by the First Indian Ecumenical Conference, 1970 (Nason et al 1973:25). The 1971 Symposium of the Plains Anthropological Conference reported a case concerning the Nez Perce whose tribal shamen approved of the work to be done in a salvage operation.

Guidelines have been established (Rogers 1977/8:36 asserts too little too late) for research by many institutions (see for example the University of Manitoba, Appendix II), by the various museum sub-disciplines and by the A.A.M. (1978) itself. All that is needed now is for these ideals to be carried through. By way of example, the A.A.M.'s Committee on Ethics has stated that research must be carried out in a manner acceptable to professionals and to religious beliefs (emphasis added) (A.A.M. 1978:25). It is

all too obvious in many cases to date that this has not been adhered to in practice.

[As a general guideline E. Maynard (1974:403) has stated that a primary requisite of research must be that it provides a needed service to the people rather than being pure scholarship per se.] Native people themselves are now recognizing the value of research in such fields as ethnology and archaeology and in fact are hiring their own anthropologists to help solve certain community problems as well as to work on land claims cases (Rogers 1977/8:38).

Again, the key to successful relations here seems to be that Native people determine the priorities and directions of research. Although such control and direction by Native groups may be frustrating to the researcher (J. W. St. G. Walker personal communication), it seems only logical that with limited, and indeed shrinking, funds and consequent ability to do research, that the most efficient avenues to pursue are those which Native cooperation rather than resistance is assured through their control and close involvement.

In general, a new concern for ethical research and sensitivity toward Native people, their feelings and problems is called for (Rogers 1977/8:38-9, Bradbury 1977:48).

Solutions to problems criticised in the exhibition/education mandate of museums seem again to be couched in the importance of consultation and cooperation. L. Biddle (1977:40) asserts that it is difficult for non-Natives to arrange an exhibit without offending Native sensibilities (the example given was treatment of Bering Land Bridge migration theories to the exclusion of Native ideas about their origins). Although there is a serious question as to whether co-ethnics are the only ones who can correctly interpret a culture for the museum public, the point is well taken that museum exhibits have not been particularly successful from the Native viewpoint.

A participant at the Convention of American Indian Scholars (A.I.H.S. 1971:209) recommended that museums should check with Native sources to determine how, or whether, sacred objects should be exhibited. E. Bradbury (1977) examines a successful interpretation of a number of sacred objects from the Ghost Dance religion in the "I Wear the Morning Star" exhibition. The key factor again is that the museum staff recognized the sensitive and potentially contro-

*many feminist
the scientific
was the
disagree
only school
of thought*

versial nature of the exhibition and discussed their plans with local Native people. They received approval for their plans and they continued to strive to present an objective and as undistorted view as possible. In deference to Native sensibilities, Native symbolism was incorporated into the design, contact with the Indian community was maintained and the materials were blessed by shamen at each new installation of the travelling exhibit.

Other solutions recommended for exhibit problems were the use of reproductions rather than the sacred originals. This approach is favoured by the Hodenosaunee (Hill 1977:44-5). If properly interpreted, it is argued, substitutes could fulfill the public's educational needs without savaging native sensibilities.

There is some little difficulty here, however, in that such a strategy denies that the actual objects can and do have significant meaning for non-Hodenosaunee as well. This strikes at the very heart of the museum's mandate and a great deal more communication is needed before this issue can be settled.

K. R. Hopkins (1970:120) has recommended that a re-evaluation of all exhibits should take place and those which no longer respond to today's needs or are no longer acceptable in light of modern social science should be purged. W. C. Sturtevant (1969:644) has also recommended that museums "catch up to modern anthropology" and not dwell on the culture area concept, but rather on concepts relevant to current research. *(determined only by social scientists?) - very arbitrary*

In terms of the education mandate of museums, there are a great many areas that need improvement as indicated in another paper. The solutions here seemed to begin with improving the training and evaluation of the volunteer docents upon whom many feel the greatest burden of interpretation falls. LaRoque (1975:13-29) has pointed out the need for a more "wholistic"^(sic) treatment of Native cultures.

A major factor in the entire conflict is its cross-cultural nature. Of course, underlying this is difference, -- difference in world view and religion; difference in perceptions of what constitutes appropriate "respect".

For instance, the point at which scientific curiosity and acquisitiveness should give way to respect for a culture's integrity has yet to be determined. Although they protest about undue infringe-

ment, Native people themselves have not been able to define this point satisfactorily (see for eg. Anonymous 1977). Again, a great deal more consultation is needed here.

The answer to the cross-cultural problem of course is not to attempt to minimize or eliminate the difference (nor to ignore it), but to tolerate and work with the differences toward a truly informed and sympathetic understanding. This implies much improved communication between museums and Native people.

In the past, as pointed out in the first paper, this communication has tended to be ineffectual because museums and Native people are often operating on different levels, the former on scientific and operational, the latter political and emotional. It seems as though Native people will continue to operate on the political level, not only because they are beginning to discover their own strength in this area, but because museum workers such as F. Dockstader are recommending to them the techniques of "group pressure" (A.I.H.S. 1971:196). Museums must therefore be prepared to meet these challenges ~~at~~ the level on which they are made. They must be prepared beforehand with "positive, reasonable" policies (Nason et al 1973:20). In concert with this strategy Hopkins (1970:122-4) has recommended that board membership should be altered to more accurately reflect as wide a range of community interests as possible (note however that there are other theories as to how best to approach the selection of boards) (Selby 1978), and that minorities should be reflected in staff make-up.

Museums must take care, however, even though they learn to give up the ostrich response and begin to accept political approaches, that the response is an apolitical one. The museum must protect its own integrity and avoid being pawn to politics and propaganda (Newsome and Silver 1977:93). However the fact that museum collections are political is inescapable (Berreman 1973:9). The colonial implications of the extra-cultural control of Native material culture were explored in the first paper. Exclusive museum control "protects" this heritage, yes, but it colonializes it as well.

This brings us to the most discussed and controversial of solutions to the conflict, -- the return of artifacts to the control

of Native people. E. S. Rogers (1977/8:37) asserts

Museum collection of ethnological materials are not the private preserve of Western Society to be retained solely for the gratification of its members, no matter how these items are presented to the public.

Indeed, despite some disclaimers (Reynolds 1970:10-11), modern museological theory holds that democratization and decentralization are the ideal.

A common demand is heard for any and all Native materials to be returned (A.I.H.S. 1971:209). However museums have cited technical, scientific, legal and emotional/aesthetic reasons for why this will never happen. Generally, museums have relied on "temporary", "extension" exhibits, permanent loans" etc. to meet such requests. Nevertheless "repatriations" are being made, Blackfoot and Iroquois examples already having been cited.

Some Native groups have even resorted to their own legal powers (such as those under the Indian Act of Canada) to require materials which have been obtained on reserves to be returned for inclusion in their own museums (AI.H.S. 1971:197).

The crucial factor in such returns (and note that it is a factor which has been determined by museums, not Native people) has been the availability of appropriate facilities. Again the exclusivity in the museum field along with the operation of a double standard has served to heighten the difficulty with the incompatibility between acceptable museum and Native uses of artifacts. Further negotiations are needed here.

Despite the fact that museum--cultural centres are being created at a great pace, there still is a great deal that museums must do in order to assist with financial and technical problems (C.M.A. 1973). According to Nason et al (1973:22) and Hill (1977:45) museums have an obligation to ^{do more to} help create native museums and cultural centres, to assist in funding, development, design and training in order that a fast--disappearing heritage might be preserved. Native communities often do not have the technical expertise nor the finances to preserve objects or to purchase collection at their market value. (Anonymous 1972, Biddle 1977:40). Museum efforts in repatriating the Speyer, Hooper, Walsh and Blackfoot Collections are an excellent beginning in this regard.

p157

"Ownership" of returned materials still tends to be a hang-up, but there are museums who are willing to cede legal title as long as the facilities are maintained properly. In sum, D. Elias (1973:14) states "In general, there was not so much a feeling of hostility towards established museums as a positive feeling that Native cultural centres would be much more able to guarantee the preservation of Indian, Inuit and Metis cultures." At least now there is some evidence that museums are beginning to examine return as a viable solution. *† material culture a very limited avenue for cultural survival.*

In conclusion, although these papers have focussed on the conflicting interests of museums and Native people, it is true that past relationships have not all been negative. At the basis of any museum/Native cooperation as Anna Mae One Star, a Sioux (Dailey 1977:53-4) has stated,

I as an Indian, am indebted to the people in museums because of the artifacts that have been collected and put on exhibition for the education and understanding of the people. If that hadn't happened, I don't think I'd know as much about my people or about other tribes as I do now. My grandmother told me things that the ancestors did and what things they used, but she didn't have things to show me.

Surely this is the real value of the work museums have done which is recognized by all.

Nevertheless, there are some serious problems that museums and Native people must confront. It seems only obvious that solutions depend on much--improved sensitivity and communication between the two parties. Meaningful consultation and serious cooperative efforts concerning all museum functions are of paramount importance. It is clear that such participation is a necessity, not only to give a legitimacy to museum work not always accepted by Native people in the past, but to give the people themselves an increased interest and stake in preserving their own heritage.

These strategies will not work however until Native people are given more power to control museum functions. Far from being something which is dysfunctional to museum goals, -- something to fear, there is significant evidence that Native control is of mutual benefit. Museum aims can in fact be fulfilled, and ^{at the same time} Native people are able to take this small step at least toward decolonialization and reclamation of their heritage.

The real point is that Native heritage, of particular importance to their own identity and cultural integrity, is also a part of the larger North American scene. It cannot be preserved by one or the other in isolation, but only through sincere cooperative effort.

approximately 5,600 words

P. C. T. 18/2/79

Additional Bibliography

- Biddle, L.
1977 "Keeping Tradition Alive". Museum News 55/5:35-42.
- Bradbury, E.
1977 "Successful Interpretation of a Sacred Object". Museum News 55/5:47-9.
- Budger, M.
1978 "The Mud Above, The Dig Below". Macleans 91/29:51-2.
- Dailey, C. A.
1977 "Bringing a New Perspective to Museum Work". Museum News 55/5:53-4.
- Daugherty, R. D. and Kirk, R.
1976 "Ancient Indian Village Where Time Stood Still". Smithsonian 7/2:68-75.

1974 "A 'Pompeii' by the Northwest Sea". The American West 11/2:26-37.
- Demmert, J. and D.
1972 "Bringing in the Totems". Museum News 50/8:21-4.
- Efrat, B. and Mitchell, M.
1974 "The Indian and the Social Scientist: Contemporary Contractual Arrangements on the Pacific Northwest Coast". Human Organization 33/4:405-7.
- Fraser, G.
1978 "Something Old, Something New". Macleans 91/21:20-1.
- Gwyne, P. and Gayle, S.
1977 "Indian Pompeii". Newsweek 91:81-2.
- Hill, R.
1977 "Reclaiming Cultural Artifacts". Museum News 55/5:43-6.
- Hochfield, S.
1975 "Plundering Our Heritage". Art News 74/6:30-3.
- Hopkins, K. R.
1970 "Is Confrontation in Your Future?" Curator 13/2:120-4.
- Quimby, G. and Nason J. D.
1977 "New Staff For a New Museum". Museum News 55/5:50-52.
- Reynolds, B.
1970 "Ethnology in Museums". Museum News 49/4:10-11.
- Swinton, G.
1976 "Archaeology As a Concern of the Inuit Community." New Perspectives in Canadian Archaeology, a Symposium sponsored by the Royal Ontario Museum and the Royal Society of Canada, Toronto, October 22-23.

Additional Bibliography Con'tNewspapers

Anonymous

1976 "Indians Demand Return of Artifacts or Else." The Province, Vancouver, November 28.

Dutton, D.

1976 "Indians in Museum Sit-In, Say Old Bones Desecrated". Toronto Star, December 1.

Ferretti, F.

1976 "Indian Museum Under State Orders, Is Taking Inventory". New York Times, January 29.

Grant, D.

1976 "Ontario Promises to End Removal of Indian Bones". Toronto Globe and Mail, December 2.

Warden, K.

1979 "Blackfoot Jubilation". Calgary Herald, January 27.

Wright, D.

1976 "B. C. Indians Want Potlatch Regalia From ROM". Toronto Star, March 26.

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR HUMAN RESEARCH

- 976
1. Any research must be justifiable in that it must have scientific value.
 2. The benefit of the proposed research to science and the subject must significantly outweigh any risks to the subject. In general any significant risk to the subject should be offset by the expectation of benefit, such as a therapeutic effect.
 3. The research must be conducted by competent people.
 4. The research must be conducted under a sound design and protocol and be carried out according to the protocol. The design and protocol may be modified only with the approval of the committee which had originally approved it.
 5. No subject should be used in research unless he has given his free consent after being fully informed (except as in clause 8). It is essential to make a candid explanation of the research and its risks and to ensure that the subject understands them before his consent is taken. When a person is powerless to determine his own participation because of incapacity due to illness, unconsciousness or age, proxy consent of his parent, spouse, other next of kin, or other person responsible must be sought. Such proxy consent is acceptable only when there is no significant risk or discomfort to the subject or when any significant risk or discomfort is outweighed by the probability and degree of benefit to the subject.
 6. The subject or proxy must appreciate that he is free to withdraw at any time without penalty.
 7. Care must be taken throughout to see that the subject will not be harassed and the research should be terminated if risk or harm, physical or emotional, is apparent.
 8. Notwithstanding clause 5, when it is necessary in psychological or social research that the subject be less than fully aware of the purpose of the research it is sometimes permissible to disguise the purpose of the research, but only if (1) this procedure is absolutely necessary to the research design; (2) the research is not of such a nature that, if the subject realized what was under study, his refusal to participate could be foreseen; (3) the subject is to be informed of the true nature of the study immediately upon the completion of the study. The subject should be as fully informed as possible about what he will be asked to do and what will be done to him. The subject may have been misinformed, but he must never feel he has been exploited, tricked, or put in a situation where he has acted in a way he regrets.
 9. Results of research that gathers information of a personal nature, such as answers to questionnaires, must be kept confidential and anonymity must be afforded to the subject of the research unless he freely consents to the contrary
 10. Approval of the appropriate Ethics Review Sub-committee must be acquired before research involving human subjects can proceed.