

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9013788

**The politics of heritage: Native American museums and
the maintenance of ethnic boundaries on the contemporary
northwest coast**

Broyles, Julie Anne, Ph.D.

University of Washington, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Broyles, Julie Anne. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**The Politics of Heritage: Native American Museums and the
Maintenance of Ethnic Boundaries on the Contemporary
Northwest Coast**

by

Julie Anne Broyles

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

1989

Approved by James D. Nana
(Chairperson of Supervisory Committee)

Program Authorized
to Offer Degree Anthropology

Date August 16, 1989

© Copyright by
Julie Anne Broyles
1989

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for copying or reproduction of this dissertation may be referred to University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom the author has granted "the right to reproduce and sell (a) copies of the manuscript in microform and/or (b) printed copies of the manuscript made from microform."

Signature Julie Anne Boyles

Date August 15, 1989

University of Washington

Abstract

**THE POLITICS OF HERITAGE: NATIVE AMERICAN MUSEUMS AND THE
MAINTENANCE OF ETHNIC BOUNDARIES ON THE CONTEMPORARY
NORTHWEST COAST**

by Julie Anne Broyles

Chairperson of the Supervisory Committee:
Professor James D. Nason
Department of Anthropology

This dissertation is an investigation of the role of Native American museums in the construction and maintenance of ethnic boundaries in contemporary Native American communities. It is posited that the Native American museum is an "artifact" (Ames 1986) of the sociopolitical context of activism and militancy associated with the Red Power movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The Native American museum is seen to be an institution in which "culture" is mobilized as a strategy to preserve distinctiveness and facilitate ethnic boundary maintenance (Barth 1969b).

The analysis presented here is based on a comparative examination of the exhibit and interpretive content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center in Neah Bay, Washington, and the Suquamish Museum in Suquamish, Washington.

Comparative assessment of the exhibit content of these two museums identifies that each expresses an "identity configuration" which collectively characterizes the people of each community. Each identity configuration is based on a constellation of symbols drawn respectively from the Suquamish and Makah past. Within the museum those symbols are coalesced into a "perceived past" (Shils 1981), projected as the essence of a people's distinctiveness.

Finally, the question is posed as to whether the sense of continuity with the past projected within these two museums represents the "invention of tradition" (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983) or the perpetuation of continuity. It is argued that the characterization of the Suquamish and Makah within each museum mobilizes new symbols to represent an old idea - that is, of "the Suquamish" and "the Makah" as distinct, bounded entities. Thus, these two Native American museums are seen to be strategies in perpetuating a people's cultural, social, and historical continuity. It is concluded that the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center are exemplary of the museum as a "social instrument" through which Native Americans secure their survival as distinct peoples within a pluralistic North American society.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction A Reflexive Examination of The
Research Process.....1

Chapter One The Research Problem38

Chapter Two The Museum Through an
Anthropological Lens.....51

Chapter Three The Native American Museum in North
America: A Sociopolitical
Strategy.....88

Chapter Four Analysis: The Role of the Makah
Cultural and Research Center and the
Suquamish Museum in the Construction
of Ethnic Identity.....116

Chapter Five Conclusion: The "Invention of
Tradition" or the Perpetuation
of Continuity?.....225

Bibliography.....240

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

If anyone had foretold me all the incidents I would experience on this trip and the length of time I would spend here I would never have believed it (Jacobson 1977:9).

So Johan Adrian Jacobson reflected incredulously on his journey to the Northwest Coast in 1881 for the Royal Berlin Museum. Jacobson's reflexive statement aptly sums up my feelings about my own very complicated "journey" to the Northwest Coast, which this dissertation completes. It was an actual geographical journey to several communities to collect the data and insights presented in these pages - Terrace, Port Alberni, Neah Bay, Suquamish, Cape Mudge, and Hazelton. It was a conceptual journey over many years as I waded through the intellectual legacy compiled by my Northwest Coast predecessors. And it was a journey of discovery through which I learned truths about self and others you can't read in books. When I first began this venture many years ago as an eager graduate student I couldn't have predicted all the twists and turns that lay ahead, and I too "... would never have believed it".

It is a truism that dissertations don't write themselves. I take this opportunity to thank the many people who helped me bring this particular dissertation into reality.

I thank the various organizations that funded this research. The Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund made possible the first exploratory field trip to Port Alberni, British Columbia in 1983. They continued to fund the project in its various guises in 1984 and 1986.

The Canadian Embassy's Canadian Studies Graduate Student Research Programme funded a year of field research in Terrace, British Columbia in 1985. It is difficult for an American to obtain funding to conduct Canadian research, and I thank the Canadian Embassy for making my research venture possible.

The Smithsonian Institution's Short Term Visitor Funding Program provided funding for the final phase of research conducted at the Smithsonian's Native American Museum Program, administered by the Office of Museum Programs. The Smithsonian research was crucial in finalizing the focus and structure of this dissertation.

Finally, the University of Washington Graduate School and Department of Anthropology offered assistance in the form of the W. W. Stout Fellowship and the Graduate Student Research Travel Award.

The most crucial part of any dissertation is, of course, the substance. There are many people who contributed to this dissertation by sharing their knowledge with me, thus providing a glimpse of worlds previously unknown to me. It was from these people that I learned a great deal on both a scholarly and a personal level. I thank (in chronological order) Ron Hamilton and the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council of Port Alberni, British Columbia; Viola Thomas, the Board of Directors, staff, and members of the Kermode Friendship Centre in Terrace, British Columbia; Eve Hope, Director of the Northwest National Exhibition Centre of 'Ksan Indian Village and Museum in Hazelton, British Columbia; Estelle Inman and the staff of the Kwagiulth Museum in Cape Mudge, British Columbia; Greig Arnold and the staff of the Makah Cultural and Research Center in Neah Bay, Washington; Leonard Forsman, Director of the Suquamish Museum, Suquamish, Washington. Carey Caldwell's thorough

history of the development of the Suquamish Museum was invaluable in filling many informational gaps; I thank Nancy Fuller, Coordinator of the Native American Museum Program at the Smithsonian Institution for her support of this project, and for making unique and valuable information available to me. I also thank Jane Glaser and the staff of the Office of Museum Programs for graciously tolerating my temporary take-over of the OMP photocopy room for ten days in October 1987.

The members of my supervisory committee have given me important encouragement and assistance throughout my tenure as a graduate student, particularly in the production of this dissertation. I thank Dr. James Nason, the chair of my committee for his continued support and encouragement over many years. He has more than adequately fulfilled his role as my "academic guide". I also thank committee members past and present - Simon Ottenberg, Bill Holm, Victoria Wyatt, and Morton Kroll. I give special thanks to Jim Green. Although he was the committee member with the shortest tenure, he has given me a tremendous amount of input and support.

There were others, not directly involved in the production of this dissertation, who importantly encouraged me to pursue anthropology and Northwest Coast studies whom I would like to thank. I think especially of Tom Grigsby and Pamela Amoss.

The friends who supported and sustained me through the production of this dissertation and the many years leading up to it deserve a special thanks. They include Heidi Kelley, Kathleen Adams, Robin Minietta, Sally Ness, Carol Jolles, Susan Jasniewski, Jane Eert, Maryann Helferty, Lillian Lin, and Coralynn Whitney.

I give appreciative thanks to my siblings, their spouses, and offspring for their support. They didn't always believe this undertaking would come to fruition, but they were gracious when it did.

I thank George Lawrence for his calm reason and intuitive kindness.

Finally, there are two people without whom the completion of this undertaking would have been more difficult. I give special thanks to my parents Wendell and Rosella Broyles for their loving

encouragement. They faithfully (and accurately) assured me I would indeed ride out the rockier stretches of this journey.

Without the help of all these people there wouldn't be another page to turn ...

Dedicated to the memory of my
"fictive grandmother", Lila Keene.

INTRODUCTION: A REFLEXIVE EXAMINATION
OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS

It is time we abandoned the mystique which surrounds fieldwork and made it conventional to describe in some detail the circumstances of data collecting (Maybury-Lewis 1967:xx).

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation constitutes the presentation of acquired knowledge. The insights and understanding on which it is based derive from an all-encompassing accumulative research process. It was a process in which personal, scholarly, and intellectual experiences were not separate, in which "knowledge" and "experience" were tightly interwoven, and in which the process of "coming to know" led to the "knowing" I present here.

This dissertation is the cumulative product of a study I initiated in 1983 to investigate the role of Native American museums in the formulation and expression of contemporary ethnic identity in Northwest Coast native communities. It is an analysis of the exhibit and interpretive content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center, in Neah Bay, Washington, and the Suquamish Museum in Suquamish, Washington. The interpretive analysis focuses on the role of these two institutions in

constructing a contemporary definition of ethnic identity to represent the members of their host communities through the manipulation of symbols and the creation of meaning in the museum context.

The substance of this dissertation, although presented here as a cohesive, finished product, is actually the end-point in a complex developmental process. The analysis presented here grew out of an evolving process with many phases. There were intellectual and logistical "doors" which led me in certain directions, as well as barriers and obstacles which also shaped the inquiry. Thus, this discussion of the research process is included here not as mere personal catharsis, but as an examination of the events and issues which directly affected the work, the resulting data, and analysis.

This discussion stands as a preface to the formal presentation of data within this dissertation. It is an exploratory, reflexive examination of the steps, phases, and experiences which led to the understanding and insights I present in the body of this dissertation. This discussion is based on the belief that understanding of cultural phenomena is processual and grows gradually out of experiences that are both personal and professional in nature. To present only the intellectual product of

anthropological research is to disavow its processual roots, resulting in a presentation which is unbalanced and incomplete.

My purpose is to provide a straightforward introspective account of how those understandings took shape over time. The goal of this preface is to document the processes through which I came to know the information presented in this dissertation. How did I come to this particular understanding? How did experience turn into insight, and insight into analysis? In trying to answer those questions I will examine the relationship between "knowledge" and "experience" in this particular case, thereby integrating into the presentation of research results "...the authority of the personal experience..." from which it is made (Pratt 1986:33).

A REFLEXIVE PERSPECTIVE ON THE RESEARCH PROCESS

This preface to the presentation of data is predicated on a "reflexive", "introspective", or "experimental" approach toward examination of the relationship between the research process and the resulting conceptual product (Clifford and Marcus 1986). It is an approach stimulated by the ongoing discussion in anthropology today regarding "new ethnography" or meta-ethnography. I refer here to

the growing body of literature which seeks to raise our profession's collective consciousness about the practice and presentation of ethnography (Clifford 1983, 1986; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Crapanzano 1977; Marcus and Fischer 1986; Rabinow 1977; Scholte 1972). The meta-ethnographic approach facilitates an introspective examination of the ways in which we as ethnographers collect data, and importantly how we use and present that information. Such introspective self-assessment - whether directed at a conventional ethnography of cultural phenomena, or applied to a research product (like this one) which draws broadly on a variety of research methods, is extremely valuable and important. It allows us as researchers to recognize and acknowledge the various factors which bear on the "realities" we create through the description, analysis, and interpretation of cultural phenomena.

I have adopted a reflexive approach in this prefatory discussion primarily because that perspective sanctions analysis of the experiences which lie behind the collection, analysis, and presentation of data. The value of such action is that it allows us to retrace "... the relationship between what an ethnographer knows and how he came to know it" (Marcus and Cushman 1982:32). In so doing it corrects a shortcoming of the conventional

approach to the presentation of anthropological data which has prevailed in the past, a failure to recognize and acknowledge the relationship between process and product, between knowledge and experience.

In a conventional treatment much of the research process is dismissed as "personal", "subjective", and thus inadmissible as data, invalid as an integral component of the research product. The result has been the omission of the experiential, or "personal" side of the research process. The impact of the research experience on the researcher as an individual is not acknowledged, and thus the relationship between "knowledge" and "experience" is disavowed.

The reflexive approach attempts to correct such failures through the inclusion of narrative which is purposefully and decidedly told through the researcher's eyes and in the researcher's voice (in this case, this preface is just such a narrative). Thus the presence and role of the ethnographer is acknowledged, and recognized as a central component of the research product, correcting the conventionally accepted and perpetuated portrait of ethnographer as "... scientific (invisible or omniscient) narrator who is manifest only as a dispassionate, camera-like observer..." (Marcus and Cushman 1982:32). Such

practice creates an illusion of the ethnographic experience and resultant knowledge that is improbable and inaccurate.

To present anthropological research results as a cohesive product which is not preceded by an exploratory learning process but springs into existence complete and full-blown is to misrepresent the nature of the anthropological research process. Such a representation seriously distorts the nature of the research product by failing to acknowledge that the understanding on which it is based is cumulative. Through experience and reflection "messy" learning experience gradually grows into cohesive understanding.

EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE AND THE ISSUE OF MEMBERSHIP

The cumulative knowledge and understanding which results from anthropological research is complex and multifaceted. A considerable portion of it is experientially based. For instance, fieldwork is one research method which by definition, sets up a context in which the ethnographer experiences rather than merely collects, a context in which understanding inherently grows out of experience. Therefore, what a researcher comes to "know" as the result of such research consists

of much more than exclusively formalized, codified, fieldnote information. A considerable part of the "knowing" that results comes to be held as experientially based personal knowledge. The conceptual product that results from anthropological research then, is based on the intertwining of formal and experiential knowledge. As such it is an understanding that is simultaneously objective and subjective, both "scientific" as well as personal.

The intertwining of formal and experiential knowledge in this particular research project revolved around the central theme of membership, a factor which was paramount to the project in several respects. First, "membership" was the central issue which underlay the formal research questions. My objective was to understand the role of selected Northwest Coast community based Native American museums in the construction, expression, and maintenance of collectively held concepts of membership and identity. I utilized methods of formal data collection (participant observation, ethnographic interviewing, archival research) to understand how Native American museums are part of identity processes in selected Northwest Coast native communities.

But the total, cumulative understanding I gained of the phenomena under investigation was not simply the result of formal data collection. I came to understand a great deal about the construction and expression of contemporary definitions of group membership experientially as well as formally. In studying ethnicity processes, I purposefully sought out settings in which identity was a focal concern, settings in which native people involved in museum development or operation were consciously involved in the presentation of images of collective self to both natives and non-natives. My presence as a temporary outsider (in the role of stranger, researcher, interviewer, anthropologist) often was a critical catalyst in activating the very identity concepts and related boundary protection mechanisms I had come to study. I did not learn of identity processes in contemporary Northwest Coast native communities then, only through participant observation or ethnographic interviews. Instead, I learned of them as the cumulative result of my experience in a contemporary native arena where identity is a valuable commodity, and power is derived from its preservation and protection.

THE RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

The Native American museum research project of which this dissertation is the cumulative end-point, evolved over several years. The total process can be divided into three phases spanning the period 1983-1987. The initial phase of research began with the project's fieldwork inception in Port Alberni, British Columbia in 1983. The second was comprised of the extensive field research phase conducted in Terrace, British Columbia in 1985. The final data collection phase spanned 1986-1987, when data was collected from several Native American museum institutions, as well as the Native American Museums Program of the Smithsonian Institution (each of these phases will be discussed in greater detail below).

My concern here is with the ways in which experiences unique to the various phases of the research undertaking shaped my over all understanding of Native American museum phenomena, as well as my personal understanding of my role as an anthropologist and ethnographer.

PHASE ONE: 1983 - THE MUSEUM PLANNING PROJECT OF THE
NUU-CHAH-NULTH TRIBAL COUNCIL, PORT ALBERNI, BRITISH
COLUMBIA

Experiential knowledge of membership began to accrue immediately with initiation of field research in 1983. That first exposure was in the British Columbia community of Port Alberni (on Vancouver Island), where I did a short period of fieldwork on the museum planning project of the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. It was the first opportunity I had to apply my theoretical thoughts to reality. As such it was a valuable learning experience and an important testing ground.

In late summer of 1983 I spent two months in Port Alberni (funded by the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund) researching the museum development project undertaken by the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. The Nuu-chah-nulth museum planning project was in a feasibility study phase when I began my research. Much of the planning activity had taken place prior to the summer and fall of 1983, so much of my work was reconstructive, retracing steps that had been taken at that point to "construct" the idea and concept of a museum. Data collecting was slow. It was often difficult to generate interest among potential informants in something that had previously taken place (if only in the past six months) and seemed passe. (In retrospect now as an experienced fieldworker I see that the Port Alberni research went

amazingly well and made great headway in a very short period of time).

The fieldwork in Port Alberni provided an introduction to the realities of fieldwork in native communities, and to the predefined role and label of "anthropologist". It was also there that I received my first face to face introduction to "the oratory" - the recitation of past anthropological wrongs, and warnings for the present (see discussion below).

The general reaction to my work and to my presence was not one of hostility or conflict, but indifference. Thus it was often frustrating to make contact, to get responses, to arrange interviews. The data I collected however were very valuable. The dynamics, motivations, problems, and politics involved in Native American museum development were clearly illustrated by the Nuu-chah-nulth case. My understanding and view of the whole phenomena was tremendously broadened, and additional avenues for research highlighted.

In 1984 the Nuu-chah-nulth museum development project slowed considerably, and remained inactive. The apparent halt to the project, coupled with the indifference I had encountered in collecting data, caused me to revise my

plans to do a case study of the Nuuchahnulth project. I began to look elsewhere for a fieldwork site.

PHASE TWO: 1985 - THE MUSEUM PLANNING PROJECT OF THE
KERMODE FRIENDSHIP CENTRE, TERRACE, BRITISH COLUMBIA

In January 1985 I initiated a year of field research in Terrace, British Columbia, funded by the Canadian Embassy. Terrace is situated on the Skeena River in Northwestern British Columbia, at the intersection of Coast Tsimshian territory with that of the Gitksan of the Upper Skeena, and the Nishga of the Nass River to the north.

The project focused on development of a native museum by the Kermode Friendship Centre. The Friendship Centre, like similar organizations across Canada, is a non-profit organization which represents and serves the off-reserve (often non-status (1)) native population of the community.

1. The term "non-status" refers to native people who are defined by the Canadian government's Indian Act as no longer possessing status as native people eligible for residence on reserves and associated benefits. "Non-status" generally refers to women who have married non-native men, an action which subsequently has caused them and their children to be defined as "non-status" native people in accordance with a provision of the Indian Act, which was repealed in 1985.

The prospect of development of a multi-tribal native museum by the Centre was an interesting one. The native population of Terrace is made up primarily of Coast Tsimshian, Nishga, and Gitksan, as well as native people from other parts of British Columbia and Canada. The interethnic dynamics of an institution designed to represent a diversity of native people, rather than a single band, tribe, or community, would be unique. I was especially interested in how such an institution would serve to formulate and express a variable and broadly defined native identity.

The 1985 fieldwork in Terrace was one of the most important phases of the entire research process. The sum of experiences there (both formal and experiential) led to crucial insights about native identity processes, and broader issues of membership, exclusion, and the protection of ethnic boundaries. The experiences in Terrace immersed me in the realities of fieldwork in native communities, and to the "anthropologist as exploiter" ideology (see discussion below).

Due to extenuating circumstances, the Terrace research would not provide the substance of the dissertation; the Native American museum data came from elsewhere.

Instead, the Terrace research came to form the substance behind the dissertation, the experiential insights leading to the understanding which is the groundwork of this analysis. It was an important door to the whole research process, although at first glance it looked like a wall.

THE TERRACE EXPERIENCE

I first traveled to Terrace in September of 1984 to request permission from the Kermodé Friendship Centre to research and observe the Centre's museum development process as it occurred. I was granted research permission and made preparations to initiate the research sometime in 1985. In late December 1984 I received funding from the Canadian Embassy's Canadian Studies Graduate Student Fellowship programme. I thus arrived in Terrace in January 1985 to initiate a year of field research on the Centre's museum project.

The distance between Seattle and Terrace is not especially far; the time zone doesn't even change. But when I arrived in Terrace I entered into a decidedly different reality, a fact which was exemplified by the events, circumstances, and difficulties of "entry" into the community following my arrival.

Even though I had the permission and support of the Kermode Friendship Centre to "observe" their efforts to develop a community native cultural museum, that permission however, did not provide me entrance into the community, and perhaps in some ways made my entry even more difficult. My observable characteristics gave me immediate (relatively easy) access to the white, middle-class sphere of the community. But those same observable traits (coupled no doubt with my "anthropologistness") excluded me from the native sphere of the community. It is a "sphere" which exists on many different levels, is not location/enclave specific, and it is extremely private. In that early period I found the "native community" to be somewhat illusive. I experienced a great deal of isolation.

Conflict erupted early on in the first months of my time in Terrace, and for the first six months virtually froze my efforts to pursue the agreed upon data collection. It was not overt or confrontational conflict, but instead hostility directed toward me by those who were my "gatekeepers" and thus in control of my entry into the desired research setting. The expression of hostility made it virtually impossible for me to pursue the research plan. More specifically, as I continually,

systematically, and repeatedly, tried to gain access to the museum project, I was continually rebuffed. My efforts were increasingly met with hostility, suspicion, and resistance. I couldn't get anywhere, and my frustration and anger grew. I felt thwarted and exploited. In those early months it looked like the research wasn't going to succeed; it was a frightening possibility.

At that point (February-May 1985) I was prevented from doing the work I had come to do. I could not see through the fog of deterrents and smokescreens (and internal politics to which I was not privy), to really understand the variables that were impacting my research so heavily. I felt powerless. As Rabinow said of the frustration of his own field experiences, "... I mentally tried several occupations on for size..." (Rabinow 1977:46).

The stalemate continued through the first six months of fieldwork. In an effort to break it I made a formal request to the Board of Directors of the Kermode Friendship Centre to pursue data collection as agreed upon in September of 1984. I hoped it would reduce the "unknowns" that were contributing to "... geometrically spiralling anxiety..." (Rabinow 1977:26). But unfortunately, it had the opposite effect. Hostility,

anger, resistance reached a peak. Everything was absolutely frozen.

After nearly six months in Terrace the stalemate broke. In late May a response to my request came in the form of a short, terse letter outlining several conditions to which I was to agree before any request from me would be considered. Primary among these was the condition that the Kermode Friendship Centre retain copyright over all data resulting from the research, and retain the right to exercise publication control (a condition to which I did not ultimately agree. See discussion below).

The copyright control condition represented a crucial turning point at which I reconsidered the viability of the project. Although I was tempted to return to Seattle and the familiarity of the University, I remained in Terrace until December of 1985, the original project termination date.

In the summer of 1985 my relationship with the Kermode Friendship Centre, and especially with my primary "gatekeeper" the Centre's director, improved. My position in the community became more tolerable as well. I was more visible, accepted, had friends and a relatively "normal" range of social interactions. During that period

I was able to collect data in the community at large with greater ease and to improve relations with the Kermode Friendship Centre.

As I became more visible in the community I believe I was watched, judged, and assessed to be convincingly human. I gradually was moved beyond the "exploiter" label originally placed on me as an anthropologist. That advance in particular gave me renewed hope for the future of the work. The frustration I had become accustomed to me became interspersed with optimism.

However, in the long run, the copyright condition determined the outcome of the research venture. The condition was reiterated to me in September of 1985, at which time it was necessary for me to make a conscious decision about the future of the Kermode Friendship Centre native museum research project. I could not ethically agree to the condition, knowing such an agreement would violate the spirit of scientific research.

In October 1985 I reevaluated the likelihood of collecting satisfactory data on Kermode Friendship Centre museum development under satisfactory conditions as unlikely. At that time I began to broaden the research

project focus. The project was redefined to encompass only existing and operating native museums, rather than projects in the planning stage. I also moved toward a comparative study of more than one Native American museum institution rather than continuing to pursue a focused (and apparently politically volatile) examination of a single organization.

I left Terrace in December of 1985, and continued to pursue these new directions in the research project.

SUMMARY

It was only after I had left Terrace and returned to the University that I came to have enough distance (situational, emotional, and psychological) to begin to see the conflictive side of the fieldwork experience as data. It gradually became clearer to me that the difficult and often trying experiences of the Terrace research were more than just annoyances or unanticipated roadblocks and really were important and integral parts of the research. I had indeed found what I had come in search of. There I was, in the thick of "ethnic boundary maintenance". The structure of the situation was very different than I had anticipated; I was both target and catalyst.

Even though the experience didn't feel very much like "science" at the time, it was social science, and especially participant observation, in the truest sense. Much of the understanding I present in this dissertation comes out of my experience in Terrace in general, and out of the endemic conflicts in particular.

PHASE THREE: 1986-1987 - COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ON EXISTING
NATIVE MUSEUMS

The next, and final phase of the Native American museum research project spanned 1986-1987. That phase of data collection formalized the shift in focus that was initiated late in the Terrace research phase. During Phase Three data was collected on a number of operating Native American museum institutions including 'Ksan Indian Village and Museum, Hazelton, British Columbia, The Kwagiulth Museum, Cape Mudge, British Columbia, The Makah Cultural and Research Center, Neah Bay, Washington, and The Suquamish Museum, Suquamish, Washington. In 1987 the data collected on-site was supplemented by data collection at the Native American Museums Program of the Smithsonian Institution, which yielded background data on the Makah and Suquamish cases specifically. The Makah Cultural and Research Center and the Suquamish Museum

were eventually selected from among the studied native museums to form the specific comparative focus of the dissertation.

Phase Three marked a crucial and significant turning point in both the project scope and method. There were two primary changes initiated in Phase Three which significantly affected the nature and focus of the project. The first was the broadening of scope to include a study of more than just a single institution. This change was made to provide a comparative base for analysis, and also to avoid a potentially conflictive, tense data collection situation. This approach would lessen the threat of "exposure" the individuals involved in the operation of a single institution might potentially perceive if targeted as the single focus of an in-depth ethnographic inquiry.

The second major change initiated in Phase Three was alteration of research methodology. There were three primary data collection methods used in Phase Three. The first was formal interviewing of Native American museum administrators, as opposed to informal ethnographic interviewing of museum staff and community members. I narrowed the interviewing scope for very specific reasons. I felt that formal, structured interviews with

Native American museum administrators would effectively reduce the possibility of conflict and tension. In a formal interviewing capacity the individuals would be in control - they would be within the museums they directed, in their own offices, answering specific, limited questions posed by me in capacity of temporary visitor. These factors in combination were crucial, I felt, in creating a non-conflictive, non-threatening interview context, thus increasing the possibility of successfully conducting interviews and collecting data.

The second data collection method used was documentation of the institution's exhibit and interpretive content. It is extremely important to note that this shift to a primary data collection emphasis on exhibit content in this phase of the research was a crucial change. At this juncture the project became focused specifically on the communicative, symbolic messages constructed and projected within these Native American museum institutions. This focus represented a move away from the broad scope extant in Phases One and Two focusing on the general dynamics of Native American museum development. This shift was motivated by my changing interest in Native American museum dynamics. As the Native American museum research progressed my personal interest in the topic shifted from a museological concern with the

dynamics of museum operation, to a broader anthropological interest in the messages being constructed and expressed within native museums. I thus became less concerned with issues such as the governing structure of the institutions or their source of funding, and more concerned with the creation and manipulation of symbols within the Native American museum setting. Such a shift in interest required inclusion of a method which would facilitate documentation of the symbolic, expressive side of native museums. For that reason, exhibit and interpretive content, rather than community based ethnographic interviews, became the primary target of data collection, and later of analysis.

The third data collection method used in Phase Three was historic, archival research utilized primarily to reconstruct each institution's developmental history. This data was utilized to place the exhibit and interpretive content of a specific Native American museum within a processual, historic context.

This phase of comparative research yielded rich data on Native American museum development, operation, and importantly, exhibit and interpretive content, which forms the basis of the analysis presented in this

dissertation (focusing specifically on the The Makah Cultural and Research Center and the Suquamish Museum).

In addition to resulting in data suitable for analysis, this Post-Terrace research phase also continued to yield experiential insights. I was still an anthropologist entering into native communities, and still encountered the same issues present in earlier phases of the research, relating to membership, power, conflict, and my own "anthropologist-ness". The impact of these recurring issues on the final product of this research undertaking is discussed below.

THE BASIS OF EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE: THE ISSUES

Conflict played a crucial, generative role in this research project, as in all fieldwork. It was an integral part of the work, and an important springboard for changes and insights. However, according to convention, conflict isn't supposed to be a part of ethnographic research:

States of serious confusion, violent feelings or acts, censorships, important failures, changes of course, and excessive pleasures are excluded from the published account (Clifford 1986:13).

A primary reason for that exclusion derives from the implicit belief that the presence of conflict is a sign of irreconcilable differences, or worse, a failure to build the necessary groundwork, to "build rapport", to act in the appropriate (and unrealistic) role of neutral, invisible observer.

But conflict unequivocally is a part of ethnographic research, and as such, is an important creative force.

Rabinow sums it up well:

Interruptions and eruptions mock the fieldworker and his inquiry; more accurately, they may be said to inform his inquiry, to be an essential part of it. The constant breakdown, it seems to me, is not just an annoying accident but a core aspect of this type of inquiry. Later I became aware that these ruptures of communication were highly revealing, and often proved to be turning points. At that time, however, they seemed only to represent our frustration... (Rabinow 1977:154).

Many of the conflicts that occurred in this research (particularly in Terrace) came to be crucial pivotal points of entry into fruitful situations. Those conflicts were also important pivots in my cumulative process of gaining insight and understanding of the phenomena under investigation.

One such conflict related issue which played a primary part in all three phases of the research process revolved around my identity as an anthropologist, and the assignation of meaning to me on the basis of that fact by my potential informants.

THE "ANTHROPOLOGIST AS EXPLOITER" IDEOLOGY

But Indians have been cursed above all other people in history. Indians have anthropologists (Deloria 1969:83).

From the outset of the first fieldwork experience in Port Alberni throughout the research process, membership, or more accurately my non-member, outsider status, remained a focal issue. In nearly every setting it was necessary, as an inherent condition of cultural inquiry, to cross cultural boundaries. That's what anthropological fieldwork is about. But it was "crossing" in particular that consistently and repeatedly brought the member/non-member issue to the forefront. In most of those situations, crossing catapulted me into a different reality. Each time I crossed I entered into a social scene where there were existing identities, categories, and niches. My "arrival" (and implicitly my presence, prescribed identity, assumed aims and methods) activated a response to me predicated on the current working

definition of membership, and on an insider/outsider dichotomy.

With each of those "crossings" several very important things happened. But they didn't just happen once or even twice, they happened nearly every time I "arrived" in a research setting in the role of "anthropologist". Upon my entrance, issues of identity, membership, and boundaries came to be of paramount importance. First of all, an identity was usually assigned to me on the basis of my perceived traits, the most important ones being white, anthropologist, American, young, stranger, female.

Those pre-existing labels assigned me to a relative position in the existing social structure, usually on the margins. They conferred on me a socially operative identity, generally that of "outsider" and "anthropologist". They meant something specific within that particular context, and generally served to elicit some kind of a response. When the people I sought to collect information from responded to my perceived and assigned attributes, their behavior told me two things: first, it told me who they thought I was (and what kind of action that necessitated from them); it also told me who they (whether individually or collectively) thought they were (often in contrast to my perceived features).

It was the label of "anthropologist" which was the primary catalyst in eliciting identity data.

Application of that label however, also engendered a not entirely pleasant learning experience for me. Being assigned to the category of "anthropologist" certainly gave me a viable social role, but it was predicated on an unappealing trade-off. The niche which came along with the "anthropologist" label was generally "interventionist-corruptor-of-the-culture" (Pratt 1986:44), predicated on a definition of "anthropologist as exploiter".

The pre-defined category was narrow, confining, stereotypical, and one that made it quite clear early on in the research that being an anthropologist was something inherently negative. It was a definition which I was not surprised to see within the context of native communities. But in many ways I was not prepared for the unequivocal nature of the definition, the quickness with which it was applied to me and to my assumed motives, and the degree to which it stymied and froze my research efforts in many instances.

The definition of "anthropologist as exploiter" came to play a central part in this research project. In nearly

every Native American context in which I pursued data collection that ideology was expressed to me at the outset. It was expressed by different individuals in different places, in varying degrees of intensity, but was always directed at my presence, and at my identity as an anthropologist.

The "anthropologist as exploiter" belief system was often expressed implicitly in the form of assumptions made about my motives, methods, and moral character. In one instance where I was seeking initial entry and research permission my research request was challenged on the assumption that my aim was "taking people's stories", when in fact my purpose was not to document oral tradition, but to observe the organizational process of museum development. The individual assumed that because I was an "anthropologist" (a) I was inherently "bad", and (b) taking people's stories" was what I did and what I would do in her community. In another instance (also seeking research entry) I was challenged as to why I thought I had the right to "analyze people". I explained that my purpose was to analyze a process (i.e. that of museum development), not the motives, character, or personality of individuals, an undertaking which I felt not to be inherently intrusive or exploitative. The challenger did not respond to my distinction.

As my experience broadened, I became more familiar with the parameters of the label, with the expectations it entailed, and with the patterned content and structure of its expression. I gradually came to perceive of it appropriately as a set of beliefs, an ideology, rather than simply a stereotype. The "anthropologist as exploiter" ideology is based on a set of commonly held, shared beliefs (in this case shared by those from whom I sought information), framed by Vine Deloria's well known seminal diatribe against the evils of anthropology and anthropologists:

A fundamental thesis of the anthropologist is that people are objects for observation, people are then considered objects for experimentation, for manipulation, and for eventual extinction. The anthropologist thus furnishes the justification for treating Indian people like so many chessmen available for anyone to play with (Deloria 1969:86).

According to the central belief system on which the ideology is based, the anthropologist as exploiter has a callous disregard for the humanness of others, for their rights and privacy; is a self-interested manipulator of others to his own ends; is interfering, and an "interventionist-corrupter-of-the-culture" extraordinaire. (Pratt 1986:44)

The characterizations which form the core of Deloria's portrait - the essence of the "anthropologist as exploiter" ideology - are given expression in a patterned, ritualized oral form I have come to call "the oratory". Through experience I have also come to recognize both the ideology and the oratory as structural features of contemporary Native American research. As such they are features which have a tremendous impact on the entrance (or lack thereof) of an anthropologist into a community, and on the fabric of relations around which ethnographic research revolves. It is for that reason, as well as the demand for accountability the oratory carries, that the ideology/oratory configuration must be examined.

My purpose here is not to debate the accuracy of the portrait, or necessarily even to defend myself and my profession against it. Instead, the purpose of this discussion is to examine and explain how I have experienced "the oratory" in the course of doing this work, and how it has affected my understanding, insights, and perspective.

THE "ORATORY"

The "oratory" itself is predicated on a basic definition and conception of what an anthropologist is, what an anthropologist does, and what a specific anthropologist (i.e. the one the oratory is being directed at) is going to do in a specific situation. It is based on shared beliefs and presuppositions about motive, approach, technique (and sometimes about morality and philosophy). It has several definitive components: (1) a narrative description, (2) a warning, (3) expression of a power stance, (4) setting of limits, conditions, ground rules, and (5) an expression of strength, continuity, identity.

I have been the recipient of the oratory primarily in instances where I sought entry to a research situation, such as in the traditional role of resident ethnographer, as in Port Alberni and Terrace. Interestingly, I also often received the oratory in Phase Three of the research, as I initiated formal structured interviews. It was generally delivered to me by an individual (significantly, often by Native American men) in a situation where relative roles, control, power were being established between the two of us. Once roles and lines of power were established (and implicitly respected) then the oratory was generally not delivered again.

The descriptive component of the oratory is based on an oral chronicling of the perceived attributes of anthropologists and anthropological research, and is a verbal expression of beliefs about what anthropologists do and how they do it. It often includes a listing of evils, infractions, inappropriate behaviors. The compendium includes taking unauthorized or insensitive photographs, hiding a tape recorder, collecting information without permission, violating privacy, disregarding an individual's dignity and personal rights, violating community or cultural rules, misrepresenting an individual or community, claiming "expert" status, being a stranger and an outsider, taking without giving back, using the people of a community for personal benefit (we'll give you this information, you'll take it away, write a book about it, and get rich, and we won't get anything out of it), appropriating the knowledge, and thus the power, of the members of the community. For example, my first receipt of this version of the oratory was in an early stage of the ethnographic research phase of the Native American museum project. As I sat in the office of the initial "gate-keeper" I was told in a one way oratory of the offensive behavior of a young, female, American anthropologist, (i.e. thus much like myself), who had offended members of the community

(including the orator) by her intrusive methods and pushy behavior. I sat and listened compliantly as I was essentially instructed in culturally appropriate behavior - to behave properly as a young woman one must be quiet, understated, and respectful. I was thus implicitly warned to behave acceptably and not to violate the rules of the game.

In some instances, where I have been the recipient of the oratory, such as the one described above, I have found it to be powerful and compelling. The listing of committed wrongs is usually based on real events, real people, anthropologists with names and academic affiliations. But too, in other instances it has sounded canned, perfunctory.

The core of the oratory is made up of a warning and power stance. The warning grows out of the narrative description and is usually directed at an individual targeted anthropologist. At this point, the "heat" (in terms of power and political posturing) goes up several notches. The warning message is not to do what others have done, not to behave badly. There is a strong power component to it, based on the display of relative power statuses (the warning essentially is to respect that, and not to overstep it). Delivery of the oratory also usually

involves a power display on an individual level, an expression of power held by the individual giving the oratory over the anthropologist in question, and a reminder of that person's ability to exercise negative sanctions. Another gatekeeper in another office told me of the power he held over me: "I can have you speaking to people by this afternoon if I want to, or I can make it impossible for you to talk to anybody". This phase of the oratory often involves a verbal setting of limits, conditions on activities, and possibly an agreement. The limit setting action is an important one. It provides the parameters of the anthropologist's role in that particular community.

The "grande finale" of the oratory is a show of strength, pride, self-possession, collective power - "you don't need to tell us who we are because we already know". It is a final admonition, that the culture in question is owned and controlled by its bearers, not by the intruding outsider, and an admonition to the researcher to remember that as the members acquiesce to give her a partial, momentary glimpse of their lives and thoughts. My experiences as recipient of the "oratory" constituted valuable lessons about insiders and outsiders, about belonging and otherness; always, membership was at the core.

The "oratory" played a central part in my research experience. It was a crucial component in shaping my understanding of politics, power, and identity in contemporary Native American communities.

CONCLUSION

The knowledge and understanding I acquired about membership (and its definitive dichotomizations - insiders/outsideers, Indians/non-Indians, and Indians/Anthropologists) did not come about through detached observations of "others", or by some omniscience derived from the academic degrees I hold in anthropology. I learned of the parameters of membership primarily through my personal experience of being the "other" not merely by studying the others. I learned of boundaries and markers and protection by being subject to them, not by witnessing them as an invisible observer. I learned of definitions of nativeness as they were shown to me in contrast to my perceived features - anthropologist, American, white, female. I was in no position of superiority or privilege enabling me to make pronouncements about my "subjects".

That total, cumulative, experiential knowledge forms the basis of the insights presented in this dissertation.

CHAPTER ONE

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

These Indian museum pieces are the physical essence of our cultural continuity, the "footprints" of our families and ancestors ... these cherished items are our direct link to our past heritage and confirm our present existence, as well as strengthen us for the future. To us they are not just another collection. They are the only collection. They are sacred. ... we can and will protect and honor these few remaining touchstones.

... To do so successfully, we must adapt some of the white man's ways and methods, but do this in such a way that we revive and preserve our "Indianness". One of the methods we should adopt is the establishment and maintenance of museums - viable tribal museums (Horse Capture 1981:21).

Native American museums are a phenomenon of the twentieth century. They comprise a cultural institution that plays an important role in social, cultural, and political processes in contemporary Native American communities.

Native American museums exist today throughout North America in communities that are geographically, culturally, socially, and historically diverse. Yet they generally share in common a set of definitive traits. They are institutions that grow out of a community-level action directed and defined by Native American people, aimed at the interpretation of culture history specifically from a Native American perspective. They are, significantly, native owned, operated, and

controlled - financially, administratively,
substantively.

In spite of the apparent significance of these institutions, anthropological investigation of Native American museum phenomena (as well as ethnic museum phenomena on a broader level) has been virtually non-existent. This dissertation stands as an effort to correct that oversight. It is a contribution of knowledge of Native American museums to the anthropological literature.

More specifically, this dissertation is a study of the sociocultural significance of Native American museums. It is an investigation of the role of these institutions in the construction and maintenance of ethnic boundaries in contemporary Native American communities. It is based on a comparative case-study analysis of the exhibit and interpretive content of two operating Native American museums - the Makah Cultural and Research Center in Neah Bay, Washington, and the Suquamish Museum in Suquamish, Washington.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE AND CENTRAL THESIS

The theoretical basis of this investigation comes from two primary sources, the "anthropology of museums" (Ames 1986; Broyles 1988), and the body of ethnicity theory which elucidates the nature and dynamics of ethnic processes in plural societies (Barth 1969b; Keyes 1981; Weber 1968; and Shils 1957). In combination, these two key theoretical perspectives coalesce to form the central thesis which provides the basis of this inquiry.

The concept of the museum as "artifact" (Ames 1986) is a fundamental component in the theoretical foundation of this dissertation. The concept is taken from the "anthropology of museums", an emergent theoretical perspective which guides the anthropological investigation of museums as significant sociocultural phenomena (Ames 1986; Broyles 1988) (see also Chapter Two of this dissertation).

The museum as "artifact" is definitively a product of a specific social, cultural, and political context, and thus is itself a document of the cultural system within which it is produced (Chapter Two). In this investigation the idea of museum as artifact is used to

characterize the essential nature of the Native American museum.

The Native American museum's artifactual nature lies in its historical patterns of growth and development. Native American museums are institutions whose history is characterized by primary growth virtually confined to a two decade span in the 1970s and 1980s. This marked, concentrated period of growth significantly occurs in association with a period of Native American political activism and militancy, which is itself one component of a broader context of societal change (the Civil Rights movement, feminism, anti-war protest) extant in North America in the 1960s and 1970s.

The specific sociopolitical context out of which Native American museums have grown is one in which there is an emphasis on the achievement of power - social, cultural, political, economic - by Native American people. It is a context in which the goal of self-determination - efforts by Native American people to gain control over all areas of their lives - provides an overarching ideology, epitomized by the Red Power movement.

It is that sociopolitical context which "produces" the Native American museum. That is, it is a central

component of the thesis applied in this investigation that Native American museums do not simply or coincidentally grow in association with that context of Native American self-determination and Red Power, but that Native American museums in fact are a product, an "artifact" of that sociopolitical context.

More specifically, the Native American museum grows out of the self-determination context as a "social instrument". The museum as social instrument is an institution which manipulates symbols to construct meaning relevant in a sociopolitical context. This definitive function endows the museum with the capability to reflect the existing "social reality" (Ames 1986; Cameron 1971), yet also to shape and influence the perception of social reality. The museum as a social instrument is an institution of considerable sociopolitical power which can be deployed as a strategy in a sociopolitical arena to alter social reality (Chapter Two).

The Native American museum as "social instrument" then, grows out of a sociopolitical milieu of self-determination as a strategic resource utilized by the people of a specific Native American community to construct and express an emic perception of social

reality. I believe it represents the seizure of a traditional institution of western culture by indigenous people of North America, an effort to reappropriate control over the writing of history and the presentation of collective self. It is an institutional setting in which "culture" (however situationally defined) is highlighted, symbolized and manipulated.

To fully understand the sociocultural significance of these two primary traits of the Native American museum - an institution which generates a version of culture and which emerges from a sociopolitical context of Native American militancy and self-determination - I have turned to ethnicity theory. I believe the Native American museum is an institution in which "culture" is mobilized as the basis of ethnic group formation. It is an institutional locale in which a subjectively believed tie of shared descent is defined and mobilized as the basis of unification among a group of people. Within the native museum "culture" is mobilized to mark and evidence that claim of shared descent, which forms the basis of a people's claim to cultural, historical, and ethnic distinctiveness. The Native American museum then, is an institution in which a people's shared self perceptions are affirmed for the benefit of the community and also

projected outward beyond the community itself, to the wider societal context.

METHOD

The central thesis of this investigation depends on a broad perspective of the sociocultural functions and significance of Native American museums. In the analytical section of this dissertation however, the focus of investigation is narrowed to two operating Native American museums - the Makah Cultural and Research Center and the Suquamish Museum.

The Makah Cultural and Research Center and the Suquamish Museum were selected as the focus of this analysis because they are comparable on a number of important levels. Both are successful Native American museums. The Makah Cultural and Research Center has been in operation for a decade, the Suquamish Museum for half that time, which lends an important degree of stability to each institution. In addition they have both grown and operated in the same regional context. Both grow out of community efforts to address cultural needs, yet each represents a community's individualistic approach to the expression and transmission of culture.

In short, the Makah Cultural and Research Center and the Suquamish Museum each provide an interesting example of the Native American museum in action. Taken together they provide a strong basis for comparison and contrast of the role of the Native American museum in a community setting. It is hoped that analysis of these two institutions will shed light on the dynamics of symbolic, communicative processes occurring today in Native American museums.

The central thesis is applied specifically to case study analysis of the exhibit and interpretive content of these two institutions. The primary concern of analysis is the construction of meaning and the manipulation of symbols within the context of these institutions, rather than with largely Euro-American museological issues such as administrative structure, funding sources, collection management. The analysis of the exhibit and interpretive content of the two museums seeks to answer two primary questions: Is an ethnic image constructed in the Makah Cultural and Research Center and Suquamish Museum respectively? If so, what is its content, and how is it symbolically constructed and expressed?

Three primary data collection methods were used to answer those questions. First, formal interviews were conducted

with museum administrators to establish each institution's history, operating structure, and formal goals and objectives. Second, the exhibit content and layout of each museum was documented as the primary basis for exhibit and interpretation analysis. Third, historical and archival data on the institutions' developmental history were collected.

These data were used in two ways: (1) to reconstruct the developmental history of each institution in order to place its growth, development, and operation within a temporal, community, and sociopolitical context, (2) to create a description of the exhibit and interpretive content, forming the basis for analysis and thesis testing.

FINDINGS

The focused analyses of the exhibit content of both the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center yielded a characterization of the processes of meaning construction taking place within each respective museum. More specifically, analysis indicated that each institution comprises a locale in its host community where culture is applied to construct a definition of the collective image of the members of that community, which

I have called an "identity configuration". In both cases that identity configuration is constructed in reference to that people's collective past. Within the context of the museums' exhibit content the past becomes a primary symbol of a peoples' unique background and ancestry from which they derive the cultural traits which define them as a cohesive group. Symbolically, a "perceived past" (Shils 1981) is constructed out of their collective raw past (the "sequence of occurred events" Shils 1981) to collectively characterize them in the present.

The image of collective identity conveyed in each museum is also importantly based on the communication of a sense of continuity with the past. The symbols utilized in the identity configurations constructed in the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center respectively are community specific - they are drawn from the individualistic history, culture, and experience of the specific people they represent.

The identity configuration constructed in the Makah Cultural and Research Center is one phase in a complex developmental process. The Makah Cultural and Research Center itself grows out of the response of the Makah Tribe to excavation of the pre-contact Makah village site of Ozette in the 1970s. The Center was developed

specifically to house the excavated artifacts. The Center's exhibit content interprets and displays the Ozette data in the form of an "ethnic charter" which delineates the definitive traits of Makah identity. Via the ethnic charter constructed in the Center, the source of Makah identity and distinctiveness is identified as being the "ancestors" of the pre-contact past, and its content to be the distinct culture which the Makah inherit from them. Thus, "Ozette" and the pre-contact past are the primary symbols mobilized in the Makah Cultural and Research Center. Together they create an identity configuration which characterizes the Makah's uniqueness and distinguishes them from others.

The identity configuration constructed in the Suquamish Museum has a different history and symbolic basis from that presented in the Makah Cultural and Research Center. The Suquamish Museum grows out of conscious tribal policy efforts to develop cultural programming. The Suquamish Museum itself is one in a series of cultural programs initiated by the Suquamish Tribe in the 1970s and 1980s. The exhibit content of the Suquamish Museum expresses a Suquamish identity configuration which is based on representation of the Suquamish post-contact past. Historic photographs, artifacts, and the recollections of contemporary elders conveyed in label text are presented

simultaneously to create a unique Suquamish "identity assemblage" which defines the contemporary Suquamish primarily in terms of shared experience. The quintessential experiences mobilized in this instance to define the Suquamish are conveyed and transmitted by the contemporary Suquamish elders who thus become the "ancestors", the purveyors of Suquamish culture.

The specific individual identity configurations constructed in the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center respectively are, on one level, (a) projected inward to the community to create cohesion; and, (b) projected beyond the community to non-natives to establish distinctiveness and to mark and maintain ethnic boundaries (Barth 1969b).

The "ethnic" content of the identity configurations created in these two Native American museums varies by degree. The identity configuration expressed in the Makah Cultural and Research Center is based on an explicit claim to descent from identified ancestors. The Suquamish identity configuration, in contrast, "assembles" the symbolic components of Suquamish identity, but is not predicated on an explicit claim of shared descent.

In conclusion, it is significant to note that the exhibit and interpretive content of both Native American museums analyzed, the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center, create and express a cohesive image of the people of those two communities predicated on characterization of them in terms of a sense of continuity with their past.

The final question posed is this: Is that sense of continuity with the past, conveyed in each museum, so crucial to the collective representations created and expressed there, an "invention of tradition" (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983) or the perpetuation of continuity? In closing it is argued that the Suquamish and Makah past-based identity configurations are representative of Suquamish and Makah continuity with the past, which via the medium of the tribal museum in the late twentieth century is recast in new symbols. It is the act of expressing and maintaining "the Suquamish" and "the Makah" as a bounded entity which is continuous. The symbols which represent that entity are constantly revised and recast in forms relevant and meaningful within the context of a specific social, cultural, and political present.

CHAPTER TWO

THE MUSEUM THROUGH AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL LENS

I want to look at museums as artefacts of society, as exhibits in their own right (Ames 1986).

The focus of this dissertation - the Native American museum as a powerful and significant cultural institution - is predicated on a perspective towards museums as "artifacts", sociocultural products (Ames 1979, 1986) which both represent and provide evidence of the underlying bases of a culture.

Such a perspective forms the basis for the anthropological study of museums, and is the cornerstone of the approach I will take in this dissertation in the analysis of Native American museums. This chapter specifically comprises an effort to lay the conceptual, theoretical, and historical groundwork for that analysis. Toward that end my discussion here will focus on the concept of "museum as artifact" in order to construct a working definition for that concept (see Part I of this chapter). The definition resulting from that discussion will then be placed within the theoretical perspective of the "anthropology of museums" (Part II).

I begin with a brief consideration of the concept of "museum", and an examination of the institution's history embedded within the culture history of Western Europe. It is out of that history that the museum's definitive traits have gradually evolved.

PART I: THE MUSEUM, ITS HISTORY, FORM, FUNCTION, AND
DEFINITIVE TRAITS

The "museum", both as a concept and an institution, has taken many different forms since its origins as the "temple of the muses" in Classical Greece (Alexander 1979; Ripley 1969; Wittlin 1970). The history of its changing form and function over time is the history of a cultural institution that has evolved "... through a metamorphosis lasting many centuries" (Ripley 1969:28).

There have been several crucial junctures in the museum's history which have had a tremendous impact on the institution's nature and function. My discussion here will focus briefly on selected aspects of that history that have been especially influential in the development of the modern museum - cabinets of curiosities of sixteenth and seventeenth century Europe, the development of the public museum in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the related "scientization" of museums as

the locus of systematic research and study in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Such an historically focused discussion will provide the groundwork for construction of an expanded definition of "museum" that moves beyond conventional "material" definitions of the institution.

MUSEUM: FORM AND FUNCTION

The earliest museums existed in classical Greece and Rome in a form very different from the public cultural repositories that gradually evolved out of more recent European culture history (Alexander 1979; Ames 1986; Ripley 1969). The roots of the modern museum are more accurately found within sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth century Europe, "a product of Renaissance humanism, eighteenth-century enlightenment and nineteenth-century democracy" (Crook in Alexander 1979:8).

CABINETS OF CURIOSITIES

Wittlin specifically traces the intellectual origins of the modern museum to seventeenth century European thought. She cites Francis Bacon's concept of "knowledge as power" as the crucial underlying thread in the

formation of "cabinets of curiosities", the prevalent form of collection and display at that time (Wittlin 1970:42).

Cabinets were private collections made by individuals of the upper classes "dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge" (Wittlin 1970:43), Hudson 1987:21). They contained various exotica of the natural and cultural world and represented "... a collection as an enhancement of knowledge, something which instructs and elevates through a wide or indeed a complete circle of knowledge" (Ripley 1969:28). Such collections embodied Bacon's ideas in that they were amassed "as a means of increasing human control over nature..." (Wittlin 1970:42).

Cabinets were significant not only as a representation of a European definition of knowledge, but as an especially European method of defining and representing the external world that lay beyond European boundaries. It was a time when the known world was being expanded through exploration and colonialism. The formation of collections served to establish physical evidence of those external worlds. In this respect, natural and cultural curiosities served to translate those worlds into European terms, and to make a place for them in

European culture. (Clifford 1985; Cole 1985; Defert 1982).

The shift from private collections maintained as cabinets of curiosities to public collections housed within museums marked an important juncture in the growth of the institution. Two key developments were crucial in effecting that transition in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. One was the growth of the museum into a public institution; the other was the development of museum-based systematic scholarly research.

THE PUBLIC MUSEUM

The establishment of public museums in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was "a watershed in the history of museums and an important step nearer the institution as it is known today" (Lewis 1984b:11; Wittlin 1970:75-79,81; Alexander 1979:8). The "transfer of private collections to public hands ..." (Ames 1986:7) occurred gradually (Lewis 1984b:11) and had a tremendous impact on the institution's form and definition. It marked a crucial shift that resulted in the "democratization" of museums, and greatly changed the relationship between the museum and the public (Ames 1986:7) That is, the museum defined as an essentially public institution, in a sense

belongs to the people it serves. Such a relationship engenders relative roles of obligation and expectation (Ames 1986:7) which bear heavily on the museum's form and focus.

In addition, the public museum was an institution that not only served a diverse audience, but (because it belonged to that audience) was expected to serve them by providing an "authentic" experience to reaffirm their view of reality, as Ames describes:

Thus, gradually, the public-or more correctly, the educated classes-came to believe that they had the right to expect that the collections would present and interpret the world in some way consistent with the values they held to be good, with the collective representations they held to be appropriate, and with the view of social reality they held to be true (Ames 1986:7).

The museum in such an incarnation became more than a repository for a society's valued physical objects; it was a mirror and reflection of "objective" reality, of worldview, a cultural touchstone (Ames 1986: Cameron 1971).

THE "SCIENTIZATION" OF MUSEUMS

With the shift of private collections to museums in the eighteenth century, and the related evolution of the institution into a public trust, a transformation occurred: On a conceptual level "curiosities became ... scientific specimens" (Ames 1986:4); on a practical level staff with specialized expertise were needed to care for the collections. The result was that museums became the site of systematic study, classification, and scholarly research (Ames 1986:4). This move towards the "scientization" of museums was further influenced by social Darwinism, which left its mark on museum presentation and scholarship (in the form of evolutionary classification, and related debates about the efficacy of the approach for many decades (Hudson 1987:67)).

Both the "scientization" and "democratization" of museums played an important role in shaping the museum into the form it takes today. The museum's obligations to the public have had a tremendous impact on its form in the twentieth century, giving rise to many other crucial "junctures" which have in turn shaped the more recent history of the museum. In the twentieth century the institution, in its many diverse guises has become increasingly responsive to its audience, developing in some respects into an "ultra democratized" museum

increasingly conscious of its audience, their needs, demands, and rights (Alexander 1979; Ames 1986; Hudson 1977; Ripley 1969).

In summary, these key historical developments had an important impact on the growth of the museum as a cultural institution. Its definitive functions and traits emerged gradually, and the institution itself took shape over time.

The museum emerged from many centuries of European culture history as a repository for a society's valuable objects, for the physical things deemed to possess collective significance as critical evidence of a people's knowledge of themselves and of others. In that form however, the museum grew to be more than a cultural storehouse. It is charged not only with keeping things of collective significance, but with preserving them, keeping them both physically and ideologically viable. In that respect, based on "democratic ideals" (Wittlin 1970; Alexander 1979), the museum provides access for the masses to the objects held therein, as well as to the concepts those objects represent - "knowledge", "culture", "history", "identity"; The museum thus is an institution that keeps, but also imparts.

THE MUSEUM AND ITS FUNCTIONS: MOVING TOWARD A DEFINITION

The constellation of traits that emerge from the museum's history form the core of a formal (and traditional) definition of "museum". Such definitions characterize the museum in terms of a set of commonly agreed upon definitive functions - the retention of physical objects (collecting), the care and maintenance of those objects (preservation, conservation), the generation of educational information about those objects (research, education), and the presentation of both object and engendered information to the public (interpretation, exhibition) (Katz 1965:26; American Association of Museums 1969; American Association of Museums 1970; Burcaw 1975; Alexander 1979; Ullberg 1981). The formal statement made by the International Council on Museums (ICOM) in 1974 is representative of such a definition of "museum":

...a non-profit-making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates, and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of man and his environment ... (International Council on Museums 1974 in Hudson 1977:1).

Such definitions of "museum" are primarily material in nature (Stocking 1985:4); they define museums in terms of the things they do to the material objects they hold - collect, preserve, exhibit, interpret. While a materially based definition accurately identifies some of the museum's definitive traits, it is not adequate in and of itself; it fails to accurately characterize the museum as a dynamic institution of considerable sociocultural significance. To perceive of museums as institutions that function only in a material realm is to look at them through a distorted lens, to fail to see their true character as a cultural institution endowed with meaning and significance relevant to a complex and dynamic sociocultural domain. An accurate definition then, requires recognition of the museum's "non-material" traits. These features, which characterize and define the museum as much as do its material traits, exist in a domain most accurately identified as symbolic, and involve the role of the museum as a locus for the construction and expression of culturally based and culturally significant meaning.

THE MUSEUM, MEANING, AND "SOCIAL REALITY": A "MODEL OF"
AND A "MODEL FOR"

The museum viewed from a "non-material" (or at least increasingly comprehensive) definition, is not merely a setting in which objects are simply kept, preserved, exhibited, and interpreted, but a context in which those objects are endowed with meaning. That is, objects placed within the museum context absorb new meanings and become powerful evocative symbols used to represent ideas, events, and concepts.

The true power and unique character of the museum however, lies not simply in the conferral of meaning, but more specifically, in the museum's capability to transform meaning. Placement of an object into a museum context (through collection) is the first step in a transformational process. The very fact of an object's presence within the museum changes the referents from which its meaning is drawn; the object is divorced from its prior context and thus no longer has the same use, significance, power, and meaning it once did. The museum itself then becomes the context from which the object takes its meaning.

The transformation process is mobilized precisely by performance of the museum's materially focused activities. It is specifically collection, preservation, exhibition, and interpretation that effect a change in

the way the objects are "read", the significance assigned to them, and ultimately, the meaning they carry. More specifically, collecting effects removal of the object from one setting to another and thus to a new domain of meaning; preservation of the object over time itself lends meaning and significance to the object regarding its importance and value that was not previously attached to it; exhibition and interpretation both form arenas where new meanings are constructed and attached.

Those "transformed" meanings are, of course, constructed, assigned, and mobilized in reference to the broad sociocultural context within which the museum exists and functions. Within the authoritative structure of the museum those symbolic meanings are a "model of social reality" (Ames 1986); they reflect and mirror cultural values and beliefs, and present a view of reality considered to be true and objective (Ames 1986:8; Cameron 1971).

However, it is possible, and I believe necessary, to take this characterization of the museum a step further. That is, museums not only reflect or "model" social reality, but they have the power and symbolic malleability to influence, shape, and mold "social reality". Thus, the meanings and messages constructed and expressed within

the museum are not simply "a model of", but "a model for" (Geertz 1973:93-94; Goffman 1974:41 cited in MacCannell 1976:24); they not only reflect existing values, beliefs, but influence the commonly accepted, shared view of reality, and in turn impact the social order.

The capability of the museum to both mold and model the perception of "social reality" (using physical objects to mobilize symbolic meanings) places it in a position of considerable sociopolitical power. The museum in this guise is the vehicle of symbolic messages that are essentially about power, which are deployed to influence and change power relations between people. In this respect the museum is a powerful strategy, a strategic tool that functions in an essentially political arena.

The museum, so characterized, is in essence a "social instrument". I offer that concept here to complete my exploration of the museum's nature and definitive traits. The "museum as social instrument" is a concept that has been used in various forms in the past to describe the museum. In the 1940s Theodore Low used the term to characterize the museum as a source of education within society, with a primary obligation to fulfill the societal function of education on a mass scale (Low 1942; Cushman 1985). The concept resurfaced in the 1970s in a

slightly different guise as an indicator of the growing role of the museum in social advocacy (Alexander 1979; Hudson 1977; Kinard 1985; Kinard and Nighbert 1972). However I use the term "social instrument" here in yet another sense, to summarize those qualities which I believe comprise the true nature of the institution. The "museum as social instrument" is a sociocultural institution of power and influence which can construct and carry meanings significant in reference to a larger sociocultural and sociopolitical context, messages which can influence, shape and impact that context. The museum plays an important and powerful role as a strategy in a political arena - the strategic vehicle of messages, meanings that ultimately impact power relations between people and function in a sociopolitical arena.

THE ETHNIC MUSEUM AS A "SOCIAL INSTRUMENT"

The ethnic museum, an institutional variant which has become increasingly prevalent worldwide in recent decades, is an excellent example of the museum as "social instrument". However, it is not adequately characterized merely as an institution which "... cannot escape the politics of our time" (American Association of Museums 1988:22), but more accurately as one which is inherently entrenched in a complex web of culture, power, and

politics, whether on a local, regional, national, or international level.

Ethnic museums arise as a response to a complex set of social, cultural, political, economic, and historical factors. They are decidedly an "instrument for social change" (Kinard 1985:223). They grow out of political settings, conceived of by their proponents as strategies developed in response to a given sociopolitical landscape (Aithnard 1976; Assogba 1976; Hill 1977; Horse Capture 1981; Mead 1983; Monreal 1976).

It is a type of museum utilized by groups within a plural society to attain power previously inaccessible to them. Ethnic museums, developed and operated by "the people" themselves, stand as a concerted effort to seize control over the representation of their culture. The development of ethnic museums, particularly in the Third and Fourth worlds, serves to redefine and adapt the museum - stereotypically an elitist institution of Western culture - to their own ends (Aithnard 1976; Mead 1983). In that respect, ethnic museums represent rejection of the prevalent nineteenth century model of a museum, one which represented "others" as a political statement of the "civilization" of a dominant power, evidence of empire,

expansion, and manifest destiny (UNESCO 1983:135; Konare 1983:146).

In contrast, the ethnic museum of today is predicated on the representation of self, not of others. In a world fast becoming a "global village" (MacDonald 1987), the preservation of social boundaries and ethnic distinctions becomes crucial to the cultural and political survival of the peoples which compose the populations of diverse, plural societies (UNESCO 1983:135).

In the past three decades there has been marked development of ethnic museums, an institution designed to represent and preserve the culture of an ethnic or minority group in a larger socio-political context. Ethnic museums have developed in numbers in the Third and Fourth worlds, part of post-colonial "tribalism" in Africa, a vehicle of Native American political activism in North America (see Introduction and Chapter Three), and as a marked feature of the cultural landscape of pluralistic North America. The situations that give rise to ethnic museums are so diverse that it is simplistic and misleading to identify a single unified homogeneous "ethnic museum movement". Instead, it is more useful heuristically, to characterize three types of ethnic museums prevalent today.

One important type of ethnic museum is found in industrialized Western nations, representative of the diversity inherent in a plural society. The development of ethnic museums by immigrant and minority peoples in the Canadian and American context, for instance, represents an interesting effort to preserve diversity as the basis of national unity. In a diverse plural society whose history and growth has been characterized by the ongoing addition of immigrant ethnic groups to the national fabric, the ethnic museum represents a means for those immigrant peoples to retain distinctiveness. On another level, the ethnic museum in the North American context represents an effort to make those various ethnic components visibly apparent, to institutionalize their contribution to a complex national unity. Thus, ethnic museums - of Asian culture, of Ukrainian heritage, of Basque roots - are part of complex processes of nationalist politics in the post-industrial First and Second world (American Association of Museums 1984:18).

A second type of ethnic museum is the nationalistic ethnic museum increasingly prevalent in Europe. In some European nations the rural agrarian past has taken on new significance in recent decades as the focal symbol of unity and nationalism. Ethnic museums - such as the

Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation (Papantoniou 1983), The Cypress Folk Art Museum (Diamantis 1983), ethnographic museums in Bulgaria (Puntev 1983), and the Hungarian National Museum (Selmeczi 1983) - have become an important context where the "peasant" past is woven into a contemporary heritage which signifies the unity of a nation's people.

A third type of ethnic museum is that developed by indigenous peoples of the Third and Fourth worlds who have been dominated and colonized at some point in their history. Ethnic museums are increasingly developed by indigenous people who seek independence from a paternalistic past, and turn to indigenous ethnic museums to grasp an autonomous, "authentic" heritage of their own. Such museums are prevalent, for example, among indigenous people in North America, New Zealand, and post-colonial Africa. One need only look to the rhetoric attendant to museum development by indigenous people to see clearly their inherent quality as "social instrument".

First, such institutions are perceived of as a statement of autonomy and independence. To their proponents they represent much more than a mere symbolic break with the past:

The museum in Africa will no longer be merely a "reservoir" - a reserve of folklore for tourists hungering for exotica - but a living image of the past, a source of culture, a cross-roads of ethnic cultures, a symbol of national unity. A true museum cannot be built solely for the satisfaction of the escapist needs of tourists. Rather it is the expression of the values with which the autochthonous population has been and still is impregnated. In these conditions the museum can help the tourist to understand the African and his environment, to grasp the dynamics of his history (Aithnard 1976:192).

It is ... for the Africans themselves ... to decolonize existing museums and create the types they need, breaking free from all cultural alienation and rejecting foreign concepts. These museums must be created in response to local needs, and not at the request of tourists or foreigners (Konare 1983:146).

An indigenous people's ethnic museum is thus conceived of as a museum "... by and for the people - a collective venture" (Monreal 1976:187):

... to be popular, to appear as projects resolutely integrated in socio-economic and cultural development, museums must become the property of the people; they must be open to all, within the comprehension of everyone, of interest to every citizen, whatever his level of education (Aithnard 1976:192).

The ethnic museum also represents an opportunity for indigenous people to control interpretation of their culture, and to do so in their own sociocultural terms:

... why should the societies of Oceania follow the Western mode? Why should they secularize their meeting house or custom house, their valued objects and their knowledge? To accept the Western model is to lose control over the culture itself and especially the indigenous philosophy and educational system (Mead 1983:101).

Rather than dismantle the belief system of the indigenous people for the sake of setting up a European-style museum, one should work within that belief system as much as possible (Mead 1983:101).

The museum of a Western country is integrated into the way of life of the people in quite a different way from its indigenous counterpart. If the people of the Pacific are to be encouraged to establish culture centres, perhaps they should be advised to model such centres on the indigenous museum and fit them into the way of life of the people in a more traditional mode (Mead 1983:101).

Thus the ethnic museum utilized by indigenous people is one component in a broader sociopolitical movement to gain and hold power. The remainder of this dissertation will focus on the role and significance of Native American museums as a specific incarnation of the indigenous ethnic museum as "social instrument".

In summary, this definition of museum - as artifact, as the locus for the construction of cultural meaning, as a social instrument - is manifested, and theoretically applied, in anthropology today in the form of the "anthropology of museums", an emerging theoretical perspective that frames, informs, and directs the study of museum as "artifact" and cultural product, and which

guides my analysis of Native American museums. I turn now to an historical and substantive consideration of that perspective.

PART II - THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF MUSEUMS

The anthropology of museums, the framework for the study of museums as powerful, influential, expressive sociocultural institutions, constitutes an effort, both theoretical and practical, to redefine traditional museum anthropology by expanding it beyond the boundaries of collection research and the confines of the museum laboratory. Toward that end, the "anthropology of museums" provides a bridge between museum anthropology, mainstream anthropological theory, and ethnographic method. It takes the practice of museum anthropology beyond museum ethnology, material culture, and collection research; it advocates a look into museums as cultural phenomena, into their social structure and social organization, and into their role in shaping and expressing cultural values, beliefs, and assumptions (Ames 1979, 1986).

It is noteworthy as an innovative approach to the anthropological study of museums, and significant also in that its growth and development represents an important

change in the role of museums in anthropology, one component in a long and complex history (Cantwell and Rothschild 1981b).

MUSEUMS AND ANTHROPOLOGY: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Museums once occupied a central position and played an important role in the growth of American anthropology. However, a number of factors contributed to their declining importance over several decades (Collier and Tschopik 1954; Fenton 1960; Mason 1960; Collier and Fenton 1965; Dockstader 1967; Lurie 1981; Cantwell and Rothschild 1981b:1). The "anthropology of museums" grows out of that history of fluorescence and decline, its roots embedded within the changing role of museums in anthropology. I will briefly review that history in order to identify the chronological and theoretical roots of the theoretical perspective.

THE "MUSEUM PERIOD"

Many anthropologists who have summarized the changing role of museums within anthropology identify an integral historical link between the two: Nancy Lurie has identified the museum as the "institutional homeland of American anthropology" (Lurie 1981:180); Fenton names it

as the site where the growing discipline was "nurtured" (Fenton 1974:19).

The link between museums and anthropology was formed in the mid-nineteenth century. During the period from 1849 to 1890, an era characterized as the "Museum Period" (Sturtevant 1969), the museum was the focus of much anthropological activity. Most anthropological research conducted was undertaken by museum anthropologists (Sturtevant 1969:622), and the collection and research of material culture was "an important and respectable part of anthropological research" (Sturtevant 1969:622) (1). In this early period of American anthropology then, the museum and the discipline were closely linked.

THE "MUSEUM-UNIVERSITY PERIOD"

The historians of museum anthropology (both formal and informal) agree that the late nineteenth century was a period of fluorescence (Collier and Tschopik 1954; Fenton 1960, 1974; Stocking 1985:8). 1890-1920 marked the "Museum-University Period" (Sturtevant 1969:623), a time

1. It is important to note that even though museum anthropology and material culture studies were in a position of strength at this time, Sturtevant states that the decline in their importance began at the turn of the century, shortly after the "peak" of the Museum-University period (Sturtevant 1969:622).

when "anthropological museums played a dominant role in the development of anthropological research, theory, and teaching in the United States" (Collier and Tschopik 1954:772) (2).

During this period the position of museums within anthropology remained strong: "... nearly all the jobs were in museums, most of the teaching was done by anthropologists who also had museum appointments, and museums supported most of the field work" (Sturtevant 1969). Museum collections persisted as an important research focus (Sturtevant 1969:623), with the theoretical emphasis placed on the "comparative and descriptive study of material culture" (Collier and Tschopik 1954:771). In fact, there was a "great burst of museum research during the nineties" (Collier and Tschopik 1954:769). However, the importance of museum collections and material culture studies peaked in 1900 and began "a steady decline" (Sturtevant 1969:624) (2). In addition, the site of anthropological training began

2. Within the literature there is some disagreement over the relative importance of museums and material culture studies to the development of American anthropology. Collier and Tschopik (1954) and Fenton (1960) identify the museum's role in the discipline's growth as formative and integral. Sturtevant (1969) however disagrees, and characterizes that position as an overstatement. He claims museum anthropology was never central to the development or application of anthropological theory.

to shift from the museum to the university during this time (Fenton 1974:19). These changes eventually had a tremendous impact on the position of the museum within anthropology.

THE "UNIVERSITY PERIOD" AND THE DECLINE OF MUSEUM ANTHROPOLOGY

In the twentieth century universities increasingly became the primary focus of anthropological research and teaching, a shift that contributed to "an ever widening gap" between museum anthropology and "mainstream" anthropology (Collier and Tschopik 1954:772). The decline of museum anthropology that followed has been well documented and attributed to a variety of factors - the rise of theoretical concerns focused away from material culture, research conducted independent of collections, the entrenchment of anthropology within university departments, the narrow conception of "museums", the relatively low status of museum work and its increasingly public, as opposed to scholarly, orientation (Collier and Tschopik 1954; Fenton 1960, 1974; Collier 1962; Collier and Fenton 1965; Sturtevant 1969; Ames 1986; Cantwell and Rothschild 1981a).

This combination of factors during the "University Period" (1920 to approximately 1969) (Sturtevant 1969:624,625) was characterized by a substantial move away from museums as an integral focus of the discipline or as a respected site for the practice of anthropology. The reputation of museum anthropology changed accordingly: It came to be stigmatized as non-theoretical and non-progressive (Cantwell and Rothschild 1981c:580; material culture was a "dead duck" (Collier and Tschopik 1954); and museums were thought of as "intellectually low grade" (Collier and Tschopik 1954:775).

At that point in time, museum anthropology, as Stocking has so aptly phrased it, was "... stranded in an institutional, methodological, and theoretical backwater" (Stocking 1985:8).

THE INTROSPECTIVE PERIOD

The changing role of the museum within anthropology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and specifically the decline of museum anthropology in the first half of the twentieth century was a crucial juncture in the history of museum anthropology. In the 1950s this state of affairs caused museum anthropologists to assess their circumstance, their

position within anthropology, and museum anthropology's future prospects. By virtue of their own activity they defined the "introspective period" in the history of museum anthropology (Collier and Tschopik 1954; Shapiro 1958; Fenton 1960; Frese 1960; Mason 1960; Collier 1962; Collier and Fenton 1965; Dockstader 1967; McFeat 1962, 1967; Sturtevant 1969).

It is out of that period of introspection and assessment that new perspectives on the relationship between anthropology and museums gradually began to emerge. That body of literature provides invaluable insights into the climate of review and appraisal which is the source of the theoretical perspective, the anthropology of museums.

The reflexive museum anthropologists of the 1950s and 1960s undertook a conscious effort to change the thinking of their colleagues, to identify and open up new directions for growth, change, and redefinition deemed vital to the continued survival of that branch of the discipline. In order to do that it was necessary to understand what museum anthropology was - its definitive traits, *raison d'etre*, as well as its limitations.

The result of much of the questioning of that period was the construction of an emic definition of museum

anthropology, an implicit understanding based on a conscious recognition that material culture studies were the definitive core feature of museum anthropology at that time. Importantly, that definition equates museum anthropology and material culture studies as synonymous.

That conscious equation formed a crucial juncture in the history of museum anthropology; it provided an opening for looking even farther into museum anthropology's character, qualities, and prospects; once material culture was identified as the definitive focus it was possible to venture a look beyond existing boundaries to further assess the role, place, and importance of material culture in museum anthropology. How can museum anthropology and material culture studies, individually and collectively, be revitalized and revamped? Can museum anthropology be something other than the study of material culture? Is it necessary to change that trait in order for museum anthropology to remain viable to the rest of anthropology? In this respect, the museum anthropology/material culture equation served as a "jumping-off-point" for assessment of new ways to integrate museum anthropology into the broad focus of the discipline.

FROM "INTROSPECTION" TO THE "ANTHROPOLOGY OF MUSEUMS"

The assessment of present, past, and future in museum anthropology during the "introspective period" sowed the seeds for the emergence of the "anthropology of museums" in the decades that followed. The introspective assessment characteristic of that time gave way to efforts to identify possible directions for change, growth, expansion, and redefinition.

Out of that activity practitioners and theorists of museum anthropology began to seek new approaches to museums, new ideas about their nature, value, and applicability (Frese 1960; Collier 1962; Sturtevant 1969). Such efforts at reformulation of the concept of "museum" were proffered originally as a type of "survival tactic", an effort to retain museum anthropology as a viable branch of the discipline.

A first, and crucially important step in that direction took the form of a question posed in Collier and Tschopik's classic Introspective Period article (Collier and Tschopik 1954). They identified the museum itself as "a fair and necessary field for investigation", and asked "Why is not the anthropological museum as a medium of mass communication itself a suitable object for study?"

(Collier and Tschopik 1954:776). Though the statement may be subtle, its significance is marked; it represents a turning point (albeit gradual and subtle), a change in thinking about the relevance of museums to anthropology. It is a first step in the redefinition (or at least the expansion) of anthropological approaches to museums, and specifically in the extension of anthropological perspectives on culture to the "culture" of the museum itself.

Fenton (1960) also made a contribution in that direction (toward a changed perspective on the nature important and contribution of museums in anthropology) in characterizing the relationship between museum and the sociocultural context within which it exists as subject to a "continuous feed-back effect" (1960:343) (3). His observation, embedded into a broader "introspective" assessment of the state of museum anthropology, was a conscious recognition of the museum as a complex institution, integrated into a sociocultural context, which both impacts and reflects the external world.

3. In this instance Fenton was speaking specifically of the circular relationship between museums, collectors, the art market, and the growing popular interest in "primitive art" at that time. Ethnological activities in museums were responsible in part for stimulating interest in "primitive art", which further stimulated collecting activity in the art market, in turn effecting the quality of artifacts available for future museum collecting.

Collier and Tschopik's explicit identification of the museum as a possible focus of anthropological research, Fenton's recognition of the socioculturally integrated role of the museum, and various remarks and observations made by others in the 1950s and 1960s were indicative of a subtle yet important shift in worldview towards the role of museums in anthropology. Gradually the museum came to be recognized as more than simply the locale where museum anthropologists practice museum anthropology. The literature indicates a growing recognition of the museum itself as a cultural reflector, a factor in the complex relationship between anthropology and the "other". Thus anthropologists themselves, and museum anthropologists specifically, have gradually come to be aware of the role their own activities - fieldwork, theorizing, and "museumizing" play in creating and influencing the "realities" they study. Gradually, the museum has come to be a newly recognized source of non-material cultural data.

Such statements and subtle observations however, did not in and of themselves constitute a movement towards an "anthropology of museums". In fact, for several decades, from the 1950s up until the mid 1970s, the ideas that later formed the basis of the anthropology of museums

were expressed as single ideas, speculative suggestions that were diffuse, and embedded into explorations of other topics. The emergence of the anthropology of museums per se (which is still in the process of emergence and definition today) occurred very gradually, subtly, quietly as separate threads, rather than as a cohesive heralded "movement".

However, in the 1970s the separate threads cast by museum anthropologists over two decades began to be gathered and woven into a single fabric - a perspective on the role of museums in society, and their potential as the subject, rather than merely the physical locus, of anthropological research. In 1979 Michael Ames, Director of the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology, observed the move in that direction, stating that "Museum anthropologists regularly extol the virtues of basic research ... but rarely and only recently have anthropologists directed this research interest inwardly to the study of the very world in which they live and work" (Ames 1979:23).

THE STUDY OF MATERIAL CULTURE, AND THE MUSEUM AS
"ARTIFACT"

The move toward recognition of the museum as a component of a larger cultural system, and thus a likely target of cultural anthropological research, was propelled and mobilized by work in the 1970s and 1980s (continuing up to the present) which seizes upon ideas about museums and culture previously expressed only diffusely. Such work by Michael Ames and others (Ames 1979, 1981, 1986; Annis 1986; Bean 1987; Clifford 1985; Cole 1985; Dawn; Dominguez 1986, 1988; Eisenbeis 1972; Graburn 1976; Halpin 1978, 1983; MacCannell 1976; Reynolds 1984, 1987; Stewart 1984; Stocking 1985; Sukel 1974; Vallance 1981; Vastokas 1976;) has been instrumental in first, drawing attention to the great potential of the museum as a domain of culturally based behavior, a source of cultural data, and a potential focus of anthropological research. It is important to note that this trend toward application of anthropological perspectives on culture to the study of museums parallels the "reflexive" trend in anthropology briefly discussed in this dissertation's introduction (Clifford and Marcus 1986). That is, the emergence of an "anthropology of museums" is part of a broader movement in anthropology toward greater reflexivity in critically and honestly assessing the impact of "anthropolgizing", and thus "museumizing", on the representation of the cultures we study.

It is from that theoretical and scholarly activity that the "anthropology of museums" as a theoretical approach toward the study of museums, begins to emerge. More specifically, the emergence of the anthropology of museums in recent decades is attached to what some have called a "resurgence" (4) of material culture studies in the 1970s and 1980s (Reynolds 1987; Reynolds and Stott:1987b).

A body of literature has recently been produced by museum anthropologists (and some non-anthropologists) that once again attempts to re-focus the attention of the discipline on the continuing viability of museum anthropology and/or material culture studies (Cantwell and Rothschild 1981a; Reynolds and Stott 1987a; Schlereth 1982). This "post-introspective" work of the 1980s is, I believe, the product and outcome of the introspection of the 1950s, the result of conscious efforts to revitalize museum anthropology. It is the expression and manifestation of the efforts mobilized in the 1950s and 1960s to redefine museum anthropology, to revive it by changing its focus, application, and practice.

That recent body of writing is based on a broad approach towards material culture as a dynamic, integral aspect of a cultural system, emphasizing the importance of

"contextualization" in its study (Reynolds 1987:155). Reynold's concept of a "material system" is representative of the valuable contribution made by some of this work. He uses the term to designate the "complex interrelationships" between material and other aspects of culture. He explains that within a material system "Clustered around each such element are other objects and associated ideas and behavior with which there is a high though varying degree of interaction" (Reynolds 1987:156). A "material system" then, encompasses the entire sociocultural realm within which material culture is integrated, thus recognizing material culture as a dynamic component integrated into a dynamic system that consists of overlapping interrelationships between object, culture, and context.

This type of approach towards the study of material culture, represented most recently by the work of Reynolds and by earlier work of Graburn (1976), has great significance for the emergence, definition and establishment of the anthropology of museums. It forms the crucial link between the study of material culture and the study of the museum as artifact; it thus provides the framework into which the anthropological study of museums fits. That is, the "anthropology of museums" borrows from the study of material culture the underlying

premise that investigation of the artifact and its context will not only yield data on the object itself, but on the complexities of the cultural system that give rise to that object. The study of the artifact then, provides entrance into a system that is more complex than the physical presence of the object itself. In much the same way, the study of museums as artifacts (tangible cultural products, powerful, dynamic institutions integrally bound in processes of politics, power, and identity) will lead the investigator far beyond analysis solely of the technical features of the institution, into examination of the cultural beliefs, sociopolitical factors, and worldview that comprise the context within which that museum develops and functions. To study the museum as artifact is to undertake an ethnographic study of the museum as one component in a broad, dynamic, sociocultural system.

To date, the application of the anthropology of museums as a theoretical perspective has yielded several characterizations of the museum as "artifact" - the museum as cultural expression, the museum as symbol, as social instrument as catalyst (Ames 1979, 1981, 1986; Annis 1986; Bean 1987; Clifford 1985; Cole 1985; Dawn; Dominguez 1986, 1988; Eisenbeis 1972; Graburn 1976; Halpin 1978; 1983; MacCannell 1976; Reynolds 1984, 1987;

Stewart 1984; Stocking 1985; Sukel 1974; Vallance 1981; Vastokas 1976).

These characterizations constitute an important contribution to contemporary studies of dynamic cultural processes of culture change, ethnicity, and the construction of meaning, and the role of the museum in those processes. They are contributions towards redefinition of the concept of "museum", and reformulation of its role within in anthropology; These characterizations of the museum as "artifact", based on application of the anthropology of museums as a theoretical perspective are, in essence, evidence of the validity of the museum as a cultural institution, as a valuable source of cultural data, and as a "new" and extremely important focus of anthropological research. The long term result I believe, will be an expanded and updated "incarnation" of museum anthropology, manifested as a revitalized role within the discipline of anthropology.

These crucial concepts, briefly presented and defined here, will be refined, illustrated, and elaborated upon in coming chapters in application specifically to Native American museums as artifact, cultural expression, symbol, and social instrument.

CHAPTER THREE

THE NATIVE AMERICAN MUSEUM IN NORTH AMERICA:

A SOCIOPOLITICAL STRATEGY

Indian people are becoming aware that museums are not just white dominated institutions but institutions which they can also develop for their own purposes. In a larger perspective, the new developments indicate that Indians are gaining recognition and will survive as definable peoples.

... Among Third World nations recently freed of colonialism, museums are important in their building priorities to affirm national identity and rally sentiment through recognition of an ancient and respected heritage (Lurie 1976:250).

The Native American museum in North America is a contemporary institution of considerable social, cultural, and political significance. The various features that characterize it - its definitive traits, the history of its growth and development, the context in which it exists - serve as crucial signals of its sociocultural significance as artifact and cultural product.

In this chapter I will construct a working definition of "Native American museum", and then look closely at the configuration of features that define and are associated with the institution. The goal is to formulate an explanatory thesis of the Native American museum phenomenon.

DEFINITIVE TRAITS OF THE NATIVE AMERICAN MUSEUM

The Native American museum is, in many respects, a "traditional" type of museum - based on a permanent collection, which is kept as a public trust, housed in an environment designed to facilitate care and preservation, exhibited and interpreted, made accessible to the public, and used for educational purposes.

The Native American museum however, is also a unique institution which possesses traits exclusive to it. Those traits, discussed in greater detail below, in combination comprise the institution's essence, and define it as a unique, significant, and powerful institution. Those definitive traits are central in distinguishing it from other types of museums, as well as from other types of Native American institutions and projects.

Within the context of this study administrative structure is used as the key identifying and distinguishing feature. A "Native American museum" is native-owned and operated, characterized by a predominant Native American controlling interest on several levels - financial, administrative, and substantive.

The concept of Native American control as a definitive feature of the institution extends beyond administrative concerns. Within a Native American museum structure emphasis is also placed on Native American control over the institution's collection, its interpretation and preservation. Toward that end, Native American museum exhibits and programming are generally based on the interpretation of culture history from a Native American perspective (1). The expression of a community or tribal specific worldview within a museum context implicitly stands as a correction of or alternative to previous non-native cultural interpretations.

Finally, on an organizational level Native American museums are also defined by provision of a multiplicity of educational services to both native and non-native segments of the community. Ultimately, they are active institutions within the community seeking dynamic, creative approaches to cultural preservation and education.

In addition to these characteristic functional traits the context within which Native American museums have grown

1. The perspective generally projected in Native American museums is that of the members of a specific Native American community or tribal group, rather than a generalized Pan-Indian worldview.

and developed historically has played a crucial role in shaping and defining the institution. Thus, it is necessary to look to the circumstances associated with the growth and development of Native American museums in North America in order to construct an explanatory thesis of the Native American museum phenomenon.

HISTORY OF NATIVE AMERICAN MUSEUM GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

In examining the history of Native American museums and their patterns of growth it becomes quite clear that the Native American museum is a phenomenon of the twentieth century. The institution's growth and development in native communities across North America is confined to a two decade span in the late twentieth century.

Very few Native American museums existed in the first half of the twentieth century. In fact, in 1952 John Ewers described a "unique" museum owned by the Osage tribe, which was not only operated for Indians, but by Indians (Ewers 1952). His documentation of the existence of that clearly defined Native American museum barely half way through the twentieth century is extremely significant. In 1952 the Osage museum, administered by Indians, was virtually one of a kind. At that time the prevalent model of a "Native American museum" was a

museum for Indians, operated in reservation communities, with a specific focus on the culture history of an individual tribal group, with the reservation's population as its targeted audience. Such an institution however, was administered by non-Indians. The Native American administration of the Osage museum, in contrast, represented a significant departure. However, within slightly more than two decades Native American museums grew in number to an estimated fifteen in the late 1960s, and a burgeoning total of eighty estimated planned or operating Native American museums in the late 1970s (Broyles/Native American Museum Program 1987). Those figures significantly indicate that the 1960s and 1970s were a time of a concentrated surge in Native American museum growth.

Native museums not only grew quickly in North America in the 1970s, but rapidly achieved a widespread geographical distribution (Broyles/Native American Museum Program 1987; Hanson 1980). The native museum, as an institutional type, occurs in distinct native communities across North America. It is not confined to any one geographical region, cultural group, political faction, economic or historical context. It has grown with equal fervor and speed in both the United States and Canada. Thus, native museums are most accurately defined by a set

of traits shared in common by institutions in as diverse settings as Niagara Falls, New York; Window Rock, Arizona; and Alert Bay, British Columbia. Although there are many site specific variables, such institutions are essentially similar in terms of their role, function, and impact.

The combination of factors associated with the growth of native museums in North America in the twentieth century is more than mere trivia. The fact that native museums are confined to a specific historical period, grow rapidly within that period, do not occur earlier in the post-contact period in native North America, appear in diverse settings at the same point in time exhibiting the same basic set of characteristics, are all crucial and highly significant factors. What are the possible explanations for the development of Native American museums in association with these particular features?

One explanation lies in the availability of Federal funding: The surge of Native American museum growth corresponds with the availability of federal funding specifically earmarked for the construction of Native American museums and cultural centers in the 1970s (Fuller in Combs 1987). Specifically, funds available

from the Economic Development Administration (2) "...in the form of building loans for the construction and expansion of facilities; technical assistance for such activities as feasibility studies; ... planning grants ..." (League of Women Voters 1976:82) were widely utilized to plan, build, and develop Native American museums and cultural centers. However, the availability of such funding is not a satisfactory explanation for the phenomenon in that it focuses on only one instrumental factor in Native American museum growth, and does not fully take the broader sociocultural context into consideration. Provision of funding does not explain why the burgeoning growth of Native American museums occurred in the 1970s, but only identifies programming that facilitated and aided that growth.

In fact, to the anthropologist's eye the Native American museum configuration serves as an indicator first, that Native American museums do not exist in a sociocultural vacuum. It is also more specifically indicative that

2. The Economic Development Administration (EDA) was a Federal agency which "... began to take a more active role in reservation development ..." in 1967 after the discontinuation of the Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA) (League of Women Voters 1976:81). "EDA's philosophy was that Indians themselves must take a leadership role in ... altering the poor socioeconomic conditions in Indian communities. It emphasized that Indian involvement, together with comprehensive planning could result in change" (League of Women Voters 1976:81).

other external factors have influenced the institution's growth and development. The analysis of Native American museums presented in this dissertation is grounded on the premise that it is necessary to look to a broad and complex set of external factors, chiefly the social, cultural, political, historical, and economic context within which the phenomenal growth of Native American museums has taken place, in order to formulate a satisfactory explanation for their sociocultural significance. Native American museum growth and development in the second half of the twentieth century is a sociocultural phenomenon and must thus be understood and explained in reference to the larger arena within which it occurs.

Looking beyond the correspondence between Native American museum growth and federal funding programs then, it is extremely significant that the appearance of native museums in communities across North America corresponds with a specific period of Native American political activism and militancy in the 1960s and 1970s. The phenomenal growth of Native American museums at a particular point in time corresponds with a sociopolitical demand for self-determination. Native American museums grow out of a contemporary sociopolitical context in North America in which

sovereignty and self-determination are overarching issues and concerns, part of a larger sociopolitical movement toward autonomy and political power. The association of these two phenomenon in time and space is more than coincidental. The Native American museum is, I believe, specifically an "artifact" and cultural product of that context. Its relationship to the broader sociopolitical context is such that it is a dependent variable that does not stand alone; it grows out of that context and is a specific factor in it. It is inherently linked with that broader sociopolitical context, a feature which is a key definitive trait of the institution. Thus, a brief discussion of the issue of self-determination and the context within which the demand for self-determination is expressed, is necessary.

THE SOCIOCULTURAL CONTEXT OF NATIVE AMERICAN MUSEUM GROWTH

In the 1960s, fueled by the Civil Rights Movement and a history of domination and colonization, Native American political activism and militancy reached a peak. Most visible as the rhetoric of Red Power, the militant activities of the American Indian Movement was represented by the occupation of Wounded Knee in 1973, Alcatraz from 1969-1971, the Trail of Broken Treaties and

the occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs offices in 1972 (League of Women Voters 1976:1-3; Josephy 1970).

The Native American sociopolitical activism of the 1970s grew out of a much longer history of native/non-native relations in North America. The rhetoric and activism of Red Power comprised one more historical phase in the relationship between natives and non-natives in the United States. The activism of the 1970s was a response by Native American people to their historical treatment under United States government Indian policy. Federal Indian policy has been characterized over time by distinct policy phases, each of which has left its characteristic mark on the lives of Native American people - whether on an individual tribal community level, or a pan-Indian level. In order to understand the historical context out of which Native American museums have grown, it is necessary to briefly examine the more significant of these policy periods.

REMOVAL

The period of "removal" (which occurred largely in the mid-nineteenth century) was a significant phase during which treaties between major Western tribes and the United States government were signed, territory ceded,

and reservations created to which Native American people were "removed". These actions by the United States government were spurred by increasing settlement of the United States and westward expansion.

The primary objective of the removal period was creation of reservations as a means to achieve assimilation of Native American people. The reservation context in the nineteenth century (and into the twentieth century) was one in which the indigenous people of North America were exposed to the values and practices of American culture in an effort to "civilize" them (Svensson 1973:21).

Although the creation of reservations was intended as a solution to the "Indian problem", removal itself instigated a number of serious long-lasting problems

Reservations lent themselves to all manner of problems ... Boundaries were necessary ... particularly since treaties usually mentioned keeping the two races physically separate ... It also, however, from the Indian point of view, limited Indian use of what was once all Indian country, and opened excluded areas up to settlement. ... population pressure on resources within the reservation led to increasing the vulnerability of Indian people to efforts to "civilize" them, that is, to encourage them in learning customs and livelihoods, notably agriculture, more in keeping with the lifestyle of American society as a whole (Svensson 1973:21).

Once most Native American people were removed to reservations, pressure for land did not cease. Thus allotment, the next policy phase, was instituted to engender further "solutions".

ALLOTMENT

The Dawes Act of 1887 (the legislative vehicle of allotment) facilitated division of reservations established by treaty into individual parcels which were allotted to tribal members. The remaining "surplus" land existing within reservation boundaries was then sold to non-Indians, facilitating non-Indian settlement, control, and development of treaty designated (and supposedly protected) reservation land (Svensson 1973:22).

Allotment resulted in the shift of many tribal land holdings from Indian to non-Indian hands, seriously reducing the Native American land base. The effect of allotment is still quite visible on many reservations today. The Port Madison reservation created for the Suquamish and Duwamish tribes in 1855 is a case in point. 2,638 acres were allotted to tribal members, while 4,604 acres of the original reservation is owned by non-Indians creating a situation where a greater percentage of the land within reservation boundaries is owned by non-

Indians than Indians (Confederation of American Indians 1986:282).

THE INDIAN REORGANIZATION ACT

The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (IRA) was another policy action which had an important impact on reservation life and tribal politics. The Indian Reorganization Act facilitated creation of tribal governments based on elected tribal councils.

The IRA provided for recognition of tribal governments for certain specified purposes, halted the process of alienation of tribal land through allotment, provided for the formation of tribal corporations for land acquisition and economic development ... and in general established the tribal unit as a viable self-determining authority ... (Svensson 1973:27).

Although the Indian Reorganization Act created a basis for tribal government and represented a concerted move toward self-determination (a somewhat temporary effect of the New Deal (Svensson 1973:27) it was not itself problem free.

While most Indian people have welcomed the return of the tribal government as recognition of an Indian right to internal self-determination, they have been quick to note the contradictions, inadequacies and ambiguities of the Act as it has developed since its passage (Svensson 1973:28).

TERMINATION

Government sanctioned movement toward self-determination was essentially erased by the policy of termination initiated in the 1950s. The objective was to gradually terminate the "... special status of reservation and tribal government. The policy of termination ... refers to the unilateral rejection of the concept of a special legal and social status for American Indian communities within the American political framework (Svensson 1973:31).

Under termination the status of several tribes was nullified, an ultimate assimilationist action. Within the past decade some tribes that were terminated in the 1950s have been reinstated. The Klamath Tribe of Oregon is one such example.

This brief summary of the "highlights" of United States Indian policy serves to provide a historical backdrop to the Red Power movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The Native American demand for political, economic, social, and cultural self-determination did not occur in a sociopolitical vacuum. It was a collective, political response to a history of domination. Interestingly, the self-determination activism of the 1970s, unlike the

previous phases in native/non-native relations summarized here, was an Indian initiated and Indian controlled action. Significantly, its origins lay in a grass roots Native American sociopolitical movement, rather than a Federal government initiated policy action.

SELF-DETERMINATION, MILITANCY, ACTIVISM, AND RED POWER

There were several key issues that came to the forefront under the rubric of self-determination during the 1960s and 1970s. These included "... issues of Indian rights under treaties, Indian rights to a cultural identity, Indian rights to justice and fair treatment" (League of Women Voters 1976:1). The demand for Native American sovereignty and self-determination was the prevalent and overarching theme (League of Women Voters 1976:35), as Josephy explains:

The aim of Red, or Indian, Power - the right of Indians to be free of colonist rule and to run their own affairs, with security for their lands and rights - is the major theme of contemporary Indian affairs ... (Josephy 1970:19).

More specifically, self-determination emerged as the key issue, or more accurately sociopolitical movement, that shapes and informs the contemporary Native American political context in North America. While self-

determination emerged in the forefront of recent political activism, it has been an issue in native/non-native relations since contact. The quest for self-determination has been expressed over time in different forms, but has consistently and unequivocally been "... one manifestation of that earlier, still unresolved, struggle between the American colonies, foreign powers and American Indians for control of the North American continent" (League of Women Voters 1976:26; McNickle 1973:v-xii).

Self-determination is a governmental, political, and cultural issue advocating a people's right to determine their own future - to exercise control over decision making, governance, leadership, resource use, education, and cultural transmission, in other words, control over the economic, political decisions that shape the nature and quality of a people's life.

... the right of self-determination, most broadly understood, is the right of all peoples to participate freely and fully in the sharing of all values (e.g., power, well-being, enlightenment, respect, wealth, skill, rectitude, and affection). The right to political self-determination involves this broader focus but may be summarized as the collective right of a peoples to pursue their own political demands, to acquire power equally ... (Paust 1980:13).

Self-determination is based on "... the idea that a homogeneous people has the "right" to ... maintain its own national traditions within a larger political entity" (Cline 1980:xi in Alexander and Friedlander 1980b). Self-determination is designed to protect human rights, it is also "... first and foremost a political weapon..." (Alexander and Friedlander 1980b:xii).

Deloria and Lytle's discussion of the history and impact of U.S. Federal government Indian policy (Deloria and Lytle 1983) sheds light on Native American self-determination issues.

Deloria and Lytle characterize Native American self-determination of the 1960s and 1970s as a policy approach proffered by the Federal government, and accepted by many on the tribal level, which did not achieve Native American autonomy but only further perpetuated Native American governmental and political dependency and subordination. Self-government in this respect,

... implies a recognition by the superior political power that some measure of local decision making is necessary but ... must be monitored very carefully so that its products are compatible with the goals and policies of the larger political power (Deloria and Lytle 1983:14).

Native American self-determination from their perspective is vested in a set of watered-down policy actions and programs that came from the government level rather than the grass-roots level. From this perspective it was based on the transfer of program administration to the tribal level, yet still under the federal government umbrella, intended to placate rather than liberate (Deloria and Lytle 1983:215-216). Such actions were centered primarily in reservation economic development programs and educational programs (Deloria and Lytle 1983:220-223). They succinctly express their perspective:

Self-determination was regarded as something of substance, which Congress might bestow on Indians, not a goal, which Indians might achieve for themselves (Deloria and Lytle 1983:223).

Even though I do not agree with nor apply their definition of self-determination here, it implicitly provides a valuable distinction between self-determination as externally conferred policy and a grass-roots sociopolitical movement. I draw on that distinction in defining Native American self-determination, in contrast with Deloria and Lytle, primarily as a political movement with an ideological basis that comes from within tribal government, native community organization, pan-Indian activist organizations. From my perspective,

self-determination is not solely based on Congressionally designed programming, but is a genuine ideologically based social movement.

CULTURAL SELF-DETERMINATION AND THE NATIVE AMERICAN MUSEUM AS A SOCIOPOLITICAL STRATEGY

The self-determination rhetoric and ideology that emerged out of the Native American sociopolitical context of the 1970s is complex and far reaching. The demand for Native American self-determination is actually manifest in many guises - land and fishing rights, legislative action, efforts to attain religious freedom, and tribal government and economic programs. Native American self-determination ideology can be broken down into several sets of concerns - political, economic, social and cultural, all coming under the rubric of self-determination.

The rise of Native American museums in the 1970s and 1980s grew out of concerns related specifically to cultural self-determination. A significant theme that arose out of the cultural self-determination context emphasized the relationship between "culture" - particularly material heritage - and power. This emphasis was underlain by a belief by Native American people that

"culture" was one important path to power - both political power and strength, cohesion and pride. Thus, cultural self-determination in the Native American context involved seeking control over culture in all respects - its definition, projection, interpretation - as a means to broader based sociopolitical power.

The Native American people do not need a great white father to look after their culture, government or religion. The Hodenosaunee's requests for the return of Wampum belts, medicine masks and ceremonial objects are not unreasonable demands that arise from rediscovered ethnic pride. For many generations they have watched their children try to assimilate to American society while retaining the sacred messages and beliefs that were entrusted to them ...

Painfully, the Hodenosaunee have learned that the survival of their culture - the traditional religion, philosophy, government and lifestyle - is in question. ... They believe in their ancestors' way of life, but they see their children grow confused without the same messages that inspired earlier generations. They must take the necessary steps to protect their grandchildren's religious, governmental and cultural choices (Hill 1977:44).

Many of the cultural self-determination actions and rhetoric of the 1970s were a reaction against the representation and interpretation of Native American cultures in non-native museums. Conventional museums - run by non-natives which portrayed Native American cultures in collections and exhibits - came under heavy attack for distortion, racism, desecration, and cultural destruction.

It seems appropriate at this time to discuss the matter of the museums of America - those mausoleums of various and sundry collections of what is known as "artifacts," or "evidences of ancient cultures." There is gross hoarding of artifacts and art materials in the great museums. In many, many cases, our most priceless pieces of antiquity are ill cared for, hidden in steel caskets ... One need only look to the sorry mess existing in the Smithsonian Institution to know the truth (Henry 1970:17).

American museums suffer from culture shock in trying to define Native Americans by ethno-centric evaluation. Museums also have a bad habit of measuring today's Native Americans by such definitions, determining that our cultural, artistic, social and religious needs are less valid than "historic" Indians. It's called racial prejudice, but museums have hid behind their public trust to preserve the objects (Hill 1984:148).

The movement toward cultural self-determination was an effort to regain control and possession of Native American cultural artifacts as the foundation for cultural preservation, strength, and survival. The initiation of repatriation actions and demands became the focal point of cultural self-determination demands.

A wave of fear passed through museums in the late 1960s and early 1970s, as Native people began an active campaign against the individuals and institutions that they perceived as contributors to their poverty and oppression. Militant groups seized and reburied skeletal remains, disrupted anthropological research, occupied one museum and burned another to the ground. Tribal elders and religious leaders began to challenge museums' interpretations of Native cultures and to threaten legal action in efforts to recover religious materials they felt were wrongfully acquired

(Hanson 1980:49).

Native American repatriation demands comprised a significant expression of the important relationship between culture, artifacts, and power. The demand for repatriation was thus recognized as a significant action on many levels.

It seems reasonable to believe that requests for specimen returns will be forthcoming ... This is not a fad so much as a representative facet of the growing interest of American Indians in their own cultural heritage and in their identity as contemporary residents of this country. Museum specimens are not only the physical representations of this heritage and identity, but also the symbols of the loss of American Indian autonomy and culture by military, legal, and demographic processes (Nason 1973:21).

To take back Native American objects held in museums was to take back cultural pride, strength, and autonomy. It was an action through which Native Americans could reappropriate and reaffirm the power derived from the presentation and interpretation of culture.

Repatriation demands by Native Americans comprised a significant manifestation of the belief in the relationship between culture and power, a connection which is complex and multifaceted. On one level culture is recognized as a source of power for Native American people. That is, strength and cohesion is derived from

the retention of conscious awareness of one's cultural inheritance. To "know" one's culture, to use it and to participate in it, to receive it and transmit it, is to keep it viable. The recognition by Native American people that "culture" (and history) make them akin to each other and distinct from others is a source of strength.

On another level, it was also recognized that power could be obtained through culture, a recognition that culture is not just a source of shared strength but one path to political power. That is, in a self-determination context culture becomes crucial evidence in demonstrating how, why, and in what respect a people are a distinct entity, with a distinct history which warrants their retention, of control over their own affairs. Culture in that respect provides an historical, conceptual, and ideological basis for asserting and claiming the right to self-determination. Culture thus becomes a tool to achieve political power in that it facilitates a people's social, cultural, and political visibility, gives them a voice, and provides them a forum through which to make a contribution within the broader societal context.

These ideological themes - the value of culture as both a source of power and a means to power, formed the backdrop

of Native American cultural self-determination concerns of the 1970s. The Native American museum arose out of this ideological context as a means for Native American people to regain control over the presentation and interpretation of culture. The Native American museum is thus a specific strategy mobilized by Native American people to seek power in culture and power through culture.

A tribal museum can have the greatest positive impact on the local Native culture. Through consolidating cultural/educational programs on a reservation, tribal museums can address the historical, cultural, artistic, and educational needs of their community (Hill 1984:149).

Tribal museums must first define themselves to address the needs of their own community, rather than a tourism or economic development project. A tribal museum, therefore, becomes a community culture center, contributing to cultural enrichment of the tribal members, and bringing historic materials, oral history, elders as instructors, artists as interpreters together to preserve culture through active participation, not just analytical study (Hill 1984:140).

The tribal museum is a long-term investment measured by the transfer of knowledge from one generation to the next (Hill 1984:151).

More specifically, the growth and development of Native American museums in North America, represents the "seizure" of a traditional Western cultural institution and the reappropriation of culture by a dominated people. The fact of a Native American museum in and of itself

alters the status quo of relative power roles (especially those related to the presentation and interpretation of culture).

First, within the context of the Native American museum control over the interpretation and presentation of culture is regained, and culture is reappropriated through retelling, reconstruction, and reinterpretation. Within the museum setting the people of a Native American community take back the power, and the resources, to write their own history, to present a sense of themselves, and to construct and project a public definition of their collective identity.

Such action constitutes rejection of the role of cultural social and political "other", historically subject to subordinate placement in a social hierarchy by a dominant power. The Native American museum develops and disseminates an alternate (or corrected) view of a people's history and identity. Projection of their own story is in effect a renouncement of previous external interpretations.

The physical and conceptual products of culture are also reappropriated. Thus "culture" itself is taken back in the form of artifacts, oral tradition and oral narrative,

knowledge, and access to knowledge. Such reappropriation can be physical, based on the return of artifacts and cultural property to the community. The reappropriation of culture can also be symbolic based on the construction of history by the people themselves (as in the case of the Suquamish, where recovery and repossession is not predicated on the physical possession of physical objects, but on other kinds of evidence such as photos and oral narrative).

In the process of reappropriation aspects of the repossessed culture (represented by a set of traits, objects, events, or possessions) are endowed with meaning. Selected aspects of reappropriated culture stand as especially representative and evocative signifiers of who a people collectively believe themselves to be, and how they believe they came to be a bounded group with specific distinguishing features. In that form specific aspects of culture become the symbolic focus of the story told within the museum. They are, in other words, crucial ethnic markers presented as the ultimate symbol and source of a people's distinctiveness. Such markers, are not merely important but sacred (Horse capture 1981; Rothschild 1981). The body of Ozette artifacts and an expanse of Suquamish culture history represented by photographs and elder's oral histories are

both examples of the mobilization of selected aspects of culture as sacralized ethnic markers.

The set of ethnic markers identified and presented within the context of the Native American museum compose a "package" made up of selected features of history, ancestry, and cultural legacy. I am calling that package "heritage". "Heritage", in the Native American museum context is a product of the reappropriation process. It is a constructed package that summarizes a people's essential traits from their own perspective. Heritage in that form is predicated on the selective presentation and assignment of meaning to aspects of a people's past (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983).

That "package" forms the content of collective identity and creates a "picture" of a people. Whatever its specific content, heritage provides the basis for construction (and expression) of a definition of collective identity. Heritage, formulated and projected within the Native American museum delineates and evidences group boundaries, shared membership, and ultimately, collective identity. The heritage package thus serves to mark and maintain ethnic boundaries, establishes distinctiveness, as one component of a larger self-determination process, a crucial piece of evidence.

The Native American museum thus is a setting in which "culture" becomes a commodity, a subjectively defined package with a selective content (history, ancestry, descent, the past, identity, indigenoussness). Culture in this guise is mobilized as evidence of distinctiveness, descent, identity, longevity, autonomy, persistence, and ultimately, as justifying evidence of a claim for self determination. The Native American museum then, forms the institutional locus for the mobilization of culture toward a political end.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS: THE ROLE OF THE MAKAH CULTURAL AND RESEARCH CENTER AND THE SUQUAMISH MUSEUM IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF ETHNIC IDENTITY

INTRODUCTION

Native American museums in contemporary North America comprise a complex sociocultural phenomenon. It is a phenomenon, however timely, significant, or anthropologically relevant which has virtually escaped scholarly analysis. Although the institutional phenomenon has attracted some attention in the museum profession it has been primarily of a practical nature (Biddle 1977; Hanson 1980; Hartman 1983; Hitchcock 1973; Horse Capture 1981; Quimby and Nason 1977; Steinbrueck 1982). Such examinations have focused only minimally on the role and sociocultural significance of these institutions in Native American communities.

In recent decades as scholarly trends have changed jointly within museum anthropology and the discipline of anthropology as a whole (see Chapter Two) some attention has been turned to museums as the focus of

anthropological inquiry (Ames 1986; Bean 1987; Broyles 1988; Dominguez 1988). Some of these examinations have focused specifically on Native American museums to varying degrees.

The purpose of this theoretical and analytical discussion is to closely examine the Native American museum as a sociocultural phenomenon. My analysis focuses specifically on two operating Native American museums, specifically the Makah Cultural and Research Center in Neah Bay, Washington, and the Suquamish Museum in Suquamish, Washington.

The theoretical basis of my analysis is derived from ethnicity theory. More specifically, I believe the Makah Cultural and Research Center and the Suquamish Museum are examples of a particular type of Native American museum, one which is the site of processes of ethnic differentiation, boundary marking, and boundary maintenance. The theories of Barth, Weber, Geertz, and Keyes form the theoretical basis of my analysis; the works of Hobsbawm and Ranger and Shils provide a guide for interpreting the nature and significance of the individual ethnic processes seen to operate within the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

In the first section of my discussion I will build the theoretical groundwork for analysis of these two Native American museums, then turn to individual analyses of the exhibit and interpretive content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center and Suquamish Museum respectively as the sites of complex community-based ethnic processes.

PART ONE: THEORETICAL BASIS

"ETHNICITY" DEFINED

The term "ethnicity" has been used variously and loosely in the social sciences (Cohen 1978; Isajiw 1974). Though lack of consensus on its meaning, usage, and rigorous definition is often cited as a fundamental weakness, I believe "ethnicity" is an important and powerful concept with theoretical utility. In that respect, I adopt the concept here as a primary tool in understanding the sociocultural significance of Native American museums.

DESCENT IN SOCIOCULTURAL TERMS

I derive my theoretical perspective on ethnicity jointly from the theoretical works of Weber (1968), Barth (1969a; 1969b), Geertz (1963), and Keyes (1981a; 1981b). I apply

here a definition of ethnicity as a category of group membership based on a subjectively perceived tie of shared descent, called into action in a specific sociopolitical context (Keyes 1981b; Weber 1968).

The concept of descent is critical in such a definition of ethnicity. It is not only a central feature of my working definition of "ethnic group", but according to Weber, is the definitive foundation of ethnic phenomena (Weber 1968). A group is "ethnic" when its formation is based on a belief in shared descent and ancestry held in common by the members of a group, however they may define descent. A group of people recognize the existence of sameness between them based on the belief that they share descent, and thus organize on that basis. "Ethnicity" is thus mobilized as the basis of group formation when it is elaborated in cultural terms in a social context (Keyes 1981b; Weber 1968).

However, the tie of descent that binds the members of a group and makes their interaction "ethnic" is not necessarily strict genealogical descent, but "subjectively believed consanguinity" (Weber 1968). The crucial foundation of shared descent in this respect is evidenced not by kinship charts and strict genealogical reckoning, but by a common view of history, experience,

and reality, a common collective self-perception. The evidence for a binding tie of descent lies in the social, cultural, and historical environment. Thus, descent as the basis of ethnic phenomenon and ethnic group formation is variably interpreted and defined in different social, cultural, and political settings.

The believed tie of descent must be elevated to a level where it is visible as a rallying point for group formation and "social action". Descent as such becomes the basis for people acting together as a group because they believe they have common interests derived from shared ties of blood. It is the elaboration of that tie of descent in cultural terms that forms the focal point of ethnic unity and organization.

A subjective belief in shared descent alone does not create an ethnic group. Ethnicity is also a social, as well as a genealogical distinction. As Barth (1969b) and others have argued, ethnicity does not exist objectively (i.e it is not an objective tangible phenomenon "out there", as Naroll (1964) argues) but exists only behaviorally through social action.

Thus "ethnicity" is a configuration that reflects a perception of a shared past and a shared political

present. The form descent takes in any given setting is related to the existing political climate in the present. The form of ethnicity that is expressed at a particular point in time is a reflection of a people's perception of "time-depth", of their origins, of what makes them similar to each other and different from others in a form that is socially, culturally, and politically relevant in the present.

ETHNIC MARKERS

Activation of a subjectively believed tie of descent as the basis for group formation sets into action a chain of events. The act of bringing descent to the forefront symbolically or through social action specifically activates a process of differentiation.

The mobilization of ethnicity is underlain by a process of differentiation whereby a people claiming shared descent delineate the nature and source of their distinctiveness. Through social action and symbolic mobilization the definitive traits derived from descent "... are marked as being intrinsic elements of one's heritage acquired from one's forebears through one's ... parents" (Keyes 1981b:5).

The social and symbolic processes through which descent is "culturally construed" is based on marking the specific traits derived from descent which make the group in question unique. This process involves the mobilization of "... such cultural markers of ethnicity... (which) constitute a system of classification that permits one to distinguish different categories of people" (Keyes 1981b).

Markers are "... the most superficial features of historically accidental habits ..." (Weber 1968:387) and can include language, religion, dress, food, historical experience, beliefs and practices (keyes 1981b; Weber 1968). Weber's description continues: "Any cultural trait, no matter how superficial, can serve as the starting point for the familiar tendency to monopolistic closure..." (Weber 1968:388); "Almost any kind of similarity or contrast of physical type and of habits can induce the belief that affinity or disaffinity exists between groups that attract or repel each other" (Weber 1968:388).

Generally markers serve to identify cultural distinctions and are "...predicated upon the perception of real cultural differences" (Keyes 1981b). There is great variation in the form and nature of the ethnic markers

that may be mobilized. More specifically, there are varying perspectives on the nature of the markers used to signal ethnic differentiation. Fredrick Barth (1969) for instance, identifies the specific markers used to proclaim differences between people and mark the resultant social boundaries as "arbitrary" (Barth 1969).

In contrast, I do not fully concur with Barth. There is an important and complex interrelationship between the markers used and the nature of the boundaries marked. Ethnic markers are creations of a particular context and so have significance and meaning specifically in relation to that environment. The markers used to differentiate people are not arbitrary in a given social, cultural, and political environment, they are products of that environment.

Thus, the relevance of specific markers in a specific setting is part of a larger interpretive process, as Keyes explains: "What cultural characteristics are marked as emblematic of ethnic identity depends upon the interpretations of the experiences and actions of mythical ancestors and/or historical forebears" (Keyes 1981b:8). Ethnic markers are products of a given context and reflective of a shared perception of history and reality.

Because of this important relationship, in order to ultimately understand the significance of the markers used one must look not simply to the theoretical mechanics of ethnic differentiation, but more closely to the whole social, cultural, and political context within which that differentiation occurs. It is within that context that distinctions are made, descent mobilized, ethnic group formation activated and markers "selected" and displayed.

DICHOTOMIZATION AND ETHNIC BOUNDARIES

Ethnic markers - however they may be defined, symbolized, and expressed - do not simply denote subjectively perceived distinctions. The processes through which those distinctions are marked create contrastive characterizations of a people. The mobilization of markers not only make explicit the traits that define a people, but specifically the traits which define them in contrast to others.

Such contrastive definitions of group membership deployed in a sociopolitical context, serve to mark and maintain "ethnic boundaries" (Barth 1969). These processes create distinctions between people that run deeper than

differences in dress and food preferences. More specifically, "...the boundaries to which we give our attention are, of course, social boundaries (Barth 1969:15), which according to Barth, "... canalizes social life - it entails a frequently quite complex organization of behavior and social relations" (Barth 1969:15). That is, the marking and maintenance of differences through the processes described above give rise to and reinforce distinctions between people. The differences so marked and reinforced exist not only in the form of outward traits such as language and dress, but more fundamental differences in social organization, politics, and ideology. In the investigation of ethnic phenomenon, Barth has claimed, the appropriate focus of investigation is on "... the ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses" (Barth 1969:15). It is these boundaries, which grow out of history, action, and interaction, which comprise the substance of ethnic phenomena.

THE "SALIENCE" OF ETHNICITY

What gives rise to ethnic differentiation? What are the factors that cause descent to become a focus of group formation? What societal pressures activate identification on the basis of a tie of shared descent?

What brings descent to the forefront as a motivation of behavior?

The answers to these questions are extremely complex, yet can initially be stated in fairly simple terms. The emphasis on shared descent as a significant factor in differentiation of human groups grows out of a social setting in which all actors are not equal. Ethnicity as a form of differentiation arises in contexts where all participants do not have equal access to power and resources. Stated in more dynamic terms, ethnicity arises out of a social climate in which there is pressure of some kind restricting the access of some to power, resources, recognition, and autonomy.

Ethnicity is a strategy in just such a competitive struggle. It can be deployed to gain desired resources, to redefine reality, to reconstruct the bounds, limits, and constraints of a particular social reality. The Native American museum, arising out of a contemporary sociopolitical context, is precisely that type of strategy, as I will argue in analysis of the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

PART TWO: CASE ANALYSES

The Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center are two operating Native American museums that share many traits in common. They are both tribally owned and operated. Both grow out of a long but distinct process of development. They both play a unique role in their respective communities. Most importantly, the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center each project a unique emic perception of a people's history and their derived collective "essence".

Interestingly, each museum, while being a powerful emic expression of collective identity and shared culture history, has been developed and operated with considerable non-native assistance. For instance, the Makah Cultural and Research Center grew out of a collaborative effort undertaken jointly by the Tribe, the Washington State University archaeologists excavating Ozette, and an Advisory Council based in Seattle comprised of non-natives. In addition, various non-native consultants were hired throughout the planning process (e.g. architect, exhibit designer).

In the case of the Suquamish Museum there was a comparable collaborative effort with non-natives. The

inherent lack of artifactual and informational resources at the disposal of the Suquamish Tribe necessitated not only consultation but cooperation with non-native museums and specialists. Many of the artifacts displayed in the Suquamish Museum were borrowed from the Burke Museum; non-native specialists consulted on the photo archives projects; both natives and non-native museum professionals provided advisory and consultation services under the auspices of a grant received by the Suquamish Museum from the National Endowment for the Humanities. In addition, the Suquamish Museum was initially under the direction of a non-native in its early years of development and operation (Caldwell 1987).

It is important, first of all, to note this considerable non-native input in the development and operation of both museums in order to avoid creating the impression that both were purely tribal efforts created without help or collaboration from others outside the tribal community. It is also interesting to speculate on the significance and impact of that input on the direction and focus of the institutions. Does the fact of non-native participation in the development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center make it less of a "Native American" museum? Is the Suquamish Museum less Suquamish because it was developed and directed under the leadership of a non-

native? These are important questions, and ones which have relevance to the operation of Native American museums across North America. I believe the answer to them is no, non-native collaboration does not "weaken" the native-ness of a Native American museum. I believe that elucidation of the significance of non-native involvement in Native American museums can be found in Horse Capture's admonition concerning the development of tribal museums:

We now are engaged in the long struggle to regain some of our former glory and traditions. To do so successfully, we must adapt some of the white man's ways and methods, but do this in such a way that we revive and preserve our "Indianness" (Horse Capture 1981).

Collaboration between natives and non-natives in the development and operation of Native American museums is a laudable cooperative effort. It is indicative of efforts by Native Americans to utilize available resources, including those outside of the native community, to achieve their ends of self-determination, education, and cultural strength.

DATA COLLECTION

The data on each museum analyzed here were collected by similar methods. I made short-term site visits to each

institution to collect specific types of data (see discussion below). I traveled to Neah Bay in September 1986 for four days of data collection. During that time I collected data via formal interviews with the Center's director and documentation of the Center's exhibit and interpretive content. I also visited the Ozette village site. Even though excavation of the site was discontinued in 1980, visiting the site at Cape Alava gave me a much better personal understanding of the nature of the site and its significance to the Makah.

The Suquamish interview and exhibit data were collected on two visits to the Suquamish Museum in September 1986 and May 1989. The format of data collection was similar to that utilized for the Makah Cultural and Research Center. I interviewed the Museum's director, and documented the exhibit content. I returned to the Museum in May 1989 to collect additional details, check my notes, and record changes underway at that time in the Museum's exhibit format.

At each institution I conducted formal interviews with the museum's director. Interviews with each covered specific aspects of the museum's history and administration - goals, developmental process and phases, administrative structure, budget, staff, the

institution's relationship to the community, and programs.

In addition to the site visits to each institution, historical background research was also an important part of data collection. This included library research, reading newspaper accounts of the museum development process, opening, and exhibits. I also read and analyzed museum development related documents. In October 1987 I collected data on the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center at the Smithsonian Institution's Native American Museum Program in the Office of Museum Programs. The Native American Museum Program offers assistance, information, and training to Native American museums, and has been involved with both the Makah Cultural and Research Center and the Suquamish Museum since their inception.

A considerable amount of time, energy, and attention was devoted to documentation of the museums' exhibit and interpretive content, both in data collection and analysis. Exhibit and interpretive content data are the primary type of data utilized in this study. Exhibit and interpretive content documentation consisted of recording exhibit layout, conceptual content, artifacts displayed and method of display, as well as other exhibit features

and techniques. A very important part of exhibit documentation was recording the exhibit label text verbatim. The verbal message of the exhibit text is the most explicit form of information that is conveyed to the museum visitor, and thus, an important source of data. For that reason, I have emphasized exhibit text in my analysis perhaps more than the other types of data collected.

All of the forms of data collected from interviews with the museum directors, the additional historical research conducted on each museum, exhibit content and label text documentation - comprise the key "informants" in this study. While this is an unconventional approach to data collection, it has been an effective method in the study of specific aspects of the "culture" of Native American museums, specifically in this case, the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center. The various types of data collected and analyzed here have facilitated one type of ethnographic study of the content of specific museums, rather than a larger ethnographic study focused specifically on the museum within the community as a whole.

THE MAKAH TRIBE

The Makah tribe resides today on a reservation located on the Olympic Peninsula in Washington state. It exists in a portion of their original territory which ranged from "... the mouth of the Hoko River on the Strait of Juan de Fuca, all along the coast, around Cape Flattery and down the Pacific Coast to the site of the Makah Village of Ozette" (United States. Indian Claims Commission 1970 23:168).

The Makah are Nootkan speakers, related culturally and linguistically to the Westcoast people (Nootka or Nuuchah-nulth) of Vancouver Island. Prior to contact the Makah were characterized by a maritime based culture and economy. Sea resources (fish, shell fish, sea mammals) provided a greater percentage of the subsistence base than did the utilized land resources (wood and wood products, plants, berries) (United States. Indian Claims Commission 1970 23:174).

The Makah's maritime adaptation was "fine-tuned", and they were accomplished fisherman and sea mammal hunters (Drucker 1951; Sapir 1967; Mauger 1978:9; Goodman 1978:9; Swan 1870:22-25). The Makah and related Nootka of Vancouver Island were the only active whale hunters on

the Northwest Coast, a trait which interestingly is a crucial contemporary ethnic marker and, not unimportantly, a primary one mobilized and displayed within the Makah Cultural and Research Center (see discussion below).

At the time of initial contact by European explorers to Cape Flattery in the 1700s (United States Indian Claims Commission 1970 23:171-172; Colson 1953:45) the Makah lived in local groups occupying five permanent villages at Baada Point, Neah Bay, Waatch Point, Tsues and Ozette" (Indian Claims Commission 1970 23:167; Goodman 1978:25-26). In the historic period following contact the Makah were subject to assimilationist pressures from missionization, settlement, and the edicts of U.S. government policy. The Treaty of Neah Bay (12 Stat. 939), signed in 1855, created the Makah reservation on a portion of their original territory and effected cession of the remaining land (Swan 1870:1). Creation of the reservation consolidated the existing five villages into the single village of Neah Bay.

Even though government policy and other measures of culture change had a marked impact on the Makah, there were several factors which modified the impact of change to some degree (Colson 1953). The Makah's relatively

isolated location placed them outside of the range of primary white settlement (Colson 1953:7). In addition, their land was not deemed especially desirable for farming or settlement, and so pressures for assimilation and removal were not as marked as in other more populated areas such the Puget Sound area. The impact of settlement and colonization thus was not so unidirectional as to totally eradicate traditional beliefs, practices, and worldview. The result has been a relatively high degree of cultural continuity in the face of change which has been observable over time (Colson 1953:293-294; Goodman 1978) among the Makah in the form of a "... sense of local tradition and their pride in their common past" (Colson 1953:3).

Today Neah Bay is the primary community on the reservation. It is "... a quiet, peaceful town, at least superficially ... Winter months are quiet, damp, grey, and rainy. Summers find Neah Bay the center of much tourist activity" (Goodman 1978:24). The community's economic base is derived primarily from the area's resource industries, mainly logging and commercial fishing. Tourism plays a small role (Colson 1953:32; Goodman 1978:23).

The members of the Makah tribe are the descendents of the inhabitants of the five winter villages, a primary factor in identification by self and others as Makah, as Colson explains:

"... the recognition of an individual as a Makah has nothing to do with the language that he speaks, the degree of Indian blood which he has, the customs which he practices. It is due purely to the recognition of descent from former members of the Indian communities about Cape Flattery" (Colson 1953:71).

The tribe is governed today by a tribal council consisting of five elected council members (Indian Claims Commission 1970 23:171), the result of acceptance of the terms of the Indian Reorganization Act in 1936 (Confederation of American Indians 1986:277; Colson 1953:22).

Goodman (1978) portrays Neah Bay as a unique community, and the Makah as a people who have retained a sense of identity in spite of assimilationist pressures (Colson 1953; Goodman 1978).

With or without the tourists, the United States government, the churches, and general White influence, the Makah continue to live a unique style of life which they have fashioned for themselves (Goodman 1978:24).

THE MAKAH CULTURAL AND RESEARCH CENTER, NEAH BAY,
WASHINGTON

In the contemporary context, the Makah Cultural and Research Center, owned and operated by the Makah tribe in Neah Bay, is one component in the Makah's "unique style of life" (Goodman 1978:24). From a broad perspective it is an institution that grows out of the configuration of culture, history, change, and continuity that typifies the Makah today.

The Makah Cultural and Research Center was developed by the Makah Tribe in the 1970s to fill a number of cultural, social, and heritage preservation needs identified by the Tribe (see Phase Two: Planning and Development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center). The museum planning process was primarily motivated by the large-scale excavation of the pre-contact Makah village site of Ozette from 1970-1981 (1).

The Makah Cultural and Research Center is a significant institution in Neah Bay today, charged specifically with the task of interpreting and preserving Makah culture.

1. The excavation project was undertaken jointly by Washington State University archaeologists and the Makah Tribe.

My goal is to examine the role and significance of that institution. In order to gain an understanding of the nature of the Makah Cultural and Research Center, the greater part of my analysis will focus on the meanings and messages communicated via the Center's exhibit and interpretive content. Accomplishment of that task requires that my discussion take a broad view of the development and operation of the Makah Cultural and Research Center in order to build the necessary historical and conceptual foundation for analysis of the Makah Cultural and Research Center exhibit and interpretive content. For that reason, this discussion is divided into three sections, each examining crucial processual steps in the conceptualization, development, and operation of the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

The first phase in the development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center was specifically the excavation of Ozette. The excavation process put into motion a series of events that changed the meaning and significance of Ozette, and eventually culminated in the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

The second phase in the development process was museum planning and development. While "Ozette" provided the impetus for museum development, the museum planning

process itself consisted of a step by step decision-making process which gradually translated the Tribe's desire to build a museum into reality.

The third phase is comprised of the Makah Cultural and Research Center itself. Once in place the Makah Cultural and Research Center itself was not stagnant or frozen. Its exhibit and interpretive content represents an ongoing process whereby the Makah Tribe communicates in a significant form. Much of my analysis therefore, will focus on interpretation of the exhibit and interpretive content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

THREE PROCESSUAL PHASES IN THE CONCEPTUALIZATION,
DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF THE MAKAH CULTURAL AND
RESEARCH CENTER

PHASE ONE:

The Museum begins with Ozette (Arnold 1986).

The first step in the development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center began, not with the conscious undertaking of a museum planning project, but with the excavation of the village site of Ozette in the 1970s.

The events of excavation put into motion a series of events which culminated in the Makah Cultural and Research Center. In order to fully understand the role of Ozette in the museum development process it is necessary to understand the changing significance of Ozette in Makah culture history.

THE CHANGING MEANING OF OZETTE

The village site of Ozette itself lies at Cape Alava, the southern expanse of Makah territory. Ozette was one of five permanent winter villages occupied by the Makah at contact. The locale was an advantageous site which (Mauger 1978:136) facilitated development of "... a sophisticated and relatively stable maritime culture..." (Gill 1983:350). Archaeological evidence dates occupation at the site in some areas to two thousand years ago (Gleeson 1980).

Significantly, Ozette has played a changing role in the history of the Makah. At the time of contact in the eighteenth century it was one of the five permanent winter villages occupied by the Makah, and is thus perceived of today as a "traditional" village (2). As

2. The other four Makah villages at contact were Deah, Baada, Tsooyes, and Waatch (Broyles/Makah Cultural and Research Center 1986).

such the village of Ozette was one component in a Makah social network. The occupants of the various villages including that of Ozette participated in reciprocal exchange, were bound by ties of marriage, shared the same language (3), and "...engaged in a variety of activities with the Makah who resided in the villages in the vicinity of Cape Flattery, including whaling and battle" (Indian Claims Commission 1970 23:167). It is believed that the Makah tribe constituted a political entity, of which the Ozette and occupants of the other Makah villages were "separate bands" (Indian Claims Commission 1970 23:167).

Ozette then, is significant as a long occupied Makah village site. It is a locale where people known to be Makah culturally and politically have lived for a long time (Swan 1870 in Mauer 1978:137). But Ozette is also significant as a place where the Makah stopped living. In the early twentieth century habitation at Ozette ceased when Makah children were required to attend school in Neah Bay. Thus Ozette families moved to Neah Bay, and soon the village was no longer occupied (Colson 1953:20; Mauer 1978:19; May 1970:2A), used thereafter only as a

3. The Makah are Nootkan speakers, a language family comprised of themselves and the Westcoast (Nootka or Nuuchah-nulth) of Vancouver Island.

seasonal resource site (Gleeson 1980:8). In the twentieth century Ozette stood unoccupied as a casualty of culture change, a document of the impact of assimilationist pressures and policies on the Makah and on their long-held patterns.

Most recently, Ozette has taken on yet another role in the history of the Makah. Ozette's most recent significance derives from large scale archaeological excavations carried out at the village site from 1970 to 1981. The excavation yielded a quantity of artifacts, and attracted a great deal of scientific and public attention. As I argue in my discussion below, the excavation of Ozette transformed its meaning from "Ozette as village site", "Ozette as resource site", "Ozette as deserted village site", to "Ozette as symbol of the essence of Makahness", representative of the strength and integrity of Makah culture. As such, Ozette is a crucial component in the process which culminated in the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

THE PROCESS OF EXCAVATION

In the winter of 1969 storms at Cape Alava eroded hillsides behind the uninhabited Ozette village site (Gleeson 1980:15; Mauger 1978:36).

As a result, numerous wooden artifacts were strewn along the upper reaches of the beach. Bentwood box fragments, baskets, mats, arrows, boards, and stakes were being collected by local beach walkers" (Gleeson 1980:15).

The cultural remnants that washed on to the beach signalled the presence of additional cultural evidence below the surface (Gleeson 1980:14; Gill 1983:350). The appearance of the artifacts corroborated previously collected archaeological evidence (4) (Gleeson 1980:10,12; Gill 1983:350; Mauger 1978:34; Seattle Post-Intelligencer 1966:4) which indicated that "... portions of an occupied village were being overridden by clays, sealing the deposits and preserving the vegetable materials" (Gleeson 1980:13; Seattle Times 1968:9). It also became evident that the covered village included a "succession of prehistoric house floors" (Gleeson 1980:12).

Further, it was commonly known through Makah oral tradition that in the distant past at Ozette there had been "... mud slides covering portions of the village in a "truly catastrophic event" (Gleeson 1980:11; Mauger 1978:34). Interestingly, Waterman documented a similar

4. Excavations at Ozette were conducted in 1966 and 1967 by an interdisciplinary team of Washington State University scientists (Gleeson 1980:10,12).

oral tradition among the Makah in the early twentieth century which chronicled the destruction of a village at Ozette "by a cave-in of the cliff" (Waterman nd:17 cited in Mauger 1978:34).

The Makah Tribal Council was notified and archaeological excavation began in 1970 (Gleeson 1980:15). Excavation of the village site began as a salvage effort, but soon was of a huge scope (Lund and Zimmerman 1970:8-9). As excavation progressed evidence was found that supported the elders' stories in greater detail: In approximately the fifteenth century a village at the Ozette site was buried in mud and clay when the bank behind the village collapsed (May 1970a:2a, 1971:3A).

The area excavated during 1970-1981 was a neighborhood within the Ozette village, including three complete houses, portions of four others, and the exterior areas immediately surrounding these houses. The excavation area was subject to numerous clay slides during the period of occupation by the Ozette villagers (Gill 1983:350-351).

The contents of the village houses were essentially sealed from decay, and survived into the twentieth century as evidence of the inhabitants. Normally perishable materials, especially those of plant, fiber and wood, were preserved in a remarkable state (Mauger 1978:36-7; Croes 1977:3).

Significantly, the excavation resulted in data on on-going Northwest Coast pre-contact life of unparalleled depth, detail, scope, and quantity (Mauger 1978:37; Gill 1983:351) which was "of incalculable scientific value" (Fagan 1978:80). The data provided a comprehensive view of Makah culture and pre-contact Makah life that was unsurpassed. Thus the excavation of Ozette was recognized, by the scientific community, the public, and the Makah themselves, as extremely significant.

OZETTE AS SYMBOL

The events of excavation had a tremendous impact on the Makah (Fagan 1978:80; Gwynne and Gayle 1977:81-82; Kirk 1973:30-35; Seattle Times 1972:A6), their knowledge of their culture history and heritage, on their view and expression of their collective identity.

"The Ozette project has "suddenly opened up their past for them and is producing a real cultural revitalization which is particularly noticeable among young people because they have never known how much stock to place in the old myths and stories", Daugherty said" (Everett Herald 1971:4A). Thus, "Ozette" itself came to have tremendous significance for the Makah (Colfax 1987:3),

transforming the meaning associated with the village site. Through the process of excavation Ozette came to symbolize the essence, strength, and tenacity of Makah culture and identity.

It is that process of symbolization - the construal of Ozette into a symbol of Makah culture and identity - that is the crucial first step in the development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center. The process of symbolization was stimulated initially by excavation of Ozette. Representation of the excavation process and its significance by the media, the Tribe, and the Washington State University archaeologists together created new meaning. Ozette thus came to be a symbol of the source of Makah distinctiveness, of the Makah's inherited cultural legacy.

Symbolization rests on a process of extrapolation. The excavation of Ozette yielded data about the pre-contact inhabitants of the village who were buried in a mud slide in the fifteenth century. But through the process of excavation (aided by media attention) meaning relevant to the twentieth century inhabitants of Neah Bay was extrapolated from that information about the fifteenth century villagers of Ozette. A connection was made between the two peoples of different times, a connection

which links and identifies them as "... fundamentally the same people" (Trottier 1981:284). That connection is one of descent. "Ozette" the pre-contact village, "Ozette" the archaeological excavation site, "Ozette" as symbol comes to represent and embody a tie of "subjectively believed consanguinity" (Weber 1968) which links the contemporary Makah with the prehistoric Ozette in relative roles of ancestors and descendents (for an in-depth discussion of this point see PHASE THREE: THE MAKAH CULTURAL AND RESEARCH CENTER).

It is that significance attributed to the village of Ozette that is formalized within the Makah Cultural and Research Center. The Center's exhibit and interpretive content institutionalizes the symbolic meaning of Ozette and disseminates it as representative of the essence of Makah culture, history, and identity. It is in this respect that "Ozette" is a key component in contemporary Makah identity.

I turn next to consideration of the museum planning process, comprised of practical steps that translated the symbolic significance of Ozette into the physical reality of the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

PHASE TWO: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MAKAH CULTURAL
AND RESEARCH CENTER

The second phase in the developmental history of the Makah Cultural and Research Center was the museum planning process. During this phase the symbolic significance of Ozette was gradually institutionalized into the form of the Makah Cultural and Research Center (Williams 1971:E6; Quimby and Nason 1977:50; Arnold 1986; Hughes 1978).

The Makah feel the need for a permanent place on the Reservation where they can have a sense of participation and can preserve the physical evidence of their culture for their children and grandchildren. The Makah hold sacred their songs, dances, ceremonial designs and legends. The Ozette artifacts, the ethnographic collections, and the recordings materially document this culture (Makah Tribal Council 1975).

MOTIVATING FACTORS IN MUSEUM DEVELOPMENT

In the preceding discussion I described the excavation and subsequent symbolization of the Ozette village site as the initial impetus behind development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

Specifically, excavation had a tangible effect on initiation of museum planning activities by the Makah

Tribe. As excavation progressed a tremendous number of artifacts were removed, necessitating development of storage space. In addition, the artifacts were valuable, unique, and fragile (Makah Tribal Council n.d.), creating a need to conserve as well as to store them (Arnold 1986; Hughes 1978; Makah Tribal Council n.d.:5,6,7; Makah Tribal Council 1975:1,22).

Third, the excavation itself and the romanticization of Ozette generated a great deal of public interest. Several thousand people per year hiked to Ozette to see the dig in progress, and a large number visited the laboratory facility in Neah Bay (Makah Tribal Council 1975:1). However, the facility in which the objects were documented, conserved, and stored (Hughes 1978) was inadequate and could not accommodate visitors. It became clear that there was a need to make the excavated materials accessible to the Makah community, the general public, and the scientific community.

Specifically, these three needs - storage, conservation, and interpretation - were central motivating factors in museum development. It was recognized that "The extreme richness of the site with its thousands of specimens, while being one of the most significant archaeological discoveries ever made in America, creates problems of an

unusual nature ..." (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:5).
Development of a Makah museum was perceived as a viable solution to these problems.

Yet more than simply solutions to practical needs lay behind the museum development process. Much of the planning process was motivated by implicit goals held collectively by the Makah (Makah Tribal Council n.d.; Makah Tribal Council 1975). Museum development was also undertaken specifically to fill the unique needs of the Makah people.

Primary among these was the desired retention of the Ozette artifacts in the community in order to prevent their removal from Makah hands (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:15; Makah Tribal Council 1975:1).

There now exists the opportunity to develop a resource of major economic and cultural significance, a resource that can provide a people with unparalleled documentation of their prehistoric past, while at the same time providing jobs, training, and improved economic conditions in the community. Without adequate facilities at Neah Bay for the care, storage, and protection of the magnificent Ozette materials, they must be returned to Washington State University where they will be placed in the comparative collections of the Laboratory of Anthropology, with the accompanying loss of cultural and economic benefits to the Makah (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:15-16).

... Lack of storage has given rise to possible removal of these artifacts from the Reservation

to many different universities and museums at all points of the globe, thus dissipating a rare collection (Makah Tribal Council 1975:1).

It would be tragic to break up a collection which is unique anywhere in the world and scatter it among various museums and universities. The uniqueness of the site and its national significance demand that these materials be maintained and displayed in the area in which they occurred (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:5).

The retention of Makah control and ownership over the Ozette archaeological materials was very much an issue of the times. In the 1970s (when Ozette excavation and Makah museum development was taking place) debate between Native Americans and archaeologists was at a peak. Demands for repatriation were heated and vocal, and the anthropological and museum establishment was under attack for alleged historical mistreatment of native people (see CHAPTER THREE). The Makah's "... demand that these materials be maintained and displayed in the area in which they occurred ..." (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:5) arose as part of that broader context.

Relatedly, it was strongly felt that the proposed museum, be fully and uniquely a Makah museum (Arnold 1986; Nason 1988). Operation of a financially independent museum owned by the Makah Tribe (Makah Tribal Council 1975:3)

would "...allow the Makah Indians the opportunity to tell their own story..." (Makah Tribal Council 1975:2).

PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF MUSEUM DEVELOPMENT

On one level museum development was undertaken to fill specific needs. In addition, it was anticipated that several benefits would accrue to the Tribe and community from museum development and operation (Makah Tribal Council n.d.).

Expected economic benefits potentially associated with museum operation was an important theme in the planning process. It was hoped that the proposed museum would benefit the community in the form of increased tourism, positive impact on community businesses, and creation of a resource for provision of job training opportunities for members of the community (Hughes 1978; Makah Tribal Council n.d.:6-7, 12-16; Makah Tribal Council 1975:1; Makah Cultural and Research Center Advisory Council 1979b; Nason 1975).

In addition to anticipated economic benefits it was also expected that the museum would benefit the community culturally.

A museum facility and its associated research activities would serve as a focus of cultural activities in the community; there is every reason to believe that such a facility would immeasurably increase the knowledge and appreciation of their part [i.e. the part of cultural activities and practices e.g language, dance, basket making, carving] on the part of the Makah citizens (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:13).

It was anticipated that the museum would provide a physical location as well as ideological support for furtherance of cultural activities, serving as "... a source of real pride in the culture",, as well as a major educational resource within the community (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:1, 14).

THE MAKAH CULTURAL AND RESEARCH CENTER: FROM VISION TO REALITY

The process through which this conglomeration of goals, desires, and expectations was translated into the reality of the Makah Cultural and Research Center was a complex one. The actual decision making process that culminated in the museum building that opened in Neah Bay in 1979 was highlighted by several key issues and decisions that clarified museum development goals, and step by step brought the Makah Cultural and Research Center into reality.

My purpose here is not to write a comprehensive history of the Makah Cultural and Research Center planning process (see Hughes 1978). Instead, my discussion focuses on key issues central to the planning phase which shaped the Makah Cultural and Research Center. The central issues to be discussed here are funding, budget planning, administrative structure, exhibit design, and staff.

FUNDING AND MUSEUM BUILDING PLANS

In 1975 application was made to the Economic Development Administration to cover building construction costs. The Economic Development Administration proposal itself both expresses and crystallizes museum development goals. Funding was requested to build a "... museum, storage and research facility large enough to house the Ozette collection" (Makah Tribal Council n.d.). The Economic Development Administration proposal painted a picture of a future Makah museum facility large in size as well as scope, "... a museum, storage, and research facility to be located at Neah Bay" to be "architecturally excellent" with exhibits of "high caliber" (Makah Tribal Council n.d.).

The goal which guided the building design development as well as funding activities, focused on development of a high quality museum to house and showcase the Ozette artifacts in a manner and scope that reflected the significance of the excavation and its yield (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:8; Hughes 1978; Makah Museum Committee 1975).

More specifically, the proposed museum would ideally fit the following profile:

The Center will present the Ozette artifacts and the Makah ethnographic collection accurately and dramatically to provide the non-Indian the opportunity to relate in a positive way to the Makah people. The Center will provide the necessary controlled environment to avoid deterioration and/or dispersement (sic) of the present artifacts ... The Center will provide career opportunities in the professional fields of Museology; curator, archivist, director, registrar, and conservator (Makah Museum Committee 1975).

Architectural plans for the museum's physical design, which formed the basis for the existing building, were developed by 1975 (Kirk and Kirk 1975:Pictorial 8-11). The plans were drafted and revised several times, eventually resulting in a final product that incorporated elements from all previous plans (Arnold 1986). Actual construction of the museum building began in 1977 and was completed in 1978, at which time the Tribe took

possession of the building and began exhibit installation (Arnold 1986).

BUDGET PLANNING

Request for funding to the Economic Development Administration was an important step in crystallizing the goals and expectations that lay behind the museum development and planning process. However, the Economic Development Administration grant (awarded in the amount of \$970,000) covered only initial construction costs. Therefore, it was necessary to seek funding for equipment, exhibit design and installation, and operating budget from other sources.

Efforts to estimate the size, scope, and potential sources of (1) initial start-up budget (2) annual operating budget comprised an additional crucial step in shaping the Makah Cultural and Research Center. Funding and income estimates were made in relation to expectations for the nature size scope and magnitude of the museum (size of building, inclusive facilities, scope of activities, overall goals of the institution, expected role in community, estimated size of staff). This included efforts to estimate and predict operating costs of the museum - including expected income, staff size and

training - salaries, annual operating expenses, and sources of potential operating budget.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Development of the administrative structure of the proposed museum was a central part of the planning process, and an important part of eventually making the museum a viable enterprise. One issue in this process was the relationship of the museum and its administration to the tribal government structure - would the museum be independent of the Makah Tribal Council? Would it be governed by the Tribal Council? There were clear indications that it was desired that the museum be financially independent of the Tribal Council, though in the planning stages it was evident that financial independence and self-sufficiency might not be immediately achievable (Makah Cultural and Research Center Advisory Council 1980). The plans for administrative structure evolved as decision making in regard to the scope, nature, and content of the museum evolved.

STAFF

In the planning stage estimates for staff size of the proposed Makah Cultural and Research Center varied, yet fit into the "grandiose" scheme described above. The Economic Development Administration grant proposal described a ideal planned staff of twelve - director, secretary, two curators, two exhibit preparators, a craft shop staff of two to four, two maintenance workers (Makah Tribal Council n.d.:12). This profile delineates a desired staff size, complexity, and diversity that is very different from the Center's small staff today.

It was not only desired that the staff be professionally trained, but also predominantly Makah. The solution to provision of professionally trained Makah staff was an interesting and unique one. By request of the Makah Tribal Council a training program was designed at the University of Washington's Burke Museum to train selected members of the tribe to function as the museum's initial staff (Arnold 1986; Nason 1988; Quimby and Nason n.d., 1975, 1977).

The specially designed staff training program began in 1974 and ran through the academic year 1976. The program was designed to meet the special needs of the future staff of the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

... Professor Quimby and I are the principle investigators for a three-year NEA Museum Programs grant titled "The Makah Indian Museum Training Project". This project, begun January 1974, is designed to provide University and on-site training for six Makah Indian students who will form the core of the personnel for the Makah Cultural and Research Center... .

The students are enrolled full-time all year for three years in a specialized B.A. program that will provide them, at its conclusion, with a B.A. degree in museology The students have been selected by us with concurrence from the B.I.A. education officer (who provides for B.I.A. stipends) and the Makah Tribe (which provides additional education monies for the students initially and, of course, the prospect of employment at the successful completion of the degree)" (Nason 1976).

EXHIBIT DESIGN AND LABEL TEXT

The exhibit format of the Makah Cultural and Research Center was developed by Jean Andre, at that time the exhibit designer at the British Columbia Provincial Museum in Victoria. Andre spent six months in Neah Bay in 1975, and in collaboration with the Makah's Museum Committee developed the storyline on which the exhibit structure and content is based (Williams 1976:B7). The emphasized themes selected in the planning and development process - seasonal patterns and activities (May 1977a:3A), the nature of pre-contact life at Ozette, and the importance of whaling as a distinguishing Makah

feature - are the organizing principles for the Center's exhibits.

Development of label text for the Center's exhibits was somewhat problematic. The Center opened in 1979 without label text in place (Hanson 1979). At one point, text to accompany the exhibits was written by a non-native member of the Advisory Council, but ultimately rejected as conveying an insufficiently Makah perspective. Eventually a series of interpretive label texts were written by the Makah, agreed upon, and installed in the exhibit galleries (Nason 1988, 1989).

In summary, the concerns, priorities, and decisions embodied in the planning process eventually culminated in the opening of the Makah Cultural and Research Center in Neah Bay in June 1979. The Center continues to operate today, a decade later.

PHASE THREE: THE EXHIBIT AND INTERPRETIVE CONTENT OF THE MAKAH CULTURAL AND RESEARCH CENTER

The third step in the development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center is the museum itself, which is the dynamic culmination of the three-part developmental process. Once the museum was in place in 1979, the

symbolic process initiated by the excavation of Ozette was in no way terminated. In contrast, the museum itself, operating today in Neah Bay, represents an ongoing expression of the significance attached to the Ozette events of the 1970s. The Makah Cultural and Research Center is not static, but the living expression of the meaning "Ozette" carries for contemporary Makah identity.

My discussion focuses on the exhibit and interpretive content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center rather than on technical features of the Center's operation. My purpose is to understand the symbolic meaning of Ozette institutionalized within the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

THE EXHIBIT AND INTERPRETIVE CONTENT OF THE MAKAH CULTURAL AND RESEARCH CENTER

The exhibit and interpretive content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center has rich symbolic meaning. To interpret it simply as an exhibit about culture and technology with only one level of meaning is to seriously distort and misrepresent its significance. To accurately understand the role of the Makah Cultural and Research Center itself in the whole Ozette/museum development

process it is necessary to look much more closely at the Center's exhibit content.

I believe that the Makah Cultural and Research Center is a locale where symbols are mobilized to form a definition of collective Makah identity. There are two major contentions that form the basis of my argument. First, that the exhibit and interpretive content is one component in a process whereby the Makah define themselves as a group bound by a tie of descent. That definition, projected within the Makah Cultural and Research Center, identifies them as a people who derive rights, traits, privileges from that line of descent which definitionally sets them apart from others.

However, that mobilized ethnic definition is much more complex than a simple unilinear presentation of "descent", and the resultant marking of an ethnic boundary. Thus, I argue that the identity definition mobilized in the Makah Cultural and Research Center is expressed in the form of a visual and verbal narrative which provides a "charter" for Makah identity.

The "ethnic charter" mobilized in the Makah Cultural and Research Center sets out shared descent as the basis of a Makah claim to collective identity. It justifies that

claim, and traces the source of Makah identity to the pre-contact past of which "Ozette the village" and "Ozette the excavation" is a symbol par excellence.

That ethnic charter is communicated through the content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center exhibits and interpretive text as a whole. It is not proffered as an origin myth. Instead it is presented as a factual description of the culture, lifestyle, patterns of the Makah "ancestors". It is a visual and verbal illustration of the source of Makah culture and distinctiveness in the pre-contact past. Before turning to a discussion of these claims, it is necessary to further define the concept of ethnic charter.

ETHNIC CHARTER

Although "ethnic charter" is a significant concept, it has received limited attention in the ethnicity literature to date (Keyes 1981b; Nagata 1981; Troster 1981; Trottier 1981). Those who have dealt with the concept identify it as a type of narrative strategically mobilized to chronicle a group's origins and to assert a claim to a distinct identity (Keyes 1981b; Nagata 1981). An "ethnic charter" is an expression that "... serves ... to objectify the identity of the group - to give it

reality in people's minds and to define and express the distinctiveness of its members" (Trottier 1981:282), and is thus a central component in processes of ethnic mobilization.

In this respect a charter is an expression, outline, description of a people's perception of their shared definitive traits. It provides an explanation of the origins of those traits, whether implicit or explicit. As such it stands at the foundation of the public mobilization of ethnic identity, a publicly voiced expression of legitimacy, a validating self perception, a "model for" in its truest sense, as Trottier describes below.

... part of the means of effecting unity among people is the formulation of a suitable "charter" of identity ... By manipulating the symbols of group identity, political leaders can inspire sentiments conducive to collective action. The charter, ... an expression of group identity, also provides ... valuable insights into the actor's own view of their sociopolitical situation" (Trottier 1981:273).

An ethnic charter can take several forms. Nagata describes it as providing a myth to explain a people's origins (1981:93), as does Keyes (1981a:87; 1981b:8). I find such an exclusive definition of an ethnic charter to be narrow, limiting to the degree that it excludes from

consideration a broad range of symbolic constructions which set out a groups' definitive traits. Thus, the working definition of ethnic charter I apply here is more fluid and broadly based.

I define ethnic charter not strictly as an "origin myth", nor solely based specifically on "... an historical event or series of events" (Trosper 1981:247). Instead it is a symbolic construction that draws from a people's past (historical and mythic) to set out their self-perception of the definitive traits which unify them and set them apart from others. An ethnic charter characterizes the traits which are emically considered to be the source and essence of their distinctiveness, and importantly accounts for the source and origins of those traits. I believe an ethnic charter is always based on a symbolic configuration of the past.

An ethnic charter is not only a symbolic constellation, but one which provides a focus for ethnic mobilization and unity in that,

The set of symbols that make up a group's charter serves in the first place to objectify the identity of the group - to give reality in people's minds and to define and express the distinctiveness of its members... to attract and unify the prospective members of the group for collective action ... to protect group

prerogatives ... by excluding all but genuine members of the group ... (Trottier 1981:282-3).

An ethnic charter of course is more than a simple descriptive narrative. It is a symbolic construction, a product of a sociopolitical context which both spurs ethnic mobilization and legitimates it.

Along these lines, Trosper characterizes an ethnic charter as a construction which "... when used in three ways aids ethnic mobilization." First, the descriptive substance of the charter is "primordialized" (Keyes 1981a:5; Geertz 1983) defined as a "given", derived from birth that endows the people in question with the traits that definitively distinguish them as a collective entity, and "... becomes a characteristic symbolizing the cultural givens of a group..." (Trosper 1981:247).

Second, the descriptive and symbolic substance of "...a charter defines the boundaries of a group" (Trosper 1981:248). A charter thus defines a people as an entity and sets them off (potentially culturally, socially, politically, economically) from others.

And third, Trosper continues, "... a charter provides a guide to action" (Trosper 1981: 247-8). More specifically, I believe an ethnic charter is based on

representation of the past to legitimate action in the present. These three functions epitomize the role and significance of an ethnic charter in ethnogenesis and ethnopolitics.

THE EXHIBIT CONTENT OF THE MAKAH CULTURAL AND RESEARCH CENTER: AN ETHNIC CHARTER EXPRESSED

The ethnic charter presented through the exhibit and interpretive content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center fits the definition of "ethnic charter" discussed above. The Makah ethnic charter is a descriptive narrative about Makah culture and history that outlines the traits, sources, and origins of Makah identity. It is an implicit yet cohesive definition of "Makah" that is based on the primordialization of specific aspects of Makah culture and history. That is, certain traits/features are portrayed through the museum constructed charter as "givens" which essentially define and distinguish the Makah. There are three such elements that are primordialized within the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

First, through exhibit labels, artifact display, and interpretation, descent and ancestry are established as the definitive basis of Makah identity, as well as the

primary focus of the exhibit content, thus primordializing birth. Second, the pre-contact past is introduced as the significant temporal focus of the Makah Cultural and Research Center exhibits, and primordialized as the source of Makah distinctiveness. Third, specific selected aspects of culture are presented as comprising the unique substance of Makah identity, which derive from descent (these include whaling, culture and environment, and material culture in general - see discussion below). These three factors comprise the core of the Makah Cultural and Research Center exhibits. Taken together they form the foundation of the charter for Makah identity mobilized within the Makah Cultural and Research Center.

PRIMORDIALIZATION OF BIRTH: DESCENT AND THE ANCESTORS

The foundation for the Makah ethnic charter is established in the exhibit introduction upon entry to the main exhibit galleries. In that introductory section the Makah ancestors are identified and shared descent from them is claimed, building a strong, symbolic foundation upon which the exhibit content and story-line rests.

The initial ethnic claim made in the Makah Cultural and Research Center is presented via explanatory label text

coupled with photo murals of Makah "ancestors". It is a crucial visual and verbal presentation that establishes the descent-related significance of the material to be presented within the museum exhibits.

With this building speaking of our past, we wish to acknowledge our ancestors. The goods we now respectfully - and proudly - display were the private and personal property of those who made and used them. To these families, from whom we are descended, we express deep gratitude for renewed awareness of our wealth as ... the people of the Cape... (Broyles/Makah Cultural and Research Center 1986).

This introductory label text significantly makes an explicit link between the past and present, between the contemporary Makah of Neah Bay and the inhabitants of the excavated houses at Ozette. The objects displayed within the museum, the text tells us, were made by those from whom the contemporary Makah are descended. The artifacts - and the ideas, lifeways and achievements they represent - exhibited within the museum are (a) material evidence of the ancestors (b) and the markers and substance of the Makah's legacy. The artifacts displayed within the museum demonstrate what the Makah derive from descent, all of which comprises their "wealth" as "the people of the Cape". Thus, the introductory label text sets the stage for mobilization of an ethnic definition of Makah

identity, and a charter detailing its source and substance.

In addition to establishing a claim of descent the crucial introductory label text also explicitly defines birth as a crucial "given" that makes the Makah a distinct and bounded group. That is, the text implicitly tells us, the Makah are who they are because of birth, because they are descended from particular people, and inherit specific things from those people. Thus importantly birth is set out as a most basic given that defines the Makah collectively.

Thus, the initial introduction to the Makah Cultural and Research Center exhibit galleries establishes the "ethnic" nature of the exhibits, the ethnic content of the meanings and messages to be conveyed within the museum's exhibits. It is on that foundation that the total Makah Cultural and Research Center exhibit content, and most importantly the ethnic charter constructed and displayed there, rests.

PRIMORDIALIZATION OF THE PRE-CONTACT PAST

The second crucial component in construction of a Makah ethnic charter is primordialization of the pre-contact past.

As the visitor moves past the introductory label text additional interpretation narrows the exhibit focus to the pre-contact past. Within the museum presentation that crucial period in Makah history is equated with the ancestors. Thus the significance of the pre-contact period is derived from its association with the ancestors. The pre-contact period is defined in the Makah Cultural and Research Center as the time of the ancestors.

Within the Makah Cultural and Research Center that significant pre-contact period is represented specifically by Ozette. Ozette, mud slide covered village, Ozette archaeological excavation site, is the domain of the past. "The past" is incarnate in the interior of the houses destroyed at Ozette; the past is held under ground at Ozette. As such, "the past" is finite, tangible, real. It can be recovered, preserved, opened, and importantly, it can be entered through the "door" of archaeological excavation.

Our Makah opportunity is extraordinary: we know the richness of our past through songs and

stories, and now through scientific recovery of part of our ancient village of Ozette, which was one of our traditional villages along with Deah, Baada, Tsooyes, and Waatch.

The earth itself has preserved this past. Mudflows repeatedly have buried houses, turning them into time capsules. Subsequent waterlogging has prevented decay even of wood.

For centuries our houses slept. Then a time came to open them

Ocean waves driven by storms began cutting into the bank, washing out the things our ancestors left. So that this erosion wouldn't destroy all that remained of our village, we decided to lead a recovery of our legacy.

... we have opened this our door to our past. We invite you to look in, and feel the spirit of our ancestors (Broyles/Makah Cultural and Research Center 1986).

Ozette is presented as the resting place of the material things the ancestors made and used. It is those material goods that the Makah inherit from their ancestors as representative of the history, culture, ideology, knowledge, and experience that makes them distinct.

Thus Ozette not only represents the past, but a uniquely Makah past. It is one they inherit through birth, and in a unique way through excavation. Access to that past, rights to it, and ownership of it can only be obtained by birth, and is thus exclusive to the Makah. The past in the specific guise of Ozette, is presented in the Makah Cultural and Research Center as the source of Makah

distinctiveness. Associated with the ancestors, birth and descent, it is thus "primordialized", defined as "given" which makes the Makah Makah.

The Ozette houses are canoes carrying scientists into a new world. The Ozette houses are war clubs against ignorance and hostility. The Ozette houses are thunder and lightning for Makahs voices from the past illuminating our heritage.

At Ozette, endings have become beginnings. From Ozette comes new understanding (Broyles/Makah Cultural and Research Center 1986).

THE PRIMORDIALIZATION OF "CULTURE"

The primordialization of birth and the pre-contact past discussed above are elements of the Makah ethnic charter that are established in the exhibit's introductory section.

That introductory exhibit section of the exhibition gallery leads to the main exhibit galleries where Ozette derived artifacts are displayed and interpreted. While the crucial elements of the ethnic charter set out in the introductory section (birth/descent, the pre-contact past) are primarily conceptual, the focus of the remainder of the exhibits (and the charter) is decidedly artifactual. Seasonal patterns, technology, resource use, and the accoutrements of daily life of the ancestors (i.e.

the Ozette villagers) are displayed and interpreted in a variety of formats.

It is in this main artifactual segment of the Makah Cultural and Research Center exhibits that the final component of the Makah ethnic charter is established. More specifically, through the display and interpretation of the Ozette artifacts specific aspects of "culture" are highlighted as especially representative of Makah culture, history, and identity. These are specifically whaling practices and technology, Makah relationship to the environment, and material wealth.

The practice of whaling stands out in the Makah Cultural and Research Center as a primary, crucial piece of information about the Makah and their ancestors. The Makah were whalers who hunted whales in ocean-going canoes. Even though whaling ceased in the early twentieth century, it is presented here in the late twentieth century as a primary distinguishing trait of the Makah. In fact, a large section of the main exhibit gallery is dominated by an equipped whaling canoe, Edward S. Curtis photo murals of Makah whalers, and interpretation of whaling practices and technology.

It is both interesting and important that whaling is mobilized in the Makah Cultural and Research Center as a primary definitive and distinguishing trait of the contemporary Makah, even though it is no longer practiced. Its significance I believe, lies in its uniqueness and distinctiveness. It is a clear cut distinguishing trait. It is a factor that delineates their shared membership with each other and distinctiveness from others.

While the Makah were noted for their ability as fisherman and seal hunters, they were probably more noted for their exploits as whale hunters.

More than anything else whale hunting utilized almost every technical skill possessed by the Makahs, from the building of the canoes, to the development of the equipment, the intense physical training, the fulfillment of spiritual preparations for the hunt, and extraordinary knowledge of the ocean.

More than anything else, the whale hunt represented the ultimate in both physical and spiritual preparedness and the wealth of the Makah Indian Culture (Broyles/Makah Cultural and Research Center 1986).

Another aspect of culture emphasized in the Makah Cultural and Research Center is the relationship between Makah culture and the environment. Important data resulting from the Ozette excavation provided evidence that the Makah/Ozette had developed a complex culture, well adapted to the environment, and efficiently utilized

the resources available in the environment. The relationship to the environment and the success of resource evidences the Makah's success.

The Makah ancestors developed a relationship with the environment which allowed success, survival, and longevity. The contemporary Makah thus inherit a complex, long-standing cultural tradition. The relationship between Makah culture and environment is interpreted in many forms in the exhibit content, primarily through the emphasis of resource use - fishing, sealing, whaling, the use of wood and wood products in all aspects of life, seasonal patterns - illustrated by the following label interpretation of wood technology:

The practical application of wood technology is a key to Makah Indian life of the period before the mudslide. almost every facet of Makah existence was dependent upon the need for wood products. Not least were the whaling, sealing, and fishing canoes, and other articles of daily use such as baskets, utensils, hunting and fish equipment, houses ... and fire wood for cooking and heating (Broyles/Makah Cultural and Research Center 1986).

Thus, the relationship of the Makah ancestors to the environment, and their efficient use of it in subsistence technology and other areas of their lives is mobilized in the museum as a significant distinguishing trait.

The final aspect of culture which receives special attention in the exhibit format is comprised of the vast number of artifacts and range of material goods produced and used by the people of Ozette. The Ozette excavation yielded an incredibly large number of artifacts. Those artifacts provide substantial material evidence of the lifestyle, technology, knowledge of the Ozette inhabitants and Makah ancestors.

The final exhibit gallery essentially sets out these material things that mark and evidence the complexity, diversity, and wealth of Makah culture. Central among these is the reconstructed shed roof house, along with a myriad of material goods displayed in the Makah Cultural and Research Center. These artifacts taken as a whole serve to present the material, conceptual, and historical basis of Makah collective identity. Implicitly these "things" comprise the cultural legacy that sets the Makah apart; they are the evidence of descent. In summary, the primordialization of these specific cultural features in the Makah Cultural and Research Center completes the descriptive, symbolic image of the Makah and their distinguishing traits which is mobilized in the Makah Cultural and Research Center as an ethnic charter.

In conclusion, the Makah ethnic charter is a symbolic (sometimes implicit) narrative that defines and marshalls the definitive traits and features of Makah identity. It sets out descent, defines what derives from descent, provides evidence of those traits, and ultimately marks and maintains the ethnic boundaries which distinguish the Makah as a distinct people.

The "identity configuration" constructed within the Makah Cultural and Research Center provides a basis for comparison with that expressed within the Suquamish Museum. Although the Suquamish Museum is comparable in many respects - it is also tribally owned and operated, interprets a people's culture history, presents information about their past, and characterizes their view of their collective identity - it is also distinct from the Makah Cultural and Research Center. The Suquamish Museum differs in terms of its specific history, exhibit content, and symbolic focus.

The two cases taken together form a strong basis for comparison and contrast of the role specific Native American museums play in community based ethnic processes.

THE SUQUAMISH MUSEUM, SUQUAMISH, WASHINGTON

The Suquamish Museum operates on the Port Madison reservation in Washington state. It is a tribally owned and operated enterprise which opened in 1983 in an adapted portion of the existing tribal government and community center overlooking Puget Sound's Agate Pass.

The history of the Suquamish Museum is an interesting one and contrasts in several respects with the growth and development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center. Whereas the excavation of Ozette provided the impetus and symbolic focus for development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center, the Suquamish Museum does not grow out of a similar dramatic event. Instead, the Suquamish Museum evolved gradually over several years, the product of tribal policy, programs, and cultural preservation activities consciously undertaken in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

From the perspective of the Museum's current director the museum was built in a period in the Suquamish Tribe's recent history in which the tribe began to "get on its feet" in a variety of ways (Forsman 1986). The museum thus was an outgrowth of a combination of factors: The Native American political activism of the 1960s; economic and tribal development spurred by the Boldt decision, and the Suquamish Tribe's gradual move over several decades

towards greater strength, power, consolidation (Forsman 1986).

The goal in developing the Museum, he explained, was legitimation of Suquamish culture, to "create a sense of cultural pride within the tribe... Through the museum we've been able to show people what our culture was, how great it was, to show our young people how good it was, and to show old people it was all right to be Indian" (Forsman 1986).

The Suquamish Museum today plays an important role in contemporary Suquamish life. On one level its existence provides evidence of the commitment at the tribal level to the implementation of cultural programs. On another level the museum documents Suquamish cultural strength and continuity. Finally, the museum itself stands as a communicative, informational, and symbolic resource through which the Suquamish represent their view of themselves, past, present, and future.

ETHNOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND: THE SUQUAMISH PEOPLE

The Suquamish were one of several bands of Coast Salish peoples that inhabited Puget Sound (Thompson and Marr 1983:8), "... an inland sea ... honeycombed by streams

which drain east or west toward the salt water" (Smith 1941:197). The term "Suquamish" (Suqwabs[^]), (Hess and Hilbert n.d.) denotes "the place of clear salt water", the main village at Agate Pass (Suquamish Museum 1985:16), as well as being a collective designation for the peoples of several villages that existed "on the eastern half of the Kitsap Peninsula and on Bainbridge Island" (Thompson and Marr 1983:8; United States. Indian Claims Commission 5:157; Smith 1941:207).

The Suquamish today reside on the Port Madison reservation, which was created for the Suquamish and Duwamish people by the Treaty of Point Elliott in 1855 (12 Stat. 927; Suquamish Museum 1985:34). The Treaty set aside a piece of land within Suquamish territory on Puget Sound "... surrounding the small bight at the head of Port Madison" (United States 1855 in Kappler 670).

As with other Native American peoples the impact of government Indian policy and other assimilationist measures on the Suquamish was great. The various peoples of Puget Sound, including the Suquamish, occupied territory and controlled resources that were advantageous and crucial to white settlement. They were in the center of a highly desired area, a factor which bore heavily on their experience in the post-contact period. Myron Eells,

a missionary in the Puget Sound region in the late nineteenth century, documented the impact of change and settlement on the native peoples of Puget Sound in observing "... the almost total overturning of the way of life of the Salish peoples ... within a period of no greater than a single lifetime" (Castile in Eels:xiii). It is specifically the nature and impact of those changes on the Suquamish that is interpreted in the Suquamish Museum.

The Suquamish were not geographically set apart from white settlement and the overwhelming pressures of culture change like the Makah; they were directly in the center of it. Their history is reflective of that fact. The Port Madison reservation, which includes the community of Suquamish and the Suquamish Museum, is characterized by greater non-Indian land ownership than Indian (Caldwell 1987:8). The experience of the Suquamish in the historic and contemporary period thus has been characterized by "innumerable problems" (Caldwell 1987:9):

"... non-Indian challenges to the authority and jurisdiction of the Suquamish tribal government and court system, coupled with other issues relating to rights guaranteed to Indians by treaty, resulted in increased anti-Indian sentiment in the area (Caldwell 1987:9).

Thus, Caldwell characterizes the situation of the Suquamish in the present:

Despite Federal self-determination policies and tribal efforts toward self-sufficiency, progress has been slow for the Suquamish, as they have faced continued resistance from within the reservation community and the outside world (Caldwell 1987:10-11).

In addition, Suquamish tribal and cultural history has not previously been documented or recorded, characterized by "... a historical record lacking both vital information and systematic interpretation and dominated by the perspective of non-Indian observers" (American Association of Museums 1984:50). It is this set of circumstances that the Suquamish Museum was designed to address.

The Suquamish Museum is the result of a tribal and community research effort (American Association of Museums 1984:50) (see discussion below). The Museum's interpretive exhibits depict the "transitional period" in Suquamish culture history (Caldwell 1987). Through the combined use of historic photographs, artifacts, label text, transcribed oral history excerpts, and an audiovisual program a cohesive story previously lacking in the historical and ethnographic record is told of

Suquamish history and experience from contact to the present (see THE EXHIBIT AND INTERPRETIVE CONTENT OF THE SUQUAMISH MUSEUM for a more detailed description and analysis).

My purpose in this discussion is to analyze the conscious and unconscious meaning conveyed through the exhibit and interpretive content of the Suquamish Museum. My starting premise is the belief that the content of the Suquamish Museum conveys - whether intentionally or unintentionally - a Suquamish perception of collective identity, predicated on a uniquely Suquamish view of past and present, and of the bearing of one on the other.

Within the context of this discussion I look to the content of the Suquamish Museum in order to understand (1) who the Suquamish collectively consider themselves to be at a particular point in time, (2) how they choose to represent themselves, their culture, and history in the museum context, and (3) in what form and through what means that information is conveyed. To accomplish that goal it is necessary to broaden the scope of my discussion to include not only the physical content of the museum, but the various circumstances which gave rise to its development and which bear on its operation.

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUQUAMISH MUSEUM

The Suquamish Museum is the outgrowth of a cumulative series of actions. Its beginnings can most directly be traced to Suquamish tribal cultural policy actions in the late 1970s. In her history of the Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center and Suquamish Museum (Caldwell 1987:1) Carey Caldwell describes a combination of factors extant in the second half of the twentieth century which had tremendous bearing on the social, cultural, economic and political position of the Suquamish Tribe (Caldwell 1987:8-11).

The Port Madison reservation like many other Indian reservations in the U.S., was affected by the Dawes Act (see Chapter Two) which facilitated sale of lands within reservation boundaries to non-Indians, thus reducing Indian land ownership and control. Thus non-Indian land ownership had "checkerboarded" the Port Madison reservation making "... the Suquamish ... a minority on their own reservation with a non-Indian to Indian ratio of ten to one" (Caldwell 1987:8).

Further, the Boldt decision (US vs. Washington) heightened tensions between Indians and non-Indians in conflicts over fishing rights (Caldwell 1987:9). All of

these factors in combination had the effect of making "... Indian/non-Indian relations on the Port Madison Reservation... volatile in the late 1970s" (Caldwell 1987:10).

In seeking a descriptive explanation for the development of the Suquamish Museum, as I am doing here, it is crucial to acknowledge these factors. However, their identification alone does not serve as explanation. It would be far too simplistic to argue that the Suquamish Museum was developed directly in response to these pressures as an intended corrective. More accurately, the social, cultural, political climate facing the Suquamish in the late 1970s stimulated a variety of actions on the tribal level. Included among these was increasing emphasis on the development of cultural programs and policies, not as a "band-aid" to the complex situation obtaining on the Port Madison Reservation, but as one in a series of steps to strengthen the social, cultural, political, and economic position of the Suquamish in the late twentieth century. It was out of that context that interest in and movement toward development of a museum by the Suquamish Tribe grew, and gradually became a reality over a period of several years.

FORMATION OF THE OFFICE OF CULTURAL PROGRAMS AND THE
SUQUAMISH TRIBAL CULTURAL CENTER

Movement toward museum development began to crystallize in the late 1970s. As Caldwell describes "... the dream of a tribal museum had been in the minds of the Suquamish members for many years, and the first active and financial commitment toward this goal occurred in 1977" (Caldwell 1987:14).

1977 specifically marked the creation of the Office of Cultural Programs as one branch of the Suquamish tribal government (which became the Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center (STCC) in 1981 ...) (Caldwell 1987:16) and served "... as the umbrella for tribal activities relating to research, collections, historical and cultural programs" (Caldwell 1987:16). Concurrently, a tribal curator was hired to initiate tribal cultural programs (Caldwell 1987:16). It was first under the guise of the Office of Cultural Programs from 1977 to 1981 (and the Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center thereafter) that much headway was made toward development of policies, project, programs which eventually culminated in development of the Suquamish Museum in 1983.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

Various assessment activities accomplished in conjunction with the duties of the Office of Cultural Programs succeeded in identification of tribal community cultural needs, which had a tremendous impact on shaping the direction of Office of Cultural Programs programs specifically, as well as on immediate plans to develop a museum. For instance, tribal cultural research conducted in 1976 identified a significant lack of historical data on the Suquamish, both within and outside of the tribe (Caldwell 1987:15).

... while working to establish a tribal enrollment program, developing a criminal justice plan and provide information for legal cases, the tribal researcher discovered the absence of any coherent tribal history. And, as the need for historical data escalated because of increased litigation, this lack of organized information became a cause for growing concern (Caldwell 1987:15).

In addition, resource assessment by the tribal curator (c. 1977-1978) found Suquamish ethnographic data to be "... virtually non-existent" (Caldwell 1987:18), and also determined that there was a paucity of Suquamish ethnographic materials available (Caldwell 1987:18).

Further, specific assessment of cultural needs within the Suquamish community resulted in succinct identification of the following needs.

- The need to centralize historical information pertaining to the Suquamish Tribe;
- The need for wider understanding of Suquamish history both within the tribe and the community at large;
- The need for tribal elders to have a greater role in transmitting heritage and in community affairs (Caldwell 1987:22-23).

Thus it became clear that (1) there was a need for a resource like a museum to collect, document, interpret Suquamish culture history, but (2) that available informational, artifactual, and financial resources were limited. These factors acted as significant constraints and "shaped further planning and development efforts for Suquamish cultural programs and the future museum" (Caldwell 1987:21,22).

In spite of identification of need for a cultural facility and cultural programs, plans for development of a museum became "a long-range goal" (Caldwell 1987:21) in the late 1970s. Plans for museum development were slowed by various difficulties, including those presented by the lack of available collections, lack of funding for museum developing and operation (Caldwell 1987:21), and exclusion of museum facilities from the plans for a tribal council and community center (Caldwell 1987:20).

Thus attention, energy, and funding was turned away from immediate museum development, and the work of the Office of Cultural Programs work became focused on program and collection development.

PROGRAMS OF THE OFFICE OF CULTURAL PROGRAMS AND THE SUQUAMISH TRIBAL CULTURAL CENTER AND THE "ELDER FACTOR"

The programmatic achievements of the Office of Cultural Programs/Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center were substantial and importantly came to form the foundation of the future museum. The scope and substance of the developed programs was strongly influenced by two important factors which had come to light in the assessment activity (Caldwell's "resource assessment phase" Caldwell 1987: 26) of the late 70s. These included " ... the incomplete state of the tribal historical and cultural record and the need to involve tribal elders in program efforts" (Caldwell 1987:25).

Much of the program development activity of the Office of Cultural Programs/Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center then, was undertaken to fill the existing gap in the Suquamish historical record based on elder involvement and input as a core component (Caldwell 1987:25; Nason 1989).

The urgent need to document the knowledge and memory of tribal elders, along with the prerequisite role this information played in subsequent interpretation of Suquamish heritage, focused and shaped the Office of Cultural Programs' planning efforts (Caldwell 1987:27).

The identification of the elders as a valuable resource, and potential focus of Suquamish cultural programs was an important factor in shaping the substance and direction of Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center projects, and eventually of the Museum itself.

Once the priority of elder involvement was identified, "... the next task was to determine a method for eliciting the participation of tribal elders in the research process. Most elders were of the generations of Indian youth who were removed from their homes and placed in Indian boarding schools, where they were punished for speaking their native language and discouraged from following traditional ways. Program planners, therefore, were confronted with a distinct irony: as children these individuals were taught to forget their culture; now, in later adult life, they were asked to remember and to lead the cultural renaissance (Caldwell 1987:28).

The major programs developed under the auspices of the Office of Cultural Programs to fill the identified cultural needs grew out of this recognized need to document the elders' knowledge and to involve them in tribal cultural programming, as Caldwell explains:

In order to systematically document elders' knowledge and to centralize resources pertaining to Suquamish history and culture, a series of

archival projects was defined. The progression of projects - historical photographs to oral history to language -- was designed to enhance the quality and quantity of information to be collected. Furthermore, the programs were to be sequenced to encourage and coincide with growing participation of tribal elders (Caldwell 1987:28).

The Office of Cultural Programs/Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center specifically initiated the Suquamish Tribal Photographic Archives Project and the Suquamish Tribal Oral History Project (Caldwell 1987:30), the products of which formed the basis for an archival collection, and eventually became the collection and interpretive foundation of the Suquamish Museum. Essentially, the projects came first, and the Suquamish Museum was developed to house, display and disseminate the fruits of those two projects (Caldwell 1987).

SUQUAMISH TRIBAL PHOTOGRAPHIC ARCHIVES PROJECT

In 1978 the Office of Cultural Programs initiated a six year tribal photographic archives project, which gave substantive impetus to the formation of the Suquamish Museum. The project was first funded by the Tribe in 1978, and sustained in 1979 by a \$19,453 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (Broyles/Native American Museum Program 1987).

The Suquamish Tribal Photographic Archives Project (1978-1982) (Caldwell 1987:36) was the first of the major programs initiated by the Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center. Historic photos pertaining to the history of the Suquamish and the Indians of Puget sound were collected, identified, cataloged, copied and stored (Caldwell 1987:36).

The project was designed to promote Suquamish cultural preservation activities, and to spur interest in culture history and preservation within the community. The project consisted of the collection, identification, conservation, and copying of historic photographs depicting various aspects of Suquamish culture and tribal history from approximately 1850-1930 (Broyles/Native American Museum Program 1987). The photographs were collected from tribal and community members as well as from existing institutional collections (Forsman 1986; Broyles/Native American Museum Program 1987; Suquamish Museum 1985). Approximately two thousand photographs were collected, copied, identified, and placed in the museum's archive. The project resulted in building of a visual record of a crucial point in Suquamish period, amassing visual evidence of a time of transition, characterized by a peculiar coexistence of change and continuity.

SUQUAMISH TRIBAL ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

The other major project undertaken by the Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center was the Suquamish Tribal Oral History Project (1981-1983). Suquamish elders were interviewed on a variety of topics by trained Native American interviewers, resulting in "... over one hundred seventy one-hour interviews with elders of the Suquamish and other Puget Sound tribes as well as long-time community residents" (Caldwell 1987:38)

The oral history project represented one important means to utilize and document the elders' knowledge and life experience as a cultural resource. The collection of oral histories from Suquamish elders formed the basis for the reconstruction and documentation of Suquamish history from a Suquamish perspective, interpreted and deployed in the Suquamish Museum.

The resources that resulted from both projects formed the basis for many interpretive programs (Caldwell 1987:41,42). Most significant in terms of developing and implementation of the Suquamish Museum was production of the slide tape program COME FORTH LAUGHING: VOICES OF THE SUQUAMISH PEOPLE, and development of the exhibit which

was to form the basis for the initial exhibit content of the Suquamish Museum, THE EYES OF CHIEF SEATTLE.

COME FORTH LAUGHING

The slide tape production COME FORTH LAUGHING was compiled from excerpts from the oral history interviews and still photographs from the photo archives project. It is a vivid, lively presentation of the substance of Suquamish history in the targeted time period. In their own words the elders (with a considerable sense of humor) tell about Suquamish history, about what they know of the old ways, about the experiences of their lives. The presentation overall comprises a powerful and cohesive image of a tribal people and the changes and continuities that have characterized their history.

It is important to note that through the vehicle of COME FORTH LAUGHING, and particularly through the stories they tell, the elders become the "ancestors", the viable link between the past and present in Suquamish culture history, the bearers of tradition and continuity.

THE EYES OF CHIEF SEATTLE

In 1982 the Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center in conjunction with the Museum of History and Industry in Seattle developed the exhibit THE EYES OF CHIEF SEATTLE which played an important role in the formalization of the Suquamish Museum, and later came to be installed in the museum as the primary exhibit (Caldwell 1987:46). The exhibit was specifically developed to "... represent Seattle in the 1982 Nantes Sister City celebration." (Caldwell 1987:47). The exhibit interprets "... the traditional lifestyle of Puget Sound [Indians and] ... explores the impact of white settlement on that lifestyle. Topics portrayed include the effect of treaties consummated between Indian people and the United States; successful attempts by Indian peoples to cope with, adapt to, and survive the effects of relocation to reservations; their re-education in Indian boarding schools; and the absorption of Indian peoples into non-Indian society and the world of the twentieth century" (Caldwell 1987:48)

Once the exhibit was completed and back in the hands of the Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center after being displayed in France and in Seattle, it became a motivation and legitimation for seeking museum space.

The STCC's possession of a major exhibition with no suitable space for displaying it

created a compelling reason for furthering tribal museum development (Caldwell 1987:48).

With a commercial bank loan the Tribe completed a portion of the existing tribal government building into museum gallery space (Caldwell 1987:49).

Thus, the existence of THE EYES OF CHIEF SEATTLE exhibit was a crucial impetus in development of a physical housing for display of that exhibit and the other achievements of the Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center projects.

THE SUQUAMISH MUSEUM

The Suquamish Museum began to become a physical and conceptual reality in the early 1980s. A 1979 feasibility study funded by the American Association for State and Local History (Caldwell 1987:45-6) had identified the vacant upper floor of the existing tribal government and community center as an acceptable potential museum gallery space. Though museum development was deferred at that time, increased motivation to fund and develop exhibit space to display the completed EYES OF CHIEF SEATTLE exhibit reactivated interest in development of a museum within the existing tribal center. A commercial bank loan was obtained by the tribe to convert the upper

floor of the tribal center into museum exhibit and work space (Caldwell 1978:48; Forsman 1986).

The Suquamish Museum opened in June 1983. THE EYES OF CHIEF SEATTLE composes the museum's main exhibit. Through the use of historic photographs, oral history excerpts, and label text the exhibit tells the story of Suquamish culture history, documentation of which is "missing" in the ethnographic and historic record. The exhibit gives a unique view of the Suquamish, milestones in their own history, from their own perspective. The exhibit, together with showing of COME FORTH LAUGHING supplementary to the exhibit, comprises the main exhibit and interpretive content of the museum.

The programs of the Office of Cultural Programs, Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center, and eventually the Suquamish Museum, succeeded in drawing on a number of resources to create a cohesive picture of Suquamish history. To understand the content, structure, and significance of that picture it is necessary to look closely at the exhibit and interpretive content of the Suquamish Museum.

THE EXHIBIT AND INTERPRETIVE CONTENT OF THE SUQUAMISH MUSEUM

The exhibit and interpretive content of the Suquamish Museum (in the form of THE EYES OF CHIEF SEATTLE and COME FORTH LAUGHING) is based on the use of a combination of techniques to depict and interpret Suquamish culture history. These include historic photographs, artifacts, dioramas, third person interpretive label text, first person oral history label text, and audio visual presentation.

Upon entering the exhibit the visitor first encounters a photograph of Chief Seattle. He was the nineteenth century Suquamish and Duwamish leader who represented his people in a time of crucial change, as the settlement which bears his name took shape and the way of life of Puget Sound's native people changed dramatically.

Presentation of his photograph and display of a written transcription of his famous speech made at the signing of the Treaty of Point Elliott serve to initially link the Suquamish of today with that famous leader. Once made, that connection forms the basis for the retelling of Suquamish culture history in the post-contact period.

The exhibit format of the Suquamish Museum is divisible into three thematic and temporal sections. The exhibits in total serve to paint a cohesive historical view of the

Suquamish in "the transitional period" from Treaty signing in 1855 to the present (Caldwell 1987).

The first of the three sections interprets the experience of the Suquamish at contact. Photos, dioramas, artifact displays, and label text interpret various aspects of Suquamish life. Major divisional headings and interpretive themes include Winter Dwellings and Lifestyle, Suquamish Villages, Food Gathering and Preparation, Fishing, Basket Making, Matting Weaving, Canoes, Spiritual Life, Tribal Alliances and Trade. This portion of the exhibit presents a factual, well-rounded ethnographic view of various aspects of Suquamish life forming an informational basis about the nature and content of Suquamish culture.

The second thematic section shifts from the contact and settlement period to the reservation period. Again, combined use of historic photographs, interpretive label text, oral history excerpts, and artifact displays and dioramas illustrate the changing circumstance of the Suquamish in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The major exhibit themes include The Advent of Reservation Life, Indian Boarding Schools, Changes in Land Ownership, Transition in Labor and Economy, Indians in the Military, Sports. (Broyles/Suquamish Museum 1986,

1989). The final of the three exhibit divisions is interpretation of the contemporary Suquamish, focusing on "The Suquamish Tribe Today".

EXHIBIT CONTENT INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS

THE DISTANT PAST

The exhibit format employed in the Suquamish Museum presents a view of Suquamish culture history that interestingly is simultaneously static and dynamic, a treatment which has tremendous bearing on the meaning and impact of the presented information. That is, there are two "voices" which speak within the exhibit format to simultaneously present a description of Suquamish culture history. One voice is that of a third person narrator that tells of the Suquamish of the distant past. They are represented in nineteenth century historic photographs that show a people in transition, a visual document of the coming together of worlds and cultures. They are anonymous in the sienna-toned photographs, representing the experience of the Suquamish at a particular point in time. The result is an objectified view of Suquamish culture history and experience. A detached narrator tells of the lifestyle of these distant people. That story of life at contact and the subsequent period of substantial

change is not told in the voice of the Suquamish; it is not the Suquamish speaking of their own history.

THE RECENT PAST: THE ELDERS SPEAK

Yet the Suquamish themselves are not entirely silent in this portrayal of their past. Presented simultaneously with this objectified narration is an engaged first-person Suquamish voice which tells of individual knowledge and first hand experience. Transcribed excerpts from oral history interviews conducted with Suquamish elders in the 1970s (5) are interspersed throughout the exhibit galleries, importantly introducing the collective voice of the Suquamish into the exhibit format.

It is through the oral history excerpts that the Suquamish tell of what they know - about the past, about "the old Indians", about the experiences of their own lives as Indians and as Suquamish. The impact of the inclusion of Suquamish voice in the exhibits is extremely significant, and impacts the over all meaning and significance of the Museum's exhibit and interpretive

5. The oral history excerpts transcribed and used as label text in the Museum exhibits are products of the Suquamish Tribal Oral History Project.

content. Specifically, I believe it is expression of the elders' collective knowledge and life experience which comprises the core meaning created in the exhibit content of the Suquamish Museum.

Through their recollections and descriptions the substantive traits of "Suquamishness" are established, painting a composite picture of what it means to be Suquamish. Thus, it is not just the fact alone that the elders "speak" in the Suquamish Museum's exhibits that is so important. It is what they speak about and how it is expressed that is so crucial.

The elders' descriptive statements are complex and multifaceted. I have identified three features which form the foundation of a definition of "Suquamish-ness" constructed and presented in the Museum. First, the voices of the elders connect the past and present. Second, as the vehicles of historical and cultural information the contemporary elders themselves become the purveyors of culture. Third, their thoughts and statements serve to define shared experience as the unifying commonalty which forms the foundation of Suquamish collective identity.

CONNECTING PAST AND PRESENT

Much of the Museum's exhibit and interpretive content stands alone as a static depiction of "culture". Yet with inclusion of a first-hand description - such as recollections of gathering basketry materials or a verbal description of the Agate Pass village of an elder's childhood - these representations come to life. Thus, even though the exhibits and label text depict the lifestyle of the long ago Suquamish, the elders' descriptions establish a link between those Suquamish of the distant past and the contemporary Suquamish.

In that respect, the elders' words connect the past to the present, creating vivid images of knowledge from "the old days" which still hold relevance. The unnamed distant Suquamish of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries lived in villages on Puget Sound, fished, made baskets, lived in cedar plank houses, and so on. The elders' words tell us first-hand of similar experiences and similar knowledge. The common ground of history, experience, and continuity is established.

For example, an encased display of Puget Sound baskets bounded by photographs of named nineteenth century basketmakers is made vivid and relevant with inclusion of first-hand accounts. As a whole, the elders' statements

depict basketmaking as a form of specialized knowledge shared by the nineteenth century Suquamish frozen in historic photos, and the twentieth century Suquamish conveyed through written labels which speak in their own voice.

I used to go with my grandmother once in awhile, gathering cedar roots or cedar limbs for basketry. The best place to look for them is in shady places, and I remember if there was an old rotten log, she used to go there and get all the roots from that tree. It would be all along, following the log. Sometimes those roots would be eighteen or twenty feet long. She used to take them and cut them up into about four-five foot lengths and pack them down the beach. (Martha George in Suquamish Museum 1985:22)

It was my grandmother that taught me how to make baskets. She used to go out and get the cattails and go get the cedar bark and get cedar limbs to make clam baskets. She used to make me sit down and do it. She says, 'You got to learn how. You're goin' to get old, too, like I am, so you better learn how to make this (Ethel Sam in Suquamish Museum 1985:22).

Similarly, winter villages, cedar plank longhouses, and life along the beach depicted in nineteenth century photographs seem distant from the reservation lifestyle of the late twentieth century. Today the Suquamish Mall lines the road leading to the village of Suquamish, where much of the land is under non-native ownership (Caldwell 1987:8). However, an elder's description brings knowledge

of the experience of village life circa 1900 into the present, bridging that gap.

My earliest recollection of living in the village in the first five or six years of my life and the children were always playing there and the village run for about a mile along the shore of Suquamish. There's where we always seemed to gather, elders and children, sometime through the day ... and the life of the people at that time wasn't too complicated... get up and do whatever chores or work they had to (Lawrence Webster in Suquamish Museum 1985:14).

Finally, an elder's eyes see continuity in the lives of the people of Puget Sound, blurring distinctions between past and present.

The main strength of the Suquamish is that they have always been able to fish, dig clams, get what they needed ... keep their own culture (From COME FORTH LAUGHING in Broyles/Suquamish Museum 1986).

THE PURVEYORS OF CULTURE

In addition to linking past and present, the interjection of the elders' voices into the Museum's exhibits conveys dynamism and vibrancy which highlights their contribution and sets their perspective apart. The elders who speak through the oral histories come to be representatives of the Suquamish as a whole, representing Suquamish history, experience, and culture.

Their collective recollections tell us that they are the ones who hold important knowledge about culture, history, and the past. Through the vehicle of oral history and museum exhibits that knowledge is transmitted. In that role the elders are the vehicles of knowledge, the carriers of culture, and the purveyors of continuity.

Some of that knowledge is about subsistence, technology, and environment.

Daddy knew just what time of the year to kill a bear. And you can't tell the difference between it and beef. But if it's a time when they eat fish, their meat tastes bad. Time of the year when the berries are ripe, and the bears eat all berries, their meat is good and the fat on this is thick (Clara Jones in Suquamish Museum 1985:18).

They'd make spears out of ironwood and they'd even put two points and sharpen the points. They'd tie it onto a long pole, I'd say eight or ten to twelve feet long, and then they could go out in deeper water to spear the fish with them. Sometimes they'd put three of those points on and they could catch smaller fish that way. On the spear points they'd have little notches on each of them, and that held the fish from slipping ... So easy with those notches on the points (Martha George in Suquamish Museum 1985:20).

When the sap is running, they used to go out in the woods and peel the cedar bark and then they'd peel the outer bark and just save the inner bark, between the real bark and the tree. They made mats out of them and they made baskets out of them. They made a flat mat and wove it, and they'd use it as a tablecloth... they even used it to make their beds on next to

the floor, they they'd put their blankets on it (Martha George in Suquamish Museum 1985:24).

Other recollections convey knowledge of definitively "Indian" practices and experience that lie in the past.

I can remember about the hop field-they'd pick through the day but every evening there was a bone game and songs going on. I don't know who was winning all the money or losing it or if they were playing for money or not, they'd have it just about every evening. So I sometimes wonder if it wasn't just more for pleasure than anything else-to get away from those ordinary run of things. Nobody ever seemed to come home rich. It was a change to get out and enjoy themselves, I guess. Could have been economically good for some of them, but there was an awful lot of them that didn't seem to care whether they made any money or not (Lawrence Webster in Suquamish Museum 1985:33).

At a certain time of the year, which was generally in August - I remember it from being a youngster - they'd gather over in Seattle, down on the flats, there. When I say flats, most people don't know where it is. That's nearly everything beyond or south of Yesler Way. Mud flats, cattails, one thing an' another. They'd get in there and do a little trading with the whites and also with some Indians (Lawrence Webster in Suquamish Museum 1985:29).

Finally, the contemporary elders convey cultural values which the elders of another time taught to them.

You want to leave things as they are and just take what you need. Don't be wasteful, that's what the elders taught (Martha George in Suquamish Museum 1985:30).

SHARED EXPERIENCE AS A UNIFYING COMMONALTY

The elders' recollections do not merely supplement the information conveyed in the Museum's exhibits, however. The substance of their thoughts tell of the shared experiences that make up the fabric of their lives as the first Suquamish generation of the twentieth century. Through their narratives we come to understand the shared reference points of the boarding school experience, a portion of childhood lived outside of the community, coming into adulthood in the 1930s and 1940s, and the rhythms of work, family, and community. These individual and collective memories combine to define the experiential basis of being Suquamish in the twentieth century.

The boarding school experience in particular, reflected upon from late adulthood, is powerful and indelible. For this generation it is quintessential of their life experience as Indians. Through their descriptions and recollections of separation from the community and childhood spent in a harsh environment, the boarding school experience of the early twentieth century is objectified and integrated into a conceptual compendium of definitively Suquamish experience. However painful,

the boarding school experience becomes an important component of Suquamish heritage.

All of a sudden, why, my folks... broke the news to us that we were to go to this school because there wasn't any schools around here. And that we had to go... Mother didn't like it very well, but she said it just had to be done, that's all there is to it. I didn't even know anything about it. I felt bad when we was goin'... along come a boat, a big motor boat... anchored out here and picked us up. Like little cows, we got in and away we went. We didn't even know where Tulalip was or anything... and at the end of the year, they'd bring us back. Next year, same thing (Woody Loughrey in Suquamish Museum 1985:41).

They took you off to school, and while you got white man education there you lost what you could have learned at home. I don't begrudge the going to school, but I almost lost the Indian language, to boot. I lost that much time away from home with those long winter evenings when they used to tell us the stories and one thing and another (Lawrence Webster in Suquamish Museum 1985:38).

They tried to give us an education by sending us to school and at the same time they tried to take your culture away from you by not letting you talk your own language...All we did was talk Indian until I went to school, and then I had to learn how to talk English (Lawrence Webster in Suquamish Museum 1985:38).

I wouldn't even notice I'd say something in Indian, and then the teacher'd come along with his ruler and hit me on the hand, 'You talk English'...the teachers used to scold us. Sometimes they'd think that we were talking about 'em (Ethel Sam in Suquamish Museum 1985:41).

Work and livelihood in adult life is also an important theme and unifying commonalty in the elders' recollections.

Indians always worked. They worked at the logging camps and worked at the Gamble mill (William Pickrell in Suquamish Museum 1985:44).

Logging. In those days it was dangerous. You could break your back or lose your leg or your arm, something like that... Ain't everybody that's fast enough to get out of the way of a tree when it's falling down (Bernard Adams in Suquamish Museum 1985:44).

And the clams...in those days, right after the Depression, if you had a contract with the market, say for three sacks on Monday, three sacks on Wednesday, and maybe four or five on Friday, that meant just what they said. Because there was plenty of people waiting in line to grab that job if you once slipped up. We never had any trouble with the market (Bernard Adams in Suquamish Museum 1985:44).

I used to cook so much for the Shaker meetings after I grew up, and I thought, 'Well, I'm going to get this boarding school, and maybe I'll learn something else.' do you know that when I got there, they just threw me right into the kitchen work again. And, oh brother, I thought I was getting away from the kitchen work (Ethel Sam in Suquamish Museum 1985:41).

The world wars played an important role in the lives of this generation, which reached maturity in the first half of the twentieth century.

I went to work for the government - I will never forget this date - it was the 20th of May, 1940, and I got into Keyport and I got on a permanent list the same year in November of that year, and I stayed with it. I started

right on the bottom as a laborer and I worked up to foreman pipefitter when I retired. I put in twenty-five years in Keyport (Ben George in Suquamish Museum 1985:44).

I worked for the ammunition depot, World War II. I worked in the sewing room and I worked in the laundry, I worked in the packing house filling projectiles with powder. I will never forget when I first entered that building, there were 'Danger' signs all over the place and it scared me. 'Danger' here, 'Danger' there! But after you work there awhile you don't pay no attention to it (Martha George in Suquamish Museum 1985:46).

The descriptions of collective life experience, such as those excerpted above, serve to collectively define the Suquamish. The elders' narratives set out specific kinds of knowledge, experience, and commonalties that define them as Suquamish and distinguish them from others. Essentially, the elders' narratives tell us that they are Suquamish because they share the specific described experiences, and they share those experiences because they are Suquamish. Thus, in these narratives it is specifically shared experience that stands at the basis of that definition as that which makes the Suquamish Suquamish.

In summary, the contemporary Suquamish elders play an important role in the exhibit and interpretive content of the Suquamish Museum, and implicitly in contemporary Suquamish life. Within the Museum context their words

coalesce to form the basis of a contemporary definition of Suquamish identity.

Their descriptions reactivate knowledge of the past, establishing the relevance of the past for the present and future. Similarly, transmitting knowledge of the past, as well as sharing descriptions of their life experiences, they pass on Suquamish culture, affirming its viability in the present. Finally, they speak of shared life experiences which, taken as a whole, form the basis of an experiential definition of Suquamish identity. The crux of my argument then, is that the exhibit and interpretive content of the Suquamish Museum, based primarily on the elders' verbal contributions, comprises an identity construction. That construction composes a cohesive picture of Suquamish history, culture, and experience as the basis of a definition of twentieth century Suquamish identity.

IS THE CONTENT OF THE SUQUAMISH MUSEUM "ETHNIC"?

In the beginning of this chapter I made the claim that the content of many native museums is "ethnic", serving to symbolically establish, define and mobilize a collective claim to ethnic identity by a specific people in a specific context at a particular point in time.

In the preceding discussion of the Suquamish Museum I have argued that the exhibit and interpretive content in a number of ways and on a number of levels establishes the basis for a contemporary definition of Suquamish identity. However, in light of the theoretical claim presented in the beginning of this chapter it is necessary to ask: Is the content and definition of Suquamish identity presented in the Suquamish Museum specifically "ethnic", and does it present and/or evidence a Suquamish ethnic claim?

The answer to that question is both interesting and complex. I have established that the exhibit and interpretive content of the Suquamish Museum portrays a picture of a people. The elders' contributions establish the basis of a collective Suquamish-ness. However, that image expressed within the Suquamish Museum is not explicitly linked to descent within the exhibit and interpretive format. The conceptual and symbolic picture of the content of Suquamish-ness composed in the Museum is not explicitly coupled with a claim that those qualities derive from descent from the "ancestors".

That observation raises an apparently paradoxical question. While the content of the Suquamish Museum does

present and communicate information about the Suquamish collectively, it does not do so in explicit reference to descent. Is the identity configuration constructed in the Suquamish Museum then not fully nor explicitly "ethnic", due to the absence of explicit descent symbolism and rhetoric? Does the case of the Suquamish Museum present a "negative result" in terms of the central thesis posed in Chapter One of this dissertation? To the contrary. The unique form, content, and symbolic base of the Suquamish Museum's identity configuration provides the opportunity to see variation in Native American museum form, content, and function.

AN IDENTITY ASSEMBLAGE

I believe the Suquamish Museum represents a variation in the potential ethnic nature of native museums. It is, in a sense, one point on a continuum. While the identity configuration represented there does not explicitly invoke descent as does the exhibit content of the Makah Cultural and Research Center, I believe the Suquamish Museum content is still definitively "ethnic".

The exhibit and interpretive content of the Suquamish Museum, as I have established, presents information about Suquamish history, culture, and experience which taken

together conveys crucial information about the Suquamish collectively. Although descent is not explicitly claimed nor proven, it is a crucial, implicit theme woven throughout the exhibit content. That is, a claim to a tie of shared descent as the basis of a contemporary collective Suquamish identity is implicit. The elders' whose words play such a crucial role in the exhibit content and building of a symbolic configuration themselves become "the ancestors" - those within whom culture and continuity resides, who provide a link between past and present, ultimately transmitting Suquamish culture within the context of the Museum to subsequent generations.

The content of the Suquamish Museum assembles aspects of Suquamish culture and history which are combined in the museum to form an image of Suquamish identity based on an implicit claim to descent and cultural continuity from "the ancestors" in this case the contemporary elders.. Thus, within the Suquamish Museum a potential pool of identity related symbols is amassed in the museum, currently deployed as the descriptive content of a contemporary image of Suquamish identity, perhaps to be deployed in the future in a slightly different form.

The Suquamish Museum's identity assemblage forms the foundation for a potential claim of shared ethnic membership. In its current form it is a resource, an arsenal of symbols ready to be activated and deployed. When, in what form, and for what reason those assembled symbols may be mobilized in the future cannot be predicted.

CONCLUSION

The Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center are two institutions that provide important data on the nature and sociocultural significance of Native American museums in North America today. Taken together they provide a good example of one type of Native American museum, that is, one which is the site of important ethnic processes. More specifically, the exhibit and interpretive content of each forms the basis of a constructive process whereby symbols are brought together to convey meaning relevant to the projection of a subjectively perceived collective identity within a larger sociopolitical arena.

In many respects then, these two Native American museums share important features in common. They both construct a symbolically based identity configuration, invoke a tie

of descent to justify their claim to a shared identity, and each characterizes a people's identity in terms of their shared past. However, each one displays important individuality in terms of the form, nature, and expression of that museum constructed identity configuration.

An important trait shared by the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center is that both museums are the site of processes of ethnic differentiation. Each mobilizes a descent based definition of a people (varying by degree - see discussion below). That identity configuration sets out the definitive traits which distinguish each people. In the case of the Makah Cultural and Research Center that ethnic definition is based on blood ties to the Ozette ancestors of the pre-contact past. The Suquamish ethnic definition is based in reference to the shared experiences of the twentieth century Suquamish elders.

Each museum marshalls the crucial markers which identify those boundaries. The Ozette artifacts are the markers of Makah distinctiveness, evidence of their tie to the pre-contact ancestors, the source of the substance of their inherited "legacy". Those markers are comprised of whaling equipment, artifacts used in subsistence,

technology, utilization of the environment and its resources, and the "stuff" of everyday pre-contact life - house styles, canoes, looms, and so on. The markers presented in the Suquamish Museum are more conceptual and experiential than artifactual. It is the shared experience of the Suquamish since contact which ties them together and sets them apart from others. The twentieth century experiences of the contemporary Suquamish elders are mobilized in the museum as representative of the substance of Suquamish identity. Thus, the form and content of the ethnic processes seen to occur in the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center are individualistic in their substantive detail.

Over all, these separate identity configurations are projected outward, marking the Suquamish and Makah individually as distinct peoples, and in true Barthian terms, defining ethnic boundaries. That is, through the projection of the museum constructed identity configuration, boundaries existing between "the Makah" or "the Suquamish" and the larger (implicitly) non-native society, are reinforced.

Both museums also share in common the mobilization of a claim to shared descent as justification of their collective identity. However, the invoking of descent in

the two museums varies by degree. The Makah identity configuration is based on an explicit claim of descent from identified ancestors. Demonstration of that justifying link of descent is presented in the form of an ethnic charter. In contrast, the Suquamish identity configuration implies that the cultural and historical experiences which define and distinguish the Suquamish is inherited from the ancestors, i.e. the elders. The substance of that inherited experiential-based collective identity is presented in the Suquamish Museum in the form of an "identity assemblage" in which the descent connection is not explicitly invoked.

What is the significance of this difference between the two museums? I do not believe that the more explicit claim to descent made in the Makah Cultural and Research Center means that the Makah are more cohesive or have a stronger sense of identity than the Suquamish. The possible explanations for that variation are many - differences in worldview, differences in historical experience, and/or differences in the type, nature, and tangibility of the evidence they had available to them in the building of their museum projected identity configuration. More specifically, Ozette yielded a large number of artifacts which provided unique evidence of descent. Perhaps that circumstance made it easier for the

Makah to more explicitly demonstrate descent than was possible in the case of the Suquamish, where the evidence was experiential not artifactual. Thus, the variation in the degree to which descent is explicitly invoked in each museum represents a slight variation in the form of the identity configuration constructed in the museums, but not a significant variation in function.

Another feature shared in common by the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center is that in both museums it is a people's collective perception of their shared past which stands at the root of the image they project within their tribal museums. Thus within each museum's exhibit and interpretive context a cohesive image of "the Makah" and "the Suquamish" is created, built on symbols evocative of a people's past. As Shils explains,

There are two pasts. One is the sequence of occurred events ... this is the real past which has happened and left its residues behind. Nothing can be done which will change these facts which are the scene of human action in the present.

There is another past. This is the perceived past. This is a much more plastic thing, capable of being retrospectively reformed by human beings living in the present (Shils 1981:195).

The images coalesced into a definition of identity in the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center are drawn from the "raw" past, whether the precontact lifeways of the Ozette villagers, or the boarding school experiences of twentieth century Suquamish elders. Those selected features of the Suquamish and Makah pasts are mobilized in each museum as the symbolic core of a contemporary definition of that people's shared definitive traits, which symbolically defines and represents the Suquamish and Makah in the present.

The symbolic configurations created individually in the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center are a unique reflection of the collective past and present of the people of those individual communities. The "raw" past which forms the symbolic resource base for the museum constructed configuration, the "perceived past" which is created there, and the unique emic view of collective self which is projected are site, situation, and community specific. Each such configuration is intricately tied to an individual set of circumstances - historical, cultural, political. As such, that native museum constructed identity configuration is a unique constellation of symbols and resources derived from a people's background.

Within the context of the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center then, it is the past that is mobilized to distinguish these Native American peoples from others. The past-based identity configuration projected in these two museums serve as examples of Native Americans as indigenous people looking to their cultural and historical past to find that which sets them apart. It is significant that it is the Makah and Suquamish perception of their respective pasts - and of what they derive from the past - which is used to distinguish them from their immigrant cohabitants of North America.

In summary, the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center both comprise a locale where an image of the collective identity of the people of a particular native community is constructed. The Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center in that respect act as a resource which creates a collective image relevant in a particular social, cultural, and political context at a particular point in time. That museum-constructed image draws from a people's whole past utilizing selected symbols and events which make up a "perceived past" (Shils 1981). That image of the perceived past is portrayed in the museum as representing

the essence of a people's collective identity, and is projected to mark and maintain ethnic boundaries. The Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center then, are exemplary of the Native American museum as a sociopolitical strategy, a boundary maintaining mechanism.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION: THE "INVENTION OF TRADITION" OR THE PERPETUATION OF CONTINUITY?

"INVENTION" OR CONTINUITY?

The identification of a community specific identity construction process occurring within these two Native American museums is an important step in gaining a broad understanding of the role and significance of contemporary Native American museums. However, that recognition does not stand alone as an adequate conclusion to this discussion. A central issue that remains to be addressed is the issue of continuity.

More specifically, the image of a people created in these two Native American museums is built on a presupposition of continuity with the past. Within each institution a people is characterized by symbols drawn from selected aspects of their past. The identity configuration created and projected in these two museums is predicated on symbolization of the past to characterize a people, communicating the strength and relevance of that past for them in the present. The past is thus presented as viable and relevant to that people, the source of accurate information about their collective identity.

This central role of continuity in the institutional processes analyzed here raises a crucial question. Is the semblance of continuity proffered in these Native American museums a genuine expression of continuity with the past, or is it a by-product of self-conscious image making? In other words, is the sense of the past projected in the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center "fabricated"; is it an "invention of tradition" (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983)?

This is an interesting and important question. The aim in asking it is not to make a subjective value judgment about the "authenticity" of the content of these two museums. Instead, the purpose is to facilitate a closer examination of the nature and significance of the constructive identity processes occurring there. Thus, it is important to explore both sides of the invention/continuity question.

THE "INVENTION OF TRADITION"

The concept of the "invention of tradition" introduced by Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983) is a crucial one for understanding the nature and significance of the constructive processes occurring within the Suquamish

Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center. The "invention of tradition", as defined by Hobsbawm describes a specific type of phenomenon related to the changing role and representation of the past in the present.

The term "invented tradition" is used in a broad, but not imprecise sense. It includes both "traditions" actually invented, constructed and formally instituted and those emerging in a less easily traceable manner within a brief and dateable period (Hobsbawm 1983:1).

Invented tradition is taken to mean a set of practices ... accepted rules ... of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a suitable historic past (Hobsbawm 1983:2).

An "invented tradition" then, is one that arises in a short period of time, and projects a belief in continuity with the past. The implication in Hobsbawm's definition is that such traditions lack time depth and an actual developmental connection with the past. An "invented" tradition thus creates a relationship with the past, and projects a substantive link with the past where such a connection may not actually exist, as Hobsbawm explains below.

... insofar as there is such a reference to a historic past, the peculiarity of "invented" traditions is that the continuity with it is largely factitious. In short, they are responses to novel situations which take the form of reference to old situations, or which establish their own past by quasi-obligatory repetition (Hobsbawm 1983:1,2).

An invented tradition is actually a new tradition consciously swathed in the mystique of the past; it is the present altered through application of a symbolic patina. It is a phenomenon, according to Hobsbawm which is a side effect of societal and cultural change.

... we should expect it to occur more frequently when a rapid transformation of society weakens or destroys the social patterns for which "old" traditions had been designed, producing new ones to which they were not applicable, or when such old traditions and their institutional carriers and promulgators no longer prove sufficiently adaptable and flexible (Hobsbawm 1983:4-5).

These definitive traits of invented traditions have some relevance for the past based identity configurations created in the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center. Both "traditions" of characterizing, defining, and representing Suquamish and Makah identity have arisen within a short period of time, in both cases within the space of a decade.

Both traditions similarly "...attempt to establish continuity with a suitable historic past". In the case of the Makah Cultural and Research Center that "suitable historic past" is the pre-contact past, specified and represented by the fifteenth century occupation of Ozette. Formulation of connection with that past comprises the exhibit and interpretive content of the Center's discussed in Chapter Four. Similarly, the historic past with which the contemporary Suquamish are linked is comprised of the post contact life experiences of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth century Suquamish. In addition, both museum's constructed identity configurations also grow out of a period of change and the passing of "old" ways, a definitive trait of invented traditions.

THE REFLECTION OF CONTINUITY?

In spite of these congruences between Hobsbawm's definition and the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center constructed identity configurations, I believe the invention of tradition concept does not adequately characterize the processes occurring in these two institutions.

More specifically, I believe the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center configurations deviate from Hobsbawm's and Ranger's definition in one important respect. That is, there is no evidence in either case to indicate that the connection with the past projected in both museums is in some way fabricated or ingenuine.

Quite to the contrary. I believe the relationship with the past expressed in the two museums is a genuine reflection of time-depth. Even though that past-based identity construction is made in the present I argue that it is not an "invented tradition" but a reflection of continuity. More specifically, in the guise of the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center content I see a complex symbolic process occurring. A people's connection with the past is "recast" in new forms, communicated via new symbols that are forged in the present.

The sense of continuity manifest in the content of the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center lies in the efforts of a people to reflect themselves as a unified entity. The idea of the entity persists even though the symbols used to express and define the entity naturally change over time.

Thus the symbolic constellations formulated in the two museums are components of a process that is not new, and which has a great deal to do with continuity. Those new symbolic constellations created in the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center are new ways to transmit an old idea, that is, a cohesive image of Makah or Suquamish collective identity. The tradition that is genuine and continuous is the tradition of defining the Makah as Makah, and the Suquamish as Suquamish; each is defined as a distinct bounded group with definitive traits and history that set them apart from others. The continuity perpetuated in the two museums then, is the practice of defining self collectively and cohesively, which both the Makah and Suquamish have done for a long time, even though the form, symbols, and content of that identity has changed myriad times.

More specifically, the social, cultural, and political context within which the Suquamish and Makah live changes, and so the image of collective self they project outward changes. Thus, the symbols they use to signify that collective image also change. Those symbols of collective identity are in fact "revised" to be relevant in the contemporary present. "Makah-ness" and "Suquamish-ness" are constantly recast in new symbols and transformed into situation specific, temporally relevant

forms. That process, rather than being evidence that the current symbolic constellation used to characterize those peoples is invented, shallow, or fabricated indicates that those symbolic constellations are quite genuine and valid.

Tradition, like any other cultural construction, by its nature changes over time. Across generations a people remember a tradition differently, symbolize it differently, and use it differently - but yet they still think of it as being the same thing, the same tradition, as Shils explains below:

"Constellations of symbols, clusters of images, are received and modified. They change in the process of transmission as interpretations are made of the tradition presented; they change also while they are in the possession of their recipients.

... A rule of conduct, explicitly articulated or implied in a pattern of conduct, or a belief about the soul, or a philosophical idea about the common good does not remain identical through its career of transmissions over generations ...

This chain of transmitted variants of a tradition is also called a tradition... Even in the course of a short chain of transmission over three generations, a tradition is very likely to undergo some changes (Shils 1981:13).

All traditions are made and constructed. All traditions change over time, and all are represented by symbolic

constellations that are fluid and variable. To label some traditions "real" and others "false" on the basis of duration or imagined invariability of symbols is a serious misinterpretation of the phenomenon. What is visible in the guise of ethnic processes occurring in the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center is not fabrication of a false or ingenuine tradition, but simply tradition in process.

In summary then, within the context of the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center symbols of identity are reconstrued into forms that are relevant in a contemporary sociopolitical context. But what stays the same is that a people who call themselves "Makah" and a people who call themselves "Suquamish" continue to construe symbolic representations of their collective identity. They continue to represent and interpret their culture, whether through time tested methods such as oral tradition, or through the new medium of the tribal cultural museum.

In conclusion, the Suquamish Museum and Makah Cultural and Research Center stand as specific examples of the Native American museum as a vehicle of cultural resilience and continuity. The Native American museum as such is a "social instrument", an institution of power

and influence instrumental in the communication of a people's perception of "social reality".

FINAL REMARKS

The Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center bear out the thesis stated in Chapter One on a community specific level. They are each examples of the Native American museum as an artifact of a contemporary sociopolitical context in which Native American people seek self-determination in all spheres of their lives. In that respect, these two institutions are strategies in ethnic group formation. They aid the people of a specific native community in achieving and exercising control over the representation of their shared identity.

Both the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center are exemplary of the Native American museum as a "social instrument" through which the people of a specific Native American community influence the way in which they are perceived within the broader societal context. As I have discussed in Chapter Four, the exhibit content of each museum serves to construct and convey an identity configuration which projects a sense of the Makah and Suquamish respectively as a cohesive, bounded entity. The people of each community are portrayed as

sharing in common continuity with their cultural past, from which they derive strength and persistence. Thus, projection of that image within the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center marks and maintains the group's distinctiveness, projecting an image of strength and cohesion which implicitly affects how they are perceived and treated.

This investigation of the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center has confirmed the ethnic strategy thesis posed within this dissertation. In addition, data collection and analysis on these two museums has led to new insights and greater depth of understanding. Analysis of the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center has contributed important insights on the symbolic processes through which Native American people confirm and maintain a distinct identity under the auspices of a museum institution. We now know that some Native American museums, like the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center, are important symbolic resources within the communities they serve. That recognition is an important step in achieving a broad anthropological understanding of the sociocultural significance of Native American museums.

FUTURE RESEARCH

I began this research project in 1983 with the thesis that the Native American museum is a significant sociocultural institution, specifically an ethnic strategy through which the people of a native community project a sense of identity. Through the many phases of this research project that thesis has held, and has continued to be a central component in my perspective on Native American museums. Now, at the conclusion of the research, my perspective is broadened by data collection and analysis. I still believe Native American museums are ethnic strategies; the Suquamish and Makah examples eloquently illustrate this. But analysis of these two institutions has broadened my understanding of Native American museums. Now, on the basis of insights accrued from those analyses I believe that the "ethnic strategy" explanation of Native American museum operation provides a starting point, rather than an end point, for the further investigation of Native American museum phenomena.

The provision of evidence in favor of the ethnic strategy explanation generated here, serves as entrance to deeper investigation of the sociocultural processes (ethnic and otherwise) occurring in Native American museums. This

research provides a starting point for examination of the range and variability of Native American museum phenomena existing in North America today. It is necessary to continue the level of investigation initiated in this dissertation, that is, anthropological investigation of individual Native American museums. The goal of undertaking future research is to broaden the existing data base and contribute to further knowledge of Native American museum dynamics.

There are several important questions about Native American museums which remain to be addressed in future research. First, this investigation has focused on the ethnic nature of specific Native American museums. It is reasonable to assume that not all Native American museums are ethnic strategies, that not all function as do the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center. What then of variation? What other types of Native American museums exist, and how are they best explained?

Second, the two institutions analyzed here are successful Native American museums with a relatively long life-span. However, many Native American museums do not survive for a decade as has the Makah Cultural and Research Center. What is the average life-span of a Native American

museum? What are the factors and circumstances that are correlated respectively with success and failure?

Third, this analysis has focused much attention on the nature of the symbols construed and communicated within the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center. Analysis here has shown those symbols to be predominantly focused on a people's shared past, and on the sense of continuity derived from the past. Further investigation of a broad range of Native American museums will provide a basis for examination of the processes of symbol construction that occur there. Is symbolization of a people's past an unequivocal feature of Native American museum content? Or do the Suquamish Museum and the Makah Cultural and Research Center represent unique cases in that respect? If Native American museums are not symbolically past based, then what other types of symbolic constellations are constructed within Native American museum settings?

Finally, what of the future of Native American museums? Are they institutions that will be integrated into the fabric of Native American communities? Or will they achieve their mission of cultural perpetuation so successfully that designation of a special institution to transmit culture will no longer be necessary in Native

American communities? Will the success of Native American museums ensure their own obsolescence? Future data collection and analysis will make it possible to answer these questions and thus contribute deeper understanding of Native American museum phenomena to the anthropological literature.

Whatever the fate of Native American museums, for the present they continue to be highly significant institutions. They are artifacts in the true sense. As such, they represent a rich source of anthropological data on the social, cultural, political, and symbolic means employed by Native American people to ensure their survival in the pluralistic North American society of which they are a part.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aithnard, Mathem Kokou
1976 Museums and Socio-Economic Development in Africa. Museum 128 (4):188-195.
- Alexander, Edward P.
1979 Museums in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History.
- Alexander, Yonah, and Robert A. Friedlander, editors
1980a Self-Determination: National, Regional, and Global Dimensions. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Alexander, Yonah, and Robert A. Friedlander, editors
1980b Introduction. In Self-Determination: National, Regional, and Global Dimensions. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- American Anthropological Association
1989 Steilacoom Tribe Opens Tribal Museum. Anthropology Newsletter 29(8):1.
- American Association of Museums
1969 America's Museums: The Belmont Report. A Report to the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities by a Special Committee of the American Association of Museums. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums.
- 1970 Museum Accreditation: A Report to the Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums.
- 1984 Museums for a New Century. Washington D.C.: American Association of Museums.
- 1988 Museums: A Global View. Museum News 67(1):22.
- Ames, Michael
1979 Applied Anthropology in Our Own Backyards. Practicing Anthropology 2(1):7, 23-24.
- 1981 Museum Anthropologists and the Arts of Acculturation on the Northwest Coast. B.C. Studies 49:3-14.
- 1986 Museums, the Public and Anthropology: A Study in the Anthropology of Anthropology. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

- Anderson, Barry, and Hilda Anderson
 1984 Museum with an Indian Point of View. Seattle Post
 Intelligencer April 26:D6.
- Annis, Sheldon
 1986 The Museum as a Staging Ground for Symbolic
 Action. Museum No. 151:168-171.
- Appello, Tim
 1985 Telling it Like it Was. The Weekly January 25:11.
- The Argus
 1983 Suquamish Museum Documents Culture of Puget Sound
 Indians. Argus Discover Washington, September 1983
 2(6):10.
- Arnold, Greig
 1986 Interview. Makah Cultural and Research Center.
- Assogba, Romaine-Philippe
 1976 Revolution and the Conservation of a National
 Heritage. Museum 128(4):212-218.
- Barth, Fredrick, editor
 1969a Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social
 Organization of Culture Difference. Boston:
 Little, Brown.
- 1969b Introduction. *In* Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The
 Social Organization of Culture Difference,
 Fredrick Barth, ed., pp. 9-38. Boston: Little,
 Brown.
- Bean, Susan
 1987 The Objects of Anthropology. American Ethnologist
 14(3):552-559.
- Biddle, Lucy
 1977 Keeping Tradition Alive. Museum News 55(5):35-42.
- The Bremerton Sun
 1977 Suquamish Tribe Wins Grant for New Community
 Center. October 21: 1.
- Broyles, Julie
 1988 Defining an "Anthropology of Museums": Native
 American Museums as "Artefacts of Society". Paper
 Presented at the Eighty-Seventh Annual Meeting of
 the American Anthropological Association, Phoenix,
 Arizona.

- 1987 Unpublished Fieldnotes. Native American Museum Program, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
- 1986 Unpublished Fieldnotes. Makah Cultural and Research Center, Neah Bay, Washington.
- 1986 Unpublished Fieldnotes. Suquamish Museum, Suquamish, Washington.
- Burcaw, G. Ellis
1975 Introduction to Museum Work. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History.
- Caldwell, Carey T.
1987 Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center and Suquamish Museum: Development and History. MA Thesis Project, Anthropology Department, University of Washington.
- Cameron, Duncan
1971 The Museum, a Temple or the Forum? Curator 14(10):11-24.
- Cantwell, Anne-Marie E., James B. Griffin, and Nan A. Rothschild, editors.
1981a The Research Potential of Anthropological Museum Collections. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Volume 376. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Cantwell, Anne-Marie E., and Nan A. Rothschild
1981b The Research Potential of Anthropological Museum Collections. In The Research Potential of Anthropological Museum Collections, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences Volume 376, pp. 1-6, Cantwell, Griffin, Rothschild, eds. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Cantwell, Anne-Marie E., and Nan A. Rothschild
1981c The Future of the Past. In The Research Potential of Anthropological Museum Collections. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Volume 376, pp. 579-584, Cantwell, Griffin, Rothschild, eds. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Castile, George Pierre
1985 Introduction. In The Indians of Puget Sound: The Notebooks of Myron Eells, pp. ix-xix, George Castile, editor. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- Clifford, James
 1983 On Ethnographic Authority. *Representations* 1(2):118-146.
- 1985 Objects and Selves - An Afterword. *In* *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture. History of Anthropology, Volume 3.* George Stocking, ed., pp. 236-246. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- 1986 Introduction: Partial Truths. *In* *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Clifford and Marcus, eds., pp. 1-26. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, editors
 1986 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cohen, Ronald
 1978 Ethnicity: Problem and Focus in Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7:379-405.
- Cole, Douglas
 1985 *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Colfax, Lloyd
 1987 Makah History. *In* *Portrait in Time: Photographs of the Makah by Samuel G. Morse, 1896-1903,* pp. 3-5. Seattle: Makah Cultural and Research Center.
- Collier, Donald
 1962 Museums and Ethnological Research. *Curator* 5(4):322-328.
- Collier, Donald, and William Fenton
 1965 Problems of Ethnological Research in North American Museums. *Man* 65:111-112.
- Collier, Donald, and Harry Tschopik, Jr.
 1954 The Role of Museums in American Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 56(5):768-779.
- Colson, Elizabeth
 1953 *The Makah Indians: A Study of an Indian Tribe in Modern American Society.* Manchester, England: University of Manchester Press.

- Combs, Mary
1987 Native American Museums Program celebrates 10th Anniversary. Smithsonian Institution Research Reports 51:3.
- Confederation of American Indians
1986 Indian Reservations: A State and Federal Handbook. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Crapanzano, Vincent
1977 The Writing of Ethnography. Dialectical Anthropology 2:69-73.
- Croes, Dale
1977 Basketry from the Ozette Village Archaeological Site: A Technological, Functional, and Comparative Study. Ph.D. Dissertation, Anthropology Department, Washington State University.
- Cushman, Karen
1985 Masterworks. The Museum as a Social Instrument, Theodore Low, 1942. Museum Studies Journal 2(1):60-62.
- Dawn, Leslie Allan
1981 'Ksan: Museum, Cultural, and Artistic Activity Among the Gitksan Indians of the Upper Skeena, 1920-1973. MA Thesis, Department of History in Art, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
- Defert, Daniel
1982 Collection of the World: Accounts of Voyages from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries. Dialectical Anthropology 7(1):11-20.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr.
1969 Custer Died for Your Sins. New York: Macmillan Company.
- 1974 Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., editor
1985 American Indian Policy in the Twentieth Century. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Deloria, Vine, Jr. and Clifford M. Lytle
1983 American Indians, American Justice. Austin:
University of Texas Press.
- Diamantios, Adamantios
1983 The Cyprus Folk Art Museum. Museum 139(3):
173-177.
- Dockstader, Frederick
1967 Anthropology and the Museum. In the Philadelphia
Anthropological Society: Papers Presented on its
Golden Anniversary, Jacob W. Gruber, ed., pp. 132-
142. New York: Temple University Publications.
- Dominguez, Virginia
1986 The Marketing of Heritage. American Ethnologist
13(3):546-555.
- 1988 On Creating a Material Heritage. Paper Presented
at the 87th Annual Meeting of the American
Anthropological Association, Phoenix, Arizona,
November 1988.
- Drucker, Philip
1951 The Northern and Central Nootkan Tribes. Bureau of
American Ethnology Bulletin 144.
- 1963 Cultures of the North Pacific Coast. San
Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Eells, Myron (George Castile, editor)
1985 The Indians of Puget Sound: The Notebooks of Myron
Eells. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Eisenbeis, Manfred
1972 Elements for a Sociology of Museums. Museum
24(2):110-116.
- The Everett Herald
1971 Makah Heritage Rich in Culture. December 3:4A.
- Ewers, John C.
1943 Museum: The Blackfeet Indians Now Have a Word for
It. Museum News XX(18):12.
- 1952 Museums for Indians in the United States.
Fundamental Education 4(1):3-9.

- Fagan, Brian
1978 *Quest for the Past: Great Discoveries in Archaeology*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Fenton, William N.
1960 *The Museum and Anthropological Research*. *Curator* 3(4):327-355.
1974 *The Advancement of Material Culture Studies in Modern Anthropological Research*. In *The Human Mirror: Material and Spatial Images of Man*, Miles Richardson, ed., pp. 15-36. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Forsman, Leonard
1986 Interview. Suquamish Museum, Suquamish, Washington.
- Frese, H.H.
1960 *Anthropology and the Public: The Role of Museums*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Friedman, Janet
1975 *The Prehistoric Uses of Wood at the Ozette Archaeological Site*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Anthropology Department, Washington State University.
- Geertz, Clifford
1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Gill, Steven
1983 *Ethnobotany of The Makah and Ozette People, Olympic Peninsula, Washington (USA)*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Botany Department, Washington State University.
- Gleeson, Paul F.
1980 *Ozette Woodworking Technology*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Anthropology Department, Washington State University.
- Goffman, Erving
1974 *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper and Row.

Goodman, Linda

- 1978 *This is My Song: The Role of Song as Symbol in Makah Life*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Anthropology Department, Washington State University.

Goodnow, Cecelia

- 1983 *Museum Fascinates the Suquamish People*. November 24: E1.

Graburn, Nelson

- 1976 *Ethnic and Tourist Arts: Cultural Expressions from the 4th World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gwynne, Peter, and Stephen Gayle

- 1977 *Indian Pompeii*. Newsweek September 5: 81-82 (RC)

Haeberlin, Hermann, and Erna Gunther

- 1930 *Indians of Puget Sound*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Halpin, Marjorie M.

- 1978 Review of "The 12,000 Year Gap: Archaeology in British Columbia", and "First Peoples: Indian Cultures in British Columbia" at the British Columbia Provincial Museum. Canadian Museums Association Gazette 11(1): 40-48.

- 1983 *Anthropology as Artefact*. In *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*, National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper No. 89, Frank Manning, ed., pp. 262-275. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.

Hammad, Manar

- 1987 *Semiotic Reading of a Museum*. Museum 154(2): 56-60.

Hanson, James A.

- 1979 Letter from James A. Hanson, Native American Training Coordinator, Smithsonian Institution to Dale Johnson, Chairman, Makah Tribal Council, December 13, 1979.

- 1980 *The Reappearing Vanishing American*. Museum News 59(2): 44-51.

Hartman, Russell P.

- 1983 *The Navajo Tribal Museum: Bridging the Past and Present*. American Indian Art Magazine 9(1): 30-35, 81, 89.

- Hartman, Russell P., and David E. Doyle
1982 Preserving a Native People's Heritage: A History of the Navajo Tribal Museum. *The Kiva* 47(4).
- Henry, Jeanette
1970 A Rebuttal to the Five Anthropologists on the Issue of the Wampum Return. *Indian Historian* 3(2):15-17.
- Hertzberg, Hazel
1971 The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Hill, Richard
1977 Reclaiming Cultural Artifacts. *Museum News* 55(5):43-46.
- 1984 The Impact of a Museum on a Native Community. In *Sharing a Heritage. Contemporary American Indian Issues Series, No. 5, Sharing a Heritage: American Indian Arts*, pp. 147-152. American Indian Studies Center. Los Angeles: UCLA.
- Hitchcock, Ann
1973 Tribal Cultural Centers: An Attempt to Salvage Cultural Heritage. In *Museums of Mexico and the U.S.: Policies and Problems*. Texas Historical Foundation.
- Hobsbawm, Eric
1983 Introduction: Inventing Traditions. In *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., pp. 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, editors
1983 *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hogden, Margaret T.
1964 *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Horse Capture, George P.
1981 Some Observations on Establishing Tribal Museums. *American Association For State and Local History Technical Leaflet 134, History News* 30(1).

- Hudson, Kenneth
 1975 A Social History of Museums. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.
- 1977 Museums for the 1980s: A Survey of World Trends. Paris: UNESCO.
- 1987 Museums of Influence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, Helen
 1978 A History of the Development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center, Neah Bay, Washington. MA Thesis, Anthropology Department, University of Washington.
- Hutton, J.H.
 1944 The Place of Material Culture in the Study of Anthropology. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 74(1-2):1-6.
- The Indian Voice
 1979 Suquamish Cultural-Historical Program in Full Operation. 9(2):2-3.
- 1980 Suquamish Creates Photographic Archives. January 10:3.
- Isajiw, W. W.
 1974 Definitions of Ethnicity. Ethnicity 1:111-124.
- Jacobson, Johan Adrian
 1977 Alaskan Voyage 1881-1883. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Josephy, Alvin M., Jr.
 1971 Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom. New York: American Heritage Press.
- Katz, Herbert
 1965 Museums, U.S.A.; A History and Guide. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Keyes, Charles F., editor.
 1981a Ethnic Change. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Keyes, Charles F.
 1981b The Dialectics of Ethnic Change. In Ethnic Change, Charles F. Keyes, ed., pp. 3-30. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- Kinard, John
 1985 The Neighborhood Museum as a Catalyst for Social Change. Museum No. 148:217-222.
- Kinard, John R., and Esther Nighbert
 1972 The Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.. Museum XXIV(2):103-109.
- Kirk, Ruth
 1973 Cape Alava - Window to the Past for the Makahs. Seattle Times Pictorial November 4:30-35.
 1980 The Pompeii of the Northwest. Historic Preservation 32(2):2-9.
- Kirk, Ruth, and Louis Kirk
 1975 The Makahs Prepare to Share Their Heritage. Seattle Times Pictorial August 17:8-11.
- Konare, Alpha Oumar
 1983 Towards a New Type of "Ethnographic" Museum in Africa. Museum 139(3):146-14.
- Landmarks
 1983 Suquamish Museum Preserves Salish Culture. Landmarks 2 (3):24.
- League of Women Voters
 1976 Indian Country. Washington, D.C.:League of Women Voters Education Fund.
- Lewis, Geoffrey D.
 1984a Introduction. Section I: The Museum Context. In Manual of Curatorship: A Guide to Museum Practice, John M.A. Thompson, ed., pp.1. London: Butterworths.
 1984b Collections, Collectors and Museums: A Brief World Survey. In Manual of Curatorship: A Guide to Museum Practice, John M.A. Thompson, ed., pp. 7-22. London: Butterworths.
- Low, Theodore
 1942 The Museum as a Social Instrument. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art for the American Association of Museums.

- Lund, Roland, and Wayne Zimmerman
 1970 Hoses Slice, Sluice, Spray Path into Ancient Ozette Indian Past. Tacoma News Tribune Magazine Section, August 23:8-9.
- Lurie, Nancy
 1976 American Indians and Museums: A Love Hate Relationship. The Old Northwest 2(3):235-251.
 1981 Museumland Revisited. Human Organization 40(2):180-187.
- MacCannell, Dean
 1976 The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class. New York: Schocken Books.
- Makah Cultural and Research Center
 1987 Portrait in Time: Photographs of the Makah by Samuel G. Morse, 1896-1903. Seattle: Makah Cultural and Research Center.
- Makah Cultural and Research Center Advisory Council
 1979a Meeting Minutes, Seattle, Washington, February 27, 1979.
 1979b Minutes of Meeting with Makah Tribal Council, Seattle, March 29, 1979.
 1980 Recommendations. February 14, 1980.
- Makah Museum Committee
 1975 Letter from Shirley Johnson, Chairperson, Makah Museum Committee, Makah Tribal Council, to James D. Nason, Thomas Burke Memorial Washington State Museum, July 29, 1975.
- Makah Tribal Council
 n.d. Makah Ozette Proposal Submitted by the Makah Tribal Council to the Economic Development Administration.
 1975 Abstract: Makah Cultural and Research Center, July 29, 1975.
- Marcus, George and Dick Cushmen
 1982 Ethnographies as Text. Annual Review of Anthropology 11:25-69.
- Marcus, George, and Michael Fischer
 1986 Anthropology as Cultural Critique. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mason, J. Alden

- 1960 Observations on the Function of the Museum in Anthropology. In *Culture in History, Essays in Honor of Paul Radin*, Stanley Diamond, ed., pp. 340-348. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mauger, Jeffrey

- 1978 Shed Roof Houses at Ozette. Ph.D. Dissertation, Anthropology Department, Washington State University.

May, Allan

- 1970a Saddle, Comb Excite Scientists. *Everett Herald* October 6:2A.
- 1970b Probing the Ancient Makah Village Ruins. *Everett Herald Magazine Section*, December 5:4-5.
- 1971 500 Year Old Indian House May be Intact. *Everett Herald* June 19:3A.
- 1977a Housing for a Heritage. *Everett Herald* March 19:3A.
- 1977b The Digs At Alava: Time to Stop and Take Stock. *Everett Herald* March 19:3A

Maybury-Lewis, David

- 1967 *Akwe-Shavante Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MacDonald, George F.

- 1987 The Future of Museums in the Global Village. *Museum* 155:204-216.

McFeat, Tom S.

- 1962 *Museum Ethnology and the Algonkian Project*. Anthropology Papers, National Museums of Canada, No. 2.
- 1967 The Object of Research in Museums. *National Museums of Canada Bulletin* 204, Anthropological Series 70. Contributions to Ethnology 5:91-99.

McNickle, D'Arcy

- 1873 *Native American Tribalism: Indian Survivals and Renewals*. London: Oxford University Press.

Mead, Sidney Moko

- 1983 Indigenous Models of Museums in Oceania. *Museum* 138(2):89-101.

- Monreal, Luis
 1976 The African Museum in Quest of its Future
 Direction: Introduction. *Museum* 128(4):187.
- Nagata, Judith
 1981 In Defense of Ethnic Boundaries: The Changing
 Myths and Charters of Malay Identity. In *Ethnic
 Change*, Charles F. Keyes, ed., pp. 87-116.
 Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Naroll, Raoui
 1964 On Ethnic Unit Classification. *Current
 Anthropology* 5(4):283-296.
- Nason, James D.
 1974 Letter from James D. Nason, Chairman, Anthropology
 Division, Thomas Burke Memorial Washington State
 Museum, to Norm Down, Program Planner, Makah
 Tribe, December 20, 1974.
- 1975 Makah Cultural and Research Center, Sources of
 Funding, January 23, 1975.
- 1988 Personal Communication.
- 1989 Personal Communication.
- Nason, James D., Kenneth Hopkins, and Bea Medicine
 1973 Finders Keepers? *Museum News* 51 (7):20-26.
- Papantoniou, Joanna
 1983 The Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation. *Museum*
 139(3):168-173.
- Paust, Jordan J.
 1980 Self-Determination: A Definitional Focus. In *Self-
 Determination: National, Regional and Global
 Dimensions*, Alexander and Friedlander, eds., pp.
 3-20. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Pratt, Mary Louise
 1986 Fieldwork in Common Places. In *Writing Culture:
 The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Clifford
 and Marcus, eds., pp. 27-50. Berkeley: University
 of California Press.
- Puntev, Penko
 1983 The Bulgarian Ethnographic Heritage, Past and
 Present. *Museum* 139(3):186-189.

- Quimby, George, and James D. Nason
n.d. The Makah Museum Training Program: A Synopsis of Events.
- 1975 Makah Museum Training Project. Annual Report 1974-1975, August 30, 1975.
- 1977 New Staff for a New Museum. *Museum News* 55(5):50-52.
- Rabinow, Paul
1977 *Reflections On Fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Reynolds, Barrie
1984 *Material Culture: A System of Communication*. Margaret Shaw Lecture I. Cape Town: South African Museum.
- 1987 *Material Systems: An Approach to the Study of Kwandu Material Culture*. In *Material Anthropology: Contemporary Approaches to Material Culture*, Reynolds and Stott, ed., pp. 155-188. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Reynolds, Barrie, and Margaret A. Stott, eds.
1987a *Material Anthropology: Contemporary Approaches to Material Culture*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Reynolds, Barrie, and Margaret A. Stott
1987b *Material Anthropology: Contemporary Approaches to Material Culture*. In *Material Anthropology: Contemporary Approaches to Material Culture*, Reynolds and Stott, ed., pp. 1-12. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Ripley, Dillon
1969 *The Sacred Grove: Essays on Museums*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rothschild, Joseph
1981 *Ethnopolitics: A Conceptual Framework*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sapir, Edward
1967 *The Social Organization of the West Coast Tribes*. In *Indians of the North Pacific Coast*, Tom McFeat, editor, pp. 28-48. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- Schlereth, Thomas J., ed.
 1982 Material Culture Studies in America. Nashville:
 American Association for State and Local History.
- Scholte, Bob
 1972 Toward a Reflexive and Critical Anthropology. *In*
 Reinventing Anthropology, Dell Hymes, ed., pp.
 430-457. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Seattle Post-Intelligencer
 1966 W.S.U. Big Dig Uncovers Artifacts of Ozettes. July
 11:4.
 1980 Preserving a Tribe's Culture: Vista Volunteers
 Pass Muster. May 2:A2.
- Seattle Times
 1968 Discovery of Old House Spurs "Dig" at Ancient
 Indian Town. January 21:9.
 1972 Indian Oldsters Visit Ancient Ozette. Seattle
 Times August 27:A6.
- Seeley, Ralph
 1984 Suquamish Voices Tell Their Own Tale. Bremerton
 Sun June 28.
- Selmeczi, Laszlo
 1983 Museums and National Identity. *Museum* 139(3):
 204-207.
- Shapiro, Henry L.
 1958 Primitive Art and Anthropology. *Curator* 1(1):46-
 51.
- Shils, Edward
 1957 Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties.
British Journal of Sociology 8(2):130-145.
 1981 Tradition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Slemmons, Rod
 1982 Survivors: 100 years of photographs from the
 Suquamish Tribal Archives. *Northwest Photography*
 5(5):7.
- Smith, Marian W.
 1941 The Coast Salish of Puget Sound. *American*
Anthropologist 43(2):197-211.

- Steinbrueck, Lisa
 1982 Establishing a Museum: A Manual for Native Americans. MA Thesis, Anthropology Department, University of Washington.
- Steiner, Stan
 1968 The New Indians. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Stewart, Susan
 1984 On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stocking, George W.
 1985 Essays on Museums and Material Culture. In Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture. History of Anthropology, Volume 3. George Stocking, ed., pp. 3-14. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sturtevant, William C.
 1969 Does Anthropology Need Museums? Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington 82:619-649.
- Sukel, William
 1974 Museums as Organizations. Curator 17(4):299-301.
- Suquamish Museum
 1985 The Eyes of Chief Seattle. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center
 1982 A Guide to Oral History in the Native American Community. Suquamish, Washington: Suquamish Tribal Cultural Center.
- Svensson, Frances W.
 1973 The Ethnics in American Politics: American Indians. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company.
- Swan, James G.
 1870 The Indians of Cape Flattery. Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, No. 220. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Tacoma News Tribune
 1975 Aged Indians Visited Scene of Their Youth. August 25.

- Tarzan, Deloris
1983 A Tribal Tribute. September 14, 1983:B1.
- Thompson, John M.A., ed.
1984 Manual of Curatorship: A Guide to Museum Practice.
London: Butterworths.
- Thompson, Nile, and Carolyn Marr
1983 Crows' Shells: Artistic Basketry of Puget Sound.
Seattle: Dushuyay Publications.
- Trosper, Ronald L.
1981 American Indian Nationalism and Frontier
Expansion. In *Ethnic Change*, Charles F. Keyes,
ed., pp. 246-270. Seattle: University of
Washington Press.
- Trottier, Richard W.
1981 Charters of Panethnic Identity: Indigenous
American Indians and Immigrant Asian Americans. In
Ethnic Change, Charles F. Keyes, ed., pp. 271-305.
Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Ullberg, Alan D., with Patricia Ullberg
1981 Museum Trusteeship. Washington, D.C.: American
Association of Museums.
- UNESCO
1983 In This Issue Museum 139(3):135.
- United States. Department of Commerce.
1974 Federal and State Indian Reservations and Indian
Trust Areas. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government
Printing Office.
- United States. Indian Claims Commission
1957 The Suquamish Tribe vs. The United States of
America. Docket No. 132. In *Cases Decided Before
the Indian Claims Commission* 5:140-150. Washington
D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- 1970 The Makah Tribe vs. The United States of America.
Docket No. 60-A. In *Cases Decided Before the
Indian Claims Commission* 23:165-175. Washington
D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- United States.
1855 Treaty of Neah Bay. 12 Stat. 939. In *Indian
Affairs, Laws and Treaties*, Charles M. Kappler,
ed., Vol. II:682. Washington D.C.: Government
Printing Office.

1855 Treaty of Point Elliott 12 Stat. 927. *In* Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties, Charles M. Kappler, ed., Vol. II:669. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Vallance, Julie

1981 The Internal Dynamics of the Community Museum. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Vastokas, Joan M.

1976 Architecture as Cultural Expression. Arts Canada 33 (3):1-15.

Waterman, T.T.

n.d. Geography of the Makah. Bureau of American Ethnology, Manuscript No. 1864.

1973 Notes on the Ethnology of the Indians of Puget Sound. New York: Museum of the American Indian/Heye Foundation.

Weber, Max (Gunther Roth and Claus Wittich, editors)

1968 Economy and Society; An Outline of Interpretive Sociology. New York: Bedminster Press.

The Weekly

1983 Indian Preservations. July 6, 1983:28.

Welsh, Peter H.

1981 An Activity System Approach to Material Culture Studies. *In* The Research Potential of Anthropological Museum Collections. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, volume 376, Cantwell, Griffin, and Rothschild, eds., pp 325-336. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Williams, Hill

1970 Ozette Village, Cape Alava. Seattle Times Pictorial November 8:14-19.

1971 Makahs Propose Major Museum at Neah Bay. Seattle Times March 3:E6.

1976 Makah Tribe to Open Museum for Ozette Excavations. Seattle Times January 18:B7.

Wittlin, Alma S.

1970 Museums: In Search of a Usable Future. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Curriculum Vita

**Julie A. Broyles
Department of Anthropology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195**

BIRTHDATE

June 7, 1955, Seattle, Washington

EDUCATION

- 1989** **Ph.D., Sociocultural Anthropology.
University of Washington, Seattle,
Washington.**
- 1983** **M.A., Sociocultural Anthropology with
Specialization in Museology. University
of Washington, Seattle, Washington.**
- 1977** **B.A., Anthropology. University of
Washington, Seattle, Washington.**
- 1973** **High School Diploma, Bellevue High
School, Bellevue, Washington.**

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

***The Politics of Heritage: Native American Museums and the
Maintenance of Ethnic Boundaries on the Contemporary
Northwest Coast.***

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

**North American Native Ethnology, Northwest Coast
Native Ethnology, Ethnicity, Native American Studies,
Material Culture, Museology, Native American Museums,
Expressive Culture.**