

You Are Here

The NMAI as Site of Identification

MARIO A. CARO

The nationalist function of museums has been the topic of much scholarly attention.¹ The collection of museums at the heart of Washington DC serves as a prime example of how these institutions demand that visitors identify along national affiliations. Whether as a foreign or a domestic visitor, the address of these museums often highlights this aspect of our identity.² This address, however, does not necessarily begin at the entrance; it begins with the ways in which museums present themselves through their publicity. Similarly, our response to that address includes not only our interaction with exhibits within the museum but also includes our pilgrimage there. Where we come from determines what and whom we find there. In the case of visiting the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI), it is a trip that makes one extremely aware of the relationships among the Native cultural products on display, the site of the museum, and one's concept of home. Whether the process is one that reaffirms one's identity as Indigenous or one that stresses the ways in which we identify others as Native, traveling to the museum makes one conscious of the importance of location in the processes of identification.

The ideological implications of the representation of Native cultures within museums has been the focus of recent scholarship, much of it critically analyzing the practices of display that take place within these museums.³ Many historical accounts trace the development of the museum from its origins as private rooms used to exhibit collections full of wondrous curiosities—gathered from colonial enterprises around the world—to the more recent establishment of public museums that display materials that reify a nation's patrimony. The recent emphasis on the nationalist implications of the museum is particularly important when

considering the ideological implications of the colonial legacy marked by the collection of Native culture products.⁴ It is especially relevant to an analysis of the NMAI, an institution that forms a national collection of Native nations. A focus of this scholarship has often been on the objects and the spaces they occupy, on the relationships between the specimens and the architecture used to contain and present them to the public.⁵ One should keep in mind, however, that the museum itself is an object on display, which can lead to a broader consideration of its function in the narration of nation.⁶ The presentation of the museum is, of course, a major consideration for its architects who consider not only the building's aesthetic profile but also how it fits its surroundings. In terms of the NMAI, the architects chose a strategy that highly contrasts with the many neo-classical structures nearby, including the Capitol building directly facing the museum. While the curvilinear design and stone façade, originally conceived by the prominent Native architect Douglas Cardinal, refer to a southwestern landscape, the disjuncture in styles is productive; it connotes dislocation and relocation, key concepts in considering the histories of Native nations.

I would like to consider further the idea of location, as both a place and the act of placing, in relation to the site occupied by the NMAI. I am particularly concerned with examining how the approach to the museum informs the visitor's experience within the museum.

YOU ARE HERE

When reading a map that shows your location with a sign that reads "You are here," you seek a path to your destination mindful that you may have to return to that same spot in order to make your way home. "You are here" also marks a spot that, like Ariadne's thread, leads you safely out of the labyrinth. This process of stringing your way to and from the museum is one that helps to place you in context. This was made evident during the opening ceremonies on September 21, 2004, when thousands of people from many parts of globe came together to celebrate the opening of the NMAI.

In many ways, the people participating in the opening ceremonies represented a condensed version of the audience that will come to visit the museum. The diversity of the museum's visitors was most apparent during the part of the opening ceremonies billed as the Native Na-

tions Procession.⁷ Representatives from Native nations all over the world had been invited to take part in the procession. It was an opportunity for Native peoples to come together and celebrate their commonalities and appreciate their differences. The result was a grand procession of more than twenty-five thousand participants, most of them wearing traditional regalia, marching through the Mall toward the museum. The regalia, flags, and banners were visual signs used to denote the variety of Native identities on display.

This sight, however, was not intended for an audience of tourists expecting to see “real Indians” on display. Instead, this was a demonstration that worked to visually affirm Native sovereignty and identity.⁸ This affirmation occurred among the marchers as well as between them and the spectators. Whether native or non-Native, the emphasis on the visibility of identity demanded a response, one that required the viewer to geographically locate the visual signs being presented. It is this relationship between place and visibility, the process of locating the visual signs, that I would like to emphasize as being significant to the process of identification.⁹ It was obvious to all, and especially to members of the local Piscataway and Delaware nations, that they found themselves at a crossroads where the paths taken marked the location of the NMAI—a site whose significance is spatially and temporally situated, for it should be kept in mind that the process of locating occurs both in time and space. The site that is today marked by the museum is the same location, although at a different historical time, of the original inhabitants of the area.

If the NMAI is located at a particular time and place, it is necessary to measure this spatial and temporal distance from a starting point, from the visitor’s “home.” The notion of home as a place, and its relationship to the nation’s capital, leads us to consider the significance of the placement of the NMAI—its site specificity. It is essential to consider the site specificity of museums in general in order to complicate the workings of the narratives produced inside. It is also productive to think about the site-specificity of museums in taking into account their relationship to the communities they address and those they represent.

ESSENTIAL SITES

A recent study that is helpful in thinking about the idea of site specificity as it relates to the formation of communal identity is a book by

Miwon Kwon titled *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*.¹⁰ In it, Kwon theorizes the “spatio-political problematic [of the] nexus between the subject/object and location.”¹¹ One of the issues she examines is the relationship of public art to community. Although Kwon is mainly addressing issues that pertain to art produced in an urban setting—which often involve negotiations between the artist, community, and art institutions—her discussion raises important issues in terms of the negotiations among viewer, museum, and communities that I want to emphasize. The most applicable of her insights for my project is her discussion of the location and production of community, of community as site.

One of Kwon’s caveats is against the possibility that the production of public art that purports to engage a particular community’s concerns will reify, and therefore commodify, that community. Her deconstruction of the concept of community critiques what she characterizes as the essentialist production of space, a space occupied by “authentic” communities. As she states:

It seems historically inevitable that we will leave behind the nostalgic notion of a site and identity as essentially bound to the physical actualities of a place. Such a notion, if not ideologically suspect, is at least out of sync with the prevalent description of contemporary life as a network of unanchored flows. Even an advanced theoretical position . . . predicated on the belief that a particular site/place, with its identity-giving or identifying properties, exists always and already *prior* to whatever new cultural forms might be introduced to it or emerge from it [seems dated].¹²

Kwon’s analysis, based on the “prevalent description of contemporary life as a network of unanchored flows,” leads her to the conclusion that “reckoning with the impossibility of community . . . may be the only way to imagine past the burden of affirmational siting of community to its critical unsiting.”¹³ In other words, the fragmentary nature of identity cannot sustain a unitary notion of community and, subsequently, its siting.

The irony of Kwon’s project—to think “beyond and through the impossibility of community”—is that, at least in terms of Native identity, “the notion of site and identity as essentially bound to the physical actualities of a place” is precisely the belief often advocated by those looking

to maintain homelands or, alternately, regain territories taken away by force.¹⁴

SITING RESERVATION X

It is the survival of such place-bound identities that Gerald McMaster addressed when he curated *Reservation X: The Power of Place in Aboriginal Contemporary Art* in 1998. For this exhibition, he chose the Native reservation as the operative site of engagement. McMaster was fully aware of the contradictions such a place represents: “a negotiated space set aside for Indian people by oppressive colonial governments to isolate them, to extricate them from their cultural habits, and to save them from the vices of the outside world.”¹⁵ And yet, he also understood that, despite operating as “both sanctuary and prison,” reservations “will always be both a symbolic and real home for most Indian people.”¹⁶ The reservation is the site, real or imagined, to which many Native communities have an essential relationship. This is true even of those Native communities who have been so severely displaced that they lack a homeland.¹⁷ Even then, the locus of the reservation functions dialectically as formative of Native identity. McMaster elaborates: “The urban and rural now make up two discursive spaces or communities that form the new reservation narrative.”¹⁸ This is a narrative that, unlike the urban-centered analysis proposed by Kwon, acknowledges the complicated relationships of various sites to the formation of identity.

AUTHENTIC PLACES/ESSENTIAL IDENTITIES

The discursive production of the space defined as “Reservation X” by McMaster is further affirmed by claims of authenticity that are often made for such spaces by Native communities themselves. It is at this point that a project such as Kwon’s, which is explicitly informed by postmodernist discourses, reveals the incommensurabilities between Western aesthetics and those theories centered on autochthonous notions of identity. The former espouses an anti-essentialism that is wary of the “cultural valorization of places as the locus of authentic experience and coherent sense of historical and personal identity,” and endorses, instead, a fluid notion of identity that is constituted at the nexus of site and performance, while the latter may appeal to a sense of identity dependent on the stability of

history and place.¹⁹ It is important to realize, however, that Indigenous claims to authentic sites and essential identities are not necessarily strategic; they are often fundamental to Native epistemologies.²⁰

Whereas notions of authenticity and essentialism become limiting burdens for artists attempting to avoid ghettoization in today's global art market, many Indigenous artists eschew this Western problematic. The art critic Ian McLean has noted how these different approaches function in the presentation of Aboriginal art in Australia. He states:

The burden of authenticity felt so heavily by postcolonial artists . . . is, for Indigenous artists, a liberation and essential component of their identity. The old desert painters wear this authenticity lightly because it is so much a part of them. Far from being a burden hoisted on them by Eurocentric intellectuals wanting to legitimise their own modernity, it is and always has been the secret of the success of Indigenous art.²¹

It is important to note a distinction that McLean makes between the Indigenous artists, whom he describes as belonging to a traditional culture, and that position occupied by the postcolonial artists, whom he identifies as those who “work across a range of styles and ideas in a deliberate hybrid fashion that is global and temporal in outlook.”²² Postcolonial art, according to McLean, “is a syncretic modernism that, in the spirit of modernism, is grounded in the temporality and spatiality of modernity,” which he contrasts to art emerging from traditional cultures and characterized by “the specificity of place and locality.”²³ This is a provocative distinction, particularly since it does not account for the location of artists, such as the participants in Reservation X, who strongly identify with a specific place and yet participate in the production of what McLean considers postcolonial art.²⁴ His discussion of the essentialism involved in claiming authenticity explicitly points to a paradigmatic chasm between certain Indigenous perspectives on the essentialism of identity and those espousing a (post)modern perspective. As Linda Tuhiwai Smith, a Maori cultural studies scholar, observes:

The essence of a person is also discussed in relation to indigenous concepts of spirituality. In these views, the essence of a person has a genealogy which can be traced back to an earth parent, usually glossed as an Earth Mother. A human person does not stand alone,

but shares with other animate, and in the Western sense, “inanimate” beings, a relationship based on a shared “essence” of life. The significance of place, of land, of landscape, of other things in the universe, in defining the very essence of a people, makes for a very different rendering of the term essentialism as used by indigenous peoples.²⁵

For Smith, a Native perspective often includes the notion that one’s land is frequently a site of authenticity that engenders essential identities; it represents the place essential to identity.

BEEN THERE/BEING THERE: VISITING TRIBAL MUSEUMS

The propriety of place, the relationship of Native bodies to sites that ground identity, can be explored by examining the experience of the non-Native visiting a tribal museum.²⁶ The sites of these museums, often located on reservations, help to produce narratives that are greatly influenced by the visitor’s approach and departure from the building, which often involves negotiating a Native space, a space often clearly designated as sovereign. This relationship to place, to the setting that provides a prologue for the museum’s narration, is crucial for noting the differences in the ways museums function on the reservation versus off the reservation. This is especially true for the non-Native visitor whose performance of the tribal museum can be a somewhat uncanny experience, the infelicitous experience of not belonging to a place, of being a foreigner.

In his analysis of the museum as site, James Clifford describes the museum as a “contact zone,” a term he borrows from Mary Louise Pratt, who defines it as “the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict.”²⁷ In this essay, Clifford’s focus is on the relationships produced within the space of the Western museum, and particularly the exchanges between Native communities and Western museums whose holdings include their cultural property. He is careful to acknowledge the power inequalities that constitute these relationships. These are not places for benign cultural encounters. Instead, these are sites that collect “particular histories of dominance, hierarchy, resistance, and mobilization.”²⁸ To address these

inequalities, he advocates the enacting of the Western museum as a site for negotiation where the “contact work” of “active collaboration and a sharing of authority” can occur.²⁹

In an earlier essay, titled “Four Northwest Coast Museums,” Clifford compared the display strategies of two Western museums, the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology and the Royal British Columbia Museum, with those of two smaller tribal museums, the U’mista Cultural Centre and the Kwagiulth Museum and Cultural Centre.³⁰ While all four museums feature materials belonging to various Northwest Coast communities, the two tribal museums have an unusual history. They were formed in the late 1970s as part of an agreement to repatriate items confiscated during a potlatch ceremony held in 1921, a ceremony that by that time had been outlawed.³¹ These Native museums are also different in terms of their relationship to the cultures they represent. Clifford notes the significant difference it makes to belong to the immediate community represented by the tribal museums, the difference it makes to how the museum’s narrative is performed. As he states: “Objects here are family and community memorabilia. To an outsider, at least, a great part of their evocative power—beyond their formal, aesthetic values—is the simple *here* . . . In a local museum, ‘here’ matters.”³²

Clifford’s experience can be useful not only in thinking about an outsider’s engagement with a tribal museum, a site where “here” matters, but also as a contrast to a museum such as the NMAI, where “here” also matters. Although there is no doubt that in many respects the museum functions much like a Western museum, particularly in terms of its site, there are many other aspects of it—such as the careful landscaping that references cosmologically significant directions—that invoke “home” to many Native visitors. As I suggested earlier, it is precisely this dislocation from home that make visitors aware of their relationship to the processes of identification.

If we return to McMaster’s formulation of Reservation X as a discursively produced site—one that functions as both sanctuary and prison, can be real or imagined, and accommodates urban and rural Native populations—what can we say about its relationship to the NMAI? Is it possible to conceive of the museum as located on such a site? How would non-Native visitors respond to such a siting? The answers to these kinds of questions will only become apparent as visitors themselves help to

determine the use value of the institution. The museum will, of course, play a major role in how it invokes, rather than just represents, Native notions of home and identity.

AT THE THRESHOLD OF IDENTITY

There is one particular element of the museum's interior design that stands out as a work that enacts the process of identification that I have been describing. As one reaches the third level of the museum, there is an entrance to the left that leads into the Our Lives gallery, which is meant to "illustrate how Native Americans, despite many challenges, continue to exist as distinct communities."³³ Although the various displays inside are powerful illustrations of the complexities of negotiating contemporary Native identity, it is the entranceway to the gallery that first involves the visitor in actually experiencing these complicated processes of identification.

The work is designed by Jolene Rickard (Tuscarora), an artist, curator, and scholar whose work is well known for addressing the intricate relationships between visual representation and Native identity. In this installation, Rickard emphasizes the performative aspect of Native identity, particularly the ways in which identity is produced through the process of recognition. The work consists of two large screens, approximately twelve feet long and eight feet high, on either side of the entrance onto which are projected life-size images of people who seem to walk alongside visitors as they enter and exit the gallery. The people depicted are diverse; they include a great variety of ages, skin tones, and sizes. There are images of women, children, and men dressed in suits, uniforms, sports clothes, and so on. In short, they represent a wide demographic of Native peoples. The work is subtle in the way it addresses the visitor. These images do not confront the viewer but are presented almost imperceptibly aside the visitor. It is only after entering the passageway that one becomes aware of the projected images, and then only when one takes a sideward glance. It is a brief encounter, a momentary vision of a fellow traveler, but one that demands a quick and unconscious process of recognition.

It may be helpful to compare the performance of identification that Rickard's work demands and that enacted during the Native Nations Procession. One could have read the dynamics of identity played out



FIGURE 1. Native Nations Procession during the opening ceremonies of the National Museum of the American Indian, September 21, 2004.

during the procession as having to do with a simple notion of identity. A superficial glance at the activities would have shown many of the participants eager to photograph themselves and others wearing traditional regalia as enacting a simple notion of identification, one in which identity is simply worn and easily framed within the camera's viewfinder. Participants in the event, however, were aware of the complicated nature of the processes of identification. Sorting through the many visual markers may have been a daunting task, particularly for those intending to identify who was and was not Native. In fact, the strong distinction between those wearing cultural markers of identity and the rest only frustrated any easy act of recognition

The distinction I am trying to emphasize is between a fixed notion of identity and one that is aware of identification as a dynamic process. The theorist Diana Fuss has discussed the process of identification as "set[ting] into motion the complicated dynamic of recognition and misrecognition that brings a sense of identity into being." Although this process may imply a "narrowing in" on identity, she emphasizes the uncertainty of the process, which "immediately calls that identity into ques-



FIGURE 2. Threshold to the Our Lives gallery on the third level of the museum.

tion.”³⁴ It is the uncertainty of identification that is enforced by passing through the threshold. The fluid nature of recognition is emphasized by the aesthetic strategies employed. Rickard has produced an effect by which the images momentarily come into focus and then slowly blur away. There is an emphasis on motion, on the temporal aspect of the encounter. At the same time, there is also a spatial dimension to traversing the work. The sign accompanying this threshold reads: “Anywhere in the Americas, you could be walking with a 21st-century Native American.” This “anywhere” could be everywhere; it all depends where, and how, you find yourself.

AT HOME AND AWAY

The instability of the process of recognition that this work emphasizes can be seen as contrasting sharply with the essentialist notions of home discussed earlier. However, it is precisely this difference that works to reinforce a sense of identity that is place-bound. The fluidity and instability of identification performed at the site of the museum can, in turn, work to affirm a Native identity based on a fixed notion of home.

While visitors' responses to the NMAI may range from feelings of alienation to indifference to pride, it is the journey that has led them there that will inform their attachment to the museum and its contents. It is likely that a visit to the NMAI will challenge those whose ideas of Native identity depend on the recognition of stable markers of identity. It is also possible that for these visitors the cultural objects found within will only help to reify their ideas of Indigeneity. Others, however, may consider the museum as yet another passage leading them back home.

NOTES

Parts of this essay are based on a book in progress titled "Decolonizing Nostalgia: Art, History, Nationalism, and the Native as Image." I want to thank Tina Kuckahn for her helpful insights and suggestions on an earlier draft of this essay.

1. For a selection of essays on the nationalist role of the museum, see David Boswell and Jessica Evans, eds., *Representing the Nation: A Reader, Histories, Heritage and Museums* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

For an earlier analysis of the use of Native American material as part of the nation's patrimony, see Curtis M. Hinsley Jr., *The Smithsonian and the American Indian: Making Moral Anthropology in Victorian America* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981).

2. One way to think about the ways in which institutions contribute to the production of identity is to consider the Marxist notion of interpellation, an ideological call to an individual, a summons to occupy a subject position prescribed by a state institution. Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays* (London: New Left Books, 1971), 174.

3. Much has been published on museums, particularly during the last decade. A selection of works relevant to the display of Native cultures includes Tim Barringer and Tom Flynn, eds., *Colonialism and the Object: Empire, Material Culture and the Museum* (New York: Routledge, 1998); Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2000); Christina F. Kreps, *Liberating Culture: Cross-cultural Perspectives on Museums, Curation and Heritage Preservation* (New York: Routledge, 2003); W. Richard West Jr., ed., *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian: Museums and Native Cultures* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000); Lynda Jessup and Shannon Bagg, eds., *On Aboriginal Representation in the Gallery* (Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 2002); Miriam Clavir, *Preserving What Is Valued: Museums, Conservation, and First Nations* (Vancouver: University of British

Columbia, 2002); Laura Peers and Alison K. Brown, eds., *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

4. On the development of major Native collections, a process that has often involved the aid of academic disciplines such as anthropology, archaeology, and art history, see Douglas Cole, *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985). A more recent critical assessment is found in Margaret Dubin, *Native America Collected: The Culture of an Art World* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2001).

5. On the history of the museum, see Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

6. For a discussion of the historical relationship between art and architecture, see Douglas Crimp, "The Postmodern Museum," in *On the Museum's Ruins* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993): 282–325.

7. For the museum's coverage of the opening ceremonies, see its official publication: *National Museum of the American Indian* (Winter 2004). Also see *Native Peoples* 17, no. 6 (2004).

8. This was most obvious when noticing how important it became for participants to photograph themselves taking part in the event. For a lively account from a photographer's perspective see Dugan Aguilar and Liz Aguilar, "The Opening of the National Museum of the American Indian," *News from Native California* 18, no. 2 (2004/05): 4–12.

9. One can think of a category of visual signs used to represent place that would include images such as maps, flags, names of places, landscapes, landmarks, logos, etc.

10. Miwon Kwon, *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002).

11. Kwon, *One Place after Another*, 2, 8.

12. Kwon, *One Place after Another*, 164.

13. Kwon, *One Place after Another*, 155.

14. Kwon, *One Place after Another*, 154. Kwon is basing her ideas of community on an approach outlined by Jean-Luc Nancy, which posits that "only a community that questions its own legitimacy is legitimate" (155). See Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Inoperative Community* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991). The efficacy of this skeptical approach to communal identity is questionable from a Native perspective, especially when considering the oppressive conditions faced by Indigenous peoples in the Americas.

15. Gerald McMaster, "Living on Reservation X," in *Reservation X*, ed. Gerald McMaster, 19–30 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 19.

16. McMaster, "Living on Reservation X," 22, 19.

17. For an overview of the history of Native dislocation and the status of Na-

tive land claims see Ward Churchill, "The Earth Is Our Mother: Struggles for American Indian Land and Liberation in the Contemporary United States," in *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance*, ed. M. Annette Jaimes, 139–88 (Boston: South End Press, 1992). For a discussion of the establishment of community-based museums in the United States by immigrant communities, see Moira G. Simpson, "Remembering Homeland," in *Making Representations: Museums in the Post-Colonial Era* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 81–106.

18. McMaster, "Living on Reservation X," 21.

19. Kwon, *One Place after Another*, 52.

20. On the Western production of the concepts of authenticity and primitivism, see Shelly Errington, *The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998). For an analysis of authenticity and contemporary Aboriginal art, see Marcia Langton, "Dreaming Art," in *Complex Entanglements: Art, Globalisation, and Cultural Difference*, ed. Nikos Papastergiadis, 42–56 (Sydney: Rivers Oram Press, 2003). Langton argues that the representation of landscapes within various Native art practices, including those by traditional Aboriginal desert painters, form a genre that requires a different scope of reception, one mindful of an Indigenous perspective. For an analysis of the ideological implication of this genre in Australia see Geoff Levitus, ed., *Lying about the Landscape* (Sydney: Craftsman House, 1997). I am grateful to Ian McLean for bringing Langton's article to my attention.

21. Ian McClean, "Postcolonial Traffic: William Kentridge and Aboriginal Desert Painters" *Third Text* 17, no. 3 (2003): 239–40.

22. McClean, "Postcolonial Traffic," 228.

23. McClean, "Postcolonial Traffic," 228.

24. McLean goes on to complicate this distinction by concluding that "we need to be wary of a postcolonial primitivism inherited from modernist times that precludes the Indigenous from the postcolonial." McLean, "Postcolonial Traffic," 240.

25. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999), 74. See Peter Nabokov, ed., *Sacred Land Reader* (La Honda CA: Sacred Land Film Project, 2002), for an overview of issues dealing with Native religions in relation to sites considered sacred.

26. For an overview of the complicated development of Native representation in museums see Janet C. Berlo and Ruth B. Phillips, "'Our (Museum) World Turned Upside Down': Re-presenting Native American Arts," *Art Bulletin* 77, no. 1 (1995): 6–10.

27. Cited in James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1997), 192.

28. Clifford, *Routes*, 213.
29. Clifford, *Routes*, 210.
30. Clifford, "Four Northwest Coast Museums," in Clifford, *Routes*, 107–45.
31. Repatriation, which can be described as the re-siting of cultural objects to their proper place, has been a long struggle for many Native communities who have lost their cultural treasures through unethical collecting. On repatriation, see Devon A. Mihesuah, ed. *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000); Ann M. Tweedie, *Drawing Back Culture: The Makah Struggle for Repatriation* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002); Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush, eds. *Claiming the Stones/Naming the Bones: Cultural Property and the Negotiation of National and Ethnic Identity* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2002).
32. Clifford, "Four Northwest Coast Museums," 126.
33. National Museum of the American Indian press release dated September 3, 2004.
34. Diana Fuss, *Identification Papers* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 2.