

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Museums and California Indians: Contemporary Issues

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/23x635jr>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 21(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Guida, Marilyn

Publication Date

1997-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Museums and California Indians: Contemporary Issues

MARILYN GUIDA

Museum exhibits about Indians almost always draw an enthusiastic audience, but how did the personal belongings of Indian people come to be in museums? What do Indian people think of museum exhibits about their cultures? What do Indians think a museum's responsibilities should be to the people whose culture it collects, displays, and interprets? This paper will provide an historical overview of the history of collection, display, and interpretation of Native peoples and their material culture in museums, and summarize what has been learned about the contemporary opinions of California Indian people on the subject of such museum activities. The terms *Native* and *Indian* are used interchangeably in this paper.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The precontact indigenous cultures of California are not known to have had a tradition of collection and display that is comparable to the Western museum tradition. By the time Alta California was colonized by the Spanish, the Western tradition of collection and display was well established. A review of this tradition may shed some light on the changing ways that

Marilyn Guida began her association with California Indian people in 1988 while working as an archeologist. She holds a master's degree in anthropology and in museum studies, and is currently curator of education at the Haggin Museum in Stockton, California.

indigenous California material culture has been conceptualized and used within the Western museum tradition, and serve as a backdrop for California Indian's contemporary opinions about museums.

From early times, Western hegemony was expressed not only directly through conquest of territories and domination of indigenous peoples, but also indirectly through the collection and display of objects from conquered peoples and territories. The origins of the Western museum tradition may be traced to Roman times when the objects belonging to conquered peoples were publicly displayed. During the European Middle Ages (circa eleventh to fourteenth centuries) objects acquired from conquered peoples were held in private collections, including those of political and religious leaders.¹ These objects were of interest not only for reasons of nationalistic pride, but also simply as aesthetic objects, exotica, and curiosities. For example, Prince Francesco I de' Medici had private rooms (or cabinets) for storage and display of many kinds of curiosities, including those labeled "exotica"—objects from Africa, Asia, and the Americas.² From the sixteenth century, European museums and homes of royalty and aristocracy became the repositories of collections resulting from exploration and domination of the Native cultures of the Western Hemisphere. These collections were created primarily for nationalistic reasons, which have been characterized as (1) to procure evidence of what had been discovered and conquered, (2) to illustrate the usefulness of exploration, (3) to promote continued interest in exploration, (4) to document the need for missionary work, and (5) to illustrate rare works by humans from around the globe.³

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a shift of social values in European society included an expanding interest in the natural world and the development of scientific inquiry. The transition of collections and museums from private to public institutions began during this period. It was also during this time that objects from the indigenous cultures of the Americas were included in natural history collections. For example, a 1656 Oxford University collection catalogue included reference to a cloak belonging to "Pohatan, King of Virginia" which was "embroidered with shells or Roanoke."⁴

Marking the early beginnings of anthropological collections, Hans Sloane's collection of the mid-1700s, which became the basis of the British Museum's collection, is considered the first ethnographic collection to be based on firsthand field data.⁵

Just as the Linnaean system of classification revolutionized the organization of natural history collections, the Thomsen and Worsaae "Three Age System" (stone, bronze, iron) initiated a revolution in typological classifications of ethnographic materials. Using Lyell's concept of chronological stratigraphy in geology and Darwin's theory of evolution, Augustus Henry Pitt Rivers created the first typological analysis of material culture. Pitt Rivers' system proposed an evolutionary progression of forms and social development from simple to complex.⁶ Within this system, California's precontact cultures are placed in the Stone Age, and would be considered more primitive than cultures that had developed bronze or iron tools and objects.

Natural history specimens, including objects originated by the indigenous peoples of the Americas, were among the first objects to be collected and displayed in the United States. For example, the Charleston Library Society's museum, thought to be the first museum established in the United States, included in its earliest collections an Indian hatchet, a Hawaiian helmet, a cassava basket from Surinam, and the bones of Native peoples.⁷ American Indian objects were also collected by the earliest historical societies in the United States. The American Philosophical Society, founded by Benjamin Franklin in 1743, and the American Antiquarian Society, established in 1812, were initiated by scientists and intellectuals of the time who took a strong interest in representing the indigenous cultures of the Western Hemisphere. Early collectors, among them judges, doctors, and foreign ministers, donated to these societies objects removed from the graves and burial mounds of Native peoples. The research and collections of the American Antiquarian Society contributed to the emerging field of American anthropology from the 1830s to the 1880s. Eventually their collections were transferred to the Smithsonian Institution, the Peabody Museum, and other museums.⁸

In California, Spanish, Russian, English, and French explorers and colonists began collecting immediately upon contact with Native peoples. As a result, California Indian material culture may be found in museums worldwide. Apparently not untypical of early collecting practices is this account by Vane:

In the 1870s, a couple of Frenchmen, for example, loaded literally tons of stone and bone tools, ornamental items, and other artifacts from sites on the islands off Santa Barbara

and sailed away with them to the Museum of Man in Paris and other French museums, where a number of them are still to be found.⁹

In the eighteenth century, the natural history museum that combined organic and manmade objects gave way to a separation of objects considered as "art" from those considered to be natural history specimens. Museums began to arrange objects to emphasize their aesthetic qualities as well as their scientific value. Displays of American Indian projectile points arranged by size, often in a circular pattern or some design which appealed to the collector, are still seen today. Also during this period objects belonging to specific peoples began to be interpreted through writings and illustrations showing ways of life. Exhibits began to show groupings of objects by country or place of origin, a departure from the natural history exhibit style in which objects were arranged by ornamental patterns and symmetry.¹⁰

The next major development in the display of cultures began with culture history arrangements in Swiss and German museums in the nineteenth century. A step toward a new style of interpretation was taken by Artur Hazelius, a Swede, who was motivated by a desire to preserve the distinctive Scandinavian ways of living that preceded the Industrial Revolution. He created a museum "devoted to the everyday life of the Scandinavian folk" in 1873, and opened an outdoor museum, Skansen, in 1891. This outdoor museum is what today would be called a living museum as it "employed craftsmen, musicians, dancers, and interpreters to bring the whole folk village to life." It is important to emphasize that this folk museum was a museum created by Scandinavians about Scandinavians. It was intended as a celebration of national heritage.¹¹

The term *living museum* has been used in the 1990s by California Indian people who describe it as the ideal type of museum for interpreting Native California cultures. However, their concept of a living museum, in contrast to Skansen, would strongly emphasize contemporary life and its continuity with the past.¹²

Yet another step in the evolution of museum displays of Native cultures was the series of world fairs, starting in London in 1851. Many world fairs presented living cultures from around the world using a lavish exhibition style on a spectacular scale. For example, an exhibition in Amsterdam in

1883 and the World's Fair in Paris in 1891 presented African, Southeast Asian, and Asian cultures represented by people living in recreated Native settings complete with the housing, clothing, foods, music, arts, and customs of their homelands.¹³ In these exhibitions, surely, nationalistic purposes motivated the display of peoples controlled by colonial political systems.

At the start of the twentieth century, the shortcomings of the previous systems of classification and display of indigenous cultures were becoming apparent. In their place, a contextual approach gained acceptance. A new form of display was developed to illustrate contextual groupings. In natural history, the habitat group was used to illustrate the animal functioning in its home territory. In history and art, the historic period room came into favor. In the interpretation of human cultures, the new contextual orientation meant seeing human communities as functioning wholes.¹⁴

The evolution of contextual displays of ethnographic life groups in holistic settings moved forward as a result of two new ideas. One was the creation of commercial waxworks exhibits in London dating to 1842, providing the initial technology for creating representations of the human body. Another was the presentation of "living pictures or tableaux" presented by Artur Hazelius at the Museum of Scandinavian Ethnography in 1873 and at the 1878 Paris exposition, which provided a contextual template for creating displays of human cultures. The form was quickly adopted in the United States, first by Otis Mason of the Smithsonian Institution's U.S. National Museum, who saw a "village encampment of tribal peoples" at the 1889 Paris Fair and used this display technique in an 1895 exhibit for the Cotton State Exposition in Atlanta. Franz Boas used this style of display at the American Museum of Natural History. Later, at the New York State Museum at Albany, a Seneca man, Arthur C. Parker, designed and created displays of Iroquois Indian life groups which opened in 1915.¹⁵ (This may be one of the first examples of the direct involvement of an individual of Native American heritage in portraying his own people in a museum.)

Mason and Boas represent two opposing methods of analysis and interpretation of human cultures. Mason's view was fundamentally evolutionary, typological, and functional while Boas was concerned that the meaning an object carried in a culture be determined through research and illustrated in exhibits. Boas did not support the social evolutionist position that

human cultures had advanced from primitive to complex; instead he advocated that "our people are not the only carriers of civilization, but that the human mind has been creative everywhere." These two different approaches were found in contemporaneous displays at the Smithsonian Institution and the American Museum of Natural History for many years.¹⁶

TODAY'S MUSEUMS AND NATIVE PEOPLES

Today's museums have inherited the complex legacy of at least five centuries of collection, display, and interpretation of Native cultures by the Western world. In any given museum around the world displaying Native cultures today it is possible to see any or all of the previously mentioned interpretive approaches, that of nationalistic hegemony, natural history scientism, aestheticism, historical folklore, and the world fair type of spectacle.

At the turn of the twentieth century, a new type of museum, the anthropological museum, evolved as a natural consequence of the desire to understand Native peoples in context. Anthropological museums came into existence with the creation of the field of anthropology in Europe and North America in the late 1880s. One of the first instances in which a museum began a new kind of relationship with the people whose culture it collects and exhibits may have occurred in the 1960s when the National Museum of Anthropology in Mexico City involved the skilled craftsmen of Mexico's indigenous cultures in the construction of ethnographic displays.¹⁷

Peoples whose cultures have been represented in museums without their involvement may think of museums as part of a systematic effort to separate them from their cultural heritage and objectify them as individuals and tribes.¹⁸ Native Americans today are questioning not only museum display techniques, but the right of museums to hold the cultural patrimony of their peoples. For many indigenous peoples, museums represent the domination and theft of their cultures. Native peoples are reclaiming their right to name themselves and to present their cultures with the content and in the context they choose.¹⁹

Beyond the right to name oneself are more subtle points. There are cultural differences that can't be fully explained or understood by someone of a different culture. Nations as well

as individuals claim the right to withhold information about themselves. From the Native point of view, there are limits to sharing that ought to be respected.²⁰ The question of how museums are interpreting other cultures and how these other cultures wish to be interpreted is actively being discussed and debated in the museum field today. As one anthropologist posited the questions: Are we speaking *for* others, *about* them, or *with* them? Are we learning *about* others or *from* them?²¹

These important considerations and the lack of consistent efforts by museums to involve indigenous peoples may have been some of the factors stimulating the establishment of tribal museums in the United States. Nationwide there are fifty-three tribal museums. These museums give Native Americans the advantage of telling their story in their own way, handling their material culture according to their own standards, and reaping the economic advantages of tourism.²² In the latter half of the twentieth century, California Indians began establishing their own museums. Each of these museums has a purpose similar to that expressed by Ivadelle Mowery when describing the Sierra Mono Museum:

...dedicated not only to preserving the past, but representing contemporary values, and educating and sensitizing students and visitors about past and present Indian life, and planning for the future of the North Fork Mono.²³

The best contrast to the conceptualization of Native cultures in the Western museum tradition is the conceptualization of the indigenous cultures of the Americas presented by the new National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI), part of the Smithsonian Institution. The key interpretive principals that are expected to underlie the work of NMAI are that (1) contemporary Native peoples, while living in the present, maintain a genuine connection and continuity with their past material culture; (2) NMAI "needs to be proactive in making cultural material, information, and human resources available and accessible" to Indian people; (3) Native people must be present, and their voices and viewpoints must be incorporated into interpretation of collections; and (4) "the unfiltered Native voice, [must be systematically used] on the exhibition floor, in public programming, and through new approaches to scholarship that are more inclusive and collaborative."²⁴

CONTEMPORARY CALIFORNIA INDIANS AND MUSEUM ISSUES

Recognizing the importance of the Native voice and viewpoint, this paper summarizes a variety of Native California points of view about museums, identifies some of the contributions Native Californians can make to museums, and encourages increased collaboration between museums and California Indian people.²⁵ This information is needed because California Indian voices have been absent from most museum exhibits, interpretive materials, and programming about their cultures. Moreover, relatively few people within California seem to know that California Indians still exist. California Indians are even more unknown outside of California.

The viewpoints presented here are the exact words by which California Indian people have expressed their thoughts and perspectives. These viewpoints were derived from public testimony and interviews. Public testimony was taken from meetings held by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and the National Park Service (NPS) in 1990.²⁶ Interviews were conducted by the author in 1995. Names of specific museums have been disguised in some instances.

MUSEUMS TEND TO LEAVE INDIANS IN THE PAST

A number of California Natives have expressed concern about how people may perceive them as a result of viewing museum exhibits. Many exhibits tend to focus entirely on precontact material culture and lifeways. When exhibits fail to mention that California Indian people still exist and partake fully in American life today while carrying on their traditions, the impression remains that California Indian cultures are dead. As the following quotation shows, California Indian people are aware of this situation and are working to overcome it.

One of the things that we're trying to overcome in museums I've looked at is the impression that we're a dead culture, that we're no longer alive, that this is something ancient and old and part of history, but not something continuing and alive today. Most of them [museums] don't show the culture as the living vibrant culture that it is.²⁷

INDIAN IDENTITY ISSUES

California Indians are people whose ancestors were the indigenous people of the land we now call California. The California Indian people quoted here are people who self-identify as California Indians as a result of descent and ancestry, as well as upbringing and cultural identity. Second, those quoted are recognized as California Indians by other California Indians. Third, those quoted have taken an active role in representing their culture by giving testimony at public hearings, demonstrating their cultural knowledge at public events, and writing about their culture for public distribution.

The question of Indian identity is a complex one.²⁸ Its complexity arises out of the diversity of cultures in precontact California and the history of Indian-white relations. For many years anyone identified as a California Indian could be killed on the spot. In later years, being identified as California Indian could mean that children were separated from their parents, that individuals were denied even the most menial of jobs and were jailed for vagrancy.²⁹

Today California Indian people still suffer from this legacy of genocide and discrimination. Some people have only recently been willing to admit their ancestry. Others are just finding out about the Indian side of the family. In some cases, Indian people took on the identity of Spanish-speaking people in order to protect themselves from the more severe stigma associated with being Indian. The following selection of quotes speaks to these issues of identity.

People from the east think there were no Indians in California, that they were Mexicans.³⁰

I became an Indian in the last two years because you were not supposed to be an Indian where I come from (Geyserville).³¹

Children would say, "But what about real Indians?" and they are talking to their parents and grandparents who are real Indians, because they cannot make the transition from before until now.³²

INADEQUATE MUSEUM INTERPRETATIONS OF INDIAN CULTURES

The public testimony and interviews indicate a wide-ranging variety of California Indian viewpoints on museums. Overall, there was a great deal of consistency among the points of view. One of the clearest messages was that current interpretations of California Indian cultures in many museums are inadequate. Native people have indicated that museum exhibits are inadequate because they tend to simplify and trivialize Native cultures. They keep Native people in the past and are often inaccurate and one-sided. Staff and docents often lack sensitivity and depth of understanding. California Indian people have clearly stated that such inadequacies negatively influence public opinion about Indians and that they harm Indian self-identity and self-esteem. The following quotes substantiate these points:

Growing up and reading the history books it was always that we lost, we were beat, we were conquered, we were annihilated. In the treaty signing period of 1850 we controlled California, we controlled this area because we controlled...cattle drives from southern California to northern California. The mountain Indians and the Monos went clear to the coast and raided the missions....These things are pretty important to us, when we read that kind of information it makes us a little more proud of who we are, that we didn't just stand around and get beat up by the Spanish and Americans as they came through.³³

I remember traveling to visit the ABC museum when I was in the fourth grade. I remember being somewhat ashamed of how [our culture] was pictured, kind of embarrassed.... One of my goals was, someday after I'd gotten my degree, I was going to go back and redo the whole ABC museum. I wanted to reinterpret it so that when Native American people went in there they could be proud of what they saw, and it would be something they'd want to share with other people.³⁴

Some non-Indians think they are the "new Indians." This attitude is dangerous and an affront to Indian people. Some persons are so inflated with their book knowledge about Indians that they feel they don't have to consult Indians about the true character of Indian cultures.... Indians are

tired of others misappropriating their cultural heritage. We should not stand by naively and allow a new generation of docents and other brokers of Indian knowledge to commit injustice to ancient aboriginal peoples.³⁵

MUSEUM RESPONSIBILITIES TO NATIVE COMMUNITIES

In spite of these shortcomings, Native people place a high value on the Native material culture and information held by museums. They respect museum scholars for their knowledge, and they believe that by having this knowledge museums have a responsibility to give something back to the Native community.

There are a number of ways in which Native people would like to be served by museums. These are summarized below and followed by an illustrative quotation.

California Indian people would like to be provided with educational programs about their cultures for Indian youth and adults. A number of people pointed out the need within the Indian community for information about their cultures that has been lost to the Indian community through assimilation and acculturation. These conditions are the backdrop for the following comment:

The fact is that some of our own people don't know the culture or story. If you tell the story, it should be to everyone. A lot of our children don't know they are Indians. Our own people need to be re-educated.³⁶

California Indian people would like to have access to their material cultures for purposes of replication and identification of objects belonging to or made by members of the family and/or tribe. The very simple step of making contact with a museum's local Indian community and offering individuals an opportunity to view the museum's collection of the local tribe(s)' material culture privately could start a productive collaboration. An example of this kind of collaboration is illustrated in the following quotation:

They're [the Clarke Museum in Eureka] very cooperative with Native people, at least when I've been there, as far as bringing out things for them to examine and look at, so that

if they want to replicate, or if they want to make some things that they don't have access to, they're given that kind of access.... There are more people going back and researching their culture and trying to retrieve their culture. So they're having to work with museums to do this.³⁷

California Indians are aware of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). They would like to see museums go beyond the legal requirements of NAGPRA, to consider loaning back to Native communities objects needed to carry out their traditions and ceremonies that are dependent on specific objects. This quote expresses that concern:

Remember each item has its own individual soul. When a dress was made it was made to dance and it cries if they are not used. Consider making these things available for lending. Let them be repaired when they break.³⁸

California Indian people believe museums have a responsibility to educate the non-Indian community about the positive aspects of Native cultures and to counter the common myths and stereotypes about Indians held by the public. If Indian material culture is important enough to be in a museum, contemporary Indian people should be honored in a similar way. Instead, Indian people observe that the larger society ignores their social problems and has no understanding of their values. This contradiction is expressed in the following quotation:

The idea of an Indian living in the society, holding a job, providing for their families, not being on welfare, people do not understand that. In regard to Indian cultures, honor is not mentioned. The whole system of honor, of being absolutely responsible for your acts.³⁹

California Indian people wish to be acknowledged as Native scholars of their cultures and as equals. They want to be included in museum research projects. The following quotation expresses that concern:

Even [among] historians today and anthropologists and many scholarly people, Indian people are not thought of as scholars. Only in recent years I've heard of a few people begin to call Indians as scholars even if they don't have a Ph.D.⁴⁰

California Indian people believe that they should be compensated as scholars, demonstrators, collections consultants, and so forth. They have found that their knowledge and experience is sought after without the accompanying financial reward which is accorded non-Indian scholars and experts. The following quotation gives a sense of this situation:

If I go to a meeting, such as for the Crocker Art Museum basket show, they pay you per diem and a fee. They tell you ahead of time. I think that's showing respect. This other way, you're just an Indian, you don't need any pay.⁴¹

California Indians believe that museums should give something back—economically—to the Native communities whose cultures are being used to sell admission tickets to the museum. The complex history of the acquisition of California Indian collections by museums tends to disguise the fact that many objects were taken from living peoples, dug out of village and burial sites without permission, extorted from individuals, or taken at a reduced value. The legacy of this history today accrues to museums. Indian people are beginning to raise the moral issue of the legitimacy of this situation, and to ask that local Native communities derive some benefit from a museum's use of their cultural patrimony. The following quotation expresses this concern:

When you have a dress that is displayed, what comes back to my people when that is displayed on a daily basis? We want to see something go back to the tribes.⁴²

California Indians would like museums to inform the public about contemporary California Indian issues. These issues include social and health conditions and efforts to continue traditions. Basketmakers are working with the Forest Service and Park Service to reduce herbicide use in basketry gathering areas, yet the public knows little of this and how vital it is to a continued basketry tradition. From the Indian point of view, museums have very little value if they ignore or disguise reality. One individual expressed this concern in the following way:

I know there is no way of stopping these museums.... We have gathered all these things. Who cares if people are going hungry or dying of alcoholism, or their children aren't

learning? We have all this stuff and we can learn about how they used to be. We do not want to acknowledge the damage we have done to them and the lives they are forced to live now. This is what I see a museum as, I see it as a way out, for people to forget.⁴³

California Indians would like museums to inform the public about laws that protect Indian sites and the penalties for pot-hunting, that is, damaging sites and removing objects. State laws protecting Indian sites are violated frequently, violations are often not vigorously prosecuted, and convicted violators often receive minor penalties. Because there is a high level of interest in Indian sites among the general public, the provision of basic information about the gravity of the situation and the damage it does to the culture of living people would be a valuable service. The following quotation sums up this feeling:

In the museum there should be a law that says it is a felony to take artifacts. It should be in there.⁴⁴

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE MUSEUM FIELD

On the basis of the public testimony, interviews, and research summarized here and presented in the author's master's project, the following recommendations are submitted to the museum community.

A museum should always be guided by consultations with its local Native California community in regard to Native collections, displays, and programming. But before initiating contacts with the local Indian community, administrators and managers should be committed to the process of collaboration, prepared to be responsive to the concerns of Native people, and willing to work out differences. Staff must have the flexibility needed to conduct cross-cultural collaboration. Interest in and openness to Native people must be evident in every level of the museum, from board to staff to volunteers to guards and security personnel.

Museums should begin a dialogue with their local Native California community. Museum staff should meet as many people as possible and include as many segments of the community as possible. A diversity of viewpoints will be found

even in a small community. Indian people recommend that a museum should never rely only on one individual as an adviser.

Museums should develop policies addressing the collaboration process. Indian people should be involved in developing these policies with museum staff. Policies should address administration, interpretation, collaboration, collections, exhibition and display, programming, and other issues of concern in each community. Especially important are policies on hiring Native people, Native access to Native collections, openness to alternatives in the content and interpretation of exhibits, presentations on contemporary Indian life and culture, and willingness to loan and repatriate objects.

Museum staff should eliminate any references that promote stereotypes in museum galleries, exhibits, interpretive materials, and gift shop merchandise. Many museums don't appear to clean their Indian exhibits on a regular basis. Indian people notice these dusty, dirty exhibits and find that it reflects a museum's attitude toward Indian cultures as dead cultures. Exhibits and written materials should bring California Indian life and cultures up to date.

Exhibits and interpretive materials should not leave Indians in the past, as so many museums do. Contemporary Indian life can be included through recent photographs of cultural events, showcasing local Indian family genealogies, showing local Indian cultural arts and fine arts (both traditional and non-traditional), and offering items for sale in the museum gift shop that are made by local Native people and identified as such.

Educational materials and programs should be revised in collaboration with the local Native California community. Educational opportunities should be extended to Indian youth and adults. A museum should organize public forums and events that explore contemporary issues which affect both the Native and non-Native communities.

Those who plan to work with Native people should fully inform themselves about the cultural diversity of precontact California, the history of Indian/non-Indian relations in California, and contemporary Native California issues. This is a critical aspect of relationships with Native California Indians. Native people would consider it a sign of respect if museum staff are aware of the same history and realities of Indian life that are common knowledge in the Indian community.

CONCLUSION

This has been an effort to tie the history of museums and their treatment of Native cultures to the contemporary carriers of those cultures. It is a reflection of the new openness in the museum world that many museums in California are already incorporating the Native viewpoint into their planning and exhibition process. Many other museums, as the testimony presented here indicates, have not considered the benefits of listening to the Native viewpoint. The future of relations between museums and Indian people hinges on the issues and viewpoints summarized here. Working together, museums and Native peoples can jointly develop a new view of museology in which the reality of cultural differences is not a barrier but an opening to mutual understanding and respect.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

This paper is based on my 1995 master's project, titled *Viewing Museums through California Indian Eyes: A Compilation of Contemporary Native Viewpoints with Suggestions for Joint Collaboration*, for the Department of Museum Studies, John F. Kennedy University, Orinda, California. The ethical guidelines of the American Anthropological Association, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Oral History Association were followed in conducting the work for the master's project on which this paper is based. Advice about appropriate traditional standards of behavior was sought from Native people and people knowledgeable about the Native community. Verbal and written disclosure about the purposes and potential uses of the work was made to each person who was quoted. Each person was asked to sign either a release or notification form indicating that they understood and accepted the educational and scholarly uses of the project.

A prototype of a report to the public entitled *California Indians Speak Out About Museums* was included within the master's project. In this report, quotations of fifty California Indian people are organized into six topical areas of importance to museums; these are administration, collections, interpretation, exhibition and display, collaboration, and programming. The report also includes the map *Tribal Areas of California* and suggestions for how to develop collaborative contacts with

California Indians. Those wishing to obtain a copy of this document should correspond with the author at the following address: 1806 Elmwood Avenue, Stockton, California 95204.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to Clarence Brown, Vivien Hailstone, Ron Goode, Kathy Wallace, and many other Indian people who were willing to collaborate with me and on this and other projects.

NOTES

1. Edward P. Alexander, *Museums in Motion* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1979), 5-15.
2. Giuseppe Olmi, "Science-Honour-Metaphor: Italian Cabinets of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 5; Susan Pearce, *Museums, Objects, and Collections: A Cultural Study* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992), 87; Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor, "Introduction," in *The Origins of Museums*, 1-4; Elisabeth Scheicher, "The Collection of Archduke Ferdinand II at Schloss Abras: Its Purpose, Composition and Evolution," in *The Origins of Museums*, 32-35.
3. Christian F. Feest, "American Indians and Ethnographic Collecting in Europe," *Museum Anthropology* 16 (1) (February 1992): 7-11.
4. Alexander, *Museums in Motion*, 41-50.
5. J.C.H. King, "North American Ethnography in the Collection of Sir Hans Sloane," in *The Origins of Museums* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 233.
6. Andrew Sherratt, ed., *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Archaeology* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1980), 17-19.
7. Alexander, *Museums in Motion*, 41-48.
8. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., Clifford K. Shipton, John C. Ewers, Louis L. Tucker, and Wilcomb E. Washburn, *A Cabinet of Curiosities: Five Episodes in the Evolution of American Museums* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1967), 1-48; Alexander, *Museums in Motion*, 35-48.
9. Sylvia Brakke Vane, "California Indians, Historians, and Ethnographers," *California History* 71(3) (Fall 1992): 324-341.
10. Feest, "American Indians and Ethnographic Collecting," 10.
11. Alexander, *Museums in Motion*, 84-85.
12. California Department of Parks and Recreation, *California Indian Museum Study* (Sacramento: Department of Parks and Recreation, October 1991), 62-79; Lee Davis, Ralph Miguelena, Paul Apodaca, Deanna Marquart,

and Don Koue, *Report of the California Indian Museum Consultants* (Sacramento: California Department of Parks and Recreation, 1991).

13. Alexander, *Museums in Motion*, 11, 30, 63, 66, 84, 172, 175.

14. Susan Pearce, *Museums, Objects, and Collections: A Cultural Study* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992), 109-110.

15. Pearce, *Museums, Objects, and Collections*, 109-110; George Stocking Jr., *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 81-83; George Hamel, telephone conversation with author, 11 April 1995.

16. Ira Jacknis, "Franz Boas and Exhibits," in *Objects and Others* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1985), 79-83, 107.

17. Alexander, *Museums in Motion*, 58-60.

18. Richard Handler, "On Having a Culture: Nationalism and the Preservation of Quebec's Patrimoine," in *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1985), 193-94.

19. Handler, "On Having A Culture," *Objects and Others*, 193; Ovide Mercredi, Rosie Mosquito, and Konrad Sioui, "To the Source: First Nations Circle on the Constitution," in "The Politics of Difference: Other Voices in a Not Yet Post-Colonial World," Michael M. Ames, *Museum Anthropology* 18(3): 10-13; Loretta Todd, "Notes on Appropriation," *Parallogramme* 16(1): 24-32.

20. Ames, "The Politics of Difference," 12-13.

21. Ann Lane Hedlund, "Speaking For or About Others? Evolving Ethnological Perspectives," *Museum Anthropology* 18(3): 32-43.

22. California Department Parks and Recreation, *California Indian Museum Study*, 72-73; Patricia L. Parker, *Keepers of the Treasures: Protecting Historic Properties and Cultural Traditions on Indian Lands* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1990), ii.

23. Ivadelle Mowery, "The Sierra Mono Museum," *News from Native California* 1(6) (1988): 14.

24. Quoted in W. Richard West, Jr., "The National Museum of the American Indian Perspectives on Museums in the 21st Century," *Museum Anthropology* 18(3) (October 1994): 53-55.

25. Marilyn R. Guida, "Viewing Museums Through California Indian Eyes: A Compilation of Contemporary Viewpoints with Suggestions for Joint Collaboration," M.A. Thesis, John F. Kennedy University, Orinda, CA, 1995.

26. California Department Parks and Recreation, *Statewide Indian Museum Possibility*. Complete transcripts, rough drafts, transcribed by Joan Mason, 1990.

27. Kathy Wallace (Karuk, Yurok, member of the Hoopa Valley Tribe), interview 30 May 1995.

28. Jack D. Forbes, *Native Americans of California and Nevada* (Healdsburg, CA: Naturegraph Publishers, 1969), 122-129.

29. Forbes, *Native Americans*, 52-94.

30. Ron Goode (North Fork Mono/Nium), North Fork, DPR public meeting, 15 August 1990.

31. George Somersall (tribe uncertain), Ukiah, DPR public meeting, 20 August 1990.
32. Joe Giovannetti (Smith River Rancheria of Howenguet Indians/Tolowa), Eureka, DPR public meeting, 21 August 1990.
33. Ron Goode (North Fork Mono/Nium), interview, 6 June 1995.
34. Kathy Wallace (Karuk, Yurok, member of the Hoopa Valley Tribe), interview, 30 May 1995.
35. Joe Giovannetti (Smith River Rancheria of Howenguet Indians/Tolowa), Eureka, DPR public meeting, 21 August 1990; expanded remarks, 25 August 1995.
36. Clarence Brown (Kumeyaay), Bishop, DPR public meeting, 16 August 1990.
37. Kathy Wallace (Karuk, Yurok, member Hoopa Valley Tribe), interview 30 May 1995.
38. Speaker and tribe uncertain, Eureka, DPR public meeting, 21 August 1990.
39. Genevieve Seely (Wiyot), Redding, DPR public meeting, 22 August 1990.
40. Ron Goode (North Fork Mono/Nium), interview, 6 June 1995.
41. Vivien Hailstone (Yurok, Karuk, member Hoopa Valley Tribe), interview, 8 July 1995.
42. Anonymous comment, San Jose, DPR public meeting, 11 September 1990.
43. Patsy Gomez (Santa Ynez Band Chumash), Santa Barbara, DPR public meeting, 18 July 1990.
44. Clarence Brown (Kumeyaay), Redding, DPR public meeting, 22 August 1990.