Collections Care Informed by Native American Perspectives

Teaching the Next Generation

Jennifer Shannon

Curator and Associate Professor of Cultural Anthropology, University of Colorado Museum of Natural History, Boulder, CO; jshannon@colorado.edu

Abstract Through repatriation consultations, collaborative exhibitions, and research projects with Native peoples, anthropology curators and collections managers are learning different interpretations of best practice in the care of Native American collections. In this case study of the Museum and Field Studies (MFS) program at the University of Colorado, Boulder, we review the practice and potential of bringing those perspectives to bear on the next generation of anthropology collections managers. Through examples of traditional care, exhibits, course work, and student projects, we show how Native peoples are influencing how we think about and care for museum collections. We illustrate future collections managers' increasing sense of purpose and excitement toward working with Native peoples and reimagining the museum to be a resource for increasing Native community well-being and a welcoming place for alternative ways of seeing and relating to the collections in their care.

In the United States, managing collections that originated in Native American communities means addressing the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA, 1990). NAGPRA mandates that museums consult with U.S. federally recognized tribes to determine cultural affiliation of items and Native ancestors or human remains in museum collections. As more Native peoples are entering and interacting with us in the museum for NAGPRA and other reasons, we are exposed to different perspectives on the items in our care and changing how we go about our work. Through the teachings of Indigenous peoples and with their participation in the museum, their representations and our practices have changed.

Collections: A Journal for Museum and Archives Professionals, Volume 13, Numbers 3/4
Summer/Fall 2017, pp. 205–224.

I highlight these changes and how we teach them to the next generation through examples of our collection management practices, course work, and student mentoring in the MFS graduate program at the University of Colorado Museum of Natural History. This is a career-oriented program that prepares students to become collections managers, museum administrators, public program specialists, exhibit designers, and museum educators. The program trains students to manage collections in anthropology, botany, entomology, paleontology, and zoology.

Students gain hands-on experience working in the museum, which is free and open to the public (Figure 1). Teaching is at the core of our mission: "The University of Colorado Museum fosters exploration and appreciation of the natural environment and human cultures through research, teaching, and community outreach. We provide academic training for graduate students in Museum and Field Studies; build, conserve, and interpret research collections; and offer exhibits and educational programs for the University and the public." The museum has extensive collections housed in four buildings across campus and a medium-size staff.[1] Students benefit from a small incoming cohort, usually around twelve students with up to two anthropology collections management students accepted each year. Despite small numbers, throughout their careers graduates from our program act as ambassadors to the institutions in which they work. As Cara Krmpotich writes of her own collections management course, "A core objective . . . is that students develop the capacity to articulate the value of collections management: to their bosses and coworkers, and to their publics" (Krmpotich 2015, 119). We also aim for our students to develop the capacity to articulate the value of Indigenous perspectives for collections care.

Figure 1. Kerrie Iyoob in 2015 and Claire Wilbert in 2012 working with anthropology collections. Photo by author.

The museum's anthropology section is focused on teaching and practicing collections management that is informed by professional standards and by the originating communities whose collections are in our care.[2] This means not only understanding notions such as traditional care but also learning how to communicate management concerns in light of alternative perspectives on caring for Native American items and being prepared for tense or angry responses from Native peoples and how to move forward from there. Changing how we manage collections and for whom is helping us to reimagine the museum—its purpose and its future.

The History We Confront in the Museum

The former director of the National Museum of the American Indian, Rick West Jr. (Cheyenne), once said something along the lines of, We *hate* museums because they have our stuff; We *love* museums because they have our stuff. This contradiction lies at the center of contemporary museum anthropology and anthropology collections management. It points to the history, trauma, tensions, and potential of museum collections. It also shows how museums both keep safe items valued by Native peoples and house them apart from their originating communities.

Historically, both the dead and the living among Indigenous peoples were seen and treated as specimens by museums and anthropologists. In the 19th and 20th centuries, museums bought and sometimes took illegally sacred and treasured items from Native communities under duress at a time when their religious practices were outlawed and government policies were aimed at the systematic breakdown of Native American lands, families, and cultural knowledge transmission. Museums are mausoleums to Native people and their ancestors. The estimated number of Native American bodies in all U.S. university, museum, and laboratory collections is 300,000 to 600,000 (McKeown 2013, 10). Exhibits about Native Americans often made it seem like they were people of the past rather than peoples with a present and a future. And they were *treated* as if only their past was to be valued. The trauma associated with this kind of dehumanization and objectification reverberates through the generations and continues to confront us when working with Native American peoples and collections in the museum (Colwell 2017; Fine-Dare 2002; Phillips 2011; Simpson 2001).

As examples, the lives of Ishi and Minik bear witness to this history, and I often use them in teaching because they provoke visceral responses from students and get to the point of previous mind-sets using Indigenous life stories. Ishi is well known: in 1911, he walked out of the California wilderness and into a town, starving and alone. Anthropologists at the University of California brought him to their institution to study his language and cultural practices. He lived at the university, where every weekend for four years hundreds of visitors would come to watch Ishi demonstrate how to make cultural items such as arrows. After his death

and despite a letter from the curator that arrived too late, Ishi's brain was separated from his body before burial and sent to the Smithsonian National Museum. It was accession number 60884, museum number 298736 (Rockafellar n.d.).[3] The Smithsonian repatriated Ishi's brain to the Redding Rancheria and Pit River Indian Tribe of California in 2000.[4]

Minik's story is less well known but exemplifies both the mind-set of the time and the injustices to Native peoples in early museum practice. In 1897, Arctic explore Robert Peary had brought six Inuit, including Minik and his father Qisuk, from their Greenland home to the American Museum of Natural History in New York as "live specimens." They lived in the basement, and museum visitors would come to see them. The museum director had cared for Minik—even adopted him—when the other Inuit in his party had died, including his father. Minik later found out that the museum had faked his father's burial, and he had seen his father's bones on display. A *San Francisco Examiner* newspaper article from 1909 titled "Why Arctic Explorer Peary's Neglected Eskimo Boy Wants to Shoot Him" features a half-page drawing of a young Minik with hands up to shield his face from a skeleton in a glass case.[5]

Given this history, the fact that so many Native people are now working with museums is no minor accomplishment.[6] This sea change has been achieved through Native activism and demand for access, important laws like NAGPRA, and the concerted efforts of museum staff to engage in collaborative work and repurpose for whom and for what museum collections are used (see Shannon n.d.).

Collections Management and Embodied Practice

There is no substitute for learning by doing. A focus on embodied practice emphasizes that it is not just what we think or believe that matters but also how we behave and what we do. And our bodily movements, including actions and language, influence our ways of thinking, seeing, and being—sometimes in ways of which we are not immediately aware. When we comply with instructions and practice traditional care, for example, we are embodying a set of values in our relations to Native peoples and to the items in our care.[7]

One example of our changing and embodied practices in the museum, as a result of our increasing interactions with Native peoples, is our language. We address Native peoples not as specimens or objects of study but as experts who guide us in what is and is not appropriate to share. We talk about Native ancestors or individuals or even human remains instead of specimens. We talk about housing instead of storage. We say "items" or "objects" instead of "artifacts" or "specimens," and we sometimes refer to living beings in our collections. Changing our practices has changed how we see and relate to the items in our care. This became clear as I watched my students problem solve in their collections management work in 2013.

In our graduate program, students are exposed to both Native consultations and traditional care practices. Traditional care in the museum context means following instructions that are specific to a cultural group regarding how they define proper care for an item. For example, ritual feeding, smudging, or placing items in a certain direction (see, e.g., Canadian Conservation Institute 2015; Flynn and Hull-Walski 2001; Rosoff 1998).[8] There is no general practice of traditional care: native communities are diverse, and each must determine what is appropriate. While it would be impossible to conduct specific protocols for all the different tribes and items in our care, we teach future collections managers to value Native ways of knowing collections and to discuss with Native consultants how best to honor their requests.

When I was first hired at the museum in 2009, I was pleased to see that the collections policy for our anthropology section included a commitment to traditional care and that a robust repatriation effort was under way.[9] Although I had been learning and teaching about the importance of NAGPRA and repatriation for years, my first repatriation consultation was in 2010 with Tony Joe and Tim Begay of the Navajo Nation. We began our day sitting around a table together, sharing a meal—snacks with coffee and tea. Students participated as note takers during the consultation. I began our first meeting by asking Mr. Begay and Mr. Joe the question, "How should we proceed?" They provided guidance to lead us in a good way forward, and they allowed us to video record and share this conversation with other students for training purposes (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Navajo NAGPRA Officers Tony Joe and Tim Begay visiting the museum in 2010. Photo by author.

We had invited Mr. Begay and Mr. Joe to consult with us regarding our Navajo collections, which included medicine bundles—items often determined as sacred under NAGPRA. Through consultation, the bundles were identified as sacred, so we began the process to repatriate the bundles, or *jish* as we were taught to refer to them, to the Navajo Nation.[10] Since they would remain in our care as the legal process progressed, Mr. Joe and Mr. Begay gave us instructions in the meantime for how to properly care for the *jish*, who they consider to be living beings with thoughts and feelings. Our registrar, Stephanie Gilmore, followed their instructions for two years until the *jish* returned home. She took them out once each season for sunshine and fresh air and talked to them, letting them know what she was doing before she did so. She might say, "Hello, I am going to take you outside today for some fresh air and sunshine. We will be going down the elevator," and all the while our students were present, learning, and assisting.

Traditional care is for the items in the museum but also for the museum professionals who handle them. Before they left, the cultural specialists blessed us to protect us during future contact with these powerful items. We learned that *jish* should usually be handled only by males, so we asked if they wanted us to find a man to do the work. They said they preferred we do it because we had received the blessing. We were also instructed not to handle the items when menstruating as a matter of protection for the *jish* and ourselves. This is a common request when handling sacred items and required some unexpected workplace conversations when coordinating among our all-female staff, who were happy to comply.

I had instructed staff and students that, whether or not they share these beliefs, we should honor their requests when possible. But through the embodied practice of following through these care techniques, they started to "see" the items differently. They started to relate to and understand their work in new ways. They got a glimpse into how Native peoples might see the items in their care, too: not as inert objects but as non–human beings. And they began to better understand how different walking into a museum might feel to the Navajo (seeing sentient beings locked up, alone, painfully divorced from contact with their people). One outcome of this kind of work, as students and staff have noted, is a greater sense of purpose in the care of collections.

Learning these ways of seeing and relating to items also affects what collections staff and students do in the absence of consultation. For example, it can cause them to reconsider their received categories for museum items and change their approaches to mount making. This was revealed to me as I walked into the workroom where collections staff and student workers were discussing what to do with the "Vanuatu man." He (notice the "he," which everyone uses to refer to him) is a *rambaramp* from the Pacific island of Vanuatu, a place and a people to whom we currently have no ties or communication. It is our understanding that a *rambaramp* is an effigy of someone after death that includes his or her skull, which

is overmodeled and painted to resemble the person. The figure is placed in public in a communal men's house.

Staff and students asked, "How should we treat him? Should he be considered and treated as human remains or as a cultural item? Did he belong with the Native American ancestors getting ready for repatriation, resting in a quiet room set apart? Or did the original intent for him to be in a public space matter?" They decided to take seriously what they had learned from Native peoples in the United States and from their online research, which suggested that *rambaramps* are considered to house the spirit of the departed.[11] They created a crate that had a clear plastic panel (to see through) and two muslin panels (to breathe through). This is not traditional care; again, there are no general practices of traditional care that can be applied cross-culturally. Their actions were informed by the values associated with traditional care. It was their way of being respectful in their collections management practice toward him, toward Native peoples and what we had learned from them, and toward potential future visitors from Vanuatu.

What signaled to me profound changes happening among staff and students were their spontaneous conversations in the workroom about how they felt as they constructed the crate. I had asked if anyone had an issue with him (or human remains) being in their workroom with them. We are very sensitive to exposing people to human remains, as we know many Native people do not want to be in a room in which they are present. Students and staff said he "seemed happy" when he was around people and when in his crate, placed away from people, less so. They also felt it would not be right to place him with the disinterred people. This was not an intellectualized discussion, and I do not feel that it signaled claims to Indigenous knowledge or understanding, or an appropriation of others' beliefs. It was an outcome of embodied practice, their language choices, their labor on the crate, the intentions behind its construction, and their open minds to other ways of knowing. This conversation never could have happened without consultations—listening, being open to that kind of discussion, and honoring that feeling or voice in the back of your head that normally would have been dismissed. This shows that through changing practices, collections staff were indeed changing their relations to and ways of seeing the collections in their care.

Practicing trust is essential to this work. This means being honest, sharing concerns without intending to manipulate the decisions of others, and keeping an open mind. We can agree that we all share a concern for the welfare of the items or beings in our care. Handling by non–museum staff is welcomed if there are no known pesticide issues. For example, Navajo Museum curator Clarenda Begay, during an international project we did together, visited our museum and handled items in our collections to explain to Taiwanese visitors the uses and importance of Navajo ceremonial baskets (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Navajo Nation Museum curator Clarenda Begay visiting the museum in 2010. Photo by author.

Our collections management students also learn that their training should not be sidelined; rather, it is important to bring it to the table without suggesting that it should supersede other forms of expertise about the care of items. A great example I often share with my students is when, during a consultation, Mandan Hidatsa Arikara Nation NAGPRA officers Elgin Crows Breast and Calvin Grinnell requested that, according to cultural protocol, red cloth be placed beneath pipes housed in a drawer (Figure 4). Christina Cain, our collections manager, was open to doing so. She expressed concern that the felt might shed, snag, or catch on the items and asked if it would be appropriate to place muslin between the red felt and the items in the drawer. Mr. Crows Breast and Mr. Grinnell said that would be appropriate and still maintain its efficacy. All agreed that a braid of sweetgrass could also be added to the drawer (Figure 5). Christina did not intend to stop the placement of red felt; she merely wanted to inform them based on her training. We are teaching not that collections managers and Native peoples must work toward compromise but rather that openness and respect for different ways of knowing can lead to unanticipated new ways of practicing appropriate care.[12]

Exhibiting a Commitment to Native-Informed Museum Practice

We can reflect these values and changing practices not just in our teaching and museum work but also in the structure of the tools we use. We express our commitment to valuing Native ways of seeing and understanding collections care to Native community members and our students in the structure and editing of our collections

Figure 4. Consultation with NAGPRA Officers Calvin Grinnell and Elgin Crows Breast in 2013. From left: Calvin, author, Elgin, Stephanie Gilmore, and Christina Cain. Photo by Jan Bernstein.

Figure 5. Drawer housing pipes from the Mandan Hidatsa Arikara Nation collection with red felt, muslin, and sweetgrass. Photo by Christina Cain.

database. During the aforementioned Navajo NAGPRA consultation, we gathered around a table with a computer and large screen (Figure 6). As Mr. Joe and Mr. Begay provided Navajo terms and corrections to the record, collections manager Christina Cain edited the records. We added information, such as Navajo names for the items, in part so that Navajo individuals in the future could search for them by their known name as *jish* versus "fetish," for example. Key to our practice is demonstrating trust and following through: we did not say we will add comments later, but, rather, we invite review of us making the changes right now, in real time.

In addition, we want the structure of the database to reflect the value of Indigenous knowledge as a category of expertise. Therefore, we had added "Consultation" in our Re:discovery database as a new field for input (separate from researcher notes or NAGPRA restrictions). And we found a way for the database to accommodate respect for traditional care restrictions. We had not intended to take photos of the Navajo medicine bundles—they asked us to do so for their records and ours. And they shared knowledge about each item for our records. In our catalog, when these records come up, the photos are blocked with a message that says for viewing you must get permission from the Navajo Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office.

In short, we have shaped our tools to reflect the important idea that not everything is meant to be shared publicly—something Native peoples have insisted on for decades regarding the publication and display of sacred knowledge and materials. And now our public displays communicate this, too. If we simply remove from view something that is inappropriate for display, the public never knows that the conversation ever happened or that things are not meant to be shared. An excellent example is on display at the UBC Museum of Anthropology in Vancouver, British Columbia (Figure 7). The exhibit is in the Multiversity Galleries and

Figure 6. Editing database records at a Navajo NAGPRA consultation in 2011. From left: Tim Begay, Christina Cain, Tony Joe, and Jan Bernstein. Still from video recording by Kendall Tallmadge.

Figure 7. Exhibit at the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology in 2016. Photo by author.

features a wrapped item. Mikael Willie (Dzawada'enuxw First Nation) explains in the label that

> In our Kwak'wala language there is a word—*k'wik'waładl̲akw*—which means "things that are hidden." Traditionally, our wolf headdresses, whistles, and other objects with *'nawalakw*, or supernatural power, were put away when not being shown in ceremony. For some of our people, to have these things on display for the public is very disturbing. That's why we were invited here to the Museum to discuss this issue. Our elders had mixed feelings: some said that we should educate the people of the world by showing the masks; others said that we need to put them away properly and respectfully. I thought that one thing we might be able to do is wrap some of the masks on display. This is so that the public can understand that not everyone is meant to see these things. *G̲ilaskas'la* (thank you)!

In one small display, we learn that the museum consulted with First Nations people, prioritized their expertise, and erred on side of caution, and it shows there is a diversity of opinions on the matter.

We can also explain NAGPRA to the public; it does not have to be just a behind-the-scenes practice. For example, the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History has on display a three-dimensional replica of a Killer Whale clan crest hat (*Kéet S'aaxw*). The replica was created with the Tlingit *Dakl'aweidí* clan's permission, in part because they wanted "an exhibit that would educate the public about the importance of Tlingit crest objects and tell the story of the repatriation" (Hollinger et al. 2013).[13] In an exhibit about moccasins in our museum, we had a label next to one pair explaining they had been reviewed by 14 tribes through NAGPRA consultations. We explained briefly what NAGPRA is and that these were deemed appropriate for display. In a small exhibit about an international project involving our staff, the Navajo Nation Museum, and the Paiwan tribe of Taiwan, we included label text that detailed our process and why collaboration is important when working with and representing Indigenous peoples (Shannon 2014b).

Teaching Native-Informed Museum Practice

Our program offers standard and advanced collections management courses aimed at problem solving for all kinds of collections. We also provide courses that focus specifically on anthropology collections and Native American peoples. Students learn about appropriate language, Native protocols for restricting knowledge and images, and how to incorporate that into database structure. They also learn

about the history and meaning of museums to Indigenous peoples, and they accompany me in fieldwork and in collections research.[14]

I bring these perspectives and teachings to all my courses, even those that are not explicitly about anthropology. For example, when I teach the "Introduction to Museum and Field Studies" course that graduate students take in their first year of our program, students investigate the museum as a powerful institution in society and explore the history of museums and their changing roles and methods. We learn about all the professions in the museum, from administration to collections management to assessment, education, and design. Through the example of Native informed museum practice, we consider the museum as a European construct, and we denaturalize its assumptions not only about the democratization of knowledge but also about how to critically assess assumptions embedded in the structures of the museum, from exhibit panel voice to the fields in a collection database.

I also teach a practicum (hands-on course) in anthropology collections research that is open to anthropology undergraduate and graduate students and to museum and field studies (MFS) students (Figure 8). MFS students in this course act as both researchers and collections managers, preparing and pulling collection items for class exercises and student research access. They have produced research

Figure 8. Jesse Dutton-Kenny in the anthropology collections research class. Photo by author.

papers about, for example, Indigenous agency in collecting encounters in the Pacific, the construction and meaning of California basket hats and the artwork of contemporary Native artists, and the artistry and methods of making Plains possibles bags.

In "Introduction to Museum Anthropology," undergraduate and graduate students learn about the development of anthropology in museums from the late 19th century to the present day. Museums are seen as places where ideas, identities, theories, and power relations are debated, created, and placed on display. We explore how they are places that reflect and sometimes challenge dominant ideologies about Indigenous peoples to a wide audience and the importance of collaboration with Native peoples in museum work. For museum studies graduate students studying to be anthropology collections managers, I also provide independent reading courses with them, including "Contemporary Native North American Ethnography," which focuses on contemporary communities and their experiences both in relation to and beyond the museum, and "Curating Cultural Anthropology Collections," which addresses collections care and interpretation from a Native perspective.[15]

These courses and hands-on experience contribute to the MFS graduate students' master's projects, a requirement of their degree. Their projects demonstrate an attention to Native perspectives on collections work, and they are meant to be useful beyond their degree and even our museum. Students design them to be helpful to other museums, often making brochures, manuals, or pamphlets to hand out to museum professionals who may be interested in this kind of work.

Jesse Dutton-Kenny's "Preserving Ethnographic Basketry Collections" is based on her work with our museum's basket collection and visiting California basket collections at tribal and other museums. She created a manual and brochures about basket "preservation," conceived of in three ways: preservation of information (like in a database or catalog), preservation of materials, and preservation of access (such as online access, exhibitions, and sharing research back to the originating community). Kerrie Iyoob's project "Evaluating Microclimates within Fluctuating Environments in Museum Collections" modeled how a museum's environmental standards can be tailored to specific museum conditions and regional climates. As part of her assessment, she identified and suggested using these same research techniques on vented cabinets as a possible solution to items that are seen to be living beings that need to breathe.[16]

Claire Wilbert produced a teaching manual and participant materials for a two-day "NAGPRA Consultation Workshop," which prepares museum staff for NAGPRA consultations with tribes. Kayla Kramer's (2013) thesis illustrates the process of recovering the history of objects in museum collections with little or no provenance. She writes in her abstract that "as a type of restorative justice, the life history approach illustrates an example of decolonizing museum practice . . . creating an object biography is about responsible stewardship and curation, engaging communities and creating new contacts, and ultimately connecting objects, stories, and people" (15). For the "quillwork outfit," Kayla consulted with

Figure 9. Graduate student Kayla Kramer with MHA Nation member Isabelle Ripley Medchill in 2013 reviewing the quillwork suit. Photo by author.

Isabelle Ripley Medchill, the granddaughter of the original owner of the suit. She came to visit this very special item in her family's story and provided additional background information about her grandparents and use of the suit for our records (Figure 9). We were delighted when Ms. Medchill returned a year later with another family member.

The Future of Anthropology Collections Care

In our program, we are advocating, practicing, and teaching that collections care and consultation with Native peoples is essential to the future of museum practice and museum purpose. We see museums as serving not only "posterity" and the public but also explicitly the communities from which the items in our care originated. In other words, when we preserve collections for posterity, it no longer only means the general public in an undefined future: it is Indigenous peoples, today.[17] We recognize that collections work with Native peoples is not just about redressing past injustices but also about increasing health and well-being, looking to the future of Indigenous communities. Our program is certainly not the only one emphasizing this kind of work and orientation to Native communities and collections. More recently, one of the more exciting developments in the field that is aiding in bringing museums and communities together in more informed and productive ways is the School for Advanced Research Community + Museum: Guidelines for Collaboration aimed at facilitating the relationships between Native

peoples and museums.[18] Through our program, we aim to facilitate these partnerships from inside the museum, with collections managers trained and ready—and eager—to take part in and value these collaborations.

Acknowledgments

I first want to acknowledge and thank Calvin Grinnell, Tim Begay, Isabelle Ripley Medchill, Christina Cain, Ellen Pearlstein, and the anonymous reviewers for the feedback they provided on a draft of this chapter. This paper was drawn from "Allies in Unexpected Places: Transforming Museology through Partnerships between Indigenous Peoples, Anthropologists, and Museums," a talk I gave at the Oxford University Pitt Rivers Museum in April 2017. I appreciate the graciousness of Tim Begay, Tony Joe, Calvin Grinnell, and Elgin Crows Breast in sharing their teachings. I have had wonderful MFS students whose work I was pleased to represent here: Kerrie Iyoob, Jesse Dutton-Kenny, Claire Wilbert, and Kayla Kramer. A big thank-you to my colleague, museum curator Steve Lekson, for his support and outstanding NAGPRA work in our museum. I am grateful to colleagues who inspired me to write about teaching in the museum: Jennifer Kramer, Sue Rowley, Candace Greene, Cara Krmpotich, and Laura Peers. And I want to acknowledge Gwyneira Isaac and the ways in which she articulates the connection between museum work and Native community health and well-being and Cynthia Chavez Lamar and her work on the Community+Museum: Guidelines for Collaboration initiative, which has been incredibly thought provoking and encouraging to the work at our museum.

Notes

1. Museum staff include 10 curators, the director, eight collections managers, six public section staff, four administrative staff, and two education staff. The majority of our anthropological collections are from the Plains and Southwest regions.
2. We are increasingly becoming known as a program that provides this added dimension to collections training: students who apply to our program emphasize practicing NAGPRA and our collaborative philosophy as a draw, we have received a number of collections-related grants for collaborative work with Native peoples, and both the curator and the collections manger have been invited to give talks about our museum work with Native peoples. The program at the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology exemplifies these philosophies and approaches, as highlighted in Clavir (2002). Museum institutions that provide training outside of academic programs along these lines include the National Museum of the American Indian (see Shannon 2014a) and the Denver Museum of Nature and Science (see Colwell 2017; Colwell et al. 2010).
3. For more information, see Orin Starn, *Ishi's Brain: In Search of America's Last "Wild" Indian* (New York: Norton, 2004), and N. Scheper-Hughes, "Ishi's Brain, Ishi's Ashes," *Anthropology Today* 17 (2001): 12–18.

4. The Smithsonian Institution's Web page provides the research and background about the repatriation at http://anthropology.si.edu/repatriation/projects/ishi.htm (accessed June 18, 2017).
5. This sum does no justice to the story or the larger history of Minik's life, which is told in *Give Me My Father's Body: The Life of Minik, the New York Eskimo* by Kenn Harper (2001).
6. In fact, recent discussions with other anthropology curators has produced a hunch that requires further research: we believe Native peoples are the most frequent external researchers and visitors to Native American collections in the United States. I am indebted to and inspired by ongoing conversations with museum anthropologists Gwyn Isaac (Smithsonian Institution National Museum of Natural History), Jennifer Kramer (University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology), Cara Krmpotich (University of Toronto), and Cynthia Chavez Lamar (National Museum of the American Indian).
7. For an excellent discussion of embodied practice in collections management work, see Krmpotich (2015). For a more general review of anthropological approaches to embodied practice, see Csordas (1990) and Van Wolputte (2004). For theoretical foundations, look to the work of Pierre Bourdieu.
8. It is important to note that while these practices are called traditional care by people who work in museums, museum staff are not—and do not intend to indicate that they are—cultural practitioners. Museum staff do not appropriate or assume authority over the specialized knowledge associated with traditional care when providing this form of collections care.
9. The following text is excerpted from the University of Colorado Museum of Natural History anthropology section's collections policy: "The Museum acknowledges that Native American groups have traditional perspectives on how objects should be stored, handled and cared for. The Museum, at its discretion, will attempt to incorporate traditional approaches into care of collections if requested by the tribe(s), and if traditional care does not conflict with Museum policies. Additional traditional care practices by visiting tribal members (smudging, offerings, etc.) will be accommodated whenever possible, upon advance request by tribal members."
10. *Jish* refers to medicine bundles in general; each one has its own name (Tim Begay, personal communication with author, July 10, 2017).
11. See, e.g., "Effigy Figure (Rambaramp)," available at https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/opencollection/objects/171429 (accessed June 29, 2017).
12. I am indebted to a question from an audience member at the University of Oxford on April 28, 2017, that led to discussion about compromise and how she noticed that this was not the way in which our work was framed or understood.
13. The repatriation had been expedited just in time for an elder to wear it prior to his passing (Hollinger et al. 2013).
14. For a discussion about teaching Native-informed conservation work in the museum, value-based decision making, and "teaching collaborative conservation," see Pearlstein (2016).
15. I am happy to share syllabi of any of these courses on request. Some key sources we ask collections management students to read include Berlo and Phillips (1998), Clavir (2002), Fine-Dare (2002), Krmpotich and Peers (2014), Ogden (2004), and Smith (1999) and the video *Everything Was Carved* (available at http://www.prm.ox.ac.uk/haida.html).
16. For a lengthier description of these projects, see the "Teaching" tab at http://spot.colorado.edu/~jshannon. They are available on request from anthrocollections@colorado.edu.
17. This phrasing is inspired by Robert Janes's comments about the return of medicine bundles to the Blackfoot Nation: "The museum profession is fond of saying that 'museums keep things for posterity.' By 1998, we had concluded that *posterity had arrived*—both for the Blackfoot and for the Glenbow" (Janes 2015, 255, emphasis added). For a more detailed discussion of this idea, see Shannon (n.d.).

18. For a description of the project and a link to both the community-oriented and the museum-oriented guidelines, see https://sarweb.org/guidelinesforcollaborations/.

References

Berlo, Janet, and Ruth Phillips. 1998. *Native North American Art*. London: Oxford University Press.

Canadian Conservation Institute. *Caring for Sacred and Culturally Sensitive Objects*. http://canada.pch.gc.ca/eng/1448995219999. Accessed September 14, 2017.

Clavir, Miriam. 2002. *Preserving What Is Valued: Museums, Conservation, and First Nations*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Colwell, Chip. 2017. *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Colwell, Chip, Stephen Nash, and Steven Holen. 2010. *Crossroads of Culture: Anthropology Collections at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science*. Denver: University Press of Colorado.

Csordas, Thomas. 1990. "Embodiment as a Paradigm for Anthropology." *Ethos* 18, no. 1: 5–47.

Fine-Dare, Kathy. 2002. *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Flynn, Gillian A., and Deborah Hull-Walski. 2001. Merging Traditional Indigenous Curation Methods with Modern Museum Standards of Care. *Museum Anthropology* 25, no. 1: 31–40.

Harper, Kenn. 2001. *Give Me My Father's Body: The Life of Minik, the New York Eskimo*. New York: Washington Square Press.

Hollinger, R. Eric, Edwell John Jr., Harold Jacobs, Lora Moran-Collins, Carolyn Thome, Jonathan Zastrow, Adam Metallo, Günter Waibel, and Vince Rossi. 2013. "Tlingit-Smithsonian Collaborations with 3D Digitization of Cultural Objects." *Museum Anthropology Review* 7, nos. 1–2: 201–53.

Janes, Robert R. 2015. "The Blackfoot Repatriation: A Personal Epilogue" in *We Are Coming Home: Repatriation and the Restoration of Blackfoot Cultural Confidence*, ed. Gerald T. Conaty, 241–62.

Kramer, Kayla. 2013. "Object Biographies: A Mandan-Hidatsa-Arikara Nation Man's Buckskin and Quillwork Outfit, a Nez Perce Woman's Buckskin Dress, a Ramos Polychrome Jar, and a Navajo Man's Military Style-Jacket." Master's thesis, University of Colorado, Boulder.

Krmpotich, Cara. 2015. "Teaching Collections Management Anthropologically." *Museum Anthropology* 38, no. 2: 112–22.

Krmpotich, Cara, and Laura Peers. 2014. *This Is Our Life: Haida Material Heritage and Changing Museum Practice.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

McKeown, C. Timothy. 2013. *In the Smaller Scope of Conscience: The Struggle for National Repatriation Legislation, 1986–1990.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Ogden, Sherelyn. 2004. *Caring for American Indian Objects: A Practical and Cultural Guide*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Pearlstein, Ellen. 2016. "Conserving Ourselves: Embedding Significance into Conservation Decision-Making in Graduate Education." *Studies in Conservation*. doi:10.1080/00393630.2016.1210843.

Phillips, Ruth. 2011. *Museum Pieces: Toward the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Rockafellar, Nancy. n.d. *The Story of Ishi: A Chronology*. http://history.library.ucsf.edu/ishi.html. Accessed May 7, 2017.

Rosoff, Nancy B. 1998. "Integrating Native Views into Museum Procedures: Hope and Practice at the National Museum of the American Indian." *Museum Anthropology* 22, no. 1: 33–42.

Shannon, Jennifer. n.d. "Posterity Is Now." Unpublished manuscript.

———. 2014a. *Our Lives: Collaboration, Native Voice, and the Making of the National Museum of the American Indian.* Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.

———. 2014b. "Projectishare.com: Sharing Our Past, Collecting for the Future." In *Museum as Process: Translating Local and Global Knowledges*, edited by Ray Silverman, 67–89. New York: Routledge.

Simpson, Moira. 2001. *Making Representations: Museums in the Post-Colonial Era*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* New York: Zed Books.

Van Wolputte, Steven. 2004. "Hang on to Yourself: Of Bodies, Embodiment, and Selves." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33: 251–69.