

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Drawing Back Culture: The Makah Tribe's Struggle for Repatriation. By Ann M. Tweedie.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4pm2882m>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 27(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Kruger, Arnold

Publication Date

2003

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/>

Bill Grantham has gone through much of the early and better-known ethnographic literature including the work of John Swanton, Frank Speck, Albert Gatschet, W. O. Tuggle, and others. Except for a few contemporary stories, not much is original in this work. Grantham has basically arranged excerpts from the literature using his own categories of subject matter with labels such as cosmogony, cosmology, ceremony and ritual, and myths and legends. The book can be helpful to those who want a quick overview of the earlier literature and the information given by Indian informants to professional or amateur ethnologists without having to read all of Swanton's or the other writers' works. But without internally consistent philosophical tools or analysis, the stories tumble out in a jumbled fashion with uneven standards of translation and clarity of meaning.

Grantham, of course, is correct in saying that myths and legends should not be trivialized but seen as depositories of a sense of cosmic order and as keepers of values. However, without an analytical framework or in-depth interviewing in Creek, the work is a hodgepodge of information that will need careful sifting through for the serious reader. For the casual reader, it provides a reference of sorts for some Creek stories and legends.

Joyotpaul Chaudhuri

Arizona State University, Tempe

Drawing Back Culture: The Makah Tribe's Struggle for Repatriation. By Ann M. Tweedie. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002. 208 pages. \$30.00 cloth.

This small book examines the very large and complex issues surrounding the Makah Indians' efforts to regain sacred and cultural material based on the legal framework of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990 (NAGPRA). It is a reworking of the author's Ph.D. dissertation, in which she acted as a participant observer in her research on the Makah reservation. In the best tradition of progressive anthropology, the author takes the stance of an advocate for her research subjects, and clearly sees the work as benefiting the Makah Nation in its attempt to "draw back culture" that was sold to buyers from large museums in the early part of the last century.

The Makah Nation reservation extends over fifty-five square miles of the Olympic Peninsula in the northwest tip of Washington state. This isolated location spared the Makah from much of the ethnocide of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, although they were still subjected to a deliberate assault on their culture, traditions, and Indian identities. And as has been the case with other Indian nations, much of their sacred and ceremonial material culture such as masks, rattles, clothing, whaling gear, totems, and tools, now resides in museum collections around the world.

NAGPRA is a progressive piece of legislation that mandates the return or repatriation of (besides Native American human remains) objects of "cultural patrimony which shall mean an object having ongoing historical, tradition-

al, or cultural importance central to the Native American group or culture itself, rather than property owned by an individual Native." It requires all federal agencies and museums to return such material to the appropriate Native group, and requires the agencies to consult with the Indian tribes. It is essentially human rights legislation, and promotes equal partnerships between Indian nations and government agencies, the renewal of Native American spiritual practices, and the privileging of the ownership rights of tribal peoples over their own historical material culture.

It is, however, a one-size-fits-all legislation, and its intrinsic paradigm of the communal sharing of the earth and of important objects being shared and owned by tribal peoples in common is based largely on European ideals of the noble savage, and on Plains Indians practice of communitarian living and ownership. As the author points out, this legislation simply does not fit Makah reality: literally everything in the Makah world was privately owned by individuals. Private property rights were carried to an extreme seldom seen at the northwest coast: not only were songs, dances, names, and ceremonial regalia owned by individuals, but the land, rivers, beaches, and huge stretches of ocean were all in private hands. Nothing of use in the Makah universe was communally owned. The very concept of common ownership is still entirely foreign to them in relation to ceremonial objects. So this particular tribe, because it adhered to its traditional indigenous ownership patterns, became ineligible for repatriation of its cultural patrimony under NAGPRA. This situation seems paradoxical, given that the spirit of the legislation is to promote the return of such material to its rightful former owners.

There are other aspects of traditional Makah culture that challenge modern American liberal attitudes toward Indian rights and reparations. The Makah were always a hierarchical, caste-ridden society, with a small aristocracy at the top who owned everything and a large mass of commoners and slaves who did all the work but owned little. Thus, if traditional objects are to be repatriated to the Makah under their own terms of ownership, the material would go directly to the heirs of the aristocracy—directly from a museum display case to a private home. However, since the discovery of the wonderfully preserved remains of their culture (dating back to circa 1500 A.D.) in 1970, the Makah have built a state-of-the-art museum and cultural center on the reservation. Objects of their cultural patrimony could be repatriated to the museum and the process of repatriation on behalf of the whole tribal group could in itself create positive community values, like the shared ownership of significant sacred objects and the renewal of traditional group spiritual practices with the appropriate ritual tools. It would represent a healthy democratizing spirit to remove historical materials important to the whole community from the private collections of a few individuals.

A progressive postmodern view, however, might note that if the United States is to be a truly pluralistic society that accepts diversity in cultural expression among Americans, then the unique and traditional patterns of Makah culture should be celebrated and encouraged, regardless of Eurocentric ideas about how they should behave. And if the Makah are prevented from reclaiming their material heritage by the letter of the law, it could be argued that they are being discriminated against on the basis of their culture and ethnicity.

It is in this area of advocacy for the Makah in their efforts to have their cultural property returned that the author attempts the Procrustean feat of trying to make private Makah ownership patterns fit the communal ownership model mandated by NAGPRA. She offers “strategic” and “flexible” interpretations of private ownership that are embedded in a social framework. For instance, she argues that the ceremonial gear used in the Wolf Ritual or Klukwalle was used on behalf of the tribe as a whole, even though it went home with someone after the event, and that this communal use which benefited the entire group should qualify such objects for return as being “of importance central to the Native American group.” This approach is clearly consonant with the spirit of the law, which seeks to benefit Native people and hopes to promote a cultural renewal in their societies.

It should be noted, however, that the author, in her laudable effort to promote the interests of an oppressed people in repossessing their cultural property, has vitiated her own professionalism. Having combed the anthropological literature on the Makah and Nuu-chah-nulth peoples, and obviously having found no support for any other ownership pattern than the individualistic and private, the author offers a clear and tendentious misreading of one single paragraph from Colson’s 1953 work “The Makah Indians.” She states that it “represents the only source identified to date that takes an opposing viewpoint” (p. 103). But an unbiased reading of the passage clearly shows it to be a comment on the variety of privileges and resources that were owned by the individuals within family groups or households among the Makah. The passage bears repeating, since the author vests it with such unique importance in creating a space for negotiating ownership models under NAGPRA.

Theoretically, control of the ritual property was in the hands of the male head of the house [family], but all “members of the group [family] had access to its resources. The group [family] also owned ceremonial privileges, or tupat in the form of personal names, dances, costumes, games, songs, and roles in the secret societies. These tupat could be used only by its members” (p. 102). The passage is part of a discussion of family groups as the primary political and economic units of Makah society, and simply highlights the privileges that were owned by individuals within the family unit. Nowhere in Colson’s 300-page work does she offer a genuine model of communal ownership among the Makah. It is hard, though, to fault a researcher for her ethical stance when she seeks to benefit an oppressed minority through her work. And Ann Tweedie has done her homework, for besides the problematic reference to Colson’s work, she brings into her discussion the Tlingit and Haida clan groups, Trukese lineage patterns, and Ifugao property laws in an effort to “demonstrate how the boundaries between individual and communal ownership can be blurred enough to allow Makah tribal members room to negotiate” (p. 114).

The Makah and their traditional society challenge many commonly held preconceptions. They have always lived in a highly stratified, caste-ridden, slave-owning society. Their loyalties have never extended beyond the family unit. Their fiercely enacted practice of private ownership has only been equaled by late modern capitalism. Since 1999 they have begun killing whales

again, creatures which are an emblem of a new ecological paradigm for many people. They stretch our vision of what respect for other cultures really entails. They put us to the test: can we create a space in the modern American super-state that genuinely values and respects the reality of another way of being in the world? This fine volume of work reflects in itself the tensions and paradoxes involved in such a project, at the level of policy and legislation; and it makes a genuine and important contribution to the literature, and to the real people that the literature represents.

Arnold Kruger

Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, & Transgender Myths: From the Arapaho to the Zuni. Edited by Jim Elledge. New York: Peter Lang, 2002. 216 pages. \$29.95 paper.

In this investigative and documentary homage to the work of Will Roscoe, Elledge republishes a selection of thirty of the hundreds of tales cited in Roscoe's "Bibliography of Berdache and Alternative Gender Roles Among North American Indians" (*Journal of Homosexuality* 14, 3/4 (1987): 81–171) and in Roscoe's 1998 book, *Changing Ones: Third and Fourth Genders in Native North America* (St. Martin's Press). The myths are arranged in seven categories: "Origin of the World" (three tales), "Origin of the Two-Spirits" (six tales), "Men Who Become Women" (five tales), "Pregnant Men" (three tales), "Love Between Women" (two tales), "Violence and the Two-Spirits" (four tales), and "Didactic Myths" (six tales). In a ten-page introduction Elledge explains his rationale for the use of the terms "gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender" in the title of his book instead of the term "Two-Spirit." The latter term has been used colloquially since the early 1990s by many Native and First Nations individuals to refer to their gender identity and sexuality. He also gives examples of how some indigenous terms, purportedly predating precolonial times, have been put into writing by anthropologists, historians, and others who "collected" ethnographic and mythological stories from indigenous people willing to share aspects of their cultural beliefs with outsiders. The difficulty is that Elledge seems to take the English-language representation of indigenous terms within the myths as evidence of actual gender performance by real, rather than mythic, people. In addition, I am also concerned about lifting mythological stories (and characters) out of context of the full study without providing commentary about that context. Examples follow.

The challenge for this review was to locate a sampling of the original sources in order to check the veracity of Elledge's categorization of the myths and to recontextualize the samples. I began with the two examples from Elsie Clews Parsons' *Tewa Tales* (originally published in 1926 by the American Folk-Lore Society, and republished in 1994 by the University of Arizona Press, Barbara Babcock, editor): "Warrior Girl" (placed by Elledge in his "Origin of the Two-Spirit" category) and "The Hopi Ghost Kills and Gambles" (placed in "Didactic Myths"). Both of these stories are about the Hopi-Tewa of Arizona, sufficiently different in social organization from Upper Rio Grande Tewa that