

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Photography as Social and Economic Exchange: Understanding the Challenges Posed by Photography of Zuni Religious Ceremonies

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6hz8226z>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 20(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Holman, Nigel

**Publication Date**

1996-06-01

**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

# Photography as Social and Economic Exchange: Understanding the Challenges Posed by Photography of Zuni Religious Ceremonies

NIGEL HOLMAN

---

## INTRODUCTION

In the very near future—if it has not already happened while this journal was in press—the governor and the tribal council of the Pueblo of Zuni will formally request that museums and archives holding photographic images of Zuni religious ceremonies place restrictions on access to these images by scholars and commercial users. This position ultimately has its origins in the well-documented objections that some community members had to the making of these images in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and is paralleled by similar requests from other Indian communities. In this article, I do not intend to speak on behalf of the present-day Zuni religious leaders from whom this request originates. Rather, my intention is to discuss the double challenge of photography of Zuni religious ceremonies. First, I will discuss how photography in religious contexts was a challenge to nineteenth-century Zuni community standards with no straightfor-

---

Nigel Holman was the founding executive director of the A:shiwi A:wam Museum and Heritage Center in Zuni, New Mexico. He lives in Las Cruces, New Mexico.

ward solution. Zuni attitudes represented responses to a new technology—and form of exchange—that challenged all societies in the last century. In presenting the history of photography in Zuni in this context, I will dispute the idea that Indians and other native peoples have been less rational about photography and less capable of handling its remarkable capabilities than the European cultures that invented the process. Second, I will briefly discuss how the images that ethnographers and others were able to record in the half-century between 1875 and 1925 now pose a set of new challenges to the museums and archives that curate them and the Indian communities they document.<sup>1</sup>

In the last two decades anthropologists, historians, and the general public have discovered historic photography as a source of scholarly insights and popular interest. As a result, historic images have been used increasingly in exhibitions and books, and on postcards. In part through the outreach efforts of off-reservation museums, this increased interest has spread to Indian communities, many of whom have established museums or cultural preservation and research programs in recent years. Indians are now seeing photographs taken in their communities for the first time. These images represent an extraordinarily important resource for historical research and cultural renewal, and invariably evoke considerable interest among individuals of all ages. It is relatively easy for museums to provide copy prints of these photographs to Indian communities. Unlike objects, these prints are easy to curate and constitute ideal collections for tribal museums and heritage centers in the early stages of their development.

#### TECHNOLOGY OF DOMINATION OR MEDIUM OF DIPLOMACY AND COMMERCE?

Conventional wisdom suggests that European and non-European cultures had very different reactions to photography—the former understood and controlled the process, while the latter were poorly informed (or totally ignorant) about a process that they rarely controlled until well into this century. From the middle of the last century until the present, Indians and other native peoples have repeatedly been portrayed as having a “fear” of photography. Typical of many commentators, W.H. Bartlett described how he witnessed this fear overcome by the desire for candy during a visit to Zuni in 1904:

Rosy-cheeked babies greeted us on every side; and when it became known that we carried candy, even the mysteries of the camera, usually looked upon as a "shadow-stealing machine," did not frighten the little ones who clamored for *moochikwa*."<sup>2</sup>

I reject the notion that Indians and other native peoples generally believed that photography would cause them physical harm. Authors who recorded comments to this effect were taking statements literally that were intended to express an idea metaphorically and that, seen in this light, are indistinguishable from identical—yet now unremarked—comments from nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Europeans who similarly wished, for whatever reason, not to be photographed.

A new perspective has emerged in recent years that is clearly more sophisticated than the notion that Indians were afraid of photography, but this new view also suffers from some of the same flaws. Drawing from the writing of Susan Sontag and Michel Foucault, among others, a number of authors have discussed how photography has been used as a technology of domination. In Europe, cameras became an important component of technologies that controlled disadvantaged and institutionalized groups within Victorian society, including criminals and the mentally ill, through a combination of knowledge and direct surveillance.<sup>3</sup> Other scholars, extending this perspective, view native peoples as having been controlled by means of photography. This notion is clearly compatible with current ideas of colonialism and has many adherents.<sup>4</sup> It is also consistent with current Foucault-inspired interpretations of the history of museums.<sup>5</sup>

This perspective is noteworthy because, unlike the prevailing conventional wisdom, it makes no a priori distinction between the capabilities of different cultures to understand technology generally, and photography in particular. Its validity seems supported by the self-evident fact that Indians invariably have been in front of the lens and Anglos invariably behind it. This perspective is intellectually appealing for at least two reasons. First, it illustrates a correlation between overarching ideas of museum institutional history and the specific context for the creation of one category of museum collections. Second, the usual relationship between Anglo photographer and Indian subject is perpetuated in the display of the resulting images in museum galleries, contributing to the

view held in some quarters that museums are immortalizing the politics of colonialism. Real-world consequences arise from this theorizing. In particular, it has been used to question the ethical practices of archives of ethnographic photography.<sup>6</sup> Conceivably, it could also be used to articulate moral reasons for restricting access to photographs based on the wishes of Indian communities.

I find the idea of the camera as a tool of domination generally unconvincing. It ascribes an unrealistically passive role to Indians and other native peoples who only rarely found themselves in the predicament of the inmates and other institutionalized groups that Foucault wrote about. It would be inappropriate to apply this perspective to the debate about restricting access to images of Indian religious ceremonies and would, in any case, be unlikely to persuade many senior curators and administrators of the merits of limiting access to photographic collections in museums and archives at the request of Indian community leaders. In its place, I wish to explore an alternative interpretative framework that views photographers and their subjects as engaging in a transaction or exchange.<sup>7</sup> The language of photography reflects this notion: Photographers "take" photographs, the subject "gives permission," and a photograph taken clandestinely can be thought of as having been "stolen." Like the Foucault-inspired ideas outlined above, this notion of photography-as-exchange appears useful because it makes no a priori judgments about cultures and their abilities or motivations. However, it seems significantly more credible than the Foucault-inspired ideas, because it views Indians and other native peoples as active rather than passive participants in the creation of photographic images. The idea of photography-as-exchange provides important clues to understanding the bewildering range of responses of Indians and other indigenous peoples to photography, and allows photography to be incorporated into broader analyses of the activities of the two principal producers of historic images in Indian Country: ethnographers and tourists.

Although professional ethnographers, especially those in the nineteenth century, seldom explained their field methods in print, authors writing for popular audiences provide us with accounts of Anglo visitors to Indian Country engaging in a seemingly continuous series of exchanges.<sup>8</sup> In return for poses, objects, information, or food, individual Indians received money, tobacco, matches, and all manner of articles of American manufacture. Ethnogra-

phers were invariably following in the footsteps of Anglo traders and, as the last century drew to a close, ethnographers were followed in turn by tourists. Most representatives of these three groups primarily interacted with Indians through exchange relationships, and it is likely that although their immediate intention to trade was readily understood, their occupation, professional affiliations, or ultimate motives were often difficult for the Indians with whom they traded to ascertain. From a present-day perspective, the exchanges discussed here often appear extraordinarily one-sided and manipulative. While it is certainly true that individuals from Indian communities suffering economic hardships did exchange valued items for food and other necessities, the one-sided appearance of the kinds of exchanges in question here is also perhaps symptomatic of the inflated notions of the value of material culture that are embodied, in particular, in the institutional mindset of modern museums.

Photography, especially in the nineteenth century, represented a problematic exchange for all of humanity experiencing an unprecedented new technology with remarkable and unique properties. In Europe and among European cultures in the United States, the introduction and rapid evolution of photography created a variety of perceptual challenges related especially to issues of ownership of the image, the rights of the photographer to take photographs, and the rights of the subject, which became the now often-invoked "right to privacy." Legislation and both written and unwritten ethical codes of behavior ultimately resolved most—but not all—of society's problems caused by the camera, although novel circumstances continue to arise that question established principles and require them to be revised.<sup>9</sup> Essentially, these challenges stemmed from the difficulty of incorporating the capabilities and requirements of photographic technology, and the documentary properties of the photograph itself, into existing social exchange relationships. By *social exchange*, I simply mean the idea that individuals who are engaged in all manner of relationships expect to benefit from such participation. This occurs, of course, in economic spheres, but *social exchange* stresses the notion that this expectation is ubiquitous and is unrelated to the idea of profiting at the expense of one's exchange partner. Considerations stemming from social exchange principles affect the behavior of groups as well as individuals, with group dynamics invariably complicating the process of decision-making.<sup>10</sup>

The history of photography in Indian County provides examples of photography both in the context of politically motivated exchanges between tribal leaders and representatives (sometimes self-appointed) of the United States government, and in the context of more directly profit-driven exchanges between photographer and subject. The former invariably exposes the internal structure of a community's decision-making process and has some of the characteristics of "gift exchange" as a diplomatic strategy. The latter often demonstrates the bargaining prowess of individual Indians and represents a distinctive form of "barter."<sup>11</sup>

### PHOTOGRAPHY AT ZUNI PUEBLO

The photography-as-domination model outlined above produces a poor reason to restrict access to images of Zuni religious ceremonies in museums and archives, since I can find no evidence that Zuni people were coerced into allowing photography in religious contexts. On the other hand, exploring the history of photography at Zuni using the photography-as-exchange model offers valuable clues to why the taking of these photographs was a source of disagreement and controversy in the community. The period in question, between 1875 and 1925, represents a period of time when the Zuni, along with members of other Indian communities, were coming to terms with photography. More significantly, they were also dealing with the enormous political and structural economic changes taking place as a result of the increased integration of the pueblo into the United States.<sup>12</sup>

Beginning with the successful American campaign to wrest control of the Southwest from Mexico in 1848, Zuni leaders, most notably Lai-iu-ah-tsai-ah (also known as Pedro Pino), sought diplomatic relations with the United States. The Zuni expected the United States to provide both military assistance against Navajo and Apache raiding and new commercial opportunities for individual Zuni people. Through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, the Zuni leadership structure evolved to meet the challenges that were encountered as a result of new political and economic relationships. In particular, Americans found themselves dealing with officials who assumed new secular responsibilities while relinquishing traditional sacred roles. In order to further Zuni political goals, Zuni leaders greeted visiting representatives of the government in Washington warmly. On numerous occasions, as circumstances required, the two nations exchanged basic

commodities and prestige items, as well as intangible goods and services, in ways that parallel many historical colonial encounters around the world. As part of these exchanges, Zuni leaders told traditional stories that served to underscore Zuni claims to their lands—but that significantly avoided revealing much sacred information—and posed for artist Baldwin Möllhausen.<sup>13</sup>

Photographer Alexander Gardner passed by Zuni in 1867, but probably did not enter the pueblo. He was followed by Timothy O'Sullivan who, as a member of a U.S. Army survey team, came to Zuni in July 1873 and took plates and stereo images. Rick Dingus wrote that O'Sullivan "took casual snapshot like stereos of various inhabitants in the village from the eldest officials, warriors, and women, to the children . . ." <sup>14</sup> I think this characterization is misleading; I believe, instead, that the community leaders who posed for O'Sullivan were attempting to present a very formal impression as befitting statesmen on a diplomatic occasion. Although it is impossible to know the extent of the photographic knowledge of those pictured, some clues exist. William Curtis wrote in the early 1880s,

Old Pedro Pino had seen photographs and other pictures among the soldiers, and one day, in remonstrating to one of the tribe whose face had been sketched to his disgust, he said: "Though your body perish, nevertheless you shall continue to live upon the earth. Your face will not be forgotten now; though your hair will turn gray, it will never turn gray here. I know this to be so, for I have seen, in the quarters of the officers at the fort [Fort Wingate, thirty-five miles north of Zuni], the faces of their fathers, who have long since passed from earth, but still were looking down upon their children from the wall."<sup>15</sup>

Clearly, being photographed was not the only way to learn about the process, and Zuni political leaders such as Lai-iu-ah-tsai-ah had ideas about photography that appear similar to those of nineteenth-century Americans.<sup>16</sup>

When John Hillers arrived in Zuni in 1879 with other members of the Bureau of Ethnology's first expedition—Colonel James Stevenson, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, and Frank Cushing—his camera seems to have been welcomed by many Zuni people, including community leaders who were willing to pose repeatedly. But when he tried to photograph religious activities, Hillers encountered difficulties described by Matilda Coxe Stevenson:



While the priests and other high officials favored photographing the ceremonials—in fact, seemed eager to serve the expedition in every way—the populace were so opposed to having their masks and rituals “carried away on paper,” that it was deemed prudent to make but few ceremonial pictures with the camera, and the altars and masks were sketched in color by the writer without the knowledge of the people.<sup>17</sup>

In writing this, Stevenson was intent on establishing in the minds of readers that she and her husband had been on friendly terms with Zuni community leaders, but she significantly understated the devolved structure of authority over religious matters in Zuni. For Governor Ba:lawahdiwa (Lai-iu-ah-tsai-ah’s son) and a few others, the decision not to prevent photography from taking place represented a further concession to representatives of the United States government.<sup>18</sup> They hoped that this, along with their other accommodations, would accrue some future benefit for the community. For Zuni religious leaders, who were responsible for internal affairs rather than external relations, this concession was unacceptable. For them, I believe, allowing photography in such contexts represented not only an overextension of the governor’s authority, but also an inappropriate attempt to use religious activities for secular purposes.

Over the next forty years, a steady increase in the frequency of visits by photographers to the pueblo presented both opportunities and challenges for the Zuni community. Improvements in camera technology and the development of scholarly and popular interest in Zuni resulted in thousands of images being taken.<sup>19</sup> It was a period when, without obvious exception, all cultures—including those of Europe and the United States—faced similar predicaments and were victimized by so-called camera-fiends. In the absence of clear guidance on the matter of photography from traditional Zuni beliefs, community members reached individual and group conclusions about its appropriateness in various contexts.<sup>20</sup> In doing so, they took into consideration what they knew about individual photographers, their motives, and the types of transactions that they engaged in while in the pueblo. Anthropologists with cameras, including Stevenson, Stewart Culin, Jesse W. Fewkes, and Fred Hodge, initially relied on the cooperation that the Zuni had extended to individuals who claimed either a connection to the United States government or to Frank Cushing.<sup>21</sup> As the Zuni began to recognize that cooperation with anthropologists was not contributing to the community’s foreign policy

objectives, these strategies by the anthropologists became increasingly unsuccessful and were replaced by more directly economic transactions with certain community members in which objects, information, and assistance with photography all acquired value in cash or commodities.

One significant reason why Zuni people began to see photography as a form of economic exchange was the example set by Ben Wittick, the first commercial photographer to visit Zuni. For two decades beginning in 1882, he regularly visited the pueblo, and Zuni people visited him at his studios in Fort Wingate and nearby Gallup. It is impossible that community members would not have recognized that photographic images had monetary value to the photographer, both through his likely willingness to pay for them and his ability to sell them. This was a new concept in Zuni, one that had been learned in Europe and on the East Coast some three or four decades earlier.

It is clear from surviving images that some Zuni individuals—most prominently Dick Tsinnahe and Nick Dumaka (known by outsiders as “Zuni Dick” and “Zuni Nick,” respectively)—felt more comfortable than others with the notion of photography as an economic transaction and were willing to pose for anthropologists and tourists. It is no coincidence that both of these individuals not only were comfortable with other principles characteristic of American economics but also served terms as governor of the pueblo—a political role whose principal qualifications around the turn of the century included the ability to speak English and a willingness (not shared by all Zuni people despite the well-justified reputation of the Zuni as “the friendly people”) to deal with the varied and often tedious demands of visitors, including an increasing number toting cameras.<sup>22</sup>

Members of the community with none of these responsibilities were also approached by visitors with cameras. One such encounter in the 1920s was recorded as follows:

When we were visiting the Zuñi Indian village, an Indian woman marched over and took Mrs. Reeves' hand and said: “Now, make our picture.” When I had made it, she said: “Now, give me quarter.” She held Mrs. Reeves' hand until she got the money.<sup>23</sup>

The evidence is equivocal whether the Zuni woman was unclear about the concept of photography-as-exchange (you cannot

ask to be photographed and then expect to be paid), or was attempting to outwit a vulnerable tourist. Nevertheless, I believe it stands for hundreds of similar interactions in Zuni this century when community members actively controlled rather than passively endured an encounter with a photographer; also, it illustrates how many Zuni people saw photography as an opportunity to profit financially.<sup>24</sup>

Continuing the controversy that first arose with Hillers's work in 1879, issues surrounding photography were more complex in communal contexts in the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth. They became still more complex when these contexts were religious in nature. The situation is similar to that of another religious event—the Passion Play performed since the late seventeenth century in Oberammergau, Germany—whose participants, around the turn of the century, repeatedly turned down offers of large sums of money if they would consent to being filmed.<sup>25</sup> Zuni religious ceremonies are part of a complex socioreligious structure that four generations of anthropologists have sought to understand, but that Kroeber usefully summarized as consisting of overlapping systems of priesthoods, kivas, fraternities (primarily curing societies), gaming parties, and clans superimposed upon kinship ties.<sup>26</sup>

Two aspects of the use of cameras in the context of religious activities should be discussed. First, as with most cultures, the traditional socioreligious structure in Zuni is sustained by patterns of reciprocal and redistributive exchange. As photography became increasingly recognized by community members as a form of economic exchange between outsiders and Zuni individuals, it seems likely that it would have been thought to be incompatible with the very different principles that governed traditional exchanges in sacred contexts. In the first decades of this century, this reasoning may have become more relevant to the question of whether photography in religious contexts was appropriate than to the earlier concern over the incompatibility of political and religious goals.

Second, each of the numerous types of photogenic activities that comprise the annual religious cycle is sponsored, organized, and managed by different groups of individuals, with roles and responsibilities often revolving in ways consistent with the principles of reciprocity and redistribution noted earlier. All of the available evidence suggests that decisions about whether photography would be permitted during a religious activity generally

devolved to those responsible for that particular activity rather than to those holding positions of communitywide responsibility. At the same time, it is equally clear that managing the activities of photographers never had the same level of importance as ensuring the correct performance of ritual activities, and I believe that photographers were sometimes tolerated when stopping them would have caused greater disruption than allowing them to continue. One result of this organizational structure is that individuals such as Tsinnahe and Dumaka, who were comfortable with photography and actively served as subjects in exchange relationships with visiting scholars and tourists, facilitated photography by Stevenson and Culin of religious activities over which they had some influence—principally those associated with curing societies in which they were members.<sup>27</sup> While there were undoubtedly bonds of friendship between scholars and individuals such as Tsinnahe and Dumaka, these relationships were also economic in nature. Although it is unclear whether Tsinnahe and Dumaka expected direct compensation for facilitating photography of curing society activities, scholars probably found direct or indirect ways to show their appreciation, and there was likely some suspicion and possibly resentment among fellow society members that some Zuni people were benefitting financially from the activities of curing societies.

Today the best known images of Zuni religious activities are those of the Rain Dance and the Shalako ceremony, in particular those taken by A.C. Vroman and Wittick. Vroman may have been able to photograph Rain Dances in the 1890s because he was a friend of Hodge, a member by marriage of Cushing's family. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the difficulty that Wittick faced in photographing Shalako around the same time arose because he was recognized as someone who sought to profit directly from selling his images.<sup>28</sup>

Evidence for opposition to photography in Zuni at various times is scattered throughout published and unpublished materials, as well as being present in images themselves. The most explosive incident—and the one that resulted in the ban on photography during religious ceremonies that is maintained to the present—occurred in 1923 when a team of moving-picture photographers under the auspices of the Hendricks-Hodge expedition of the Museum of the American Indian attempted to film the Shalako ceremony. Expedition leader Frederick Hodge had support for this plan from community members whom he had

employed excavating the ancestral Zuni site of Hawikku since 1917 and who appear to have favored the replacement of traditional Zuni communal economic principles with American principles of individual profit and property ownership. It was no coincidence that this faction not only rejected notions about photography that had evolved in Zuni over the previous half-century, but also supported revolutionary economic change for the community. Conservative-minded individuals opposed to the filming and to these significant changes in Zuni life prevailed, and filming was stopped.<sup>29</sup>

### CONCLUSIONS: NEW CHALLENGES

The challenge that photography presented to the Zuni in the later nineteenth century is mirrored by the contemporary challenge that the museum concept has presented the community in recent years. Since the mid-1960s, tribal members have worked toward the goal of establishing a museum in Zuni. The belief that a museum would be a potential resource for both tourists and community members was gradually replaced by the view that a museum should be, first and foremost, an institution for community members. This was a viable proposition only if the institution was compatible with Zuni traditions and culture. The organizational structure, collections, and programs characteristic of conventional museums could not serve as models for a successful Zuni museum. The "ecomuseum" approach offered guidelines for how to create a culturally appropriate museum in Zuni, and such an institution was formally constituted as the A:shiwi A:wan Museum and Heritage Center (AAMHC) in 1992.<sup>30</sup>

The AAMHC's primary collection consists of historic photographs donated by other museums and archives. By far the largest collection is three thousand prints from the National Anthropological Archives at the National Museum of Natural History (NMNH), duplicated in a project initiated and underwritten by the NMNH's American Indian Program. More than one thousand of these photographs depict religious ceremonies, representing a challenge to the museum's commitment to reflect the community's traditional beliefs. Specifically, this includes the belief that such photography was inappropriate. More generally, however, it includes the notion that religious knowledge is held on behalf of the community by individuals, and that it is inappropriate for it to be known more widely.

The AAMHC initiated a project whereby traditional religious leaders identified images that they believed should be restricted. The museum agreed that these images should be held by the religious leaders in the facilities of the Zuni Heritage and Historic Preservation Office; the museum works with this office regularly on a variety of projects on behalf of the governor and the tribal council. We encouraged them to curate and not simply control the images, and we cooperated on a project whereby the religious leaders documented each image in the Zuni language. Access to the images will be promoted for purposes of "personal inquiries in connection with individual cultural and traditional responsibilities."<sup>31</sup> To this collection will be added copies of images of religious ceremonies held by other institutions as they are located. Furthermore, the request of the religious leaders that other institutions place restrictions on access to these images consistent with the policy now in place in Zuni will be publicized and explained.<sup>32</sup>

In order to remain true to Zuni traditions, the A:shiwi A:wam Museum and Heritage Center has eschewed the notion that modern museums—in contrast to their eighteenth- and nineteenth-century antecedents—contribute to democracy by making information easily available. In charting the future course of the museum in Zuni, its directors, its staff, and the people of Zuni will be challenged similarly to adopt those ideas of the wider museum community that are appropriate for Zuni and to disregard those that are not.

The next challenge will fall to those museums and archives holding photographic images of religious ceremonies taken at Zuni and other Indian communities. Ironically, this comes at a time when computer-based communications and imaging technology hold the promise of making the photographic images held by museums and archives more accessible than ever. There is a growing literature on the ethical and legal dilemmas concerning the use of this technology. As computers and networks increasingly have become capable of distributing visual information, new concerns have emerged about issues such as pornography, privacy, and artists' and owners' rights.<sup>33</sup> Questions concerning the rights that museums and tribes have over images of religious ceremonies should be resolved in the context of this wider debate, and in a process that further refines the nature of the relationship between the two groups on a case-by-case, community-by-community basis.

## NOTES

1. Research leading to the ideas expressed in this paper was made possible by a Fellowship in Museum Practice awarded by the Center for Museum Studies at the Smithsonian Institution. I am grateful to the Smithsonian Women's Committee for their support of the fellowship program, to Nancy Fuller for her ideas and encouragement, and to the staff of the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) Photo Archives for their assistance. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the NMAI's George Gustav Heye Center, New York, in May 1995. The ideas expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the view of the governor and the tribal council of the Pueblo of Zuni, the Zuni Heritage and Historic Preservation Office, or the A:shiwi A:wam Museum and Heritage Center.

2. W.H. Bartlett, "The Shalako Dance," *Out West* (1905): 391-92.

3. John Tagg, *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photographies and Histories* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988).

4. David Green, "Classified Subjects—Photography and Anthropology: The Technology of Power," *Ten/8* 14: 30-37; David Jenkins, "The Visual Domination of the American Indian: Photography, Anthropology, and Popular Culture in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Museum Anthropology* 17:1: 9-21. Susan Sontag has written of cameras as "predatory weapons" and of the "colonization through photography" of the American West, in which "[t]he case of the American Indians is the most brutal." Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1977), 14, 64. Vine Deloria has written of photography as "a weapon in the final skirmishes of cultural warfare in which the natives of North America could be properly and finally embedded in their place in the cultural evolutionary incline." Vine Deloria, preface to Christopher M. Lyman, *The Vanishing Race and Other Illusions* (New York: Parthenon Books, 1982), 11. Hopi photographer Victor Masayesva sees the camera as "a weapon that will violate the silences and secrets so essential to our group survival." Victor Masayesva and Erin Younger, eds., *Hopi Photographers/Hopi Images* (Tucson, AZ: Sun Tracks and University of Arizona Press, 1983), 10.

5. Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1992); Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum* (London: Routledge, 1995).

6. Christopher Pinney, "Other Peoples' Bodies, Lives, Histories? Ethical Issues in the Use of a Photographic Archive," *Journal of Museum Ethnography* 1: 57-68.

7. This approach has disparate influences. Paul Byers influenced many later writers when he wrote that "the photograph is the product of the photographer-subject interaction and photography itself is a social transaction among photographer, subject and viewer." Paul Byers, "Camera Don't Take Pictures," *Columbia University Forum* 9:1: 27-31. There is a growing literature about photography in the field of tourism studies. See, in particular, Erik Cohen et al., "Stranger-local Interaction in Photography," *Annals of Tourism Research* 19:2: 213-33. In a somewhat similar vein, Victoria Wyatt has written of the "balance

of power" between photographer and American Indian subjects in turn-of-the-century Alaska. Victoria Wyatt, "Interpreting the Balance of Power: A Case Study of Photographer and Subject in Images of Native Americans," *Exposure* 28:3: 23–33. More generally, almost any travel guide to an "exotic" part of the world will give explicit instructions about how and when to take photographs of local people. For example, Richard Trillo has advised visitors to Kenya, "One thing is certain: if you won't accept that some kind of interaction and exchange are warranted, you won't have many pictures." Richard Trillo, *Kenya: The Rough Guide* (London: Rough Guide Ltd, 1993), 59.

8. One example of such an account is John Bourke, *Snake Dance of the Moquis of Arizona* (New York: Scribner's, 1884).

9. George Chernoff and Hershel Sarbin, *Photography and the Law* (New York: Chilton, 1977); Jane Gaines, *Contested Culture: The Image, the Voice, and the Law* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991); Larry Gross et al., *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film, and Television* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1988).

10. Peter M. Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York: John Wiley, 1967), 64.

11. As discussed by Blau (note 10), 106, "The exchange of gifts and services . . . , which frequently assumes a ceremonial form, serves not only to create bonds of friendship and trust between peers but also to produce and fortify status differences between superiors and inferiors."

Barter has the following characteristics:

(a) the focus is on demand for particular things that are different in kind; in other cases, it may be for services exchanged for goods or other services. (b) The protagonists are essentially free and equal, either can pull out of the deal and at the end of it they are quits. (c) There is no criterion by which, from the outside, it can be judged that [one commodity] is equal in value [to another]. Some kind of bargaining is taking place, but not with reference to some abstract measure of value or numeraire; each simply wants the object held by the other. (d) . . . [T]he two parts of the transaction [may] occur simultaneously; sometimes the two may be separated in time. (e) Finally the act is transformative; it moves objects [in Appadurai's phrase] between the "regimes of value" sustained by the two actors.

Caroline Humphrey and Stephen Hugh-Jones, *Barter, Exchange and Value: An Anthropological Approach* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1. See also Arjun Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

12. This discussion about the history of photography at Zuni complements my article, "Curating and Controlling Zuni Photographic Images," *Curator* 39:2: 108–122, which emphasizes the problems of using conventional European notions of privacy and the rights of photographers and their subjects to understand the circumstances of historical photography in Zuni. Political and economic changes in Zuni during the period in question have been discussed



by numerous anthropologists and historians. Gregory Crampton's *The Zunis of Cibola* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1977) and T.J. Ferguson's entry on Zuni in *Native America in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Mary Davis (New York: Garland, 1994) are valuable, easily accessible, summaries.

13. Möllhausen visited Zuni in 1853 as a member of a survey team led by Lieutenant Amiel Whipple of the Topographical Engineers. He reported, "[The Zuni] were very much pleased with the object of our Expedition, and showed themselves so by their obligingness in many little things, and their readiness to answer all our inquiries concerning their mode of life and the physical character of the country. It needed very little persuasion, too, to induce Pedro Pino and other persons of distinction in the tribe to present themselves in warlike full dress to have their portraits taken [i.e., drawn]." Baldwin Möllhausen, *Diary of a Journey from the Mississippi to the Coast of the Pacific with a United States Government Expedition*, vol. 2 (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts, 1858), 94.

14. Rick Dingus, *The Photographic Artifacts of T. O'Sullivan* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 13.

15. William E. Curtis, *Children of the Sun* (Chicago: Inter-Ocean, 1883), 35.

16. A popular use for daguerreotypes, the earliest commercially produced photographic images, was to record the appearance after death of family members. Later, the family album became a standard method of documenting earlier generations, although the use of shots taken while the subject was still alive became the norm.

17. Matilda Coxe Stevenson, "The Zuni Indians: Their Mythology, Esoteric Fraternities, and Ceremonies," *Twenty-Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology for 1901-1902* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904), 17.

18. The Stevensons sought to exaggerate their credentials as government representatives, aided by such things as the spurious rank of colonel held by James Stevenson. See Frederick Hodge, tape-recorded interview, 1956. Transcript at the Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley, 70.

19. An incomplete list of individuals who visited Zuni with a camera around this time includes Adolph Bandelier, Victor Mindeleff, Ben Wittick, H.T. Hiester, I.W. Taber, Charles Lummis, Julian Scott, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, A.C. Vroman, George Wharton James, Stewart Culin, E.S. Curtis, Frank Churchill, Herbert Robinson, Jesse Nusbaum, Charles Saunders, and William Henry Jackson.

20. Community members were similarly required to determine the appropriateness of other aspects of the research agendas of anthropologists and the requests of tourists, including, for example, the reproduction of sacred objects or access to sacred places.

21. In this regard, connections to anthropologist Frank Cushing—who was generally well liked in Zuni—appear particularly important. Hodge was his son-in-law, Fewkes his coworker, and Culin his friend. Although generally disliked, Matilda Coxe Stevenson was well known in Zuni and had at least one influential supporter, Naiuchi, a senior bow priest.. See Triloki Nath Pandey, "Anthropologists at Zuni," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 116:4: 321-37.

22. Bertha P. Dutton, *Friendly People: The Zuni Indians* (Santa Fe, NM: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1963). The merging of Zuni political responsibility and American-style commercial acumen in individuals such as these seems likely to have been disconcerting at times for both visitors and community members.

23. Frank Reeves, "Vacation-Photography, part II," *Photo Era* 61:3: 136.

24. My discussions with tribal members suggest that over the course of the twentieth century, the willingness of some to pose for visiting photographers became a subject of critical comment or disdain among those who regarded the practice as inappropriate.

25. See Saul S. Friedman *The Oberammergau Passion Play: A Lance Against Civilization* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984), 147–61.

26. Alfred L. Kroeber, "Zuñi Kin and Clan," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History* 18:2: 39–204. For a recent explanation from the perspective of a tribal member, see Edmund J. Ladd, "Zuni Social and Political Organization," *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 9 (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1979), 482–91.

27. This assessment is based on an evaluation of the content of publications by Stevenson (note 17), unpublished reports by Stewart Culin in the archives of the Brooklyn Museum, and my familiarity with the corpus of images recorded by the two photographers. I have not deliberately studied historic images of Zuni religious ceremonies since religious leaders expressed their concerns.

28. Ben Wittick, "A Visit to Pueblo Zuni—The Shaliko Dances" (Unpublished manuscript, box 116, History Library, Museum of New Mexico).

29. I have discussed this incident in somewhat more detail in my article, "Curating and Controlling Zuni Photographic Images" (note 12). The film project is described in "Motion-Pictures at Zuni," *Indian Notes* 1: 29–30. Accounts of the controversy surrounding the filming are to be found in Pandey (note 21) and manuscript sources including transcripts of inquiries held in 1924 by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Laboratory of Anthropology/Museum of Indian Arts and Culture, Santa Fe, #89ISC.018) and the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions and the Indian Rights Association (History Library, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe, Zuni vertical file).

30. The entire issue of *Museum* 148 (1985) is devoted to ecomuseums. See also René Rivard *Opening Up the Museum* (n.p., 1984) and Nancy Fuller, "The Museum as a Vehicle for Community Empowerment: The Ak-Chin Indian Community Ecomuseum Project," in *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*, ed. Ivan Karp et al. (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992), 327–65. The community's concerted efforts, beginning in the 1970s, to repatriate sacred artifacts is an example of a similar challenge. The A:shiwi A:wam Museum and Heritage Center operates as a 501(c)(3) organization, governed by a board of directors drawn from tribal members. It is independent of, but works closely with, the governor and the tribal council. Major funders and supporters of the museum have included the Zuni Tribal Council, the Administration for Native Americans, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of the North American West.

31. Cultural Resources Advisory Team, "Policy Statement on the Curation and Use of Sensitive Photograph Collection Maintained by the Zuni Heritage and Historic Preservation Office," 1994.

32. This project was supported by a grant from the Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Community Folklife Program of the Fund for Folk Culture.

33. Carol C. Gould, ed., *The Information Web: Ethical and Social Implications of Computer Networking* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1989); Dorothy E. Denning and Herbert S. Lin, eds., *Rights and Responsibilities of Participants in Networked Communities* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1994). See also innumerable recent articles about internet ethics in trade magazines and the popular press.