

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Preface

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7rk9q0qc>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 20(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Jacknis, Ira

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

Preface

IRA JACKNIS

People have been taking pictures of Native Americans for well over a century—for almost as long as they have been taking pictures. The earliest known photograph of an American Indian was exposed soon after the invention of the medium in 1839. Ironically enough, it was taken in Great Britain in 1844, and it depicted Kahkewaquonaby (known as the Reverend Peter Jones), the son of a Mississauga Indian and a Welshman.¹ Thus, from its very beginnings, the photography of Native Americans has been inextricably bound up with the crossing of cultural boundaries.

As photographers fanned out across the American continent, native peoples struggled to render their strange activities comprehensible. A term that appears to have been devised repeatedly and independently was *shadow catcher*. This ominous phrase spoke to one of the most profound aspects of photography: its seemingly magical ability to appropriate and remove some sort of essence of a person's character. As it was phrased by Yurok author Lucy Thompson, "The old Indians do not like to look at a photograph or to have their photographs taken because they say it is a reflection or a shadowy image of the departed spirit, O-quirllth."² Contemporary Creek writer Joy Harjo remembers her "Aunt Lois's admonishments about photographs. She said that they could steal your soul. I believe it's true, for an imprint remains behind forever, locked in paper and chemicals."³

Ira Jacknis is associate research anthropologist at the Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. In addition to visual anthropology, his interests include museology, the history of anthropology, and the art and culture of the Indians of western North America.

Hopi photographer Victor Masayesva has incisively discussed the implications of what one older Hopi man saw while observing Masayesva at work. The man called him a *Kwikwilyaqa*, a kachina clown that resembles a person with a view camera and a photographic hood. Masayesva realized that, beyond the surface appearance, the photographer is like the *Kwikwilyaqa* in another way: "[H]e duplicates. When he comes into the plaza, this *Kwikwilyaqa* shadows anyone he can find, attaching himself to that person. He mimics every action and motion of the harried person he selects. In this way the *Kwikwilyaqa* rapidly becomes a nuisance."⁴ Reflecting on the comparison, Masayesva notes, "But no airs on my part will make photographers less buffoons. This aggravating, obnoxious, funny, and profoundly claustrophobic Kachina creates and contains both the photographer and the tourist. Consolation lies in his *raison d'être*: the *Kwikwilyaqa* is living commentary on what photographers are and what photography is; implicating us in turn, revealing what people do to people."⁵

As Masayesva sees it, even native photographers are not free from the possibilities of catching people's shadows, of removing some of their essence. Given the realities of most photography of Native Americans, however, most of these images have traveled across cultural boundaries, and it is to this traversal that the essays in this special issue are primarily devoted.

CONTEMPORARY CONCERNS

Since that first image of Peter Jones, thousands of Native American photographs have been created. This staggering body of work has, of course, generated a large literature. The past decade, especially, has seen the production of much research and commentary, some broad and general, some detailed and focused, but most of it dealing with the circumstances of the original photography.⁶ In the last few years, however, a new urgency has arisen in these discussions, focusing on who should own these pictures and how they should be used. The contemporary saliency of questions of ownership of and access to Native American photographs represents the coming together of several overlapping issues. Within the discipline of anthropology as a whole, the postcolonial critique that began in the 1960s has led to dramatic changes in the politics and poetics of ethnographic representation (to invoke the subtitle of the influential anthology edited by James

Clifford and George Marcus).⁷ In terms of power relationships, this critique has called into question traditional modes of anthropological authority, as represented primarily in written texts. One popular argument calls for the use of dialogical modes of cultural description, which involve more of an exchange between native and nonnative. The foregrounding of ethnography as writing has, paradoxically, highlighted the role of alternate media such as artifacts, photographs, and sound recordings. In museum exhibits, for example, these currents have resulted in the now-common acceptance of curation with a native component.⁸

Museums have also been at the forefront of issues of cultural property. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), passed by the United States Congress in 1990, calls for the repatriation of some bones and artifacts under certain circumstances. This act and the vast amount of research, communication, and discussion it generated have highlighted questions of ownership of and access to Native American cultural property.⁹ In turn, the passage of NAGPRA has led to the extension of concerns of ownership from unique and tangible objects to more multiple and disparate forms like field notes and photographs. These alternate media have thus shifted the debate from the rights to tangible property to those dealing with intellectual property, such as questions of permissions, royalties, and reproduction fees. The issues being addressed in the photographic sphere are directly analogous to those raised by another form of mechanical reproduction, sound recording. In the recent phenomenon called "World Beat," one often encounters discussions of appropriation and royalties for songs.¹⁰ Questions of repatriation and access have also arisen for audio tapes of American Indian song and speech.¹¹

Simultaneous with these developments has been the recent coming together of mutual concerns in anthropology and the world of archives and libraries, institutionalized in the Council for the Preservation of Anthropological Records.¹² This group, along with its publications and conferences, has called attention to the preservation and uses of anthropological documentation, including visual images. Related to the shifts in "ethnographic power" has been the rapid growth of native museums and archives, staffed by trained native curators and archivists.¹³

Finally, all these concerns have been exacerbated by the accelerated reproduction of photographs made possible through digitization in the form of CD-ROM disks and the internet. Entire

photographic collections can be and are being copied. Once digitized, they can be modified easily. In 1936, critic Walter Benjamin discussed the implications of "the work of art in an age of mechanical reproduction,"¹⁴ and the issues with which he grappled have only intensified in our current age of electronic reproduction.¹⁵

These are some of the reasons why photographs of Native Americans are now the subject of so much analysis and debate. Any discussion of the uses of photographs, however, rests on certain properties of the photographic image that affect how it is made and used. Taking a model from philosophy, we may gloss these concerns as ontology (how something is), epistemology (how we know something), and ethics (how we should behave toward others).

ONTOLOGY

The ontology of a photograph would deal with its mode of existence. As an object, the photograph is tangible and enduring. Unlike a conversation or an oral rendition of a myth, it outlives the moment of its generation. This means that like other tangible objects, it can be detached from its original context and interpreted variously by many persons in other places and times. These interpretations may often bear little relation to the intentions of the original photographer and subject. For this reason, photographs are almost inevitable candidates for being seen in multiple, and often conflicting, perspectives.

Almost by definition, photographs are a unique slice of time/space, privileging one small bit from the time that stretched before and after the click of the shutter and the space that surrounded the subject caught within the frame's borders. Because of the relative ease of making a picture, however, rarely is it taken in isolation. Instead, it is usually produced as part of a series—alternate images of a more or less similar subject, time, and space. Subsequently, with the exception of daguerreotype positives, most photographs exist as positive prints produced, almost limitlessly, from a unique negative. Adding to the complexity is the issue of the copy print, a new photograph made from a print and not the negative, a frequent practice in photographic archives. For all these reasons, photographs often exist in different repositories, often in slightly different versions (cropped or otherwise modified), differently annotated (attributed to different photogra-

phers, times, places, and subjects). Deciding which is the original, the one to be controlled and requested for return, is almost impossible. Thus, although issues of property rights—specifically intellectual property rights—certainly apply, the model of artifactual repatriation is unlikely to be very helpful.

Photographs derive much of their meaning and context from verbal/written information contained in diverse sources: labels and catalogs of the prints, as well as a range of other historical references.¹⁶ Just like any other communication medium, photography is a sociocultural act and takes place in a setting of multiple meanings. The photographer has motivations (such as for research, profit, or personal pleasure); the native subject has concerns and intentions. Each of these terms may be extended. For example, the subject may be various, as seen in the field of interaction surrounding a Navajo Night Chant recorded in 1905 by Simeon Schwemberger.¹⁷ Schwemberger obtained permission from both the sponsor and the patient (both of whom he paid), but some of the invited guests objected (not to mention the possible variant reactions of their descendants).

Finally, in discussing photographs and attempting to reconstruct original intentions, the issues are much different depending on whether the image is relatively historic or contemporary. For the former, we must grapple with reconstructing the original intentions of the actors as opposed to the problems of revision and contemporary perspectives. For contemporary images, ongoing social exchange is always possible to clarify conflicting or obscure points.

EPISTEMOLOGY

At the risk of vast oversimplification, we may view many of these photographs as caught between two enduring and alternate traditions of knowledge, Western and Native American. In the Western model of knowledge, as handed down to us from the Age of the Enlightenment, knowledge is viewed as an inherently good thing, as liberating, for the benefit of all (remembering, at the same time, the very real respect we have in our capitalist culture for rights of privacy and ownership). In native cultures, one often finds the view that many kinds of knowledge are to be restricted to those who have been initiated, because knowledge is seen as carrying ritual power, and even danger if not treated properly.

As many of the essays in this issue demonstrate, the sacred and the ceremonial are the most contested and disputed of photo-

graphic subjects. These issues of private knowledge have been widely discussed by students of Native American literature. What perspectives and approaches are proper for those of native and nonnative ancestry? In particular, which information should be shared with nonnatives and which restricted to natives only?¹⁸ Folklorist Barre Toelken decided to avoid analysis of Navajo Coyote tales after a certain point, in order to avoid implicating himself and his family in Navajo witchcraft beliefs.¹⁹ In an analogous way, James Faris decided that he "really did not need to view the [video] tapes" of some films of the Navajo Nightway ceremony.²⁰ These two traditions of knowledge are very real alternative ways of viewing the world, which in some cases cannot be resolved. They do form, however, the grounds on which we must conduct the argument.

ETHICS AND USE

These issues of ontology and epistemology have consequences for our actions involving photographs. Perhaps the most hotly contested issues in Native American photography today, and much of the discussion in this volume, revolve around what has been called "representational ethics": "Who has the right to represent others," and under what circumstances?²² Today, photographers and others doing social science research are expected to obtain "informed consent." Although this concept may be problematic in application, it has been continually evolving. In fact, one hundred years ago it was not seen as a problem at all; that is, it was not a recognized concept (see Holman, below), which makes the retrospective use of such historic images equally difficult and problematic. An issue related to consent is compensation, particularly to whom (to various sorts of leaders, to others present, to no one). Permission and compensation were certainly real issues in the past, but historical records in photographic archives are often silent on these points.

It is in the area of changing standards of historic images that much of today's debate lies. One classic instance is the photography of the major religious ceremonies of the Hopi and Zuni and other Pueblo peoples of the Southwest. By the late nineteenth century, the sensational Hopi Snake Dance had attracted legions of photographers, both professional and amateur. Finding the photography disruptive of their ceremonies, the Hopi increasingly restricted how, where, and when photographers could

work. Photography was prohibited outright around 1915,²³ and the prohibition continues to this day, as it does among the Zuni and the Rio Grande Pueblo people. Some contemporary Zuni have gone further, calling for the total repatriation and return of certain ceremonial images (Holman, this volume). This challenge on use—and others like it—will be negotiated along the parameters just outlined regarding ontology and epistemology. The present volume is intended to extend the necessary dialogue among those interested in Native American photographs.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SPECIAL EDITION

These were some of the issues leading to two recent conferences that generated most of the essays in this special edition. The first conference, "Images across Boundaries: History, Use, and Ethics of Photographs of American Indians," was organized by Willow Roberts Powers and Richard Hill. Held in Santa Fe in April 1993, it was sponsored jointly by the Laboratory of Anthropology/Museum of Indian Arts and Culture (part of the Museum of New Mexico) and the Institute of American Indian Arts. This conference was actually the culmination of a long process of discussion, the story of which can tell us much about the mutual concerns of natives and nonnatives regarding photography.²⁴

In 1991 an informal discussion group began to meet at the Laboratory of Anthropology/Museum of Indian Arts and Culture. The group was composed of Indian and non-Indian people with an interest in or a responsibility for photograph collections: members of the Indian communities with historic preservation programs; archivists and curators from museums and other institutions; teachers; researchers; anthropologists; and occasionally photographers. The discussions were wide-ranging and open, and the goal was to discuss frankly, without institutional constraints, topics that were of deep interest to all and were related to photograph collections in archives.

According to Powers, the group devoted itself to several critical issues: How do American Indian communities feel about images from their past, and what are their opinions about the use of them? How can the issue of protecting the sacred and restricted knowledge contained in some photographs be dealt with? How can stereotyping, inaccuracy, and misuse be discouraged? Can consultation with communities help to address the problems, and, if so, how can it effectively be implemented with institutions that

had not previously sought it? Censorship began to loom up as a problem and, indeed, the issue of equal access to knowledge, which is the underlying principle for archival practice in our society. How could the differing values be accommodated? Above all, what were the ethics of the situation, what constitutes an ethical approach, and can such ethics be shared, disseminated, and encouraged?

These ongoing discussions focused on photographs from the past one hundred years, from approximately 1860 to 1960. The issues were at once archival and political, rather than photographic. It was not intended that the topics of art history, modern photography, science, or the practices of photographers be focused on, although they entered the discussion frequently. Lastly, the discussion group was considered a place to exchange ideas in order to learn, and then to plan how, within each of their different roles, to take what they had learned further.

After the first two years, it was clear that the discussions needed to reach broader audiences. Accordingly, plans were made for a variety of different kinds of gatherings at which new ideas and a larger range of opinions could be expressed. The first of these was an open meeting, held on 6 November 1992, for community leaders from Southwestern tribes and pueblos and for curators and archivists from institutions, in Santa Fe and elsewhere, with photograph collections. About fifty people attended from the Rio Grande pueblos, the Zuni, Hopi, Apache, and Navajo tribes, and many institutions. This meeting made it emphatically clear that photographs represented an important element of culture for Indian people, hitherto unaddressed but capable of arousing rich and complex connections and memories. It was also clear that it was critical to examine the issues centering on photographs across cultures.

Another kind of discussion was planned to reach people and institutions across the country: a symposium with invited participants and an audience, and room for dialogue between them. Again, participants and audience were both Indian and non-Indian: academics, museum curators, archivists, and photographers. Powers and Hill conceived the conference and its published proceedings as a forum for the presentation of ideas on and illustrations of the unfolding elements of Native American images.

I was a participant in the Santa Fe conference. Feeling the usefulness of bringing these issues to a broader audience of anthropologists, I organized a second symposium, "The

Shadowcatcher: Ownership, Access, and Use of Native American Photographs,"²⁵ which was an invited session sponsored by the Society of Visual Anthropology, at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, held in Atlanta in December 1994. A version of this introduction and the papers by Willow Powers and Lee Brumbaugh were presented there. During the spring following the Atlanta conference, I agreed to carry forward the editing begun by Powers and Hill. To the combined essays presented in Santa Fe and Atlanta, we were fortunate to acquire the contribution of Nigel Holman.

American Indian photography is an immense subject for research and discussion, and the primary focus here will be the use of these images, rather than the taking of them. Yet in an examination of the issues it becomes clear that attention must be paid to the act as well as the result of photographing. In photography across cultural boundaries, the act, the product, and the content are bound together in a context full of emotions, misunderstandings, and politics.

The essays in this issue reflect the organizing framework of the Santa Fe symposium. That framework consisted of four broad and loosely chronological topics for sessions: (1) the history of photography of Native Americans; (2) the role of photographs in creating stereotypes; (3) the use, and the nature of that use, of such photographs; and (4) the perspective of native photographers, both in their work and in their view of the issues of current photography. Each of the present essays covers more than just its given topic. So, for example, Nigel Holman's essay on Zuni photography discusses both historical and ethical issues; and both Monty Roessel and Rick Hill offer Native American perspectives on stereotyping. Although the essays are generally grouped into these themes, because of their multiple subjects we decided to omit any limiting section headings.

RESPONSES/"SOLUTIONS"

Although there can never be any single or final solutions to such complex problems, several strategies have been devised to meet these concerns. One of the easiest and most popular is the copying and "repatriation" of images: an end to alienation. One case in point is the California Indian Library Collections project.²⁶ Copies of photographs, sound recordings, and field notes were produced and deposited in county libraries to which local native popula-

tions have access. The native groups can then make use of the images and can annotate and correct the documentation. Even more direct are the many programs of photographic documentation sponsored by tribal museums, for example in Suquamish, Washington, and Zuni, New Mexico.²⁷

In Santa Fe, the original discussion group has continued to meet and plan. The next step will be a pilot project to take the discussions—and samples of archival photographs in the form of slides or videos—out to a sample of communities, to hear their opinions and desires, and to learn in what respects each community is similar or different in its view of the issues. In exchange, an outreach program of archival workshops will provide practical assistance, where it is requested, for communities setting up their own archives. The hope of the discussion group is eventually to include as many communities as can be reached, to try to find a new ethic for photography across cultures.

Parallel to these archival projects has been the exciting rise, over the past century, of a Native American photography. Although still largely cross-cultural, these pictures directly present a distinctly native perspective.²⁸ Among earlier Native American photographers were George Hunt (Kwakiutl), Peter Pitseolak (Inuit), Horace Poolaw (Kiowa), Harry Sampson (Northern Paiute), Louis Shotridge (Tlingit), and Richard Throssel (Wasco, adopted Crow).²⁹ Their roles and motives were various—for family and community, as commercial photographers, or as ethnographic assistants. Among the ever-growing numbers of contemporary native photographers are Dugan Aguilar (Pit River/Maidu/Northern Paiute), Jesse Cooday (Tlingit-Nishka), Richard Hill (Tuscarora), Carm Little-Turtle (Apache/Tarahumara), Victor Masayesva, Jr. (Hopi), Larry McNeil (Tlingit-Nishka), Paul Natonabah (Navajo), David Neel (Kwakiutl), Jolene Rickard (Tuscarora), Monty Roessel (Navajo), Jeffrey M. Thomas (Onondaga/Mohawk), Hulleah J. Tsinhnahjinnie (Navajo/Creek/Seminole), and Richard Ray Whitman (Euchee/Creek). Like other photographers, they work in both documentary and artistic styles. As time goes on, native people, especially native photographers, will define the debate concerning Native American photography.

The commentary of Elizabeth Weatherford (National Museum of the American Indian), our discussant at Atlanta, gave us much to think about. In place of the fear and worry so often expressed, she encouraged us to view our contemporary times as exciting, vibrant, and full of possibilities. We need, she said, to pay atten-

tion to what is going on now and to look, as well, to what was left out of the practices of the past. Weatherford suggested that we put aside the prevalent view, perhaps modeled on artifacts, that photographs are something limited, scarce, and rare. A protocol (an appropriate mode of intercultural behavior) is being formed between what is mandated by the strictly legal and what is considered good manners (respect). What we have here is an ongoing dialogue, never closure, in multiple arenas. All of us—including native peoples—are moving across cultures. And, as Weatherford reminded us, much of this cross-cultural discussion is conducted by native people with other native people.

The essays in this volume go far to extend our understanding of how and why photographic images of Native Americans exist and may be used. There is still much to be said, especially from a native perspective, but this represents a beginning. These are contentious issues, and it is hard to see how any complete consensus could ever be possible.³⁰ Yet it is extremely valuable to raise the questions for discussion, for these issues will not go away.

NOTES

1. Paula Richardson Fleming and Judith Lynn Luskey, *The North American Indians in Early Photographs* (New York: Harper and Row, 1986), 15.
2. Lucy Thompson, *To the American Indian: Reminiscences of a Yurok Woman* (1916; Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1991), 94, cf. 106.
3. Joy Harjo, "The Place of Origins," in *Partial Recall: Photographs of Native North Americans*, ed. Lucy R. Lippard (New York: The New Press, 1988), 90.
4. Victor Masayesva, Jr., "Kwkwilyaqa: Hopi Photography," in *Hopi Photographers/Hopi Images*, ed. Victor Masayesva, Jr., and Erin Younger (Tucson, AZ: Sun Tracks and University of Arizona Press, 1983), 11–12.
5. I have not been able to determine the earliest use of the term *shadow-catcher*. It was given recent prominence by filmmaker T.C. McLuhan in her portrait of Edward S. Curtis: *The Shadow Catcher: Edward S. Curtis and the North American Indian* (1975, 88 min., Phoenix Films). For other references to the term, see Thomas M. Heski, *The Little Shadow Catcher-Icastinyanka Cikala Hanzi: D. F. Barry, Celebrated Photographer of Famous Indians* (Seattle: Superior Publishing, 1978); Lynn Marie Mitchell, "Shadow Catchers on the Great Plains: Four Frontier Photographers of American Indians" (Master's thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1987). In a related usage, the Kaibab Paiute highlighted the photographer's ability to capture reflections when they called Smithsonian photographer Jack Hillers "Myself in the Water." "The Indians could see themselves reflected in still water pools, just as they could see themselves

reflected in Hillers's photographs," writes Don D. Fowler in *The Western Photographs of John K. Hillers: Myself in the Water* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), 47.

6. In addition to many articles, among the more notable recent books devoted to Native American photography are general surveys: Joanna Cohan Scherer, *Indians: The Great Photographs that Reveal North American Indian Life, 1847–1929, From the Unique Collection of the Smithsonian Institution* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1973); Paula Richardson Fleming and Judith Lynn Luskey, *The North American Indians in Early Photographs; Grand Endeavors of American Indian Photography* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993); William H. Goetzmann, *The First Americans: Photographs from the Library of Congress* (Washington, DC: Starwood Publishing, 1991), Alfred L. Bush and Lee Clark Mitchell, *The Photograph and the American Indian* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994 [which has an especially comprehensive bibliography]); regional and tribal surveys: Scherer, ed., "Northwest Coast Indian Photographs in Anthropological Inquiry," *Arctic Anthropology* 27:2 (1990): 1–50; Margaret B. Blackman, *Window on the Past: The Photographic Ethnohistory of the Northern and Kaigani Haida*, Mercury Series, paper no. 74 (Ottawa: National Museum of Man, Canadian Ethnology Service, 1981); William E. Farr, *The Reservation Blackfeet, 1882–1945: A Photographic History of Cultural Survival* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984); Masayesva, Jr., and Younger, eds., *Hopi Photographers/Hopi Images*; and the most popular genre, monographs on individual photographers: Florence Curtis Graybill and Victor Boesen, *Edward Sheriff Curtis: Visions of a Vanishing Race* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976); Bill Holm and George Irving Quimby, *Edward S. Curtis in the Land of the War Canoes: A Pioneer Cinematographer in the Pacific Northwest* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1980); Christopher M. Lyman, *The Vanishing Race and Other Illusions: Photographs of Indians by Edward S. Curtis* (New York: Pantheon Books, in association with the Smithsonian Institution Press, 1982); Fowler, *The Western Photographs of John K. Hillers*; Patrick T. Houlihan and Betsy E. Houlihan, *Lummi in the Pueblos* (Flagstaff, AZ: Northland Press, 1986); Paul V. Long, *Big Eyes: The Southwestern Photographs of Simeon Schwemberger, 1902–1908* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1992); William Webb and Robert A. Weinstein, *Dwellers at the Source: Southwestern Indian Photographs of A.C. Vroman, 1895–1904* (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973); Victoria Wyatt, *Images from the Inside Passage: An Alaskan Portrait by Winter and Pond* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1989); Patricia Janis Broder, *Shadows on Glass: The Indian World of Ben Wittick* (Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1990); see also Mick Gidley, "North American Indian Photographs/Images: Review Essay," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 9 (1985): 37–47.

7. For the postcolonial critique, see Dell Hymes, ed., *Reinventing Anthropology* (New York: Random House, 1972). James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); George E. Marcus and Michael M. J. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

8. Taking examples only from the Northwest Coast, there was Aldona Jonaitis, ed., *Chiefly Feasts: The Enduring Kwakiutl Potlatch* (New York/Seattle: American Museum of Natural History/University of Washington Press, 1991) and Robin K. Wright, ed., *A Time of Gathering: Native Heritage in Washington State* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991).

9. Agnes Tabah, *Native American Collections and Repatriation* (Washington, DC: American Association of Museums, Technical Information Service, 1993); Tamara L. Bray and Thomas W. Killion, eds., *Reckoning with the Dead: The Larsen Bay Repatriation and the Smithsonian Institution* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994). For a general review, see Tom Greaves, ed., *Intellectual Property Rights for Indigenous Peoples: A Sourcebook* (Oklahoma City, OK: Society for Applied Anthropology, 1994).

10. Steven Feld, "From Schizophonia to Schismogenesis: On the Discourses and Commodification Practices of 'World Music' and 'World Beat,'" in *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues*, Charles Keil and Steven Feld (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 257–89.

11. Thomas Vennum, Jr., "Who Should Have Access to Indian Music in Archives?" in *Sharing a Heritage: American Indian Arts*, ed. Charlotte Heth (Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, UCLA, 1984), 137–46; Richard Keeling, "Tribal Music and Cultural Revival," in *Sharing a Heritage*, 165–73.

12. Sydel Silverman and Nancy J. Parezo, eds., *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed. (New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1995).

13. Julie Anne Broyles, "The Politics of Heritage: Native American Museums and the Maintenance of Ethnic Boundaries on the Contemporary Northwest Coast" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1989); Ivan Karp, Christine Mullen Kreamer, and Steven D. Lavine, eds., *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992).

14. Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (1936; New York: Schocken Books, 1969), 217–51.

15. William J. Mitchell, *The Reconfigured Eye: Visual Truth in the Post-Photographic Era* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1992).

16. Scherer, "Historical Photographs as Anthropological Documents: A Retrospect," in "Picturing Cultures: Historical Photographs in Anthropological Inquiry," ed. Scherer, *Visual Anthropology* 3 (1990): 131–55.

17. Long, *Big Eyes*, 39–75.

18. Dell Hymes, "Anthologies and Narrators," in *Recovering the Word: Essays on Native American Literature*, ed. Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 42–44.

19. Barre Toelken, "Life and Death in the Navajo Coyote Tales," in *Recovering the Word*, 396–400.

20. James C. Faris, *The Nightway: A History and a History of Documentation of a Navajo Ceremonial* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990), 22.

21. Anonymous, "Ethical Implications of the Documentary Record," *Museum Anthropology* 18 (1994): 64–66.

22. Peter Loizos, pers. comm., see Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz, and Jay Ruby, eds., *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film, and Television* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

23. Masayesva and Younger, *Hopi Photographers/Hopi Images*, 24.

24. The following discussion of the genesis of the Santa Fe conference is derived from a statement prepared by Willow Roberts Powers.

25. The phrasing in the subtitle was intentionally ambiguous, since it refers to photographs of, by, and for Native Americans.

26. Lee Davis and Don Koué, *Going Home: The California Indian Library Collections Manual* (Berkeley: California Indian Project, Lowie Museum of Anthropology, University of California, 1989).

27. For Suquamish, see Suquamish Museum, *The Eyes of Chief Seattle* (Suquamish, WA: The Suquamish Museum, 1985); for Zuni, see Holman (below).

28. Lippard, ed., *Partial Recall*; Bush and Mitchell, *The Photograph and the American Indian*; Aperture Foundation, *Strong Hearts: Native American Visions and Voices*, no. 139 (New York: Aperture Foundation, 1995); Theresa Harlan, "A Curator's Perspective: Native American Photographers Creating a Visual Native American History," *Exposure* 29 (1993): 12-28.

29. Scherer, "Historical Photographs as Anthropological Documents," 149.

30. Even the preparation of this special issue was caught up in contention. Joanna Cohan Scherer submitted an essay on early photographs of the Sun Dance among the Blackfoot of Canada ("W.H. Boorne's Photos of the Medicine Lodge Ceremony: The Construction of an Icon"), but because of objections from a native reviewer, the journal declined to publish it, for fear of offending native sensibilities. Both of the special issue editors had felt that, although clearly sensitive, the paper should be published in order to raise and discuss some of these opposing issues. Instead, these necessary discussions will have to take place in another forum.