

Perceptions of Repatriation in Anthropological Literature

by

Suzanne Kroeger
Anthropology Degree, from University of Victoria, 2017

An Essay Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the

HONOURS PROGRAM

in the Department of Anthropology

© Suzanne Kroeger, 2017
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Abstract

Over the last three decades the topic of repatriation has become widely, and at times intensely, debated. Anthropologists, members of Indigenous communities, and governments have varying opinions and agendas regarding this issue. As such, this subject often appears within academic literature. As repatriation emerges as a best practice for the building and maintaining of relationships between institutions with legacies in the settler colonial state and Indigenous communities, the subject of repatriation in academic literature has been framed in several different ways. This paper addresses how repatriation has been framed within the anthropological journals *Museum Anthropology* and *American Antiquity* over the last three decades. Specifically, it asks what are the common trends and rationales pertaining to the repatriation debate? Has there been a shift over time in how repatriation has been discussed in each journal? How are these articles framed in relation to religious freedom, scientific inquiry, calls for collaboration or executing bureaucratic obligations? Ultimately, this research seeks to identify trends in the discourse surrounding the topic of repatriation over time.

Keywords

Repatriation, discourse analysis, framing, collaboration

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
Research Question	5
Situating Repatriation	6
NAGPRA, Repatriation & Museums	7
The Changing Role of Museums	8
Methods	9
Journal Selection	10
Overview of Research	11
Description of Research Process	13
Critical Discourse Analysis	14
Qualitative Content Analysis	15
Framing	16
Cultural Safety	18
Findings	20
Discussion	22
Significance & Limitations	34
Conclusion & Recommendations	35
Appendix 1: Database	36
Appendix 2: Database Bibliography	38
Bibliography	39

Introduction

Over the last three decades the topic of repatriation has become widely, and at times intensely, debated. Anthropologists, members of Indigenous communities, and governments have varying opinions and agendas regarding this issue. As such, this subject often appears within academic literature. As the discourse surrounding repatriation becomes more common Indigenous and other previously colonized communities worldwide are asserting their rights regarding the return of ancestral human remains and material legacy from institutions, such as museums and universities. Moreover, Indigenous groups are asserting their rights from the post-colonial state. This assertion of rights is of great significance to those institutions which have had ancestral remains in their possession for decades as a result of archaeological excavations (Fforde, Hubert and Turnbull 2002).

As repatriation emerges as a best practice for the building and maintenance of relationships between institutions with legacies in the settler colonial state and Indigenous communities, the subject of repatriation in academic literature has been framed many different ways. For some, the repatriation of First Nations and Native American remains and objects has been interpreted as a threat to anthropological science and scientific inquiry. For others, it is perceived as a manifestation of the right to religious freedom through the return of ancestors and sacred objects to their descendent communities. Others again, see it as the attempt to reconcile divergent world views on cultural heritage and the need create collaborative research environments. For still others, it is a bureaucratic obligation.

Research Questions

This essay addresses how repatriation has been framed within the anthropological journals *Museum Anthropology* and *American Antiquity* over the last three decades. Specifically, it asks what are the common trends and rationales pertaining to the repatriation debate? Has there been a shift over time in how repatriation has been discussed in each journal? How are these articles framed in relation to religious freedom, scientific inquiry, calls for collaboration or executing bureaucratic obligations? Ultimately, I seek to understand whether a museum-centered anthropological journal compared to one focusing on archaeology express conflicting or similar opinions regarding repatriation and whether these discourses have changed over time.

In the first section, I provide some context for my research by briefly discussing a current example of repatriation in practice and the legislation surrounding it. In the second section, I outline my methods and theoretical perspectives and give an overview of my research. Here I explain my journal selection, how my research engages with anthropology, and my expected results for my research; followed by a description of the work I am building on. The third section contains a discussion of my research process and the literature plus key concepts that informed my research approach, including discourse and content analysis, framing theory, and cultural safety. I then outline my findings followed by a discussion of my results. The final sections contain my interpretation followed by a conclusion and a discussion of future research.

Situating Repatriation

Perhaps the best known example of the repatriation debate that highlights the contention and differences between anthropological scientists and Indigenous people is the case of the Kennewick Man, also known as The Ancient One. The remains of this 9,000-year-old individual were discovered in a riverbed in Washington State in 1996 and quickly became the center of an

intense legal debate. Under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) a coalition of five Native American communities claimed the remains as their rightful ancestor and requested their return for immediate reburial. However, eight anthropologists sued to prevent the remains from being repatriated citing a lack of evidence of cultural affiliation (Kakaliouras 2012, 211). This resulted in an eight-year lawsuit between the US federal government, Native American tribes, and a group of anthropologists, finally settled in 2004. The Ancient One's association to present-day Native American groups has generated both historical and legal questions surrounding land claims, cultural affiliation, and religious beliefs. What is more, the genomic sequence revealed similarities with several contemporary Native American groups that live in the same geographic region, thus suggesting that The Ancient One was a member of a population directly ancestral to those populations (Slatkin and Racimo 2016, 6384). In terms of repatriation, this solidified the Native American coalition's claim that these remains were their ancestors which granted them the right to reburial. This example highlights the debate surrounding the practice of repatriation.

NAGPRA, Repatriation & Museums

NAGPRA is concerned with the ownership and control of Native American “cultural objects,” which include “human remains, associated and unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony” (Gough 2008, 210). The NAGPRA legislation was established to implement a set of procedures and legal standards the US federal government, certain museums, educational and other institutions must uphold regarding the repatriation of human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and cultural patrimony. It also recognizes the tribal, Native American and individual rights relating to burial sites on federal and tribal lands

(Gough 2008, 210). One problematic feature of NAGPRA is that it only addresses the repatriation of cultural property from public sectors, leaving the private sector, such as private collectors or auction houses, without any sort of repatriation procedural policies or legislation.

NAGPRA affects not only repatriation efforts in the United States, it can also affect First Nations communities in Canada, when their ancestral objects are held in American museums, for example (Gough 2008, 210). Within Canada there is no federal legislation equivalent to NAGPRA. Repatriation claims are handled on a case-by-case basis, and “are subject to the discretion of museum directors and the protocol established by various ad hoc museum policies and treaty precedents” (Gough 2008, 210). According to Williams (1995), “repatriation has actually increased the ambiguity and conflict between First Nations and museums, as it raises questions of appropriate care and disposition of all kinds of objects” (183). There are four main arguments museums usually raise when trying to retain cultural objects in their collections. First, museums argue that it is the museum's responsibility to preserve and display objects “for the benefit of the public (Williams 1995, 184).” Museums also argue that repatriation could ultimately lead to the depletion of collections. Third, museums cite difficulties and challenges to designating appropriate tribal ownership as an argument against repatriation. Finally, museums will nevertheless claim legal title over the cultural property in their collections (Williams 1995, 183-184). For these, and other reasons, museums continue to be source of debate and point of contention for members of Indigenous populations. The right to ownership and control over culture and heritage have conflicting meanings for both museums and Indigenous groups.

The Changing Role of Museums

Museums have always been involved in cultural preservation programs, as an attempt to “rescue” and preserve cultural heritage (Williams 1995, 201). However, as First Nation and Native American people began to make their concerns over collections heard, the role of museums started to change (Winter 1995, 36). This change may be drastic for museums; however, many argue it is not enough. Terri-Lynn Williams is a citizen of the Haida Nation and serves as their General Council, she practices aboriginal-environmental law and is a founding Executive Director of the EAGLE (Environmental-Aboriginal Guardianship through Law and Education) national charity (White Raven Law 2017). Her article “Cultural Perpetuation: Repatriation of First Nations Cultural Heritage” (1995) provides insight into how museums and repatriation are perceived from an Indigenous perspective. In the article she states:

To some extent, First Nations are thankful for the preservation of these objects and for the exposure of cultural objects to the general public. There is still room for a limited role by museums in presenting the richness of our culture through the display of cultural objects, but the role of presentation and preservation of First Nations cultures must now rest with First Nations. The ultimate control and management of collections of First Nations' heritage properly lies with First Nations themselves. Museums now have an opportunity to participate in cultural *perpetuation*, and this is exactly what repatriation offers to museums and other institutions. Returning collections to the appropriate First Nations will help to ensure the survival of First Nations cultures and, upon the creation of First Nations-controlled cultural centres, will mean that some of these collections could be presented in the natural and appropriate context by their rightful "owners." (Williams 1995, 201-202)

According to Winter (1995), “[a]ll cultural property represents contrasting values to different groups in our contemporary society: cultural and heritage values, social and family rights and prerogatives, scholarly and educational values, and even monetary and economic values” (36). The contrast of these values is evident in the debate of museums. Where museums claim to “preserve” culture through the exhibition and display of cultural objects, Indigenous people argue that museums have created a romanticized and inaccurate portrayal of a static

representation of the “Vanished Indian” (Wilson 1992, 6), and have preserved their culture to the brink of extinction. A series of historical events in Canada triggered the awareness of repatriation, including treaty and land claim negotiations and “The Spirit Sings” exhibit put on at the Glenbow Museum in Calgary. It is important to be mindful of the historical climate and the dominant narrative of repatriation in order to contextualize the contemporary debate (Gough 2008, 208).

Methods

To answer my research questions, data was collected from the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) Bulletin, its flagship journal *American Antiquity*, and the *Museum Anthropology* journal published by the Council for Museum Anthropology (CMA), a section of the American Anthropological Association. I analyzed all the articles, news and notes, and reviews relating to repatriation, First Nations, and Native Americans, within these two leading journals. I examined all the articles from 1985 until 2016 in both *Museum Anthropology* and *American Antiquity*, and counted the repatriation articles, as well as assessed how repatriation was framed and discussed in relation to specific chosen themes, including; religious freedom, scientific inquiry, calls for collaboration, and execution of bureaucratic obligations. A preliminary search of *American Antiquity* through the JSTOR database yielded 114 results, of those I found eleven that adequately discussed repatriation to be considered. My initial search for “repatriation” in *Museum Anthropology* through the AnthroSource database yielded 223 results. Of those, 29 contributions were considered for this paper.

Journal Selection

These journals have been chosen because they are leading journals in their subfields within anthropology, and are frequent points of reference for professionals in these subfields. As museums play a considerably large role in the holding and displaying of First Nations and Native American cultural objects, I hypothesized that there would be significant literature, research and comments regarding repatriation within anthropological journals with museum foci. *Museum Anthropology* was selected because it:

Seeks to be a leading voice for scholarly research on the collection, interpretation, and representation of the material world. Through critical articles, provocative commentaries, and thoughtful reviews, this peer-reviewed journal aspires to cultivate vibrant dialogues that reflect the global and trans-disciplinary work of museums. Situated at the intersection of practice and theory, *Museum Anthropology* advances our knowledge of the ways in which material objects are intertwined with living histories of cultural display, economics, socio-politics, law, memory, ethics, colonialism, conservation, and public education. (Museum Anthropology 2017)

It was hypothesized that the *Museum Anthropology* would shift from opposing repatriation to supporting it over time. I expected the major themes to be preservation of cultural heritage, and the need for collaboration between museums, anthropologists and Indigenous communities.

The other journal selected, *American Antiquity*, was chosen to provide contrasting insights into the discussion of repatriation. As *American Antiquity* is considered to be “the premier journal of North American archaeology” and “devoted to the archaeology, method and theory of the New World” (American Antiquity 2017), I hypothesized that the articles from this journal would offer an interesting avenue for comparison. For the *American Antiquity* journal, it was anticipated that the contributions would be primarily focused on science, and the anthropologists’ right to scientific inquiry. As such, I expected the tone of the articles to oppose repatriation.

This research does not directly engage with articles from a physical anthropology journal, though a cursory keyword search of repatriation in the database for the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* revealed 121 matches. Only one contribution, however, contained

‘repatriation’ in the title. Further research on this topic could include the evaluation of other anthropological journals, including *Current Anthropology*, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *American Journal of Archaeology* and the *Annual Review of Anthropology*.

The time period, 1985 to 2016, was chosen to provide a large temporal sample that could show changes in themes, or shifts in opinions over time. Starting the search in 1985 allowed for insights into the atmosphere of anthropological literature in the lead up to NAGPRA and other repatriation legislations and policies being implemented. Including articles into 2016 provided contemporary opinions and views of the repatriation debate. As more Nations are standing up and demanding their rights to sovereignty, it was expected that there would be an increase in repatriation articles within the current publications of each journal. Having the database span thirty years also allowed me to discover potential trends in the discussion over time.

Overview of Research

This research will engage all four subfields of anthropology. Repatriation policies and legislations influence the work of anthropologists from the physical, cultural and archaeological subfields, as it influences what is considered best practice in each of these fields. In particular, I will be engaging with the cultural and linguistic subfields most readily, using qualitative research methods and linguistic analysis. Linguistically, I examine how the language and frames in articles can act to inform and contextualize the perceptions of repatriation in these journals. From a cultural perspective, this discourse analysis of the discussion of repatriation in literature and legislation will provide insight into the practice of repatriation as it becomes a factor in reconciliation between postcolonial institutions and Indigenous communities. This research allowed me to create a detailed inventory of academic literature with repatriation as a topic, by

applying discourse analysis to the texts with mention of repatriation. I will be able to conclude whether there was a commonality between the emergence of repatriation in anthropological literature and government policy as well as discover how this subject was perceived by anthropologists over time. In a broader sense, this research will act to inform anthropologists, policy makers, and others that may engage in this practice, about both the importance of repatriation and the importance of practicing it in a culturally respectful manner.

I build on the work of Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh, who in 2010 wrote an editorial in *Museum Anthropology* highlighting how anthropological journals have fallen short in fostering thoughtful dialog about repatriation. They discovered that since NAGPRA became law in 1991, only nine contributions have appeared in *Museum Anthropology* with “repatriation” in the title. Half of those were printed within a year of the legislation being implemented and one was a reprint of the legislation (Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2010, 100). One article had to do with repatriation in Germany (Feest 1991), two others related to the National Museum of the American Indian’s (NMAI) repatriation policy, not NAGPRA directly (Carpenter 1991; West 1991). The other two articles are David Hurst Thomas’ (1991) reflections on NAGPRA’s implications for museums and Bruce Bernstein’s (1991) analysis of repatriation at the Museum of New Mexico. At the time of this study, they found only three contributions had been published in *Museum Anthropology* since 1992 (Jacobs 2009; Lippert 2002; Rosenblum 1996).

Their analysis of *American Antiquity* also returned few articles regarding repatriation.

They found that:

Within three years of NAGPRA’s passage, Goldstein and Kintigh (1990) published a statement on ethics and the “reburial controversy,” Meighan (1992) published an antirepatriation polemic, Deloria (1992) retorted with a polemic of his own, and Klesert and Powell (1993) published a paper arguing for balance and respect. Taken together, these contributions offer a considered and spirited debate on the implications and potential ramifications of NAGPRA on archaeological research. However, since then scant few papers addressing the topic have been

published (i.e., Bruning 2006; Dongoske et al. 1997; Goldstein 1998). Several papers address issues related to NAGPRA, such as the use of oral tradition in cultural affiliation, or briefly reference the legislation (Bernardini 2005; Echo-Hawk 2000; Watkins 2003). Other contributions in *American Antiquity* provide only a cursory mention of NAGPRA and repatriation, and thus do not merit citation here. (Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2010, 100)

While Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh's work focused on the number of articles regarding repatriation, I was interested in how repatriation was discussed within the articles mentioned as well as other articles published after their editorial within *Museum Anthropology* and *American Antiquity*. For my research, I was interested specifically in the articles that contained significant discussion, dialog or debate of repatriation implications, policies and opinions relating to First Nations and Native Americans. An article was excluded if there was only a cursory mention of repatriation. There were many results where repatriation was only mentioned in the references section, or when referring to the NAGPRA legislation. I limited my sample to contain articles that had in depth discussions of repatriation and dealt with the pragmatic and policy issues surrounding repatriation. This method of selection and exclusion provided me with a sample of forty-one journal articles from both journals.

Description of Research Process

My research process involved reading the title, abstract (when available), and the article to identify how the article's arguments were constructed and what themes were present. The titles (in earlier years) and the abstract (in more recent years) offer framing perspectives that help facilitate data gathering (Borofsky 2002, 465). When assessing each article, I had a specific set of questions I sought to answer. (1) Did the author (or authors) discuss repatriation in terms of religious freedom, scientific inquiry, collaboration between Indigenous and non-indigenous groups, or executing bureaucratic obligations? (2) Does the tone of the article support or oppose

repatriation. This was inferred from tone and language used. For example, when discussing NAGPRA after ten years, Owsley and Jantz (2001) wrote that “the original intent is being replaced in some quarters by politically expedient decisions that favor some American Indian interests to the detriment of sound scientific inquiry and the public's right to information about the past” (571). Here, the language used cast repatriation in a negative light. In using the word detriment when talking about repatriation, it is implied that repatriation is an obstacle or barrier to scientific inquiry. This article discussed repatriation in terms of scientific inquiry and bureaucratic obligation and was opposed to repatriation. Further analysis of themes and this quote will be discussed later in this paper. To identify themes and support my argument I applied critical discourse analysis, framing analysis, and qualitative linguistic analysis to the content, meaning, and themes surrounding repatriation in academic journals in order to complete a comparative analysis of the two journals.

Critical Discourse Analysis

As discourse is socially constructed and conditioned, critical discourse analysis can be used as a function to disarticulate and critique texts. It helps researchers to understand the social problems mediated by conventional ideology and power relations that are perpetuated in written texts (Mogashoa 2014, 106). This method is useful for uncovering assumptions concealed within texts, as ideological assumptions can generate and enable frames. Mogashoa's (2014) article stated “critical discourse analysis aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between discursive practices, events and texts, and wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power” (105).

This approach allowed me to uncover the motivations and political orientations behind an article's position for or against repatriation. For example, when discussing museum's collection and knowledge production, Rosenblum (1996) argues that museums produce a "functional knowledge." She uses an example of an elephant displayed in a museum, in a good exhibit one should get an "idea of its size, measurements, habitat, and even behavior. All of these are helpful in the event you want to find one, try to catch it, ship it, or make it useful in some way" (61). She argued that this type of knowledge is "utilitarian in nature" as it does not address the actual collection of an object or the curator's intentions when displaying objects (Rosenblum 1996, 61). Here, science sees human remains as a material object, decontextualized from social relationships, on display for the public, objectified as the "savage other." The issue is about what human remains are - people - and by decontextualizing them from their history and social environment, they lose their meaning. In other words, in using human remains for scientific inquiry, human beings are reduced to material objects rather than being recognized for their sociality and morality. Objectifying Indigenous peoples' culture and heritage in museums, decontextualizes them from their traditional meanings, meanings that go beyond what can be explained by science. This article spoke to the power inequalities Indigenous people face with representation in museums and questions who decides how to represent Native American and First Nation culture and heritage.

Qualitative Content Analysis

In addition to counting words and extracting objective content, a qualitative content analysis (QCA) will be useful to examine the meanings, patterns, and themes within each text and compare them with texts from previous years and within both journals. QCA requires the

researcher to be mindful of specific themes and how they may describe “the range of the meanings of the phenomenon rather than the statistical significance of the occurrence of particular texts or concepts” (Zhang and Wildemuth 2016, 2). The article “Complex Legal Legacies: The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Scientific Study, and Kennewick Man”, by Susan B. Bruning (2006), in *American Antiquity*, argues that “NAGPRA has notably *affected* the archaeological profession, both by *requiring* increased interaction with extant Native American groups and by *limiting* access to certain materials traditionally available for *scientific inquiry*” (502, italics added). Here, the words “affected”, “requiring” and “limiting” frame NAGPRA as a restriction. In this, “limiting” or “limits”, are barriers to science; “requiring” or “requirements” are restrictions or demands placed on science, and “scientific inquiry” is framed as the victim. These words reflect the ideological assumptions of the author that views repatriation as an obstacle to scientific freedom and inquiry. This is an example of how I used QCA to identify themes. In this case, the language used (affected, requiring, limiting) connote repatriation as a threat, thus this article was deemed to oppose repatriation.

Another example of identifying themes is in the article “Indigenous Peoples' Claims to Cultural Property: A Legal Perspective” by Rebecca Tsosie (1997). She discusses NAGPRA and Anglo American property laws and found that “NAGPRA protects tangible cultural resources... NAGPRA's overriding goal is to repatriate essential cultural resources to Native American people, and thus, the statute's intent is to respect Native American beliefs and provide a legal means to enforce their claims” (6). She argues that NAGPRA protects cultural resources and respects Native American cultures. The language in Tsosie’s excerpt frames NAGPRA with “protection” and “respect.” These words convey a sense of recognition of Native Americans right to religious freedom and acknowledges the validity of Native American cultural beliefs.

The word “protects” connotes that these vulnerable populations need to be protected by legal means. Providing a “legal means” speaks to a group's right to culture and cultural resources. For these reasons, I classified this article to support repatriation with the theme of religious freedom.

Framing

I used framing analysis to describe general trends in the coverage and discussion of repatriation across media, in this case *Museum Anthropology* and *American Antiquity*. Within the social sciences, framing involves the theoretical perspectives and concepts that individuals, groups, and societies perceive and convey of reality. It organizes the social construction of social phenomena (Benford and Snow 2000, 612). George Lakoff (2010) argues that “all of our knowledge makes use of frames, and every word is defined through the frames it neurally activates,” all thinking and talking comprises framing (71). Frames also come in systems, where one word not only stimulates the defining frame, but also various other frames within that system (Lakoff 2010, 71). The best example of this of Lakoff's (2004) exercise “Don't think of an elephant! Whatever you do, do *not* think of an elephant” (italics in original, 3). He asks his students to complete this task, and has yet to find a student who has been able to not think of an elephant. Because of the way he set up the exercise, asking his students not to think of elephants, he evoked the frames associated with them. Every word, like elephant, repatriation or reconciliation evokes a frame. This can be an image or other forms of knowledge. For the elephant example, they are large, gray, have big floppy ears and a trunk, they can be associated with Africa, circuses, or safaris (Lakoff 2004, 3). Thus, the word is defined relative to its frame.

Framing is not only about finding language that suits a specific worldview, or even just about language. It is primarily about ideas, where the language conveys and evokes those ideas

(Lakoff 2004, 4). A major finding in cognitive sciences is that humans typically think in terms of unconscious constructs or frames. These include semantic roles, the relation between roles, and the relation to other frames (Lakoff 2010, 71). According to Lakoff (2004), “since political ideologies are, of course, characterized by systems of frames, ideological language will activate that ideological system” (72). One key principle of framing theory is that a subject can be understood from a variety of perspectives, with implications for multiple values or considerations. This concept is relevant because of the subjectivity of this thesis, I am one person with one perspective.

With the same information being used as a constant, the frame surrounding an issue can influence a reader’s perception without having to alter the facts (Goffman 1974). The framing process allows people to construct a particular conceptualization or reorient thinking of an issue (Chong and Druckman 2007, 104). Anthropologists writing about repatriation may highlight certain features of repatriation or NAGPRA to frame how they want the reader to perceive or interpret them. For example, emphasizing their expected effects (positive, the revival of ceremonies and rituals or negative, preventing skeletal analysis), or emphasizing their relation to important values (cultural or scientific). For the purpose of this paper, framing is the process in which some aspects of reality are selected and emphasized, so that the subject (repatriation) is defined, its causes are identified, moral judgments are suggested and appropriate solutions and actions are proposed. Frames are built through the selection, emphasis, and exclusion of facts (Ardèvol-Abreu 2015, 428). The influences of framing are fundamental in the formation of attitudes and opinions (Chong and Druckman 2007, 120). Through the examination of frames produced by anthropologists on either side of the repatriation debate in the articles and editorials,

within the publications of interest, a set of ‘culturally available frames’ in anthropological repatriation discourse was developed.

Cultural Safety

Museum curators and staff, researchers and anthropologists, policy developers should all aim to work in a culturally safe manner. Brascoupé and Waters (2009) argue that a culturally unsafe practice can be defined as “any actions that diminish, demean or disempower the cultural identity and well-being of an individual” (7). Culturally safe policies and practices involve implementing cultural considerations to policy development, strategic planning and training for any institution or researcher that carries out research with Indigenous communities (Brascoupé and Waters 2009, 7). One main requirement of cultural safety is the explicit and detailed recognition of Indigenous peoples’ cultural identity and the historic legacy of power disparity and repression (Brascoupé and Waters 2009, 14). Cultural safety is one way to challenge and change “broad attitudes and deep-seated conceptions” of an individual and community or society (Brascoupé and Waters 2009, 13). Its outcome is to provide a collaborative relationship fostered in respect and bicultural exchange with equality and shared responsibility (Brascoupé and Waters 2009, 15).

The principles of ownership, control, access and possession (OCAP) were built upon Indigenous claims to self-determination to “indigenize” knowledge and offset inequality (Brascoupé and Waters 2009, 12). It is described as the “political response to colonialism and the role of knowledge production in reproducing colonial relations,” motivated by the history of questionable research relations with Indigenous people (Schnarch 2004, 3). These principles are defined further as:

- **Ownership:** a community or group owns information collectively in the same way that an individual owns his or her personal information.
- **Control:** affirms that Aboriginal communities are within their rights in seeking control over all aspects of the research process.
- **Access:** Aboriginal peoples must have access to information/data about themselves and their communities, regardless of where it is currently held. The right for Aboriginal communities to manage and make decisions regarding access to their information and resources.
- **Possession:** Actual physical control of data (ownership identifies the relationship between people and their information). A mechanism by which ownership can be asserted and protected. This is the most legally significant of all the OCAP principles. (Brascoupé and Waters 2009, 12).

With these principles, the transfer of power is real. It has the potential to threaten the current power structures of organizations and society, and is extended to the policies and practices in place by these institutions (Brascoupé and Waters 2009, 12). For example, the collection, research, and display of Indigenous artifacts at museums. The fundamental features of cultural safety are the visibility of cultural differences and the powers that flow from that visibility, which lead to the demand for control, equality and respect of Indigenous people (Brascoupé and Waters 2009, 12). OCAP is designed to promote Indigenous knowledge and perspectives as well as minimize bias and misinterpretations caused by differing cultural frameworks. It also provides communities with empowerment, self-determination and healing (Schnarch 2004, 32-33).

Findings

In creating a database for this project, I categorized my findings by the title and author(s) of article, the theme of the article (scientific inquiry, religious freedom, bureaucratic obligation and collaboration), the tone of the article (support or oppose repatriation) and then provided evidence from each text that justified my findings. See Appendix 1 for a table which documents my findings. A preliminary search of *American Antiquity* through the JSTOR database yielded 114 results, of those I found eleven that adequately discussed repatriation to be considered. My

initial search for “repatriation” in *Museum Anthropology* through the AnthroSource database yielded 223 results. Of those, 29 contributions were considered for this paper. There were many contributions with only a cursory mention of repatriation or NAGPRA and were excluded from my data set. I limited my sample to contain articles that had in depth discussions of reparation and dealt with the pragmatic and policy issues surrounding repatriation. I have listed all the articles considered to contain significant discussion of repatriation in Appendix 2, so readers, whatever their background, can read through my sample and make their own assessments, if they so choose.

	Articles	Support	Opposed
American Antiquity	12	9	3
Museum Anthropology	29	26	3

Table 1. Article Breakdown

Within *American Antiquity*, I found nine articles to be in support of repatriation and three articles opposed to it. Each article contained one or more of the themes selected for this project. Of the three articles I found with tones opposing repatriation, one had the theme of scientific inquiry, and the other two had themes of scientific inquiry and bureaucratic obligation. The most common theme for this journal was collaboration, this theme was evident in seven articles. Followed by the theme scientific inquiry appearing in five articles and bureaucratic obligation in four articles. Religious freedom was found in three articles. Bureaucratic obligation was the only theme to appear always in association of another theme, either scientific inquiry or collaboration.

For *Museum Anthropology*, I determined that 26 articles supported repatriation and three articles opposed it. The articles opposing repatriation all had themes of scientific inquiry and two of them had bureaucratic obligation as a second theme. The most common theme for this journal was religious freedom which was apparent in thirteen articles. Followed by collaboration in twelve articles, and bureaucratic obligation also in twelve articles. Scientific inquiry was the theme in five articles and representation was the theme in three. Representation emerged as a theme within *Museum Anthropology* only. Many of the articles with themes of scientific inquiry, bureaucratic obligation and collaboration supported repatriation but framed the subject somewhat negatively. Examples of this dichotomy will be presented in the next section.

	Bureaucratic Obligation	Scientific Inquiry	Religious Freedom	Collaboration	Representation
American Antiquity	4	5	3	7	0
Museum Anthropology	12	5	13	12	3

Table 2. Themes of each journal

Discussion

This section provides a detailed explanation followed by examples of how and why each theme was selected and defined. For the theme scientific inquiry, I selected any article that described repatriation as negatively affecting science, and any article that used science and the right to knowledge as a justification against repatriation. I expected this to be to predominant theme at the beginning of my research as the work of many anthropologists, especially those in the subfields of physical anthropology and archaeology, would be affected by repatriation legislations. In the articles that supported repatriation within the theme of scientific inquiry, they

often stated the negative effects repatriation would have on science and the public's right to “knowledge.” I will provide examples of how the theme of scientific inquiry was employed for articles. Two when it was framed as supporting repatriation and two in opposition.

The first example in support of repatriation with the theme of scientific inquiry is from an article published by *Museum Anthropology* in 1989. In the article “Update on Repatriation/Reburial” Keith W. Kintigh wrote about the SAA’s position on reburial. The “position maintains that both scientific and traditional interests in human remains are legitimate. It states that the disposition of human remains should be determined on a case-by-case basis, considering the beliefs and strength of the relationship of claimants to the remains and the scientific value of the remains” (Update on Repatriation/Reburial 1989, 11). This was one of the only articles in this study published before the passing of NAGPRA, and somewhat acknowledges both sides of the repatriation debate. It was troubling that depending on the “strength of the relationship” an Indigenous group proclaims to have to a set of remains or the “scientific value” of those remains, repatriation happen. This could be problematic and potentially lead to the fabrication of discoveries with “scientific value.” Another question this excerpt raises is, who has the authority to decide how to measure what constitutes enough “scientific value” to prevent repatriation or a group's “beliefs and strengths of relationship”?

The next article is an example of an entry that supports repatriation with the theme of scientific inquiry. However, this author is highly critical of science and opposes the scientific inquiry. In *American Antiquity* the article “Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future” published in 1992, the Native American author Vine Deloria Jr. wrote “we have been the objects of scientific investigations and publications for far too long, and it is our intent to become people once again, not specimens” (595). He argues that science “has the edge in establishing itself as the primary

source of truth because of the spectacular success of technology” (595). This article’s negative view of science is most apparent in the excerpt “considering the vast financial and status rewards that the academic community bestows on its members, the chances are that scientists would lie, cheat and steal in order to advance their personal careers. But the implication of crying out ‘Science’ whenever reburial was mentioned was just the opposite--Indians were made to appear as if they were looting the scientific heritage instead of receiving back the remains of loved ones who had been illegally and immorally taken from them a century or more ago” (Deloria 1992, 595-596). Here it is argued that rather than preserving their cultural heritage through the repatriation and reburial of ancestral remains, Indigenous people are seen as cheating scientists out of work and glory. That repatriation and reburial prevent scientists from furthering their research. Scientist’s often focus on the consequences these policies have to their research and rarely consider those of the community from which their research “subjects” take place. When does someone's ancestor become a research specimen, and ultimately, who holds the power to distinguish the two? This highlights the problematic view of science and the scientific truth.

Also published in *American Antiquity*, the article “Archaeological Politics and Public Interest in Paleoamerican Studies: Lessons from Gordon Creek Woman and Kennewick Man” by Douglas W. Owsley and Richard L. Jantz (2001), is a stark contrast to the previous article. This article was found to oppose repatriation with the theme of scientific inquiry. These authors are two of the eight anthropologists previously mentioned that sued to prevent the repatriation of the Ancient Man’s remains. Their views of repatriation are apparent in the following quote when discussing NAGPRA after ten years. They argue that “originally NAGPRA was a compromise to resolve potentially conflicting interests including those of American Indians, museums and scientists, and the public” (Owsley and Jantz 2001, 571). My interpretation of the statement that

scientists and Native Americans have “potentially conflicting interests” is a colossal understatement that minimizes the extent and longevity of mistreatment Native American and First Nations people have experienced at the hands of science. Their stance is further demonstrated by the following excerpt regarding NAGPRA, “the original intent is being replaced in some quarters by politically expedient decisions that favor some American Indian interests to the detriment of sound scientific inquiry and the public's right to information about the past. As a result, a number of ancient remains like Minnesota Woman, Browns Valley, and Hourglass Cave already have been reburied, preventing future analysis using newly developed scientific techniques” (Owsley and Jantz 2001, 571). The language used casts repatriation in a negative light and explicitly states that repatriation is a “detriment” to scientific inquiry and reburial prevents future discoveries. These “politically expedient decisions” involved the reburial of Native American human remains, which some argue, never should have been excavated in the first place, and once found should have been immediately reburied to prevent causing the further harm to the individual. One author described grave excavation as “scientific grave looting” that denied ancestors “lasting burials” (In 1996, 238). However, these authors appear to argue that the public’s right to information outweighs the rights of Native Americans.

The other article interpreted as opposed to repatriation was “Repatriation Policy and the Heye Collection” by Edmund Carpenter (1991) published in *Museum Anthropology*. When discussing repatriation in relation to the archaeological work carried out on three thousand Native American graves, Carpenter (1991) wrote “the skeletal material alone offers an unparalleled reservoir of medical data that might some day save Seneca lives” (17). Referring to a human being, someone's ancestor, as “skeletal material” and a “reservoir of medical data,” reduces the individual to an object or specimen and is highly problematic. This could be

understood to mean that the potential for scientific technology to advance far enough so that it may some day save a life, is reason enough to prevent a human from being laid to rest. To further his criticism of repatriation, rather insensitively, he wrote “now we are told those efforts should be undone. Which means what? Rebury everything? Store in a closet or under a bed? Display in a tourist center adjoining a souvenir shop, or worse, a casino? Abandon all study, all conservation?” (Carpenter 1991, 17). A question that this passage raised was, if these bones contained a “reservoir of medical data,” and scientists were simply waiting for technology to advance so that at one point they may one day save lives, what will they do with the remains while they wait for technology to catch up to scientist’s aspirations? Store them? Display them in a museum? I would argue that the study of human remains has little to do with “conservation.” As every sample and test is completed, it destroys more of the remains.

Bureaucratic Obligation

The theme of bureaucratic obligation was not pre-selected at the beginning of this research, but emerged throughout the data collection period. This theme included any article that considered the logistic and policy implications of repatriation legislation. Many articles with this theme examined how repatriation legislation and policies were implemented, when repatriation was required, or how items met the criteria for repatriation. Articles within this theme discussed the “compliance” of museums and anthropologists in regards to repatriation. This theme was predominant in articles that supported repatriation but framed it negatively.

An example from *Museum Anthropology* is the article “Repatriation: The Bitter End or A Fresh Beginning?” by David Hurst Thomas published in 1991. In regards to NAGPRA, the article states that “the legislation requires all federal agencies and museums receiving federal funding to inventory and identify the nature of Native American and Hawaiian materials curated

in their collections” and “repatriation is required when federally recognized American Indians and Native Hawaiian groups can demonstrate a right of possession over human remains and specified cultural items” (Thomas 1991,10). Here it outlines that NAGPRA only applies to federal agencies, museums receiving federal funding and federally recognized Indigenous groups. The word required in both these quotes frames repatriation as an obligation and an imposition placed on museums and anthropologists. The following quote from the same article further exemplifies the theme of bureaucratic obligation in relation to repatriation legislations, “the museum and scientific communities initially lobbied strongly against both bills, but as reality sank in, most participants came to recognize the inevitability of legislation in some form” (Thomas 1991, 10). Here the futility of contesting repatriation is being recognized by some scientists and museum personnel. They may not agree with it, but are forced to uphold legislation. With the theme of bureaucratic obligation, I found this article to begrudgingly support repatriation.

The next example for theme of bureaucratic obligation is also from *Museum Anthropology*. In the article “NAGPRA at 20: What Have the States Done to Expand Human Remains Protections?” Seidemann (2010) argued in regards to NAGPRA that “[t]he purpose of this legislation was to remedy certain perceived injustices against Native Americans by returning to appropriate parties the remains of recently deceased Native Americans (i.e., those dead that were culturally affiliated with modern, existing tribes) whose remains were housed in federally funded museums and institutions” (199). Here, “perceived injustices” implies that Native Americans suffered a history of alleged or supposed mistreatment. By returning remains “housed in the federally funded museums and institutions” to their “appropriate” descendants, scientists

may be absolved of their “perceived injustices.” From the language used, I found the tone of this article to be opposed to repatriation.

Religious Freedom

In the context of repatriation, religious freedom is often used for the justification of the return of sacred and cultural objects housed in museums and other institutions. Limiting access to sacred objects interferes with indigenous religious practice and therefore conflicts with the guarantee of freedom of religion (Bell 1992, 516). The Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees of equality and religious freedom, however, Indigenous people “could argue that the treatment of their human remains as archaeological property and the subject of scientific study offends the equality of provisions of the Charter because their skeletal remains are not provided the same respect and protection as other skeletal remain (Bell 1992, 516).”

For the purposes of this study, religious freedom is synonymous to cultural freedom or right and freedom to practice one’s culture. If one has the right to practice religion, they also have the right to practice culture. The return of sacred artifacts, ceremonial objects and other cultural items, through repatriation is part of a group's right to religious and cultural freedom. As the return of these objects allows for the continuation of religious and ceremonial practices it is an important source of healing and reconciliation for many Indigenous communities.

Here is one example of an article determined to have the theme religious freedom. When discussing repatriation, Rosenblum (1996) wrote “Prior to 1990 most of the repatriations of Native American artifacts, religious items, and grave goods were based on the 1978 American Indian Religious Freedom Law. It stated that, “[i]t shall be the policy of the United States to

protect and preserve for American Indians their inherent right of freedom to believe, express, and exercise their traditional religions ... including but not limited to access to sites, [and the] use and possession of sacred objects" (65). This article describes the legislation involving religious items and grave goods and explicitly states that Native American's have the right to practice their traditional religion with the use of sacred objects and access to sacred sites.

Another example in *Museum Anthropology* where repatriation was discussed in terms of a group's right to religious freedom was the article "National Museum of the American Indian Policy Statement on Native American Human Remains and Cultural Materials" published in 1991. It stated that "[t]he goal of the Museum's repatriation policy is to support the continuation of ceremonial and ritual life among Native American peoples" and that "[t]he wishes of Native American peoples with respect to access to and treatment and use of ceremonial and religious materials needed in the practice of their religion must be granted" (Museum Anthropology 1991, 25). Perhaps more telling of this mandate is the affirmation that "[a]ll Native American materials, including human remains and religious objects, and communally-owned property, together with all culturally specific information, must be treated as the sole property of the affected Native American culturally-affiliated group with the utmost respect by scholars and interpreters of those cultures, whether in collections research, scientific study, exhibitions or educational programs" (Museum Anthropology 1991, 25). This article clearly states that Native American people's right to religious and ceremonial materials are fundamental in the production and continuation of culture and need to be considered for repatriation.

A final example of an article with the theme of religious freedom is Rebecca Tsosie's (1997) article "Indigenous Peoples' Claims to Cultural Property: A Legal Perspective." Tsosie (1997) claims that the failure of scientists and government officials to recognize Indigenous

rights, has in many instances resulted in the permanent loss of essential knowledge of indigenous cultural and religious life, which has negatively affected tribal social organization (5). She argues that “indigenous peoples have begun to reclaim their cultural property. American Indian nations represent living cultures with strong ties to their traditional past. Contemporary efforts to protect tribal rights to cultural property are closely related to the emerging movement among Indian nations to define their sovereignty according to their own concepts and traditions” (Tsosie 1997, 5). Indigenous peoples' struggle for self-determination encompasses the powerful normative concept of cultural integrity, and is centrally linked to their efforts to protect both tangible and intangible aspects of their cultural heritage; including their right to religious and cultural freedom.

Collaboration

The next theme that was developed for this project was collaboration. This theme of collaboration included any article that called for or discussed the collaboration between museums, Indigenous communities, and anthropologists. I found collaboration to be the most prevalent theme of this project. With 20 of the 41 articles containing this theme. The theme of collaboration was apparent in articles from both journals in all three decades of consideration. All the articles with the theme of collaboration were found to be in support of repatriation, though in some instances, collaboration was viewed as a bureaucratic obligation. Here are examples of articles with this theme.

In the article “Repatriation and Collaboration: The Museum of New Mexico” by Bruce Bernstein published in *Museum Anthropology* in 1991, he wrote that “collaboration allows a museum to gain greater knowledge about collections and enhanced interpretive powers.

Repatriation is about creating partnerships and giving cultures authority over their own heritage” (19). This suggests that not only is repatriation a benefit to the Indigenous community, but also the museum community. The collaboration between the two produces a greater understanding of objects and the meanings associated with them. Through collaboration, the museum can display objects knowing they have the approval from a descendent community and that they can give a more informed or accurate interpretation of objects. Bernstein (1991) also noted that “in the past, we have not included the people of our subject matter in our decisions and planning, nor have we made our collections and knowledge accessible to them. Repatriation can be a collaborative process based on dialogue and trust which empowers Indian people and removes the stigma of cultural paternalism which has hindered museums for decades in their attempts to interpret Indian cultures with respect and accuracy” (19). Even though this article was published in 1991, it had very progressive ideas about repatriation. I would argue that though Bernstein called for increased respect for and collaboration with Indigenous people, and that museums could benefit tremendously from collaborations, many museums fall short of fostering the level of collaboration and respect needed to create an environment built on mutual benefits.

The next example for collaboration was published in 2004 by *Museum Anthropology*. The article “Remembrance of things and things past: Museums as memorials and encounters with Native American history” by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh discusses how repatriation has started to reverse the flow of objects, ideas, values and important cultural information back to communities. It maintained that “[w]hether collaborating with knowledgeable elders on new exhibits or establishing native advisory boards, these efforts have sought to better understand how native peoples interpret their history, and to find novel and productive paths in a postcolonial world. This work entails a syncretic approach, coalescing and reconciling the

different beliefs of anthropologists and native peoples” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2004, 38). This statement highlights the benefits of establishing a collaborative environment with Native American communities. Colwell-Chanthaphonh attempts to alleviate some anthropologists fears by stating that repatriation is not the end to anthropology, but a way towards new beginnings.

Another example for the theme of collaboration comes from the journal *American Antiquity*. Published in 2014, Natasha Lyons discusses the relationship between Indigenous People in Canada and anthropologists and archaeologists. The article states that “archaeological practice has the power to hear, cultivate, and share the voices of individuals as they speak about their respective histories, meeting the local knowledge economies while recognizing and acknowledging the broader social context” (Lyons 2014, 187). For her project she noted that “more than a decade of collaborative engagement between southern and Inuvialuit research partners who have collectively developed and pursued concerted heritage agenda” (Lyons 2014, 187). This articles highlights some of the benefits collaboration can have between researchers, museums and Indigenous people.

Representation

Only evident in *Museum Anthropology*, the theme of representation was described in articles with questions and issues pertaining to the display, portrayal, and representation of Indigenous peoples in institutions such as museums. To exemplify this theme, an excerpt from the article “Museums and First Peoples in Canada” was selected. In regards to the controversy surrounding The Spirit Sings exhibit at the Calgary Glenbow Museum, Wilson (1992) maintains that “[i]ssues included who has the right to represent the arts and cultures of First Peoples and to what extent native peoples should have a say in their own representation. Because the exhibition

concerned historical themes and did not present First Peoples as living cultures, critics charged that it perpetuated the myth of the 'Vanished Indian.' Finally, the controversy concerned presentation of sacred objects and repatriation of certain objects to groups which they originated" (Wilson 1992, 6). This article raises the ethical questions of how to display cultural heritage in museums, and who has the right to represent culture.

The next example is from the article "Prisoners of Conscience: Public Policy and Contemporary Repatriation Discourse" published in 1996. In critiquing museum displays Rosenblum (1996) noted that "Native people as dramatizations of themselves no longer seems ethically possible, but museums seem reluctant to give up on dramatization altogether. Mannequins have replaced actual people, along with miniatures and motion and still pictures. The reason for this lies in the fact that dramatization still tends to lend legitimacy to documentary displays, even after they may have themselves lost any authenticity they might once have claimed" (Rosenblum 1996, 64). Here, the author questions the authenticity of museums and who creates the exhibits for display. She also presents the issue staging cultures. Both these provide examples that illustrate the issue of representation.

Throughout my research I found many articles that had more than one main theme. These articles were very informative, as they often involved complimentary themes, for example six articles contained the themes bureaucratic obligation and scientific inquiry, while seven articles contained the themes collaboration and religious freedom. From *American Antiquity*, the article "Beyond the Margin: American Indians, First Nations, and Archaeology in North America" by Joe E. Watkins had themes of scientific inquiry and collaboration. This is the excerpt I made that conclusion from; "[c]oncessions have been made towards allowing North American indigenous groups to become more involved in the protection of their heritage, but such concessions

generally have been made within a framework that gives scientists and archaeologists the opportunity to present the recommendations most often taken into consideration by federal land managers and decision makers” (Watkins 2003, 281). This example suggests that even though concessions are made to facilitate the collaboration between Indigenous communities and researchers, these concessions are constructed by scientists and do not always fit into the cultural frameworks or benefit decedent communities. I found this article to support repatriation.

In *American Antiquity*, “Some Scholars’ Views on Reburial” by Clement W. Meighan (1992) repatriation is presented as a threat to anthropological science and a bureaucratic obligation. This article was classified as opposed to repatriation. The following excerpt shows why this distinction was made.

In these times of stringent budgets, it is hard enough to convince the taxpayers that they should finance archaeological excavations without having to convince them that they should also finance the reburial of the items recovered. There are major negative results for archaeology in the present situation where not only the federal government, but states, counties, cities, and a plethora of political agencies believe that they should pass regulations controlling archaeological research. These laws and regulations conflict with one another and vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In some states the conduct of archaeological research is a risky business. The smart archaeologist in California does not find certain things. If they are found, they are either thrown away or not mentioned in his/her reports. (Meighan 1992, 707)

For many obvious reasons this article was classified as opposed to repatriation. They argue that it is unjust to place archaeologists and taxpayers with the financial burden of reburial following an excavation. Here, according to Meighan, not only are the archaeologists suffering because of these laws, but the taxpayers too. He claims that repatriation laws are conflicting, and archaeology is “risky business” in some states. Perhaps most troubling in this excerpt is statement that explains how the “smart” archaeologists “does not find certain things,” or merely throws them away to avoid getting involved in repatriation claims. This attitude, though less apparent in contemporary discourse is still disconcerting in the repatriation debates.

After completing my inventory analysis of ‘repatriation’ within each journal, I was surprised by my findings. In answering my research questions, I found the most significant difference in themes between journals to be religious freedom. In *Museum Anthropology* it appears as a theme in thirteen articles compared to only three in *American Antiquity*. The most common themes were bureaucratic obligation and collaboration, and I found there was no clear shift in how repatriation was discussed over time. My findings did not support my hypothesis as the shift I expected to see from anthropologists viewing repatriation within a frame of science to collaboration was not evident. When considering some anthropologist’s views that repatriation is a threat to science, I expected to discover specific, documented and published case studies of repatriations possible and concrete negative effects. Perhaps it is time to stop viewing repatriation as an obligation and recognize the right to religious and cultural freedom. Though there may be trends in the repatriation debate, an absolute conclusion is hard to draw. This is, and will continue to be, a contested subject within the discipline of anthropology as many still have conflicting views regarding repatriation.

Significance of Research

This research has a broader significance in the world as it is bringing attention both to the practice of repatriation, and the arguments surrounding it. This is important because repatriation is an essential step towards the reconciliation and rebuilding of relationships with Indigenous communities that have been affected by colonial occupation and its ongoing effects. This research also brings to light the belief that still exists surrounding the idea that Indigenous cultures and cultural objects are something to be put on display. When Indigenous groups do not have the power over their own cultural objects or ancestral remains, it reinforces colonial ideologies and institutional and structural relationships about power relations and control.

Limitations

This research is limited by the fact that only two journals were used for data collection. Furthermore, the sample was comprised of only forty-one articles. With such a small data set, it is hard to discern whether or not this sample is in fact an accurate representation of all articles pertaining to repatriation. Additionally, the two journals were only from two different subfields. For a more comprehensive and diverse study, journals from other subfields would also have to be engaged. Another limitation is the fact that this research focused only on North American cases of repatriation. The practice of repatriation is not isolated to North America, and as such research surrounding repatriation should not be either. Finally, this research is subjective as it is based solely on the researcher's own interpretations. There are plenty of other interpretations and conclusions that could be not only drawn from this research, but also drawn from the articles themselves, and I encourage others to engage in this research and do so.

Conclusion & Recommendations

In conclusion, the repatriation of Indigenous artifacts and ancestral remains has become an important topic of consideration and debate in academic, non-academic, and institutional settings. Based on this sample, repatriation is still a contested subject and there is no firm disciplinary consensus as to whether repatriation is seen as an obstacle to science, a bureaucratic obligation, a right to religious freedom or as a mechanism to increase collaboration between anthropologists and Indigenous communities. As this debate is still ongoing within the discipline, we need to think more carefully on how to balance the goals of anthropology and the political context in which science takes place with the goals of the communities we work with. I recommend that the public do more to inform themselves about repatriation so that it becomes a

recognizable form of sovereignty, reconciliation, and the reassertion of Indigenous culture. I hope my research raises the awareness to the way both scholars and the public, view and take sides in the repatriation debate. I recommend people be more conscious of how they approach repatriation as there are many, arguably misguided, arguments surrounding the sensitive area involving the return of ancestral remains, cultural objects, and sacred and spiritual items. I hope that my research brings more awareness to the importance of the practice of repatriation and the debate that surrounds it.

Appendix 1: Table of Articles Analyzed

Museum Anthropology

Date	Title	Theme	Tone
1988	Proposals for Improving Relations Between Museums and the Indigenous Peoples of Canada. Michael M. Ames	Collaboration	Support
1989	Update On Repatriation/ Reburial	Scientific Inquiry & Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
1991	A Technical Museum Services Program for Tribal Museums in Arizona. Marilyn Norcini and R. Gwinn Vivian	Collaboration	Support
1991	Repatriation: The Bitter End or a Fresh Beginning? David Hurst Thomas	Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
1991	National Museum of the American Indian Policy Statement on Native American Human Remains And Cultural Materials	Religious Freedom & Collaboration	Support
1991	New National Museum of the American Indian Collections Policy Statement: A Critical Analysis. William C. Sturtevant	Religious Freedom	Support
1991	Repatriation and Collaboration: The Museum of New Mexico. Bruce Bernstein	Collaboration	Support
1991	Repatriation Policy and The Heye Collection. Edmund Carpenter	Scientific Inquiry & Bureaucratic Obligation	Oppose
1992	Museums and First Peoples in Canada. Thomas H. Wilson, Georges Erasmus, David W. Penney	Religious Freedom & Representation	Support
1993	An Anthropological Definition of the Museum and Its Purpose. Richard Handler	Bureaucratic Obligation & Scientific Inquiry	Oppose
1994	Museums, Voices, Representations. Shepard Krech Iii	Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
1994	The National Museum of the American Indian Perspectives On Museums in The 21st Century. W. Richard West Jr.	Collaboration	Support
1996	Prisoners of Conscience: Public Policy and Contemporary Repatriation Discourse. Amalia Rosenblum	Representation & Religious Freedom	Support
1997	Beyond The Museum: The Politics of Representation in Asserting Rights to Cultural Property. Tressa Berman	Representation	Support

1997	Indigenous Peoples' Claims to Cultural Property: A Legal Perspective. Rebecca Tsosie	Religious Freedom	Support
2004	Remembrance of Things and Things Past: Museums as Memorials and Encounters with Native American History. Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh	Religious Freedom & Collaboration	Support
2009	Repatriation and The Reconstruction of Identity. Jordan Jacobs	Religious Freedom & Collaboration	Support
2010	Repatriation from Scottish Museums: Learning from NAGPRA. Neil G. W. Curtis	Religious Freedom & Collaboration	Support
2010	Journeys To Repatriation: 15 Years Of NAGPRA Grants, 1994–2008. Sangita Chari	Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
2010	NAGPRA at 20: Museum Collections and Reconnections. Martha Graham, Neil Murphy	Collaboration & Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
2010	NAGPRA After Two Decades. Stephen E. Nash, Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh	Collaboration & Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
2010	Repatriation of Ahayu:Da: 20 Years Later. T. J. Ferguson	Religious Freedom & Collaboration	Support
2010	Trials and Tribulations in a Tribal NAGPRA Program. Eric Hemenway	Religious Freedom & Collaboration	Support
2010	2010: Repatriation and Collaboration: 20 Years Later. Bruce Bernstein	Collaboration	Support
2010	LOST AND FOUND: NAGPRA, Scattered Relics, and Restorative Methodologies Margaret M. Bruchac	Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
2010	NAGPRA at 20: What Have the States Done to Expand Human Remains Protections? Ryan M. Seidemann	Scientific Inquiry & Bureaucratic Obligation	Opposed
2011	Science, Property, And Kinship in Repatriation Debates. Stuart Kirsch	Scientific Inquiry & Bureaucratic Obligation & Religious Freedom	Support
2015	Museum Anthropology: Continued Conversations in The Field, Part 3 Lillia McEnaney, Maxine E. McBrinn, Antonio R. Chavarria	Religious Freedom & Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
2016	On Not Showing Scalps: Human Remains and Multisited Debate at The National Museum of Denmark. Randi Marselis	Religious Freedom & Bureaucratic Obligation	Support

American Antiquity

Date	Title	Theme	Tone
1991	The Many Publics for Archaeology. Francis P. Mcmanamon	Collaboration & Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
1992	Indians, Archaeologists, And The Future. Vine Deloria, Jr.	Scientific Inquiry	Support
1992	Some Scholars' Views On Reburial. Clement W. Meighan	Scientific Inquiry & Bureaucratic Obligation	Oppose
1993	A Perspective On Ethics and The Reburial Controversy. Anthony L. Klesert And Shirley Powell	Right To Religious Freedom & Collaboration	Support
1997	Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice: Development of an Ethics Policy. Mark J. Lynott	Collaboration	Support
2000	Ancient History in The New World: Integrating Oral Traditions and The Archaeological Record in Deep Time. Roger C. Echo-Hawk	Religious Freedom	Support
2001	Archaeological Politics And Public Interest In Paleoamerican Studies: Lessons From Gordon Creek Woman And Kennewick Man. Douglas W. Owsley And Richard L. Jantz	Scientific Inquiry & Bureaucratic Obligation	Oppose
2003	Beyond The Margin: American Indians, First Nations, And Archaeology In North America. Joe E. Watkins	Scientific Inquiry And Collaboration	Support
2006	Complex Legal Legacies: The Native American Graves Protection And Repatriation Act, Scientific Study, And Kennewick Man. Susan B. Bruning	Scientific Inquiry	Oppose
2010	The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology. Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, T. J. Ferguson, Dorothy Lippert, Randall H. Mcguire, George P. Nicholas, Joe E. Watkins And Larry J. Zimmerman	Collaboration & Bureaucratic Obligation	Support
2013	Archaeologies of Persistence: Reconsidering The Legacies of Colonialism in Native North America. Lee M. Panich	Collaboration	Support
2014	Localized Critical Theory as an Expression of Community Archaeology Practice: With an Example from Inuvialuit Elders of the Canadian Western Arctic. Natasha Lyons	Collaboration	Support

Appendix 2: Database Bibliography
Museum Anthropology

1. 1989. "Update on Repatriation/Reburial". *Museum Anthropology* 13: 11–13.
2. 1991. "National Museum of the American Indian Policy Statement on Native American Human Remains and Cultural Materials." *Museum Anthropology* 15: 25–28.
3. Ames, Michael. M. 1988. "Proposals for Improving Relations between Museums and The Indigenous Peoples of Canada." *Museum Anthropology* 12: 15–19.
4. Berman, Tressa. 1997. "Beyond the Museum: The Politics of Representation in Asserting Rights to Cultural Property." *Museum Anthropology* 21: 19–27.
5. Bernstein, Bruce. 1991. "Repatriation and Collaboration: The Museum of New Mexico." *Museum Anthropology* 15(3):19–21.
6. Bernstein, Bruce. 2010. REPATRIATION AND COLLABORATION: 20 Years Later." *Museum Anthropology* 33: 196–198.
7. Bruchac, Margaret. M. 2010. "LOST AND FOUND: NAGPRA, Scattered Relics, and Restorative Methodologies." *Museum Anthropology* 33: 137–156.
8. Carpenter, Edmund. 1991. "Repatriation Policy and the Heye Collection." *Museum Anthropology* 15(3):15–18.
9. Chari, Sangita. 2010. "JOURNEYS TO REPATRIATION: 15 Years of NAGPRA Grants, 1994–2008." *Museum Anthropology* 33: 210–217.
10. Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip. 2004. "Remembrance of things and things past: Museums as memorials and encounters with Native American history." *Museum Anthropology* 27(1-2): 37-48.
11. Curtis, Neil. G. W. 2010. "REPATRIATION FROM SCOTTISH MUSEUMS: Learning from NAGPRA." *Museum Anthropology* 33: 234–248.
12. Ferguson, T. J. 2010. "REPATRIATION OF AHAYU:DA: 20 Years Later." *Museum Anthropology* 33: 194–195.
13. Graham, Martha and Neil Murphy. 2010. "NAGPRA at 20: Museum Collections and Reconnections." *Museum Anthropology* 33: 105–124.
14. Handler, Richard. 1993. "An Anthropological Definition of the Museum and its Purpose." *Museum Anthropology* 17: 33–36.

15. Hemenway, Eric. 2010. "TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS IN A TRIBAL NAGPRA PROGRAM." *Museum Anthropology* 33: 172–179.
16. Jacobs, Jordan. 2009. "Repatriation and Reconstruction." *Museum Anthropology* 32(2):83–98.
17. Kirsch, S. 2011. "Science, Property, And Kinship in Repatriation Debates." *Museum Anthropology* 34: 91–96.
18. Krech, Shepard. 1994. "Museums, Voices, Representations." *Museum Anthropology* 18:3–8.
19. Marselis, Randi. 2016. "On Not Showing Scalps: Human Remains and Multisited Debate at the National Museum of Denmark." *Museum Anthropology* 39: 20–34.
20. McEnaney, Lillia., McBrinn, Maxine. E. and Chavarria, Antonio. R. 2015. "Museum Anthropology: Continued Conversations in the Field, Part 3." *Museum Anthropology* 38: 69–87.
21. Nash, Stephen E., and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh. 2010. "NAGPRA After Two Decades." *Museum Anthropology* 33(2): 99-104.
22. Norcini, Marilyn. and, R. Gwinn Vivian. 1991. "A Technical Museum Services Program for Tribal Museums in Arizona." *Museum Anthropology* 15: 22–26.
23. Rosenblum, Amalia. 1996. "Prisoners of Conscience: Public Policy and Contemporary Repatriation Discourse." *Museum Anthropology* 20(3):58–71.
24. Seidemann, Ryan M. 2010. "NAGPRA at 20: What Have the States Done to Expand Human Remains Protections?" *Museum Anthropology* 33(2): 199-209.
25. Sturtevant, William C. 1991. "New National Museum of the American Indian Collections Policy Statement: A Critical Analysis." *Museum Anthropology* 15: 29–30.
26. Thomas, David Hurst. 1991. "Repatriation: The Bitter End or a Fresh Beginning?" *Museum Anthropology* 15(1):10.
27. Tsosie, Rebecca A. 1997. "Indigenous Peoples' Claims to Cultural Property: A Legal Perspective." *Museum Anthropology* 21(3): 5-11.
28. West, Richard W. 1994. "The National Museum of the American Indian Perspectives on Museums in the 21st Century." *Museum Anthropology* 18: 53–58.
29. Wilson, Thomas. H., Erasmus, Georges. and Penney, David. W. 1992. "Museums and First Peoples in Canada." *Museum Anthropology* 16: 6–11.

American Antiquity

1. Bruning, Susan B. 2006. "Complex Legal Legacies: The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Scientific Study, and Kennewick Man." *American Antiquity* 71(3):501–521.
2. Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, T. J. Ferguson, Dorothy Lippert, Randall H. McGuire, George P. Nicholas, Joe E. Watkins, and Larry J. Zimmerman. 2010. "The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 75(2): 228-38.
3. Deloria, Vine Jr. 1992. "Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future." *American Antiquity* 57(4):595–598.
4. Echo-Hawk, Roger. 2000. "Ancient History in the New World: Integrating Oral Traditions and the Archaeological Record in Deep Time." *American Antiquity* 65(2):267– 290.
5. Klesert, Anthony L., and Shirley Powell. 1993. "A Perspective on Ethics and the Reburial Controversy." *American Antiquity* 58(2):348–354.
6. Lynott, Mark J. 1997. "Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice: Development of an Ethics Policy." *American Antiquity* 62(4): 589-99.
7. Lyons, Natasha. 2014. "Localized Critical Theory as an Expression of Community Archaeology Practice: With an Example from Inuvialuit Elders of the Canadian Western Arctic." *American Antiquity* 79(2): 183-203.
8. McManamon, Francis P. 1991. "The Many Publics for Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 56(1): 121-30.
9. Meighan, Clement W. 1992. "Some Scholar's Views on Reburial." *American Antiquity* 57(4):704–710.
10. Owsley, Douglas W., and Richard L. Jantz. 2001. "Archaeological Politics and Public Interest in Paleoamerican Studies: Lessons from Gordon Creek Woman and Kennewick Man." *American Antiquity* 66(4): 565-75.
11. Panich, Lee M. 2013 "Archaeologies of Persistence: Reconsidering The Legacies of Colonialism in Native North America." *American Antiquity* 78(1): 105-22.
12. Watkins, Joe. 2003. "Beyond the Margin: American Indians, First Nations, and Archaeology in North America." *American Antiquity* 68(2):273–285.

Bibliography

1989. "Update on Repatriation/Reburial". *Museum Anthropology* 13: 11–13.
1991. "National Museum of the American Indian Policy Statement on Native American Human Remains and Cultural Materials." *Museum Anthropology*. 15: 25–28.
- "American Antiquity." Cambridge Core. Journal. Cambridge University Press, accessed February 20, 2017.
- "Museum Anthropology." 2017. Accessed February 20, 2017
<https://museumanthropology.org/museum-anthropology/>
- Ardèvol-Abreu, A. 2015. "Framing theory in communication research. Origins, development and current situation in Spain." *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social* 70: 423.
- Bell, Catherine. 1992. "Aboriginal claims to cultural property in Canada: A comparative legal analysis of the repatriation debate." *American Indian Law Review* 17 (2): 457-521.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (1): 611-39.
- Bernstein, Bruce. 1991. "Repatriation and Collaboration: The Museum of New Mexico." *Museum Anthropology* 15(3):19–21.
- Borofsky, Robert. 2002. "The Four Subfields: Anthropologists as Mythmakers." *American Anthropologist* 104(2): 463-480.
- Brascoupé, Simon, and Catherine Waters. 2009. "Cultural safety: Exploring the applicability of the concept of cultural safety to Aboriginal health and community wellness." *International Journal of Indigenous Health* 5(2): 6.
- Bruning, Susan B. 2006. "Complex Legal Legacies: The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Scientific Study, and Kennewick Man." *American Antiquity*: 501-521.
- Carpenter, Edmund. 1991. "Repatriation Policy and the Heye Collection." *Museum Anthropology* 15(3):15–18.
- Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "Framing Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10 (1): 103-26.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip. 2004. "Remembrance of things and things past: Museums as memorials and encounters with Native American history." *Museum Anthropology* 27(1-2): 37-48.

- Deloria, Vine Jr. 1992. "Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future." *American Antiquity* 57(4):595–598.
- Kakaliouras, Ann M. 2012. An Anthropology of Repatriation: Contemporary Physical Anthropological and Native American Ontologies of Practice. *Current Anthropology* 53 (S5): S210-21.
- Lyons, Natasha. 2014. "Localized Critical Theory as an Expression of Community Archaeology Practice: With an Example from Inuvialuit Elders of the Canadian Western Arctic." *American Antiquity* 79(2): 183-203.
- Feest, Christian F. 1991. "Coming Home at Last: Reunification and Repatriation in Germany." *Museum Anthropology* 15(2):31–32.
- Fforde, Cressida, 1969, Jane Hubert, and Paul Turnbull 1954. 2002. *The Dead and Their Possessions: Repatriation in Principle, Policy, and Practice*. Vol. 43 New York;London: Routledge.
- Gough, Meagan. 2008. "The Changing Relationship between First Nations Peoples and Museums." *kā-kī-pē-isi-nakatamākawiyahk Our Legacy: Essays*: 205-231.
- Graham, Martha and Neil Murphy. 2010. "NAGPRA at 20: Museum Collections and Reconnections." *Museum Anthropology* 33: 105–124.
- In, James Riding. 1996. "Repatriation: A pawnee's perspective." *American Indian Quarterly* 20 (2): 238-50.
- Jacobs, Jordan. 2009. "Repatriation and Reconstruction." *Museum Anthropology* 32(2):83–98.
- Lakoff, George. 2004. "Framing 101: How to Take Back Public Discourse." in *Don't Think of an Elephant! Know Your Values and Frame the Debate — The Essential Guide for Progressives*. 1-14
- Lakoff, George. 2010. Why it matters how we frame the environment. *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture* 4 (1): 70-81.
- Lippert, Dorothy. 2002. "Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?" *Museum Anthropology* 25(2):80–83.
- Meighan, Clement W. 1992. "Some Scholars' Views on Reburial." *American Antiquity* 57(4): 704-10.
- Nash, Stephen E., and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh. 2010. "Nagpra After Two Decades." *Museum Anthropology* 33(2): 99-104.

- Meighan, Clement W. 1992. "Some Scholar's Views on Reburial." *American Antiquity* 57(4):704–710.
- Mogashoa, Tebogo. 2014. "Understanding Critical Discourse Analysis in Qualitative Research." *International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Education* 1(7): 104-113.
- Owsley, Douglas W., and Richard L. Jantz. 2001. "Archaeological Politics and Public Interest in Paleoamerican Studies: Lessons from Gordon Creek Woman and Kennewick Man." *American Antiquity* 66(4): 565-75.
- Panich, Lee M. 2013 "Archaeologies of Persistence: Reconsidering The Legacies of Colonialism in Native North America." *American Antiquity* 78(1): 105-22.
- Ryan, Gery W., and H. Russell Bernard. 2003. "Techniques to Identify Themes." *Field Methods* 15(1): 85-109.
- Rosenblum, Amalia. 1996. "Prisoners of Conscience: Public Policy and Contemporary Repatriation Discourse." *Museum Anthropology* 20(3):58–71.
- Schnarch, Brian. 2004. "Ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP) or self-determination applied to research: A critical analysis of contemporary First Nations research and some options for First Nations communities." *International Journal of Indigenous Health* 1: 80.
- Seidemann, Ryan M. 2010. "NAGPRA at 20: What Have the States Done to Expand Human Remains Protections?" *Museum Anthropology* 33(2): 199-209
- Slatkin, Montgomery, and Fernando Racimo. 2016 "Ancient DNA and human history." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113 (23): 6380-6387.
- Thomas, David Hurst. 1991. "Repatriation: The Bitter End or a Fresh Beginning?" *Museum Anthropology* 15(1):10.
- Tsosie, Rebecca A. 1997. "Indigenous Peoples' Claims to Cultural Property: A Legal Perspective." *Museum Anthropology* 21(3): 5-11.
- Watkins, Joe. 2003. "Beyond the Margin: American Indians, First Nations, and Archaeology in North America." *American Antiquity* 68(2):273–285.
- West, Richard W. 1991. "The National Museum of the American Indian Repatriation Policy: Reply to William C. Sturtevant." *Museum Anthropology* 15(3): 13–14.
- Williams, Terri-Lynn. 1995. Cultural perpetuation: Repatriation of first nations cultural heritage. *University of British Columbia Law Review* 29 (SPEISS): 183.
- Wilson, Thomas. H., Erasmus, Georges. and Penney, David. W. 1992. "Museums and First Peoples in Canada." *Museum Anthropology* 16: 6–11.

Winter, Barbara J. "New Futures for the Past: Cooperation between First Nations and Museums in Canada." *UBCL Rev.* (1995): 29.

White Raven Law. 2017. "Our People." Accessed February 22, 2017.
http://www.whiteravenlaw.ca/people_terrilynn.html

Zhang, Yan, and Barbara M. Wildemuth. 2016 "Qualitative Analysis of Content." *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science.* 1-12.