

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Great Plains Quarterly

Great Plains Studies, Center for

Fall 2001

Review of *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?* Edited by Devon A. Mihesuah

Julia D. Harrison

Trent University, jharrison@trentu.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsquarterly>



Part of the [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#)

Harrison, Julia D., "Review of *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?* Edited by Devon A. Mihesuah" (2001). *Great Plains Quarterly*. 2196.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsquarterly/2196>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Great Plains Studies, Center for at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Great Plains Quarterly by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains? Edited by Devon A. Mihesuah. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000. Notes, appendix, contributors, source acknowledgments, index. viii + 335 pp. \$20.00.

In writing a review for *Great Plains Quarterly* one is asked to emphasize the book's Great Plains content. So while Devon Mihesuah's edited reader does not specifically mention particular Native peoples who lived on the Plains any more than it discusses others who lived outside the region, it is of direct relevance to anyone interested in the Great Plains, particularly anyone interested in the region's Native history and the contemporary lived reality of these populations. Issues of repatriation, reburial, looting, the effectiveness of the NAGPRA legislation, relationships among Native people, museums, archaeologists, and anthropologists are currently central to any such interest.

In this volume of sixteen essays a mixture of Native and non-Native writers present a range of reasoned views and important case studies on these hotly contested themes. I found particularly useful the introductory chapters by Robert E. Bieder ("The Representations of Indian Bodies in Nineteenth-Century American Anthropology") and Curtis M. Hinsley Jr. ("Digging for Identity: Reflections on the Cultural Background of Collecting"). Both provide historical grounding and insight into ideologies shaping the focus the traditional American archaeological and anthropological establishment has had on "Indian prehistory" and the anthropological study of American "Indians" more generally. This context elucidates the hegemony that contains much of the work of archaeology and the wider discipline of anthropology. Such articulation may be helpful in prompting critical reflection on that very discourse.

Several selections conclude by pointing the reader towards reflection on the moral principles that should ground the work of science. Adopting such a posture takes any reader be-

yond the realm of the "hard facts" and acknowledges that the work of archaeology and anthropology is unquestionably grounded in the cultural world of politics, economies, ideology, and morality. The final section entitled "Studies in Resolution," drawing on both American and Canadian examples, suggests that there are different routes to achieving resolution of these complex issues. One could only have asked for a further discussion on what makes "resolution" more achievable in some situations than in others. Such reflection, without looking for generic "answers" but following the model of the introductory chapters, would position these debates in a broader, theoretical context, a position resistant to the assumption that they can only be worked out at the specific level. Resolving these debates over the long-term requires an acknowledgement of the hegemonies at work on both sides of the discussion.

JULIA D. HARRISON
Department of Anthropology
Trent University