LETTER FROM THE COORDINATOR

Letter from the Committee Coordinator

As this is my first Newsletter as coordinator of the Working Group on Ethnographic Collections (WGEC) for the 2011-2014 period I want you to know that I feel thrilled about this new challenge. I am looking forward to working with you!

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Carole Dignard for all her work as WGEC’s coordinator in the last 6 years and specially for the effort she has made to complete the Name Change Consultation (you will see more on this below).

The WGEC 2011-2014 ACOs

The WG is fortunate to keep its expert ACOs for another triennial period, and to have Emily Kaplan as new ACO. Thus, our team for this triennial is:

- Kim Cullen Cobb, Smithsonian Museum Conservation Institute, Museum Support Center, Washington DC, USA
- Farideh Fekrmanat, Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde/National Museum of Ethnology, Leiden, the Netherlands
- Marian Kaminitz, Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of the American Indian, Washington DC, USA
- Emily Kaplan, Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of the American Indian, Washington DC, USA

Membership

Our group currently holds around 90 registered members. While most of our members are based in Europe, North America, Australia and Oceania I am pleased to inform that our membership is growing in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. I would like to welcome these new members and to encourage more conservators from these regions to join our WG!

Lisbon

The WGEC session at the 16th Triennial Conference in Lisbon was a total success, demonstrated by the excellent line up of papers and the high turnout. On 23rd September we had our business meeting when our new Triennial Program and the Name Change Consultation were discussed.

WGEC Agenda

I would like to call your attention to the ICOM’s 23rd General Conference to be held from 10 to 17 August 2013 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Given the nature of many of the Brazilian collections it would be very pertinent to have our group strongly represented in this conference. Please let us know whether you would like to present a paper or suggest a theme for representatives of our WG to focus on.

Various drafts of the WGEC Triennial Program 2011-14 have been circulated and discussed among the membership, by email and on the Forum <http://www.icom-cc.org/forums/viewtopic.php?f=7&t=21080&sid=3850cc2922462952e6f777057889149e>. Here is the final programme, approved by the ICOM-CC Directory Board:

Ethnographic Collections Working Group program 2011-14

Projects

- Discussions with the membership to reach a decision on whether the group should change its name and if so, what the new name should be (coordinated by Carole Dignard).
- Publication of annual issues of the ICOM-CC Ethnographic Conservation Newsletter (coordinated by Kim Cullen Cobb).
Follow up on research of biocides in collections and updating the WG’s Biocides webpage (coordinated by Farideh Fekrsanati, Monika Harter and Emily Kaplan)

Participation in the ICOM 23rd General Conference in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, August 2013 (coordinated by Renata Peters).

Specific themes of research /investigations
The working group will investigate, research, and report on the following areas of interest. Many of the items may be explored concurrently.

A. Materials science, deterioration and conservation
   1. Investigation/ technical study of objects, object materials and production methods
   2. Deterioration of materials found in objects
   3. Conservation case studies

B. Ethics, values and decision-making
   1. Preservation rationales and decision-making processes
   2. The role of conservators in negotiations between different interest groups
   3. Historical reviews
   4. Socio-political responsibilities

C. Indigenous Knowledge, Communities and Collaborations
   1. Traditional preservation knowledge and techniques used since ancient times
   2. Consultations and collaborations
   3. Community involvement in conservation

D. Cross-disciplinary collaborations
   1. Collaborations between conservators and other professionals (in conjunction with item C or not)

I look forward to a productive and dynamic collaboration with all of you!
Renata Peters

---

ARTICLE

The Study and Analysis of Marine Mammal Membrane Use in Yup’ik Eskimo Objects

Introduction
The use of internal organ membranes from marine mammals is common in the manufacture of ceremonial and utilitarian objects by many cultural groups that inhabit the Arctic region. However, despite the frequent use of these materials, knowledge regarding them beyond these communities is quite limited. This problem was made evident during the academic case study of a Yup’ik Eskimo pouch when attempting to identify its unknown material components. It quickly became obvious that the availability of resources, such as relevant reference literature or access to vouchered sample materials, was limited and would likely impede research efforts.

A number of approaches may be considered to determine the organ and species of origin when confronted with an unknown specimen. In addition to a literature search, the most logical and cost-effective form of analysis is to rely on gross visual or microscopic examination. By observing texture, color, size or other unique features, it may be possible to categorize materials at the organ or species level through comparison with published examples or museum specimens. However, given the limited and possibly inaccurate information available in published literature and museum collections, comparative analysis might be inadequate for secure identification. In an effort to learn more about the originating cultures and fabrication materials of objects made from marine mammal internal organs, new methods of analytical testing were explored with the goal of definitively identifying the materials.

Histology, the analysis of cell and tissue anatomy at a microscopic level, and DNA sequencing, used for species identification, were the methods employed in this investigation of the membrane components from a number of artifacts from the anthropology collection of the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH). There were two limitations to the successful implementation of these methods. First, the artifacts would need to be destructively sampled and the minimum sample size for successful DNA analysis has yet to be determined. Destructive sampling of a particular artifact may not be possible at all. However, the analytical results could aid in determining the provenance and date of origin of objects that have left their communities and have limited or questionable background information. Second, it was unknown whether changes in the material structure from processing during manufacture, prior ethnographic or conservation intervention, or improper storage would jeopardize the success of obtaining results from these analytical procedures.

Scientific Analysis of Membrane Materials

Sampling Protocol
A sampling protocol that could be applied to any material originating from an unknown or questionable biological source needed to be established. The protocol would, at a minimum, attempt to ascertain an appropriate sample size required for successful identification, as well as whether the general condition of the membrane the sample was taken from was a significant factor.
After polling experts, we decided to use 1 cm² samples for each histological and DNA analysis trial, since this was a size that could reasonably be expected to give results if usable DNA or histological information was still present. The samples were taken from three artifacts in the reference collection of AMNH.

Description of Objects
Each of the sampled artifacts, none of which had been manufactured into a usable object, had associated accession records that identified them as lengths of seal or sea lion intestine (Figures 1 to 3). Object 60/1771 is a long, thin, off-white colored, translucent, coiled tube identified in records as seal intestine. Object 60.1/5486, also translucent but slightly darker in color and papery in texture, was also identified in records as seal intestine. Unlike the previous artifact, this one was unraveled and in poor condition with several worn areas and tears. 60.1/3986 is a darker, slightly more opaque, roll that was cut down the length and flattened. Its wider width distinguished it from the previous two examples, leading us to suspect it was from a different animal or organ, though records identified it as either seal or sea lion. The accession records do not contain any information regarding processing and without further analysis manufacturing details cannot be concluded at this time.

Histological Analysis
Information gathered from intact cell structures of tissues and their comparative arrangement in relation to each other can be used to identify the organs from which they originated. To determine whether the AMNH samples that had undergone processing during manufacture still possessed the characteristic cells used to identify the source organ, a sample, positively identified as ringed seal intestine preserved in formalin was first examined. Even though the exact location from which the cross-section was taken is unknown, a slide of fresh material was used as a frame of reference to see how modification alters the readability of the structures and to try to establish which layers of the membrane were in fact used by the Yup’ik in their production of objects. In Figure 3, all of the intact layers of the formalin-preserved tissue sample, including the epithelium, are visible.

Usually, when viewing a cross-section of the epithelium layer up-close, characteristic features and cells, such as the villi, columnar epithelial cells and absorptive cells, with their distinctive size and shape, can be used to aid in the identification of the source organ. The preservation, and hence readability, of these structures in the AMNH samples was of concern, since they did not undergo a standard fixative process to preserve the raw tissue. It was feared that the natural degradation of the material might result in the obliteration of key cell structures. Furthermore, the scraping of the superficial membrane layers during processing would certainly have removed, or possibly altered, the tissue layers, including the overlying epithelium and its associated characteristic cells.

Upon analyzing the AMNH samples 60.1/5486 and 60.1/3986 after rehydration, Dr. Blake, veterinary pathologist from the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, confirmed that while smooth muscle type...
cells and connective tissue were present, the epithelium and its associated cells that could have been used to identify the source organ (Figure 3), were not visible in the AMNH samples (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Mounted slides of AMNH samples, courtesy of Dr. John Blake and Christine Terzi, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

While the source organ did not appear to be identifiable using histology, some evidence indicated that there may have been an intentional choice behind the layers of the membrane that were kept and those that were discarded. According to Lynn Morrison in her study of Aleut parkas, the “tough submucosa and muscularis externa are the membrane layers that remained after processing”. In the AMNH samples, however, Dr. Blake noted that both the epithelial tissue and underlying submucosa were both probably scraped off. The muscularis externa consists of two distinct smooth muscle layers, one inner and “circular”, the other outer and “longitudinal”. The fibers for the AMNH samples running in only a single direction suggested that the muscularis externa’s two component layers were split during processing with either the inner circular or outer longitudinal layer remaining. At this point, without further analysis, it is unclear whether the difference in processing between that seen on the AMNH samples and the description given by Lynn Morrison can be interpreted as a regional variation or seen as dependent on the intended use of the object.

DNA Analysis
Recent advances in molecular technology and analysis have provided an efficient and precise means for genetic identification. However, it was unclear if DNA analysis would be a viable option in identifying the source species of the AMNH samples. Given the method of manufacture and age of the material, the DNA may have been too degraded to produce meaningful results. Furthermore, the sample might be contaminated with exogenous DNA from decades of handling, which may overwhelm that of the specimen of interest.

The DNA technology used for this research is polymerase chain reaction (PCR), which provides the opportunity to conduct genetic analysis even when only trace amounts of DNA are initially available. The process involves the amplification of DNA molecules until enough are produced for subsequent analysis. The products undergo a second enzymatic reaction where fluorescent-tagged nucleotides are incorporated into the DNA strands. The color of fluorescence at each base pair in the DNA fragment is then translated into a specific DNA sequence that can be matched with an extensive database of sequences. It is important to note that the field of bioinformatics and database gathering constantly builds upon itself and as such, with the compilation of each new piece of data resulting from studies such as this, there will be a corresponding increase in accurate information and resources that can be utilized towards further research.

Two of the three AMNH samples were able to be identified, while the source species for one of the samples was inconclusive. Specimen 60.1/5486, the sample in poorer condition, yielded inconclusive identification, possibly because the area sampled suffered from significant wear and damage perhaps due to human contamination. The results of DNA analysis for specimen 60/1771 were an exact match with the sequence of bearded seal, in agreement with its archive information. Specimen 60.1/3986, however, was identified as beluga whale. This result was inconsistent with the archive information, which had identified it as seal or sea lion. Although the appearance of this artifact did differ in width, color and texture when compared to the other samples, the species can only now be identified with certainty due to scientific confirmation.

Conclusion
Histological analysis of the AMNH samples was not successful for identification of the source organ used in the production of these artifacts since the cells associated with specific organs had decomposed or were removed. However, because one can see which layers of membrane remain, discoveries in manufacturing nuances may direct researchers to differences in regional trends or possible correlations in production determined by the needs of the final product. The different membrane layers each might possess unique properties that were leveraged by the makers when producing utilitarian items. For example, parkas would require a thin, lightweight, waterproof material while drum covers would require a stronger and thicker material. It would be interesting to establish, by surveying objects from a wider range of cultures, if not only the type of organ membrane, but also their
component layers, were considered by the makers when producing specific types of objects.

DNA sequencing yielded conclusive results for two of the three artifacts despite the processing they had been subjected to. Identification for the third specimen, on the other hand, was inconclusive. Further analysis will be attempted on object 60.1/5486 to determine whether analysis of a sample from a less degraded area can yield a positive identification. If results are unsuccessful, research will be performed to determine whether it is the condition of the artifact or a different method of processing during production that prevented this particular artifact’s successful identification. Further research will also be undertaken on these same artifacts using smaller samples to determine if positive results can be obtained using smaller sizes. Smaller sample sizes would increase the likelihood that artifacts might be permitted to undergo destructive sampling.

It should be noted that the corrected identification of the beluga whale specimen clearly illustrates the effectiveness of this analytical tool. This technique could be utilized to contribute to the integrity of collection data and to support attribution of museum objects to their respective cultures. For example, accurate identification would offer insight into the types of animals used by certain ethnographic groups. In addition, when coupled with stylistic analysis, interpretations could also be made regarding trade relationships among Eskimo communities or between Eskimos and non-native peoples, and whether areas of specialization might be attributed to certain groups. The deployment of such technologies can lead to an expanded and accurate understanding of the materials used in Arctic objects to learn more about their background and history. A variety of research and other analytical tools are currently being explored by conservators. Currently, Kelly McHugh, Michele Austin-Dennehy and Landis Smith at the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) are working with proteomics scientist, Mehdi Moini at the Museum Conservation Institute (MCI) to collect standards for a protein database that can be used to identify and assess the age of marine mammal samples. Lauren Horelick, also at NMAI, is evaluating treatment methods commonly used by the conservation community in the repair of gutskin. Furthermore, they are hoping to organize a symposium focusing on gut-related research to enable greater cross-disciplinary communication between marine mammalogists, conservators, traditional skin sewers, curators and anthropologists. Finally, Ellen Carrlee at the Alaska State Museum is working to compile a material reference set, which can be used to develop an identification protocol for gutskin material and assess if these physical characteristics should have any bearing on treatment choices. She has also created a weblog, The Ethnographic Gutskin Project\(^4\), as a forum to collaborate and share information on the topic. We look forward to everyone’s findings and ultimately to a broader understanding of the modern methods available for the successful identification of the membrane materials used in the fabrication of ethnographic objects.

Endnotes:

1. Because of the regulations prohibiting possession of actual marine mammal materials, Dr. John Blake, a veterinary pathologist, from University of Alaska at Fairbanks provided images of a mounted specimen of ringed seal intestine. Analysis was conveyed via email or telephone correspondence with him and his technician, Christine Terzi.
3. Analysis was performed by Kari Schmidt, PhD. Sackler Institute for Comparative Genomics, AMNH

Amy Tjiong
Conservation Fellow, AMNH
tjiong@amnh.org

Judith Levinson,
Director of Conservation, AMNH
levinson@amnh.org
On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the conservation laboratories at the Vatican Ethnological Museum, the head of Conservation Stefania Pandozy, organized a conference entitled Sharing Conservation, and invited an international roster of speakers from the curatorial, conservation and scientific fields to share their expertise. Collections at the Ethnological Museum include papal gifts and missionary collections from areas outside of Europe.

Included among the presenters at Sharing Conservation were the Ethnology Museum’s team of conservators who have worked over the last ten years to create a digital inventory and treat 80,000 objects from the ethnographic collections. This recent focus on conservation is undoubtedly connected to the appointment of art historian Professor Antonio Paolucci as director of the Vatican Museums. Prof. Paolucci has been actively involved in the protection of cultural heritage and has directed restoration projects in Florence and Assisi.

The first session entitled “A Glimpse of the East”, was dedicated to multi- and interdisciplinary conservation projects of cultural heritage from China, Myanmar, Tibet and Japan. The conservators Nadia Fiussello, Stefania Passerini, Flavia Serena di Lapigio and Fabio Morresi from the Vatican Museum presented the materials research and conservation of thirteen Japanese kakemonos, polychrome scroll paintings which were donated to Pope Pius XI in 1925. These precious scrolls were made at the Buddhist temple Tentoku-in in Kanazawa between 1667 and 1669. Long term exhibition and inappropriate climate conditions caused tensions in the supports that resulted in deformations, losses and flaking polychrome. Considering both eastern and western traditions, the most appropriate conservation approach was developed.

Francesco Civita, Curator of the Japanese section of the Stibbert Museum in Florence, offered a presentation about tangible and intangible cultural heritage, inspired by his experience at the course on the conservation of Japanese lacquer in Japan sponsored by the National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, Tokyo and ICCROM. Objects are not exclusively manifestations of tangible heritage but are also repositories of intangible cultural heritage, embodying a specific cultural tradition. To Civita the use of modern conservation materials for works of art from distant cultures warrants discussion and might even be disrespectful. Unfortunately he missed the opportunity to talk about various ethical, aesthetic but also technical aspects conservators and also curators are confronted with when traditional materials are used for conservation.

A Chinese mega-project was presented by Zhan Changfa, Coordinator of National Heritage Conservation, Xi’an Center of Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage, Beijing. The monumental statue of the Avalokitesvara Bodhisattva (7.7m x 12.5m) from the Southern Song Dynasty (1127-1279) is one of the most famous carvings situated in the Giant Buddha Bay among the Dazu rock carvings, which were listed as a World Heritage Site in 1999. The statue with one thousand hands is decorated with gold foil and polychrome. In 2008 the Chinese Academy of Cultural Heritage started a joint scientific research project with three major Universities in China and initiated a precise mapping of the statue. A multidisciplinary team of scientists carried out material testing, monitoring of the environment and an investigation of the impact of weathering on sandstone, gold foil and paint. This project will continue for at least another three years.

Carlo Giantomassi and Donatella Zari shared their experience working in the historical city of Bagan (Myanmar) and in a Tibetan monastery in Dége County where many Buddhist sites suffered damage--either through benign neglect or outright destruction. The conservators were invited to train local groups in conservation of historic buildings and to support major conservation work in the respective areas. The project in Bagan was financed by UNESCO, and the temple of Kubyaunkyi of Mynkaba, with mural paintings and external stuccos, was chosen as a pilot project to carry out a complete conservation. In Baiya Gonpa, a Sakya sect monastery with finely-done and historically
significant murals had suffered from a previous earthquake. The conservators were asked to detach the murals from the underlying damaged walls and to re-attach them after consolidation of the building structure.

The second session of the program was dedicated to “Formation and Training” and started with an inspiring talk by Jill Cook, Senior Curator Department of Prehistory & Europe from the British Museum about restoring collections of prehistoric artifacts made of stone, bone, antler and ivory. The responsibility of curators is to restore the history and significance of the collection and to make them accessible for academic research and exhibitions. Cook emphasized the importance of establishing social context and allowing the visitor to interact with these early collections by breaking time barriers. The curator described various methods used to achieve this including the provision of physical contact with prehistoric artifacts. Approaches like this do not correspond with our conservation guidelines but Cook described how compromises are achieved at the British Museum.

Liliana Rivero Weber, Coordinadora Nacional del Patrimonio Cultural Mexicano presented an overview of conservation issues today at various archeological sites and museums in Mexico. Weber emphasized the importance of archival and materials research as foundational to conservation interventions. She also emphasized the understanding of past and present cultural contexts as critical to conservation decision-making.

A story of success in collaborating with locally trained conservators in Yemen was presented by Renzo Ravagnan and Paolo Marani from the Instituto Veneto per I Beni Culturali (IVBC). The Al-Ashrafiya mosque & Madrasah in Taiz was built in 1397 and is a jewel of Yemenite architecture, a monument where history and religion have materialized. The main aim of this project was not only to preserve this monument but to strengthen the awareness amongst professionals and the general Yemenite citizen of the incredible value of their heritage. During training of 21 Yemenite students, the Italian conservators incorporated local techniques and traditions such as using the Islamic calendar for labeling wall paintings in the mosque or working with traditional methods like bamboo scaffolding. Remarkable was the acceptance of female students to undertake conservation work, as women are traditionally not allowed to enter and pray in this mosque. This project was successful and rewarding for both sides - but success became most clear when the workshop continued after the Italian experts left the country in March 2010 due to political unrest.

The last session with the title “Communication and Research” explored various conservation approaches focusing on the improvement of communication and collaboration between different countries, cultures and professions but also between different disciplines within conservation.

A binational project on Mexican featherwork between the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia of Mexico and the Museum of Ethnology in Vienna was presented by Christian Feest, former director of the Museum of Ethnology in Vienna and professor at the University there. Christian Feest presented a case study of a penacho--a feather headdress from ancient Mexico-- designed to demonstrate the importance of conservation-curatorial research alliances. The headdress was part of the Ambras collection and dates back to the 16th century. Based on the notion of shared cultural heritage curators and conservators from Mexico and Vienna have been sharing their knowledge and expertise to make a contribution toward a better understanding of this ancient tradition of featherwork.

Mexico and California share exceptional ancient but also living traditions of featherwork techniques. Ellen Pearlstein, Professor of Conservation at UCLA/ Getty and Molly Gleeson, UCLA Research Associate, developed a conservation survey instrument designed to provide a searchable resource for information about indigenous featherwork, focusing on material from California. Feathers and their colors have cultural significance to regalia makers and basket weavers in California, and different colorant systems found in undyed feathers account for differences in their susceptibility to fading. The survey form uses controlled vocabularies and visual glossaries to assist stewards in recording feather descriptions, cultural modifications, attachment methods, and conditions, including evidence of color change. In developing the survey as a tool for searchable reference information, rather than as a device for comparing items within a single collection, a large user pool is both possible and desirable. The collections reviewed thus far include California native featherwork selected from eight major collections.

Next on the program was Roch Payet, Director since 2008 of the l’Institut National du Patrimoine (the National Institute of Cultural Heritage) which has training programs for conservators and curators of French cultural heritage, which is unique in Europe. Payet outlined the five year training program in conservation which covers seven areas of specialties (earthenware and glassware, graphic arts and books, textile arts, furnishings, painting, photography, and...
sculpture). In order to address the need for interdisciplinary exchanges that allow students to go beyond the limits of their specialty, the program offers a seminar to all 4th year students irrespective of their specialization to discuss conservation issues of contemporary art and technical or ethnographic heritage. This seminar is intended to support students managing new challenges in conservation in terms of growing numbers of composite object in Museums and on the private market.

Karen Abend, Consultant and Catherine Antomarchi, Unit Director, Collections Unit, ICCROM, evaluated the outcome of four courses entitled Sharing Conservation Decisions which took place between 2002 and 2008. Designed to foster cooperation between various professions and stakeholders in conservation decision-making, the courses aimed to analyze decision-making in other fields in order to benefit processes within the field of cultural heritage. Value systems and their application, responsibilities of professionals, expectations of the users, and resources and their availability were discussed - all within the respective social, cultural, legal, and economic contexts. Analyzing the key information collected during the courses, the speakers hope to gain valuable knowledge about decision-making challenges heritage professionals are confronted in everyday life.

Bianca Fossa from the Istituto Superiore per la Conservazione ed il Restauro (ISCR, Higher Institute for the Conservation and Restoration, formerly the ICR) talked about collections of polymaterial works prevalent in ethnographic, popular and religious arts. Conservation theories and methodologies have to be adjusted and reconsidered when conservation is confronted with unstudied heritage which tends to become more valued in an ideological but also monetary sense. The multidisciplinary approach at the ISCR is expressed in collaboration of experts from the humanistic, scientific and technical disciplines as well as consultations and trainings in Italy and abroad. The Institute was involved in research and development of conservation strategies for the ethnological collection at the Vatican Museum. Part of this collection was digitized with the support of ISCR and the Risk Card, a system that incorporates cartographic data through GIS as well as potential risk factors that affect the cultural heritage, allowing users to prioritize risks.

The conference was well attended by a primarily Italian audience of conservators. To commemorate the anniversary of the founding of the laboratories at the Vatican Ethnology Museum, a lavishly illustrated publication entitled Esperienze Del Laboratorio Polimaterico (Reports from the Ethnological Materials Laboratory) edited by Stefania Pandozy and published by Edizioni Musei Vaticani 2011, Città del Vaticano features case studies about conservation of the museum’s collections has been produced. To access, see www.museivaticani.va.

Renée Riedler
Getty Conservation Institute

Ellen Pearlstein, Associate Professor, Information Studies and UCLA/Getty Conservation Program epearl@ucla.edu

**Partnerships in Understanding:**
**Materials Characterization and Condition Assessment of Tlingit Spruce Root Baskets at the National Museum of the American Indian Smithsonian Institution.**

In early May of 2011 a consultation and workshop was held with Tlingit basketry artist and weaver Teri Rofkar at the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI). The consultation and workshop was part of the condition assessment and characterization studies phase of an ongoing research project on preservation of the NMAI’s collection of Tlingit basketry objects made from spruce root, by NMAI conservation fellow Luba Nurse. A large group of these baskets suffer from extensive brittleness and loss, uneven darkening and discoloration, and numerous previous undocumented restoration campaigns. Their fragile condition prevents them from being displayed or studied.

The four-day event brought together NMAI conservators, Andrew W. Mellon fellows in Conservation and invited conservators and conservation scientists from the National Museum of Natural History, the Museum Conservation Institute, the American Museum of Natural History, the Winterthur/University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation and the University of Pennsylvania.
Museum. The consultation included technical studies of spruce root material processing, weaving, and microscopy of the spruce root at different stages of preparation.

The consultation has lead to a greater understanding of the material properties and degradation of spruce root, greatly assisting conservators in determining a preservation protocol for the Tlingit basketry collection.

The initial results of this project were presented at the ICON Ethnography Group symposium in November 2011. Results and interpretation of the microscopy and FTIR investigations of the historic fragments are being finalized.

Luba Dovgan Nurse
Research Fellow, Metropolitan Museum of Art

Conservation and Source Communities: Research, Objects and Treatments

ICON Ethnography Group Seminar
November 16th, 2011, Pitt-Rivers Museum, Oxford

The Pitt-Rivers Museum in Oxford provided an outstanding venue for a one-day seminar centred on the interactions between indigenous communities and the conservation profession. Between 40 and 50 people packed the conference room at the museum to listen and watch presentations featuring collaborative projects that have been or still are underway in various parts of the world. Participants were warmly welcomed by Ethnography Group committee member Emilia Kingham. She neatly summed up some of the common themes we all would later hear throughout the day. Namely, consultations or collaborations occur at a range of institutions, in a variety of places, usually involve several people, and require extensive planning to ensure the experience is meaningful for all.

Conservator Heather Richardson of the Pitt-Rivers Museum launched the first session of the day and remarked that, in general, providing greater access...
to collections has become more prevalent as museums seek ways to remain relevant and sustainable in the current times. She then went on to discuss three projects that occurred between conservation staff at the Pitt-Rivers Museum and First Nation communities in Canada. Staff worked with a group of Canadian researchers focused on material culture from the Great Lakes Region, the Haida, and Blackfoot. In her concluding comments about working with source communities, Heather noted that respect and sensitivity towards culture was vital.

The second talk was co-presented by conservator Luba Dovgan Nurse and Tlingit weaver and basket artist Teri Rofkar. They began their collaborative work at the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian conservation laboratories, in Washington D.C., while Luba was there as a Fellow and Teri was invited to act as a cultural consultant and teach a four day workshop in Tlingit spruce root basketry. Luba and Teri flawlessly took turns discussing their partnership in the investigation, materials analysis, and conservation of Tlingit-made spruce root baskets. They also brilliantly described their partnership as a union of traditional Tlingit science and conservation science.

Next, Debra Carr, a materials engineer, discussed a long-term and equally profound partnership she has developed with Māori Rua McCallum in New Zealand, in which they have integrated indigenous and western knowledge in the investigation of plant materials used to create objects there. I liked the way Debra described her collaborative work with Rua and other Māori community members as an ongoing series of negotiations, in which trust, mutual respect, and friendship were built over time.

Session two started with a presentation by Titika Malkogeorgou, a teaching assistant in the anthropology department at University College London. She evaluated a course of action implemented at the Victoria & Albert Museum which resulted in sacred texts being removed from a hollow, fourteenth century, Tibetan bronze sculpture of the Buddha. The texts were discovered when the sculpture was sent to the conservation studio for condition assessment and conservation. The decision whether or not to remove the texts from the sculpture involved conservators, curators, the museum director, board of trustees, and the local Buddhist community. Titika outlined the arguments that were made in support of or against removing the texts but, ultimately, the board of trustees decided in favour of removing the texts, in keeping with the museum’s secular principles. This presentation conveyed a different character than the other talks that occurred throughout the day.

Conservator Teresa Heady spoke about her years of field work working with communities in Nepal, India, and Mongolia. Teresa discussed her efforts to provide training to the communities in documenting and conserving Thangkas (painted devotional pieces on textiles) and wall paintings, using the materials available in their region and in practical techniques they could carry out. A motto she developed over time was that the “lab does not go to the field rather the field with its local community dictates what you do in the lab.” The communities she worked with lived in remote regions so it was interesting to learn of the challenges involved and how they were resolved to the benefit of all.

To begin session three, Cecilie Gravesen, an artist and curator of contemporary art, presented an experimental documentary film about the traditional Māori meetinghouse Hinemihi that was brought from New Zealand in the nineteenth century and reassembled at Clandon Park in Surrey. The Māori consider Hinemihi to be the living embodiment of an ancestor and permission was obtained from the custodians, The National Trust, to have a sleepover in the meetinghouse. The experience was documented in the film visually but was also enhanced by series of sounds and by the display of hands affectionately touching elements of Hinemihi. The tactile nature of the film was essential as, I learned from Cecilie’s abstract, the meetinghouse is considered a human being, “an imbued ancestor capable of losing its spirit if not subjected to human touch and warmth.” The film definitely returned life and understanding to a structure that had been removed from its original environment.

Charles Stable, a conservator at the National Museums Scotland, talked about a collaborative project that took place between the conservation staff at the museum and Māori artist George Nuku.
Charles described the project as a “renewal of a waka,” a waka being a war canoe. Conservators and George Nuku worked in concert to restore and conserve an incomplete wooden waka that was in the museum’s collection. George carved the missing components out of perspex (acrylic material also known as plexi) so that it would be quite obvious which sections were recreated and which were original. George also aptly named the vessel ‘to join,’ since the waka became a combination of new and old materials. Because it is a unique approach, Charles concluded the talk with a request for feedback from colleagues in order to discuss the ethics and appropriateness of the methods used to restore and conserve the waka.

To continue with the theme of Māori canoes, conservator Farideh Fekrsanati discussed a project between the Māori community in New Zealand and the Museum Volkenkunde and Njord Royal Rowing Club in Leiden, the Netherlands. Two wakas, plus a wharewaka (waka shelter), were commissioned in order to establish a long-term relationship between the Māori and Dutch people. The wakas also introduced the Dutch people to Māori culture and traditions and were made to be used by both Māori and non-Māori people. Farideh went on to talk about the concerns and logistics that arose from the wakas being used as living, working representations of culture rather than accessioned objects in a collection that receives minimal handling. One such concern was deciding when was the right time to address cracks in the wood or flaking paint caused by use. Audience members could sympathise with Farideh’s journey to find balance between the waka’s purpose, to be used, and the desire to deter damage.

Luba Dovgan Nurse returned in session four to recount the conservation of a rare Māori rain cloak in the Economic Botany Collection at Royal Botanic Gardens in Kew. She collaborated with Dinah Eastop, Mark Nesbitt, and Māori communities living in the United Kingdom and New Zealand. This work formed the basis of her dissertation, submitted at the Textile Conservation Centre, University of Southampton. The dissertation also became a way to share and make the cloak more available to the Māori communities in the UK and New Zealand. The dissemination of information resulted in a positive response from the cultural representatives and demonstrated that research had value to source communities.

The final presentation was given by conservator Marian Kaminitz via Skype. Marian’s talk was reflective and provided an overview of the consultations that have occurred between indigenous communities and the conservation staff at the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian over the past several years. Since the museum considers itself the steward of the collection, this has created greater dialogue and led to long-term relationships with source community members. She noted that respect and inclusiveness has produced greater rewards and concluded that the conservation field needs more diversity, more indigenous conservators in the conservation profession.

Dinah Eastop closed the day with thoughtful and thought-provoking remarks. She commented on the interrelationships between the tangible and intangible, the persistent problem with terminology and describing objects, and who is considered the owner or custodian of cultural heritage. And, she reminded audience members not to assume everyone thinks the same way, which is sound advice when collaborating with colleagues and source communities.

This was the first ICON Ethnography Group event I have attended and it proved to be a contemplative and engaging day. This subject could easily consume a conference over several days but the one day seminar still provided a terrific opportunity to hear about projects taking place in diverse parts of the world, be inspired by the dedication and creativity of colleagues, and to appreciate that consultative work is an organic and bespoke process built on respect.

Francis Lukezic, Student, MSc Conservation Practice, Cardiff University
LukezicFV@cardiff.ac.uk
BOOK REVIEW

Museums and Maori: Heritage Professionals, Indigenous Collections, Current Practice
Conal McCarthy, Te Papa Press, 2011. 315 pages

Museums in New Zealand are frequently cited for their policies and practices concerning working with indigenous collections and communities. With the publication, Museums and Maori, comes perhaps the most significant book to date discussing museums and Maori in New Zealand.

The author, Dr Conal McCarthy, is Director of the Museum and Heritage Studies program at Victoria University of Wellington in New Zealand. This is McCarthy’s second book on the relationship between Maori and museums. His first, Exhibiting Maori: A History of Colonial Cultures of Display, was published in 2007.

In the introduction McCarthy relates an incident from early in his museum career. Needing to carry a tray of food through a gallery, but aware food is not supposed to be in contact with Maori objects, McCarthy is uncertain how to proceed. Asking the only person in sight, a “gruff” Maori security guard aged in his 60’s, the fledgling museum professional is told quite plainly to ‘just do it with respect’ (pg 1). It is a predicament many conservators who work with indigenous materials could perhaps relate to; a desire to ‘do the right thing’, but not always knowing what that means.

This opening anecdote sets the tone for much of the book. It is full of personal experiences and case studies, making it highly readable and engaging. The author interviewed over 70 museum professionals as research for the book. Quotations have been used extensively, often making up large sections of the text. This gives an impression of the indigenous professionals being able to tell their own story.

The experiences the interviewees share are fresh, insightful and thought provoking. For example, a Maori registrar relates a difference of opinion with colleagues regarding an upcoming exhibition:

Hey, you fellas have tried to get this exhibition up and running and it’s not happening. Does that not tell you something? You’re so busy thinking about the paperwork, the paperwork. What about the taonga? Have you bothered to think about the taonga? Have you bothered to think perhaps they don’t want to go anywhere? (pg 135)

A thorough literature review is weaved in with personal experiences and case studies to give a detailed account of the history and politics in New Zealand that has influenced museum practice.

Of particular interest to the conservator may be examples where indigenous values seem to contrast with professional practice. Issues such as the use of objects by traditional owners, the rationale of storing objects by tribal provenance and gender issues regarding handling, are discussed in small part.

The book uses many Maori words. The author notes that many of these are in common usage in New Zealand vocabulary and so have not been translated in the text. A glossary is provided in the back of the book but it may still prove challenging for some readers.

Although the book refers solely to New Zealand, it is of relevance to an international readership, particularly those in postcolonial countries. It is likely to be of great interest to a professional working with indigenous collections and of real value to the student of museums studies or conservation.

Tharron Bloomfield, Lecturer, University of Melbourne Centre for Cultural Materials Conservation

MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

ICOM-CC The Theory & History Working Group Interim Meeting
Copenhagen, May 16-17th, 2013.

The topic of the meeting is The Impact of Cult on Conservation Theory and Practice. We intend to focus on this topic, interpreting it as broadly as possible. In addition to the traditional concept of cult value as applied to religious objects of veneration (for example, polychrome sculptures in the Catholic Church), we would like to explore the impact of cult on objects used by indigenous people, and even the concept of cult in the art trade (personality cult, cult of money). The interim meeting will be a direct continuation of the (non-ICOM-CC) conference - Conservation in the Nineteenth Century (CINC), organized by the National Museum of Denmark, which will hopefully
NAME CHANGE

Second Discussion Paper Concerning the Possibility of Changing the Name of the ICOM-CC Working Group on Ethnographic Collections

Prepared by Carole Dignard, Chair, ICOM-CC-WGEC
Name Committee, with assistance from committee members: Tharron Bloomfield, Ellen Carrlee, Sherry Doyal, Farideh Fekrsanati, Monika Harter, Ann Howatt, Marian Kaminitz, Emily Kaplan, Janet Mason, John Moses, Luba Nurse, Ellen Pearlstein, Renata Peters, and Catherine Smith
May 29, 2012

1. Introduction

This Second Discussion Paper is intended as a reference document for the upcoming Second Membership Consultation which aims at determining the most suitable alternative name to the current name of the ICOM-CC’s Working Group (WG) on Ethnographic Collections. Once the outcome is conclusive, there shall be a Third Membership Consultation to decide, yes or no, whether to replace the current name with the alternative name identified in this Second Consultation. Therefore in this document, the suitability of the current name, ‘WG on Ethnographic Collections’, is not discussed.

Reflection on this WG’s Name has been ongoing since Tharron Bloomfield raised objections, based on his Maori perspective, to the current WG Name in his talk at the ICOM-CC conference in 2008\(^2\). The Name Committee, which is moving this reflection forward, currently consists of the former (2005-2011) WG Coordinator, who chairs the committee, plus 13 conservators from different countries and backgrounds, including two of indigenous heritage, who responded to an open call for participation to work together on this issue. At the WG’s Business Meeting at the ICOM-CC Lisbon Conference in September 2011, the Chair reported on the results of the June-July 2011 First Consultation\(^3\) whereby 26 name options proposed by the membership were rated and ranked: the main results were that a majority of voters (70%, out of a 40% participation rate) were in favour of a change in name for this WG; and a few names and in particular two name groupings or ‘streams’ were identified as being the most promising alternative name options. It was decided that the Name Committee would further investigate the promising options and their ramifications, with a view to narrowing down the options, and submit their findings to the membership.

2. Criteria for the WG Name

2.1 WG Aims and Vision

Articulating the WG’s Aims and Vision was found to be the first essential step in order to establish the suitability of a potentially new WG Name. The goal was to express the WG’s core focus, vision and values, which would serve as a reference text and guide for determining whether a possible Name would ‘fit’. The following Aims and Vision statement, developed by the Name committee, is recommended:

WG Aims and Vision

This ICOM-CC WG focuses on objects that are significant because they embody the traditional and living distinct cultural heritage of a people in such areas as customs, beliefs, symbolism, function, technology, craftsmanship, design, aesthetics, histories, environments, and traditional as well as emergent knowledge systems. These objects originate from diverse cultures of the world, including indigenous cultures. Typically, but not exclusively, the WG specializes in three-dimensional, composite objects. The WG is committed to a conservation approach that gives priority to respecting and protecting the material aspects of objects, where those material aspects embody tangible or intangible heritage or specific cultural content. This approach relies on consulting culturally-specific sources and specialists and, wherever possible, collaborating with originating/source communities and cultural stakeholders.

2.2 Context and Broader Outlook

ICOM reference documents such as the revised 2004 ICOM Code of Ethics\(^4\) and the ICOM 2010 Cultural Diversity Charter\(^5\) provide additional, broader
context and set of values that assist in articulating an appropriate WG Name, as presented below.

Use of International Charters for Ethical Guidance and Terminology

Article 7 of the revised 2004 ICOM Code of Ethics states a duty to refer to, and conform to, United Nations (UN) and other authoritative international charters:

• Article 7. Museums Operate in a Legal manner. Principle: ‘Museums must conform fully to international, regional, national, or local legislation and treaty obligations. In addition, the governing body should comply with any legally binding trusts or conditions relating to any aspect of the museum, its collections and operations.’; [...]  
• Article 7.2 International Legislation: ‘Museum policy should acknowledge the following international legislation which is taken as a standard in interpreting the ICOM Code of Ethics: [... what follows is a list of seven United Nations (UN) and international conventions that pertain to cultural heritage, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO's) Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)]

It is implicit in the above Article 7 of the Code that similar, more recent UN and UNESCO documents relevant to tangible cultural heritage are to be consulted as a standard in interpreting the ICOM Code of Ethics. Notable documents that pertain to this WG Name discussion include the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions; and the 2007 UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) with its culture, heritage and language provisions (articles 11, 12 and 31). The UN's Office of Legal Affairs has stated that 'in United Nations practice, a 'Declaration' is a solemn instrument resorted to only in very rare cases relating to matters of major and lasting importance where maximum compliance is expected'. Some relevant clauses from these charters have thus been integrated in this Name discussion, as seen below. UN documents have also been used as authoritative sources to clarify certain terminology or provide definitions.

Respect of All Cultures Falling within the Scope of the WG, and of the Distinctiveness of Indigenous Peoples

Article 6.7 of the ICOM Code of Ethics concurs with the WG's core values and commitment of respect for all cultures whose cultural heritage fall within the scope of the work of this WG:

• Article 6.7: Use of Collections from Contemporary Communities: ‘Museum usage of collections from contemporary communities requires respect for human dignity and the traditions and cultures that use such material. [...]’

And as well the following set of principles adopted in 2010 as the ICOM Cultural Diversity Charter:

1. Diversity: To recognize and affirm all forms of cultural diversity and biological diversity at local, regional and international levels, and to reflect this diversity in all policies and programs of museums across the world. (…)

4. Peace and Community Building: To promote the sense of place and identity of diverse peoples through appreciating their multiple inheritances – natural and cultural, tangible and intangible, movable and immovable – and fostering a shared vision inspired by the spirit of reconciliation through intercultural and intergenerational dialogue.

Equal dignity and respect of all cultures is also a fundamental UN principle, as expressed in the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions:

• Article 2. Guiding Principles: [...] 3. Principle of equal dignity of and respect for all cultures: The protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions presuppose the recognition of equal dignity of and respect for all cultures, including the cultures of persons belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples.

• Article 7 - Measures to promote cultural expressions: 1. Parties shall endeavour to create in their territory an environment which encourages individuals and social groups: (a) to create, produce, disseminate, distribute and have access to their own cultural expressions, paying due attention to the special circumstances and needs of women as well as various social groups, including persons belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples; [...].

In particular, it is noted that the above principle of equal dignity and respect for all cultures, indigenous peoples are explicitly mentioned and recognized. This occurs in other UN documents as well. Indigenous people’s right to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, and the public recognition of this right, is stated in the 2007 UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) as follows:

• Article 15.1. ‘Indigenous peoples have the right to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations which shall
be appropriately reflected in education and public information. [...]"

The above UNDRIP text is understood as reflecting the aspiration of indigenous peoples toward the recognition of the unique, parallel status that needs to be accorded their cultures as being indigenous to a place, while still recognizing the equally worthy cultures of all peoples. As stated by the International Law Association, ‘The adoption of UNDRIP by the UN General Assembly in 2007 represented a major accomplishment. It epitomized the change of attitude of the international legal community vis-à-vis indigenous peoples, eventually recognizing their dignity as different social and cultural groups.’

2.3 Conclusion
The Name Committee recommends the following Criteria for the WG Name:

Criteria for the WG Name

The Working Group Name should:
• Reflect and be compatible with, the WG’s Aims and Vision, key identifying concepts and activities;
• Distinguish this WG from other ICOM-CC WGs;
• Be respectful of all cultures falling within the scope of the WG and of the distinctiveness of indigenous peoples;
• Refer to authoritative sources for terminology and definitions
• Avoid redundancies (as a WG of the International Council of Museums - Committee for Conservation, it may not be necessary to re-iterate the terms ‘Museums’ or ‘Conservation’);
• Be clear and unambiguous (i.e.: the general meaning should be easily understood);
• Be as concise as feasibly possible.

3. Possible Alternative WG Names:

To provide structure, clarity and coherence so as to assist the membership in forging an informed decision on the choice of a Name for this WG, the Name Committee studied the most promising Name options, based on the results of the First Consultation. The Committee focused its study on the intent, implications and ramifications of various Names, using the above Name Criteria and the WG’s Aims and Vision as guides. As a result, some initially promising Names were found to be imperfect, and therefore work focused on articulating improved modified versions, or other new names which were fitting, as reported below.

3.1 ‘Collections’, ‘Objects’, ‘Cultural Materials’ or ‘Material Culture’

Recall that in the First Consultation on the Name Change Proposal, Question #4 asked: ‘In your preferred name choice(s), should the term ‘Objects’ or ‘Collections’ be used?’ The membership voted 48.5% for Collections, 24% for Objects; 18% had no opinion or no preference; and 9% said the issue was not applicable². The terms ‘Cultural Materials’ and ‘Material Culture’ were not included in Question #4 and a few respondents commented that the terms should have been considered. These results and terms were also briefly re-discussed at the Lisbon Business Meeting last September.

The Name Committee decided to further examine the terms ‘Collections’, ‘Objects’, ‘Material Culture’ and ‘Cultural Materials’ and recommends to the membership that it is preferable to choose the most appropriate term among the above on a case-by-case basis within the context of each specific, full Name option, rather than independently of any other descriptors. The following is a summary of the strengths and weaknesses for each term.

• The term ‘collections’ has certain clear strengths: it refers to a group of objects that were specifically selected (collected) because they are valued for their rich meanings; the objects have added meaning(s) when grouped together; and they are kept or safeguarded within one body (which may have more than one location). The term ‘Collections’ refers to the ‘collecting’ or museum environment and purpose, which is valid, considering that this WG is part of ICOM. A drawback is that the term suggests organizing principles for the ‘collection’ that are based on specific museum and research-based disciplines, which do not necessarily reflect the perspectives and values of the originating peoples when describing their own heritage objects, even those housed in museums.

• The term ‘objects’ is appropriate because of its precision in referring to ‘artifacts’ or material-based creations, whereby materials are selected and typically worked (modified, assembled, crafted, etc), to create a finished item intended for a particular purpose(s). The term ‘objects’ also implies tangible material(s) intentionally selected or modified by human actions to embody intangible cultural properties, such as knowledge, values, or creativity. “Objects” is a culturally neutral and adaptable term, well understood in everyday and professional
situations. It is commonly used in the conservation field to describe a specialization generally understood to mean expertise in three-dimensional artifacts, often made of a variety of materials. The term can be used in its singular form, allowing the possibility of referring to a single object on its own account, and not necessarily dependent on the notion of a collection.

• The term ‘material culture’ is an appropriate term as it articulates the link between materials and culture, while clearly stating that we are referring to material (i.e. tangible) items. The 2001 Canadian Oxford dictionary states: ‘Material Culture: the physical objects (tools, articles of domestic and religious use, dwelling places, etc) which give evidence of the type of culture developed by a social group.’ This description corresponds to the groups of items that pertain to this WG. ‘Material culture’ is a term widely used by others professionally in the social sciences and in academia and, while it is not as widely used by the public, nor by the originating peoples themselves when describing their own heritage objects, it is however, easily understandable, accurate, and can be used for items independant of their setting, originator, owner or custodian.

• The term “cultural materials” has certain strengths within the context of this WG’s Name, as it invokes ‘culture’, hence context and people. It is a broad expression that can encompass the diversity of objects this WG deals with, and has the advantage of not referring to academic disciplines or museum structures that may distance the culture and originators from their items. However the term ‘materials’ is too overly broad, as it can also refer to all intangible cultural heritage, such as music, literary opus, poems, recipes, processes, ideas, etc (RE: 2001 Canadian Oxford Dictionary (see in particular #5): ‘Material’: (noun) 1) the matter from which a thing is made. 2) cloth fabric. 3) (in plural) things needed for an activity (building materials, cleaning materials, writing materials); 4) a person or thing suitable for a specific role or purpose (officer material); 5) (in singular or plural) information, ideas, evidence etc to be used in creating an artistic or literary work, drawing a conclusion etc (experimental material; materials for a biography); 6) (in singular or plural) the elements or constituent parts of a substance.)

3.2 Names Considered from the First Consultation

WG on Indigenous* Collections

“Description of the term ‘Indigenous’: The term ‘indigenous’ is used in several Name options presented below. Because ‘indigenous’ can have several meanings, a first step was to clarify this term. The UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples provides an authoritative source on terminology and usage, while the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues further describes it as follows:

‘Who are Indigenous Peoples? It is estimated that there are more than 370 million indigenous people spread across 70 countries worldwide. Practicing unique traditions, they retain social, cultural, economic and political characteristics that are distinct from those of the dominant societies in which they live. Spread across the world from the Arctic to the South Pacific, they are the descendants - according to a common definition - of those who inhabited a country or a geographical region at the time when people of different cultures or ethnic origins arrived.’

Assessment: Given that the name option WG on Indigenous Collections gathered the highest support in the First Consultation, the Name Committee studied this Name and its ramifications in detail. This Name option has strengths: it unambiguously identifies ‘indigenous’ collections, which consist of a highly significant group of collections and cultures that this WG focuses on, and conforms with the UN charter principles previously described, which the ICOM Code of Ethics recognizes; it is simple and clear; it is unique with respect to other ICOM-CC WGs. To ensure clarity (see Criteria), the term ‘indigenous’ is used following its UN description (see above) and refers specifically to certain cultures. Thus, this Name option would exclude a range of culturally-representative objects from diverse peoples, which are included within “ethnographic” collections and fall within the scope of this ICOM-CC WG. Therefore, the Name Committee decided that this Name, and other Names that refer only to indigenous cultures (such as WG on Indigenous Material and Issues which also gathered some support in the First Consultation), were too limiting and did not meet the Name Criteria (‘be respectful of all cultures within the scope of this WG’) and our WG Aims and Vision. The Name Committee recommends that it is important to acknowledge indigenous cultures in the WG Name, but not at the expense of other cultural groups which are represented in our WG.

WG on Objects / Collections from World Cultures

Assessment: The Name WG on Objects (or: Collections) from World Cultures, which gathered
the second highest number of ‘good’ and ‘acceptable’ votes in the First Consultation, was also studied in detail. This Name also has various strengths: it uses terms that are simple, clear, easy to understand, and reflects the international, culturally diverse nature of the collections we work on. The term “World Cultures” refers to all cultures sharing one world with equal respect rather than singling out any specific cultural groups. The Name is inclusive and open, and preserves the WG’s original broad scope by including all culturally-representative objects from all cultures understood by the term global “cultural diversity”. The term ‘cultures’ figures prominently to articulate, first, that it is the cultural aspects of objects that are the focus of our work (those characteristics which reflect the heritage of a culture), and second, that culture-rich objects require specialized conservation knowledge to preserve the distinct tangible and intangible cultural characteristics that they represent. These culturally-specific objects may be of a traditional, non-traditional, or contemporary nature. However, the Name Committee felt that the term ‘World Cultures,” on its own, was deficient for not explicitly providing for the right of Indigenous Peoples to self-identify in accordance with UN charters, which the ICOM Code of Ethics supports, and for not explicitly acknowledging indigenous cultures’ special place in the history and future of our WG (as recommended after the First Consultation, as discussed above). Other possible variants such as WG for the Material History of World Cultures, which also gathered significant support in the First Consultation, have the same drawback.

3.3. Names Recommended to the Membership

After extensive deliberations over several months (January to May 2012), the Name Committee recommends to the WG membership the following 3 Name options as viable alternatives to replace the WG’s current Name. Each of these is, to varying degrees, consistent with the Criteria and the WG’s Aims and Vision. The 3 share a common feature: the term ‘indigenous’ is contained in all, as a means of acknowledging the important past, current and future role that the various Indigenous Peoples and their tangible and intangible heritage have in the development and activities of our Working Group. As well, as discussed in the Criteria (above), the explicit reference to ‘indigenous’ cultures/objects is a means of recognizing indigenous voices and dignity, in conformity with the ICOM Code of Ethics and UN charters. Nevertheless the 3 Names vary in important ways, namely by the choice of terms used to describe the type and scope of the collections that fall within the realm of our WG. The three names are described below.

(1) WG on Objects from Indigenous and World Cultures

Description/justification of why this Name fits our WG:
This Name, which integrates the two main themes (‘indigenous’ and ‘world cultures’) that gathered the most support in the First Membership Consultation, fits our WG for several reasons. Firstly, it includes in a prominent way the term ‘indigenous’ (‘cultures’), for the reasons discussed above. Secondly, this Name includes the term “world cultures”, which recognizes the concept of all cultures sharing one world with equal respect. This term and its associated concept have been adopted in recent years by new and established organizations and international activities which explicitly focus on cultural diversity in the museum and cultural fields; some of these museums and activities were formerly called ‘ethnographic’.” World Cultures” also evokes the WG’s culturally-focused conservation approach for objects valued, or-researched expressly because they are culturally representative. The Name is inclusive and open, and preserves the WG’s original broad scope by including objects from all cultures, as reflected by the United Nations in the term “cultural diversity”.

By combining “Indigenous” and “World Cultures”, the Name reflects the spirit and intent of the ICOM Cultural Diversity Charter and the UNESCO 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which advocates equal respect of, and protection for, diverse cultural expressions (including cultural objects) originating from all cultures, both traditional and contemporary, including those of Indigenous Peoples, in the interests of world peace and security. This Name also reflects UN usage in respect of a distinct Indigenous identity.

This name extends beyond categories to include tangible cultural expressions by all cultural groups who identify themselves as distinct, regardless of whether they take their identities primarily from association with the land or a locality, or from certain belief systems, customs or traditions, or from other factors. All groups and individuals can consider themselves included among “World Cultures. It supports a vision and future for the WG in step with the world’s mobile populations, with social change, and with cultural studies in today’s museums. The word ‘Objects” is appropriate within the context of this Name for the reasons described in section 3.1.
Questions/Comments and Responses:
1. Indigenous peoples are part of world cultures, why single them out?
Response: By doing so, the Name acknowledges the prominent role of indigenous cultural objects in this WG and it respects the dignity and diversity of indigenous cultures in conformity with UN charters which the ICOM Code of Ethics supports. Explicit reference to including indigenous cultures when referring to all cultures reflects contemporary UN usage in cultural spheres.6,9
2. “World Cultures” sounds vague. Its neutrality is excessive, to the point of having no meaning. All of ICOM-CC’s 21 Working Groups are concerned with cultural property from all over the world, so the expression is too broad to rely on, to articulate the specificity of our WG.
Response: The term “World Cultures” is increasingly used in the museum community in recognition and respect of cultural diversity. This Name draws from the view that the WG’s original name was also broadly inclusive of diverse cultures. It reflects the principle that it is appropriate to acknowledge and respect cultural diversity of all kinds, including indigenous cultures. The Name’s merits are two-fold: (1) all cultures are referred to in an equal way, thus not limiting the scope of the WG, nor excluding any one cultural group; (2), it evokes our specialization as being distinguished not by a limited selection of cultural groups or collections we work with, but by our culture-focused approach, which recognizes the central role of respecting cultural priorities when conserving objects that were collected specifically for being culturally representative. ‘World Cultures’ is thus intentionally culturally inclusive.

(2) WG on Indigenous and Local* Material Culture

Description of the term ‘Local’: (NB: any underlining in citations below are by Dignard).
The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) refers to ‘indigenous and local communities’ when describing the originators of such cultural items as traditional and folklore handicrafts:
‘Traditional cultural expressions (TCEs) (or, “expressions of folklore”) include music, art, designs, names, signs and symbols, performances, architectural forms, handicrafts and narratives. (…) TCEs are integral to the cultural and social identities of indigenous and local communities, they embody know-how and skills, and they transmit core values and beliefs.’15
The Convention on Biological Diversity also uses the term ‘indigenous and local communities’ with reference to:
‘(…) communities that have a long association with, and depend on, the lands and waters that they have traditionally live on or used. Sometimes such communities are also referred to as “traditional communities”. Because of this long association and reliance upon local resources, local communities have accumulated knowledge, innovations and practices regarding the useful environmental knowledge. (…) 5. Many communities may be considered local and may also be described as traditional communities. Some local communities may include peoples of indigenous descent. They are culturally diverse and occur on all inhabited continents. (…) 6. However, “Local community” remains, to some extent, an ambiguous term. (…)”16
UNESCO also refers to this expression in the context of Local and Indigenous Knowledge:
‘Local and indigenous knowledge refers to the understanding, skills and philosophies developed by societies with long histories of interaction with their natural surroundings. For rural and indigenous peoples, local knowledge informs decision-making about fundamental aspects of day-to-day life. This knowledge is integral to a cultural complex that also encompasses language, systems of classification, resource use practices, social interactions, ritual and spirituality. These unique ways of knowing are important facets of the world’s cultural diversity, and provide a foundation for locally-appropriate sustainable development.’17

Description/justification of why this Name fits our WG:
This Name, which derives from a name proposal that gathered much support in the First Membership Consultation (WG on Indigenous and Local Cultural Materials), fits our WG for the following reasons. Firstly, it gives prominence to “indigenous” material culture, which describes a large part of the objects this WG focuses on, and is respectful of UN charters that the ICOM Code of Ethics supports. The addition of the term ‘Local’ broadens the scope to refer to other cultural groups closely identified by a locality, for example by geographical, natural or rural environments, as used by international organizations (as described above). ‘Local’ means a particular, limited-size place, geographically unique in terms of land, fauna, flora, and specific communities associated with it; the intention is to imply that the material culture’s specific place of origin is a critical, defining characteristic. The term ‘local’ would include cultural groups producing traditional and folk objects, and it is sufficiently open and flexible to allow the inclusion of all cultures and of various kinds of groups who identify themselves, at least in part, in relation to their locality. The term ‘indigenous’ is kept distinct from the term ‘local’ in
recognition of the distinct nature of indigenous cultures, as recommended in the Criteria. Using the terms ‘indigenous and local’ also allows for groups of people to refer to themselves more specifically, in myriad of other ways. “Material Culture” is a broad expression for the diversity of objects we deal with, invoking the material or tangible expressions of cultures and peoples, and is appropriate within the context of this Name as per the reasons described in section 3.1.

Questions/Comments and Responses:
1. The UN’s and others’ specific usage of ‘local’ is uncommon and unfamiliar to our members and stakeholders; even the Convention on Biodiversity who uses it, recognizes that the term is ambiguous (see end of quotation above). How does this term satisfy the Criteria: ‘Be clear and unambiguous’?
Response: Although an imperfect term itself, “local” as used in this Name has the benefits of being open, neutral and enjoys the credibility of growing usage within the international system (e.g. the Convention on Biological Diversity, the World Intellectual Property Organization, UNESCO) concerning indigenous rights, the rights of national cultural minorities within states, and issues around traditional knowledge, traditional cultural expressions and intellectual property. There are limited terms that can be used, and all have some drawbacks. This term aims at making the best of a multi-layered situation. The expression “Indigenous and local” is somewhat vague but the vagueness allows it to be inclusive. The WG could further define ‘local’ in its WG Aims and Vision and on the ICOM-CC website if necessary.
2. “Local” is unclear - for example, ‘local’ relevant to whose place, to whose geography, and when, in a group’s cultural history? This term is also counter-intuitive since ‘ethnographic’ museum objects were often collected from foreign lands and so typically, are not currently ‘local’ at all following the normal definition of ‘local’.
Response: ‘Local’ is vague with respect to which locality we are talking about, but the term has the benefit of implying the importance of a certain ‘local’ place for the material culture referred to.
3. Not all cultures primarily identify themselves according to a particular ‘local’ geographic environment, and we should not assume or require that they do; they may prefer to name and identify themselves according to other characteristics, such as language, genetic commonalities, or belief system.
Response: Local geographic environment may not be the primary identifying factor. All cultures have various means of expressing their identity and this Name does not seek to find one term for all, it is merely stating that locality is one characteristic. Even one sole person living elsewhere, if he/she identifies with a cultural group that group will be located somewhere. Even an urban community originally from another place, it may choose to identify to its now adopted urban locality, or it may choose to identify to its locality of origin, or maybe both.

(3) WG on Indigenous and Traditional* Material Culture

*Description of the term ‘Traditional’: [NB: any underlining in citations below are by the current author (Dignard)].
The term ‘traditional’ includes folk/ folklore objects, and can qualify all objects or creations that are based to some degree on cultural traditions, and reflect a culture’s, or a community’s, identity. According to the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), ‘traditional’ is essentially equivalent to ‘folklore’, but is a more widely accepted and neutral term (see our bolded text):
‘This booklet [=Inte llectual Property and Traditional Cultural Expressions/Folklore] uses the terms ‘traditional cultural expressions’ (TCEs) and ‘expressions of folklore’ interchangeably. Although ‘expressions of folklore’ has been the term used most commonly in international discussions and is found in many national laws, some communities have expressed reservations about negative connotations of the word ‘folklore.’’

Traditional objects can refer to living, contemporary objects, and as well to objects of hybrid origin or inspiration:
‘What are “traditional cultural expressions” (TCEs)? Traditional cultural expressions, often the product of inter-generational and fluid social and communal creative processes, reflect and identify a community’s history, cultural and social identity, and values. While lying at the heart of a community’s identity, cultural heritage is also ‘living’ – it is constantly recreated as traditional artists and practitioners bring fresh perspectives to their work. Tradition is not only about imitation and reproduction; it is also about innovation and creation within the traditional framework. Therefore, traditional creativity is marked by a dynamic interplay between collective and individual creativity.
Characteristics of traditional cultural expressions (TCEs)/folklore: In general, it may be said that TCEs/folklore:
(i) are handed down from one generation to another, either orally or by imitation,
(ii) reflect a community’s cultural and social
identity,
(iii) consist of characteristic elements of a community's heritage,
(iv) are made by 'authors unknown' and/or by communities and/or by individuals communally recognized as having the right, responsibility or permission to do so,
(v) are often not created for commercial purposes, but as vehicles for religious and cultural expression, and (vi) are constantly evolving, developing and being recreated within the community.

(...) 'Traditional cultural expressions'/ 'expressions of folklore' means productions consisting of characteristic elements of the traditional artistic heritage developed and maintained by a community of [name of country] or by individuals reflecting the traditional artistic expectations of such a community, in particular:
- verbal expressions (...); - musical expressions (...); and,
- tangible expressions, such as: productions of folk art, in particular, drawings, paintings, carvings, sculptures, pottery, terracotta, mosaic, woodwork, metalware, jewelry, basket weaving, needlework, textiles, carpets, costumes; crafts; musical instruments; architectural forms.

'Expressions of' traditional culture (or 'expressions of' folklore) may be either intangible, tangible or, most usually, combinations of the two - an example of such a 'mixed expression of folklore' would be a woven rug (a tangible expression) that expresses elements of a traditional story (an intangible expression).

UNESCO also associates folklore objects with tradition-based objects:

'Definition of folklore: Folklore (or traditional and popular culture) is the totality of tradition-based creations of a cultural community, expressed by a group or individuals and recognized as reflecting the expectations of a community in so far as they reflect its cultural and social identity; its standards and values are transmitted orally, by imitation or by other means. Its forms are, among others, language, literature, music, dance, games, mythology, rituals, customs, handicrafts, architecture and other arts.'

Description/justification of why this Name fits our WG:

The Name WG on Indigenous and Traditional Material Culture recognizes and gives prominence to indigenous cultures, while the addition of the term "traditional" broadens the scope to traditional objects, which include folk objects as per the WIPO definition above. The Name is inclusive of the traditional material culture from all cultures, since all cultures have a traditional or folk component to them. The term focuses on material culture linked to community traditions. The term 'traditional' also includes new, modern, living creations: "While lying at the heart of a community's identity, cultural heritage is also 'living' - it is constantly recreated as traditional artists and practitioners bring fresh perspectives to their work. Tradition is not only about imitation and reproduction; it is also about innovation and creation within the traditional framework. Therefore, traditional creativity is marked by a dynamic interplay between collective and individual creativity." The Name is clear and simple to understand. It follows internationally-recognized terminology and is neutral and respectful of all. "Material Culture" is a broad expression for the diversity of objects we deal with, invoking the material or tangible expressions of cultures and peoples, and is appropriate within the context of this Name as per the reasons described in section 3.1.

Questions/Comments and Responses:

1. This Name is too limiting: why not non-traditional cultural items? Who defines what is traditional and what is not? Many people will assume modern cultures are non-traditional and so this Name would not intuitively suggest that we work with "living" cultures. Also "traditional" cultural materials would deny the importance of emerging cultural expressions, and the fact that many museums are collecting materials and works created by living artists.

Response: 'Traditional' objects means objects representative of cultural communities and working within cultural traditions, and includes contemporary objects, as described above. It includes artworks although it is unlikely to include those purely artistic creations not linked to or inspired by the artist's cultural identity. Our WG has always focused on certain type of objects - but not on all objects, and this is a way to express this distinction in a respectful, neutral way.

2. Our Working Group focuses on conserving those aspects of an object that are considered to be particularly culturally significant, and have been identified as such by either the originating peoples, or for, example, researchers and curators specializing in cultural studies. A non-traditional work, for example an individual's artistic creation, could very well prove to be highly significant culturally, if only for the reason that it excludes certain more obvious traditional components, and therefore is noteworthy for study, collection or conservation because of its relationship to more traditional works.
Response: There is creativity in what is defined here as traditional material culture. "Traditional" is often a matter of degree. For example: contemporary artists of indigenous heritage may work entirely in non-traditional media but consistently refer to or receive inspiration from traditional themes, including for example traditional indigenous spirituality.

4. Procedure to Decide on the WG Name

As stated in the introduction, above, this document is intended to prompt further discussions on alternative WG Names and to assist as a reference document for the upcoming Second Membership Consultation (SMC) which aims at determining the most suitable alternative name to the current name of the ICOM-CC’s Working Group (WG) on Ethnographic Collections.

The upcoming Second Membership Consultation will involve the members in choosing an alternative name, possibly via multiple steps. Once the outcome is conclusive, and an alternative name is identified, there shall be a Third Membership Consultation to decide, yes or no, whether to replace the current name with the alternative name identified in this Second Consultation.

In summary, the following are the proposed steps:
1. Send this 2nd Discussion Paper out to the membership for their thoughts, ideas, input etc. + online discussion.
2. Circulate membership comments and responses.
3. Send out 2nd Membership Consultation via SurveyMonkey, to determine preferences among viable alternative WG Names; do 2nd round as required to obtain a conclusive majority.
4. Once an alternative WG Name is identified, proceed with Third Membership Consultation, i.e. a final yes or no vote, in favour or against changing the WG name to the above-identified alternative name.
5. Report on outcome to members; inform the ICOM Directory Board of the outcome, and implement name change if applicable.

Endnotes:
9. Similarly, in the 2003 UN Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ref. 5 above), when referring to issues that concern all peoples of the world, indigenous peoples are explicitly recognized: ‘(...) Recognizing that communities, in particular indigenous communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals, play an important role in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and re-creation of the intangible cultural heritage, thus helping to enrich cultural diversity and human creativity, (...)’.
11. UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues Who are Indigenous Peoples? Fact Sheet, 21 October 2007, www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/Ssession_factsheet1.pdf. This document also states: ‘Understanding the term “indigenous”: Considering the diversity of indigenous peoples, an official definition of “indigenous” has not been adopted by any UN-system body. Instead the system has developed a modern understanding of this term based on the following: Self-identification as indigenous peoples at the individual level and accepted by the community as their member; historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies; strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources; distinct social, economic or political systems; distinct language, culture and beliefs; form non-dominant groups of society; resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities. A question of identity: According to the UN the most fruitful approach is to identify, rather than define indigenous peoples. This is based on the fundamental criterion of self-identification as underlined in a number of human rights documents.’ See also a
Results on the Second Consultation Concerning the Possibility of Changing the Name of the ICOM-CC Working Group on Ethnographic Collections

Prepared by Carole Dignard, Chair, ICOM-CC-WGEC
Name Committee
June 21, 2012

Method: SurveyMonkey web addresses were emailed to ICOM-CC WG Members (including Friends of ICOM-CC, Students and Student Friends, and designated representatives of an ICOM-CC Institutional Membership) and to Non-Members (WG Participants or Interested Parties).

- The Second Consultation text provided background information, the WG Aims and Vision, Broader Context, and Criteria in Selecting the Name (as presented above), as well as Descriptions and Justifications for the 3 proposed Names (including descriptions of terms).
- The Consultation took place June 13-19.
- SurveyMonkey data is received by the Name Chair only, and remains confidential (the collector cannot identify who responded).

Results:

Response rate:
MEMBERS: 43 members responded out of 104, or 41%.
NON-MEMBERS: 37 interested parties responded out of 190, or 19%

Question 1: Please rate the suitability of the following WG Names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Not Acceptable</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG on Objects from Indigenous and World Cultures</td>
<td>31 (72%)</td>
<td>7 (16%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG on Indigenous and Local Material Culture</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>16 (37%)</td>
<td>16 (37%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG on Indigenous and Traditional Material Culture</td>
<td>14 (33%)</td>
<td>18 (42%)</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>NON-MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Not Acceptable</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG on Objects from Indigenous and World Cultures</td>
<td>21 (58%)</td>
<td>10 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG on Indigenous and Local Material Culture</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>17 (46%)</td>
<td>10 (27%)</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG on Indigenous and Traditional Material Culture</td>
<td>13 (35%)</td>
<td>9 (24%)</td>
<td>10 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Members
1. Hard to choose...however the first one will be quickly shortened to ‘objects’ thus will loose in meaning compared to previous one.
2. I can not identify with the terms local and traditional in the other two options, they seem to me two narrow and potentially misleading or limiting.

3. Unacceptable because of "local". Unacceptable because of "Traditional Material Culture" - every WG includes some form of this. On the other hand, one might think that it's only Indigenous traditional material culture that's considered here.

4. Local does not apply to our Museum, we are in Europe and our collection so far is strictly non-European

5. I think the first group name provides the most general and all encompassing terminology.

6. I think the name “Objects from WG on Indigenous and World Cultures” is the most obvious of all. The terms are clear and appropriate. I'm still undecided about the other options, because I fear that the terms “local” and “traditional” can be anthropologically and historiographically questionable.

7. I really dislike the term 'Local' in this context

8. The term "Local" is too limited

9. "WG on Indigenous and Local Material Culture" is in my opinion too restrictive

Comments: Non-Members

1. I find 'local' difficult as many members of any particular cultural tradition have been displaced for any number of reasons but may continue to produce traditional cultural expressions in a very different environment. All names give scope to include cultural minorities even in Western Europe, e.g. Breton, Basque etc.

2. I do not believe that changing the name from one term (ethnographic) to another (indigenous) with different combinations will settle this issue. We need to think larger than this.

3. The use of the words “local material” and “traditional material” culture is very limiting since it does not allow for the inclusion of material culture made in modern contemporary times. What I mean to say is that contemporary “ethnographic” or indigenous artists/peoples may incorporate items in their work that may not be local (due to trade) or traditional (because of changes or modifications an artists makes). It seems by changing the names to included loaded terms like “local” and “traditional” you are excluding certain types of cultural material that may still fit the “indigenous” or “ethnographic” criteria but be left out of this category because of semantics.

4. I prefer to use local or traditional rather than world.

5. Preference remains for cultural materials over material culture

6. Re the last option - I don't believe that the name is "clear and simple to understand", particularly when viewed without the thorough explanation we have been provided with. I suspect that some communities might find the word "traditional" as limiting as the previous "ethnographic", when it's seen or heard in isolation from the references given. In other words, at first glance, it's not clear that it includes "new modern, living creations".

7. I like the inclusive and flexible meaning of the word 'local'. It fits the preservation of material culture of various social groups defined by their locality, for example, diasporas. Diasporas are connected to their original historic location and their new home. The meaning of ‘local’ incorporates ‘traditional’ and ‘new’ forms of material culture.

8. The term "traditional" is problematic, since collections we work with can be contemporary and indigenous and not considered “traditional” by the makers. The term “local” is also problematic; for example when a Cree person is now living in Santa Fe NM and creating contemporary art, "local" has little meaning.

9. I understand the rationale given for the term "local", however, it seems ambiguous and could cause confusion, especially as these objects are often collected, studied, and conserved far from where they originated. I think there may be a future of constant explanation and clarification if we choose this option.

10. I find that "world cultures" is more all encompassing and less ambiguous. While "traditional material culture" is also a good word, it is less clear and may require further clarification as to what is considered 'traditional' and to whom/which group this is referring.

11. Local could mean only cultures near indigenous ones; I agree with "traditional" but this could leave out evolving cultures both traditional and of other time periods.

Question 2: Please rank the following 3 possible names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>First choice</th>
<th>Second choice</th>
<th>Third choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WG on Objects from Indigenous and World Cultures</td>
<td>27 (63%)</td>
<td>11 (26%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG on Indigenous and Local Material Culture</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>11 (26%)</td>
<td>26 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG on Indigenous and Traditional Material Culture</td>
<td>13 (30%)</td>
<td>19 (44%)</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(abstention)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments: Members
1. Reason for choice: I think it is better to define by broader type than by geography; the accent is on the social and spiritual value more than the geographical belonging. Both names are good though.
2. I think all are viable alternatives. I believe number three is the most generalized, which is preferable. I also think it is essential to have "material culture" in the name.
3. Have no other choices, for reasons above, in 1 (Unacceptable because of "local". Unacceptable because of "Traditional Material Culture" - every WG includes some form of this. On the other hand, one might think that it's only Indigenous traditional material culture that's considered here.)
4. After all of the comments back and forth, I think that my first choice is open to the least interpretation. I also like the work objects - it is clean and simple, without the material culture, cultural materials debate.
5. WG on Indigenous and Traditional Objects, a fusion of my first choices would have convinced me even better.

Comments: Non-Members
1. I find 'local' difficult as many members of any particular cultural tradition have been displaced for any number of reasons but may continue to produce traditional cultural expressions in a very different environment. All names give scope to include cultural minorities even in Western Europe, e.g. Breton, Basque etc.
2. There was no alternative where I could choose "None of the above named choices." Therefore I had to choose first, second and third choice although I don't prefer either of them. (Note from Dignard: this person's vote were therefore counted as: Abstention.)
3. It is too difficult to choose between local and traditional. Quite the same. But I prefer local since local more specific and unique to describe indigenous.

4. Recognizing how difficult it is to come up with a name that encompasses the broad nature of what this group does, my first choice reflects the broad nature of the work that is done by this group. I feel the other two are confusing.
5. I think the arguments put forward for all 3 options are sound, finding it hard to choose between them. But I do think it makes sense to focus on the objects conservation specialisation rather than e.g. works on paper etc, hence my first choice. Thank you for the work put in by the Committee.
6. Traditional material culture best encompasses objects and cultural material produced by groups no longer living in their original homeland.
7. "World culture" seems to indicate a world-wide culture.

Question 3: After an Alternative Name is identified, a Third Consultation will ask whether, yes or no, the current Name of the WG should change to this Alternative Name. Are you satisfied with the proposed way this Name Change issue shall be resolved?

MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 (93%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NON-MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 (89%)</td>
<td>1 (3%) (see*)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Members
1. En terme de pédagogie et d'identité, les 3 noms proposés seront dans tous les cas plus explicites que l'ancienne dénomination du groupe de travail.
2. Long but fair.
3. I think you are doing a great job.
4. I think the members of the Working group have already decided in their majority that the name should change. So I am not sure about the third consultation. It would be really sad if after this remarkable effort, all ends where it started. But I am sure you have good reasons to proceed the way you decided.

Comments: Non-Members
1. *1. Why is it that we, instead of discussing the broader issue that was the original thought for this discussion, settle with only a name change?
In the discussions referenced to there is obviously a range of different opinions whether we should change name at all, and I think it is not settled that easily. Ethnographic is not a bad name, but is symbolises a much bigger issue that needs to be discussed rather than rationalised away by a simple name change.

2. Excellent and thorough
3. I have been very impressed with the entire process of this name change. I think that this survey too has been extremely well presented.
4. Although the WG name "Indigenous and world cultures" is a great alternative, I am still of the mind that "Ethnographic Collections" is clear and understandable to all. It defines the collections we work on and I don’t feel it needs to be a sensitive issue (just as changing ‘french fries’ to ‘freedom fries’ seemed wholly unnecessary).
5. Sadly, in view of the diligent and difficult work of the committee, I don’t think we are quite there yet. for example, what kinds of things would be excluded or included for each option? what about "folk art"? is this individual art? a cultural tradition? this varies. what about "hobo art" in the US? this is not traditional nor indigenous, and was specific to a time and place. It would be excluded from ‘mainstream art’ or “culture". the definitions should allow us to know whether a specific/group of objects IS or IS NOT included. And when does “traditional" stop? When artists copyright derived prints? Would these definitions describe the education and training required for a conservator or others to decide whether a particular conservator was qualified to work on a specific object or group of objects?

Question 4: Comments on this Second Consultation?
Other Comments?

Members:
1. I appreciate your thorough statements regarding definitions of each proposed name changes.
2. The way this name change (and the consultation) has been studied and handled is very professional and well done.
3. Excellent work! Very clearly and thoroughly conducted. Thank you, Carole.
4. Personally I am in awe and disbelief of all of the work that the committee and its members have put into this name change project.
5. No! Great work, good effort of transparency and explanations
6. I’m very impressed with the thoroughness and inclusiveness of this process. Congratulations to all of those involved.

Non-Members
1. I am pro democratic consultations like these, but not for the name change.
2. Nope.
3. The summary in the Survey Monkey was concise and useful. Thank you for all the thoughtful consideration and obvious effort during this process.
4. Thank you and all the working group for all this work.
5. I think this a fair and thorough process.
6. I have been very impressed with the thoughtful, careful and well-researched way this name change process has been carried out. Kudos to you all.
7. Congratulations to the group for taking on this daunting task.

Question 5: Are you a current ICOM member? If so please provide the code you were sent, or your ICOM card number. (NOTE: This allowed us to verify whether those listed in the non-members category were actually paid current members. After verification, we found 9 such members. The data from these was transferred to the Members section.)

Results of the Third Consultation on Whether to Change the Name ICOM-CC Working Group (WG) on Ethnographic Collections, to ICOM-CC WG on Objects from Indigenous and World Cultures

Prepared by Carole Dignard, Chair, ICOM-CC-WGEC
Name Committee
November 5, 2012

Participation rate:
ICOM-CC Members: 38 out of 107, or 35%
Participants (non-members): 38 out of 187, or 20%

Question 1: Do you support changing the current Name of the ICOM-CC Working Group on Ethnographic Collections, to: ICOM-CC Working Group on Objects from Indigenous and World Cultures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Non-Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (change the name)</td>
<td>32 (84%)</td>
<td>33 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (keep the current name)</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided / none of the above / other</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Members
1. Your explanation why is clear and good.
2. It is a good idea and the time & effort involved in initiating this change is commendable.

3. I still prefer the original name, but since it is perceived to be problematic for some members, I am ok with a name change.

4. Although I have chosen the option YES, I still prefer to have the word ‘indigenous’ removed. For me it associates with ‘ethnographic’ and has the same meaning.

5. This whole thing has been handled badly. It is clear a new name is desired, but the suggested new name simply doesn’t work.

6. I agree with the name change and find the statements in this survey explaining the change to be clear and convincing. While I understand others’ hesitations to change names, in particular the excellent definition of ethnographic provided by the Oxford English Dictionary, there are simply too many people that have negative associations with the word ethnographic. Negative connotations are not something easily reversed by a dictionary definition, even if the definition is fully understood. The fact that committees have considered a name change for 40 years is significant. If the negative connotations did not exist - or were easier to overcome - this wouldn’t be a recurring issue. The language of the new name does not contain any single word, as far as I can see, that can be understood negatively. Though a bit clumsy, the new name describes, simply, what we conserve.

7. I strongly feel that changing the name is important

Comments: Non-Members
1. The title Indigenous and World Culture seems to exclude local culture and culture that is not tied to ethnicity. The term “ethnographic” does not. This seems to me to make the us/them dichotomy worse, not better.

2. I strongly feel that changing the name is important.

3. I feel that the name change is unnecessary. I understand that much work has gone into exploring a new name but still feel that there isn’t enough evidence put forward, or in my own research, to suggest that the word Ethnographic is offensive, racist or outdated ‘to the majority’. I feel that the term Ethnographic incorporates each and every culture including my own being British white, which does not readily fit into a category of Indigenous or World cultures. Throughout this debate I have found it difficult to understand why we wish to separate ‘Indigenous Cultures’ from ‘World Cultures’ in the group title.

4. Ethnography is not a racist term. This is my opinion. Is my point of view more or less valid that that of a Maori conservator? Any word might have different connotations to different people, depending on their viewpoint. The proposed new name is slightly odd—is an Indigenous culture not a world culture? What’s the difference between the two? Do you not think that the word ‘indigenous’ is itself loaded with meaning—just as much as the word ‘ethnographic’ may be?

5. I have described myself as a conservator of ethnographic objects for many years without feeling or experiencing any negative implications. However, I think the term is now more of a convenient ‘short-hand’ for what we do for those of us in the profession rather than a useful description. I agree that it can be offensive to indigenous peoples and out of step with wider policy and approaches. It also means nothing to the majority of museum visitors. Although the new name is a bit cumbersome it approaches more closely our remit. I am very grateful to the naming committee for the extensive, detailed hard work they have put in to get us to this point.

6. I won’t be unhappy if the name isn’t changed but I was impressed with the process of working through the name change options and am comfortable that the new name is appropriate and that there is good justification for the change.

7. Only remark: it’s a long denomination and can be a bit clunky in some context. But I agree with the meaning and choice of each word.

8. Hi, sorry, i may not have understood one point, but for my understanding the term “World cultures” already expresses that ALL cultures are included in an unbiased manner.

Question 2: Other Comments

Members:
1. Background research for this survey process and its deliberations, cultural sensitivity and inclusivity is impressive.

2. I would like to thank the name change committee for all the work that has been put into this process!

3. Congratulations with the way this name change has been set up!

4. Thank you Carole for your careful consideration of everyone’s views, the meanings of words and phrases, the organization and sequence required for fair discussion, the compilation of view points and communicating (and encouraging communication) with the working group membership and other interested people. A terrific job.

5. This Working Group has been at the leading edge of many technological advances in the
international conservation of culturally representative objects. So, it is especially rewarding at this time in our history to see how its membership is equally sympathetic to ICOM's and UNESCO's recent initiatives in support of culture and society. This name change and new name being proposed reflect a significant development in the history of not only this Working Group, but also within the Conservation Committee itself.

6. Dears, I support the name change. In my opinion, the new name is not motivated by political correctness. It's better, updated and the most suitable description about what we do and what we use to identify our collection. Best regards, Ana Carolina Delgado Vieira Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia Universidade de São Paulo Brasil

7. I have the greatest respect for the conservators on the name change committee, many of whom are old friends, but I still in my heart do not believe the name change is the right way forward.

8. Thanks for the process and thoughtfulness.

Non-Members:
1. Changing the name is fine for now but ultimately, I think that conservators need to address whether the existence of this group is relevant in this day and age--it feels like a form of out-dated affirmative action. Most of the WGs are materials-based and I'd rather see indigenous and world cultures objects take their place in the relevant materials-based WG, for example the conservation of a Naskapi semi-tanned leather coat in the Leather and Related Materials WG (maybe providing the opportunity for fruitful interaction with conservators working on other painted leather objects such as wall coverings, shields etc?). Ethical issues should be discussed in a more multidisciplinary forum as they will have relevance to conservators working on sacred materials, working objects, contemporary art etc. (perhaps in the Theory and History of Conservation or Legal Issues in Conservation WGs or whatever works best--maybe an expanded remit or re-working of one/both of these groups is necessary?).

2. I have been a member of ICOM-CC in the past but can no longer afford the membership fee on a fixed income. This may become an issue for more people as the economy constricts, especially in museum funding. ICOM-CC may wish to consider this issue, as access to professional information should not depend on income level.

3. Please accept my gratitude for your thoughtful and clearly expressed presentation of the thoughts and opinions of so many people. I feel this has been a very fair and considered process and an example of how potentially divisive topics can be addressed.

4. Dear team members: thanks for the effort and all the time you have dedicated to this challenge!!!