(Blueprint Collection, cont.) archival materials are in keeping with the scope and mission of this Archives.

The item level descriptions that the automated system provides result in an inventory to these materials at more levels than was ever possible before. Searching can be done by date, by building, by project name or number, etc. Access has been increased while the wear and tear on the materials has been eliminated. The new housing, safe environment, and centralized study location will ensure their preservation. The ease of use and access for staff that might otherwise not consider using historical collections has increased the visibility of the Archives within the institution.

Despite the awkward size and the unwieldy quantity, the type of objective documentary information that the original blueprints and drawings render to researchers cannot be overlooked as one of the most valuable sources of historical information in an institutional archive. The cost of maintaining these collections in time, supplies and space should always be factored into the formation of any new archives. The effort of providing item level descriptions for blueprints and drawings is justified by the enhanced access and reservation the new system provides. This aspect of the archival project was never specifically identified in the grant here at the Museum—it evolved from the obvious need for care and management that the collection exhibited.

Waneta Sage-Gagne
Ringling Museum

REPATRIATION & MUSEUM ARCHIVES

As a result of the recent federal legislation concerning the "repatriation of Native American group or cultural patrimony," curators in museums that have archaeological collections may need to do research in their archives to ascertain the acquisition background of archaeological collections or to verify the circumstances of burials and associated artifacts. A museum archives has a variety of documents, such as archaeological permit and archaeological project files, which may include contracts, correspondence, field notes and analysis data, that are useful in providing information on the museum's collections. Museum archivists may need to assist curators in searching archaeological permit files or project contracts to determine the acquisition background of collections, in using archaeological project documentation to identify burials.

Archivists may also experience an additional demand on their time through requests for lists of documentation for collections recovered from Federal, State or tribal lands. Because the archaeological collections that are curated in an institution like the Arizona State Museum are often the property of State or Federal agencies, situations could arise when collections are recalled by such an agency or when the agency requests an inventory of collections from a particular land unit such as a National Forest, or related to a specific Native American culture.

The Arizona State Museum, for example, is a designated repository for archaeological resources located on State, Federal and Indian land. Since enactment of the 1906 Federal Antiquities Act, those resources located on Federal lands have been protected by law. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 further strengthened the legal basis for this protection. Similar legislation in the form of the Arizona Antiquities Act of 1960 was enacted to protect archaeological resources on land owned or controlled by the State of Arizona. These laws require that archaeological collections from Federal, State and Indian lands be curated at an appropriate repository; artifacts removed from Federal lands remain Federal property and the appropriate government agencies are responsible for their protection and preservation.

Museums also curate collections from tribally owned lands, which are the property of tribes, as well as culturally related materials from other lands. Recently the role of museums in collecting cultural property such as human remains and sacred objects has been called into question by Native American activists concerned about issues of self-determination and conflicting cultural values. Some Native American tribes have requested the repatriation of sacred objects, such as the Zuni War gods, or the reburial of human remains and associated grave goods.

Native American concern about these issues has resulted in the enactment of 1990 Federal legislation, H.R. 5237, which states that "the ownership, control, or right of possession of Native American human remains and funerary objects which are excavated or discovered on Federal or tribal lands after the date of enactment of this Act" shall be in order of priority: the lineal descendants; the tribe on whose land the objects or remains were found; or the tribe with the closest cultural affinity. In addition, this legislation requires Federal agencies and museums in (cont.)
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possession of Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects or objects of cultural patrimony to compile inventories of these remains and objects and identify their geographic and cultural affiliation.

Due to the complex circumstances involving museum curatation of collections, as well as the new legislation, there will be an increased demand for access to museum archives. I will describe a few cases in which documents in the Arizona State Museum Archives have been useful in answering curators' questions about acquisition background such as might arise in regard to repatriation requests. Then I will explain how the inventories of selected document collections have been produced in response to requests from Federal agencies or tribal entities.

Recently we received a request from the National Park Service for return of collections recovered in the 1960s by Arizona State Museum archaeologists working under contract to the Park Service. Museum records that had just been transferred to the Archives contained contract correspondence showing that the Museum had been authorized to retain the artifacts. While the Museum may ultimately decide to return these artifacts to the Park Service, it is important that this decision be based on accurate information regarding the original agreement.

In 1987, a tribe requested repatriation of human remains and associated artifacts excavated during a particular archaeological project. The Curator reviewed project records and discovered that the land from which the excavated materials were recovered had been allotted and was now essentially owned by a large number of individual Native Americans rather than by the tribal entity. University lawyers required that the individual allottees would have to sign an agreement on the disposition of these materials before anything could be released by the Museum. To resolve this problem, the tribe arranged to legally indemnify the Museum, protecting it from accountability to the allottees and enabling it to release the materials to the tribe.

Another sort of problem that may occur more frequently due to the new legislation involves the identification of burials and associated grave goods and accounting for burials when the public reports don't correspond to actual collections. In some cases, a burial may have been recorded in the field but not recovered. Perhaps a pot is found in what seems to be a burial feature but there are no associated human remains. Should artifacts be considered grave goods if they are not associated with human remains? The field investigator's notes may explain why a feature was identified as a burial or why the remains were not recovered.

One recent case affected by the new legislation concerns a request received by the Heard Museum from the Hopi tribe for repatriation of a sacred shield. In this case, the Museum's Board of Trustees unanimously voted to relinquish ownership "in recognition that it was a communally owned object" (Art-Talk). In other situations, a museum may need to research the object's history through field notes or other archival documents to determine that it has in fact been used in sacred ceremonies and is necessary for the continuation of those ceremonies as defined in the law.

In the event that inventories are requested by a tribe or Federal agency, museum archivists must be able to provide lists of relevant documentary collections. As the Archivist of a museum that is a major archaeological repository, I have received two such requests for inventories. The first request, which came from the Tonto National Forest, asked for a complete inventory of collections taken from Tonto National Forest land. A Museum archaeologist identified which archaeological sites occur within Tonto National Forest, using the Museum's site survey cards, USGS quadrangle maps with plotted sites, and published land ownership maps. These records were not always sufficient to verify site location as on or off the Forest, but a reasonably accurate listing of site numbers was produced.

Thus, through this research, lists of site numbers on Forest land were generated by the computer. I then used these lists 'to check Archives' subject indices. At that time, the Archives had a computerized subject index, but many site numbers were not listed in this index or were inconsistently formatted. I had to manually check the inventories to our archaeological project collections, which are organized in three separate record groups, for site numbers or project names. Since our indexing is quite thorough, I was confident that the resulting inventory was complete. However, I realized that in the future it would be much easier to produce these inventories if all of the site numbers were consistently entered into our database. This was finally completed last year. My next task will be to enter accession numbers into the database in a field created for this purpose. Until recently the Archives was separate from the Collections Division and did not use Museum accession numbers. Now that our databases contain information in similar formats, the (cont.)
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various types of collections resulting from an archaeological project, such as artifacts, photographs and documents can be more fully integrated through use of a common accession number.

We recently received a request from the Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department for an inventory of Navajo cultural resources in the Museum's collections. This request was handled by providing a computer-generated list of Navajo subject headings from the Archives' index. This inventory is undoubtedly not complete in terms of records related to early archaeological activities on Navajo lands (the majority of which involve Pueblo rather than Navajo cultural remains) but it does provide a listing of ethnographic, governmental and other resources of value to the Navajo Nation.

Most museums that are affected by the new repatriation legislation understand and ethically support the desire for Native American tribes to be involved in determining the disposition of ancestral human remains and sacred objects. The major issue now facing these institutions will be how to comply with this legislation given limited finances and staff. Inventories of archival collections will be less complicated to produce than inventories of burials or sacred objects, where the Museum may need to research the background of these collections as in the cases described earlier. It is perhaps in the area of providing support to collections' research, that museum archivists will most experience increased demand as a result of the new legislation.


Jeanne Armstrong
Arizona State Museum

THE CALM BEFORE THE STORM
DISASTER PLANNING IN SOUTH CAROLINA

As early as 1984, South Carolina institutions began planning for disasters on the community level. Individual institutional plans were tested on several occasions in Charleston, located in the East Coast "hurricane alley." Based on the premise that there is strength in numbers, tri-county institutions met and established the disaster-planning consortium CALM—Charleston Libraries, Archives & Museums. Supplies were stockpiled, professional and support service lists compiled, and a phone tree created. CALM also met with fire, police, and emergency preparedness departments, informing them of the special needs and importance of collections. To improve response, surveys were scheduled so that personnel could familiarize themselves with physical layout and sensitive collections.

The advance planning paid off in September 1989, when Charleston was hit with a category 4 storm. Using a 3-phase alert system (watch, warning, alert), institutions began securing collections four days before projected landfall on Friday. On Monday, computers were backed up and copies distributed to several locations, supply stockpiles checked. By Tuesday, vulnerable collections were being moved inland. By Wednesday most institutions were secured, allowing staff time to evacuate or prepare their homes.

Hugo made landfall on Thursday, 12 hours early. With sustained winds of 135 mph, it cut a path of devastation far greater than expected. Buildings were flattened as a 17-foot storm surge pounded the shore. Remarkably, few cultural institutions sustained any severe damage; what did occur was unavoidable and did not involve collections.

Immediately after the storm, institutions that had little or no damage came to the aid of those that were harder hit and helped secure collections. Careful planning and quick recovery efforts helped to minimize the damage.

Sharon Bennett
Charleston Museum

WORTH READING

The Spring 1990 issue of Library Trends, "Intellectual Access to Graphic Information" (Mark E. Rorvig, ed.), focusses on computerized systems that can handle images and the Art and Architecture Thesaurus.