

## Paths to Indigenous Self-representation: the Round Table of Santiago de Chile 50 years later

*Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology of the University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*

*Voies vers la représentation autochtone. La Table de Santiago 50 ans plus tard*

**Rebeca Ribeiro Bombonato and Marília Xavier Cury**

---



**Electronic version**

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/iss/4137>

DOI: 10.4000/iss.4137

ISSN: 2306-4161

**Publisher**

ICOM - International Council of Museums

**Printed version**

Date of publication: 1 December 2022

Number of pages: 67-81

ISSN: 2309-1290

**Electronic reference**

Rebeca Ribeiro Bombonato and Marília Xavier Cury, "Paths to Indigenous Self-representation: the Round Table of Santiago de Chile 50 years later", *ICOFOM Study Series* [Online], 50-1 | 2022, Online since 01 December 2022, connection on 31 December 2022. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/iss/4137> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/iss.4137>

---

# Paths to Indigenous Self- representation: the Round Table of Santiago de Chile 50 years later

**Rebeca Ribeiro Bombonato**

Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology of the  
University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

**Marília Xavier Cury**

Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology of the  
University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

## ABSTRACT

---

The Declaration of the Round Table of Santiago de Chile in 1972 was more than a milestone for museological thought. It paved the way for new forms and understandings of museum work and the inclu-

sion of different participants. In recent years, different Indigenous groups have come to recognize the museum as a space where they can make their stories and struggles visible to society. Through the museum, Indigenous peoples have had their right of access respected, regarding the objects of their ancestors that were musealized in the past. Therefore, this article discusses different collaborative practices between museums and Indigenous peoples through examples in Brazilian territory, in order to highlight the Declaration's influence on these new practices and new horizons. Bearing in mind the museum's social function, we highlight the importance of museum exhibitions for the re-elaboration of museological thinking and the (re)organization of museum practices.

**Keywords:** museum exhibitions, collaborative processes, shared curatorship, Indigenous participation

## RÉSUMÉ

---

### Voies vers la représentation autochtone

La Table de Santiago 50 ans plus tard

La Déclaration de la Table ronde de Santiago en 1972 a été plus qu'un jalon pour la pensée muséologique. Elle a ouvert la voie à de nouvelles formes et compréhensions du travail muséal et à l'inclusion de différents participants. Ces dernières années, différents groupes autochtones en sont venus à reconnaître le musée comme un espace où ils peuvent rendre leurs histoires et leurs luttes visibles à la société. Par le biais du musée, les peuples autochtones ont fait respecter leur droit d'accès aux objets de leurs ancêtres qui ont été muséalisés dans le passé. Ainsi, cet article aborde différentes pratiques de collaboration entre musées et peuples autochtones à travers des exemples sur le territoire brésilien afin de mettre en évidence l'influence de la Déclaration de Santiago sur ces nouvelles pratiques et ces nouveaux horizons. Gardant à l'esprit la fonction sociale du musée, nous soulignons l'importance des expositions muséales pour la réélaboration de la pensée muséologique et la (ré)organisation des pratiques muséales.

**Mots clés:** expositions muséales, processus de collaboration, curatelle partagée, participation autochtone



## Introduction

In 1972, due to the social demands and political realities in Latin America, the Round Table of Santiago de Chile was held by ICOM and UNESCO, generating its much-publicized Declaration that is still studied and analyzed by many. In 2022, the Decade of Museological Heritage established by the Ibermuseum comes to an end (2012–2022), and we recall the 50th anniversary of the Declaration as a milestone that calls us to reflect on advances related to the museum's social function.

Among the several contributions of the Round Table of Santiago de Chile are the concepts of the Integral Museum and the Integrated Museum. For Trampe (2012), the concept of being integral contributed to the expansion of the museum's work around collections to meet social expectations:

*The integral museum is one that deals with aspects other than the traditional ones with the aim of better meeting the needs of people and the cultural vitality of the communities to which they belong. For this purpose, it was necessary to cross borders and overcome conservative resistance. (Trampe, 2012, p. 195)*

”

The museum must always be understood in a historical moment, a circumstantial context, and through public policies, especially since the idea of “integral” has shifted the museum's action to the current context in which it operates. In this sense, the commitment to the social function was included in the Declaration in that “the integrated museum is one that is actively and organically connected to a larger social and cultural framework as a link in a chain and is no longer a fortress or an island that only a privileged few can have access to” (Trampe, 2012, p. 195).

For Hugues de Varine, president of ICOM in 1972, the novelty of the Declaration in Santiago fell on “the concept of Integral museum, i.e., the museum that takes into account all the problems of society; and the concept of museum as action, i.e., the museum as a dynamic instrument of social change” (Varine, 2012, p. 233).

Between May 20 and May 31, 1972, the Round Table on the Development and the Role of Museums in the Contemporary World brought together UNESCO and ICOM authorities, along with experts from several Latin American countries, for discussions. From the documentation and reports (Nascimento Junior et al., 2012) and the resulting Declaration (UNESCO, 1973), we have a set of writings that reflect the human, intellectual, and financial investments undertaken. With the Round Table, we have a dense panorama of emerging thoughts and practices being negotiated with traditional views. In the years that followed the Round Table, an accumulation of functions and responsibilities

fell upon museums as collection activities continue—study, conservation, and documentation—and others are incorporated at each step taken in the process of opening museums. Among the many obligations for museums, we have a contemporary agenda, considering social participation, cultural diversity, inclusion, citizenship, and equity among many other demands inherent to the museum’s social function, as well as social justice through the musealization process.

Within the social dynamics, museum responses require experimentation from interdisciplinary teams. With that, according to the Final Report of the Round Table, Argentinean Mario Teruggi proposed a social museum:

*a new type of museum in which man would be shown in conjunction with his environment. Every exhibition, whatever its theme, and whatever the museum, should link the object with the environment, with man, history, sociology, and anthropology [...], a research center staffed by specialists in various disciplines, bringing a different approach to the study of the same object. (Nascimento Junior et al., 2012, p. 221)*

”

An experiment was suggested at the Museo Nacional de Antropología in Mexico, “as the center for a temporary exhibition which would serve as a pilot project” (Nascimento Junior et al., 2012, p. 221). It is exactly at this point that we wish to highlight the relevance of exhibitions for the re-elaboration of museological thought and the (re)organization of museum practice alongside the museum’s social function. It is between past and present, between exhibitions and the new/different approaches to the study of museum objects, and between work teams and social participation that this article finds itself. This article brings up current issues in Brazilian museology in its relationship with Indigenous peoples and their right to have access to their ancestors’ objects, musealized in the past.

Here we present some museums selected for their experiences with Indigenous groups to contribute reflections that depart from the Round Table of Santiago, and which go beyond its original discussions with contemporary issues, with the strength allowed by collaborative work.

## **Collaborative processes and shared curators at exhibitions in Brazil**

In Brazil, we have a panorama of community museums, which are part of what emerges from the Round Table document as a theoretical and museographic framework. The document echoes traditional museums and other orientations

like the different transformations in areas of knowledge such as museology, as well as the social and cultural movements that expanded after the 1970s.

As for the dialogics as part of the museum's social functions, working methods aimed at joint actions between museum teams and cultural groups continue to be developed, such as action research and collaboration. In Brazil, archaeology and anthropology museums have stood out with actions with Indigenous peoples (Cury, 2017). Other institutions have also been concerned with dialogue with Indigenous peoples (Cury, 2021). Many actions are related to the curation of collections and exhibitions in collaboration with Indigenous peoples, and we highlight a few.

The first case highlighted involves one of the oldest museums in Brazil. Founded in 1866, the Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi (MPEG) is linked to the Ministry of Science, Technology, and Innovation and comprises biological, human, and paleontological collections, being one of the main references in Amazonian studies. Since its origin, the museum has worked with Indigenous archaeological and ethnographic collections. The museum's encounters and dialogues with different Indigenous peoples, through work in its ethnographic collections, bring new questions and challenges for the museum and anthropological research (Garcés & Karipuna, 2021). The designation of new meanings to already musealized collections with Indigenous participation enables the propagation of previously ignored and discredited knowledge.

Based on such understanding, MPEG and members of the Ka'apor from the Alto Turiaçu Indigenous Land in the state of Maranhão (Brazil) participated in a detailed study of the Ka'apor ethnographic collections at the National Museum of Ethnology in the Netherlands (Museum Volkenkunde) between 2013 and 2014. This project dealt with the requalification of collections present in both museums to reconnect them to their heirs. An exhibition entitled "*A festa do Caium*" ("Caium party") was developed with the participation of Indigenous people and both museums, which was available to the public between 2014 and 2015 at MPEG (University of Leiden, 2016).

Thirty Ka'apor attended the exhibition's opening and performed the ritual of the Caium celebration, which includes different rites of passage such as weddings, female initiation into adulthood, the inauguration of chiefs, and naming ceremonies for children. The exhibition itself had a large and representative collection of Ka'apor material culture, such as basketwork, feathers, ornaments, and clothing, as well as photographs and videos, dating from the 1960s to 2007, from the collection of the Museu do Índio at the National Indian Foundation (Funai) (Maciel, 2014).

Anthropologist Claudia López, one of the exhibition's curators, stated that presenting the Ka'apor traditions in an exhibition is a way to demonstrate their resistance, their living culture, and their struggle to defend their territory (Maciel, 2014). This collaborative action was also part of an effort by

the museum and researchers to create public policies aimed at recognizing Ka'apor struggles.

In 2019, the collaborative work between MPEG and Indigenous peoples had a new chapter with the opening of the exhibition “*Zo'é rekoha: construindo o futuro na Terra Indígena Zo'é*” (“Zo'é rekoha: building the future on the Indigenous Land Zo'é”). The exhibition was the result of a partnership between MPEG, the Zo'é Indigenous community from the north of Pará (Brazil), the Indigenous Research and Training Institute (Iepé), the Cuminapanema Ethno-environmental Protection Front (FPEC, Funai). It introduced the visitor to the daily activities of the Zo'é, such as hunting and fishing, their celebrations, and the elaboration of body adornments. The exhibition was also related to the launch of the Zo'é's Land and Environmental Management Plan, which was the theme that concluded the exhibition (Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, 2019).

A more recent collaboration took place amid the Covid-19 pandemic scenario. The Kayapó (Mëbêngôkre) developed a digital exhibit “*A camera é nossa arma*” (“The camera is our weapon”) with a 3D showcase in partnership with MPEG, the American Museum of Natural History (New York), and the Graduate Program in Museum Anthropology at Columbia University (New York). The new exhibit was made available online by both the MPEG and Columbia University websites, and it brought together photos and videos produced by the Kayapó as well as testimonies about their resistance and their adaptation to continue their fight for recognition (Columbia Center for Archaeology, 2020), which are their historical narratives in the museum space.

Another important case for this discussion is the exhibition “*Nhande Mbya Reko: Nosso jeito de ser Guarani*” (“Nhande Mbya Reko: Our way of being Guarani”), open to visitors from July 2018 to October 2019 at the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Federal University of Paraná (MAE-UFPR) in Paranaguá (Paraná, Brazil). It was developed jointly by professors from the Anthropology department, museum staff, and members of five Mbya communities from the coast of Paraná: Guaviraty, Karaguata Poty, Kuaray Guata Porã, Kuaray Hexa, and Pindoty. In 2017, during the development of the exhibition, the members carried out meetings and visits both to the Technical Reserve in Curitiba and the museum's exhibition space in Paranaguá, as well as to the Mbya locations (Pérez Gil et al., 2020).

The exhibition addressed the differences between two types of objects that are part of Mbya Guarani daily life: sacred objects for exclusive use by the Guarani—objects created by Nhanderu (the true god)—and those intended for sale to the non-Indigenous—objects created by Anhã (Nhanderu's brother) for the Guarani. The exhibition highlighted the differences between these types of objects, as instructed by the Indigenous curators. Regarding the objects destined for sale, baskets, bows and arrows, wooden animals, and beaded ornaments were put on display, hanging from the ceiling by transparent wires

or on the walls to allow observation by visitors from different perspectives (Coelho & Almeida, 2019).

The objects produced for exclusive use by the Guarani were displayed inside elevated showcases, protected from any touch. The intent to differentiate both types of objects through different expographies arose from the collaboration between the museum and the Indigenous peoples with respect for the Mbya Guarani's cosmology. In the same exhibition, there was a portrayal of the interior of an *opy* (prayer house), which for a long time were spaces from which non-Indigenous people were restricted. The portrayal was made with photographs and the presence of sculptures and other sacred objects used in rituals (Coelho & Almeida, 2019), whose presence was possible only due to the authorization given by the Mbya, considering their relationship of trust in MAE-UFPR.

From a shared curatorship point of view, one of the possible particularities in the method of collaboration was the objective of the exhibition. For the exhibition at MAE-UFPR, the objective was to present certain aspects of the Guarani lifestyle—mainly their cosmology—based on their artwork (Coelho & Almeida, 2019, p. 7). The Indigenous leaders who participated in the curatorship and development process of this exhibition linked it to a strengthening of Indigenous culture and memory for future generations (Coelho & Almeida, 2019). During the opening of the exhibition, the director of MAE-UFPR recalled the importance of the choice for the exhibition's discourse by the Mbya (Coelho & Almeida, 2019), which was reflected in the exhibition, as previously mentioned.

This method of collaborative work generates more results for the public than an exhibition itself. For the exhibition to take place in collaboration, meetings, conversations, and negotiations are necessary between the Indigenous representatives and members of the museum's team, with the exchange of different knowledge generating a learning curve between them.

Although MAE-UFPR's headquarters is in Curitiba, the state capital, there is an exhibition space in Paranaguá on the coast of Paraná, where most of its ethnological collections from other regions of Brazil are stored. Perez Gil (2012) reminds us that it was only in 2012 that the museum began to dedicate itself to contemplating the ethnic-cultural diversity of Paraná, including the creation of a Guarani collection. Thus, the development of this exhibition also contributes to a policy of recognition of local diversity in dialogue with the local visitor in order to generate self-knowledge. Laura Pérez Gil points out that, before, the museum had a perspective of university extension from inside the museum to the outside, which has been replaced more recently by an attitude of dialogue (Pérez Gil et al., 2020).

The Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Federal University of Santa Catarina (MARquE-UFSC) presents different projects with Indigenous groups—mainly the Guarani and Xokleng/Laklanō—in its trajectory, focused



on the demarcation of their territories, cultural preservation, and education (Guimarães, 2016). The exhibition “*Guarani, Kaingang e Xokleng: memórias e atualidades ao sul da mata atlântica*” (“Guarani, Kaingang e Xokleng: memories and current events in the south of the Atlantic Forest”) opened in 2011 with participation by Guarani, Kaingang, and Xokleng/Laklanõ students from UFSC’s Indigenous Intercultural Licentiate Course in the South of the Atlantic Forest. The premise for the exhibition was to welcome the course’s students, but it culminated in the museum’s invitation to participation by students. The collaboration method (Guimarães, 2016, p. 85) enabled the construction of such expographic narrative.

To involve all three groups in the proposal, the students visited the museum’s technical reserve to get to know the objects under MARquE’s care (Guimarães, 2016). Meetings were held to design the exhibition, its theme, title, colors, and other elements (Guimarães, 2016). The musealization in MARquE, related to conservation, documentation, and research, was discussed with the students.

Regarding the exhibition, students were responsible for selecting objects from their own cultures. Differences occurred regarding the objects, as some groups brought objects made for sale, while others selected objects from their daily lives (Guimarães, 2016). Due to their different views, the placement of each object was decided by the students when the exhibition was assembled.

In addition to the interaction between course students and the university museum, new policies were implemented to consider the creation of collections—as most of the objects used in the exhibition were later donated to MARquE. Thus, the objects entered the museum not through ethnographic research—as normally established—but through the communication and exhibition, which made the involved groups see the museum’s potential for visibility, something that certainly favors them. This collaboration also provoked a desire in one of the groups to create a museum within their Indigenous land (Guimarães, 2016), later promoted by Josué Carvalho, a Kaingang course teacher.

Since 2010, museologist Marília Xavier Cury has been developing a project, Indigenous Relations and Museums, at the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology of the University of São Paulo (MAE-USP). This project aims to understand such a historically placed relationship, mainly to create new bases for dialogical and other relationship processes that mobilized the museum to new thoughts and museum practices. The research uses the methodology of collaboration with the Kaingang, Guarani Nhandewa, and Terena from the Araribá, Icatu, and Vanuíre Indigenous Lands in São Paulo. The most recent reflections stem from Indigenous self-narrative in the exhibition and educational action “*Resistência Já! Fortalecimento e União das Culturas Indígenas—Kaingang, Guarani Nhandewa e Terena*” (“Resistance Now! Strengthening and Union of Indigenous Cultures—Kaingang, Guarani Nhandewa and Terena”) (Cury, 2019, 2020). It involves MAE-USP’s staff in both the exhibition and collections curatorship processes and resulted in receiving the Best Practice

Award from the ICOM International Committee for Education and Cultural Action (CECA-ICOM) in 2021, especially due to the educational action “I’m here, and always have been!” (Silva et al., 2021) led by educators Maurício André da Silva and Carla Gibertoni Carneiro.

Cury’s continuous and permanent relationship since 2010 with the Kaingang, Guarani Nhandewa, and Terena also allows for interactions with many Indigenous museum initiatives—such as the Worikg Museum (Kaingang, Vanuïre Indigenous Land) (Pereira et al., 2021), Trail Museum Two Peoples One Fight (Kaingang and Terena, Icatu Indigenous Land) and Nhandé Manduá-rupá Museum (Guarani Nhandewa, Aldeia Nimuendaju, Araribá Indigenous Land)—and other Indigenous museums from the western region of São Paulo, such as the Memory House (Guarani and Terena, Tereguá Village, Indigenous Land) and the Akâm Orâm Krenak Museum (Krenak, Vanuïre Indigenous Land). We wish to highlight that there are at least two possibilities for Indigenous peoples: their rightful participation in musealization processes in traditional museums; and the creation of their own museums, which we hope public policies will recognize and develop in respect of Indigenous voices in the museums, to the different views and ways of making a museum.

The development of exhibitions with Indigenous voices is the result of their fight for respect and for the autonomy to deal with their heritage, so that the museum does not carry out actions about or for Indigenous people but rather dialogues with them in the museum. The political dimension is inherent to shared exhibitions, mainly considering the Indigenous demands that are present in these spaces.

## **Museums, Indigenous peoples and the Declaration**

The Declaration of the Round Table of Santiago de Chile has no ancient DNA that could be identified in museums today, just like the Declaration’s reflections would not be easily identified since time has passed and many social transformations have occurred. Therefore, no visible or invisible line fixes us to an evolutionary continuity. However, some points can be raised considering museological thoughts and museum practices in the exercise of its social function.

It is inevitable to remember that the relationship between museums and Indigenous peoples in Brazil is marked by how collections were formed in the past, involving violence and violations resulting from the process of colonization and territorial occupation. On the other hand, museums have become institutions that are distant from the social and cultural realities of their audiences and groups that relate directly to museological objects, such as Indigenous peoples. Reverting this process would be on the agenda of the Integral, Integrated, and Social museums, referring to the Round Table discussion, without forgetting that power is centered on the museum, as are the conflicts, disagreements, disputes over meanings, negotiations, and the exercise of tolerance.

Exhibitions are methodological places that allow us to experiment and analyze communicational relationships laden with social and cultural issues. That is, we attempt to know a fraction of society, the one that visits museums, through a conceptual framework and conditions of institutional production in the relationship with its visitors, as representatives of different socio-cultural contexts that participate in the museum due to the complex work of interpretation and reinterpretation.

The exhibition also represents a visibility strategy, which is of great interest to Indigenous peoples. In this sense, exhibitions are not a consequence of collections studies, as traditionally occurs, but arise from new interactions and discussions whose main structure can be found in spirituality, tradition, land, and expand to the traditional Indigenous territory. Exhibitions support Indigenous peoples' resistance, their living culture associated with their ancestral traditions, their struggle to defend their land rights, but also memories linked to the territory. From this perspective, we have a rupture in the paradigm structured on linearity, a sequence around the idea of musealization—from the collection to the study, conservation, and documentation of musealia, leaving the exhibition and educational action at the end of such a sequence. Museality comes from the resistance expressed in the exhibition and in the same museum, which has musealized collections formed by the oppression of the occupation of lands occupied by Indigenous peoples in their territories. Even in the face of pain for the suffering of their ancestors, what prevails are the lives of children and future generations in these traditions.

When Indigenous curatorship is respected in collaborative processes, it takes place in the exhibition and educational action, in the requalification of collections, as in the formation of new contemporary collections, in respect for Indigenous rights to musealization, considering different and future generations, with other logics, their own and ancient epistemologies.

This article emphasizes the museum's openness to new thoughts and new practices supported by museological communication and dialogue between professionals and Indigenous peoples. Opening the museum is not a concession but an inevitable democratic action, which intervenes in centralized structures that control collections. Indigenous peoples are not visitors; they are social actors who seek what belongs to them in the museum as legitimate heirs. In this sense, the method of collaboration favors dialogical relationships that, without forgetting the historical dilemmas between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Brazil, seek other bases of relationship and conciliation. The museum can aim to do this, but to do so it needs to face the challenge of many layers, issues, and points that need to be overcome, nuances from different eras and with different actors, to deal with decolonization.

In the role of Indigenous peoples in the museum and in what concerns musealization, we need to be attentive to conducting joint work with the principles

of collaboration, to avoid forms of imposition and control. Technical-political support, according to Indigenous anthropologist Gersem Baniwa:

*paradoxically, generates both a limitation and a risk to the anthropological thought and practice of Indigenous peoples insofar as it blinds, intimidates, inhibits, or eludes critical reflection processes. One of these subfields is that of the historical relationship of tutelage that was established between Indigenous anthropologists and Indigenous peoples, and the other is the epistemological subfield that directly involves the place of Indigenous thought in the field of anthropological science.' (Baniwa, 2016, p. 52)*

”

Concerning Indigenous epistemologies in the museum, the issue of tutelage with specialized professional guidance, so widespread in museology and in a way present in the Declaration, must be treated with attention. If professionals, including museologists, are important, it would be coherent to work in universities with affirmative and differentiated policies for Indigenous peoples. Another issue relevant to professional training is that we cannot forget that Indigenous peoples have their own pedagogies and, therefore, their views on museum education. In addition, the place of Indigenous thought in the field of Museology is under construction, as Indigenous museology has been presented in Indigenous protagonism.

We also consider the lack or weakness of public policies that, instead of assuring Indigenous peoples their rights in Brazil, favor conflicts between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, prejudice, and threats to the occupation of their lands. As mentioned, museums are closely related to violence and violations involving the use of rightfully Indigenous lands, which are constantly threatened by invaders, exploiters of natural resources, deforestation, water contamination by illegal mining, and the construction of hydroelectric plants such as Belo Monte. How many and which museums keep objects and collections of Indigenous peoples threatened both in the past and present? What do museums hold, why, and for whom?

If public policies are essential for development, including what is understood as development, the absence of public policies abandons certain social, cultural, and identity segments with their problems. However, these parts of society, a large population constituted of the forgotten and those deprived of fundamental rights, demonstrate the capacity to organize and coordinate through networks and social movements—seeking solutions to problems through collectivism and public visibility through activism. Either way, contributions to guide the formulation of public policies come from this population, a

---

1. Translated by the authors.

process to which museums have come to add their contribution as well. The National Museum Policy (Brasil, 2003) provides a basis for organization in museum systems—federal, state, and municipal—but encourages working in networks (Siqueira, 2018) for both professional and collective meetings. We emphasize here the many concepts of community (Siqueira, 2020), which free museology from the visions of communities of generalizations, simplifications, and romanticizations.

MPEG and university museums such as MAE-UFPR, MARquE-UFSC, and MAE-USP have a privileged position, as they maintain collaborative experiences to develop actions both in Indigenous lands and in museums. The museums whose experiences were discussed in this article have had an assumed expression of the Indigenous resistances in their exhibitions, as a constitutive part of the museum's institutional policies and discourses, as well as their intercultural intentions for which the exhibition once again becomes strategic for visibility and dialogue between museum professionals and Indigenous peoples, and between Indigenous people and museum visitors. As Baniwa (2016) points out, it is through mutual recognition that a more promising coexistence can be achieved. His insights into anthropology can bring some ideas to museology:

*Anthropology allowed me to know a little about what white people think about Indigenous peoples and how Indigenous peoples relate to this way of thinking of white people about them. This has allowed us to seek ways to improve the understanding of different rationalities and ways of life, without which there cannot be widespread intercultural dialogue.<sup>1</sup> (Baniwa, 2016, p. 48)*

”

## Final thoughts

We recall the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of the Round Table of Santiago de Chile (1972). It is an important reference document for museology, and we cannot miss the opportunity for reflection. But we also remember 30 years of Convention 169 of the International Labor Organization on Indigenous and tribal peoples in independent countries. In this sense, this article sought to discuss the particularities of Brazil, its Indigenous peoples, and their relationship with the museum. We do not present conclusive ideas but make some points to situate the participation of Indigenous groups in important museums that, in their efforts over many years, contribute to museum public policies for constant improvement.

---

1. Translated by the authors.

In Brazilian territory, the thoughts fostered by the Round Table materialized mainly through the creation of new types of museums, such as community museums. However, the concepts of a proposal for an Integral Museum or an Integrated Museum are also present in traditional institutions, as noted in this article. The transformations proposed, based on Round Table discussions in different areas of knowledge, appear not only in the exhibitions in traditional museums but also in the whole musealization with new parameters.

The intersection of new methodologies with social and cultural movements, as in the case of Indigenous groups, became fertile ground for new experiments and debates. Contemporaneity makes itself present in these experiences, and the topics of these new exhibitions are aimed at recognizing issues related to fundamental rights, such as respect for Indigenous culture and territorial rights. The cases discussed in this article bring different examples of the struggles of Indigenous voices, placing the museum as a space of resistance.

The exhibition “*A festa do Caium*” by the Ka’apor showed the capacity for international recognition of Indigenous knowledge through the partnership between a European museum and MPEG. The fight for the Zo’és Land and Environmental Management Plan and its launch gained visibility through the exhibition “*Zo’é rekoha: construindo o futuro na Terra Indígena Zo’é.*” Different Mbya Guarani groups came together to discuss, with visitors to the exhibition “*Nhande Mbya Reko: Nosso jeito de ser Guarani,*” the aesthetic, functional, and cosmological differences between objects produced for sale to non-Indigenous people and those sacred ones for the exclusive use of the Guarani. New methods for generating collections also gained space through the exhibition “*Guarani, Kaingang, and Xokleng: memórias e atualidades ao sul da mata atlântica,*” where students from the Indigenous Intercultural Licenciature Course in the South of the Atlantic Forest selected objects from their communities to be incorporated in the exhibition. At MAE-USP, the issue is in the historical relationships between Indigenous peoples and museums, but new bases are proposed for dialogical relationships.

Each of these exhibitions, as well as others, shows the gains and possibilities achieved by the partnership between museums and Indigenous peoples. This relationship, which can generate both exhibitions with shared curatorship and the creation of Indigenous museums, generates a polyphony in which the conservative vision and authority of the traditional museum are no longer the only possibilities for communication.

## REFERENCES

- 
- Baniwa, G. (2016). Indígenas antropólogos: Entre a ciência e as cosmopolíticas ameríndias. In C. Rial, & E. Schwade (Eds.), *Diálogos antropológicos contemporâneos* (pp. 47-57). Associação Brasileira de Antropologia.

- Brasil, Ministério da Cultura. (2003). *Bases para a política nacional de museus: Memória e cidadania*.  
<https://files.cercomp.ufg.br/weby/up/106/o/bases-para-a-politica-nacional-de-museus.pdf?1363194576>
- Columbia Center for Archaeology (CCA). (2020). *A câmera é nossa arma*. Columbia Center for Archaeology. <https://archaeology.columbia.edu/video-guerreiros-kayapo/>.
- Coelho, K. C. A., y Almeida, F. L. (2019). Identidade, memória e cultura material: Uma etnografia em torno do artesanato indígena Mbya Guarani no litoral do Paraná. *RELACult—Revista Latino-Americana de Estudos em Cultura e Sociedade*, 5, ed. especial—SEMLACult, 1-18.
- Cury, M. X. (2017). Circuitos museais para a visitação crítica: descolonização e protagonismo indígena. *Ritur*, 7, 87-113.
- Cury, M. X. (2019). The sacred in museums, the museology of the sacred—the spirituality of Indigenous people. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 47(1-2), 89-104.
- Cury, M. X. (2020). Indigenous peoples and museology—Experiences at traditional museums and possibilities at Indigenous museums. In B. B. Soare. (Ed.), *Decolonising Museology—Museums, Community Action and Decolonisation* (pp. 354-370). International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM).
- Cury, M. X. (2021). O protagonismo Indígena e museu: Abordagens e metodologias. *Museologia & Interdisciplinaridade*, 10(19), 14-21.
- Garcés, C. L. L., & Kariupuna, S. P. S. (2021). “Curadorias do invisível”: Conhecimentos indígenas e o acervo etnográfico do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. *Museologia & Interdisciplinaridade*, 10(19), 101-114.
- Guimarães, V. W. (2016). A participação indígena no Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. In M. X. Cury (Ed.), *Direitos indígenas no museu. Novos procedimentos para uma nova política: A gestão de acervos em discussão* (pp. 83-98). Universidade de São Paulo, Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia.
- Maciel, M. (2014, October 23). *Festa do Cauim: Tradição Ka’apor em exposição no Museu Goeldi*. Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. <https://www.museu-goeldi.br/noticias/festa-do-cauim-tradicao-ka2019apor-em-exposicao-no-museu-goeldi>
- Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi (MPEG). (2019, November 27). Exposição apresenta a cultura do povo indígena Zo’é. <https://www.museu-goeldi.br/noticias/exposicao-apresenta-a-cultura-do-povo-indigena-zo2019e>.
- Nascimento Junior, J., Trampe, A., & Santos, P. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Mesa redonda sobre la importancia y el desarrollo de los museos en el mundo contemporáneo: Mesa Redonda de Santiago de Chile, 1972*. Ibram/Programa Ibermuseos.



- Pereira, D. J. L., Melo, S. E., & Cury, M. X. (2021). Museu Worikg (São Paulo, Brasil): a transmissão cultural Kaingang e a comunicação na pandemia do Coronavírus. In F. Magalhães, L. F. Costa, F. Hernández Hernández, & A. Curcino (Eds.), *Museologia e Patrimônio* (pp. 240-279). Politécnico de Leiria.
- Pérez Gil, L. (2012). O acervo etnográfico do MAE-UFPR: Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia da Universidade Federal do Paraná (MAE-UFPR). In M. X. Cury, C. M. Vasconcellos, & J. M. Ortiz (Eds.), *Questões Indígenas e Museus: Debates de Possibilidades* (pp. 103-111). Universidade de São Paulo, Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia.
- Pérez Gil, L., Portela, B. M., & Freire, G. de C. (2020). Prática extensionista em museus universitários: A trajetória do Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia da Universidade Federal do Paraná (MAE-UFPR). *Revista CPC*, 15(30esp), 247-277.
- Silva, M. A., Carneiro, C. G., & Cury, M. X. (2021). "I'm here and always have been!" In C. Angelini (Ed.), *Best Practice 9—A tool to improve museum education internationally* (pp. 13-21). International Council of Museums (ICOM), Committee for Education and Cultural Action.
- Siqueira, J. M. (2018). Comunidade. In Instituto Brasileiro de Museus (Ed.), *Caderno da Política Nacional de Educação Museal* (pp. 62-66). Instituto Brasileiro de Museus (IBRAM).
- Siqueira, J. M. (2020). Rede SP de Memória e Museologia Social: A construção de um caminho decolonial. In J. Primo, & M. Moutinho (Eds.), *Introdução à sociomuseologia* (pp. 173-192). Edições Universitárias Lusófonas.
- Trampe, A. (2012). Making up for a lost time. In J. Nascimento Junior, A. Trampe, & P. A. Santos (Eds.), *Mesa redonda sobre la importancia y el desarrollo de los museos en el mundo contemporáneo: Mesa Redonda de Santiago de Chile, 1972* (p. 195). Ibram/Programa Ibermuseos.
- University of Leiden (Universiteit Leiden). (2016, November 28). *Compartilhando coleções e conectando histórias*. <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/research/research-projects/archaeology/compartilhando-colecoes-e-conectando-historias-sharing-collections-and-connecting-histories>
- UNESCO. (1973). Resolutions adopted by the round table of Santiago (Chile). *Museum*, 25(3), 198-200.
- Varine, H. de. (2012). About the Santiago Round Table. In J. Nascimento Junior, A. Trampe, & P. A. Santos (Eds.), *Mesa redonda sobre la importancia y el desarrollo de los museos en el mundo contemporáneo: Mesa Redonda de Santiago de Chile, 1972* (pp. 233-234). Ibram/Programa Ibermuseos.