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Fifteen to 20 years ago, few curators working in an American museum housing Native American collections would have questioned their right to open and handle the contents of a sacred medicine bundle, to put an Inupiaq false face mask on display, or to mount an exhibition without consulting representatives from the source community. These were the taken-for-granted, exclusive roles and responsibilities of curators working within professional guidelines and ethics of the time. However, as museums have been making efforts to become responsive to the needs and interests of their diverse constituencies, especially minority and Indigenous communities, they have become more inclusive of diverse perspectives and sensitive to the rights of people to have a voice in how their cultures are represented and their heritage curated. Today, collaboration between museums and source communities and the co-curation of collections and exhibitions has become commonplace in many museums (see Peers and Brown 2003). These activities have also inspired the development of more culturally relative and appropriate approaches to curatorial work (see Kreps 2008).

Collaboration and co-curation has also revealed how many Indigenous communities have their own curatorial traditions, ways of perceiving, valuing, handling, caring for, interpreting, and preserving their cultural heritage. What we have learned is that just as museums are diverse in the multiple voices, perspectives, and identities they represent so too are approaches to curating and cultural heritage preservation.

While the recognition of Indigenous or non-Western approaches to curation has become de rigueur in some mainstream museums, Western-based and professionally oriented museological theory and practice continues to dominate the museum world. Indigenous curatorial traditions and approaches to heritage preservation are unique cultural expressions. As such, they should be recognized and preserved in their own right as part of a people’s cultural heritage. They also, however, contribute to world cultural diversity and have much to contribute to our understanding of museological behaviour cross-culturally, in addition to the formulation of new museological paradigms.
The growing awareness of Indigenous curators outside, with personal historical, cultural, and spiritual backgrounds, has led to discussions within the international museum community on the place of Indigenous peoples and ideas in cultural heritage (ICH) in museums. The discourse has been ongoing since the inception of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 2003. Many of the discussions have focused on the role of Indigenous curators in museums, the need for greater engagement and recognition of Indigenous knowledge systems, and the importance of preserving and presenting Indigenous cultural expressions and traditions. Indigenous curators are increasingly being addressed in museums and global public debate, climate change, and biodiversity protection. This special edition, Indigenous Curation, is designed to bring together those current anthropological trends and ideas associated with the cultural expressions of Indigenous communities around the world. The term Indigenous curation has been used in the museum world to refer to the practice of Indigenous curators in museums, and the ways in which they contribute to the understanding and presentation of Indigenous cultures. Indigenous curators are often responsible for the creation of new ways of representing and understanding Indigenous knowledge systems and cultural expressions, as well as for the development of new curatorial practices and approaches. They are also often responsible for the preservation and presentation of Indigenous cultural expressions and traditions, and for the development of new ways of representing and understanding Indigenous knowledge systems and cultural expressions.
The effect is seen in both the development of Th1 and Th2 responses. This is due to the selective activation of macrophages and dendritic cells by specific cytokines, which in turn produce distinct patterns of cytokines that influence the development of T helper cell responses.

**Th1 Response**

Macrophages and CD4+ T cells exposed to IFN-γ and IL-12 produce TNF-α, IL-12, and IL-18, which stimulate CD8+ T cells and NK cells to produce IFN-γ. This leads to the activation of Th1 cells, which secrete IFN-γ, TNF-α, and IL-12, enhancing the immune response against intracellular pathogens.

**Th2 Response**

In contrast, macrophages and CD4+ T cells exposed to IL-4 and IL-13 produce IL-4 and IL-13, which stimulate B cells to produce IgE and IgG4, respectively. This leads to the activation of Th2 cells, which secrete IL-4, IL-5, IL-6, IL-9, and IL-13, enhancing the immune response against extracellular pathogens.

**Conclusion**

The Th1 and Th2 responses are critical for the regulation of immune responses to different types of pathogens. Understanding the mechanisms that selectively activate these responses can help in the development of more effective immunotherapies and vaccines.
Indigenous curatorial methods may be intended to protect the spiritual as well as material integrity of objects. These practices reflect a particular community's religious and cultural protocols pertaining to the use, handling, and treatment of certain classes of objects. Collaboration between museums and Native American communities in the USA has illustrated how these objects are differently perceived and how they should be curated. Several museums and organisations have established guidelines and procedures for caring culturally sensitive, ceremonial and sacred objects, such as the Association of Art Museum Directors' Report on the Stewardship and Acquisition of Sacred Objects (2005), the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian’s ‘Culturally Sensitive Collections Care Program’ (see Sullivan and Edwards 2004), and the Minnesota Historical Society’s Caring for American Indian Objects. A Practical Guide (Ogden 2004). Such publications and programmes provide guidance on how to appropriately store, handle, and treat culturally sensitive and sacred items. This is because every tribe has its own methods of ‘traditional care’, and cultural protocol, making consultation essential to integrating Indigenous curatorial practices into museum practices. As noted in one National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) publication:

The manner in which certain objects are stored may be important to the Native community. For example, some tribes prefer certain objects to be placed according to one of the cardinal directions, others to be handled only by women or only by men, others to be fed regularly, others to be handled regularly, and so forth. (NMAI 2004: 138)

In many museums, culturally sensitive and sacred objects are separated from general collections and stored with access restricted to certain tribal members such as elders, religious leaders, ‘spirit keepers’, and so on. In some cases, objects have been removed from sealed containers or plastic since they are spiritual entities imbued with a life force and need to breathe. Corned House, Navajo, was dismantled to find masks stored in plastic when he visited one museum, as described in the following passage:

At the museum, I saw a number of sacred masks covered up with plastic. In our way, this is wrong. The masks have to breathe because there’s energy in them — in the Navajo way, they’re alive. You can’t suffocate them or they’ll be angry in time to come. (House 1994: 95)

The periodical smudging and feeding of objects has also become acceptable practice in some museums. The Cultural Resource Center of the NMAI has a room specifically designated for these ceremonies. Culturally sensitive and sacred objects have also been removed from public display in exhibitions and publications in many museums (see Ronoff 1998; Flynn and Hall-Walsh 2001; Clavir 2002; Kreps 2003; Ogden 2004; Sullivan and Edwards 2004). These practices illustrate how Native American interpretations of the meanings and values of objects stand in sharp contrast to how they are perceived and valued in museums. To most Indigenous people, objects are not just scientific specimens or works of art. They are also family heirlooms, symbols of rank and status, sacred materials necessary for the perpetuation of religious beliefs and practices, or documents of a community’s history and heritage. Objects stand for significant traditions, ideas, customs, social relations, and it is the stories they tell, the performances they are a part of, and the relationships among people and between people and places that are more important than the objects themselves (see Clifford 1997 and Fiepert-Riordan 2003). The process of creation and an object’s function also may be more highly valued than the object (Weiss 2004).

The above examples show how Indigenous models of museums and curatorial practices are tangible expressions of the intangible, or rather, ideas about what constitutes heritage, how it should be perceived, treated, passed on, and by whom. They exemplify holistic approaches to heritage preservation that are integrated into larger social structures and ongoing social practices. The concept of *pusaka*, common among many ethnic groups in Indonesia, is one such approach to cultural heritage that takes both tangible and intangible forms. Moreover, pusaka has worked to protect and preserve valuable cultural property and transmit cultural knowledge and traditions through the generations.

The word pusaka is generally translated into English as 'heirloom'. However, it takes on a wide range of meanings in the Indonesian language. Soebadio, in the book Pusaka: Art of Indonesia (1992) states that one Indonesian dictionary lists three separate definitions for the word pusaka:

1) something inherited from a deceased person [analogue to the English word inheritance]; 2) something that comes down from one's ancestors [analogue to heirloom]; 3) an inheritance of special value to a community that cannot be disposed of without specific common consent [analogue to heritage in the sense of something possessed as a result of one's natural situation or birth].

(Tangible forms of pusaka include things like textiles, jewellery, ornaments, weapons, ceramics, beads, dance regalia, land, ancestor figures and houses. Intangible cultural expressions such as songs, dance dramas, stories or names can also be considered pusaka. Virtually anything can be regarded as pusaka, although not everything that is inherited is pusaka nor are objects created to be pusaka. An object or entity becomes pusaka in the course of its social life. As one Indonesian curator/anthropologist, Suwati Kartiwa, explains, pusaka...)

(1992: 13)
are social constructs, and it is the meaning a society gives these objects, not anything innate in the objects themselves, which makes them patuaka (1992: 159).

So, like cultural heritage in general, the meanings and values assigned to particular patuaka are socially and culturally constructed and contingent on specific contexts and circumstances. Because patuaka is a social construct, it is more appropriate to think of it in terms of social relationships because patuaka emphasizes, expresses or defines relationships within a society (Marlowe/Desmond 1992: 129).

Different cultural groups throughout Indonesia have their own categories of patuaka and ways of assigning value and meaning to it. Hence, they may have their own, particular notions of what constitutes their heritage and approaches to its preservation. They may also have their own protocol regarding who is responsible for looking after the patuaka, or its curators. In one group it may be a village headman, in another a shaman or a priest, and yet in another a member of a royal court. Curatorial work in this context is a social practice that is deeply embedded in larger social structures and processes that define relationships among people and their particular relationships to objects (Kreps 2005b).

These examples of Indonesian and Indigenous models of museums, curatorial practices and concepts of heritage demonstrate how different cultures have their own curatorial traditions and ways of preserving aspects of their culture, which, in themselves, are part of people's cultural heritage. Additionally, they illustrate how approaches to cultural heritage protection and curatorial traditions are products of specific cultural contexts, and are culturally relative and particular.

Indigenous curatorial practices are being recognised and openly embraced in some quarters, but it is still a relatively new phenomenon to many in the professional museum world. The body of literature on Indigenous curatorial practice remains relatively small given the volumes devoted to the study of Indigenous arts and artefacts. It is ironic that anthropologists, curators, art historians, and collectors have historically taken an interest in non-Western materials, but have not, until recently, turned their attention to the study of how source communities have curated these materials despite the fact that curatorial practices are also part of culture. As I have previously maintained (Kreps 2003a), this lack of attention can be attributed to an ideology that locates the invention of the museum and the development of museological practices firmly in the West. Western, scientifically based museology has been the primary context and referent for our thinking and practice. Because of the hegemony of Western museology, it is difficult for many to imagine museological behaviour expressed in alternative forms.

The hegemony of Western museology has contributed to two phenomena that have worked to undermine or erase Indigenous curatorial traditions, and, paradoxically, the preservation of people's cultural heritage. The first is the global spread and reproduction of Western-oriented museum models, the second is a reliance on expert-driven, top-down, and standardised professional museum training and development (see Kreps 2008).

Some members of the profession museum community resist the promotion and application of Indigenous curatorial methods because they believe them to be too closely tied to religious beliefs, and therefore, in conflict with the secular, scientific character of museums. Others consider Indigenous curatorial practices technologically inferior, and believe their use compromises a museum's ability to properly care for and save valuable art and artefacts. However, collaboration between Indigenous communities and museums has shown that the recognition and use of Indigenous curatorial techniques should not compromise the integrity and value of standard, professional museum practices. Instead, traditional methods can be combined with professional practices to maximize choices on how to better and most appropriately curate cultural materials. Co-curation opens channels for the exchange of information, knowledge and expertise and the development of new museological paradigms.

Indigenous curatorial practices, such as Native American approaches to the care and handling of sensitive materials discussed above, fit the definition of intangible cultural heritage because they consist of practices, knowledge systems, skills and instruments that function to transmit culture and are part of people's cultural heritage. According to the Convention, intangible cultural heritage is defined as:

the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and in some cases individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity that promotes respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.

(Article 2.1, Definition)

The Convention also includes in its definition of ICH objects, artefacts and cultural spaces that are associated with manifestations of ICH and goes on to state:

Intangible cultural heritage is manifested in oral traditions, including language; performing arts (traditional dance, music, and theatre); social
practices, rituals, and festive events; knowledge and practices; and traditional craftsmanship.

(Article 2.2, Definitions)

As previously discussed, Intangible cultural heritage can be both a form of intangible cultural heritage as well as a measure for its safeguarding, for example, as seen in the Indonesian concept of pusaka and the Kenyan Dayak rice barn (lumbung). Under the Convention, ‘safeguarding’ means:

measures aimed at ensuring the visibility of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission (particularly through formal and informal education) as well as revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage.

(Article 2.3, Definitions)

One of the primary purposes of the Convention is to raise awareness and appreciation of ICH and foster the conditions under which it can survive. Consequently, the focus is on helping sustain living cultural traditions, practices, and processes instead of just collecting and preserving cultural products. The Convention also establishes a fund for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage that can be drawn on to support such efforts. Furthermore, the Convention supports international cooperation and assistance, especially in the areas of research, documentation, education, and training (Article 21). An important requirement of the Convention is that local communities and the ‘culture bearers’ themselves are involved in identifying their ICH and developing and implementing measures for its safeguarding, although it also institutes ‘standard-setting’ objectives.

The different articles under each section of the Convention outline safeguarding measures in detail, as well as the role and responsibilities of state parties or signatories to the Convention. One of the primary means for safeguarding ICH is the creation of national inventories of ICH and lists, such as the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding. Listing and lists are to play a major role in ensuring better visibility of ICH, increasing awareness of its significance, and encouraging dialogue that respects cultural diversity.

The 2003 Convention is the fifth legal instrument adopted by UNESCO over the past 30 years for the protection and safeguarding of world cultural heritage. The Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted in 1972, concentrated on identifying and protecting tangible cultural heritage, defined as monuments, architectural works, monumental sculpture and painting, archaeological sites, and natural features thought to be of outstanding universal value in the fields of history, art and science. Thus, its focus is on protecting the products of human creativity and ingenuity predominantly of the past. It also favoured what can be seen as ‘classical’ works produced by ‘great civilizations’. In contrast, the 2003 Convention shifts attention to safeguarding the knowledge, skills, and values behind tangible culture, concentrating on the people and social processes that sustain it. In addition to demonstrating a heightened concern for protecting living culture expressed in popular and folkloric traditions, it also acknowledges how these traditions are of value to local communities, and in particular, communities that can be characterised as marginal vis-à-vis dominant cultures, such as those of indigenous peoples (see Kuzir 2004).

Intangible cultural heritage and museums

Since the Convention was adopted in 2003, there has been a great deal of discussion within the international museum community on the role of museums in safeguarding ICH. The International Council of Museums (ICOM), a division of UNESCO, has been a particularly strong voice in advocating ICH. Many articles on the topic have appeared in its publications, most notably, ICOM News, the organisation’s newsletter, as well as its journal, Museum. Intangible Cultural Heritage was also the theme of ICOM’s 2004 tri-annual conference in South Korea. In a 2003 piece in ICOM News, Amir Gdris states that:

ICOM strongly supports UNESCO’s efforts towards the safeguarding and promotion of intangible heritage, and stresses the importance of inputs from professional bodies like ICOM. The UNESCO Convention is a significant first step in renewing our relation to cultural heritage, by promoting integrated approaches to tangible and intangible heritage.

(2003, n.p.)

It is logical that museums should play a prominent role in promoting ICH and the aims of the Convention since museums have long been devoted to creating and preserving cultural heritage, albeit mostly in tangible forms. But the curatin of ICH is not an entirely new role for museums. Many museums around the world have been doing this all along, such as community-based and Indigenous museums where language and literature programmes, dance and musical performance, festivals and ceremonial gatherings take place on a regular basis (see Simpson 1996; Stanley 2007). There are also examples of museums and cultural centres where Indigenous approaches to curating have always been integral to their purpose and function. The Makah Cultural and Resource Centre on the Makah Indian Reservation in the state of Washington, for example, is concerned with documenting and preserving Makah culture as a knowledge base for the Makah Indian Reservation in the state of Washington.
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and tribal members see this as a way of preserving the sensibilities, memories, and emotions of Makah histories (Erlikson et al. 2002: 177).

The Makah and other examples described above underscore how Indigenous curatorial practice cannot be isolated or detached from their larger cultural contexts. This ethos is beginning to take hold in mainstream museums as more and more curators are coming to realise that their job is not only to take care of objects, but also relationships between objects and people. As Richard Kurin of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC, remarks:

Some anthropologists in the museum world are making the shift from curating collections of objects to curating the systems, and the people, that produce them. Anthropologists have long recognized a moral responsibility to the people with whom they work. And they long recognized that their study or curating of some small abstraction of the studied culture is dependent upon a much larger system. Rather than create dead or captured specimens of a culture, are increasingly concerned with the living larger whole. (1997: 95)

This trend represents a turn toward the social and cultural dimensions of curatorial work. It signals how museums today are being defined more in terms of their relationships and responsibilities to people than to objects, collections, and tangible culture. In this light, museums are becoming key agents in the appreciation, promotion, and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage.

These trends are also in keeping with the emergence of what Eileen Hooper-Greenhill calls the ‘post-museum’, which counterpoint many of the premises and practices of the ‘modernist’ museum seen in the nineteenth century (Hooper-Greenhill 2000: 152). Hooper-Greenhill contends that the post-museum will ‘retain some of the characteristics of its parent, but it will re-shape them to its own ends’ (Hooper-Greenhill 2000: 152). Regarding the place of objects and collections in museums, she asserts that the post-museum will place more emphasis on their use rather than on accumulation and that intangible heritage will also receive greater attention (Hooper-Greenhill 2000: 152).

In the post-museum, curatorial authority is shared among the museum, community members, and other stakeholders whose voices and perspectives contribute to the production of knowledge and culture in the museum through partnerships that celebrate diversity. As Hooper-Greenhill states, ‘Knowledge is no longer unified and monolithic; it becomes fragmented and multisided’ and ‘much of the intellectual development of the post-museum will take place outside the major European centres which witnessed the birth of the modernist museum’ (2000: 153).

The Convention and paradox of cultural heritage preservation

Like the post-museum, the Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage can be seen as a break from modernist paradigms of cultural heritage preservation in which concepts of heritage were lodged in material things, and heritage resources were curated and managed largely by experts. In contrast, the Convention advocates sharing curatorial authority by emphasizing the central role of local communities and the cultural bearers themselves in safeguarding their own cultural heritage. In this sense, it recognises the cultural right of people to have greater control over and a say in how their cultural heritage is treated. Of special significance is how the Convention celebrates the cultural expressions of people who historically have been marginalised and disenfranchised, such as Indigenous and minority peoples. While these principles and guidelines can be seen as considerable advancements, the Convention’s suitability for promoting Indigenous curations in museums is debatable due to the problematic nature of the safeguarding measures it recommends.

As discussed earlier, one of the main reasons for safeguarding ICH proposed in the Convention is the creation of inventories and lists, such as the Representative List of the Intangible Heritage of Humanity and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding. Some question the logic involved in creating such inventories and lists, and see their creation as a ‘vast exercise in information management’ (Brown 2005). Especially disconcerting is how the ‘safeguarding’ mission behind the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding echoes the sentiments behind nineteenth-century ‘salvage ethnography’.

Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2006) critically examines the concept of world heritage and the instruments and measures designed to protect it. She is concerned with ‘how valorization, regulation, and instrumentalization alters the relationship of cultural assets to those who are identified with them, as well as others’ (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006: 162). Ultimately, such processes create a paradoxical situation in which the diversity of cultural assets and those who produce them are subsumed under the umbrella of humanity and world heritage.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett labels Conventions and lists as well as the heritage enterprise itself as ‘mesticultural artifacts’. Of special interest is how the process of safeguarding, which includes defining, identifying, documenting and presenting cultural traditions and their practitioners, produces something mesticultural. What is produced includes not only an altered relationship of practitioners to their art but also distinctive artifacts such as the list ...

(Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006: 171)
In cases where Indigenous curatorial knowledge is in danger of being lost, documentation and archiving may be welcomed, but documentation and listing raise a number of issues and concerns. For one, this process may inadvertently undermine the integrity of Indigenous culture by isolating or detaching practices from their cultural whole and making them fit criteria outlined in the Convention. Herein lies one of the more contradictory aspects of the Convention as a mechanism for supporting Indigenous culture. One of the ultimate goals of the Convention is to protect world cultural diversity and promote diversity as a universal value, yet the methods used in the archiving and documenting process in themselves can lead to the standardisation and homogenisation of practices that are inherently varied, and governed by specific cultural protocols. The universality principle inscribed in the Convention is especially problematic because it implies that one people's cultural heritage is the heritage of humanity and is thus part of a public cultural commons. As Kishenblatt-Gimblett points out, 'when culture becomes the heritage of humanity, the preservation is open access' (2006: 185). This premise is unacceptable to many Indigenous communities that find the public nature of museum collections and curatorial work disturbing. For some, the concept of collecting objects to be seen, studied and cared for by outsiders is inconsistent with tribal traditions. Certain objects can only be seen, touched, or used by specific members of the community, such as men or women, elders. Parker states that 'the fact that public collections exist is a source of social problems in Indian communities' (1990: 37).

Peter Jemison, Seneca, further explicates the problem:

The concept in the white world is that everyone's culture is everyone else's. That is not really our concept. Our concept is there were certain things given to us that we have to take care of and that you are either part of it or you are not part of it. (Jemison, quoted in Parker 1990: 37)

Given these issues, listing is not a culturally appropriate measure for safeguarding Indigenous culture, nor does this strategy represent a significant departure from previous heritage preservation tactics, such as the World Heritage List that was a product of the 1972 Convention. Perhaps, as Kishenblatt-Gimblett suggests, the value of listing and more to the Convention, rests primarily in the symbolic realm:

The list is the most visible, least costly, and most conventional way to 'do something' – something symbolic – about neglected communities and traditions. Symbolic gestures such as the list confer value on what is listed, consistent with the principle that you cannot protect what you do not value. (2006: 170)

Despite its limitations and contradictions, the Convention has stimulated an international dialogue on the role of ICH in museums, and thus, has opened avenues for the exploration of Indigenous culture as ICH on theoretical and practical levels. It has expanded the notion of what constitutes heritage and could similarly be used to broaden ideas of what constitutes 'safeguarding' as well as the measures for that safeguarding. The promotion of Indigenous culture in museums as both a form of ICH plus a means of safeguarding could liberate museums from their traditional role as custodians of tangible, static culture to stewards and curators of intangible, living, dynamic culture. In the words of Dr Nguyen Van Huy, former director of the Vietnam Museum of Ethnology:

'Presenting intangible cultural heritage requires the museum to develop new skills, knowledge, and methodologies; subjects of study and for presentation are no longer simply objects and artifacts, but living people and living culture. This calls for further research and capacity-building, closer relationships with local communities, and available staff and funding for these activities. (2003, n.p.)

On the one hand, the Convention contains elements of older heritage preservation models that were largely about documenting and making lists, but on the other hand, it represents a departure by placing emphasis on supporting conditions necessary for cultural reproduction. The museum is one arena in which Indigenous curatorial practices can be encouraged and kept alive, allowing for further research on such practices in addition to the creation of innovative museological approaches:

The museum itself has become a feidtule – a place for cross-cultural encounter and creative dialogue. A more inclusive and multi-perspectivist approach to material in museum collections is crucial in illuminating the multiple meanings of specific objects as well as the complex processes involved in their production, collection and interpretation. Working with members of source communities provides an opportunity for developing productive relationships and collecting contemporary material for future generations. (Esterle 2003: 204–5)

Conclusion

The 2003 Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, as opposed to earlier instruments, acknowledges that our conceptualisation of heritage, like culture in general, is an ever evolving process expressed in
Cultural museums and intangible heritage

Cultural processes (the heritage scenarios) are inherently particular and policy to have the same modes in all situations. (Hullander, 2002: 144)
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multitudinous forms. The work being done today in museums with source communities is clear evidence of how museums are key sites for the protection and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. However, it is only through sustained critical analysis and reflexive practice that our concepts of heritage can be continually revised, and safeguarding measures appropriately applied:

Cultural processes (like heritage curation) are inherently particular and particularizing, so we should not expect the application of a global policy to have the same results in all situations. (Handler 2002: 144)
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