THESIS

REINFORCING HEGEMONIC STRUCTURES: REMEDIATING AND STYMIEING MEMORIES OF NATIVE AMERICANS AT EURO-AMERICAN HISTORIC SITES IN THE AMERICAN WEST

Submitted by

Esther Stocker

Department of Communication Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2024

Master's Committee:

Advisor: Thomas Dunn

Greg Dickinson
Doreen Martinez

ABSTRACT

REINFORCING HEGEMONIC STRUCTURES: REMEDIATING AND STYMIEING MEMORIES OF NATIVE AMERICANS AT EURO-AMERICAN HISTORIC SITES IN THE AMERICAN WEST

This thesis examines the Crazy Horse Memorial and the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument to better understand how both places of public memory articulate Native American identities. Drawing on scholarship in public memory, the materiality of rhetoric, and Native American rhetorics, this analysis shows in part how both sites strive to remediate public memories related to Native Americans in the broader U.S. culture. However, the chapters also show that these efforts at Crazy Horse and Little Bighorn are simultaneously stymied from within and without through intentional and unintentional means. As the chapters reveal, the stymying components of each memorial presents a specific articulation of Native identity with the Crazy Horse Memorial presenting Native identities as ownable and the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument presenting Native identities as existing in the past, respectively. Putting both presentations into conversations suggests that there is a broader cultural articulation of Native identity as controllable in these U.S.-American memory sites. Such a rhetoric perpetuates prioritizing Euro-American values, stories, and identities within the U.S.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I was able to complete this thesis thanks to the assistance, support, and guidance of many people. I would first like to thank my wonderful advisor, Dr. Thomas Dunn, whose patience and encouragement guided me through this project. Your insights, dedication, and guidance helped me complete a project I am proud of. I would also like to thank my committee for their time and insights. The expertise of Dr. Greg Dickinson and Dr. Doreen Martinez aided me in immeasurable ways and the continued investment of their time and energy is deeply appreciated.

While not directly connected to my thesis, I would like to thank the instructors who encouraged me throughout my academic journey. I am thankful for all of my instructors at Whitworth University who helped equip me for graduate school. And thank you to the faculty and staff at the Colorado State University Communication Studies department. Their continued support, encouragement, and investment during this project helped in countless ways.

The final group I would like to acknowledge in the completion of this thesis is my partner, friends, and family. From traveling with me while researching this project to encouraging me through the final edits to this document, I would not be half of successful or sane without their continued support and encouragement. Thank you to my partner for supporting me in every way possible throughout this project. Thank you to my parents for being a stable rock I could always lean on when things felt overwhelming. Thank you to my siblings for commiserating during challenges and celebrating my successes. Thank you to all my friends for encouraging me along this journey. These few words are not adequate to express the gratitude I feel for the numerous people who made this project possible.

DEDICATION

Dedicated to Karlo Evidente, my partner and pillar of support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter 1- From Crazy Horse to Little Bighorn: Introducing Places of Public Memory

> *A great bald eagle circles high overhead against a clear blue sky. On a mountainside a small band of Indians moves slowly over a ridge and down into a beautiful valley. Below the soaring eagle and near the end of the slow-moving line of Indians walked two eleven-year-old Indian girls dressed in loose-fitting deerskin dresses.*[1]
>
> *Kenneth Thomasma*

I was struck by these first sentences of Naya Nuki as a young White girl growing up in Montana. I would imagine this scene while driving by mountainsides and remember her fictional yet heroic story of escaping capture and journeying across present day Montana to return to her people. On the road to my grandparents' house or on the way home from a baseball game, I would look to the mountains around me and think of that Shoshoni girl walking below a bald eagle, surviving a bison stampede, or even overcoming illness while avoiding enemies. Her story along with others by Kenneth Thomasma about Native children like Moho Wat and Soun Tetoken painted a picture of the past that was not about fur trappers or gold miners, peace pipes or treaties. Even though the author is not Indigenous, he crafted a mental image of Native communities with children who overcame obstacles through their own bravery, competence, and strong will. They lived all across the land and their imagined presence alongside mine kept me company throughout my travels around Montana. My interest in the people who lived in present-day Montana before colonial contact began with Naya Nuki walking under a blue sky on a mountainside.

My parents bought this book and others like it for my elder sister (and later for me) on their first trip to the Crazy Horse Memorial. While fictional stories, they fostered real memories for me and my family of Moho Wat being attacked by a mountain lion, Naya Nuki walking alone

[1] Thomasma, *Naya Nuki, Shoshoni Girl Who Ran*.

for weeks to find her family, and a community cheering during Soun Tetoken's horse race. The memories are true even if their stories are not. Depictions of Native American people like those rendered by Thomasma are important rhetorics in remediating long-standing and often deeply problematic representations of Native peoples and cultures that have circulated in White, Western, U.S. culture for more than a century.[2] Rather than depict Native people as unique individuals with complex lives and a rich and proud culture deserving of human rights and fair treatment, U.S.-American cultural rhetorics have regularly presented Native people as uncivilized, dangerous, subhuman, from a different time, and vanishing.[3] Such rhetorics have been highly destructive to Native peoples and cultures and play a significant role in settler colonialism and other ideologies that justify their continued mistreatment.[4] Stories like Thomasma's, which greatly impacted me as a White American child, are an important example of how rhetorical interventions can be used to disrupt these discourses of colonialism and dehumanization among non-Native communities.[5] When these rhetorical strategies can be scaled up to impact larger audiences, their impact is even more significant.

We can see attempts to remediate public memories of Native American people with wider impact in some U.S. commemorative sites. This is particularly true in sites that either address or discuss Native peoples and often include sites visited by large numbers of European American tourists. Two important sites of this sort are the aforementioned Crazy Horse Memorial and the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument. The Crazy Horse Memorial (CHM) was established in 1948 and consists of four primary museums, an outdoor sculpture garden, and all

[2] Kelly, "Representations of Native Americans in Mass Media."
[3] Kelly; Chevrette and Hess, "Unearthing the Native Past."
[4] Running Wolf, "Loose Production but Great Cause!!"
[5] Palczewski, "Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn National Monument: Remapping the Gendered/Sexed Circumference of Memory," 51–54.

the views made possible by being in those locations. The Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (LBN) was established in 1881 and includes a large complex divided between two battlefields, a cemetery, and a visitor center. LBN also contains the primary battlefield, colloquially called "Custer's Last Stand," marked by walking paths, and lined with textual displays. Both sites rely on two related theoretical concepts to provide visitors with opportunities to remember the past. The first of these is public memory, broadly understood as acts of remembering and forgetting of the past by the public in an effort to make sense of the present and imagine the future.[6] The other are rhetorics of place, which we should understand as the way spaces impact people.[7] Drawing on rhetorics of memory and place, both sites provide their visiting audiences messages and narratives about Native people and cultures—and both sites have taken different steps to try and remediate broader dominate memories surrounding Native American communities. This thesis will focus on the stories told by these places of public memory and how they articulate different messages to visitors.

However, even as these two commemorative sites have attempted to present genuine, meaningful, and productive representations of Native Americans, those efforts have been simultaneously stymied by each memorial. More specifically, despite the fact that new installations and revisionist memories have been introduced into these spaces, the places themselves—and people's movements through them—continue to be directed by deep seated ideologies and practical challenges that effectively render these remediation efforts mute. Exemplary of this point is the fact that visitor's interpretations of these memorials—and their memories of Native peoples as a result—are shaped not just by what appears in the

[6] Houdek and Phillips, "Public Memory."
[7] Dickinson, "Being Through There Matters: Materiality, Bodies, and Movement in Urban Communication Research."

commemorative zone itself, but also by sights and rhetorics just outside the memorials and their control. The surrounding space is out of the control of the curators; yet it is still a factor when understanding what a place of public memory articulates about the past. If, as we will see, these outside sites reinforce for visitors' longstanding and dehumanizing rhetorics of Native American people *before* the visitors even step into these remediated sites, hopes for changing minds and restoring voice to Native peoples in these spaces are greatly reduced. These stymying rhetorics in the places of Native American public memory—from both the outside and within—are my central concern in this thesis.

In this thesis, I argue that while CHM and LBN both attempt to remediate inaccurate public memories of Native peoples in the American West, aspects of each memorial—and places and spaces just beyond their reach—stymie those remediation efforts for many, if not most, visitors. In particular, contrary messages in these same commemorative sites overwhelm these remediation attempts by articulating Native American identity as ownable, oriented in the past, and controllable by the broader culture. More specifically, CHM represents Native American culture and identities as ownable by outside forces. LBN articulates Native American identities as existing in the past, disconnected from the present. Placing these sites in conversation presents both articulations as opportunities to enforce control and reinforce Euro-American identities as dominant within the U.S.[8]

Over the course of this project, I will seek to answer several interesting questions about rhetorics at work in the CHM and the LBN, such as: What were the original messages of these

[8] Euro-American will be used for the rest of this thesis and is understood as the continued imperialism of settler colonialism within North America. While Western Colonialism, White Imperialism and the Global North can be used in similar ways to critique systems of domination developed over time by European countries, they do not adequately address the impact of the continued presence of Europeans and their decedents in the United States. The individual is not responsible for the continued displacement and discrimination of Indigenous people. It is still important to note, though, that the past and present occupation of land by Europeans and their American descendants continuously perpetuates the prioritization of their cultural values.

commemorative sites and what efforts were made to remediate them? What messages do these two sites and their surroundings articulate about Native American and Euro-American identities? What intentional and unintentional aspects of the place influence public memory? Further: how do these places represent American identities as distinct, cohesive, or exclusionary? And what can we learn more broadly about studying these kinds of sites from our examination of CHM and LBN? Answering these questions will be an important task in this project and these answers drive my central argument for this thesis.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will provide a broader overview of the sites I will discuss, how they are similar and different, and how I gathered data to conduct this analysis. Transitioning from these sections, I will discuss my own critical standpoint as influential to how I conducted my analysis, how my upbringing influences how I view place, and why it is important to discuss these places of public memory in the contemporary moment. I conclude this chapter with a summary and preview the remaining chapters in this thesis discussing public memory.

The Texts

CHM near Rapid City, South Dakota and LBN located next to Crow Agency, Montana are two sites of memory that can help us understand how Native identity is articulated within the U.S. I visited both locations in July 2023 and noted how memory is fostered within and around these curated spaces as they strive to remember the past. Before moving into the relevant literature and analysis for this thesis, I will provide a brief overview and rational for both sites of public memory. Both places do their work in the present through a variety of means including pictures, headstones, videos, and constructed monuments.

CHM centers on a mountain statue of the Oglala Lakota warrior Thašúŋke Witkó (also known as Crazy Horse) who died in 1877. The statue's original sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski was contracted by the Lakota Chief Henry Standing Bear in 1939 because he wanted Ziolkowski to "[c]arve us a mountain so that the white man will know the Red man had great heroes also."[9] The mountain statue is still a work in progress 75 years later. To date, most of Thašúŋke Witkó's form is completed and none of the horse he will ride is yet started. The slow progress is in part due to a lack of state and federal funding, meaning the entire memorial is financed by admissions fees and donations. The project also began with only Ziolkowski and his family working on the statue, constructing places to live, and creating additional buildings to house museums for visitors. Currently, CHM displays "a large collection of arts and artifacts reflecting the diverse histories and cultures of over 300 Native Nations" in four museums: The Indian Museum of North America®, The Native American Educational and Cultural Center®, Mountain Carving Gallery®, and Sculptor Home & Studio®.[10] Over the course of two hours, I was able to walk through the museums, watch a short documentary about the mountain statue, and observe part of a jingle dancing demonstration performed by an Indigenous woman. Throughout my visit, the mountain statue was never far from sight. From the entrance to end, CHM strives to present multiple different Native American communities, cultures, and stories that come together to create public memory around Native identity. This is done through both intentional and unintentional components of the place as it strives to inform visitors broadly about Native communities.

LBN shifts focus away from general people and instead centers around a particular event called the Battle of Greasy Grass (or Battle of Little Bighorn) in 1876 where many Native people

[9] Crazy Horse Memorial, *Indian Museum of North America*.
[10] "THE INDIAN MUSEUM OF NORTH AMERICA®"; "Museums."

resisted the forced relocation by the U.S. government, including Thašúŋke Witkó.[11] In the era known as the Indian Wars, the U.S. government moved Native Americans onto reservations through military action, intentional starvation, and the gradual homesteading of land by civilian settlers.[12] In defiance of forced removal and broken treaties, some Native Americans came together from different tribes to form an encampment of resistance. According to LBN's Visitor Center, the village was comprised of "[t]he Lakota bands, Hunkpapa…, Oglala, Miniconjou, Sans Arc, Blackfeet (the Lakota band not the tribe) and Brule" who "were joined by two Dakota bands: the Yanktonais and Santees" with "[l]odges of the Northern and Southern Cheyenne." General Custer led five companies into the territory to force the Indigenous people onto reservations without knowing they had banded together into a village of several thousand people. When the military force found the massive village, they attacked on June 25th, 1876. The battle ended the next day as a resounding victory for the resisting Native Americans and a devasting loss for the U.S. military.[13] At the site, visitors are able to walk along paths in the area known as Last Stand Hill where U.S. soldiers, including General Custer, put up a last line of defense before being killed by Native soldiers who were protecting their family and freedom. This event is remembered at the battlefield with textual displays and headstones that can be reached by walking or driving. While I visited the battlefield, I was able to walk to a ravine US soldiers scrambled up to escape the fight, drive between two major locations of the battle, and see the expanse of land the village rested on. LBN remembers a moment in U.S. history and seeks to create a sense of memory connected to the site for visitors. Just as in CHM, intentional and

[11] Palczewski, "Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn National Monument: Remapping the Gendered/Sexed Circumference of Memory."
[12] Rifkin, *Beyond Settler Time*, 81.
[13] Russell, Hume, and Sichler, "Libbie Custer's 'Last Stand.'"

unintentional aspects of the memorial influence the formation of public memory and its reception by visitors. Images from both sites will be included in the analysis chapters to follow.

Many kinds of memory places could be used to study how Native identity is articulated. CHM and LBN are not singular in their construction of public memory relating to Native communities. Some places have curated content related to Native Americans such as the Plains Indian Museum in Cody, WY and virtual museums created by the Museums of Civilization and the National Museum of the American Indian.[14] There are many more places managed by the National Park Service that strive "to preserve native cultural heritage and celebrate tribal cultures" including Mesa Verde National Park, Effigy Mounds National Park, and Trail of Tears National Historic Trail.[15] Still other memory places are not curated, but instead crafted by visitors who are able to see assertions of Native Americans in the space such as on Alcatraz Island where the occupation of the island by IOAT in 1969-1971 is still seen today through graffiti.[16] Many memory places for Native Americans in the United States have their own stories, histories, and experiences to share. However, CHM and LBN are uniquely oriented as two sites in different states with different goals that both memorialize similar people, events, and points in history.

It is important to note that the creation of both sites was motivated by westward expansion. The Battle of Greasy Grass was an attempt to forcefully relocate Native people in order for the U.S. government to expand. Chief Henry Standing Bear initiated Thašúŋke Witkó's mountain statue in response to Mount Rushmore and in acceptance of increased Euro-American tourists to the Black Hills. No matter how both sites attempt to remediate memories or change

[14] Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting"; Emberley, "(Un)Housing Aboriginal Possessions in the Virtual Museum."
[15] "American Indian Heritage (U.S. National Park Service)"; "Visit - American Indian Heritage (U.S. National Park Service)."
[16] Smith and Bergman, "You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space."

what information is shared, their foundation was built on settler-colonialism. The foundation also reveals where the value is placed. Both sites matter not because of value placed on the locations by Indigenous communities' pre-contact with Euro-Americans, but because of how settlers decided to interact with the land through violence and the construction (or destruction) of land to create Mount Rushmore. The motivation, foundation, and value behind both sites reveals their inherent connections to settler colonialism, no matter how they strive to resist that connection in the present.

While they are distinct locations, both of these memory places center on Native Americans with a particular emphasis placed on Thašúŋke Witkó. CHM is centered around a massive mountain statue of Thašúŋke Witkó who fought at the Battle of Greasy Grass and remembered within LBN. The bands involved in the Battle of Greasy Grass are represented within CHM through different material and textual displays making both locations memorialize similar people. Their differences stem from the people and/or institutions who operate the memorials as well as their original intent. CHM is privately owned with a board of directors managing the organization, minimizing public input while simultaneously loosening constraints frequently placed on government agencies. This memorial was started to spread positive representation of Native people in America. LBN is different as a federally managed site that requires government interventions to change (which can be a slow process) while also being a place where American identity is most tangibly represented. The original goal was to remember a highly publicized battle where many U.S. citizens died. How these people and communities are represented influence how they are remembered by visitors and, as a result, are remembered by the broader culture.[17] Being remembered by the broader culture does not mean these sites are

[17] Chevrette and Hess, "Unearthing the Native Past."

paragons of representation. Both their successes and shortcomings are discussed. Their prevalence fosters opportunities for academic inquiry as rhetorical texts that speak to and inform on American culture and identity.

To conduct this analysis, I used rhetorical criticism as method. I visited the sites in July 2023 with the intent of rhetorically analyzing the memorials, so I took notes as I walked through the space, documented what caught my eye both inside and outside the memorial, and continuously reflected on what I saw by sharing my insights with others who joined me on my research trip. While at the memorials, a camera was used to record my visits and served as a resource to look back while conducting this analysis. I will discuss my methodology in more detail in Chapter 2.

Critical Standpoint

The perceived quality of representation within places of public memory are influenced by the perceptions and expectations formed by visitors around and within the memorial. These factors bring to light ideas that influence visitors' attitudes towards the site. The ideas presented to visitors are articulated through "signifiers and practices, both corporeal and symbolic."[18] Ideas do not need to be explicit, but instead articulated through interconnected symbolic and material means. The space and material items visitors experience articulate different messages which influence how they interact with the space.[19] This interaction, in turn, influences what information is held onto after they leave. Detailing the specific modes of articulation that lead to different message retained from places like CHM and LBN will be at the core of my work.

[18] Schowalter, "Disarticulating American Indianness in the National Museum of the American Indian," 255.
[19] Aoki, Dickinson, and Ott, "The Master Naturalist Imagined: Directed Movement and Simulations at at the Draper Museum of Natural History."

Places are experienced by real people (like me) who bring their own stories, identities, and experiences into spaces with them. Growing up in rural Montana in a family with five kids, I learned about the Battle of Greasy Grass but was not able to visit till I was older. My classmates who were able to explore LBN always made me jealous. That was until my family took a trip to Mt. Rushmore and CHM when I was eleven. No one else in my class of fifteen had visited the massive mountain sculpture, so I was able to tell everyone about the humongous statue, fun museum, and peculiar door decorated with clips from The Wizard of Oz. My interest in Native American history was nurtured on that trip and stuck with me as I learned more about the founding of the United States of America. More exposure to history reinforced my concerns for the intentional annihilation of Native people in the past and the consequences for those efforts in the present.[20] Because the Blackfeet and Gros Ventre people were removed from the Montana territory, my great-great-great-grandfather was able to homestead Hamilton, Montana.[21] The Tulalip Tribes ceded land for fishing- and hunting-rights, making property accessible for another great-great-great-grandfather to operate a farm in present day Snohomish, Washington.[22] As a small child, I was not aware of the stories shared within my family on my first visit to CHM. My adult self is different and carries these stories as I live and reflect on the land I was raised. The stories I learned over time and the childhood memories from CHM stuck with me and kept bringing my mind back to the mountain statue. So, I decided to return and also visit LBN in July 2023 with the hope of conducting a rhetorical analysis on both places of public memory. During this visit, I entered the spaces more aware of how the presentation of history influences perceptions, how my personal identities impact experiences, and the ways reality leads to infinite

[20] Findling et al., "Discrimination in the United States: Experiences of Native Americans."
[21] "History « Native News 2018."
[22] "Treaty History with the Northwest Tribes | Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife."

interpretations.[23] My goal is not to establish a universal lens to understand the places, but to bring to light ways the places encourage visitors to see the space.

How space is seen is increasingly important as conversations of land ownership and racism become interconnected and amplified in the U.S.[24] Places of public memory such as museums, battlefields, or monuments are controlled and managed spaces. The power and authority that makes these opportunities for control and management possible are built from history that has privileged some and harmed others. U.S.'s forced removal, manipulation of treaties, and unfulfilled promises with Native communities has resulted in almost all homeland for Native people being owned by the U.S. government and its citizens.[25] Who owns the land is strongly influenced by history which has advantaged White Americans over any other group.[26] Places of public memory make these tensions more salient as they inform public perceptions of the past through intentional and unintentional means. Rhetorical scholars who look at public memory and place must critically examine how the articulation of White supremacy throughout history and privileged land ownership inform the continued construction and remembrance of the past.

Preview

This Masters' thesis will examine how Native American identities are articulated within and around the Crazy Horse Memorial and Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument. This thesis will have four further chapters consisting of a review of literature and method (Chapter 2),

[23] Blair, Dickinson, and Ott, "Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place," 10–11.
[24] Rocha Beardall, "Settler Simultaneity and Anti-Indigenous Racism at Land-Grant Universities."
[25] Rifkin, *Beyond Settler Time*, 95–96.
[26] Bonds and Inwood, "Beyond White Privilege: Geographies of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism."

analysis of CHM (Chapter 3), analysis of LBN (Chapter 4), and ending by comparing and contrasting the two sites with each other as well as implications for my findings (Chapter 5).

Chapter 2 will be a review of relevant literature on public memory scholarship, materiality, and Native American rhetorics followed by a discussion of rhetorical criticism as method. Public memory is the starting point as it seeks to understand the ways in which people remember the past. The body influences how visitors create public memory and experience a space leading to the importance of materiality in my project. Materiality examines how and why bodies create meaning by moving through a space. Within these places of public memory, the influence on the body is integral to understanding what is articulated about Native identities. Native American rhetorics will be brought forward as the anchor for the analysis with both the problematic understanding of the rhetorical frame as well as an explanation how it will be used throughout the thesis. These three literatures will be utilized within the method of rhetorical criticism to evaluate, understand, and interpret the rhetorical artifact, leading into the following analysis chapters.

My analysis of CHM will be the focus of Chapter 3. I will provide a more detailed history and context for the memorial to help explain its creation in response to Mt. Rushmore, prominent people involved in the project, and its contemporary components that influence public memory. This provides context for my visit to CHM in July 2023 when I gathered data for this analysis. I look at the location of the memorial, which items it chooses to display, and the messaging within as they articulate Native American identity. My analysis is broken into two sections with the first being the intentional choices made by CHM to remediate public memory around Native identity through the presentation of cultural heirlooms, presence of Native people within the organization, and public facing aspects of the memorial. Following this section is my analysis of

unintentional components of the memorial that stymie these remediation efforts by centering Euro-American values and voices, presenting nature as controllable, and prioritizing Euro-American perceptions of ownership. The combination of these analytical frames culminates in the memorial's articulation of Native identities as ownable.

An analysis of LBN will follow in Chapter 4, beginning with the history of the battle, how the memorial has changed over time, and what it looks like in the present moment. This also leads into my experiences of the place in July 2023 and its location in rural Montana on the Crow Reservation, curated displays, and messages that articulate Native American identity. Some of these components work to intentionally remediate public memory to depict the experiences of Native people more accurately during the battle by incorporating their voices into a guided tour, etching their stories and names into the Indian Memorial, and constructing the Spirit Warrior Memorial to remember the events. These efforts are also stymied by the memorial through places that frame visitor experiences such as the Custer National Cemetery, the Visitor Center as it informs visitors how to view and understand the battlefield, and the battlefield itself as it guides perspectives and bodies to view the conflict in a particular way. Bringing both the remediation efforts and the stymying components together leads to the articulation of Native identities as existing in the past instead of the contemporary moment.

Chapter 5 will conclude my thesis by bringing the analysis of CHM and LBN into conversation to understand key findings and implications for this research. I will begin by summarizing the main ideas from each chapter. This will lead into an analysis of both CHM and LBN by comparing and contrasting of the memorials. Comparing what both sites articulate about Native identities reveals broader cultural articulations of Native identity as controllable. The relationship between the two places of memory emphasizes the importance of noting both the

good work being done as well as unintentional aspects of the site that hinders its effectiveness. Contrasting the memorials highlight contributing factors that can be impactful when analyzing places of public memory. I will unpack what these findings mean for public memory scholarship moving forward, particularly for memory places for Native Americans. Concluding this thesis, I will present key takeaways for both scholarship as it relates to memory places as well as broader takeaways for all spaces as they strive to remediate memories and more accurately reflect American identities and histories.

Chapter 2- Grounding Literature for Public Memory, Materiality, and Native American Rhetorics

Literature grounding my project focuses on three primary areas: public memory, materiality, and Native American rhetorics. Each area of study is similar in its long history of scholars toiling with and developing ideas. Yet, while research in public memory and materiality are now well-established in the field of Communication, integrating the still understudied findings of Native American rhetorics into these theoretical developments and critical analyses will be essential to conduct a productive, affective, and accurate analysis of these memory places. Using these different areas of literature will allow for an informed analysis on the specific enactments of rhetorics at CHM and LBN.

Public Memory

Literature in public memory examines how collectives of people—often understood as a "public"—remember and forget the past together. In other words, quoting Matthew Houdek and Kendall Phillips, "[t]he term public memory refers to the circulation of recollections among members of a given community. These recollections are far from being perfect records of the past; rather, they entail what we remember, the ways we frame it, and what aspects we forget."[27] The imperfection and continuous navigation is part of how public memory develops. In the words of Jason Edward Black, public memory is "the ongoing, active past that contributes to present and future public cultures" indicating how ever-changing public memory can be.[28] As we will see in this thesis, the creation of memories through retellings of past events can come in many forms and lead to particular interpretations of the past, such as whether we remember

[27] Houdek and Phillips, "Public Memory." P. 1
[28] Black, "Remembrances of Removal," 192.

General Custer as a national hero or to what extent we recall the treatment of Native Americans as genocide.[29] Public memory recognizes what the present (or a specific point in time) chooses to retain and present from the past. An individuals' memories can become public if they are shared with a given collective (i.e., the family, the social, the nation, the public, a counter public, etc.) and it is through this shared remembering that public memory is formed, creating space for cultural values to influence the remembering and forgetting. What is worth retelling? What should be forgotten? Values inform these answers as well as how these answers are presented to audiences. Indeed, thinking about the interactions between the presentation of the past and its audiences is key to the rhetoric of public memory.

It is important to differentiate between memory and history when discussing the rhetorical nature of public memory. History, as Pierre Nora famously claimed, is "a representation of the past" that is established, firm, and unmovable, while separate from the present moment.[30] History is anchored in facts that are as true five minutes after the event as they are five years, five decades, or five centuries afterwards. Time does not change what happened in history. By contrast, memory informs what events in history are remembered and helps understand changing perceptions of the past. Robin George Collingwood believed "the difference between them is that memory is subjective and immediate, history objective and mediate."[31] Events from the past are not of import until they become public memory, making them relevant in the moment where people are trying to hold on to the past. History is what happened and public memory is how the public retains those events.

[29] Russell, Hume, and Sichler, "Libbie Custer's 'Last Stand'"; Running Wolf, "Loose Production but Great Cause!!"
[30] Nora, "Between Memory and History." P. 8
[31] Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, 366.

Public memory is anchored in "the public" as foundational to its formation. Memory is fostered within the public and being part of the public involves fostering memory. Houdek and Phillips claim that "we are a public…to the extent that we share a set of memories."[32] These memories are developed within a socially constructed framework coined by Maurice Halbwachs as "collective memory."[33] Before his development of the theory, memory was understood as an individual's thoughts with a person's own mind holding ideas and memories without assistance from outside forces. Halbwachs shifted memory from being individual to a collective activity where groups create "the means to reconstruct" memory.[34] Sharing memories creates a public, wherein the past and present can be remembered or forgotten. To be part of the public is to share memories, either lived or retold by the collective.

Scholarship experienced a "memory boom" in the 1980s, characterized by an increase in memorials and scholarship about the past within multiple fields "including communication, rhetoric, history, religion, architecture, philosophy, sociology, English, literature, and political science."[35] This abundance of scholarship and insights helped further understand how memories are formed and used, such as within presidents' speeches or the framing of the Civil Rights Movement.[36] Stephen H. Browne was influential in explaining how memory is used by different people for different reasons through his 1999 essay about Crispus Attucks.[37] The "memory boom" also expanded the forgetting of the past through "selective amnesia" which "refers to the omission of events that would dramatically reframe our understanding of how historic conflicts

[32] Houdek and Phillips, "Public Memory," 1.
[33] Halbwachs and Coser, *On Collective Memory*.
[34] Halbwachs and Coser, 38.
[35] Houdek and Phillips, "Public Memory," 3.
[36] Browne, *Jefferson's Call for Nationhood*; Wilson, "The Problem with Public Memory: President Benjamin Harrison Confronts the 'Southern Question'"; Kiewe, "Framing Memory through Eulogy: Ronald Reagan's Long Goodbye"; Reyes, "Memory and Alterity: The Case for an Analytic of Difference"; Pauley, "John Lewis' 'Serious Revolution': Rhetoric, Resistance, and Revision at the March on Washington."
[37] Browne, "Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration."

connect to contemporary social relations were they explicitly included within mainstream public discourse."[38] Forgetting, before that point, "signif[ied] a loss, absence, or lack" making it bad to forget things from the past.[39] Bradford Vivian reframes the lack of memory as a way "in which instances of forgetting can play a positive, formative role in works of public memory" and result in beneficial outcomes as opposed to an indication of inadequacy or failure.[40] Forgetting is not always accidental, but can be an intentional choice to aid in simplifying continuously shared memories. Knowing the omitted stories or memories help explain why certain aspects of the memory are retold. Studying public memory entails examining what is remembered and forgotten.

While public memories can take many forms—speeches, newspaper articles or biographies, textbooks, family stories, among others—my focus in this project are the places of public memory.[41] Herein we might include well-defined spaces like museums, commemorative sites, and heritage zones but also non-tangible experiences that people have in and surrounding a space.[42] How public memory manifests influences how the past is remembered. This makes the form and context of memory places important for understanding *what* is and *can* be remembered within them. Memory is complicated, allowing "scholars [to] unpack the often-conflicting messages inscribed in such sites to reveal the power relations imbued therein."[43] Carole Blair, Marsha Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci navigate these conflicts through examining "multivocal

[38] Hoerl, "Selective Amnesia and Racial Transcendence in News Coverage of President Obama's Inauguration," 194–95.
[39] Vivian, *Public Forgetting*, 5.
[40] Vivian, 6.
[41] Black, "Remembrances of Removal," 200; Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity"; Russell, Hume, and Sichler, "Libbie Custer's 'Last Stand.'"
[42] Houdek and Phillips, "Public Memory"; Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting"; Russell, Hume, and Sichler, "Libbie Custer's 'Last Stand'"; Maldonado, "Commemorative (Dis)Placement: On the Limits of Textual Adaptability and the Future of Public Memory Scholarship."
[43] Houdek and Phillips, "Public Memory," 6.

rhetoric."[44] Places of public memory are complicated with multiple perspectives that can exist as contradictory while still being fully present. Visitors feel an affect which is "understood as a kind of energy or intensity circulated among individuals by virtue of their contact with events, objects, and others" that is felt in mind and body.[45] Indeed, places of memory are particularly multi-sensory for Cynthia Smith and Teresa Bergman as they "increase the durability of memory because memories can be embedded in an enduring space that visitors can see, smell, and touch."[46] As a result, the study of public memory alone will not equip this project to be successful; it also requires a deeper engagement with materiality.

Materiality of Place

Michael Calvin McGee first introduced the idea of materialist rhetoric with the hope of extending rhetoric beyond the theoretical and into the lived world.[47] His article pushed rhetorical scholars away from dissecting aspects of rhetoric and towards a holistic approach, requiring all parts of the rhetorical event to be understood in relation to each other and the world around it. For Bryan McCann, "to call rhetoric material was to appreciate its status as a social force whose capacity to coerce and transform public life depended on its sociohistorical context."[48] The necessary context also involves an analysis of power and control as discussed by Ronald Walter Greene.[49] Centering power and social construction finds its roots in Marxist views of materialism, differing from McGee's materialist rhetoric which centers rhetoric as material and

[44] Blair, Jeppeson, and Pucci, "Public Memorializing in Post-Modernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype," 199.
[45] Houdek and Phillips, "Public Memory," 9.
[46] Smith and Bergman, "You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space," 165.
[47] McGee, "A Materialist's Conception of Rhetoric."
[48] McCann, "Materialist Rhetoric," 5.
[49] Greene, "Another Materialist Rhetoric."

not solely symbolic.[50] Zachary Beckstead et al. builds off these theories by presenting materiality as the "corporeality of a 'thing' [which] provides access to normally inaccessible feelings" making material things influential as we experience place.[51] Material rhetoric extends the field beyond unpacking individual aspects and into a deeper analysis of context, paying more attention to the physical place and space.

The contemporary study of the materiality of place—or the rhetoric of materiality—centers on how the physical places and its forms and features direct and invite bodies to move for rhetorical purposes.[52] For Greg Dickinson, it is a rhetorical framework for understanding the "resources of which, in which and through which, we create our bodies and ourselves."[53] In this way, the intentional construction and design of spaces has a rhetorical effect because of how it makes bodies move through space.[54] Material things are an act/artifact of its own that have "consequences embedded in the places that surround us as we celebrate, mourn, or consume" in the eyes of Samantha Senda-Cook.[55] Where bodies are guided, how they are guided there, and what impressions those movements create all impact interpretations of place.

Materiality is often studied in prominent and important places or zones like memorials or commemorative sites. But materiality has consequence in any place the body moves. As a result, materiality has value in everyday life just as much as it does in our most sacred places. Therefore, hiking trails, malls, museums, coffee shops, and cities can all be studied because they influence how the body moves and is instructed to make meaning.[56] This idea will matter to this

[50] McCann, "Materialist Rhetoric"; McGee, "A Materialist's Conception of Rhetoric."
[51] Beckstead et al., "Collective Remembering through the Materiality and Organization of War Memorials," 199.
[52] Blair, Dickinson, and Ott, "Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place."
[53] Dickinson, "Joe's Rhetoric."
[54] Dickinson, "Being Through There Matters: Materiality, Bodies, and Movement in Urban Communication Research."
[55] Senda-Cook, "Materializing Tensions," 357.
[56] Senda-Cook, "Materializing Tensions"; Stewart and Dickinson, "Enunciating Locality in the Postmodern Suburb: Flatiron Crossing and the Colorado Lifestyle"; Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting";

project in particular because visitors must physically travel to and be at the place, making movements toward and at the memorials materially consequential.

Capturing the experience of material rhetoric in a place can be challenging because it requires "being there" through site visits or even virtual representations of the space.[57] Knowing how the body is materially influenced involves having the critic's body be in the space making fieldwork necessary. It also involves paying attention to what is around because "a monument's rhetorical character relies on the bodies walking through it, as well as other physical spaces surrounding it."[58] Materiality of rhetoric has many components. Different tools are at the critic's disposal such as recording the site, acquiring maps, or even drawing different features of the space. Each way to take notes and remember the site involves physically being in the space and reflecting on how the place influences the body.

Examining the stories that are told outside of the memorials is another way to understand public memory; but this approach results in a less robust analysis of how people experience memories through both mind and body. Material factors influence the ways stories are remembered and forgotten, making the intersecting analysis of public memory and materiality necessary. These places are not disconnected from the broader context though. Cultural factors influence how these places are perceived, understood, and remembered making it important to pay attention to cultural rhetoric's in the place, leading to the emphasis of Native American rhetorics in my analysis.

Dickinson, "Joe's Rhetoric"; Dickinson, "Being Through There Matters: Materiality, Bodies, and Movement in Urban Communication Research."

[57] Blair, "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places"; Dickinson, "Being Through There Matters: Materiality, Bodies, and Movement in Urban Communication Research."

[58] McCann, "Materialist Rhetoric," 12.

Native American Rhetorics

While public memory and materiality are important academic literatures for examining commemorative sites like those examined in this thesis, both literatures were developed within contemporary Western scholarly contexts. Within the field of rhetoric, Western scholars have most often used these theories. In fact, some scholars have argued that these and similar literatures have been used in ways that reinforce imperialist norms within the field of rhetoric.[59] As such, it is prudent to wonder the extent to which these theories are useful for examining commemorative sites that claim to take up Native American names, experiences, and perspectives.

At the same time, looking at artifacts through a Western or Euro-American lens does not inherently make these tools antithetical to non-Western voices and perspectives. I believe, for instance, that public memory and materiality literature can productively critique Euro-American norms and ideologies, as they have been used by scholars adopting feminist, Black, queer, and other marginalized perspectives, including Native American perspectives (although admittedly often by non-Native scholars).[60] Indeed, rhetorical lenses can be tooled to support, challenge, and give space for a variety of cultural definitions of rhetoric. However, to that end, these literatures need to be synthesized with other tools. To conduct this synthesis equitably, Native American and Euro-American rhetorics cannot be held equally. The long history of prioritizing Euro-American rhetoric has inherently privileged that scholarship when discussing rhetorical theory

[59] Asante, "#RhetoricSoWhite and US Centered"; Lechuga, "An Anticolonial Future: Reassembling the Way We Do Rhetoric."
[60] Dubriwny and Poirot, "Gender and Public Memory"; Gallagher and LaWare, "Sparring with Public Memory: The Rhetorical Embodiment of Race, Power, and Conflict in the Monument to Joe Louis"; Dunn, "Remembering Matthew Shepard: Violence, Identity, and Queer Counterpublic Memories"; Rosiek, Snyder, and Pratt, "The New Materialisms and Indigenous Theories of Non-Human Agency: Making the Case for Respectful Anti-Colonial Engagement"; Smith and Bergman, "You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space," 182–85.

and method.[61] In this project, to push against institutionalized Euro-American rhetorical values, Native American rhetorics will need to be centered within both the method and analysis.

Composition scholars have striven to reduce the prioritization of Euro-American rhetorics through the method of transrhetorical analysis where perspectives are treated as equals, not comparative. Rachel Jackson defined transrhetorical analysis as "the movement of rhetorics across multiple location categories—historical, spatial, temporal, cultural, local, regional, national, and global, as well as across disciplines."[62] The purpose behind a transrhetorical approach, according to Ellen Cushman et al., "is not to create another area of rhetorical studies based upon categories of knowledge and race created in the Imperial difference, but it is to create the possibility for multiple knowledges, methodologies, and texts to exist as equally important and valued."[63] This allows for "rhetorical modes, patterns, and strategies across time within Indigenous spaces while also mapping them across cultural boundaries."[64] Bringing both Native American rhetorics and Euro-American rhetoric together as equally valuable allows multiple perspectives to inform on the rhetorical importance of a text or artifact. The goal is an equitable balance of ideas, not an equal one. This is a shift from how rhetoric has engaged with other frameworks in the past because in the eyes of Jackson and Dorothy Whitehorse DeLaune, a transrhetorical approach "invites us to listen differently, *with* a community rather than *to* a community or *for* a community [original italics]."[65] My interest in the material and memory components of rhetoric makes it challenging to productively conduct a transrhetorical analysis in

[61] Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity."
[62] Jackson, "Locating Oklahoma: Critical Regionalism and Transrhetorical Analysis in the Composition Classroom," 305.
[63] Cushman et al., "Decolonizing Projects," 20.
[64] Cushman et al., 6.
[65] Jackson and DeLaune, "Decolonizing Community Writing with Community Listening: Story, Transrhetorical Resistance, and Indigenous Cultural Literacy Activism," 42.

this thesis, but the embedded critique of how Euro-American rhetoric has been prioritized within the field is important to continuously reflect on while conducting my analysis.

Native American rhetoric is a broad category with no clear center. Bruce Dadey considers, "[t]he very concept of a general Native American rhetoric [to be] problematic since rhetorical systems reflect the contexts in which they are formed and used, and Native American tribes differ significantly from one another in terms of their languages, social structures, political systems, and ethical or religious beliefs."[66] There is no discrete rhetoric that can or should be categorized as *the* Native American Rhetoric.

Rather, at best, we might begin to imagine a diverse and complex constellation of Native American rhetoric*s*. A clear example of different ways Native American rhetorics can manifest is through oceanic rhetoric.[67] To Tiara Na'puti, there have been "land-based preoccupations and containment through colonial logics" which focuses on the homogenization of Indigenous people existing on the land such as communities in the Great Plains.[68] Oceanic rhetoric shifts this orientation and "insists upon the centrality of Indigenous subjects to the ocean, islands, atolls, and archipelagoes," allowing for cultures that look to the ocean as the rhetorical space to express their understanding of land and water.[69] Having only a land-orientation or ocean-orientation collapses the variety of cultures into a simplistic relationship of land and diminishes the variety of ways Native American rhetorics can manifest.

But the necessary complexity of constellating Native American rhetorics does not mean it should be dismissed. While there are differences between groups, "Native critics from a variety

[66] Dadey, "Identity, Narrative, and the Construction of the Rhetorical Situation in Euro- American and Aboriginal Cultures," 1.
[67] Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity."
[68] Na'puti, "Oceanic Possibilities for Communication Studies," 96.
[69] Na'puti, 95.

of tribal backgrounds have suggested that a number of key commonalities are shared by many aboriginal cultures, some of which have rhetorical significance."[70] Some of those commonalities are "the relationship between individual and group identity, and the role of narration" as well the importance of listening.[71] Native American rhetorics will be the center of my analysis, but matching theoretical similarities by a non-Native American scholar (such as myself) does not create the required rhetorical framework. Part of creating Native American rhetorics comes from within the communities through agreed genre norms of what it means to be Native American and practicing rhetoric which fosters unifying representations of identity.[72] Native American rhetorics are also created through opposition to colonial methods such as when Alcatraz Island was occupied by IOAT (Indians of All Tribes).[73] This act of protest pushed many Native Americans to adopt an identity of belonging to a larger tribal community as well as repurpose the rhetorical tool of détournament as it is "a fitting inventional device for enacting decolonization"[74] which is a form of resistive rhetoric to Black where "subaltern groups appropriate dominant discourses and turn them around to expose the problems and duplicity of these discourses."[75] Native American rhetorics are a broad field characterized within my thesis by similarities between cultures and agreed expectations among Native American scholars.

Among the similarities is the orientation of place through "place-thought," understood by Vanessa Watts as a "decolonial concept 'based upon the premise that land is alive and thinking and that humans and non-humans derive agency through the extensions of these thoughts.'"[76]

---

[70] Dadey, "Identity, Narrative, and the Construction of the Rhetorical Situation in Euro- American and Aboriginal Cultures," 1.
[71] Dadey, 1; Cushman et al., "Decolonizing Projects."
[72] Makmillen and Riedlinger, "Markers of Identification in Indigenous Academic Writing: A Case Study of Genre Innovation."
[73] Kelly, "Détournement, Decolonization, and the American Indian Occupation of Alcatraz Island (1969–1971)."
[74] Kelly, 7.
[75] Black, "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse," 70.
[76] Cushman et al., "Decolonizing Projects," 17.

Place, as seen through Native American logics, have inherent power distinct from humans that people are able to experience and exist within, but not control. Watts emphasizes the importance of place-thought as both a pre-colonial effort and in opposition to colonization.[77] In this way, non-human entities have agency and should be considered influential in their own right when examining society. Place matters, not because of how people use it, but because it manifests meaning on its own. While examining places of public memory, it is important to consider how "place-thought" connects to these memorials and the land they exist on as meaningful and influential.

Place-thought makes each location unique and impactful to the construction of culture. The physical space people call home influences the similarities and differences between their communities, cultures, and rhetorical practices. In a co-authored piece including LuMing Mao and Peter Siminson, rhetorical commonalities between groups reflect commonalities between cultures because "rhetoric is a *cultural* [original italics] practice. This means that it takes shape not just through texts and discursive performances but also through institutions, technologies, social structures, and bodies within ongoing forms of life."[78] Each community is in a different space and place with their environment influencing their culture. Put simply by Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, "the environment is constitutive of the culture, and vise-versa."[79] Rhetoric is connected to culture and culture is connected to place. In order to analyze the rhetorical artifact, the culture and its place of origin need to be examined as a foundational

[77] Watts, "Indigenous Place-Thought & Agency amongst Humans and Non-Humans (First Woman and Sky Woman Go on a European World Tour!)."
[78] Mao et al., "Manifesting a Future for Comparative Rhetoric," 260. Mao is first author for an article with multiple sections credited to individual authors. Peter Siminson is the sole author for this quote.
[79] Kelly and Black, "Introduction: Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric," 3.

influence on the text. Place-thought factors into understanding the structures of a space, the communities who call that space home, and the rhetoric created by both.

The combination of communities within any given space have frequently been understood through a framework of difference: different voices, perspectives on the past, and ways of knowing are all seen as distinct in places such as CHM and LBN. Characterizing these components of place as differences creates an unnecessary and unrealistic divide between Indigenous/Euro-American, Indigenous scholar/White academic, and Indigenous epistemologies/colonial views. Chris Andersen critiques this divide and presents *density* to replace *difference* when discussing epistemologies within academia that are traditionally characterized as distinctly White, Black, or Indigenous epistemologies.[80] Mark Rifkin furthers density by using it to understand both ways of knowing as well as the temporal impact people have on space.[81] As people exist in a place, they influence the land and the land influences how they live. The longer a people live in a place, the stronger their density of experiences within that space. When settler-Americans migrated West, they brought with them a density of experiences from a different place which informed how they built homes, developed crops, and interacted with wildlife. Time developed a density of experiences for the settling-colonizers that is carried into the present and future. While places of public memory (such as CHM and LBN) have a density of experiences pre-colonization, the impact and history of colonization cannot be removed from the density of experiences felt in the place and communities belonging to that space. Density of experience brings all involved communities into conversation as they live and die on the land.

[80] Andersen, "Critical Indigenous Studies: From Difference to Density."
[81] Rifkin, *Beyond Settler Time*, 95–114.

These three literatures (public memory, materiality, and Native American rhetorics) will anchor my analysis for my project. Public memory creates a helpful lens to examine what stories are told and forgotten by communities. Materiality prioritizes the important of place and its ability to act as a rhetorical text. Native American rhetorics allow the voices presented in the places of public memory to be seen and heard as critics, supporters, or scholars of these spaces instead of solely prioritizing Euro-American perceptions of rhetoric. These lenses inform my critical rhetorical analysis.

Method

In my thesis, I will use rhetorical criticism as my method to establish how the places and ideas I am studying will be approached, analyzed, and understood. Rhetorical criticism to Wayne Booth is a way to approach a text, artifact, or other communication experiences to "engage in the most carefully informed, detailed judgment possible, for or against."[82] This modern definition was crafted in the twentieth century with the rise of scholars such as Kenneth Burke, James Guetti, and Booth.[83] Rhetorical criticism is typically done when a critic examines a discourse and attempts to discern what meanings, influences, and contexts led to the rhetorical moment.[84] The definition and scope of what can be rhetorical criticism has changed over time, starting with it being a way to determine the effectiveness of speeches.[85] As time has gone on, the scope of what can be considered appropriate rhetorical artifacts and lenses has changed to include an unpacking of the ideologies present within the texts, an exploration for how social movements organize and communicate their ideas, a reflection on how rhetoric reinforces social views on race, gender,

[82] Booth, "Criticism."
[83] Booth.
[84] Black, *Ebook of Rhetorical Criticism*.
[85] Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory."

and sexuality, and an investigation into the ways the physical space humans move through influences us.[86]

These criticisms are not to condemn or devalue the communication experience, but to further human understanding because each time criticism is practiced, it "recommends a way of life."[87] Examining any communicative event such as a social movement or a political speech creates claims about the communication ranging from the purpose, intent, effectiveness, assumptions, or motivations of the event. These claims are anchored in a particular temporal framework of the past and present while they lead into the future. The breadth and depth of rhetorical criticism allows for many events to be analyzed and the evaluation to make large, broad, and profound claims about the ways humans create meaning.

While what can be rhetorical criticism has expanded, the people conducting the criticism has largely remained White men.[88] Frequently, the lineage of rhetoric is traced back to the Greeks around 400 BCE and carried through the history of other nations such as Rome, France, England, and the United States.[89] This lineage of rhetoric often centers European (and Euro-American) perspectives as well as reaffirms the ways rhetoric has been taught as a skill for a particular sect of people. Rhetoric has been a largely White dominated field which has resulted in a critique of rhetorical criticism for prioritizing Whiteness.[90] Because criticism "recommends a way of life", privileging White rhetors continuously supports a White perspective of what way of life is best. Western and Euro-American rhetorics have been seen as the center of the field with differing

[86] Philip Wander and Steven Jenkins, "Rhetoric, Society, and the Critical Response"; Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies"; Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation"; Paula Chakravartty et al., "#CommunicationSoWhite"; Tom Dunn, "Remembering 'A Great Fag'"; Carole Blair, "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places."
[87] Wander and Jenkins, "Rhetoric, Society, and the Critical Response," 441.
[88] Asante, "#RhetoricSoWhite and US Centered."
[89] Booth, "Criticism."
[90] Asante, "#RhetoricSoWhite and US Centered."

perceptions of rhetoric being seen as 'other,' resulting in a Euro-American "way of life" as the norm.[91] Criticism is a continuously evolving tool to examine human communication and it can either be used to affirm preexisting norms or it can aid in promoting change. Because rhetorical criticism has largely remained a White field does not mean it is remaining so. Many scholars have spoken against these ideas and promoted a rhetoric that centers non-White views such as shifting the focus of what is considered valuable and which voices are centered within scholarship.[92] The Whiteness of rhetoric is slowly shifting allowing for more voices and ideas to be shared.

Using methods of rhetorical criticism rooted in Western values is not done to continue the cycle of comparing 'other' types of rhetoric to Euro-American rhetoric and reaffirm the 'superiority' of Whiteness, but to expand ways of understanding the world by treating differences "as equally important and valuable."[93] The multiplicity of spaces allows for a variety of experiences to be held equally at one time. My analysis of CHM and LBN will be formed from my singular perspective while simultaneously hearing other voices present while "being there."

"Being There" at CHM and LBN

To enable me to read how the past is represented at each Indigenous memory site, I will reflect on my visits to the sites and the depictions of the past captured therein. I visited CHM and LBN in July 2023 and spent one day at each site. While traveling to both locations, I was able to be a passenger and take notes of what I saw along the road such as businesses, road signs, and

[91] Asante.
[92] Shome, "Thinking Culture and Cultural Studies--from/of the Global South"; Rifkin, *Beyond Settler Time*; Lechuga, "An Anticolonial Future: Reassembling the Way We Do Rhetoric"; Chakravartty et al., "#CommunicationSoWhite"; Asante, "#RhetoricSoWhite and US Centered"; Shome, "Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon"; Kelly and Black, *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*; Mao et al., "Manifesting a Future for Comparative Rhetoric"; Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity."
[93] Cushman et al., "Decolonizing Projects," 20; Massey, *For Space*.

wildlife. I wrote field notes and took pictures along the road, at the borders of the memorials, and at their respective entrances. During my visits to CHM and LBN, I took pictures of displays, recorded my walk through the memorials, and took notes of what I saw that struck me as meaningful. I took pictures of the glass display cases, prominent statues, and items in the space unrelated to the explicit focus of the memorial. These are objects that lead to the creation of public memory within the space because of the implications they afford and the stories they tell. Identifying what stories and facts are promoted in a space helps explain what memories are being shared and reestablished as truth through public memory.

In addition to the physical enactments of documentation at the sites, I also listened. I listened to the voices of other visitors, the combination of natural and artificial sounds throughout the place, and the messages sent by the memorials through place-thought. Moments of stillness and reflection allowed me to hear the memorial and be an active receiver of its stories as opposed to a passive and disconnected observer. Being in the place involved listening to more than what I was being told and paying attention to the unique thoughts, feelings, and ideas manifest at each site.

Public memory anchors the sites I examine in my analysis because they are seeking to imbue historic events with immediacy for the audience. Memory is being formed because history is being brought into the present. There is a need to care about the Battle of Greasy Grass and Thašúŋke Witkó which are amplified within the memorials, leading to the public continuously reinforcing memories communicated within the space and the broader cultural context. The places are trying to remember particular stories which leads to the forgetting of others. Analyzing the memories prioritized within CHM and LBN helps better understand what these sites

articulate about American identities while also clarifying how the particular places influence those stories.

In order to utilize materiality, I needed to be in the physical space and walk through it because that is how both spaces are designed to be experienced by visitors. I drafted notes while my body was traveling to the locations and within them. My field notes include perspectives on how the structure of the road, movement into the memorials, and walking through the places influenced what I saw, experienced, and felt. To aid in posterity, I used a 360-degree camera as I walked to record how I navigated the space, what the space looked like, and remember what experiences I had as a visitor. A 360-degree camera will also help reduce the subject selection of what is framed, allowing for all physical obstacles and paths to be recorded while conducting my analysis. I also gathered maps of the space distributed by the facility to indicate what places are accessible to visitors, the flow of the space, and see which locations are prioritized by the memorials. Using materiality involves examining how the space physically moves people, resulting in a particular persuasive experience. It also involves learning the context of the particular place in its singularity. Knowing the history of the broader state or even country is not adequate to know the specifics of place leading to both a discussion of the physical place and the interwoven cultural importance of the space over time leading to a culturally sensitive equitable analysis.

Approaching these spaces equitably involves holding both rhetorical traditions—the Euro-American and Native American perspectives—as equally in relation to each other as possible. Identifying their individual perspectives and how they influence each other in the space (i.e., how do Native American rhetorics influence Euro-American rhetoric in the space?) requires a shifting in perspective from the traditional framework found in public memory and materiality.

Those rhetorical tools have historically centered Euro-American understandings of space, time, and memory. To truly hold different rhetorical disciplines equitably, I strove to introduce a post-colonial lens to my data collection and analysis.[94] Using a post-colonial lens does not negate my education that prioritizes Whiteness but assists me in doing the best I can to treat the density of perspectives with the respect and equity they deserve. A post-colonial lens involves (at least) three things: challenge imperialism, create space for transnational and cultural identities, and practice self-reflexivity.[95] I need to consciously integrate these principles into my analysis because unconscious bias may influence my ability to be engage in post-colonialism despite my self-perception of being anti-racist. Utilizing these three aspects of post-colonial rhetoric involves reflecting on how imperialism manifests at the memorials, examine how different cultures and groups of people are represented (who is speaking, what are they saying, who is not speaking, etc.), and contemplating how my upbringing, education, and worldview influence how I interpret the space. This is a starting place for using Native American and Euro-American rhetorics equitably within my analysis. Combing all of these methods will aid in understanding how CHM and LBN foster meaning and memory of Native Americans within the broader U.S. culture.

Conclusion

Public memory, materiality, and Native American rhetorics are the anchors for my criticism of CHM and LBN. Public memory examines what stories and events are being remembered or forgotten by the public. Materiality pushes scholars to reflect on how the physical place impacts and influences bodies. Both public memory and materiality assist in understanding

[94] Shome, "Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon."
[95] Shome.

what the place and stories within communicate to visitors. Native American rhetorics aid in clarifying how those stories are told and understood by Native American communities. Utilizing both Euro-American and Indigenous rhetorical scholarship presents multiple lenses to view the sites as places of public memory that articulate different ideas about American identities.

Chapter 3- Native People in Crazy Horse Memorial: Permission to Own

The Lakota people refer to the Black Hills of South Dakota as "the heart of all things" because it is the center of their origin story.[96] This important place became a site of conflict as the U.S. government's westward expansion brought Euro-American into the Black Hills. As the pendulum of control over the land shifted from Native people to Euro-Americans, Native people were pushed off their sacred land. In their place, settlers panned for gold, homesteaded, and created commemorative sites. People strove to celebrate and memorialize settler colonialism through monuments to western conquest such as Mount Rushmore which is a widely known and accepted commemorative site that demonstrates U.S. greatness. Native people were removed from their homelands and (unsuccessfully) erased from memory rhetorics, which partially obscured the U.S. government's long and painful practice of stealing sacred land.

In an attempt to countermand those dismissive memory rhetorics, Chief Henry Standing Bear instigated the construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial (CHM). The memorial began as a response to Mount Rushmore and still serves as a counternarrative to visitors due to their close physical location and mirrored methods of representing heroism in America. People who visit CHM are also likely to visit Mount Rushmore, requiring the monument of four U.S. presidents to be considered when analyzing CHM as a prominent but not unproblematic site of Indigenous representation in the broader U.S. public imagination. Yet as we will see, despite efforts to restore representation of Native folks through CHM, Native people's stories and representation have been stymied from meaningfully emerging there in numerous ways.

Interpretations of CHM as inherently colonial informed by own perspective when I visited in July 2023. I understood the mountain as a desecration of sacred land stolen from

[96] Marshall, *The Journey of Crazy Horse*, 1.

Native people and used to reaffirm methods of White self-aggrandizement. Visiting the memorial shifted my perspective of the site from one of explicitly supporting neoliberal colonialism to a place of unintentional articulations of what it means to be American, Indigenous, and living in the Western United States. I saw the mountain statue, sat through an orientation film, walked through multiple museums, and watched part of a jingle dance demonstration during my visit and found articulations of identity embodied throughout.

I was one of hundreds of people at CHM the day I visited. The memorial was well patronized which allowed its messaging to be received by a large audience. CHM is a rhetorical place that influences visitor's perceptions of Native identity and is supported by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people alike. Through its creation of public memory, a specific articulation of Native identity is presented to the U.S. population.

I will start this chapter by explaining the history and context of CHM that these memories are being formed around and within. I will then explain how CHM strives to remediate the public memory articulated at Mount Rushmore—a mere 24 miles away—through its representation of Native cultures and peoples at the memorial and public facing aspects of the organization. I next explain why these remediation efforts are stymied through other components of the memorial. These include centering the White sculptor and Euro-American values, presenting nature as manageable, and emphasizing Euro-American perceptions of ownership. At the end of this chapter, I argue CHM articulates Native American identities as ownable, allowing Native American communities to be commodified in both tangible ways through the ownership of land as well as intangible ways through possessing stories and ideas.

History and Context

The Black Hills in present day South Dakota (and a small sliver of Wyoming) are "considered sacred by its original residents."[97] They revere it as an important place. For these Indigenous communities, the location's value was not born from monetization or profit, but from history and tradition. When the U.S. government began negotiating treaties to make westward settler-colonialism as easy as possible, they originally agreed to respect the Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota rights to their homeland in the Black Hills.[98] This agreement was not respected by U.S. soldiers and civilians for long and met the fate of many other treaties as the U.S. disregarded its promises. Gold was discovered in the Black Hills which encouraged many settlers to invade the land, contrary to promises made in the original treaty.[99] Instead of condemning and striving to remove their citizens, the U.S. government encouraged the homesteading of Indigenous land for profit. Quickly, the land ensured to and protected by the Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota people shrunk to a small reservation while the gold rich land of the Black Hills was being occupied by the U.S. government.

The government's occupation of the land quickly shifted to utilization as they began construction of Mount Rushmore 50 years after Indigenous people were forcefully relocated in 1877.[100] Mount Rushmore represents four U.S. presidents and was under construction from 1927 to 1941. The stated goal of the project was to increase the employment of civilians in the region and to revitalize South Dakota's economy through tourism in the Black Hills.[101] Part of the appeal of the faces on the mountain is simply its oddness.[102] There was very little around the

[97] Jarvis, "Who Speaks for Crazy Horse?: The World's Largest Monument Is Decades in the Making and More than a Little Controversial."
[98] Magazine and Cutlip, "In 1868, Two Nations Made a Treaty, the U.S. Broke It and Plains Indian Tribes Are Still Seeking Justice."
[99] Marshall, *The Journey of Crazy Horse*, 198–200.
[100] Marshall, 276.
[101] Blair and Michel, "The Rushmore Effect: Ethos and National Collective Identity," 157.
[102] Blair and Michel, 156–58.

statue when it was first constructed making it seem a peculiar location for a project meant to celebrate U.S. greatness. The bareness of infrastructure in the area did not last long or dissuade people from developing other attractions for visitors to Mount Rushmore.[103]

Critics of Mount Rushmore have frequently discussed the White-centric nature of the memorial. Gutzon Borglum, the original sculptor of the four White presidents, espoused White-supremacist views and choose the presidents based on their alignment with what he thought the U.S. *should* look like.[104] In an effort to celebrate U.S. greatness, Borglum refused to incorporate any non-White men into the statue leading to the rejection of prominent figures such as Lakota Chief Red Cloud and Susan B. Anthony on the mountain.[105] Centering Whiteness dismisses other voices which leads to Native people being minimized at the monument. Native people protested Mount Rushmore in the 1970s which highlights the inadequacy of the memorial to speak to multiple groups, leading to the creation of projects to speak to or against the mountain statue of four presidents.

One project built in response to Mount Rushmore was the mountain statue of Thašúŋke Witkó, long known in Euro-American culture as Crazy Horse. In 1939, shortly before the statue of four presidents was completed, Chief Henry Standing Bear approached the increasingly famous Polish-American sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski and asked him to "[c]arve us a mountain so that the white man will know the Red man had great heroes also."[106] As Standing Bear's statement suggests, the goal of the proposed monument was positive representation of Indigenous people in a way that would make sense to the broader U.S. population. Said otherwise: if Mount Rushmore was created to reinforce the assumed grandeur of the U.S.

[103] Blair and Michel, 171–72.
[104] "The Sordid History of Mount Rushmore | History| Smithsonian Magazine."
[105] Feuerherd, "The Unlikely Reason Why Mount Rushmore Exists."
[106] Crazy Horse Memorial, *Indian Museum of North America*.

government, its presidents, and ability of invasive American citizens to use the land, CHM was envisioned to challenge that memory in terms legible to South Dakota's numerous tourists. Standing Bear strove to challenge the normalization of U.S. grandeur through the celebration of Euro-American figures by presenting Native heroes to the broader population that embody the positive components other national heroes already embody, resulting in a linkage between the positive interpretations of American heroes with Native communities. But while rhetorically adept, such a plan had a key issue at its core: to the extent that CHM was legible to U.S. citizens, it was not in alignment with Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota values.

But given Standing Bear's aim, Korczak Ziolkowski was a fitting sculptor for the project. Ziolkowski moved to the Black Hills and began working on CHM shortly after Mount Rushmore was completed. Standing Bear heard of the sculptor after he won an award for Best Statue in the 1939 New York World's Fair.[107] Ziolkowski had also worked on Mount Rushmore which furthers the connection and juxtaposition to CHM. Despite Mount Rushmore's development and continued westward expansion, the Black Hills still lacked significant infrastructure requiring Ziolkowski to homestead the land, build log cabins, and find additional sources of income for his family. From 1948 when he moved to the Black Hills to his death in 1982, he was primary lead on the project with his wife, Ruth Ziolkowski, supporting him and having children that also helped carve the mountain.[108] Ruth began managing the project after her husband's death and followed his example of leading till her death in 2014. CHM in the present is managed by a board of directors who operate the multiple facets of the memorial such as hiring, development, and public outreach. The memorial has changed over time as people become involved with or

[107] Tully, "Korczak Ziolkowski: Storyteller in Stone," 59.
[108] Tully, "Korczak Ziolkowski: Storyteller in Stone."

leave the project, but the purpose of constructing a mountain statue in the Black Hills to bolster Native representation has remained consistent.

Figure 1: Replica statue of Thašúŋke Witkó in front of mountain. Photo by author.

The Black Hills have always been sacred. Their importance in the eyes of the U.S. public have changed as gold was discovered and Mount Rushmore was constructed. Resistance to the settler colonialist messages present within the presidents' statues prompted the creation of Thašúŋke Witkó's statue, bringing Ziolkowski from the East coast into "the heart of all things." It was in the Black Hills he started his family and began construction on the statue to create positive representation of Native people. Even after his death, the project continued and is still under construction with no clear end in sight.

Remediation Efforts

The original hope of Standing Bear to increase positive representation for Native people is seen through multiple aspects of CHM, including the mountain statue itself. This was done in response to the construction of Mount Rushmore which prioritizes White grandeur and praises settler colonialism in America, reinforcing White supremacy in public memory. Thašúŋke

Witkó's statue speaks to and resists this memory. The memorial remediates negative memories and perceptions through presenting Native cultures, incorporating members of local native communities in the memorial, and financing public facing works that allow CHM to go beyond the statue in the Black Hills.

Contemporary CHM houses The Indian Museum of North America® which displays a variety of items with varying cultural significance and presents Native cultures as complex, rational, integral, and beautiful. The memorial attempts to change public memory from a monolithic interpretation of history that collapses Native cultures into a two-dimension box and strives to remediate public memory through CHM's presentation of Native cultures and their complex values. One display in CHM clearly presents the complex values of Native cultures. Mounted on a load bearing pillar in the museum hangs a cradleboard with white, blue, green, and black beadwork. A plaque underneath explains that cradleboards are tools to make carrying children while traveling safer and easier while also incorporating beadwork that displays "traditional tribal designs as well as beautifully expressing the family's pride in the child." The device holds multiple cultural values such as family, tradition, and functionality, all of which resist collapsing Native cultures into a shallow representation of values. This is one item on display in the museum with many more articulating complex characteristics of Native cultures. Cases are filled with knifes, shoes, beadwork, bone carvings, and much more with each item reflecting a unique set of values manifest in each respective culture. CHM expresses the depth of Native cultures and their values which aids in shifting public memory away from a shallow understanding of Indigenous communities.

The complexity is furthered through the presence of Native people working throughout the memorial and featured within the organization. Public memory around Native people has

presented them as existing in a different time or place from the contemporary moment, making their presence in CHM remediate past stories connected to Native work ethic and their ability to contribute to a broader collective. Native-coded clothes such as beaded lanyards or a jingle dress as well as visitors being informed that many employees at CHM are Native highlights their presence in the space. While visiting, a jingle dance demonstration was being performed on the Viewing Veranda by a Native woman in a sparkling dress as she explained the significance of the dance. Her labor reflects the voluntary and paid employment of Native people within CHM. The presence of Indigenous people is not only through bodies, but names and contribution to the organization through physical and organizational labor to CHM operations. Chief Executive Officer Whitney A. Rencountre II (Crow Creek Hunkpati Dakota) is featured on CHM's website as influential to the organization, providing another point of remediation. A Native individual is leading the organization as it strives to create positive representation. The presence of Native bodies remediates racist memories that corelate Native people with historic artifacts and nonproductive bodies that are incapable of contributing to society at large.

Figure 2: Jingle dance demonstration. Photo by author.

The final primary method of remediation exercised at CHM is the utilization of public facing works. Aspects of the memorial, such as the Indian University of North America® (a

college readiness program), intentionally connects CHM with systems outside of the site to allow it to accomplish more than simply housing a statue. The local community is tied to CHM through this college readiness program, which complexifies the messages and impact of the memorial beyond displays and videos towards something that makes a tangible difference. The program is the most powerful and prominent component of CHM that ties itself to the community, but there are other parts that strive to accomplish a similar goal. A conference space is made available for a variety of uses such as a "conference, seminar, class, board meeting, retreat, family reunion, or other special event."[109] People are able to use the space for more than just a visit, creating an opportunity for it to connect to other components of their lives. Both the college readiness program and the availability of the conference space ties the memorial to multiple parts of the public and develops a complex representation of Native communities for how they are tied to the broader population.

CHM was founded to resist public memories formed by artifacts such as Mount Rushmore. The presence of culturally important items indicates the complex values, stories, and lived experiences of the different people Indigenous to North America. Native people working at and supporting the memorial reflect their continued presence on the land instead of relegating them to the past. CHM's public face emphasizes the positive components of Native stories previously overlooked and undermined by the broader U.S. populous. A change in public memory is needed to more accurately tell the story of Native people and CHM strives to meet that need through their displays reflecting complex cultures, integrating Native people into their workforce, and bolster public facing works that connect the memorial to the local communities.

[109] "Our Campus."

Stymying Components

CHM intentionally resists memories and stories created by nearby Mount Rushmore in an effort to more accurately and respectfully present Native identities to the public. But while these efforts are both clear and intentional, I argue they are ultimately unsuccessful due to other components of the memorial that stymie these remediation efforts. In other words: I argue that messages within the memorial present a different articulation of Native American identity from what Standing Bear originally intended, reducing the effectiveness of the memorial's other components that remediate memories regarding White settler-colonialism. In this section, I analyze CHM's origin story, its connection with nature, and the importance of proprietorship as primary components that result in stymied memories.

CHM's origin story and values

Stories are an integral component of CHM with its origin story both central to and prominently featured throughout the memorial. First introduced within CHM's orientation film, the story of the memorial brings to light why Standing Bear strove to remediate public memories through a mountain statue. But, through the memorial's origin story, remediation efforts are stymied. As we will see, this is because the film that tells visitors the memorial's origin story reaffirms White values in multicultural spaces, centers Ziolkowski's story, and maintains settler colonialism's continued practice.

CHM's origin story is presented to visitors after walking through the main entrance to CHM. There, visitors see two theatre entrances clearly marked to the left. Regular overhead announcements share when the 24-minute film will be starting and in which theater. The flow of the memorial encourages visitors to watch the orientation film first through its close proximity to the front entrance of the memorial and the short wait time between each viewing. It is convenient

to watch the film that is branded as the beginning of the memorial, making it crucial to understanding what messages CHM shares with many of its visitors as well as how visitors are primed to view other aspects of the memorial. The film explains the history of the memorial from its inception to the film's creation in 2020.

The first 5-minutes of the film centers Standing Bear and discusses the rationale behind the project which stymies remediation efforts by emphasizing Euro-American communication practices as correct. The Lakota chief is discussed as the catalyst who invited Ziolkowski to the Black Hills and proposed the project be a mountain statue to juxtapose Mount Rushmore. His story begins as a young boy at Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania, the first government-run Native American boarding school. The film does not discuss the history of Native American boarding schools in the United States as places where cultural genocide was practiced, children died from abuse and neglect, and families were destroyed because of the removal of children for many years.[110] His school records say he attended school from 1883-1991. While he was only in school for 8 years, Carlisle remained open till 1918 and over that time, many students died with 186 children being buried on the land which is now home to the U.S. Army War College. The complexity and tragedy of attending boarding schools is not discussed within the film, and instead is simply presented as the place where Standing Bear adopted the position that the best way to preserve Native culture is to adopt Western rhetoric. The implications for his acceptance of this position indicate he was impacted by the "kill the Indian, save the man" mentality that led boarding schools to abuse many children. He understood the value of preserving Native American culture and teaching its value to the White supremacist culture while also felt there must be concessions through the adoption of Euro-American methods of communication.

[110] "Carlisle Indian School Project - Richard Henry Pratt Carlisle Indian School."

Centering Euro-American rhetorics and communication practices stymies attempts to integrate other communication practices such as Native American rhetorics, reducing CHM's ability to remediate memories that continuously dismiss Native practices.

Standing Bear's short story jumps from his time at the boarding school where he learned White customs to the 1930s when he asked Ziolkowski to carve a statue to show White people that Native Americans are also honorable, heroic, and worthy of respect. Using modes and values coherent to Euro-Americans emphasizes them as the intended audience for the memorial, requiring the site to adapt to their perspectives. This project was intended to build from Mount Rushmore's messaging, making the massive mountain statue of Thašúŋke Witkó legible as an articulation of Indigenous heroism, respect, and value. Standing Bear intentionally chose representation legible to the broader U.S. population because he had learned in his time at boarding school that information about Indigenous people needed to be presented in a particular way for non-Indigenous communities to understand.[111] The influence of White supremacy means that it is not only White voices and people that are highly valued, but also the stories and symbols that reaffirm and support those expectations.[112] Attempts by CHM to push against those stories and symbols are hindered by the intentional construction of the memorial which strives to be legible to Euro-Americans in particular. Listening to the story of the Lakota chief allows visitors to reaffirm the value of White American culture and see CHM as a project that supports and is desired by Native people.

As opposed to Standing Bear's brief introduction in the CHM film origin story, the story of White sculptor Ziolkowski takes up a substantial portion of the 24-minute film. The focus on Ziolkowski brings to light multiple ideologies presented within CHM such as the inherent value

[111] "Henry Standing Bear (Kills Little) Student File | Carlisle Indian School Digital Resource Center."
[112] Bonds and Inwood, "Beyond White Privilege: Geographies of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism."

of hard work, rejection of all government assistance, and expectation of men in a family leading decision. The emphasis on hard work is first presented through Ziolkowski's embodiment of the American dream, which supports Euro-American values and stymies opportunities for different articulations of labor to be valued. His parents immigrated from Poland and died when he was young, leaving him to find his own way in the world. Instead of receiving a formal education in art, he taught himself and became skilled enough to win an award at the World's Fair. The hard work he put into his craft led to the request from Standing Bear and allowed him to embark West as the leader of a major project. These accomplishments are meant to praise Ziolkowski instead of highlighting potential shortcomings and concerns this method of schooling can create for larger projects (such as the statue of Thašúŋke Witkó). Ziolkowski's story presents him as hardworking, competent, talented, and capable of overcoming obstacles, which reinforces Euro-American values as opposed to remediating memories that have frequently dismissed Native voices in the past.

Public memory is continuously stymied in the orientation film through its emphasis of neoliberal values which supports Euro-American beliefs for how private organizations and businesses should function. Presenting the sculptor as competent justifies his rejection of government assistance which is carried into the contemporary moment. After Standing Bear asked him to carve a statue, Ziolkowski traveled to the Black Hills with a crew of people. The only details provided about this crew is that Ruth Ross was part of that original group and she soon married Ziolkowski. No other outside workers or trained sculptors are presented in the film despite additional help being present in the beginning. Help is seen as unnecessary, especially from government forces. Such an absence both minimizes the diversity of others who participates in the project—who might complicate the White savior narrative of Ziolkowski—

and also emphasizes Western value of the individual. The story continues with Ziolkowski slowly and intentionally developing infrastructure such as building houses, clearing trees, and carving steps to make access to the mountain easier. The film explains the slow progress of the project as being due to the meticulous nature of Ziolkowski who wants to make sure everything is done right (since a dynamite blast cannot be reversed), justifying the project's 75-year history with no end in sight. As the story continues, Ziolkowski's hard work, stubbornness, and quality of character is developed through his frugal use of an old compressor called Buda that regularly shut off and forced him to climb down the mountain multiple times a day to restart it. The challenges he faced with aged equipment did not push him to accept outside aid. He was resolute in his decision that all funding for the project would come from donations, patrons of his family's dairy farm, and visitors to the mountain statue. The lack of state and federal funding is emphasized within the film and articulated throughout the memorial from the entrance booths where fees are paid to the brochures visitors carry around with them. It was Ziolkowski's desire that the project be done slowly, correctly, and through self-funding which is what guided Ruth's management of the project after Ziolkowski's death in 1982. Continuously validating neoliberal values recenters Euro-American voices throughout the memorial and stymies remediation efforts to present different cultural perspectives.

Even after his death, Ziolkowski's voice and desires are centered within CHM which reflects the patriarchal nature of the memorial due to the continues discussion of the man as the leader of the project and stymies attempts to present different cultural values where men are not the only voices that matter. Ziolkowski's story does not stop after his death but continues through his family who is still involved in the management of the project. Ruth took up her husband's position and held it till her death in 2014. After that, the project became controlled by a board of

directors with many decedents of Ziolkowski connected to the project. Continued involvement presents the story of Ziolkowski as a family-man who worked on a family-run project that took time to do correctly and should not be rushed to completion. Ziolkowski's story never really ends within the film because he becomes imbued within the present state of the project as its original sculptor and origin point for many of the people involved. His narrative presents a particular interpretation of Western ideals that emphasizes hard work over all other traits, shuns government support, and sees family as a patriarchal construction with the father being the legacy and lead on decisions.

The story of Ziolkowski builds on the story of the Western settler that is imbued throughout the film which reinforces and normalizes settler colonialism in America instead of challenging public memory around land ownership. Within an individualistic culture, it is not surprising the story of Ziolkowski is the center of the film with other people included as they pertains to his story. Throughout the individual story of the sculptor, there is a larger story at play of people moving West and homesteading on land originally promised to Native American communities. Ziolkowski is praised in his story as a survivor who can accomplish incredible feats, but this does not completely obscure the story of settler Americans migrating West at the expense of Native peoples. The memorial is named after Thašúŋke Witkó who is remembered as an accomplished warrior because he fought his entire life to prevent his people from losing their way of life by killing U.S. soldiers and civilians who settled on Native land unlawfully according to signed treaties.[113] He fought to prevent this invasion and is being respected through the homesteading of the Ziolkowski family, their continued presence in the place, and abundance of White visitors who support the memorial through their patronage. This story presents the irony

[113] Marshall, *The Journey of Crazy Horse*.

of Native people resisting the loss of their lands and lives only to be valorized by the descendants of people who live on stolen land. The stories of individual settlers are seen as justified acts of survival. Within my own family, the hardships my ancestors faced when homesteading are seen as great accomplishments we should praise. It is not the individual who is responsible for stealing Native land. The story of how landownership has continued over time in the Western United States is presented as a collective mistake but an individual victory. Ziolkowski embodies the story of many settlers in the West through the continued valorization of hardship, perseverance, and utilization of land in order to survive, stymying remediation efforts that attempt to tell a different story about settler colonialism.

CHM's origin story diminishes the effectiveness of remediation efforts within the memorial by centering Euro-American values, focusing on Ziolkowski's story, and praising settler colonialism on the land. These are the opening messages within CHM that create the lens to view the rest of the memorial, allowing visitors to maintain and perpetuate the centering of Euro-American voices within history. Centering values and stories not shared by the Indigenous people being represented overturns the progress made through remediation efforts.

Nature as manageable

CHM also stymies changes to public memory by emphasizing Euro-American perceptions of nature that present it as able to be managed by humans. Native people are frequently associated with nature, so it is expected for the memorial to discuss nature in some way. However, the memorial focuses on nature as it relates to human control and manipulation in order to articulate the importance of human-agency as opposed to discussing the cultural importance of nature. This perspective builds to a larger understanding of nature as manageable

and subsequently, so are Native people. The articulation of nature as manageable is accomplished through the long journey to the memorial, frequently seeing the outdoors from within the complex, and the intentional use of construction materials that resemble natural elements.

Before discussing nature as manageable, it is important to emphasize the cultural and discursive connection between Native people and nature. Native Americans are frequently associated with nature as "tribal cultural identities continue to be deeply rooted in the natural world."[114] Nature is an integral component of many Native cultures, but this does not inherently create a connotation of Native as natural. This link is formed through external discourses that collapse Native people, artifacts, histories, and ruins as parts of nature resulting in Native people being intrinsically linked to nature in ways distinct from other communities.[115] Native people are presented as inherently tied to nature which is continuously felt throughout CHM as it strengthens this tie through their representation of both. As I will argue later in this section, nature is made highly visible through the construction of CHM which strengthens the tie between nature and Native representation. Branded as a space that represents Native culture, CHM's emphasis and ties to nature reinforces the discourse of Native people being inherently part of nature.

A primary physical characteristic of the place that influences visitors is the distance from the memorial to any other location. CHM is only accessible by driving on a highway, making the journey a crucial aspect of the memorial itself. Rapid City is almost an hour away from the memorial and is the nearest city leading to much of the drive bringing to light the natural beauty of "the heart of it all." Roads through the Black Hills are filled with tall pine trees and curving roads that follow the ebb and flow of rivers through the landscape. The forests and rivers are

[114] Cordalis and Suagee, "The Effects of Climate Change on American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes," 45.
[115] Derek, "Culture as Nature: How Native American Cultural Antiquities Became Part of the Natural World."

natural and disconnected from the urban development many Americans live in. Many other businesses around CHM and Mount Rushmore are easy to see from far away, giving visitors time to consider a spontaneous visit. A visitor cannot easily walk from a different business to the memorial because there are no other businesses close to CHM and it is challenging to see the memorial in advance and stop spontaneously. Between its distance from other attractions and difficulty to see along the road, visitors need to exert some effort to plan a trip and arrive at the memorial. The memorial is challenging to reach which makes the journey feel like an accomplishment. People overcome nature by arriving at CHM while also continuously seeing the numerous ways humans have altered the landscape to fit their needs. Driving along the human-constructed roads with visible infrastructure such as telephone lines and railroad tracks brings to light the multitude of ways people have learned to manage and tame wilderness. As visitors travel to the memorial, nature is presented as conquered and manageable from the outside which is furthered from within the memorial.

Travelers spend a large portion of time in nature before arriving at their destination, linking the external drive to the interior components of CHM. Visitors are primed to associate the natural beauty of the Black Hills with the memorial itself. This connection to nature is a consistent factor when discussing the materiality of CHM. The link between nature and CHM increases the memorials connection to place and belonging in the Black Hills and it is through this interweaving of ideas the memorial reaffirms its correctness and belonging. Visitors are primed to connect the memorial to nature through their trip to the location which is then solidified through two major aspects of CHM. The first is the continued efforts to see nature through large windows and while standing outside. The second aspect is the material construction of the memorial with open facing wood and river stones.

The outdoors are seen continuously seen while visiting CHM through large windows and intentionally maintained sections of forest around the buildings. While arriving at the memorial, the road and parking lot are lined by the same tall pine trees seen during the drive. Walking outside of the memorial onto either the Viewing Veranda or small statue garden bring those trees back into focus as they line the memorial's borders and the horizon while gazing at the mountain statue. Even from indoors, the trees are still present and emphasize the memorial's location in the Black Hills. Both floor-to-ceiling windows and small stained-glass outlooks give visitors the opportunity to view the pines and reaffirm they are in a place closely connected to nature.

The construction materials used by CHM also alludes to nature despite the features being manufactured. The exterior of the memorial is made from wood paneling and stone siding made from smooth river stones, making the architecture fit within the natural landscape of the Black Hills. This impression is furthered inside CHM through floor to ceiling wood paneling and large windows, making visitors feel they are in a space that is organic and natural. Tying the memorial to nature also ties the displays to the organic and authentic aspects of nature. Instead of being a space of cold steel and concrete filled with constructed interpretations of reality, CHM uses natural resources which leads to interpretations of the space as more authentic and aligned with the values of Native Americans as they are heavily emphasized as being connected to the land and nature. The physical construction of the memorial bolsters the connection between CHM, nature, and Native American communities.

Centering the natural components of the memorial by making trees highly visible and using natural construction materials builds towards the primary message communicated through the materiality of CHM: humans manage land. Nature is curated by the memorial as a component that enhances the mountain statue within the Black Hills. Despite the memorial being entirely

fabricated (human carved mountain, constructed buildings, curated vistas, etc.), the natural components of the space are emphasized by directing visitors to the trees Ruth Ziolkowski cut down, the stone debris brought into the memorial as souvenirs, and warning visitors of inclement weather that may push people indoors for safety. Nature is relevant as far as people have impacted it and are capable of managing its impact in turn. Through the management of nature comes the overarching message and articulation of Native identity. Nature is continuously emphasized, but only as it relates to what humans are able to control. Place is presented as a thing that humans can dominate, and it is through that domination that meaning is made.

Figure 3: Souvenir rocks from the mountain statue. Photo by author.

Nature is imbued throughout CHM. When the memorial addresses natural components, it is through a lens of management. Native representation and culture are also imbued throughout the site and closely tied to nature. Through CHM's representation of nature as manageable and the connection between Native people and nature, Native people are also presented as manageable. Connecting Native people to nature and presenting nature as manageable leads to the message of Native people being manageable in the same way. Orienting visitors towards the

natural world as it relates to human creation increases the authority of the creators of CHM while diminishing the agency of place as integral to understanding the broader memorial.

Euro-American ownership

The final primary component of CHM that stymies remediation efforts is the continued emphasis of ownership. Perspectives on ownership and property differ based on culture, leading to Euro-Americans and Native Americans viewing ownership differently.[116] CHM discusses ownership through a Euro-American lens, continuously recentering non-Native values. From the glass displays to the copyright of Crazy Horse's image, CHM emphasizes their possession of objects and ideas in alignment with traditional Euro-American values of property, monetization, and control.

When visitors arrive at the ticket booths to pay the entrance fee, they can catch their first glimpse of the mountain statue which is obscured by hills and trees along the main roads around the memorial. Paying to enter also means paying to see the mountain statue, requiring commodification of the land since money is needed to gain access. Managing who can enter reflects ownership of the space. The land that intends to memorialize Native American cultures reinforces Euro-American perspectives of land and ownership, which largely have differing views of what land can be owned and by whom. This perspective is continuously reinforced throughout the memorial as it discusses CHM's control over the mountain and adjacent land through construction, demolition, and management. In the orientation film, the land is presented as under the sole control of CHM and the Ziolkowski family. Throughout the memorial, the prioritization of the memorial on the land as it involves CHM emphasizes that the land is not for

[116] Rifkin, *Beyond Settler Time*, 169.

public use, but for private development because the organization owns it. Refusing federal and state aid reinforces this perspective by articulating neoliberal views of ownership, government intervention, and individualistic success.[117] From a neoliberal worldview, organizations work best when they have minimal government control, are operated in a free market system, and aid in individualistic success. This framework is understood as natural and expected within CHM which articulates a broader understanding of which cultural norms should be prioritized in multi-cultural spaces. If land can be owned and managed by a private entity, it should be. Euro-American values are reinforced through the articulated position of naturalized land ownership.

The ownership of items is also seen as natural within CHM. The entrance to the memorial is also the start of The Indian Museum of North America® with glass cases filled with Native American bead work, clothes, bone work, art, and other items crafted by or for Indigenous communities. Each item is identified with a small plaque labeling the object and sometimes who donated it, where they are from, and the object's tribe of origin. Three prominent display cases in the room have labels indicating everything in the case was donated by a family or individual who owned the items. The Bud Duhamed, Borman Family, and Charles Eder Collections are easily visible with large signs and prominent locations. Because they are placed near the entrance to the museum and memorial, they establish a tone through which visitors identify other objects in the space. Those items were owned by someone and entitled to credit for its display at CHM. Presenting these objects as possessions managed by individuals articulates a continuously problematic view of Native American artwork and culture as commodities and artifacts that are from the past and belong in museums to be displayed instead of possessed by Native American communities. Donations are given by Native and non-Native individuals alike, but this does not

[117] Brown, *In the Ruins of Neoliberalism*.

diminish the impression these items are old artifacts of a time now past instead of representations of present and vibrant cultures in the world. The museum displays articulate the idea that Native American cultures can be owned by those outside of it. No matter who you are or where you are from, you can own 'artifacts' from Native people which further objectifies and invalidates the lives and experiences of Indigenous people today.

Figure 4: Borman Family Collection display. Photo by author.

Ownership of ideas and objects is not all CHM claims to have. There is an impression of ownership for the stories of Native Americans within the memorial due to its mission statement, names for different aspects of the memorial, and efforts to maintain a firm copyright for Crazy Horse the person. The mission of CHM is to "protect and preserve the culture, tradition, and living heritage of the North American Indians" which is done through "acting as a repository of Native American artifacts, arts, and crafts," continuing to carve the mountain statue of Thašúŋke Witkó, "establishing and operating The Indian University of North American®," and "providing educational and cultural programming to encourage harmony and reconciliation among all peoples and nations." This mission statement presents CHM as the managers who are responsible for overseeing the stories of Native people, guiding reconciliation, and presenting the value of Native communities to the broader population. CHM preserves, protects, and manages the

information shared to visitors about Native communities and stories. The scope of who is included in this mission is vast since it includes all Native people in North America, but the diversity of cultures and people within that entire continent is not expressed in CHM. A large quantity of items within The Indian Museum of North America® are from the Lakota, Nakota, Dakota, Cheyenne, and Navajo people, who are only a small percentage of the number of Native communities within North America. The most diverse demonstration of these communities is within the Native American Educational and Cultural Center which is lined by flags of Native nations and has a binder in one corner listing the nation and place of origin for the over 100 flags hung overhead. The size and scope of these flags is impressive but noticeably lacking. There are no flags from any communities south of the U.S./Mexico border and there are certainly more than 100 Native tribes within North America. CHM makes it clear that the flags are donated by representatives of the different nations instead of being accrued by the memorial itself. Even with this lack of control on the part of CHM, there is an apparent gap between who is represented through the flags and who CHM claims to represent. The memorial's mission is to "protect and preserve the culture, tradition, and living heritage of North American Indians," yet does not represent all Native communities in North America in the space where there is supposedly the most representation. The identity of "Indian" is collapsed into the select ones present within CHM.

Centering particular communities is reinforced through the naming of different elements of the memorial. CHM has three primary components: the mountain statue, the visitors center with four museums, and the Indian University of North America®. The name of each component reflects who is included, excluded, and prioritized within each space. The Crazy Horse mountain carving is where the entire memorial began and reflects who is invited into the space. As

discussed earlier, Crazy Horse was not the name the Oglala Lakota warrior would have been called when alive. He was known as Thašúŋke Witkó with Crazy Horse being the anglicized version of his name. While "Thašúŋke Witkó" appears within the memorial a couple of times, centering the anglicized version of his name in the title of the memorial centers Euro-American visitors as belonging and given space to experience Native American culture in a familiar way. This impression continues through the naming of the museums. The Indian Museum of North America® and The Native American Heritage and Cultural Center® prime visitors for information about Native people from all over North America. How these museums are named creates the anticipation for a large breadth of information. This expectation is inadequately met through the heavy emphasis of certain communities within the museums, but this gap is not discussed leaving visitors with the impression that this information is truly speaking for all Native Americans. The last two museums present different expectations through their naming. Mountain Carving Gallery® and Sculptors Home & Studio® have vague names for people who have not already walked through the other parts of the memorial. For visitors who have already watched the orientation film and walked through multiple parts of the memorial, these names help prepare visitors to learn more about Ziolkowski and his mountain carving. Focusing on the statue and Ziolkowski reinforces what the focus of the memorial truly is: the carving and its sculptor. Two museums prepare visitors for an exhaustive representation of Native people but only receive a small portion of the diverse cultures in North America, while the other two recenter visitors to the mountain carving that has been heavily critiqued and resisted.

The final component of naming within the memorial that reflects Euro-American ownership is the effort CHM has exerted to emphasize and maintain a copyright and trademark on the name Crazy Horse. Thašúŋke Witkó is a prominent historical figure whose image has

been used "for motorcycle gear, whiskey, rifles, and, of course, strip and exotic dance clubs."[118] The widely recognized name has been the center of many lawsuits as CHM tries to maintain its firm control over their copyright of Crazy Horse. While the memorial is claiming to do this to preserve his legacy, they have resisted having the image of Thašúŋke Witkó placed on the South Dakota state quarter "because doing so would have put the image in the public domain." Managing the copyright and emphasizing the trademarked nature of all aspects of the memorial with consistent use of © and ® on their website, brochure, and signage reflect the Euro-American perception of ownership embedded throughout the memorial. The name and image of Thašúŋke Witkó is a commodity the memorial is striving to control and manage instead of trying to use everything in their power to let "the white man…know the Red man had great heroes also."

CHM monetizes land, objects, and public figures in alignment with Euro-American values which reinforces colonial mindsets of commodification. Land is presented as private property that has selective connections the public. Items of cultural importance are owned, managed, and displayed for the entertainment of visitors. CHM maintains firm copyright and trademark control on all elements of their organization, prioritizing their private management of public facing works. Through the commodification of land, objects, and branding, CHM undermines Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota values and emphasizes Euro-American perceptions of ownership.

[118] Jarvis, "Who Speaks for Crazy Horse?: The World's Largest Monument Is Decades in the Making and More than a Little Controversial."

Conclusion: Native American identity as ownable

CHM was constructed in response to Mount Rushmore as a site of public memory to remediate representation of Native Americans and has been unsuccessful in truly changing public memory because of contradictory components within the memorial. The complex representation of a variety of Native cultures is undermined by the celebration of Euro-American values, validation of settler colonialism, and centering of the Ziolkowski family while trying to understand the memorial. Intentional engagement with Native people throughout the functioning of the organization promote a diverse workforce but is minimized through the connection of nature and Native people as manageable. Public facing works are made apparent, yet each aspect of CHM is intentionally marked with trademark or copyright labels to indicate they are the private and intellectual property of the organization. Despite good intentions to change public memory, CHM is filled with components that stymie positive change and articulate particular interpretations of Native American identity.

Combining each aspect of the memorial leads to the broader articulation of Native American identity as ownable by others. Native cultures are represented as diverse and complex, while also being less valuable than dominant Euro-American perspectives. Diminished value for Native cultures in comparison to dominant cultures reinforces the connection between Native people and nature through the objectification of both. If Native people are linked with nature and nature is manageable, Native identity can be owned and monetized in the same way nature can be. Each aspect of CHM that stymies remediation builds towards an understanding of Native people as different from other communities, comparable to non-human entities, and a resource to be managed by an organization. CHM's articulations of Native American identity as lesser than Euro-American, connected to nature, and understood through a lens of property comes together to present Native people, culture, and identity as ownable. Visitors watching, walking, and

waiting throughout CHM are continuously sent messages that present Native identity as a property to be owned and possessed by others. They are commodifiable entities making their relevance only importance insofar as organizations can make money from them.

Understanding Native American identities as ownable reaffirms the settler colonial myth of vast expanse of North America being open and ownable. The possession of tangible resources paired with the ownability of Native identity decreases concerns with buying land. If Native people are the only barrier to owning land and they can be managed through the same type of commodification, there are no obstacles in the way of extending Euro-American control westward. Continuing to buy, own, and sell property is presented as a natural course of action in the contemporary moment, dismissing continued efforts to return land to Indigenous communities or simply respecting treaty agreements for "ownable" things such as water- and hunting-rights. Commodifying Native people pushes this normative discourse further into a place of being able to buy more than just the tangible, but also the intangible such as spiritual practices, names for non-Native entities, and stories used by media corporations. Native identities as "ownable" fits within and supports the same social values that normalize "Native American" Retreats, Jeep's Grand Cherokee, and Disney's Pocahontas. Each example benefits from the commodification of Native ideas, continuing colonial efforts beyond the extraction of resources and to the extortion of Native communities themselves.

Each prominent source of meaning-making within the memorial leads to implications for Native American identities as ownable to the broader culture. CHM's original goal to remediate public memory created by Mount Rushmore is partially accomplished through presenting multiple Native American cultures, integrating Native people throughout the organization, and having public facing parts of the memorial. These efforts are stymied from within the site

through the centering of the sculptor and Euro-American values, presenting nature as manageable (and Native people through association), and emphasizing non-Native values of ownership. These components that stymie memories lead to the perception that Native American identities are ownable, giving a sense of "permission" to other identities to possess and hold power over Native people.

Chapter 4- Native People in Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument: Placed in "Times Gone By"

The Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (LBN) rests on the site of the battle called by many names including Battle of Little Bighorn and Battle of Greasy Grass. Memorialized next to Crow Agency (a small town in rural Montana), the location's evolving meaning is an excellent example of how memory about historic events can change or remain the same over time. No conflicts are being fought there at the present; yet it is still a meaningful place for the construction of public memory around the Indian Wars, the legacies of General Custer and Thašúŋke Witkó, and contemporary representation of Native people. While my analysis of CHM in Chapter 3 brought to light the perception that Native identity can be owned, LBN offers a different articulation of Native identity due to distinct elements of both sites. CHM is privately owned, strives to represent Native people broadly, and centers on how humans have changed the land. LBN contrasts this as a government operated site that tells a specific story about Native people and discusses the importance of land as it is. These differences lead to different articulations of Native identity as I will discuss in this chapter.

To explain the different articulations of identity, I will discuss the history of LBN from before, during, and after the conflict. My analysis will follow beginning with efforts to remediate public memory through the guided audio tour, etched walls of the Indian Memorial, and the Spirit Warrior Memorial statue. Next, I look at the multiple ways those efforts are stymied throughout the memorial from outside elements that frame the site for visitors, information provided at the Visitors Center that orients visitors to the site, and elements of the battlefield's walking paths that tell the story of the battle. Concluding this chapter, I discuss how the combination of those two frames leads to an articulation of Native people existing in the past. Through the creation,

remediation, and resulting stymying of those created memories, I argue Native American identities are presented as existing in the past and disconnected from the present.

History and context

Before the battle in 1876, present day LBN was part of the homeland for the Crow people which ranged from the Bearpaw Mountains in Northern Montana to Wind River Valley in Central Wyoming as well as from the Yellowstone River in Southern Montana to the edges of the Black Hills in South Dakota.[119] Large portions of present-day Montana and Wyoming are the homeland for the Crow people, but they are not the Native people portrayed within LBN. The battle occurred on Crow land but did not include the Crow Nation as primary combatants. The Battle of Greasy Grass included multiple bands from the Lakota, Dakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Southern Cheyenne people as they tried to avoid forced relocation onto a reservation. LBN explains that the conflict occurred because "the Lakota and Cheyenne people left the reservation," traveled west in defiance of the broken Fort Laramie Treaty, and were attacked by General Custer and the 7th U.S. Calvary on June 25th-26th, 1876.[120] The defiance, forced relocation, encroachment by settlers, and attempts to gain land are frequent events throughout the 1800s as Native people strove to maintain their existence and the U.S. government tried to expand west.

This period is known as the Indian Wars as the U.S. government viewed Native nations as direct threats to their expansion. The Indian Wars ranged from 1851 to 1890 concluding with the "close of the frontier period" and the Massacre at Wounded Knee where the deaths of 150 Lakota people and 25 U.S. soldiers marked the last major armed conflict between Indigenous people and

[119] "Belonging to the Land - Crow Nation | Teacher Resource."
[120] National Park Service: U.S. Department of the Interior, "Little Bighorn Battlefield Brochure."

the U.S. government.[121] This period of U.S. history is largely marked by battles, forced treaties, violence by and towards U.S. settlers, and racism against Native people as they strove to maintain their livelihood, culture, and safety.[122] Conflict and resolutions with the U.S. government were not the only components of the time period. Civilian settlers seeking new opportunities for wealth and prosperity traveled west across the country despite the natural hardships of the land and the physical threat of Native people protecting their land from invasion. While some settlers moved onto land signed over to the U.S. government in treaties, others ignored these agreements and sought prosperity on Native land. These incursions led to violence against Native people by settlers and vice versa. The continuous threat of violence and increased awareness of gold and other resources in the West prompted the U.S. government to intervene, instigating the Indian Wars.[123]

Resisting communities were faced with harsh treatment. Soldiers conducted scorched-earth campaigns would burn all a community's food and possessions to decrease the ability of Native people to survive the winter or steal the reserves of food back.[124] Without prepared resources to survive the harsh winter, many communities surrendered their treaty rights for the ability to live through the winter on government food rations. Native communities were not treated well once they conceded to live on reservations. For instance, the U.S. government would send low quality and unfamiliar foods that were difficult for Native bodies to process, were moldy, or made them sick.[125] This, combined with decreased land to harvest and hunt on, led to reservations being areas of malnutrition and hardship.[126] To be on a reservation was to suffer

[121] Utley, *The Indian Frontier, 1846 - 1890*, 36, 246–49.
[122] Killsback, "The Northern Cheyenne and Arapaho," 47–50.
[123] Andersson, "The Lakota Sioux," 23–29.
[124] "The Long Walk | The Navajo Treaties."
[125] Least Heat-Moon, "A Stark Reminder of How the U.S. Forced American Indians Into a New Way of Life | History| Smithsonian Magazine."
[126] Black, "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse."

leading to many communities fighting back or trying to flee to Canada. The Lakota, Dakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Southern Cheyenne choose to leave their reservations and resist.

All of these bands came together in 1876 unbeknownst to the U.S. government who sent General Custer with the 7th Cavalry to force "hostile Indians" onto reservations.[127] Custer had gained a reputation as a military leader during the Civil War with that war glory following him into the Indian Wars as he pursued and relocated Native people.[128] While traveling west on this mission, he was accompanied by Major Marcus A. Reno and Captain Frederick W. Benteen who he sent along with three companies from the 7th Calvary in pursuit of a separate group of Indigenous people a few miles away from his final destination before learning how large the opposing force was.[129] Through his pursuit of the Lakota and Cheyenne, he found the large encampment of all the bands residing alongside the Little Bighorn River, conservatively estimated at 6,000-8,000 people. Such a large encampment and relatively small number of U.S. soldiers (around 600) did not bode well for the upcoming conflict, but that did not stop Custer from attacking the settlement. Over the course of two days, three skirmishes occurred with "Custer himself and the five companies he commanded…[being] wiped out in the second engagement."[130] The overwhelming victory for the Native people was (not unsurprisingly) framed differently for the U.S. population at the time with Custer being the center, the conflict being coined Custer's Last Stand, and his actions being identified as a heroic resistance against great odds.

Almost immediately after the battle, surviving U.S. soldiers placed markers for where their comrades died, turning the place of victory for the Native communities into a place of

[127] National Park Service: U.S. Department of the Interior, "Little Bighorn Battlefield Brochure."
[128] Russell, Hume, and Sichler, "Libbie Custer's 'Last Stand.'"
[129] National Park Service: U.S. Department of the Interior, "Little Bighorn Battlefield Brochure."
[130] Marshall, *The Journey of Crazy Horse*, 283.

mourning for the defeated. Survivors buried bodies in shallow graves after the battle and marked their remains with wooden crosses. The devasting loss by the U.S. government led many scholars to analyze the event with the hope of gleaning new insights. As one of the most heavily studied battles in U.S. history, it is a widely known instance that informs perceptions of the Indians Wars and Native Americans. According to the LBN Visitor Center, the War Department formally designated the site a national monument in 1881 and sought to honor the U.S. soldiers from the conflict with the 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial on Last Stand Hill as well as white marble headstones along the hillside where remains were removed. It was not until 1999 that fallen Native warriors were shown the same respect through red granite headstones marking where they died defending their way of life. LBN began as a space to remember U.S. soldiers and has gradually changed over time to also remember Native warriors and the grief of the Indian Wars.

Under the control of the National Parks Service, the location was called Custer Battlefield National Monument and only focused on the stories of U.S. soldiers. The American Indian Movement (AIM) protested at the memorial in 1988 "by placing a metal plaque on the 7th Cavalry mass grave at Last Stand Hill" which led to the name being changed to Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument as well as the construction of the Indian Memorial which was completed in 2013.[131] Their protest also prompted the placement of red granite headstones over the locations where Native warriors died during the conflict. In addition to incorporating more voices to LBN, the Indian Memorial is a noteworthy place of memory as "the only memorial to the Native American experience mandated by Congress and constructed with federal funds."[132] AIM's protest encouraged positive change within LBN through changing its name, adding granite headstones, and constructing a memorial that more inclusively tells the story of Native

[131] National Park Service: U.S. Department of the Interior, "Indian Memorial Brochure."
[132] National Park Service: U.S. Department of the Interior, "Indian Memorial Brochure."

participants in the conflict. Increased representation of Native people contributes to a more expansive and inclusive creation of public memory for the Battle of Greasy Grass.

LBN in the present day is a well-maintained national monument in rural Montana with multiple parts of the community tying themselves to the memorial. LBN is divided into three sections with one being the battlefield proper for the Battle of Greasy Grass, another is the Reno-Benteen Battlefield 4.5 miles away, and the final component is the Custer National Cemetery. Each part builds upon public memory with the broader community through connections to each component. The 4.5-mile drive to the Reno-Benteen Battlefield is privately owned and used as grazing land for horses, requiring a connection between visitors, the memorial, and the community around LBN. The national cemetery has a similar feature with each headstone being "decorated with a small American flag by students from Pretty Eagle Catholic School" for Memorial Day, granting people who live near Crow Agency access to the land. The battlefield of the Battle of Greasy Grass is the most famous part of the memorial as it contains Last Stand Hill. Local businesses connect themselves to the memorial through their names such as the Custer Battlefield Trading Post which is visible from the road through its large (but sun-bleached) billboards, wooden buildings, and colorful teepees. While LBN creates memories about events in the past, it is still strongly connected to the present and the people who live in it.

Just as within CHM, public memories about Native American experience have been remediated in LBN through intentional means. And just like CHM, those efforts are stymied at the same time, preventing true change from taking place. The memorial, both inside and outside, influences perceptions and interpretations of LBN. Combining its stories and place articulates a presentation of Native American identity as belonging in the past as opposed to existing (and thriving) in the present.

Remediated memories

The public memories within LBN have changed since its creation in the 1800s. The most transformative shift took place after the AIM protests in the 1980s. The movement's dissent for the presentation of public memory around the historical event pushed the memorial and the National Parks Service to increase Native representation and stories regarding the Battle of Greasy Grass. Memory has been remediated within LBN by incorporating the experiences and voices of Indigenous people through multiple influential components. This section discusses the primary methods of remediation, which are the guided audio tour integrated throughout the memorial, the etched walls within the Indian Memorial, and the Spirit Warrior Memorial.

The most famous location at LBN is Last Stand Hill. It is also the beginning of the Cell Phone Audio Tour. Last Stand Hill was the origin point for this place of memory because it is where Custer's Last Stand occurred. Along one fence (which pens in white marble headstones) is a plaque with clear instructions for how to access and use the "Dial and Discover" feature within the memorial. Visitors can dial a phone number, access a website, or scan a QR code to begin their audio tour. While it is an effort to be inclusive, the audio tour relies on phone service, which is notoriously unreliable in rural Montana. Once each audio segment has ended, visitors have the opportunity to continue listening by selecting the next locations number or stop the tour. Last Stand Hill contains the first five audio segments and alternates between perspectives from Native communities and the U.S. government during the conflict. The first stop on the audio tour is narrated by a Native person who explains this land is where their Native ancestors "prayed, lived, hunted, fought, and died" before the Battle of Greasy Grass which was a joyous victory against the U.S. government. Starting the tour with this voice and narrative centers the value of Native stories when discussing the conflict in 1876. Public memory formed within this memorial is not

solely centered on the U.S. government but incorporates the stories and experiences of Native people.

If visitors continue to listen to the audio tour, they will learn about the red granite headstones. These headstones are another way Native voices have been integrated back into public memory. The third stop in the audio tour shares the importance of the white marble and red granite headstones scattered throughout the memorial as markers that indicate where a soldier or warrior died during the conflict. White marble headstones were placed in 1890 to replace wooden crosses that marked where members of the 7th Calvary died during the Battle of Greasy Grass. Red granite headstones were placed in 1999 to mark the locations where two Native people who died in the conflict with more being created over time. As of July 2023, there were 16 red granite headstones and over 200 white marble headstones within LBN. Introducing markers for Native deaths alongside those for U.S. soldiers works to remediate memories that had only focused on the deaths of soldiers and ignored the Native experience during the battle. Deaths on all sides of the conflict are represented, mourned, and remembered within LBN.

To further this broader remembering, the Indian Memorial was commissioned and constructed in the 1990s-2000s. In contrast with Last Stand Hill's highly visible monument, the Indian Memorial is constructed inside a hill and blends in with its natural slopes. The impression of the memorial blending into the landscape is continued inside the space as the etched stone plaques curve around the border and end at the lowest slope of the hill where a wrought iron statue stretches to connect the etched stone, continuing the circle. The intentional effort to incorporate the landscape into the memorial runs counter to the harsh white constructions throughout LBN as representations of the death of U.S. soldiers. The Indian Memorial tells a

different story that focuses on the lives and experiences of Native people on both sides of the conflict through two components: the etchings and the statue.

A brochure distributed by LBN explains the etched quotes, titles, and names on the walls were selected by people from each respective community. The communities identify themselves, the people who participated or died in the battle, and a few translate their names on the stone walls. There are the Arikara (Sahnish), Apsaalooke (Children of the Large Beaked Bird), Arapaho (Hinono'eino': Blue Sky People), Cheyenne (Tsé tsêhéstâhese: The People Like Us; Só'taa'eo'e: The People Left Behind), and Oyate (We Are Allied: Dakota-Lakota-Nakota). Respect is shown for all participants by allowing all people to self-identify and include names of their choosing for people who both opposed and supported the U.S. government during the battle. Different quotes and stories are shared such as General Custer sharing a peace pipe with the Cheyenne in 1869 where he vowed to "never kill another Cheyenne" or Wooden Leg's (Cheyenne) quote in 1906 saying "we had killed soldiers who had come to kill us." All these voices and positions work together to present a different story about the battle than the one created through the 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial. On all sides, the heroism is praised, deceit is condemned, and death is mourned when remembering June 25-26th, 1876. The memory shifts from only the perspectives of U.S. soldiers to a more inclusive and complicated view of the space where death is mourned, and victory is celebrated.

These complicated emotions are expressed in art through the wrought iron statue along the hill's slope named the Spirit Warrior Memorial. The simple sculpture of three Indigenous warriors riding horses with one Indigenous woman handing a fighter a shield reflects the movement of Native people in 1876 as they rode across the same grassy plains sprawling in the background. Instead of forming a story, the statue invokes the sense of memory as if the wrought

iron is a snapshot from the past with Native people rising together in resistance. It is a still moment that the audience can imagine unfolding as the riders continue toward the battle and those left behind try their best to protect their livelihood and families. The sense of memory is amplified through the ribbons of cloth tied at different points throughout the statue. People have intentionally attached small objects as if to remember the people portrayed, making the image more real. Instead of simple caricatures of Native people during the conflict, they feel like real people who are riding and defending their communities. This statue amplifies the emotions evoked from the rest of the Indian Memorial as it makes the individuals engaging in the conflict living people who intentionally engaged in battle. Through this portion of LBN, the emotional weight of the battle where people fought and died is strengthened and forms a memory of grief for both sides in the conflict.

Figure 5: Spirit Warrior Memorial. Photo by author.

The influence of AIM's protest is clear within LBN through the intentional efforts to remediate public memory to more correctly tell the stories of Native people involved in the conflict. From the audio tour to the headstones, Native communities and the U.S. government are represented as equally important to visitors as they try to understand the space. The Indian

Memorial's etched walls and iron sculpture allow visitors to hear the stories, see the names, and imagine the battle through the eyes of the communities involved as opposed to paying sole attention to the U.S. military. Through all of these components of LBN, public memory has been changed to share the complicated emotions more accurately and respectfully around the memorial as a place of grief, joy, pride, remorse, and celebration.

Stymied stories

While good faith attempts have clearly been made to remediate memory at LBN, these efforts are not entirely successful. Indeed, just as we saw in Chapter 3, many of these remediated memories are stymied by other elements within the memorial. These other elements continuously orient visitors away from the more complex memory created through remediated rhetorics and towards a viewpoint that prioritizes the voices and stories of U.S. soldiers yet again. In doing so, prior rhetorics of Native people rooted in the past re-emerge. As previously mentioned, LBN solely represented events from the lens of colonial settlers till the 1990s. Continued orientation towards the dominant viewpoint developed a density of experiences in the space, layering and intrenching settler perspectives in the memorial.[133] The more time spent prioritizing and centering Euro-American voices, the deeper their worldview becomes imbedded in the site. Despite the intentional efforts to accurately tell the stories of Native people, the past centering of the U.S. government is strongly manifest in the present. This section walks through many of the ways a U.S. perspective is still centered throughout the site, starting from the outside with the Custer Battlefield Trading Post and Custer National Cemetery, then moving into the Visitor Center and

[133] Andersen, "Critical Indigenous Studies: From Difference to Density."

its small museum, and concluding with the material components represented in the space as visitors maneuver the battlefield.

Outside LBN

LBN as a place is bound by a fenced border with a clear point of entrance and property boundaries. However, this does not mean visitors only develop their understanding of the place through what is on one side of the fence. Places around LBN influence visitor perceptions of the memorial with the most notable being Custer Battlefield Trading Post (CBTP), which is directly across the road from LBN and has both a café and gift shop. The Trading Post is one of the first stops people see before entering and leaving the site. Brightly colored teepees and a wooden turret outside the Trading Post along the road opposite LBN draws the eye as visitors approach the memorial. While there are other businesses in Crow Agency that have many of the same aspects of the CBTP such as Crow Hop Restaurant or Medicine Turtle Trading Post, none of them tie themselves so closely with the memorial through their name or make themselves as visible to tourists through large and vibrant displays.

CBTP distinguishes itself in the community and to visitors, making it a contributing factor to understanding how place impacts LBN. As visitors travel to LBN, they understand the place not only from within but also perspectives *around*. The cafe and gift shop are part of LBN as an unofficial beginning where lenses are crafted for how the place should be viewed. CBTP presents LBN as a unique location, distinct and inherently anchored in caricatured representations of Native people with war bonnets and teepees situated in a time with conflicts between homesteaders and Native communities. As the marker for the beginning and end of LBN, CBTP tells visitors when they are entering the past and returning to the present. This place

marks the time travel when people start looking at the world differently as they hear facts about a battle in the 1800s connected to people long dead and far away. CBTP is where the rhetoric of memory and place within LBN begins and ends as it transitions the perceptions of visitors from present to past.

Figure 6: Teepees, sign, and turret outside Custer Battlefield Trading Post. Photo by author.

When visitors pass through the gates into LBN, they can either drive straight or turn right into the parking lot with the Visitor Center, bathrooms, and Custer National Cemetery surrounding it. Like CBTP, the cemetery also plays an important role in shifting visitor's perceptions of the site back to the U.S. soldiers. The cemetery consists of thousands of white marble headstones laid in neat rows along rolling hills that mark, "the graves of known and unknown veterans of our nation's wars" as well as "women and children from isolated frontier posts, Indian scouts, and Medal of Honor recipients."[134] The national cemetery was established in 1879 and has 4,950 buried soldiers, veterans, and family members buried there today.[135] There is no mention of the Native people who fought, died, and still live on the land in the cemetery.

[134] Agency and Us, "Custer National Cemetery - Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (U.S. National Park Service)."
[135] Agency and Us, "Custer National Cemetery - Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (U.S. National Park Service)."

Visitors to LBN must drive by the hills covered in white marble headstones before continuing to the battlefield or entering the Visitor Center. While connected to LBN through its proximity and name, the cemetery does not house the remains of soldiers who died in the battle. Instead, it is largely the interment location for remains originally buried at forts in western territories that were eventually closed down. People originally buried at Fort Peck, Fort Belknap, and many other strongholds were reinterred at Custer National Cemetery with their original burial sites being marked on their headstones, linking U.S. westward expansion to the messaging of LBN. An epitaph within Custer National Cemetery reaffirms this intent and goal through its dedication "[t]o the officers and soldiers killed, or who died of wounds received in action in the territory of Montana, *while clearing the district of Yellowstone of hostile Indians* [italics added]." This phrase represents the prejudiced and discriminatory perception of the period that viewed Native people as the enemy that should be removed. While not all visitors see this marker, it embodies the perspective that the goals, intent, and actions discussed within the memorial occurred in the past. The epitaph remains as a symbol that supports the messaging from the headstones. Visitors must see the thousands of headstones that represent the lives and deaths of supporters for U.S. expansion before learning about one of Indigenous peoples' greatest victories. Sacrifices made for the U.S. government are consistently centered throughout LBN, starting with the cemetery on the border of the battlefield.

Figure 7: Custer National Cemetery. Photo by author.

The framing of LBN enacted by CBTP and the cemetery were not created in response to the remediation efforts. The cemetery was one of the first elements of LBN as a national monument and CBTP opened in 1985, three years before AIM's protest that sparked remediation efforts within the memorial. Neither site were created to stymie remediation efforts or intentionally hinder the creation of more accurate public memories. Despite the lack of intentionality, both sites stymie internal remediation efforts by framing the memorial through a particular lens. The intent of CBTP and Custer National Cemetery does not dismiss their impact as elements that stymie remediation efforts.

The Visitor Center

After wandering through the cemetery, the flow of the memorial encourages visitors to stop at the Visitor Center housed within the largest building in LBN. The Visitor Center has two main sections with one half being a gift shop and point of contact with a National Park Service park ranger while the other half has a small theatre and museum with glass displays filling the medium-sized room. As visitors navigate the flow of LBN, it makes sense to go through the museum to become oriented to the events that made the site historically important and look at the

displays with different items from the time period such as weapons, uniforms, and leather clothes owned by people who were involved in the conflict. There is no natural flow to the museum, resulting in the stories fostered by a combination of information of the viewers choosing. While CHM had an orientation film that presented a clear narrative for visitors to walk away with, LBN has individuated displays visitors can use to foster a unique understanding of the site. The level of autonomy left to the viewer makes it challenging for a singular narrative to arise as the most accessible to the audience. Yet, dominant narratives are still present through broad, general conceptualizations of what visitor's experience. And each of these dominant narratives' further orients visitors towards the hegemonic memory of the site focused on U.S. soldiers at the expense of any attempts at remediation in support of Native people's experiences.

The first is about American progress. Many of the displays focus on how the U.S. has changed over time either through military capabilities or continuous expansion West. Visitors see how the country has changed over time and differentiates itself from 1876 when the battle took place. Maps at the entrance of the space indicate national borders in 1876 and weapons on display from the time period emphasize what America used to be like with visitors knowing what it is like in the present. Because the two sides of battle were the U.S. government and Native people, the focus on the government within the Visitor Center presents only one side of the conflict as progressing and changing. Only one community has made progress in the last 148 years which stymies efforts to bring Native people into the present space since they are not the community that has made progress.

Another dominant narrative is the understanding of the conflicts from the time as war. The Indian Wars, The Great Sioux War, and the Battle of Greasy Grass all present interactions between Native communities and the U.S. government as parallel to Western expectations of

armed conflicts with fighters engaging each other without civilians being present. Displays frequently contain words like “battle,” “war,” and “soldiers” which reinforces the military component of the conflicts in a way legible in the present. There is also an expectation of sovereignty and power for both sides involved in the “war” which justifies aggressive action. None of these expectations align with the reality of the conflicts as U.S. soldiers attacking and destroying the homes and possessions of large groups of people who do not have the same opportunities to resist. The U.S. government also obscures the power inequities between them and Native communities through both population size, communication capabilities, and weaponry which turns armed conflicts from battles into carnage. The Visitor Center presents conflict as equal, justified, and fitting within modern expectations for war. A more accurate representation of events would reflect the complicated and unequal nature of the conflict as opposed to presenting the engagement as a war in the modern sense. Inadequate representations of events stymies efforts to accurately discuss the conflict because the perspectives of Native people are dismissed as not fitting in with the Euro-American understanding of war.

The final narrative within the Visitor Center presents the Battle of Greasy Grass as the conclusion of a period in history where the Native communities existed as they once had. The battle is seen as the end of a broader story where U.S. soldiers fought in the Great Plains against Native communities to protect the lives and livelihood of settlers. There is little to no information about the Native people who participated in the battle and their decedents. Ending the story at this point hides the continued violence against Native people enacted by the U.S. government in multiple ways as well as the continued efforts of Native people to maintain the traditions previously outlawed. Distance is created between the U.S. government and Native communities by presenting Native ways of life as ending with the Indian Wars. The values, views, and voices

presented through remediation efforts are seen in a different time and place. Remediation efforts that strive to bring Native people into LBN are stymied through the metaphorical distance fostered within the Visitor Center.

The orientation towards the past is consistent within LBN's presentation of the Indians Wars in the 1800s through maps and a prominent timeline. These components form the parameters around what period is supposed to be remembered by visitors as they move through place. A large map is positioned directly at the entrance of the museum within the Visitor Center with the title "Sioux War 1876" clearly displayed at the top. Directly next to this is another large map with equally large text displaying "The United States in 1876." Both maps orient visitors' time and place while reading displays, walking paths, and applying information. The memorial does not solely center around 1876, but has a confined scope made apparent by a large timeline covering the first wall visitors walk to within the center. The timeline extends from the entrance to the far wall encouraging visitors to read it as they first begin maneuvering the space and is broken into three sections: People of the Plains, Contact, and The Nation. Information is provided from 1851 when the Fort Laramie Treaty marked the "establishment of tribal boundaries" to 1890 when Sitting Bull was killed, the Wounded Knee Massacre occurred, Wyoming was admitted to the Union, and marble markers were placed on the battlefield. The important dates and information are presented from 1851-1890, constraining the rest of the memorial to that timeline. Remediation efforts throughout the memorial that strive to present Native identity beyond 1890 is minimized and dismissed as not existing within the scope of LBN, stymying efforts to present Native more fully in the space.

All of these stories communicate a different understanding of the battle and what it means for the broader context. The U.S. government is different from Native communities because it

has continuously progressed, presenting Native people as existing in a nonprogressive time. A Euro-American understanding of war presents the Indian Wars as conforming to modern expectations of conflict, minimizing the complex nature of the battle. The Battle of Greasy Grass is understood as the ending of Native people's way of life, which diminishes their continued presence in the memorial and the world. LBN strives to confine its scope from 1851-1890 which limits the voices of Native communities within the site. Visitors can take each narrative together or focus on a specific one, but they all frame the memorial for visitors as a space that celebrates U.S. progress, presents conflicts as equitable, and places Native people in the past.

Walking the battlefield

The namesake for LBN is outside of the Visitor Center along curving sidewalks that indicate primary locations for the Battle of Greasy Grass. As visitors begin to maneuver the battlefield, prominent places of public memory become revealed beginning with Last Stand Hill where visitors are presented with a story that stymies remediation efforts. The 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial marks the top of Last Stand Hill as a tall, white marble, etched obelisk. Markings share that the monument was constructed five years after the conflict and can be seen from far away as a tall, pure white pillar on the top of a hill within the rolling landscape of Southeast Montana. Weathered corners and discolored stones around the square of grass the monument rests upon reflect is age. A small plaque informs visitors it was constructed in 1881 and "the remains of about 220 soldiers, scouts, and civilians are buried around the base" with their names carved into the granite sides. Sidewalks surround the monument, blocked on one side by the road and the other by a fenced slope of the hill with a scattering of white marble headstones, press visitors closer to the obelisk-like symbol for the memorials original name: Custer's Last Stand. The focus

is on the deaths of people who supported the U.S. government which is unsurprising as they constructed it in 1881 after they gained control of the land, allowing them to hone the focus of the memorial as they saw fit. Because the battle was a devasting lose to the U.S. military, this space does not try to celebrate U.S. greatness and instead tries to focus on the sorrow and hardship of losing so many lives. Unlike the Beaches of Normandy and the Battle of Gettysburg, the U.S. government did not arise as the victor meaning that if the focus is going to be on the U.S., it cannot be about their triumphs. Centering the U.S. narrative involves contextualizing events from their viewpoints which makes this battle a tragedy. White headstones clustered within the fenced space indicate where people died 148 years ago and elicits a feeling of remorse and grief for the dead. No space is given to the joy, triumph, or celebration felt by Native people for their victory. While remediated memories allow for both celebration and sorrow in other spaces of LBN, the original purpose of Last Stand Hill is only to grieve defeat. A story is told on this hill of death and sadness due to the untimely demise of many people.

Figure 8: 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial. Photo by author.

The material place that the Battle of Greasy Grass occurred has increasingly mattered as the memorial evolves and reemphasizes where the events and deaths in the past occur. Centering the exact location of the conflict through headstones strengthens the emotional impact while discussing death. Often when the place is connected to the battle, it is through death. The headstones are bright white markers scattered along hillsides that remind people that the battle was here. They are not figurative reminders of death but seemingly unmovable objects with one even sliding to the middle of a walking path and remaining there. *This* place is important because of *these* deaths. There are no physical markers for where the Indian Encampment was or where first aid was administered during or after the conflict. Place is affirmed through death and death is always mourned, never celebrated.

LBN also tells a story in the present through its material construction of walking paths and access to parts of the memorial. Sidewalks guide visitors through Custer National Cemetery, up to Last Stand Hill, and around Indian Memorial indicating where people should go and what

parts of LBN are most important. This impression is furthered by lesser maintained trails such as the dirt path to a ravine where a textual display (that is nearly impossible to read with its red text over a complicated image) indicates this gully is where U.S. soldiers fled uphill during the conflict. This place is presented as less important through the more challenging path and poorly designed informative display. Visitors are guided towards the components understood as more important which simultaneously presents the battlefield through the lens of the U.S. military. Even the poorly designed path down the ravine is discussed because it was used by U.S. soldiers. At the top of Last Stand Hill, visitors look down the hillside to where soldiers would have also looked while trying to escape death. In both instances, visitors imagine the conflict through the eyes of U.S. soldiers which leads to the impression their perspective is the correct one to adopt when remembering the battle.

The visual construction of the memorial also leads to a centering of the 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial while visitors navigate the space. At the top of the hill, the white monument is highly visible from all directions as a beacon for the memorial. The striking stone construction exists as an inversion of the Indian Memorial's natural construction that sits within a hill and blends into the landscape. Inverse characteristics of the memorials begin with their visibility and extends into their connection with the other. The 7th Calvary's memorial does not discuss the Native communities who resisted relocation. No signs point towards the Indian Memorial or the location of encamped people prior to the battle because the white monument only speaks about the U.S. experience. The opposite is true for the Indian Memorial. Designed by Cathleen Cutschall, the memorial opens at all four cardinal directions to honor Native beliefs and values with the southward gap intentionally framing the 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial. One memorial's construction intentionally speaks to the other while the other sits singular. The 7th Calvary's memorial is

unavoidable and self-focused while the Indian Memorial is easy to overlook and inclusive, resulting in one view being seen as superior to the other.

A walk through the battlefield articulates Native identity through both prominent locations such as the 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial as well as smaller experiences gathered by visitors. People gather information about the site through the accumulation of information which presents Native people as belonging in the past. From a walk through the Visitor Center to a walk up to Last Stand hill, Native people and their perspectives are presented in the past tense. The Visitor Center states the Battle of Greasy Grass's "victory was short lived and marked the last glow of a passing nation," presenting Native communities as ending after the conflict with their culture dissipating. Other displays in the center communicate similar ideas such as a display that explains what the "People of the Plains" used to value and the past structure of their societies. This sense of disconnect is felt in other parts of LBN such as within the first part of the guided audio tour where an Indigenous person discusses the land as where their ancestors "prayed, lived, hunted, fought, and died" with all events being in the past tense. Textual displays throughout the battlefield do the same thing with one praising archeological effort because it "help[ed] to humanize the cavalrymen who until now, were just statistics." Native participants are not presented as equally human or equally worthy of having their story told. When the Indian Memorial is discussed as a primary place where Native stories are presented, the participating tribes are discussed in broad strokes without embodied voices by saying the inscriptions were crafted by "tribal representatives and descendants" which rhetorically disconnects the inscriptions from their inscribers. The personal loss felt by the communities is not felt within the space as it centers on the lives and experiences of those who fell within the scope of 1851-1890. Native stories and experiences are disconnected from the present as they focus on the past as an

isolated series of events. The place and stories formed around LBN have been continuously crafted since the battle in 1876 but stay confined to the past.

LBN's efforts to remain singularly focused on what story and experience people are supposed to take away is most apparent in their unwavering refusal to allow outside forces to influence the construction of the memorial. Near the top of Last Stand Hill are two chokecherry bushes (brimming with ripe berries when I visited) that are on parallel sides of the road. The one on the same side as the 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial is next to a handful of parking spaces making it easy to see and access by walking a few feet on prairie grass. The difference between the two bushes are the hundreds of cloth ribbons tied to the one closest to the memorial. Some are sun-bleached and others look recent. All of them look intentional in their abundance. There is no plaque or marker informing visitors why there are ribbons on the bush leading to the assumption they were tied by people unaffiliated with LBN, potentially by Indigenous people from the area or by visitors with an unknown intent. The bush overlooks the hill that General Custer famously died on as well as the landscape where thousands of Native people joined together to resist the U.S. government. The location of the prominent bush connects it to one of the most important and famous moments of the Battle of Greasy Grass and the lack of information makes it clear it is not a component curated by the National Parks Service who manage the memorial. While AIM was affective in creating change at the memorial, their initial protest in the 1980s invoked slow change that took about 25 years to reach fruition. The slow progress as well as the unaddressed perspectives are equally revealing to how LBN wants the larger story to be told. The place is important in the present for the unspoken and uncommunicated reasons held by the people who tied the cloth to the chokecherry bush. LBN does not share the stories of the people who tie ribbons to the bush showing their desire to stymie remediation efforts.

Efforts to accurately represent multiple viewpoints and experiences from the Battle of Greasy Grass are impeded throughout the memorial. Starting with the Custer Battlefield Trading Post and Custer National Cemetery, visitors are primed to view Native people as caricatures and U.S. soldiers as the center of greatness and grief. Visitors who walk into the Visitor Center are primed for the rest of the memorial through the dominant narratives of American progress, engagement with Native communities being equal to modern war, and the Indian Wars as a marker for the conclusion of traditional Native communities. The final experience of walking the battlefield solidifies the perspective that the "correct" way to understand the conflict is through the lens of the U.S. government because of the orientation of the battleground from the perspective of U.S. soldiers, the prioritization of U.S. deaths, ignoring external remediation efforts within the memorial, and repeatedly disconnecting Native people from the present through discussions of them in the past. Each element comes together to thwart remediation efforts and stymie celebration for a momentous victory by Native resistors.

Conclusion: Native people exist in "times gone by"

The combination of remediated efforts and stymied stories articulate how LBN view's Native identity, cultures, and communities. Intentional efforts to integrate multiple voices and perspectives into the memorial complexify the ability of historic sites to represent past events accurately and fairly. This complexity is not consistently integrated throughout the memorial, resulting in inconsistent interpretations of events with the default perspective centering on the experiences of the U.S. government. Inadequate efforts to accurately present Native identities within LBN result in all Native people being presented as existing in the past, disconnected from the present, and irrelevant in the future.

LBN presents the battle, its impacts, and the communities involved as existing in a different time despite those same communities living and thriving in the present. While the emotions elicited from the memorial are felt in the present, the threats of violence and death are continuously placed in a different time. The present is safe and distinct from the past. LBN is a safe place where death is remembered and not experienced. Death connects the place to the battle, but this is disconnected from the present as visitors do not consider potential dangers as they look upon white monuments or the rolling hills leading to far away mountains. A line is drawn between the past and present through the feeling of safety in a space remembered for its violence. By tying Native identities to violence and that violence to the past, Native people are presented as existing in a time-gone-by.

The disconnect between the past and present obscures the many ways the U.S. government's treatment of Native people during and since the 1800s has caused substantial and systematic harm. Before 1851, the U.S. government had intentionally continued pursuing westward expansion through violence, coercion, and deceit. The Indian Wars began once the underhanded methods of the U.S. government became widely known and understood as unacceptable by Native communities. This period is marked by violence and uncertainty which did not end at the conclusion of the Indian Wars. While this period of conflict is said to end in 1890 with the Wounded Knee Massacre, the violence did not cease as Native children were transported to boarding schools, communities were persecuted for practicing their traditions, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) became corrupt, and the broader U.S. population fostered a deep racism for Indigenous people. Once forced violence became too expensive for the government, the tactic of sending Native children far away from their communities to boarding schools was heavily practiced and praised as it taught Native children how to be Euro-American while

forgetting their Indigenous culture and language. Erasing Native culture was a primary goal of the boarding schools as their cultural practices were seen as "barbaric" and "immoral." This perspective also carried over into government policies that limited the religious freedom of Indigenous people which has gradually been alleviated through the passing of bills in 1883, 1934, 1978, and 1988 with some limitations still being placed on what traditions are legal.[136] The federal organization responsible for implementing programs and policies on Native reservations is the BIA which was notorious for its corruption that largely went unnoticed until AIM conducted sensational protests to draw attention to the injustices still being perpetrated against Native communities by the government.[137] These protests enacted long-lasting change in the U.S. and highlighted the continued racism against Indigenous people since 1492. LBN does not address the hardships that came after the Battle of Greasy Grass or the Indian Wars. The racism, corruption, discrimination, and abuse that caused generational trauma for many communities is still felt 148 years after a major Native American victory against the U.S. government.[138] Ignoring this pain disconnects the stories from the past with the lived experiences of people in the present. Native American identities are relegated to the past which obfuscates how the stories within LBN are continuously impactful in the present.

In this chapter, I discussed the history, rhetoric, and impact of LBN as a place that remediates Native American identity and memory in the present while simultaneously stymying those efforts. LBN is the location of a historic battle in 1876 that has been continuously reimagined as different efforts to memorialize the past are enacted. Intentional efforts to remediate public memory at LBN led to the integration of an audio tour, red granite headstones

[136] "Native Americans and Freedom of Religion."
[137] "Native American Trust Fund."
[138] Findling et al., "Discrimination in the United States: Experiences of Native Americans."

for Native warriors, and the Indian Memorial constructed to juxtapose the 7th U.S. Calvary Memorial. These remediation efforts are thwarted by multiple aspects of the memorial such as CBTP, the national cemetery, displays in the Visitor Center, and the continued centering of U.S. perspective through the walking trails and Last Stand Hill. All of these components build together to create the impression of Native American people existing in times-gone-by and detached from the present. Centering Native people in the past dismisses their contemporary culture, communities, and hardships that are connected to events from this time, presenting large groups of people as relegated to history. Articulating some Americans as existing more fully in the present than others reaffirms the dominant paradigm of privilege as different communities are given more voice and body in the present.

Chapter 5- Conclusion: Native Identity as Controllable in Public Memory

I discovered my favorite poster in a bathroom near LBN. Hanging above a toilet at Custer Battlefield Trading Post in May 2022, I saw a poster with a map stretching from the Artic Circle to present day Panama. Unlike most maps, this one had no countries depicted through lines drawn on the land. Instead, the land was filled with people who lived on the land before European contacts during the "Glory Days" (according to the posters self-description). Names were written onto the lands they called home and prominent people from different groups are highlighted such as Chief Joseph (Nez Perce), Quanah Parker (Comanche) and Osceola (Seminole). I looked closely at the map and appreciated all the names covering the areas my family has lived: Crow, Gros Ventre, Assiniboine, and Hidatsa. I saw the same poster for sale in a corner of the gift shop before leaving the trading post. Despite the possibility of destroying the map in my coming travels, I bought the paper poster and carefully carried it with me between five states. I hung it in every apartment I could, showed it to each roommate, and dragged many visitors into my room just to see the borderless map. Michael Mcardle-Nakoma (Anishinabe-Lakota) created this map which fully matches the title by depicting "The Tribes of North America, Central America, and The Caribbean" as separate and distinct from colonial forces. This map was the first time I clearly saw Native territories without state or national borders overlaid and remediated personal memories surrounding land ownership in the U.S. Discovering this map before I visited LBN forced me to view the battlefield and land around it differently. The place did not end at the fence but extended into the Crow Reservation and beyond, altering my understanding of borders, place, and home.

My visits to CHM when I was eleven and LBN two years ago inspired this project and my last two years of listening, reading, and thinking about what being Indigenous in America has

meant to the broader culture gave me the tools to complete it. As this project ends, I wish to synthesize my thoughts to this point, based in my travels and research, with the hope of contributing something important to this broader area of study and practice. In particular, I will spend time in this conclusion reviewing my analyses in the previous two chapters. These two chapters emphasize two different articulations of Native identity at CHM and LBN: that LBN presents Native identity as existing in the past and CHM displays Native identity as ownable. In this chapter, I will draw on both claims from both sites to argue that they collectively understand Native identity as controllable. However, before discussing why remediation efforts in the memorials resulted in such negative messaging, I will summarize the main ideas of my thesis so far. Following this, I will compare and contrast both sites as they reveal different aspects of how Native identity is created and public memory is formed. Concluding this thesis, I will provide takeaways from this research for similar projects in the future.

Summary

Chapter 1 started this thesis with my guiding research questions and central arguments for each site separately and together. I wanted to know what were the original messages of these commemorative sites and what efforts were made to remediate them? CHM's original message was about the heroism within Native communities and LBN's message focused on mourning the deaths of U.S. soldiers. CHM has not tried to remediate their original message, but instead expanded Native representation beyond heroism and towards normalcy. LBN has attempted to remediate their original message by integrating Native voices and memories into the memorial to depict the Battle of Greasy Grass more accurately. I also asked what do these two sites and their surroundings articulate about Native American and Euro-American identities? As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, Native identities are articulated as ownable and existing in the past

respectively. These articulations are due to Euro-American identities and values being centered throughout the memorial despite being multicultural spaces. I next wanted to know what intentional and unintentional aspects of the place influence public memory? Within CHM and LBN, the intentional components are the explicit stories shared through different aspects of the memorials such as displays as well as the curated progression through the sites for visitors. The unintentional components of both sites reflect the memorials' perception of what it means to be Native American which is seen in multiple parts of CHM and LBN ranging from the physical construction of the buildings to what is seen on route to either memorial. I also asked how do these places represent American identities as distinct, cohesive, or exclusionary? Because both sites focused on Native and Euro-American people, CHM and LBN presented these identities as separate without clear overlap. Individuals who belong to both communities are not discussed, leading to a distinct divide between Native American and Euro-American identities within the memorials. And lastly, I asked what can we learn more broadly about studying these kinds of sites from our examination of CHM and LBN? Scholars can use these sites to highlight potential elements of memorials that influence the creation of public memory. I will answer this question in more detail later in this chapter.

The culmination of answers to my research questions led to my central arguments for the sites separately and together. CHM articulates Native identities as ownable through its prioritization of Euro-American values, presenting nature as manageable, and emphasizing Euro-American perceptions of ownership. LBN articulates Native identity as existing in the past through external elements that frame the memorial in a particular way, center dominant paradigms that focus on Euro-American values, and elements of the battlefield that continuously discuss Euro-American experiences. The combination of both articulations' present Native

identities as controllable by outside forces. This conclusion is only made possible by being at both sites and reflecting on how public memory and place work together to create meaning.

Public memory, materiality, and Native American rhetorics are anchors throughout my thesis because my artifacts are places of public memory that represent Native people. In Chapter 2, I define each body of literature, discuss how they work together, and explain how they influence my methodology during my trip and analysis. Public memory involves paying attention to the stories that are remembered and forgotten from the past as people move into the future.[139] The repeated picking-up or putting-down of memories influences how people shape their world which has material consequences. Those material consequences communicate messages through the rhetoric of materiality, influencing what bodies experience while traveling through places.[140] The importance of "being there" reflects the rhetorical power of place as it connects with the body.[141] Both public memory and materiality are rooted in an academic linage that has prioritized and privileged Euro-American perspectives and values, diminishing their ability to speak to other perspectives and values without additional effort to remedy the disparity.[142] Native American rhetorics allow me to conduct a more equitable analysis that creates space for more voices than would be possible through solely traditional forms of rhetorical analysis. Multiple rhetorical lenses based on Native American values, traditions, perspectives, and communication tactics are blended within my analysis such as the importance of oral history within a community, place-thought, and density of experiences. The three frameworks of public memory, materiality, and Native American rhetorics guided my methodology for analysis which involved traveling to the sites and listening. While I wrote down details and recorded the visit, I spent time listening to the

[139] Houdek and Phillips, "Public Memory."
[140] Beckstead et al., "Collective Remembering through the Materiality and Organization of War Memorials."
[141] Blair, "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places.: EBSCOhost."
[142] Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity."

stories, walking around the sites, and paying attention to how communities have become layered overtime in the bordered place. These literatures were used throughout my analysis chapters to understand how identities are articulated and what their messaging implies for the broader context.

CHM was the first place I visited and site I analyzed in Chapter 3. The memorial continuously strives to remediate public memory but stymies these attempts from within through both intentional and unintentional means. CHM began as a project in response to Mount Rushmore which was constructed to celebrate U.S. greatness. The statue and memorial's original goal of remediating public memory is attempted through displays that reflect the cultural values of Native communities, presence of Native workers, and public facing works that expand how people are connected to the memorial. These remediation efforts are stymied by other aspects of the place such as the orientation film, messaging around nature, and discussions of ownership regarding objects and land. Combining the remediation efforts and stymying components leads to what I argue is the overarching articulation of Native identity presented at CHM: Native identities can be owned by others.

LBN presented a different articulation of Native identity as I explain in Chapter 4. Intentional remediation efforts within the memorial have been made to discuss the historical event more accurately, but components of the memorial stymie the effectiveness of those efforts. The Battle of Greasy Grass was a resounding victory for Native people, but the battlefield had only focused on the U.S. government's experience until AIM's protest in 1988 when remediation efforts began. The memorial has changed since the battle to represent the conflict more accurately by incorporating Native voices throughout the site and intentionally constructing the Indian Memorial to represent and respect Native people. These efforts are not entirely successful

due to other elements of the memorial that hinder their ability to remediate memory such as elements on the outside of LBN that frame the site for visitors, the Visitor Center as it orients visitors to the memorial, and the walking trails around the battlefield that tell people what is worth paying attention to. All of these factors brought together leads to my central argument that LBN articulates Native identities as existing in the past and are disconnected from the present.

CHM and LBN: Compare and contrast

My analysis of CHM and LBN presented two different articulations of Native identities. The individual sites express particular views through their specific methods of creating public memory. But bringing the sites together also reveals a perception of Native identities accepted by the broader U.S. population that highlights their differences and reveals important, shared elements of places of public memory. This section will discuss the implications for the combined messaging of the sites as they reveal the idea that Native identities are controllable by others. I will also contrast what the sites say about places of public memory through discussions of who is able to be heard at these sites, how stories are told, and what influence place has on creation of memory.

Compare

CHM and LBN are different sites yet point towards similar articulations of Native identity within the broader culture. CHM presents Native identity as ownable while LBN presets it as oriented in the past. Both articulations present Native identities as controllable. The owner of something is able to control it and choose what happens with it. Presenting something in the past means it does not have agency in the present, granting control to those in the current moment. Through the presentation of public memory at both places, the messaging becomes

clear that Native identities can be controlled. Each memorial accomplishes this through the possession of objects, selective acknowledgment of land, and telling of stories.

Control over Native identities starts with the objects that represent identity. CHM controls a large repository of Native "artifacts" donated by people all across the country and LBN displays multiple items owned by Native people such as weapons and clothes. Both memorials legally own items—or display them to audiences in glass cases in traditional museum style that suggest as such—of varying significance to Native communities. The items are not what construct identity, but they aid in the construction of Native identity in culture. Possessing and displaying items in this style is considered normal. Routine presentations of items created by Native people further demonstrates the normalized ability of other people to control objects that embody Native identity. Objects do not construct the culture, but they are reflective of the ways both organizations view Native identities as controllable. This sense of ownership was discussed in Chapter 3 as it relates to CHM's presentation of ownership based on Euro-American values. It is also seen within LBN's Visitors Center where owned objects are presented to visitors. Aspects of both memorial that speak to their articulations of Native identities point towards the perceived ability to control those same identities.

Presenting Native identity as controllable also allows for land to be controlled and acknowledged in selective contexts. All land is homeland for Indigenous people, yet there are controlled situations and opportunities for it to be addressed and discussed such as within land acknowledgments. Within CHM, land is only discussed as it relates to human control and management. Since Native people are strongly associated with land and nature, the link extends to Native identities also being presented as manageable, ownable and controllable. Controlling how and when land is discussed influences when Native communities are presented as belonging

in the space. LBN discusses land through its relation to the Battle of Greasy Grass in 1876 which controls both the conversation in the past as well as which voices are heard while discussing land management. Controlled conversations about place dissuade discussions of how land became privately or government owned through the strategic removal of Native people. The U.S. government has yet to acknowledge its treatment of Native people as a genocide and continuously distances itself from the conversation by controlling how and when land is discussed. Being able to control land and Native identities allows outside forces to select when they discuss historic injustices, the people who call that land home, and what culpability they have for continued ownership of Native land.

The final aspect of CHM and LBN that articulate Native identities as controllable are the stories of both Native and Euro-American people that construct the sites. CHM orients visitors to the memorial through stories and spends a significant amount of time in both the orientation video and museums valorizing Ziolkowski. LBN accomplishes a similar goal by physically orienting visitors to the movements of the U.S. military. Both sites control their internal narrative which results in valorizing Euro-Americans as well as diminishing the experiences of Native people. Standing Bear is a prominent voice within CHM as it discusses its relationship with the Native community but does not acknowledge past and present critiques of the memorial. LBN controls the story by presenting Native people in selective terms. Within the Battle of Greasy Grass, only Native warriors are discussed despite their entire communities being present in the Indian Encampment alongside the river. Narrative control characterizes the Native resistance through their warriors as opposed to the children, elders, and family members being protected from the U.S. military. CHM and LBN control of sites' stories which align with dominant discourses around Native stories that present them as controllable by the broader U.S.

population. Controlling Native identities allows Native stories to be maneuvered and changed as desired by non-Native people. All places should be pushed to share the complex and diverse story as opposed to providing a narrow and selective discussion of events.

Objects, land, and stories all contribute to how rhetoric is understood within a community as messages and ideas are shared with people. Those three components are rhetorically effective because of how they present Euro-American rhetoric within Native American-centered spaces. The historic centering of Euro-American values has unfairly prioritized their voices which is an issue I discussed when presenting Native American rhetorics in Chapter 2. Continuously centering one voice has weighted the conversation in one direction. Just as I needed to emphasize Native American rhetorics in this thesis, so to do places of public memory need to lean into Native American ways of creating meaning in order to approach a more equitable balance of ideas and values. The unjust focus on Euro-American logics is not an isolated issue within rhetoric, but a far-reaching concern in all public places that have been primarily controlled and influenced by Euro-American values.

Contrast

The differences between CHM and LBN highlight points of consideration for future scholars when examining places of public memory. Three differences are particularly relevant at these memorials. First, LBN is federally managed while CHM is privately owned which influences how civic engagement and protests are received by the memorials. Second, the memorials focus on either general or specific stories and their creation of public memory as either a universal or singular narrative. The final contrast between the sites is the importance of place as it relates to the agency enacted by humans or place on that location. Both sites need to

be placed in conversation with each other to understand what their differences mean for the creation of public memory.

A key difference between the two sites is who manages the memorial which informs who is heard in the space. CHM began as a privately managed project and has never accepted state or federal funding while LBN has always been under the control of the federal government. As a result, any changes that occur in the sites come from different processes. At CHM, for instance, change occurs as a result of internal discussions. Meanwhile, at LBN, changes to the site emerge through civic engagement. Changes are needed at both sites since they have been critiqued for various reasons such as use of resources and inaccurate representations of history. But the sites have responded to those concerns differently due to expectations around where civic engagement can take place and who is expected to listen. More specifically: as a privately owned organization, CHM is able to manage the space however they would like due to selective oversight, making external concerns irrelevant to the internal construction of the memorial. This gives CHM more agency in deciding how to remediate public memory, but also results in less opportunities for outside voices to speak to those remediation efforts. LBN does not have the same opportunities. When AIM protested in 1988, they were prompted to respond by developing the Indian Memorial. Civic engagement is seen as a reasonable course of action to promote change within government operated facilities; however, this change is only possible insofar as the government is willing to accept culpability for their actions. As places of public memory, each catalyst for change needs to be examined to understand what change is possible and how the memorials have overcome their inadequacies in an attempt to remediate memories. The management of both sites influences which voices are heard and how change is achieved with neither being paragons of public engagement and change.

Another foundational component of both sites is their storytelling. Stories matter at both sites since stories are how public memories are made and were fundamental texts in my analysis. As public memory scholars strive to understand what is remembered and forgotten at such sites, particular kinds of stories need our attention to the extent that each site can tell different stories. For instance, we should pay attention to what is made universal and what remains singular within the stories being told at these sites. Stories told at CHM present Native people's experiences as general, broad, and universal. Broad strokes are used to represent the diverse and distinctive histories of Native people in North America. Meanwhile, LBN uses stories in a very different way. LBN presents a single, specific story related to the Battle of Greasy Grass. Whether stories are broad or general informs what the site is—or able to—speak to. CHM tells universal stories and broad interpretations of Native identity because they are attempting to coalesce Native people into a collective who have all experienced colonization. Loss of land and life is not a singular experience but a collective reality for all Native communities in America. LBN presents different messaging through its telling of singular stories. Every Native community has a different and complex history as it relates to colonization and LBN presents this complexity through the particular story of the Battle of Greasy Grass where multiple Native people made different choices. The stories within a place of public memory inform whether a universal or singular idea is presented with both lacking in some way.

The final difference brought to light by contrasting these memorials with each other is the impact of human-agency and place-agency on land. Both sites were originally constructed with Euro-American ideals of celebration, remembrance, and ownership in mind. Human-agency was considered the only force enacting its will on the memorial, but the agency of place, as presented through the idea of place-thought, has still made its presence known at both locations. Within

CHM, human-agency is emphasized through the presentation of nature as manageable. The independent ability of nature to impact humans (such as through rockslides, erosion, flash floods, forest fires, and other natural events) is not discussed in favor of discussions around humans controlling nature. CHM also does not ignore the ways that human-agency has harmed the land. Paying attention to what people have done creates space for discussions of climate change and continued harm to the environment. LBN contrasts this by integrating the ways nature impacts the memorial. Headstones are left where they were originally planted and allowed to move with the land as the hills shift. Fires have passed over the land and erosion has deteriorated headstones, which are seen as impactful within LBN. The human impact of developing the land is ignored, though. In an effort to maintain the battlefield, the human impact on the environment is minimized or ignored entirely. The land matters and how place promotes action within the memorials is evidence of place-thought. CHM ignores the land's agency and discuss how people impact place. LBN blends elements of place-thought with the memorial while simultaneously ignoring how human-agency has changed the world. Place-thought and human-agency are relevant everywhere and ignoring one over the other does a disservice to fully understanding the site and what it truly accomplishes in the world.

CHM and LBN are places of public memory centered around events and Native people during the Indian Wars. Their differences provide opportunities for scholars to critique and promote changes within places of public memory. Memorials that are privately owned allow for different types of change and engagement than government-controlled facilities with one having less oversite and the other allowing for more public engagement. Stories that create public memory can present a broad and collective understanding of the past or emphasize a singular and unique situation. Memorials are changed both by place and people requiring both to be discussed

from within for the complexity of the site to be fully expressed. Contrasting the two sites brings forward factors with places of public memory as they continuously change what is remembered and forgotten.

Implications

CHM and LBN are not summative of all commemorative sites for Native people or for marginalized communities within the United States. Different sites, stories, and identities can be examined throughout the U.S. and new discoveries made at each one. Nonetheless, my research herein provides some important insights for what future scholarship on places of public memory can do in the future. Three implications arise in particular: 1) scholars should incorporate elements outside the proper boundaries of memorials into their analyses to better understand what messages visitors receive, 2) scholars should look beyond the facts shared at the site and consider what stories are told, and 3) scholars must continuously reflect on how the researcher's identities influence their work.

First, scholars who look at places of public memory to understand what visitors learn and remember need to look beyond what is within the specific location and towards external elements that may influence the visitor's experience. While I visited CHM and LBN, I noticed that the surrounding elements of both sites influenced my experience as a visitor. These elements in turn influenced my perception of the memorials' internal messaging. This observation was made on route to CHM. During that journey I observed the blending of nature with human development that led to an impression of nature being easily managed by people. I also noticed on my way to LBN that my experience felt like it began when I saw the colorful teepees outside the trading post, not when I passed through the memorial's main gates. These elements influenced my perception by framing both the region around the memorials before I arrive at

each location and the connection between the sites and the communities surrounding them. These experiences allowed me to reflect on what elements of the memorial speak to, are informed by, or are framed in a particular way because of elements outside of the site. While this is an example from my own research, I could imagine other potential examples at different commemorative sites in future research. For example: the Roosevelt Arch in Yellowstone National Park marks the entrance to the world's first national park. While not commemorating a particular group or event, the arch symbolizes U.S. pride and support in the national parks system dating back to April 24th, 1903, when it was completed. Studying the rhetorical impact of the Roosevelt Arch would involve more than simply seeing the structure or reading stories, but also observing how local businesses have marketed themselves in response to their close physical proximity. It is also impossible to miss the high school football field (potentially filled with grazing bison) on one side of the arch, presenting the land as more than just a site to celebrate U.S. greatness. These external elements of the arch influence its rhetorical messaging. As my experience and this example suggest, more attention should be paid to external elements because people make public memories through the accumulation of experiences and perceptions. All components of that creation should be considered when analyzing how meaning is made.

Second, scholars should also look beyond the facts and history told at sites in their analyses to fully appreciate its meaning. Euro-American standards prioritize objectivity with facts being the determiner of truth. This fact-based approach can be useful but can also results in personal stories and community experiences being diminished or dismissed all together. For example, both CHM and LBN discussed facts of their site's past through data (e.g. when each memorial was founded, the number of people buried at the site, important event for the sites, etc.). Yet each site also told stories about the people and events connected to both locations.

CHM told the story of Ziolkowski to explain the origin of the mountain statue to visitors. LBN presents the story of the Battle of Greasy Grass where U.S. soldiers were overwhelmed by Native fighters on horseback in help visitors to understand the intense emotions felt by the U.S. populous. These stories contribute to the creation of public memory and are a valuable way for scholars to identity what messages are being communicated and how memory is formed. Looking beyond the facts and history requires identifying and listening to the stories being told. Nor must scholars limit themselves to what stories the sites tell themselves. Instead, scholars should also be attentive to stories that might emerge from "being there" at a site—stories that may be very important to their overall understanding of a site's meaning or messages. This might mean that researchers must intentionally sit and listen to the stories that emerge in a given space. Doing so requires patience and silence. I tried to wait and listen to the stories but was not always successful. For instance, I did not sit in LBN's Visitor Center which resulted in me missing how other visitors navigated the space as well as a park ranger's monologue about the site. This failure to wait and listen limited my ability to identify all voices shared within the site. In my own work, I will be certain to attend to this issue going forward. Meanwhile, other scholars must listen to the stories of the sites to know what ideas are truly being shared from within.

The final element scholars should consider when doing this work in the future is how multiple parts of their identity (i.e., perspectives, characteristics, and experiences) might impact their interpretations of a memory site or space. This point is not necessarily new in public memory scholarship; however, in my own experiences as a researcher, the importance and difficulty of doing this became particularly clear. In my project, I continuously tied my personal experiences into the messaging of both memorials through my ancestral connection to colonization, implicit messaging around generational land ownership, and conversations within

my family about colonization (or lack thereof). My perspective influenced which elements of each site I focused on and deemed important to the creation of public memory. Who I am impacted how I interacted with the memorial which in turn influenced my interpretations of the sites. Conducting this research as a White scholar influenced what information I found important, what I choose to focus on, and my ability to truly integrate Native American rhetorics throughout my analysis. While I strove to use Native American rhetorics in my thesis, I was unable to meaningfully incorporate it throughout my analysis as I had originally hoped. This is in large part because of how I was trained to conduct a rhetorical analysis. It is also based in personal uncertainty for using many theoretical principles based in Indigeneity. These experiences influenced my interpretation and analysis of both sites. I am aware that my perspectives, characteristics, and experiences made my analysis unique from different scholars. These factors need to be considered when conducting an analysis of places of public memory as well as acknowledged as strengths or weaknesses for accomplishing an effective rhetorical analysis.

By analyzing CHM and LBN individually and together as sites of public memory, I identified three primary implications for research in the future that examine places of public memory. People conducting this research should consider the influence of what is outside the memorial when striving to explain what meaning is made from within. Stories should be taken seriously as contributing factors to the creation of public memories which requires sitting and listening at the sites. Scholars should continuously reflect on how their perspectives, characteristics, and experiences influence their research and subsequent analysis. All of these implications need to be carried into future evaluations of places of public memory.

Conclusion: Naya Nuki and Sacagawea

This thesis began with Naya Nuki and will end with her, too. The fictional story of Naya Nuki—the Shoshoni girl who ran—is based on true events gleaned from diaries kept during the Lewis and Clark Expedition. As I argued in Chapter 1, her story is a remediation of the depiction of Native peoples in the U.S. past. Her story was created by Kenneth Thomasma to be one of determination, bravery, and success. Its aim, among others, was to remediate broader memories of Native people in the West. In inspiring my own passion for Native people's history, it can be measured as a success. But far too often, as this thesis shows, such remediation attempts fail.

We can see this fact in the story of Sacagawea. Sacagawea is today a well-known figure in U.S. public memory famed for her assistance to Lewis and Clark on their expedition across North America with her newborn child. But for much of U.S. history, she was largely forgotten only to be remembered again thanks to the Suffrage Movement.[143] Even then, her story was only celebrated to the extent that it served U.S. interests, particularly how she aided in the creation of the United States of America with its national borders and state lines. Most of her remembrances also emphasize how she was a good wife and mother who translated and eased tensions with Native communities. But Sacagawea's story was in reality much darker, including many lesser-known details such as her capture at 11 and enslavement to her future "husband" at 12.[144] Indeed, Sacagawea's story has been crafted by public discourse for a wider U.S. public in a way that emphasizes and selects only certain elements deemed worthy of retelling.

Ironically, the story of Sacagawea and Naya Nuki are very much the same. Indeed, Thomasma based much of Naya Nuki's fictional story on true events in Sacagawea's life. This shared lineage is hinted at in Lewis and Clarke diaries that describe when on August 17th, 1805,

[143] "Sacagawea's Story (U.S. National Park Service)."
[144] "Sacagawea | Biography, Husband, Baby, Death, & Facts | Britannica."

The Corps of Discovery encountered the Shoshoni people and Sacagawea had a tearful greeting with her long-lost friend, Naya Nuki (as named by Kenneth Thomasma).[145] Further, Naya Nuki's storyline about being captured by enemy warriors along with her close friend Sacagawea emphasize their shared inspiration. In many ways, Naya Nuki and Sacagawea lived in the same world, a world more closely resembling the bathroom map I discovered with complex and overlapping boundaries between communities. But as this project demonstrates, shared events and experiences filtered through different stories can create wildly different memories.

In Naya Nuki's story, real Native people's experiences are remediated and reimagined to create new memories of what the world could look like. But today, we are still far too often subjected to representations of Native peoples who, like Sacagawea, are presented only in ways that reaffirms preexisting articulations of Native identity. In these stories, Sacagawea is a figure of the past, enslaved and owned by others, and presented as if this is normal for her situation. To this day, her story is controlled by other people, people who choose to forget or reclaim elements of her life as they desire to accomplish their own ends. In that way, the memory of Sacagawea suffers, as does our wider capacity to actually remediate the memories of Native peoples across this nation.

Like Sacagawea, Native people presented at CHM and LBN are articulated in all these ways as well. At this project's end, the recurrence of these memories strongly suggests that these places of public memory are not unique in their articulation of Native identities as controllable. The breathtaking reach of how Native people are rendered in this way, from historic mothers to contemporary communities, is only just beginning to be appreciated.

[145] "A Bittersweet Homecoming | History| Smithsonian Magazine"; Thomasma, *Naya Nuki, Shoshoni Girl Who Ran*.

Bibliography

"A Bittersweet Homecoming | History| Smithsonian Magazine." Accessed March 21, 2024. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/a-bittersweet-homecoming-82872129/.

Agency, Mailing Address: Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument P. O. Box 39 Crow, and MT 59022-0039 Phone:638-3236 Contact Us. "Custer National Cemetery - Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (U.S. National Park Service)." Accessed February 17, 2024. https://www.nps.gov/libi/planyourvisit/custer-national-cemetery.htm.

"American Indian Heritage (U.S. National Park Service)." Accessed September 27, 2023. https://www.nps.gov/subjects/americanindians/index.htm.

Andersen, Chris. "Critical Indigenous Studies: From Difference to Density." *Cultural Studies Review* 15, no. 2 (2009): 80–100.

Aoki, Eric, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott. "The Master Naturalist Imagined: Directed Movement and Simulations at at the Draper Museum of Natural History." In *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Rhetoric, Culture, and Social Critique. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, n.d.

Asante, Godfried Agyeman. "#RhetoricSoWhite and US Centered: Reflections on Challenges and Opportunities." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 105, no. 4 (October 2, 2019): 484–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2019.1669892.

Beckstead, Zachary, Gabriel Twose, Emily Levesque-Gottlieb, and Julia Rizzo. "Collective Remembering through the Materiality and Organization of War Memorials," 2011. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183511401494.

Black, Edwin. *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study In Method*. The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb31784.0001.001.

Black, Jason Edward. "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse," 2007. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/00335630802621052?needAccess=true&role=button.

———. "Remembrances of Removal: Native Resistance to Allotment and the Unmasking of Paternal Benevolence." *Southern Communication Journal* 72, no. 2 (May 4, 2007): 185–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/10417940701316690.

Blair, Carole. "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places." *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 3 (2001): 271–94.

———. "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places.: EBSCOhost," 2001. https://web-p-ebscohost-com.ezproxy2.library.colostate.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=b70d9ce8-24db-4831-8fdd-4d48c96ce34c%40redis.

Blair, Carole, Greg Dickinson, and Brian Ott. “Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place.” In *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Blair, Carole, Marsha Jeppeson, and Enrico Jr. Pucci. “Public Memorializing in Post-Modernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 263–88.

Blair, Carole, and Neil Michel. “The Rushmore Effect: Ethos and National Collective Identity.” In *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. Studies in Rhetoric/Communication. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2004.

Bonds, Anne, and Joshua Inwood. “Beyond White Privilege: Geographies of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism.” *Progress in Human Geography* 40, no. 6 (2016): 715–33.

Booth, Wayne C. “Criticism.” In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Oxford University Press, 2001. http://www.oxfordreference.com/display/10.1093/acref/9780195125955.001.0001/acref-9780195125955-e-58.

Brown, Wendy. *In the Ruins of Neoliberalism: The Rise of Antidemocratic Politics in the West*. The Wellek Library Lectures. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019.

Browne, Stephen H. *Jefferson’s Call for Nationhood: The First Inaugural Address*. 1st ed. Library of Presidential Rhetoric. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2003.

———. “Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, Rhetoric, and the Politics of Commemoration.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1999): 237–50.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. “The Rhetoric of Women’s Liberation: An Oxymoron.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59, no. 1 (February 1973): 74–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637309383155.

“Carlisle Indian School Project - Richard Henry Pratt Carlisle Indian School,” April 17, 2020. https://carlisleindianschoolproject.com/past/.

Chakravartty, Paula, Rachel Kuo, Victoria Grubbs, and Charlton McIlwain. “#CommunicationSoWhite.” *Journal of Communication* 68, no. 2 (April 1, 2018): 254–66. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqy003.

Chevrette, Roberta, and Aaron Hess. “Unearthing the Native Past: Citizen Archaeology and Modern (Non)Belonging at the Pueblo Grande Museum.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 12, no. 2 (April 3, 2015): 139–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2015.1012214.

Collingwood, Robin George. *The Idea of History*. Rev. Oxford: Oxford University Press, n.d.

Cordalis, Daniel, and Dean Suagee. “The Effects of Climate Change on American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes.” *Natural Resources & Environment* 22, no. 3 (2008): 45–49.

Crazy Horse Memorial. *Indian Museum of North America*. July 2023.

Cushman, Ellen, Rachel Jackson, Annie Laurie Nichols, Courtney Rivard, Amanda Moulder, Chelsea Murdock, David M. Grant, and Heather Brook Adams. "Decolonizing Projects: Creating Pluriversal Possibilities in Rhetoric," 2019. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/07350198.2019.1549402?needAccess=true&role=button.

Dadey, Bruce. "Identity, Narrative, and the Construction of the Rhetorical Situation in Euro-American and Aboriginal Cultures," 2011.

Derek, Bousé. "Culture as Nature: How Native American Cultural Antiquities Became Part of the Natural World." *The Public Historian* 18, no. 4 (1996): 75–98.

Dickinson, Greg. "Being Through There Matters: Materiality, Bodies, and Movement in Urban Communication Research," 2016.

———. "Joe's Rhetoric: Finding Authenticity at Starbucks." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (September 2002): 5–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/02773940209391238.

Dickinson, Greg, Brian Ott, and Eric Aoki. "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3 (March 1, 2006): 27–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420500505619.

Dubriwny, Tasha N., and Kristan Poirot. "Gender and Public Memory." *Southern Communication Journal* 82, no. 4 (2017): 199–202.

Dunn, Thomas R. "Remembering 'A Great Fag': Visualizing Public Memory and the Construction of Queer Space." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97, no. 4 (November 2011): 435–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2011.585168.

———. "Remembering Matthew Shepard: Violence, Identity, and Queer Counterpublic Memories." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13, no. 4 (2010): 611–52.

Emberley, Julia. "(Un)Housing Aboriginal Possessions in the Virtual Museum: Cultural Practices and Decolonization in Civilization.ca and Reservation X," 2006. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412906070512.

Feuerherd, Peter. "The Unlikely Reason Why Mount Rushmore Exists." JSTOR Daily, October 27, 2017. https://daily.jstor.org/the-unlikely-reason-why-mount-rushmore-exists/.

Findling, Mary G., Logan S. Casey, Stephanie A. Fryberg, Steven Hafner, Robert J. Blendson, John M. Benson, Justin M. Sayde, and Carolyn Miller. "Discrimination in the United States: Experiences of Native Americans." *Health Services Research* 54 (2019): 1431–41.

Gallagher, Victoria J., and Margaret R. LaWare. "Sparring with Public Memory: The Rhetorical Embodiment of Race, Power, and Conflict in the Monument to Joe Louis." In *Places of*

Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials, 87–112. Rhetoric, Culture, and Social Critique. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Greene, Ronald Walter. "Another Materialist Rhetoric." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15, no. 1 (March 1998): 21–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295039809367031.

Halbwachs, Maurice, and Lewis A. Coser. *On Collective Memory*. The Heritage of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

"Henry Standing Bear (Kills Little) Student File | Carlisle Indian School Digital Resource Center." Accessed January 3, 2024. https://carlisleindian.dickinson.edu/student_files/henry-standing-bear-kills-little-student-file.

"History « Native News 2018." Accessed December 12, 2023. https://nativenews.jour.umt.edu/2018/history/.

Hoerl, Kristen. "Selective Amnesia and Racial Transcendence in News Coverage of President Obama's Inauguration." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 98, no. 2 (2012): 178–202.

Houdek, Matthew, and Kendall R. Phillips. "Public Memory." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*, 2017. https://oxfordre-com.ezproxy2.library.colostate.edu/communication/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-181.

Jackson, Rachel C. "Locating Oklahoma: Critical Regionalism and Transrhetorical Analysis in the Composition Classroom." *College Composition and Communication* 66, no. 2 (2014): 301–26.

Jackson, Rachel C., and Dorothy Whitehorse DeLaune. "Decolonizing Community Writing with Community Listening: Story, Transrhetorical Resistance, and Indigenous Cultural Literacy Activism." *Community Literacy Journal* 13, no. 1 (2019): 37–54.

Jarvis, B. "Who Speaks for Crazy Horse?: The World's Largest Monument Is Decades in the Making and More than a Little Controversial." *The New Yorker*, September 16, 2019. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2019/09/23/who-speaks-for-crazy-horse.

Kelly, Casey Ryan. "Détournement, Decolonization, and the American Indian Occupation of Alcatraz Island (1969–1971)." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 44, no. 2 (March 15, 2014): 168–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2014.888464.

———. "Representations of Native Americans in Mass Media." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. London: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Kelly, Casey Ryan, and Jason Edward Black. *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

———. “Introduction: Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric.” In *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, 1–24. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

Kiewe, Amos. “Framing Memory through Eulogy: Ronald Reagan’s Long Goodbye.” In *Framing Public Memory*, 248–66. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2004.

Lechuga, Michael. “An Anticolonial Future: Reassembling the Way We Do Rhetoric.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 17, no. 4 (2020): 378–85.

Magazine, Smithsonian, and Kimbra Cutlip. “In 1868, Two Nations Made a Treaty, the U.S. Broke It and Plains Indian Tribes Are Still Seeking Justice.” Smithsonian Magazine. Accessed January 16, 2024. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/1868-two-nations-made-treaty-us-broke-it-and-plains-indian-tribes-are-still-seeking-justice-180970741/.

Makmillen, Shurli, and Michelle Riedlinger. “Markers of Identification in Indigenous Academic Writing: A Case Study of Genre Innovation.” *Text & Talk* 41, no. 2 (2021): 165–85.

Maldonado, Chandra Ann. “Commemorative (Dis)Placement: On the Limits of Textual Adaptability and the Future of Public Memory Scholarship.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 24, no. 1–2 (2021).

Mao, LuMing, Bo Wang, Arabella Lyon, Susan C. Jarratt, C. Jan Swearingen, Susan Romano, Peter Simonson, Steven Mailoux, and Xing Lu. “Manifesting a Future for Comparative Rhetoric,” 2015. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/07350198.2015.1040105?needAccess=true&role=button.

Marshall, Joseph. *The Journey of Crazy Horse: A Lakota History*. New York: Viking, 2004.

Massey, Doreen. *For Space*. London: SAGE, 2005.

McCann, Bryan J. “Materialist Rhetoric.” In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia: Communication*, 1–18, 2018.

McGee, Michael Calvin. “A Materialist’s Conception of Rhetoric.” In *Explorations in Rhetoric: Studies in Honor of Douglas Ehninger*, 23–48. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1982.

“Museums : Crazy Horse Memorial®.” Accessed September 2, 2023. https://crazyhorsememorial.org/the-museums.

Na’puti, Tiara R. “Oceanic Possibilities for Communication Studies.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 17, no. 1 (January 2, 2020): 95–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2020.1723802.

Na'puti, Tiara R. "Speaking of Indigeneity: Navigating Genealogies against Erasure and #RhetoricSoWhite." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 105, no. 4 (October 2, 2019): 495–501. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2019.1669895.

National Park Service: U.S. Department of the Interior. "Indian Memorial Brochure." Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, Montana, July 2023.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations*, no. 26 (1989): 7–24. https://doi.org/10.2307/2928520.

"Our Campus : Crazy Horse Memorial®." Accessed February 24, 2024. https://crazyhorsememorial.org/visit/our-campus.

Palczewski, Catherine. "Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn National Monument: Remapping the Gendered/Sexed Circumference of Memory." In *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*. New York: Peter Lang, 2020.

Pauley, Garth E. "John Lewis' 'Serious Revolution': Rhetoric, Resistance, and Revision at the March on Washington." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 320–40.

Reyes, G. Mitchell. "Memory and Alterity: The Case for an Analytic of Difference." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 43, no. 3 (2010): 222–52.

Rifkin, Mark. *Beyond Settler Time: Temporal Sovereignty and Indigenous Self-Determination*. Hauppauge, UNITED STATES: Duke University Press, 2017. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/csu/detail.action?docID=4792678.

Rocha Beardall, Theresa. "Settler Simultaneity and Anti-Indigenous Racism at Land-Grant Universities." *Indigenous Sociologies of Race and Ethnicity* 8, no. 1 (2022): 197–212.

Rosiek, Jerry Lee, Jimmy Snyder, and Scott L. Pratt. "The New Materialisms and Indigenous Theories of Non-Human Agency: Making the Case for Respectful Anti-Colonial Engagement." *Qualitative Inquiry* 36, no. 3–4 (2020): 331–46.

Running Wolf, Myrton W. "'Loose Production but Great Cause!!': A Response to the 2019 Rhetoric Society of America Project in Power, Place, and Publics at the University of Nevada, Reno." *Review of Communication* 20, no. 2 (April 2020): 188–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2020.1737199.

Russell, Karen Miller, Janice Hume, and Karen Sichler. "Libbie Custer's 'Last Stand': Image Restoration, the Press, and Public Memory." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 84, no. 3 (2007): 582–99.

"Sacagawea | Biography, Husband, Baby, Death, & Facts | Britannica," March 7, 2024. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Sacagawea.

"Sacagawea's Story (U.S. National Park Service)." Accessed March 21, 2024. https://www.nps.gov/places/sacagawea-s-story.htm.

Schowalter, Daniel F. “Disarticulating American Indianness in the National Museum of the American Indian.” In *Rhetoric, Materiality, and Politics*, 13:253–76. Frontiers in Political Communication. Peter Lang, 2009.

Senda-Cook, Samantha. “Materializing Tensions: How Maps and Trails Mediate Nature.” *Environmental Communication* 7, no. 3 (September 2013): 355–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2013.792854.

Shome, Raka. “Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An ‘Other’ View.” *Communication Theory* 6, no. 1 (1996): 40–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1996.tb00119.x.

———. “Thinking Culture and Cultural Studies--from/of the Global South.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 16, no. 3 (2019): 196–218.

Simons, Herbert W. “Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56, no. 1 (February 1970): 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637009382977.

Smith, Cynthia Duquette, and Teresa Bergman. “You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space.” In *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Stewart, Jessie, and Greg Dickinson. “Enunciating Locality in the Postmodern Suburb: Flatiron Crossing and the Colorado Lifestyle.” *Western Journal of Communication* 72, no. 3 (2008): 280–307.

“THE INDIAN MUSEUM OF NORTH AMERICA(r); : Crazy Horse Memorial®.” Accessed September 2, 2023. https://crazyhorsememorial.org/the-museums/the-indian-museum-of-north-america.

“The Sordid History of Mount Rushmore | History| Smithsonian Magazine.” Accessed March 13, 2024. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/sordid-history-mount-rushmore-180960446/.

Thomasma, Kenneth. *Naya Nuki, Shoshoni Girl Who Ran*. Grand Rapids, Mich., Jackson, WY: Baker Book House ; Grandview Pub. Co., 1983.

“Treaty History with the Northwest Tribes | Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife.” Accessed December 12, 2023. https://wdfw.wa.gov/hunting/management/tribal/history.

Tully, Fred. “Korczak Ziolkowski: Storyteller in Stone.” *Reclaiming Children and Youth* 6, no. 1 (2007): 56–60.

“Visit - American Indian Heritage (U.S. National Park Service).” Accessed September 27, 2023. https://www.nps.gov/subjects/americanindians/visit.htm.

Vivian, Bradford J. *Public Forgetting: The Rhetoric and Politics of Beginning Again*. University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State university press, 2010.

Wander, Philip, and Steven Jenkins. "Rhetoric, Society, and the Critical Response." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 58, no. 4 (December 1972): 441–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637209383142.

Watts, Vanessa. "Indigenous Place-Thought & Agency amongst Humans and Non-Humans (First Woman and Sky Woman Go on a European World Tour!)." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 2, no. 1 (2013): 20–34.

Wichelns, Herbert. "The Literary Criticism of Oratory." In *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking, in Honor of James Albert Winans*, 181–216. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.

Wilson, Kirt H. "The Problem with Public Memory: President Benjamin Harrison Confronts the 'Southern Question.'" In *Before the Rhetorical Presidency*, 267–88. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008.