

Out of Place: Case Studies of Native American Interpretive Projects and Processes

Prepared for WESTAF

by Dinah Zieger

1999

WESTAF

For most whites ... the Indian of imagination and ideology has been as real, perhaps more real, than the Native American of actual existence and contact. As preconception becomes conception and conception became fact, the Indian was used for the ends of argument, art and entertainment.¹

For much of U.S. history, non-Native scholars and others have been the principal interpreters of Native life and lifeways. But what happens to a culture whose symbols are chosen (or ignored) by outsiders, by those who do not understand its deepest beliefs, structures and ways of life? Although unexpressed, these questions surely lay at the heart of the *New Interpretations of National Parks: The Grand Canyon Project* undertaken by Western States Arts Federation five years ago. The project has been refocused recently, but those fundamental questions continue to drive the new initiative.

Interpretive control of Native cultures was beginning to change hands when the *New Interpretations* project was first proposed. Today, Native interpreters are systematically reclaiming their own voices concerning cultural representations. It is a significant step, indicative of the profound changes – political, economic and educational – that are occurring in Native communities. David Hurst Thomas, an archeologist and member of the board of the National Museum of the American Indian, has called for what he terms a “cubist” approach to interpretation of Native cultures, an approach that examines them

from multiple viewpoints. “To one degree or another, all views of the human past are created by those telling the story.”²

The purpose of this report is to offer a series of “case studies” of similar (though not identical) interpretive projects, examining how each grappled with the problem of telling stories – who chose the stories, who told them and how. Perhaps from this examination some points of similarity will emerge, from which strategies useful for future projects may become evident. The feature that unifies these projects ultimately is whose voice is heard. Implied in voice is language, native tongues. Anglo attempts to eradicate the languages of Native peoples succeeded far too often, for within oral cultures, loss of language inevitably includes loss of culture and identity itself. The role of tradition and belief, of memory, family and history are the matrix of community. The bonds of community are forged through telling stories, a process of drawing strength from the history, beliefs and values of the past to inform the present. Listening to other voices, different stories, empowers both the hearer and the teller.

In the past, the oral-cultural tradition of Native origin stories and tribal history has played only a minor role in park interpretation. The *New Interpretations Project* was seen as a bridge to rectify the omission, one that could also serve as a model transferable to other NPS properties. As envisioned, Native artists would produce works about the Grand Canyon, interpreting it from their traditional perspectives. The project’s goals were to strengthen ties between the NPS and the tribal communities and create a model that could form the basis for future NPS initiatives in other national parks. Changes in project management

several years ago prompted a reassessment of the project and a shift in focus. As the *Tribal Interpretive Arts Initiative*, it emphasizes community-based partnerships in which the tribes determine internally what they want to present and places the fiscal management in their hands. Such an arrangement gives them greater control of the process, making them active generators rather than passive recipients in determining the final product.

Shifting the emphasis to active rather than passive participation has profound implications for future projects. Within the frameworks of constantly shifting social, political, scientific and ideological movements, working out whose judgment prevails in the description and exhibition of a culture properly belongs in the hands of those within the culture. It is up to the tribal communities to decide, and to tell in their words, what purpose particular objects serve within their cultural system.³ The whole dynamic of the process is changed, in turn altering power relationships. The product outcome in such circumstances, as evidenced by the particular cases studied, is far more compelling than the mono-directional view of earlier Euro-centered scholarship.

Why were these particular projects selected? In large measure they were chosen because, with one exception, they lie within the Western States Arts Federations' 14-state region and are therefore representative of the particular tribes with which WESTAF members come into contact. They also share certain characteristics in terms of the processes involved in bringing a project from idea to product and illustrate the complexities of negotiating differing interpretations. Among the issues each case study will consider are these:

- Is the project an expression of an individual or part of the collective memory?
- Who defines what is traditional?
- Who defines the space/site to be interpreted?
- Who determines what kinds of art/artifacts expresses/occupies the space and how?
- What kinds of public-private partnerships were undertaken?
- How was the consultation process structured?
- Who funded the project, and what part did funding play in the outcome?

Finally, the case studies should reveal several issues common to the process.

These include, but aren't limited to:

- The importance of relationships, both within the tribal communities and from outside those communities;
- Respect for internal tribal-community power structures;
- Recognition of inter-tribal political issues;
- The necessity of tribal economic control;
- Respect for differences in management style.

The report begins with an examination of the Grand Canyon project.

Grand Canyon: New Interpretations Project

The idea of a national park is an American invention: “A public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people,” according to the legislation enacted by Congress in 1872 designating Yellowstone as the first national park. The act ordered the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the “preservation, from injury or spoliation, of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders within said park, and their retention of their natural condition.” In 1916, Congress created the National Park Service to promote and regulate the parks “by such means as conform to the said purpose of such parks ... which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of and ... leave them unimpaired for future generations.”

The Grand Canyon is one of the crown jewels of the nation’s parks. Oddly enough, it wasn’t declared an official national park until 1919, more than 40 years after Yellowstone. President Theodore Roosevelt had extolled the canyon’s virtues on a visit in 1903, but it was by means of the Antiquities Act, using executive not congressional authority, that he was first able to designate the site for protection in 1906. That act was a catalyst for preservation of land where “objects of historic or scientific interest ... [were] controlled by the Government of the United States.”⁴ Roosevelt interpreted the word “scientific” to include areas

noted for their geologic (hence scenic) as well as man-made significance and brought under federal control large tracts of land.

By the time the Grand Canyon was officially declared a national park, countless visitors were already flocking to it, sped on their way by the Santa Fe Railroad. The railroad's owners recognized the powerful appeal of the canyon's scenery, and by 1892 had developed a mutually beneficial working relationship with well-known artists, trading paintings, which were used in its advertising campaigns, for passage and accommodations.⁵ Significantly, the paintings pictured the canyon in its monumental grandeur, capturing the stunning geology illuminated by some preternatural light. But few depicted people, and almost none showed the Native inhabitants still living in and near the canyon. It wasn't an oversight: the Anglo-European explorers who first mapped the area paid scant attention to the people living there. What they saw was evidence of the divine hand, as revealed in the Bible and interpreted by white Protestants. John Wesley Powell, the first white explorer to descend the entire length of the Grand Canyon by boat in 1869, wrote in 1875: "One might imagine that this was intended for the library of the gods; and it was. The shelves are not for books, but form the stony leaves of one great book. He who could read the language of the universe may dig out letters here and there, and with them spell the words, and read, in a slow and imperfect way, but still so as to understand a little, the story of creation."⁶

Tourists at the beginning of the century visited the Grand Canyon – carried in safety and comfort on the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad – to see the awesome scenery. And at the end of the twentieth century scenery remains

the primary attraction. Missing from the NPS enabling legislation, and from vacation brochures, was any acknowledgment that the natural wonders being protected might have some human or cultural dimension. Over the years the NPS has tried to rectify that omission, incorporating cultural interpretation within its ongoing biologic-geologic chronicles. In 1995 the National Park Service approved a new General Management Plan for the Grand Canyon, an ambitious undertaking that proposed a new transportation network to move visitors around the park and a wholesale remaking of some of its interpretive sites and projects. WESTAF's *New Interpretations Project* seemed to mesh well with the overall plan. The Grand Canyon management plan proposed policies for specifically identified zones within the park -- a natural zone, a development zone and a cultural zone. Within the latter was the redevelopment of the Grand Canyon Village, a historic district at the railway head that had made possible the development of tourist hotel facilities in the 1920s. The existing historic buildings would be renovated and updated, including a new museum collection storage and research facility, with appropriate environmental controls, near the NPS maintenance area. The former mule barn was to be devoted to Native American arts.⁷

The *New Interpretations Project* started in 1992 with a simple idea: Bring together a group of Native American artists and communities with traditional ties to the Grand Canyon to create specific works of art interpreting the spiritual-cultural significance of the place. Originally, the works were to have been collected and reproduced as a book, which would be published by the Grand

Canyon Association, a non-profit organization that supports a variety of money-making ventures to promote the canyon. The guiding hand behind the project was Krista Elrick, at the time visual arts director for the Arizona Commission on the Arts. When she took a similar position with WESTAF in 1993, she brought the project with her. Elrick, a photographer, had worked on a major collaborative project on the Navajo Reservation and brought with her both expertise and experience in such an undertaking. Atlatl, a Native American-run arts organization that promotes contemporary Indian art forms, was also drawn into the early planning.

It seemed a fairly straightforward matter to draw up a list of artists, explain the project and set them to work. But a host of issues arose when the magnitude of the project became clear. Among the problems were defining whose project it was (the National Park Service's, the tribes', or WESTAF's); who would decide what was to be depicted; and how much authority and control the outside agencies wielded. There were eight tribes involved, and each had internal political issues to deal with, as well as some long-standing inter-tribal antagonisms. It became evident that dealing one-on-one with artists, without consulting the tribes, would lead to confusion and perhaps outright opposition to the project. It was at this stage in the project (1995) that Dave Warren came on board. Warren, of the Santa Clara Pueblo (Tewa Tribe), is one of the most respected Native American scholars and educators working today. His background included stints with the Smithsonian, founding deputy director of the National Museum of the American Indian, and a 20-year career as a teacher and

director of curriculum at the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe. He had just completed work on the *Glen Canyon Environmental Studies Archival Strategy Report* and suggested that the Grand Canyon project shared similarities with it. Thus, that earlier report might provide a model of how to proceed. “He brought something as a respected elder of a Pueblo with national political contacts [that] we were unable to tap,” said Shelly Cohen, executive director of the Arizona Commission on the Arts and a former WESTAF board member. “He understood both sides – the government and the tribes’. Under his involvement the project began to take shape. There were many voices speaking for the Native communities; he recommended getting the governance of the tribes involved in it, rather than focusing on the artists.”⁸

And so began the long process of meetings, both individually with each tribe and with the tribes collectively, to try to spell out the issues and craft a document that satisfied all parties. WESTAF’s role was to be the convenor and facilitator of the meetings; to establish a communication system to keep all parties informed about the process; and to raise funds for the planning and lay the groundwork for funding individual projects. The early meetings were to gauge the receptivity of the tribes to the concept and to working with the National Park Service. “It was our belief that the canyon was being interpreted by everyone but the tribes,” said Jim Copenhaver, former executive director and board member of WESTAF.⁹ “We felt this project was a way to let them express their views and their understanding of the Grand Canyon through some artistic means, not restricted to visual interpretation. Over time, we began to understand that the

tribes themselves should control how they wanted to do that and decide who in the tribe would make the artistic expression.”

It was imperative that an agreement clarifying who did what be drafted. Such an agreement had to be negotiated through tribal governments and their duly elected officials. Both the tribes and the NPS believed the agreement, or memorandum of understanding (MOU), had to be on a government-to-government basis. One of the continuing problems between the U.S. government and Native Americans is the inability of the dominant culture to acknowledge that each tribe is a distinct and often diverse community that doesn't always get along with other tribes. As Rick Hill, former director of the Institute of American Indian Arts and an assistant professor at State University of New York at Buffalo, says: “The word ‘Indian’ is not monolithic. We’re like the Democrats: everywhere but without a unified political point of view.”¹⁰ There are more than 300 tribal communities in the United States, with incredible differences. In his seminal work, *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, Vine Deloria, Jr., pointed out that even within a tribe, differences of opinion are rampant and programs are often disrupted by bickering within the reservation.¹¹ “Each election on a Sioux reservation is generally a fight to the finish. A ten-vote margin of some 1,500 votes cast is a landslide victory in Sioux country.”¹²

Thus, the process of drafting a one-size-fits-all MOU proved nearly impossible, as each tribe had its own issues. Besides the political issues – both inter and intra-tribal and with the NPS – there were religious issues of what they wanted to share with the Anglo community and of the possible misuse of

religious articles. Copenhaver said that despite some hesitance, the tribes believed it was important to participate. They saw their contributions as a way for their children to learn their culture as interpreted by themselves.

A major milestone in the project was a three-day meeting in 1995, at which representatives of WESTAF, the NPS and all eight tribes came together at the Grand Canyon to hammer out the broad outlines of a plan. Everyone agrees it was a seminal event – not least because it was the first time the eight tribes had willingly come together. At one point in the proceedings, the tribes asked to meet in executive session to feel out each other's positions and talk over difficulties among themselves without the outside parties present. The outcome was a new layer of issues that hadn't been identified previously, for example, the all-important economic issue. Who would pay for the projects, what income deriving from them would revert to the tribe and the artist, who would control this aspect? The NPS was, at the time, renegotiating vendor contracts at the Grand Canyon, and some among the tribes felt it was appropriate that they be considered as concessionaires. The NPS expressed its willingness to open the concessionaire contracts to the tribes, but the issue has not been resolved.

All of this meeting and drafting took time, and the process began to fray as carefully nurtured relationships among key players unraveled. There were changes in management at the Grand Canyon. Gary Cummings, assistant superintendent of the park and an ardent supporter of the project from the beginning, was transferred to NPS' main interpretive center in Harper's Ferry, Md. Various representatives from the tribes left as the result of electoral

decisions, and WESTAF itself underwent a major restructuring, moving its headquarters from Santa Fe to Denver. Several of WESTAF's key personnel chose not to make the move, and new people, unfamiliar with the project, came on board. Copenhaver admits the transition wasn't handled very well. "It got dropped through the cracks. We should have known better. We should have gone around to each tribe and introduced the new personnel, made personal introductions. We did to the tribes what all whites have done – made promises and left them in the lurch."

The changes in project management in 1997 propelled a reassessment of the project. Now reconstituted as the *Tribal Interpretive Arts Initiative*, the focus has shifted to emphasize a commitment to developing community-based partnerships in which the tribes identify the artists as well as plan and implement the particular art initiative from within their own communities. The goals still envision both an interpretive model useful to other tribes and parks and the production of art works by tribal artists to educate and promote understanding in the public at large. But the new initiative gives the tribes greater control of the process. For example, each tribal community will draft fiscal management procedures, as well as its own cooperative agreements, and develop a communications plan with the partners.

Lost in the process was the end product, which had become less and less defined. As Suzanne Benally noted in her December 1997 assessment report for WESTAF, artists have not been involved in the process thus far, and incorporating their voices at a later stage will be sensitive. The NPS has backed

off the project to the extent that it's content to let WESTAF and Atlatl handle the tribal negotiations. When the tribes know what they want to do, the park will provide a venue for their product, whether it's dance, music or demonstrations of various art forms.¹³

WESTAF continues to work with three tribes – Zuni, Hualapai, and Kaibab Band of Paiute – which have signed MOUs. The focus has shifted to within the communities, to encourage them to find their own cultural expressions and determine what they want to share with visitors to the Grand Canyon about who they are. WESTAF has applied for planning and implementation grants to move this stage forward with the ultimate goal of producing a product by September of 2000, but the onus is on the tribes to identify their cultural resources and determine how their communities will be involved.

The Grand Canyon project is not unique, either in intent or outcome. There are many instances, mainly in museums and galleries, where Native people have been invited to speak for themselves. Often, however, these are one-off exhibitions. One of the distinguishing characteristics of the projects chosen for this study is that they are of more or less permanent duration. An attempt has been made to group them around similar themes to illustrate recurring problems and solutions. Group I considers projects managed by the National Park Service. Group II looks at projects managed entirely within Native communities. And Group III examines projects that involve tribes and some other outside entity, perhaps state arts councils or private foundations.

GROUP I

Each of the projects in Group I has parallels with the Grand Canyon, involving multiple tribes and federal agencies, often with conflicting interpretations of events that make the places significant. Each worked from within the Native community to arrive at a more complex, “cubist” interpretation of the cultural impact of the particular event. Where these projects diverge most markedly from the *Grand Canyon: New Interpretations Project* is that each concerns an historical event that occurred at a particular place at a particular moment in time. In each case, the documentation provided by the Anglo participants was the one that defined the place.

Lewis & Clark National Historic Trail Interpretive Center, Great Falls, Montana

(Note: Reporting and site visit to come March 12)

Located on a bluff overlooking the Missouri River, the center features the Lewis and Clark expedition’s portage around the Great Falls of the Missouri River. Congress authorized the center in October 1988, and it officially opened in the summer of 1998 on land transferred from the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Forest Service Division. The defined focus of the center is Lewis and Clark in Indian Country, and exhibits in the main facility were structured from the beginning to reflect the

impact on the tribes as well as by the tribes on Lewis and Clark's Corps of Discovery's 1804-1806 expedition. In exploring the profound influences that the Plains Indians had on the outcomes of the expedition and the resulting influences on the Indian way of life, the exhibits transcend the usual ethnocentric Euro-American focus of other Lewis and Clark facilities. The exhibits relate the expedition's dependence on the Indians, the cultural differences among the tribes as well as with the explorers, and the resulting changes in Indian lifestyle. For visitors, the exhibit follows two main story lines: one is the chronology of events of the expedition from St. Louis, Missouri, to the Pacific Ocean and back. The other focuses on the particular events that occurred in the uncharted territory of the plains.

Planning began with a community planning meeting in March of 1989, with participants drawn from the Forest Service, the Montana Department of Wildlife, Bureau of Land Management, Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, Cascade (MT) County Historical Society, the Montana Power Co. and community leaders. The steering committee crafted an approach to planning the interpretive focus based on a team of 12 specialists representing expertise in American history, museum planning, exhibit development, interpretive planning and Forest Service administration. Because interpretive history is not the traditional mission of the Forest Service, and because other existing Lewis and Clark interpretive facilities focused on portraying the journey and its Euro-American participants, the steering committee sought outside expertise to broaden the historical subject matter and deepen the interpretation. It selected four outside participants: the

director of the Smithsonian's Quincentenary Programs commemorating the 500th anniversary of Columbus's landfall in the New World; a leading scholar on the Lewis and Clark expedition; an exhibition-design expert; and George Horse Capture, an internationally recognized authority on Plains Indians history and culture, now assistant director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian.

Working together, the team selected a "story hook" to make the Great Falls Interpretive Center unique. The exhibition narrative focuses on the historical and cultural context in which events occurred, rather than on the events per se. Ten broad thematic areas are subdivided into one or more subthemes. For example, one thematic area,

"Indians: To Whom the Land Belonged," introduces the nomadic tribes that had co-existed in the region for many years. Subthemes explore how tribes used the land for seasonal food sources and examine "border disputes" that arose between competing tribes, for example, a power struggle between the Piegan Blackfeet and the Shoshoni and how that led to an alliance between the Shoshoni and the Lewis and Clark expedition. Another explains how members of the expedition understood the native tribes they found in the area around the Great Falls.

Outcomes expected to arise from the exhibits were also clearly defined before ground was broken for the interpretive center. They included making sure that visitors understand that the West of 1805 was not an unknown, unpopulated land, but rather one settled by many Indian tribes, whose expertise was integral

to the success of the Lewis and Clark mission. Another objective seeks to erase stereotypes of Indian culture and raise an emotional awareness of the toll that contact took on Native peoples.¹⁴

Using reproductions of objects and notes from expedition members, the Lewis & Clark National Historic Trail Interpretive Center presents competing interpretations of a seminal event – contact and Western expansion – in American history. By including other voices and other views it tells a more complete and complex story.

Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, Crow Agency, Montana

(Note: Reporting and site visit to come March 11)

With the stroke of a pen, President George Bush renamed Custer Battlefield National Monument in 1991, designating it the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument. The act didn't address changing the interpretation, but it was an inevitable outcome of altering the name of the site of one of the most-debated military engagements in U.S. history. Rep. (now Sen.) Ben Nighthorse Campbell initiated the legislation after representatives from tribes involved in the momentous battle approached him in the late 1980s. But agitation for change had begun much earlier, in the actions of the American Indian Movement in 1973 at Wounded Knee and demonstrations in 1976 and 1988 at Custer Battlefield. It took two attempts in Congress, which finally passed the bill in 1991.

The Little Bighorn Battlefield has always been unusual insofar as it is one of the few monuments in the United States to memorialize a defeat. In June

1876, in the valley of the Little Bighorn River, near what is today Crow Agency, 263 soldiers and attached personnel of the U.S. Army died attacking a Lakota-Cheyenne village. Among the dead were Lt. Col. George Armstrong Custer and every member of his command. Some 100 Lakota and Cheyenne warriors -- led by Sitting Bull, Crazy Horse and other war chiefs -- also died. Within three years of the battle, the site was designated a national cemetery, and the Army and federal government assumed control, including control of the interpretation of the battle, around which grew the myth of "Custer's Last Stand." Unlike similar memorials, like the Alamo and Pearl Harbor, the battlefield never became a rallying point, except for the Custer myth and the urge to pay tribute to fallen soldiers. However, with the name change the issue of honoring fallen heroes arose again, only this time the focus was on the warriors who fought at the Little Bighorn, not the soldiers.¹⁵ The point, said Rep. Campbell, was "equal honor on the battlefield." In order to insure equal honor, the events that unfolded there more than 120 years ago had to be dissected and viewed from a different angle.

Prior to 1992, the site was interpreted primarily for and by non-Indian Americans, to whom it signified little more than a stirring footnote to their national history. But Little Bighorn Battlefield symbolizes much more, especially to the tribes who participated -- the Lakota, Cheyenne, Arapaho, Crow and Arikara. On this battlefield the tragedy of cultural conflict that had existed between native tribes and Euro-Americans for more than 400 years unfolded. The efforts of Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse and other Lakota and Cheyenne leaders represented the last stage of resistance to attempts to remove them from their

lands and eradicate their cultures. For Indians, especially the descendants of the tribes that fought there, Little Bighorn is seen in light of its product: the end of their traditional existence and eventual relocation onto reservations.

The National Park Service approved a new interpretive plan for the battlefield in February 1997 grouped around six broad themes: The symbolic dimensions of the battle; the Great Sioux War of 1876-77; the public desire to place the Army as a buffer between the Indians and white society; inter-tribal conflicts and alliances; the influence of terrain and fighting styles; and recognition that the battle was the climax of a series of conflicts between Indians and whites that began the 17th century.

Among other things the plan calls for a new visitor center to serve as an information/orientation facility. From the center, visitors can drive to significant spots within the battlefield, where additional interpretive material, as well as interpreter-guides, are available. The planning document acknowledges a “moral obligation” as well as a legal one to consult with tribes associated with the battle, to decide what should be interpreted and how the messages should be presented.

Barbara Suteer (Unita-Cherokee), director of Little Bighorn Battlefield during the period leading up to and following the name change and now Indian Affairs Coordinator with the NPS’ Rocky Mountain division, cites several factors that fostered such a sweeping change.¹⁶ Key to the process was that she herself is Indian. Tribal leaders feel more comfortable dealing through her with the federal government, she said. While still at Little Bighorn, she reconfigured the

11-person staff, which now comprises Indians and non-Indians in equal numbers. In addition, the battlefield's new chief interpreter, Ken Woody, is Indian (Oneida) and in a position of authority, which reassures tribes that their voices will be heard.

Even with these changes, tribal members haven't turned out in significant numbers to present their views on interpretive changes. Suteer attributes that to the fact that many don't feel welcome because the decision-makers are "too white." In addition, she points to inter-tribal tensions – Sioux and Cheyenne won't come to the site because it's on the Crow reservation, who were scouts for Custer. Four of the interpretive programs are devoted to Plains Indian culture, but NPS administrators say that recruitment of qualified Native Americans willing to work at such an isolated park is a major problem and response from tribes involved in the battle is very low.

However, on one level the park service has succeeded. Four years ago, Little Big Horn College, a tribal community college in Crow Agency, bid for and won the contract for bus tours of the site. The company hired five locals and trained them at the college and at different locations within the monument area as guides. The guides often talk about their daily lives on the reservation as well as deliver their spiel, and the stories they tell are drawn from "what the older people heard from the Sioux and Cheyenne who fought here," one guide told a group of rapt passengers last summer.¹⁷

Sand Creek Massacre, Colorado

(Note: Difficulty arranging interviews with tribal leaders to talk about this)

One of the most savage massacres of Native peoples occurred toward the end of the Civil War in an arid corner of southeastern Colorado. The slaughter is a fact of history: the U.S. Army killed and mutilated some 163 Cheyenne and Arapaho women, children and old men in the Sand Creek Massacre in 1864. It is an event worthy of commemoration, but thus far the exact site along the Big Sandy Creek in Kiowa County hasn't been identified. In October 1998, President Bill Clinton signed a bill authorizing the National Park Service to study suspected sites to locate the spot where the massacre occurred. The act pays for an 18-month study, jointly undertaken by representatives of the tribes and the NPS, with the Colorado Historical Society as advisers. If the site is identified, it could lead to national park designation and protection.

Again, the legislation was carried by Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, who is part Cheyenne and one of the 44 chiefs of the Northern Cheyenne tribe. And again, the impetus came from tribal members, who testified before Congress about the significance of the site and the importance of commemorating such shameful deaths. Laird Cometsevah, president of the Southern Cheyenne Sand Creek Descendants and chief of the Council of 44, and Steve Brady, president of the Northern Cheyenne Sand Creek Descendants, are designated by their tribes to speak on behalf of descendants.

Identifying the site has proven difficult, in large part because so much time has elapsed since the massacre. Unlike the Little Bighorn Battlefield, which was designated a memorial cemetery three years after the event, no attempt was made to mark Sand Creek. And some attempts have been made to recast the event. For example, Sand Creek appears on a Civil War monument that sits on the grounds of the state capitol in Denver, which ostensibly commemorates engagements with Confederate troops. The reasons why are tied to the history of the event.

On Nov. 29, 1864, soldiers and volunteers led by Civil War hero Col. John Chivington marched into the Sand Creek reservation of Cheyenne and Arapahos in southeastern Colorado to retaliate against attacks by a group of Cheyenne “Dog Soldiers.” Their attacks had crippled the wagon trains that the three-year-old territory depended on for economic survival. The Dog Soldiers were an autonomous military wing of the tribe, and the people living at the Sand Creek camp were neither behind the attacks nor harboring the soldiers. In fact, the tribes were in the middle of peace talks with the U.S. government, which had guaranteed Chief Black Kettle and his tribe safe passage through the territory. When Chivington’s troops arrived at the site, they were met by an American flag and a white truce flag. Nonetheless, Chivington ordered an attack, and an estimated 163 Cheyenne and Arapaho were slaughtered. Two-thirds of the dead were women, children and old men. The attack was so savage that Congress stopped, in the midst of the Civil War, to investigate and ultimately condemn Chivington and the Colorado Volunteers for the massacre and pledge reparations

in the Treaty of Little Arkansas in 1865. Even so, white settlers, alarmed by the raids by the Dog Soldiers, cheered Chivington, even naming a town in Colorado in his honor. Years of careful research and close contact with tribal leaders of the descendents have helped Colorado historians piece together another version of the events, one documented in a series of 107 remarkable drawings by Cheyenne warrior-artists chronicling the Dog Soldiers' battles.

Finding the exact place where the massacre happened is essential. But for the descendents of the Cheyenne and Arapaho slaughtered, there's more at stake. They want an active voice in the interpretation of the events, a clear statement from their perspective of what happened there. The situation is fraught with tensions stemming from a long history of unfulfilled promises. Even though Congress ordered reparations, no money has ever been paid. Moreover, a recent three-year effort by the Colorado Historical Society failed to uncover irrefutable evidence at the place long believed to be the site of the massacre, throwing the site in doubt. Then there's the friction between the tribes and the National Park Service, which has specific legal guidelines that determine how, when and with whom it does business. The tribal descendents groups don't constitute a legal governmental entity according to NPS rules, forcing a series of meetings with tribal councils which have already designated the groups to speak on behalf of the descendents.

GROUP II

The projects in this group consider what happens when Native peoples exercise total, or near-total, control over interpretation. The examples range from the Institute of American Indian Arts Museum, with its focus on contemporary Native art, to the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center, a stunning showcase devoted to a revitalized tribe declared extinct by white scholars. They are the clearest examples of community-based cultural interpretation. Their choices of art works and artifacts are often based on different ways of viewing objects, which don't necessarily reflect the standards of aesthetic or historic value prevailing in mainstream institutions. Instead, the objects become expressions of distinct ways of seeing the world, an entrée for the viewer into a different cultural understanding of the tribal community and American history.¹⁸

Institute of American Indian Arts Museum, Santa Fe, New Mexico

For more than 30 years Santa Fe's Institute of American Indian Arts has claimed the right to interpret Indian art through Indian eyes. It isn't always what the American public wants or expects to see, and the Institute's path is strewn with battles lost and won. But for its founders and present administration, IAIA's mission is to reclaim Indian authority over their art, to control the interpretation of who and what they are. A recent exhibition at the IAIA Museum shows what can happen when the people who live a culture are given free rein to interpret that culture.

Savage Truths: Realities of Indian Life opened in June of 1998 after nearly two years' of planning, and in both form and content challenged the status quo of Santa Fe's usual depiction of Native Americans. The exhibit was a collaborative effort from the beginning. It was shaped initially through conversations between Fred Nahwooksy, director of the IAIA Museum, and Lloyd Kiva New, president emeritus of the Institute, and later between Nahwooksy and Michael Kabotie about the realities of contemporary Indian life and the possibilities inherent in new technologies.¹⁹ "Part of the core beliefs of this Institution is our willingness to present contemporary Native art," Nahwooksy said. But it's more than simply art by contemporary artists. The museum is controlled by Native scholars and interpreters, which adds an edge to all of its exhibitions. "First-hand interpretation from the Native perspective is what this is all about," Nahwooksy says. "We have Native artists and curators. Growing up as a Indian, having that history and that burden, having those successes, the wholeness of your being, that is the direct truth of what we present."

For *Savage Truths*, a team of four curators (Nahwooksy, New, Rick Hill, former director of IAIA Museum, now with the National Museum of Native American Arts, and Nancy Marie Mithlo, professor of museum studies at the Institute) selected 12 Native artists and outlined an open-ended, conceptual framework.²⁰ In essence, IAIA offered the artists a facility, staff, a budget and a timeframe in which to mount the exhibition. "We essentially asked the artists to fill in the pieces – both the statement they would make as a group as well as the art they intended to put into the gallery," Nahwooksy said. "We weren't sure which

way it would go. They negotiated among themselves; the curators weren't defining what would happen, they were more like facilitators of the process." Budget and space were the boundaries. Because several of the individual pieces required video and audio, the museum invested some of the budget in a small studio in its basement. "Basically, the curatorial staff said, here's the dirt, paint, bricks and lights you said you needed, 'now go do it,'" Nahwooksy said.

Over the span of 10 months and two planning meetings, the artists filled in the pieces. The name itself, which the artists chose, is an important element of the exhibition, Nahwooksy says, because it is both a statement about survival and a sign of the times. "They were saying, 'This is where we are as Indian people today.'" In an essay for the exhibition, Nahwooksy expounded on savages: "The name empowers anyone to treat Indian people in inhuman ways and to denigrate lifeways in an effort to destroy groups. ... With this exhibit of contemporary art, the artists and curators wear the mantle of "Savage" on their own terms."²¹ In another essay, Rick Hill elaborated on a "savage" reality: "The savage is often edited out of contemporary Indian art. Both the artists and the art consumer want to see the one proud and noble Indian resurrected."²²

Individually and collectively the artists set about showing the realities of contemporary Indian life. It was risky for the museum to propose a collaborative approach, because it ceded control over the exhibition to a group; it was equally risky for the artists, who are all recognized names in the art market. And, as Curator Nancy Mithlo notes: "In an arts market that values individuality over communal thought, losing ownership is akin to losing authority and power ... this

signals a very different approach than is the norm in the Native arts market.”²³

The resulting exhibition was not a totally collaborative effort. Within a loose concept agreed on collectively, each artist took responsibility for one or more installations.

The individual works they produced were a departure from the usual fare found in Santa Fe. Marcus Amerman’s “Rez Car,” for example, is a reflection of the realities of poverty and a celebration of survival. As Amerman explained in his artist’s statement: This “rusted, out-of-date, broken-down junker transports large numbers of people in any conditions and over any terrain. It is the modern counterpart of the horse, and is also an intricate part of stories and jokes about Indian Country. ... Perhaps this is my fantasy: an Indian superhero car.”²⁴ Truman Lowe’s piece critiqued Southwestern commercialism with a display of “marked down” coyote-skin rugs made from artificial turf and psychedelic fake fur. Dorothy Grandbois’s “Diary of a Teen Mother” documented a facet of contemporary Indian life through larger-than-life photos of teenage mothers coupled with handwritten stories.²⁵

Such an exhibit, with its shattering images and in-your-face truth-telling, was possible only because the IAIA Museum has the means and the institutional authority to control its exhibitions in their entirety. The Institute’s roots lie in an arts education program instituted in the 1930s by the Bureau of Indian Affairs at the old Santa Fe Indian School. “This first formal studio approach to art instruction evolved in an atmosphere of white paternalism,” writes Lloyd Kiva New. “As a result of sympathetic, although often misguided, interest in American

Indian culture on the part of non-Indians – scholars, patrons, artists of the community and zealous instructors – there emerged a style of painting that became widely accepted as the exemplar of “traditional” Indian painting.”²⁶ Popularly known as the Santa Fe Studio Movement, it derived from tribally evolved designs found in basketry, pottery and decorations used on religious paraphernalia. But the style itself was defined largely by white notions as to which visual forms might properly be construed as “traditional,” conditioned by drawings and paintings produced by Indians in the 1920s at the request of anthropologists. By the 1950s, Abstract Expressionism was ascendant in the art world, and the notion spread that “traditional” Indian painting had ossified into an ethnic/aesthetic cliché. The search for a solution was initiated at the Directions in Indian Art Conference in 1959 and pursued in the experimental Southwest Indian Art Project, which ran from 1960 to 1962 at the University of Arizona in Tucson. Both were funded by the Rockefeller Foundation.²⁷ From these came the principles that guide the Institute of American Indian Arts, which opened in 1962 under a charter issued by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, replacing the Studio.

As a result of the IAIA’s incorporation of modernist principles, and the presence on its staff of accomplished contemporary artists, like Fritz Scholder and Allan Houser, who were also Native Americans artistic practice shifted radically. What emerged was Indian art that consciously engaged the Euro-American avant-garde. Its curriculum shifted from the “ethnological to the aesthetic,” and emphasized individualism over tribalism.²⁸ The changes created friction within Indian communities and from the patrons, curators and collectors of

Native American art. As Rick Hill points out in an interview, “the commingling of influences is what an art school is all about. [But] as Indians, too often, we’re accused of ‘ruining the art’ when we seek out those influences. Somehow we’re supposed to be cultural robots who keep repeating the past when, in actuality, the very reason we’re here today is because we haven’t destroyed ourselves by being culturally static.”²⁹ The Institute, Hill said, is training artists, who are also Indians. “We’re not trying to play to tourist preconceptions ... the other museums do that well enough.”

Outside influences, in particular the Civil Rights movement and the conflicts between the federal government and the American Indian Movement, placed additional stresses on the Institute, which teetered precariously throughout the 1970s and early 1980s. After years of hearings and debate, the U.S. Congress in 1986 passed the American Indian, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Culture and Development Act, which transferred control and direction of the IAIA from the Interior Department to a presidentially appointed board of trustees. In addition, the Institute became a direct line-item in the federal budget, giving it the same standing as the Smithsonian has. Control of the Institute was transferred in 1988, and enrollment, which had lagged throughout the late 1970s and early 1980s, increased by 50 percent in two years.

The IAIA Museum, a \$5 million reconfiguration of a 1921 U.S. Post Office across the street from St. Francis Cathedral in the heart of Santa Fe, opened in 1992. About one-third (\$350,000) of its fiscal 1999 budget of \$1.1 million comes from the federal government, and another \$150,000 derives from admission fees.

The remainder comes from foundations and from the City of Santa Fe Arts Commission and the 1 percent Lodgers' Tax. "There's no question in my mind that it's significant that we control the purse strings," said Nahwooksy. "Who controls the dollars controls what gets interpreted, how it's presented, and how much [is presented]."

Identity and the politics of representation are constant themes in the IAIA Museum's exhibitions, and Nahwooksy acknowledges that some who visit the museum are "disappointed" by its insistence on presenting contemporary expressions of Native life. "We try to advise them [on entering] that they are entering a space that presents contemporary art works. ... In the United States, most people have been socialized in such a way that they believe Native people are dead and gone. They're surprised to see a place like this and to see brown people are still alive. ... This is an Indian statement. That's what this place is about."

Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center, Mashantucket, Connecticut

(Note: McBride interview to come)

Another Indian statement is the \$193-million Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center, which opened in August 1998, in Connecticut. It's the largest Native-owned and operated cultural center of its kind in North America, the museum that gambling built, funded by the tribe's Foxwoods Resort Casino. The collection has its roots in the archeology, genealogy, oral history and

other records gathered by the tribe as it sought sovereign status from the federal government in the 1970s. Although its state-of-the-art physical plant is the envy of any museum, some criticize its presentation and interpretation because many of its staff are non-Native and its focus is on the past rather than the present and future.

The museum is the culmination of 25 years of reclamation of the Pequot birthright. The Pequots were among the first Eastern Woodland people to encounter European settlers when they arrived on the North American continent more than 350 years ago. It was not an auspicious meeting. Prior to European contact, the Pequots numbered about 8,000 and inhabited some 250 square miles of land.³⁰ But disease, mainly smallpox, and the Pequot War of 1636-38 decimated the tribe. Some 600 Indians died when armed settlers from the Connecticut and Massachusetts Bay colonies attacked, and the survivors were sold as slaves or sent to other tribes; the Mashantucket Pequot are the descendents of those survivors sent to the Mohegans.³¹ Survivors were forbidden to return to their villages or use the tribal name. In the 1640s, however, Robin Cassacinamon, an influential Pequot leader, persuaded the English to return some 3,000 acres of land, and a reservation at Mashantucket was established. But it was an uphill struggle to hang onto the land, and the tribe dwindled. According to a colonial census of 1774, only 151 tribal members lived on the reservation, and by the early 1800s, only 40 remained.³²

By 1856, illegal land sales by the state had reduced the 989-acre reservation to 213 acres in Connecticut, supporting a handful of families. In the

1970s, inspired in part by the American Indian Movement, tribal members began moving back to the Mashantucket reservation. Many of them were related to Anne George and her sister, Elizabeth George, who had spent a lifetime fighting for the tribe's survival. With the assistance of the Native American Rights Fund and the Indian Rights Association, the tribe filed suit in 1976 against neighboring landowners to recover the land sold by the state of Connecticut in 1856. It took seven years, but the tribe finally reached a settlement with the landowners, and the Connecticut Legislature petitioned Congress to grant tribal recognition to the Mashantucket Pequot. The federal government finally agreed in 1983, when President Ronald Reagan signed into law the Mashantucket Pequot Indian Land Claims Settlement Act, formally recognizing the status of the Mashantucket Pequot tribe and returning to them 1,259 acres of land. Three years later, the tribe opened a bingo hall, followed by Foxwoods Resort Casino, the largest revenue-generator in the state, in 1992. The casino brought economic security to the tribe, and funds from it and several other tribal-owned businesses have contributed to building the community's infrastructure, including roads, a public safety complex and housing, as well as the museum.

From the outset, the museum was intended to be a visible reminder that the Pequot had not vanished, but rather were flourishing on their own ancestral lands. With nearly \$200 million available, the museum incorporates state-of-the-art technologies, from sound and sight to smell and touch, into a series of stunning exhibits that tell the story of the Pequot over a long period of time. It begins 11,000 years ago as the last Ice Age ended and the first people settled

the area in southeastern Connecticut, and moves through life-sized models of villages to huge topographical models of the reservation and its geology and ecology. Creation stories of the Pequot, Kiowa, Tlingit and Mohegan, tribes which settled nearby, are told through videos, contemporary paintings, ceramics, masks and Native beadwork. The research center contains space for 250,000 volumes devoted to Native histories and cultures. Classrooms, labs and study areas are designated for children, students and scholars-in-residence.

Kevin McBride, the museum's non-Indian research director, says the real benefit of the museum is the way that tribal history is being rewritten. "It's not just the information; it's the new perspectives on the past," he said. "We used to have one way of looking at the past ... not necessarily through Western eyes, but through certain methodologies. But any time you engage in a dialogue with people looking at things with a different perspective, you're bound to see something new. At Mashantucket, the traditional approach ... had been to look at [Native history] through the study of acculturation. But now, it is from a perspective of continuity and resistance. The people are saying, 'We have made decisions. We have maintained certain aspects of our identity and culture.'"³³

Theresa Hayward Bell, granddaughter of Elizabeth George, is the museum's executive director. Cheryl Metoyer (Cherokee), director of information services, says that from the beginning the facility was intended to provide information not only about the Pequots but other Native peoples of the United States and Canada. The museum has ties with major educational institutions, including the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian in New

York and Washington, D.C., Chicago's Newberry Library, the University of Connecticut and the Native American Rights Fund. "With proper links to tribal, national and international agencies, the Library and Archives will transform the study of Native people," Metoyer said.³⁴

There is no question that this is the Mashantucket Pequot's museum; there are no federal or foundation dollars behind it. It is owned by the tribe, which controls the purse strings. The tribal council decides what stories it wants to tell and budgets funds for that purpose. According to David Holahan, the museum's public relations director, Bell and a three-member executive committee were chosen by the tribe to tell the Pequot's story. He said tribal members were involved extensively in the structure and design of the exhibits, although "a lot" of the museum's 150 staff members are non-Indians. "The final word on everything is approved by a seven-member tribal council, but they make accommodations to seek the advice of outside experts," he said.³⁵

Fred Nahwooksy, former director of the IAIA Museum in Santa Fe, is critical of the museum's efforts. "Experience [in running an arts-cultural organization] determines what you choose to promote and why," and the Pequot have little such experience. "A lot comes down to intent," he says. Nahwooksy thinks a museum with proximity to so many tourists, attracted by the casino, should take advantage of the opportunity to educate "vast numbers" of visitors about contemporary Indian politics and everyday living conditions for most Native Americans. Instead, it perpetuates a romantic past. "It [the Pequot Museum] is an

opportunity to make some serious statements about contemporary culture, [but] it hasn't happened so far as we can tell," he said.

The Museum at Warm Springs, Warm Springs, Oregon

(Note: Reporting, site visit March 15)

The Museum at Warm Springs, which opened in March 1993, is the brainchild of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, which comprise the Wasco, Paiute and Warm Springs Indians. The \$7.6 million museum, designed to evoke a creekside encampment among a stand of cottonwood trees, is the result of a 20-year effort to preserve and showcase culture on the reservation. From its inception, the museum was planned to serve as a living legacy of their combined cultures. Its goals were to preserve a representative sampling of their rich and thriving traditional cultures; to teach young people the history and precepts of Indian sovereignty; and to serve as a window onto reservation life and traditions for neighbors and tourists.

The reservation's history goes back nearly 150 years, when the Wasco and Warm Springs tribes ceded 10 million acres of land in central Oregon to the United States. Under the treaty, signed in 1855, the tribes reserved a portion of the land for their own use. Some 20 years later, the Paiute, who were prisoners of war, asked to be relocated to the reservation.

The museum draws from a rich collection of native artwork, photographs and stories to tell the long history of the tribes. Since 1974, the tribal council has spent more than \$900,000 buying artifacts from families in the Warm Springs

community, and the collection now contains some 2,500 objects. Storytelling is an essential feature of the museum, and several permanent exhibits use audiovisual aids to teach visitors about daily life, traditions, songs, dances, medicines and rites of passage for each of the tribes. Artwork featured in the displays includes beaded vests and headdresses, patterned woven baskets and decorated cornhusk bags.

Decisions about what is displayed and how is an open-ended process, which allows tribal elders to re-think the appropriateness of the intention. Involvement is widespread throughout the community, and opinions are seriously considered in a painstaking review of word choices, images and artifacts. It is an ongoing process, says director Michael Hammond, which allows the tribes to control their stories and the way they live their lives.

GROUP III

The projects in this group involve one or more tribes and a third party, such as a state arts council or a private foundation. The thread that links them is that the idea for each arose largely from outside the tribal community, although it's stretched thin in the case of Roadside Theater-Zuni Idiwanan, because the idea germinated from within the Zuni community following presentations by Roadside. It considers how issues are negotiated and final products emerge.

Drawing the Lines, a joint project of Arizona State University and Atlatl, Arizona

Drawing the Lines was a multi-layered project that began with a series of artists' residencies at five tribal communities and culminated in a festival of public performances in 1997. The idea wasn't just to have a festival, but to use the arts as a way to bridge the gap between contemporary and traditional Native communities. The artists, using traditional stories and tools, would help the community make something new that expressed their contemporary lives. The coordinating partners were Arizona State University's Public Events Office and Atlatl. ASU Public Events is a presenting organization whose mission is to make performing arts accessible to all in the community, emphasizing audience understanding of various art forms. Atlatl, a national service organization, promotes the vitality of contemporary Native American arts and the enhancement of Native communities through cultural efforts. The project spanned two years of planning and development prior to the weekend-long "festival" of exhibits, lectures and performances at ASU's Gammage Memorial Auditorium in April 1997.

The goal of *Drawing the Lines* was first to develop understanding of the continuum of work by contemporary Native artists and their relationship to their traditional communities. It was also intended to develop new audiences by educating existing ones about Native cultures and art forms, and improve relationships among the communities and ASU. The project grew out of conversations between the directors of Atlatl and ASU Public Events, which had

previously worked together on a project with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community called *Dancers of the Dreaming*. ASU and Atlatl first approached the Southwestern Inter-Tribal Museum Coalition, an association of Native American cultural centers, to gauge possible interest among their member institutions. The coalition helped identify five communities to participate in the proposed festival – Ak-Chin and Gila River Indian communities; Salt River Pima-Maricopa; San Carlos Apache; and ASU American Indian Institute, a support center for Native American students on campus. The artists were selected from Atlatl’s roster of contemporary Native American artists.

Initial meetings were held with representatives of the five communities to explain the purpose of the project and to outline what the presenting partners would provide and what the tribal communities were expected to contribute. ASU’s project coordinator, April Edwards, says that at first the tribes were skeptical: “They didn’t accept that we were offering something that they could decide on and tailor to their own needs. It took a bit of time to explain it. Also, we were using all kinds of jargon – things like ‘residencies,’ and ‘outreach,’ and ‘presenting organizations.’ We found out that we had to convey our ideas better,” in more understandable language.³⁶ Part of the skepticism also stemmed from the long and often negative history that ASU had with tribes statewide. There was a feeling among them that its scholars came and took, but left nothing. It was an obstacle that ASU had to contend with throughout the project, one which Atlatl helped smooth out, Edwards said.

The San Carlos Apache Reservation was one of the traditional communities selected for artist residencies. In this case, two artists were paired to make a complete project -- Chesley Goseyun Wilson, a San Carlos Apache and instrument-maker, and Brent Michael Davids, a Mohican composer. During the first week, some 25 adult students worked with Wilson learning to make traditional Apache violins, which were fabricated from the Century plant that grows on the reservation. In the second week, Davids coached about a dozen of the students through the process of creating a contemporary performance work. First he taught them how to play the instruments, then he helped them develop an idea and write their own piece. Using both traditional and new songs, the students created a collaborative musical work, performed on instruments they had made, which was presented at the festival.

The San Carlos Apache Reservation spreads over 1.8 million acres in southeastern Arizona and has been home to the San Carlos Apache since 1874. Today, some 10,000 people, most living in the town of San Carlos, live there. The tribe functions as a democracy, and council members serve staggered four-year terms. Various boards and committees oversee the economic, social, safety and health needs of the reservation. According to a tribal publication, the tribe is revising its constitution with the goal of increasing sovereignty and self-governance by eliminating laws that cede authority to the federal government, specifically the U.S. Department of the Interior.³⁷ Ranching, farming and timber are traditional sources of income, but recreation draws the most visitors. The reservation attracts anglers, hunters, boaters and hikers, and the Apache Gold

Casino, a 60,000-square-foot gaming resort on the western edge of the reservation, opened in 1996. Still, making a living on the reservation is hard work, and the wages are relatively low.

The Apache Cultural Center, which opened in 1994, is an attempt by the tribe to reclaim its identity. The tribe is proud of the displays, which inform visitors of land grabs and massacres by white settlers, as well as the traditions and stories of its past. “Here Apaches tell our history instead of the version repeated through the filter of non-Apache historians and archeologists,” a tribal publication states. “The Apache version is different from the anthropologists’ view that Athabaskan-speaking people crossed over the Siberian land bridge and came to North America. ‘Many knowledgeable and respected elders believe the Apache have always been here – as far back as the very ancient times spoken of in their stories,’” according to a wall panel in the center.³⁸

The Cultural Center was pivotal to the success of the *Drawing the Lines* residencies, for it was where students would meet with Wilson and Davids. The center is located on Highway 70, the state highway that crosses the reservation, and a few miles from the town center. This may seem beside the point, but in fact location, and the means to get there, is an important factor in the success (or failure) of such a project. In its report to the funder of *Drawing the Lines*, ASU acknowledged that meeting the transportation needs of the participants was a challenge. “We tried to provide transportation when needed, (but) there were times when our resources were spread too thin and we were not able to respond

at the last minute. In future, there must be some plan set forth when working with communities lacking transportation.”³⁹

Planning took two years. First, each community was asked to set up a planning committee of community members, who would determine the goals of the project and choose which artist(s) they wanted. Each committee then met with the artist(s), and they jointly decided what specific activity would fit their needs. The primary goal for the San Carlos Apache Cultural Center was to support the then-new center, empower local artists and pass on the knowledge of making traditional crafts.⁴⁰ Setting up the committees and scheduling meetings wasn't a simple matter. As Edwards points out, tribal and Anglo systems of organization differ greatly. There were assumptions by the partners that committee members all had telephones, calendars and transportation, and scheduling a meeting was simply a matter of picking up the phone and setting a date. “Expecting that to happen was very naïve on our part,” she said. Social and conversational differences also cropped up – such issues as the Anglo tendency to talk too much and too fast, to jump right in to the business at hand rather than making social talk before getting down to business.

There were also changes in key staff at ASU Public Events and Atlatl during a crucial point in the project, when the lead coordinators from both organizations left. Although there was some continuity, it was a difficult transition. Despite meetings between the departing and incoming coordinators, “there were still many aspects of the project where it was unclear if there was a previous commitment made on behalf of the previous coordinators.”⁴¹

Because of their previous experience working with Salt River Pima-Maricopa, the partners had a relationship with the tribal government. But they lacked such ties with the other communities, so they met with directors in charge of the tribal cultural centers. In assessing the project after the fact, ASU acknowledged that not presenting the project to the tribal council(s) before beginning work with the communities was a “set back.”⁴² Native American communities are as political as any other community, and the politics is often linked to family history as well as tradition. Edwards says understanding that history is an important part of working with the Native communities. The slippery slope is not to become enmeshed in the politics. “As outside agencies, we need to be aware of the need to remain neutral in these communities. It’s important to establish relations with the tribal governments initially, because that’s where the money, the support, the buildings are centralized,” she said.

Herb Stevens, director of the San Carlos Apache Cultural Center, admitted he didn’t think too much of the project at first, but became enthusiastic once he saw the response. About 25 adults turned out for the first week to learn to make the instruments, but only about half of them stayed on for the second week. He thinks that had the program been open to children the turnout would have been much higher.⁴³ Initially, the project was confined to Apaches only, but in the end it was opened to non-Apaches living and working on the reservation, mainly teachers and social workers. Edwards says there’s value in teaching adults, who become teachers and role models for the children of the community by transmitting what they have learned. Stevens points out that it is often difficult for

families to make child-care arrangements for evening programs, especially when, as with the *Drawing the Lines* project, it requires a commitment of every night for two weeks. And it was difficult to gauge the level of response before classes actually began because few people turned out for the informational meetings or volunteered to be part of the community committee.

Stevens attributes the lower-than-expected response to economics. “People aren’t enthusiastic about learning about their culture because it’s not a way to make money, and people are occupation-minded. Everything costs money, and the art business isn’t particularly a money-making thing,” he said.

Edwards concurs, noting that some of the people contacted in the community felt they should be paid to go to the workshops. Money is an issue in the long-run with projects of this kind. During the Gammage Festival, ASU waived the normal fee for renting the space and charged a nominal fee to artists who set up booths during the run of the show to sell their wares. The artists were permitted to keep the profits from their sales, and the booth fee was waived if they contributed a piece of work to the festival, which was then raffled off.

Edwards says that economics is a part of the equation, but should be handled as any business arrangement is undertaken. “We should not deal from a position of ‘we’re sorry for everything ever done to you.’ It doesn’t build a good relationship. Instead, as many Native service organizations have pointed out, it only promotes apathy. Native communities should be recognized as business partners. Maybe there should be an initial break, but we should spend the time to really work out these issues,” she said.

One of the stated goals of *Drawing the Lines* was to develop new audiences and educate existing ones about Native American culture. Overall, the communities and artists demonstrated the links between traditional and contemporary culture in new works originating from within their communities. In an assessment of the project, Atlatl praised the outcome but admitted it was “disappointed with the attendance of non-Native people during the festival. The project reinforces the need to continue to educate non-Native, as well as Native, audiences about Native American art forms.”⁴⁴

The project also raised the issue of on-going commitments. Often initiatives with tribes are based on the desire to open communications and build relationships, and a particular project is selected, but little thought is expended on long-range program planning. “We are so busy dealing with the immediate that we don’t think about what’s next,” said Edwards. “We need to think about next year. One project is just a seed to build on.”

Stevens followed up the Apache violin project with a class in moccasin-making. He charged \$20 for the four-day class, and the center provided the materials. Twenty-five people turned out to learn how to make and decorate traditional moccasins, but another 50 signed up; he just couldn’t accommodate that number in the space available at the Cultural Center. “It was successful because they wear moccasins and they wanted to learn how to make them rather than buying them. Moccasins are a thing of need – in our traditional Sunrise Dances the ladies wear their beaded dresses, and wearing tennis shoes looks

awful.” But it was a budget-buster for the center, and Stevens hasn’t offered the class again.

Idiwanan An Chawe, Collaborative Project with Appalshop’s Roadside Theater, Zuni Pueblo, New Mexico

The risk of weaving different languages into a single performance is that some of the audience won’t get it: Either they won’t come at all, or they’ll leave at the first opportunity. It was a risk that Roadside Theater and Idiwanan An Chawe, a Zuni-language performance troupe, were willing to take, and it paid off.

Audiences from New Orleans to Kentucky have been enchanted by stories told in Zuni and in English of an agrarian way of life.

Roadside Theater is a professional theater company rooted in the culture of Appalachia, whose songs and stories provide the subjects of its productions. The theater is part of Appalshop, the cultural arts organization based in Kentucky that includes Appalshop Center, the American Festival Project and a variety of media concerns from TV to films. Dudley Cocke, Roadside’s director, had first become acquainted with Edward Wemytewa, a Zuni Indian, in the 1969, when Cocke was a VISTA volunteer. In 1987 when Roadside was touring the nearby Navajo reservation, Cocke’s troupe made a slight detour to Zuni Pueblo. The seeds of cultural collaboration were sown at that first meeting. Years later, in 1995, Roadside and Wemytewa’s newly formed performance group, Idiwanan An Chawe (it means Children of the Middle Place), decided to write a play together.

Idiwanan came about gradually, over a period of 15 years during which Roadside continued to visit Zuni Pueblo, performing in the schools and spending time with residents in informal situations. Cocke says Idiwanan grew out of Wemytewa's recognition that the Zuni -- an oral culture with a vast store of secular stories -- had a storytelling tradition similar to Appalachia's. But the tradition was slowly dying as television and mass culture overwhelmed the old language. "He saw the need [to tell stories in Zuni] in his own culture and made a commitment to do it," Cocke said.

The playwriting began orally, using Roadside's model of a story circle, with storytellers from Idiwanan and Roadside telling each other about their places and people. These stories painted a picture of the monumental changes that had occurred in both cultures when people abandoned an agricultural way of life. "The idea wasn't to romanticize it, but to reflect on the loss of it," said Donna Porterfield, Roadside's managing director.⁴⁵ In structure, their joint play, *Corn Mountain/Pine Mountain, Following the Seasons*, begins with mythic stories and moves to more contemporary tales. In a kind of mix-and-match interweaving, each group of performers trades stories, using traditional and original humor, songs and dances to tell the story of an agricultural way of life that once provided spiritual and physical sustenance to both the people of Zuni and the Appalachian Mountains. The stories alternate two distinct cultural points of view in two very different languages, but what emerges is not only difference but connection.

Roadside's entire 25-year history is about such collaborations, although the Zuni project was longer than most. All of Roadside's collaborations operate

from a matrix that articulates the principles of grassroots theater.⁴⁶ Foremost among them is the notion that the people who are the subjects of a work are part of the culture, and their stories inform the work produced. Grassroots theater is grounded in the local and specific. Each play is conceived and produced in partnership with community organizations and the individuals who make up those organizations, and performances are held in places where everyone feels welcome. Perhaps one of the most significant principles Roadside articulates concerns how such projects are managed. “Management structures aren’t neutral,” Cocke said. “They are value-laden and affect the creative process. You have to be conscious how you conduct meetings. To arrive at a collective place as a group doesn’t mean that you can’t have strong, individual voices; the two can be joined. You want those individual opinions. But it’s a matter of setting up an ethos where all opinions expressed are respected.”⁴⁷

Fundamental to the collaboration process is recognizing that it’s not a one-way exchange, Cocke says. The partnership between Roadside and Idiwanan required commitment from the tribe as well as from Wemytewa. “The Zuni are very conscious of how they’ve been ripped off. They’ve been bothered to death by Anglos,” Cocke said. To ensure equity in the proposed arrangement, they set up a partnership that gave each group one vote, which required unanimous agreement to proceed at each stage. When Roadside met with tribal elders, “it wasn’t so much about details of the script as to see how we conducted ourselves,” Cocke said. “There was protocol involved, good manners. They wanted to see how we treated older people and children. In many respects, we

share the same ideas of deference to elders; it's part of our [Appalachian] culture, too."

Cocke believes the reason Roadside Theater is successful is because its roots are in poor and working-class communities, and many of its performances address that constituency. "People coming from a different class sensibility [into poor and marginalized communities] have a lot of learning to do. If you're coming into a Native American community from a different class, you'll likely be met by someone from within the tribe who is adept at manipulating the Anglo [world], an "apple" -- someone who's red outside and white inside. They serve a useful purpose in the tribe," he says, functioning as a kind of gatekeeper, politely answering questions but ultimately barring the door.

For Wemytewa, the playwriting project was a way to create a Zuni-language theater for the pueblo that would provide a public occasion for storytelling, singing and dancing.⁴⁸ It is part of his continuing efforts to encourage the use of the Zuni language, to write it down and to teach young people, in particular, public-speaking skills. "It [storytelling in Zuni] was everywhere when I was growing up," said Wemytewa. "There were benches outside one of the trading posts on the plaza and around the stove and the old people would sit and talk. But not now. [Still] we want to be conscious that we don't appropriate our own culture," he said.

Wemytewa says that use of the Zuni language in religious context is "healthy." The language is an integral part of sacred stories, and community participation in religious rituals remains high because it's important. It is in the

everyday context that the language has atrophied, he says. Sacred stories are off-limits to outsiders and are not included in performances, but many Zuni secular stories interpret religious beliefs, Wemytewa said. “Our [secular] stories clarify how we should live our lives and behave with others; they are moral tales,” he says. Tribal elders and custom determine which stories are appropriate for public performance.

Audience development is an essential component, even in the pueblo. Because storytelling is rapidly disappearing from the culture, Wemytewa said that one of the first steps was preparing the audience to listen quietly and absorb the slow rhythm and cadence of the language. Much of that was tackled in the classroom. In addition, Wemytewa and his pool of storytellers prepare special scripts of forthcoming plays, which are broadcast live on KSHI, Zuni Community Radio.

Taking a Zuni-language performance outside of the culture isn’t easy. Roadside’s Donna Porterfield says arts presenters are often afraid that audiences “won’t get it. It’s just too strange an idea,” she said. “Presenters want Native American dancers. On the surface they seem more understandable and razzle-dazzle.” But audiences for *Corn Mountain/Pine Mountain* don’t seem to have a problem, mainly because program notes and English translations at key points help them understand parts that might be difficult, she said.

If the process of getting Idivanan off the ground was long and slow, keeping it going is a struggle. It receives funds from Zuni Rainbow Project, an education program that operates on a \$40,000-\$50,000 annual budget mostly

contributed by the tribal government. Lila Wallace Reader's Digest Foundation provided seed funds for Idiwanan's initial script-writing and planning stage, and the Ruth Mott Foundation funded the critical third year. Idiwanan also taps funds from various educational foundations. For example, it received state funding for an oral-video history project recording the stories of community elders. As a direct outgrowth of the initial collaboration, Idiwanan has produced one new play, *Ulohanan Dewutso'ya A:deya'kya (They Once Lived in a Beautiful Place)* about caring for the environment on Zuni reservation, and a five-part storytelling series about water loss that was broadcast on local radio. It is now working on a new play incorporating Salt Woman stories, and it also has a contract with Arizona State University to produce workshops encouraging similar grassroots performance groups among other tribes. "We rely on these [contracts] to carry on the program," Wemytewa said.

Cultural Corridors: Public Art on Scenic Highways, New Mexico

Cultural Corridors is a multi-year partnership between New Mexico Arts, New Mexico State Highway and Transportation Department and 14 local communities that lie along two of the state's major roads, the historic El Camino Real and U.S. Route 66. The project is coordinated through the Art in Public Places program of the state Office of Cultural Affairs. The first two phases of a three-phase program are complete, and the final phase is in the bid stage. Funded mainly through federal highway dollars, the project commissioned(s) site-specific, monumental artworks that celebrate New Mexico's historic roadways

and the communities they link. The total budget was \$1.8 million, and each site is awarded \$100,000, three-quarters of it from federal funds, 15 percent from the state and 10 percent matching community monies. Control is largely in the hands of the local community – each town names a 10-member selection committee made up of arts organizations and artists, business and civic leaders, county government and highway districts. The committee selects the site, reviews the artists' proposals and works with the artist chosen to ensure community participation.

El Camino Real and Route 66 lie at either end of a spectrum of travelers and explorers who have traversed New Mexico, first on foot and horseback, today in automobiles. These historic roadways have dramatically shaped the cultural, political and economic landscape of New Mexico. The projects funded thus far have ranged from Tom Coffin's *Roadside Attraction*, celebrating Tucumcari's place as the eastern gateway to New Mexico on Route 66, to *Royal Road*, sculptor Tom Askman's tribute to life in Las Cruces. None of the projects was specifically concerned with coordinating between Native tribes and governmental entities, per se, although a project slated for the Acoma Pueblo in phase three will interface with the tribal council as the local committee. However, that's not to say that issues haven't arisen. One in particular is worth considering.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico, sits smack on the old Camino Real. The local committee selected Geronimo Springs as the midtown site for its monumental artwork. It wanted to redevelop the springs as a community gathering space honoring the historic use of the springs as a place of healing for

Native Americans as well as Hispanics and Anglos traveling along the ancient route that eventually became known as El Camino Real. The artwork was to reflect the city's cultural heritage and acknowledge the environmental qualities specific to the hot springs. The artwork selected, by ceramicist Shel Neymark, involves demolition of an existing open-sided building covering a basin in which the spring flows as well as an asphalted area around it which residents use as a parking lot for the nearby post office. The work will create a kind of plaza or gathering place for the community, with water from the springs cascading down ceramic "mountains" and channeled through glazed river beds to a central collecting basin. Ceramic benches with tiles depicting various symbols from historic as well as contemporary users of the springs will surround the basin.

Because each *Cultural Corridors* project is funded with federal monies, an environmental assessment is required at each site. In Truth or Consequences that further involved the Bureau of Land Management, which leases to the town the land on which the spring emerges. BLM is conscientious about protecting cultural resources. The site is known as "Geronimo Springs," and the BLM was concerned that the Apache might attach some cultural or sacred significance to it.

There was initially a suggestion that the project coordinator seek out the descendants of Geronimo to make sure there was no familial objection to changes to the site. That was scrapped, but BLM requested that the Mescalero Apache Tribal Council, whose lands are closest to the town, be consulted before planning and development proceeded and a tribal representative be included on

the selection committee. (It is generally the policy of New Mexico Arts to request that a Native American be included on the local site selection committee. In the case of Truth or Consequences, the local committee indicated there were no nearby tribes and none stepped forward asking to be included.)⁴⁹ Because it was supposed that other Apache tribes might have some traditional connection to the springs, the federal Department of Transportation sent notices to all Apache tribes, giving them 30 days to respond if the site had cultural or historic significance. It is an instance of good intentions gone awry, or at least falling on deaf ears. The Mescalero Apache tribe's cultural resource officer never communicated with the project coordinators, and no responses were received from the mailing to other tribes.⁵⁰

Some background about names might illuminate this apparent lack of interest. Truth or Consequences may be New Mexico's most persistently asked about, and controversial, place name. Long before Europeans ventured into the area, the springs were known to Native Americans as a place of healing, drawing Indians from vast distances to the hot, mineral-rich waters. An early Spanish name for the locale was Alamocitos, "little cottonwoods," and later Ojo de Zoquete, "mud spring." When English-speaking settlers moved in, sometime around 1905, it became known as Hot Springs. The springs were and remain integral to the town's economy – according to one writer, there are probably more spas and thermal bath houses per capita in this town than anywhere on earth.⁵¹ In 1951 the town changed its name to Truth or Consequences, prompted by a promotional gimmick dreamed up by Ralph Edwards, host of a popular radio and

TV game show of the same name. To celebrate the program's 10th anniversary, Edwards offered to broadcast the show from any town that would adopt the name Truth or Consequences. According to one account, the New Mexico State Tourist Bureau relayed the news to New Mexico Senator Burton Roach, who was president of the Hot Springs Chamber of Commerce. Changing the name, residents believed, would garner the community national publicity, which would be good for local business. The name change was actually voted on four times between 1950 and 1967 and always won by a landslide.⁵²

But it wasn't the first time a local name had been changed to attract attention. Records are scanty, but what is today known as Geronimo Springs used to be called "Government Springs," according to a postcard dating from the 1940s. Ann Wellborn, administrator of the Geronimo Springs Museum and a lifelong resident, says it may have been called Government Springs because it was across the street from the Post Office, which owned both parcels of land. A New Mexico State tourist map of "Battlefields of the Conquistadors in New Mexico" from 1942 pinpoints a place called "Geronimo's Lookout" just west of the town of Hot Springs, with a label reading "Geronimo's Raid of 1885 & Percha Canyon Apache Lair." At any rate, sometime in the late 1940s or early 1950s the proprietors of Government Springs changed its name to Geronimo Springs. Wellborn speculates that the earlier name probably "wasn't romantic enough," so they latched onto the popularity of Geronimo to attract business.

Over the years a mythology of sorts has grown up around the name Geronimo Springs, which has contributed to the economic development of the

community. A Web site cataloging points of interest in Truth or Consequences lists Geronimo Springs as a “hot springs, named for Apache leader Geronimo, who used them as a gathering place for his warriors.” The Museum next to the springs houses “area relics, murals, bronzes, exhibits from Army forts and mining camps, a large collection of Mimbres pottery and other Indian artifacts and a gift shop and book store.”⁵³

When the Geronimo Springs site was selected for inclusion in the *Cultural Corridors* project, the confusion over the name raised several issues that bear on this report. Foremost is the issue of whose interpretation prevails. The contemporary interpretation (or meaning) of Geronimo Springs is not the direct product of Indian oral tradition or culture. The stories told about it are a fanciful mix of romance and legend, constructed by mid-20th century Anglo inhabitants of the town to promote its primary business. That is not to imply that the springs were not known or used by Indians for their medicinal properties long before whites discovered them. Carla Sanders, coordinator of the Cultural Corridors project, says that traditionally the springs were a kind of “neutral zone,” where individuals from any tribe could come without fear of confrontation or conflict. It may be that the site was always more secular than sacred; but the meaning the tribes attach to it has been diluted, misunderstood or even twisted by Anglo interpretations.

There may be no deeply felt cultural significance, which could account for the lack of response from those tribes contacted. But their silence could also indicate that the way the response-request was framed (30-day reply period) was

too bureaucratic and too short. Was the proper person (or people) approached for input, or was it assumed that the request would be routed to that person? These are significant issues in dealing with tribes and are often the point where communication breaks down. Sanders says she thinks that if the matter had been important to any of the tribes contacted, they would have responded immediately. That there was no objection to the project could indicate the tribes have lost the threads of the tradition. Conversely, it may be felt that the artwork planned for the site is as good a way as any to mark its significance.

CONCLUSION

Several themes recur throughout these case studies – such issues as control, authority and respect for difference. In the early 1990s, the Canadian Museum Association and groups representing Aboriginal peoples tackled similar issues, hammering out a set of principles governing how institutions in future would present materials from Native cultures.⁵⁴ It might be instructive to examine their conclusions. The report, *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples*, was born out of the controversy that erupted over an exhibition called *The Spirit Sings* at the Glenbow Museum during the 1988 Calgary Olympics. Several tribes directly challenged the Anglo interpretations of their history and beliefs presented in the exhibit. Their challenge raised questions about the role Native peoples should play in the presentation of their own past.

A task force, comprising 25 members including Native elders with extensive experience in the field of cultural heritage as well as museum professionals, was formed. Over the space of several years, the task force developed an what it called an “ethical framework” and spelled out strategies by which Aboriginal peoples and cultural institutions could work together to present Native history and culture. Among its recommendations were:

- Recognition of First Peoples’ right to speak for themselves;
- Acceptance by both museums and First Peoples of an equality of partnership, involving tribal elders as well as academics in the interpretation and presentation of Aboriginal history;
- The primacy of Aboriginal language, on labels and other interpretive materials;
- Acceptance of tribal rights over the presentation and disposition of sacred and ceremonial objects;
- Development professional and technical training for First Peoples in museum practices and concomitant training in Aboriginal cultural knowledge by non-Native museum professionals.

Gerald McMaster (Plains Cree), curator of contemporary Indian art at the Canadian Museum of Civilization and a task-force member, points out that Native peoples have inherited a system of representation that largely excludes them from representing themselves. They have historically “play[ed] the role of

subject/object, the observed, rather than the observer. Rarely have we been in a position of self-representation. ... [We] have always been the informant, seldom the interrogator or initiator."⁵⁵ Reversing the situation requires that ownership of interpretation, control, be transferred to the Native community.

¹ Robert Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian From Columbus to the Present*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), p. 96 passim.

² W. Richard West, Jr., *All Roads Are Good: Native Voices on Life and Culture*, (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994), p. 9.

³ Dave Warren, *Powerful Images: Portrayals of Native Americans*, (Seattle: Museums West, 1998), p.xii-xiii.

⁴ Alfred Runte, *National Parks: The American Experience*, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1987, third edition), p. 71.

⁵ Joni Louise Kinsey, *The Majesty of the Grand Canyon: 150 Years in Art*, (Cobb, CA: O.G. Publishing Corp., 1998) p. 28.

⁶ Joni Louise Kinsey, p. 16.

⁷ The tribes have basically said 'no thank you' to the mule barn, which they say has nothing historically to do with them and they would just as soon have an open space outside where they can perform or display their art works. Interview with Ellis Peters, chief interpreter Grand Canyon National Park, Dec. xxx, 1998.

⁸ Interview with Shelly Cohen, Jan. 7, 1999.

⁹ Interview with Jim Copenhaver, Jan. 4, 1999.

¹⁰ Jacqueline Pontello, "Museum Directions," *Southwest Art*, 22:1, June 1992, p. 55.

¹¹ Vine Deloria, Jr. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, (Norman, OK. University of Oklahoma Press, 1988 reprint), p.22.

¹² Deloria, p. 23.

¹³ Interview with Ellis Peters, NPS chief interpreter, Grand Canyon National Park, Dec. xxx 1998.

¹⁴ Information regarding the participants, the process and the interpretive focus was derived from Jane Schmoyer-Weber's *Intepretive Story Development for the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Interpretive Center, Great Falls, Montana*, June, 1990, and from *Report to Congress, Addendum to Conceptual Design and Budget Report, Lewis & Clark National Historic Trail Interpretive Center*, 1990.

¹⁵ Kenneth Foote, *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*, (Austin: Texas UP, 1997), p. 325 passim.

¹⁶ Interview with Barbara Suteer, 8 December 1998.

¹⁷ Robert Struckman, "Looking at Little Bighorn," *Denver Post*, July 4, 1998, Sec. A, p. 24.

¹⁸ Clara Sue Kidwell, *All Roads Are Good: Native Voices on Life and Culture*, (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994), p. 15.

¹⁹

Interview with Fred Nahwooksy, Jan. 20, 1999. Nahwooksy was in his last week as director of the IAIA Museum. He is now director of Red Earth Inc. in Oklahoma.

20

The 12 artists who participated in *Savage Truths* were: Marcus Amerman, Arthus Amiotte, Doug Coffin, Dorothy Grandbois, Michael Kabotie, Jean LaMarr, Truman Lowe, Patricia Michaels-Abeyta, Nora Naranjo-Morse, Edward Poitras, Bently Spang, and Richard Ray Whitman.

21

Fred Nahwooksy, *Savage Truths: Realities of Indian Life*, exhibition essay, Institute of American Indian Arts Museum, June 14-October 14, 1998, p. 1.

22

Richard Hill, Sr. *Savage Truths: Realities of Indian Life*, exhibition essay, Institute of American Indian Arts Museum, June 14-October 14, 1998, p. 6.

23 Nancy Marie Mithlo, *Savage Truths: Realities of Indian Life*, exhibition essay, Institute of American Indian Arts Museum, June 14-October 14, 1998, p. 3.

24

Marcus Amerman, *Savage Truths: Realities of Indian Life*, artist's statement, Institute of American Indian Arts Museum, June 14-October 14, 1998, p. 7.

25 Jo Ortel, exhibition review of *Savage Truths: Realities of Indian Life*, *New Art Examiner*, December, 1998, p. 56???

26

Lloyd Kiva New, *The Institute of American Indian Arts Alumni Exhibition*, Amon Carter Museum of Western Art, 1973, p. 1.

27

W. Jackson Rushing, "Critical Issues in Recent Native American Art," *Art Journal*, Fall 1992, p. 10.

28

Joy Gritton, "Cross-Cultural Education vs. Modern Imperialism: The Institute of American Indian Arts," *Art Journal*, Fall 1992, p. XXX.

29

Jacqueline M. Pontello, "Museum Directions: Reclaiming Authority," *Southwest Art*, June (1992) 22:1, p. 54.

30

"High Stakes History: The Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center," *History News*, Summer 1998, p. 17.

31

Charlene Teters, "The Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center," *Indian Artist*, Winter 1999, p. 69.

32

"High Stakes History," p. 17.

33

Ben Winton, "We Have Survived," *Native Peoples*, Fall, 1998, p.58.

34

"High Stakes History," p. 18.

35

Interview with David Holahan, Feb. 8, 1999.

36

Interview April Edwards, Tempe, Az., Dec. 17, 1998.

37

Arizona's San Carlos Apache Tribe, Tribal publication, June 1998, unpaginated.

38

“Crafts and Exhibits at Apache Cultural Center,” in *Arizona’s San Carlos Apache Tribe*, unpaginated.

39

Report to Funder, *The Drawing the Lines Project: Arizona State University Public Events in Partnership with Atlatl Inc.*

40

Report to Funder, unpaginated.

41

Report to Funder, unpaginated.

42

Report to Funder, unpaginated.

43

Interview with Herb Stevens, San Carlos Apache Reservation, Az., Dec. 17, 1998.

44

Report to Funder, unpaginated.

45

Interview with Donna Porterfield, Dec. 8, 1998.

46

Dudley Cocke, *From the Ground Up: Grassroots Theater in Historical and Contemporary Perspective*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 81.

47

Interview with Dudley Cocke, Feb. 9, 1999.

48

Interviews with Edward Wemytewa, Dec. 23, 1998, and Jan. 19, 1999.

49

Interview with Carla Sanders, *Cultural Corridors* coordinator, New Mexico Arts, Jan. 21, 1999.

50

Sanders interview.

51

Rick Cahill, *New Mexico Hot Springs Guide*, Pruett Publishing Co., Boulder, 1988, p. 60.

52

Robert Julyan, *The Place Names of New Mexico*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1996, p. 361.

53

http://www.globaldrum.com/sierra_newmexico/torc

54

Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples, (Ottawa: Report by the Assembly of First Nations and the Canadian Museums Association, 1992, second edition), p. 1.

55

Gerald R. McMaster, “Indigena: A Native Curator’s Perspective,” *Art Journal*, 51:3, Fall, 1992, p. 66.