Missed Opportunities

Reflections on the NMAI

AMY LONETREE

> The Columbian Legacy, now 510 years and counting, is by many accounts genocidal. The atrocities committed by Columbus, those under his command, and those who followed him are legion. In the name of God or science, in the pursuit of gold or glory, and in the services of imperialism or manifest destiny, the bodies and beliefs of the Indian peoples of the Western Hemisphere, along with their possessions and their lands, were plundered and debased. And a substantial portion of the American Indian collections hoarded in museums is made up of that tainted bounty.
>
> Craig Howe, "The Morality of Exhibiting Indians"

Museums are indeed very painful sites for Native peoples as they are intimately tied to the colonization process. The study of the relationship between Indigenous peoples and museums—both the tragic stories of the past as well as examples of successful Native activism and leadership within the museum profession that are happening today—have preoccupied my professional life both inside and outside the academy. The museum world has changed significantly from the days when they were considered "ivory towers of exclusivity" to today when Indigenous people are actively involved in making museums more open and community-relevant sites.[1]

We can certainly see this new development reflected in exhibitions—the "most prominent and public of all museum offerings."[2] Native Americans have witnessed a shift from curator-controlled presentations

of the American Indian past to a more inclusive or collaborative process with Indian people actively involved in determining exhibition content. As art historian David Penney writes,

> Today, when museums consider organizing an exhibition with an American Indian topic, there are nearly always three major agents at work: the institution of the museum and the representatives of living American Indian communities . . . both of whom address the third agent, the "object" of the exhibition.[3]

This new "shared authority" relationship between Native people and museum curators has changed the manner in which Indian history and culture is represented.

During the course of my research I have found that one of the primary objectives of those working with museums is to have the exhibition not only serve as important sites of "knowledge making and remembering" for their own communities but also to challenge the commonly held stereotypes about American Indian history and culture that are predominant in our society.[4] These stereotypes were often reinforced by museum displays of the past that tended to obscure the great historical, cultural, and linguistic diversity of tribal nations by dividing Native people into cultural groups—giving a sense that all tribes are the same, or at least the same within one particular region. Exhibitions tended to reinforce the view of static, unchanging culture. Certainly the diorama, a popular display technique used in natural history museums, tended to do this by keeping Indians frozen in a particular time period and by displaying them near the dinosaurs and other extinct animals.[5] Exhibitions also defined Indian societies by functional technology (we are only what we made) and displayed sacred and sensitive objects and information. Most tragically, even our ancestors' remains often served to emphasize the notion of Indians as a vanishing race, an idea prevalent at the time when the collecting of Native American material culture began. The movement by tribal communities to be involved in the development of exhibitions today is recognition that controlling the representation of their cultures is linked to the larger self-determination movement and cultural survival.

While collaborative efforts on the surface appear to be a positive direction—and there are certainly success stories to note—these successes are uneven at best.[6] The story is not that simple. The historical legacy of the relationship between American Indians and museums is

difficult to overcome. We suffered great injustices in the colonization process and in the name of Western science—both of which are intimately linked with the museum world. And, the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian, the self-proclaimed "Museum Different," reflects this still complicated and evolving relationship.

MUSEUM COLLABORATIONS: THE NMAI IN CONTEXT

One of the most important works to emerge in recent years on the processes of collaboration is Ruth Philip's essay in *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader*. She asserts that there is "a spectrum of models . . . bracketed by two distinct types."[7] She is careful, however, to acknowledge that there is no prototypical model or single collaborative process. Each project is firmly rooted in the institutional history of the particular museum and also dependent on relationships between individuals in the museums and on the community advisory boards. Even though each project is unique, Philips has noted there are two models that most collaborative projects fall into—the multi-vocal model and the community-based model. Throughout the NMAI's history the museum has followed both, or a combination, of these models for their exhibitions.

According to Philips, the multi-vocal exhibit model allows for multiple perspectives in the exhibitions. The voices of curators, scholars, and Indigenous people are all present in the interpretative space offering their own interpretation on the significance of the pieces and themes presented. The NMAI's George Gustav Heye Center in New York employed this approach in their display Creations Journey: Masterworks of Native American Identity and Belief, which opened in 1994. The gallery focused on the museum's masterworks (determined by Western standards of aesthetic quality) and showcased the views of anthropologists and art historians who offered their view of the objects from their own disciplinary lens. At the same time, Native labels offered the tribal perspective on the relevance of these pieces. This very ambitious enterprise by the NMAI was critiqued by many as failing to address the needs of the audience. Visitors were often confused over the display techniques. As one of the staff members told me when we discussed NMAI's evolving museology, "there were just too many voices talking at once in that exhibition."[8] A reviewer with the *New York Times* recognized the beauty

of the five hundred objects on display but felt they were "sabotaged by an over produced installation."[9] Margaret Dubin, in her review of the Heye Center exhibits, included commentary from visitors expressing confusion over the display techniques, which left one visitor compelled to write: "Organization seems confused, the presentation was horrendous—very cramped, chaotic media blitz, no sense of scale, not enough space and information incomplete."[10] The criticisms of this exhibition strategy may have led the NMAI to choose a different method for its exhibitions on the National Mall in Washington DC, one that falls into what Philips calls the community-based model.[11]

In the community-based approach—the second of the models outlined by Philips, "the role of the professional museum curator or staff member is defined as that of a facilitator who puts his or her disciplinary and museological expertise at the service of community members so that their messages can be disseminated as clearly and as effectively as possible."[12] The community is given final authority in all decisions related to the exhibition, from the themes and objects that will be featured to the design of the actual exhibition. The tribal perspective has primacy in interpretation in this model, and exhibition text is typically in the first person. This strategy is reflected in each of the three community-curated sections of the permanent galleries at the DC site that opened in September 2004. The effectiveness of this strategy at the site will be discussed in the following section.

One further point needs to be made in regard to museum collaborations. The NMAI has become the most visible model for community collaborative exhibitions with Indigenous groups. But what I want to emphasize here is that the NMAI *is only part* of an evolving new relationship between American Indians and museums—one where tribal nations collaborate in the development of exhibitions on their history and culture. Other museums have pursued this approach prior to the NMAI, and the institution is not unique in this regard.[13] NMAI director W. Richard West has noted this, saying, "Most smaller museums who work with first nations or native communities or tribes invoke the native voice in interpretation and representation."[14] But West has also noted that what makes the NMAI unique is that "the National Museum of the American Indian is the first institution of this size to take this approach on this scale."[15] My own experience and the research of others has demonstrated that collaboration in museum exhibitions is becoming more the

norm than the exception and that the NMAI's claim to uniqueness does indeed rest in the scale in which they employed this approach. The NMAI represents the most ambitious of these collaborative projects to date. For the exhibitions on the National Mall that opened on September 21, 2004, they "co-curated" with twenty-four different tribal nations from across the Western Hemisphere for their three permanent galleries—Our Universes, Our Peoples, and Our Lives. How successful have these three exhibitions been in advancing the public's understanding of American Indian history and culture through their collaborative model?

REFLECTIONS ON THE GALLERY SPACE: MISSED OPPORTUNITIES

The NMAI's community-based approach for their DC site is the topic of much discussion and has been both widely praised and critiqued. Their ambitious "new Indian museology" has been praised by several scholars and journalists for offering a complicated, nuanced, and ultimately effective presentation of Indigenous philosophy, history, and identity as told from the perspective of Indigenous communities.[16] But for many, something is missing. Voices of individuals from all cultural and professional backgrounds express dissatisfaction at what they view as ineffective and vastly disappointing exhibitions that are confusing, unengaging, and lacking in historical context.

In my estimation the museum does many things right. One of the most impressive aspects of the museum is the privileging of the Native voice, and by so doing they are following one of the more positive new directions in the museum world. The curatorial staff, especially those that worked closely with Native community advisory boards in developing the twenty-four community-curated sections of Our Universes, Our Peoples, and Our Lives, should be praised for bringing so many Native people to the table, establishing trust, and honoring those issues the community wanted to present, most notably survivance. Many of the community-curated displays that deal with this issue are wonderful—clearly conveying contemporary survival. Through these exhibitions, no one leaving this museum will question our vitality today.

A notable absence for me, however, is a failure to discuss the colonization process in a clear and coherent manner. As a result, my thoughts and feelings about the exhibitions are mixed. There are certainly days when I am downright angry about this missed opportunity to truly chal-

lenge the American master narrative—a narrative that has silenced or even erased the memory of the genocidal policies of America's past and present. The museum falls short in telling the hard truths of America's treatment of Indigenous people. I am not alone in this view—a number of scholars, activists, and journalists have voiced similar concerns.[17] Notably, Ken Ringle a non-Native journalist critical of the museum wrote that what we needed but didn't get was "a tough-minded museum that truly explores Native American history and culture and its astonishing resilience in the face of 400 years of land theft, genocidal warfare, racial bigotry, misplaced paternalism, and disease."[18]

The emphasis in their exhibitions is on survival or survivance, and therefore they tackle head-on the vanishing race stereotype. But the museum needs to provide more context on what tribal communities were fighting to survive in the first place. In order to understand Indigenous agency (another popular theme) and survival in the wake of government policies designed to destroy us, one must have a clear understanding of what we were up against. The more painful stories of the last five hundred years of colonization are excluded, or if they are there, they are not prominently displayed. I agree with the American Indian Movement activists who criticized the museum for not telling the story of the American Indian Holocaust along with our stories of survival. As they stated, "The museum falls short in that it does not characterize or does not display the sordid and tragic history of America's holocaust against the Native Nations and peoples of the Americas."[19] The museum allows for silences around the tragedies of what took place. Museum director W. Richard West argues that this was the intention because this period of tragedy is only a small portion of our time in the Americas:

> Here's what I want everyone to understand. As much, and as important as that period of history is—the centuries of war, disease and exile—it is at best only about 5 percent of the period we have been in this hemisphere. We do not want to make the National Museum of the American Indian into an Indian Holocaust Museum. . . . You have to go beyond they story of the tragedy and the travesty of the past 500 years.[20]

If "the centuries of war, disease, and exile" are "only about 5 percent" of the broad sweep of our history, where is our earlier history? There is no extensive treatment in this museum on our pre-Columbian past in any

of the galleries. So while West seems to be implying that the thousands of years before contact are critical and that the museum will give equal emphasis to the entire span of our history (not just the last five hundred years) those earlier periods are not reflected on the exhibition floor.

It could be argued that this is a community-collaborated museum and therefore that several of the communities decided to not focus on the pre-Columbian past explicitly in their sections. But not all of the exhibitions were community-curated. There is this great misconception by the public that all of the exhibitions were developed in consultation and collaboration with Indigenous groups. It is important to keep in mind that all three of the permanent galleries have sections devoted to NMAI-curated sections. The NMAI staff, not communities, framed the issues, themes, and reflections in these sections. It is not appropriate for the museum, when challenged as to why certain stories are not emphasized or included, to say that that is not what the communities wanted or to imply that Native communities determined all of the content. NMAI curators had control over a significant portion of the galleries, and it is more accurate to say that in many sections of the museum the content reflects what the NMAI curators, not the communities, wanted to convey.

Furthermore, it is accurate to say that the last five hundred years of "war, disease, and exile" are not the entire span of Indigenous history. However, even though the last five hundred years may be only a short period of time, it has had a disproportionate impact. Colonization is not over and our holocaust in the Americas has never been recognized or acknowledged. The continual legacies of those policies in Indian County are very much a part of our contemporary experience. This may be only a short period of time, but it has had the greatest impact.

ABSTRACTIONISM, POSTMODERNISM, AND AUDIENCE CONFUSION

One of the most interesting arguments made by several scholars is that the museum is advancing an Indigenous way of knowing in the exhibitions, "an Indigenous museology," that non-Natives and even some Native people are not working hard enough to understand.[21] The exhibitions are designed to be challenging, reflecting engagements with both postmodernist and postcolonial critiques, as well as decolonizing strategies. I agree that many of the very thoughtful displays at the institution

are indeed there to challenge us, to provide us with new insights through the presentation of Indigenous knowledge from the Indigenous perspective. But why is this new knowledge system at work in the institution not clearly conveyed? Given that the public carries with them so many stereotypes about who we are, isn't it critical that we engage those issues right away? Reviews of the exhibitions have indicated that visitors are often left feeling overwhelmed, confused, and frustrated by the display techniques. If the museum is to truly challenge stereotypes that have long dominated in the representation of our histories and cultures, then content, design, text, and images must be clear, consistent, and coherent.

Their failure to tell the more painful stories of colonization, as well as their inability to convey their ideas clearly to the public is prevalent throughout the Our Peoples gallery focusing on tribal history. There are eight community-curated sections in Our Peoples, as well as sections curated by NMAI staff. Eight Native communities—Seminole Tribe of Florida, Tapirapé (Brazil), Kiowa Nation (Oklahoma), Tohono O'odham Nation (Arizona), Eastern Band of Cherokee (North Carolina), Nahua of the Rio Balsas (Mexico), Ka'apor (Brazil) and Wixarika from Bancos de Calítique, Mexico—collaborated with the NMAI curators on displays focusing on pivotal events in the respective histories of each tribal community.

I will focus on the NMAI-curated site titled Evidence for my discussion here. The importance of this particular gallery cannot be emphasized enough. Curator Paul Chaat Smith has stated that the content to be covered in this exhibit "is the *raison d'etre* for the existence of the museum itself" and comprises roughly one half of the gallery space in Our Peoples.[22] This gallery is meant to tell the "biggest untold story of all"—that contact between vastly different worlds changed everything.[23] The exhibition deals with the aftermath of "contact": disease, warfare, and dispossession of lands and resources and the role Christianity played in the process. Evidence is an object-based exhibition but without any labels associated with individual objects.

At the entrance to the gallery the word "Evidence" is emblazoned on a large frosted glass wall with objects buried underneath, designed to suggest that the exhibit itself is an "excavation site . . . where history is buried, lost and found."[24] From there you find a case with large black letters stating "1491" filled with figurines that are there to supposedly represent the diversity of tribal nations before "contact." Next are cases filled with

gold and other "riches" of the Americas symbolizing the great wealth in abundance throughout the hemisphere. From there you see weapons such as swords and guns, which one could assume was used to plunder these resources. Behind the gun display is a case filled with Bibles. Some have argued that these "symbols of power" are just meant to overwhelm you, hence the reason for the lack of labels with identifying information including tribal affiliations, provenance, and dates.[25]

Gwyn Isaac in her review essay for this issue argues that this gallery reflects an engagement "with the postmodern discourse on the history of colonialism—a discourse that stems from the academic critique of how history is created, constructed, and controlled." She further states that "in Our Peoples (curator) Paul Chaat Smith does not want us to learn the details of Native American history, he wants us to question our ethnocentric ideas about history itself."[26] This certainly reflects the words of Chaat Smith's co-curator Jolene Rickard, who stated, "There are other places where you can learn the exact dates of the Trail of Tears. It's less important to me that someone leave this museum knowing all about Wounded Knee than that they leave knowing what it takes to survive that kind of tragedy."[27]

This may be a valid role for a museum. But it is important to keep in mind that it took Isaac, a highly trained academic, two different encounters with this institution to come to these conclusions about the intended meaning of this exhibition. Should an exhibition require a person be well schooled in postmodern and postcolonial theory to engage effectively with the displays? It is one thing for a curator or academic to understand this theory-laden argument, but it is another thing entirely to be able to convey that message to the general public in an engaging, moving, and compelling manner. A majority of the estimated 4 plus million people a year coming to this museum will only have one opportunity to engage with the exhibition—only one—and do not bring with them extensive background on postcolonial theory as well as museum training. We must keep in mind that communities did not curate this section, and one wonders whether the community advisory boards would approve of such an omission of critical historical events.

The decision to pursue an abstract storyline in connection with a postmodernist critique was a poor choice for the museum. A postmodernist presentation of Indigenous history does not work. Abstraction isn't a correct choice for a museum hoping to educate a nation with a willed

ignorance of its treatment of Indigenous peoples and the policies and practices that led to genocide in the Americas. Our survival, as many people have argued, is one of the greatest untold stories, and the specifics of this difficult and shameful history need to be told.

One of the most powerful and moving sections of the museum is at the end of the Our Peoples gallery. Listed on a black wall with the words "WE ARE the EVIDENCE" are both the names of tribes who survived, as well as the names of those who perished as a result of the last five hundred years of colonization in the Americas. The wall appears inspired by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which in its beautiful and serene simplicity honors those who perished in the war by listing their names in white letters on black granite. The following text panel is located near the list.

ALL MY RELATIONS

> Entire nations perished in the waves of death that swept the Americas. Even their names are lost to us. We cannot tell you where they lived, what they believed, or what they dreamed. Their experiences are buried and unknowable. Like much of Indian history, only fragments are left to us.
>
> This wall names many of the languages spoken by our relatives who are still here, as well as those ancestors who vanished without a trace. The list can never be whole. It will always be incomplete.
>
> Nine of ten Native people perished in the first century of contact between the hemispheres. One in ten survived. They didn't fear change; they embraced it.
>
> Their past lives on in our present. As descendents of the one in ten who survived, we in the 21st century share an inheritance of grief, loss, hope, and immense riches. The achievements of our ancestors make us accountable for how we move in the world today. Their lessons instruct us and make us responsible for remembering everything especially those things we never knew.[28]

As a Ho-Chunk woman, when I read these words written by Paul Chaat Smith, they profoundly move me. I, along with other Native peoples, have inherited the lesson he mentions, and I've also studied them. But somehow what is conveyed so powerfully in this moving text panel is not illuminated in the previous displays in the Our Peoples gallery encoun-

tered by the visitor. I can only hope that other visitors will take the time to read this panel, for it articulates beautifully the power and meaning of Indigenous survivance—the central message of the museum.

CONCLUSION

We have long critiqued the elitism and insider nature of Western institutions. But by producing a museum that features exhibits that only curators or those from the academy engaged in postmodern theory can readily appreciate, have we created a new institution of elitism? In my opinion, the museum misses an important opportunity to educate because of its choice to present a blurred abstract message to dispel those stereotypes about Indian history and culture that have long predominated in American culture.

I argue that if we celebrate only benign histories and survival without context, or present stories in a manner that fails to carry out their educational directives, we do a grave disservice to tribal people. For those of us who are committed to giving voice to Native people in the telling of our own history and culture and in moving museums forward in their efforts to decolonize Indigenous communities, the silences around the subject of genocide are a tragedy. In this museum—our monument to Native history and memory on the National Mall—the failure to tell these tragic stories alongside our stories of triumphant survival is wrong. Historian Elizabeth Castle notes that without a clear presentation on genocide and the atrocities committed against Indigenous peoples, we can never fully understand our survival. She states,

> In every conversation, research project, or book that addresses in some way the state of Native America, the powerful current that rumbles underneath is the intergenerational impact of largely unacknowledged genocide against the American Indians. The trauma of genocide manifests itself in every aspect of Native life, and precisely because it has never been fully and officially recognized lends to the need to bring it up in all possible contexts. Historians are becoming braver in taking the strong position of naming the genocidal past in their writing. However, it has been a challenge for those who write about the past to connect the important revelations to today's prob-

lems. Whether the tremendous danger of diabetes to Indigenous peoples, or concerns over intellectual property and ethnic fraud, this discussion illustrates that without recognition of the intergenerational impact of genocide, we cannot understand the unique historical positioning of contemporary Indigenous survival.[29]

NOTES

I would like to thank all those who greatly influenced my thinking on the NMAI and its inaugural exhibitions both before and after its opening. Sonya Atalay, Anita Gonzalez, Claire Smith, Gwyneira Isaac, Robin DeLugan, and Myla Vicenti Carpio helped shape my thoughts and reflections for this essay, and I am most grateful for their input. I greatly appreciate Sonya Atalay's helpful suggestions on an earlier draft of this piece. A special thank-you goes to Jon Daehnke for his insightful and important comments on this essay, and for all his support while working on this special issue.

1. Gail Anderson, "Introduction: Reinventing the Museum," in *Reinventing the Museum: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on the Paradigm Shift*, ed. Gail Anderson (Walnut Creek CA: AltaMira Press, 2004), 1.

2. Kathleen McLean, "Museum Exhibitions and the Dynamics of Dialogue," in Anderson, *Reinventing the Museum: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on the Paradigm Shift*, 193.

3. David W. Penney, "The Poetics of Museum Representations: Tropes of Recent American Indian Art Exhibitions," in *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian: Museums and Native Cultures*, by the National Museum of the American Indian Smithsonian Institution (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000), 47.

4. This quote is taken from one of the most important studies of a Native American tribal museum, see Patricia Pierce Erikson with Helma Ward and Kirk Wachendorf, *Voices of a Thousand People* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 30. Also, see Patricia Pierce Erikson, "A-Whaling We Will Go: Encounters of Knowledge and Memory at the Makah Culture and Research Center," *Cultural Anthropology* 14, no. 4 (1999): 556–83.

5. See Richard Hill, "The Museum Indian: Still Frozen in Time and Mind," *Museum News* (May/June 2000): 40–74.

6. For a recent examination of the involvement of Native people in the museum world, see Nancy Marie Mithlo, "Red Man's Burden: The Politics of Inclusion in Museum Settings," *American Indian Quarterly* 28, nos. 3 & 4 (2004): 743–63.

7. Ruth B. Phillips, "Introduction: Community Collaboration in Exhibitions" in *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader*, ed. Laura Peers and Alison K. Brown (New York: Routledge, 2003), 158.

8. NMAI staff person, personal communication.

9. Holland Cotter, "New Museum Celebrating American Indian Voices," *New York Times*, October 28, 1994.

10. Margaret Dubin, *Native America Collected: The Culture of an Art World* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2001), 94.

11. For other scholarly reviews of the NMAI's George Gustav Heye Center, see Allison Arieff, "A Different Sort of (P)Reservations: Some Thoughts on the National Museum of the American Indian," *Museum Anthropology* 19, no. 2 (1995); Richard White, "Representing Indians: Art, History, and the New Museums," *The New Republic* 216, no. 16 (April 21, 1997): 28–34; Patricia Penn Hilden and Shari M. Huhndorf, "Performing 'Indian' in the National Museum of the American Indian," *Social Identities* 5, no. 2 (1999); and Shari M. Huhndorf, *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2001), 199–202.

12. Phillips, "Introduction," 163.

13. For discussion of other collaborative projects, see Jocelyn Wedll, "Learn About Our Past to Understand Our Future: The Story of the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe," in *The Changing Presentation of the American Indian: Museums and Native Cultures*, ed. the National Museum of the American Indian (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000); Amy Lonetree, "American Indian Self-Determination and the Emergence of Tribal Museums: The Development of the Mille Lacs Indian Museum" (in preparation); Gerald T. Conaty, "Glenbow's Blackfoot Gallery: Working Toward Co-existence," in Peers and Brown, *Museums and Source Communities*; Michael Ames, "How to Decorate a House: The Renegotiation of Cultural Representations at the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology" in Peers and Brown, *Museums and Source Communities*.

14. Judy Stoffman, "Natives Tell Their Own Story at Smithsonian: Controversy in Calgary Led to Collaboration; Native Groups Consulted on Every Aspect of Museum," *Vancouver Sun*, August 21, 2004.

15. Stoffman, "Natives Tell Their Own Story."

16. Gerald McMaster used this term when describing the NMAI's evolving exhibition strategy. Gerald McMaster, deputy assistant director for cultural resources, interview with the author, December 11, 2001, Suitland, Maryland, tape recording, Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of the American Indian Cultural Resources Center, Suitland, Maryland.

17. For scholar's critiques, see Robin Maria DeLugan, Myla Vicenti Carpio,

and Sonya Atalay in this special edition. For journalist and cultural critics, see Marc Fisher, "Indian Museum's Appeal, Sadly, Only Skin Deep," *Washington Post*, September 21, 2004; Paul Richard, "Shards of Many Untold Stories: In Place of Unity, a Melange of Unconnected Objects," *Washington Post*, September 21, 2004; Edward Rothstein, "Who Should Tell History: The Tribes or the Museums?" *New York Times*, December 21, 2003; Tiffany Jenkins, "The Museum of Political Correctness," *The Independent Review*, January 25, 2005; Joel Achenback, "Within These Walls, Science Yields to Stories," *Washington Post*, September 19, 2004; and Timothy Noah, "The National Museum of Ben Nighthorse Campbell: The Smithsonian's New Travesty," *Slate*, September 29, 2004, available at http://www.slate.msn.com/ed/2107140 (accessed October 13, 2004).

18. Ken Ringle, "Where's Tonto? You Won't Find Out at the New Indian Museum," *Weekly Standard*, April 4, 2005.

19. Signed statement by American Indian Movement leaders Floyd Red Crow Westerman, Dennis Banks, and Clyde and Vernon Bellecourt as quoted in Jodi Rave's article "Indian Museum Looks at Life, Death," *Bismark Tribune*, September 26, 2004.

20. As quoted in Achenback, "Within These Walls."

21. Claire Smith, "The National Museum of the American Indian: Decolonizing the Museum," *Antiquity* 79, no. 304 (2005); and Debra Ann Doyle, "National Museum of the American Indian Opens in Washington DC" *Perspectives*, November 2004.

22. To hear the lecture in its entirety see, Smithsonian TV, "Curator's Talk: Paul Chaat Smith" Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian http://smithsonian.tv/videos/nmai/Curator_Talks/2005-03-04_ChaatSmith.htm (accessed May 14, 2005).

23. Smithsonian TV, "Curator's Talk."

24. Smithsonian TV, "Curator's Talk."

25. Gwyneira Isaac, "What Are Our Expectations Telling Us? Encounters with the National Museum of the American Indian," Special issue, *American Indian Quarterly* 30, no. 3–4 (2006): 586.

26. Isaac, "What Are Our Expectations Telling Us?" 586–87.

27. As quoted in Richard Lacayo, "A Place to Bring the Tribe," *Time*, September 20, 2004, 70.

28. This text is attributed to Paul Chaat Smith.

29. Elizabeth Castle, "Intergenerational Indigenous Women's Activism from the Local to the Global (and Back Again)," *American Indian Quarterly* 27, nos. 3 & 4 (2003): 842.