

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

WHAT AFFECTS HAVE “DISCOVERY” “WESTWARD EXPANSION” AND
“MANIFEST DESTINY” HAD ON THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES OF NORTH
AMERICA AND MUSEUM CULTURES TODAY?

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

LARRY LEE MYERS
Norman, Oklahoma
2016

WHAT AFFECTS HAVE “DISCOVERY” “WESTWARD EXPANSION” AND
“MANIFEST DESTINY” HAD ON THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLE OF NORTH
AMERICA AND MUSEUM CULTURES TODAY?

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL STUDIES

BY

Dr. Hollie Mackey, Chair

Ms. Barbara Bilek

Dr. Steven R. Gullberg

© Copyright by LARRY LEE MYERS 2016
All Rights Reserved.

Dedication

The Abenaki (Abnaki, Abanaki, Abenaqui), Acatec, Achi, Achumawi (Achomawi), Acoma, Adai, Ahtna (Atna), Ais, Akimel O'odham, Alabama-Coushatta, Aleut, Alsea, Alutiiq, Algonquians(Algonkians), Algonquin (Algonkin), Alsea, Andoke, Anishinaabe (Anishinabemowin, Anishnabay), Antoniaño, Apache, Apalachee, Apalachicola, Applegate, Arabela, Arapaho (Arapahoe), Arara, Arawak, Arikara, Arua, Ashaninka, Assiniboine, Atakapa, Atikamekw, Atsina, Atsugewi (Atsuke), Avoyel (Avoyelles), Aymara, Aztec Babine, Bannock, Bare, Bari, Baure, Beaver, Bella Bella, Bella Coola, Beothuks, Bidai, Biloxi, Black Carib, Blackfoot (Blackfeet), Blood Indians, Bora, Bororo, Boruca, Bribri Caddo (Caddoe), Cahita, Cahto, Cahuilla, Calusa (Caloosa), Carib, Carquin, Carrier, Caska, Catawba, Cathlamet, Cayuga, Cayuse, Celilo, Central Pomo, Chahta, Chalaque, Chappaquiddick (Chappaquiddic, Chappiquidic), Chatot, Chawchilla, Chehalis, Chelan, Chemehuevi, Cheraw, Cheroenhaka, Cherokee, Chetco, Cheyenne (Cheyanne), Chiaha, Chickasaw, Chilcotin, Chimariko, Chinook, Chinook Jargon, Chipewyan, Chippewa, Chitimacha (Chitamacha), Choctaw, Cholon, Chontal de Tabasco, Chukchansi, Chumash, Clackamas (Clackama), Clallam, Clatskanie, Clatsop, Cmique, Cochimi, Cochiti, Cocopa (Cocopah), Coeur d'Alene, Cofan, Columbia (Columbian), Colville, Comanche, Comcaac, Comox, Conestoga, Coos (Coosan), Copalis, Coquille, Cora, Coree, Coso, Costanoan, Coushatta, Cowichan, Cowlitz, Cree, Creek, Croatan (Croatoan), Crow, Cuna, Cucupa (Cucapa), Cupa, Cupik (Cuit) Dakelh, Dakota, Dawson, Deg Xinag (Deg Hit'an), Delaware, Deline, Dena'ina, Dene, Dene Tha, Diegueno, Dine (Dineh), Dogrib, Dumna, Dunne-za Eastern Inland Cree, Eastern Pomo, Eel River Athabaskan, Eeyou, Endeve, Eno, Entiat, Erie, Eskimo, Esselen, Etchemin,

Euclache, Excelen, Eyak Flathead Salish, Fox Gabrielino, Gae, Galibi, Galice, Garifuna, Gitksan (Gitksan), Gosiute (Goshute), Grand Ronde, Grigra, Gros Ventre, Guarani, Guarijio, Gulf, Gwich'in (Gwichin, Gwitchin), Haida, Haisla, Halkomelem, Hän, Hanis, Hare, Hatteras, Haudenosaunee, Havasupai, Hawaiian, Heiltsuk, Heve, Hiaki, Hichiti (Hitchiti), Hidatsa, Hocak (Ho-Chunk, Hochunk), Hoh, Holikachuk, Hoopa, Hopi, Hualapai, Huichol, Huichun, Humptulips, Hupa, Huron Illini (Illiniwek, Illinois), Inca, Ingalik, Innoko, Innu, Inuktitut (Inupiat, Inupiaq, Inupiatun), Iowa-Oto (Ioway), Iroquois Confederacy, Ishak, Isleño, Isleta, Itza Maya, Iynu Jaqaru, James Bay Cree, Jemez, Juaneno (Juaneño), Jumano Kalapuya (Kalapuyan), Kalina, Kallawaya, Kanien'kehaka (Kanienkehaka), Kalispel, Kansa (Kanza, Kanze), Karankawa, Karkin, Karok (Karuk), Kashaya, Kaska, Kaskaskia, Kathlamet, Kato, Kaw, Kawki, Keres (Keresan), Kickapoo (Kikapu), Kiliwa (Kiliwi), Kiowa, Kiowa Apache, Kitanemuk, Kitsai, Klallam, Klamath-Modoc, Klickitat, Koasati, Konkow, Kootenai (Ktunaxa, Kutenai), Koso, Koyukon, Kulanapan, Kumeyaay (Kumiai), Kuna, Kupa, Kusan, Kuskokwim, Kutchin, Kwakiutl (Kwakwala), Kwantlen, Laguna, Lake Indians, Lakhota (Lakota), Lassik, Laurentian (Lawrencian), Lenape (Lenni Lenape), Lillooet, Lipan Apache, Listiguj (Listuguj), Lnuk (Lnu), Lokono, Loup, Lower Umpqua, Luckiamute, Luiseño, Lumbee, Lummi, Lushootseed Maca, Macuna, Madi, Mahican, Maidu, Makah, Mako, Maliseet, Mam, Manao, Mandan, Mangué, Mapuche (Mapudungun), Marawa, Mariate, Maricopa, Matabo, Matis, Matlatzinca, Mattole, Mayan, Mayo, Meherrin, Menominee (Menomini), Meskwaki (Mesquakie), Methow, Miami-Illinois, Mical, Miccosukee, Michif, Micmac (Mi'gmaq), Mikasuki, Mi'kmaq, Minsi, Miskito (Mosquito), Missouriia, Miwok (Miwuk), Mixe, Mixtec (Mixteco, Mixteca), Mobile, Mobilian Jargon, Mococo, Modoc, Mohave,

Mohawk, Mohegan, Mohican, Mojave, Molale (Molalla, Molala), Monacan, Monache (Mono), Montagnais, Montauk, Multnomah, Munsee (Munsie, Muncy, Muncie), Muskogee (Muscogee, Mvskoke) Nahuatl, Nakoda (Nakota), Nanaimo, Nanticoke, Narragansett, Naskapi, Natchez, Natchitoches, Nauset, Navajo (Navaho), Nawat, Nespelem, Neutral, Nez Perce, Niantic, Nipmuc, Nisga'a (Nisgaa), Nlaka'pamux (Nlakapamux), Nooksack (Nooksak), Nootka (Nutka), Nottoway, Nuuchahnulth, Nuxalk Oconee, Odawa, Ofo, Ohlone, Ojibwa (Ojibway, Ojibwe, Ojibwemowin), Okanagan (Okanogan), Okmulgee, Omaha-Ponca, Oneida, Onondaga, O'odham (Oodham), Opata, Osage, Otchipwe, Otoe, Ottawa, Ozette Pai, Paipai, Paiute, Palouse, Pamlico, Panamint, Papago-Pima, Pascua Yaqui, Passamaquoddy, Patuxet, Patwin, Paugussett (Paugusset), Pawnee, Pecos, Pee Dee, Pennacook, Penobscot (Pentagoet), Pensacola, Peoria, Pequot, Petun, Picuris, Pima, Pima Bajo, Pipil, Piscataway, Pit River, Plains Indian Sign Language, Pojoaque, Pomo (Pomoan), Ponca, Poospatuck (Poosepatuck), Popoluca (Popoloca), Potawatomi (Pottawatomie, Potawatomie), Powhatan, Pueblo, Puquina Quapaw (Quapa), Qualicum, Quechan, Quechua, Queets, Quilcene, Quileute, Quinault, Quinpiac Raramuri, Red Indians, Restigouche, Rumsen, Runasimi Saanich, Sac, Saliba, Salinan, Salish, Samish, Sanpoil, Santee, Santiam, Santo Domingo, Saponi, Sarcee (Sarsi), Sasta, Satsop, Savannah, Sauk, Saulteaux, Sechelt, Sekani, Seminoles, Seneca, Seri, Serrano, Shakori, Shanel, Shasta, Shawnee (Shawano), Shinnecock, Shoshone (Shoshoni), Shuar, Shuswap, Siksika, Siletz, Sinkyone, Sioux, Siuslaw, Skagit, Skin, S'Klallam, Skokomish, Slavey (Slave, Slavi), Sm'algyax, Snohomish, Sooke, Southern Paiute, Spokane (Spokan), Squamish, Steilacoom, Stockbridge, Sto:lo, Stoney, Suquamish, Suruwaha, Susquehannock, Swampy Cree, Swinomish Tachi (Tache),

Tagish, Tahltan, Taino, Takelma, Takla, Tanacross, Tanaina, Tanana, Tangipahoa, Tano, Taos, Taposá, Tarahumara, Tataviam, Tehachapi, Ten'a, Tenino, Tepehuano, Tequesta, Tesuque, Tewa, Thompson, Tigua, Tillamook, Timbisha, Timucua, Tinde, Tiwa, Tiwanaku, Tjekan, Tlahuica, Tlingit, Tohome, Tohono O'odham, Tolowa, Tongva, Tonkawa, Towa, Tsalagi (Tsa-la-gi), Tsilhqot'in, Tsimshian, Tsuu T'ina, Tualatin, Tubar (Tubare), Tulalip, Tunica, Tupi, Tuscarora, Tutchone, Tutelo, Tututni, Twana, Twatwa, Tygh Uchi (Uche), Ukiah (Uki, Ukia), Umatilla, Unami, Unkechaug, Uru, Ute Virginia Algonquian Waco, Wahkiakum, Wailaki, Walapai, Walla Walla, Wampanoag, Wanapam, Wanki, Wappinger, Wappo, Warm Springs, Wasco-Wishram, Washo (Washoe), Wateree, Waxhaw, Wea, Wenatchee, Wendat, Weott, Wichita (Witchita), Willapa, Winnebago, Wintu (Wintun), Wishram, Wiyot, Wyandot (Wyandotte), Wynoochee Yakama (Yakima), Yamasee, Yamel, Yanesha, Yaquina, Yavapai, Yaqui, Yellowknife, Yokuts (Yokut), Yoncalla, Yucatec Maya (Yucateco, Yucatan), Yuchi, Yuki, Yuma, Yupik (Yuit), Yurok Zapotec, Zia, Zoque, and Zuni.

Acknowledgements

Were it not for the University of Oklahoma Outreach College Of Continuing Education and the College of Liberal Studies, my goals for academic achievement may have never come to fruition. There is a long list of very patient staff and professors that have made this journey both enlightened and a joy for me. Each and every one of the following people share in my academic and personal success. Professors: Barbara Bilek, Marcia Ann Britton, Nathan Brown, Scott Childers, Bryan Coppedge, Robert Con Davis, Steven Gullberg, Beth Hansen, Diane Harp, Michelle Johnson, John Lancaster, Hollie Mackey, Susan Nash, Kathryne Roden, Keni Sturgeon, Courtney Vaughn, Ira Michael Yantz, Staff: Kacee Butcher, Jennifer Gatlin, Lindsey Gunderson, Frank Rodriquez, Missy Mitchell, Michelle Shults, Terri Stubblefield, Russ Tresner, Associate Dean Martha Banz, and Dean James Pappas. Thank you all.

I would especially like to thank my Thesis Committee for their assistance, council, and guidance, keeping me focused and accountable, Chair Dr. Hollie Mackey, Dr. Steven Gullberg, and Professor Barbara Bilek.

Finally I would like to thank my friends and family for their support, and specifically my children for their unselfish sacrifice of my time to see my dreams come true. I love you all.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iv
Abstract.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Systematic Settler Colonization, Misrepresentation, and Genocide.....	17
Chapter 3: The Continued Exploitation into the Twenty-first Century.....	56
Chapter 4: The Discussion.....	67
Chapter 5: The Conclusion.....	75
References.....	85

Abstract

Museums have always shaped the observations and perspectives of the people who visit them and the communities that rely on them to enlighten and educate. Not only do they act as a point of reference for academia and scholarly studies, they are also institutions of education for the general public. Whether the focus of museums are the sciences or the arts, natural or social history, they educate the people who visit them. A museum's responsibility is to promote knowledge without bias and to represent its collections without personal preference or prejudice. Society depends on the academic and scholarly communities to take the lead in opening our minds to the realities, and separate our fantasies and misconceptions from romanticized versions of popular truth and myth. Science, archeology, anthropology, and written records can tell us volumes about the world's races and cultures from the past. It is always an eye-opening experience when a new piece of evidence is validated and gives the world a clearer view of a past culture and civilization, or even when misconceptions are realized and corrected, giving us an accurate representation of that civilization's culture and existence.

Today many museums struggle with and or ignore representing America's Indigenous peoples in "Discovery," "Westward Expansion" and "Manifest Destiny" in telling of our country's history. By omission, this lack of storytelling tends to leave a romanticized, stereotypical view of the colonization and settlement of North America by Europeans. If these misconceptions are to be corrected and attitudes about Indigenous peoples and their relationship with American-European settlers and the country's government are to be understood, museums must stand in the gap and act as the bridge from illusion to truth.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Inaccurate, romanticized representations of Indigenous peoples as far back as the very early 1500's in Europe's museums and literature have perpetuated the views carried over to North America by creating a model for the representation of primitive people, artifacts, and culture. Although many artifacts were collected, representations and displays were created to chronologically date and describe items, rather than identify the specific tribe of origin, the use or significance of the object, or the way an artifact impacted or represented daily life of the Indigenous person to whom the artifact once belonged (National Museum of the American Indian (National Museum of the American Indian [NMAI]), 2004). The collections were treated more as curiosities and oddities used to sensationalize and titillate as we would consider a sideshow attraction at a carnival. For the most part, creators of early museum collections exercised little effort in attempting to understand the culture of Indigenous peoples. Early museums exhibits, or cabinets of curiosity, were created to entertain rather than educate a curious population (NMAI, 2004).

Museums in the past have helped to further the misconception that the first people inhabiting North America were a savage population, wishing only to resist civilization and murder innocent settlers, farmers, and ranchers as European-Americans endeavored to settle what they perceived was rightfully theirs to take (Brady, 2007; Lonetree & Cobb, 2008; NMAI, 2004). Collections showed an ungrateful people refusing the conditions of law and treaty to halt the "Westward Expansion" of a conquering nation. Museums represented American Indians as a warring savage peoples, depicting them in pictures and dioramas in violent confrontation and battle scenes that painted a one-sided view of

American Indian culture (Brady, 2007; NMAI, 2004; West, 2005). Museums in the past have often represented all American Indians contacted in the movement west as hostile and non-conforming to the alternative life afforded them through numerous generosities outlined in treaties and the security of the reservation (Brady, 2007; Lonetree & Cobb, 2008; Mihesuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004).

For years, there was little change in the way Indigenous peoples were represented in museums and exhibitions. A conquered race was portrayed living happily and peacefully on reservations or alongside mainstream Americans, adapting to civilized culture and being thankful for the Americanizing education of their youth to become productive, conforming members of society (Brady, 2007; Lonetree & Cobb, 2008; Mihesuah, 2000). American Indian history, culture, religion, and art were observed as a curiosity of an old way of American Indian life rather than an active, fluid, breathing, culture that exists in every section of America's Indigenous peoples. Seldom, if ever, was there any significance attributed to the importance of the spirituality of the life and culture or explanation of how certain artifacts related to the religious values of the people being represented (Brady, 2007; Mihesuah, 2000; West, 2005).

Slowly the Academic community began to change the way it viewed and represented American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian people. With the contributions of collectors and curators like Stuart Culin, George Gustav Heye, Tom and Richard Hill, along with many others, museum exhibits began to focus on a more accurate representation of Indigenous peoples (NMAI, 2004). The face of museum representations in American museums began to take an improved view of Indigenous peoples and their life and cultures by attempting to communicate an understanding of the

existence of the people and an appreciation for the religions and cultural attributes of the many tribes that make up the Indigenous peoples of America. Although many tribes had been forced into extinction, there was still an overall view and representation of American Indian cultures as a past existence as one might think of the Neanderthals or Cro-Magnon humanoids of pre-history (Mihsuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004). In retrospect, the failure of museums and curators to grasp the shortcomings of their representations had to do with European-Americans trying to interpret and understand a culture they had never experienced firsthand. For the non-indigenous curator, this was would be like trying to explain and understand what life must be like in an extinct, ancient culture or civilization (Mihsuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004; West, 2008).

Mainstream attitudes reflected in this long history did not start to change until the 1960's. By then America was rethinking itself and its stereotypical attitudes about itself as well as other races and cultures (Archuleta, Meyers, Nahmias, Woodson, & Yorba, 1994; NMAI, 2004). The Civil Rights and American Indian Movements slowly broke down previous barriers for African Americans, Indigenous peoples, and women (Grabouski, 2011; NMAI, 2004). A national awareness and sensitivity of past injustices toward these people changed the way we saw ourselves and our treatment of many groups. With a newly acquired self-awareness, the consciousness of righting old wrongs began to take shape in the form of new attitudes and laws giving new rights and representation to many groups (NMAI, 2004). The ways in which we perceived Indigenous peoples and the way Indigenous peoples were represented in history and in our museums evolved. With the help of the legal system, Indigenous peoples were able to challenge the stereotypical perceptions of their place in America's history along with

exercising some basic human rights that had been ignored for hundreds of years (NMAI, 2004). Indigenous peoples now collectively voiced concerns of misunderstanding and misrepresentations and how that history was reflected in museums and history books. Indigenous peoples were able to slowly become consultants to museum collections and tribal histories shedding new insights and context to all aspects of American Indian culture, religion, and art (NMAI, 2004). By the 1980's several laws were enacted to allow tribes the rights to have input into how their tribal culture was represented, and to have returned to them certain religious artifacts, burial items and regalia, along with any American Indian remains held in collections private and public (Grabouski, 2011; NMAI, 2004).

Although museums have become more responsive, changes in museums' representations of America's Indigenous peoples have been a slow evolution. Often suppressed over debates of sensitive issues and subject matter, museums struggle when it comes to the highly volatile and politicized dialogue as it pertains to the extreme and abusive treatment of Americas' Indigenous peoples (NMAI, 2004).

When we look beneath the surface of what most people believe to be a tragic consequence of divine right to create a nation dedicated to a higher purpose, we observe patterns that emerge. These patterns are not random acts of cause and effect. The patterns that emerge are deliberate and strategic in their design. Long before there was a word to describe the acts and policy toward indigenous populations of other countries, the effects have been well documented. Defeat, colonize, remove, assimilate, restructure, and assume the resources into the wealth of the conqueror. If Indigenous peoples refuse to assimilate, the ruling authority will force assimilation by removing the social structures,

religion, and culture that supports it and defines the people (Hinton, 2014; Stannard, 1993). From first contact centuries ago to the policies practiced today, our government continues to force the assimilation of America's Indigenous peoples. Only through an understanding and education of our past can we reconcile our future and put an end to the practices that continue to devastate not only our own Indigenous peoples, but also indigenous populations throughout the world community (Jaimes, 1992; Wilkins, 2007).

It has long been a concern that the attempted genocide of a race of people in the quest to own North America has been overlooked and softly taught in the education system of the United States (Gross, 2005; Ward, 2011). National level politicians, along with state and local governments, have long held together that the conflicts with Indigenous peoples were just an inevitable circumstance of discovery and natural expansion that led to the creation of the greatest country in the world (Gross, 2005; Ward, 2011).

We have used the terms "Indian Wars" and "Native Hostiles" to cover up a deeper, darker side of American progress to claim a country that was not ours to claim (Thornton 1987; Yenne, 2008). We may argue that our intent was to share the land with American Indians. It might also be said that the idea of land ownership, to an immigrant population that had been pressed out of their native home land, held opportunity and promising futures. Though the vast territory was unclaimed by civilized social standards, it was not difficult for them to understand the American Indians' connection to the land (Doan, 1999). Many of these immigrants were peoples indigenous to Scotland and Ireland who had fought for freedom and their right to ancestral lands for hundreds of

years on their native soils. Many who came to this country seemed content to share and co-exist with American Indians (Doan, 1999).

The question is: What pushed settlers deeper into land that did not belong to them, at a cost paid in blood by nearly twelve million Indigenous peoples (Alvarez, 2014; Lewy, 2004) between 1140 AD and 1910? Government, business, greed, or the combination of all three? What drove the colonist settlers so hard to justify the near extinction of an entire race of people from a land that was theirs to tend and protect for thousands of years before the first White man appeared at their shores? Perhaps the greater question is why we are, as a country, still engaging in the cultural genocide of America's Indigenous peoples today?

A History Prior to 1492

Despite schoolhouse history rhymes, Europeans ventured to what became the Americas long before "Columbus sailed the ocean blue" (Marzollo & Björkman, 1991, p. 2). The earliest accounts recorded in the Viking Sagas describe the first Viking contacts with Indigenous peoples of this continent. It was clear that after the discovery and colonization of uninhabited Iceland and Greenland the Norse explorers were now again searching and seeking new uninhabited lands. Viking settlers pushed north and south along what is now Nova Scotia to the northern territory of what would become the United States. The first encounters with those arriving in this new land ended very violently for both the White explorers and the Indigenous peoples (Axtell, 2001; Kolodny, 2012). In the saga describing Thorvald's exploration of Vinland (the east coast of the North American continent), after spending the winter at the settlement and houses of his brother Leif Erickson, Thorvald and thirty men travel north along the coast until a storm forces

them ashore damaging the ship. While searching for timber to make the needed repairs to the ship Thorvald and his men came upon three small humps on the sandy beach. As the Vikings moved closer, they observed that the humps were actually animal skin boats with three Indigenous men under each of the boats. The Norse divided and captured eight of the nine, as one escaped. The Norse killed the eight men they had captured on the beach. Then they returned to their ship to make the needed repairs (Kolodny, 2012). Without knowing the pre-Christian belief patterns and religion of the Norse, it is difficult to comprehend the unprovoked violence on the men sheltering under the boats on the beach. The saga continues to tell of encounters with Indigenous peoples and the murderous conflicts that ensued from that first contact on the North American continent (Kolodny, 2012). It is not completely clear today the extent of the Viking exploration of North America or exactly how long the Norse remained. From the accounts of the Indigenous population, the floating islands with the white clouds and the huge white swans on the water, continued to come to their shores bringing the White men that brought death to their people (Kolodny, 2012).

Museums Shape Perspectives

Today most museums continue to struggle with the political realities of implementing the primary premise of excellence and equity: to combine intellectual rigor with the inclusion of a broader spectrum of our diverse society. (Melber, 2014). Museum educators and curators face increased scrutiny and responsibility to represent excellence in academic education in their exhibits, programs and educational outreach in both the physical and virtual communities they serve. The American Association of Museums

(AAM) sets the standards and challenges for museums to engage their diverse audiences and provide meaningful learning experiences (Fitzgerald, 1973; Melber, 2014).

Museums are diverse in their subject and their form, and contribute to communities by collecting, interpreting, and preserving items and ideas important to this country and to the world. Museums engage visitors and they ignite the imagination of the young and old alike (Lipman, 2002; United States Congress House Committee on Education Labor, 2008). Libraries not only provide a vast amount of knowledge, ready and available to the community for free, but they also serve as locations for groups to meet and for people to connect to the internet and community networks (Lipman, 2002; United States Congress House Committee on Education Labor, 2008).

Museums and libraries are committed to sharing their resources to advance knowledge and nourish the human spirit (Fitzgerald, 1973; Melber, 2014). Member museums and libraries of the American Alliance of Museums (AAM) work together striving to engage their administrations and staffs to ensure that their member museums articulate its commitment to present its educational resources with accuracy, clarity, and relevance to a broad-based audience. Institutions must provide interpretive programs that reflect multiple perspectives that promote an exchange of ideas through their exhibit objectives and in the representations of their collections (Fitzgerald, 1973). The institutions' civic responsibility is realized when assessment through information gathering provides evidence of impact on visitor learning (United States Congress House Committee on Education Labor, 2008). Member institutions also ensure that multiple appropriate technologies are incorporated to expand access to knowledge and self-directed learning. The AAM stresses respectful inclusion of other voices and ideas in the

work environment when developing institutional policy, programs, and products (Melber, 2014).

Communities depend on museums and libraries to provide workshops and programs on a wide range of topics to educate and develop understandings to broaden our skills and views in a rapidly changing world society. Libraries and museums contribute to the health and welfare of the communities they serve (United States Congress House Committee on Education Labor, 2008). Museum educators help institutions fulfil their educational missions. Educators recognize the many factors that affect personal and voluntary learning in their institutions. Educators promote the process of individual and group discovery and document their effects (Fitzgerald, 1973; Karp, Kreamer, & Lavine, 1992). Museum educators provide guidelines for all museum professionals who are concerned with the needs of museum visitors. As a part of museum teams, educators serve as the voices and advocates for audiences and visitors, working to provide accurate, meaningful, and lasting educational experiences for a diverse public (Karp, Kreamer, & Mullen, 1992; Melber, 2014).

Museums and libraries are evolving with the changes necessitated by the changing needs of their communities. The role of the library today has developed over time to meet the publics' ever changing quest for information and knowledge. For the library, civic engagement is just a part of their nature in their relationships that they have with their communities (American Alliance of Museums, 2002). Museums are typically easily accessible and engage the communities they serve. By developing and maintaining relationships with their community, organizations, schools, cultural institutions, universities, other libraries, museums, and the general public, these institutions meet the

complex needs of a changing society (Karp, Kreamer, & Lavine, 1992). By shaping their content and exhibits toward relevant issues, museums reach their audiences and create broad dialogues (Karp, Kreamer, & Mullen, 1992; Melber, 2014).

When museums acknowledge a variety of interpretive perspectives, they promote understanding that fosters public engagement (American Alliance of Museums, 2002; Falk & Dierking, 2013). The American Association of Museums sets the principles and standards for museums and promotes accountability through demonstration of excellence in content knowledge by collaboration with scholars and subject specialists. The AAM communicates to its supporters and members that improvement and advancement in the museum profession comes from education and research (Fitzgerald, 1973). Museums that provide ongoing professional development and training for new and established staff provide a significant investment in the future success of their institutions and communities they serve. By staying on the cutting edge of best practices, education methods, learning theories, and technologies, institutions incorporate lifelong learning experiences for their audiences (American Alliance of Museums, 2002; Falk & Dierking, 2013). Institutions that promote education at the center of their missions ensure that education is clearly incorporated into the goals and strategies when planning exhibit design and programs for the community. When museums contribute education expertise to their communities they are able to discover and address community needs (Falk & Dierking, 2013; Melber, 2014).

Communities look to museums to help bridge understanding to complex social, cultural, and political issues. Modern museums are expected to provide more to their communities than the nostalgic dust laden institutions from the past, filled with long

descriptive dialogs and specimens of so-what and who-cares? Successful museums provide perspectives into complex subjects and issues that shed light on misunderstanding and misconception (American Alliance of Museums, 2002; Falk & Dierking, 2013). Museums have the ability to change people's thoughts and perceptions by engaging them in the educational process by providing personal and social context while stimulating and entertaining through physical and mental interaction (Falk & Dierking, 2013).

In an ongoing ethical manner, institutions need to collect data from and about their visitors to measure learning (Karp, Kreamer, & Lavine, 1992). The institution can determine the best educational services to provide to meet the community's interests based on this data. The information that institutions collect is a valuable and can be disseminated throughout the museum community to ensure the institution is meeting its commitment to facilitate education and learning. The information that is gathered can also be used to influence public policy in support of community learning initiatives (Melber, 2014).

Museums and libraries have the responsibility to not only provide understanding and education of their communities' relevant past, they also inform their communities about why the past is relevant today. Many individuals receive their first meaningful educational experiences through preschool visits to museums and libraries. For many children and young adults, these educational learning experiences continue throughout their secondary education and for many these experiences will continue into adulthood (American Alliance of Museums, 2002; Falk & Dierking, 2013; Karp, Kreamer, & Mullen, 1992; United States Congress House Committee on Education Labor, 2008). The

American Alliance of Museums, recognizing the magnitude of these educational benefits, aggressively promotes high professional standards for museum educators. Well trained museum educators have knowledge of, and respect for the audiences their institutions serve. Museum educators promote their institutions public service role within a rapidly changing and diverse society. The AAM supports museum educators and expects the standards of accountability be maintained through their educational knowledge and expertise in the history, theory, and practice of disciplines that are relevant to their institutions and collections. By advancing these goals, AAM member institutions their missions to promote education within their institutions to serve the best interests of their audiences (Lipman, 2002; Melber, 2014).

Through community and civic engagement, museums and libraries not only change perspectives, these institutions of knowledge and education change lives (American Alliance of Museums, 2002; Falk & Dierking, 2013; Karp, Kreamer, & Lavine, 1992; United States Congress House Committee on Education Labor, 2008). The American Alliance of Museums and their member institutions advocate a commitment to nurture and develop an informed and humane citizenry (Melber, 2014).

Equity Literacy

How can we bring a true and meaningful representation of Americas Indigenous peoples to classrooms in secondary education? Perhaps we can start the educational process by having discussions about equity as a fundamental component of multicultural curriculums in schools. (Gorski & Landsman, 2014; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015) assert that today's schools are attempting to educate students in multicultural diversity but may be adding as much issue to the problem of cultural bias as they are resolving. Gorski and

Landsman (2014) and Gorski and Swalwell (2015) offer instead an equity literacy framework to address issues of difference in important and meaningful ways.

When we began to discuss the issues connected to attitudes of bias and multicultural racial equality, our society struggles with how we resolve bigotry and racism in our country. We often witness special celebrations of cultural diversity in our schools. Many adults in our country they feel that schools address cultural diversity, while others feel that nothing has been discussed or addressed to the degree it should (Goodman & Gorski, 2015; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015). Many parents, educators, and the general public often disagree as to whether or not students are too young to talk about issues like racism. What we tend to overlook is that even preschool age children have been exposed to socializing messages about themselves and one another, and often these messages are experienced at daycare and schools (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015). Students already experience bias and discrimination, and for those that do not experience these issues learn that it is impolite to point out or mention and physical or cultural distinctions (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015). When we assume that students are too young to talk about issues like racism, it is important that we stop and think of whom exactly, we are trying to protect. Are we trying to protect the students who are experiencing the racial bias or the adults who are uncomfortable that these issues need addressed? Educators ignore these necessary conversations about race while asking children to celebrate diversity. When we look around schools, we observe classrooms having cultural celebrations and hallways filled with student artwork depicting ideas of what cultural diversity and acceptance looks like to a student (Colbert, 2010; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015). The issues that are impacting students and making them feel invisible in our society are not due to a

lack of multicultural programs or diversity initiatives in our schools or a lack of educators that champion diversity and multiculturalism. The issue in our schools is that we fail to recognize that many students feel marginalized while schools believe they are addressing the issues that marginalize them. There seems to be a lack of understanding and discomfort in moving beyond curriculums in multiculturalism (Goodman & Gorski, 2015; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015).

An honest dialogue must exist in conversations when educators and school administrations come together to discuss multicultural initiatives and programs. Unless principles of equity and social justice are at the heart of curriculum design, schools will struggle to have meaningful multicultural curriculums (Colbert, 2010; Goodman & Gorski, 2015). Educators must understand that it is not enough to simply have diversity awareness. Students, whose voices and identities have been historically omitted from privilege and understanding must be made to feel deserving as students and members of society. When issues of racism and racial inequities, as well as homophobia, sexism, and economic inequality are at the core of multiculturalism, there can be a perceived feeling of exploitation if students and families that experience these inequities allow other students and families that do not experience them to grow in their knowledge while these inequities themselves continue to go unaddressed (Colbert, 2010; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015).

Educators must be able to recognize even subtle forms of bias, discrimination and inequity, and respond to in a thoughtful equitable manner (Colbert, 2010). Educators should not only redress issues by responding to them but help students develop an understanding about how to bring about much larger social change. Schools must

embrace frameworks for multicultural curriculums and development of equitable classrooms in schools (Colbert, 2010; Gorski & Landsman, 2014). A meaningful approach to diversity and multiculturalism relies more on teachers' understanding of equity and inequity and justice and injustice than on their understanding of a particular culture (Cabello & Burstein, 1995; Colbert, 2010; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015).

Without a combined commitment from educators, school districts, and teachers in our communities and states to place equity, rather than culture, at the center of diversity conversations, we cannot expect our children to grow in understanding and acceptance of people that may be like them or different from them (Cabello & Burstein, 1995; Colbert, 2010). Students, with the help of educators, should begin to understand what makes something equitable or inequitable. Students should understand what local, regional, or global inequities exist and how have they changed over time and why, as well as the individual and collective responsibilities we have to address inequities or injustices (Gorski & Landsman, 2014; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015).

The assertion in this thesis is that collectively, we do not teach issues connected to racial and social inequities and injustices in our own history that lead to ideas and attitudes of racial and cultural biases as children move into adulthood. These attitudes become the lenses through which these young people view local and global relationships with people who differ from them. These attitudes are then perpetuated by passing biased points of view and understanding on to future generations.

People will often rebuke the idea of teaching equity literacy because it introduces views about social justice into curriculums and assert that these concepts do not belong in the classroom. Avoiding issues like poverty, sexism, and racism is a political choice akin

to pretending that poverty, sexism, and racism do not exist by omitting them from curriculums. “How do we explain the politics of not teaching about these issues when students in our schools today are experiencing them daily and within their own schools?” (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015, p. 39). How can we expect the next generation of local, state, national, and global leaders to understand the complexities of equity and justice for people in a global community if they are never taught?

Summary

The exploitation and genocide of our country’s Indigenous peoples is a history that must be told. If our society is to ever overcome racial bias, cultural inequities, and injustices, we must begin by educating our young students about our past treatment and continued attitudes towards American Indians. Museums are often the first, and sometimes the only, educators guided by their civic responsibilities and standards set by their professional association, to accurately represent and teach the history of America’s Indigenous peoples. Aligning with an equity literacy framework guided by consultation and input from tribal people will move museums towards this goal. First, we must dismantle the systematic colonial retelling of history. The next chapter will begin to break down the myths of the stereotypical representations of European-American relationships with American Indians and reflect an accurate oration of injustice towards American Indian people.

Chapter 2: Systematic Settler Colonization, Misrepresentation, and Genocide

The early Europeans who made their way to these shores were already well versed in their attitudes toward sex, religion, and the annihilation of peoples and cultures that fell prey to the aggressors' desires for wealth and land (Axtell, 2001; Milton, 2000; Richter, 2013). By the time Europeans were settling the North American coast, due to their persecution from European soils and for their religious beliefs, instead of understanding, accepting, and cohabitating with Indigenous people, the colonists lashed out and killed as many as possible and in large numbers. Many of the early colonial contacts with Indigenous peoples left numerous tribes extinct or near extinction (Axtell, 2001; Hinton, 2014; Jaimes, 1992; Thornton, 1987).

Justifying Dispossession of the American Indians

Early Americans created laws and policies to perpetuate removal of Indigenous peoples from colonized land through countless acts of brutality through treaty and legislation (Calloway, 2013; Heidler & Heidler 2007). Over many generations, Europeans had devised rules and laws intended to justify the dispossession and subjugation of Indigenous peoples of the Western Hemisphere and disposed them of them of the land on which they lived. The most fundamental of these laws were those governing land ownership. Anglo European colonists and their descendants continually recrafted these laws to create laws a clear path for seizure and title to Indigenous people's land of the North American continent. In America, as in other British colonies around the world, the Crown forbid colonists from purchasing land directly from Indigenous peoples, reserving that privilege for the government, who could then sell any purchased land to settlers. After declaring independence, land claims became ambiguous because

the colonies were no longer under British law. As a result, the newly formed U.S. Supreme Court used the former British law to settle land disputes involving Indigenous peoples because the nation had adopted a similar judicial system to their former sovereign (Robertson, 2005). The legal rule in the United States justifying claims to Indigenous lands “discovered” by Europeans can be traced back to a decision by the Supreme Court in 1823. In *Johnson v. M’Intosh* (21 U.S. 543), the Court recognized the “discovery” doctrine, which delineated the land ownership rights between settlers and Indigenous peoples. According to the Court, upon discovery of the new continent, the discovering sovereign was granted ownership and title to the lands while the inhabiting Indigenous peoples were afforded occupancy rights (Prucha, 1975; Robertson, 2005). Essentially, the Court’s decision converted the occupying Indigenous people to tenants. As tenants, American Indian people were subject to eviction by the landlord at any time. The Indigenous tenants could sell their leases but only to the landlord. After more than 180 years, the decision of the Supreme Court and the discovery doctrine is still the law (Kades, 2001; Robertson, 2005).

To understand how such an unfair ruling could be made by the Court we have to go back to colonial America pre-1776. England held most of the land east of the Allegheny Mountains. It was difficult for individuals and land speculators to acquire tribal land. Without proper petition and permission of the British government (Robertson, 2005). After the Seven Years War with France and their American Indian allies, in 1763, Britain expelled the French from North America leaving the land west of the Alleghenies to the tribes. Britain made it illegal for persons or land speculators to cross over the mountains to acquire or purchase land from the tribes, but a misconstrued document was

prevaricated by representatives for land speculation groups to allow them to negotiate with tribes for non-occupied land. As the relationship with England and the American colonies deteriorated, political separation escalated from 1765 to the Declaration of Independence by the colonies in 1776, causing jurisdictional lines to blur, economic networks to fragment, and political allegiances to waiver (Robertson, 2005). The turmoil allowed groups of well-funded land speculators with tenuous legal authority to pour money and political capital into the current vacuum of political and legal authority in the hopes of acquiring a favorable outcome to the ill-gotten land deeds, and the speculation that the growing population would force a market for expanded lands. This promised to provide huge profits for the land speculators and their backers. Although the land the speculators managed to acquire from the Indigenous peoples was cheap, it would take years before a possible return could be realized on their outlay of money (Robertson, 2005; Watson, 2012).

The Continental Congress reserved the right to deal with tribes on land acquisitions, ignoring lawyers speaking on behalf of land speculators and insisting that the speculators had legally acquired the land prior to independence and the war with England and should therefore be granted legal titles and rights to the land. Still the young government resisted and refused to recognize speculators' claims to the land citing that the land was acquired without proper legal license (Robertson, 2005).

By the end of the Revolutionary War with Britain, the country was ready for expansion. Treaties had been a way of attempting to bargain with Indigenous peoples, but the newly formed government often worked through appointed agents to acquire other lands. The agents would identify a cooperating tribe out of many tribes occupying the

land and only deal with the leaders of that tribe in order to procure desired lands (Robertson, 2005; Watson, 2012). The government would negotiate with a tribe willing to sell off the land, and often more than not land that rightfully or completely belong to them. The government would then force all Indigenous peoples off the land sold by another tribe. Along with displacing people from ancestral homes, the government would wait until settlers were pushing the boundaries of land available to them for purchase, observe the American Indians relocation site miles away from their established homes and then claim the land they desired was devalued. In the government' argument, because the now vacant land was no longer "occupied", the land was now less valuable. In this way, the government could pay even less than the minimal amount they had initially agreed it would pay (Axtell, 2001; Prucha, 1975).

As the new Federal Government grappled to grow into its responsibility of governing and representing a young nation, the speculation companies with many new petitions for claims seized to exploit any vulnerability in a government expanding its jurisdictional duties. Many arguments for title claims previously heard in lower Courts were now being prepared for argument in the newly appointed Supreme Court. Seated on the Court was Chief Justice John Marshall (Robertson, 2005; Watson, 2012). The argument to be heard by the Court was *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (21 U.S. 543). Both were non-indigenous White men claiming land that was argued to overlap each other's claimed title. In fact, the two tracts of land did not overlap and the claim was misrepresented in the hopes of obtaining the Court's favorable ruling (Kades, 2001). Joshua Johnson and Thomas Graham had inherited land from Joshua's father, Thomas Johnson, who was one of the original investors of the Illinois Wabash Land Speculation Company. He had

acquired the land in a questionable purchase from the Piankeshaw tribe. William M'Intosh, a Scottish fur trader, had obtained a land patent from the Federal Government along the Wabash River on government land acquired from the Piankeshaw. The case was argued by Daniel Webster on behalf of Johnson, the plaintiff, and William Winder on behalf of M'Intosh, the defendant. (Robertson, 2005; Watson, 2012).

The case sat for two years before receiving Court's decision authored by Chief Justice Marshall. Marshall's lengthy decision begins with a discussion of European discovery of the Americas, the legal foundations of the colonies, and how European powers acquire land from Indigenous peoples. Marshall continues to explain that European power gains sovereignty over the land it discovers and gains the exclusive right of occupancy over Indigenous peoples. Marshall went on to rule that when the United States declared independence from Great Britain, the U.S. government inherited England's preemption over American Indian lands. Marshall had also clearly drawn on the previous arguments of Winder and Murry's that "Indians had no right of soil" (Robertson, 2005, p. 76) and in effect have no right to sell land to individual purchasers because the land was not theirs to sell. The American Indians were tenants on land owned by the sovereignty and as such could not sell what was not theirs. Therefore, Johnson's claim to own the land inherited by purchase through the Illinois and Wabash Land Company was dismissed and the M'Intosh land patent upheld. This opinion is the outline and grounds for the doctrine of aboriginal title in the United States, and the discovery doctrine. Marshall had made it very clear that only government could acquire land occupied by American Indians and not individuals attempting to purchase from them (Robertson, 2005; Watson, 2012).

Marshall's lengthy and elaborate drafting of the decision by Marshall was strategic in method. Incorporating *obiter dicta*, Marshall wrote into his ruling extensive language that sounded authoritative and could be perceived as persuasive but technically has no precedential value (Robertson, 2005). Marshall had several personal interests and causes he wished to move forward, one of which was a promise by the state of Virginia to provide land grants to former Revolutionary War veterans (Robertson, 2005; Watson, 2012).

The magnitude of his decision was not even realized by Chief Justice Marshall until the basis of his ruling was used a few years later as the foundation of the *Indian Removal Act*, (4 Stat. 411) passed by Congress on May 28, 1830 and signed into law by President Andrew Jackson. Marshall's ruling has also been cited as the driving doctrine in the acquisition of Indigenous peoples' land in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (Robertson, 2005; Watson, 2011)

First Slaves

From the very beginning and long before the transatlantic African slave trade, a North American transatlantic slave trade in indigenous peoples had existed since the first European settlers had arrived (Axtell, 2001; Gilio-Whitaker, 2015; Stone, 2013). Slavery was first used as a weapon of war by the European colonists and later used as a survival tactic by the Indigenous population who participated in the slave trade as slavers. This practice contributed to the drastic decline in the American Indian populations in the eastern-most parts of the country. Regardless of the slaving of rival tribes as an attempt to stave off their own decline, contact with the settling Europeans resulted in ongoing conflicts coupled with devastating disease epidemics that lasted well into the eighteenth

century. As a result, many of the Indigenous tribes fled their ancestral lands and moved deeper into the eastern, southeastern, and southern parts of the country to escape contact and conflicts (Gallay, 2009; Gilio-Whitaker, 2015; Stone, 2013).

Broken Treaties and a System of Betrayal

After numerous conflicts, two large scale wars and a lengthy list of treaties, American Indian nations wishing to maintain their independence had moved even deeper into the frontiers of the country. The treaties the tribes had agreed to had both acted as a method to secure and protect lands for American Indians and as a tool for government to acquire lands for expansion. But as the European-American population grew the need for further expansion for settlements was imminent (Robertson, 2005). The United States government adopted the *Northwest Ordinance Act* in 1796 (2 The Laws of the United States of America 559), and the *Commerce Clause to the Constitution* (U.S. Const. art. 1 § 8 cl. 3). These policies allowed the United States to treat some American Indians as sovereign nations, while it made treaties with some and made war on others. Later in 1789, the U.S. Government assigned the first American Indian agents under the Department of War to negotiate treaties with American Indian tribes (Tyler, 1973; Wilkins, 2007; Wrone, 1986).

In 1790, the *Indian Trade and Intercourse Act* (1 Stat. 137) was adopted. As a result, the federal government had established jurisdiction in handling and dealings with American Indian tribes. Through additional negotiated treaties the federal government promised to protect the American Indian nations from the encroachment of settlers into American Indian land. By the time Marshall had delivered his decision in *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (21 U.S. 543), the relationship between the tribes and the United States federal

government had deteriorated (Bowes, 2016; Finkelman & Garrison, 2009; Miller, 2011). For the next thirty-five years, a period of wide scale expropriation and escalating violence existed as the federal government pushed the American Indian nations deep into Florida and Georgia (Tyler, 1973; Wrone, 1986). The Eastern United States Indian Wars would yet again devastate the populations of American Indians. The federal government's policies, treaties, and beliefs that Indigenous peoples were a sub-race of human beings that were inferior to White European-Americans shaded the manner in which the government treated and related to American Indian nations (Tyler, 1973; Wrone, 1986).

The massive influx and rapidly swelling numbers of European settlers intensified the pressure on politicians to accommodate settlers, pushing tribes off land that had been treaty-ceded to American Indian nations. American Indians were not passive as they felt their existence being held in the pressure of a vise. As American Indians continued being squeezed out of their homes and land, the treaties that promised to protect them were once again being threatened (Heidler & Heidler 2007; Miller, 2011). American Indian tribes protested by fighting back and the government used these acts as grounds to force the tribal nations out of lands given to them with treaties. The *Northwest Ordinance Act* (2 The Laws of the United States of America 559), had promised the American Indian nations that their land and property would never be taken away without their consent (Heidler & Heidler, 2007; Miller, 2011; Tyler, 1973; Wrone, 1986). As settlers pushed into occupied land the government sent in the military to protect them. It became quite apparent to the American Indian nations that the treaties and promises of the federal government were faithless and empty. As long as there was land with American Indians on it, the United States government would take it from them. The passage of the *Trade*

and Intercourse Act (1 Stat. 137) was to restore and keep the peace with the tribal nations. Though it seems the part of the Act that most interested the federal government was to restrict the ability of anyone other than the federal government to have authority for any official relations with American Indians unless it approved otherwise. This limited the ability of any party to have diplomatic relations or negotiations of any type. Especially when it came to the purchase or acquisition of land, to guarantee American Indian land did not fall into private hands. The model was now complete. The U.S. Government and their agents would resolve conflicts with American Indian nations by promising protected land by treaty, allow encroachment under military protection, then exercise sole authority to resolve the conflict by treaty (Miller, 2011). The federal government maintained that both the United States and the American Indian nations benefited from the treaties and sale of American Indian land. The government acquired the land needed for expanded settlement, and American Indian tribes received a steady flow of income along with federal guarantees of continued financial, medical, and educational aid (Heidler & Heidler, 2007; Miller, 2011; Tyler, 1973; Wrone, 1986).

American Indian Removal and Relocation

Systematic American Indian removal by the United States began in the early 1800's. The acculturation of tribes first proposed by George Washington allowed American Indians the opportunity to coexist with Anglo-Europeans if the members of the tribes would convert to Christianity and learn to speak, read, and write the English language (Axtell, 2001; Heidler & Heidler, 2007; Miller, 2011). Tribes and tribal members were also encouraged to adopt Anglo-European practices such as individual ownership of property, including the ownership of slaves. To help with the assimilation

process special American Indian schools were created to teach American Indian children a new culture, the White American culture (Axtell, 2001; Hinton, 2014; Richter, 2013).

Tribes, such as the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Seminole, and Muscogee-Creek, were allowed to remain on ancestral lands as long as they complied with the government and the processes of assimilation. Thomas Jefferson affirmed this practice and further encouraged the autonomous nations to conform to an agricultural-based society. However, many tribal members and many eastern tribes refused to assimilate and be forced out of the land of their ancestors (Alvarez, 2014; Heidler & Heidler, 2007; Hinton, 2014).

Physical Extermination

Time after time large groups, and at times entire tribes, were massacred as either a punitive action for refusal to comply with removal or the self-preservation attempts to protect their people from the trespass of settlers into and onto native lands. As the American people reached further across the continent and attempted to push American Indians off tribal lands and onto reservations, the American Indians' reluctance to leave was often met with overly harsh and deadly repercussions (Heidler & Heidler, 2007; Miller, 2011). Considered less than human and treated as animals, American Indians have suffered a decline of nearly fifteen million people. Over five million American Indians died as a direct result of the Indian Wars. The others succumbed to the disease, starvation, and abuse leveled against them for populating land that was desired by government, business, and settlers (Alvarez, 2014; Heidler & Heidler, 2007; Miller, 2011).

The practice of finding a conflictive or feuding group of American Indians to do business with had been well established for many years (Richter, 2013; Robertson, 2005). It was a way of one tribe making treaties with representatives wanting land for expansion, and another wishing to remove and or eliminate another tribe. American Indians would sell land that did not belong to them to representatives who knew the tribe they were purchasing land from did not occupy the land. Once the deal was struck, White settlers often with the help of the selling tribe would forcibly remove or eliminate the occupying and rightful owners of the land that had been purchased (Calloway, 2013).

American Indians had fled south into Florida to escape United States authority. Florida under Spanish rule had little to no control over American Indians pouring across its borders. American Indians, along with escaped slaves banded together and raided American settlements in the southern portions of the United States (Rosen, 2015). The Florida tribes and slaves became known as the Seminoles. The raiding Seminoles posed a continued threat to settlers in Georgia and Alabama. In 1818 Andrew Jackson led an army into the Spanish territory capturing two Spanish forts and defeating the Seminoles. The Spanish, concerned that they would lose Florida without compensation, agreed to sell the Florida territory to the United States in 1819. The Seminoles were then removed to a reservation in central Florida (Missall, Missall, Arsenault, & Mormino, 2004; Rosen, 2015).

It was clear that American Indians were considered the enemy of White civilized culture and the future expansion of a new country by the 1820's. The Cherokee had lived in Georgia in relative peace as farmers. A "civilized" tribe, the Cherokee built houses, roads, and communities, flourishing in the state of Georgia until gold was discovered on

their territory. When word of the gold spread, White settlers encroached upon the lands and the state of Georgia claimed jurisdiction over the Cherokee's territory (Anderson, 1991; Perdue & Green, 2005). The Cherokee sued the state of Georgia in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (30 U.S.1, 17). Claiming they were independent from Georgia. The Court ruled in favor of the Cherokee recognizing their independence from the state. President Andrew Jackson, upset with the Court stated that John Marshall had made his decision, now he needed to enforce it. Instead Georgia officials began the process of removal while details of enforcement were hashed out in Washington, and by the time it was resolved, the federal government intervened, but it was too late. Georgia had started the process of seizing the land and had started removing the Cherokee nation to Oklahoma (Byers, 2004; Perdue & Green, 2005).

Removal seemed to be the answer to a population eager to push into areas populated by long standing tribes. Government authorities often used threats, bribes, and alcohol to secure one- sided treaties. The *Indian Removal Act* (4 Stat. 411) was the U.S. government's answer to ridding itself of the American Indian infestation and forcibly acquiring the desired lands inhabited by several tribal nations. Under President Andrew Jackson the brutal organization and removal of American Indians from the east, northeast, and southeastern United States thousands of miles to the southwestern U.S. marks one of the saddest entries in our Nation's history (Perdue & Green, 2005). A forced march by U.S. troops to remove Indigenous peoples of the country's newly claimed land drove a human train, of whom many were shackled and chained, under-rationed, and starving across half a continent to federal territorial lands, later known as the Indian Territory, leaving hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children

diseased, starving, and dead along what would come to be known as “The Trail of Tears” (Byers, 2004; Bowes, 2007).

The forced removal of hundreds of thousands of Indigenous peoples from the northeast and southeastern states halfway across a continent without medicines or adequate food or clothing. The *Indian Removal Act* (4 Stat. 411) left a trail of dead and human suffering from sickness, starvation and the elements (Bowes, 2007) stretching over thousands of miles. Although no documentation directly suggests a mass extermination of Indigenous natives, the total disregard for the health and wellbeing of those under the charge of the federal government shows a lack of human compassion or willingness to provide the necessary essentials to adequately insure survival on such a journey. An estimate of over 10,000 American Indian lives were lost in the eastern removals (Anderson, 1991; Bowes, 2007).

By the late 1840’s a massive migration of settlers was pouring into the western parts of the United States. Western tribes were being forced onto reservations. In 1849, the Indian Office was transferred to the newly created Department of the Interior that was formed to manage the public land that had been expropriated from American Indian peoples (Finkelman & Garrison, 2009; Field, 1993).

Conflicts between the settlers and American Indians escalated to horrific violence when gold was discovered on American Indian land in California. Thousands of American Indians were killed and American Indian agents reported that American Indians in California were being killed every day (Field, 1993; Lindsay, 2015). In 1851 California Governor Peter H. Burnett stated that a war of extermination would continue to be waged between the two races until the American Indian race became extinct (Field,

1993). Between the years of 1850 and 1861 the state militias of California had carried out twenty-four American Indian killing campaigns spending \$1.5 million to exterminate Californian American Indians. The United States Congress paid all but \$200,000 of that money back to the state of California (Lindsay, 2015). America was determined to remove American Indians to reservations and use whatever force necessary to accomplish its goal.

Eager to hold and maintain the Great Plains, seven of the American Indian Nations, including the Cheyenne, Sioux, Crow, and Arapaho, negotiated peace with the United States at Fort Laramie in September 1851 (Hatch, 2004). Cheyenne Chief Black Kettle was instrumental in seeking a peaceful existence for the Cheyenne and the other tribes that roamed the area across South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, parts of Colorado, and Kansas. The United States Government was interested in maintaining a safe passage for settlers using the Oregon Trail that passed through these lands on their way west (Hatch, 2004; Yenne, 2016). The Nations would be able to roam free on the lands and the settlers would remain safe as they passed through. When gold was discovered in Denver, Colorado in 1858, settlers poured into the area creating havoc and conflicts with American Indians. During the early years of the Civil War, Union troops were sent to New Mexico and Colorado to fight Confederates disrupting supply lines, trade routes and attempting to invade the Colorado gold fields. Successful in defeating the Confederate raiders, the Union cavalry remained in the area that had been the American Indians' land, protected by treaty (Hatch, 2004; Yenne, 2016). The United States government remained concerned that after the war was over, the occupied territories entering the Union be a slave holding or non-slave holding state. Conflicts with American Indians increased as

settlers encroached onto American Indian land. After a family of settlers was killed near Denver, it was assumed the killings had been committed by members of the Cheyenne and Arapaho tribes. The territorial governor of Colorado, John Evans, called on citizens to “kill and destroy” hostile American Indians. Governor Evans intent was a punitive action on American Indians in the area and he ordered friendly American Indians to seek protection at nearby U.S. forts. Chief Black Kettle and the Cheyenne along with other allied tribes initiated talks with the fort commander and were told to stay in their camp at Sand Creek until they received further orders (Hatch, 2004; Yenne, 2016).

Governor Evans was intent on “chastisement” of all the tribes in the region and found a willing participant in Colonel Chivington who had defeated the Confederates two years earlier. Chivington had aspirations of going to Congress after the war and hoped further victories would propel him to Washington. Months had passed with no success of locating “hostile” American Indians. Chivington and his unit were increasingly mocked as the “Bloodless Third.” Frustrated that his unit’s enlistment was about up and he had seen no action, Chivington led 700 men on a night ride to Sand Creek (Hoig, 1961; Yenne, 2016).

Chivington reported that he and his unit, at daylight, attacked a Cheyenne village of 130 lodges, 900-1,000 warriors strong. Chivington further reported that his men engaged in a furious battle against a well-armed entrenched foe, ending in a great victory. Chivington went on to say that the victory nearly annihilated an entire tribe, killing several chiefs and between 400-500 warriors and other American Indians (Hoig, 1961; Yenne, 2016).

When Chivington's troops returned to Denver they were displaying scalps they had cut from American Indians. The scalps were used as props in celebratory reenactments glorifying a great victory. The gruesome celebration was interrupted when a very different storyline emerged conflicting with the report from Colonel Chivington (Hoig, 1961; Yenne, 2016). Captain Silas Soule had joined Chivington's command and had ridden into the Cheyenne camp on that November morning. Soule however was appalled by the attack on Sand Creek and the betrayal of peaceful American Indians. Soule refused to fire a shot or order his men into action and instead bore witness to a massacre and recorded it in cold, harsh detail (Hatch, 2004; Yenne, 2016).

Soule recorded that hundreds of women and children were coming toward us, and getting on their knees for mercy, only to be shot and have their brains beat out by men professing to be civilized (Yenne, 2016). The American Indians didn't fight from trenches as Chivington has reported: the American Indians fled up the creek and desperately dug into the sand banks for protection. From there the men protected themselves as best they could. The American Indians had a few rifles and bows. They were overwhelmed by carbines and howitzers. Others were chased down and killed as they ran across the plains (Hatch, 2004; Yenne, 2016).

Soule estimated the American Indians casualties at 200, 140 women and children, 60 men. Soule also described how the soldiers scalped the dead and cut off the ears and genitals of the chiefs. The women's genitals were cut out for trophies. Soule went on to say that U. S. casualties experienced from the incident were more likely the result of Chivington's lack of organization that allowed his troops to act as a mob rather than a military unit. And given the chaos, the dozen or so soldiers killed at Sand Creek were

likely killed by friendly fire (Hatch, 2004; Yenne, 2016). A Congressional committee found that Chivington had deliberately planned and executed the massacre, murdering and killing in cold blood American Indians that had every reason to believe that they were under U.S. protection. Chivington only escaped court martial due to his resignation from the military (Hatch, 2004; Yenne, 2016).

Another casualty of Sand Creek was any remaining hope of peace on the Plains between American Indians and the government represented by its military (Yenne, 2016). Black Kettle, the Cheyenne chief who had raised a U.S. flag in a futile gesture of fellowship, survived the massacre, carrying his badly wounded wife from the field and straggled east across the winter plains. The next year, in his continuing effort to make peace, he signed a treaty and resettled his band on reservation land in Oklahoma (Hatch, 2004; Hoig, 1961; Yenne, 2016).

Many American Indian tribes looked upon Sand Creek as proof that there would never be a peace with the White settlers or their government. Although the Civil war soon ended, the war on the plains with American Indians continued for many years to come. The policies and actions leading up to and including Sand Creek created a huge obstacle in the expansion of the country for the United States government. Removal of American Indians would become an even more expensive, timely, and daunting task. The strategic campaign against American Indians to extinguish their resistance took three times longer than the War Between the States (Hatch, 2004; Hoig, 1961; Yenne, 2016).

At the conclusion of the Civil War the United States government appointed and redeployed Generals Sherman and Sheridan to the western plains to subdue and relocate American Indian tribes to reservations and other assigned lands (Hatch, 2004; Hoig,

1961; Yenne, 2016). Once removed, a people who were once hunter-gatherers were expected to change their culture to accommodate the wishes of the government and the soldiers sent to watch over them. Clashes with other tribes, sickness and starvation, along with the punitive actions of a determined and aggressive military, took another toll on the American Indian populations (Hatch, 2004; Hoig, 1961; Yenne, 2016).

Slowly, the appetite of a Nation turned its eyes to the North and Northwest. Again, eager to expand its territory after the Civil War, the new federal government was anxious to heal its debts and looked to help push settlers across the country (Clampitt, 2015). Rail lines reached deep into and across the frontiers of America. Once again Indigenous people stood in the way of progress, wealth, and commerce. One of the points on the map the government wanted was the American Indian Territories. During the war, both the Union and the confederacy desperately sought control of the Indian Territory for both its resources and geography (Barreyre & Goldhammer, 2015). Now in the post war the territory would be the crossroads between Kansas, Texas, and Arkansas. Due to the fact that most tribes in the American Indian nation sided with the Confederacy during the war and were among the last to surrender to the Union, the post-Civil War government required new treaties with the tribes which forced them to concede land and also required them to either free any slaves that they owned or make them full tribal members (Clampitt, 2015; Grinde & Quitard, 1984).

Until 1866, American Indians in the territory had exclusive use of the land deep in the heart of the nation. After the new treaties, the U.S. government forced cession of approximately 2,000,000 acres from the tribes. This land was later known as *the unassigned lands* (Clampitt, 2015). The U.S. Government looked across the landscape to

expand the country for settlement and grow the ailing economy. The problems facing them were that there were already people occupying the land before them, and they had already been pushed and compressed into sharing the land that was quickly shrinking around them. The U.S. Army again was called upon to round up and remove American Indians to reservations and protect those that exploited the homes and livelihoods of American Indian life and culture (Clampitt, 2015; Grinde & Quitard, 1984).

As long as long as there were buffalo roaming plentifully over the plains, American Indians would remain sovereign (Yenne, 2008). The U.S. government grew impatient, however, with the lack of progress of the Army to successfully subdue and remove American Indians from the territories and frontiers to reservations, put pressure on the military to scale up its aggressive strategies to control the American Indian problem (Smits, 1994; Yenne, 2008).

General William Tecumseh Sherman, who had broken the back of the Confederacy with his ruthless March to the Sea, helped to negotiate treaties at Fort Laramie and Medicine Lodge in 1867, attempting to end hostilities on the plains (Yenne, 2016). But, as long as American Indians were able to flourish and live off the plains they would not be pressed onto reservations. Advisors to Sherman reminded him that the Confederacy's will to fight and resist was extinguished by his brutal tactics during the Civil War. Sherman's scorch the earth methods had decimated the South's ability to supply itself and resist the onslaught of military force (Yenne, 2016). Officers under Sherman's command proposed that the same strategy could be applied in subduing American Indians, remove their food supply and the buffalo. The government realized that as long as the food source was there, and as long a key cultural element was there, it

would remain difficult to move American Indians onto reservations (Brown, 2009; Yenne, 2016). The Army had already used this strategy in its campaign against the Navajo in 1863-1864, and it was clear to the U.S. government that as long as the buffalo remained on the plains, so too would American Indians. The policy to remove tens of millions of buffalo by the Army was unfeasible, but allowing hunters to use military forts as bases of operations and the resources of the railroads for support the Army would make no effort to enforce treaties obligating government protection from settlers hunting on American Indian lands. Colonel Richard Dodge stated that every dead buffalo is an American Indian gone (Smits, 1994; Yenne, 2016). In Secretary of the Interior Columbus Delano's annual report he stated that a rapid disappearance of game from the former hunting grounds operated largely in favor in our efforts to confine American Indians to smaller areas and compel them to abandon their nomadic ways. Years later Delano would go on to say that if the buffalo was extinct, American Indians of the Great Plains would have to surrender to the reservation system (Smits, 1994; Yenne, 2016).

The people watched the once plentiful food source hunted carelessly and tragically to near extinction while leaving the carcasses rotting on the plains. The buffalo hunters took only their tongues and hides to be shipped back east. The hides were used for manufacturing factory gear and pulley belts while the tongues were considered delicacies in restaurants (Branch, 1929; Brown, 2009; Franke, 2005; Krech, 1999; Wheeler, 1925).

The federal government broke treaty after treaty in attempts to force American Indians off native lands and onto reservations where they died from diseases once foreign to them and without treatment and medicines to heal and protect the young and the old

from sickness and death (Anderson, 2014; Brown, 2009). Those that escaped disease slowly starved as the government's promise to feed and protect only filled graves. Time and time again soldiers were used to hunt and exterminate those American Indians that refused to condemn their people to slow agonizing deaths on reservations (Anderson, 2014; Brown, 2009).

The Turning Tide of Public Opinion

Countless accounts in history have described the policy of the U.S. Government toward the Indigenous population. The United States, through the Department of War, carried out systematic military campaigns to destroy the subsistence base of the Plains people by the U.S. Army. The United States government aggressively used policy, treaties, and the strength of the U.S. military to forcibly relocate American Indian people to the new American Indian territories or onto reservations and then expropriate their lands (Greene, 2008; Yenne, 2008). The U.S. military finding itself increasingly under pressure from the politicians in Washington and with increased scrutiny of U.S. newspapers, struggled to overcome a less than favorable image as an effective enforcer of U.S. American Indian policy (Greene, 2008; Yenne, 2008).

In November of 1868 while winter camped on the banks of the Washita River in the American Indian Territory, Chief Black Kettle and a small number of his tribe consisting of mostly women, children and elderly came under the attack of the Seventh Cavalry led by George Armstrong Custer (Hardorff, 2006). Black Kettle's Cheyennes were believed to have been part of a larger group including Arapahos, Kiowas, Comanches, Brules, Oglalas, and Pawnee warriors responsible for raiding White settlements in Kansas, Colorado, and Northwest Texas. The Cheyennes and Arapahos

had been required to move to the territory following the signing of the Medicine Lodge Treaty (Greene, 2008; Yenne, 2008). Having been removed from their primary food source, the buffalo, the Cheyennes and Arapahos ventured off reservation in order to secure adequate food to feed their people.

In the summer of 1868 a band of Cheyennes from above the forks of Walnut Creek set out to raid Pawnee villages. Instead the Cheyennes raided White settlements. Some of the members of the attacks returned to Black Kettle's camp. One of Black Kettle's band reported to an American Indian agent that he knew who had participated in the raids and gave their names over to the agent. He went on to tell the agent that he would agree to try and have the men responsible handed over to authorities (Greene, 2008; Hardorff, 2006; Hatch, 2004). Black Kettle's village moved to join other Cheyenne bands on the Washita River in November.

Black Kettle, along with several other chiefs, traveled to Fort Cobb to discuss peace agreements (Greene, 2008; Hardorff, 2006; Hatch, 2004). As part of the discussion the chiefs learned of General Sheridan's war plans on American Indians. Black Kettle did not want to be subjected to further trouble for his tribe and wished to move them to Fort Cobb. Before Black Kettle and the other chiefs returned to the camps on the Washita River, a band of warriors that had participated in a raid on settlers had returned to the camps (Greene, 2008; Hardorff, 2006; Hatch, 2004). On November 26 the chiefs arrived along the Washita and gathered to discuss what they had learned with other tribal leaders. The talks lasted until early morning and it was decided that Black Kettle would move his camp farther down river and join the rest of the Cheyenne camps. It was also decided that

as soon as the snow cleared Black Kettle would move his people to Fort Cobb (Greene, 2008; Hardorff, 2006; Hatch, 2004).

Later that morning Custer and the Seventh Cavalry, tracking the members of the settlement raids, came across Black Kettle's isolated camp. Dividing his force, Custer ordered the attack on the camp. It was estimated that over 140 Cheyennes were killed, another 100 wounded and several women and children taken into custody (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2008; Hardorff, 2006). The ponies were herded into the river and shot, the lodges burned and anything of value destroyed. Custer's forces chased several American Indians before realizing there were many other camps on the river. After feigning attack on an Arapaho camp, Custer ordered his troop north to join his supply train and return to Fort Supply (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2008; Hardorff, 2006; Hatch, 2004).

Many American Indians and their advocates felt that the brutal attack on Chief Black Kettle's winter camp was the U.S. Army's retaliation on the Cheyennes for the aftermath of Sand Creek (Greene, 2008; Hardorff, 2006; Hatch, 2004). Regardless, this event like many others exposed the resolve of the United States government to subdue the plains American Indians through the use of military force. In 1871, an act of Congress put an end to the use of treaties with American Indians. At that time, there had been 800 treaties entered into with American Indian people. Of that 800, 430 were never ratified by the government and 370 were violated. President Hayes in his first annual message to Congress on December 3, 1877 stated that many if not most of our Indian Wars had their origin in broken promises and acts of injustice on our part (Brown, 2009; Gerhard & Woolley, 1999).

Resisting Relocation

By 1890 most of the American Indian tribes in America had been relocated to reservations. The last of the Apaches and Comanches had surrendered and moved to their reservations and all that remained of the Great Plains American Indians were the Lakota Sioux (Cozzens, 2005; Greene, 2014). In late 1890 the last of the Lakota Sioux led by Chief Big Foot were on their way to South Dakota's Pine Ridge Reservation to join with other Lakota Sioux seeking peace. Concerned that Chief Big Foot's tribe was heading to meet up with hostile Lakota's, the U.S. Army followed the tribe to Wounded Knee Creek (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2014; Jensen, Paul, & Carter, 1991). Contemplating a reservation life subjugated by Whites, a religious ceremony known as a Ghost Dance became popular across the Pine Ridge Reservation. Calling for their ancestors to help free them from the Whites, the dance was a peaceful expression of the oppressed life and conditions they were experiencing and the hope and promise of fulfillment and salvation (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2014; Jensen, Paul, & Carter, 1991). The American Indian Agents, fearful that the dance was a call to a militarist preparation to revolt, sent tribal police to Sitting Bull's home to arrest him and force him to stop the dancing. Sitting Bull was killed along with several of the tribal police. Concerned that the death of Sitting Bull would ignite hostilities from Big Foot's tribe at Wounded Knee Creek, the Seventh Cavalry was ordered to disarm the Lakota's (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2014; Richardson, 2010).

On December 28, 1890, the soldiers captured and separated Chief Big Foot from the tribe and spent the night celebrating and drinking. The soldiers camped above and a few hundred feet away from the Lakota encampment of 120 warriors and 250 women, children, and elderly. The next morning, Monday, December 29, a compliment of 472

soldiers, including 4 mounted troops, prepared to disarm the Lakota. The mounted troops rode out quickly to positions around the camp in a show of overwhelming strength as the large guns zeroed in on the camp. Officers and soldiers on foot neared the Lakota. The morning was clear but very cold. The tribesmen alerted by the army activity around them were up early and had already eaten the army rations provided them for breakfast. Soldiers and officers approached the camp and asked that the men gather at the designated council area to be addressed by Colonel Forsyth.

The mood in the Lakota camp was better than what could have been expected. The women were generally happy, some singing and others going about general morning activities as the children played nearby. The Lakota knew that as a part of accepting life on the reservation they would be expected to give up their guns and horses, at least for the time being until they had adjusted to reservation life. The men generally expected that the requested gathering meant that this must be the day to hand over their rifles and ponies (Greene, 2014; Richardson, 2010). As the men randomly approached the council area civilian newspaper reporters, photographers, and other civilian correspondents gathered on the rise above to observe and record the transition of the Lakota's from free spirits to reservation dwellers, the last of the Great Plains People. Eating the hard tack and coffee they could scrounge from what the soldiers had left earlier that morning they stood lazily or sat in the grass to witness the passing of an era. Colonel Forsyth purposely wanted to separate the men from the women and children as to not alarm them. As Colonel Forsyth walked toward the council area he passed the tent of Chief Big Foot and asked him if he would attend the council. Big Foot declined saying he was feeling ill and would stay in his tent (Greene, 2014; Keenan, 1997).

As Forsyth approached the area he managed a quick count and realized not all of the Lakota men were present. Colonel Forsyth spoke clearly, cordially, and with conciliation. Forsyth offered a greeting, remarked regretfully for the circumstances of the moment explaining that they were prisoners and as such must surrender their weapons. Forsyth went on to convey that they would not be harmed and that they would be compensated for their weapons. Forsyth further explained that wagons were on their way to take them and their belongings to a camp near the reservation agency. The Colonel instructed the men to return to their camp in groups of twenty and bring their weapons back to the council area for surrender (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2014; Richardson, 2010). The first group consulted among themselves and then headed off to the camp as the others waited for their return. This was the day that Big Foot's Lakota had dreaded. Surrendering their Winchesters was by far giving up their most prized of possessions and signaled the end of their freedom and self-reliance.

There had been a report of a rumor circulated among the Lakota camp that instead of being escorted to the Pine Ridge Agency, once disarmed the tribe would be taken to a waiting train and loaded into box cars and sent to Nebraska, and in fact that was exactly the Army's plan all along (Calhoun, 2012; Greene, 2014; Keenan, 1997). When the men returned to the council area not all the men returned and some were escorted back with women at their sides. Reports said that only a couple of useless, old, and outdated guns were placed on the ground. Frustrated, Forsyth had Chief Big Foot brought to the council grounds where he pleaded with his people to comply with the wishes of Forsyth and the Army. Forsyth admonished the lack of cooperation from the tribal members and ordered his soldiers into the camp to search for weapons (Greene, 2014; Richardson, 2010). As

the soldiers searched, the women were making preparations to leave the camp for the Agency. Many of the soldiers returned to the council grounds with a cache of powder, broken, and antique guns, bows, arrows, knives and axes, while several soldiers against orders remained throughout the Lakota camp. As the Army's frustration grew from attempting to forcibly disarm the Lakota men, tensions also grew between the soldiers, the Lakota camp, and the officers at the council grounds. What was later described as a Lakota medicine man danced and chanted as he lifted up dirt from the ground and tossed it into the air (Calhoun, 2012; Gitlin, 2011; Greene, 2014).

As the soldiers continued to attempt to disarm the Lakota men, a soldier grabbed a rifle from what was later believed to have been a deaf man and the rifle discharged (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2014). What happened in the next few minutes was recorded by the civilian correspondents and recounted by surviving witnesses. Confusion ensued and a hand full of Lakota men that had resisted the soldiers fired their weapons causing the soldiers to fire back on the Lakota men. As the Army brought its entire strength to bear on the camp the soldiers began killing indiscriminately until an estimated 250 Lakota men, women and children lay dead. The dead laid scattered across the area for several days before being buried in a mass grave (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2014; Richardson, 2010).

Although several accounts of what took place that day at Wounded Knee Creek were reported and or recounted in personal correspondences, the tragedy was described in several newspapers adding to public sentiment and concern over the treatment of American Indians (Gitlin, 2011; Jenson, Paul, & Carter, 1991). However, this did not stop the government from later taking the reservation land back from the Lakota while

offering small allotments of land and money in exchange for the land that had been promised them (Brown, 2009; Greene, 2014; Richardson, 2010).

In the 1930's and then in the 1940's, after years of inquiries and hearings into the treatment of the Lakota's, South Dakota representative and later senator Francis Case introduced legislation to recompense the descendants of the Lakota Wounded Knee survivors (Greene, 2014; Jensen, Paul, & Carter, 1991). The legislation was met with ongoing resistance from the U.S. Army and eventually the declining economic climate and war in Europe ensured the compensation would go unfulfilled (Greene, 2014; Grua, 2013). Removal and relocation of America's Indigenous people had proven deadly to the many tribes that cooperated and resisted. For those that survived the removal to reservations it was ominous to watch their source of food hunted to near extinction, and their way of life disappear, foretelling the future of their existence (Brown, 2009; Smits, 1994).

The *Dawes Act* (24 Stat. 388) was adopted by Congress to allow the United States Executive Branch to survey various American Indian tribal lands and divide the land into allotments for individual American Indians. American Indians who accepted the allotments and lived separately from the tribes would then be granted United States citizenship (Pevar, 2012). The objectives of the Act were to accelerate the assimilation of American Indians into White civilized culture, promote the progress of American Indian farming, and break up tribes as social units (Pevar, 2012). Allotments not claimed would be made available to White settlers. It was apparent that the U.S. Government was intent on forcing American Indians into abandoning tribal lands and reservations along with their traditions, religions, culture, and tribal identity (Otis & Prucha, 1973; Pevar, 2012).

With the help of the *Dawes Act* and an amendment to the *Indian Appropriations Act* (25 Stat. 980) passed by Congress on March 2, 1889 the Indian Territory was opened to settlement beginning on April 22, 1889 (Otis & Prucha, 1973; Pevar, 2012). The Territory was settled through the use of seven land runs, two lotteries, four allotments, one sealed bid and two acquisitions of unassigned lands (Otis & Prucha, 1973; Pevar, 2012).

Under the *Dawes Act*, the head of each American Indian family would receive 160 acres to encourage American Indians to become farmers in order to support themselves. The purpose of the family allotments was also designed to force American Indians to live in smaller family units resembling American families rather than communal communities in hopes that these units would renounce their tribal loyalties (Otis & Prucha, 1973; Pevar, 2012). The allotments only became permanently deeded to the American Indian family after successfully farming the land for twenty-five years and receiving a certificate of competency. In the event the family could not successfully farm the land or the man in the family left or died, the land would revert back to the government to be sold, usually to White settlers (Otis & Prucha, 1973; Pevar, 2012). The Dawes Act reduced American Indian landholdings from 138 million acres in 1887, to 78 million in 1900, and continued to pass over to White settlement of previously held American Indian land (Otis & Prucha, 1973; Pevar, 2012).

Not only did the loss of tribal land to allotments signal the end of hunter-gatherers as a way of life and force American Indians into an agricultural existence, it would forever change the social structure of the American Indian family unit (Pevar, 2012; Prucha, 1975). American Indian women were respected vital tribal members having

position and standing within their culture. For those accepting land allotments, the roles of men and women changed. Women, unless legally married, had no legal rights to own property and no legal claim to land upon her husband's death or in the case of divorce. This forced American Indian women into the subjugation of a subservient role (Pevar, 2012). As for American Indian men, the forced subjection into the role of farmer and crop gatherer which had been the responsibility of the women in American Indian culture now made men feel less than a man in their new role (Carlson, 1981; Pevar, 2012). For many American Indian family units, the cultural structure and identity that defined their existence was quickly disappearing (Carlson, 1981; Otis & Prucha, 1973; Pevar, 2012).

As the nineteenth century came to a close, the United States Government's plan to remove American Indians to reservations and assigned lands had succeeded, but not without a great and horrific loss of life (Jaimes, 1992). Hundreds of conflicts and wars resulted in thousands of American Indian lives lost. Forced removal and relocation resulted in thousands more dying from mistreatment and disease, while tens of millions of buffalo were slaughtered shamelessly to the threshold of extinction to satisfy a lustful greed of government, business, and European-Americans to take and claim a land that was not theirs (Brown, 2009). Corruption in the federal government fed the desire to remove American Indians at any cost. That same corruption allowed American Indians to be continually victimized after they had been forced onto reservations. The ongoing exploitation of America's Indigenous people was a profitable resource for government, business, and the others pouring into and across the land. Although now subdued and forced to the assigned lands and reservations, the ominous task of caring, feeding, educating, and maintaining the reservations and American Indian lands became the

daunting responsibility of the policymakers that had forced their removal. The American Indian problem had not gone away.

The acts and policies of the United States government had turned toward a philosophy of American Indians adopting self-sufficiency through conversion to White European-American practices or lose the land they were promised. *The Dawes Severalty Act* (24 Stat. 387) was finally abolished in 1934, under President Franklin Roosevelt's first term, but not before hundreds of thousands of acres of American Indian land had passed over to White settlement and American Indian families were forcibly absorbed into White communities (Carlson, 1981; Otis & Prucha, 1973; Pevar, 2012).

Eradication of a Culture

By the late 1890's and early 1900's those American Indians that had survived the deadliness of "Manifest Destiny" and "Westward Expansion" found themselves only a husk of what they once resembled across the Americas. And yet the American government was not yet done with American Indians. American Indian youth were forced to attend American Indian Schools to educate and re-educate American Indian people. Schools across the country opened and American Indians were forced to send their youth to schools to learn the ways of White civilization (Piccard, 2013). American Indians were not allowed to speak their native tongue, dress in native dress, or practice their native culture. Those American Indians breaking these rules were punished into submission (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012, Piccard, 2013). For American civilization, it wasn't enough to have nearly exterminated Indigenous people from what was once their home. Through re-education American Indians suffered an emotional and psychological genocide of culture, spirit, and soul (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013).

The die had been cast for decades in how the government viewed the Indigenous people of America. They considered tribes inhabiting the country fierce savages whose occupation was war and whose subsistence was drawn chiefly from the forest. To allow them to possess this country would be to leave the country as a wilderness. After decades of dispossessing American Indians from the land and onto assigned reservations the United States government, in its haste to assimilate what was left of Indigenous populations across the country, found it necessary to obliterate American Indians in every conceivable way: physically, culturally, ethnically, and religiously (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

Psychological Destruction of a Race

In the late 18th century Christian reformers were attempting to “civilize” American Indians through American Indian schools rather than leaving them to live in a traditional manner or assigned lands or reservations (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013). Choosing to educate American Indian children in current American culture according to Euro-American standards, which at the time was largely based in rural agriculture, these schools attempted to separate children and youths from their native cultures and identities and replace them with Christian beliefs. In 1819 the *Civilization Fund Act* (3 Stat. 516) promoted civilization and assimilation of Indigenous people by providing funding to religious and other societies to provide education to American Indians in American Indian communities. These schools, often run by missionaries, served as models for what would later be recommended by an agency that emerged from the United States War Department in 1824, the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was later

transferred to the Department of the Interior in 1869 (Reyhner & Eder, 2004; Finkelman & Garrison, 2009).

Although schools for the purpose of education, conversion, and assimilation had existed for well over a hundred years, it wasn't until after the end of the Civil War that a major shift in policy occurred due to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013). Congress, tired of war and faced with lack of unity within the country, decided to force the assimilation of American Indians into White society and make them good citizens of the United States. However, this could not happen if American Indians were allowed to retain their land, culture, and sovereignty (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013).

The United States government decided on a policy of re-education of the American Indian population and the mandate for American Indian children to attend school was strictly enforced. Though Mission schools had been present for a hundred plus years, the government's need for schools to re-educate American Indians with a dedicated curriculum focused on teaching European-American language, culture, and values were now in strong demand (Smith, 2002). In American Indian communities that existed in close proximity to White communities, religious schools often existed with the help of the religious denominations and these communities. The White communities being offended by the practices of American Indians felt it in their own interests to help support the schools in attempts to conform American Indians to White ways of life (Churchill, 2004).

Schools established on American Indian land or on reservations were directly under the Department of the Interior. In 1882 Interior Secretary Henry Teller called

attention to the “great hindrance” (Smith, 2002, p. 129) of American Indian customs to the progress of assimilation. The resultant “Code of Indian Offenses” in 1883 outlined the procedure for suppressing “evil practices” (Smith, 2002, p. 134). A Court of Indian Offenses, consisting of three American Indians appointed by the American Indian Agent, was to be established at each American Indian agency. The Court would serve as judges to punish offenders. Outlawed behavior included participation in traditional dances and feasts, polygamy, reciprocal gift giving and funeral practices, and intoxication or sale of liquor. Also prohibited were “medicine men” who “use any of the arts of the conjurer to prevent the Indians from abandoning their heathenish rites and customs” (Smith, 2002, p. 134). The penalties prescribed for violations ranged from 10 to 90 days, imprisonment and loss of government-provided rations for up to 30 days. For reservations and American Indian lands that were either too large or too remote to support a school the establishment of American Indian boarding schools was necessary to carry out the U. S. policy of American Indian assimilation.

Thus began the era of assimilation, or the progressive era, a legacy of the American Indian day or boarding schools. After years of fighting and forcing American Indians onto reservations the U.S. government determined that the best way to assimilate the Indigenous People was to take their children from them (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013). The United States government created and funded the American Indian boarding schools for the purpose of assimilation of American Indian youth into White society and civilized culture. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was responsible for the boarding schools and carried out the government’s mandates by forcibly taking children from their families and sending them to the boarding schools (Churchill, 2004). The premise was simple

enough. Stripped of their tribal clothing, the students then were given haircuts and indoctrinated to strict militaristic discipline. The agency forbade the speaking of American Indian languages and prohibited traditional religious and cultural practices and activities that identified American Indian youth with their tribes. All aspects of American Indian life and traditional government were outlawed (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013). American Indians were made to feel ashamed of who they were and punished severely for violating any of the rules of the school or the agency. Harsh corporal punishment was applied to the youths as they were brutalized physically, emotionally, spiritually, and psychologically. Every effort was made to eradicate any trace or semblance of American Indian life (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013).

Although many schools west of the Mississippi River had been founded by missionaries who believed they could benefit American Indians through education and a conversion to Christianity, this was not the case of the schools established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Churchill, 2004). Many of the schools were located on former military posts and often incorporated military and or former military personnel as instructors. By 1879 the federal government undertook the goal to destroy American Indian culture. The model for schools established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs was the Carlisle Indian Industrial School located in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, founded by Army Officer Richard Henry Pratt in 1879. In a speech delivered by Pratt in 1882, Pratt spoke the following: “A great general has said that the only good Indian is a dead one. In a sense, I agree with the sentiment, but only in this: that all of the Indian there is in the race, should be dead. Kill the Indian in him and save the man” (Piccard, 2013, p. 8). Pratt professed “assimilation through total immersion.” This was to be the government’s and the country’s final

solution to the American Indian problem. The boarding schools were not designated to provide an education in any sense of what the word means today, and very little education was achieved. Farming was taught in several schools but assimilation was the primary goal. If American Indian youth were fortunate they may learn a trade as well (Churchill, 2004; MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

The school day consisted of a half day of studies, then a half day of trades and related activities such as blacksmithing, carpentry, and farming for the boys and sewing, cooking, and other domestic activities for the girls (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012). The federal government worked very closely with the schools to assure the curriculums reflected mainstream goals of assimilation. Although student punishments for breaking school rules may vary from school to school, they only differed in the degree of abuse and cruelty (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

The brutality and abuse at these schools has been well documented. Personal accounts from survivors have resonated well into the later decades of the twentieth century. English was the only language to be spoken and those guilty of breaking this rule were subject to corporal punishment or severe beatings (Piccard, 2013). Continued violations often resulted in needles pushed through the tongues of the students. Other displays of American Indian cultural roles or behavior could result in time locked in isolation with only bread and water for the duration of the punishment, often lasting for days, weeks, and on occasion thirty days or longer. Boys and young men were often beaten for violation of school rules, but many would be beaten on a regular basis for no other reason than their race (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

Girls and young women were targeted by the Bureau and the schools because they represented the best opportunities to affect prolonged change in their culture. If the females were properly assimilated they would in turn help to ensure that their children would be properly assimilated as well (Piccard, 2013). Along with other cruel and barbaric practices found in these schools, rape, or the threat of some type of sexual assault, was also reported to have been a constant abuse on the girls and women in the boarding schools. After a rape had occurred in one of the dormitories and was witnessed by the young women it became a nightly ritual to crawl into the beds of the other girls for protection after the evening lights-out (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013). Forced to remain in their beds fear tested full bladders but it was preferred to remain in the safety of the group rather than risk taking the trip to the bathroom in the dark. The girls and young women would also travel in groups to avoid male teachers that were known to molest them. The girls and young women in these schools lived under a dark cloud of the ongoing threat of sexual abuse (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

The negative results from the insensitive and abusive effects of the boarding schools on the American Indian youth was devastating. The psychological influences imprinted a self-image of shame on Indigenous people that would impact the lives of not only those who had attended these schools but also the generations that followed (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013). For American Indians that survived the boarding schools, the absence of parenting skills that were not taught in these schools to the thousands returning to reservations contributed to the demise of many family units both

on and off reservations. The practice of forced attendance to boarding schools lasted well in to the twentieth century (Piccard, 2013).

The legacy of these schools on the hundreds of thousands that passed through them is reflected in the disproportionate rates of suicide, drug and alcohol abuse, and crime and imprisonment among American Indians, especially for American Indians on reservations (Churchill, 2004; Piccard, 2013). The impact on American Indian culture was devastating. The psychological trauma inflicted on thousands of students that passed through the doors of the American Indian boarding schools left them fearful, emotionally damaged, and often socially dysfunctional (Churchill, 2004; MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

Forced removal of American Indian children from their families for the purpose of assimilation did not end with the end of the forced separation to boarding schools. The Indian Adoption Project of 1958 operated from February 1959 to 1967 (Barth, Webster, & Lee, 2002; Palmiste, 2011). The United States Children's Bureau and the Bureau of Indian Affairs partnered with the Child Welfare League of America to assist in the planning of the adoption of some American Indian children from impoverished and or abusive families into White families and track the success of the children's placement with the new families. The 395 adoptions were executed under the scope of the project to afford better lives for the at-risk children. The lack of White, blue eyed babies for adoption had created a demand for adoptable American Indian babies. The Bureau of Indian Affairs realized an opportunity to assimilate American Indian children into White culture while reducing funds it paid out to the tribes while reducing the American Indian population. As a result of questionable methods and practices an additional 12,486

American Indian children were adopted outside the scope of the project between the years of 1961 thru 1976 (Barth, Webster, & Lee, 2002; Palmiste, 2011).

The Adoption Resource Exchange that operated from 1966 thru the early 1970's contributed to the number of American Indian children adopted or fostered out to White families. The organization also worked with churches to help take thousands of children into their denomination's institutions and then later adopted out across the country.

According to a 1976 report by the Association on American Indian Affairs, as many as one third of American Indian children were separated from their families between 1941 thru 1967 (Finkelman & Garrison, 2009; Palmiste, 2011). Yielding to the pressure of American Indian Organizations, Congress held hearings on the adoption practices that ultimately led to the passage of the *Indian Child Welfare Act* (24 Stat. 306) in 1978 to bring to an end the massive widespread removals of American Indian children from their communities (Barth, Webster, & Lee, 2002; Palmiste, 2011).

Chapter 3: The Continued Exploitation into the Twenty-first Century

Broken by a string of policies that brutally abused and alienated a race of people, America's Indigenous population has been subjected to living in abject poverty (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013). American Indians, now suffering from a loss of identity, designed by forced assimilation policies and architected by a government intent on making the race disappear from existence on what was now American soil, spiraled into conditions of deplorable poverty. Decimated socially and spiritually, those who did not assimilate to survive physically were relegated to live in deplorable conditions without means or method to improve their quality of life (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013). Alcoholism and drug use was epidemic both on the reservation and in and among American Indian communities (Piccard, 2013). Indigenous people were now in limbo between two worlds, the world of the Whites, and the world of American Indians, and with no recognition to either. A once proud people and culture now saw lines of identity and existence blurred and their pride skewed by hopelessness. American Indian people had been reduced to a hollow shell of what once had been productive and meaningful to a life of mere day to day existence (Churchill, 2004; MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

Aliens in Their Own Land

In 1915, the U.S. Census reported that only 8% of the American Indian population in this country was being taxed (Finkelman & Garrison, 2009). American Indians that had not accepted land grants and become U.S. citizens under the provisions of the *Dawes Act* (24 Stat. 388) were not recognized as U.S. citizens and not subjected to the same considerations as American citizens. The United States government seized on an

opportunity to increase its tax base. On June 2, 1924 Congress signed into law the *Indian Citizenship Act* (43 Stat. 253) granting citizenship to all American Indians born in the U.S. (Finkelman & Garrison, 2009). In 1928 a study, *The Problem of Indian Administration* (Institute for Government Research, 1928) aka the Meriam Report, assessed the problems with American Indians in the U.S. The report revealed that the government and its policies had oppressed American Indians and destroyed their culture and society.

The study led Congress to the *Indian Reorganization Act* (48 Stat. 984). The Act returned some of the American Indian land and helped to improve conditions for some American Indians. Although the passage of the *Civil Rights Act* (78 Stat. 242) assured equal and inalienable rights to the country's minority races and women, neither the Act nor the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1) addressed the rights of Indigenous peoples in the United States (West's, 2005). The United States Supreme Court had made clear that internal tribal affairs concerning tribal members' individual rights were not covered by the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution (U.S. Const. amend. V). However, the tribes were ultimately subjected to the power of Congress and the Constitution. The *Indian Civil Rights Act* (82 Stat. 77) applies to the American Indian tribes of the United States and makes many, but not all, of the guarantees of the Bill of Rights applicable within the tribes (West's, 2005).

The adoption of the *Archeological Resources Protection Act* (93 Stat. 721), the *National Museum of the American Indian Act* (103 Stat. 1336) and the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act* (104 Stat. 3048) has accomplished a great deal to protect the rights of Indigenous peoples especially in academic and museum culture

(Mihesuah, 2000; Bergmann, 2011). From the point of first contact with Europeans, the Indigenous people of the Americas were viewed as lacking intelligence, a backward, primitive people incapable of improving their lives and evolving their cultures to accept and adapt to the lifestyle and theologies being injected into the Americas by European colonists and explorers. And from the beginning of contact Europeans, when not killing the Indigenous people, were curious about how they bury their dead and often disturbed, pilfered and looted gravesites and burial grounds for items of value and or interest (Mihesuah, 2000).

American Indians were being looked upon as a sub-species of human beings, and European Americans quickly moved away from any ideas of coexistence with the Indigenous population to a plan of forced servitude, removal and or extermination from desired lands and territories (Mihesuah, 2000). European science soon followed the new population to the Americas and with it a misguided ideology of racial superiority over all so called under developed Indigenous populations such as Africans, West Indians, and of course American Indians of the Americas. European science and medicine seized on the idea of racial and cultural superiority by collecting skulls and skeletal remains from American Indian burial sites so that proof of the assertion of physical and mental deficiencies could be studied, cataloged, later to be used to educate these theories in academies, colleges, and universities, both in Europe and in the colonies in America. It was commonly communicated that due to the size of the cranium and other physical attributes of the so called sub-species Europeans were encountering, specifically in the Americas, that these Indigenous peoples were not and probably were never going to be

capable of grasping the culture or ideology that European-Americans were spreading across this new land (Mihsuah, 2000).

As Europeans moved across the mountains and into the Ohio Valley below, settlers discovered ancient burial mounds of tribal ancestors that quickly fell to the plundering and looting of the curious and greedy (Mihsuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004). For the next two hundred years in America, Indigenous people of this country were forced out, hunted down, massacred, and murdered by the military, the dead often being decapitated and having the heads of men, women, and children, shipped to military hospitals for examination and study (Mihsuah, 2000). The first of these decapitations took place at the Sand Creek Massacre in 1864 (Yenne, 2016). Archeologists and anthropologists filled universities and museums with remains and funerary objects excavated from all over the country. Many of these atrocities lasted into the twentieth century (Mihsuah, 2000). The last American Indian massacre took place in Nevada on February 26, 1911 (Geranios, 1988).

The looting of American Indian graves and gravesites continues today. Both professional and amateur archeologists along with grave robbers and pothunters for profit and plunder desecrate graves and gravesites of Americas Indigenous peoples (Mihsuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004). For hundreds of years, Indigenous people of the Americas have been oppressed and treated as a sub-human race of primitives once believed to be unable to exist or function in a European-American society. For Indigenous people, whose religion and culture were considered inconsequential, the choices offered to them were few. The European-Americans pouring over the continent were blinded to the simplest measure of human dignity and human consideration as they doled out these choices to

America's first inhabitants. You can assimilate or move. You can assimilate through reproduction with Europeans or leave. You can assimilate by directive or die (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

Many politicians and people today will claim that the European-Americans and our government tried to be humane and treat American Indians with dignity, respect and reasonable consideration and that it was American Indians that refused to cooperate (Ward, 2011). The administration of the colonial and federal governments of this country entered into 800 treaties with American Indians of which 429 were never ratified, and 371 were broken. All told, none were completely honored by the U.S. Government (Mihesuah, 2000).

With the passage of the *Archeological Resources Protection Act* (16 U.S.C. § 470aa-470mm), the *National Museum of the American Indian Act* (P. L. 101-185 § 80), and the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act* (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013) Indigenous peoples finally had the tools to correct many of the injustices they had endured for centuries, they now had the law and rights under the law to help create legislation that attempted to reconcile the past mistreatment of Indigenous peoples (Grabouski, 2011). Contemporary civil rights and archeological protection laws helped Indigenous peoples to finally have a voice in how they were represented in museums and historical collections. Indigenous peoples were hired as consultants and staff for museums, galleries, institutions holding American Indian artifacts and collections and even motion pictures studios. After endless decades of being misrepresented, stereotyped, villainized, and demonized, Indigenous peoples were finally able to voice a different

perspective of what history and the past was like for Indigenous peoples (Mihesuah, 2000).

The 19th century was by far the most devastating to Indigenous peoples in many regards. With the growth of archeology and anthropology as scientific disciplines in the late half of that century, and along with museums growing their collections, and learning institutions developing scholarly studies of American Indian people, the demand for remains and artifacts exploded. Science and private collectors were fiercely competing for materials to study and build collections. Countless graves and American Indian gravesites have been desecrated and looted for remains and artifacts. An estimate of skulls and skeletal remains reaching into the hundreds of thousands are scattered throughout the world in museums, institutions, and private collections along with the hundreds of thousands ceremonial, religious, funerary, and sacred objects removed as well (Mihesuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004).

American Indians have voiced concerns of violations of religious and cultural transgressions for as long as “First Contact” with little avail. After the *Indian Civil Rights Act* and the American Indian Movement, those voices were more organized and began to grow a bit louder. In the early 1970’s the Department of Transportation road crews in Iowa accidentally unearthed the remains of twenty-six White people and an American Indian mother and child. The remains of the twenty-six White people were quickly reburied and the American Indian mother and child were sent to the office of the State Archeologist for study. An engineer with the project told his wife Maria about the incident and she was appalled that the remains uncovered were treated differently. Maria Pearson was a member of the Turtle Clan of the Yankton Sioux Tribe. Maria protested to

the Governor of Iowa, Robert D. Ray about the incident but was not granted an audience with the governor until Maria, dressed in her tribal attire, sat outside his office and refused to leave until he spoke with her about her concerns. When Governor Ray finally met with Maria he asked her what he could do for her. Maria responded, “You can give me back my people’s bones and you can quit digging them up” (Cinemo, 2014, para. 2). Afterwards Governor Ray, Maria and the State Archeologist Marshall McKusick met and had many discussions until an agreement was reached. The Iowa Burials Protection Act of 1976 (Ch. 1332 § 1 p-6028-19), was the first legislation enacted in the U.S. that specifically protected American Indian remains (Cinemo, 2014).

American Indians seeking to protect ancestral remains and have remains and funerary artifacts returned turned to law and legislation to stop the desecration of burial sites and demanded equal protection under the First Amendment. Indigenous peoples also wanted Tribal Sovereignty recognized and their jurisdiction over tribal matters upheld. After weaving through many State Legislatures and Federal Mandates, Indigenous peoples witnessed the 101st United States Congress H.R. 5237 pass the House and Senate and then signed into law on November 16, 1990 - the *Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act* (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013), (Bergmann, 2011). The intended purpose of NAGPRA was to finally address the long-standing claims of Indigenous peoples (federally recognized tribes) to have returned to them the ancestral remains and cultural objects that have been unlawfully removed from ancestral sites and homelands. The Act requires all federal agencies and all institutions that receive federal funding to catalog all indigenous remains, cultural objects, and funerary objects and provide a list of all said holdings to be reviewable on request (Bergmann, 2011). If any institution is in control of

any remains or items associated to any federally recognized tribe and that recognized tribe or descendent can show lineage to the remains or items and makes a written claim to the institution for the remains or items, the property claimed must be repatriated to the claimants under penalty of fine and or imprisonment. The Act also makes it a criminal offense to buy and sale American Indian remains or cultural items without a right of possession. The Law additionally allows a method of appeal for all principal parties (Bergmann, 2011).

Although the Act addresses many long-held concerns of Indigenous peoples the Act falls short of protecting all people's burial sites, cultural items, or tribal rights of all Indigenous peoples (Mihsuah, 2000). One of the glaring problems is in the use of the term "federally recognized tribes."

Whether by the colonial government or federal government, Indigenous peoples have been disbanded, relocated, or hunted to near extinction (NMAI, 2004). It was and has been left to the non-indigenous governments to decide who will be recognized and who shall not be recognized. In addition, U.S. policies regarding assimilation and re-education of Indigenous peoples has effectively created a cultural genocide of many of Americas Indigenous tribes (NMAI, 2004).

Until an acceptance of responsibility and reconciliation of the government's policies and treatment of the country's Indigenous people is rectified, many Indigenous peoples will continue to find themselves on the outside of recognition and equal rights for some tribes and tribal members (Lonetree & Cobb, 2008). There are still thousands of remains and cultural items that will never be repatriated under the laws as they are currently written (Mihsuah, 2000: NMAI, 2004).

Today, museums, galleries, and scholarly institutions benefit from Indigenous peoples as consultants and staff giving insight and direction to collections, study and research. Indigenous peoples are changing the misconceptions about how they are represented (Mihesuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004; Thomas, 2000). There still remains the heated battle between Indigenous peoples, government, archeologists, anthropologists, and cultural science. In cases like Kennewick Man, remains of an American Indian found near Kennewick, Washington were claimed by four federally recognized tribes (Thomas, 2000). The land upon which the remains were found is recognized as the ancestral land of the Umatillia. The Umatillia was one of the federally recognized tribes claiming the remains (Thomas, 2000). However, archeologists claim that the age of the remains predates any connection to modern tribes and therefore should remain in the control of science for research and study (Mihesuah, 2000; Thomas, 2000). Although one of the tribes claiming the remains has shown through DNA testing that the remains are more closely related to modern Indigenous peoples than any other living population and the body was about to be released to tribal members, the Colville, Umatilla, Yakama, Nez Perce and Wanapum filed a lawsuit preventing the release and the battle for the remains ensued (Mihesuah, 2000; Thomas, 2000).

We cannot go back in time and undo all of the atrocities committed on Indigenous peoples, however that does not mean that we should stop trying. The people, the government, the archeologists, and anthropologists need to learn from past mistakes and try to amend old conflicts with better communication and acting on present issues that need addressing. Indigenous peoples need to help to keep the lines of communication open and engage ongoing conversation with all the principals involved active and vibrant.

Museums have the opportunities to partner with the Indigenous people to create a clearer and more accurate representation of a living, breathing culture that exists and thrives (Mihsuah, 2000). Museums have the responsibility to educate the public about how American Indian live and exist in today's modern culture and the plights of the cultural pressures that are felt throughout the tribal communities (NMAI, 2004).

Today, mainstream society could demonstrate a tremendous amount of credibility and goodwill by enforcing the protections provided under NAGPRA and toughening the penalties imposed on the looters desecrating thousands of burial sites every day (Lonetree & Cobb, 2008). Fines imposed on the sellers and buyers of American Indian remains and cultural items have little effect on people desecrating gravesites and turning huge profits from the illegal sales of remains and artifacts (Lonetree & Cobb, 2008; NMAI, 2004). It is obvious that the only probable deterrent to these people is incarceration to remove them from the trafficking pipeline of such grave robbing and trafficking of remains and artifacts (Lonetree & Cobb, 2008; Mihsuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004).

Let us suppose a bulldozer ripped through an area of Arlington National Cemetery or the cemetery at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania to expose the graves of several men and women to the same pilfering and vandalism. It is doubtful the perpetrators would get off with only a fine? Why is there not the same outrage and concern for the protection of American Indian burial sites, remains, and cultural artifacts? If we are truly equal under the laws of this country and in the eyes of each of its citizens, should we not be insisting on equal protections for all regardless of race, color, sex, creed, origin, or religion? I believe it is the responsibility of everyone to insist that our government and our laws are equal to everyone. Americans should compel the leaders and lawmakers to acknowledge

that we have contributed to the inequities bestowed on Indigenous peoples and though we cannot go back to change what has happened, we can move forward to balance it.

Chapter 4: Discussion

Through a brief and open evaluation of the documented events outlined in this paper the evidence shows a purposeful and continued effort by this country's government and political system to dispossess Indigenous peoples of ancestral land. The evidence will also reflect that from "First Contact," (Axtell, 2001; Kolodny, 2012) North American colonization, (Miller, 2011; Robertson, 2005) and the westward push of settlers into Indigenous peoples' ancestral lands, the European-Americans used laws, policies, violence, and cultural destruction to marginalize or eliminate American Indians. The events in this country's history clearly show the intent of European-Americans to push American Indians out of their homes and their lands to make way for the expansion west across North America. Once the conquest of the land was complete, what was left of the Indigenous population could not be assimilated quickly enough for the U.S. government and the people that now reached across the country from East-to-West coast and from Mexico to Canada. The assimilation of American Indians into Western culture was expedited by law and policy mandating the cultural extermination of indigenous belief systems, religions, lifestyle, and language (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013). For more than one hundred, the United States government and her people would engage in the cultural genocide of the country's Indigenous population. Today, these same factions continue to exploit and commit cultural genocide through lingering overt and subtle settler colonist attitudes and racism (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2015).

How can the greatest country in the world put itself on display as the model of democracy and the leader in the respect for diversity, equality, and justice if it cannot hold itself accountable for its historic and contemporary treatment of American Indian

people? If the United States cannot accept responsibility for the genocidal treatment of American Indians how do government officials expect the future leaders of this country to understand the critical issues in many second and third world countries that face global leaders today?

Perhaps museums and libraries can help fill in the gap by taking the first steps towards positive education and accurate representation of the historical perspectives that created the strained relationship between Europeans and American Indians. Museums, have shaped how their communities view and understand the world around them. Through the museums standards of commitment to accuracy and education, exhibits can begin to represent a contextual history of America's attitudes and treatment of its Indigenous populations.

The problem still exists that government and politicians still defend a romanticized version of the treatment of American Indians and refuse to accept responsibility for the treatment of Indigenous peoples. Therefore, the education and the study of the treatment of Americas' Indigenous peoples is left to a stereotypical version of "cowboys and Indians" found in the movies and books rather than a true academic review and developed course curriculums.

If museums and libraries, as first and lifelong educators, take the lead in initiating the conversations that develop into meaningful dialogues, then their efforts can evolve into impactful exhibitions. These institutions and their educational program directors can become the sparks needed to not only bring accurate narratives about American Indian history to the forefront of American history, but also represent the front line of equity literacy for the schools that participate in their programs and exhibitions.

One of the main arguments against accepting responsibility for past transgressions held by politicians is that by accepting responsibility, the blame and guilt laid upon impressionable youth and society could have negative psychological and emotional impacts that serve no real purpose other than pointing fingers to lay blame (Ward, 2011). This is also the view of some of today's American Indian community. It is not the intent of educators to point out blame, but to educate and communicate the truth about the lived experiences of Indigenous peoples around the world and in our own country. Educators have the opportunity to cultivate in their students a sturdy and vigorous understanding about how people are treated by one another, and by institutions. The idea is to place equity rather than cultural diversity at the center of their conversations for programs and curriculums (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015). We should strive to learn how to be more aware to the humanitarian and civil rights of all people in a global community.

It is imperative that school systems allow their students to learn the accurate history of American colonization and European settlers' treatment of and attitudes toward the Indigenous peoples of this country as part of an equity literacy framework undergirded by justice initiatives. This is the only way they will truly understand the dynamics of diversity, equity, and cultural acceptance, and how those complex dynamics apply to how they view themselves and the world community in which they live.

Many schools do not currently have a clear curricular or instructional path to educate their students in the treatment of America's Indigenous peoples and struggle with issues such as genocide or ethnic cleansing. Museums and libraries, by using the definitions and guidelines available today provided by the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the General Assembly of the

United Nations, can clearly provide a transparent case for America's treatment of Indigenous peoples and through education hold our country accountable in a positive awareness of equity, responsibility and accountability to insure a realistic view of our relationships with American Indians and the racial biases that are still alive today (Pewewardy, 1998).

According to the current guidelines and definitions from the Genocide Convention of the United Nations General Assembly (United Nations, 1948), there is enough evidence available from documented and published accounts of the treatment of North America's Indigenous population along with published treaties, laws, and reports available, that it is a viable claim that the United States government enacted an intentional genocide upon Indigenous peoples inhabiting North America through settler colonization. The definition is as follows (United Nations, 1948, Article 2):

Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- a. Killing members of the group;
- b. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to the members of the group;
- c. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- d. Imposing measures intended to prevent births within a group;
- e. Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

The acts of genocide under the definition of the convention have been met. The documented history of the United States' decisions over the course of well over 200 years of federal American Indian policy shows an ongoing disregard for the existence of

American Indian people. Through policy, act, or action, the United States government used the growing immigrant population of this country along with the desire for increased economic commerce to continually expropriate land set aside by numerous treaties between the United States government and Indigenous peoples (Keenan, 1997).

In the government's final solution to the so-called "Indian problem", the United States turned to boarding schools to solve the demand for assimilation. By forcing the separation of American Indian children from their parents and homes, forcing them to change their names, clothing, language, and culture, while killing and raping some of them in the process, the definition of genocide is satisfied (Piccard, 2013).

It is obvious to observers of this country's history that from the dispossession of Indigenous lands to the mass killing of the American Indian populations, the United States government, through its agents, committed mass murder of easily recognizable non-combatants such as women, children, and the elderly. By evidence documented through personal journals, letters, and detailed accounts, the government continued to inflict serious bodily harm and mental cruelty on American Indians. With little to no remorse from the U.S. government for the tragic loss of Indigenous life, the policies directed toward American Indians were deliberately calculated to bring about their physical destruction. The government of this country conspired to eradicate American Indians by imposing policies and measures that forced the assimilation of a race of people and the calculated obliteration of their cultures through the removal of generations of Indigenous youth from their homes and families to the residential American Indian schools. In the countries' final solution to the "Indian problem", it acted on the forced removal of American Indian children to White families. The ongoing disregard of respect

and recognition of inherent and inalienable rights of America's Indigenous peoples speaks to a lack of acceptance and inclusion that is the foundation for coexistence. The United States government's departments and agencies have penned few words to acknowledge the mistreatment and abuses on the sovereign Nations whose crimes against the country began with the premise of existing on this soil first (Piccard, 2013).

The documentation clearly indicates the government's lack of concern for Indigenous life. Through forced dispossession of Indigenous lands and the disregard for basic life essentials, government officials demonstrated blatant neglect toward the life, health and welfare of the Indigenous populations. Furthermore, the hunting and mass killing of Indigenous peoples refusing to relocate to designated reservations expresses the indifference of the United States government to the cultural concerns and physical survival of Indigenous populations (Anderson, 2014; Jaimes, 1992). Genocide covers more than mass murder and does not specify that a certain number of deaths must occur in order for the act to be considered genocide (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

The act of forced removal separated Indigenous populations from European-American cultures. Removal also separated Indigenous peoples that were forced to assimilate to European-American language and culture from those who took drastic measures to avoid removal in order to maintain their language, appearance, religion, culture and traditions. Forcing an Indigenous race of people from long standing ancestral homes reflects a punitive action on the part of the United States government to disregard inherent human rights and a willful disregard for the basic inalienable rights of another race, culture, and religion (Byers, 2004).

The documented lack of provisions, medicines, and protection from the elements in extreme weather conditions speaks to the lack of consideration for the risk of life, health, and wellbeing during the forced marches across the country to assigned American Indian lands. Documentation shows that the Army could not have expected the Indigenous peoples to survive the journey without adequate provisions, medicine, and protection. Yet American Indians were force-marched without the same considerations as the military forces escorting them (Bowes, 2007).

It is difficult to comprehend any other way that the Convention's definition of genocide does not describe with complete accuracy the United States' use of the American Indian boarding schools to eradicate, annihilate, and obliterate Indigenous peoples in every conceivable method: physically, culturally, racially, ethnically, and religiously (MacDonald & Hudson, 2012; Piccard, 2013).

In the preceding chapters this paper has provided evidence that has shown that the United States has, and is still committing genocide, both physically and culturally, on its Indigenous peoples. Furthermore, the evidence has revealed many of the underlying reasons that drove federal policy along with the complicit actions of the settler population who needed the government to accommodate the growing immigrant demand for land.

Although significant strides in education about these issues have been made in several states like Montana and New Mexico (Carjuzaa, 2012), public understanding across the country will not evolve until education about these issues are as common as the European-American version of history that is widely taught and accepted today. It is also the responsibility of our museum communities to educate the public about America's Indigenous peoples. Museums have greatly improved over the years in how they

represent America's Indigenous people. But until museums as a whole begin to treat American Indians in their exhibitions as an existing, living, and breathing culture of today, instead of presenting them as a people of our ancient past, we will never be able to change how we view Indigenous cultures (Lonetree & Cobb, 2008; Mihesuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004). Through the combined efforts of educators, museums, and libraries, we can begin to understand not only our Indigenous peoples but also the Indigenous populations in other countries as well.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

A Question of Genocide

Between the 1490's and the 1890's an estimated 14 million Indigenous people disappeared from existence. The documentation shows numerous examples of their mass killing, often at the direction of the United States government and carried out by the United States Army (Alvarez, 2014). The forcible removal of thousands of Indigenous peoples from ancestral lands as they were herded like livestock halfway across the continent with little food, virtually no medicine, and without protection against the elements shows neglect and total disregard for human life. The removal of these Indigenous peoples left a trail of thousands of dead over routes to assigned American Indian lands (Byers, 2004). Enough can ever be said about the detrimental effects forced removal had on Indigenous youth after they were moved to boarding schools to assimilate them into White culture and re-educate them to reject their parents' language, principles, religion, and way of life (Piccard, 2013).

Hunting the American Indians traditional food source forced a drastic change in lifestyle leveraging American Indians into a dependence on government rations and an agrarian lifestyle (Smits, 1994). Forcing a life on reservations and forcibly subjecting American Indians to mandates and conditions contributing to the breakdown of traditional family units and values brought about the mental and emotional demise of American Indians. The continued lack of food, medicine, and medical attention drastically reduced the populations of American Indians on reservations (Smits, 1994).

Alcohol use on reservations and in American Indian communities propagated the dependence on the substance and created an impending epidemic of alcoholism among

American Indian populations. This practice contributed to the decline of health on reservations causing a sharp decline in term pregnancies and infant survival rates (Axtell, 2001; Piccard, 2013).

Forced removal of Indigenous children from their families to boarding schools has been cited as the mandated assimilation of American Indian children into White culture. The forced removal and adoptions of thousands of American Indian children to White families ranks as one of the most insensitive crimes perpetuated on Indigenous peoples from the late nineteenth century through the 1970's of the twentieth century (Palmiste, 2011).

Responsibilities of Museums to Educate

For nearly two hundred years, museums have struggled with how they represented Indigenous peoples of North America (NMAI, 2004). Often treating Indigenous peoples as a savage, godless, primitive cultures, museums treated their representations of Indigenous populations of North America as sensationalized curiosities rather than active cultures with strong social values and spiritual morality (Mihesuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004). This approach is not difficult to understand when you understand that many of the sciences were split over how to best approach the study of any civilization and its culture (NMAI, 2004). Although Academe, scholarly study, and professional museum standards have made great strides in how museums represent America's Indigenous populations, these gains in understanding are often very hard fought and met with bias, bigotry, and an unwillingness to truthfully acknowledge the country's treatment of its Indigenous peoples (Lonetree & Cobb, 2008; Mihesuah, 2000; NMAI, 2004).

The purpose of this study is to gather available information to investigate the relationship between the treatment of America's Indigenous peoples and the U.S. government and how that relationship been reflected in museums' representations of American Indians and their culture; both past and present. Furthermore, it is the intent of this thesis to convey to the reader the responsibility of museums, as extensions of research institutions, to educate the general public and the communities they serve. It is also the responsibility of museums to represent accurate exhibitions that help people to understand and explore what the effects of discovery, westward expansion, and manifest destiny have had on America's Indigenous peoples. It is not only their responsibility to accurately represent Indigenous peoples and their culture but also represent American Indian history as it pertains to the Euro-American culture and history of this country.

Educational institutions and communities today expect museums to take the lead to help educate students and the general public in the understanding and acceptance of racial and cultural diversity. We also expect museums to help educate us to understand those moments in history that are difficult to comprehend, such as the Armenian genocide of World War I, the genocide and systematic extermination of millions of Jews during World War II, the acts of genocide in Cambodia during and after the Viet Nam War, the ethnic genocide of over 800,000 people in Rwanda, and the ethnic cleansing that occurred in Bosnia shortly thereafter (Naimark, 2016; Watson, 2011). Yet there is very little to no representation in museums or in education to this country's acts of genocide on its Indigenous population that has been ongoing for hundreds of years.

As a member of the world community, we cannot expect our society to comprehend the humanitarian and social issues facing cultures across the globe if we

cannot first understand those issues that have existed and still exist today in our own nation. We also cannot understand or comprehend issues of race and culture in our own communities if we refuse to acknowledge and examine the circumstances around them. Our society will never be able to overcome bias, racism, and the need for diversity if we wait for our children to enter institutions of higher education before we attempt to educate them about cultural and humanitarian issues that tend to divide cultures rather than create acceptance. Developmental studies show us that children's behavioral and social patterns are instilled at a very early age. This makes it imperative to begin the education of equity, justice and cultural diversity as early as possible (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015). Communities look to museums to help show the way to understanding by offering outreach to daycares and schools offering age appropriate programs and exhibits to open the doors to education and learning (Falk & Dierking, 2013).

By acknowledging the wrongful treatment of Indigenous peoples in its history, this country can credibly move forward to educate its population, and future world leaders, towards a better understanding of accepting racial and cultural differences. Youth can view this country's and the World's political and humanitarian issues with a more diverse understanding regarding global communities through categorical identification of social and cultural issues and injustices in our past. We not only need education to understand these issues, we need museums to help open the doors to perspectives that put the opportunities of cultural equity and acceptance before the social communities that patronize them.

For the purpose of education and understanding of Indigenous peoples, I feel the accurate representation and of American Indian history must be told. I believe that if our

society is to ever successfully overcome issues of racism and bigotry it must start with understanding our Indigenous population and our relationship with American Indian people over the centuries. We must also understand that although improvements in this relationship have been made, we are far from treating this race of people as equals in this country. Education of America's relationship with Indigenous peoples has improved immensely over the last half century. The vast availability of materials on this subject speaks to this truth. The information and documentation included in this thesis is only a very small sampling of the abundance of available documentation to draw upon. Instead of attempting to document every event, I have documented the journey of a people in their own land from first contact through today. From the very first contact, Europeans have massacred the Indigenous peoples of this continent for the sole reason of taking what they wanted from a people they did not understand, and through their actions they did not want to understand what they considered to be sub-human (Axtell, 2001; Kolodny, 2012).

The Indigenous peoples of this country did not understand what it meant for an individual to own the land, but the European-Americans educated American Indians in what it meant to own the earth. American Indians were content to coexist and the colonial Americans taught them what it meant to covet what you do not own. The people of this fledgling country demonstrated how Discovery can subjugate a people, and how words can be used to steal their inherent rights (Miller, 2011; Robertson, 2005).

A society of wanton greed compounded its transgressions on an unsuspecting people when it used the personal interests of a few to gain ownership and become the task masters over a race of forced tenants. That same society and government later used the

Marshall decision to craft the *Indian Removal Act* (4 Stat. 411) that not only forced the Indigenous peoples from their ancestral homes, but forced marched thousands of poorly supplied men, women, children, and elderly halfway across a country through horrific conditions leaving thousands dead along the way (Byers, 2004). And still the greed persisted.

The United States government aggressively sought to remove the remaining Indigenous populations to reservations with disregard for cost of life in an attempt to expand the economy and gain safe passage for settlers and the railroads. Destroying the food supply and the way of life for tribes of North America was not enough for the government to control the dwindling Indigenous population so the United States engaged in ethnic cleansing of the country from coast to coast and boarder to border (Brown 2009; Smits, 1994). Even after the American Indian people had been removed to reservations and assigned lands, the United States government squeezed them out of desired locations and forced them into accepting land allotments to allow American Indian land to be once again claimed as federal land or land to be offered for settlement.

The country's final solution to the "Indian problem" came in the form of forced separation and assimilation of American Indians through the re-education of their youth and mandatory ban on their language, dress (appearance), religion, and culture. Later when they are forced into poverty through an existence on reservations, their children were systematically removed from their parents and families and adopted into thousands of White families.

From "discovery" to the beginning of the twentieth century an estimated fourteen million Indigenous people have disappeared from existence on this continent. Although

many of these lives have not been directly accounted for through documentation, it is clear from the documented evidence that through the actions and policies of this country and its government it was and still is the intent to force the assimilation of indigenous culture into the diverse melting pot of Euro-American culture. Not until the last half of the twentieth century have the Indigenous people of this country had the ability to take control and shape their own destiny. But even with the legislation of guaranteed laws and rights, it is still a daily battle to maintain a cultural sovereignty that protects the inherent human rights of Indigenous people who were the occupants and guardians of a land before European contact.

Through hundreds of years of abuses and neglect many American Indians, American Indian land, reservations, and American Indian lives have fallen under siege of poverty, alcohol and drug abuse, suicide, prostitution, and child sex trafficking (Mandeville, 2015). Although reservations receive funding from the government, what is needed is education, training, jobs and a community-based economy to support reservation life for American Indian families.

Indigenous peoples continue to experience bias and inequities when attempting to speak about the impacts of “Manifest Destiny” on Indigenous peoples. The attempt to dispel traditional European-American myths about the treatment of Indigenous peoples can be met with swift and harsh repercussions from both the public and government. In 1991, the Smithsonian Institute’s National Museum of the American Indian presented an art exhibition *The West as America* focused on the theme of westward expansion and manifest destiny. The exhibition was met with severe criticism and attracted the displeasure of several congressional leaders (NMAI, 2004). When demands to remove

the exhibit were addressed with respectful regret to not comply until the end of the scheduled duration of the exhibit came to a conclusion, the Smithsonian and the National Museum of the American Indian had their federal funding sharply cut. Protests on behalf of the museum and the arts was then further met with significant funding cuts to the National Endowment of the Arts budget (NMAI, 2000).

Government, corporations, and public sentiment continue to suppress Indigenous peoples, their culture, their religion, their rights and existence today (Frantz, 1999). Until a true and factual representation of American Indian history is either taught side-by-side or incorporated into state and American history courses in our classrooms we will not be able to rid our country of our racial bias about and toward America's Indigenous peoples (Ward, 2011). Without this education, we can never expect our youth to grow into the leaders of this country with an understanding of what Indigenous people around the world must deal with as governments attempt to eradicate their people and cultures in every corner of the globe. Unfortunately, one of the world's guiltiest institutions for nation building and displacement of Indigenous peoples is still the United States of America.

America continues to ignore its genocidal treatment of Indigenous peoples. Without accepting the responsibility for our actions, we will never completely heal the wounds within our own country and move our country's inherent hate and bigotry out of our social consciousness. The dialog needed to resolve the past and present issues of America's understanding of its treatment of American Indians must start with the effects that "Discovery," "Westward Expansion," and "Manifest Destiny" had on Indigenous people of North America, and this must begin with museums. Museums have long been

the institutions of understanding and learning that open our minds to our realities in the proper perspective.

Today cooperation between museums and American Indian Communities is at its highest level. Many museums have standing consultants from American Indian Communities and most American Indian Museums have American Indian Directors and Curators. America's largest museums containing huge American Indian Collections are curated by Indigenous peoples (NMAI, 2004).

Although we have come a long way in our understanding of American Indian people and their representation in the museum community, it is grossly apparent that our people and government have a long way to go in accepting the rightful place of American Indians in America's history. Through the collaborative efforts of all stakeholders, an accurate representation of life and survival of America's Indigenous peoples can be appropriately represented through museum communities to the general public they serve. Through community outreach, programs, and educational development, age appropriate educational materials can be developed by museum educational staff to help put those materials in the hands of teachers to begin the learning processes for K-12 students.

In conclusion, it is my belief, and my hope, that by accepting responsibility of our history we may gain the following educational and social benefits. Our society should strive to gain a better understanding of indigenous culture and help rid ourselves of racial bias and bigotry as we create a clear path for true American Indian equality in our country. By understanding cultures within our own country, we will become more accepting of racial and cultural diversity at home and abroad. It should be our goal to see our own missteps in this country's history with Indigenous peoples as a means to better

understand issues in other countries with regard to Indigenous peoples around the world. By acquiring an enlightened perspective in the formidable years of cognitive development, secondary students will gain understanding of racial and cultural diversity as a natural order of coexistence rather than the racial and cultural isolationism that comes from fear and the lack of broad-based education. Museums have played a significant role in shaping our perceptions of America's Indigenous peoples in the past. Therefore, it is only natural that museums evolve in their representation of America's Indigenous peoples to not only represent them as a living, breathing, and thriving culture that exists today, but also as a resilient people that have survived "Discovery," "Westward Expansion," and "Manifest Destiny."

Knowledge has to be improved, challenged, and increased constantly, or it vanishes. (Bui & Drucker, 2015, para. 16)

References

- Alvarez, A. (2014). *Native America and the question of genocide*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- American Alliance of Museums. (2002). *Mastering civic engagement; a challenge to museums*. Washington, DC: American Alliance of Museums.
- Anderson, G. C. (2014). *Ethnic cleansing and the Indian: the crime that should haunt America*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Anderson, W. L. (1991). *Cherokee removal: before and after*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, 16 U.S.C. §§ 470aa-470mm (2012).
- Archuleta, M., Meyers, M., Nahmias, S., Woodsum, J., & Yorba, J. (1994). *The Native American fine art movement*. Phoenix, AZ: Heard Museum.
- Axtell, J. (2001). *Natives and newcomers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Barreyre, N., & Goldhammer, A. (2015). *Gold and freedom*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Barth, R. P., Webster, D., II, & Lee, S. (2002). Adoption of American Indian children: Implications for implementing the Indian Child Welfare and Adoption and Safe Families Acts. (Statistical Data Included). *Children and Youth Services Review*, 24(3), 139-158
- Bergmann, K. (2011). *Native American graves and repatriation*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Bowes, J. P. (2007). *The Trail of Tears: Removal in the South*. New York, NY: Chelsea House.
- Bowes, J. (2016). *Land too good for Indians: Northern Indian removal*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press
- Brady, M. J. (2007). *Discourse, cultural policy, and other mechanisms of power: The Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of the American Indian* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Accession Order No. 304821091).
- Branch, E. D. (1929). *The hunting of the buffalo*. New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company.

- Brown, D. A. (2009). *Bury my heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian history of the American West*. New York, NY: Sterling Publishing Co. Inc.
- Bui, K., & Drucker, P. (2015, November 16). Focus on contribution. School of Herring. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolofherring.com/2015/11/16/focus-on-contribution/>
- Byers, A. (2004). *The Trail of Tears: A primary source history of the forced relocation of the Cherokee Nation*. New York, NY: The Rosen Publishing Group Inc.
- Cabello, B., & Burstein, N. D. (1995). Examining teachers' beliefs about teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(4), 285-295.
- Calhoun, L. (2012). *Public memory of the Sand Creek massacre*. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press.
- Calloway, C. (2013). *Pen and ink witchcraft: Treaties and treaty making in American Indian history*. New York, NK: Oxford University Press.
- Carjuzaa, J. (2012). The positive impact of culturally responsive pedagogy: Montana's Indian education for all. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 14(3), 1-17. doi: 10.18251/ijme.v14i3.620
- Carlson, L. (1981). *Indians, bureaucrats, and land: The Dawes Act and the decline of Indian farming*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, 30 U.S. 1, (1831).
- Churchill, W. (2004). *Kill the Indian, save the man: The genocidal impact of American Indian residential schools*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Publishers.
- Cinemo. (2014, May 3). Maria Pearson (Running Moccasins). American-Tribes.com. Retrieved from <http://www.amertribes.proboards.com/thread/2076/maria-pearson-running-moccasins>
- Civilization Fund Act, Ch. 85, 3 Stat. 516 (1819).
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-2000h-6 (2012) 78 Stat.
- Clampitt, B. R. (2015). *The Civil War and reconstruction in Indian Territory*. Lincoln, NE: The University of Nebraska Press.
- Colbert, P. (2010). Developing a culturally responsive classroom collaborative of faculty, students, and institution. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 7(11), 15-24.
- Commerce Clause to the Constitution, U.S.C. art. 1 §§ 8 cl.3, 1 Stat. 305 (1793).
- Cozzens, P. (2005). *Eyewitnesses to the Indian Wars 1865-1890*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books Publishing.

- Dawes Act, Ch. 119, 24 Stat. 387 (1887).
- Dawes Severalty Act, 24 Stat. 388 (1887).
- Doan, J. (1999). How the Irish and Scots became Indians: Colonial traders and agents and the Southeastern Tribes. *New Hibernia Review*. 3(3), 9-19. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20557571>
- Dunbar-Ortiz, R. (2015). *An Indigenous peoples' history of the United States: Re-visioning American history*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1 (1868).
- Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2013). *The museum experience revisited*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Field, M. (1993). *Genocide and the Indians of California, 1769-1873*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Massachusetts, Boston, MA. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1142&context=masters_theses
- Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, U.S. Const. amend. V, (1886).
- Finkelman, P., & Garrison, T. A. (2009). *Encyclopedia of United States Indian policy and law*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Fitzgerald, M. H. (1973). *Museum accreditation: Professional standards*. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.
- Franke, M. A. (2005). *To save the wild bison: Life on the edge in Yellowstone*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Frantz, K. (1999). *Indian reservations in the United States: Territory, sovereignty, and socioeconomic change*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gallay, A. (2009). *Indian slavery in colonial America*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Geranios, N. K. (1988, September 18). Survivor returns to site of last Indian massacre. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://www.articles.latimes.com/1988-09-18/news/mn-3209_1_indian-massacre
- Gerhard, P., & Woolley, J. (1999). *Rutherford B. Hayes: "First annual message," December 3, 1877*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29518>.

- Gilio-Whitaker, D. (2015). The untold history of American Indian slavery. *About Education*. Retrieved from <http://nativeamericanhistory.about.com/od/controversies/a/The-Untold-History-Of-American-Indian-Slavery.htm>
- Gitlin, M. (2011). *Wounded Knee Massacre*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood.
- Goodman, R., & Gorski, P. (2015). *Decolonizing "multicultural" counseling through social justice*. New York, NY: Springer Verlag.
- Gorski, P., & Landsman, J. (2014). *The poverty and education reader: A call for equity in many voices* (First ed.). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing LLC.
- Gorski, P. & Swalwell, K. (2015, March). Equity literacy for all: Culturally diverse classrooms. *Educational Leadership Magazine*, 72(6), 34-40. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar15/vol72/num06/Equity-Literacy-for-All.aspx>
- Grabouski, L. R. (2011). *Smoke and mirrors: A history of NAGPRA and the evolving U.S. view of the American Indian*. (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from Digital Commons.
- Greene, J. A. (2008). *Washita: The U.S. Army and the Southern Cheyenne's, 1867-1869*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Greene, J. A. (2014). *American carnage: Wounded Knee, 1890*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Grinde, D. & Quitard, T. (1984). Red vs. black: Conflict and accommodation in the Post-Civil War Indian Territory, 1865-1907. *American Indian Quarterly*, 8(3), 211-229. doi: 10.2307/1183929
- Gross, L. W. (2005). Teaching American Indian studies to reflect American Indian ways of knowing and to interrupt cycles of genocide. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 20(2), 121-145. doi: 10.1353/wic.2005.0020
- Grua, D. (2016). *Surviving Wounded Knee: The Lakotas and the politics of memory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hardorff, R. G. (2006). *Washita memories: Eyewitness views of Custer's attack on Black Kettle's village*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hatch, T. (2004). *Black Kettle: The Cheyenne chief who sought peace but found war*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Heidler, D., & Heidler, J. T. (2007). *Indian removal: A Norton casebook*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

- Hinton, A. L. (2014). *Colonial genocide in Indigenous North America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hoig, S. (1961). *The Sand Creek Massacre* (1st ed.). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Indian Appropriations Act, 25 Stat. 980 (1889).
- Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 25 U.S.C. §§ 1901-1923, -1931-1934, 1951, 1952, 1961, 1963. (2012)
- Indian Citizenship Act, Ch. 233, 43 Stat. 253 (1924).
- Indian Civil Rights Act, of 1968, 25 U.S.C. §§ 1301-1304 (2012).
- Indian Removal Act, Ch. 148, 4 Stat. (1830).
- Indian Reorganization Act, 48 Stat. 984 (1934).
- Indian Trade and Intercourse Act, 1 Stat. 137 (1790).
- Institute for Government Research (1928). *The Problem of Indian administration. A report of a survey made at the request of Honorable Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and submitted to him, February 21, 1928*. Baltimore, MD: The Lord Baltimore Press.
- Iowa Burials Protection Act, Ch. 1332 § 1p-6028-19 (1934).
- Jaimés, M. A. (1992). *The state of Native America: Genocide, colonization, and resistance*. Boston, MA: South End Press Publishing.
- Jensen, R., Paul, R. E., & Carter, J. E. (1991). *Eyewitness at Wounded Knee*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Johnson v. M'Intosh, 21 U.S. 543 (1823).
- Kades, E. (2001). History and interpretation of the great case of Johnson v. M'Intosh. *Law & History Review*, 19(1), 67-116. doi: 10.2307/744212
- Karp, I., Kreamer, C. M., & Lavine, S. *Museums and communities: The politics of public culture* (1992). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Keenan, J. (1997). *Encyclopedia of American Indian Wars 1492-1890*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Kolodny, A. (2012). *In search of first contact: The Vikings of Vinland, the peoples of the Dawnland, and the Anglo-American anxiety of discovery*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Krech, S. III. (1999). *The ecological Indian: Myth and history*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company
- Lewy, G. (2004, September 1). Were American Indians the victims of genocide? *Commentary*, 118(2), 55-63.
- Lindsay, B. (2015). *Murder state: California's Native American genocide, 1846-1873*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press
- Lipman, H. (2002, November 28). Museum group issues guidelines on ethics. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 15(4), 8-8.
- Lonetree, A., & Cobb, A. J. (2008). *The National Museum of the American Indian: Critical conversations*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- MacDonald, D., & Hudson, G. (2012). The genocide question and Indian residential schools in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 45(2), 427-449.
- Mandeville, G. (2015). Sex trafficking on Indian reservations. *Tulsa Law Review*, 51(1), 181-207. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.law.utulsa.edu/tlr/vol51/iss1/5/>
- Marzollo, J., & Björkman, S. (1991). *In 1492*. New York, NY: Scholastic.
- Melber, L. M., (Ed). (2014). *Teaching the museum: Careers in museum education*. Washington, DC: American Alliance of Museums Press.
- Mihesuah, D. A. (2000). *Repatriation reader: Who owns American Indian remains?* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Miller, D. (2011). *The forced removal of American Indians from the northeast: A history of territorial cessions and relocations, 1620-1854*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company Inc.
- Milton, G. (2000). *Big Chief Elizabeth: The adventures and fate of the first English colonists in America* (1st American ed.). New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Missall, J., Missall, M. L., Arsenault, R., & Mormino, G. R. (2004). *The Seminole wars: America's longest Indian conflict*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Naimark, N. A. (2016). *Genocide: A world history*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- National Museum of the American Indian Act of 1989, 20 U.S.C. §§ 80q. 80q-1 to 80q-9, 80q-9a to 80q- 10 to 80q-15 (2012).

- National Museum of the American Indian. (2004). *The changing presentation of the American Indian, museums and native cultures*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, [NAGPRA]. Of 1990, 25 U.S.C. §§ 3001-3013 (2012).
- Northwest Ordinance Act, 2 U.S. 559 (1796).
- Otis, D. S., & Prucha, F. P. (1973). *The Dawes Act and the allotment of Indian lands*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Palmiste, C. (2011). From the Indian Child Welfare Act: The resistance of Native American communities. *Indigenous Policy Journal* 22(1), 1-10. Retrieved from <http://www.indigenouspolicy.org/index.php/ipj/article/view/4/3>
- Perdue, T., & Green, M. D. (2005). *The Cherokee removal: A brief history with documents* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Pevar, S. (2012). *The Dawes Act: How Congress tried to destroy Indian reservations*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Pewewardy, C. D. (1998). Fluff and feathers: Treatment of American Indians in literature and the classroom. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 31(1), 69-76.
- Piccard, A. (2013). Death by boarding school: "The last acceptable racism" and the United States' genocide of Indigenous peoples. *Gonzaga Law Review*, 49(1), 137-185.
- Prucha, F. P. (1975). *Documents of United States Indian policy*. Lincoln, NE: The University of Nebraska Press.
- Reyhner, J. A., & Eder, J. M. O. (2004). *American Indian education: A history*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Richardson, H. (2010). *Wounded Knee: Party politics and the road to an American massacre*. New York, NY: Basic Books/Perseus Books.
- Richter, D. (2013). *Trade, land, power: The struggle for eastern North America* (1st ed.). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Robertson, L. G. (2005). *Conquest by law: How the discovery of America disposed Indigenous peoples of their lands*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rosen, D. A. (2015). *Border law: The first Seminole War and American nationhood*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Smith, D. A. (2002). *Henry M. Teller: Colorado's grand old man*. Boulder, CO: The University Press of Colorado.
- Smits, D. (1994). The frontier army and the destruction of the buffalo: 1865-1883. *The Western Historical Quarterly*, 25(3), 312-338. doi: 10.2307/971110
- Stannard, D. E. (1993). *American holocaust: The conquest of the new world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Stone, E. (2013). America's first slave revolt: Indians and African slaves in Española, 1500-1534. *Ethnohistory*, 60(2), 195-217.
- Thomas, D. (2000). *Skull wars: Kennewick man, archaeology, and the battle for Native American identity* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Thornton, R. L. (1987). *American Indian holocaust and survival: A population history since 1492*. Norman, OK: The University of Oklahoma Press.
- Tyler, S. (1973). *A History of Indian Policy*. Washington, DC: University Press of the Pacific.
- United Nations. (1948). Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/index.html>
- United States. Congress. House. Committee on Education Labor. Subcommittee on Healthy Families Communities. (2008). *Examining the role of museums and libraries in strengthening communities: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Healthy Families and Communities, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, One Hundred Tenth Congress, second session, hearing held in Washington, DC, September 11, 2008*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ward, M. K. (2011). Teaching indigenous American culture and history: Perpetuating knowledge or furthering intellectual colonization? *Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(2), 104-112.
- Watson, B. A. (2011). The impact of the American doctrine of discovery on Native land rights in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. *Seattle University Law Review*, 34(2), 507-550.
- Watson, B. A. (2012). *Buying America from the Indians: Johnson v. McIntosh and the history of native land rights*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- West, W. (2005). *The Native universe and museums in the twenty-first century: The significance of the National Museum of the American Indian; with a foreword by W. Richard West*. Washington, DC: National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution.

- Wheeler, H. W. (1925). *Buffalo days: Forty years in the old west: The personal narrative of a cattleman Indian fighter, and Army officer*. Indianapolis, IN: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Wilkins, D. (2007). *American Indian politics and the American political system*. New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Wrone, D. (1986, December). Indian treaties and the democratic idea. *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, 70(2), 82-106. Retrieved from <http://search.library.wisc.edu/catalog/9910114821402121>
- Yenne, B. (2008). *Indian Wars: The campaign for the American West*. Yardley, PA: Westholme Publishing.
- Yenne, B. (2016). *The Sand Creek massacre: The official 1865 Congressional report with James P. Beckwourth's additional testimony and related documents*. Yardley, PA: Westholme Publishing.