Spirit Warriors:

Contested Commemoration at Little Bighorn

Easton R. J. Alan von Anspach
Tejoni Sahdona Mahtola
"River Spirit"

April 21, 2009

Introduction

The power of a thing or an act is in the meaning and the understanding.
–Nicholas Black Elk (1989)

The battle being fought on a rolling, grassy plain outside of Crow Agency, Montana is lost on most casual observers who pass. Perhaps it is because the antagonists in this conflict are comprised of marble and are small, stationary, and unassuming: hardly stereotypical soldiers. Or perhaps it is because the field is held almost entirely by the army of white marble with only a few red marble obelisks standing in opposition. Maybe the conflict goes unobserved because change happens slowly, the 'soldiers' stand immobile, and the opposing commanders, a large granite tower and a circle of red sandstone, sit in suspiciously close proximity upon a nearby hill. Conceivably, visitors go about unaware of the struggle taking place around them because this is a National Monument and a tourist destination, a peaceful place of the past.

The place is the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, the site of the single largest confrontation in the Great Sioux War of 1876-1877 and the second largest fatality of United States soldiers in the history of the Indian Wars. It was here that Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer and approximately 288 United States soldiers, scouts, and civilian contractors met their deaths. It is also here where Sitting Bull, Crazy Horse, and Chief Gall led one of the last armed rebellions of Native Americans against the wholesale destruction of their culture; where somewhere from 36 to 136 Native American warriors, women, and children lost their lives. But the conflict discussed in this paper is not the battle that took place on June 25th, 1876 and the combatants are not the United States 7th Cavalry and the people of the Lakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Arapaho nations. The struggle in question here is the one that began directly after the fighting finished, the battle over commemoration, and the soldiers the monuments deployed upon the landscape.

Little Bighorn, or Greasy Grass Creek as it was known to Native Americans, was an important spiritual site long before the arrival of Western colonists (Black Elk 1989), but it was the battle in 1876 that catapulted the area to a site of national, historic, and cultural importance for both the United States and the Native American First Nations. The United States, however, gained control of the area almost immediately after the battle and quickly began a process of commemoration that honored their fallen countrymen through monumental memorialization in the form of a giant granite obelisk and the placement of small white marble markers at the site of the fallen. Meanwhile the Native American presence at the Little Bighorn was rendered all but invisible and, when in attendance, served as a foil to the glorified Custer and his 7th cavalry. As a result, Indian peoples of the First Nations have struggled against a hegemonic colonial and postcolonial American discourse in an arduous attempt to achieve their own public, monumental commemoration at the Little Bighorn.

It is only recently that these struggles started to come to fruition. In 1991, Congress passed law 102-201 changing the name of the Custer Battlefield National Monument to the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument in recognition that, "while many members of the Cheyenne, Sioux, and other Indian Nations gave their lives defending their families and traditional lifestyle and livelihood, nothing stands at the

battlefield to commemorate those individuals" (US, Congress, 1991)[1]. In 1999 two red marble markers took up residence among the field of white. Finally, in 2003, nearly 127 years to the day after the greatest First Nation military victory against the U.S., an American Indian Memorial was constructed adjacent to the granite obelisk of the 7th cavalry. This paper will explore the prolonged contestation surrounding the commemoration of Native Americans at the Little Bighorn through a three part investigation into the interrelation of the politics of commemoration, the memory of the dead, and the ability of monuments to create and manipulate history.

The Politics of Commemoration

History is written by the victors.

-Winston Churchill

The act of commemorating is an observance or celebration designed to honor the memory of some person or event.[2] It is, in other words, a historical act and therefore, as Churchill reminds us, a political one. What Churchill fails to mention, however, is that the winner is not always easily determined and not all history is written.

The Battle of Little Bighorn offers an excellent example. On the surface, an analysis of Greasy Grass Creek seems simple. The battle itself was a resounding success for the First Nations, the largest military triumph during the entirety of the Indian Wars. The United States lost five full companies, including sixteen officers, and their summer offense stagnated. History, in this case, would seem to be the domain of the Natives. Yet few Americans recognize the name Greasy Grass Creek, fewer can name all three tribes involved in the skirmish, and for over a hundred years Little Bighorn bore only the markers of the 7th Cavalry. Mention Custer, however, and most American middle school students can spout off a short 'history' report. The irony is not lost on Native American Congressmen Ben Nighthorse Campbell: "It is the only place I know where the monument has been built to the losers" (Reese 2005).

But Campbell is also guilty of oversimplification. One battle does not a war make and although Little Bighorn was a clear victory for Native Americans, it took place within a larger war of which Indians were ultimately the loser. It is precisely for this reason that many critics contend that First Nations are owed no special recognition for defeating the 7th cavalry. Indians may have prevailed at the battle of Little Bighorn, but ultimately, they lost the war (Wilkinson 2003). But even this is not sufficient to describe the extent to which history was written into Little Bighorn and vice versa.

The truth is that at the time the battle took place, the outcome of the United States wars against the remaining First Nations of the West was anything but secure (Donovan 2008). The country was still healing from the Civil War and had already suffered a number of defeats at the hands of burgeoning tribal alliances (Greene 1993). As a result, the first accounts of the defeat of the 7th Cavalry tapped a somewhat pervasive nineteenth- century apocalyptic fear upon which newspapers quickly capitalized:

---

[1] See Appendix A for the full text of Public Law 102-201.
[2] Oxford English Dictionary, 6th Edition.

> Massacred, General Custer and 261 Men the Victims. No Officer or Man of 5 Companies Left to Tell the Tale. 3 Days Desperate Fighting by Maj. Reno and the Remainder of the Seventh. [.] Squaws Mutilate and Rob the Dead. Victims Captured Alive Tortured in a Most Fiendish Manner. What Will Congress Do About It? Shall This Be the Beginning of the End? (Bismarck Tribune 1876).

Congress responded to the public outcry by increasing the cavalry companies to one hundred enlisted men and the ceiling on the size of the Army by twenty five hundred men. This was not enough, however, to keep a sense of dread from permeating the America public (Utley 1973).

This fear, combined with the United States need to justify their relentless westward expansion, quickly catapulted Custer and the Battle of Little Bighorn to iconic status. At the time of the battle, Custer had already achieved a modicum of fame as a Civil War hero and infamous politician. He was well aware of his media appeal and oftentimes sported a uniform that included shiny jackboots, tight olive-colored corduroy trousers, a wide-brimmed slouch hat, tight hussar jacket of black velveteen with silver piping on the sleeves, a sailor shirt with silver stars on his collar, and a red cravat. He wore his hair in long glistening ringlets liberally sprinkled with cinnamon-scented hair oil. Custer even employed or invited journalists on his campaigns in order to document his life (Urwin 1990).

Upon his death, Custer's wife capitalized on his unfortunate fate through the publication of a series of books which portrayed the Lieutenant Colonel as an archetypal Victorian gentleman who died in order to preserve the American way of life (Wert 1996). Buffalo Bill Cody, arguably one of, if not the, most famous American media persona of the nineteenth century, incorporated Custer into his Wild West show. He traveled throughout the country with a troupe of performers reenacting the battle, sometimes winning and sometimes losing, but always going down in a blaze of glory. Eventually, Sitting Bull even joined the troupe and played himself in the reenactments (Hall 2001). Soon after the battle, Anheuser-Busch commissioned a painting of "Custer's Last Stand" which was distributed as a print to saloons all over America

Comanche, the horse of Brevet Lt. Colonel Myles Keogh and the sole survivor of the battle, was actually mounted for exhibition by Professor Lewis Dyche for display at the 1893 Chicago World's Fair and is still on permanent exhibit at the Natural History Museum of the University of Kansas. Custer's name came to adorn: counties in five states; a mine in Idaho; townships, villages, and cities in Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; a military fort; two national cemeteries, an observatory; and the list goes on. In 1942, Errol Flynn played Custer in "They Died with Their Boots On," a Hollywood movie portraying Custer as a heroic and brave soldier who served his country, followed his orders, and died a glorious death in battle against Indians who stood in the way of American progress (IMDB 2009).

As these examples show, The Battle of the Little Bighorn was not just another battle; it was an icon of American expansion and the triumph of Western civilization. As such, its elevation within the culture of the United States was paralleled by a physical cementation in the structures at the site itself. It was a process that began with the arrival of United States military reinforcements and the original interment of Custer and the soldiers of the 7th Cavalry a mere three days after the conclusion of the battle:

> The exemplar burial was given to Lt. Colonel George Armstrong Custer – only 18 inches deep, but six feet compared to the other 200 plus 7th cavalrymen. Stakes driven into the ground marked recognized officer's graves. The officer's name was written on a piece of paper, rolled up and slipped inside a spent cartridge, then pounded into the head of the stake for later identification. Additionally, the graves were numbered on a map. The private was not so lucky. His final resting place remained mostly unmarked; there just was not enough time to cut stakes from the trees along the river or salvaged tipi poles (Reese 2008a).

These original burials were performed in haste as reports of hostile troop movement kept relief forces wary. Interestingly, it was also this immediate period following the battle that saw the only Native memorial construction to take place for the next hundred years. As the night of June 25th came to a close the Native American warriors carried their dead from the field, leaving small rock cairns in their place. The interment of these bodies took place in private and remains a secret as is the custom of most plains tribes (Deloria 1969). It's a practice that would come to play a significant role in the discourses surrounding commemoration at the battlefield.

For awhile then, the commemoration at Little Bighorn was almost politically neutral, at least between the First Nations and the United States. The interment of the soldiers, however, revealed an explicit differentiation in American burial practices as shown by the effort put into Custer's and the officer's burial when compared to the relative indifference shown to privates. Already a politics of commemoration was being put into place based on military rank. It is a hierarchy that is still maintained, reflected in the government's decision to name the cemetery after Custer in 1886 despite the fact his remains were moved to West Pointe in 1877.

The original, partial interment of the 7th cavalry was insufficient given the importance of Custer and his men to America, or at least that's what Custer's wife argued to Congress. They must have agreed because the Secretary of War ordered the establishment of a National Cemetery on January 29, 1879 and in April the first monument to the United States soldiers was erected there out of boulders and wood (Rickey 1998). In 1881 this wooden monument was replaced by a granite obelisk placed at the top of Last Stand Hill in order to "…present a view of the battle from Custer's own perspective" (Reese 2005). In 1890 white marble markers were added to mark where individual soldiers fell using both the maps drawn by the first relief troops and the current locations of soldiers' bodies. The rock cairns, on the other hand, seemed to slip from the battlefield's consciousness.

The result of this process was the creation of a highly politicized site which continued to play a recursive role in both the development of the national discourse of the United States and the establishment of American identity. Consequently, the Little Bighorn was center stage when these discourses came under postmodern scrutiny towards the end of the twentieth century with increasing emphasis on the recognition of the mistreatment of First Nations in the settling of the American West. The civil rights movement provided a voice for minorities and marginalized peoples of the United States which highlighted their previously obscured role in American history: "During much of the 20th century, the lion's share of public education at the battlefield focused on the movements of the cavalry, treating Indians as nearly invisible" (Wilkinson 2003). Media

portrayals of Custer, like the 1970 film *Little Big Man*, moved away from idealized stereotypes to more realistic, gritty portrayals of what the last days of Custer's life may have been like.

The threat of iconoclash, however, resulted in a conservative backlash especially visible at Little Bighorn. Consider for example *Keep the Last Bullet* (1976), a work by noted American historian Thomas Bailey Marquis which was:

> …refused by publishers for forty years because of its unpopular conclusions concerning the fate of the Custer soldiers. Marquis contended that the troops were terrified of torture -- thus, fearing capture, many of Custer's relatively inexperienced men did away with themselves and/or their companions when the likely outcome of the battle became clear (Liberty 2006).

Or take for example the fact that Congress refused to pass the first act calling for recognition of Native Americans at the battlefield because it included a name change which removed Custer (Reese 2005). Some protestors

> Traditions, even the most sacred ones, are having about as much luck against liberal orthodoxy as General George Armstrong Custer had against the Indians. And now even poor Custer is about to fall victim to the "political correctness" of the Left…A memorial will be built to honor the Indians who massacred U.S. cavalrymen; thus PC dictates that perpetrators of the massacre be given equal standing to the massacred. (Custer Slain Again, NCF, WSM)

But the reticence surrounding change at Little Bighorn is more than iconclash: it is guilt. Commemoration is often thought of as the act of remembering and honoring the dead. However, it can also be an act of dishonoring the living as shown by escrache ceremonies in Argentina (Kaiser 2002), which are used to publicly shame unpunished criminals, and reconciliation hearings in South Africa where perpetrators must publicly acknowledge their guilt (Krog 1998). The erection of a monument at Little Bighorn is essentially an escrache and reconciliation hearing, publicly shaming the United States while simultaneously demanding overt acknowledgement of its guilt. In fact, prior to its construction no memorial existed which even recognized the conflict between First Nations and non-Indian people in the West and the responsibility signified by the monument is of paramount importance to Native Americans:

> Mr. La Pointe says what matters is not the memorial's physical trappings but the fact that it exists at all. He interprets the memorial's construction as an admission from Washington that the treatment of native peoples has never been adequately addressed (Wilkinson 2003).

Little Bighorn, in other words, is not merely a historical site of the past; it's a modern political arena in which current conflicts are still being played out.

The Memory of Dead

But Little Bighorn is a cemetery as well and, therefore, serves as a locus of the memory of the dead. This memory includes not only the memories of the living regarding the dead, but also the memories held by the dead. The creation, maintenance and manipulation of memory is also a political process but the introduction of the dead seems to introduce a more intimate, emotional level which sets these considerations apart.

There seems to exist an unwritten rule in Western internment practices that states that enemies are not to be buried together. Consider, if you will, the idea of a Ku Klux Klan member being buried adjacent to a murdered slave or a Nazi and a Jew coming to rest in neighboring urns. These are polemic examples to be sure, but the uneasiness is palpable. The dead have wills that extend beyond death (Lacquer 2002) and in the West one of these wishes is not to be interred with your murderer. Doing so can harm the memory of the dead and the memory of the living.

It is precisely this qualm with honoring those who killed their ancestors which has created some of the most radical oppositions to a Native Monument at Little Big Horn.

> What's next? A Shinto temple to the Japanese Air Force on the site of the Arizona? How about a posthumous Oscar to John Wilkes Booth at the Ford Theatre for 'Outstanding Performance By An Actor'? The world has obviously gone mad (Armstrong 1988).

Descendents view the erection of a monument at Little Bighorn as a direct challenge to the memories they have of their ancestors and their heritage. Some of Custer's descendants felt that the change was a personal insult to their family. His great-grandnephew even threatened to pull his family's artifacts from the museum if the name change happened (Battle of the Little Bighorn, NCF, WSM).

Advocates of the memorial, however, have been extremely vocal in their consideration of these memories, "This is in no way meant to take away from the battlefield as it is now or to denigrate the soldiers of the Seventh Cavalry" (Congressman Urges…, NCF, WSM). Instead, they point out that prior to the erection of Native memorials, the site had no place for the memory of the Indian dead or living and that this too can be harmful. In fact, the acknowledgement of only one side of the conflict made the space antagonistic for Natives wishing to honor their fallen ancestors and many Indians felt alienation and indignity having to pray in the shadows of shrines erected to Custer and his men (Wilkinson 2005).

Ironically, however, the monument to the 7th Cavalry sits atop the tallest hill at the site and subsequently the entire battlefield is in its shadow. In order to create a space at which people could honor the memory of Native Americans in spatial equality, the memorial had to be located in close proximity to Custer's monument, which led to a new surge of complaints (Reese 2005). It happens that during the construction of the granite monument all of the bones that could be found of the 7th Cavalry were gathered up and buried and the monument erected atop this mass grave. Protestors were adamant that the creation of the Native American memorial was paramount to grave destruction. They argued that as the First Nations carried off and buried their own dead, location was unimportant, an argument also deployed to discourage the placement of red marble markers on the battlefield to denote fallen Native American warriors.

What is ironic in this debate is the fact that the bodies of the 7th Cavalry have already seen a great deal of disturbance. The threat of renewed hostility immediately following the battle resulted in hasty first burials. As a result, scavengers and flooding scattered remains across the battlefield in an annual cycle that was only stopped with the creation of the mass grave in 1881. Even so, remains have been unearthed as recently as 1985 (Reese 2008a). Regardless, the creation and demarcation of the grave calls upon traditional beliefs of the sanctity of the grave and protestors therefore contested the erection of the monument on moral grounds, "You wouldn't dig up a church graveyard, why would you dig up Custer and the unfortunate 7th Cavalry" (Silkes 2001). Ignoring for a moment that Custer was moved to West Pointe in 1877 and that this argument has not stopped over two hundred years of colonial and postcolonial anthropological practice, at question here is what consecrates a site.

The memory of the dead deployed by Americans at Little Bighorn is a historical one based on Western philosophical notions of objective fact. The white marble markers stand where bones were found, testaments that a United States soldier fell precisely at that point. The granite obelisk marks the time and place where the battle took place. The museum houses texts, photos, and archives, scientific records of the battle. The Native memory of the dead, on the other hand, is a social one. It is tied up in a collective, cultural memory bound to the landscape and shared through experience (Basso 1996). It is essential, therefore, that an American has proof of where a Cheyenne warrior fell before he will mark it, while for the Cheyenne it is enough to know that his people say his ancestor fell at Little Bighorn. The space is sacred, regardless of the "objective" history.

The concept is not foreign to Americans and can be found in such monuments as the Vietnam War Memorial. The memorial itself is not a grave nor does it stand on the site of any battle fought during the conflict. It is the site of shared memory of the dead which gives it importance, and this is where the conflicting views of America and the First Nations come together.

> For Earnie La Pointe, the great-great grandson of famed Sioux spiritual leader Sitting Bull - who predicted the outcome of the battle on the basis of a vision he had had - the memorial holds profound symbolism. As a proud Vietnam veteran who has traveled to the Vietnam War Memorial in Washington D.C. and wept for fallen comrades, he's convinced this shrine will be a similar touchstone for Native Americans (Wilkinson 2003).

Monuments as History

Monuments are often thought of as structures which become part of the remembrance of past events, and this is true. But monuments do not only mark history, they also make history. Just as texts are changed in the reading through interpretation and translation (Borges 2008) and objects are changed in our engagement with and use of them (Latour 1993), so do the objects of monuments affect the texts of history and vice versa. It is for this reason that monuments should not be said to reflect history, but to refract it.

As the manufacture of history refractors, therefore, monument creation is a political process which significantly influences the memory of the dead. It does this by tying commemoration to the thread of time, past, present, and future. Take the following quote regarding the erection of a Native American Monument at Little Bighorn:

> Why not show the scalpings and mutilation of the troopers? It happened, and many times. I notice the illegal 'Russell Means' plaque is still in the patio with its reference to (the mass murder of) 'our women and children.'…Visitors don't come here for that. They want to know what happened, not why. I feel the same way. Did my ancestors steal an incredible amount of Indian land? Yes, they sure did. Do I feel guilty? Absolutely not!!…I like the way it turned out…We should shut down all of the Indian reservations, give the land to each individual Indian, and let them join the mainstream of American life and close the B.I.A. [Bureau of Indian Affairs]…No monuments where Indians fell at the battle? No one knows who, where or how many fell. This is an unfair accusation (Wells, LBHA, WSM, February 1990).

The author of this statement is afraid that a monument created in the present will change the understanding of the past and that the prevention of such a monument could influence the future.

But this quote goes much farther. It reveals an understanding of the malleable nature of history. Although far from invoking Benjamin or Baudrillard, there is a basic postmodern understanding in Wells' words that history is a selective process. She laments that certain things aren't shown, that other things are, that there are histories of what and histories of why. Well's reveals, in other words, a basic recognition that there exists not one history, but histories, even if she believes only one of them is correct. The one dependent on Western philosophical standards of truth: body equals fact.

The creation of a Native American Monument on Last Stand Hill at Little Bighorn not only questioned United States politics and American memories of the dead, it challenged the understanding of truth. To the right, a Western, humanist philosophic objective and factual history in which bodies mark the dead and Little Bighorn was the unfortunate inevitability of the expansion of liberty and protection of the American peoples. To the left, an oral narrative history in which memory marks the dead and the story is predominantly overshadowed by exploitation and suffering at the hands of American hegemonic ideals. Somewhere between lies the intergalactic rupture that will someday eat the galaxy whole.

But monuments do more than mark the past. They bring the past into the present where it can be touched, changed, and projected into the future. The theme of the memorial is Peace Through Unity (Reese 2005). The idea of Peace allows the monument to escape from the turmoil of the past and come to the present. From the conflict and anger of the past, the monument is structured to bring tranquility, a movement emphasized by the word through. The combination of the two honors the history of the site while trying to heal the wounds of the past "…[W]e should dedicate ourselves…to righting the wrongs of the past, but in reaching for that goal, let us not infuse the battlefield with a modern meaning untrue to the past" (Utley 2005).

The final word is unity and it is here that the monument is working to build the future. Unity is not a new concept at Little Bighorn. As early as 1916 Chief Two Moon stood on

Last Stand Hill and spoke: “Forty years ago, I fought Custer, all day, until all were dead. I was then the enemy of the white man, now I am the friend and brother, living under the flag of our country (Reese 2005). It is a goal, as of yet, that has not been reached. It is difficult to reach unity when only one is present, when only one side is recognized, acknowledged, and commemorated. There is a need to see the trouble, to give it a face, a place, and a name. Chief Red Hawk discussed this in 1926:

> I do not blame any individual for the trouble that arose between the Indian race and the White race; but personally I feel today that I would like to see the trouble right here, so that we could both of us, on both sides, fight that one common enemy…so that we would have no trouble forever. In view of that, I see you all; and I see you as brothers and sisters. It makes my heart so glad to see all of you on friendly terms with the Indians, and I hope that lasts forever…So today we meet again once more, and I hope it is final; we shall seal friendship which shall never be broken again; I am glad today that I am with you today [sic]. I thank you (US, CSCC, 1926).

The problem is that at the time Chief Red Hawk spoke, he could not see the trouble manifested in from of him. Instead there existed only side of the story, one army of white marble obelisks, one cultural narrative at the battlefield. It is only with the recent construction of the Native monument that the contestation between the United States and First Nations has become commemorated in physical form. Perhaps this will allow General Godfrey to finally fulfill his end of the pact;

> General E.S. Godfrey said: Time out of mind, the hatchet has been with the red race the symbol of war. We now unite in the ceremony of burying the hatchet, holding it a covenant of our common citizenships and everlasting peace. We pray to the god of our fathers, the Great Spirit, to insure this covenant to all future generations (US, CSCC, 1926).

Regardless, the battle continues on the grassy field outside of Crow Agency, Montana. The bulldozers are gone, the monument stands, and once again it is tempting to be fooled by the monolithic presence of marble and granite. But, as this paper has shown, these stationary objects are engaged in a dynamic struggle over the politics, memory of the dead, and history creation involved in commemoration and are therefore engaged in a continuous recapitulation of Little Bighorn. "People have been saying that this event closes the circle. No, it doesn't. Installing a memorial was a big step but there is a lot more to do. We need to bring more balance to the larger story” (Wilkinson 2003).

Bibliography

Basso, Keith. H. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. University of New Mexico Press.

Bismarck Tribune. 1876. Massacred. Bismarck Tribune, July 6.

Black Elk, Nicholas. [1989] 1953. *The Sacred Pipe*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Borges, J-L. 2008. Interview. *Habitus* 3:75-83.

Brown, Dee. 1970. *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*. New York: Holt, Rineheart, and Winston.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1969. *Custer Died for Your Sins*. New York: Macmillan.

Donovan, James. 2008. *A Terrible Glory*. Hatchette Book Group.

Greene, Jerome A, ed. 1993. *Battles and Skirmishes of the Great Sioux War, 1876-1877: The Military View.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
-- 1994. *Lakota and Cheyenne: Indian Views of the Great Sioux War, 1876-1877*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Hall, Roger. 2001. *Performing the American Frontier, 1870-1906*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaiser, Susana. 2002. Escraches: demonstrations, communication and political memory in post-dictatorial Argentina. *Media, Culture & Society* 24:499-516.

Internet Movie Database. 2009 [1941]. They Died With Their Boots On. Accessible at http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0034277/.

Krog, A. 1998. *Country of my Skull.* New York: Three Rivers Press.

Laqueur, T.W. 2002. The dead body and human rights. In S.T. Sweeney and I. Hodder (eds) *The Body*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 75-93.

Liberty, Margot. 1997. Oral and Written Indian Perspectives on the Indian Wars. PP. 125-138 in Rankin, ed., *Legacy: New Perspectives on the Battle of the Little Bighorn*.
-2006. *Cheyenne Primacy: The Tribes' Perspective As Opposed To That Of The United States Army; A Possible Alternative To "The Great Sioux War Of 1876"*. Accessible at http://www.friendslittlebighorn.com/cheyenneprimacy.htm.

Linenthal, Edward Tabor. 1991. *Sacred Ground: Americans and Their Battlefields*. Chicago: University of Illinois.

Little Bighorn Associates *Newsletter* Collection. White Swan Memorial Library, Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument. November 1988.

Marquis, Thomas Bailey. 2003 [1931]. *Wooden Leg, A Warrior Who Fought Custer*. Bison Books.

-1985 [1976]. *Keep The Last Bullet for Yourself*. Reference Publication Inc
-1978. *Cheyennes of Montana*. Reference Publication Inc.

Means, Russell. 1995. *Where White Men Fear to Tread*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Newspaper Clipping File. White Swan Memorial Library, Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument, Montana.
- Campbell, Congressman urges new battlefield name, NCF, WSM
-Custer Slain Again By US Vote.
- Battle of the Little Bighorn, Part Two.

Piehler, Kurt. 1995. *Remembering War the American Way*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Reese, Bob. 2008. *History of the Warrior Markers Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument.* Accessible at http://www.friendslittlebighorn.com/warriormarkershistory.htm.
-2008a. Interment of Custer Dead. Accessible at http://www.friendslittlebighorn.com/dusttodust.htm.

Reese, Megan. 2005. The Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument and an Indian Memorial After 1988. Accessible at http://www.friendslittlebighorn.com/meganreecethesis.htm.

Rickey, Don Jr. 1998. History of Custer Battlefield. Fort Collins: Old Army Press.

Scott, Doug, Richard A. Fox Jr., Melissa Connor, and Dick Harmon. et al. 1989. Archaeological Perspectives on the Battle of the Little Bighorn. Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Silkes, Fred. 2001. What's the Dig Deal? Des Moines Register, April 24: 3.

United States. Department of the Interior. Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument Indian Memorial: Award Winning Design.

United States. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. The Custer Semi-Centennial Ceremonies: 1876 – June 25-26 – 1926. Casper, Wyoming, 1926.

United States. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. Design Competition for Little Bighorn Battle Monument.

United States. Hearing Before the Select Committee on Indian Affairs United States Senate: One Hundred and First Congress Second Session. Wounded Knee Memorial and Historic Site: Little Bighorn National Monument Battlefield. Washington: GPO, 1991.

United States. One Hundred and Second Congress. An Act. Washington: Jan. 1991.

United States. Statement of Robert M. Utley, Historian, Before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, On H.R. 847, H.R. 848, and H.R. 770, Relating to Custer Battlefield National Monument. Montana: 23 April 1991.

Urwin, Gregory J. W. 1990. *Custer Victorious.* University of Nebraska Press.

Utley, Robert. 1969. Custer Battlefield National Monument. Washington, D.C.: Office of Publications.
-1973. *Frontier Regulars: The United States Army and the Indian 1866-1890*.
-1991. Statement to the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, on H.R. 847, H.R. 848, and H.R. 770, Relating to Custer Battlefield National Monument, Montana, April 23: 2-3.
-2004. *Custer and Me*. Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Wert, Jeffry D. 1996. *Custer: The Controversial Life of George Armstrong Custer*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Western National Parks Association. The Indian Memorial at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument: Peace Through Unity. 2003.

Wilkinson, Todd. June 24, 2003. First Stand for the Indians. In *Christian Science Monitor*. Accessible at http://www.friendslittlebighorn.com/atcusterslaststand.htm.

Appendix A

Little Bighorn

105 STAT. 1631 PUBLIC LAW 102–201—DEC. 10, 1991

Public Law 102–201 102d Congress

Dec. 10, 1991 [H.R. 848]

Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. REDESIGNATION OF MONUMENT.

The Custer Battlefield National Monument in Montana shall, on and after the date of enactment of this Act, be known as the "Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument" (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "monument"). Any reference to the Custer Battlefield National Monument in any law, map, regulation, document, record or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument.

SEC. 102. CUSTER NATIONAL CEMETERY.

The cemetery located within the monument shall be designated as the Custer National Cemetery.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) a monument was erected in 1881 at Last Stand Hill to commemorate the soldiers, scouts, and civilians attached to the 7th United States Cavalry who fell in the Battle of the Little Bighorn;

(2) while many members of the Cheyenne, Sioux, and other Indian Nations gave their lives defending their families and traditional lifestyle and livelihood, nothing stands at the battlefield to commemorate those individuals; and

(3) the public interest will best be served by establishing a memorial at the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument to honor the Indian participants in the battle.

SEC. 202. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall establish a committee to be known as the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument Advisory Committee (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Advisory Committee").

(b) MEMBERSHIP AND CHAIRPERSON.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 11 members appointed by the Secretary, with 6 of the individuals appointed representing Native American tribes who participated in the Battle of the Little Bighorn or who now reside in the area, 2 of the individuals appointed being nationally recognized artists and 3 of the individuals appointed being knowledgeable in history, historic preservation, and landscape architecture. The Advisory Committee shall designate one of its members as Chairperson.

(c) QUORUM; MEETINGS.—Six members of the Advisory Committee shall constitute a quorum. The Advisory Committee shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of the members voting at a meeting at which a quorum is present. The

Advisory Committee shall meet on a regular basis. Notice of meetings and agenda shall be published in local newspapers which have a distribution which generally covers the area affected by the monument. Advisory Committee meetings shall be held at locations and in such a manner as to ensure adequate public involvement.
(d) ADVISORY FUNCTIONS.—The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary to insure that the memorial designed and constructed as provided in section 203 shall be appropriate to the monument, its resources and landscape, sensitive to the history being portrayed and artistically commendable.
(e) TECHNICAL STAFF SUPPORT.—In order to provide staff support and technical services to assist the Advisory Committee in carrying out its duties under this Act, upon request of the Advisory Committee, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to detail any personnel of the National Park Service to the Advisory Committee.
(f) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Advisory Committee shall serve without compensation but shall be entitled to travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in Government service under section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.
(g) CHARTER.—The provisions of section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix; 86 Stat. 776), are hereby waived with respect to the Advisory Committee.
(h) TERMINATION.—The Advisory Committee shall terminate upon dedication of the memorial authorized under section 203.

SEC. 203. MEMORIAL.
(a) DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE.—In order to honor and recognize the Indians who fought to preserve their land and culture in the Battle of the Little Bighorn, to provide visitors with an improved understanding of the events leading up to and the consequences of the fateful battle, and to encourage peace among people of all races, the Secretary shall design, construct, and maintain a memorial at the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument.
(b) SITE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, shall select the site of the memorial. Such area shall be located on the ridge in that part of the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument which is in the vicinity of the 7th Cavalry Monument, as generally depicted on a map entitled “Custer Battlefield National Monument General Development Map” dated March 1990 and numbered 381/80,044-A.
(c) DESIGN COMPETITION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, shall hold a national design competition to select the design of the memorial. The design criteria shall include but not necessarily be limited to compatibility with the monument and its resources in form and scale, sensitivity to the history being portrayed, and artistic merit. The design and plans for the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 204. DONATIONS OF FUNDS, PROPERTY, AND SERVICES.
Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept and expend donations of funds, property, or services from individuals, foundations, corporations, or public entities for the purpose of providing for the memorial.

SEC. 205. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.
There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.
* * * * * * *

Approved December 10, 1991.