

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Communication Theses

Department of Communication

Summer 7-14-2010

Cultural Play at the Crazy Horse Colossus: Narrative

Thomas M. Cornwell
Georgia State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cornwell, Thomas M., "Cultural Play at the Crazy Horse Colossus: Narrative." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2010.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.57709/1394565>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

CULTURAL PLAY AT THE CRAZY HORSE COLOSSUS: NARRATIVE
RATIONALITY AND THE CRAZY HORSE MEMORIAL ORIENTATION FILM

by

THOMAS M. CORNWELL

Under the Direction of Dr. Mary Stuckey

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the Crazy Horse Memorial orientation film and its rhetorical claim to represent Lakota values in the rhetorically contested Black Hills of South Dakota. Walter Fisher's concept of narrative rationality is used to analyze the informal logic of the memorial film narrative. The Crazy Horse Memorial is seen as a response to Mt. Rushmore's colonialist legacy. Analysis shows that the Crazy Horse Memorial actually has much in common with Rushmore's legacy of Euro-American colonialism. This thesis discusses the effects of this redefinition of Lakota cultural values on the rhetorical sphere of the contested Black Hills.

INDEX WORDS: Narrative rationality, American Indians, Crazy Horse Memorial,
Black Hills, Lakota, Mount Rushmore, Colossal art, Orientation film

CULTURAL PLAY AT THE CRAZY HORSE COLOSSUS: NARRATIVE
RATIONALITY AND THE CRAZY HORSE MEMORIAL ORIENTATION FILM

by

THOMAS M. CORNWELL

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Masters of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2010

Copyright by
Thomas M. Cornwell
2010

CULTURAL PLAY AT THE CRAZY HORSE COLOSSUS: NARRATIVE
RATIONALITY AND THE CRAZY HORSE MEMORIAL ORIENTATION FILM

by

THOMAS M. CORNWELL

Committee Chair: Dr. Mary Stuckey

Committee: Dr. Michael Bruner

Dr. Gregory Smith

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

August 2010

DEDICATION

For Kelly and Harry

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thesis would not have been possible without Mary Stuckey. Her input was invaluable in navigating the complex issues I encountered. I would also like to thank Greg Smith and Michael Bruner for their honest critical advice during the writing process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 The Memorial Orientation Film.....	5
1.2 Cultural Battles in American Indian Territory.....	9
1.3 Contested Rhetorical Ground of the Black Hills.....	12
1.4 The Crazy Horse Memorial.....	14
1.5 Significance of Memorials.....	20
1.6 Significance of the Crazy Horse Memorial – The Rushmore Effect.....	22
1.7 Politics of Public Commemoration: Crispus Attucks and Crazy Horse.....	26
1.8 Theory: Narrative Rationality.....	29
1.9 Narrative Probability and Narrative Fidelity.....	30
1.10 The Logic of Good Reason.....	32
1.11 A Minor Adjustment: Barbara Warnick and Narrative Rationality.....	34
1.12 Method: Textual Analysis.....	35
2 Harmony with Nature versus Conquest over Nature.....	37
2.1 Korczak’s Conquest of the Crazy Horse Memorial.....	42
2.2 Korczak’s Colossus and Crazy Horse’s Contribution to a Unique American Art Form.....	47
2.3 The Logic of Good Reasons: An Assessment of the Truth Qualities of the Narrative.....	52
2.4 Conclusion.....	55

3	Individuality versus Collectivity.....	56
3.1	The Problematic Billy Mills.....	59
3.2	Korczak’s Absurd Heroism	62
3.3	Korczak’s Greatness and the Myth of the Vanishing Indian.....	65
3.4	The Logic of Good Reasons – An Assessment of the Truth Qualities of the Narrative.....	69
3.5	Conclusion.....	72
4	Sacred versus Material.....	73
4.1	Billy Mills’ Peculiar Perspective on Sacredness.....	75
4.2	Korczak’s Predictable Perspective on Sacredness.....	77
4.3	Selling Sacredness.....	78
4.4	The Logic of Good Reasons – An Assessment of the Truth Qualities of the Narrative.....	80
4.5	Conclusion.....	85
5	Conclusion.....	85
	References.....	97

Chapter 1: Introduction

In the Black Hills of South Dakota the effigy of a man is being carved from a mountain. Emerging from the mountain is an image of the Oglala Lakota leader Crazy Horse. Blast by blast a story in stone is being told. The story is being crafted by sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski, a white man from Boston, Massachusetts who describes himself as “a storyteller in stone” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). Ziolkowski explains the story he is telling at the memorial by saying, “when Standing Bear asked me to tell the story of their great chief who was killed many years ago, I wanted to tell the story of the North American Indian” (2002). But does the memorial actually tell the story of Crazy Horse and the North American Indians or does it tell the story of a sculptor on a quest to build the largest sculpture in the world? An answer to that question rests in the twenty-minute feature film that is shown to visitors upon their arrival at the Crazy Horse Memorial. The film, *Crazy Horse: Dynamite & Dream*, claims in its first line that the memorial “honors North American Indians: all tribes” (2002). Understanding that one cannot honor all American Indians¹ in a monolithic manner, I present research on the celebrated values and cultural traditions of the Lakota, as a way of guiding my understanding of the truth qualities involved in the representation of American Indians in the memorial film. I chose the Lakota because the location of the memorial is on their land and the central figure of the memorial is the Lakota leader, Crazy Horse. Since it is impossible to represent all American Indians in one way at one time, the claim of the voice over narrator, that the

¹ I use the term American Indians because of the prevalence of it as a description of programs of study by indigenous Americans. For further discussion, refer to Donald Fixico in the chapter “The Rise of American Indian Studies” (Fixico, 2003, 105-124)

memorial, “honors North American Indians: all tribes,” is inherently faulty. This bold misstatement reveals a lack of fundamental knowledge about the ethics of representing American Indians and therefore invites scrutiny of its other narrative claims. Instead of analyzing the unworkable rhetorical claim of honoring “Native American: all tribes,” I will focus my attention on the equally compelling but more coherent narrative claim made by Billy Mills, an Oglala Lakota and Olympic Champion, who offers his explanation of what the Crazy Horse Memorial represents. During the second minute of the film Mills states, “our elders made a commitment. They wanted Korczak to build a monument honoring our people, our way, our culture, our values” (2002). Mills’ claim is particularly powerful because he is the only Oglala Lakota, or American Indian of any nation for that matter, who is represented in the memorial film. Since the memorial is dedicated to the Oglala Lakota leader Crazy Horse, Mills’ various statements have an authentic resonance produced by virtue of his ethnic and cultural links to the memorial and the people it supposedly honors. What Mills says carries added weight because he is a member of the same nation as Crazy Horse. In short, I chose to hold the memorial film accountable to Mills’ claim that it represents the Lakota people, their culture and ways, because of the fallacy of the film’s claim to honor “all tribes” and because of Mills’ ethos. One thing is absolutely clear: the memorial film never claims that the viewer is about to witness the story of a sculptor’s quest to construct the largest sculpture in the world.

Nevertheless the story of sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski is exactly what is presented during fifteen and a half minutes of the film’s twenty-minute running time. The film presents only four and a half minutes of narrative that can be said to be devoted to

telling the story of Crazy Horse and American Indian values. Yet those four plus minutes are not devoted to an accurate or complete telling of the story of Crazy Horse and American Indians. In later chapters I will go into detail about the dubious nature of the information presented during the sections of the film allotted to Crazy Horse and American Indian culture and values. Suffice it to say that the four and a half minutes of the film that is devoted to a discussion of American Indians lacks as much narrative clarity as it does narrative length.

The result of this lengthy devotion to the story of Korczak Ziolkowski is that the values celebrated by the pioneer narrative of Korczak's² acquisition and "improvement" of his piece of the Black Hills reveal ideological underpinnings that are at odds with Lakota cultural values. The sculptor's story celebrates his brash individualism and his conquest of the mountain site, as well as his technological ingenuity by destroying it with dynamite then carving it with drills and torches. Since the Lakota consider the Black Hills sacred land (Deloria, 1973, 2003; Deloria, 1995; Coleman, 2000; Brown, 1970; Banks, 2005; Matthiessen, 1992; Fixico, 2003; Kidwell, 2003; Mann, 2003) this pioneer narrative cannot be considered the accurate representation of Lakota cultural values that the memorial film narrative promises. By claiming that the memorial represents Lakota culture then presenting a film that is dominated by Euro-American values, the memorial film invites the viewer to conflate the values that underpin the pioneer narrative with the values that define Lakota culture. If the viewer believes the memorial's claim to represent Lakota culture, then the Euro-American values that dominate the memorial film come to

² I refer to the sculptor as Korczak because that is how he was known at the memorial and how the memorial rhetoric refers to him.

be perceived as Lakota values. In this way the memorial film offers a redefinition of Lakota cultural values.

In order to represent the Lakota, the film must present a valid reflection of their social reality. If the memorial film does not offer a representation of Lakota culture and values that is accurate when compared with indigenous accounts of these values then the resulting narrative necessarily offers a redefinition of what it means to be a Lakota. The resulting redefinition of Lakota culture and values influences the memorial film viewer to adopt the redefinition of culture as an authentic understanding of the subject matter, contributing to the misunderstandings non-American Indians maintain about indigenous peoples.

In their essay, "The Rushmore Effect," Carol Blair and Neil Michel suggest that monuments like both Mount Rushmore and the Crazy Horse Memorial constitute "a dwelling place of national character, a construction of national ethos" (Hyde ed., 2004, 159). This dwelling place is described by Michael Hyde as a place where people can deliberate about and "know together" (*con-scientia*) some matter of interest" (Hyde ed., 2004, xv). These dwelling places are where a person's ethics and moral character take form and develop (Hyde, ed., 2004, xv). The Crazy Horse Memorial, like Mount Rushmore, is a dwelling place of national memory; therefore, it is important that the narrative of the memorial film be reflective of Lakota values. If Lakota values are misrepresented or conflated with Euro-American values then the public's ability to "know-together" the matter at hand, or at least to "know-together" the matter at hand with cultural accuracy, is jeopardized.

A memorial narrative claiming to honor American Indians, located on contested ground, has the power to influence the rhetorical and political landscape in a way that can naturalize the exploitation of American Indians and the acquisition of their land. Since a “dwelling place of national character” offers a reflection of who we are as a nation then any presentation that leads the public to a false consensus about national character has the power to alter a nation’s perception of itself. If the story being told at the memorial conflates traditional American Indian values with Euro-American values and presents a history of American Indians in a contested area that is incomplete, then the result is a continuation of Euro-American cultural allocation of American Indian identity. I contend that the Crazy Horse Memorial film conflates Lakota and Euro-American value systems by presenting a narrative that claims to represent the Lakota people but instead works to naturalize Euro-American exploitation of American Indians while attempting to absolve Euro-American responsibility for continued colonial expansionism in the Black Hills.

The Memorial Orientation Film

The film, *Crazy Horse: Dynamite & Dreams*, is shown to visitors upon their arrival at the memorial where it is screened each half hour all day long. There is no requirement to see the film per se but it was my experience upon my last visit to the memorial that once my wife and I were ushered through the main entrance we were immediately approached by a staff member who informed us that the orientation film would be running again in a few minutes and that we could “just look around here until it starts.” My wife asked if we had to watch the movie and she was informed that indeed we didn’t *have* to view the film but, as the docent said, “most everyone who visits see it and says it adds to the experience.” I had the distinct feeling that refusal to step into the

theater is an uncommon occurrence and does not happen without a few more attempts being made at changing the visitor's mind. I can say for certain that all of the people that I witnessed enter the memorial around the time we did also stayed to watch the film. By being presented to most visitors immediately upon their arrival at the Crazy Horse Memorial, the orientation film shapes the visitor's experience at the memorial with the stories and claims it offers.

The Crazy Horse Memorial orientation film is structured in what documentary film theorist Bill Nichols (1992) describes as the expository mode of documentary. This type of film uses "voice of God" commentary and poetic perspectives to create a narrative about the historical world and emphasizes the impression of objectivity and well-substantiated judgment (33). One of the dominant features of the expository mode of film is the use of a voice over narrator whose perspective dominates the text and moves it forward toward its persuasive end (Bergman, 2008, 91). Expository films can contain elements of interviews but "these tend to be subordinated to an argument offered by the film itself, often via an unseen "voice of God" or an on-camera voice of authority who speaks on behalf of the text" (Nichols, 1992, 37). The memorial film is a textbook example of this expository mode of documentary. By structuring the memorial film to meet the expectations of a genre that emphasizes an impression of objectivity and well-substantiated judgment, the facts and values presented by the film are likely to be deemed objective and well-substantiated whether they are or not.

Another way that the expository mode of documentary garners credibility for its claims is by sequencing voice and visual cues in a logical manner that underscores the themes of the narrative. Nichols describes how viewers of expository documentaries

expect that a narrative is logical as long as it unfolds in terms of the establishment of a logical, cause/effect linkage between sequences and events bolstered by recurrent images or phrases that function as refrains, “underscoring thematic points or their emotional undercurrents, such as the frequent montages of artillery fire and explosions in combat documentaries that stress the progression of a battle, its physical means of implementation, and its human cost” (Nichols, 1992, 37). These verbal and visual cause/effect linkages work to sequence the narrative in a logical fashion and therefore imbue it with a sense of authority.

The orientation film *Crazy Horse: Dynamite & Dreams* uses just such verbal and visual refrains to build a coherent and authoritative narrative. Explosions on the mountain are used to transition between sections of the narrative, creating the logical, cause/effect linkage between sequences that Nichols mentions. This repetition of explosions emphasizes the thematic point that destruction of the mountain equals both the progress on the mountain carving as well as progress through the narrative. The cause/effect linkage between sculptural and narrative progress invites the viewer to accept the destruction of the mountain as a natural progression.

The memorial film also uses verbal refrains to underscore thematic emphasis. A graphic of the phrase attributed to Crazy Horse, “my lands are where my dead lie buried,” is presented in the first scene and is repeated by the voice over narrator, Billy Mills, and Korczak at different moments during the film. This repeated phrase adds to the logical sequencing of the film and establishes a unifying theme of the narrative that the Crazy Horse Memorial is a defiant response to Mount Rushmore. By repeating this phrase the narrative reminds the viewer that the Crazy Horse Memorial is meant to be seen as a

rebuke to the audacity of Mount Rushmore and its installation of a memorial to white heroes in Lakota land. Later I analyze the Crazy Horse Memorial's relationship to Mount Rushmore in detail. Whether or not it is accurate or inaccurate to claim that the Crazy Horse Memorial is a rebuke of Mount Rushmore, the film's use of the expository technique of verbal repetition reinforces the belief that the memorial is, in fact, just such a rebuke.

In the tradition of the expository mode of documentary the twenty-minute orientation film is a well-done, quickly paced homage to the life and work of sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski. A voice over artist moves the narrative forward by interjecting exposition in between testimonials from Billy Mills, the sculptor and his family. The narrative power of the off camera "voice of God" seamlessly ties together file footage of the early days at the memorial, time-lapse views of the progress on the mountain, and repeated sequences of big, fiery explosions demonstrating the work being done. These expository techniques are used to create a unity to the flow of the narrative so as to lend authority to the message presented.

Although the memorial film uses the expository mode to establish its authority as a rhetorical text, as well as a logical narrative, not all of the film is as logical or as coherent as the expository mode suggests. Yet the power of this authoritative mode of documentary presentation leads viewers to accept the authenticity of the information offered in toto. Since the fifteen and a half minutes of the film dedicated to Korczak are logical and coherent, the expository mode necessarily suggests that the remaining minutes devoted to Billy Mills' pontifications about Crazy Horse and the Lakota be deemed as coherent as well. The problem with this result is that dubious facts are

presented during the coherent, four and a half, non-consecutive minutes of the film where Billy Mills and the voice over narrator discuss Crazy Horse and Lakota culture. The resulting authority that the expository form gives the memorial film validates a definition of Lakota cultural values that is conflated with Euro-American cultural values. Despite the suggestion that the memorial represents Lakota cultural values, the narrative of the memorial film, both in length and in substance, encourages the viewer to believe that Lakota values are the same as Euro-American values.

Since this film is seen by most visitors and it contains all of the rhetorical claims overtly issued by the memorial, along with the authoritative ethos of the expository mode of documentary, it plays a central role in the formation of meaning at the Crazy Horse Memorial. Because of this central role the film is a useful text to analyze in order to understand the ideological work being done by the memorial. Considering that the film plays an important role in meaning making at the memorial and that the film's claim to represent Lakota values is belied by the overt celebration of the Euro-American values, it is a provocative site for a textual analysis of the memorial film narrative.

Although the film is most likely produced by Ziolkowski biographer Robb DeWall, the only person to be employed by the memorial as an official producer of text, no credits are listed. I refer to the text of the film as being produced by Korczak's Heritage Inc., since the memorial preservation firm has the only production credit on the film. Because of the private ownership of the memorial, access to the decisions that were made during the film's production is unavailable. Therefore my analysis will not attempt to unpack the details of the film's production. Instead, I will focus my attention on the rhetoric of the film rather than the underpinnings of its construction.

The rest of this chapter is a discussion of the cultural and military battles that created the contested ground where the memorial is built, followed by a brief history of the memorial and the people who created it. Then I present narrative rationality, the main theoretical tool I use to analyze the text of the memorial film. Finally I will describe the opposing cultural value codes that I use in my analysis as well as preview the chapters that will follow.

Cultural Battles in American Indian Territory

The story of the American Indian's struggle against white, westward expansion is well known (Brown, 1970; Page, 2003; Utley, 1973; Utley, 1993; Olsen, 1965; Mooney, 1973, 1886; Hittman, 1990; Coleman, 2000; Miller, 1959). Although the legal battle that continues over ownership of the Black Hills is a lesser-known story, it has particular significance to the indigenous people of the Black Hills, especially the American Indians of the Dakotas (Banks, 2005; Matthiessen, 1983; Wilkins & Lomawaima, 2001; Deloria & Lytle, 1984; Deloria, 2000). Many military as well as cultural battles were fought in the area. The battle of the Little Bighorn in 1876, the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek in 1890, and the American Indian Movement (AIM) resistance at Pine Ridge in 1973 are just a few of the struggles between Indian and non-Indians in the region (Banks, 2005; Deloria, 2000; Utley, 1973; Utley, 1993; Olsen, 1965; Mooney, 1973, 1886; Miller, 1959; Brown, 1970; Bailey, 1970).

Cultural battles have been a constant as well, such as compulsory education in non-Indian schools and the struggle over land allotments (Deloria & Wildcat, 2001; Riley, ed., 1993, 167-188; Deloria & Lytle, 1984; Deloria, 2000, 187-206). Randall Lake describes how Native Americans have long seen preserving traditional ways of life and

resisting assimilation with Euramerican society as their vindication and salvation in the cycle of life. “The best-known example of such a movement is the spread of the Ghost Dance religion in the late nineteenth century, which stimulated the Sioux uprising of 1890 that culminated in the massacre of nearly 300 natives at Wounded Knee Creek” (Lake, 1991). Black Elk described the massacre as the moment when “a people’s dream died” (Neihardt, 1998, 270), because it was a watershed in the relationship between American Indians and Euro-Americans. This period in western history is described by Fredrick Jackson Turner, in his thesis delivered three years after the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek, as the end of the frontier (Turner, 1921, I). Turner states, “the existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward explains American development” (Turner, 1921, I). Therefore a “frontier line” no longer existed and thus a great historic movement in America ended (1921, I). The massacre at Wounded Knee Creek was seen as a “final battle” in the long waged war between American Indians and white colonialists in which the colonialists won.

The event had a demoralizing effect on American Indians across the continent, so much so that it was not until the 1970s and the American Indian Movement (AIM) that a sense of unity, or pan-Indianness, was again formed (Banks, 2005; Braatz, 2004; Deloria, 2000; Lake, 1983; Lake, 1991; Lindsley et al., 2002; Matthiessen, 1992; Morris & Wander, 1990; Sanchez & Stuckey, 2000). While it may be understandable for a memorial narrative to avoid a discussion of boarding schools and land allotments, it is curious that a memorial honoring and representing the Lakota ignores the story of Wounded Knee altogether. Especially since the massacre was perpetrated on, and had a

profound effect on, the memorial subject's people, the Lakota. By omitting pertinent history, the memorial film narrative continues a Euro-American tradition of forgetting the past in order to absolve guilt for present day actions (Braatz, 2004; Deloria, 2000; Deloria & Lytle, 1983; Dickenson et al., 2005; Matthiessen, 1992; Morris & Stuckey, 1998; Morris & Stuckey, 2004). In the case of the Crazy Horse Memorial, the attempt to forget the past and redefine Lakota cultural values demonstrates an unwillingness to deal with the memorial creator's role in the continued illegal ownership of Indian land and cultural co-option that the memorial represents.

Contested Rhetorical Ground of the Black Hills

Considering the present and historical cultural and political struggles that take place in the Black Hills, the terrain on which the Crazy Horse Memorial sits is decidedly political. By treaty the Sioux Nation of South Dakota rightfully own all of the land in the Black Hills. The treaty of 1868, signed by President Ulysses S. Grant, in effect said, "As long as rivers run and grass grows and trees bear leaves, Paha Sapa – the Black Hills of Dakota – will forever be the sacred land of the Sioux Indians" (DeWall, 1984, 28). However, following the discovery of gold in the Black Hills in 1876, "Congress broke the treaty and reclaimed the land for white settlement" (Chu, 1991, 68). After years of protest by the Lakota, the United States Supreme Court upheld the 1868 treaty June 13, 1979. Justice Harry Blackmun noted, "a more ripe and rank case of dishonesty may never be found in American history" (1991, 68). The government offered \$122.3 million to the Sioux as a "purchase price" for the region, including retroactive interest on the land since 1877.

The Sioux have yet to accept the financial settlement for the land, demanding that the land be returned to the rightful owners. As Rick Two-Dogs, an Oglala Lakota medicine man, explains, “All of our origin stories go back to this place. We have a spiritual connection to the Black Hills that can’t be sold. I don’t think I could face the Creator with an open heart if I ever took money for it” (McCloud, www.sacredland.org). Rick Two-Dogs agrees, arguing that the Lakota believe that the Black Hills are sacred (Banks, 2005; Brown, 1970; Colman, 2000; Cook-Lynn, 1996; Deloria, 2000; Neihardt, 1932). The United States government understood this to be true as well, since the treaty of 1868 refers to the “Black Hills of Dakota” as “the sacred land of the Sioux Indians” (DeWall, 1984, 28). By reneging on the treaty of 1868 and reoccupying the area, Euro-America knowingly stole Lakota land. An equally important result of this treaty violation is that, because of the Lakota belief in sacred land, Euro-America also knowingly stole a fundamental spiritual element of Lakota society.

Considering the double violation of land and spirituality that the Euro-American occupation of the Black Hills represents, a white-owned and operated memorial dedicated ostensibly to an Oglala Lakota hero is, by nature of its existence, troubling. More troubling than the mere fact of the memorial’s physical existence is the possibility for the memorial to redefine the spiritual beliefs of the Lakota for a wide audience. One way that this redefinition of Lakota spirituality could be achieved is by omitting important facts about the subject at hand (Braatz, 2004; Brown, 1999; Lake, 1991; Morris & Stuckey, 1998).

The absence of discussion about the controversy over the treaty of 1868 is a rhetorical opportunity for redefinition. Omitting stories of past struggles between

American Indians and non-Indians naturalizes the notion that the struggle for the Black Hills is somehow over. But the terrain where the memorial is built was contested then and remains contested now. Any representation that reinforces a belief that the contest for ownership of the Black Hills is over works to absolve the memorial for continuing the same physical and spiritual violation that is represented by the breaking of the treaty of 1868.

The physical and rhetorical contest over the land on which the Crazy Horse Memorial is built persists to this day. Therefore a representation of Lakota culture and values emanating from the Black Hills occupies a privileged position rhetorically and invites analysis. The introductory film is just such a privileged representation because of both the memorial location and its subject matter. Therefore my analysis of the narrative rhetoric of the memorial film will contribute to a better understanding of the message being sent from the contested ground of the Black Hills. Before turning my attention to the rhetorical work occurring at the memorial, an understanding of the history of the memorial is enlightening.

The Crazy Horse Memorial

In 1939 the sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski received a letter from a Lakota Indian and relative of Crazy Horse, Henry Standing Bear, who lived on South Dakota's Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, asking Korczak if he would be interested in carving a mountain memorial in the Black Hills (DeWall, 1984, 8). Standing Bear wrote, "My fellow Chiefs and I would like the White Man to know the Red Man had great heroes, too" (1984, 8). Although the memorial film claims that this letter has been lost, the fact that Standing Bear spent many years working to get a monument built in honor of Crazy

Horse is well documented (Taliaferro, 2002; Tichi, 2001; Blair & Michel, 2004; DeWall, 1984).

Chief Standing Bear is described as the hereditary chief of the Brule band by Ziolkowski biographer Robb DeWall (2000, 37). Standing Bear was one of the leaders of the Lakota people at the turn of the 20th century and one of the first American Indian children sent to Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania for a white education (Swanson, 2005, 386). He spent much time in the white world working at Sears Roebuck and going to night school in Chicago before returning to the reservation (387). As an adult, Standing Bear had resolved that a memorial to Crazy Horse should be built, and he searched for many different sites and opportunities to do so, including lobbying Gutzom Borglum to put Crazy Horse on Mount Rushmore (Swanson, 2005, 388; Blair & Michel, 2004, 175). He also supported another project at Fort Robinson in Nebraska that never came to fruition (Swanson, 2005, 388).

Along with his resolve to create a memorial to Crazy Horse, Standing Bear had apparently also resolved that the Black Hills no longer belonged to the Lakota. He stated that the memorial would be “a memorial to the *early* ownership of the Black Hills by the Sioux Nation and a memorial to Crazy Horse who fought for that country” (Swanson, 389). By using the phrase, “early ownership of the Black Hills” it would appear Standing Bear’s opinion was that the Sioux Nation no longer owned the Black Hills. Since it was Standing Bear who invited Korczak to build the Crazy Horse Memorial, his belief that the Sioux Nation no longer owned the land where the memorial was to be built naturalizes the Euro-American authorship of the memorial. If Standing Bear does not believe that the Black Hills are owned by the Lakota, then Korczak and his memorial do

not have to recognize this controversy either. Standing Bear essentially gives Korczak permission to create a memorial to Crazy Horse as well as permission to ignore the fact that Korczak's ownership of the land is a continued violation of the treaty of 1868. Even though Standing Bear's belief about the ownership of the Black Hills naturalizes the Euro-America authorship of the memorial, this result was not his intention.

In explaining his idea for the monument, Standing Bear was clear that it was "to be entirely an Indian project under my direction" (Swanson, 2005, 390). He believed the memorial should remain entirely in the hands of Crazy Horse's descendents because Standing Bear believed his family lineage gave him this right to honor Crazy Horse in this way (2005, 391). Korczak recalls Standing Bear once telling him, "with the Indians, only a relative of a great man has the right to honor that man or build a memorial to him. Other people who are not relatives have no right to honor that great man because somehow those people might have evil motives, want to get something out of it" (2005, 390). Standing Bear is a maternal relative of Crazy Horse, this is the reason he became leader in the cause to memorialize Crazy Horse (2005, 385).

Since Korczak clearly remembers this conversation with Standing Bear about the ethics of memorializing a Lakota, it is interesting that no other descendents of Crazy Horse have worked at the memorial. In fact, no American Indian of any nation has sat on the Board of Directors or held a key position at the memorial (Kent, 2003; Little Eagle, 1996; Giago, 1998; Tizon, 1997). The fact that Korczak did not continue to include other members of Crazy Horse's family in the ideological or physical construction of the memorial appears to be a violation of his agreement with Standing Bear, but this apparent violation is a non-issue at the memorial. There is no other mention made of Crazy

Horse's descendents working at the memorial. Standing Bear's demand that the memorial remain "entirely in the hands of Crazy Horse's descendents" is ignored by the Ziolkowskis. A review of the literature produced by the memorial reveals that Korczak considered the offer from Standing Bear to construct the memorial to be the only association he needed in order to author a memorial to Crazy Horse³ (DeWall, 1984, 23; DeWall, 2000, 37; Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). Ignoring a fundamental promise to Standing Bear that he and other descendents of Crazy Horse always be in control of the memorial, Korczak began pioneering the land and blasting away the mountain.

Korczak started work at the mountain site in 1949 and received non-profit status from the government in that same year. For the first few years Korczak lived as a pioneer on the land. He diverted rivers to create a lake for water and started a logging company with the lumber he hauled off of the mountain. Although Korczak vowed never to draw a salary from the memorial and he never did, his ownership of the land provided a foothold for his family's financial stability. In fact, to this day a profitable logging and construction company are owned and operated at the mountain site by two of Korczak's sons (Tizon, 1997). The memorial literature likes to tout the fact that, although Korczak and his family owned and made a living on the land in the Black Hills, they only came out of debt in 1971, after more than twenty years of work on the mountain (DeWall, 1984, 40). More recent financial statements show that in 2003 the Crazy Horse Memorial listed thirty-one million dollars in assets and they reported over four million dollars in revenue (Kent, 2003, 9).

³ In the chapter devoted to a discussion about the film's representation of individualism and collectivism, I will show how, in essence, the rhetoric of the film attempts to transform Korczak into the cosmic descendant of Crazy Horse; thus authorizing him to create the memorial.

Considering that the Ziolkowskis own a memorial that claims assets over thirty-one million dollars with yearly profits in the millions, as well as a profitable logging and construction company, it would seem natural that the people who the memorial “honors” would benefit financially from the endeavor started by Standing Bear. But since no relative of Crazy Horse was ever associated with or employed by the memorial beyond Standing Bear, the humanitarian projects that the memorial promises have yet to materialize.

Official memorial literature portrays Korczak as a man “who was almost forty and had only \$174 to his name” when he started on the mountain, and as a man “who vowed never to draw a salary.” (DeWall, 1984, 44) This portrait of Korczak as a self-sacrificing pauper in service of a cause is misleading. The reality for the Ziolkowskis is that being landowners in the Black Hills has been extremely lucrative. Even though the Ziolkowskis have a plan for a university and medical training center that would benefit American Indians, it has yet to be constructed. The reality is that to this date none of this substantial money making has benefited the people whose land the memorial is on and whose hero it memorializes; the Lakota.

Korczak planned to build a university and medical training center dedicated to the education and healthcare of American Indians. In 1983, Korczak left extensive plans for the mountain carving as well as explicit instructions to his family that the carving had to be completed before any of the humanitarian projects would begin (DeWall, 1984, 46). When Korczak Ziolkowski passed away at age 74 he willed ownership of the Crazy Horse Memorial to his wife and family. His last words to his wife Ruth were, “You must work on the mountain, but do it slowly – so you do it right” (DeWall, 1984, 48). Since he

decided to wait to construct these service buildings until the memorial is complete, the reality of this plan is still decades away, with no set date for a ground breaking. The memorial is still many years from completion. Although the memorial literature states, “the University and Medical Training Center will be perpetually endowed by the ongoing admission fee after the mountain carving is completed,” to date the admission fees have yet to contribute to a University or Medical Training Center because the money is appropriated for completing the memorial first (DeWall, 1984, 46).

Although the memorial began construction in 1949, the complex to benefit American Indians does not yet exist. To date the memorial consists of a museum, a gift shop and a restaurant. The memorial grounds also contain a construction business and a timber company. All of these businesses benefit the Ziolkowski family financially.

Research about the Crazy Horse Memorial reveals that there are many inconsistencies between what Standing Bear wanted done on the mountain and what Korczak did. There are also inconsistencies between what the memorial states it will do to benefit American Indians and what it actually does to benefit American Indians. Korczak took the offer from Standing Bear to carve Crazy Horse as an invitation to represent Crazy Horse without any oversight or association with members of Crazy Horse’s family, even though Standing Bear explicitly told him that a family member must be involved in order to honor a great Lakota. Since no relatives of Crazy Horse since Standing Bear have been associated with the memorial, and no American Indians have ever sat on the Board of Directors, it appears that Korczak and the Ziolkowskis have taken exception to, or at least liberty with, the cultural significance of Standing Bear’s claim about the importance of family involvement in Lakota memorialization.

This disregard for honoring the Lakota concept of memorialization is troubling because the memorial claims to represent the Lakota people. Since the Ziolkowskis did not honor Standing Bear's demand that the memorial be run by a family member of Crazy Horse and instead created a privately owned memorial that in sixty years of profitable operation has yet to fulfill any of its proposed humanitarian goals, the rhetorical claims of the memorial film should not be accepted at face value.

If Korczak cannot honor Standing Bear's explicit instructions, instructions that at their core are based in Lakota cultural values, then how can he be trusted to honor Standing Bear's cultural values? The privileged position the Crazy Horse Memorial possesses by being in the sacred Black Hills gives its message a significance that cannot be underestimated. The largest mountain carving in the world sitting just seventeen miles south from Mount Rushmore is not going to go unnoticed. The ability of this memorial to craft an image of the Lakota people worldwide is expressed in the film by Billy Mills who describes how, wherever he goes in the world, when people find out that he is Lakota they inevitably ask about Crazy Horse and the memorial (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). Considering the significance of memorials, and the pervasive association that the Crazy Horse Memorial will forever have with the Lakota and other American Indians, it is important to analyze the message of the memorial presented in the orientation film.

Significance of Memorials

Museums of Western history are among the most important sites in constructing and maintaining national identity, as well as in reminding people what it means to be "American" (Blair & Michel; 2004; Bergman, 2008; Braatz, 2004; Dickinson, et al. 2005). Since museums function ideologically as reminders of the past, the stories told at

these sites are instrumental in forming impressions and opinions of a people or an event. People who visit these sites theoretically have their perception of the subject matter altered in one way or another. Whether they simply inform, reaffirm, modify, or radically alter that perception, the museum plays a role in human understanding of certain events. Rhetorical scholars consistently point to the ways that museums make claims on audiences (Blair, 1999; Blair & Michel, 2004; Braatz, 2004; Hooper-Greenhill, 2000; Luke, 2002; Dickinson, et al., 2005). “Rhetoric’s concern with textual invitations therefore turns our attention to the ways material sites engage audiences in compelling historical narratives” (Dickinson, et al., 2005). The geographical location of a memorial lends that memorial the historical and cultural narratives that are associated with the area. The way in which the memorial relates to these regional narratives invites visitors to create meaning from the representations.

The privileged setting of the Crazy Horse Memorial wields a profound amount of persuasive force precisely because of its material presence in the sacred Black Hills. Any message sent from this contested ground benefits from the authenticity of location. In other words, a memorial located in the Black Hills and dedicated to an American Indian hero can be assumed to have a valid and compelling historical narrative to share. Building from this line of thought, the material location of the Crazy Horse Memorial is a good example of a site that would engage audiences in a compelling historical narrative. This is another reason an analysis of the memorial narrative is needed.

The suasive force of museums and memorials has been examined by many scholars who agree that museums are sites for Americans to engage the past and are perceived by the public to be the most trustworthy source of information about the past

(Blair, 1999; Nichols, 1992; Hyde, 2004; Dickinson, et al., 2005; Hooper-Greenhill, 2000). Analyzing the narrative presented by the Crazy Horse Memorial film is an extension of the rhetorical work that adumbrates the profundity of the complicated existence of a memorial, built by a family which espouses Euro-American thought, in the sacred (and, some argue, illegally occupied) land of the Black Hills.

I analyze how the Crazy Horse Memorial is presenting a characterization of American Indian identity through the lens of a Euro-American world-view. This narrative contradiction is important to note because the representation of the American Indian, especially those of the Dakotas, created with a Euro-American world-view, offers an assimilative message of civic nationalism in a contested area, thus rhetorically antagonizing an oppressed people at one of their sacred sites. The memorial claims to tell a story about American Indian cultural values but instead presents a celebration of Euro-American cultural values. So although attempts to fuse a sense of civic nationalism among a country's populous is not intrinsically bad, cloaking a message of civic nationalism in the guise of honoring American Indian culture extends the material exploitation of the Lakota into the realm of the rhetorical. Considering the location of the Crazy Horse Memorial and its rhetorical claim to represent American Indians, the memorial is not an appropriate venue for the spread of Euro-American nationalism.

Significance of the Crazy Horse Memorial: The Rushmore Effect

The lone Lakota who appears in the memorial film, Billy Mills, explains the significance of the Crazy Horse Memorial.

Wherever I travel today, whether I'm on a college campus back east, or I'm in a foreign country, as we start to talking and as people become aware of me as an Olympic Gold Medalist they become aware of me being a member of the Oglala Lakota tribe, one name comes up and that is Crazy Horse. And in conjunction

with Crazy Horse comes Korczak and the mountain. It's touched lives not just locally anymore, it's touched lives globally. It's changing and educating the future. (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002)

This passage shows how much potential influence the Crazy Horse Memorial has as a tool for teaching people in the United States and around the world about American Indian culture, specifically Crazy Horse and Lakota culture. Mills claims that the Crazy Horse Memorial is educating the world about what it means to be a Lakota, therefore, if the memorial represents Lakota culture in terms of Euro-American culture, then the learning experience offered by the memorial becomes a colonizing experience that naturalizes Euro-American ownership of Lakota land by presenting an authentic Lakota hero as a repository of Euro-American values.

Mills says that the memorial is "changing and educating the future" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). The problem is that the only change promoted by the memorial is a change in perspective about what it means to be a Lakota. The Crazy Horse Memorial teaches that Euro-American and American Indian culture are identical. By conflating American Indian and Euro-American culture, the memorial naturalizes the notion that American Indians are a defeated people without a strong cultural identity. The fact that this rhetorical colonialism is positioned in the contested Black Hills gives its colonialist message a profound rhetorical weight.

My analysis focuses on the narrative of the official Crazy Horse Memorial orientation film, *Crazy Horse: Dynamite and Dreams*, and how it attempts to redefine Lakota identity in a contested area. Although the Crazy Horse Memorial has not received much academic attention, the significance of scrutinizing places of commemoration, such as Mount Rushmore, is well documented (Blair & Michel, 2004; Braatz, 2004; Bergman,

2008; Taliaferro, 2002; Tichi, 2001). The significance of the politics of commemoration lies in the power of memorializations as a realm of meaning making and identity construction (Hyde, 2004; Brown, 1999; Blair, 1999).

The Crazy Horse Memorial functions as a realm of identity construction not unlike Mount Rushmore. In a recent chapter for *The Ethos of Rhetoric* (2004), Carole Blair and Neil Michel discuss the “Rushmore Effect” and its claims to national collective identity. Before they begin their analysis, they ponder the areas of collective identity construction that are less frequently appropriated for political, commercial, or satirical ends (2004, 156). The two they mention are Stone Mountain in Georgia and the Crazy Horse Memorial. To these memorials they pose their “incredulous question” - “How in the world could this have happened...the construction of Rushmore and its use as a shorthand for patriotism” and politics (2004, 156)? My thesis builds on that question and will address the issues that face a less prominent memorial, the Crazy Horse Memorial, with the same attention as any other area of identity contention.

Carol Blair and Neil Michel claim that the Crazy Horse Memorial, along with Stone Mountain in Georgia, are part of the “Rushmore Effect” because they both “repeat Rushmore’s equation of scale and worthy commemoration,” and like Rushmore they invite us to overlook their problematic ideological contents (2004, 175). Blair and Michel conclude that Mount Rushmore offers “an image of imperialist pride, an obsession with outlandish size and an ‘aesthetic sensibility’ that approves of accomplishing national commemoration by dynamiting scenic places” (2004, 183). They claim that the imperialist pride and technological bombast that fostered the creation of Mount Rushmore also led to the creation of the nation’s other colossal mountain carvings, Crazy

Horse and Stone Mountain; hence, the Rushmore Effect (2004, 159, 163, 174, 175, 178, 182).

Of the Crazy Horse Memorial Blair and Michel assert that although it was “intended to right the wrongs of Rushmore, (it) simply repeats them” (2004, 175). They also claim that “Crazy Horse, while honoring a true American martyr, can do so only in the rhetorical terms of the conqueror” (2004, 183). I agree with the assertion that the Crazy Horse Memorial repeats the wrongs of Rushmore by celebrating technical accomplishment and individual achievement as the main focus of the memorial (2004, 175, 183). I agree that Korczak and his family overshadow the memorialized subject, Crazy Horse (2004, 179). But I do not agree that, as Blair and Michel claim, in the shadow of Korczak, “there is little room for representations of the commemorated subjects to assume any rhetorical force” (2004, 179).

At the Crazy Horse Memorial the commemorated subject does assume rhetorical force. Although the stated intent of Standing Bear was for the memorial to be built so that “the White Man (would) know the Red Man had great heroes, too,” the Crazy Horse Memorial film does not claim to honor Crazy Horse as a hero necessarily (1984, 8). The first claim of the film is that the Crazy Horse Memorial “honors the North American Indian: all tribes” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). Then the only Lakota speaker to appear in the film, Billy Mills, further explains the rhetorical intent of the memorial by saying “our elders made a commitment. They wanted Korczak to build a monument honoring our people, our way, our culture, our values” (2002). Mills further makes the point that the memorial is a synecdoche for American Indian culture and values by saying, “what I see in the mountain is the spirituality of indigenous people – the

spirituality of the Lakota people. One person is never greater than the sum. And Crazy Horse represents the sum of the Lakota people, I think, of indigenous people” (2002). Since the film claims that the Crazy Horse Memorial does not represent Crazy Horse specifically but rather American Indian culture and values generally, the commemorated subject becomes an open vessel that assumes rhetorical force by virtue of the values that are presented in the memorial film.

Blair and Michel conclude that “the mountain sculptures become visually prominent but virtually empty commemorative signifiers” (2004, 179). I argue that, at the Crazy Horse Memorial, the empty commemorative signifier that is the mountain carving is filled with rhetorical connections to Korczak in such a way that the effect is a promotion of Euro-American values in the guise of presenting American Indian values. The conflation of value systems challenges American Indian identity construction by assuming control of Lakota representation on culturally meaningful rhetorical ground. My analysis is positioned as an addendum to the work of Blair and Michel. I explore the ideological underpinnings of the rhetorical message in the memorial film so as to better understand the rhetorical force that is assumed by the image of Crazy Horse when it is used as a synecdoche for Lakota culture and values.

The Politics of Public Commemoration: Crispus Attucks and Crazy Horse

The politics of public commemoration work in powerful ways to fix an identity of a nation, entity or event. Stephen H. Browne explains the importance of the politics of commemoration: “Because this space of the political is a space of power, citizens have always appreciated the stakes involved in tactical representations of the past. When remembrance is organized into acts of ritual commemoration, it becomes identifiably

rhetorical” (Browne, 1999, 169). In other words, control of past representations attempt to structure the present rhetorical usage of it. The struggle over control of these representations is the struggle to preserve the fidelity of their present and future rhetorical usage. Any misrepresentation of the commemorated subject holds the power to alter a viewer’s understanding of the subject.

From its privileged position of public commemoration the Crazy Horse Memorial has the power to re-define the Lakota culture for all who witness it. This Euro-American re-definition of Lakota culture is a rhetorical challenge to the many Lakota and American Indians around the country who are perfectly capable of representing their own culture. By presenting the legacy of Crazy Horse as one that supports Euro-American values the memorial attempts to neuter the rhetorical effect of using Crazy Horse and the Lakota’s military and cultural resistance to the theft of their land as a way of ever again building a sense of pan-Indian unity that was best exemplified by the AIM movement of the 1970s (Banks, 2005; Braatz, 2004; Deloria, 2000; Lake, 1983; Lake, 1991; Lindsley et al., 2002; Matthiessen, 1992; Morris & Wander, 1990; Sanchez & Stuckey, 2000). This attempt to redefine a historical figure with a radical legacy into an expression of official culture has been accomplished before. A good example of this redefinition of historical events and figures is the story of Crispus Attucks.

In his article, “Remembrance of Crispus Attucks,” Stephen Browne presents a good example of how commemorative practice can transform traditions of resistance into an expression of official culture (1999). He explores the deliberate rhetorical transformations of the Crispus Attucks story by rhetors to serve their contemporary political purposes. He reveals that in the official commemorating of Attucks as symbolic

of all Americans, then and now, present rhetors destroy the radical rhetorical power of the Attucks story (1999). By “rewriting him into more universalized narratives of American origins, growth, and prosperity,” the ultimate effect was to diffuse the radical use of his legacy (1999, 179). Much in the same way that rhetors redefined Attucks, thus complicating the ability for present rhetors to use his authentic legacy rooted in African American resistance with any effect, the redefinition of Crazy Horse’s legacy threatens to do the same thing to the authentic legacy of Crazy Horse as a resistance leader for his people. The transformation of Crazy Horse’s legacy into an expression and celebration of Euro-American culture threatens to weaken the radical rhetorical power of that legacy much in the same way that rhetors took possession of the Attucks story and turned it into an American myth that diffused its radical rhetorical value to future rhetors of African American resistance.

The rhetorical battle for control over the legacy of Crazy Horse is an example of the complexities of the politics of remembrance. The illogical narrative and the ambiguity of the official memorial film is a good text to explore in order to expose the implications of museum narrative structure and its role in transforming Crazy Horse’s legacy into a more acceptable expression of official culture. This transformation threatens to neutralize Crazy Horse’s legacy as a revolutionary, creates an image of Crazy Horse as another example of Euro-Americans power, and exemplifies the ability to appropriate Lakota culture and define it in terms of Euro-American values. An analysis of the memorial film narrative reveals the specific Euro-American values that are being used to subsume Lakota culture and thus redefine Crazy Horse’s legacy. By applying narrative theory to the textual analysis of the story being told by the memorial film, the Euro-American

cultural values that underwrite the memorial narrative and threaten to garner a privileged position as an authentic interpretation of Crazy Horse's legacy and Lakota values can be brought to light and assessed for whether they are the best basis for behavior by a self-proclaimed representative of American Indians.

Theory: Narrative Rationality

I use Walter Fisher's narrative rationality as a critical tool to analyze how cultural value systems are represented in the narrative of the Crazy Horse Memorial film.

Narrative rationality proposes a conception of rationality based on the informal logic of story. It is not the fictive narration of literature but, as Fisher writes, the "symbolic actions – words and/or deeds – that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create or interpret them" (1987, 58). The physical and symbolic destruction of Lakota land and spirituality that is accompanied by a resurrection of the Lakota leader Crazy Horse in the form of a Euro-American restatement of colonial domination is an example of the type of narration to which Fisher refers.

Narrative rationality treats the sequence and meaning of words and deeds as a logical argument. This narrative paradigm combines the rhetorical traditions of the argumentative persuasive theme and the literary aesthetic theme to show that rhetorical claims are posited in forms other than formal argumentation. It "implies that human communication should be viewed as historical as well as situational, as stories or accounts competing with other stories or accounts purportedly constituted by good reasons" (1987, 58). A theory based on a narrative paradigm allows for proper weight to be given to competing stories when analyzing a message. Fisher's theory for analyzing informal argument is well suited for use in exploring the historical and cultural

inconsistencies that are hewn into a plausible historical narrative by the memorial film. Since the memorial narrative claims to represent American Indian cultural values but instead celebrates Euro-American values, the competing stories of human communication simultaneously entertain and persuade the audience, inviting the viewer to commit to the value system of the coherent narrative.

If the more coherent narrative that is presented by the memorial film is the story of Euro-American values instead of the competing story about American Indian values, then, according to Fisher's theory, the audience will commit to the belief that Euro-American values are indeed a proper portrayal of American Indian values. Since the Crazy Horse Memorial narrative contains competing stories, the narrative paradigm is a useful critical lens through which to view the cultural values represented in the memorial film.

Narrative Probability & Narrative Fidelity

A narrative is considered a rational argument when a story satisfies the demands of narrative probability (coherence) and narrative fidelity. "Narrative *coherence* refers to formal features of a story conceived as a discrete sequence of thought and/or action in life or literature (any recorded or written form of discourse); that is, it concerns whether the story coheres of "hangs together," whether or not a story is free of contradictions" (Fisher, 1987, 88). Narrative probability does not measure the truth claims of a narrative but rather it simply acknowledges the narrative's coherence or lack thereof as a story. Narrative fidelity, on the other hand, "concerns the "truth qualities" of a story, the degree to which it accords with the logic of good reasons: the soundness of its reasoning and the value of its values" (1987, 88). The fidelity of a narrative is judged by an audience

member's conception of what is true about the world. If a story reinforces the audience member's conception of reality then the story has achieved narrative fidelity.

The concept of narrative fidelity concerns the truth statements in a story and how they stand up to the critical questions in Walter Fisher's logic of good reasons. Fisher believes that stories or accounts that are considered rational are constituted by "good reasons." Good reasons are "elements that provide warrants for accepting or adhering to the advice fostered by any form of communication that can be considered rhetorical" (Fisher, 1987, 48). Good reasons are the stuff of stories, the means by which humans realize their nature as reasoning and valuing animals. If claims in a narrative are not based on "good reasons," the narrative fails to reflect reality appropriately and therefore lacks narrative fidelity. So although a narrative can be coherent and thus achieve narrative probability, the same narrative can lack narrative fidelity because it fails to underwrite its truth statements with good reasons.

In the case of the Crazy Horse Memorial narrative rationality is invaluable in helping to expose the truth qualities of the narrative in order to understand how it retains narrative probability (coherence) while failing to achieve narrative fidelity. Fisher's narrative rationality helps analyze arguments that exist in human communication that do not follow a traditional argumentative structure. To codify the validity of my claims about the narrative probability and fidelity of the memorial narrative I address the key questions in Fisher's logic of good reasons and discuss how the answers to these questions reveal the accuracy or inaccuracy of narrative probability and narrative fidelity of the memorial film.

The Logic of Good Reasons

The logic of good reasons asks five critical questions that can locate and weigh cultural values in a rhetorical text (Fisher, 1987, 48). The first question in the logic of good reasons is the question of *fact*: are the purported facts indeed facts, and “what are the implicit and explicit values embedded in a message” (Fisher, 1987, 109)? What is the narrative openly claiming and what is being suggested by the context? Are the explicit claims made in the narrative indeed factual? Factual claims and the play between implicit and explicit values representations in the narrative are a major focus in my analysis of the film. Some claims appear factually unfounded and many values are presented with contradictory explicit and implicit representations.

Fisher’s second question concerns *relevance*: “Are the values appropriate to the nature of the decision that the message bears upon” (1987, 109)? In the case of this analysis the question is whether or not the values that are represented in the memorial film are appropriate in terms of the rhetorical claims it makes. Since the film claims to represent Lakota cultural values, the values that it presents must be appropriately represented as such. By understanding the stated intent of the narrative presentation and then analyzing the rhetorical text of the introductory film, I assess the relevance of the values represented. Therefore, if the values presented in the narrative are irrelevant to the rhetorical claim of the film then an assessment of the appropriateness of the narrative is possible.

The third question is that of *consequence*: “What would be the effects of adhering to the values for one’s concept of oneself, for one’s behavior, for one’s relationships with others and society, and the process of rhetorical transaction” (1987, 109)? In terms of this

study, the question of consequence deals with the impact the memorial film narrative has on the contested rhetorical terrain of the Black Hills. The story that the memorial film tells will constitute what many viewers believe to be true or untrue about Lakota cultural values. Since there are distinct cultural and legal differences concerning the land on which the memorial sits, the consequences of an illogical narrative could lead to a naturalization of misinformation about traditional Lakota culture.

The fourth question relates to *consistency*: “Are the values confirmed or validated in one’s personal experience” (1987, 109)? The question of consistency will be answered with research about traditional Lakota values and traditional Euro-American values rather than with my personal experience. My personal experience is not enough to judge the truth of a claim. Barbara Warnick pointed out this flaw in Fisher’s theory, which will be further discussed momentarily. If the values represented in the narrative are not consistent with the values cherished by the culture being represented, then the lack of consistency will present more challenges to the appropriateness of the memorial film.

The fifth and final question in the logic of good reasons is *transcendent issue*: “Even if a prima-facie case exists or a burden of proof has been established, are the values the message offers those that, in the estimation of the critic, constitute the ideal basis for human conduct” (1987, 109)? The question of transcendent issue cannot be judged solely by the critic and will be informed by my research on the opposing value systems. Once a proper perspective is given to the cultural values in play, then an assessment can be made about the values presented in the memorial rhetoric. Since transcendent issues “concern ultimate values and are generally taken for granted by the arguer, but when brought to the surface, they reveal one’s most fundamental

commitments” (1987, 108-109), the exposure of the Crazy Horse Memorial’s fundamental commitments will shed light on their ideological agenda. This revelation of the fundamental commitments of the narrative exposes the value system that shaped the content of the Crazy Horse Memorial film.

A Minor Adjustment: Barbara Warnick and Narrative Rationality

The main problem with the “logic of good reasons” is that Fisher uses no source beyond the critic’s judgment to assess values embedded in narratives. Barbara Warnick correctly points out that his “studies of narratives used rhetorically do not reveal value criteria external to the critic’s own value system” (Warnick, 1987, 180). She argues that “Fisher has made explicit the values embedded in respective narratives and then employed his own value system to assess the worth and merit of those values” (1987, 180). I agree with Warnick on this point. I cannot place my value system as the arbiter of fact and fiction when assessing any culture, even it is my own.

Writing about the logic of good reasons, Warnick states, “in order to apply such a system, however, we would need to know the status of rationality within it, the external sources for value legitimation, the status of public judgment sans rationality, and how a critic’s claims are to be warranted” (1987, 181-2). Warnick’s concern is that a critic using Fisher’s theory without adjusting it assumes that the scholar is somehow the objective arbiter of what is valid for a culture by virtue of their position as a critic. I cannot sit in judgment of the “truth” about a culture because my particular view cannot claim precedence over the consensus viewpoint that can be articulated through research on predominate cultural values within a society.

I attend to Warnick's concerns by using external sources to inform my understanding and analysis of cultural values. Since "the absence of rational analysis and of data about the values and reactions of the narrative's audience leave us without criteria to judge the quality of the critic's judgment" (1987, 180), I present data about Lakota and Euro-American values instead of relying on my own judgment as to what is or is not culturally accurate. I will rely on cultural values representations culled from researching traditional Lakota and traditional Euro-American value systems. By comparing the different emphases placed on cultural values between these societies, I will explore the possibility that the Crazy Horse Memorial film narrative naturalizes the appropriation of Lakota culture and land.

Method – Textual Analysis

My textual analysis of the Crazy Horse Memorial film narrative will be guided by Walter Fisher's theory of narrative rationality. First I watched the Crazy Horse Memorial introductory film, *Crazy Horse: Dynamite & Dreams*. Then I transcribed the text to be used as a reference tool in analyzing the film's narrative. Next I noted the cultural value representations evident in the narrative of the memorial film. Then I analyzed the values I inventoried by answering the critical questions in Fisher's logic of good reasons. Finally I drew some conclusions about the truth qualities of the narrative based on my analysis.

The logic of good reasons provides measures for assessing elements in reasoning. Here is how Fisher describes the purpose of the logic of good reasons:

The purpose of a logic of good reasons is to offer a scheme that can generate a sense of what is good as well as what is reasonable, to ensure that people are conscious of the values they adhere to and would promote in rhetorical transactions, and to inform their consciousness without dictating what they should believe. (1987, 113)

Therefore my goal is not to resolve a dispute over the representation of values in the memorial film but rather to define these representations, assess them, and then to compare the rhetorical claims the memorial film makes with the rhetorical actions that the memorial narrative takes.

The values discussed are dictated by the content of the memorial film narrative. Since the film centers on the pioneer story of Korczak, the values found in the pioneer narrative are the values presented to the viewer. The film celebrates Korczak's lone expedition to the Black Hills, his subsequent conquest of the raw nature that surrounded him, and his technical prowess in creating a mountain carving. After doing some research about Lakota values, the values pairings became clear. The biggest cultural differences presented by the film deal with the idea of the individual, humankind's relationship with nature, and the concept of land as being sacred or as being a material possession. The film is about an individual who conquers nature in order to create a privately owned memorial in the Black Hills, which the Lakota believe to be contested and sacred land. Therefore the values pairing I analyze are harmony with nature versus conquest over nature, individualism versus collectivism, and material versus sacred.

I proceed by presenting chapters dedicated to explicating the cultural values discussed in the film. I devote a chapter to each values pairing in which I discuss the values and how they function in the memorial narrative. Next I answer the critical questions in the logic of good reasons to assess the truth qualities of the representations. After presenting the chapters devoted to values pairings I end the thesis with a recap of my findings and a discussion about how the play between narrative probability and narrative fidelity in the memorial rhetoric could confound a viewer's understanding of

Lakota culture and lead to a naturalization of the Euro-American conquest of the Black Hills.

Chapter 2: Harmony with Nature versus Conquest over Nature

In this chapter I discuss the Lakota value of living in harmony with nature as a way of preserving the sacredness of the land versus the Euro-American value of conquering nature in order to acquire its natural resources. A short discussion of the different weight these values possess within Euro-American and Lakota societies will be followed by a discussion of how the values are represented in the film narrative. I focus on the pioneering narrative of Korczak's early years on the mountain as well as the narrative fixation on Korczak's colossus and the technology used to help bring it to fruition. Using the logic of good reasons I answer questions about the value representations and then reflect on whether or not they stand the test of narrative logic. Since many inconsistencies, misrepresentations and conflation of Lakota values are found in the narrative, I will draw some conclusions about the effects such an illogical narrative can have on the contested rhetorical ground of the Black Hills.

The impulse to conquer nature not only helped drive Euro-American expansion from the east to the west coast of North America but it helped define the character of a new nation. In his book *The Frontier in American History*, Fredrick Jackson Turner argues that America's frontier history defines the ideals and values of Euro-Americans (1921). Turner claims that the social and economic tendencies of the state are the vital forces that work beneath the surface and dominate the external form of a society (Turner, 1921, IX, 1). Whether it is called a democracy, an aristocracy, or a monarchy, it is actually the changes in economic and social life of the people that define the character of

a nation (1921, IX, 1). Therefore, if a people were to conquer nature through technological means as a way of expanding a new nation, then that fact of existence would be the main defining value of that society, no matter what label it is given.

Considering the character of the people of the United States Turner observes that, “for nearly three centuries the dominant fact in American life has been expansion” (1921, VII, 6). He sees the conquest over the vast spaces of the New West as one of the actions that have forged the national character of Euro-Americans (1921, IX, 6). “Up to our own day American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the Great West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development” (1921, I, 1). Turner describes the constant push to fill up and utilize for personal benefit the open areas of the west as defining aspects of Euro-American cultural values.

In the decades after Turner presented his frontier thesis, projects from the Panama Canal to Boulder Dam, to Mount Rushmore and the Apollo missions to the moon, all stand as a testament to the premium Euro-American society places on the conquest of nature as well as to the validity of Jackson’s observation about the Euro-American impulse to conquer nature. For instance, the Panama Canal is a good example of how Turner’s thesis correctly foretold America’s need to expand territory as well as to conquer nature. When presented with the need to increase the efficiency of shipping lanes America completed a project that split a continent in half in order to let the ships through.

Turner’s characterization of Euro-Americans as individuals who view all natural resources as open to claim and exploitation by the “shrewdest and the boldest” (Turner, 1921, VII, 3) is echoed by American Indian Movement (AIM) activist Russell Means.

Means claims that Euro-Americans are united by their faith in science and technology, and in their willingness to exploit the natural resources of the earth (Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999, 109). He sees the Euro-American celebration of the conquering of the west as displaying a profound lack of respect for the earth. In Euro-American society, “it becomes virtuous to destroy the planet. Terms like progress and development are used as cover words here, the way victory and freedom are to justify butchery in the dehumanization process” (quoted in Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999, 109). In this passage Means compares the rhetorical power that nationalist ideographs like victory and freedom possess to dehumanize an enemy so that the extermination of that enemy is justified to the rhetorical power that industrialist ideographs like progress and development have in justifying the destruction of the earth for material gain.

Means’ observations of Euro-American values are not unlike those of “an Indian boy” from the turn of the 20th century:

Centuries ago we undoubtedly had full control over this fair land- this vast domain from east to west... What did the fertile valleys, the rich plains, the mineral treasures concealed in the hillsides mean to us? They simply told us that there was a good hunting ground, and there a good site for temporary habitation. But when the white man came he put everything into a new light. He saw how everything in nature could render him a service. ‘Twas not long before we saw his engines making their way across our domains westward. Mountains were in his way but he climbed them. Rivers were there, but he crossed them. (anonymous in Morris & Stuckey, 1997, 159)

The anonymous Indian boy, like Means and Turner, understands that the value Euro-Americans put on nature is based predominantly on their ability to conquer it and use it for materials gain. This quotation exemplifies the schism between Euro-American and American Indian concepts of nature. For the anonymous Indian boy the fertile valleys, rich plains and hillsides represent a place for good hunting and temporary habitation.

Using the land in this way the boy's people could forever benefit from the relationship to the land because the land remains unchanged and therefore resources that are utilized can be renewed and replenished.

This same quotation displays the Euro-American reaction to nature as a renderer of service. Mountains were not valuable for their streams, wildlife, beauty or sacredness; instead, mountains are vessels that hide mineral treasures and streams are sources of power for industry. If the narrative of the Crazy Horse Memorial film discusses nature in the same terms that Turner uses in his frontier thesis, veiling the virtue of conquering nature with discussions of technology and progress, then the memorial's claim to represent American Indian values authentically is a dubious one.

The Lakota and many other American Indian nations have a cultural relationship with the land that fosters a long-standing responsibility for maintaining the sanctity of the earth (Deloria, 1973, 2003; Deloria & Lytle, 1998; Cook-Lynn, 1996; Banks, 2005; Fixico, 2003; Kidwell, 2003; Mann, 2003). Cheyenne scholar Henrietta Mann claims that it is horrifying for indigenous people to see excessive pollution of the air and water and to see the desecration of places that are sacred (Mann, 2003, 197). She states, "sacred site development is antithetical to the indigenous interdependent view of life, which requires one to live in a balanced, prayerful way and to protect and renew all earth through ceremonies" (Mann, 2003, 197). To Mann, developing a sacred site like the Crazy Horse Memorial severs this interdependent view of life and threatens to destroy earth-based ceremonies rather than protecting and renewing them.

Noted Lakota scholar Vine Deloria Jr. claims that for most American Indian people, their collective sense of self depends upon identification with a specific place

(Deloria, 1994). Deloria sees the difference between Euro-American and Lakota views of nature as being based in each culture's understanding of creation. To the Euro-American, the fall of Adam signifies the fall of man from God's grace. Deloria claims, "with the fall of Adam the rest of nature also falls out of grace with God. Adam being a surrogate for the whole of creation" (Deloria, 1973, 2003, 79). The belief that the natural world has been corrupted by the fall of man makes it theoretically beyond redemption. In contrast to the Euro-American view of a corrupted and doomed planet, Deloria claims that

The Indian is confronted with a bountiful earth in which all things and experiences have a role to play. The task of the tribal religion, if such a religion can be said to have a task, is to determine the proper relationship that the people of the tribe must have with other living things and to develop the self-discipline within the tribal community so that man acts harmoniously with other creatures. (Deloria, 1973, 2003, 87)

Like Mann, Deloria suggests that the Lakota view of nature is not one that gives humans dominion over the earth and all living creatures as the Judeo-Christian God promises; instead, the Lakota see themselves as a vital part of the balance in nature.

As N. Scott Momaday said, "From the time the Indian first set foot upon this continent, he centered his life in the natural world. He is deeply invested in the earth, committed to it both in his consciousness and in his instinct. To him the sense of place is paramount. Only in reference to the earth can he persist in his true identity" (quoted in Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999, 109). Mann, Deloria, Means and Momaday suggest that for humans to conquer the landscape and dominate its resources strips the land of its relationship to the ecosystem as a whole and absolves humanity's responsibility to act harmoniously with the natural world and its creatures.

To the Lakota and many American Indians, this responsibility to sacred land is paramount to their conception of self and to the practice of religion. A sense of place is

paramount to the cultural identity of the Lakota people. Blasting away the natural landscape in order to serve a technical purpose strips away the Lakota's relationship to the land while complicating religious life and challenging identity.

In the sections that follow I discuss how the memorial film presents nature in terms of man's conquest of it through Korczak's technical prowess. I explore colossal art and its ideological underpinnings. I then assess what effect these presentations have on the narrative claim to represent American Indian culture and values.

Korczak's Conquest of the Crazy Horse Memorial

The Crazy Horse Memorial film begins with a powerful display of humanity's conquest over nature. The film opens with a shot of the memorial bathed in moonlight. A quotation attributed to Crazy Horse comes on the screen: "My lands are where my dead lie buried." Then a voice repeats "fire in the hole, fire in the hole, fire in the hole" just before a spectacular series of blasts travel from one end of the memorial to the other, outlining the image of Crazy Horse in a blaze of fiery explosions. The viewer is left with a vision of a mountain ablaze with the image of the Lakota leader on horseback, pointing to the hills as they hear the sounds of a crowd cheering enthusiastically. Moments later, as the explosions burn off and the applause fades, the voice over narrator says, "Welcome to the Crazy Horse Memorial, which honors the North American Indian: all tribes" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002).

This opening celebration of technological prowess in conquering a mountain for the purposes of creating a colossus is representative of the rhetorical problem with the Crazy Horse Memorial film narrative. The contradictions between the narrative claim and the film's presentation begin in the first scene and continue throughout the twenty-minute

feature. Thus, while watching a sacred mountain being blasted away, the narrative voice of authority claims that what the audience just witnessed honors the very people that it most offends.

Of the twenty-minute introductory film, fifteen and a half minutes of it are devoted to either a telling of Korczak's early pioneering days at the memorial site, a description of the physical conquest of the mountain, a discussion of its scale, a detailed account of the technical problems that were overcome, or testimonials from the Ziolkowskis about their personal history and memorial philosophy. At a memorial dedicated to the representation of the Lakota it is surprising to see more than three-quarters of the film is devoted to the various ways the Ziolkowskis conquered the. The following question then arises: why would a film that claims the Crazy Horse Memorial represents Lakota values spend so much time explaining the technical and physical aspects of the memorial instead?

Russell Means, an Oglala Lakota, offers insight into that question. In a speech titled "For America to Live, Europe Must Die!" Means indicted European-derived politics for relying on technological abstractions to distance actions from their consequences, for removing the spiritual component of communal life, and for displaying a fundamental disrespect for the environment (Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999, 107-108). By focusing on the abstraction of technical accomplishment Euro-Americans separate themselves from the consequences of their environmentally or culturally destructive decisions. Instead of coming to terms with the natural world that has been spoiled by their endeavor, Euro-American society celebrates the advancement in technical achievement that created the destruction. Means points out that what he and many Lakota consider

environmental degradation Euro-American society describes as progress or development-words Means claims are used as cover words for a world-view that considers it virtuous to destroy the planet as long as a valuable natural resource has been extracted from the earth (Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999, 109). Therefore, if the memorial film digresses into a celebration of the technological mastery of the mountain, then it is representing Euro-American values instead of Lakota values.

The Crazy Horse Memorial film relies heavily on what Means would call technological abstractions. By relying on the narrative of technological abstractions the memorial film neither grapples with the competing stories about the appropriateness of the memorial nor does it concentrate on presenting a truly representative view of Lakota or other American Indian cultures and values. Instead the film offers a plethora of technical explanations about the destruction of the mountain, destruction that is portrayed as progress.

After Korczak gives his firsthand account of his early days as a pioneer conquering the mountain site, the voice over continues the story of technological conquest.

That first blast took off only ten tons. It was at the June, 3rd 1948 dedication attended by five survivors of the Battle of Little Bighorn. Comparing then and now shows a dramatic change. With over eight million tons of granite blasted off so far, the progress is measured in tons and in decades. The first rock removed was from the area in red in front of Crazy Horse's face. It took Korczak years, working alone. Next he leveled this area in red above the arm which will be more than 200 feet long. Cutting the tunnel under the arm was the hardest part. When finished that huge opening could hold a ten-story building. It took more than a decade to remove this area. It's in front of the horse's head. It will be 219 feet high. Korczak had blocked out most of the sculpture before he died. Since then his family and others have removed more than 1 million more tons. For size perspective, picture Mount Rushmore where these marvelous heads are over 60 feet high. All 4 heads on Rushmore combined would fit in Crazy Horse's head which is almost 9-stories tall. This huge bulldozer gives another size perspective.

On the other side, one bulldozer did fall off the edge but the lucky driver leaped to safety just in the nick of time. Crazy Horse is the largest sculpture in the world, on a scale higher than the Washington Monument and the Great Pyramids of Egypt. Over all the Crazy Horse colossus will be 563 feet wide and 641 feet long. And the entire mountain is being carved 3-dimensionally, in the round. The work on the mountain is done by one of the top explosives and engineering teams in the country. They use small jackhammers and big hydraulic drills and a variety of high explosives. One of the finishing tools is a dangerous, super-sonic torch. Following the completion of Crazy Horse's face, work began on the massive horse's head. It will be 22-stories high. The ears will be 42 feet long. The nostrils more than 30 feet in diameter. All of the progress is guided by Korczak's scale models and books of measurement that he prepared for that purpose. (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002)

This section of narrative begins with one of many subtle attempts to legitimize what Korczak is doing on the mountain and then immediately digresses into the narrative of technological abstraction.

As the "voice of God" narrator speaks a series of images are presented. "That first blast took off only 10 tons. It was at the June, 3rd 1948 dedication attended by five survivors of the Battle of Little Bighorn. Comparing then and now shows a dramatic change. The first image is a still frame photo of the first blast on the mountain, and then two pictures of Korczak sitting with the "five survivors of the Battle of the Little Bighorn" are displayed. The next image is a before and after of the mountain. First there is a mountain, then there is "Crazy Horse." This imagery is important because the effect suggests viewers believe that, since five survivors of the Battle of Little Bighorn were at the opening ceremony, for whatever reasons of their own, Korczak has the authority to destroy the mountain and create various private enterprises at the mountain site. The visual sequence supports this suggestion by showing first the mountain, then Korczak with the American Indians, then showing the mountain as it quickly morphs into "Crazy Horse." In other words, here is the subject at hand, the mountain, here are the people who

gave the permission to blow up the subject at hand, the Indians, and now here is the product of this arrangement between Korczak and the American Indians, the Crazy Horse Memorial. The logical progression is clear: these Indian men wanted this white man to blow up that mountain.

After making this quick claim the narrative turns to explanations of the technological conquest of the mountain. Although survivors of the Battle of the Little Bighorn were mentioned, there is no explanation of what happened at the Battle of the Little Bighorn, no discussion of why Crazy Horse and his people fought there, or what the consequences of the battle ultimately were for the Lakota people. The memorial narrative indulges in technological abstractions to distance Korczak from the fact that his memorial continues the Euro-American legacy of stealing Lakota land for personal profit.

The narrator fixates on the size of the structure, the danger for the bulldozer operators, the type of super-sonic drills used, as well as the state-of-the-art explosives team that they now have blasting at the memorial. The code word “progress”, that Means refers to as a cover word, making it virtuous to destroy the planet, is used in this section as a way to describe the amount of rock that has been blown off of the mountain. The voice over says, “with over eight million tons of granite blasted off so far, the progress is measured in tons and in decades.” Considering that the Lakota people do not celebrate destruction of sacred lands as progress, this area of the narrative is not honoring American Indian culture and values. This passage shows how the story of technological conquest is used to substitute for a substantive presentation about Crazy Horse or Lakota culture and values to distract from what these topics would inevitably lead to: a need to

explain the issues that complicate the Ziolkowski's Euro-American ownership and authorship of a purported symbol of Lakota identity.

The function of this section of narrative is clear. It begins with an effort to justify Korczak's Euro-American ownership/authorship of the memorial by presenting survivors of the Battle of the Little Bighorn as honored guests at the memorial opening. But from that moment on, no other mention of these men or the battle is made, and a sharp rhetorical turn toward technological abstractions begins and continues for many minutes. Since the narrative fascination with the technological aspects of the mountain carving and its relation to other colossal structures like Mount Rushmore and the Great Pyramids of Egypt figures so prominently in the Crazy Horse Memorial rhetoric, I will proceed with a discussion of the meaning of colossal art in Euro-American culture.

Korczak's Colossus: Crazy Horse's Contribution to a Uniquely American Art

Mount Rushmore and the Crazy Horse Memorial both represent a new form of commemorative art that fuses the language of colossal technical accomplishment with comparisons to ancient colossal art as a way of legitimizing and naturalizing their existence (Blair & Michel, 2004). Blair and Michel claim that Gutzom Borglum, the sculptor responsible for Mount Rushmore, shifted the discourse of American commemoration away from the Greek columns, roman arches, and European allegorical images with classical and Beaux-Arts tendencies, to a "discourse of enormity" that found its source in the culture of corporate and public works projects (2004, 163-167). Jim Pomeroy makes a similar claim in "Selections: Rushmore-Another Look." He writes, "Rushmore was associated with other big projects of the '30s-Boulder Dam, TVA, and the Golden Gate Bridge-reinforcing ideas like Yankee ingenuity, impossible

accomplishment, precision engineering, utilization of great power on a huge scale, new technology, man taming nature, and better living through science and industry” (Pomeroy, 1992, 52). The discourse about public works projects and Mount Rushmore alike used references to colossal size and technical achievement to justify the importance of their accomplishment. Rushmore was also associated with the great colossal construction of the past. Newspapers and magazines at the time of its construction compared Rushmore to the Colossus of Rhodes, the Sphinx, and the pyramids of Egypt (Blair & Michel, 2004, 166).

By joining the movement toward colossal construction, like the skyscraper, with that of ancient colossal art, like the Sphinx, Borglum, “changed the discourse of commemorative sculpture to resemble that of corporate and public engineering projects” (2004, 167). This change in discourse placed Mount Rushmore into the same rhetorical category as the other, non-commemorative, colossal structures of the time, thus allowing Rushmore, like Boulder Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge, to claim the unique American trait of impossible accomplishment through technical expertise. By joining this tradition Borglum’s new colossal commemorative art form gained the validation of Euro-American history as well; an American history that is, as Louis Lozowick observed, “a history of gigantic engineering feats and colossal mechanical constructions” (Lozowick in Blair & Michel, 2004, 167). Having fused the importance of Mount Rushmore not only with the Euro-American value of impossible achievement and Yankee ingenuity, but also with a reminder that Rushmore’s completion would finally allow America to match and surpass the ancient colossal structures of the old world, naturalized the legitimacy of Borglum’s new art form. This new, uniquely American, art form, known as a “mountain

carving,” thus becomes the embodiment of the Euro-American need to conquer nature in order to benefit materially and prove the value of American technical prowess to the world. What follows is an analysis of how the Crazy Horse Memorial film justifies and classifies the memorial in the same terms that Borglum did with Mount Rushmore, while assessing the impact that this rhetorical framing has on the narrative claim to represent Lakota culture and values.

When the Crazy Horse Memorial film discusses the mountain carving it usually focuses on the conquest of the mountain or on the scale of the mountain carving. The film presents both detailed descriptions of the technical process that created the memorial, as well as numerous comparisons in scale with well-known landmarks. In almost every description that the film offers the memorial is couched in the same terms that Borglum used to characterize Mount Rushmore. In the ninth minute of the memorial film, for instance, the voice over narrator explains that,

Crazy Horse is the largest sculpture in the world, on a scale higher than the Washington Monument and the Great Pyramids of Egypt. Over all the Crazy Horse colossus will be 563 feet wide and 641 feet long. And the entire mountain is being carved 3-dimensionally, in the round. The work on the mountain is done by one of the top explosives and engineering teams in the country. They use small jackhammers and big hydraulic drills and a variety of high explosives. One of the finishing tools is a dangerous, super-sonic torch. (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002)

This passage positions the Crazy Horse colossus in the same rhetorical space as Mount Rushmore by using the same terms to describe it. The Crazy Horse Memorial film, like Borglum, stresses its size comparison with great works of ancient colossal art. In a pamphlet produced for Mount Rushmore Borglum wrote that the great ancient civilizations of Greece, Rome, China, and Egypt, along with ancient figures like Pericles and Plutarch, were the context for his work (Blair & Michel, 2004, 165). Borglum

compared Rushmore to the Colossus at Rhodes, which, he points out, would be, “very little taller than the length of the face of Washington” (Borglum in Blair & Michel, 2004).

Interestingly enough, the Crazy Horse Memorial narrative describes the mountain carving as an extension of Rushmore’s achievement in colossalism by saying, “for size perspective, picture Mount Rushmore, where these marvelous heads are over 60 ft. high. All four heads on Rushmore combined would fit in Crazy Horse’s head which is almost nine-stories tall” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). By playing a game of one-upsmanship with Borglum’s claim to size superiority, the memorial narrative not only proclaims its proper spot alongside Rushmore but it aligns the memorial with the values Rushmore represents. Values that offer, as Blair & Michel describe, “an image of imperialist pride, an obsession with outlandish size and an ‘aesthetic sensibility’ that approves of accomplishing national commemoration by dynamiting scenic places. It implores us to be enthusiastic or at least acquiescent about any representation—even of an odious part of our national past—as long as it is immense” (2004, 183). Justification through jaw-dropping immensity is the main motivation behind using scale as a focus of commemorative rhetoric. In this way both sculptors, Borglum and Korczak, can justify the existence of their controversial mountain carvings by claiming colossal size and technical accomplishment as reasons unto themselves.

In the pamphlet published in 1932 Borglum elaborates on the meaning of his unique American art. He writes, “colossal art has another value - human and soul stirring - that should be incorporated permanently in all National expression—consciously and deliberately in scale with its importance in scale with the people whose life it expresses”

(Borglum in Blair & Michel, 2004, 165). This view of colossal art suggests that the size of the structure is directly proportional to the importance of the subject. Therefore, the Crazy Horse Memorial by nature of being far larger than Mount Rushmore suggests that Crazy Horse himself, and by extension all American Indians, are more important than the men on Rushmore. At first glance this would seem to fulfill what the memorial narrative claims Standing Bear requested of Korczak: to build a monument so that white people would know that the American Indians had great heroes too (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). But in joining the same tradition as Mount Rushmore, the Crazy Horse Memorial is less of a defiant response to Rushmore and more of a friendly echo; an echo in the familiar voice and terms of the Euro-American conqueror. By joining in on this "discourse of enormity," the narrative of the Crazy Horse Memorial film aligns itself with the imperialist themes of Rushmore. In this sense the Crazy Horse Memorial "joins in" on Rushmore's celebration of the expansion of America through the conquest of nature. By representing the value of nature explicitly in terms of Euro-American conquest the memorial narrative fails to live up to its claim of representing Lakota values.

The Logic of Good Reasons: An Assessment of the Truth Qualities of the Narrative

To assess the values presented in the memorial film I will answer the five questions from Fisher's logic of good reasons. First is the question of fact. What are the implicit and explicit values embedded in the message? The explicit representation of conquest over nature dominates the film. Almost half of the twenty-minute film is spent discussing the scale of the mountain carving and the technology used to create it. There is little ambiguity about the fact that Korczak is proud of his accomplishment in blasting a sculpture from a mountain. The problem with this explicit celebration of technological

conquest over nature is that the rhetoric is at odds with the rhetorical claim of honoring and representing Lakota cultural values. The film's narrative fixation on technological achievement is paradigmatic of Russell Means' claim that Euro-Americans absolve themselves of any role in the destruction of sacred land by focusing on technological abstractions.

Along with technological absolution, the narrative presents an implicit effort to justify the memorial's controversial existence. The narrative describes how five survivors of the Battle of the Little Bighorn attended the inaugural blast on the mountain. Having these men present at the beginning of the carving process implies that Korczak is somehow authorized to destroy this piece of sacred land. Just as the letter from Standing Bear represents the memorial's explicit claim to Korczak's authority to carve the mountain, the reference to the survivors who attended the opening ceremony function implicitly to authorize the first moment of destruction. Interestingly, the significance of having survivors of the Battle of the Little Bighorn is never explicitly stated. This omission of relevant information leads to a need to answer the second of Fisher's five questions.

The second question in the logic of good reasons deals with the relevance of the values presented to the subject at hand, as well as whether important values have been omitted, distorted, or misrepresented. In the case of the survivors of the Battle of the Little Bighorn being present at the memorial, the narrative omits any explanation of the battle, the reasons it was fought, or the consequences for the Lakota that stemmed from the event. By omitting this relevant information the narrative avoids discussing Euro-America's culpability in attempting to destroy a culture that it is claiming to honor.

Considering the memorial's claim to represent Lakota values, the relevance of the entire section devoted to the construction methods and scale of the memorial is questionable. Instead of a discussion about the importance of harmony with nature to the Lakota people, the memorial tells the story of a man who diverted rivers and deforested tracts of land all in order to make the land "useful." Then after making the land "usable" the narrative continues to tell about how Korczak skillfully destroyed a sacred mountain with dynamite and super-sonic drills. The logic of good reasons asks if the values presented are appropriate to the nature of the decision that the message bears upon (1987, 108). Analysis reveals that in celebrating the value of conquest over nature the film's narrative fails to live up to the rhetorical claim of representing the Lakota value of harmony with nature.

The third consideration in the logic of good reasons is what would be the effects of adhering to the values for one's relationships with others and society, and the process of rhetorical transaction? Since the narrative clearly articulates the Euro-American value of conquest over nature and completely omits any mention of the Lakota value of harmony with nature, it fails to fulfill the rhetorical claim to represent American Indian values. Therefore the effects of adhering to these values would be to conflate and replace the Lakota value of harmony with nature with that of the Euro-American value of conquering nature. In the realm of rhetorical transaction an adherence to a belief that the Lakota people celebrate physical conquest over nature circumscribes the rhetorical battle between different value systems. If people believed that Euro-American and Lakota perspectives on nature are identical, then the rhetorical naturalization of the destruction of the sacred Black Hills would be complete.

The next questions Fisher asks concerns consistency and whether the values presented are confirmed or validated in one's personal experience, in the lives or statements of others whom one admires and respects, and in a conception of the best audience that one can conceive? Any validation of the presentation of nature in the narrative comes from my research about the Lakota perspective on the issue. The explicit celebration of man's conquest over nature carries a cultural validity for Euro-America, whereas this fixation over conquest is anathema to the value system of the Lakota. When considering how the value of nature is presented in the film it is conceivable that a Euro-American audience would see a reflection of their own cultural perspective, whereas a Lakota with knowledge of traditional culture would see an inconsistent message about nature that is not validated in their belief system. Since the rhetorical claim of the memorial is to represent the cultural values of the Lakota, the celebration of human conquest over nature should not be presented in the narrative. But conquest over nature is not only a consideration of the narrative it is a fixation. This narrative preoccupation with conquest over nature is not valid in the lives of the people the memorial claims to honor and represent.

Fisher's final concern in the logic of good reasons is the question of transcendent issues. Fisher asks if the values that the message offers are values that, in the estimation of the critic, constitute the ideal basis for human conduct (1987, 109)? When contemplating transcendent issues Fisher urges the critic to make a judgment as to whether or not the message directly addresses the "real" issues in the case. In other words, one asks whether or not the message deals with the questions on which the whole matter turns or should turn (1987, 108-109). The narrative of conquest presented in this

section of the memorial film does not deal with the issues on which the matter should focus. Not only does the narrative omit any rhetoric describing harmony with nature as a desirable value, it explicitly celebrates the destruction of land as an achievement to be admired. Considering that the narrative claim of the memorial film is that the memorial represents Lakota cultural values, the narrative presentation of nature as an obstacle to tame and commodify does not offer the ideal basis for narrative conduct in the contested rhetorical realm of the Black Hills.

Conclusion

I began this chapter with a discussion about the different cultural attitudes that Euro-American and Lakota societies have concerning humankind's relationship with nature. I presented research on these prevailing cultural values to illuminate and validate the supposition that these cultures have decidedly divergent perspectives about their societal relationship with nature. My analysis of the memorial film rhetoric reveals that the Euro-American predilection for conquering nature is the only way in which the value of nature is presented. The Lakota value of living in harmony with nature is omitted from the narrative entirely. By applying the logic of good reasons I was able to show how the memorial narrative omits any discussion of living in harmony with nature as a cultural value of the Lakota while simultaneously claiming that the narrative honors the Lakota and represents their cultural values. Therefore, since the truth qualities of the narrative are not sound, the contradictory representation of cultural values found in this section of the memorial film fails Fisher's test of narrative rationality.

Chapter 3: Individuality versus Collectivity

The next set of opposing cultural values represented in the film that I will address is individuality and collectivity. A short discussion of the different weight these values possess within Euro-American and Lakota societies will be followed by a presentation of these values as they are presented in the memorial film. Using the logic of good reasons I answer questions about the value representations and then reflect on whether or not they stand the test of narrative logic. If too many inconsistencies, misrepresentations and conflation of Lakota values are present, then I will draw some conclusions about the effects such an illogical narrative can have on the contested rhetorical ground of the Black Hills.

The Euro-American celebration of individuality as the basis of society is in stark contrast to the traditional Lakota notion of collectivity, which underpins the structure of traditional Lakota and many other American Indian societies. Euro-American society, underpinned by the Judeo-Christian tradition that celebrates individual excellence and personal salvation through Christ, and informed by the Hellenistic philosopher's search for a wise individual, holds the success and satisfaction of the individual as one of its fundamental societal values (Tinker, 2003, 223; 230).

The value of individualism is a bedrock principle for Euro-American society. According to Tom Brokaw in his book *The Greatest Generation*, the Euro-American virtues of self-reliance, self-discipline, and self-sacrifice are what citizen-subjects should emulate in order to create a new sense of American "oneness" (Biesecker, 2002, 399). These three values - self-reliance, self-discipline, and self-sacrifice - have emerged as the underpinning of Euro-American culture. Each of these three values are manifestations of

a society convinced that the importance of the individual outweighs concern for the collective.

In considering this Euro-American cultural emphasis on individualism as it pertains to the topic at hand, Fredrick Jackson Turner offers an apropos observation about Euro-American expansion in the west. He states,

The old democratic admiration for the self-made man, its old deference to the rights of competitive individual development, together with the stupendous natural resources that opened to the conquest of the keenest and the strongest, gave such conditions of mobility as enabled the development of the large corporate industries which in our own decade have marked the West. (Turner, 1920, IX, 6)

In this passage Turner attributes the Euro-American admiration for the individual and his ability to utilize vast amounts of natural resources that were “opened to the conquest of the keenest and the strongest” as a major reason Euro-America continues to create profitable industries in the west. Although the decade of individualistic expansion across the west that Turner refers to is a century past the trend of industrial expansion has never ceased.

In fact, the Crazy Horse Memorial is a good example of Turner’s observation. Korczak, the self-made man, benefited from the democratic admiration of such individuals by obtaining the ownership rights to the mountain site for a vague promise to the government that he would, “improve that land” (DeWall, 1984, 23). Korczak did not pay a dime for the land because of the government’s deference toward individual development. He then proceeded to utilize the “stupendous natural resources” to enrich his family and build a memorial.

Conversely, traditional Lakota and many American Indian societies believe that “the dominant culture, based as it is on European concepts of individualism, is a

collection of individuals, not a community” (Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999, 109). Or as Donald Fixico puts it, “community is central to indigenous societies and holds more importance than individual status in the community. Community is the most important social unit among Native Americans” (Fixico, 2003, 29). In other words, the individual within many American Indian societies, including Lakota society, measure their individual status in the community by how they benefit that community. Since what an individual can do to benefit a society is more important than that glorification of that individual alone, a distinct emphasis on community should be the narrative thrust of the memorial film. Traditional Lakota cultural values do not define society as a collection of individuals out to fail or succeed as a lone entity. In this way Lakota culture is at odds with the Euro-American cultural emphasis on the individual and thus would reject the view of community offered by Brokaw and Turner. The traditional Lakota sense of self relies on identification with a specific place that is shared with the community; it does not stem from a specific personal attribute like self-reliance (Fixico, 2003; Deloria, 1973, 2003; Mann, 2003). For the Lakota the sacred Black Hills is the physical repository of their communal self (Deloria, 1973, 2003; Coleman, 2000; Brown, 1970; Matthiessen, 1992; Banks, 2005; Fixico, 2003; Kidwell, 2003; Mann, 2003). Any attempt to conflate Lakota values with the values espoused by Euro-America misrepresents their cultural values completely.

With such contrasting cultural values at play, the stories that are told in the name of America Indians on the contested ground of the Black Hills must be evaluated for their fidelity to the cultural values revered by the Lakota. Since the film attempts to teach people about the Lakota and Crazy Horse it is important to discuss the values that

underwrite the narrative. I will proceed by discussing the values of collectivity and individuality as they are presented in the film. Then I will wrap up the discussion by applying the logic of good reasons to those values representations so as to understand better how they function in the memorial narrative.

The Problematic Billy Mills

Olympic Champion Billy Mills, the only Oglala Lakota voice on the orientation film, is presented to explain traditional Lakota thought by stressing the importance the Lakota people put on the value of community verses the value of the individual. He says in reference to Crazy Horse and the Lakota view of community that “no one man is bigger than the sum of the people” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). This statement is in line with much traditional Lakota thought. George Tinker describes how the rigorous Rite of Vigil always yields a personal benefit for the person completing the ceremony, but that “these benefits are always experienced as intended to help that person in her or his commitment to the well-being of the whole” (Tinker 226, 2003). In Lakota communities, for instance, “the community greets the individual upon completion of the ceremony not with an exclamation of ‘congratulations’ but rather with a simple handshake and the words ‘thank you’ – thank you, because the community has benefited from the person’s successful completion of the commitment” (226, 2003). For the Lakota, an individual achievement is only as valuable as the community it benefits. Billy Mills appears to understand this as he voices Lakota values on the memorial film.

Mills continues, “Crazy Horse represents the sum of the Lakota people, I think, of indigenous people” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). Here Mills creates a synecdoche. Crazy Horse and the memorial represent all American Indians. They are one and the

same. The native speaker lends his ethos to create a synecdoche between the memorial and all “indigenous people,” while bolstering the narrative’s claim to represent traditional Lakota values. This conflated identity between the memorial, Crazy Horse and all American Indians that Mills creates, puts even more pressure on the memorial narrative to pay off with an accurate representation of Lakota values.

Billy Mills speaks for Crazy Horse when he says, “I believe Crazy Horse would like this memorial” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). He continues by connecting Crazy Horse’s love of community with the memorial, referencing how, “Crazy Horse would be the last to eat when his people had no food” (2002). Mills connects this selfless act of Crazy Horse with the act of memorializing one man for the benefit of his community as a way of explaining the apparent contradiction in the glorification of one individual Lakota. Traditional Lakota culture does not revere one individual, even Crazy Horse, as more important than others. Considering Crazy Horse never had a picture taken, never lived on a reservation, and fought for a people whose world view did not revere the individual above the collective, Mills’ characterization of what Crazy Horse would think about the mountain is dubious at best. Furthermore, the inappropriate synecdoche Mills draws between the Crazy Horse Memorial and all American Indians, and his personal credibility as an authentic Lakota voice, present challenges to the rationality of the narrative.

Billy Mills’ ethos as spokesperson for the Lakota people in the memorial film is comprised of both his ethnic and cultural link to the subject as well as his cultural link with Euro-America as an Olympian. Mills is a Lakota, yes, but he is also an Olympic champion. It is intriguing that someone who was a member of the United States Olympic Team is imbued with the power essentially to speak for the strident separatist Crazy

Horse. Lakota or not, participation in one of the dominant culture's ceremonially defining moments, such as the Olympics, is a contradiction in and of itself because of its assimilative acquiescence to the other culture. Mills' credibility as a traditional Lakota voice is compromised in that the only American Indian presented in the film not only joined the dominant culture's team, so to speak, he competed in an individual event, rather than a team event. Mills was the winner of the 10,000m gold medal at the 1964 Olympics. Of course his choice of event is ironic but of minor consequence, but his participation in the Olympics does appear to be an important component of Mills' ethos. As he pontificates from the top of the Crazy Horse Monument he is signified as, "Olympic Champion Billy Mills" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002) several times in the few minutes of screen time he has.

Although the memorial has an Oglala native speaker, this speaker is compromised by personal contradictions. On one hand he is an Oglala Lakota who understands the traditional ways, but on the other hand he has assimilated into Euro-American society to the degree that he has risen to national prominence not as a member of the community of Lakota but as an Olympic Champion – a stellar individual deserving of our accolades and attention. Both qualities comprise his ethos as a speaker equally. So while Mills is an authentic Lakota voice he is also the perfect embodiment of the success and satisfaction of the individual in Euro-American culture. Mills, as an assimilated American Indian, is the embodiment of the co-option and conflation of values in the film's narrative.

Although he voices the values of collectivity in the correct terms, his presence symbolizes both American Indianess and Euro-Americaness. Therefore his ethos on the mountain implies a fusing of both value systems.

Of course the question must also be asked, who gave Billy Mills the right to speak for the Lakota in this narrative – the Lakota or the Ziolkowskis? If Mills took it upon himself to speak for the Lakota people, then could this be considered yet another individual effort on his part? Mills is not a Lakota leader nor is he a descendent of Crazy Horse. Considering the demand by Standing Bear that the memorial be forever guided by members of Crazy Horse's family, it is telling that neither a member of his lineage nor a Lakota leader is presented as a spokesperson for the legacy of Crazy Horse. Instead the memorial chooses an individual whose identity is as much defined by his accomplishments as a paradigmatic Euro-American as they are defined by his heritage as a Lakota. Since he is neither a leader of the Lakota nor a descendent of Crazy Horse, his decision to lend Lakota credibility to the memorial film can be seen as an individualistic act taken without the council of his traditional community. Whatever the details of how Mills became spokesperson for the Lakota people on the memorial film, his simultaneous presence as both the authentic traditional Lakota voice on the film and as the epitome of Euro-American success through individual achievement implies that a conflation of value systems is natural at the Crazy Horse Memorial despite what the narrative overtly claims to represent.

Korczak's Absurd Heroism

Another example of the narrative celebration of individualism displayed in the memorial film is presented through the telling of Korczak's pioneer beginnings at the mountain. Spending nine minutes of a twenty-minute film presenting Korczak as the white pioneer conqueror is antithetical to the memorial's rhetorical purpose of representing Lakota cultural values. Since Korczak's pioneer story and subsequent

discussion of various technical accomplishments on the mountain takes such prominence in the film, I discuss some of the narrative implications of the “white pioneer conqueror” story and its relationship to the cultural values of the Lakota people.

The cultural meaning that the narrative of the lone, heroic pioneer determined to conquer an empty land and make a life for himself represents is discussed in great depth by Louis Owens, who draws parallels between film portrayals of white heroes in the American west, such as Kevin Costner’s embodiment of Michael Blake’s character Lieutenant Dunbar in *Dances with Wolves* and the various western cowboys played by John Wayne (1999, 99-112; 113-243). Owens noted that “the very idea of the American hero could only be absurd. While the hero must operate alone, ahead of the rest, for the Indian the community was and is essential to both physical and psychological survival” (Owens, 1998, 109). Owens describes how the wandering cowboy heroes so revered in Euro-American culture would be considered absent of identity within many traditional Indian cultures because of his disconnection from the community. In traditional American Indian culture, to be isolated, outside the tribe, was seen as being thrown away rather than heroic (1998, 109).

In that context, “the years of hard, lonely work” that Korczak endured could easily be seen as social suicide by the people he intended to honor. The voice over narrator describes the early years at the memorial like this: “the memorial began very humbly. Korczak lived in a tent the first seven months. Like a pioneer he cut trees to build a log home. There was nothing here. No food, water or electricity” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). The social isolation celebrated as heroic by the memorial film is not viewed as heroic in traditional Lakota culture. Nevertheless nine plus minutes of the brief

twenty-minute film are dedicated to Korczak's lonely pioneering of the land. This narrative juxtaposition and celebration of these two great individuals - the lone, white "frontier hero" and the lone, red "warrior Indian" - is in direct conflict with the traditional Lakota value of community. The relevance of this heroic pioneer narrative is questionable considering the stated purpose of the film is to represent Lakota values and ways, not to tell Korczak's uniquely Euro-American story.

Although Euro-Americans and the Lakota have divergent understandings of individualism, Euro-American society has nevertheless a history of believing that American Indians must join American society as individuals rather than as tribes. This predilection for celebrating the individual over the collective is evident in the observations of Robert Berkhofer, who argues that cultural assimilation would proceed according to "the values of individualism and not those of tribalism" (1978, 155). The echoes of this message are found in many places in the film. Ruth Ziolkowski, Korczak's wife, describes how adamant they are about keeping the government out of the memorial and relying solely on "donations from individuals to support the project" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). She continues, "Korczak believed in individual initiative and private enterprise. He didn't believe you had to wait around for someone to help you out, you have to get out there and do it yourself" (2002).`

This statement can be compared with Biesecker's analysis of Tom Brokaw's bestseller *The Greatest Generation* in which she concludes that the book's oversimplified text acknowledges disparities of social power but nonetheless lays all blame for any citizen's failure at her or his own feet (Biesecker, 2002). The appearance of this common commentary on the individual nature of "Americanness," from the owner of Crazy Horse

Memorial to a best-selling author/news anchor, suggests the pervasiveness of the emphasis on the individual in Euro-American culture. Portions of the narrative devoted to the Ziolkowskis reflects this type of individualist ideology both implicitly and explicitly, whereas the Lakota they claim to represent, for the most part, share a different view of the world of individuality versus collectivity.

Korczak's Greatness and the Myth of the Vanishing Indian

The narrative naturalizes the celebration of individual greatness by evoking of the myth of the vanishing Indian. Korczak was fond of saying, "when the legends die, the dreams end; when the dreams end, there is no more greatness" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). Notice the individuality of this statement – "the legend" – "greatness." He relegates the Lakota to the past because they once lost a great warrior to the Euro-Americans, and now he thinks of them as "legends" – "dreams" that have ended. Another way of saying this is to say that a culture has died. In this way, the memorial rhetoric perpetuates the myth of the vanishing Indian.

As Randall Lake describes it the myth of the vanishing Indian is "the belief that primitive native societies must and would give way before the advancing tide of Euramerican civilization, either to be absorbed or crushed" (Lake, 1991, 126). The memorial film voice over states "Korczak felt that both the glory and the tragedy of the Native American were reflected in Crazy Horse's short life and death" (DeWall, 2002). According to the film Korczak believed that American Indians had a short "life and death" full of glory and tragedy that is best symbolized by a colossus of an Indian who had a short life and death full of glory and tragedy as well. What should not escape notice is that in this description both Crazy Horse and all American Indians are dead and no one

is responsible for their fate. As Lake states, “most Americans believe the problems of native tribes to be facts of American history, not problems of the present” (1991, 128). This belief absolves Euro-Americans of any guilt or responsibility for the continued exploitation of American Indian land and culture. Believing that the theft of American Indian land is something that happened in the past, and done by people who have long since passed away, gives Euro-Americans the ability to deny the reality that there is a present day illegal occupation of Lakota land in the Black Hills.

The memorial narrative falls in line with this Euro-American logic. Korczak says, “I wanted to tell the story of the North American Indian. I want to right a little of the wrong that they did to these people. Because this is a part of American history” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). In this statement Korczak naturalizes his presence in the Black Hills by referring to the wrongs done to American Indians as the wrongs that “they did” to these people. Here Korczak not only rhetorically separates himself from Euro-American society but places all the wrongs suffered by American Indians in the past. By presenting himself as an outsider in Euro-American society and by describing wrongs done to American Indians in past tense, Korczak remains blameless in his personal acquisition of contested land. He at once decries the wrongs done to the Lakota while ignoring his own contribution to those continued wrongs.

Korczak, like many artists, lived a life possessed by his work. The Crazy Horse Memorial is an individual endeavor and he is proud of his involvement, for he sees it as a path to individual “greatness” as well as for the “greatness” of a defeated people. Korczak goes on to say that, “if I can just give back to these people something of their dignity...that is not too much to ask” (2002). Notice how Korczak can give “something”

to the people his culture exploited whether they want it or not. One man giving back dignity and culture to a “defeated” people is quite a feat for an individual. Korczak seems to believe that the Lakota are incapable of reclaiming dignity without his assistance. In this way Korczak subsumes and replaces the Lakota in the area. Because without him the Lakota will never return to “greatness” or even remember that it once existed. But the narrative of the memorial film goes even further in using the myth of the vanishing Indian to naturalize their presence in the Black Hills and to rationalize Korczak’s quest for individual greatness.

The memorial film tells the story of Korczak Ziolkowski, a white pioneer whose behavior in the Black Hills represents a continuation of the Euro-American conquest of Lakota land. But the film also attempts to distance Korczak from any association with the colonialism of his undertaking by separating him from the Euro-America that has oppressed American Indians while simultaneously linking him to the Lakota hero Crazy Horse.

Consider how the film depicts Korczak’s childhood and connection to Crazy Horse and the memorial. Korczak describes his history by saying,

You know I, I’ve been an orphan since I was a year old. I was born in Boston and I was brought up by an Irish prizefighter. And I always told him that when I was 16 I was gonna beat...well I was just gonna whoop him that’s all. Well when I was 16 I couldn’t do it so I left him. I went to work on the waterfront. And I always said that I wanted to do something worthwhile with my life. And I wanted to become a sculptor. And one day when I was 13 I read about this man Borglum carving a mountain. Little thinking that in about 16 years I was going to be working as his assistant on Mount Rushmore. Then I got a this letter from an old Indian I’d never meet, Standing Bear. He asked if I would build a memorial to their people so that the white men would know that the red man had great heroes also. Well, I brought myself up and being an American of Polish descent I thought that was, well it wasn’t too much to ask for. And I had nowhere else to go, so I thought I would spend my life doing this. (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002)

In these passages the film depicts Korczak as an immigrant orphan, a sort of cultural outsider, as Korczak says to Standing Bear's request, "being an American of Polish descent I thought that was, well it wasn't too much to ask for" (2002). The implication is that he too, being an immigrant, had felt the oppressive nature of Euro-American society and felt that, since he understands such injustice personally, a memorial for a people who have also experienced injustice "wasn't too much to ask for."

This story also touches on the spirit of individual greatness that so typifies Euro-American thought. Korczak is an orphan who "went to work on the waterfront" when he was 16 years old with a burning desire to "become a sculptor" and "do something worthwhile with (his) life." This story simultaneously portrays Korczak as a cultural outsider sharing many commonalities with American Indians and presents him as a paradigm of the Euro-American rags-to-riches, pull yourself up by the bootstraps celebration of individual accomplishment. By making the rhetorical move to align himself with both Euro-American and Lakota cultural experiences, Korczak embodies the conflation of value systems at the memorial. In this way both Korczak and Mills represent a conflation of values. This has the effect of naturalizing the blending of value systems within the narrative which could result in a misleading definition of Lakota values in the mind of memorial film viewers.

Korczak goes further in separating himself from Euro-America while subsuming American Indian identity when he states at the end of the film, "I'm a storyteller in stone. When Standing Bear asked me to tell the story of their great chief who was killed many years ago, I wanted to tell the story of the North American Indian. I want to right a little of the wrong that they did to these people. Because this is a part of American history"

(2002). Korczak in this passage does not see himself as doing any wrong to American Indians. He relegates any offense that has been perpetrated on the Lakota or other American Indians to the past. The implication is that there are no American Indians left to memorialize their own so it is left up to Korczak to “tell the story of the North American Indian.” This section of the memorial film narrative presents Korczak as the lone white hero left to make sure that, when all of the American Indians are gone, white people will know that they were once here.

The Logic of Good Reasons – An Assessment of the Truth Qualities of the Narrative

To assess the values presented in the memorial film I answer the five questions from Fisher’s logic of good reasons. First is the question of fact. What are the implicit and explicit values embedded in the message? The memorial film explicitly discusses the values of both individualism and collectivism. Billy Mills, as a native Lakota, speaks for the traditional ways of his people. The film voice over and quotes from the Ziolkowskis explicitly express individualistic values. Since the speakers are from distinctly different cultures this is understandable. But the rhetorical claim made by Mills is that “they (Lakota elders) wanted Korczak to build a monument honoring our people, our way, our culture, our values” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). Although this is the stated purpose of the film the Ziolkowskis explicitly present individualistic values as the driving force behind the memorial.

Furthermore, Billy Mills’ ethos and presence reinforces the individualistic viewpoint being celebrated by the memorial narrative. Considering the native Lakota speaker is essentially in the service of the Ziolkowskis and lends his ethos as a Lakota to the memorial, his presence implies that he agrees that the Crazy Horse Memorial is

honoring and representing Lakota values. Despite what Mills says about traditional ways, the gestalt of the film is underpinned by a celebration of individual achievement – Korczak’s colossus, Mills’ gold medal, and Crazy Horse’s position as the paradigmatic Lakota.

Fisher’s next question asks if the values presented are appropriate to the nature of the narrative claim. Also, “are the values omitted, distorted or misrepresented” (1987, 109)? Since the memorial narrative claims to represent Lakota values, the time spent celebrating Korczak’s individualism is wholly inappropriate to the narrative. The fact that the native speaker expresses traditional views on collectivism verbally, and also lends his ethos to validate the narrative claim of representing Lakota values, leads to a distorted view of collectivism when the narrative fails to represent those values in similar terms. Viewers are told that they are learning about Lakota values, they are presented with a native speaker to authenticate the claim, and then the narrative proceeds to celebrate individuality without any mention that this value system differs from that of the Lakota. Therefore, the narrative celebration of individualism, along with its distorted and conflated presentation of collectivism, is inappropriate to the narrative claim.

The third question is that of consequence. “What would be the effects of adhering to the values for one’s relationships with others and society, and the process of rhetorical transaction” (Fisher, 1987, 108)? Since the value that takes precedence in the narrative is that of individuality rather than collectivism, and the stated purpose of the film is to represent Lakota values, the effect of adhering to the conflated values presented would be to understand the Lakota as a people who celebrate individuality, lone achievement and heroic greatness. The effect on one’s concept of self is difficult to assess, but it can be

claimed that the conflation of values could lead Euro-American viewers to the conclusion that the Lakota are just like Euro-Americans. This gives the viewer the sense that the Euro-American world-view is not so different from the Lakota world-view.

Since individualism is not a cherished value in Lakota culture, it can be claimed that Lakota viewers may see their distorted values as a violation of their rhetorical space. Lakota viewers may also begin to see themselves in terms of the conflated values presented, thus challenging their concept of collective identity and continuing the long tradition of Euro-American assimilation of American Indian culture. One thing is certain, the Euro-American owned and operated Crazy Horse Memorial is claiming to define Lakota values, thus shutting out the American Indians who at once legally own the land where the story is being told and who want to tell the story themselves.

The fourth question is that of consistency. "Are the values confirmed or validated in one's personal experience, in the lives or statements of others whom one admires and respects, and in a conception of the best audience that one can conceive" (Fisher, 1987, 108)? To answer this question I rely on the statements of others whom "one admires and respects" (1987, 108). By referring to native scholars for their views on the topic, I have shown the lack of consistency in discussing the values of collectivism and individualism. The values presented as American Indian by the film are not consistent with the experience of the Lakota because they do not represent their values with accuracy.

The final question is a question of transcendent issues. Fisher asks, "Are the values the message offers those that, in the estimation of the critic, constitute the ideal basis for human conduct" (Fisher, 1987, 108-109)? The value the memorial narrative celebrates is that of Euro-American individualism rather than that of American Indian

collectivism. By presenting individualism as a celebrated Lakota value the narrative conflates the Lakota and Euro-American value systems. In this case the values the message offers does not constitute the ideal basis for human conduct. The ideal basis for constructing the memorial narrative would have been to live up to its claim of representing Lakota values. Since the narrative misrepresents, distorts, and fails to present the traditional Lakota value of collectivism consistently, it fails the test of narrative rationality.

Conclusion

I began this chapter with a discussion about the different cultural emphases that Euro-American and Lakota societies place on the values of individualism and collectivism. By referring to native scholars on the matter, I show that traditional Lakota and Euro-American societies place different cultural emphases on individualism and collectivism. My subsequent discussion of Billy Mills shows how his ethos on the mountain implies a fusing of both Euro-American and American Indian value systems. Then I analyzed the pioneer story told about Korczak's early years on the mountain. By borrowing from Louis Owens and comparing Korczak's story with the heroic narratives of old western movies I was able to show how the memorial narrative contributes to the celebration of the lone, white hero who overcomes the "wilderness" and subsumes Indian identity. This discussion led to my explication of how the narrative of the memorial film uses the myth of the vanishing Indian to naturalize the Euro-American presence in the Black Hills and to rationalize Korczak's quest for individual greatness. Finally, by applying the logic of good reasons to the narrative representations of individualism and

collectivism, I argue that the truth qualities of the film are not sound and therefore fail the test of narrative rationality.

Chapter 4: Sacred versus Material

I further my discussion of cultural representations in the memorial film by next addressing the opposing values of sacredness and materialism. Traditional Lakota and Euro-American societies differ greatly in their beliefs about what is sacred and used for spiritual enrichment and what is considered material and used for personal gain. In this chapter I first define and discuss the different values and the weight that these values possess within Euro-American and Lakota societies. Then I describe and explain how the values of sacredness and materialism are presented in the Crazy Horse Memorial film. Next I use the logic of good reasons to evaluate whether or not the value representations constitute a logical narrative. Finally I draw some conclusions about the effects that an illogical presentation of cultural values can have on the contested rhetorical ground of the Black Hills.

The Euro-American focus on the material world has been noted by scholars as a struggle to control and own property for the sake of proving their individual worth in a society that defines “civilization” as the accumulation of wealth (Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999). AIM activist Russell Means argues that Euro-Americans are united by their faith in science and technology, and in their willingness to exploit the natural resources of the Earth (1999). Underwritten by the doctrine of Manifest Destiny, it is hard to deny that the impulse of Euro-American society is to see the world as a series of materials that can be harnessed, owned and used to create individual prosperity. As Sanchez & Stuckey state, “in a society that depends upon the accumulation rather than the sharing of material

goods, ‘civilization is defined as those areas in which the display of such accumulation is recognized and valued as a signifier of individual worth’ (1999, 107).

The story of the illegal reclamation of the Black Hills by the Federal Government is a paradigmatic example of this Euro-American trait. When valuable mineral deposits were discovered in the Black Hills the government quickly reneged on the treaty of 1868 that left the sacred Black Hills under Lakota control, and it reclaimed ownership over the region in order to harvest wealth from the land. In other words, once material wealth was discovered in the Black Hills the Euro-American impulse to “civilize” the area was renewed and Lakota land was once again stolen. If this Euro-American materialistic perspective concerning the civilizing value of science and technology is found to be a major thematic element of the memorial narrative that ostensibly claims to represent Lakota values, then the validity of that narrative claim is in doubt.

Unlike Euro-Americans, for the Lakota, “their collective sense of self depends upon identification with a specific place. Their communal life is communal to the extent that it reflects that shared sense of place and its meaning” (Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999, 109). Clara Sue Kidwell elaborates on the Lakota connectedness to geography in her recounting of a group of Lakota that “makes an annual spring journey through the Black Hills in the three-month period from the spring equinox to the summer solstice” to celebrate the Lakota origin story of the Pleiades (2003, 9). Without the Black Hills as a place of ceremony for these celebrants, this religious tradition is stripped of its sacred significance.

The Lakota believe that they have a long-standing connectedness to, and responsibility for maintaining the sanctity of, the earth. “Their spiritual earth roots have

resulted in a kinship like that of a mother to her children. It is a sacred relationship that is characterized by prayerful love and deep religious reverence for holy ground” (Mann, 2003, 194). Therefore any separation from or destruction of this holy ground complicates and challenges the Lakota people’s ability to worship god in their own way, on their own land.

The Crazy Horse Memorial represents exactly this kind of destruction to sacred land. Considering the religious significance of place to the Lakota, the possession of the Black Hills by Euro-Americans is not only a challenge to Lakota sovereignty but also to Lakota identity. Therefore, the narrative of the Crazy Horse Memorial has the potential to exacerbate further this challenge to Lakota identity and their ability to define themselves.

Billy Mills’ Peculiar Perspective on Sacredness

Since Billy Mills is the only Lakota to be featured in the memorial film, I again turn to his words in order to catalogue the Lakota perspective on sacredness as it is presented at the Crazy Horse Memorial. Mills affirms the sacredness of the Black Hills to the Lakota when he states, “what I see in the mountain is the spirituality of indigenous people – the spirituality of the Lakota people” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). He goes on to describe Crazy Horse as, “a spiritual being living a human experience” (2002). Mills continues, “Crazy Horse could see the value (of the memorial). We need these human existences to teach as we understand and empower ourselves spiritually” (2002). In these passages Mills is saying that, although he understands that in Lakota society one person is never greater than the sum, he believes Crazy Horse would approve of this individualist celebration because it will be used as a teaching tool for generations.

But considering the sacred nature of the Black Hills it is hard to image a native speaker equivocating about the demolition of spiritual ground in order to represent the spirituality of the Lakota. It seems that the image of Crazy Horse materializing from the mountain has become conflated with Mills' understanding of the intrinsic sacredness of the Black Hills. If the memorial is to be used to teach and empower Lakota spiritually, as Mills suggests, then any inaccurate or inappropriate characterization of Lakota values, such as the destruction of a sacred place in order to honor an individual Lakota, can lead to an inaccurate understanding of Lakota spirituality.

Mills' peculiar take on the sacredness of the Black Hills continues as he explains the origin of the memorial and the sacred ground on which it sits. "I think the elders were not only correct, I think it was visionary to put a man who I think is sacred...his image is sacred and to place it in the Black Hills which is sacred. It is the only place it could've been" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). He goes on to speak of his youth and how, "when growing up we would hear about Crazy Horse. Just the simple fact that when he is asked, where are your lands now Crazy Horse? And he points and says, 'my land is where my people lie buried.' I've identified with that" (2002). Mills explicitly expresses the traditional value of sacredness of place with accuracy, just as he did when discussing the Lakota value of collectivism. He understands that the Black Hills are sacred to his people, so much so that he attributes the development of his early concept of self partly by identifying with Crazy Horse's words, "my land is where my people lie buried." Mills has overlooked the fact that the sacred Black Hills are being destroyed for the sake of gaining a material representation of the very sacredness that he describes as already existing in the area. Mills believes that the Crazy Horse Memorial can somehow enhance

the sacredness of the Black Hills by altering and commodifying them. This implicit celebration of the material benefit that the memorial may bring to the Black Hills does not logically fit with Mills' explicit representation of the sacredness of place for the Lakota people. Therefore, Mills' rhetorical fusion of sacredness with commodity shows how Euro-American and Lakota values are being conflated in the memorial narrative.

Korczak's Predictable Perspective on Sacredness

Just as in the previous chapter about individualism and collectivism, sections of the memorial narrative dedicated to Korczak portray a distinctly Euro-American perspective of the value at issue: sacredness. The voice over artist on the film cloaks the inception of the memorial in spiritual terms when he describes how "Crazy Horse died on Sept. 6th 1877. Korczak was born 31 years later on that same day, Sept. 6th. Many Native Americans believe this is an omen that Korczak was destined to carve Crazy Horse" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). In an effort to establish credibility for the presence of the memorial in the contested Black Hills, the narrative suggests that a cosmic alignment foresaw the coming of Korczak as a preserver of Crazy Horse's legacy. In this sense, Korczak functions as a kind of spiritual conduit through which Crazy Horse returns to his people. This sacred legitimation is needed because of Korczak's understanding of Standing Bear's claim that "only a relative of a great man has the right to honor that man or build a memorial to him. Other people who are not relatives have no right to honor that great man because somehow those people might have evil motives, want to get something out of it" (Swanson, 2005, 390). Since Standing Bear's passing, no relatives of Crazy Horse have been involved with the memorial. Crazy Horse has living ancestors but they

are not part of the Crazy Horse Memorial. Korczak needs this sacred link to Crazy Horse in order to re-establish his credibility to create the memorial.

This connection between Crazy Horse and Korczak, when added to the synecdoche created by Billy Mills between Crazy Horse, the memorial, and all American Indians, has the rhetorical effect of broadening the synecdoche to include Crazy Horse, the memorial, all American Indians, and Korczak. Not only is the audience left without an appropriate representation of sacredness, they are left with the implication that Korczak, like the Black Hills, is somehow sacred as well. By implying a sacred connection exists between Korczak and Crazy Horse the memorial film attempts to legitimize the Euro-American ownership of the contested ground while further naturalizing the conflation of value systems presented in the narrative. Although the memorial narrative is rhetorically diligent in conflating value systems in order to legitimize the Ziolkowskis' ownership of the Crazy Horse Memorial, other messages are less artful in their approach to the sacredness of the Black Hills versus the material value they represent for the memorial.

Selling Sacredness

For the most part the memorial film displays a fascination with the material manifestations on the mountain rather than with its sacredness. The film documents the amount of rock moved over the years while showing pictures of the "progress" on the mountain. They display a collection of pictures that show more and more stone missing from the mountain. At one point the film displays a pile of blasted rock that sits prominently in Korczak's old workshop so that people, as the narrator informs us can, "take a piece of the Black Hills home with you" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). Any

paying visitor to the memorial can have a piece of the Black Hills in order to honor the Lakota.

In contrast to this activity, Carole Blair describes an old practice at commemorative sites: “the practice of decorating graves and other personal memory sites with flowers and intimate tokens is not uncommon...visitors leave flowers, clothing, letters, and other personal items” at the memorial (Blair, 1999, 40). Coming to a memorial and being encouraged to take a piece of the sacred site stands in stark contrast to the practice of leaving an offering at a commemorative site. Leaving an offering symbolizes the loss a visitor feels for the sacrifice or tragedy that a memorial represents. Conversely, it can be said that taking a memento from a memorial site symbolizes the gain a visitor feels for the sacrifice or tragedy that the memorial represents.

In the case of the Crazy Horse Memorial this taking of sacred mementos can be seen as a celebration and continuation of the exploitation of American Indian land by Euro-America. The narrative claims to represent the sacredness of the Black Hills yet the “owners” offer pieces of the sacred mountain as a commodity. On one hand is the sacredness of the mountain, on the other is the commodity fetishism of taking a piece of the mountain home – personally possessing material from sacred land. In a land illegally occupied by Euro-Americans, self-appointed white spokespeople for the Lakota are giving away pieces of the sacred Black Hills to paying visitors.

As Rick Two-Dogs, an Oglala Lakota medicine man, explains, “All of our origin stories go back to this place. We have a spiritual connection to the Black Hills that can’t be sold. I don’t think I could face the Creator with an open heart if I ever took money for it” (McCloud, www.sacredland.org). Compare the material focus on the mountain with

the more traditional American Indian values expressed by Oren Lyons, Faithkeeper of the Onondaga nation, who says, “in the absence of the sacred, nothing is sacred – everything is for sale” (Lyons in, Sanchez & Stuckey, 1999, 109). Notice that sacredness is not something a single person can possess but rather sacredness is an abstract spiritual concept that cannot be possessed individually. Sacredness belongs to a community of believers as a whole. This is an American Indian perspective, concerned with the sacred nature of place, as opposed to the Euro-American perspective that values the Black Hills as material that individuals have a right to possess. The act of possessing a piece of the sacred Black Hills works to trivialize and naturalize the Euro-American possession and commodification of the Black Hills and Lakota culture.

The Logic of Good Reasons – An Assessment of the Truth Qualities of the Narrative

Fisher suggests first exploring the implicit and explicit values embedded in a message. But considering some of the claims made in this portion of the memorial narrative I must first attend to the factual question posed in the logic of reasons which suggests that one must first consider “whether the statements in a message that purport to be ‘facts’ are indeed ‘facts’; that is, are confirmed by consensus or reliable, competent witnesses” (1987, 108). At the beginning of the memorial film the voice over informs the viewer that “Lakota elders picked Crazy Horse for the carving and they insisted the memorial be located in the Black Hills” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). Moments later Billy Mills reinforces this factual claim, saying “I think the elders were not only correct, I think it was visionary to put a man who I think is sacred...his image is sacred and to place it in the Black Hills which is sacred. It is the only place it could’ve been” (2002). The factual problem with the claim that the Lakota elders “insisted” the memorial be

located in the sacred Black Hills is that, during the summer of 1933, Standing Bear “learned of a monument to Crazy Horse to be constructed at Fort Robinson” (Swanson, 2005, 388), and instead of rejecting the idea of a memorial to Crazy Horse outside of the Black Hills, he wrote letters that “offered his support and willingness to be a part of the project in Nebraska” (2005, 388). If Standing Bear was willing to be a part of a memorial to Crazy Horse outside of the Black Hills, then the claim that he insisted it be in the Black Hills, and that, as Mills puts it, “it is the only place it could have been,” is false. It apparently could have been in Nebraska with Standing Bear’s approval. This misrepresentation of fact attempts to use the ethos of Standing Bear to justify the controversial location of the memorial.

Another dubious factual claim that is often expressed by the narrative is the suggestion that Lakota elders picked Crazy Horse as the subject and the Black Hills as the location. The problem is that the only Lakota elder ever mentioned in the memorial narrative by name is Standing Bear. The voice over claims, “Lakota *elders* picked Crazy Horse” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). Mills states, “our *elders* made a commitment” (my emphases). The voice over goes on to say that “to carve the mountain the *elders* picked sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski” (2002). But when Korczak describes his first memories of the memorial origins he says, “I got this letter from an old Indian I’d never met Standing Bear he asked if I would build a memorial to their people” (2002). Nowhere does Korczak say other elders wanted his help. The voice over goes on to describe Standing Bear’s inspiration for contacting Korczak: “In 1939 the sculptor’s dramatic, marble portrait of Pederevsky won first prize at the New York’s World’s Fair. That gave Chief Standing Bear *and the other chiefs* the idea to invite Korczak to the Black Hills”

(2002). Toward the end of the film they describe the dedication ceremony that was attended by Standing Bear and “by five survivors of the Battle of Little Bighorn” (2002). Nowhere in the narrative are the names of the “other chiefs” who gave permission to create the Crazy Horse Memorial provided. The only Lakota mentioned by name is Standing Bear. It can be assumed that the “other chiefs” had names, and that if they were truly involved with bringing the memorial to fruition they would be referenced and remembered, yet oddly enough they are omitted.

In the summer of 1935 Standing Bear wrote a letter to James Cook expressing his frustration about the Crazy Horse project, saying “I am struggling hopelessly with this because I am without funds, no employment, and no assistance from any Indian or White” (Swanson, 2005, 388). If Standing Bear had other chiefs involved in his cause, then one would think that he would not describe himself as such a lone crusader. By implying that more than one elder sought to build the memorial, and that “they” insisted on the Black Hills, the narrative attempts to bolster legitimacy and naturalize the Euro-American owned memorial that actively transforms sacred ground into material wealth in the name of Lakota traditions.

Fisher’s next question asks if the values presented are appropriate to the nature of the narrative claim and if they have been omitted, distorted or misrepresented? In sections of the film centered on Korczak, the narrative distorts sacredness by claiming that somehow cosmic factors were involved in Korczak’s building of the memorial. This distortion of sacredness suggests that the carving of the memorial was preordained, and thus inevitable. As the Lakota voice for the memorial, Billy Mills verbally represents the sacredness of the Black Hills with clarity but omits and distorts the Lakota value of

sacredness. Mills distorts the concept of sacredness by at once invoking the traditional Lakota sense of spiritual oneness with the Black Hills while celebrating the Euro-American destruction and commodification of them.

But when considering the supreme importance of place to the Lakota concept of sacredness, it is what Mills omits from his thoughts about the sacredness of the Black Hills that is most interesting. Mills omits the fact that the Black Hills legally belong to his people, the Lakota. Instead Mills spends his time speaking about how he thought that the elders were not only correct but “visionary to put a man who I think is sacred...his image is sacred and to place it in the Black Hills which is sacred” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). In this section the memorial narrative misrepresents the value of sacredness and conflates it with materialism while omitting fundamental facts about the sacredness of the Black Hills.

The next consideration in the logic of good reasons is what would be the effects of adhering to the values for one’s relationships with others and society, and the process of rhetorical transaction? Since the narrative clearly articulates the Euro-American value of materialism and consistently distorts the Lakota value of sacredness, and the stated purpose of the film is to represent Lakota values, the effects of adhering to these values interpretations/misinterpretations would be to misunderstand the Lakota value of sacredness. Euro-American viewers could easily identify with the materialistic presentations in the narrative while at once gaining a new understanding of Lakota sacredness that invites the viewer to, as Billy Mills says on behalf of Crazy Horse, “see the value” in commodifying a sacred mountain. Of course, American Indian viewers could also adopt this distorted representation of sacredness as commodity as accurate

also. The rhetorical effect of this conflation continues the Euro-American assimilation of Lakota culture while naturalizing the “inevitable” acquisition of Lakota land.

The next question Fisher asks concerns consistency and whether the values presented are confirmed or validated in the lives or statements of others whom one admires and respects. Although the value of materialism was presented in a way that is valid to the Euro-American perspective, the Lakota value of sacredness was distorted. By referring to native scholars for their views on sacredness, I have shown how the Lakota value was distorted and conflated with materialism. Not only does the narrative distort, omit, and misrepresent facts about Lakota values in order to legitimize the memorial’s presence on sacred land, it fails to be consistent with traditional Lakota values.

Fisher’s final question of transcendent issue asks if, “the values the message offers those that, in the estimation of the critic, constitute the ideal basis for human conduct” (1987, 108)? The lone Lakota voice on the film conflates the value of sacredness with the value of materialism while omitting fundamental facts about the struggle over ownership of the sacred land, and the portions of the narrative featuring Billy Mills’ rhetoric fail to live up to the narrative claim of honoring Lakota values. The voice over continues this conflation of sacred and material with intimations that Korczak shares a certain sacred destiny with Crazy Horse and the Black Hills while at the same time offering pieces of the sacred mountain to paying visitors. When Mills’ narrative is combined with the distinctly Euro-American values expressed by the voice over narration it is clear that the narrative does not live up to its claim of representing Lakota values and thus does not present the ideal basis for rhetorical conduct.

Conclusion

I began this chapter with a discussion about the different cultural emphases that Euro-American and Lakota societies place on the values of sacredness and materialism. By referring to native scholars on the matter I was able to show that traditional Lakota and Euro-American societies differ greatly in their belief about what is considered sacred and what is considered material to be used for personal gain. My subsequent discussion of the narrative presentation of these values showed that the values of sacredness and materialism are conflated and misrepresented both implicitly and explicitly. I discussed how Billy Mills voices the value of sacredness properly but then reveals that he believes the Crazy Horse Memorial can enhance the sacredness of the Black Hills by altering and commodifying them. This adds to the conflation of Euro-American and Lakota values. Next I discussed the sacred connection the narrative makes between Crazy Horse and Korczak and how this connection attempts to legitimize the Euro-American ownership of the contested ground. Next a discussion of the selling of blasted Black Hills stone at the memorial shows the blatant materialism of the narrative. Finally, by applying the logic of good reasons to the narrative representations of sacredness and materialism, I was able to claim that the truth qualities of the film are not sound and therefore fail the test of narrative rationality.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In the Black Hills of South Dakota a mountain is slowly being transformed into an image of the Lakota leader Crazy Horse. Seventeen miles down the road from Mount Rushmore, one of America's most identifiable structures representing American colonial expansion and the theft of American Indian land (Blair & Michel, 2004; Pomeroy, 1992;

Bergman, 2008; Taliaferro, 2002), the Lakota leader will stand in supposed defiance of this Euro-American theft. This interpretation of the Crazy Horse Memorial as a response to Rushmore is shared by many observers (DeWall, 1983; Bergman, 2008; Hammel, 1996; Tichi, 2001; Taliaferro; 2002; Swanson, 2005). Cecilia Tichi excoriates Mount Rushmore for representing the “embodiment of the expansionist idea of Manifest Destiny” that “stares down from the lands of their victims, the vanquished native Americans” (2001, 16). But her view of the Crazy Horse Memorial is that it is “a deliberate pro-Native American statement of pride and rebuke to Borglum and to the U.S. government for its shameful treatment of native peoples” (2001, 17). This popular understanding of the Crazy Horse Memorial as a defiant rebuke to the offensiveness of Mount Rushmore does not stand up to rhetorical scrutiny. In fact, my analysis has shown that the Crazy Horse Memorial repeats so many of the same offenses of Mount Rushmore that the memorial is more of a friendly echo than a defiant rebuke of Borglum’s colossus.

In three chapters of analysis I discussed the profound differences between the cultural value systems of the Lakota and Euro-Americans. I showed how Lakota and Euro-Americans differ in their cultural emphasis on values of individuality and collectivity, materialism and sacredness, as well as conquering nature versus living in harmony with nature. I then demonstrated how the memorial film presents these cultural values in a distorted and conflated manner. The narrative of the orientation film claims that the memorial represents Lakota culture, ways, and values. My analysis proves that the film does not live up to this rhetorical claim. The film instead presents Euro-American values in the guise of Lakota values; therefore, what follows is a discussion

about the effects that this narrative of conflated values has on the contested rhetorical area of the Black Hills.

By claiming to represent Lakota cultural values with a memorial dedicated to the Lakota leader Crazy Horse, the memorial film positions itself to redefine the significance of Crazy Horse's legacy as well as to redefine what it means to be Lakota. Considering the authority that audiences generally grant the information presented in an expository mode of documentary (Nichols, 1992, 35) the ability for audiences at the Crazy Horse Memorial to leave with a false understanding of Crazy Horse and Lakota cultural values is a distinct possibility.

This is especially true because the memorial film presents a coherent narrative about a sculptor and his mountain that is easy to understand. Considering that narrative probability (coherence) does not measure the truth claims of a narrative but simply acknowledges the narrative's coherence or lack thereof as a story (Fisher, 1987, 35), the narrative of the Crazy Horse Memorial film has the ability to conflate and redefine cultural values as long as the story "hangs together" and is entertaining.

With this much power afforded this form of narrative documentary, questions of voice often arise. Specifically, do the people who are crafting the message have the authority to do so, and in attempting to speak on behalf of someone else do they speak objectively, persuasively or even propagandistically (Nichols, 1992, 34)? My research demonstrates that the Ziolkowskis are not only very conscious of proving their claim to authentic voice at the memorial but they boldly speak on behalf of the Lakota and persuasively conflate Lakota values with Euro-American values.

The only justification to create the memorial that the Ziolkowskis consider important or valid is the invitation that Korczak received from Standing Bear. But that invitation came with a caveat that Korczak always work under the direction of a relative of Crazy Horse. Korczak never honored this agreement. No members of Crazy Horse's family have been associated with the memorial since Standing Bear.

Crazy Horse does have descendants alive today. According to Crazy Horse descendant Elaine Quiver, the primary problem is that Standing Bear had no right to invite Korczak to create the memorial. She explained that Lakota culture dictates consensus from family members on such a decision and that no one asked all of the family members at that time, just Standing Bear (Kent, 2003). Quiver added, "the more I think about, the more it's a desecration of our Indian culture. Not just Crazy Horse, but all of us" (2003, 9). It is clear from this quote that Quiver sees the synecdoche the memorial creates between the mountain carving, Crazy Horse, and all Lakota and is not happy with the result. Not only do Crazy Horse's relatives have an opinion of the memorial other Lakota like AIM activist Russell Means offers this perspective. He states, "Imagine going to the Holy Land, in Israel, whether you're a Christian, Jew or Muslim, and start carving up the mountain of Zion. It's an insult to our entire being" (Roberts, 2002, 66). Like Quiver, Means sees the memorial as an insult, an affront to the "entire being" of Lakota people. Anne Ziolkowski, Korczak's daughter, gives a common response of the family when confronted with such criticism. She says, "I don't care what you do, you're not gonna please everybody. If we offend people, we're very sorry. But we're doing what we were asked to do" (Kent, 2003, 9). But Anne's dismissive comment

believes the effort the memorial film makes at creating an ethos for Korczak that gives him the right to memorialize Crazy Horse.

Crazy Horse has living ancestors but they are not part of the Crazy Horse Memorial. Therefore Korczak needs to establish a sacred link to Crazy Horse in order to affirm his credibility to create the memorial. My analysis shows that the narrative creates a synecdoche between the Crazy Horse Memorial, all of the Lakota, and Korczak. The voice over narrator informs us that “Crazy Horse died on Sept. 6th 1877. Korczak was born 31 years later on that same day, September 6th. Many Native Americans believe this is an omen that Korczak was destined to carve Crazy Horse” (Korczak’s Heritage Inc., 2002). This connection between Crazy Horse and Korczak when added to the synecdoche created by Billy Mills between Crazy Horse, the memorial, and all American Indians, has the rhetorical effect of broadening the synecdoche to include Crazy Horse, the memorial, all American Indians, and Korczak. This narrative implies that Korczak shares a celestial bond to Crazy Horse, a bond that could be considered familial. It also implies that Korczak has become an Indian.

In fact, Korczak is buried in the mountain carving (DeWall, 1984, 45) thus, in the end, becoming one with “Crazy Horse”. Because Korczak reneged on his agreement with Standing Bear to have Crazy Horse’s family oversee the project, it is imperative that Korczak establish his credibility in another way. What he chose to do was, in essence, to become a member of Crazy Horse’s family. In creating this synecdoche the memorial rhetoric evokes the myth of the vanishing Indian, and in the end Korczak subsumes American Indian identity and “becomes” an Indian in order to have the right to memorialize Crazy Horse.

Phillip Deloria, in a book titled *Playing Indian*, describes the Hopi peoples experience with a group of non-Indians, called the Smoki, that insisted on claiming authority to perform the Hopi Snake Dance in order to preserve it in its traditional form (1998, 136). The Smokis of Prescott, Arizona, were a group of non-Indians formed in 1921 by the town's Chamber of Commerce who insisted for decades that they needed to preserve the Hopi Snake Dance in its "proper" form by performing it regularly. Unimpressed, Hopi leader Don Nelson eventually escorted members of the Smoki to a Hopi village to show them that the Hopi were able to carry out the Snake Dance without help from non-Indians (Garrouette, 2003, 93). After seventy years of appropriating the ceremony, pressure from the Hopi people eventually caused the Smokis to stop.

Like the Smokis of Prescott, Arizona, who claimed a right to perform the Hopi Snake Dance, Korczak insists upon his right to memorialize the Lakota people. In the same way that the Smoki used the Hopi Snake Dance to boost commerce and benefit the people of Prescott (Deloria, 1998, 136), Korczak uses the Crazy Horse Memorial to enrich the Ziolkowski family. Both the Smoki and Korczak see themselves as the only ones left who can properly perform the necessary American Indian ritual. The Smoki claimed they were the only ones who could carry out the Hopi Snake Dance until it was made clear that their appropriation was unacceptable to the indigenous Hopi community. Korczak believes that, since he was the only man Standing Bear could find with the ability to carve a mountain, he is the only person left who can properly memorialize Crazy Horse. So far the protestations from descendants of Crazy Horse, such as Elaine Quiver, and American Indian activists, such as Russell Means, have been ignored or dismissed by the Ziolkowskis. Despite the protestations from present day American

Indians, the Ziolkowskis continue Korczak's effort to subsume Lakota identity in order to justify the construction of the Euro-American owned memorial.

The subsuming of Lakota identity that the memorial represents is yet another retelling of the myth of the vanishing Indian. With the help of an extended metaphor from Louis Owens, I will discuss the use and effect of this myth at the memorial. Owens' analysis of the symbolic relationship between Blake and Costner's character Dunbar, in *Dances with Wolves*, and his wolf companion Two Socks (a name given by Dunbar), is particularly illuminating to the discussion of Korczak and the Crazy Horse Memorial. Owens finds it absurd that a free animal such as Two Socks would linger around an old Army post where recent extreme violence and degradation is evident. "Only in a cartoonish Hollywood film or a badly written, romantic novel would a wolf come seeking suicidal companionship in such a way" (Owens, 1998, 114). To understand the unlikely literary pairing of wolf and white man, Owens suggests that "Two Socks is an essential metaphor for the submission of natural America to the "white god" – as Blake repeatedly calls Lieutenant Dunbar – who has come to stake his colonial claim to the territory" (1998, 114). Owens sees Two Socks as foreshadowing the submission of the Lakota to the Euro-Americans.

The wolf, as well as the Lakota friend, Kicking Bird, who Dunbar associates with, serves to authorize the rightful role of the Euro-American in asserting dominion over the land and its occupants (1998, 114). In the end Kicking Bird and Two Socks are dead and the Lakota are facing cultural if not physical extermination. But Dunbar returns to civilization, "having established his natural supremacy and subsumed the powers of the natural world, including Indians, into his greater self" (1998, 114). The narrative that

Dances with Wolves presents of the white male who conquers his surrounding and subsumes Indian identity reinforces the myth of the vanishing Indian.

The narrative of the Crazy Horse Memorial film presents Korczak as a character that functions much like Blake and Costner's Dunbar does in *Dances with Wolves*. Like Blake and Costner's Dunbar, Korczak is portrayed as a lone, pioneer hero who conquers the challenges of the natural habitat while peacefully coexisting with the indigenous creatures and subsuming the identity of the native inhabitants. Korczak, like Dunbar, was issued a post by the Euro-American government; he made "peace" with the animals and the Indians in the area; he subsumed American Indian identity by creating the memorial; and his colossus returns him to civilization as an authorized voice of the Lakota and as a Euro-American genius of technical accomplishment. The narrative describes how "Korczak worked alone for years but mountain goats kept him company. The goats loved the staircase and they climbed it right along with Korczak. They've never left despite the decades of blasting" (Korczak's Heritage Inc., 2002). This relationship the lone Korczak developed with the mountain goats is a parallel of Dunbar's relationship with the wolf Two Socks. As this scene is described, video of goats traversing the mountainside is shown as proof of the harmonious existence Korczak maintained with the animals. Like Dunbar's unlikely companion Two Socks, the mountain goats approve of and trust this particular white man. Although in the case of the Crazy Horse Memorial the goats are not a fictive contrivance like Two Socks, the verbal and visual reference to them keeping Korczak company serves the same purpose of naturalizing the conspicuous invader's presence.

An even more salient parallel with the *Dances with Wolves* plot can be seen in the relationship between Blake and Costner's characters, Kicking Bird and Dunbar, and the relationship between Standing Bear and Korczak. In *Dances with Wolves*, the relationship between Kicking Bird and Dunbar progresses from one where Dunbar is invited to explore Lakota culture and learn from Kicking Bird to one where Dunbar learns so well the Lakota way that he subsumes Indian identity. In fact, Dunbar becomes such a good Lakota that he is "able to show the poor, ignorant Indians where to find a herd of buffalo" (Owens, 1999, 125). At this point Dunbar no longer needs Kicking Bird in order to learn Lakota ways; he is now an authority himself. As Owens states, "when Dunbar has absorbed everything possible from the fragile Lakota band, the Indians become disposable" (1999, 123). Dunbar has become more Indian than the Indians and has thus justified his possession of their land.

Like Dunbar being invited by Kicking Bird to learn Lakota ways, Korczak was invited by Standing Bear to memorialize Crazy Horse and the Lakota. Standing Bear invited Korczak to build the monument because he could not find an American Indian with the expertise to do the work (DeWall, 1983). In this sense Standing Bear's request for Korczak to help the Lakota assert their identity mirrors the absurd portrayal of Dunbar as a better Lakota than Kicking Bird by virtue of his being able to teach the Lakota to find buffalo.

I call both of these suggestions absurd because, in the case of *Dances with Wolves*, one could assume that the Lakota, having been native to the plains for hundreds of years, would not need help from a white man to find buffalo; and, in the case of the Crazy Horse Memorial, a case can be made that there was no need for any help from a

white man in order to memorialize a Lakota. The Lakota are perfectly capable of telling their own story and representing themselves. As Owens states, “we are not dead, and unlike the native people in Conrad’s novel (*Heart of Darkness*), we do not need a Marlow or a Costner to tell our story” (1999, 130). Similarly the Lakota do not need Korczak to tell their story. But Korczak tells the Lakota story nonetheless.

Like Dunbar and Kicking Bird, after Korczak has learned what he can about the Lakota from Standing Bear, Standing Bear becomes obsolete. He is no longer needed because Korczak has replaced him as the sole person responsible for memorializing Crazy Horse. In this way the Lakota disappear at the Crazy Horse Memorial and Korczak remains as the arbiter of Crazy Horse’s legacy and the definer of Lakota ways. The synecdoche established between the memorial, the Lakota, Crazy Horse, and Korczak works to transform Korczak into the celestial relative of Crazy Horse, therefore negating the need for any Lakota representation at the memorial.

The insidious nature of the narrative of *Dances with Wolves* is not only that it reestablishes the myth of the vanishing Indian in popular culture but that it is seen as a “marked and important breakthrough in the American film industry’s conception and representation of Native Americans” (Owens, 1999, 121). In fact *Dances with Wolves* represents “the apex of America’s adroit, very self-conscious institutionalizing of the colonization of Native America. It is a movie that casts a vivid spotlight on Euramerican culture and history, providing an index to the power of the colonial metanarrative that informs the self-concept of contemporary America” (1999, 121). Owens’ point is that a movie that is widely seen as a positive portrayal of American Indians actually works to reinforce and naturalize Euro-American colonial expansion. The popular view that the

Crazy Horse Memorial is a defiant response to the colonialist message of Mount Rushmore presents the same type of insidious valorization of the colonial metanarrative as *Dances with Wolves*.

The Crazy Horse Memorial's redefinition of Lakota cultural values and reification of the colonial metanarrative of the vanishing Indian presents a rhetorical challenge to the Lakota who have spent their lives struggling with Euro-America to define themselves. The memorial and its assimilative presentation of Lakota culture is a direct affront to American Indian activists in the battle for both physical and rhetorical possession of the Black Hills. In fact, the American Indian Movement (AIM) grounded its rhetoric in "traditional Indian religion and its values and concepts" (Means in Lake, 1991, 130). They attempted to define a new understanding of their history and culture with a strong emphasis on traditional American Indian mores (Sanchez & Stuckey, 2000, 128). Therefore the Crazy Horse Memorial's attempt to redefine Lakota values as Euro-American values creates a rhetorical battle with the very people who the memorial supposedly celebrates: the Lakota. By possessing the image of Crazy Horse the memorial lays claim to his legacy.

Just as historians redefined Crispus Attucks, the Crazy Horse Memorial narrative rewrites Crazy Horse's legacy into a more universalized narrative of Euro-American colonialism. The effect this redefinition has is to diffuse the radical use of Crazy Horse's legacy for future generations. By presenting the legacy of Crazy Horse and the Lakota as one that supports Euro-American values, the memorial neuters the rhetorical effect of using Crazy Horse and the Lakota's military and cultural resistance to the theft of their land as a way of ever again building a sense of pan-Indian unity, as AIM rhetors did in

the 1960s and 1970s (Banks, 2005; Braatz, 2004; Deloria, 2000; Lake, 1983; Lake, 1991; Lindsley et al., 2002; Matthiessen, 1992; Morris & Wander, 1990; Sanchez & Stuckey, 2000). This misrepresentation of Crazy Horse and Lakota cultural values holds the power to alter a viewer's understanding of the subject. From its privileged position of public commemoration the Crazy Horse Memorial re-defines the Lakota culture for all who witness it.

Carol Blair notes that “rhetoric has material force beyond the goals, intentions, and motivations of its producers, and it is our responsibility as rhetoricians not just to acknowledge that, but to try to understand it” (1999, 23). This is what I have attempted to do with this thesis: to understand the rhetorical force behind the Crazy Horse Memorial. It would be easy to fall in line with the popular conception of the memorial as a defiant response to the colonialist message of Mount Rushmore because the memorial encourages this perception. Using a tool of the expository mode of documentary the memorial film often repeats the phrase Standing Bear wrote to Korczak about wanting “the white man to know that the red man has heroes too” in order to orient the viewer to the narrative claim of honoring American Indians. But this rhetorical intention of the memorial belies the rhetorical content of the film. Whether intentional or not, the Ziolkowskis created a memorial film that celebrates Euro-American values instead of Lakota values. Because of the material force that the memorial has, thanks to its privileged position in the Black Hills, the message that Crazy Horse and the Lakota are good examples of Euro-American values is a powerful one that threatens to supersede other, more authentic, representations of Lakota culture. The authority of the expository mode of documentary, along with the narrative coherence of the memorial film, invites

the viewer to believe all of the facts presented in the film. But as my analysis shows, the truth qualities of the narrative are not logical. Therefore most viewers without prior knowledge of, or strongly held convictions about, Lakota cultural values will take away a false understanding of the Lakota people and their hero Crazy Horse.

In the final analysis, the Crazy Horse Memorial film narrative naturalizes the presence of a Euro-American owned and operated memorial to a Lakota hero. This naturalizing effect serves to absolve the Ziolkowskis of any responsibility for the continued theft of Lakota land and identity of which they are guilty. In turn, the memorial narrative and its naturalizing of Euro-American colonialism serves to absolve all Euro-Americans of any guilt or responsibility for the broken promises and stolen land that the treaty of 1868 and the Black Hills represent.

References

- Bailey, Paul. (1970). *Ghost Dance Messiah*. New York: Tower Publications Inc
- Banks, Dennis (2005). *Ojibwa Warrior: Dennis Banks And The Rise Of The American Indian Movement*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Biesecker, Barbara, A. (2002). Remembering world war II: the rhetoric and politic of national commemoration at the turn of the 21st century. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 88(4), 393-409.
- Berkhofer, R. (1978). *The White Man's Indian: Images of Native American from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Knopf.
- Bergman, Teresa. (2008). Can Patriotism be carved in stone? a critical analysis of mt. rushmore's orientation films. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 11(1), 89-112.

Blair, Carol (1999). *Rhetorical Bodies*. Selzer, Jack & Crowley, Sharon (Eds.) Contemporary u.s. memorial sites as exemplars of rhetoric's materiality. The University of Wisconsin Press.

Blair, Carole & Michel, Neil (2004). *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. Hyde, Michael, J. (Ed.). The rushmore effect: ethos and national collective identity. (157-196). The University of South Carolina Press.

Braatz, Timothy (2004). Clash of cultures as euphemism: avoiding history at the little bighorn. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 28(4), 107-130.

Brown, Dee. (1970). *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*. New York: Bantam Books Inc.

Browne, Stephen H. (1999). Remembering crispus attacks: race, rhetoric, and the politics of commemoration. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. (85) 169-187.

Chu, Daniel. (1991). About Faces: Sioux Editor Tim Giago Sees Mount Rushmore as a Symbol of Dishonor. *People Weekly*, 36, 68.

Churchill, Ward (1999). *Contemporary Native American Cultural Issues*. Champagne, Duane (Ed). The crucible of american indian identity: native tradition versus colonial imposition in postconquest north america. (39-61). Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

Coleman, S. E. William (200). *Voices of Wounded Knee*. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln & London.

Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth (1996, November 18-25). A 'desecration tour' now awaits travelers who visit the sacred black hills. *Indian Country Today Magazine*.

Deloria, Phillip (1998). *Playing indian*. Yale University Press.

- Deloria, Vine, Jr. (2000). *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence*. University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. (1973, 2003). *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*. Fulcrum Publishing.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. (1995). *Red earth, white lies: native Americans and the myth of scientific fact*. Scribner: New York.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. & Lytle, Clifford, M. (1983). *American Indians, American Justice*. University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. & Lytle, Clifford, M. (1998). *The Nations Within*. University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. & Wildcat, Daniel, R. (2001). *Power and Place: Indian Education in America*. Fulcrum Resources.
- DeWall, Robb (Ed.) (2000). *Carving a Dream: A Photo History of Crazy Horse Memorial*. Crazy Horse: Korczak's Heritage, Inc.
- DeWall, Robb (Ed.) (1984). *Storyteller in Stone: A Capsule Biography of the Crazy Horse Sculptor*.
- Dickinson, Greg, Ott, Brian L. & Aoki, Eric (2005). Memory and myth at the buffalo bill museum. *Western Journal of Communication*, 69(2) 85-108.
- Dirlik, Arif (1999). *Contemporary Native American Political Issues*. The past as legacy and project: postcolonial criticism in the perspective of indigenous historicism. 73-93. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.
- Fisher, Walter, R. (1987). *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*. University of South Carolina Press.

- Fixico, Donald, L. (2003). *The American Indian Mind in a Linear World: American Indian Studies & Traditional Knowledge*. Routledge.
- Garrouette, Eva, M. (2003). *Real indians: identity and the survival of native america*. University of California Press: Berkeley & Los Angeles.
- Giago, Tim (1998, September 28). Crazy horse memorial: a bitter legacy for Lakota. *Indian Country Times*, A4.
- Grounds, Richard A. & Tinker, George E. & Wilkins, David E. (Eds.) (2003). *Native Voices: American Indian Identity and Resistance*. University Press of Kansas: Lawrence.
- Hammel, Paul. (2007, August 20). Maligned Rushmore Sculptor Voiced Sympathy for the Sioux in a Letter. Omaha World-Herald (NE).
- Hittman, Micheal (1990). *Wovoka and the Ghost Dance*. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln & London.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean (2000). Changing values in the art museum: rethinking communication and learning. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 6(1) 9-33.
- Hyde, Michael (2004). *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. University of South Carolina Press.
- Kent, Jim (2003, September, 22). Crazy Horse Monument Commemorates Lakota Leader's Death; Elders Cite Project's Lack of Consultation, Question Financial Goals. *News from Indian Country*, A9.
- Kidwell, Clara S. (2003). *Native Voices: American Indian Identity and Resistance*. Grounds, Richard A. & Tinker, George, E. & Wilkins, David, E. (Eds.) Ethnoastronomy as the key to human intellectual development and social organization. University Press of Kansas: Lawrence.

- Korczak's Heritage Inc. (2002). *Crazy Horse: Dynamite & Dreams*. (DVD).
- Lake, A. Randall. (1983). *Readings on the Rhetoric of Social Protest*. Morris, E. Charles & Browne, H. Stephen, (Eds.), Enacting red power: the consummatory function in native american protest rhetoric. (266-284), State College, PA. Strata Publishing Inc.
- Lake, A. Randall (1991). Between myth and history: enacting time in native american protest rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, (77) 123-151.
- Lee, Jodi Rave (2001, May, 3). In Honoring Yesterday, We Ignore Today. *Lincoln Journal Star (NE)*, B7.
- Lindsley, Sheryl, L. & Braithwaite, Charles, A. & Ahlberg, Kristin, L. (2002). Mending the sacred hoop: identity enactment and the occupation of wounded knee. *Great Plains Quarterly*, 22, 115-26.
- Little Eagle, Avis (1996, July 2). Crazy Horse Memorial: Rising Up from the Sacred Paha Sapa. *Indian Country Today*. B1.
- Luke, Timothy W. (2002). *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition*. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.
- Mann, Henrietta (2003). *Native Voices: America Indian Identity and Resistance*. (Eds.) Grounds, Richard A.; Tinker, George E. & Wilkins, David E. Earth mother and prayerful children: sacred sites and religious freedom. University Press of Kansas: Lawrence. 195-208.
- Matthiessen, Peter (1992). *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse*. Penguin Books.
- McCloud. (2005). www.sacredland.org.
- Miller, H. David (1959). *Ghost Dance*. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln & London.

- Mooney, James (1973, 1896). *The Ghost-Dance Religion and Wounded Knee*. Dover Publications Inc.: New York
- Morris, R. (1997). Education savages. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 83(2), 152-171.
- Morris, R., Sanchez, J. & Stuckey, Mary E. (2000). *AmongUS: Essays on Identity, Belonging, and Intercultural Competence*. Lustig, Myron & Koester, Jolene (Eds.) Why Can't They Just Get Over It? 134-148.
- Morris, Richard & Stuckey, E. Mary (2004). Cultured Memories: Power, Memory, and Finalism. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 28(4), 1-35.
- Morris, Richard & Stuckey, Mary E. (1998). *Cultural Diversity and the U.S. Media*. Kamalipour, Y. R. & Carilli T. (Eds.), Destroying the past to save the present: pastoral voice and native identity. 137-147.
- Morris, Richard & Wander, Philip (1990). Native American rhetoric: dancing in the shadows of the ghost dance. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76, 164-191.
- Neihardt, John G. (1932, 1961). *Black Elk Speaks*. Bison Books: New York.
- Newhouse, David. (2004). Indigenous knowledge in a multi-cultural world. Native Studies Review. 15(2), 139-154.
- Nichols, Bill (1992). *Representing Reality: Issue and Concepts in Documentary*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington & Indianapolis.
- Olsen, C. James (1965). *Red Cloud and the Sioux Problem*. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln.
- Owens, Louis (1998). *Mixedblood Messages: Literature, Film, Family, Place*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman.

Page, Jake (2003). *In the Hands of The Great Spirit: 20,000 Year History of American Indians*. Free Press: New York.

Pomeroy, Jim (2004). *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*. Senie, Harriet F. & Webster, Sally (Eds.). Selections from Rushmore – Another Look. The University of South Carolina Press.

Rice, Julian (1998). “It was their own fault for being intractable”: internalized racism and wounded knee. *American Indian Quarterly*, 22, 63-83.

Riley, Patricia, (Ed.). (1993). *Growing Up Native American: An Anthology*. William Morrow and Company Inc.: New York.

Roberts, Chris (2002, December). Sculptor korczak ziolkowski’s crazy horse memorial in the black hills is an eye-catching work in progress. *Wild West*, 15(4), 66-68.

Sanchez, John & Stuckey, Mary E. (1999). Communication culture through leadership: one view from Indian country. *Communication Studies*, 50(2), 103-115.

Sanchez, John & Stuckey, Mary E. (2000). The rhetoric of american indian activism in the 1960s and 1970s. *Communication Quarterly*, 48, (2), p.120-135.

Sanchez, John & Stuckey, Mary E. (1999). From boarding schools to the multicultural classroom: the intercultural politics of education, assimilation, and american indians. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, p.83-95.

Simons, M. Herbert. (1970). *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism Second Edition*. Burghardt, Carl R.(Ed.), Requirements, problems and strategies: a theory of persuasion for social movements. (379-390), Strata College PA. Strata Publishing Inc.

Stewart, Charles J. (1999). Championing the rights of others and challenging evil: the ego function in the rhetoric of other-directed social movements. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 64, (2), p.91-104.

Stuckey, Mary E. & Murphy, John M. (2001). By any other name: rhetorical colonialism in north america. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 25, (4), p.72-98.

Stuckey, Mary E. & Morris, Richard (1999). Pocahontas and beyond: commodification and cultural hegemony. *World Communication*, 28, (2), p.45-65.

Swanson, John (2005). Mato Najen: Chief Standing Bear.
<http://moh.tie.net/content/docs/MatoNajen.pdf>.

Taliaferro, John (2002). *Great White Fathers: The Story of the Obsessive Quest to Create Mount Rushmore*. Public Affairs: New York.

Tichi, Cecelia (2001). *Embodiment of a Nation: Human Form in American Places*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge Massachusetts.

Tinker, George (2003). *Native Voices: America Indian Identity and Resistance*. (Eds.) Grounds, Richard A.; Tinker, George E. & Wilkins, David E. American Indian religious traditions, colonialism, resistance, and liberation. 225-239. University Press of Kansas: Lawrence.

Tizon, Alex. (1997, November 16). Forceful vision behind crazy horse monument. *The Times Union*, G1.

Turner, Fredrick J. (1921). *The Frontier Thesis in American History*. Henry Holt and Company of New York: retrieved, 2010, May.
<http://xroads.virginia.edu/~Hyper/TURNER/>

Utley, M. Robert (1973). *Frontier Regulars: The United States Army and the Indian 1866-1891*. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.: New York.

Utley, M Robert (1993). *The Lance and the Shield: The Life and Times of Sitting Bull*. New York. Ballantine Books.

Warner, Gary (1999, July 4). The Great American Face-off Mount Rushmore and Crazy Horse Share Space and Controversy in the Black Hills of South Dakota. *The Orange County Register*, D1.

Warnick, Barbara (1987). The Narrative Paradigm: Another Story. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 172-182.

Welsh, Chris (2003, July, 27). Crazy Horse Monumental Man. *Star Tribune: Newspaper of the Twin Cities*, G10.

Welsh, Chris (1994, November, 27). Is Changing the Nature of a Mountain – by Making a Man out of it – in the Spirit of Crazy Horse? Captured in Stone. *Star Tribune: Newspaper of the Twin Cities*, G1.

Wilkins, David, E. & Lomawaima, K., Tsianina (2001). *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman.