

Unearthing the Native Past:

Citizen Archaeology and Modern (Non)Belonging at the Pueblo Grande Museum

Roberta Chevrette
Doctoral Candidate
Hugh Downs School of Human Communication
Arizona State University, PO Box 871205
Tempe, AZ 85287, USA.
roberta.chevrette@asu.edu

Aaron Hess, PhD
Assistant Professor of Communication
Arizona State University
Mailcode: 0320
411 N. Central Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85004
aaron.hess@asu.edu

Roberta Chevrette is a Doctoral Candidate in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication at Arizona State University. Aaron Hess is Assistant Professor of Communication in the College of Letters and Sciences, Languages and Cultures, at the Downtown Phoenix campus at Arizona State University. The authors, who contributed equally to the essay, would like to thank editor Robert DeChaine and the two anonymous reviewers for their keen insights on this manuscript. Amira de la Garza, Karen Leong, Sarah Tracy, Elizabeth Swadener, and Erica Redner-Vera also provided generous feedback in earlier stages of this project. Correspondence to: Roberta Chevrette, Hugh Downs School of Human Communication, Arizona State University, PO Box 871205, Tempe, AZ 85287, USA. Email: roberta.chevrette@asu.edu

Unearthing the Native Past:

Citizen Archaeology and Modern (Non)Belonging at Pueblo Grande Museum

Abstract

Portrayals of the US Southwest's Native American inhabitants as "primitive" relics have been shaped by the intertwining practices of archaeological collection and museum display. Focusing on Pueblo Grande Museum in Phoenix, Arizona, this essay analyzes the interpellation of museum visitors as *citizen archaeologists*, a process which re/produces racialized discourses through rhetorics of science and time. It is argued that as visitors excavate remnants of the past they engage an *archaeological vision* that reinforces dominant constructions of "modern" citizenship. This vision maintains colonial histories by disallowing Native peoples both authorship of the past and belonging in the present.

Keywords: Pueblo Grande Museum; primitivism; citizen archaeology; Native American Other;

US Southwest

Unearthing the Native Past:

Citizen Archaeology and Modern (Non)Belonging at Pueblo Grande Museum

The US Southwest has played a central role in the formation of US national identity against an internal, “primitive” Other. As part of the greater Old West, the Southwest forms an important component of the frontier mythos that constructed Native Americans as “the ‘savage’ opposite to Anglo-Americans’ ‘civilization’ and culture.”¹ However, the region’s extensive settlement by Indigenous peoples with sedentary lifestyles prior to Euro-American contact also imbued Southwestern memoryscapes with unique characteristics. In contrast to the Hollywood trope of “wild Indians”² in feather headdresses with fierce battle cries, Native Americans of the Southwest have instead been popularly portrayed as gentle individuals living in agricultural societies typified by the Pueblos.³ With its dense communities of “peaceful Indians” imagined to reflect earlier stages of human progress, the Southwest powerfully contributed to national discourses of the “noble savage.”

This historical portrayal of the Southwest’s Indigenous inhabitants and the national imaginary to which it contributed were heavily influenced by three interrelated enterprises: tourism, anthropology, and archaeology. Due to the preservation of artifacts enabled by its arid climate, the still-standing physical structures that offered evidence of the region’s long occupancy, and the artisanry of its inhabitants, the Southwest has been “one of the most intensely anthropologized areas of the globe.”⁴ As material cultures were codified through archaeological collection and displayed in museums, the Southwest attracted professionals and tourists alike seeking to excavate remnants of the past, including the region’s Native peoples. Cast as “living relics,”⁵ Natives of the Southwest were viewed through the lens of primitivism, or “the ideology that noble savages live in a highly desirable state of purity and harmony.”⁶

Primitivism involves what Renato Rosaldo describes as imperialist nostalgia, in which “people mourn the passing of what they themselves have transformed.”⁷ According to Leah Dilworth the imperialist nostalgia that informed historical tourism in the Southwest reflected a yearning not for an actual past but for an Indian that never was, a version of Native life that reflected the anxieties and desires of the US middle-class.⁸ The meanings tied to Native Americans through primitivism featured the romantic idealization of simplicity, appealing “to modern desires for tradition, authenticity, and the spiritual associations ‘primitive’ people held with the natural world.”⁹ The Southwest thus became a site for both the physical and imaginary wanderings of Euro-American settler society in the 20th century, leading novelist D. H. Lawrence to describe the region as “the great playground of the white American.”¹⁰

The Southwest continues to function as a “national playground.”¹¹ In Phoenix, Arizona, the largest Southwestern metropolis, a proliferation of museums and memory sites exist among other attractions. Visitors come to tour the past, enjoy the Spring Training baseball season, attend business meetings, gamble at “Indian casinos,” or golf while escaping the winter cold. Amidst these, however, the Native past is inescapable. Freeways are adorned with petroglyph designs. Native souvenirs are available throughout the valley. Hotel rooms feature artworks depicting Native Americans, and lobbies contain brochures for historical sites. Among these is the Pueblo Grande Museum and Archaeological Park (PGM). Established in 1964 and designated an Arizona “Point of Pride,” the museum offers visitors a chance to tour an excavated platform mound once occupied by the region’s Indigenous peoples, enter recreated living structures, and examine artifacts on display. Unlike many surrounding memory places, this museum also serves a different purpose. As described by the City of Phoenix, PGM visitors not only encounter “a

prehistoric Hohokam archaeological village site,”¹² they also participate in hands-on activities to learn “the science of archaeology.”¹³

PGM’s focus on archaeology makes it an intriguing site for analyzing how museums, tourism, and archaeology rhetorically position Native Americans as objects of the past, an act which has consequences for present-day Native subjects, including the 22 federally-recognized tribes residing in Arizona. By attending to the specificities of archaeological knowing as it is authored by and engaged within the museum, we examine archaeology as a mode of rhetorical vision/experience that re/produces the borders of citizenship.¹⁴ We argue that through *archaeological vision*, museum visitors construct an image not only of Native American culture and the Southwest but also of what it means to be “an American” and “modern” citizen, a process we call *citizen archaeology*. Informed by the western epistemology that undergirds scientific discourses, citizen archaeologists hierarchize knowledge practices and subjectivities within the museum space through a rhetoric of difference that extends into larger national structures and modes of belonging.

National Subjects and Primitive Objects: Archaeology, Museums, and the Southwest

PGM’s offering of archaeology as a lens for understanding culture serves as a powerful epistemological framework. As a “form of expertise and as an intellectual discipline [archaeology] occupies a privileged position in Western societies, and in debates about the past.”¹⁵ Rhetorically, archaeology engages a discourse of science that implies a sense of self-evidence, of “facts” standing on their own without need of interpretation.¹⁶ The deployment of scientific discourse is politically consequential; as Laurajane Smith argues, positioning archaeology as “neutral and value free....ensures that the power/knowledge strategy that underpins archaeological expertise is maintained in the face of the critiques and challenges

offered by Indigenous peoples.”¹⁷ As visions of the past pass through an archeological lens, they can reflect or refract strategic representations of identity and community, affecting Indigenous struggles for sovereignty. Archaeology’s “expert knowledge thus becomes included in the ‘political’ arena.”¹⁸ But archaeology is not only political when it directly enters the legal realm. By (re)defining Indigenous histories as knowable only through Western frameworks, archaeology also serves as a technology of governance through its regulation of cultural discourses about the past. Simultaneously, the scientific discourses on which archaeology relies enable its knowledge production to be understood as apolitical “as it is seen to rest on technical rationalist calculation, which must operate above competing interests.”¹⁹

Emerging from the archaeological enterprise, museum representations of Native Americans further regulate discourses about the past, in the process also regulating present subjectivities. One primary manner by which this is accomplished is through technologies of vision. As Tony Bennett has argued, the “exhibitionary complex”²⁰ of the museum emerged as part of “a new regime of representation”²¹ for disciplining subjects in the imperial order. Shifting the display of colonial “curiosities” from private parlors to public spaces, 19th-century museums organized vision according to Social Darwinist principles in which the colonial powers occupied the highest stage of civilization with all other cultures placed along an evolutionary scale. Moreover, museums were specifically envisioned as sites where “civilized” behaviors could be cultivated and instilled. Historical spectatorship of Native Americans and other “primitives” reified “modern” subjects against distant (and different) objects, offering a means of ordering the populace into a “self-regulating citizenry” through visitors’ public performances as the “subjects rather than the objects of knowledge.”²² In the US, this process re/produced racial structures

underpinning the settler colonial nation-state, turning Indigenous persons into data, cultures into relics, and museums into the “Noah’s arks of salvaged cultures.”²³

The technologies of vision underlying the racialized production of citizen-subjects in museums directly intersected with the rhetorics of science mobilized by the discipline of archaeology to contribute to tourism in the Southwest. In a 20th-century tourist guide, museum curator George Dorsey stated “if we may better understand civilized man of to-day by a knowledge of man in more primitive conditions, then surely the Southwest forms a field, not only to scientific students but to all who have a broad interest in mankind, second to that presented by no other region in the world.”²⁴ Visitors flocked to the Southwest to view what was promoted as a kind of “American Orient,” a land where “foreign people, with foreign speech and foreign ways, offer[ed] spectacles...equaled in very few Oriental lands.”²⁵ And like the disciplinary formation of Orientalism described by Edward Said, in which the East was discursively created as the West’s mirror,²⁶ popular conceptions of the Southwest have long reflected a vision of white Euro-American society back to itself.

Contrasting the Native Other against the Euro-American self, primitivism’s “backward gaze of nostalgia was more than a consolatory leisure escape into the simpler times of a ‘bygone era.’”²⁷ Instead, nostalgia established Natives of the Southwest as spectacles for the national gaze while simultaneously functioning “to legitimize new political orders, rationalize the adjustment and perpetuation of old social hierarchies, and construct new systems of thought and values.”²⁸ As “a pose of ‘innocent yearning,’ [imperialist nostalgia served] both to capture people’s imaginations and to conceal its complicity with often brutal domination.”²⁹ Inextricable from moralizing discourses of progress and preservation, primitivism thus masked the genocidal and imperial practices on which the nation was founded, fostering American pride in its

“antiquities” while configuring Native Americans as the nation’s objects rather than its subjects. These colonial discourses not only inform contemporary interpretations of culture and civilization, they actively circulate in many areas of society, and especially at museum sites.

The Museum as Rhetorical Site

In examining the display of Native American material culture at the PGM, we understand the museum to be a rhetorical site, insofar as it provides clues into identity and citizenship for visitors. Bennett’s theorization of the exhibitionary complex provides a foundation for understanding the museum site as forming national subjectivities. We thus view the museum as a sphere in which cultural citizenship, or what Aihwa Ong describes as the “dual process of self-making and being-made within webs of power linked to the nation-state and civil society,” is enacted.³⁰ As Teresa Bergman argues, “[t]he act of visiting a museum, memorial, or historic site constitutes a performance of citizenship.”³¹ Moreover, this performance is collectively enacted with other visitors who together traverse the spaces of the past through contemporary notions of identity and belonging.³² Our focus in this essay is therefore not on how the categories of citizen and citizenship function in a legal or directly political sense, but on citizenship as a mode of public engagement through which national subjects are discursively and relationally constructed. In other words, while visiting the museum can itself be understood as an act of citizenship, our focus is on how the museum and interactions occurring within rhetorically construct the national citizen as “a symbolic and collective identity”³³ through a discourse of cultural and temporal belonging that, as Robert Asen puts it “includes and excludes.”³⁴

To examine enactments of citizenship at PGM, we analyze the museum from a critical rhetorical and ethnographic approach. Rhetorical approaches examine how museums “make claims on audiences” and “the ways material sites engage audiences in compelling historical

narratives.”³⁵ These narratives do not merely tell of the past; they “provide their audiences with an opportunity to reflect on events, and they provide a touchstone or basis for present and future actions for individuals and for countries.”³⁶ In other words, rhetorical scholars examine museum texts to understand how narratives of the past may be implicated in present subjectivities and national identities. To further understand these processes as they occur within the museum site, we follow the recent turn in rhetorical scholarship toward augmenting traditional criticism with embodied and participatory tools.³⁷

Regarding museum sites, a variety of rhetorical scholars have attended to the material functions of such spaces.³⁸ However, despite many instrumental analyses of memory places as material and embodied sites, few rhetorical scholars have situated their analyses of museum texts within an ethnographic engagement that includes visitor interviews and sustained attention to conversations inside the museum.³⁹ At PGM, the vision offered by museum texts is actively taken up by many visitors. Including their voices in our analysis offers insight into how the museum interacts with, and extends into, larger experiential landscapes of the US Southwest. As defined by Greg Dickinson, Brian Ott, and Eric Aoki, “experiential landscapes” include museums’ physical surroundings as well as the “range of memorized images” visitors bring to the site, which offer “a set of intertextual relations or ‘codes’” that reflect larger ideological structures.⁴⁰ By playing upon these “memorized images,” museums reinscribe existing subject positions and ideologies. Inquiring directly into visitors’ experiences in relation to these landscapes adds to our understanding and interpretation of the museum’s representational claims.⁴¹

In our analysis, we follow an experiential path frequently taken by first-time visitors that primes visitors for their encounter with the outdoor excavation site. This priming, enacted

through the museum's design, videos, and exhibits, offers visitors a mode of seeing and reading the museum space. They are directed to become *citizen archaeologists*, which we contend is a constitution of identity and citizenship through a colonial narrative of Othering. Reinforcing discourses of scientific progress and expertise against a nostalgic vision of "the primitive," the museum reproduces colonial asymmetries of knowledge while encouraging visitors to envision themselves outside of these structures. Leaving the museum, visitors extend their *archaeological vision* into larger experiential landscapes and to the people, places, and subjectivities found therein. These landscapes both inform visitors as they traverse the museum and become points of cultural distinction as they exit.

Acquiring the Tools: Becoming an Archaeologist at the Pueblo Grande

To visit PGM, which lies just outside downtown Phoenix, visitors must travel under freeway overpasses and over light rail tracks, passing by billboards, office buildings, and industrial neighborhood sights. The city skyline and air traffic from the nearby airport further engage visitors in an urban experience, contributing to an experiential landscape in which the museum and the culture represented within are constructed as separate and removed from these "modern" surroundings. On Washington Street, an entrance sign invites visitors to "Explore the Ancient." Two images accompany this appeal: in the center, an adult and child gaze at a display of artifacts. Atop the sign, a second image depicts a group of white visitors engaged in conversation. Taken together, the images illustrate the technologies of vision mobilized by the expansion of Southwestern tourism and the anthropological display of Native "Others" that contributed to US nation building. As white visitors converse with one another while looking upon the material objects of the Native "past," the act of spectatorship within the museum unfolds as a racialized "conversation of 'us' with 'us' about 'them.'"⁴² The building sits far back

from the street; to get to the entrance visitors follow painted lizards down a cement path toward aluminum-framed double glass doors flanked by “primitive” Kokopelli and warrior designs, previewing the temporal juxtapositions, and distancings, that continue within.⁴³

The museum visit begins with a ten-minute film in the small theater located off the *Dig It!* gallery. The video provides a summary of the site’s occupation and abandonment, and its subsequent archaeological excavation and interpretation. Here, visitors are exposed to claims such as “the great mystery remains,” and “what you see today will tantalize and intrigue you.” The video primes viewers to engage in a narrative of mystery in which they become detectives, excavating Native Americans’ “lost” history through archaeological evidence.

Emerging from the theater, one faces a lifelike model of an archaeologist kneeling atop a cutaway wall, revealing the strata of the earth below. Each stratum presents a different layer of time. Compressed into the dirt, visitors can see and touch the different eras and their artifacts. At the top, a hubcap, a shard of glass, and a sunglass lens are visible. Below the “modern” dirt, a broken pot juts out toward the visitor. The stratigraphic display provides visitors with a linear interpretation of history that eschews Indigenous understandings of time as cyclical and reinforces narratives of progress through its positioning of modern artifacts above and against the more “primitive” layers below. Continuing down the strata, as visitors “find” Native artifacts, the objects reflecting their own existence disappear, distancing their contemporary experiences and identities from Native peoples. Further down, vertebrae rest near the floor at the bottom of “time.” A sign informs the visitor that these are not dinosaur but mammoth bones and that “they would need to dig deeper” to find the dinosaurs. The sign also reminds visitors that paleontologists are those who study dinosaurs while archeologists “study human cultures.” The juxtaposition of animal remains with Native artifacts underscores the objectification of Native

peoples inside natural history museums.⁴⁴ Another association is also made in this exchange; archeology is about extinction. Whether dinosaurs, mammoths, or Native Americans, the objects being investigated here are remnants of a past that no longer exists.⁴⁵

In the same room, interactive displays shout in bright colors: “Build Your Own Adobe Compound,” and “Design Your Own Pot.” Although the room is designed to appeal to children, many adults also begin here, learning the “Tools of the Trade.” In its presentation of how archaeologists know what they know, this gallery grounds visitors in an archaeological epistemology accented with particular notions of linear time and progressive evolution. It sees Native artifacts as containers of knowledge or resources available for an empirical investigation rather than Natives themselves as harboring such knowledge. Also situated beneath the mannequin archaeologist are a series of definitions: “archaeology,” “site,” “artifact,” and “excavate.” The central term, “archaeology,” is defined as the “scientific study of the remains of past cultures.” The other definitions further emphasize science, with “excavate” meaning to “carefully uncover, measure, map and record remains of the past,” and “artifacts” defined as providing “clues about past lifeways.” Interactive exhibits ask visitors to determine which basket would have left a particular fossilized imprint or which tool would be most appropriate for digging, providing them with the knowledge by which, they too, can excavate the past’s meanings.

Hinting at the racialized subjectivities enacted in museum performances of archaeological knowing is the photograph of predominantly white archaeologists excavating the site that stretches across one wall. On a different wall, a large photograph of a contemporary Native woman appears. As she stares intently at the pot she is shaping, the display text discusses pottery crafting under the heading: “Clues from Tradition.” Situated between an oversized pot replica

and a display requiring visitors to identify various animal bones, the location of this photograph—the only image of a Native American in this gallery—suggests a reading of the woman not as a contemporary citizen-subject but as a historical object or living fossil, a “clue” to be studied by archaeologists as well as the larger public for whom the display is intended. In this manner, the culture and fate of the Hohokam is offered as a “puzzle” to be “solved” through “clues” interpreted by professionals and visitors alike. To partake in the rhetoric of the museum is thus to *become* an archaeologist.

The next stop, *The Land and the People* gallery, is frequently the starting point for the museum’s guided tours. On the wall facing the entryway, a timeline offers a linear narrative of the site’s occupancy, ending in 1450 when the Hohokam are said to have disappeared.⁴⁶ A map of the “ancient” canal system stretches horizontally across the adjoining wall, a network of blue lines. On one guided tour, a docent pointed out several fragmented lines. “You see these lines?” he asked. “These appeared to archaeologists to be canals too, but there were parts missing, maybe eroded, or gone for whatever reason. They could have just assumed and stretched the lines to connect, but if the archaeologists in the early twentieth century didn’t find it they didn’t put it on the map—that’s the way scientists work.” Such discourses of scientific expertise suggest that the museum offers a factual reconstruction of the past.

Across the room, an artist’s rendering of life on the platform mound engages pastoral tropes: a landscape quilted by crops and dotted with trees is surrounded by hills much greener than their current state, inviting a nostalgic reading of an idyllic past. On the same guided tour, the docent explained that the painting is an interpretation of Hohokam society. “They didn’t leave a written language, which makes it more fun, ‘cause you can make up your own story,” he joked. “Of course, archaeologists, they prefer evidence.” The emphasis on knowing the past

through scientific evidence enables Indigenous oral histories to be positioned as “stories” or “legends” in contrast to archaeological modes of knowing.⁴⁷ The scientific archaeologist is thus displayed as the central narrator of the authorized story, faced with the nearly insurmountable task of “uncovering” the “truth” of the past.

Beside this image a sign reads: “Did they Disappear? The Debate...” After offering three possible interpretations of the past, the text invokes a visitor response: “What do you think happened?” The Hohokam “disappearance” is presented for pondering, as visitors are invited to use the archaeological tools and evidence to come to their own conclusions. Wandering deeper into the gallery, one exhibit asks passing visitors, “How do archaeologists know?,” providing answers through recreated field notes that “reveal an archaeologist’s answers.” A neighboring exhibit notes that trash mounds provide clues into the Hohokam culture and that “archaeological research benefits” from their existence. Through this language, the exhibit suggests that the knowledge of the Hohokam past exists due to—and for—the benefits of science. The focus on archaeological interpretation simultaneously draws visitors back into the present, inviting them to enter the role of an expert able to know about Native cultures of the past and, ostensibly, of the present.

These experiences and interpellations instill a sense of *archaeological vision* that features prominently in producing the citizen archeologist.⁴⁸ As a mode of seeing, archaeological vision invites superiority, objectification, and expertise, allowing visitors to distance their own subjectivities from the excavated culture. This vision presumes a sense of cultural extinction in which the “lost” past can only be known through its relics. Leaving the gallery with the tools and knowledge of science in hand, visitors are ready to enact their archaeologist role on the grounds

of the excavation site. Their journey toward citizen archaeologist is only partly complete; at the mound, they must utilize and extend their knowledge into the dig itself.

Excavating the Past: Experiencing Native Relics in “Our” Time

The museum’s outdoor interpretive trail includes many exhibits: the mound itself, described as an excavated “city”; an adobe compound, or what signs identify as “the suburbs”; recreated pithouses, which display typical living arrangements; the ball court, described in reference to a contemporary sporting arena; and an outdoor kitchen and garden. Circumscribing the grounds, a contemporary canal carries water for the modern desert city surroundings. In interacting with various exhibits, visitors not only look upon the past but are invited to “experience what it was like” for themselves. Moreover, engaging with these outdoor features requires visitors to implicate their new-found scientific knowledge within the larger urban context surrounding the site. The contrast between the “ancient” grounds and the surrounding cityscape contributes to the rhetorical effects and affects circulated within this portion of the museum, which rely on and sediment juxtapositions between present/past, civilized/primitive, and us/them. These juxtapositions contribute to the collective identities and (non)belongings created within the museum by contrasting contemporary citizen-subjects against their temporal Others.

To begin the self-guided mound tour, visitors exit the museum through another set of Kokopelli-flanked doors. Outside, small placards identify the scientific and popular names of surrounding plants and animals. These signs are peppered throughout the tour, intertwining the experience of learning about Native culture with learning about the natural environment. The placement of Native objects with flora and fauna was common in the display of ethnographic collections as “cabinets of curiosities,”⁴⁹ a practice carrying over into the natural history

approach in which Native peoples belonged only as scientific specimens and spectacle—“dinosaurs on the left, Indians to the right.”⁵⁰ As “parts of nature,” Native peoples were “classified and presented according to similarity of form, evolutionary stage of development, or geographical origin.”⁵¹ Throughout the museum, frequent discussions of Native practices in relation to the vegetation indirectly reference these traditions of display and the narratives of progress on which they rely, positioning Native peoples of the past as seemingly springing from nature itself while positioning urban visitors as more “advanced.”

Visitors are also juxtaposed against Native culture through direct references to time.⁵² The trail entrance sign reads: “A Special Place: Welcome to Pueblo Grande, a prehistoric Hohokam Indian village. For the next half hour your walk along this trail will take you back in time when this place was very different.” As visitors begin their journey down a winding adobe path, subsequent signs continue this theme with claims of “moving back in time,” or “Time Travel.” These references are bolstered by the initial framing of the museum through the stratigraphy exhibit in the *Dig It!* gallery. Time progresses forward, but the museum can reclaim and reconstruct the past—at least partially—to represent its primitive nature. Through these framings and the experience of the “natural” setting, visitors are invited to imagine themselves in an ancient place. The chirping of birds and the sighting of the occasional lizard or jackrabbit further instill a feeling of escape from “modern” life, offering a glimpse of the pastoral experience that has long fascinated the Euro-American imagination.⁵³ In our experiences at PGM, we found that even the steady hum of nearby traffic quickly faded from awareness until a glaring train whistle or noisy aircraft approaching the nearby landing strip interrupted the “silence.” The attempted entrance into “another time” is therefore impossible to fully achieve—reminders of contemporary urban life literally hover overhead.

The museum does not endeavor to hide these surroundings from visitors; in fact, it engages them directly, with one sign noting: “Pueblo Grande has become a prehistoric island in a sea of urban development.” Visitors took up these juxtapositions in their remarks, expressing awe at the site’s preservation amidst massive industrialization. One visitor stated, “Well, it’s pretty phenomenal that all this is still here after all these years, and we see that it’s in...downtown Phoenix.” Another visitor descending from the mound commented: “Pretty neat stuff up there...Pretty amazing that it exists in the middle of a city.” As the museum’s frequent references to time act upon visitors in relation to their urban surroundings, they extend the archaeological discourses encountered inside the museum in more experiential ways. As the past is envisioned as a retreat to a pastoral oasis, it becomes a site for the nostalgic longings through which “modern” subjectivities are reaffirmed.

The emphasis on archaeological knowing presented within the museum is also extended through the outdoor tour. Atop the mound, a sign identifies the first rectangular indentation as “Miller’s Room,” named after Dr. Joshua Miller who conducted the initial excavation at PGM in 1901. Rather than commemorating the mound’s former occupants or their contemporary descendents, the first room encountered instead privileges the act of excavation. Placards identify the purposes of other rooms through archaeological evidence, marking places for storage, ceremonies, and other activities. As they traverse the mound, visitors are thus invited to engage with it as an archaeologist would, applying their knowledge to interpret the lives of the peoples who once lived there. The mound tour also foregrounds the Hohokam’s accomplishments, emphasizing the architectural structures and the canal system. While this could be seen as an interruption of the Native=Nature equation, it fails to fully negate the terms of this pairing. Instead, through the lens of primitivism Natives are revered for their practical, skill-based labor

and artisanry and their ability to make use of the materials provided by the environment in contrast to the alienation of labor produced by industrialization.⁵⁴ Because industrialization—as progress—is embedded in narratives of US citizenship, this reinforces rather than disrupts the location of Native Americans in the past proceeding US American civilization.

Conversations about the canals revealed this tension: One tour guide explained that “people think of ancient people as unsophisticated, backward...but to be able to know that water needs to go faster to go around curves...that takes sophistication. You have to be brilliant, very bright to get this to happen.” Another guide described the precision required of canal gradients: too shallow and the water would stagnate; too steep and the water would be uncontrollable. “They had to be very clever to do that,” one visitor replied. While these comments seem, on the surface, to counter stereotypes of Native societies as unadvanced, the use of patronizing adjectives such as “bright” and “clever” maintain historical discourses of primitivism in which Southwestern Native Americans were seen to offer a glimpse into “our” past. As with the layers of sediment that reflect the “natural” progression of time, the “primitive” labor through which the canal systems were built can be seen as simply another stage of civilization’s progress.

Continuing along the path, the next stage of the visitor’s journey through time invites them to walk directly into the past itself. Arriving at the adobe compound and pithouses, visitors enter recreated structures where reproductions of the artifacts presented inside the museum adorn the walls and floors. Here, the earthen smell and temperature shift felt upon stepping out of the Arizona sun draw the visitor into an embodied relationship with the structures. Comments frequently exchanged inside included: “What would it have been like to live back then?” “What if this was your house?” “Where would you sleep?” Docents often asked visitors to guess the purposes of various items, extending the ongoing positioning of visitors as archaeologists while

also reminding them that “the people living during this time period had to use only what Nature provided. They couldn’t just drive over to the nearest Wal-Mart or Home Depot and buy what they needed.” Such statements invite visitors to experience the past through a nostalgic lens, as evidenced in visitors’ wistful statements about a “lost” past in which one’s labor was more meaningful. As one visitor announced, “I think people had to live closer...you had to rely on each other.” Another stated, “living during that time period...you live with a purpose in life.” Valorizing Native culture for its presumed connection to a more authentic way of being, visitors are continually reminded of the relationship between Native culture and nature—and their own distance from it, a contradiction built into primitivism itself. Even as visitors take up the appeal to imagine themselves living in a different time, in harmony with nature, they are continually reminded through comments, displays, and the surrounding cityscape itself that such a return is not possible.

Further down the adobe trail, the final exhibits include the ball court, kitchen, and garden. In one instructive exchange at the court, a docent remarked that “we” don’t really know how the game was played. Pointing into the deep pit, he said, “See that rock in the center? That was there when it was dug out. So *we* left it there, thinking it was there on purpose.” Through this language, the docent positions himself as one of the site’s excavators. Repeated utterances of “we” by museum texts and docents likewise invite visitors to not only excavate the site’s meanings as archaeologists would, but to take authorship over the knowledge constructed within the museum. Furthermore, through frequent invocations of “we,” visitors are not only interpellated into the subject position of the archaeologist but into “normative discourses of belonging” that rely on their distance and distinction from the culture represented within the museum.⁵⁵ The final stops at the outdoor kitchen and garden only reinforce this distance,

presenting forms of subsistence still utilized in regions of the world as “what people did before there were grocery stores.”

Time therefore serves a dual purpose in this outdoor setting. Rhetorically, it is deployed by the museum, which invites visitors to step back in time to uncover the cultural past of the Hohokam. This experience is recreated by the relative quiet of the grounds, the expansive natural surroundings, and the reproductions of living areas. But time is also used as a means of reinforcing the “modern” citizen-subject through differentiation as visitors contrast contemporary technology and comfort against the “primitive” Hohokam culture. Visitors attempting to imagine themselves “back in time” are constantly reminded that when their visit ends, they will indeed drive away in air conditioned cars, go shopping at Wal-Mart for frozen dinners, cook them in microwaves, and watch T.V. while they eat. In this manner, visitors are able to profess admiration for the peoples of the past through a “distanced, observational gaze” in which science and technology are still rendered superior.⁵⁶ The museum thus sediments and reinforces progress narratives that have long undergirded Euro-American structures of knowledge regarding Native cultures. Such narratives hinge upon essentialized constructions of difference that locate Native peoples of the past—and also Native peoples of the present, as we argue below—outside of contemporary civilization, enabling their supposed disappearance to be seen as the inevitable outcome of modern society’s advancements.

Citizen Archaeology: Extending the Museum into the Southwestern Landscape

The archaeological vision fostered by the museum underscores a rhetoric of difference through which visitors contrast their own subjectivities against Native peoples. Bolstered by the science of archaeology to “know” the lost Hohokam culture, visitors often extend their knowledge to comment about the “lost” cultures of present-day Native peoples in the Southwest

region and throughout the nation. And yet, given the primitivist romanticization of the past, contemporary Native Americans are caught in a double-bind; they are unable to return to the past or reclaim it from the grip of archaeological science, nor are they afforded a place to belong in the narrative of modern progress. As one visitor puts it, “you...respect [Native Americans’] way of life although we know that they can’t live like they used to. You’ve got to keep up.”

Because Native culture is already equated with the past, however, for present-day Native cultures to “keep up” does not present itself as a viable rhetorical option. Instead, the celebration of the past can negatively affect Indigenous communities who fail to “properly” perform their cultural identity in the present. This was evidenced in visitors’ occasional juxtapositions of praise for past Native culture with disdain for present-day Native Americans’ lack of “authenticity.” One visitor, for instance, easily transitioned from a glowing description of the Southwestern culture portrayed in the museum to make a disparaging reference to the “Casino Indians” she had encountered elsewhere. “All those Indians were in malls,” she said. As Celeste Lacroix contends, casinos feature as “antithetical” to the image of the noble savage, which positions “native peoples as outside of and alien to dominant American capitalistic cultural practices.”⁵⁷ In Phoenix, markers of affluence dot the landscape in the form of malls, golf courses, and the expansive mansions found in nearby Scottsdale. Casinos can also be found in all corners of the Valley and advertised on digital billboards just outside the museum grounds. But for this visitor, “Casino Indians,” or Native Americans who occupy the materialistic spaces of capitalism informing US cultural citizenship, simply do not belong.

Continuing the conversation, the visitor further reinforced her point. “The Indians need to get involved with their own damn culture,” she said. “They don’t even speak their languages anymore, these kids, they don’t care.” “They want to be white,” her date interjected. Frozen in

time, Native Americans are excised from the sphere of modern belonging in a directly racialized manner; no longer worthy of idealization, contemporary Native Americans simply want to (but cannot) be white. Revealed in this and other like comments is that despite Euro-American settler society's long fascination with "playing Indian,"⁵⁸—as in, visiting a museum and imagining living "back then" in adobe pithouses—contemporary Native Americans cannot similarly "'play civilized' and still be 'Indians.'"⁵⁹ Instead, the regulating discourses of primitivism subject Native Americans to a "kind of purism in which [their] value...lies in their ability to elude westernization."⁶⁰

However, despite these sometimes blatant references to race that clearly positioned Native peoples outside "modern" society, when asked direct questions about museum representations and their purposes, docents and visitors acknowledged past racism while failing to recognize inequalities that extend into the present. For example, one visitor stated: "in the past we know that the Native Americans in the United States were not treated fairly." The US nation-state's less than idyllic treatment of Native Americans is thus, like the Hohokam culture, seen as something that existed long ago. For this visitor, past racism against Native peoples is not implicated in PGM's discourses; instead, as a site of learning, the museum is a place where these structures are imagined to be undone. As one visitor stated, "I think the more you learn about Native culture, the more...respect you give to those people." From this perspective, having knowledge of Native Others is part of ensuring their equal treatment. Moreover, although their travel to and spectatorship of Native culture in the Southwest is enabled by dominant structures of capital, knowledge, and power, visitors are invited to see themselves as located outside of these structures. Rather, visitors exist in a happily multicultural present where all cultures are equally valued and have equal opportunity. The sentiment that cultural and racial inequalities

exist only in the past absolves (white) visitors of any implication in the ongoing destruction of Indigenous communities. The museum's perpetuation of a narrative of disappearance further sediments this absolutism. When read alongside constructions of "Casino Indians" and their rejection of their own (primitive) culture, Native Americans themselves can only be to blame for their own impoverished situation.

As visitors exit the museum through the Kokopelli-flanked doors and traverse the painted lizard path to return to cars or tour buses, the knowledge constructed within extends into experiential landscapes, affecting broader understandings of belonging, citizenship, and place. The archaeologist's tools are left behind in the *Dig It!* exhibit for others to pick up and use. Yet, newly trained visitors carry with them the ideologies of archaeology: its epistemology, abstraction of human experience, and colonial legacies. Departing from the "past" contained within the museum to return to the present, the role of the archaeologist becomes fully realized. Visitors leave the museum space to return to the modern streets of Phoenix, the greater Southwest, and their home states and countries with the knowledge gained from exhibits, docents, and interactions with others, all of which bolster a sense of belonging authored through colonial processes. In turn, they become not merely lay archaeologists at the site of excavation; they are *citizen archaeologists*.

The concept of citizen archaeology provides a way of understanding how the intertwining of science and time in the museum's discourses contribute to the production of (non)belonging in the present. As a science, archaeology provides profound "evidence" of the past, hierarchizing knowledges and value systems through the language of authority. The preferred mode of evidence as derived through scientific methods—against Native oral traditions and storytelling—sediments the Native past against the (non-Native) national present. Citizen archaeologists thusly

understand their own contemporary positioning relative to both the Hohokam and Native Americans writ large as informed by scientific tools and expertise. This concept collapses the past and present, much in the way that the museum does, implicating the cultural findings of the dig into contemporary beliefs about the US nation-state and its citizen-subjects.

Regarding time, citizen archaeology instructs visitors about what it means to belong in the present through a reading of what the US land and people were like before the arrival of European settlers. As it excavates the cultural objects of the past and, in turn, the past itself, archaeology presumes a sense of extinction, of a past that can only be known through its objects. As the Hohokam's "extinct" culture is represented through remains and exhibits that invite visitors to imagine what Native life would have been like "back" then, what is not asked is what it is like now. In inviting visitors to become citizen archaeologists, the museum disrupts a chronology that would otherwise thread together the region's contemporary Native inhabitants and the Hohokam, with the destructive influence of colonialism found in between. Cordoned off from the colonial project on which it relies, this version of the past provides an ideological foundation for dismissing colonialism's continued presence.

Conclusions

Throughout our analysis, we have argued that PGM's rhetoric draws on, and reinforces, tropes of primitivism and progress, and that the performance of archaeological knowing interpellates museum visitors as citizen-subjects actively engaged in the study of Native Others. The concept of citizen archaeology can further be implicated into broader understandings of museums as sites of citizenship. Scholars of rhetoric, public memory, and museum studies have long been intrigued by the rhetorical processes occurring in museums. Museums remain important sites for rhetorical inquiry given that they "materialize values and throw the processes

of meaning-making into sharp relief.”⁶¹ In analyzing museums as “instrument[s] for the democratic education of the ‘masses’, or the ‘citizen,’”⁶² recent rhetorical scholarship has recognized the incorporation of visitors in the production of knowledge.⁶³ Citizen archaeology attends to the dissolution of divisions between experts and laypersons as museum visitors are interpellated into the subject-position of archaeologists. While museums may materialize ideologies through the symbols included and articulated within, visitors as well engage in the discursive construction of cultural citizenship. The theorization of citizen archaeology therefore serves as a critical praxis for understanding rhetorical processes of museums as inextricably bound to the ways visitors take up and contribute to the production of knowledges within. This is especially true for museums that actively seek to engage visitors in participatory roles.

Rhetorical inquiries into museums and other memory sites may benefit from attending more closely to how visitors mobilize museum texts. Such engagements do not merely assess museums’ rhetorical effects; rather, as evidenced in our analysis, visitor comments offer insight into the larger landscapes within which museums operate. In addition, scholars might attend to how archaeology functions as a mode of rhetorical vision/experience to authorize past, present, and future subjectivities. On a practical level, museums that take up participatory language to include visitors in the science of archaeology should consider the effects of positioning predominantly white museum visitors as experts in relation to Indigenous cultures past and present. When visitors become coauthors of the histories of the Other, Native American voices—and modes of knowledge and existence—are erased. In other words, museums that provide a scientific epistemology for visitors may inadvertently exclude decolonizing ways of knowing.⁶⁴ Opening spaces for alternative epistemologies and subjectivities may provide visitors with a more reflective means of interpreting their complicity in present-day colonial landscapes.

Within the context of the Southwest and its intersecting enterprises of tourism, anthropology, and archaeology, the theorization of citizen archaeology attends to the mode of reading Native culture as an object that can be excavated from the past to authorize claims of knowledge, superiority, and belonging in the present. The construction of the citizen archaeologist in the museum carries profound consequences for how knowledges encountered within are contextualized into broader landscapes of citizenship. As primarily non-Native museum visitors engage in the processes of “self-making and being made,”⁶⁵ they also become the privileged subjects of the museum space, and of the narratives of culture, civilization, and progress it upholds. Differentiated from a generalized Native Other rendered as non-white, non-modern, and irreconcilably different, visitor-subjects engage the Native past as a reflection of what civilization and US citizenship are *not*.⁶⁶ In the process, elements of citizenship that snugly fit within the experiential landscapes of the Southwest and US nation-state, such as material consumption and modern technology, are reinforced, while uneven access to these items is justified through racial and temporal juxtapositions.

While the nostalgic engagements with the past that we have analyzed in many ways reiterate the turn-of-the-century discourses of primitivism with which we opened, they also reveal significant shifts. The first shift is the acknowledgment of past racism informing the historical treatment of Native Americans in the US. However, by failing to recognize its continuance into the present, references to past racism serve not as the kind of “truth-telling” called for by Indigenous scholar Waziyatawin;⁶⁷ instead, they enable visitors to distance themselves from racism’s endurance. Second, while the primitivist discourses of the 19th- and 20th-centuries centered on the belief that Native cultures were disappearing or dying out, it is clear in today’s Southwest that Native Americans are most certainly *not* disappearing. To

accommodate the enduring existence of Native Americans without interrupting the racialized structures that continue to privilege “us” over “them,” contemporary primitivism thus necessitates the differentiation of the “noble” past-Native from the “ignoble” present-Native.⁶⁸ While the past-Native invites nostalgic yearning, present-Natives are deplored for leaving behind their cultural ways, investing in casinos, or attempting whiteness. In this colonial construction, the proper place of Natives is as material objects of history—not as present-day subjects permitted to engage in the materialist structures of capitalist citizenship. Despite archaeology’s claims of preserving past lifeways, what is instead preserved in the process we have described as citizen archaeology are the symbolic and material inequalities of the present. When the Native past is isolated and contained, excavated from the earth and displayed behind an archaeological glass in which (white) visitors primarily see a reflection of themselves, change is not possible. Revealing the racial and colonial orders of the present is a necessity for visioning otherwise. As Waziyatawin suggests, “it is only when injustices are recognized that a momentum for dramatic change can be achieved.”⁶⁹

¹ Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, “Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum,” *Western Journal of Communication* 69 (2005): 97.

² Given that there is not one preferred term for Indigenous peoples in the Southwest or greater US, who may identify as Indigenous, Native, Native American, American Indian, or by their tribal affiliation, we use a variety of terms in our discussion; however, we use “Indian” only when referring to stereotypical constructions of Native peoples, or when quoting the speech of others.

³ See, for example, Barbara A. Babcock, “A New Mexican Rebecca”: Imaging Pueblo Women,” *Journal of the Southwest* 32 (1990): 400-437.

⁴ Anthony Shelton, "The Imaginary Southwest: Commodity Disavowal in an American Orient," in *Les Cultures à L'Oeuvre: Recontres en Art*, edited by Michèle Coquet, Brigitte Derlon, and Monique Jeudy-Ballini, (Paris: Maison des Sciences De L'Homme, 2005), 76.

⁵ Leah Dilworth, *Imagining Indians in the Southwest* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997), 3.

⁶ Richard A. Rogers, "Deciphering Kokopelli: Masculinity in Commodified Appropriations of Native American Imagery," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 4 (2007): 236.

⁷ Renato Rosaldo, "Imperialist Nostalgia," *Representations* 26 (1989): 108.

⁸ Dilworth, *Imagining Indians*.

⁹ Mark Neumann, *On the Rim: Looking for the Grand Canyon* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 36.

¹⁰ D. H. Lawrence as quoted in Marta Weigle, "From Desert to Disney World: The Santa Fe Railway and the Fred Harvey Company Display the Indian Southwest," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 45 (1989): 130.

¹¹ Lawrence as quoted in Weigle, "From Desert to Disney World," 132.

¹² The "Hohokam" is what the Native peoples who once occupied the museum location and numerous sites throughout the Southwest are called in museum and other anthropological texts, but the label is not without contestation. Given that many contemporary Southwestern Native Americans are direct descendants of the peoples frequently called "Hohokam," the popular use of the term to refer to a "disappeared" Southwest civilization invokes a discontinuity between past and present that does not exist. (See Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, *Living Histories: Native Americans and Southwestern Archaeology* [Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2010], 42-43).

¹³ City of Phoenix, Pueblo Grande Museum Archaeological Park,
<http://phoenix.gov/parks/culture/museum/pueblo/index.html>.

¹⁴ By archaeology, we mean the use of a particular epistemological framework associated with archaeology as guided by tourism and museum discourses. Certainly, archaeology as a discipline does not always adhere to these epistemologies, nor have critical interpretations been absent from archaeology. Contemporary archaeology has frequently embraced an epistemological shift toward inclusion of Native perspectives and away from cultural resource management and the objectification of Native peoples. What we focus on, however, is PGM's use of a particular strand of archaeological thinking based upon empiricism and excavation. This ideologically and epistemologically positions visitors in ways that exclude Native perspectives and erase the experiences of

contemporary Natives Americans outside of the museum. For more, see Laurajane Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage* (New York, Routledge, 2004).

¹⁵ Smith, *Archaeological Theory*, 2-3.

¹⁶ Leah Ceccarelli, "Rhetorical Criticism and the Rhetoric of Science," *Western Journal of Communication* 65 (2001), 318.

¹⁷ Smith, *Archaeological Theory*, 3.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Tony Bennett, "The Exhibitionary Complex," *New Formations* 4 (1988): 73-102.

²¹ Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 84.

²² Bennett, "The Exhibitionary Complex," 76.

²³ Dilworth, *Imagining Indians*, 44. For further discussion of the role of museums in the construction of colonial identities see Curtis Hinsley, *The Smithsonian and the American Indian: Making a Moral Anthropology in Victorian America* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994); and Anne Maxwell, *Colonial Photography and Exhibitions: Representations of the 'Native' and the Making of European Identities* (London: Leicester University Press, 1999).

²⁴ George Dorsey as quoted in Dilworth, *Imagining Indians*, 55.

²⁵ Erna Fergusson as quoted in Dilworth, *Imagining Indians*, 58.

²⁶ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978).

²⁷ Neuman, *On the Rim*, 45.

²⁸ Michael Kammen, as cited in Neumann, *On the Rim*, 45.

²⁹ Rosaldo, "Imperialist Nostalgia," 108.

³⁰ While we utilize Aihwa Ong's terminology to describe national subject formation, we depart from Ong in our focus on how members of dominant (rather than marginalized) groups become "cultural citizens." (See Ong, "Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States," *Current Anthropology* 37 [1996]: 738).

³¹ Teresa Bergman, *Exhibiting Patriotism: Creating and Contesting Interpretations of American Historic Sites* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2013), 16.

-
- ³² Carole Blair and Neil Michel, "Commemorating in the Theme Park Zone: Reading the Astronauts Memorial," in *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies*, edited by Thomas Rosteck (New York: Guilford Press, 1999), 29; Greg Dickinson, "Memories for Sale: Nostalgia and the Construction of Identity in Old Pasadena," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 1-27.
- ³³ J. David Cisneros, "Rhetorics of Citizenship: Pitfalls and Possibilities," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 100 (2014): 376.
- ³⁴ Robert Asen, "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90 (2004): 189-211.
- ³⁵ Dickinson et al., "Memory and Myth," 89.
- ³⁶ Bergman, *Exhibiting Patriotism*, 34.
- ³⁷ Aaron Hess, "Critical-Rhetorical Ethnography: Rethinking the Place and Process of Rhetoric," *Communication Studies* 62 (2011): 127-152; Michael K. Middleton, Samantha Senda-Cook, and Danielle Endres, "Articulating Rhetorical Field Methods: Challenges and Tensions," *Western Journal of Communication* 75 (2011): 386-406.
- ³⁸ See, for example, Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3 (2006): 27-47; Kenneth S. Zagacki and Victoria J. Gallagher, "Rhetoric and Materiality in the Museum Park at the North Carolina Museum of Art," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95 (2009): 171-191; Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott (eds.), *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010).
- ³⁹ For an exception see Tamar Katriel, "Sites of Memory: Discourses of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement Museums," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 1-20.
- ⁴⁰ Dickinson et al., "Spaces of Remembering," 30.
- ⁴¹ For more regarding this methodological intersection at museum sites, see Roger C. Aden, Min Wha Han, Stephanie Norander, Michael E. Pfahl, Timothy P. Pollock, and Stephanie L. Young, "Re-Collection: A Proposal for Refining the Study of Collective Memory and its Places," *Communication Theory* 19 (2009): 311-336.
- ⁴² Trinh, T. Mihn-ha, *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 67.
- ⁴³ Richard Rogers describes how the ubiquitous image of Kokopelli has become "a metonym for Southwestern Native Americans [and] an icon of the Southwest in general." (Rogers, "Deciphering Kokopelli," 234).

⁴⁴ Amanda J. Cobb, “The National Museum of the American Indian,” *American Indian Quarterly* 29 (2005): 363.

⁴⁵ Numerous scholars have examined the associations made between Native Americans and extinction through depictions of Native Americans as a “vanishing race,” or as “living fossils.” See, for instance, Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died For Your Sins* (New York: Macmillan, 1969); and Lora Romero, “Vanishing Americans: Gender, Empire, and New Historicism,” *American Literature* 63 (1991): 385-404.

⁴⁶ The museum’s focus on the Hohokam’s “disappearance” fits within larger narratives of settler colonialism, especially when referenced in conjunction with the Columbian “discovery,” as one docent did. Pointing to the end of the timeline, he noted “this was the interesting part—when they disappeared...And when did Columbus discover America?” While his comment was perhaps intended to emphasize Native Americans’ long existence prior to Columbus’ arrival, the emphasis on the culture’s disappearance may also reinforce a vision of settlers in the Southwest—and “The New World” more broadly—arriving in an otherwise “empty” land.

⁴⁷ This is further evidenced in one of the museum signs, which describes a Pima narrative of the area’s settlement as “A Legend.”

⁴⁸ This language of vision draws from Dickinson and colleagues, who discuss the Plains Indian Museum’s use of anthropological vision to position visitors as professional interpreters of existing “exotic” cultures. While similar, archaeological vision emphasizes the scientific interpretation of the past’s remains, perpetuating a vision of a culture that no longer exists (Dickinson et al., “Spaces of Remembering,” 35).

⁴⁹ Ames, *Cannibal Tours*, 51.

⁵⁰ Cobb, “The National Museum of the American Indian,” 363.

⁵¹ Ames, *Cannibal Tours*, 51.

⁵² Johannes Fabian argues that anthropological uses of Time contribute to “the denial of coevalness to the cultures studied,” locating contemporary Others outside of the anthropologist’s shared Time. (Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* [New York: Columbia University, 1983], 35).

⁵³ See, for example, Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

⁵⁴ For further discussion see Dilworth, *Imagining Indians*, and Neumann, *On the Rim*.

⁵⁵ Karma R. Chavez, “Border (In)Securities: Normative and Differential Belonging in LGBTQ and Immigrant Rights Discourse,” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 7 (2010): 139.

⁵⁶ Dickinson et al., “Spaces of Remembering,” 28.

⁵⁷ Celeste Lacroix, “High Stakes Stereotypes: The Emergence of the Casino Indian Trope in Television Depictions of Contemporary Native Americans,” *The Howard Journal of Communications* 22 (2011): 6.

⁵⁸ For discussion, see Phillip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1988).

⁵⁹ Dilworth, *Imagining Indians*, 164.

⁶⁰ Maxwell, *Colonial Photography*, 22.

⁶¹ Rhiannon Mason, “Cultural Theory and Museum Studies,” in *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Sharon Macdonald (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2011), 18.

⁶² Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, “The Museum in the Disciplinary Society,” in *Museum Studies in Material Culture*, edited by Susan M. Pearce (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1989), 71.

⁶³ Bergman, *Exhibiting Patriotism*, 21.

⁶⁴ For more on decolonizing museums, see Amy Lonetree, *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

⁶⁵ Ong, “Cultural Citizenship,” 738.

⁶⁶ Much of the literature on citizenship examines the exclusionary rhetoric that surfaces in immigration debates. We add to these robust discussions through our analysis of the intersections of public memory and scientific epistemologies, thereby offering additional lenses to understand the complexities of cultural citizenship. See Linda Bosniak, *The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 17-36.

⁶⁷ Angela Cavender Wilson, *What Does Justice Look Like?: The Struggle for Liberation in Dakota Homeland* (St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press, 2008), 11.

⁶⁸ For further discussion of the “noble” and “ignoble” savage, see Lacroix, “High Stakes.”

⁶⁹ Wilson, *What Does Justice Look Like?*, 83.