

43. These findings in the field of paleontology and their application to preserve policy were controversial, of course, but this matter will not be explored here. The four "refuge" authors cited by the plan are Jürgen Haffer, Paulo Vanzolini, Ghilleen T. Prance, and K. S. Brown, Jr.
44. IBDF/FBCN, *Plano do Sistema*, 26–27; Pádua, interview with author.
45. IBDF/FBCN, *Plano do Sistema, II Etapa*, 39–40, 42.
46. In 2000, partially under the influence of the proposals contained in the 1979 plan, the Brazilian Congress voted into law a plan that instituted a "conservation unit system" composed of twelve types of protected areas. Some were reminiscent of the 1979 proposals, while others were not. See Drummond et al., "Brazilian Federal Conservation Units: A Historical Overview of Their Creation and of Their Current Status," *Environment and History* 15 (2009): 463–91.

ELEVEN

Conquering Sacred Ground? *Climbing Uluru and Devils Tower*

ANN MCGRATH

TWO LANDMARK SITES OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE, Uluru (formerly Ayers Rock) in Central Australia and Devils Tower in Wyoming, have sparked controversies over climbing, and primarily over whether it should be permitted at all.¹ These huge monoliths are located in landscapes considered worthy of inclusion in the national estates of two settler-colonizer nations: Uluru as a national park in Australia, and Devils Tower as a national monument administered by the National Park Service of the United States. Despite the protests of indigenous custodians over the last decades, both rocks remain popular climbing destinations. Uluru is accessible to anyone with a reasonable degree of fitness, while the sheer rock faces of Devils Tower prevent any but skilled and experienced climbers from scaling its heights. In Australia, Uluru has taken on the status of a crucial national icon. Although Devils Tower is well known, it does not hold the same central place in the American imagination. In this chapter, I examine how climbers and other visitors have engaged in contested national and transnational history stories. I will also explore how the histories of national parks have helped render indigenous landscapes a shade of colonizer white, while simultaneously creating theaters for defining, redefining, and contesting nation.

In settler-colonizer states, "national parks" and "national monuments" take on historical meanings that reveal the basis of their respective national foundations. As national parks are ostensibly for the public and for the nation, a person or a group's distinctive relationship to nation becomes highly significant. Not everyone feels an insider in the national polity. Historical thinking reinforces such perceptions. For example, national parks have been dubbed a "gift of the new world to the old."² While settler-colonizer nations have long been

designated as the New World, they were obviously someone else's Old World. Hence, that "gift" of national parks inevitably signifies a loss. What colonizers might see as a "benefit" may not appear so altruistic to others, notably indigenous traditional landowners. Rather, the legal status of a national park may serve to lock them out of their own land. With land appropriation a core enterprise of colonialism, the topic of indigenous dispossession is thus vital to the history of national parks.

The nations of the United States and Australia were founded more than a century apart, with quite different indigenous cultures, colonizing histories, and emergent collective national identities. In both cases, however, it was the later colonized, relatively undeveloped zones that attracted national parks designations. Under the auspices of two settler-colonizer states, their recognition as significant geographical places enabled protection through special legislation. As sites left underdeveloped by colonizer industries, and valued for antiquity and "wilderness" attributes, Devils Tower and Uluru enabled some people to imagine that these places stood outside colonialism—if not outside modernity and history.³ The concept of wilderness has often designated a place without human imprints, and without human occupation—past or present.⁴

As spectacular sites in nonurban locations, they have also become focal points for competing assertions of indigenous and colonizer sovereignty. While they might offer the welcome relief of pristine natural vistas far from the ravages of industrialization, settler-colonizers combine this with an impulse to "preserve" and "conquer" for modern nationalistic purposes. At the same time, they are used as decolonizing sites for transnational negotiations between colonizer and colonized. Here, I refer to indigenous "nations" and the settler-colonizer nation as entering "transnational" negotiations. I do not use the term "transnational" to indicate connections, but rather as a way of looking *across* nations or *transnationally*, and also *between* and *across* nations within settler-colonizer states.⁵

At a cosmetic level, Uluru and Devils Tower appear to have commonalities that make them worthy of comparison. Both stand in sharp contrast to the surrounding flat country, their lofty peaks and massive size visible from many miles distant. Both are tourist destinations, and at both, climbing is a central attraction. Yet there is much that divides them. Uluru, along with the adjacent Kata Tjuta range (previously known as the Olgas), are the principal features of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, which has been a UNESCO World Heritage site since 1987 and is one of the few Australian sites listed for both cultural and aesthetic values. It is somewhat unusual in being managed by the federal government rather than by state governments, which manage most other Australian national parks. Uluru-Kata Tjuta is located in the Northern Territory, which, although self-governing, does not hold the status or independence of a state and has a low population. Federal or Commonwealth refusal to give up control to the Northern Territory government is another indicator of Uluru's vital national status. "The Rock," as it is colloquially known, is a destination

for large numbers of Australian and international visitors. They are drawn to the Red Centre to experience the heart and essence of that vast continent. It is the iconic Australian place known all over the world for its remarkable geology and coloration, a place that has, since it became more widely known to nonindigenous peoples in the early twentieth century, attracted adventurers, travelers and sightseers. Visitors, including the European Ernest Giles, who arrived in 1873, found it both "ancient and sublime": "Its appearance and outline is most imposing, for it is simply a mammoth monolith that rises out of the sandy desert soil around, and stands with a perpendicular and totally inaccessible face at all points, except one slope near the north-west end, and that at least is but a precarious climbing ground to a height of more than 1,100 feet."⁶

Although Devils Tower is not nearly as well known to Americans or internationally, its fame grew after the release of Stephen Spielberg's blockbuster movie *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*, in November 1977. This film entrenched its status as eerie and alien, extraplanetary, and exuding strange energies attractive to New Age spiritual seekers. Nonetheless, the early impetus for the recognition of this "lofty and isolated rock in the state of Wyoming" as a national monument arose from being "such an extraordinary example of the effect of erosion in the high mountains as to be a natural wonder and an object of great historical and scientific interest."⁷ By 1936 the National Park Service was borrowing imperial imagery to encourage Americans to participate in the "great Wonder" of this majestic natural spectacle, to "pause for a moment in reflection of this royal member of the world's prodigious marvels and realize that it is more than a National Monument. As we view it resting in silent solemnity on its imposing throne, we sense that it bespeaks a commemorative message from the directing force of all nature."⁸

Including an analogy to a "royal member" and a "throne" is somewhat unusual in an avowedly republican nationalist discourse. Unlike Uluru, Devils Tower is neither a World Heritage Site nor a national park, and although managed by the U.S. National Park Service, it is technically classified as a national monument of the United States. Significantly, however, it was the first national monument, proclaimed under the federal Antiquities Act of 1906, which gave the president of the United States executive powers to protect "historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic and scientific interest" without the need for congressional approval. The level of protection for a national monument is not as great as for a U.S. national park, which may demand the protection, for example, of wildlife and biodiversity. Consequently, Devils Tower is not protected as a cultural landscape but rather, in keeping with the aims of the legislation, as a monument "confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected."⁹

The word "national" in parks and national monuments may be taken for granted, but it encapsulates a deeper semiotic meaning, in that it indicates a particular collective and nationalistic form of political and cultural connection

to wilderness landscapes. Belonging to "nation" suggests something larger than individual self-interest, an implied membership in a supposed entity glued together by sentiment. "National landscapes" is a new designation that Australia's national parks establishment is applying to regionally themed tourist destinations, whereas the much earlier American term "national monuments" metaphorically heightens the sense of drama in the notion of a "landscape." Like the man-made Washington Monument, Devils Tower rises above flatness to memorialize a nation. National parks, national monuments and national landscapes are not just about management; they make emotive assertions of nation, ownership and sovereignty.

Inspired by the American romanticist movement and transcendentalism, national park landscapes are often valorized not only as offering a historic "first" gaze but as something pure, an unmediated connection between man and nature. When humans connect with the beauty of nature, it is as if they are elevated. However, national parks are experienced cross-culturally and historically in different ways. Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds demonstrated how, during the late nineteenth and early decades of the twentieth century, Australia and the United States were both explicitly conceptualized as "white men's countries."¹⁰ As Melissa Harper and Richard White suggest, in contrast to transcendentalism, Australia's national parks activists stressed leisure, recreation, and a favorable climate's capacity to forge a healthy race.¹¹

Despite national differences, both Uluru and Devils Tower reveal important things about the way protected areas, including national parks and monuments, may be used by nations to approach questions of the rights of indigenous peoples, and in the process, to illuminate issues of national identity and competing uses of natural spaces. Both places are of high significance to Native custodians as sacred places. In the case of Uluru, this was crucial to the successful struggle of Anangu traditional owners to regain control of their land under the Australian Federal Land Rights Act (1976). Similarly, for Devils Tower traditional custodians, the Arapaho, Cheyenne, Kiowa, Lakota, Shoshone, and Crow, it is the sacred nature of the rock that has underwritten attempts to restrict climbing. In 1996 this desire was reflected in the National Park Service Final Climbing Management Plan, which proposed a voluntary suspension of climbing during the month of June "in deference to Indian sacred ceremonies."¹²

In both places, the climbing practices of visitors have ignited assertions of indigenous religious freedom and rights. Their pleas to control an activity that attracts strong support in the wider community serves to crystallize larger issues of indigenous rights in the management of public lands, and it highlights the uneasy relationship of indigenous minorities to the nation-state. Both the Anangu traditional owners of Uluru and the Plains Indian groups with a spiritual connection to Devils Tower have prominently expressed their wishes that climbing should be curtailed. Under two very different legal and management regimes, both parks authorities have endeavored to introduce voluntary climbing

protocols. Although they have advised visitors that they object to climbing, until recently the Anangu have lacked the backing to enforce their right to stop climbing. Similarly, while Plains Indian tribes have gained the support of the U.S. National Park Service for a voluntary cessation of climbing for one month of the year, the power of the service to control such activity on Devils Tower has not been supported by U.S. courts.¹³ Nevertheless, there is evidence that voluntary bans have had an impact, with both places recording substantial compliance amongst visitors, suggesting a desire by many to respect the wishes of the traditional custodians.

Layering the Transnational

For the purposes of this paper, artificially placing Devils Tower next to Uluru is a practice of transnational juxtaposition that enables us to consider issues in fresh ways, and to benefit from a wider scholarship and contrasting historical trajectories.¹⁴ Rather than evaluating only difference and likeness, I will examine thematic links within and between networks of meaning. While several transnational studies have compared the Anglophone, British imperial-settled nations, there has been little attention to the extra layering of the transnational as a contest over sovereignty within settler-colonizer societies, that is, between Native nations and the colonizer nation-state. Yet focusing on this dynamic offers potential for some decolonizing critique. The two nation-states are generally defined according to end population—with most settler immigrants arriving from the British Isles and Europe. However, in other analyses, the settler-colonizer state refers to the hegemonic power structures of colonialism, and a subsequent polity that came about through dispossessing indigenous peoples of their land.¹⁵

In comparing these sites in national contexts, my approach takes the opportunity to compare climbing in discrete "spaces of nation," and in two settler-colonizer nation-states. Australia and the United States have different geographical, demographic, and sociopolitical characters, and their nation-state chronologies and key policies also differed. Significantly, in the United States, American Indian groups have long been officially recognized as a type of nation. Given the outright warfare conducted during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Department of War saw them as an enemy or at least as a competing polity; under a treaty system, they were diplomatically dealt with as, or akin to, foreign nations. The 1831 Marshall judgment defined them as "domestic dependent nations."¹⁶

In Australia no treaties were negotiated, and with settlement legally based on *terra nullius* or wasteland rather than conquest by war, indigenous sovereignty and ownership of lands were not recognized. After the 1970s, however, the introduction of limited land rights shifted this dynamic. Since the *Mabo* judgment of 1992, more Aboriginal Australians are entitled to claim native title, and larger language-sharing groups increasingly describe themselves as nations.¹⁷

The evolution of national parks in each country has certainly differed. For one thing, while Australian parks are called "national," almost all are funded and managed by individual states within the federal system. Various state parks are also classified as World Heritage—for example, Willandra Lakes, Greater Blue Mountains—twelve of them on the basis of "natural" significance. The only three classified exclusively for "cultural" significance are British-Australian built sites, including convict sites and the Sydney Opera House. Those with both natural and cultural values include indigenous-owned Kakadu National Park (1981) and Uluru–Kata Tjuta National Park (1987).¹⁸ In these areas, Aboriginal people have continued to live and carry out culture on their traditional lands, with nonintensive European economic activities leaving a relatively minimal colonial footprint.

Parks Australia, a federal authority, has oversight of World Heritage listed sites, with the parks within its primary authority located in Australian Territories, including the Northern Territory. When the Australian federal government moved belatedly, in 1979, to establish national parks in the Northern Territory, Kakadu was developed with explicit reference to and help from the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. In negotiating indigenous majority management in Uluru–Kata Tjuta and Kakadu National Parks and the handover of Uluru to indigenous owners in 1985, Australia exercised international leadership in developing protocols for indigenous or joint control of national parks. As Catton's chapter in this volume reveals, neighboring New Zealand's early national parks were informed by Māori concepts of custodianship. This reflected a contrasting history marked by Māori wars that ended in the Treaty of Waitangi, which is celebrated, albeit often controversially, as New Zealand's day of national unification. In a land that had been designated as *terra nullius*, or vacant wasteland, Australian joint management of the Northern Territory parks constituted an important, even radical, recognition of indigenous land rights. It followed in the wake of the Northern Territory Land Rights Act of 1976. The handback of Uluru/Ayers Rock preempted recognition of native title by the High Court of Australia, which did not take place until 1992.¹⁹

The prior history of national parks lands is a vital factor in this story. While each different era will reinvent its own conceptions of the parks mission, in the United States the 1963 Leopold and National Academy reports envisaged that each national park should be an "illusion of primitive America." Their mission was thus to preserve and create the "mood of wild America." Parks historian Richard West Sellars implies that this was therefore a patriotic, ethnocentric goal—to maintain some "landscape remnants of a pioneer past" as they were "when first visited by the white man" or "viewed by the first European visitors."²⁰ Such a preservation mindset reifies the "first moment" of the colonizer gaze, meaning that it was primarily settler-colonizer traditions that became codified in land, heritage, parks, and antiquities law.²¹

As historian Mark Spence explains, parks history became an arm of

settler-colonizer land alienation and, as his title sums up, was a means of "dispossessing the wilderness."²² After all, their resumption showed that even "waste land" incapable of "improvement" had some meaning to colonizers and could be alienated by the nation-state.²³ Taking this further, Australian and Pacific historian Tracey Banivanua Mar concludes that the declaration of national parks was an endpoint of dispossession and the ultimate triumph of private property.²⁴

Because parks designations encoded race segregation, heritage expert Denis Byrne describes the archaeologies of designated Aboriginal reserves as "nervous landscapes."²⁵ While "national monuments" and "national landscapes" may be viewed similarly as landscapes of colonizer anxiety, Byrne and Maria Nugent argue more optimistically for the possibility of "shared landscapes," which include parks.²⁶ Indigenous people in both nations are using national parks venues to assert their ongoing sovereignty claims. They also use them as sites over which to test the sincerity of national reconciliation goals, although levels of state interest in accommodating them may differ. In Australia the 1992 Mabo decision and the 2008 prime ministerial apology raised national consciousness of indigenous history and ways to compensate for past injustice. While Americans have long been cognizant of frontier warfare, many historians still depict America's "colonial" era as something that ended with the anti-British revolution.²⁷ The powerful legacies of African American slavery and a more multifaceted European colonizing history detract attention from the singularity of any foundational act of indigenous dispossession.

National Monoliths

Despite the treaties enjoyed by many Native Americans, the several American Indian tribes with links to Devils Tower lack formal ownership or officially recognized rights in regard to the site. Before it became a national monument, its surroundings were a ranching area held by private landowners. It would appear that the "protection of lands" declared in conservation enactments have been just as effective as other styles of landholding in diminishing indigenous title rights.

Furthermore, national parks lands are understood as publicly accessible. While special conservation values or "wilderness" classifications create exceptions, in order to justify government land takeover and maintenance costs, generally a national park must be used and visited. By promoting a voluntary June climbing closure to coincide with Sundance ceremonies, the National Park Service has attempted a compromise in relation to Devils Tower. This ensures that it is not totally ignoring one of the nation's constituencies. Yet despite such gestures, the invitation to climb remains ubiquitous. With some safety warnings, this also applies at Uluru, where climbing remains the much-anticipated visitor activity.

In the 1980s Ayers Rock, as it was then known, became the centerpiece in

a heated controversy in which political conservatives declared that conferring indigenous land rights to the rock would "divide the nation." Politicians of the newly self-governing Northern Territory staged an aggressive campaign to assert masculinist "outback" tropes of white entitlement and colonizer sovereignty. However, the federal Labor government, backed by Prime Minister Bob Hawke and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs Clyde Holding, appreciated the powerful unifying and healing symbolism of "handing back the Rock."²⁸ The Anangu thus gained rights of veto, joint management, and income rights from the national park. The handback ceremony involved dance and song rituals in which the Anangu leadership, and various tiers of the white national leadership, including the queen's representative, Governor General Sir Ninian Stephen, officiated. The Anangu valued this deeply, as they appreciated that it was the British government, with its head the queen, that had originally divested them of sovereignty, and without treaties.²⁹ Ninian Stephen was admired for having made landmark public statements in favor of Aboriginal rights. Dealing with the regal and vice regal was in keeping with Aboriginal sovereignty thinking, as through history they had nurtured a relationship with and had petitioned the kings and queens of England for redress for their lands. While the Northern Territory government absented itself, the Anangu saw the event as a breakthrough marking a hopeful future for their children. The Anangu now held statutory and traditional title to Uluru. This recognition of title rights, however, came with a big catch, for it was conditional upon Uluru being leased back as a national park for ninety-nine years.

Both Uluru and Devils Tower have long been singled out as suitable locations for nationalist performances, reinforcing their status as icons of nation and of settler ownership. President Theodore Roosevelt's declaration of Devils Tower as the first U.S. national monument inscribed a European notion of antiquity as a national value. Thus the ancient "old" was incorporated into the modern nation. Before that, the Lakota knew the mountain as Mato Tipila, while other Plains Indian groups used their own language and storied names with distinctive meanings. It was and remains a ceremonial and gathering site for the Arapaho, Cheyenne, Kiowa, Lakota, Shoshone, and Crow, who each narrate and reenact legends about the creation of Devils Tower and the profound power of the bear, which made the place sacred and thus incompatible with recreational climbing.³⁰ Many consider the official name offensive, explaining that "Bear Lodge" is a more accurate translation of indigenous names for the place than Devils Tower or "Bad God's Tower."

Similarly, while Uluru is legally recognized as belonging to the Anangu people, a wider range of Pitjanjara and Aranda people hold it to be a significant feature of their stories, histories, and cultural landscapes. Its contested status is reflected in its changing names. In 1873 the surveyor William Gosse named it Ayers Rock after a senior government official of South Australia. A dual naming system of Ayers Rock and/or Uluru applied from the 1980s, and then in 2002 its official name reverted to the preexisting name of Uluru. Today, many Australians

familiarly refer to it simply as "The Rock," and many tourism promotions still call it Ayers Rock.

The Anangu have opposed climbing because the climb route is a sacred journey route of Mala the hare-wallaby man and is exclusively reserved for ascent by specified elders conducting seasonal ceremonies.³¹ The Anangu see the visitors' climbing practices as senseless. Because of the way their long lines appear from a distance, they call them *minga* or "crazy ants." Furthermore, and this may be equally important, the Anangu are concerned that they cannot protect those who walk on their country as they feel obligated to do. Deaths on the rock are therefore especially troubling, and the Anangu are particularly concerned about their responsibility for these events, and for the protocols to be followed regarding departed strangers.³²

Uluru and Devils Tower continue to hold indigenous sacred associations and meanings as ceremony sites within a broader cultural landscape, one which carries inscribed histories of creation, long journeys, large gatherings, kin and interpersonal connection, marriage, trade, and feasting. However, until recently, National Park Service literature about Devils Tower's sacred significance to Indians was minimal. While a recent leaflet documents the significance of the rock to six of the tribes, the main information section is vague, stating that Devils Tower is a sacred site and that Native Americans would like to see the climb banned due to their "beliefs."³³ Climbing blogs use the tower's "sacredness to all" to justify their conviction, arguing that this made climbing even more "special": a place where climbers could exercise their rightful, even God-given, privilege.³⁴

Discourses of sacredness have been used to support both indigenous and nonindigenous claims to decision-making rights over the activities allowed on these sites.³⁵ In my title, the words "conquering" and "sacred" may seem an awkward pair, but they go to the heart of contestations over these sites. Nationalism imbues an emotional connection that draws on secular and sacred iconography. Its narratives are built up, becoming increasingly layered and naturalized over time. In this case, the big rocks in focus stand for many meanings beyond themselves, including complex sets of values associated with their respective settler-colonizer nations' self-image and sense of prerogative.³⁶

When Uluru was declared a national park in 1975, this only heightened competing assertions of sovereignty. Indeed, when the Northern Territory Land Rights Act was introduced in 1976, the Anangu peoples of Uluru lost any immediate chance of having their land rights recognized. Formerly classed as an Aboriginal reserve (reserved by the Crown or the government, not owned by Aborigines), its declaration as a national park officially alienated the land from the Crown and thus meant it could not be claimed under the Land Rights act. Anangu elders could not comprehend why white Australians assumed possession; they asserted that whites visiting Uluru had no *tjukurrpa*—a word for dreaming stories or creation ontologies. Indeed, whites "saw nothing" other than a big lump. For Anangu, each crag was proof of ancient epic events, as well as

intimate present-day connections that laid down their system of law. What is more, Aboriginal people continued to live there, while very few whites did so on a temporary basis, let alone permanently.

In 1977, when indigenous owner and artist Wenten Rabuntja was informed that Uluru's national park status precluded it from being claimed under the new Northern Territory Land Rights Act (1976), he explained:

That's my place out there . . . said Nipper Winmati, the white fella knows no stories out there. That's my place, I own, my father was born there and I was born there. White fellas haven't got their stories or dreamings out there—I don't try and take away Melbourne or Adelaide. . . . We want the white men to come and visit our place, not take it away. They must know it belongs to us. Now I am left with just my tent and broken promise.

Discovery and Expeditions

Settler-colonizer narratives involve an "invention of tradition" that includes inscribing moments of "firstness"—of origins, primacy, originality, preeminence, and naming rights.³⁷ As Gosse's 1873 journey to Central Australia was for a colonial purpose and backed by government authorities, he was not dubbed a traveler, wanderer, or Rambler. As the first white male discoverer and climber, he was glorified with the valorized label of explorer. As John Weaver has demonstrated, the activities of surveying, mapping, and journeying were all part of the Great Land Rush of the New World, especially the search for pastoral land, and in Australia's case, for inland seas.³⁸ As with many other famous explorers, Gosse was not alone when he climbed the Rock. With him was camel-driver Kamran, in bare feet. An Aboriginal guide, whom Gosse knew as Moses, led the party—his nickname probably an abbreviation of his Aboriginal name, and perhaps also a humorous allusion to the biblical tale of Exodus.

In 1894 a scientific "expedition"—another loaded category of colonial purposefulness³⁹—climbed the Rock. Only twenty-five Europeans climbed it in the next sixteen years. However, after a chain was erected on stanchions driven into the rock, the slippery, steep parts of the climb became more accessible to the wider public. From the 1940s and 1950s, with the advent of sturdy trucks and light aircraft, tourism expanded. Illustrated magazines such as *Walkabout* and *Smith's Weekly*, as well as visits by talented photographers using the new arts of aerial photography, adventurous journalists, writers and novelists, contributed to Ayers Rock being firmly etched into the Australian national consciousness.

With the outback already laden with cultural meaning, Ayers Rock's central desert location was more "out" the "back" than most—an immense distance from the east coast metropolitan centers. Devils Tower is similarly distant from large urban concentrations and in an iconic region associated with nostalgia for the Wild West. Since the 1960s, with the development of roads and the growing

appeal of mass and remote tourism, the two monoliths have become increasingly accessible to tourists. Both can be accessed by good roads and highways, and they are readily visible without requiring visitors to leave their cars. This accessibility also makes them more reachable climbing destinations. In more recent decades, the rise of adventure tourism and "extreme" experiences only added to their appeal.

The National Ascent

Devils Tower was officially surveyed by the U.S. Geological Survey party in 1875, a couple of years after Gosse's survey of Uluru; however, the party found its steep slopes too forbidding to climb. In 1906 President Theodore Roosevelt's imprimatur on Devils Tower as the first national monument firmly established its special national status, but it had been earning its place as a symbol of nation beforehand. Local rancher William Rogers, the attributed "first climber" of Devils Tower, staged a nationalistic spectacle of the event. Accompanied by his wife and by fellow rancher Willard Ripley and climbing via a wooden ladder, they chose the Fourth of July, Independence Day, 1893, to make the ascent. This was also the year of the World's Columbian Exposition (or World's Fair) in Chicago, designed to celebrate the 400th anniversary of Columbus's arrival in the New World and to declare America's modernity to the wider world. And fittingly, at this exposition, historian Frederick Jackson Turner delivered his influential paper on "the significance of the frontier in American history," with its encounters-with-Indians nostalgia, outdoorsman values, and articulation of a national narrative of a modern, white colonizing manhood.⁴⁰ In this heyday of nationalist sentiment, America's progress was being watched by the wider world.

One way of asserting authority over landscapes is by naming or renaming. Another is by conquering geography—trekking to a locale, or in this case, climbing to the top. As we have seen, the official name of Devils Tower does not take indigenous sensibility into account. Renaming may present special problems as the custodial tribes have different names for the site, with divergent meanings. Historical timelines, with their positivist authority, tend to emphasize 1893, when the local rancher William Rogers made the first climb.⁴¹ Demonstrating something to be shared with and circulated among his fellow Americans, Rogers's climb exhibited an iconography of masculine performance emphasizing courage, action, and strength. Dressed in the evocative representational garb of an Uncle Sam outfit, when Rogers reached the summit on the Fourth of July, he draped a huge stars-and-stripes flag over the monument. Local white women had crafted the flag and the suit.⁴² Presumably Theodore Roosevelt would have approved; he was fond of projecting himself in the iconography of nationalist dress, being photographed in the fringed deerskin attire that drew on the hybrid garb of Native Americans and the pioneering frontiersman or backwoodsman.

In 1936 the Devils Tower climb was closed for safety reasons, although by

then only about twelve people had succeeded in climbing it. The first "technical climb" took place in 1937. By 1954 only thirty-six people had climbed it, although within five years the figure climbed to 143. Due to safety concerns, the National Park Service conceded that climbing was becoming a "public relations problem." Subsequently, the service recruited skilled mountaineers and even started to encourage the activity, promoting a Mountaineers Week event in 1956. Soon the climb gathered further momentum.⁴³

Following in the patriotic footsteps of Roosevelt and Rogers, white residents continued to deploy Devils Tower as a site of national celebration. In recent decades, climbs have taken place regularly on Independence Day. People dressed in historic clothing gather at the site to reenact George Washington's proclamations and the Declaration of Independence—moments that explicitly take pride in and memorialize American-born, white settler-colonizer sovereignty. The anniversary performances glorify the virtues of independence and liberty, and especially the gaining of New World manhood by ousting the British Old World imperialists. With the Fourth of July marking the independence of the American Republic and its sacred "manifest destiny," such bedecked climbs valorize moments of ascendant national sovereignty.

Similarly, Uluru has been frequently used as a setting for special ceremonies of nation. In the lead-up to the Australian Bicentenary in 1988, which celebrated the anniversary of the arrival of the First Fleet of British convicts (at faraway Port Jackson, Sydney), Uluru was chosen as the backdrop for a choir representing the diversity and inclusivity of the multicultural Australian nation. It was the starting point of the Olympic torch relays for the 2000 Sydney Olympics, and it has also been a conspicuous setting for advertisements for Qantas Airways' "the Spirit of Australia" theme and for a private loan company. Uluru's distinctive profile is constantly rehearsed in tourism brochures, souvenirs, and artifacts.⁴⁴ As a complex signifier, it represents many things—the outback, a vast continent, emptiness, loneliness, the mystical, and the sacred. Since writers started to engage with the place, they have inscribed this monolith with a special role in the anthropomorphic body of the nation. As "the red heart" of Australia, and in the geographic heart of the country, it was as if Uluru had come alive, representing the life force, survival, a beating pulse, and as a symbol of courage, love, and sentiment for a solid and permanent nation.⁴⁵

Sites of Pilgrimage or Sacrilege?

As monumental sites of memorialization, the national landscapes of Uluru and Devils Tower rely heavily on the creation of new chronologies of settler-colonizer histories of connection. In *Pilgrims of the Vertical*, American author Jay Taylor has explored pilgrimage as a theme taken up by Yosemite rock climbers.⁴⁶ At the same time, the mystique of the longer indigenous presence enhances Uluru and Devils Tower as tourist attractions. The indigeneity of the landscape purportedly

adds magic, power, aura, and mystery, offering in situ ruminations on an almost lost, or a frozen, static moment of "primitive" history. Ninian Stephen's reference to Uluru as the "spiritual heart of Australia" in 1985 concurred perfectly with what historian and anthropologist Nicholas Thomas referred to as the "primitivist renovation of white identity via indigenous culture."⁴⁷ In American culture the theme of pilgrimage has powerful historical resonances; by the early nineteenth century, historical and religious pilgrim themes were drawn upon to create a new colonizer history for New England, as well as for the wider nation.⁴⁸

Between the 1940s and 1960s, Australian writers and journalists such as Frank Clune, Beryl Miles, Arthur Groom, and Bill Harney wrote popular books that whetted the public appetite for tourism. Hedley Herbert Finlayson popularized the catchy metaphor of the "Red Centre."⁴⁹ Not only did such writers self-consciously follow each other's journeys and climbs, they repeatedly quoted each other, their fellow members of the "Brotherhood of the Rock," as poet Rex Ingamells had put it.⁵⁰ Frank Clune thus wrote: "Like Explorer Gosse . . . I 'had a view which repaid me for my trouble'; and, like him also, my feet 'were all in blisters, and it was as much as I could do to stand.'" When Clune descended, he blandly stated that it was "with our mountain-climbing ambitions satisfied."⁵¹ Lacking deep historical meanings, connections with place could be shallow and comments disappointing. Travel writer Arthur Groom mentions Gosse's ascent and his own interest in timing his party's "race" to the top. But, like Clune, he desperately searches for a deeper significance: "I have been on many a mountain summit, and seen many a cairn of stones and bottle filled with names; but none excited me more than those accounts of the past few who have travelled hundreds and in some instances, thousands of miles, to ascend Ayers Rock. In this lonely land it seemed to give the names written in ink and pencil definite reality and personal presence."⁵²

Another intrepid traveler, Beryl Miles, imagined her encounter with the Rock as the discovery of "a lost scroll," an image connecting the site with Northern Hemisphere antiquity, its history of writing, and the Bible. Describing her anticipation of the cairn of stones on the summit, she declared: "It was a proud moment when I added my name to those in the bottle."⁵³ Through the on-site archive of this commemorative cairn, it was as if individual experience had been elevated and at the same time sublimated to a collective ethos. In their names and signatures, visitors had thus left part of "themselves" behind. In schools, such entertaining tales delivered colonizer history lessons featuring heroes who conquered "a hostile landscape." Due to such literature and the growing visual record, climbing the Rock became a national, and increasingly well-documented, aspiration.

From time to time, Anglo-Australian notions of sacredness, and convergent ones merging with understandings of the Aboriginal sacred, have also been enacted around the Rock. Bill Harney, appointed the first ranger of the area in 1958, remembered "the holy expressions in white people's eyes as they came down after going to the top of the mountain."⁵⁴ In 1959 the legendary "Flynn

of the Inland"—the Flying Doctor whose services assisted white women to settle and give birth in the "wilderness"—recorded a ritual conducted on slabs from the rock:

with the magnificent view all around—the Olgas standing up like a medieval castle . . . all Australia stretching away on every side—the Sacrifice of Praise, of Gratitude, of Apology, of Petition, began. Father Brown was the first to raise the Host over Australia and over the men and boys kneeling on the Rock. . . . They were offered, these Masses, for the "complete Australia," both the living and the dead of our nation, all of white skin and all of black.⁵⁵

Thus was celebrated an inclusive moment in which black and white were welcomed into the arms of a renewed, benign colonizing nation. Rex Ingamells and Miles had their own sacred missions that embraced reconciliation, albeit imagined exclusively from the colonizer perspective. Ingamells was instrumental in setting up the Jindyworobaks, a white nativist movement that aspired to create an authentic Australian culture by integrating Aranda/Central Australian Aboriginal language, song, and meaning into art, poetry, and literature. However, the sacred pilgrimage could also be secular. More recently, poet Barry Hill wrote of walking not in Aboriginal tracks but in Bill Harney's tracks, and more generally in "history's tracks."⁵⁶ To Hill, such makers of written national history themselves became the "congregation of pilgrims" who had gone before him.

Few non-Aboriginal people ever see the rock without the aid of cars, buses, and planes, yet they tend to consider Aboriginal people who travel in Toyotas and who live in towns and communities around the Rock as "inauthentic." Some tour operators have been reported to refer to contemporary Uluru residents as an "eyesore," contributing to a "degraded" rather than "pure" Aboriginal vista. For others, Aboriginal people at Uluru emphasize disparities between the social status of black and white, constituting an unwelcome reminder that all is not well with the nation. Devils Tower's associations with the wonder of the Wild West are celebrated in its souvenir shops and fort-style architecture, yet less evident is the role of several American Indian tribes in the ranching industry and other modern economic pursuits, because they do not fit as neatly with the designated "authentic" image.⁵⁷ Dream catchers and spiritual iconography sell better, too, as the Indian link is more comfortably associated with the spiritual, and with "lost cultures," rather than land development and the ranching economy.

So What Is It about Climbing?

Climbing is an activity heavily laden with cultural values. It offers a powerful poetic: the individual arises above the masses, pitting body and mind to meet a great challenge. After the ascent, he or she achieves a new vantage point on the

world. Especially associated with manhood, it enables the individual to prove himself—his mind and body can master a mountain. The virtues of perseverance, determination, planning, intelligence, self-reliance, and skill are essential. The ascent takes grit, but the reward—getting to the top—becomes a metaphor for reaching the toughest of human goals.

Mountains have featured powerfully in humankind's assertion of dominance over the natural world. In the twentieth century, this reached its ultimate expression in the response to the news that a New Zealand "man of the Empire," Edmund Hillary, and his Nepalese companion, Sherpa Tenzing Norgay, had reached the summit of Mount Everest, the world's tallest mountain, in 1953. This was reified as a "conquering" moment of empire, with the queen of England conferring the highest imperial honors upon Hillary and the second highest upon Tenzing. Although not staking any claim to land, reaching the summit, the "roof of the world," was nonetheless considered a symbolic victory for the British Empire. For much of the twentieth century, Boys' Own adventure books promoted ideas of empire and conquering the world. The language of domination was slotted into an imperial tradition of landscape mastery. Explorers symbolically conquered strangeness, distance, drought, wilderness, and "hostile natives." Although they followed their tracks and were usually assisted by indigenous trackers in Australia and Indian "scouts" in the United States, the main heroes were white men. By the 1970s, however, with so many decolonizing movements around the world, the lure of the imperial adventure was losing its hold.⁵⁸

Climbing was increasingly associated with the spiritual and the "rising above" implicit in the transcendent experience.⁵⁹ While climbing pits man against nature, to use a common phrasing of mastery and domination, at the same time the climber ends up with nature, in an almost religious state of being.⁶⁰ The climber's sense of achievement is inevitably in connection with landscape, nature, place—and, as we have seen, this can also include another kind of transcendence—beyond the individual, toward a sense of belonging to the larger collectivity of nation.

At certain sites, reaching the summit can function as an endlessly repeated individual assertion of an earlier chronology of national dominance and conquest, a moment of arrival in a strange place. The moment of conquering comes to reside in a timeless zone of endless colonizer repetition. That is, every climber can win the prize and conquer. For the individual, it can always be a first. Each later climber walks or climbs in the pathways of earlier climbers, and as we have seen, people often self-consciously try to reconnect with the moment of the primeval white gaze. As a landed communication with the wilderness and the modern, climbing promises a white national moment belonging to all. Yet the seemingly innocuous "open to all" inevitably generates contests of power and control.⁶¹

As national parks authorities have the role of managing the national estate, they place controls for ecological or environmental reasons. They may ban or

restrict certain kinds of accommodation or activities, for example, the establishment of tents and camping grounds near environmentally sensitive sites. They may also ban indigenous people from hunting or fishing, or at least using modern technologies to do so. In other words, while a prescribed set of activities can be followed, for conservation or other reasons, people may be locked out of activities that would enable them to maintain the very land connections that add deep cultural value to the sites.

At the same time, many visitors to sites value indigeneity as the star attraction. As historian James Clifford has pointed out, the "indigenised landscape" is often imagined as an outdoor museum, "a fixed heritage," like a photograph or a museum collection designed to entertain the visitor.⁶² Some climbers are on a specific quest for a more ancient, primeval imagining of what it is to be indigenous. The rhetoric of heritage reinforces the notion that indigenous people have heritage but not necessarily history, which is the preserve of white settler-colonizers. Urbanized indigenous people also travel to such places simply as tourists, or searching for a connection with "pure" or "real" indigenous culture prior to colonizer destructiveness.⁶³ For others, it is simply to get into the spirit of an adventurous school field trip.

Many tourists cherish a sense of entitlement to do whatever they please. At Uluru, a common activity young men use to mark arrival at the top is urination, which, in its after-stench, can make the journey's climax somewhat unpleasant. People scratch their name on the rock. Hitting a golf ball off the summit to see how far it might go across the Plains is also a favorite visitor activity. Advertising agencies have asked permission to use Uluru to shoot scenes of paint splashing over it or planes crashing into it, suggesting that many people have little insight into indigenous sensibilities or the basics of parks management. At least such proposals have been tightly vetted by parks and by indigenous owners and disallowed. Recently a female French performer did a striptease atop a windy Uluru that proved a hit on YouTube. When the Anangu male elders stated that they considered her actions offensive (it was a men's site), she retorted that Aboriginal people had traditionally been naked. Primitivist ideas have wide circulation far beyond the nations in which these iconic geographies are situated.

Devils Tower has had its own set of bizarre events, including the story of the adventurer George Hopkins, who in 1941 parachuted out of a plane onto the mountain and could not get down.⁶⁴ In the 1980s and 1990s, bolts were inserted into the granite to facilitate and improve the safety of crack climbs. With abseiling gaining popularity, climber numbers increased. Every year, hundreds of brave climbers attempt the very steep ascent, some of whom strap themselves with cameras as well as ropes to leave a full record on YouTube. At the summit, successful climbers have erected small and large stone cairns. One contains an encased visitor's book in which climbers record their comments.⁶⁵

Souvenirs reveal changing meanings. One American pro-climbing organization uses the name "Devils Tower Sacred to Many People," and assures its

website customers that its sales of souvenirs and T-shirts will assist Native Americans.⁶⁶ In the 1980s, T-shirts declaring in large letters "I Climbed Ayers Rock" were conspicuously worn around the site. That T-shirt now competes for sales with another one proclaiming, "I Didn't Climb Ayers Rock." Visitors to Devils Tower make strained gestures toward respectfulness. As well as purchasing recognizable "Indian" motifs such as feathered headdresses and Wild West imagery, Devils Tower T-shirts glorify its associations with *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*—and with believers in UFOs and aliens generally. While popular culture can absorb both aliens and Indians into a mystique of otherness, this majestic rock's association with outer space "aliens" lends it a mysterious, ominous aura that can entirely wash away indigenous meanings.⁶⁷

Sacred Nations

White American nationalism and Native nationalism have had some transnational moments arguing over rocks. As James Clifford explains, local and global "contact zones" are sites of "identity making and transculturation, containment and excess," that suggest an ambiguous future for "cultural difference."⁶⁸ With legislative endorsement, national parks function to serve particular communities that are "inside nation." Not necessarily a stable space, these can variously include indigenous and other peoples, as Catton's chapter has also demonstrated for New Zealand.⁶⁹ As the exchange, the transaction, however, involves more than "gifting," it will be constantly contested—creating sites for sovereignty struggles that go to the foundations of settler-colonizer nations.

At Uluru and Devils Tower, we have observed how a conquering, settler-colonizer sacred vies with a modern, decolonizing, indigenous sacred. The Anangu close the Rock when an important elder dies. While they have no rights to close the climb at Devils Tower, Plains Indians tie prayer ribbons and meet to conduct gatherings and ceremonies annually. Some nonindigenous peoples also view the two monoliths as magic places—sites of potential good and evil power.

The symbolics of these two national monuments seem to be enhanced by the continuing "Indian" and Aboriginal presence and their mythologies. For Ayers Rock, the Aboriginal presence became ubiquitous on postcards, ashtrays, plates, and other souvenirs from the 1960s, adding a picturesque touch of the "primitive" and the unique. Apparently, such popular iconography of Aboriginal people was compatible with notions of emptiness, ancientness, discovery, conquest, or wilderness. The Aboriginal and the Indian were part of nature and the original white panorama. European accounts of visits to the Rock by scientists such as Walter Baldwin Spencer and Charles Mountford brought Aboriginal culture to the forefront.⁷⁰ National parks literature has increasingly emphasized the indigenous significance of Uluru and Kata Tjuta in an attempt to educate visiting tourists and thus broaden their appeal as tourist destinations.

Similarly, the significance of Devils Tower to Plains Indian groups has long

been recognized by the National Park Service, albeit in a deracinated, depersonalized format that presents the traditional stories of the place as mythologies, even as “colorful fantasies.”⁷¹ Largely absent in the official record are the voices and presence of contemporary Plains Indian peoples. Their interpretations of Devils Tower are sometimes represented as if they belong in the past, conveniently dislocated from present-day issues and concerns that stress continued connection and belonging, and from a desire to be involved in the management of the park.

Both Devils Tower and Uluru host Western-style New Age and Christian spiritual gatherings, including spiritual quests to “be Indian” or “Aboriginal.” The rocks around Devils Tower are used in Plains Indian ceremonies, as is the site itself. Ideas about power centers of special magnetic force draw people into cosmic earth journeys. New Agers and spiritual seekers have been found on various occasions chanting in off-limits sites such as sacred women-only caves. At both sites, climbers have died, imbuing the place with additional memorial significance. At both, tourists constantly pilfer rocks and, after taking them home, fall into the belief that runs of bad luck were attributable to the rocks being in their possession. They send them back in such quantities that the parks authorities do not know what to do with them.⁷²

We have now discussed how settler-colonizer states deploy Uluru and Devils Tower as modern ways of asserting new meanings imbued with nationalistic sacredness, and how Native people use these sites to assert ongoing prior sovereignties often based on spiritual significance. Yet beyond the binaries—which are essentially blurred through long histories of coexistence, intermarriage, and a mutual engagement with modernity and the larger nation—the situation is complex and convergent. Climbers, too, may be indigenous and may not necessarily follow tribal protocols.

Significantly, however, numerous indigenous people are currently using national parks as a forum in which to assert their knowledge, to tell stories, and to teach deeper meanings and longer histories. In Australia and North America, many indigenous rangers work in parks interpretation. Many sit on key committees and spend hours each week pursuing their cultural obligations. In Uluru and other Australian World Heritage areas, Aboriginal people have formed land councils, elders councils, and local, regional, and state committees to which parks turn for advice. Although the formation of parks often led to the dispossession of indigenous people, national parks have now become a key venue for sharing histories. Park interpretation may serve as the “pedagogical arm of reconciliation.” For nationals associated with the respective sites, some use key national parks sites to imaginatively jump the gap between the perceived binaries of colonizer and colonized.

This paper has suggested that, when looking at “national parks” in settler-colonizer nations, the term “transnational” takes on new layers.⁷³ The appellation “national” for landscapes denotes a strategy of ongoing spatial colonization that

potentially creates categories of indigenous exclusion and inclusion. Yet national parks and national monuments have created spaces for the assertion of indigenous and nonindigenous sovereignty over lands, as well as for negotiation and enactment of the ideals of reconciliation. Following a long period of consultation with traditional owners, tourist access to the climb was scheduled to cease at Uluru in 2012. The date appears to have been extended. Who steals the higher moral ground, if any, is yet to be seen. Parks are elastic signifiers of the sacred that can become venues for imagining a more benign colonization, and possibly a more just settlement, between Native peoples and colonizers. Nonetheless, in this metaphoric national climb, the summit always seems to loom slightly out of reach.

Notes

1. This paper refers to Uluru and Devils Tower according to contemporary official terminology. Where relevant, I refer to Uluru as Ayers Rock. The appellation “Devils Tower” has been a lingering source of controversy, and there have been periodic but unsuccessful attempts to adopt a second official name that better reflects its religious significance to Plains Indian groups. See Jared Farmer, “Devils Tower May Get a Second Name,” *High Country News*, September 2, 1996, available at <https://www.hcn.org/issues/89/2740> (accessed August 26, 2015). The place is sometimes referred to as Bear Lodge (Mateo Tepee), or by its Lakota name Mato Tipila, both of which refer to the place’s sacred association with the bear. Recognizing that different names apply across different tribal groups and the contested nature of place names, in this paper I somewhat reluctantly adhere to its official name.
2. Melissa Harper and Richard White, “How National Were the First National Parks? Comparative Perspectives from the British Settler Societies,” in *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, ed. Bernard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper, (New York: Berghahn, 2012), 50.
3. Haydn G. Washington, “The “Wilderness Knot,” USDA Forest Service Proceedings (2007), Rocky Mountain Research Station, www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_p049/rmrs_p049_441_446.pdf (accessed August 26, 2015).
4. William Cronon, “The Trouble with Wilderness: or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature,” in *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, ed. William Cronon (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995), 69–90.
5. I. Tyrrell, “Comparative and Transnational History,” *Australian Feminist Studies* 22, no. 52 (March 2007): 49–54; Joseph E. Taylor III, “Boundary Terminology,” *Environmental History* 13, no. 3 (2008): 454–81.
6. Ernest Giles, *Australia Twice Traversed: The Romance of Exploration: Being a Narrative Compiled from the Journals of Five Exploring Expeditions into and through Central South Australia and Western Australia, from 1872 to 1876* (1889; reprint, Perth, Australia: Hesperian Press, 1995), May 21–July 20, 1874; see also Jay Arthur, “Natural Beauty, Man-Made” and Michael Cathcart, “Uluru,” in *Words*

- for Country: *Landscape and Language in Australia*, ed. Tim Bonyhady and Tom Griffiths (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2002), 191–221, 207–21.
7. Devils Tower National Monument, “A Proclamation by the President of the United States of America,” Record Group 79 (National Park Service), Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–49, U.S. National Archives, College Park, Maryland (hereafter cited as RG 79), Box 584, Folder “[Devil’s Tower National Monument] History, General, 1892–1942” (location: RG 79/150/32/24/3).
8. Devils Tower National Monument, “Glimpses of Our National Parks, 1932–35,” RG 79, Box 2155 (location: RG 79/150/34/8/3).
9. http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode16/usc_sec_16_00000431----000-notes.html (accessed January 25, 2012).
10. M. Lake and H. Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
11. Harper and White, “How National Were the First Parks?” 59.
12. George Linge, 2000, “Ensuring the Full Freedom of Religion on Public Lands: Devils Tower and the Protection of Indian Sacred Sites,” 27 B.C. Env’tl. Aff. L. Rev. 307, p. 311, <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/calr/vol27/iss2/5/> (accessed January 20, 2012).
13. *Ibid.*, 312–14.
14. See Hilary du Cros and Chris Johnston, 2001, “Tourism Tracks and Sacred Places: Pashupatinath and Uluru. Case Studies from Nepal and Australia,” in Conference Proceedings, Australia ICOMOS 2001, *Making Tracks*, <http://www.aicomos.com/wp-content/uploads/Tourism-tracks-and-sacred-places-Pashupatinath-and-Uluru.-Case-studies-from-Nepal-and-Australia.pdf> (accessed August 27, 2015). For another insightful transnational comparison, see Jane Carruthers, “South Africa and Australia: Comparing the Significance of Kalahari Gemsbok and Uluru–Kata Tjuta National Parks” in *Disputed Territories: Land, Culture Identity in Settler Societies*, ed. D. Trigger and G. Griffiths (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003), 233–68. See also Taylor, “Boundary Terminology.”
15. Patrick Wolfe, “Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race,” *American Historical Review* 106 (2001): 867.
16. Andrew Boxer, 2009, “Native Americans and the Federal Government,” *History Review* 64 (September 2009), available at <http://www.historytoday.com/andrew-boxer/native-americans-and-federal-government> (accessed January 30, 2012).
17. Sarah Maddison and Morgan Brigg, *Unsettling the Settler State: Creativity and Resistance in Indigenous Settler-state Governance* (Sydney: Federation Press, 2011).
18. See World Heritage Convention website on Willandra Lakes Region, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/167> (accessed July 10, 2015).
19. For a summary of these developments, see Ann McGrath, *Contested Ground: Aborigines under the British Crown* (St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1995), introduction and chap. 1.
20. Richard Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009), 214, 256.
21. *Ibid.*, 13.
22. Mark David Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 214.
23. Harper and White, “How National Were the First Parks?” 52.
24. T. Banivanua Mar and P. Edmonds, eds., *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place, and Identity* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 76.
25. Denis R. Byrne, “Nervous Landscapes: Race and Space in Australia,” *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3, no. 2 (June 2003): 170.
26. D. Byrne and M. Nugent, *Mapping Attachment: A Spatial Approach to Aboriginal Post-contact Heritage* (Hurstville, Australia: Department of Environment and Conservation, 2004).
27. McGrath, *Contested Ground*.
28. “Courageous MP Fought for Social Justice,” *Canberra Times*, August 6, 2011.
29. The term *terra nullius* was often applied as the rationale behind colonizing take-over. This was overturned by the *Mabo* judgment of 1992, and later by native title legislation. For a summary of Australian government policy and legislation, see McGrath, *Contested Ground*, chap. 1.
30. George L. San Miguel, 1994, “How Is Devils Tower a Sacred Site to American Indians?” National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, <http://www.nps.gov/deto/index.htm> (accessed April 17, 2011).
31. Robert Layton, *Uluru: An Aboriginal History of Ayers Rock* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 1986), 3–16; Stanley Breeden, *Uluru: Looking after Uluru-Kata Tjuta the Anangu Way* (Marleston, South Australia: J. B. Books Australia, 1997), 95.
32. Barry Hill, *The Rock: Travelling to Uluru* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1994), 96.
33. A range of valuable new resources are now posted on the NPS website. See National Park Service, “Devils Tower National Monument: First Stories,” <http://www.nps.gov/deto/historyculture/first-stories.htm> (accessed April 13, 2011); <http://www.nps.gov/deto/learn/historyculture/first-stories.htm> (accessed August 17, 2015).
34. See, for example, http://www.billandcori.com/devilstower/devils_tower.htm (accessed July 9, 2015); <http://travelingringo.com/2011/02/the-power-of-devils-tower> (accessed April 14, 2011).
35. A. McGrath, “Travels to a Distant Past: Mythologies of the Outback,” *Australian Cultural History* 10 (1991): 113–24; J. Marcus, “The Journey Out to the Centre: The Cultural Appropriation of Ayers Rock,” in *Aboriginal Culture Today/Kunapipi*, ed. Anna Rutherford (Sydney: Dangaroo Press, 1998), 254–74; Elvi Whittaker, “Public Discourse to Sacredness: The Transfer of Ayers Rock to Aboriginal Ownership,” *American Ethnologist* 21, no. 2 (1994): 310–34.
36. McGrath, “Travels to a Distant Past.”
37. Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism’s Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1994), 2. See also Harper and White, “How National Were the First Parks?” 60; Jean O’Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).
38. John Weaver, *The Great Land Rush and the Making of the Modern World, 1650–1900* (Montreal: McGill–Queen’s University Press, 2003).

39. For example, see Martin Thomas and Margo Neale, eds., *Exploring the Legacy of the 1948 Arnhem Land Expedition* (Canberra: ANU E-Press, 2011).
40. See Ray Allen Billington, ed., *Frederick Jackson Turner: Historian, Scholar, Teacher* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).
41. Devils Tower National Monument, RG 79/150/34/8/3.
42. John B. Dorst, *Looking West* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 201–2. See also Frederick Augustus Fidfaddy, *The Adventures of Uncle Sam in Search after His Lost Honor* (Middletown, Conn.: Seth Richards, 1816), which is attributed as launching this allegory.
43. “Devils Tower National Monument; History, General, 1892–1942,” RG 79/150/32/24/3; “Devils Tower National Monument; Newspaper Articles, Press Notices,” RG 79, Box 2155, RG 79/150/34/8/3; National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.
44. Hill, *The Rock*, 14.
45. McGrath, “Travels to a Distant Past.”
46. Joseph E. Taylor III, *Pilgrims of the Vertical: Yosemite Rock Climbers and Nature at Risk* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010).
47. Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture*, 171.
48. For an in-depth discussion of pilgrimage and history making, see O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting*; Joseph Conforti, *Imagining New England: Explorations of Regional Identity from the Pilgrims to the Mid-twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Joseph Conforti, *Jonathan Edwards, Religious Tradition, and American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).
49. H. H. Finlayson, *The Red Centre: Man and Beast in the Heart of Australia* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1935).
50. Rex Ingamells, 1953, “Journey to the Rock,” in *Walkabout*, 119, 120. See also Hannah Hueneke, “To Climb or Not to Climb? The Sacred Deed Done at Australia's Mighty Heart,” unpublished honors thesis, Australian National University, 2006, 17–18.
51. Frank Clune, 1941, “Ayers Rock,” in *Walkabout*, 7, 11–15.
52. A. Groom, *I Saw a Strange Land: Journeys in Central Australia* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1950), 166.
53. Beryl Miles, *The Stars My Blanket* (London: John Murray, 1954), 18, cited in Hueneke, “To Climb or Not to Climb?” 72.
54. Bill Harney, 1963, *To Ayers Rock and Beyond* (London: Robert Hale, 1963), 92.
55. Frank Flynn and Keith Willey, *Northern Frontiers* (Sydney: F. P. Leopard, 1964), 101, 19.
56. Hill, *The Rock*, 17.
57. See Ann McGrath, *Born in the Cattle: Aborigines in Cattle Country* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1987).
58. Marie Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992), 1–11 and part 3.
59. David Craig, *Native Stones: A Book About Climbing* (London: Pimlico, 1995), ix.
60. Taylor, *Pilgrims of the Vertical*, 13–14.
61. Craig, *Native Stones*; Taylor, *Pilgrims of the Vertical*.
62. James Clifford, *Routes: Travels and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 217.
63. Ruby Langford, *Don't Take Your Love to Town* (Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1988), 222–26.
64. Devils Tower National Monument, RG 79, Box 2154, RG 79/150/34/8/3.
65. The book appears to be held in a cylinder. See also “Devils Tower National Monument; History, General, 1892–1942,” RG 79/150/32/24/3; U.S. National Archives, “Devils Tower National Monument; Newspaper Articles, Press Notices,” “Devils Tower National Monument; Publications, General, 1899–1948,” and “Devils Tower National Monument; Glimpses of Our National Parks, 1932–35,” all in RG 79/150/34/8/3.
66. <http://www.devilstower-sacredtomanypeople.org/shop.html> (accessed January 28, 2012; online shop no longer exists).
67. See, for example, M. Sturma, “Aliens and Indians: A Comparison of Abduction and Captivity Narratives,” *Journal of Popular Culture* 36 (2002): 318–34.
68. Clifford, *Routes*, 219.
69. Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*; Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness*, 214.
70. Breedon, *Uluru*, 140–41.
71. U.S. National Park Service, “Devils Tower National Monument: A Brief Description,” March 1938, RG 79, Box 2154, RG 79/150/34/8/3.
72. Craig, *Native Stones*, 6. See also David Craig, *Landmarks: An Exploration of Great Rocks* (London: Pimlico, 1996); Sarah James, “Negotiating the Climb: Uluru, a Site of Struggle or Shared Space?” (unpublished research paper, University of Melbourne, 2005); Hueneke, “To Climb or Not to Climb?” 59.
73. Tyrrell, “Comparative and Transnational History”; Taylor, “Boundary Terminology.”