(De)constructing the White Man's Indian

in James Welch's *Fools Crow* and Disney's *The Lone Ranger*

Katri Kilpikoski
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
May 2014

Tampereen yliopisto
Englantilainen filologia
Kieli-, käännös- ja kirjallisuustieteiden yksikkö
KILPIKOSKI, KATRI: (De)constructing the White Man’s Indian in James Welch’s *Fools Crow* and Disney’s *The Lone Ranger*
Pro gradu -tutkielma, 114 sivua + lähdeluettelo 8 sivua
Toukokuu 2014

Tutkielmani käsittelee Amerikan intiaaneihin liittyviä stereotypioita. Ensisijaisena lähdemateriaalina tutkimuksessani on Blackfoot-kirjailija James Welchin romaani *Petkuttaa Varista* (1986) sekä Disney-elokuva *The Lone Ranger* (2013). Tutkielmani lähtökohtana on Robert Berkhofer Jr:n käsite ”valkoisen miehen intiaani,” jota intiaaneihin liittyvät stereotypiat ilmentävät. Käsite kuvastaa sitä, miten ”intiaani” on enemmänkin valkoisten luoma, keinotekoinen rakennelma kuin viittaus oikeisiin intiaaneihin.

Valkoisen miehen intiaani on toistunut valkoisen, euroamerikkalaisen enemmistön tuottamissa intiaaneihin liittyvissä representaatioissa kautta historian, ja se siten edustaa hegemonian käsitystä intiaaneista. Tutkimukseni vahvistaa Berkhoferin näkemyksen siitä, että nämä varhaiset käsitykset eurooppalaisten näkökulmasta ovat säilyneet lähes muuttumattomina nykypäivään ja hallitsevat myös amerikkalaisten tämän hetkistä käsitystä Amerikan intiaaneista. Päällimmäisenä valkoisen miehen intiaanin piirteenä nousi esiin kuvausten selkeä kahtiajako ”jalon villin” ja ”epäjalon villin” kategorioihin. Koska valkoisen miehen intiaani liittyy yhteiskunnassa vallitseviin valtasuhteisiin, tutkin ilmiötä osana intiaaneihin liittyvää diskurssia. Käsitteellä viittaan Michel Foucaultin diskurssiteoriaan, jonka merkitystä Edward Said on laajentanut jälkikolonialistisessa kontekstissa. Jana Sequoya-Magdaleno on yhdistänyt diskurssikäsitteen myös intiaaneihin liittyvään teoreettiseen keskusteluun.

Valkoisen miehen intiaani diskurssina on määritellyt, kuvannut ja juurruttanut käsityksiä intiaaneista. Metodina tässä prosessissa on ollut kolonistinen stereotypia, jonka päämääränä on todentaa länsimaista auktoriteettia ja valtaa määrittelemällä intiaaneja etnosentrisesti euronamerikkalaisiin normeihin pohjautuen. Näissä diskursiivisissa käytännöissä syntyvät merkitykset esitetään objektiivisena tietona, vaikka ne pohjautuvat harhakäsityksiin, puutteelliseen ymmärrykseen ja stereotyyppisiin yksinkertaistuksiin ja yleistyksiin. Useat kriitikot, kuten Stuart Hall ja Richard Dyer, tuovat esiin myös representaation ja populaarikulttuurin merkityksen hegemonisessa valtataistelussa ja vallitsevan tilan ylläpitämisessä ja hyödynnän työssäni siksi myös heidän näkemyksiään.

Tämä on se teoriatausta, jonka pohjalta tutkin lähdemateriaalissa ilmeneviä intiaaneihin liittyviä stereotypioita. Analyysistani käy ilmi se, että yleiset intiaaneihin liittyvät stereotypiat toistuvat lähdemateriaalissa, vaikkakin niiden määrittely stereotypioiksi on tulkinnanvaraista. Kumpikaan lähdeteos ei kuitenkaan toista stereotypioita kritiikittömästi, vaan kumpikin omalta osaltaan osallistuu vallitsevien käsityksen haastamiseen ja purkamiseen, kuitenkaan siinä täysin onnistumatta. *The Lone Ranger* pyrkii autenttisuuteen ja osoittaa omalta osaltaan joitakin intiaaneihin liittyviä stereotypioita vääräksi. Vaikka elokuvan tarkoituksena on myös parodioida stereotypioita, se samalla myös osallistuu niiden vahvistamiseen toistamalla niitä. *Petkuttaa varista* puolestaan keskittyy esittämään kirjassa olevat intiaanit inhimillisinä ja monipuolisina, muutokseen kykenevinä yksilöinä, joten heitä on lähes mahdoton kategorisoida stereotyypeiksi. Welch käyttää myös kielellisiä vieraannuttamisstrategioita, jotka kiinnittävät huomion siihen, miten kieli muodostaa merkityksiä. Tutkimukseni osoittaa, että hegemoniset käsitykset intiaaneista toistuvat populaarikulttuurin lisäksi myös Amerikan intiaanien tuottamassa kirjallisuudessa ja että niiden kiistäminen on haastavaa.

Avainsanat: Amerikan intiaanit, jälkikolonialismi, *The Lone Ranger*, stereotypiat, James Welch

Preface

From the beginning of June to the end of August 2006, I worked as a receptionist in Roosevelt Lodge at the Tower-Roosevelt Junction in Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming. We provided our guests the chance to stay in rustic log cabins, ride horses or colonial style wagons and participate in cookouts that tried to capture the feel of the American Old West. Funnily enough, it was at this artificial assimilation, where I met the first real Indian I ever knew. He worked as a busboy at the lodge restaurant, which was right next to our reception desk. One day we got to talking by the employee recreation hall. He asked me what I was drinking and I wished I had picked any other drink. “I’m having a Red Indian,” I said. “Is it any good?” he asked. Soon after, I stopped thinking of my new friend as an Indian.

His name was Will—not Laughing Coyote or anything along those lines. His English was not broken at all. In fact, not only did it turn out to be his mother tongue, but it was the only language he knew. He never shared with me any sort of native wisdom; he did not even mention “the Great Spirit,” “Mother Nature” or anything of the sort. I never witnessed any special bond he might have had with nature. In fact, he drove a car, wore jeans and shopped at Walmart for groceries like the rest of us. We talked about music and other “normal” things. He did not listen to traditional tribal music. He even complained to me about his wife’s family. He said it was difficult for them to get along with his because of the culture barrier. His wife was Navajo.

Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 The White Man's Indian as an Operation of Power 8

2.1 Indigenous and Postcolonial Literary Theories 8

2.2 Stereotyping as a Representational Practice 21

2.3 The Construction of the White Man's Indian 30

3 *The Lone Ranger*: the White Man's Indian in the Making? 37

3.1 Popular Stereotypes and Authenticity 38

3.2 From a Generic Backdrop Indian to Center Stage 49

3.3 Strategies of Resistance 55

4 *Fools Crow*: the White Man's Indian Deconstructed? 64

4.1 Welch's Precolonial Space 64

4.2 Language and the Pikuni Experience 77

4.3 Humanization and Cultural Variety 82

4.4 Strategies of Resistance 94

5 Conclusions 109

Bibliography 115

1 Introduction

The Lone Ranger (hereafter abbreviated as *LR*), a film by Walt Disney Pictures and Jerry Bruckheimer Productions, has gained negative media attention after its release in June 2013 (Joe Neumaier 2013; Richard Roeper 2013). One of the issues raised by the media has been the film's portrayal of Native Americans,[1] mainly Lone Ranger's companion, Tonto. The character is played by Johnny Depp, who has been accused of reinforcing negative stereotypes of American Indians with his performance (Allison Samuels 2013, Ariz Flagstaff 2013). Many film critics also note the evident effort of Depp and the filmmakers not to insult Native Americans (Mick LaSalle 2013). As Stephanie Zacharek (2013) puts it, "[t]he movie is overanxious not to offend." Indeed, my analysis of the film will show that *LR* attempts to dismantle some of the most common stereotypes associated with American Indians rather than uncritically repeat such stereotypes. However, any representation of a minority group such as Native Americans by a production team that mostly consists of white people—the director and all the writers of *LR* are white—is bound to raise issues of authenticity and voice. As a representation of "the other" by a dominant group, it can be argued that *LR* assumes an authority over the group of Comanche it represents by participating in their definition from an outsider's point of view. It appears that there is no correct way for dominant groups to portray Native Americans because no matter what the filmmakers do, there is always someone who takes offense. More often than not, that someone is not Native American and does not necessarily even know why the film is offensive. After the film was released, actress Lena Dunham (quoted in Ria Torrente 2013) tweeted, "Can someone tell me whether we're supposed to be offended by Johnny Depp's portrayal of Tonto or not? Must know for dinner parties/twitter." The

---

[1] There continues to be controversy over the preferred term, even though many Native Americans are comfortable with using Native American, American Indian, Indian and Native interchangeably (Walter Fleming 2007, 53; Mary Lupton 2004, 1). There seems to be a general consensus among Native American scholars that generalization should be avoided by using tribal affiliation in the context of tribal members when possible (Ryan Winn 2013).

answer to her question was “Looks pretty offensive,” to which Dunham replied, “That’s what I thought” (ibid.).

Popular images of Indians are constructions formed through representation. In the words of Louis Owens (Choctaw/Cherokee; 1992, 4), “[t]he Indian in today’s world consciousness is a product of literature, history, and art, and a product that, as an invention, often bears little resemblance to actual, living Native American people.” Owens is suggesting that for many non-Natives, representation is their only link to American Indians. Although Owens does not explicitly mention popular culture here, it plays an important part in reinforcing the images and stereotypes associated with Indians because its visibility and availability for mass audiences. Furthermore, the images of Indians communicated through popular cultural representations are often produced by non-Natives, as access to mainstream is limited for Native American writers, artists and filmmakers. “Image” is a good word to describe the white conception of Indians; Viktor Shklovsky (1988, 25) explains that the purpose of an image is not to provide knowledge of the meaning of an object, but instead, to “create a special perception of the object—it creates a vision of the object instead of serving as a means for knowing it.” Many critics express the concern that Indians are constructed by non-Natives for consumption, which means that these constructed images are concerned with making profit rather than presenting authentic images of Indians. Native Americans are stereotyped and defined by non-Natives; they are consumed by the West for entertainment and spiritual or ecological relief. They are produced as commodities such as toys, cars, food products, motorcycles, etc. and their sacred items are turned into cheap trinkets. It is an ongoing process of dehumanizing the human and secularizing the sacred. The concerns expressed above are voiced by critics such as Jacquelyn Kilpatrick (1999, 9), Gülriz Büken (2002, 50) and Debra Merskin (1998, 333), all of whom are non-Native. Indeed, not only is the image of Indian largely a product of white imagination, but as I will demonstrate in this thesis, the discussion surrounding issues relating to Indians is largely in non-Native hands as well.

My interest in the representation of Native Americans in fiction emanates from the concern that popular cultural representations of Indians are mainly produced by non-Natives and thus often presumed as stereotyped misconceptions that have nothing to do with living, contemporary Indians. Robert Berkhofer, Jr (1979) employs the notion of “the white man’s Indian” to refer to the imagery of Indians constructed by the dominant, white, Euro-American groups as part of the Western attempt to define the Indian against white, ethnocentric norms that the dominant groups assume as universal. As will be shown momentarily, the white man’s Indian is therefore part of a discourse that ultimately seeks to confirm the supremacy of Western culture by assuming authority over the Native “other.” The white/Indian dichotomy is at the core of the white man’s Indian, which is reflected in popular cultural representations; as pointed out by Angela Aleiss (2005, 152), the most popular images of Indians in Hollywood are concentrated in the specific setting of the American Frontier in the nineteenth century during the westward movement of the Euro-American culture, which places the conflict between the Native and the settler cultures at center stage.

Popular representation of Indians have traditionally concentrated on the Plains Indians; as Berkhofer (1979, 89) puts it, “the stalwart tribespeoples of the Plains became the quintessential American Indian in the eyes of the White citizens of the United States and elsewhere and even many Native Americans themselves.” The imagery of Indians as buffalo hunters of the Prairie has persisted in the popular genre of the western (Berkhofer 1979, 96), for example, and in the advertising industry, which has also adopted the quintessential Plains Indian as its favorite image, “with buckskin, feather headdress, and tomahawk—even when selling Florida oranges” (Elizabeth DeLaney Hoffman 2012, xiv). Büken (2002, 49) strongly criticizes imagery of the Plains Indians as stereotyped and suggests that imagery of contemporary Indians should be used to resist these stereotyped images. However, because the American Frontier is the setting where American Indians are typically found in Indian-themed popular representations, and given the historical significance of the colonial time period for the development of American national identity, as I will show, I find it especially important to examine representations in this specific setting and with regard to the

Native point of view. As will be shown, the definition of Indianness in the mainstream has largely been in the hands of non-Natives. Consequently, I am in agreement with DeLaney Hoffman (2012, xv) who emphasizes the important task of Native American professionals to rewrite "the American Story," which is engraved in the American consciousness with images of "Thanksgiving pilgrims and Indians, Manifest Destiny, sweeping measures to civilize the Indians, and stereotypes of noble savages, murderous warriors, and Indian princesses." Consequently, stereotypes concerning contemporary Indians will not be discussed in this thesis.

The primary research material used in this thesis has been selected to exemplify representation of Plains Indians during this specific time period. In addition to *LR*, I will be analyzing the novel *Fools Crow* (1986; hereafter abbreviated as *FC*) by James Welch (1940–2003). *FC* takes place in what is currently known as the state of Montana over a period of three years from 1868 onwards, while *LR* takes place in Texas during the same time period, in 1869. Due to the considerable geographical difference in the works, the American Indians portrayed are of different tribes, mostly Blackfeet and Crow in the novel and Comanche in the film.[2] *FC* is a historical novel; not only does it contain actual persons (Blackfoot leaders, among others), but there is a strong emphasis on actual historical events (Owens 1992, 156). The publishers have included a map, which pinpoints the actual locations where the story takes place. To name an example, the white settlement of Many-Sharp-Points-Ground in the novel is, according to the map, Helena, the current state capital of Montana. The story is written from the viewpoint of a band of Blackfoot Indians called the Lone Eaters. They are part of a larger band called the Pikunis. Welch was a Blackfoot Indian on his father's side and Gros Ventre on his mother's side and both of his grandfathers were Irish (Lupton 2004, 3). *FC* culminates in the massacre on the Marias in 1870, where 173 Pikunis were killed by the United States Cavalry (Ron McFarland 2000, 2; Blanca Chester 2001, 93). In

[2] In the original radio show the film is based on Lone Ranger's companion, Tonto, was Potawatomi, but the filmmakers decided to change the tribe for *LR* because the Potawatomi never resided the parts of the United States, where the story is set. Interchangeability of Indian tribes is not uncommon in Hollywood; the Lakota in *Dances with Wolves* (1990), for example, were originally Comanche in the paperback version (Aleiss 2005, 145).

addition to stories passed on to Welch from his grandmother, who was a survivor of the massacre, Welch included traditional Blackfoot stories he had learned from tribal elders in *FC* (Lupton 2004, 4). Much of the tribal tradition Welch includes are accumulated from the works of non-Native ethnographers such as George Bird Grinnell and Walter McClintock, who worked to preserve Blackfoot culture before and after the turn of the twentieth century (ibid.).

As for *LR*, the film is based on its title character, a heroic Texas Ranger of an iconic status in the United States, fighting evil in the American Old West. As a recent release by one of the major producers in Hollywood, the film serves as a good indicator of the contemporary image of Indians in popular culture. Wheeler Dixon and Gwendolyn Foster (2011, 41) list the film's producer, Jerry Bruckheimer, as one of the most audience appealing names in contemporary Hollywood. With a budget of 250 million dollars (Tatiana Siegel and Pamela McClintock 2013) *LR* was, without any doubt, designed to draw massive audiences. Skip Dine Young (2012, 86) acknowledges the power of the massive film studios; through extensive advertising campaigns and with the ability to control film distribution in theaters, they use that power to dictate audience choices, thus having a major effect on the kind of views and values movie viewers are exposed to. Because of the power they possess, they represent institutional hegemony, a concept that shall be discussed in 2.1.

As I will demonstrate, many critics agree that popular imagery of Indians has persisted with slight variations throughout the initial contact of European settler-colonists with the indigenous peoples in the Americas. I intend to find out whether such imagery can be resisted or whether similar imagery is repeated even in the representations produced by Native Americans themselves. I have intentionally chosen a novel that dates back to the eighties, because that period of time was marked by the Native American Literary Renaissance that followed the publication of N. Scott Momaday's (Kiowa) *House Made of Dawn* in 1969 (McFarland 2000, 3; Arnold Krupat 1996, 1 and 40). Momaday's novel was the first book by a Native American author to win a Pulitzer Price. In the years that followed, several literary works by Native American writers such as Welch, Leslie Marmon Silko (Laguna Pueblo) and Louise Erdrich (Chippewa) began to emerge. The complete

void of Native American literature was replaced with a sudden materialization of a body of Native American literatures. As Welch noted at the turn of the millennium, “Now you don’t shake a tree without two or three Indian writers falling out” (Welch, quoted in Lupton 2004, 1).

It is my presumption that, firstly, these writers have worked to dismantle general stereotypes associated with Indians and secondly, these stereotypes, nevertheless, continue to dominate in popular representations of Indians. Using the selected research material as evidence, I will demonstrate whether indeed this is the case; in the analysis section, using *LR* as an example, I seek to find out whether popular cultural representations continue to bolster stereotyped images of American Indians, a concern that has persisted at least from the latter half of the twentieth century in the writings of Berkhofer (1979), James Ruppert (1996, 113) and John O’Connor (2011), for example. *FC* will be examined in the second part of the analysis in order to find out how Native Americans have, for their part, contributed in the attempts to dismantle these popular images. Given the limited scope of the primary material, the results of this study will not be generalizable, however, and further studies of both popular cultural and literary representations of American Indians are needed to examine the operations and effects of stereotyping. To conclude, my research questions are as follows: Firstly, does the primary research material repeat stereotypes included in the notion of the white man’s Indian as defined by Berkhofer? Secondly, does the research material attempt to challenge the stereotyped popular imagery of Indians? If so, how does it do this and are the attempts successful? My initial assumption is that *LR*, as a film by a non-Native production team, participates in the reproduction of the white man’s Indian by repeating stereotypes associated with Indians, and that the film does not attempt to challenge these stereotypes. Secondly, I presume that Welch attempts to contest the white image of Indians by deconstructing the general stereotypes associated with Indians. Consequently, my final research question is whether Welch manages to deconstruct the binary oppositions inherent in the colonial discourse that the white man’s Indian is part of or whether his efforts to resist the stereotyped images operates from within the same hierarchical valorization system, therefore confirming the ethnocentric norms that the discourse

assumes as its center. The necessary theoretical frame for this question, along with the related terminology, will be discussed in 2.1.

In order to avoid high levels of miscommunication between my study, the primary research material and the theoretical framework used in this thesis, I have employed a great variety of background material to support my arguments. I also acknowledge the risks involved in any study of non-Western literature conducted from a Western point of view. Therefore I wish to emphasize that this thesis cannot be used as ethnographic evidence of the Native American cultures discussed because this study takes its object in the constructed images of Indians of white imagination. Furthermore, academic writing, including this study, cannot be regarded as production of objective fact because even writing aimed at neutrality is embedded in the cultural, ideological, social and political circumstances of its author (Edward Said 1987, 3 and 272; Elvira Pulitano 2003, 8; Susan Dente Ross 2003, 30; Paula Gunn Allen 1983, 3).

2 The White Man's Indian as an Operation of Power

In the theory section that follows, I will show that the definition of the Indian as "the other" against the ethnocentric, Western norm—which is the basic operation of Berkhofer's notion of the white man's Indian—seeks to ontologically dispossess Native Americans and assume authority over them. In this thesis, the concept of the white man's Indian will be analyzed as part of a Foucauldian discourse as defined in the postcolonial context by Said (1987). I will employ Homi Bhabha's (1986) definition of the colonial stereotype in my analysis of the white man's Indian, which seeks to define the Native other by constructing him[3] through stereotypes as a completely knowable subject. I will begin with an overview of the theoretical framework employed in this thesis. Rather than focusing on one theory exclusively, I will attempt to gain a comprehensive overall picture of the way the white man's Indian operates through representation by presenting a variety of relevant theories. I will conclude the theory section with an overview of the general stereotypes of Indians in non-Native representations.

2.1 Indigenous and Postcolonial Literary Theories

According to Jyotirmaya Tripathy (2009, 44), American Indian literature is intrinsically different from Western literary traditions, because there is a fundamental difference in the Native American ways of perceiving reality. It can therefore be argued that Western theories and methodologies are inadequate in the study of Native American literatures. Pulitano (2003, 7) emphasizes the importance of a Native American critical theory that draws mainly on Native epistemology, while acknowledging the necessity to adapt some aspects of Western critical discourse. Pulitano lists a number of Native American literary critics from different cultural backgrounds, including Paula Gunn Allen (Laguna Pueblo), Louis Owens (Choctaw/Cherokee) and Gerald Vizenor (Minnesota Chippewa), who have participated in the establishment of a critical literary theory that relies mainly

[3] The masculine pronoun is employed here and elsewhere, when the stereotype or concept discussed assumes maleness (see 4.4 for a further discussion on gender). It is consistently used, then, for the essentially male noble savage and his ignoble counterpart as well as concepts that surface in the analysis, including the archetypal white men (3.3 and 4.4) and the Pikuni storyteller (4.1), for example.

on American Indian intellectual traditions and aims to express "Native ways of articulating the world" (ibid., 2–3). Nevertheless, the establishment of a strictly Native American critical tradition risks communicating a belief in a shared group essence and ignoring the heterogeneity of cultures entailed in the notion.

Whereas Pulitano recognizes the usefulness of Euro-American literary theories in the study of Native American literatures, critics like Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (Lakota) call for a clear-cut disciplinary separation from Western modes of knowledge; Cook-Lynn (quoted in Krupat 1996, 27) argues that American Indian studies should be an "alternative regime of intellectual thought . . . not only through content but through methodology." This kind of totalitarian demand, however, ignores the entwined histories and conflicted relations of Native Americans with Euro-American settler nations. Indeed, many literary critics, including Xie Shaobo (Xie 1997, 17), acknowledge the impossibility of a total intellectual separation of literary criticism emerging in previously colonized nations from Western modes of knowledge because of the profound impact of colonialism. Because of this impossibility, Krupat (1996, 21) expands to Native American literatures the argument repeatedly made by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffits and Helen Tiffin (1989; 41, 74 and 110) that all postcolonial societies and literature produced in them is hybridized. In fact, they argue that "hybridity . . . is the primary characteristic of all post-colonial texts" (ibid., 185).

This definition of postcolonial literatures speaks for an allowance of syncretism; in other words, the hybridization that results in the cross-cultural interaction between the colonizer and the indigenous nations results in the merging of ways of thinking and literary forms, which may originate from very discrete or even contradictory traditions. This notion of syncretism lends itself to literary theory as well as both American Indian and Western literary theories can be employed in the study of Native American literatures despite their differences; like Pulitano above, Krupat (1996, 28) is an advocate of inclusion as opposed to separation when it comes to using Western intellectual traditions in the study of Native American literatures. This view is supported by Patrick Morris (quoted in Krupat 1996, 26), who calls for Native American studies "to be intellectually

broad and integrative, utilizing all academic disciplines and methodologies to search, identify and address the critical issues relevant to the Native Community." I agree with Pulitano's argument against relying solely on Euro-American critical theory in the study of Native American literatures and I will therefore include critical work by Native American scholars in this thesis. However, because of its relatively poor availability, my main focus will be on postcolonial literary theory.

Ashcroft et al. (1989, 2) use the term postcolonial "to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day." Even though this definition certainly entails Native Americans, Ashcroft et al. completely ignore American Indians in their discussion of postcolonial theory. Penelope Myrtle Kelsey (Seneca; 2008, 6) observes the same tendency in postcolonial literary theory generally. The exclusion may be due to the controversy involved in placing Native Americans under the blanket term postcolonial. Critics of Native American literatures emphasize the persistence of the colonized status of American Indians as they have not achieved independence of language, culture and politics (Krupat 1996, 30; Jace Weaver 1997, 10; Pulitano 2003, 10). Krupat (1996, 30 and xii) reveals an ambivalent attitude towards the term postcolonial; he criticizes the inappropriateness of the term postcolonial in the Native American context, but at the same time, he does not hesitate to place American Indian novels among "the postcolonial literatures of the world." Some professionals of Native American studies recognize the usefulness of postcolonial studies in the field; according to Weaver (Oklahoma Cherokee; 1997, 10), postcolonial literary theory is "helpful in coming to an understanding of Indian literature that, in part, asserts itself over and against the dominant culture."

It must be noted that the demise of colonialism, insinuated in the prefix "post" in postcolonial, is a "falsely utopian or prematurely celebratory" notion, as Leela Gandhi (1998, 174) points out. This aspect of the term postcolonial has been criticized by many postcolonial critics outside the Native American context, because it disregards the ongoing effects of colonialism world over (Gandhi 1998, 175; Xie 1997, 7–8). I hope to circumvent this controversy by employing Tripathy's definition of postcolonialism in this thesis; according to Tripathy (2009, 42),

"postcolonialism is not a marker of colonial pastness, but a condition that emerges with the beginning of colonial encounter and occupation." A further note must be made of the immense heterogeneity of both postcolonial literatures and postcolonial literary theory, which draws from a diverse theoretical framework; it intersects with many European theoretical movements, including poststructuralism, postmodernism, Marxist ideological criticism and feminist criticism (Ashcroft et al. 1989, 31 and 155; Gandhi 1998, 54 and 167). Especially the convergence with postmodernism is important in this study, because both traditions share the aspiration "to move beyond Eurocentric ideology [and] beyond colonialist binary structures of self/Other," as pointed out by Xie (1997, 9). Like postcolonial theory, many postmodern views have been recognized useful in the study of American Indian literatures by Native scholars, such as Vizenor (1989).

Even though postcolonial theory has gained some support among Native American scholars, some critics see it as "another totalizing method that fails to account for differences" and reject its usefulness in the study of Native American literatures (Pulitano 2003, 9). Ashcroft et al. (1989, 11), on the other hand, argue that

> The idea of 'post-colonial literary theory' emerges from the inability of European theory to deal adequately with the complexities and varied cultural provenance of post-colonial writing. European theories themselves emerge from particular cultural traditions which are hidden by false notions of 'the universal'.

In their defense of postcolonial literary theory, Ashcroft et al. ignore, however, that much of the fundamental assumptions of postcolonial theory are taken from the "European theories" they strongly oppose. This disregard becomes explicit in their outright disavowal of postmodernism and poststructuralism, which Ashcroft et al. (1989, 164 and 172–73) label as symptomatic of the persistence of Euro-American hegemony, a "neo-universalism" that is detrimental to any efforts by postcolonial nations to counteract Euro-American assimilation. Although I disagree with Ashcroft et al. (1989, 155–56) in their critique of the "universalist paradigm" of "recent European theories," in which they include postmodernism and poststructuralism—with a simultaneous disregard of the wide ranges of these fields—they provide the methodology that shall be used in this thesis; their suggestion of a postcolonial reading strategy is symptomatic rather than totalizing as it aims to

expose the operations of binary structures within a text and to dismantle such structures through a variety of methods (ibid., 83 and 114–15). Indeed, in my analysis of *LR*, I will attempt to find the underlying binary structures that the white man's Indian relies on. In my reading of *FC*, on the other hand, I will examine whether Welch manages to deconstruct these binary structures.

The concept of "hegemony," mentioned above, is relevant to this thesis, because it reflects how power is distributed in a given society. The concept was introduced by the Marxist Antonio Gramsci, who sees hegemony as an integral part of any society; by hegemony Gramsci refers to the way dominant social groups promote their views and ideologies, often without explicit enforcement, in a way that produces a sense of conformity and the dominant values "become the predominant values throughout society" (Marcus Green 2002, 7). White values, for example, are seen as universal norms, even though in reality, they are the views of a selected few. The hegemonic status of whiteness is implicit in the way it is not seen as an ethnicity at all, because it is the assumed standard (Stuart Hall 2006, 202). Postcolonial and cultural studies have adopted the notion of hegemony in the context of race, ethnicity and culture; postcolonial studies see postcolonial societies as hierarchical organizations where certain cultural groups assume a moral superiority and predominate over the marginal or peripheral groups (Ashcroft et al. 1989, 172; Said 1987, 7; Gandhi 1998, 126). Xie (1997, 11) points out that these kinds of manifestations of hegemony are forms of neocolonialism as power is unevenly distributed to a privileged few. Western hegemony is increasingly associated with the United States, which has assumed control over publishing, knowledge, theory, economics, politics, technology and the mass media (Tripathy 2009, 45; Xie 1997, 11; Ashcroft et al. 1989, 7 and 18).

As a concept constructed by the whites, white man's Indian relies on ethnocentric notions that assume whiteness as the natural norm. The ethnocentrism and false claims to universalism made by Western humanism have been recognized by many anti-humanist movements, including postcolonial criticism. This view has been influenced by Jean-Paul Sartre, who outright declares humanism as "an ideology of lies, a perfect justification for pillage" (Sartre 1963, 25) and also by

Frantz Fanon, who sees humanism as a way of controlling the colonized nations (Fanon 1963, 43). Allon White (1987–1988, 233) accuses Western humanist theories of constructing "the European [or American], white, male, heterosexual shape which 'Man' is evidently supposed to have." The norm is legitimized as the truth while everyone outside the norm, including women and other races, is oppressed and considered as subhuman, as noted by Fanon (1963, 163). Michel Foucault (1977, 219) refers to this method of Western ethnocentrism as a "double repression," which functions by both setting the standard and excluding those who do not meet the requirements of the norm. The assumption of the Western norm as the universal standard is symptomatic of what Gandhi (1998, 37) calls "the epistemological narcissism of Western culture," which has been criticized by many poststructuralist and postmodern thinkers, including Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and Jean-François Lyotard. Ethnocentrism is an operation of power because ethnocentric standards control what is considered as normal in a given society. As a person in the video *Being White* puts it, white people continue to "colonise the definition of normal" in order to reinforce their dominant position over others (quoted in Richard Dyer 2002, 127).

The imposition of Western forms of knowledge as the universal norm has been recognized by postcolonial critics as a form of neocolonialism, or, in other words, "the conquest and occupation of minds, selves [and] cultures," which happens in the aftermath and alongside with the physical occupation (Gandhi 1998, 15). In *Orientalism*, Said (1987) disputes the totalizing nature of orthodox systems of knowledge as he exposes the Eurocentric views of the Orient manifest in Western knowledge systems and literature. Following Said's methodology, many postcolonial critics emphasize the counter-hegemonic task of postcolonial literature that seeks to subvert the forms of knowledge imposed by the colonizer cultures and to challenge the hegemony of the imperial center (Ashcroft et al. 1989, 83; Xie 1997, 9). Similarly, Tripathy's (2009, 42–43) postcolonial perspective to Native American literatures emphasizes "the agency of the resistant subject." Xie (1997, 9), however, acknowledges the danger that postcolonialism turns into a West-centered critique of Western universalism and rationalism. Tripathy (2009, 43) and Ruppert (1996,

113) express the same concern in the context of Native American literatures. Ruppert (ibid.) notes how Euro-American readings of Native American literatures tend to turn into critiques of the Western civilization, resulting in markedly West-centered readings of Native American texts. Limiting postcolonial literature to critiques of the colonizer nations would suggest a simplistic assumption that all literature produced by postcolonial peoples like Native Americans is reaction to their subjugation.

This view also suggests that the postcolonial text is thus directed at the colonizer cultures. Ashcroft et al. have been criticized in this regard because their definition of postcolonial literatures assumes the dominant center as the "privileged addressee," whose literary tastes the postcolonial text aims to please (Gandhi 1998, 161–62). This becomes evident from Salman Rushdie's expression, "the Empire writes back," which Ashcroft et al. (1989) have adopted as the title of their volume. In the context of Native American literatures, Kathryn Shanley (1991, 251) explains that even though American Indian authors aim to communicate tribal worldviews and values, there is a simultaneous effort to appeal to the tastes of Euro-American publishers and readers in order to gain visibility. Peter Wild (quoted in McFarland 2000, 9) notes that not only does the majority of fiction by American Indian authors assume a non-Native audience, but most of the writers of that fiction are "highly acculturated Indians." The underlying suggestion is that they are unfit to represent their tribal community because of their integration into the white culture. This idea is supported by Jana Sequoya-Magdaleno's (1995, 91) argument that "[t]he authors of Native American novels are often among the most marginal [perhaps even the most hegemonic] members of those Indian communities on which their imaginative works draw."

Not only do critics draw attention to the cultural hybridity of many American Indian writers, but some also note their biological hybridity; Joseph Bruchac (quoted in McFarland 2000, 9) states that most contemporary American Indian writers have white ancestry, which sometimes exceeds the Indian heritage. In fact, the contestation of Native American identity is taken to the extremes in the discussion of Indian blood percentages; Owens (1992, 3–4) points out that while "one drop of Black

blood makes an otherwise White man black . . . it takes a lot of Indian blood to make a person a 'real' Indian." Indeed, the white conception of Indians generally scorns the mixed-blood against its pristine, full-blooded counterpart (see further discussion in 2.3). Even so, it can be argued that a cross-cultural version of the American Indian is more readily accepted by the dominant culture. Timothy Brennan (1989, viii-ix) argues that in the West, "the interpreters and authentic public voices of the Third [or Fourth] World" are usually those who portray "a familiar strangeness;" although they are different in one way—color of their skin, for example—there is a similarity "in tastes, training, repertoire of anecdotes [and] current habitation." Straying too far from the familiar, ethnocentric standards of the non-Native readership risks repelling them.

Foucault's concept of a discourse is beneficial in order to understand how ethnocentrism and hegemony operate from a postcolonial perspective. According to Foucault (1972, 183), all knowledge is formed through discursive practices. Hall (1997a, 43) draws from Foucault that nothing meaningful exists outside discourses. Discourse defines, produces and controls meaning and knowledge by managing what can or cannot be said about a subject (John Storey 2003, 6; Hall 1997a, 43). In Foucault's (1980, 131) words, "[e]ach society has . . . its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true." This truth is controlled by what Foucault (ibid., 132) calls "political and economic apparatuses," including universities, writing and media. Hall (1997a, 42) explains that the areas of knowledge entailed in discourses are generally accepted in their social environment and the accepted knowledge keeps repeating itself in the form of representations. Literature and popular culture are thus important in recycling this knowledge, which relies on representations to confirm itself as the truth.

Postcolonial critics like Bhabha and Said use Foucault's concept of a discourse to examine how power and knowledge operate in a postcolonial situation. Said (1987, 3) defines Orientalism as a discourse that is controlled by the West in order to "manage—and even produce—the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively." Hall (1997b, 260) explains Said's conception of Foucault's power/knowledge argument by stating that "a

discourse produces, through different practices of *representation* . . . a form of *racialized knowledge of the Other* (Orientalism) deeply implicated in the operations of *power* (imperialism)." Bhabha's (1986, 150) analysis of the colonial stereotype reveals more specifically how the colonial subject is constructed in a discourse. Following Foucault, Bhabha (ibid., 154) defines colonial discourse as "an apparatus of power" that

> seeks authorization for its strategies by the production of knowledges of colonizer and colonized which are stereotypical . . . . The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction.

Bhabha's view of the colonial stereotype supports Said's (1987, 3) definition of Orientalism as "a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient." Said (ibid.) argues that anyone making statements or describing the Orient is, at the same time, "authorizing views of it" and "ruling over it." In this way, Western forms of knowledge seek to maintain a dominant position over the Orient and confirm their supremacy (ibid., 6).

Foucault's concept of a discourse has been adopted in the field of Native American studies by Sequoya-Magdaleno (1995, 91), who discusses "the discourse of Indianness" as a non-Native mode of knowledge that aims to constitute the Indian as a knowable subject through the construction of "categorical imperatives." The discourse of Indianness operates in the same way as Orientalism; in Sandy Marie Anglás Grande's (1999, 316) words, "white scholars presume authority in speaking for, and determining the definitive character of, American Indians." Berkhofer's (1979) notion of the white man's Indian, which entails the popular imagery of what Sequoya-Magdaleno (1995, 107) calls "the national iconography of Indianness," is thus a construct of this discourse, which operates through the apparatuses of both academic and non-academic writing and the mass media.

Kilpatrick uses James Fenimore Cooper as an example of how an imperialist discourse is at play; despite Cooper's sympathetic portrayals of Indians, Kilpatrick (1999, 3) sees his work as an "orchestration of discourse" that "dramatically polarized and simplified Indian experiences." The discourse of Indianness can be seen as a science that continues to suppress Native Americans by

assuming authority over them. It also effectively silences them from voicing their own opinions. Example of this is provided by Liu Kedong and Zhang Hui (Liu and Zhang 2011, 116), who probably mean well with their prescription of "the new Indian" that defies stereotypes produced by the whites; however, they provide all Indians with an explicit prescription that "Indians should know their traditions well" and that they "should have the capability to survive in the mainstream society" (ibid.). Armed with these imperatives, Liu and Zhang bring the Orientalist agenda of "dominating, restructuring, and having authority" over the other (see above) into the Native American context.

Othering is part of the process by which the dominant groups exercise power over the subjugated groups. According to Berkhofer (1979, 28) and Büken (2002, 47), most non-Native representations of Native Americans share the conception of the Indian as the exotic other. Despite the counterhegemonic task at the core of postcolonial studies, all marginality studies conducted from within the Western academy risk participating in a neocolonialist agenda. As Gandhi (1998, 59–60) points out, the establishment of marginality studies speaks for an interest in the classification and production of "exotic culture." Similarly, Dyer (2002, 126) observes an academic interest in "the other," or anyone who embodies a departure from the assumed norm. By chronically marginalizing the Third and Fourth Worlds, this kind of interest reinforces the sense of difference of the others, while the norm persists unawares as the natural, unquestionable standard of being human (ibid.). Even well-intended marginality studies can thus reinforce the ethnocentric view of the Western culture as the norm against which everything else is measured. Aijaz Ahmad (1992, 86) calls this phenomenon "an opportunistic kind of Third-Worldism." In his discussion of Euro-American interest in American Indian literatures, Krupat (1996, 12) observes a similar tendency, which he labels "intellectual tourism."[4]

---

[4] It can be argued that, as a non-Native scholar, Krupat himself is culpable of this "intellectual tourism."

According to Bhabha (1986, 156), "[c]olonial power produces the colonized as a fixed reality which is at once an 'other' and yet entirely knowable and visible." The word "reality" here is especially important because, by mimicking realism, the colonial discourse, like Orientalism, aims to present as the truth that which is actually artificial, constructed knowledge (Said 1987, 72). By assuming a complete and coherent knowledge of the colonial subject, the colonial discourse ignores the heterogeneity and changeability of its subject group. Furthermore, by defining the colonial subject as the other through an account of its difference to the ethnocentric norm, the discourse confirms the cultural hierarchy that presumes the supremacy of the Euro-American center. Bhabha's (1986, 154) analysis of the colonial discourse demonstrates how the colonizer aims for a total dispossession of the other by defining them, constructing them and thus gaining complete control over them. In the Native American context, Berkhofer (1979, 28) notes that the paradigm of an us/them dichotomy is fundamental in the definition of and dominance over the assumedly subordinate Native.

According to Xie (1997, 16), colonial discourse involves a set of imperial dichotomies, such as self/other and center/periphery, which postcolonial criticism aims to dismantle. Matthew Cella (2010, 20) detects a similar set of polar oppositions specifically in the contact of Euro-American civilization with "the reactionary force of Native [American] savagery." Suzanne Lundquist (2004, 19) adds binaries such as Christian/heathen, reason/passion and enlightened/ignorant to the list and adds that the Indian is always associated with the negative term. In parallel with Xie's argument above, Krupat (1996, 21) calls for a disavowal of such hierarchical models in the field of Native American studies. However, it can be argued whether the obliteration of such hierarchies is even possible; Hall (1997b, 235–36) acknowledges that binary oppositions are necessary for the classification of things while admitting that the meaning they produce is "crude and reductionist." Ultimately, the problem with hierarchical models is their involvement with power and hegemony; Lundquist above draws on Derrida's (1981, 41) argument that in any opposition, one term is always the preferred one, which makes the organization "a violent hierarchy," rather than a neutral

structure. Indeed, the colonial authorities maintain their dominant position over the subjugated nations by endorsing the constructed categories of self/other, civilization/barbarism and progress/primitivism, in addition to other binaries, where the Euro-American civilization is consistently connected with the preferred term (Gandhi 1998, 32). Despite the ambivalence of the imagery associated with the white man's Indian, as will be shown in 2.3, representations of Indians produced by the whites consistently draw attention to the savagery and difference of the Indian, as noted by Richard King (2006, 21). Moreover, the savagery is weighed against the Euro-American notion of civilization as the other to the ethnocentric norm. More than anything, the dehumanization of Indians to savages provided the "rationale for genocide" during the colonial period, as noted by Berkhofer (1979, 109).

The concept of "the other" has been vital for the establishment of American National identity, which was established to confirm a separation from the grip of the settlers' motherlands and depended on the negative definition of Native Americans (Berkhofer 1979, 91). Kilpatrick (1999, xvii) notes that the same efforts to define the American "self" against the Native "other" continue today. As Krupat (1989, 97) puts it, "[f]rom the very first period of invasion and settlement until the close of the 'frontier,' Americans tended to define their peculiar national distinctiveness . . . in relation to a perceived opposition between the Europeans they no longer were and the Indians they did not wish to become." Berkhofer (1979, 111) defines the attempt to understand Indians as "part of the recurrent effort of Whites to understand themselves." Berkhofer's conclusion parallels Said's (1987, 1–2) notion that "the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience." The Indian was created as the savage counterimage of the civilized European to bolster Europe's self-esteem as the intellectually, morally and humanly superior (Berkhofer 1979, 26). This is symptomatic of Western intellectual narcissism that seeks to define itself through its supremacy over others. In the words of Tripathy (2009, 46),

> Western culture. . . is seen as the highest stage of physiological and cultural evolution. To give unambiguous power to this history, natives had to be made 'others' of colonisers and to appear as the polar opposite of everything supposedly rational, developed, and civilised.

The fundamental dichotomy between the Euro-Americans and their Native others is the eternal conflict between civilization and barbarism (Berkhofer 1979, 92–93). As Tripathy (2009, 46) explains, the history of Euro-American conquest and dispossession of the Native Americans "justified itself as the victory of civilisation over barbarism."

In order to dismantle the imperial dichotomies discussed above, postcolonial criticism draws on Derrida's theory of deconstruction (Xie 1997, 9). According to Derrida (1981, 41), the process of deconstruction begins with an overturning of the hierarchy. Simple inversion of the poles will not suffice; the valorization of the previously subjugated term preserves the binary logic and does not contest the existing hierarchy because it remains "within the closed field of these oppositions" (ibid.). As Berkhofer (1979, 104–05) argues, any countercultural portrayal of Indians that seeks to valorize Indians over Euro-Americans does nothing but reverses the standard stereotype. To escape the inadequacy of a simple role reversal, Derrida (1981, 41) proposes what he calls "a general strategy of deconstruction," which aims to show the arbitrariness or invalidity of formal structures based on binary logic and hierarchical valorization altogether. As a method, however, deconstruction revokes itself, because by contesting all structures, including language, and thus also meaning and knowledge, there is nothing left from where to operate. In Derrida's (2000, 93) words, deconstruction becomes "a question of explicitly and systematically posing the problem of the status of a discourse which borrows from a heritage the resources necessary for the deconstruction of that heritage itself." Ultimately, by contesting all forms of knowledge, deconstruction effectively shows that there are no final, fixed meanings (Storey 2003, 6). In the words of Ashcroft et al. (1989, 83), "the notions of power inherent in the model of centre and margin are appropriated and so dismantled." The hierarchical valorization system is thus challenged "not simply by reversing the hierarchical order, but by interrogating the philosophical assumptions on which that order was based" (ibid., 33).

2.2 Stereotyping as a Representational Practice

Hall (1997a, 16) defines representation as the process by which meaning is constructed. As the platform where control over meaning and definition is contested, representation is a key site for the struggle over hegemony (Christine Gledhill 1997, 348; Storey 2003, 4). Indeed, it is precisely its role in the production of knowledge that links representation with power (Hall 1997a, 42). In Gledhill's (1997, 348) words,

> the 'real' is, as it were, an on-going production, in constant process of transformation. . . media forms and representations constitute major sites for conflict and negotiation, a central goal of which is the definition of what is to be taken as 'real', and the struggle to name and win support for certain kinds of cultural value and identity over others.

As Dyer (2002, 126) notes, representation of marginal groups by the dominant groups contributes to their subordination, oppression and ongoing marginalization. By fixing definitions of these groups and masking these definitions as knowledge, the dominant groups that control this knowledge thus confirm their own hegemony. As Gledhill (1997, 348) notes, "the power of definition is a major source of hegemony." Politically, and in the academic field, the definition of Indianness remains in non-Native hands; as Grande (1999, 319) explains,

> Federally 'unrecognized' tribes are forced to document their authenticity so as to be recognized as real Indians in the eyes of the courts, while 'recognized' tribes are put in the position of either having to defend themselves against charges of un-authenticity . . . or against accusations of hyper-authenticity when seeking ceremonial rights (i.e., to perform the Sun Dance or ceremonial use of peyote.)

Non-Native governmental institutions in the United States thus reinforce the displacement and dispossession of American Indians by assuming authority over them in this explicit way.

It must be noted that the postmodern take on fictional representation, as expressed by Lyotard, emphasizes the role of fiction in the production of knowledge. According to Lyotard (1984, 19), "[n]arration is the quintessential form of customary knowledge." Foucault (1972, 183) concurs with Lyotard's assertion as he states that "[k]nowledge . . . can also be found in fiction, reflexion [and] narrative accounts." Indeed, power and hegemony also operate through fiction. Lyotard (1984, 23) emphasizes the role of narratives in the legitimization of cultural codes, for example; they "determine criteria of competence and/or illustrate how they are to be applied. They

thus define what has the right to be said and done in the culture in question." In the discourse of Indianness, fictional narratives have played an important role in defining of the Indian for white audiences as the repetition of similar images of Indians in popular representations keeps Indians fixed in the American consciousness.

As noted by Berkhofer (1979, 96), popular culture relies on the circulation of familiar patterns and clichés in order to please mass audiences. Popular culture and the mass media are major sites of struggle, where power over hegemony is contested between dominant and subordinate groups like in all representation (Storey 2003, 3–4). According to Merskin (1998, 335), "the media reflect the dominant social values in society" and they thus "present a view of society desired by the dominant group." Ross (2003, 32) adds that the media reflect the role of power in society in subtle ways by endorsing certain ideals and values and by omitting the voice of marginal groups; they both construct and reflect the dominant worldview, the internalized norms and values within the culture they represent. According to this argument, then, the media support the status quo. The entertainment media, for example, serves to reinforce white hegemony; as King (2006, 30) argues, popular entertainment is both produced by and targeted at the whites. Consequently, the values and concerns communicated are those of white people, as can be seen in the production of white representations of Indians; according to King (ibid.), the images of Indians in the entertainment industry are "not real, but projections, the White Man's Indian, who always has said more about Euro-American issues, ideals, and identities than indigenous values, concerns, or cultures." As Berkhofer (1979, xvi) notes, "it is ultimately to the history of White values and ideas that we must turn for the basic conceptual categories, classificatory schema, explanatory frameworks, and moral criteria by which past and present Whites perceived, observed, evaluated, and interpreted Native Americans." Berkhofer's extensive analysis of the white man's Indian reveals the reliance of the imagery on Euro-American intellectual and popular trends.

Mass media is the most important reason for the persistence of cultural stereotypes, because like stereotypes of the Oriental, stereotypes of the Indian are reinforced in the mass media through

repetition (Said 1987, 26; Berkhofer 1979, 96; Celeste Lacroix 2011, 6). Lucy Ganje (2003, 113) blames news and entertainment media (movies, comic books, cartoons, literature, music, sports teams with Native names or mascots), textbooks and corporate iconography (toys, food, clothing, cars, alcohol) for the continuing symbolic annihilation of Native American cultures through misrepresentation. Because American Indians are one of the most isolated ethnic groups in the United States, as pointed out by Fleming (Kickapoo; 2007, 52), many Americans rely on this inauthentic imagery produced by popular culture when forming their own ideas of the Native population (Ganje 2003, 118). This follows that non-Native audiences begin to mistake the images of Indians for actual Indians. Audiences begin to expect that Indians look a certain way, for example, and Natives, like Welch, who do not fit the preconception are criticized for not looking Indian enough (Lupton 2004, 2).

Fredric Jameson (1979, 135) sees repetition as symptomatic of postmodern mass culture. Drawing on Jean Baudrillard's notion of a simulacrum, Jameson explains that the original referent (the Indian in this case) becomes obsolete as copies are constantly reproduced, eventually replacing the original (ibid.). In Baudrillard's (1988, 167) words,

> the age of simulation . . . begins with a liquidation of all referentials . . . . It is no longer a question of imitation, nor of reduplication, nor even of parody. It is rather a question of substituting signs of the real for the real itself.

In this sense, the effect of postmodern consumer capitalism on the Indian is that the image substitutes the real Indian in the American consciousness; the constant reproduction of stereotyped images, combined with the physical isolation of American Indians, disturbs the sense of the real of the American public as the copy is mistaken for the original and it becomes the only image accepted as the "real" Indian. Consequently, as Darlene Kawennano:ron Johnson (Kahnawake Mohawk; quoted in Büken 2002, 52) states, even Indians themselves need to play the part of the white man's Indian in order to gain any economic, cultural, social or political sovereignty.

Drawing on Roy Harvey Pearce, Krupat (1989, 188) explains how, similarly to Orientalism, the aim of a hegemonic discourse concerning American Indians is to define them as the other in a

way that allows the complete comprehension of the subject and liquidates all differences among the members of the subject group, reducing them to generalizations and stereotypes. The discourse produces a blanketing effect that minimalizes difference among the others and they are seen as a coherent, homogenous group. At the same time, this kind of a discourse aims at an establishment of a distinct polarity between the dominant self and the subjugated other, reducing the relationship to an us/them dichotomy, which functions as the starting point for Orientalism (Said 1987, 2). The colonial discourse, then, both accentuates and disavows cultural difference, as noted by Bhabha (1986, 154).

Berkhofer (1979; 3, 23, 25, 195) repeatedly criticizes the use of collective terms such as "Indian," because they ignore the heterogeneity of American Indian cultures and go against the way the indigenous people of the American continent saw themselves; Native Americans were perplexed about such terms altogether and repeatedly asked the settlers, "Why do you call us Indians?" (ibid., 4). The underlying suggestion in Berkhofer's argument is that all group categorizations and labels are invalid because they disregard the great variety of people entailed in the notions such as "the Americans" or "the human race," for that matter. Of course, the argument is viable when a marginal group is defined and labeled by a dominant group as part of the project of subjugation. Berkhofer criticizes the term "Indian" also because of its origins; not only is it a misnomer invented by Christopher Columbus, but as a white concept, Berkhofer argues, it inevitably repeats the old stereotypes associated with it (ibid., 3–5). As Sequoya-Magdaleno (1995, 88) puts it, paraphrasing Jacques Lacan, "Indian" is "a word in somebody else's conversation." Nevertheless, Krupat (1996, 5) contests Berkhofer's view by noting that general terms for Native Americans can be used especially in historical and geographical contexts, just as Europeans can be discussed in terms of space and temporality, without indulging in essentialization or overgeneralization about what it means to *be* Native American or European. However, as Hertha Wong (1992, 13) notes, especially with questions about Native American identity there is a high risk of collapsing diverse American

Indian cultures in one homogeneous category. Nevertheless, Wong argues that some generalizations about Native American conceptions "of self, life, and language" can be made (ibid., 13–20).

Berkhofer (1979, 25) also expresses a concern of the Western tendency to generalize any knowledge accumulated of a specific tribe to all American Indians. Although Berkhofer's concern over what could be labeled as pan-Indianism is probably valid, the generic terms for Native Americans are widely in use in the field of Native American studies, including in works by Native critics, such as Jeanette Armstrong (1998, 178) and Allen (1983), who both discuss Native Americans in general in their discussions, respectively, of American Indian language and oral literature. Allen, for example, has been criticized for "erasing the significant historical specificities and tribal differences among the hundreds of different epistemologies that have been subsumed under the umbrella term 'Native American' or 'Indian'" (Alicia Kent 2007, 73).[5] Despite her critique of Allen's generalization of Indians, Kent (ibid.) simultaneously commends her for providing an overview of Native American literatures that reveals the "different value systems, assumptions about the universe, and social purposes" that underlie in this body of literature. Despite her earlier criticism, this latter argument suggests a belief in an essence that differentiates Native literature from Western literature. To a certain extent, both categories and generalizations are inevitable and no representation can account for the great variety entailed in any group of people.

Consequently, no representations by an American Indians can be taken as ethnographic data of the whole group, despite "the institutional pressure" to do so, as argued by Sequoya-Magdaleno (1995, 94). If generalization of distinct individuals cannot be avoided in the representation of Native Americans, the question becomes, "who gets to be known?" Gayatri Spivak (1994) adopts the term "subaltern" from Gramsci, who defines the term as "subordinate social classes," including women and non-dominant races (Green 2002, 2). The placement of these subaltern groups in the margin effectively silences them, but at the same time, no one else can represent them. Indeed, no one can

---

[5] Kent is a non-Native scholar specializing in multicultural literatures.

truly represent a heterogeneous group, because any representation silences the majority of voices. As Spivak (1994, 79) argues, "the colonized subaltern *subject* is irretrievably heterogenous" and she thus ends her essay with an unequivocal no, "[t]he subaltern cannot speak" (ibid., 104). Accordingly, to regard Native American writers as spokespersons for the entire tribe is dangerous because they do not represent especially the disempowered members of the group. Despite the evident political dimension of *FC*, noted by Owens (1992, 26) Welch sees being a tribal spokesperson as an unwanted position and he does not see himself as a political writer (McFarland 2000, 8).

No representation can give a comprehensive view of a given group, but the ignorance of heterogeneity is taken to the extremes with stereotyping. Stereotype is difficult to define; a rudimentary definition is given by Allport (1995, 191), who sees stereotype as "an exaggerated [and often fixed] belief associated with a category." Gordon Allport's (1995, 190) and Hall's (1997b, 257–58) descriptions of the process of stereotyping are roughly similar; few essential characteristics are selected, exaggerated and presumed as natural and fixed. Everything else about the individual is ignored as they are reduced to these selected traits. The objective of stereotyping is to essentialize and naturalize difference (Hall 1997b, 258). Stereotypes are usually seen negatively and they are often associated with discriminatory practices; as Dyer (2002, 11) puts it, "[t]he word 'stereotype' is today almost always a term of abuse." However, stereotypes also help understand categories, process complex information and make sense of the world (Allport 1995, 200; Dyer 2002, 12). According to Ellen Seiter (1986, 15), social psychologists see stereotypes as a necessary means for all human beings to process information; they are both inevitable and functional. Moreover, like categories, "stereotypical views of others are part of our shared culture" and even those who consciously try to avoid stereotypes take part in the socially shared stereotypical views (Travis Linn 2003, 23).

Stereotypes are generally seen as misconceptions; Berkhofer (1979, xvii), for example, sees a stereotype as a belief that has proven to be inaccurate. Many critics, including Ganje (2003) and

Büken (2002), express a concern over the stereotypes of Native Americans that dominate in the media mainly because of their inaccuracy. Said expresses a similar concern in *Orientalism*; he names "distortion and inaccuracy" as his two main fears (Said 1987, 8). However, according to Roger Brown (1965, 180), most of the knowledge and views people accumulate are acquired through representational practices and hearsay, which is always more or less inaccurate. Misinformation about categories, for example, is thus inevitable, as noted by Allport (1995, 23). Furthermore, all generalizations about ethnic groups are more or less inaccurate, because according to Brown (1965, 178), there is no precise definition for race or ethnicity itself.

Walter Lippmann, a journalist who coined the term stereotype, regards the accurateness of stereotypes immaterial (Seiter 1986, 16). Brown (1965, 181), likewise, does not see stereotypes objectionable because they are misconceptions, but because of "their ethnocentrism and the implication that important traits are inborn for large groups." Indeed, stereotyping can lead to "a belief in essence," as noted by Allport (1995, 174). However, it is not until the connection of stereotypes with power is examined that their involvement in discriminatory practices begins to reveal itself. According to Bhabha (1986, 162), the mischaracterization inherent in stereotypes is less dangerous than their claims to a completely fixed image of the other. Bhabha argues that "racist stereotypical discourse" aims to know the native subject through "stereotypical knowledges," including racial theories, and use this knowledge to validate its "discriminatory and authoritarian forms of political control" (ibid., 171). Hall explains this from a slightly different perspective; in his words, stereotyping "classifies people according to a norm and constructs the excluded as 'other'" (Hall 1997b, 259). Stereotyping is therefore symptomatic of Foucauldian "double repression," discussed in 2.1, and for this double repression to be effective, sharp boundaries need to be drawn between social groups, which Dyer (2002, 16) sees as the main purpose of stereotyping. The stereotype thus emphasizes difference of social groups by firm separation between the norm and its others. However, as Dyer notes, such boundaries are artificial, because in reality, there is fluidity rather than a stark separation between groups of people (ibid.).

Seiter (1986, 16) revitalizes the original definition of a stereotype provided by Lippmann, which emphasized the way stereotypes legitimize the status quo. Stereotyping has been connected with power and hegemony by Native American scholars as well; Grande (1999, 311) calls for a "critical discussion of the existing power relations between Indian and white society" in the context of stereotypes. Grande (ibid.) argues that to reduce stereotyping to a merely cognitive process, as social psychologists have done, disregards "deeply rooted structures of power." Indeed, stereotypes are never neutral, because they carry values, ideologies and tradition and are deeply embedded in structures of power (Lippmann 1965, 63–64; Dyer 2002, 11; Seiter 1986, 16). According to Hall (1997b, 258), stereotyping reflects the way power is unevenly distributed in a society and it is usually directed against the subordinate or excluded group.[6] Hall's view confirms the interconnectedness of stereotypes and power; the dominant groups use stereotypes to define and label different social groups and maintain their hegemony when these definitions become generally accepted truths. As Dyer (2002, 14) notes, the stereotype aims to invoke a false consensus, or a belief that everyone agrees to be the truth, while in fact, it is the opinion of the dominant groups. Stereotypes can therefore be analyzed as manifestations of hegemony. Bhabha (1986, 171–72) sees that stereotypes are part of the way individuals submit to the rules and norms in a given society. Herein lies the potential danger of stereotypes; as Dyer (2002, 12) argues, it is a question of "who controls and defines them, what interests they serve," rather than whether the images communicated are accurate or inaccurate, positive or negative. Indeed, the more relevant question is; whose values, rules, norms and beliefs are expressed by the stereotypes? O'Connor (2011, 29) argues that Hollywood's Indian, for example, "continues to present the white man's Indian." Consequently, the values expressed are certainly not those of American Indians.

It is the connection with hegemony, power and maintaining the status quo that links stereotypes to discriminative practices; Merskin (1998, 334) points out that reducing American

---

[6] This is a simplification of Foucault's view of power; according to Foucault (1980, 98), power is not monopolized by one center, but it is "employed and exercised through a net-like organization" and it needs resistance to maintain itself.

Indians into stereotypes dehumanizes them and makes their subjugation thus more justifiable; constructed images of Indians by the whites function as tools in the symbolic annihilation of Indians by dehumanization, marginalization, commodification, trivialization or complete negligence in the media (ibid., 335). Ganje draws attention to the dehumanizing effect of stereotypes as well; Indians are dehumanized through objectification or turning them into caricatures (Ganje 2003, 117). Native Americans are used in similar contexts as animals in the names of sports teams and as mascots, which is an explicit example of the way Indians continue to be dehumanized.

Despite several efforts to define the stereotype, Seiter (1986, 25) argues that as a term, stereotype "has little explanatory value and less theoretical grounding." She also criticizes the way the word itself often remains inadequately defined in academic discussions (ibid., 19). However, Seiter fails to account for the possibility that there is no clear-cut definition for the term; as Bhabha (1986, 169) notes, the stereotype is "an impossible object." What he means by this is that a stereotype, because it is ambivalent and instable, cannot be confirmed neither as true nor false and it can thus never be proven as a stereotype. As Brown (1965, 181) notes, it is next to impossible to prove a stereotype as true or false, if it is in a probabilistic form.[7] Because of this, a stereotype depends on constant repetition in order to confirm itself and the discourse it operates in, as noted by Bhabha (1986, 164). However, the stereotype is only ever able to result in a cliché and its final confirmation is always deferred.

It is thus understandable why many critics, including Liu and Zhang (2011), Aleiss (2005) and Berkhofer (1979) participate in the critical discussion concerning Native American stereotypes at a very general level. Liu and Zhang (2011, 105) for example, despite entailing "stereotypical images of Native Americans in popular media" in the title of their essay, only mention three titles that exemplify the general notions of "negative or romanticized images of American Indians, either nasty or cruel, or subservient and laconic, but all disappearing" without providing any analysis of

[7] If stereotypes are taken as exceptionless statements, however, it is easy to prove them as false (Brown 1965, 181).

the works they mention. Indeed, many critics, including the ones above, insinuate that popular culture is the unequivocal villain in the story of the white man's Indian, but there are none that provide an exhaustive overview of specific stereotypes apart from Virginia McLaurin's (2012) thesis on stereotypes of contemporary American Indians in the media.

2.3 The Construction of the White Man's Indian

In her discussion of Native American stereotypes, DeLaney Hoffman (2012, xii) strongly criticizes "the one-note depictions that continue to saturate American popular culture today." However, the range of stereotypes of both contemporary and past Indians is, in fact, wide and highly fragmentary; Hollywood's Indian, for example, has been criticized for being both noble and brutish, both lustful and innocent as a child. He is either a bloodthirsty hostile or a loyal servant to the whites. He is admired for his spirituality and nobility or he is considered primitive and heathenish. Other stereotypes include the Indians' closeness to nature, dirtiness and exotic appearance. Furthermore, the Indian is often laconic and serious, has low intelligence and no sense of humor. The Indian is often victimized, essentialized and his race is considered as dying. The list above entails some examples of the stereotypical characteristics associated with Indians as noted by critics such as Kilpatrick (1999, xvii), Wilcomb Washburn (2011, ix), Liu and Zhang (2011, 105 and 109) and Ganje (2003, 114). However, despite the grand variety of these images, many critics express an even greater concern over the exclusion of Native Amerians from popular culture and from the Western critical discourse (Grande 1999, 307; Jimmie Durham 1992, 424; Merskin 1998, 341). Despite the great number of television shows and films produced annually, for example, there are very few that contain American Indians. When they do appear, they are often confined in iconography produced by non-Natives. To name an example, in the film *Catch and Release* (2006), the only Indian appears as a logo in a tee-shirt worn by the protagonist's love interest. The exclusion of Indians is especially apparent in television, as pointed out by Merskin (1998, 341).

Most critics subscribe to the dialectical division of the imagery into the noble savage[8] and the ignoble savage, or the good and the bad Indian, a bifurcation that most general stereotypes of the Indian rely on (Lacroix 2011, Berkhofer 1979, King 2006 and Kilpatrick 1999). Kilpatrick (1999, 2) traces the establishment of these "stereotypical extremes of the Indian" to Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826). Berkhofer's (1979, 71) analysis of the white image of Indians, however, reveals that this dual imagery has persisted from the earliest descriptions of Indians by Columbus. Indeed, Columbus was the first to provide both positive and negative images of Indians that reached the public consciousness of Europeans (ibid., 5–7). Even the early descriptions of Indians were very ambivalent; Bartolomé de Las Casas (quoted in Berkhofer 1979, 11) praised Indians for their innate virtue, honesty, peacefulness and fidelity, while others described them as spawns of Satan, as in the 1622 poem by Christopher Brooke (quoted in Berkhofer 1979, 20–21);

> Rooted in Evill, and oppos'd in Good;
> Errors of nature, of inhumane Birth,
> The very dregs, garbage, and spanne of Earth;
> ---
> (Father'd by Sathan, and the sonnes of hell)

There is already a distinct dichotomy in this early imagery. In his discussion of the colonial stereotype, Bhabha (1986, 166) sees the ambivalence of the stereotype as a sign of "a shifting of subject positions in the circulation of colonial power." Even the positive imagery functions as an instrument of colonial power. Historically, the positive images of Indians were frequently produced with ulterior motives; as Krupat (1989, 100) explains, the noble savage imagery that came alongside the portrayals of Indians as murderous savages was "prompted less by Rousseau than by the colonists' need to establish trade and military alliances with the powerful interior tribes." The puritans, on the other hand, promoted their agenda by converting Indians to Christianity and emphasized the characteristics that make them good Christians (Berkhofer 1979, 11). Stereotypes

---

[8] Historically, the noble savage has been associated with other races before Rousseau connected the idea with American Indians. Iconic non-Indian noble savages include Friday in Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719)—the ultimate loyal servant to white man—and the title character of Edgar Rice Burroughs' *Tarzan of the Apes* (1912), a man of British descent, raised by apes.

associated with the blacks are strikingly similar to those of Indians; they too range "from the loyal servant to Satan, from the loved to the hated" and, like the Indian, the black man is "the embodiment of rampant sexuality and yet innocent as child; he is mystical, primitive, simple-minded" (Bhabha 1986, 166 and 170). The similarity of these images supports the arguments made earlier that white images of the others always have more to convey about white views and values and that this imagery is used in opposition of the Euro-American self-definition; like the blacks, the Indians symbolize everything the Euro-Americans do not wish to be, including the characteristics the Euro-Americans do not wish to acknowledge in themselves, but nevertheless possess.

Most of the critics cited above agree that the master tropes of the noble and ignoble savage have persisted in slightly different forms throughout history as the most popular images of the Indian. The trend in the Hollywood imagery of Indians, however, has shifted from a bloodthirsty savage to the image of a "wronged victim," which can be seen as a subcategory of the noble savage trope (Washburn 2011, ix). Büken (2002, 46) defines the noble savage as a "peaceful, mystical, spiritual guardian of the land." According to Berkhofer (1979, 28), the friendly "good Indian," is known for his statuesque appearance, moral integrity, dignity, courteous behavior, modesty and calmness. He also has a special bond with nature; he is aligned to all things natural and lives a simple life in perfect harmony with nature (ibid.). Most importantly of all, the noble savage is welcoming to the settler-invaders and just intelligent enough to make a good Christian, although not nearly as intelligent as to pose any intellectual threat to his European superiors (ibid.). As Durham (1992, 428) concludes, "in the United States, the Good Indian is necessarily passive . . . his role is simply to allow the settlers in."

King (2006, 22) points out that the noble savage echoes the ideals of Enlightenment and romanticism. The concept of the noble Indian had its latest peak in the 1990s in the form of idealized portrayals sympathetic to Indians in popular television shows like *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman* (1993–1998) and *Northern Exposure* (1990–1995) as well as films, such as *Dances with Wolves* (1990) and *Geronimo: An American Legend* (1993). Although the sympathetic views can be

argued as an improvement from the conceptions of Indians as bloodthirsty savages, Lacroix (2011, 6) criticizes the aforementioned television shows for inauthenticity, obliteration of historical facts, the generalization of Indians, the treatment of Indians as sexual objects and, finally, romanticization or idealization of Native Americans. The idealization can be traced back to eighteenth-century France, where Rousseau, along with his contemporaries, formed what Berkhofer (1979, 75) calls "the cult of the Noble Savage," which strongly criticized European civilization and contrasted it with an idealized image of the Native American noble savage, who was believed to live in an idyllic harmony in their natural, precolonial state, untainted by the Western civilization. Indians came to symbolize everything the degenerate white man was not; values like harmony with nature, innocence, simplicity, physical and mental vigor and health, freedom and equality were adopted and transformed into a critique of modernity while Western civilization was criticized for being artificial, hypocritical and corrupted (ibid., 73–76). The idealization of Indians persisted to the twentieth century in the works of many anthropologists, writers, artists and philosophers, who saw Native lifestyle as a harmonious alternative to "the fragmented culture of modern industrial life" (ibid., 68).

Similar idealization continues today; as Ganje (2003, 115) points out, many Westerners are drawn to the ideals of "respect for the earth and all its inhabitants," which Ganje generalizes as the core of "Native forms of spirituality." However, it is not so much the Native ways, but an escape from their own circumstances of life that drives these Westerners to seek alternatives. Even today, Native American ways of life serve as a utopian alternative for the disorientation and bewilderment caused by the postmodern condition, which, for some, causes a longing for a simpler past. As Lee Schweninger (2008, 19) puts it, "mainstream America continues to stereotype American Indians as symbols . . . offering a countercultural way to Western postindustrial culture and life." In fact, Schweninger blames popular culture for reducing the image of American Indians to a sheer escape mechanism (ibid., 15). Moreover, the elevation of Indians into a mythical, idealized status is also dehumanization.

Romanticism affected the noble savage imagery by emphasizing the Indian as a child of nature (Berkhofer 1979, 78). The reduction of Indians to simplistic children of nature communicates patronizing attitudes that assume the supremacy of the Euro-American culture. According to Schweninger (2008, 9), many Native American authors, too, believe that American Indians possess an "inherent connection with the land" that has been lost to non-Indians. A closeness to the earth and respect for the natural world in Native American cultures is noted by several critics, both Native and non-Native, including Bruchac (2003, 34), Kilpatrick (1999, xvii) and Wong (1992, 14). Allen (1983, 5–6) explains that for Native Americans, all things belonging to nature are sacred and they "allow all animals, vegetables, and minerals (the entire biota, in short) the same or even greater privileges." Although American Indians' closeness to the natural environment is thus generally recognized, it is simultaneously acknowledged as part of the stereotyped imagery associated with the noble savage. As Schweninger (2008, 16) points out, "[r]epresentations of American Indians as environmentalists, as keepers of the land, or as worshipers of a Mother Earth goddess are ubiquitous." Grande (1999, 312) points out that this kind of imagery is especially detrimental when it "becomes code for living subhumanly" and when Native Americans are dehumanized by paralleling them to animals, or in Cella's (2010, 16) words, when they are considered as "part and parcel" of the wilderness that surrounds them. Indeed, Grande (1999, 312) sees the closeness to earth stereotype ultimately as a "necessary prerequisite to the establishment of white superiority."

White images of the noble savage often place him in the romantic, long-ago past. Indeed, even current trends in Hollywood demonstrate that the white man's Indian represents an essentially historical and romantic vision; the precolonial Indian uncorrupted by Western civilization, forever frozen in the precolonial past (Kent 2007, 81; Lacroix 2011, 6). This follows that the only "real Indian," according to the Euro-American imagery, is the pristine aboriginal, the pure, full-blooded Indian, uncontaminated by contact with Western civilization as opposed to his contemporary counterpart, tainted by miscegenation and cultural assimilation (Berkhofer 1979, 28). It is easy to criticize the film industry for the maintenance of this kind of imagery, but as noted by Aleiss (2005,

152 and 155), present-day audiences, quite frankly, are not interested in the hardships of contemporary Indians and prefer “the feel-good formula” of films like *Dances with Wolves*.

The trend of romanticism in the nineteenth century United States also bolstered images of Indians as a dying race (Berkhofer 1979, 86). The tragedy of the dying Indian was lamented famously by Cooper in *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826) as well as by other authors, including George Catlin, who, in 1841, wrote,

> the *Indian* and the *buffalo* . . . fugitives together from the approach of civilized man; they have fled to the great plains of the West, and there under an equal doom, they have taken up their last abode, where their race will expire and their bones will bleach together (Catlin, quoted in Berkhofer 1979, 89).

Owens (1992, 12) labels this tendency as “‘Rousseauist’ ethnostalgia” as it relied on the noble savage imagery of the European thinkers to evoke pity and nostalgia for the vanishing race. The true origins of the vanishing Indian myth can be traced to the colonizing mission and belief in Manifest Destiny (see Lundquist 2004, 22). In other words, the vanishing race stereotype left “the land open for Euro-Americans to take their ‘rightful’ place” (Kilpatrick 1999, 3). The belief that Euro-American civilization must inevitably supersede the primitive life forms of the indigenous savages persisted through the nineteenth century (Berkhofer 1979, 91). The myth of the vanishing race persists in popular representations of Indians despite demographic evidence against it that shows their growing numbers (Kent 2007, 81; Fleming 2007, 55). Like the child of nature stereotype, the myth of the dying race reinforces the view of the Indian as an infantile and passive savage, who seeks to be salvaged from his primitivism by his Western superiors. Grande (1999, 317) is dissatisfied with the interpretation of American Indian resistance as “desperate cries for salvation” and argues that Native Americans continue to be constructed “as exotic mutants, aberrant anachronisms ready to either be ‘saved’ or consumed by First World powers.”

The child of nature, the pristine precolonial and the dying race stereotypes are all commonly associated with the noble savage. The hostile “bad Indian,” also known as the ignoble savage or bloodthirsty savage, is almost an exact opposite of his good counterpart; sexually and morally lack, dirty and indolent, treacherous thief or beggar, a superstitious pagan, revengeful and warlike, the

ignoble savage is violent and cruel and practices both cannibalism and human sacrifice (Berkhofer 1979, 28). In short, he is driven by primal emotions like lust and rage and is incapable of rational thinking. Stories of Native American violence and savagery in the form of dime novels were particularly popular in the nineteenth century United States and similar imagery was repeated in the exaggerated reports of Indian attacks in the news media of the time period as well (Kilpatrick 1999, 11). The dime novels followed a tradition of captivity narratives, which repeated the same pattern of pure good, usually in the form of an innocent young woman, against the vile, diabolical savage, embodied by the Indian (Berkhofer 1979, 82). Embellished with "blood-and-gore sensationalism," the high success of these novels led to the firm establishment of Indian imagery in the popular culture of the nineteenth century, first in cheap dime novels and later in western films, which perpetuated the images of the bloodthirsty in the years to follow (ibid., 85). Early westerns repeated images of bloodthirsty Indians that attacked innocent white settlers with no other motivation than their thirst for blood and nastiness (Kilpatrick 1999, 11).

Although the trend in Hollywood has shifted towards a romantic ethnostalgia for Indians, the images of bloodthirsty savages still persist; in *Hell on Wheels* (2011–2014), the only television series at present situated in the time period discussed in this thesis, the Cheynne are portrayed as a severe Indian threat to the white central characters. The bloodthirsty savage imagery persists in a less explicit form also in sports logos and mascots of teams such as Chicago Blackhawks (National Hockey League), The Washington Redskins (National Football League) and Cleveland Indians (Major League Baseball). Ganje (2003, 115) argues that in this context, the Indian becomes a symbol of warlike, fearful and fierce adversary, although representatives of the teams persist that the labels are intended to "pay homage" to Indian tribes, as Fleming (2007, 56) points out. Ganje's (2003, 115) reports of fans wielding tomahawks, wearing war paint and whooping and hollering in encouragement of their teams, shouting things like "scalp them," speaks against the honorary argument. In addition to the images of the noble and ignoble savage, discussed above, some additional stereotypes will be discussed in the analysis that follows.

3 *The Lone Ranger*: the White Man's Indian in the Making?

In my analysis of *LR* that follows, I will investigate whether the film repeats the stereotyped images of American Indians discussed previously. As operations of power, the stereotypes associated with the white man's Indian are instrumental in the ongoing subjugation of Native Americans. Indeed, Bhabha (1986, 162) sees the stereotype as "the primary point of subjectification in colonial discourse." For this reason, Bhabha (ibid., 149) wishes to move beyond the recognition of stereotypical images as positive or negative and calls instead for "an understanding of the processes of subjectification made possible (and plausible) through stereotypical discourse." Consequently, throughout the analysis, I will employ Berkhofer's notion of the white man's Indian as part of the hegemonic discourse of Indianness. This view is supported by Kilpatrick (1999, xvi), who sees film as a platform for "a political struggle for supremacy" and the representation of minority groups like Native Americans in film as part of "an authoritative discourse," whether participation in it is the intent of the filmmakers or not. In other words, any attempt to represent "the other" from a hegemonic point of view participates in a discourse that aims to define them as opposed to the ethnocentric norm.

My initial assumption was that *LR* participates in this discourse by contributing to the reinforcement of the stereotypes entailed in the notion of the white man's Indian. The character of Tonto is especially relevant in this discussion because Sherman Alexie (Spokane/Coeur d'Alene) sees him as a critical character in this discourse; according to Alexie, the popularity of the original radio and television series that constructed Tonto as "the first really mainstream, pop culture Indian figure, the monosyllabic stoic Indian stereotype" (Alexie, quoted in Italie 2000). Alexie emphasizes the impact of an iconic image like Tonto on the popular image of Indians. Alexie's comment was made well before the latest screen version of Tonto in *LR*, but it reveals the potential in rewriting this iconic character; if popular culture is indeed the platform where the white man's Indian is reproduced, as argued by Berkhofer (1979, 96), a rewriting of this quintessential Indian icon in a film by a major production company in Hollywood could have a major impact on the status quo.

3.1 Popular Stereotypes and Authenticity

Despite the general belief that stereotypes are "bad," many critics acknowledge their importance in fiction; both Seiter (1986, 20) and Linn (2003, 24) note that stereotypes are necessary in narrative conventions because they provide the story credibility and ensure its appeal to audiences, which is especially important for popular culture targeted for mass audiences. Stereotypes can be seen as an extension of the generic requirements a representation must meet; as Gledhill (1997, 360) points out, a film must meet certain requirements generally associated with the western, for example, to guarantee "the credibility or truth of the fictional world we associate with a particular genre." Gledhill points out that even realistic narration aims at verisimilitude; in other words, the objective is to produce an illusion of reality rather than an exact replication of the real (ibid.). The narration thus leaves gaps the audience fills with generalizations and stereotypes they are familiar with. Gledhill argues that the concept of verisimilitude "refers not to what may or may not *actually* be the case but rather to what the dominant culture *believes* to be the case, to what is generally accepted as credible, suitable, proper" (ibid.). Stereotypes, then, are necessary for any representational convention while also firmly entwined in the concept of hegemony because they reflect the dominant views in a given society.

The connection of stereotypes with hegemony is dangerous when the stereotyped reproductions begin to be mistaken as the truth. Owens (1992, 3) argues that "so many people throughout the world have a strangely concrete sense of what a 'real' Indian should *be*." As discussed earlier, many Americans rely on popular cultural imagery when they form their views of Indians, but still they seem to have a firm knowledge of the Indian. In Bhabha's terms, this speaks for a socially shared belief in the colonial stereotype, which has been accepted as the truth because the images have been repeated long enough. This follows that if audiences were suddenly introduced to images of Native Americans completely different from what they are used to, they would scorn such representations as inauthentic. For example, non-Natives who have accustomed to the silent and serious images of Native Americans would reject any loquacious happy-go-lucky

Indians as inauthentic portrayals. The general public's opinion of "the real Indian" reflects the postmodern situation that could be described as a loss of the real; the images provided by popular culture are so pervasive that they begin to replace the real; they become "the hyperreal," or as Baudrillard (1988, 166) puts it, "models of a real without origin or reality." Indeed, most Americans are exposed to Indians only through mass media representations, which they begin to mistake for the real. The lack of actual contact with American Indians combined with the repetition of the same stereotypes leads to this belief. The reliance on familiar patterns certainly provides a challenge for the film industry in the representation of minority groups with the simultaneous general disapproval of ethnic stereotypes. Indeed, my analysis will reveal that in the public reception of *LR*, there is a notable tendency to judge the film as a stereotypical representation precisely because it repeats the familiar patterns its credibility simultaneously relies on. Linn (2003, 24) recognizes the interconnection of credibility and power; if a representation is not believable, the audience does not accept the views it is communicating and the representation inevitably loses its power—and its audience. Retaining credibility is thus vital for the success of popular films, and this is ultimately where *LR* fails.

According to Jerry Adler (2013), the makers of *LR* were conscious of the stereotyped and insensitive images of Indians that prevail in the entertainment industry. Depp (quoted in Anthony Breznican 2012) says, "The whole reason I wanted to play Tonto is to try to [mess] around with the stereotype of the American Indian that has been laid out through history… especially Tonto as the sidekick." The actions of the filmmakers speak for their desire to honor the tribes involved and to avoid negative stereotypes; representatives of American Indian tribes were included in both the script and the production stage of the film, a Comanche social activist was present at the set, Depp was accepted as an honorary member to the Comanche tribe and the Navajo who are native to the filming sites performed a blessing on the land before filming was started (Siegel and McClintock 2013). Moreover, the production team hired a Comanche advisor, William Voelker, to monitor the way the Comanche culture was portrayed in the film and to help add authentic cultural elements in

the film (Flagstaff 2013; Allison Stigler 2013). For the reasons listed above, it is highly unlikely that the intention of the filmmakers was to offend the Comanche Nation. Nevertheless, many non-Native critics do not hesitate to judge the film as stereotypical even though the Comanche reception of the film, according to Siegel and McClintock (2013) has been "overwhelmingly positive." Lily Rothman (2013) reports that the Comanche chairman, Wallace Coffey, praises the film for its humor and drama, for the way it incorporates spiritual elements and for its realistic portrayal of the Comanche. Non-Indian film critics' ignorance of the Comanche response is an exemplar of the way the discourse of Indianness continues to exclude Indians.

It is undeniable that Depp is undertaking a significant responsibility, because the film's representation of the Comanche relies mainly on his portrayal of Tonto. Aside from Tonto, the Comanche play minimal roles in the film despite the tribe's central function in the story. The immediate concern with the casting choice of Depp as Tonto is his race; despite Depp's public announcement declaring his Cherokee and Creek ancestry (Breznican 2012), he is not considered Indian enough to play one. As pointed out earlier, any claims to Indian ancestry are contested without the proper documentation to confirm it. Rather than letting someone take pride in their Indian ancestry, they are scorned for assuming a marginal position that does not rightfully belong to them. Depp is certainly not the first non-Native to play an American Indian on screen, although the tendency has been to cast Native actors as Native Americans in the small roles usually attributed to them. The problem with this new rendition of the Lone Ranger is that the film was meant to be a blockbuster and it needed a big name to attract audiences. Given that Depp was probably cast mainly for financial reasons to repeat the success of his iconic role as Captain Jack in the *Pirates of the Caribbean* (2003–2011) series, it is no surprise that the criticism focuses on his (lack of) ethnicity rather than his success in refuting past stereotypes.

Media critics like Merskin (1998, 342) call for authenticity as a solution to the stereotyped images that dominate media representations of Indians. O'Connor (2011, 33) states that actual cultural elements, including language, beliefs and dress, have been replaced with "a characteristic

way" of representing Indians, to which moviegoers are accustomed to and begin to expect. *LR*, however, displays a conscious effort to include authentic Comanche culture; many of the elements in the film, including Depp's face paint and breastplate, a mythological spirit horse, the eagle feathers worn by the Comanche, and even the symbolism behind a taxidermy raven on top of Tonto's head and the strange things he places on corpses are all integral to Comanche culture, according to Ken Tankersley (Piqua Shawnee; in Stigler, 2013), who says the filmmakers did a good job in portraying the Comanche. Even so, *LR* has been targeted for its inauthentic portrayal of the Comanche by film critics; Jeffrey Weiss (2013) claims that Depp's Tonto is "anything but authentic to anyone who knows even a smidge about real Comanche tribe beliefs and practices." Tonto's recount of the legend of an evil spirit called Windigo has also drawn some negative attention; according to the anthropologist Harvey Markowitz (in Jeff Hanna 2013), there is no such thing in the Comanche culture. Indeed, both Markowitz (ibid.) and Tankersley (in Stigler, 2013) reveal that the legend is of Algonquian origin. However, Chief Big Bear, the chief of the Comanche in *LR*, says that most of the legends Tonto claims as Comanche origin are, in fact, his own fabrications, which cleverly explains any possible inconstancies of Tonto's story with Comanche culture. Tonto has made up the legend of the Windigo because, according to the chief, "his mind is broken" as a result of a trauma he experienced as a child. Moreover, as Tonto is also the narrator of the main storyline, anything that is communicated in the film can ultimately be dismissed as fabrication because of this unreliable narrator.

It seems that the filmmakers made a conscious effort to avoid the secularization and trivialization of Comanche culture. Further evidence is provided by the film's portrayal of Comanche rituals and ceremonies; although they are numerous in the film to emphasize the central role of spirituality in Tonto's life, the rituals he conducts are not shown in full. Tonto, for example, performs a ceremony to revive the Texas Ranger, John Reid, who becomes the Lone Ranger later in the film. During the healing ceremony, the audience sees only glimpses of visions and dreams experienced by John. Although the film thus resists trivialization of sacred rituals, at the same time,

the way they are juxtaposed with cryptic imagery and sound mystifies the experience. The mystification of Native spirituality is reminiscent of white stereotypes of Indians, but at the same time, mysticism has also been argued as a distinctly Native characteristic by Allen (1983, 15), who, even for a Native scholar, makes a strong argument that "American Indian thought is essentially mystical and psychic in nature." Consequently, it becomes a matter of interpretation whether the film's portrayal of Native mysticism repeats a stereotype or not. If the purpose of the stereotype is to define and fix meaning, as discussed before, the ceremonies cannot be regarded as stereotyped, because they remain too hazy to form a clear picture of them. However, the Comanche "death dance" shown in the film, a ritual involving chanting, drumming, whooping and dancing repeats the imagery that has persisted ever since the captivity narratives; "Oh the roaring, and singing and dancing, and yelling of those black creatures in the night," writes Mary Rowlandson (2007, 8) of her captivity by Indians in 1675. Similar imagery is repeated in *FC* (114) when the Blackfeet's most important ceremony, the Sun Dance, is described with "And always there were the drums, the singing and dancing." In *FC*, the Sun Dance is given special attention and the profound meaning behind it is thoroughly explained. In *LR*, on the other hand, the audience is given the audiovisual image of the ritual without reference of its significance in the culture. The viewers familiar only with the popular imagery of this kind of a ritual thus easily associate it with the stereotype rather than with any profound, spiritual meaning for the Comanche.

It becomes evident in *LR* that ceremony and spirituality are important for Tonto, which is one of the film's aspects praised by Markowitz (in Hanna 2013), who says the film contains many "subtleties about Indian ways of thinking" that may be lost to the general public. Markowitz also notes the way *LR* honors the oral tradition, which is of great importance to the Comanche culture (ibid.). Both Tonto's and Chief Big Bear's functions as storytellers are instrumental in the narrative. Markowitz also commends the film's portrayal of the Comanche because it displays their sense of humor (ibid.). Humor is important, because the white man's Indian is generally humorless and stoic (Berkhofer 1979, 29; Ganje 2003, 114; Owens 1992, 29). The Comanche in the film have a sense of

humor, despite their stoic appearance. When John first meets Chief Big Bear, the Comanche patiently listen as John tells them how the outlaw gang staged Indian attacks on the white settlements. Judging from the Comanche's silence, John quickly discerns that naturally they do not understand him because they are Indians. He then proceeds to exaggerated hand gestures and a pidgin form of English, a scene reminiscent of the protagonist's meeting with the Lakota Sioux in Kevin Costner's *Dances with Wolves* (1990), where Costner's character mimes a buffalo and they soon begin to understand each other. In *LR*, however, John's miming is comical rather than constructive. The Comanche, speaking their language, speculate whether John is suffering from sunstroke or whether he is drunk on whiskey. After letting John amuse them with his buffoonery, Chief Big Bear finally speaks, pointing at the mask Tonto made John to wear; "What's with the mask?" he asks. Not only does he display his sense of humor by ridiculing John and repeating a catchphrase of the movie, but he also displays his expertise in contemporary vernacular, which the film incorporates despite its setting in the nineteenth century. Both the inarticulate and stoic Indian stereotypes are thus refuted. However, the humor in the scene relies on the audience's recognition of these stereotypes and the film still reinforces the stereotypes by repeating them even though the intent is to parody them.

It is also arguable whether Depp's rendition of Tonto challenges the stereotype of the serious Indian because he remains stoic throughout the film; even in the heat of the action, some of which happens on top of speeding locomotives, Tonto always remains calm and poised, like a stereotypical noble savage. However, it can be argued that regardless of the seriousness of Tonto's expression, he displays a subtle and dry sense of humor that manifests in his eccentric behavior and frequent truisms. Most of all, Tonto's humor is intelligent, which certainly goes against the stereotyped belief in the lower intelligence of Indians. In this aspect, Tonto resembles the Shakespearian jester who turns out to be the most intelligent character in plays like *Twelfth Night* (1601–1602). An example of Tonto's intelligent humor is provided near the end of the film; after realizing that Tonto has stolen a pocket watch that was meant for John as a bribe, and replaced it

with some bird seed, John advises Tonto; “You know, it isn’t really a trade unless both parties agree. Who would really trade a watch for some bird seed?” Tonto answers, “Bird cannot tell time, Kemosabe.” The joke is eventually on John, whose bland expression communicates his failure to understand. Indeed, many of the white men in *LR*, John especially, are constructed as ignorant fools, while Tonto is portrayed as the witty hero, despite the Spanish meaning of his name.

Tonto repeatedly uses his Indianness and white ignorance of Comanche customs as a pretext for his strange behavior and consistently outwits John with his sense of humor; when Tonto displays his knowledge of prostitution as a trade, John asks him how he knows all that, to which he replies, “A vision said it would be so.” John stays ignorant to the fact that the prostitutes seem to know Tonto, suggesting that he is a regular among them. White ignorance becomes a central theme in *LR* and it is supported by other minority groups in the film as well; after being knocked out by John, Tonto wakes up in the middle of Chinese mineworkers, and grunts, “Stupid white man,” to which the whole crowd nod in agreement. The film thus tries to project negative stereotypes on the whites instead of the Indians. By inverting the poles in the dichotomy, the film does nothing to challenge the hierarchical valorization system, which remains dependent on Euro-American ideals. Furthermore, the association of ignorance with white men generally reinforces the belief in essence stereotypes depend on and ultimately supports the us/them dichotomy at the core of the colonial stereotype.

Although the film pins some of the old stereotypes on the white man instead of the Indian, many of the stereotypes associated with the white man’s Indian are embodied by Tonto. The initial dialogue in *LR* parodies one of the popular images of Indians as barterers. Tonto’s “Make trade?” becomes one of the film’s catchphrases, similarly to “good trade” in *Dances with Wolves* (1990). Tonto reveals a dead mouse as his return trade for a pack of nuts he receives from a white little boy. With the history of Native Americans being deprived of their lands and civil rights by making bad deals with the settlers, the scene, again, inverts the traditional roles by placing the white boy at the bad end of the deal. The same scenario is repeated in several small trades throughout the film,

consistently in Tonto's favor. The image of the bartering Indian is also parodied in *Smoke Signals* (1998), the first feature film produced, written and directed by Native Americans with a predominantly Indian cast (DeLaney Hoffman 2012, xiii). In the film, written by Alexie, Coeur d'Alene woman, Velma, offers the two protagonists a ride, but only if they have something to trade for it; Velma declares, "We're Indians, remember? We barter!" Despite the fact that the bartering Indian as a source of humor is a popular theme in the works of Native authors like Alexie, the appropriateness of the humor can be debated when the representation is conducted by non-Natives, given the gravity of colonial history where this and many other stereotypes of the white man's Indian originated. This example foregrounds the importance of history behind these stereotypes. The humor made at the expense of colonial stereotypes is always overshadowed by the past.

On a larger scale, the film's approach to the bartering Indian perpetuates in the victimization of the Comanche; the main tragedy in the film results from a bad trade made by Tonto, who, as a boy, revealed the location of a source of silver to the main villains in the film, Butch Cavendish and his brother, Latham Cole, in exchange for a cheap pocket watch, which repeats the clichéd image of the Indian fascination with cheap trinkets introduced by the settlers. In many representations, these kinds of trinkets are exchanged for Indian territories, as in *FC* (see 4.4). The villain brothers in *LR* proceed to slaughter the whole tribe, in order to leave no witnesses and to return later to claim the rest of the silver. Although the minor trades in *LR* are in Tonto's favor, the main narrative thus portrays the Comanche as poor and innocent victims to the treacherous and evil white man.

Probably the most explicit stereotypes of Indians in the film are given in the introduction of Tonto to the screen; Tonto is displayed in a Wild West exhibition about fifty years after the actual events in the film. The inscription plate below the diorama Tonto is in says, "The Noble Savage in his natural habitat." The noble savage stereotype is thus explicitly evoked and the portrayal of a lifeless Indian in a museum repeats the stereotypical image of the vanishing Indian, who remains in American consciousness in the form of historical artifacts in museums, rather than people (Ganje 2003, 118). Not only is Tonto displayed as a dehumanized relic of the past, but his appearance

repeats nearly every conceivable stereotype of American Indians; an aged, statuesque Tonto is standing shirtless, face covered in paint, with a tomahawk raised in one hand and a tipi on the background. His long, black hair is adorned with what seem like tribal ornaments, and a single feather is hanging from his headband as an ironically definite sign of his Indianness. The farce is made explicit with the addition of a taxidermy raven sitting on top of Tonto's head. The peculiarity of the raven emphasizes that the character's appearance is not factual but an imaginative construction; the parody is obvious enough for people even to consider that the actual Comanche of the time period walked around carrying dead birds on their heads. The camera takes its time zooming in on the inscription plate, emphasizing the notion of the noble savage yet again. Ultimately, the humor in the scene lies in the absurdity of the stereotypical notions of the vanishing race and the noble savage. More importantly, the audience needs to recognize them as stereotypes. Despite the evident parody in Tonto's appearance that invites the recognition of stereotypes, it ultimately reinforces the stereotypes it seeks to parody. According to Linn (2003, 23), even those who consciously refrain from using stereotypes take part in them by acknowledging their existence; many popular jokes about the Jew, for example, are found funny because everybody is familiar with certain characteristics typically associated with Jewish people. *LR* attempts the same with the Indian, but judging from the films' poor reception, the attempts were unsuccessful.

The Comanche's appearance is especially important in *LR* because of the significance of the visual image in the visual media. Because of the constant display of the characters on the screen, the messages conveyed by their appearance alone are promoted over anything else. The problems arise when the characters are introduced with outward symbols of Indianness such as feathers, face paint and long, black hair that reinforce stereotypes by repeating the images of Indians familiar from popular movies of the past. Even if the images are firmly based on reality, the film as a medium has no time to specify the histories behind the choices of costume and makeup. Indeed, communication through visual images is liable to misinterpretation, as O'Connor (2011, 31) argues. In comparison with *LR*, the allusions to the characters' appearance are minimal in *FC*, which allows the author to

focus on the significance behind the images it creates. An Indian rights activist blogger, Adrienne Keene (quoted in Rothman 2013), is infuriated by Tonto's appearance, defining it as "another othering-stereotype-filled-horror." Keene, however, along with many film critics, does not specify what makes Depp's appearance stereotypical. Some have drawn attention to how Depp's version of Tonto is shirtless (Flagstaff 2013). However, such criticism ignores that the Comanche in the film, including Tonto, actually wear traditional Comanche breastplates, as pointed out by Tankersley (in Stigler 2013). The most striking features of Tonto's appearance, namely his face paint and the taxidermy raven on top of his head were inspired by a painting by a non-Native artist, Kirby Sattler, who says his work is a combination of his imagination and "a variety of visual references," and that he does not affiliate his work with any particular tribes (Breznican 2012).[9] One of the crows flying behind the Indian in the painting looks like it is sitting on top of his head, which is where Depp got the idea of the taxidermy bird (ibid.). Depp sees the raven as Tonto's spirit guide, who is alive to Tonto while appearing dead to others (ibid.). Apart from the bird, Depp adapted only the pattern of the face paint from Kirby's painting. Tankersley (in Stigler, 2013) explains that although Native Americans (his generalization) usually use face paint only in ceremonies, Tonto feels threatened by the evil spirit he hunts and for him, the paint functions as protection. Tankersley adds that Tonto no longer wears the face paint after the elimination of the threat (ibid.).

Voelker, the Comanche advisor used in *LR*, is infuriated by the criticism that targets Depp's Tonto as a stereotypical portrayal and blames the general lack of knowledge of American Indian tribes (Flagstaff 2013). However, the critics' unwillingness to specify the stereotypes they are criticizing is as telling of the indeterminate and ambivalent nature of stereotypes themselves as it may be of general ignorance. The apprehensive attitudes towards Tonto's appearance may be due to the close resemblance of the Comanche in *LR* with the Lakota familiar from *Dances with Wolves*

---

[9] The painting is paradoxically entitled *I Am Crow*. However, according to the artist, the "Crow" in the title reflects the affinity of the Indian in the painting with the crows that fly behind him and it is not a reference to the Crow tribe (Breznican 2012).

(1990) or the Cheyenne in *Hell on Wheels* (2011–2014); it is easy to draw the conclusion that the likeness is a result of the filmmakers' ignorance of the variety of Indian cultures. Be that as it may, the similarities are not inconceivable as all these tribes are Plains Indians, and the time period in the representations is the same, between 1865 and 1869. Moreover, Lupton's (2004, 20–24 and 88) analysis of Plains cultures shows that there are notable similarities among many of them.

The parody of the noble savage as an artifact is completed at the end of the film; Tonto packs up his briefcase, puts on a suit and starts walking home. This is a counterstatement to the stereotype described above as Tonto turns out to be an actual, living member of American society at the beginning of the twentieth century; he has a day job at the exhibition and wears Western clothes like any American. Liu and Zhang (2011, 109) emphasize the importance of endings in the representation of Native Americans. *Dances with Wolves* (1990), for example, concludes in a melancholic lamentation of the dying race; the postscript of Costner's film reads, "The great horse culture of the plains was gone and the American frontier was soon to pass into history." The ending in *LR* is quite different; the last word uttered by the old Tonto in the diorama is "home," and as the end credits roll, Tonto marches endlessly, almost still, in the vastness of the Prairie with his suit on and suitcase in hand. Unlike *Dances with Wolves*, the ending in *LR* highlights a sense of homelessness and displacement, which may be a relevant issue for contemporary Indians balancing between acculturation on one hand and the preservation of tribal tradition on the other, a theme that surfaces in *FC* as well. However, an action comedy film like *LR* is probably not the right medium to give rise to issues of Native American identity, because the content needs to stay relatively light to ensure audience's entertainment. At the same time, popular culture does have a certain responsibility because of its active role in the creation and reproduction of the white man's Indian. It can be argued that any effort to portray Native Americans in the mainstream easily becomes a political act. As O'Connor (2011, 35) states, for many, "every Hollywood film is a political document." Indeed, representation of minority groups is entwined in the operations of power as any attempt to represent "the other" inevitably expresses views of them and produces meaning of them.

The public response to *LR* demonstrates how even positive imagery of Native Americans ultimately gets entangled in the political polemics over the correct way to represent them and people cannot safely enjoy the film without a fear of participating in the subjugation of Indians.

3.2 From a Generic Backdrop Indian to Center Stage

As noted in 2.2, critics like Berkhofer advice against generic terms for American Indians, because they ignore the heterogeneity of Indians. In *LR*, the generic "Indian" occurs in the dialogue twenty-seven times. Many, including the protagonists Tonto and John, occasionally recognize the tribal affiliation and use "Comanche" (seventeen occurrences) interchangeably with "Indian." John even uses the generic term to refer to the Comanche language, when he tells the bordello proprietor, Red Harrington, that he is looking for a man who "speaks Indian," which is most likely meant to ridicule the white ignorance of the heterogeneity of Indians. Offensive epithets also occur in the dialogue, including "injun" (six times), "redskin" (once) and "savage" (three times). The terminology used for the Comanche is not nearly as degrading as in earlier Disney productions, such as the animated films *Peter Pan* (1953) and *Pocahontas* (1995), which have been criticized for their representation of Indians (Aleiss 2005, 150). The latter featured a song called "Savages" where Indians were referred to with offensive expressions, including "filthy little heathens" and "dirty redskin devils." Although the pejoratives were used to describe white attitudes towards Native Americans, they still confirm negative connotations of Indians by repetition and as noted before, stereotypes rely on repetition because they cannot be otherwise confirmed. In comparison, the word "savage" is used relatively few times in *LR*, and never as a direct reference to Indians.

In contemporary portrayals of Native Americans in film and television, there is a tendency to avoid the generalization of Indians by means of explicit tribal affiliation; the American Indian characters are identified as Quileute in the *Twilight* saga (2008–2012), as Navajo in the film *Windtalkers* (2002) and as Cheyenne in the television series *Hell on Wheels* (2011–2014). The same cannot be said for video games, which are completely excluded from discussions of popular images of Indians; in the video game *Red Dead Redemption* (2010), Native Americans appear as

predominantly hostile, generic Indians or savages. However, even tribal affiliation can be argued as overly generic; the Blackfeet in *FC* consist of several bands and societies and they never refer to themselves as the Blackfeet. The Indians' identification as the Comanche in *LR* is very generic in comparison. Furthermore, it creates confusion when Chief Big Bear says, "There is no more tribe [for Tonto] to return to." Because the Native characters are only referred to as Indians or the Comanche, the implication is that the whole Comanche tribe perishes in the film, which it, curiously, does twice; the tribe is slaughtered both in Tonto's childhood and again during the main narrative. The generalization of Indians is also evident in the naming of the characters in *LR*; other than Tonto, the Comanche remain anonymous, which is not uncommon in representations of Indians produced by the whites, as Ganje (2003, 118) points out. Even the protagonist is only identified as Tonto, while many of the white characters, even the ones in minor roles, are given both first and last names, like Red Harrington above. The Comanche chief, played by Saginaw Grant (Sac and Fox), is not identified as Chief Big Bear until the end credits, despite his important function in the story. Leaving the other tribal characters nameless is of course understandable, because they only have minor roles. The anonymity of the Comanche in *LR*, with the exception of Tonto, reflects a popular cliché Berkhofer expresses concern over; the Indian of popular culture usually functions merely as a backdrop despite his importance to the genre of Western (Berkhofer 1979, 98). Indeed, more often than not, the Indians are simply there to establish the mood while the action concentrates on the white hero.

In his study on media images of Indians, King (2006, 22) finds the stereotypical image of a trusty Indian sidekick as a persisting image, of which he uses Tonto as an example. In the new rendition of Tonto in *LR*, however, there is an apparent effort to promote the character from his earlier sidekick status, which is reflected already in the casting choices; Depp, a major league actor, is cast as Tonto, while a relatively unknown actor, Armie Hammer, plays the role of the Lone Ranger. Moreover, Tonto's character is given substance with a rich background story, while John's character remains unilateral. There is no question that Tonto is the true hero in the film; there is a

strong emphasis on action in the film and Tonto is always the agent of that action while John remains a passive bystander or victim. Tonto constantly displays his intelligence; he uses the bloodthirsty savage stereotype to his advantage, for example, by hurling his tomahawk in order to invoke fear in the townsfolk, which allows the duo to complete the task at hand. Tonto's resourcefulness and heroism is emphasized by a comical foregrounding of John's unheroic character. John displays a notable lack of the skills, bravery and wittiness of Tonto and he is thus completely dependent on Tonto. Any preconceptions of Tonto as a sidekick are thus quickly set aside. Curiously, the townsfolk in *LR* communicate an attitude that Indians belong to the sidelines; there is an award ceremony at the end of the film to celebrate John's heroic actions and any collaboration on the part of Tonto is completely ignored despite his agency in the action. John being rewarded as the hero reflects the dominant, white view that refuses to accept the Indian "others" as heroes. Ultimately, the film places the responsibility on the viewer; when the white little boy Tonto is telling the story to asks whether all of it is true, Tonto answers, "Up to you, Kemosabe." If indeed the film assumes a white audience, the question is finally posed to them; can Indians be heroes, or are they forever destined to the roles of backdrops and sidekicks?

LR repeats the sympathetic attitudes towards American Indians that have been dominating westerns since the 1950's in films like *Broken Arrow* (1950), *Little Big Man* (1970), and *Dances with Wolves* (1990), all of which participated in the reinforcement of the noble savage myth. Tonto certainly fills many characteristics associated with the idealized noble savage as well; in addition to his spirituality discussed earlier, Tonto seems to have a special alignment with nature as he is able to speak with a horse, he senses that nature is out of balance and he even manages to bring life to his taxidermy raven for a brief instant. The Comanche of *LR* can be analyzed as noble savages, most of all, because they make room for white civilization by riding to their inevitable doom. The victimization of the Indian characters becomes evident throughout the film; when the sheriff asks Tonto, "What's your crime, boy?" Tonto simply says, "Indian." The answer is ambivalent, as he is either correcting the sheriff for using the derogatory "boy" that reflects the white conception of

Indians as infantile, or he could be saying that his only crime is to be Indian. Either way, *LR* risks communicating a condescending disposition towards Native Americans that invites viewers to think of them as helpless victims. In a scene where Tonto and John visit a house of prostitution, the owner tells them to leave because "the clients don't take kindly on an Indian on the premises." Without hesitation, John runs to the rescue and declares in Tonto's defense that he has every right to be there. Tonto, in this scene, is seen as a helpless victim, unable to defend himself despite his general portrayal as the hero in the film.

The victimization of Indians is often associated with the tragedy of the dying race. In *LR*, there is a satirical allusion to the vanishing race myth, as Tonto is placed in the museum but turns out to be acculturated in the American society. The parody is strategically placed in both the beginning and the end of the film to add emphasis, perhaps to underline the postcolonial existence of Native Americans. However, the main narrative in *LR* sends a completely different message; Chief Big Bear tells John that Tonto cannot return to the tribe because "There is no more tribe to return to. Our time has passed. They call it 'progress.'" The tragedy is emphasized as the camera zooms in on John's teary eyes. The remnants of the tribe soon embark upon their last onslaught against the whites, which they know will turn into slaughter. In answer to John's pleas against going to war, Chief Big Bear replies, "It makes no difference. We are already ghosts." When the Comanche initiate their attack, they are quickly overpowered; as melancholy music plays in the background, the camera switches between a Gatling gun the cavalry keeps on sustained fire and the Comanche on their horses, who one by one fall to the ground, standing no chance against the force of the cavalry. The lamentation is complete as the river carries the dead bodies away; solitary feathers float amidst the corpses to make sure the audience recognizes them as Indian. In *LR*, the only option for the Comanche is to diminish. When the rest of the Comanche perish, Tonto becomes the last of his kind like Cooper's Uncas. The melancholy lamentation of the dying race is quickly disrupted with a shot of Tonto's horse standing in a tree and Tonto's remark, "Something very wrong with that horse." The mood is light again and the plot can resume its development. It can be

argued whether genocide is an appropriate theme for an action comedy like *LR*. The genre restricts the portrayal of powerful emotions, which are shrugged off with comical diversions as in the example above.

As noted before, contemporary Hollywood prefers imagery of the noble savage to his bloodthirsty counterpart, which is a trend *LR* repeats. The peaceful coexistence of the Comanche with the white townsfolk comes to a screeching halt, however, as the audience is suddenly shocked with an Indian attack. A scene with murderous savages attacking the innocent settlers would be expected in early westerns such as *The Battle of Elderbrush Gulch* (1913), *They Died with Their Boots On* (1941), or John Ford's *Stagecoach* (1939) that features John Wayne in his breakthrough role. However, in a contemporary film such as *LR*, the Indian attack comes as a shock to the audience. By building up the tension, the audience is led to expect that something dramatic is about to happen. Before a startling disruption of the harmony, the camera focuses on a ranch where Rebecca, John's love interest, is watching the empty plains. The dramatization building up to the attack and of the scene of the attack itself scandalize the events as they unfurl; the audience is shown flashes of galloping horses, fiery arrows flinging through the air and glimpses of long, black hair and feathers. The sound of yelping and whooping accompanies the attack. The invaders mercilessly kill Rebecca's servant and proceed to scalp him. The scene is highly evocative of the scandalization of Indian attacks popular to the time period where the film takes place. The horror of the attack barely comes to a halt when it is hurriedly revealed that the culprits are Cavendish's outlaws only disguised as Indians.

A prominent part of the disguise is a flamboyant red body paint, which repeats the misconception that Indians have red skin; the stereotype is a remnant of the first colonial descriptions of Indians as naked savages, whose skin is red from the constant exposure to sun (Amerigo Vespucci, quoted in Berkhofer 1979, 8). Historically, the image of the "redskin" persisted partly because of its connotation with savagery as the color of blood. Cooper (1834, 50) had a role in reinforcing the myth in his description of Uncas, the last of the Mohicans; his eyes are "terrible

and calm" and he has "haughty features, pure in their native red." The red body paint in the scene is most likely intended to mock the white misconception of Indians' skin color. Although a minor detail, the body paint is important in the context of the colonial stereotype; for Bhabha (1986, 165–66) skin is "the key signifier of cultural and racial difference in the stereotype." He emphasizes the significance of skin color in discrimination, because it is what makes difference visible; the recognition of difference is crucial, and a clear, visible sign such as the skin is therefore particularly effective in discriminative practices (Paul Abbot, quoted in Bhabha 1986, 167). Bhabha (1986, 167) explains that the color of the skin is regarded as a natural sign of inferiority and it becomes the identity of its carrier. The assumed redness of American Indians is fictional, however, and it is thus in danger to lose its function as the signifier of difference. Therefore, the myth of "the redskin" must be repeated in order to remind mass audiences of the Indians' difference from the white norm, which is eventually what *LR* does.

The staged Indian attack described above directly confronts the myth of the bloodthirsty savage and exposes the white man as the real savage, once again in an effort to invert the traditional roles while at the same time repeating a stereotype. The approach in *LR* that at least attempts to be both conscious and critical of stereotypes is certainly an improvement to the portrayal of Native Americans as feral savages in a very literal way in the *Twilight* saga; in *Twilight: New Moon* (2009) it is revealed that the Quileute in the film possess the ability to turn into wolves. Moreover, they display a natural inclination to aggressive behavior. In other words, not only are they dehumanized with an explicit affiliation to predatory animals, they are also driven by primal senses. Even more blatant version of a dehumanized savage can be found in video games where the characters are reduced to a bare minimum; the only thing the player needs to know is who to kill. In the action role-playing game *The Elder Scrolls V: Skyrim* (2011), the western parts of the fictional province, Skyrim, are infested with primitive natives of the land called the Forsworn. They are hostile towards the occupiers of their lands, and ultimately to all non-Forsworn. The Forsworn are easily identifiable from their primitive appearance; they cover themselves with strips of furs and leather

and carry simple weapons. They sleep on animal hides and live in simple constructions that resemble tipis. The Forsworn who inhabit the wilderness are unable to speak, unlike other non-player characters in the game like bandits. This is one of the more extreme examples of how popular culture continues to foster images of primitive and hostile savages.

Both the bloodthirsty savage and the noble savage stereotypes have been associated with low intelligence that is transmitted to the audiences through their inarticulateness (Kilpatrick 1999, 8). Although Depp's Tonto is certainly an improvement from Cooper's (1834, 187) "'Hugh!' exclaimed the savage," or from the yipping Indians in *Peter Pan* (1953), several film critics have called attention to Tonto's broken English in *LR* (Flagstaff 2013; Samuels 2013) and even labeled it as "the lamest stereotype of Hollywood Indian" (Britt Peterson 2013). Adler (2013) explains that since the original radio show, the broken English spoken by Tonto has become generally known as "Tonto-speak," which became a widespread practice in the representation of Indians in other forms of popular culture as well. Depp's Tonto does repeat agrammatical constructions, such as "Must to jump" and "I make urine on it." However, his "Tonto-speak" is not consistent. In fact, Depp's Tonto is quite capable of fluent English, as in the sentence, "From the Great Beyond, a vision told me, a great warrior would help me on my quest." Tonto alternates between Standard English and Pidgin English without difficulty, as in the following example: "Eight men rode into canyon… I dug seven graves. Horse says you are Spirit Walker. A man who has been to the other side, and returned. A man who cannot be killed in battle. Horse definitely stupid." It seems that Tonto's speech alternates by the seriousness of the message; his speech is suddenly flawless when he tells Cavendish, "You know me by the screams of my ancestors in the desert wind."

3.3 Strategies of Resistance

Drawing on studies of popular culture, Seiter (1986, 22) states that all representation, regardless of its classification as high or low culture, relies on intrinsic forms, such as visual and thematic conventions, genres, rules of narration and stereotypes. There are no clear boundaries as to when these forms and conventions become stereotypes, yet it is easy to judge especially a popular cultural

representation as stereotypical for repeating clichés. Characters in novels are generally less stereotyped than in film, for example, because there is more room for the development of a character's personality in a novel. Seiter (ibid., 21) argues that "[i]n humanist criticism, stereotypes are distinguished from well-rounded, individuated characters," which the Pikuni in *FC* exemplify, as I will show in 4.3. Drawing on Dyer conception of "a novelistic character" as an autonomous and full-rounded individual, Seiter (ibid.) writes,

> When these standards for the representation of fictional characters are applied to the mass media, the media inevitably come up short. Critics may suggest that the fictions created by the mass media are stereotypical because they are both false (characters portrayed are one-dimensional, undeveloped, not true-to-life) and aesthetically bankrupt (plots and characters evidence formulaic repetition). A hierarchy of cultural forms exists within the humanities based on the suitability of negative aesthetic judgments such as 'stereotypical' to describe them. Critics rarely speak of stereotypes in opera or ballet. Novels fare better than plays; theater fares better than film; film fares better than television. The word 'stereotypes' condemns any individual product of the mass media.

Indeed, film and television are more easily targeted in critiques of stereotyped representations. As a response to the stereotyped imagery of Native Americans in the film industry, for example, critics like Kilpatrick (1999, xvi) express the need for complex and varied Native American characters as "living human beings, not evanescent avatars of alterity." The argument is valid, of course, because reducing people to a few simplified featured that are assumed as essential is at the very core of stereotyping (Hall 1997b, 249). The same mechanism is at play in all cinematic representations, however, especially in subsidiary characters. It can be argued that the silent side characters are the most dangerous kind in the context of Foucault's power/knowledge argument; because they are not the ones audiences pay attention to, they silently communicate and reinforce socially shared norms.

LR is a typical Western as defined by Berkhofer; the film is set in the American frontier and civilization is rapidly advancing, and all the basic character types of the Western are there—the white agents of civilization, the outlaws and, finally, the hero, usually a cowboy with a horse and a six-gun, whose ultimate task is to "resolve the conflict between the two sides," civilization and savagery (Berkhofer 1979, 97). This is the central conflict in *LR* as well. Chief Big Bear expresses a critical attitude towards Euro-American civilization; "They call it 'progress,'" he says. His remark

contributes to the realization that Euro-American ideals of civilization are ethnocentric and disregard the possibility of alternative views. The United States Cavalry represents one aspect of white civilization in the film; at one point, John and Tonto are buried up to their necks in the ground and they see the cavalry approaching. John says, “Oh, thank God! Civilization... Finally someone who will listen to reason.” But the cavalry turns out to be less civil and reasonable as John thought, as they proceed to trample over John and Tonto with their horses.

It is established at the beginning of the film that both John and Cole are educated men with an unwavering belief in civil society. John considers John Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government* (1689) as his Bible and cites a passage from it; “Wherever men unite into society, they must quit the laws of nature and assume…” He is unable to finish his citation as Cole jumps in to finish, “And assume the laws of men, so that society as a whole may prosper.” Both men thus display their firm belief in the rationale of Enlightenment, the foundation of Western thought. At this point, the film has not revealed that Cole is the main villain. As the plot unravels, the film indulges in a critique of Western civilization, as values of reason and Christianity are constantly questioned by emphasizing the villain’s firm belief in them; after it has been established that Cole is the principal villain in the film, he recites a lengthy prayer, which creates an immediate association of his Christianity with his evil nature. This juxtaposition has infuriated some Christian communities in the United States (Weiss 2013). Even John does not find his calling as a hero until he forfeits law and justice, the foundations of civil society, and becomes an outlaw; he says, “If men like [Cole] represent the law, I’d rather be an outlaw.” In its strong critique of Western values, the film turns into a West-centered self-criticism as the filmmakers represent the culture their disapproval is targeted at.

This critique repeats itself in the film’s representation of white characters; they become symbolic archetypes of the white man in the history of colonization; the characters represent different aspects of the white man, mainly his greed, evilness, treacherousness, corruptness and ignorance. With all these negative traits, the white man in *LR* becomes everything the noble savage is not, a counterimage of the idealized Indian. This inverts a historical pattern, as Euro-Americans

have used “counterimages of themselves to describe Indians and the counterimages of Indians to describe themselves” (Berkhofer 1979, 26), and as noted before, the Euro-Americans have traditionally been associated with the positive image. The archetype at the heart of the conflict in *LR* is the greedy white man, a counterimage in direct opposition of the noble savage, who has been known for his generosity since the early description of him as “so guileless and so generous” by Columbus (quoted in Berkhofer 1979, 6). Unsatisfied with taking only what they can carry of the silver they discovered, the brothers Cole and Cavendish wait well over twenty years in order to collect all the silver there is. Cavendish gets infuriated when one of the outlaws suggests that they leave some of the silver behind; “You think I waited twenty years for scraps? I’m taking all of it! Every damn piece!” he yells. In order to claim all the silver, the brothers have devised a plan involving the establishment of a railroad network and the annihilation of the Comanche. Their ultimate goal is to seize control of everything; first the railroad company, then the silver, and last, the whole country. Cole’s hunger for money and power is accentuated even further as he tells Rebecca’s son, Danny, about the power that comes with the control of the railroad; “Imagine,” Cole says, holding a toy train close to Danny’s face, “time and space, under the mastery of man. Power that makes emperors and kings look like fools.” Indeed, to be rich beyond his dreams does not satisfy Cole. His ultimate ambition is the mastery of “time and space,” and the command over the whole nation.

The greed goes hand in hand with the evil nature of the white man, emphasized with superfluous acts of violence, such as the slaughter of the innocent settlers by the outlaws. Cole’s evilness, however, is beyond comparison; he prides himself with the slaughter of thousands at the Battle of Gettysburg; “I was at Gettysburg. Twelve-thousand casualties before lunch!” he exclaims. Cole also shoots the previous chairman of the railroad company in cold blood in front of the stockholders although he has already taken over the stock majority. The murder is motivated only by Cole’s wickedness, repeating the imagery usually associated with the bloodthirsty savage.

Similarly to his greed, the white man's savagery is also taken to extreme proportions; at the beginning of the film, there are rumors circulating about Cavendish among the townsfolk:

> "They say Butch Cavendish ate a Red-Legger's heart… Swallowed it whole."
> "I hear it was the eyes"
> "Man told me he ate part of his own foot just to win a bet."

At this point the rumors are merely comical and, again, repeat another stereotype; the early descriptions of Indians contained accounts of cannibalism (Berkhofer 1979, 28). However, not long after this exchange of rumors, John witnesses Cavendish eat his brother's heart from right off his chest. The stereotypes of the bloodthirsty, cannibalistic savage is inverted and the white man is confirmed as the true savage of the film. Several white characters are also associated with treachery, which Chief Big Bear generalizes to a stereotype; he tells John, "Like all white men, your brother lied." Indeed, John's brother had promised to protect the Comanche before his death, which resulted after he and John were both betrayed by another white man, Collins, who they had known their whole lives. John's discussion with Chief Big Bear also further reinforces the image of the Comanche as helpless victims, because they are in dire need of white protection.

Using the film *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962) as an example, Berkhofer (1979, 108) explains how the French philosophers' take on the idealized noble savage inspired the work of many American novelists and screenwriters, whose portrayal of idealized Indians were contrasted with evil white villains in an effort to criticize American society. *LR* thus follows a long tradition of representations that use the Indian as a tool for Western self-criticism. Despite the film's efforts towards a level of authenticity in its portrayal of the Comanche, the film's focus on a critique of Western civilization ultimately serves only to reinforce its position as the unequivocal center. The film's attempts to rewrite some of the stereotypes entailed in the white man's Indian does not change anything either; Hall (1997b, 272–73) explains that the substitution of negative imagery for positive images is a common technique used in resisting stereotypes of the blacks; this technique "inverts the binary opposition, privileging the subordinate term." However, "[s]ince the binaries remain in place, meaning continues to be framed by them" (ibid.). In postcolonial terms, "the

reversed scramble for cultural primacy only serves to reinforce the old binaries which secured the performance of colonial ideology in the first place" (Gandhi 1998, 147). Consequently, *LR* does not change the status quo, nor does it offer any alternatives as to how Native Americans are portrayed in film.

Any representation of Native Americans by non-Natives is faced with an impassable double bind; the exclusion of Indians altogether implies a racist favoritism towards non-Natives while any inclusion of Indians, no matter how positive or realistic the portrayal attempts to be, is assuming authority over Indians by defining them from the outside-in. It is easy to pass the blame on hegemonic institutions like the big film production companies in Hollywood. At the same time, however, audiences prefer precolonial nostalgia images to authentic, contemporary Indians. In fact, Aleiss (2005, 152) notes that Indian-themed films outside the genre of western consistently fail at the box office. How can the general American public's ideas of Indians be suddenly dissociated from the white man's Indian that has been engraved in their minds during centuries of repetition? As Lacroix (2011, 6) writes, drawing on Bhabha, "the constant circulation of these images through various forms of media over time, continually reminding the American 'psyche' who 'the Indian' was (and is)—[has provided] a sense of 'fixity' upon which ideological discourses of otherness are dependent." The audiences, who are assumed as white, have learned to expect the kind of imagery they are used to and any alternatives to the dominant views would risk alienating them (King 2006, 30; Berkhofer 1979, 98). Is it even possible to get alternative views through to the public? The persistence of the imagery certainly speaks against it. If the non-Indian production companies, writers and directors, who ultimately have the power in the film industry, cannot do right by Indians, what is there then to do? Is the final message, then, that there is no place for authentic Native Americans in popular culture because audiences prefer the white man's Indian? This is a grim outlook that would only serve to reinforce the marginalization of Native Americans and reinforce institutional hegemony.

Many critics have an answer at hand to this problem; in order to avoid what Welch (quoted in Lupton 2004, 35) calls "the white director's vision, Kevin Costner's vision," Native Americans need to be placed behind cameras. The same solution is suggested by DeLaney Hoffman (2012, xiii) and Merskin (1998, 342), who disregard, however, that access to mainstream is neither straightforward nor necessarily even desirable for American Indians. Grande (1999, 317) observes

> a certain arrogance in the assumption that unless Native American communities participate in the 'mainstream' (often code for the overconsumptive culture of industrialized nations) that they lack power and furthermore that 'voice' and 'power,' as defined by non-Indian scholars.

Indeed, the kind of solutions provided above assume that it is the objective of Native Americans to gain access to this privileged "mainstream." Is the access to mainstream, or Western culture in general, desirable for Native Americans? Krupat (1989, 217) asks, "Isn't culture best left to those who are of it?" Should American Indian literature and art forms be left to the immediate audiences that belong to the culture they are produced in? Although some scholars speak for a "humanist universalism" that sees culture as "the property of humankind as a whole" (ibid., 20), not all Native Americans are comfortable with this claim; Fleming (2007, 56) and Krupat (1996, 21) point out that many American Indians are reluctant to share their sacred histories and ceremonies with the world, especially with the tenable fear of secularization and commercialization of what they hold sacred as it is disseminated into pop images.

There is a handful of American Indian actors, who have secured their position within the industry by acculturation; Alexie (quoted in Italie 2000) praises the Cherokee actor Wes Studi for his role as a police officer in the movie *Heat* (1995) as one of his favorite pop culture images of Native Americans. Alexie says that despite his "very Indian" appearance, Studi is "just a cop" in the film (ibid.). Nevertheless, there are only few Native American actors who can be seen in roles that are not quintessentially Indian. More importantly, a comprehensive integration of American Indians into the non-Indian (mass) culture can be seen as symbolic annihilation that repeats the age-old mantra of imperialism: "the only good Indian is a dead Indian" (Berkhofer 1979, 30). Although in this case, the death is not physical, but cultural. Is cultural assimilation a desirable object for Native

Americans? Is it even possible? And if it is, at what cost? These are very volatile questions in the field of Native American Studies, as noted by McFarland (2000, 172–73).

LR did its best to answer the need for American Indian visibility in Hollywood with the promotion of an Indian character to a hero status. Leading roles are traditionally reserved for whites only, although there has been a positive development in this respect in twenty-first century Hollywood; after the 85th Academy Awards in 2001 that awarded Denzel Washington and Halle Berry as the best actor and actress in leading roles, there has been a notable increase in casting black actors as hero characters. It is yet to be seen whether similar development will follow with other ethnic minorities such as Native Americans, who, for the time being, remain in the sidelines, in roles written by non-Natives. The definition of Indianness continues to be in non-Native hands, and Native Americans have to play the part dictated by the white hegemony, which certainly speaks for a need for American Indians to "reclaim their own images," as DeLaney Hoffman (2012, xvi) puts it. Aleiss expresses the concern that young Indian actors need to dress up to the role of the white man's Indian in order to land roles; actresses show up at castings mimicking the "Disney Pocahontas type" while male actors improve their believability by looking the part of the prototypical Plains Indian as defined by Costner (Aleiss 2005, 163). Grande (1999, 319) concurs that members of the dominant culture expect Native Americans to "live up to the stereotypic images that whites have constructed for them," before they are accepted as "real" Indians. In the postmodern dimension, the Indian in the American public consciousness is a simulation that has lost its connection to any authentic original. According to Liu and Zhang (2011, 109), this imagery also affects Native Americans' own conceptions of the self as well. What is more, Native Americans themselves participate in the reproduction of these copies; Büken (2002, 51) describes how Native Americans build "imitation Indian villages" on reservations and produce "popular culture paraphernalia . . . to meet the needs of mass tourism for economic development" so that non-Natives do not reap all the profit there is to be made with the white man's Indian.

It seems that in all possible aspects, popular culture is not the correct platform for authentic images of American Indians. However, it may be the only arena where the deconstruction of these persistent images is possible, given its visibility and the fact that it is there where ethnic stereotypes are produced and reproduced in the first place, as noted by Allport (1995, 200), Said (1987, 26) and Berkhofer (1979, 96). Nevertheless, the entertainment business continues to communicate white meanings between white people and, at the same time, to define meaning of non-whiteness, by controlling the definition of an "authentic" Indian, for example. *LR*, regardless of its aspirations to be respectful to the Comanche nation and to represent them with some levels of authenticity, is judged above all because it is a representation by non-Natives, portraying Natives; not because they are portrayed incorrectly or in a disrespectful manner, but because they are represented at all, by non-Natives for a non-Native audience. Perhaps this is why, for the most part, the entertainment industry prefers to exclude Indians from representations altogether. My analysis above shows that popular culture is ultimately more interested in repeating familiar patterns than creating authentic images of Native Americans. It is probably unfair to expect that film industry would single-handedly right the wrongs that the history of colonization has bestowed upon Native Americans. Indeed, film industry is a profit-making business with every intention to "appeal to the broadest possible audience," which makes entertainment value what ultimately dictates a film's success (O'Connor 2011, 30). There is a call for Native Americans themselves to assume an active role in the eradication of stereotypes; Büken (2002, 48) makes the strong declaration that "it is the responsibility of every Native American to be a living image of the subverted stereotype." Although I disagree with the prescriptive nature of Büken's statement, I do not doubt that Native Americans themselves participate in dismantling these stereotypes. Therefore, I will now turn to an analysis of *FC* in order to find out how stereotypes can be resisted, or whether the pervasive effect of the white man's Indian manages to penetrate literature produced by Native American authors as well.

4 *Fools Crow*: the White Man's Indian Deconstructed?

My initial assumption was that *LR* contributes to the reinforcement of what I have called the white man's Indian, whereas *FC*, as a literary sample by a Native American author, attempts to deconstruct the stereotypical images associated with the notion. Nevertheless, it cannot be taken for granted that Welch does not resort to stereotyped images because, as Schweninger (2008, 5) argues, even American Indian writers perpetuate in the reinforcement of stereotypes imposed by popular culture. Indeed, Native Americans are not immune to the pervasive effect of popular culture; they are subject to the same stereotypes because they "grow up exposed to or limited to the same television programs, the same movies, and the same books" as do non-Indians (ibid., 8). Moreover, similarly to Orientalism, there is no avoiding the discourse of Indianness; Said (1987, 2) writes, "[a]nyone who teaches, writes about, or researches the Orient—and this applies whether the person is an anthropologist, sociologist, historian, or philologist—either in its specific or its general aspects, is an Orientalist, and what he or she does is Orientalism." Although Said does not explicitly expand this definition to himself, it can be argued that even he is not outside the scope of the Orientalist discourse, and neither can literature about Indians be produced without participating in the discourse of Indianness.

4.1 Welch's Precolonial Space

Kilpatrick (1999, xv) recognizes a tendency to correct white misconceptions about Indians in the efforts to resist stereotypes. Indeed, many critics, including Merskin (1998, 342), call for realistic portrayals of authentic Indians to refute the stereotyped imagery of popular culture. Realism, then, has become an important tool in the portrayal of the cultural and individual variety of Indians as opposed to simplistic, stereotyped images; for Berkhofer (1979, 106), "realism . . . means the treatment of Native Americans as individuals rather than as Indians, as human beings and not assemblages of tribal traits." However, realism has been instrumental in reinforcing the white conceptions of Indians as well and popular culture has been concerned with presenting "the real Indian" for centuries; even the legendary Buffalo Bill hired actual Indians, including Sitting Bull

and Geronimo, in his Wild West Show in the eighteenth century to attract audiences by bringing an "authentic" experience of the American West to audiences across the United States and even in Europe (Kilpatrick 1999, 12–13). The Indians in the show, however, were part of staged encounters that reflected the dominant view of the Indians of the time; they were ordained to play the roles of fearsome savages attacking settler wagons (ibid.; Berkhofer 1979, 100). This was represented as an authentic experience of the Wild West. As noted in 2.1, it is the very purpose of subjugating discourses like Orientalism or the discourse of Indianness to create meanings that are presented as reality. In fact, Said (1987, 72) calls Orientalism "a form of radical realism."

Nevertheless, it becomes evident in *FC* that Welch, too, is aiming for a very tangible level of realism, which is foregrounded in the novel's attention to historical detail. Owens (1992, 156–66) points out that *FC* "relies heavily upon documented Blackfoot history" and provides an overview of the many events and people in *FC* that are taken from actual Blackfoot history; Owens lists the Pikuni chiefs Heavy Runner and Mountain Chief among the historical people in *FC*, for example. As Lupton (2014, 90) notes, much of the history in *FC* is drawn from the anthropological and ethnological work of non-Native researchers. Although Welch can be criticized for his reliance on non-Native sources, the extensive research conducted by these scholars is among the few records on Blackfoot culture of the time period. The many ceremonies and other cultural details in the novel are based on the extensive research of Grinnell (2001), McClintock (1910) and John Ewers (1958), among others. The legend of the Pikunis' most sacred object, the Beaver Medicine Bundle is recounted by both Grinnell (2001, 117–24) and McClintock (1910, 103–12), for example. Among the many words Welch has adopted are the Blackfoot word *Napikwan* for 'white men', taken from Ewers (1958, 19), and Grinnell's (2001, 284) loan translation, *heavy-singer-for-the-sick*, which, Grinnell explains, is a type of Blackfoot healer. Welch displays an extensive effort to stay loyal to Blackfoot traditions and to honor the cultural traditions sacred to the Blackfeet, including the Sun Dance Ceremony (Lupton 2004, 9 and 100) and the vision quest tradition (Ewers 1958, 162–63), which both are given significant emphasis in *FC*.

By inclusion of Blackfoot traditions and actual events from the time period, the historicity of *FC* becomes evidently important. What Welch is attempting in *FC* is the rewriting of this fundamental time in history from an exclusively Pikuni point of view. Tripathy (2009, 43) sees the interrogation of the colonial past as a project of postcolonialism, which for Native Americans becomes a project of decolonizing the mind. It is simultaneously “a critique of Western epistemological and civilisational complexes masquerading as history . . . in retheorising an alternative history rooted in the natives’ understanding of their being in the world” (ibid.). For this reason, there is great significance in a return to a fundamental point in history, which the westward expansion of the European settler cultures certainly is. The strategy is employed also in other postcolonial works, including Timothy Findley’s *Not Wanted on the Voyage* (1984), which returns to the Great Flood in the Book of Genesis; as Ashcroft et al. (1989, 103–04) note, the novel attempts to “to deconstruct those notions and processes which rationalized the imposition of the imperial word on the rest of the world.” Although Ahcroft et al. (ibid., 195) deny the possibility of a return to a culturally pure, precolonial version of an indigenous culture, the attempt to return to a specific time in history is beneficial in challenging the views imposed by the Western civilization. Indeed, *FC* is ultimately about “[d]econstructing the ideological and civilisational contents of Western history and revalidating indigenous knowledge systems,” which Tripathy (2009, 43) sees as “the agenda in the larger postcolonial project.” The indigenous knowledge systems of *FC* will be returned to in 4.4.

The importance of rewriting the colonial history of America from an American Indian perspective is undeniable, considering that many of the most persistent and widespread stereotypes of Indians originate from that period of time as Berkhofer’s (1979) historical analysis of the white man’s Indian shows. As shown in this thesis, these stereotypes play an important role in the ongoing subjugation of Native Americans. Similar rewritings of the colonial history from a Native point of view have preceded *FC*, even in works by non-Native authors such as Dee Brown’s *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (1970). Brown’s novel concentrates on the injustices experienced by

several Native American tribes in the nineteenth century, a theme that surfaces in *FC* as well. Welch creates a pre-colonial version of the Pikuni culture in the novel, even though the Euro-American influence is already seen in the many Euro-American commodities the Pikunis use, for example. In fact, the Euro-American presence is implied on the very first page of the novel with the introduction of the protagonist, who later becomes Fools Crow, but is initially identified as White Man's Dog (3).[10] The protagonist's initial name insinuates a subsidiary position to the whites and even echoes Berkhofer's notion of the white man's Indian. The character's explicit association to a dog also repeats the dehumanization often inherent in the notion of the savage. However, later in the novel it turns out that White Man's Dog has had only minimal contact with some white traders and he was named after a presumably Pikuni storyteller, Victory Robe White Man, who he followed around as a boy (218). This is a good example of how the white's presence is prominent psychologically throughout the novel although actual contact with the Euro-Americans is minimal.

By focusing on the history before the actual contact with the white settlers, the novel rejects the modern and the contemporary, which is tainted with the colonial status of the Native Americans. However, Welch's version of the precolonial savage is ultimately very different from the pristine precolonial stereotype discussed before, as I will demonstrate. The Pikuni perspective is emphasized with the many Blackfoot names for places in *FC* and measurement of time in Blackfoot terms. Months are referred to as *moons*; *first-thunder moon* (45) or *longtime-rain moon* (180), for example. The novel contains only one date in the Gregorian form (284). However, time is still measured in the same terms, even though the words are different; 'days' and 'years' are *sleeps* (13) and *winters* (3), respectively. The reference to time in natural terms also occurs in *LR*; Chief Big Bear uses the expression "many moons ago" to refer to a time in Tonto's childhood over twenty years earlier. In its scientific sense, *moon* refers to months rather than years, which is why the chief's use of the expression can be argued slightly erroneous. There are only few momentary shifts

---

[10] In section 4, all references without a mention of an author's name are to *FC*.

to the perspective of white characters in *FC*. Consequently, the world in the novel is described in Pikuni terms and the Pikunis are placed in the center.

Almost as important as the Pikunis themselves is the nature that surrounds them; the novel establishes a firm connection with the land, which is reflected in the natural expressions of time above. Although the Indian closeness to earth is often considered as a stereotype, a firm sense of place and a connection to that place are important themes for many Native American authors, including Welch, given the colonial history and the confiscation of Indian lands by the Euro-American colonizers. Moreover, considering that displacement and alienation are reoccurring themes in American Indian literature, in works such as Welch's *The Death of Jim Loney* (1979) and Silko's *Ceremony* (1977), it is understandable that a firm establishment of a sense of place surfaces in the work of writers like Welch. Indeed, as Welch puts it in an interview with McFarland (2000, 12), "landscape is almost the main character in anything I write." Welch emphasizes its importance to the Pikuni, by a careful description of the natural environment, including the flora and fauna, mountains, the sky and the weather. Moreover, the recurring anthropomorphism of natural things in *FC* gives life to the environment, as in the following example; "Night Red Light ['the Moon'] was almost full in the clear black sky, and the stars danced around her" (253).

There is an explicit juxtaposition of nature with the power of the Pikunis, as in the following excerpt with White Man's Dog's experience of his surroundings during a simple act of urinating;

> To the east, the first streak of orange crossed the sky. He smelled the prairie grass and the sagebrush and the sweet mustiness of the horses who watched him. He listened to the clear song of the yellow-breast crouched in the grass to his right. Two long-tails flew through the sky toward Four Persons Butte, their black-and-white bodies bobbing lightly through the morning sky . . . White Man's Dog stood in the quiet dawn, his heart beating strong with all the power of the Pikunis (115).

The inclusion of sensory detail beside vision, including the sensation of power, make the experience of nature more complete. The importance of the natural world is emphasized by both starting and concluding the novel with an image of it; the novel begins, "Now that the weather had changed, the moon of the falling leaves turned white in the blackening sky" (3). At the end of the novel, the last image given is "rivers of great animals" grazing and sleeping in the prairies and the very last lines

read, “Their dark horns glistened in the rain as they stood guard over the sleeping calves. The blackhorns [‘the buffalo’] had returned and, all around, it was as it should be” (390–91). Owens (1992, 165) sees the novel’s conclusion as a “lyrical—almost Homeric—vision.” The novel’s vision of a world “as it should be” reflects the idealized image of nature at its pure, natural state, untouched by the corruption brought by Western civilization, which arguably repeats the stereotyped imagery discussed in 2.3. Although *FC* ends with what can be interpreted as a nostalgia image for a pure, simpler past, it remains merely a vision, because the natural environment has already gone through changes brought by Euro-Americans’ advancement; it is described earlier in the novel how the growing numbers of the whites had forced many of the animals in the area to move into the foothills of the Rocky Mountains (270). Cella (2010, 16) reads the natural environment in *FC* as “a biocultural ideal that is disrupted by the invasive advance of Euroamerican plow culture,” which I find arguable, because land use does not surface as a theme in the novel. Furthermore, for the most part of the novel, the narration does not focus on the differentiation of the two cultures. Consequently, rather than reinforcing binaries such as nature/artifice, the novel attempts to recreate a world from the Pikuni perspective.

The Pikunis’ connection to land, whether it is read as stereotypical or not, is also reflected in the way they commune with animals. The novel contains many animal helpers, like Fools Crow’s power animal Wolverine (118) and Raven (52), who functions as a messenger and gives Fools Crow guidance. In the Blackfoot creation story, Old Man Napi told the early Blackfeet of these powerful animals; he told them, “Whatever these animals tell you to do, you must obey them, as they appear to you in your sleep. Be guided by them” (Grinnell 2001, 141). Welch emphasizes the importance of these animals to the Pikunis in *FC*. Many of the animals in the novel function as mediators between the spiritual and the material world for the Pikunis. They possess greater power than man, which, according to Lupton (2004, 18), is an often occurring notion in Blackfoot mythology. White Man’s Dog, for example, immediately recognizes the power of Raven when the bird begins to talk; he says to Raven, “Oh, pity me, Raven! I am a nothing-man who trembles

before your power" (56). It can be argued that this bond with the Pikuni have with animals reinforces the stereotype of Indians' special alignment with nature, especially as the Pikunis are able to communicate with these animals. Moreover, because the animals are an aspect of the spiritual world, there is also something mythical about this connection. However, it is difficult to perceive Welch's version of the "child of nature" as stereotypical given that it is based on the Blackfoot creation story. Furthermore, as I will show momentarily, the Pikunis in the novel do not make a distinction between the spiritual and the physical aspects of the universe because they are perceived as part of the same reality.

Not only is the natural world described in Pikuni terms, but the Pikunis are also given control of the many stories and legends that the novel portrays as an integral part of their culture. Stories and storytelling are evidently of great significance to the Pikunis. Many Native critics accentuate the importance of stories in Native American cultures in general; Owens (1992, 164) emphasizes the importance of storytelling in all oral cultures, because he sees it as vital for cultural survival. Bruchac, on the other hand, sees stories as instruments of power, although they are often perceived as myths and legends in the mainstream (Buchac 2003, 35). Indeed, the connection of these stories with power is important also according to Liu and Zhang (2011, 107), who argue that "linguistic activeness . . . helps Indian characters reclaim the center and push whites to the margin." In *FC*, the Pikuni storyteller becomes a powerful symbol of cultural sovereignty by defying the Western attempts to silence him. At the same time, the stoic and voiceless Indian stereotype is effectively deconstructed as the Pikuni characters are given eloquence and expression. More importantly, the Pikunis in *FC* are not constructed as fixed, completely knowable objects from outside-in. Instead, by giving them the control of their stories, the novel gives them the power of self-definition; they are no longer defined through the conceptions of others as the white man's Indians. It is the Pikunis, then, who control meaning and knowledge in the novel. Not only do the Pikuni storytellers in *FC* participate in the circulation of sacred tribal legends and lore, but many of the defining moments in the novel are narrated through storytelling, including Yellow Kidney's

account of his disappearance after the Crow raid (72–81). There is an abundance of sacred stories from Blackfoot mythology in *FC*, the most important of these is the story of Feather Woman, the origin story of Sun Dance Ceremony, given by Ambush Chief (111–12). Many of the stories in the novel extend over several pages, which emphasizes the importance of the Pikuni storyteller. As noted above, the stories are important for cultural survival, which becomes evident in *FC* as well. The stories in *FC* are exaggerated to create images of great warriors; White Man's Dog earns his new name, Fools Crow, after he cleverly tricks a Crow chief into his death by feigning dead himself and being thus able to surprise his enemy, even though in truth, he is knocked unconscious (146). Heroic warriors are thus constructed in stories to symbolize the power of the tribal community. As Fools Crow's guide animal, Raven, says, "It makes them feel good that one so brave walks among them. It increases the Pikuni power" (162).

The stories often contain what seem like fantastical elements, but, for the Pikunis, they are reality. McFarland (2000, 14) observes that Welch's novels contain "surrealist techniques, including dreams and dreamlike disruptions of logic and reality." Indeed, it is not uncommon for the characters in *FC* to suddenly be talking with animals or to dive into mysterious places that exist somewhere between the realms of reality, fantasy and dream. The spirit world, for the Pikunis, is as real as the physical world. Owens (1992, 165) writes:

> In the Blackfoot world... there is no disjunction between the real and the magical, no sense that the magical is metaphorical. In the world Welch recovers, Raven talks to men and women, the sacred and the profane interpenetrate irresistibly, and this is reality.

Dreams, for example, are as real as the waking experience for the Pikunis, who receive powerful messages from spiritual beings in them; Fast Horse recognizes the dream vision he receives from Cold Maker as "a power dream such as few men know" (236). Ultimately, his failure to interpret the dream leads to his ruin. The dreams can even be shared; White Man's Dog and his father's wife, Kills-close-to-the-lake, have a secret desire for each other, which they fulfil in a dream they share; Kills-close-to-the-lake tells Fools Crow in the dream, "This is the place of dreams. Here, we may desire each other. But not in that other world, for there you are my husband's son" (119). Through

the dream, they are cleansed of the wickedness in them that made them desire each other (125). As Nora Barry (1991–1992, 12) states, dream, in *FC*, "reveals truth, morally cleanses the dreamer, and bestows power on the tested worthy."

It is within this realm of dreams and spirits where many of the significant parts of the novel take place, including Fools Crow's vision quest, which becomes the defining moment in Fool's Crow's life and affects the future of the whole tribe. Of all the events in the novel, the most attention is given to this quest Fools Crow receives from "Nitsokan, the dream helper" (249). The vision quest extends through three whole chapters. Ewers (1958, 162–63) explains that in traditional Blackfoot culture, the vision quest includes isolation from the tribe, fasting, a vision received from a totem animal and the obtainment of the animal's power. Welch, repeats the tradition according to Ewers' description. During the quest (319–28), Fools Crow travels through layers upon layers of dream worlds, which intermingle with reality so that there is no distinction of the two. The connection between these different levels of experience is holistic; no separation is made between them and neither is one valued over the other, as noted by Barry (1991–1992, 10–11). Blackfoot mythology also becomes part of this reality, where all the different aspects merge into a unified whole; the dream quest culminates in Fools Crow meeting a significant woman figure from Blackfoot mythology called Feather Woman (332–38, 349–60). Allen (1983, 8–9) writes that Native American thought generally resists any dualistic divisions into natural and supernatural, divine and mundane or material and spiritual. According to Allen (ibid., 8), the material and the spiritual aspects of the world are one in "Native American thought" generally because they are seen as "different expressions of the same reality." More specifically, no separation is made between a concrete mountain, for example, and the psychological or spiritual associations of the mountain. Regardless of the generic nature of Allen's argument, it finds support in Welch's portrayal of the Pikuni way of perceiving the world.

As noted by Lupton (2004, 97), many critics analyze Welch's technique as magical realism. There are some similarities to magical realism, such as the unexplained strangeness that is simply

there (ibid.). Ashcroft et al. (1989, 27–28) list magical realism in their findings of thematic and stylistic similarities between the postcolonial literatures of the world. As a method, magical realism can be argued useful in postcolonial literatures, because it draws attention to how people from different cultures experience reality in different ways; citing Bruce Holland Rogers, Lupton (2014, 98) explains,

> Magical realism is at its most useful when used to "explore the realities of characters or communities who are outside of the objective mainstream of our culture . . ."—really, of anyone whose belief systems are unfamiliar to the average American.

Interestingly, Rogers is evidently referring to American culture with "our culture," from which he excludes Native Americans. This exclusion reflects both the social isolation of Native Americans in the United States and the tendency of even academic discourse to separate the Indian "other" from the ethnocentric norm of Americanness. Lupton's notion of "the average American" also implies an ethnocentric norm, which confirms the marginal position of Native Americans. Regardless, I agree with the underlying argument that magical realism can help understand different ways of perceiving reality, or at least, acknowledge the existence of alternative ways, and it can thus challenge some of the existing conceptions of knowledge the reader has. The multilayered, holistic reality Welch creates by using this method does not rely on Western conventions and it can thus be argued that he manages to challenge Western rationalism as the core value of supposedly objective and universal knowledge. A fusion of the magical or the spiritual with the material aspects of reality is a reoccurring technique in Native American literature, in works such as Silko's *Ceremony* (1977) and Erdrich's *Tracks* (1988). It is possible that the makers of *LR* were aware of this tradition of magical realism in Native American literature, because Tonto exits the diorama in a way that disrupts logic; as the end credits roll, Tonto has mysteriously stepped into the painting of the Prairie that functioned as the background of the diorama he was in.

Native American worldview is often subject to non-Native interest; as noted in 2.3, many non-Native Americans turn to Native beliefs for spiritual relief. This becomes evident in the mass marketed books on Native wisdom and spirituality sold in gift shops across the United States.

According to Schweninger (2008, 18), these books are overflowing with stereotypes. Native American beliefs and histories are generally seen as myths in the mainstream, as opposed to Western history. As Lundquist (2004, 3) puts it, "[u]sing the term *mythology* to describe the foundation narratives of particular Native Nations is problematic—particularly when mythologies are often thought to be fictions created by unsophisticated cultures to explain the inexplicable." Similarly, the white image of Indians and their ceremonies associates Indians with spiritualism as opposed to religion (Krupat 1989, 235). Ceremonies are evidently of great significance to the Pikunis in *FC*; Welch devotes almost an entire chapter to the Sun Dance (98–125). There are several ceremonies in *FC*, including healing ceremonies. Fools Crow, for example, tries to heal Yellow Kidney's son, One Spot, of rabies using sage, sweet grass, and other herbs and roots (264–67). He drums, chants, prays, even imitates a wolf and bids "the Medicine Wolf to take pity on the boy and to forgive him." The Pikuni in *FC* believe in many spiritual beings, including the Great Spirit (245) and different kinds of animal helpers. They pray to Cold Maker (3), Sun Chief (8) and Thunder Chief (27) as well as the Above Ones (4), the Below Ones (23) and the Underwater people (22), even to Mother Earth (102), whose legitimacy as a Native American concept has been debated (Schweninger 2008, 5–8). Fools Crow even sees ghosts of men and their animals (228–29). Some of the Pikuni beliefs may seem like superstition to the Western reader; for example, "to tell another's dream could make one's own medicine go bad" (48). The Pikunis' belief in evil spirits (186), is also evocative of the common stereotype of native superstition; the Pikuni see disease, including *white-scabs disease* (301, 'smallpox') and *the white-mouth* (264, 'rabies') as evil spirits that have taken over the body and healing ceremonies are performed to drive out these spirits. The Pikunis believe that Fast Horse is possessed with an evil spirit that causes him to do bad things (186). A similar bad spirit appears in *LR*; Tonto believes that the silver the villain brothers are after is cursed by "evil spirits," which make the brothers do evil things. Tonto's belief in the spirits remains unexplained whereas *FC* lets the reader in on a profound understanding of the spiritual aspects of the universe in the Pikuni culture.

Before I posed the question whether *FC* manages to deconstruct the categorical binaries central to colonial discourse and the colonial stereotype. However, Foucault questions the possibility of such deconstructive practices in his discussion of categories and difference; in Foucault's (1977, 186) words, "[categories] suppress the anarchy of difference, divide differences into zones, delimit their rights, and prescribe their task of specification with respect to individual beings. . . . Difference can only be liberated through the invention of acategorical thought." In other words, the liquidation of difference between the binary oppositions would only be possible if all the categories involved were dissolved. Surprisingly, Foucault's petition for "acategorical thought" finds response in the work of Allen, whose view on Native American thought reveals an inherent resistance of categories; Allen (1983, 10) argues that "[s]eparation of parts into this or that category is not agreeable to American Indians" and the Western "tendency to separate things from one another" is an essentially non-Indian way of perceiving the world. Similar view is provided by Krupat in his discussion of "traditional cultures," by which, in this context, he assumedly means precolonial Native American cultures unaffected by European settler cultures (hence the past tense in the following excerpt). In Krupat's (1996, 17) words,

> traditional cultures neither conceptualize nor linguistically articulate the generalized abstract categories of philosophy, literature, and religion. Indeed, the absence of such categories has frequently been asserted not as a lack but as a positivity: Native cultures were holistic, unified, integral. Of course they did not rigidly separate the esthetic, religious, or philosophical dimensions of human experience, one from another.

Although Krupat is referring to categories at a very general level, this view also challenges more specific categorical binaries and hierarchical systems of knowledge. As Allen (1983, 6) explains, the Judeo-Christian worldview is hierarchical, with God at the top of the hierarchy, man second, and lastly, women and all creatures under the rule of man. Such priorities, hierarchies and dualities are not part of traditional Native societies, because of their belief in egalitarianism as opposed to unevenness, which, Allen argues, provides the basis of Western ethnocentrism (ibid., 7). Both Allen and Krupat expand their arguments to all American Indian cultures, which makes their assertions

susceptible to criticism.[11] Krupat's arguments also lack grounding in theory and evidence to support his argument. He also ignores in his discussion that knowledge in these cultures was passed orally, which certainly affects the production of meaning; the lack of a fixed, processed and neatly organized written form allows a certain fluidity and changeability of information as opposed to knowledge that is collected, studied, catalogued and arranged into hierarchies.

Nevertheless, the arguments made by Allen and Krupat are supported in the context of the Blackfeet more specifically, both in my analysis of magical realism in *FC* above, and by David Peat's analysis of the Blackfoot language; Peat (2002, 7) explains that the way knowledge is constructed in the Algonkian-speaking cultures like Blackfoot, is marked with an absence of clear-cut categories, as "all that exists is an expression of relationships, alliances, and balances between what, for lack of better words, we could call energies, powers or spirits." Categories imply a fixity of objects, which goes against this view, in which "[t]he whole notion of flux and process is fundamental" (ibid.). Peat continues that the Blackfoot language is based on verbs rather than nouns, which means that emphasis is placed on "direct experience" rather than fixed categorizations (ibid.). This aspect of the Blackfoot way of constructing meaning is specified further in the linguistic analysis of Blackfoot provided by Leroy Little Bear and Ryan Heavy Rain (1994), who explain that the Blackfoot language, niitsi'powahsin, contains no "recognizable morphemes, lexemes, or sentences, nor such classes as nouns or verbs." Although this goes against Peat's argument that verbs are the founding element in Blackfoot, Little Bear and Heavy Rain do show that action is embedded in most words. For instance, one of the many Blackfoot words for 'book' or 'text' is *sinaakia'tsisi*, which directly translates to 'facilitates the generation of images' (ibid.). The word for 'fork' is *iihtáóoyo'pa*, which is translated by Donald Frantz (1991, 120) as 'that one eats with'. An Indo-European model of speech and thought, which is based on categories, is therefore a

[11] As noted before, Allen has been criticized for disregarding the heterogeneity of Native American cultures. Krupat's "paradoxical attribution of homogeneity to indigenous Americans" has also been noted by Sequoya-Magdaleno (1995, 94), who, by "paradoxical attribution," is referring to Krupat's strong criticism against essentialization of Native cultures elsewhere (e.g. Krupat 1996, 5).

burdensome tool in understanding Blackfoot sense of meaning (Little Bear and Heavy Rain 1994). For Welch, consequently, this means that there is an unbreachable gap in relating this aspect of Blackfoot while writing in English, which is nevertheless something Welch is attempting to do through the use of loan translations.

4.2 Language and the Pikuni Experience

Fixing meaning is at the very core of stereotyping; Bhabha (1986, 165) explains that the stereotype is a construction of the colonial subject within an apparatus of power that circulates the knowledge of the colonial subject as a "limited form of otherness" or a "fixed form of difference." In this chapter I will show that Welch manages to dissociate meaning from fixed images or symbols and instead, he draws attention to the experience of things and the dynamic interaction with the surrounding conditions. Welch, who lists Hemingway as one of his literary influences (Lupton 2004, 5), uses a technique similar to Hemingway's translations from Spanish in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940), where a direct translation, or calque, is used instead of the English equivalent to retain the flavor of the original language while writing in English. The meaning of the calques in *FC* is often deductible from the word itself, as with *the ice-that-looks-back* for 'mirror' (16), or from its context, as with *White man's disease*, which one of Owl Child's gang members is suffering from; "He had drunk half a jug of whiskey two days ago and the poison was still in his guts" (208). Sometimes the gloss is given, as with "white man's water, the Napikwans' whiskey" (9). In most cases, however, the final meanings of the loan translations are up to the reader to decipher, because the publishers do not provide a glossary.

Like Hemingway, Welch is not a Native Speaker of the language the loan translations are taken from. In *FC*, Welch employs a kind of synthesis of Blackfoot language and Standard English both in the narrative voice as well as the dialogue. Ashcroft et al. (1989, 59) connect this hybridity of languages to all postcolonial texts; they see this language variance as a metonym, or, "the part which stands for the whole" (ibid., 52). In other words, although Ashcroft et al. explicitly refute theories of language relativity (ibid., 53 and 57)—that language somehow embodies culture—they

recognize that language functions as a symbol of a different cultural context; a difference in language reflects a difference in culture[12]. In Owens' (1992, 162) words,

> Throughout the novel Welch has attempted to convey the texture and sense of Blackfoot speech not only by insinuating numerous literal 'translations' of Blackfoot terms . . . but also through a careful manipulation of English syntax. Writing predominantly simple declarative sentences and avoiding complex syntactical constructions, Welch attempts the nearly impossible feat of conveying a feeling of one language through another while simultaneously avoiding the clichéd formal pidgin of Hollywood Indians.

Even though Welch's use of language emphasizes the difference of experience for members from different cultures, the thought world he represents is not unequivocally Pikuni. As Ashcroft et al. (1989, 53) explain,

> such uses of language as untranslated words do have an important function in inscribing difference. They signify a certain cultural experience which they cannot hope to reproduce but whose difference is validated by the new situation. In this sense they are directly metonymic of that cultural difference which is imputed by the linguistic variation.

Welch's calques are, more appropriately, "near-translations" because they do not directly communicate cultural content. Shanley (1991, 248) raises the question whether Indian authors can ever be "fluent in the thought-world of languages they do not speak and have never spoken fluently." It can be argued that Welch is not a plausible interpreter for the Pikuni culture because he is not an expert on the Blackfoot language and his interpretation relies on secondary information. However, the same can be said for the representation of any historical periods of time. Although Welch cannot recreate the worldviews of the nineteenth century Pikuni Indians, he manages to give the reader a glimpse of a way of perceiving the world that differs from Western conceptions of knowledge. By using the word *sticky-mouth* (52), rather than 'bear', for example, the novel draws attention to how the experience of a bear is not the same for members of different cultures. In this way, Welch thus manages to show that Western forms of knowledge are not the only way of perceiving the world and challenge the claims to universality made by these forms. Linguistically,

---

[12] Despite Ahcroft et al.'s repeated disavowal of this theory, Native critics like Jace Weaver strongly speak for the role of language as both a shaper and a reflection of culture; for Weaver, (1997, 12–13) language is indisputably a bearer of culture and worldview.

Welch's language variance also functions as an alternative to the standard varieties of English, challenging their dominance; Ashcroft et al. (1989, 7) state that Received Standard English is the universal norm as far as English is concerned. However, their argument is somewhat outdated or at least regionally limited as in the United States, the norm leans towards Standard American English.

Ashcroft et al. (ibid., 66) argue that, in postcolonial texts, omitting glossing of words taken from the indigenous language draws attention to "the fundamental importance of the situating context in according meaning. . . . the use of the word, even in an English-language context, confers the meaning, rather than any culturally hermetic referentiality." Welch's calques have the same effect because of their dependence on context. This interdependency becomes a symbol of a dynamic and interactive world; there is a constant fluidity and changeability of things and nothing is petrified or fixed in time and space. This fluidity of meaning reflects Allen's (1983, 15) general assertion that "an enduring sense of the fluidity and malleability, or creative flux, of things" is the "distinguishing characteristic" at the core of American Indian thought.

The language in *FC* also creates a strong sense of the real by forcing the reader to search the context for any clues for the meaning of the unfamiliar concepts Welch uses. The referent's interaction with the environment, its experience of its surroundings and dynamism become the focus of attention and the object itself is moved to the background. The first mention of *long-legs* in *FC* is as follows;

> Once he came upon two long-legs who had locked antlers during a fight and were starving to death. Both animals were on their knees, their tongues hanging out of their mouths. Although they were large animals, their haunches had grown bony and their ribs stuck out. White Man's Dog felt great pity for the once-proud bulls (47).

The actual experience of the animal is highlighted over any simulacra or fixed textbook symbols of it. This technique is thus reversing the postmodern phenomenon Baudrillard (1988, 167) calls "liquidation of all referentials." If the narrator was to use the word "bear" instead of "sticky-mouth" (52), for example, it would immediately summon the generic concept of the animal independent of all action or experience. One might think of bears familiar from popular culture; people are generally more familiar with the simulacra, such as teddy bears and Winnie the Poohs than with

living wild bears. The simulacra associated with Wolverine (118), Fools Crow's power animal, would be even more misleading for contemporary readers familiar with the character of Wolverine[13] from popular representations such as Marvel Comics, the *X-Men* films, video games and an animated television series. Similar tendency is detectable in Okanagan, the native tongue of Jeanette Armstrong. Her analysis of the word *kekwep* ('dog'), which translates roughly to 'little furred life', reveals that "no kekwep can ever be just a dog" because there is no fixed symbol for a dog in the Okanagan language (Armstrong 1998, 190). In other words, every kekwep is significant in its own, unique way, because the word is an experience of the unique entity, rather than

> an inanimate generic symbol for all dogs, independent of action and isolated from everything else, as though a dog without context and without anything to which it is connected could really exist. It must be a frightful experience to be a dog in English (ibid.).

By using collective terms such as "the Lone Eaters" for the Blackfeet in *FC* instead of the generic term "Indian," Welch avoids the connotations the term brings with it; for a non-Native reader especially, "Indian" readily summons the stereotypes associated with the white images of Indians, as argued in 2.2.

A related effect of the calques in *FC* is that they work in the favor of alienating the reader from even the most familiar concepts. Chester (2001, 94) argues that "Welch defamiliarizes the language, culture, and historical events that characterize non-Native perceptions of Blackfoot life. He recontextualizes these through the point of view of the Blackfeet themselves." Indeed, a process of defamiliarization, as defined by Shklovsky, is at work in Welch's writing. Shklovsky (1988, 20) argues that art functions in a way that helps the individual "recover the sensation of life;" its function is to make perception less habitual by delaying and complicating it, by replacing the habitual knowledge of something with a prolonged sensation of it. Tolstoy, for example, "describes an object as if he were seeing it for the first time, an event as if it were happening for the first time"

---

[13] The character first appeared in 1974 in the comic book *The Incredible Hulk* #181 by Marvel Comics.

(ibid., 21). The calques in *FC* can be read as "material obviously created to remove the automatism of perception" (ibid., 27). Welch forces the reader to perceive colonial history from a new perspective. The reader is made to think rather than encouraged to cut corners with immediate connotations attached to concepts familiar from history; Welch uses words like *blue-coated seizers* (15) for the United States Cavalry. The American President is referred to as *White Father Chief* (95), *the great Grandfather in the east* (158) and with the Blackfoot word *Ka-ach-sino* (ibid.). Welch's calques defamiliarize the familiar concepts and give new perspective to popular history. At the same time, the familiar notions to Americans are exotized and othered because they are perceived as for the first time, from a new point of view.

Welch takes a risk with the use of his calques, because they may reinforce a stereotypical notion of Indians as simplistic as opposed to the civilized Euro-Americans. Indeed, some of the calques seem quite straightforward; 'the buffalo' are *blackhorns* (12), because their horns are black, for example. Sometimes the stranger concepts have no name in the Pikuni language, and they need to be explained, often resulting in long and cumbersome explanations, such as *a small square opening covered with the white man's ice-shield* for 'a window' (321). Indeed, many English concepts are strange to the Pikunis, and they are explained without ever using the English word; *the white sand that makes things sweet* (16) is 'sugar', *a stick that squirted black juice* (271) is 'a pen' and *round shiny things* (228) are 'plates'. The notion of low intelligence may also be reinforced by the agrammatical constructions that appear in the novel, such as "there was talk around" (9) or to have "a big say with the Napikwan chiefs" (15). As with other stereotypes, this is a matter of interpretation, however. Welch's calques, more than anything, call Euro-American norms into question by introducing another way of knowing. Citing Ashcroft et al., Owens (1992, 158) explains the effect of Welch's language;

> If language "becomes the medium through which a hierarchical structure of power is perpetuated, and the medium through which conceptions of 'truth', order', and 'reality' become established," the primary structure of power (and epistemology) in the world of *Fools Crow* still belongs to the Blackfeet.

Indeed, the truth, order and reality in *FC* are defined in Pikuni terms, or, at least Welch is able to communicate his approximation of Pikuni ways of knowing. Power is thus re-established to the Pikunis by giving them control over language and meaning.

4.3 Humanization and Cultural Variety

Barry (1991–1992, 17) argues that the Blackfeet are "[f]amous to the white culture as elusive and fearsome warriors who dominated the northwest plains." I doubt the specific tribe is "famous" for anything to "the white culture" at large, at least outside North America, but many may indeed associate the "fearsome warriors" part with Indians generally. Barry's description is highly evocative of the warlike savage myth (see 2.3), which is present in *FC*; there are several conflicts between the rival groups of Indians in the novel and the level of violence in these encounters is high. The novel certainly abides with Grinnell's (2001, 242) observation that "[t]he Blackfeet were a warlike people" (notice the past tense). Traditionally, the bloodthirsty savage imagery is used to describe Indian brutalities against innocent settlers, as in the popular dime novels of the nineteenth century and in early western films. This aspect of the stereotype is detectable in the novel's renegade Owl Child of Mountain Chief's band, who wreaks havoc among the white ranchers (*FC*, 241). Lupton (2004, 93) reads the character as "Welch's version of the savage, murdering, scalp-hunting Indian." Eventually, the actions of Owl Child's group lead to the Massacre of the Marias, where Heavy Runner's band is slaughtered by the United States Cavalry. If the level of violence and images of scalping, for example, are used as the measure of savagery, most of the Pikuni warriors in the novel can be described as savages. Many of the violent images in *FC* stand out in their brutality, as in the detailed account of White Man's Dog scalping the Crow leader (147) and in the rituals involving self-mutilation; in a ceremony at the Sun Dance, which is described in careful detail, White Man's Dog is mutilated with a grizzly claw and skewers are punctured through his chest (116–17). During the ritual, White Man's Dog dances fiercely in all directions until he jerks himself loose from the skewers that are attached with strings to the top of the Medicine pole at the center of the lodge (ibid.). By jerking himself free, White Man's Dog leaves strips of his flesh

hanging from the skewers, and the pieces of flesh are then used as an offering to Sun Chief (117). That night, White Man's Dog dreams a powerful dream of Wolverine, his power animal (ibid.). Although the narration does not explicitly say so, the dream is a direct consequence of White Man's Dog's self-torture. Arthur Versluis (in Lupton 2014, 100) explains that it is not uncommon that the self-torture practiced at the Sun Dance results in a powerful vision dream. The feat of self-torture thus functions as an intermediary between its performer and the spiritual world. Indeed, in *FC*, the Pikuni ceremonies ease the Pikunis' access to the dimension of reality, where they are able to commune with the most powerful creatures and spirits in their world. The motivation behind the self-mutilation, then, cannot be reduced to an intrinsic savagery, because ceremonies like this have a clear purpose for the Pikunis.

The novel also shows that the violent acts the Pikunis commit are not easy for them; White Man's Dog is repulsed when he scalps a Crow leader, and vomits after the act (148) even though later, under the influence of *white man's water* ('whiskey'), he dances on the scalp and makes fun of the Crow who it belonged to (152). Fox Eyes, a Pikuni war chief, recalls how after killing a famed Gros Ventre warrior, he "had brought back his enemy's head on his lance, and the Pikuni women had kicked it around before roasting it on a fire" (138). The exceedingly violent moment in his life made Fox Eyes lose "the desire to make his enemies pay dearly, to ride among them with a savage heart" (139–40). This is the only time the word "savage" is used in *FC*. The high levels of gory violence in *FC* can reinforce the conception of Indians as bloodthirsty savages especially if the reader is accustomed to this kind of imagery and is already predisposed to see them as such; as Ross (2003, 31) suggests, people tend to "view the details of a story, not in their own particulars, but in their tendency either to exemplify or to contradict a social or cultural norm." For anyone who perceives violent behavior typical of Indians, the novel thus probably reinforces this view. The most extreme imagery, however, is given after the Massacre of the Marias, which makes the white cavalry responsible for the most ruthless violence in *FC*; as Fools Crow approaches the site of the massacre, he is almost able to taste "the smell of burnt skin" and one of the first things he comes

across is a body; "It was an infant and its head was black and hairless. Specks of black ash lay in its wide eyes" (380). Fools Crow begins to distinguish the other bodies as well; "There was skin and hair and eyes. There were teeth and bone and arms and legs" (ibid.). The devastating imagery efficiently establishes the white men as the real savages in the novel.

Nevertheless, many of the white characters in *FC* perceive Indians as savages and are fearful of them, even if they have never met one; at the Blackfoot agency, one of the white soldiers looks up at Rides-at-the-door's "fierce Indian face" and even though he has never seen an Indian before, "he had heard stories of savagery and deceit" (272). This view of Indians reflects the popular imagery of the time period in the novel; in the latter half of the nineteenth century newspapers scandalized Indian attacks and dime novels grew in popularity, circulating the imagery of the bloodthirsty savage, as noted earlier. When the Lone Eaters visit a white merchant's trading house, the merchant's wife "was smiling but there was a look of fear in her eyes" (99). Later in the novel, a Confederate deserter from Georgia is waylaid by Owl Child's group of renegades while urinating; at first, he feels embarrassed, but "As he looked into the dark face the earlier feelings gave way to a brilliant fear" (294). Indeed, *FC* reflects how the white people of its time period saw Indians as murderous savages.

The noble counterpart of the bloodthirsty savage is less detectable in *FC*. The Pikuni do have a bond with nature, as discussed above, but this is hardly evidence of their conformity with the stereotype. In his discussion of *FC*, McFarland (2000, 121) notes that "[t]he 'nobility' of the Indian is no less of a stereotype than the 'savagery.'" What he means by this is that any defining characteristics, whether positive or negative, is bound to be stereotypical, because such descriptions do not encompass the great variety of human beings even within a relatively small caption of people, such as the Pikunis. Indeed, as noted earlier, stereotyping entails the idea of a shared group essence and the liquidation of all differences between the members of the group. *FC* efficiently contests any such ideas by displaying the heterogeneity of Blackfoot Indians; in *FC*, there are well over twenty different tribes and bands living in the relatively small area in the Montana territory,

where the story takes place. The Pikunis in the novel do not identify themselves with generic notions such as Indians or even the Blackfeet. Even though contemporary Blackfoot Indians refer to themselves as the Blackfeet, the name is of non-Native origin, like many of the tribal names in use today (LaVonne Ruoff, quoted in Barry 1991–1992, 17; Lyle Campbell 2000, 6). The Pikunis in *FC* identify themselves mostly with the name of the specific bands they belong to; Fools Crow's band is the Lone Eaters, for example, which Grinnell (2001, 209) lists as one of the two dozen Pikuni bands. As for the Pikunis, they are one of the three bands the Blackfeet consist of (3). Only some of the non-Blackfeet Indians in the novel are referred to with the tribe name: *the Parted Hairs* (4, 'the Sioux'), *the Entrails People* (4, 'the Gros Ventre') and *the Spotted Horse People* (21, 'the Cheyenne'), for example. The bands consist of even more specific subgroups Welch calls societies, the All Friends society, for instance, which again is divided into the Braves, the Dogs and Tails, the Raven Carriers and the All Crazy Dogs (43–44). The Pikuni thus form a complex social system with groups that have varying opinions about tribal issues and different roles within the community. The great variety within the community resists any pan-Indian generalizations and forces the reader to recognize the heterogeneity of even the smallest bands.

The different tribes in *FC* are not seen as a harmonious whole; some of the other tribes are friendly and others, like the Crow, the Sioux and the Gros Ventre, are rivals to the Pikuni. The novel also demonstrates that members from different bands dress differently (182) and that the different tribes speak different languages that are unintelligible to each other; Yellow Kidney understands a little of the Crow tongue, but does not understand Cheyenne and relies on a sign language shared by the tribes in the area to understand them (74, 79–80). The character names in *FC* also function as a counterstatement of the homogeneity of Indians often assumed in the white images of Indians. Rather than presenting Indians as a generalized, anonymous mass, like the backdrop Indians discussed in 3.2, there is an approximation of a hundred Indian names given in *FC*. Conversely, many of Welch's white men remain nameless. The four-page recount of an episode through a white rancher's perspective, which is the longest section centered on a white character in

the novel, leaves the rancher anonymous, as he is constantly referred to as "the big man" (241–44). The protagonist, conversely, has three names during his lifetime; his birth name was Sinopa, before he was named White Man's Dog at the age of nine (218). Later in his life, Fools Crow gains his new name through his accomplishments against the Crow, as noted earlier. McClintock (1910, 399–400) explains that it was a common practice among the Blackfeet that the male members of the tribe earned several names.

The strongest counterstatement against any stereotypes made by Welch is his representation of the Pikunis as human beings. According to Büken (2002, 46), Native Americans from the WASP perspective are not "flesh and blood ordinary humans with vices and virtues, sufferings and joys, failures and accomplishments." Indeed, as opposed to complex human beings, the white images of Indians continue to dehumanize Indians by objectifying them and turning them into caricatures, which has historically been done in order to make it acceptable to subjugate them (Ganje 2003, 117; Merskin 1998, 334). Welch, by contrast, "humanizes the Indian victims of a bloody history and reveals a vital Native culture through Indian characters that contrast with stereotypical representations of the 'Indian' lying in the white imagination," as noted by Chester (2001, 93). By emphasizing the variety, the complexity and the emotional side of the Pikunis, the novel efficiently resists dehumanization of Indians and their stereotyping into clear-cut categories of "the good" and "the bad Indian." Merskin recognizes this kind of method as vital in the ongoing struggle against stereotyped portrayals of American Indians; she argues, "[b]y representing Native Americans as they are in the present, as viable human beings, the media can help eradicate stereotypical beliefs" (1998, 342). Like Büken before, Merskin also emphasizes the need to update the images of precolonial Indians by replacing them with authentic images of contemporary Indians, which of course, is a viable suggestion even though historical representations are also important in rewriting the frontier experience from the Indian point of view.

Not only are Welch's Pikuni characters capable of both moral and immoral actions, the reasons behind their actions are often complicated. The story manages to portray the ambivalence of

human nature; the same character can be heroic at times and cowardly at others or rise from hopelessness to triumph, like the novel's protagonist. Welch's Pikunis make mistakes and go through life altering changes. In fact, all the major characters in *FC* go through changes. The Pikunis in *FC* are thus nothing like the static and passive white man's Indian. The changes in Fast Horse start to manifest early in the novel; he no longer makes fun of White Man's Dog, he is no longer boastful and unlike before, he is morose all the time (48). His father refers to his condition as a "mysterious illness" and believes it is caused by a bad spirit (ibid.). White Man's Dog is going through changes from early on as well; he notices that he has gained respect among the tribe "as though he had grown up and hadn't noticed that his clothes no longer fit him" (52). Even minor characters go through changes; Heavy Shield Woman is thoroughly affected by her experience as Sacred Vow Woman at the Sun Dance; "Someday soon I will appear as I was before, but I will always be different—in here," she says, thumping her chest (131). The most profound changes in *FC*, however, happen to the whole tribe communally. After a smallpox epidemic hits the Lone Eaters camp, the change is apparent; "Gradually they emerged from the deep void of sickness and death and saw that they had become a different people" (371). According to Owens (1992, 28), many Native American novelists are rewriting "the long-cherished, static view of Indian lives and cultures." Welch is undeniably among these writers. The example above is also a powerful counterstatement to the vanishing race myth, because it emphasizes the resilience of the Pikunis.

Despite the novel's humanization of the Pikuni characters, *FC* also repeats many of the pop images that dominate white images of Indians; Welch's Pikunis yelp, hoot, whoop, yip and yodel (16, 133, 145, 294). They wear war bonnets and regalia (133) or breechcloths and moccasins (17) when they are not shirtless (133). They hang feathers from their hair (12) and paint their faces with war paint (20), sometimes their bodies too (133). They believe in evil spirits (23) and the Great Spirit (245). They live in tipis (25), hunt the buffalo (179), enjoy trading (99) and smoke pipes (44). As they go on war trails (135) they carry bows with feathered arrows for weapons (26) in addition to some firearms they have acquired from trading with the white people. On top of it all, they drum,

chant and dance, as made explicit in the description of the Sun Dance Ceremony; "And always there were the drums, the singing and dancing" (114). Most of the images listed above are firmly engraved in the image of the white man's Indian (see Ganje 2003, for example); they are therefore often judged as stereotypical when they appear in popular culture. Welch's novel even repeats what Berkhofer (1979, 89) labels as the "quintessential American Indian:" Indians as buffalo hunters of the prairie. None of the elements listed above, however, have caught the critics' attention, probably at least partly because Welch is a Native American and because his novel represents high culture. Popular culture, on the other hand, especially when produced by non-Natives, cannot escape criticism of such portrayals, as noted previously. *FC* benefits from its genre, the novel, which leaves more room for elaborate detail. Films, on the other hand, have hardly any room for such detail, as it is difficult to write great amounts of background knowledge in the lines and images films rely on. Films must also keep up the pace and "cut to the chase" to captivate the viewers and they do not have time for the development of complex screen personalities. As O'Connor (2011, 31) points out, "without a narrator, the audience's perception of what the characters say and do (and what other characters say about them) is all there is to delineate their personalities."

FC, by contrast, creates a sense of authenticity in the novel's careful attention to detail; the reader is let in on the intricacies of the daily life in the Pikuni community with the minutiae of Pikuni customs and the fabrication and use of Pikuni commodities and utilities, for example. In the following excerpt, the narrator describes how all the different parts of a buffalo carcass are used:

> Although the women possessed kettles and steel knives, they still preferred to make spoons and dippers out of the horns of the blackhorn. They used the hair of the head and beard to make braided halters and bridles and soft-padded saddles. They used the hoofs to make rattles or glue, and the tails to swat flies. And they dressed the dehaired skins to make lodge covers and linings and clothes and winding cloths (47).

This is just one of the numerous instances of the elaborate detail employed in the novel, which gives the reader a strong sense of the real. The method is also in direct opposition with stereotyping, where certain features are simplified and generalized. The attention to detail increases the novel's credibility because it is more difficult to deny the truth value behind images when the full story

behind them is accounted for. For example, wearing war paint or smoking pipes extend in the novel far beyond the visual images films rely on; White Man's Dog (23) paints himself to "gain the strength and cunning necessary to be successful," while Tonto's face paint in *LR* remains unexplained. *FC* also specifies several purposes for smoking pipes in the Pikuni community, many of which are ceremonial and sacred. A special red pipe is used to see if a man is being truthful; Three Bears watches Fools Crow smoke the pipe and finds that "Fools Crow knows the power of this pipe and he smokes it with a true heart" (173).

The peace pipe is probably a concept known to most Americans and even throughout the Western world outside the United States. Many may deem it stereotypical only because of the popularity of the image, not basing the argument on actual knowledge of pipe smoking practices among Native American tribes. Indeed, ignorance is often targeted as the source of stereotypes, as in *LR*, which consistently attempted to turn the joke on the white man, creating an archetypal model of the ignorant white man. All the Pikuni customs are not explained in full, however; the novel does not give any background information of the Pikunis' practice of scalping, for example. Ganje (2003, 115) explains that scalping was not practiced among any Indian tribes until it was introduced to them by the Euro-Americans, who started to pay bounties for Indian scalps. The practice is widespread among the Pikunis in the novel, and they wear the scalps as emblems, but no further information is given (313). The ceremonies and rituals also remain restricted; even though there are many ceremonies in the novel, the private rituals, songs and prayers involved are not given, nor are the final meanings behind the ceremonies. The sanctity of the rituals thus remains intact and the narration does not risk commodification of Pikuni culture or secularization of what the Pikunis hold sacred.

Many of the pop images in the list above have to do with appearance. In *FC*, the attention does not linger on the visual image of the Indians as it does in films and the Pikunis' appearance does not thus stand out in the novel. Moreover, instead of focusing on the description of the appearance of Indians, *FC* generally limits elaborate descriptions to the landscape and natural

phenomena instead. The description of women, for example, is not very comprehensive because it is limited to the features that highlight them as objects of sexual desire, as I will show in a moment. There is no detailed description of the protagonist, whose appearance remains up to the reader's imagination. White Man's Dog's build and hair are briefly alluded to close to the beginning, but even then, somewhat more attention is given to the appearance of Fast Horse (20). The protagonist is not described further until a brief deliberation from his wife's perspective; in Red Paint's eyes, Fools Crow "gave the appearance of burly health, of color and strength" and "his width and low gravity made one think of the real-bear. Even his gait furthered that impression" (188). The features of Fools Crow that are mentioned, as well as the comparison to a grizzly bear (*real-bear*), all insinuate his strength and stamina, not so much his facial or bodily features, as with the female characters. Interestingly, Red Paint's description of Fools Crow entails the notion of "color," the importance of which is significant in Bhabha's discussion of the colonial stereotype. In the example above, the color remains unspecified, but it is connected with positive images of health and strength. This, arguably, repeats the strategy of inversion as explained in 2.1. By not drawing attention to the Pikunis' appearance, the novel leaves it up to the reader to picture them. Although the Pikunis are thus not othered or exotized through narration, the Pikunis may still be associated with stereotyped imagery; non-Native readers fill the gaps left by narration with their own images of Indians and, more often than not, the only images familiar to them are the ones distributed by the mass media.

Even so, by omitting description of the Pikunis' appearance, attention is shifted away from the physical image of the characters and more importance is given to things outside appearances. The feathers worn by the characters function as an example of this; many popular images of Indians, such as the sports logos mentioned in 2.3, portray Indians wearing feathers in their hair. An online image search with the search term "Indian" or "American Indian" reveals that an Indian chief with a massive, feathered war bonnet is the most popular image of Indians in the Internet. In *LR*, Tonto's hair is adorned with two eagle feathers, just like Yellow Kidney's in *FC*. The difference is

that in *LR*, the meaning of the feathers is left unexplained and they may thus seem an inconsiderate repetition of a stereotype. However, the Comanche advisor, Voelker (quoted in Flagstaff 2013), explains that in what he calls "bird cultures," the feathers have a strong symbolic significance because they conjure the power of the whole bird to their carrier. In *FC*, conversely, the visual image of feathers, is introduced only briefly, and more emphasis is given to their meaning, as shown in the following excerpt; "Later that day a pair of golden eagles followed the party for a way, and again Yellow Kidney felt good, for they would give him eyes to see far off. Part of his war medicine was in the two eagle feathers he wore in his hair" (12). The attention then shifts back to the eagles. The emphasis is on the feathers' significance; indeed, they are not for decorative purposes, but, similarly to Voelker's view on bird cultures, the feathers are worn by the Pikunis for "war medicine," which roughly translates to fortune in battle. As an unfamiliar concept for especially the non-Native readership, the "war medicine" is probably what catches the reader's attention more than the feathers.

Even with the careful attention to cultural detail, heterogeneity and humanity of the Pikunis, Welch's representation is not comprehensive. As noted by Ruppert (1996, 113), works by Native American authors are not "anthropological data" or "windows on culture." They, too, are only partial representations that express the views of the individual author and reflect their social, political and cultural circumstances. This becomes evident in Welch's representation of the subaltern groups (discussed in 2.2), especially the Pikuni women. Using Alexie's "powerful, magic female characters" as an example, Liu and Zhang (2011, 111) make the generalization that "Indian tribes are predominantly matriarchal." Paraphrasing Patrice Eunice Marie Hollrah, they argue that "men and women play different but equally important roles in the Indian society" (ibid., 114). Despite their reference to Alexie's criticism of "pan-Indianism" in the same paragraph, Liu and Zhang comfortably make this generalization about "the Indian society" at large (ibid.). Although the Pikuni in *FC* do have important roles for women, most notably the demanding duties of Sacred Vow Woman at the Sun Dance Ceremony (109–14), I argue that the Pikuni community, as

presented in *FC*, is highly patriarchal and women, similarly to many Western cultures, are seen as the weaker sex. Barbara Cook (2000, 443) argues that Welch's representation of Pikuni women in *FC* is "fully rounded" and they are "crucial to the survival of the tribal community." Although I do not deny that the Pikuni women's tasks keep the Pikuni community up and running, most of the women's tasks described in *FC* involve taking care of the household or crafts, such as beadwork and tanning hides (47 and 53). The trivialization of women's work is made explicit in the dialogue; mocking Fools Crow, Owl Child (234) tells Fast Horse, "Perhaps he wishes to make you new moccasins. We hear the Lone Eater men are good at women's work."

The disparaging attitudes towards women become clear in the many invectives, such as "near-woman" (6) and "squats-like-women" (77), that men use to mock each other. Women are seen as weak and cowardly; "Are we going to run like women?" one of the Pikuni warriors asks when a war party of Pikuni warriors are frightened by a solar eclipse (144). Femininity, in *FC*, symbolizes cowardice; because the Lone Eaters do not choose to fight the white men, Fast Horse says that they "wear the dresses of women," by which he means that they are pathetic cowards for not standing up for themselves (235). Indeed, there is no doubt that the community favors men, especially capable warriors. Men are the unequivocal norm, which becomes evident in Fast Horse's declaration, "We will make those Crows cry. Perhaps we will make their women cry too" (8). The group nominator "Crows," then, actually refers to Crow men, excluding women (and children). I do not agree with Cook's (2000, 449) argument that the women in *FC* possess a "hidden economic power," because they are completely stripped of power. They have no say in important decisions concerning the tribe or the family, the do not participate in the important traditions of the tribe, such as telling stories or in ceremonies apart from the ones involved with the Sacred Vow Woman's duties.

In addition to the disparaging attitudes above, the women are portrayed as objects of the men's sexual desire. As Seiter (1986, 19) points out, gendered "stereotypes usually describe all women in terms of their personal relationships to men and in terms of their sexuality." The

description of Fools Crow's love interest, Red Paint, focuses on her womanly features and desirability from the male point of view; as Fools Crow watches her, he notices her mouth and the shape of her body, which make him feel desire for her (48). His attention is mostly focused on the physical changes in Red Paint, who is turning into a woman (53, 64). Some attention is given to her hair (53), eyes (ibid.) and skin (115), but even after Fools Crow has married her, he mostly focuses on the shape of her body (169). White Man's Dog displays sexual interest also towards Kills-close-to-the-lake who is described from Fools Crow's perspective; "She was slender but her breasts and hips were round" (118). The attention is focused on the breasts, even when a female character, Double Strike Woman, is described from her own point of view; Double Strike Woman reflects on her disposition towards her husband's second wife, feeling "strange; not betrayed, exactly, but forgotten . . . Her heart was a heavy thing beneath her full breasts" (219–20). Drawing attention to her "full breasts" seems odd in combination with the character's own inner voice.

The naming of the Pikunis in *FC* also reflects women's inferiority in the community; a clear majority of the Pikuni names for females in *FC* entail the notion of womanhood: Cutting-off-Head Woman (15), Little Bird Woman (87) and Heard-by-both-sides Woman (109), among others. Sometimes the women in *FC* remain nameless or identified merely as somebody's wife; "Even the men did not want to miss the latest story about Two Stab's wife" (220). Maleness, on the other hand, is the assumed norm, which becomes evident in the names of the male characters; maleness is expressed explicitly in only two names, Good Young Man (42) and Everybody-talks-about-*him* (110, my emphasis). The mere number of male characters in comparison with women speaks for the importance of men over women; of the around a hundred characters named in *FC*, less than twenty are female. This is interesting especially because the novel insinuates that women are a majority in the Pikuni community; death rate for men was greater because "many men did not return from the hunt, the horse-taking, the war trail" (41). The fact that polygamy is a common practice among Welch's Pikunis also supports my argument above.

Despite their numbers, the women are a marginalized group in *FC*, because they are portrayed as weaklings and cowards, they do not get their voices heard, they have no power and they are reduced to objects of male desire, as noted above. The overtly sexual portrayal of women in *FC*, along with the unevenly distributed power relations in the Pikuni community, refutes any claims for matriarchal or bilateral social structure made by Liu and Zhang (2011, 111) or Cook (2000, 449). It can be argued that in its representation of the subaltern, *FC* confirms the patriarchal nature of Euro-American society by reaffirming similar internal structures. The patriarchal Pikuni society can be typed among what Larry Gross and Suzanne Jeffries-Fox (quoted in Seiter 1986, 21) label as "accurate reflections of the sexist reality of our [American] society."

Barbara Mann (2006, 120) argues that there is a "glaring omission of [women] in virtually any meaningful discussion about the Indigenous." Although Welch does not completely exclude women, the male Pikuni is the assumed norm in *FC*. In *LR*, there is an even greater disregard of women, as all the scenes with Indians are focused on male characters. Furthermore, both the white man's Indian, including the stereotypes entailed in the notion, and the white man that defines him are essentially male. The only female-specific stereotype noted by critics like Kilpatrick (1999, xvii) and King (2006, 22) is the highly attractive, mythic "Indian princess" or "squaw," embodied by the title character in Disney's *Pocahontas* (1995).

4.4 Strategies of Resistance

Before, I drew attention to the importance of endings. Unlike the dying Comanche in *LR*, Welch's Pikunis survive despite the many tragedies they face and the changes their culture goes through. Welch's novel ends with the Pikunis preparing for another Sun Dance and the buffalo returning to their hunting lands; the last chapter portrays one more ceremony, and although the Pikunis are fewer in numbers, the singing and the drumming are louder than before, and the power of the Pikunis is strong (388–90). The novel's ultimate message is that of cultural survival as the last chapter of *FC* celebrates both the persistence of traditional culture and the beginning of new life, Fools Crow's new-born son, Butterfly (389). Despite the novel's focus on the precolonial, the

postcolonial existence of the Pikunis is also emphasized with the constant references to future generations (141, 359, 385). During Fools Crow's vision quest, he tells Feather Woman,

> I do not fear for my people now. As you say, we will go to a happier place, far from these Napikwans, this disease and starvation. But I grieve for our children and their children, who will not know the life their people once lived. I see them on the yellow skin and they are dressed like the Napikwans, they watch the Napikwans and learn much from them, but they are not happy. They lose their own way (359).

But Feather Woman tells him that although "Much will be lost to them," they will remember, because "The stories will be handed down" and it becomes Fools Crow's task to "prepare [his people] for the times to come" (ibid.). As Barry (1991–1992, 4) notes, Fools Crow brings back "the spiritual tools of cultural survival" from his experience with Feather Woman. It becomes of great importance to preserve traditional Pikuni culture, which Owens sees relevant for the establishment of contemporary Blackfoot identity; drawing on Ashcroft et al., Owens (1992, 157) argues that "[b]y imagining, or re-membering[14] the traditional Blackfoot world, *Fools Crow* attempts to recover the center—to revitalize the 'myths of identity and authenticity'—and thus reclaim the possibility of a coherent identity for himself and all contemporary Blackfoot people."

Many critics connect stereotyping of Indians with the ongoing annihilation of their tribal traditions. Vizenor (1989, 11), for example, uses "the brutish savage," "the noble savage" and "idiotism" as examples of stereotypes of the Indian that entail a "racist denial of tribal languages and ceremonies." For this reason, cultural survival is used as a method of resistance in Native American literatures. As Kelsey (2008, 1) writes, Native American writers communicate "unique tribal knowledges, epistemology, and philosophy [that] become vehicles for Indigenous resurgence, resistance, and survival." The survival of traditional culture, then, is as a powerful instrument of resistance even for contemporary Blackfeet and other tribes as well; DeLaney Hoffman (2012, xviii) argues that many Native American authors employ survival as an important tool to counter the unjust treatment of American Indians. Part of the process is the recovery and revitalization of

[14] Bhabha (1994, 63) defines re-membering as a painful process in which the "dismembered past" is put together "to make sense of the trauma of the present."

Native knowledges. Postcolonial theory in general foregrounds the privileged systems of canonical knowledge as opposed to what Foucault (1980, 82) calls “subjugated knowledges,” which are “located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity.” It is these knowledges that *FC* is recovering for the Blackfoot culture. Tripathy (2009, 46) argues that “the postcolonial critique should aim at restoring those devalued knowledges as the essence of native [American] identity.” Although I do not agree with Tripathy’s prescription and his definition of a core identity for Native American from the outside in, tribal knowledges are unquestionably of great importance in *FC*. Owens (1992, 166) makes a strong statement that “[i]n *Fools Crow*, Welch has accomplished the most profound act of recovery in American literature.” Although the superlative in Owens’ declaration remains dubious, there is no denying the novel’s significance as “a symbolic restoration of voice to the voiceless, history to the uprooted, legacy to the lost” (Hans Bak, quoted in Lupton 2004, 95).

Owens (1992, 158), places a strong emphasis on the precolonial historicity of *FC*, which ultimately ignores the message of hybridity in the novel. It is acknowledged in *FC* that the future brings changes for the Pikunis and adaptation to these changes becomes vital for the cultural survival of the Pikunis. Owens (ibid., 156) argues that Welch is attempting “full act of cultural recovery” of the precolonial past with *FC*. In the novel, however, the past is accepted as past and the inevitable changes for Blackfoot culture are likewise accepted. During his vision quest, Fools Crow experiences the coming changes; during a dreamlike episode, he sleeps in a “Napikwan” bed, sits at their table, and eats their food from their plates (322–23). Finally he meets Feather Woman, a sacred woman in Blackfoot mythology. With her help, Fools Crow sees visions on a yellow buffalo skin, such as “the end of the blackhorns and the starvation of the Pikunis,” and he knows there is nothing he can do to change the Pikunis’ destiny (358). Fools Crow sees children laughing and playing, with Pikuni children in similar clothes watching from the background (ibid.). The white children are happy, because they are living in “a world that they possessed” while the Pikuni

children are "quiet and huddled together, alone and foreign in their own country" (386). Fools Crow sees the Pikunis living in a world controlled by the whites.

The reader's attention thus shifts to contemporary Blackfoot Indians; their lack of sovereignty, inferior social status and alienation from the rest of American society is thus underscored. The Pikunis of the future become foreigners in their own country, a theme that surfaces in Alexie's *Smoke Signals* (1998) as well. Although Welch's novel is about precolonial history of the Pikunis while Alexie's film is about contemporary Coeur D'Alene, they communicate similar issues; in the film, a couple of Coeur D'Alene women, Velma and Lucy ask the protagonists, Victor and Thomas, if they have their passports with them as they are leaving the reservation. Thomas replies, "But it's the United States," to which Lucy exclaims, "Damn right it is! That's as foreign as it gets. Hope you two have your vaccinations!" Even though the characters all laugh wholeheartedly, the message at the core of the scene is serious. In the postcolonial context, both Welch and Alexie are drawing attention to the ongoing subalternization and neo-colonization of Native cultures. This example shows, above all, that regardless of *FC*'s publication in the eighties and setting in the precolonial past, it draws attention to contemporary concerns shared by Native American cultures nationwide. By attempting to give new perspective to colonial history and to deconstruct the colonial stereotypes non-Natives associate with American Indians, *FC* is participating in the project for Native American cultural sovereignty and still bears relevance three decades after its publication.

In the end, Fools Crow sees that even though the traditional life of the Pikuni is ending, there is still a future for them, albeit, different from what they imagined; Fools Crow feels "a peculiar kind of happiness—a happiness that sleeps with sadness" (390). The bittersweet melancholia in Fools Crow results from the simultaneous experience of both loss and survival. The novel ends with a peaceful realization that although the Pikunis no longer persist as the buffalo hunters of the Prairie they are in the beginning of the novel, their stories remain. These stories and histories from the Pikuni perspective reflect an important cultural legacy that persists through any

efforts of annihilation by the dominant culture. As Bruchac (2003, 35) puts it, referring to Native American cultures generally, “Our stories remember when people forget.”

FC communicates an acceptance of integration that is seen as unavoidable for Blackfoot survival without, at the same time, ignoring the importance of “recuperation of the traditional,” as Krupat (1996, 44) calls it. One of the most powerful statements against cultural annihilation in *FC* is uttered by Mountain Chief, the head of all the Pikunis, who simultaneously accepts hybridity as an option for the Blackfeet; in a speech he gives at the Sun Dance, Mountain Chief says, “They say that Napikwan is a way of life now. Some even suggest that we go to his schools and his churches. They say if we learn his language, we can beat him with his own words” (122). The last part echoes Shakespeare’s Caliban in *The Tempest* (2006, I.ii.364–65); “You taught me language, and my profit on’t / Is, I know how to curse.” According to Gandhi (1998, 148), Caliban’s statement reflects “the logic of protesting ‘out of’, rather than ‘against’, the cultural vocabulary of colonialism.” This is ultimately the message in *FC*, where acculturation is accepted as a necessity for Pikuni survival and its power as a tool for resistance is thus acknowledged.

In opposition to radical anti-colonialist nationalists such as Fanon, who speaks for “‘full independence’ of culture, language, and political organization” (Weaver 1997, 12), Welch’s approach is perhaps more realistic in the acceptance that the traditional culture of the colonized nation, Pikuni Indians in this case, cannot be unaffected by the colonial process, as history has shown. It is inevitable that the culture changes during the process of colonization. Kwame Anthony Appiah challenges nativist totalization in the context of African literature; he writes, “for us to forget Europe is to suppress the conflicts that have shaped our identities” (Appiah 1992, 72). However, this does not mean that the precolonial past should be forgotten. As Ella Shohat (1992, 110) notes, it is vital for cultural survival:

> Post-colonial theory’s celebration of hybridity risks an anti-essentialist condescension toward those communities obliged by circumstances to assert, for their very survival, a lost and even irretrievable past. In such cases, the assertion of culture prior to conquest forms part of the fight against continuing annihilation.

Even though acculturation is accepted in *FC*, the novel simultaneously participates in the restoration and revalidation of traditional Blackfoot culture.

Although the Pikuni in *FC* live relatively independent of the whites, their encroachment is a major concern among the Pikunis. Rides-at-the-door knows that "Napikwan had his hands around the Pikuni throat and was tightening his grip. Soon there would be nothing left of the people but their strangled bodies" (176). The Pikunis are aware that they are no match to the force they will be facing soon (177). Indeed, the power of the Euro-American culture is expressed quite explicitly, which emphasizes the hopelessness of the situation for the Pikuni and arguably portrays them as victims. Combined with the focus on the precolonial version of the Pikuni culture, this image resembles the ethnostalgia discussed in 2.3. Pity of the dying race is evoked by Rides-at-the-door, who tells Three Bears, the chief of the Lone Eaters, "We will lose our grandchildren. . . They will be wiped out or they will turn into Napikwans" (255).

Even though the Pikuni are divided in their attitudes towards the whites, all the major characters see the presence of the whites as anything but positive. The negative attitudes towards the whites, combined with their physical absence creates images of the whites as the strange and unknown other, and they are reduced to similar stereotypes as surfaced in my analysis of *LR*. The most notable of these is the treacherous and evil white man. Similarly to *LR*, in *FC*, the tables are turned and the white men are portrayed as merciless killers; Rides-at-the-door recounts how, back when Fools Crow's grandfather was alive, the Pikuni "were killed mercilessly by these new sticks-that-speak-from-afar ['guns']" possessed by the "strange creatures" (174). He says, "Many women and children were left to cry" (ibid.). What they learned from this devastation was that the only option for the Pikuni was to make peace with the white men if they wanted to survive. As Rides-at-the-door says, the Pikuni "couldn't hope to match . . . their cruelty" (176–77). Their cruelty is emphasized towards the end of the novel, as a survivor of the Massacre of the Marias, Bear Head, tells Fools Crow how the white cavalry officers walked amidst the smoking ruins of the site, talking and laughing amongst themselves after having just slaughtered everyone (384). The whites are,

from the first mention, associated with other negative characteristics as well, including “ruthless ways” and hatefulness towards the Indians; in “the Napikwan town at Many-sharp-points-ground . . . the big chiefs hated and feared the Pikunis and wished to exterminate them” (15). For the whites, the Pikunis are “like insects to be stepped on,” or at least that is how the Pikunis see it (175). Above all, the whites are different, and that difference manifests mainly in their violence; Rides-at-the-door tells his sons, “These Napikwans are different from us. They would not stop until all the Pikunis had been killed off” (89).

In addition to the unjust treatment of the Pikunis, the whites are known for their treacherous nature. The Pikunis have been promised repeatedly by the United States government that their lands are returned to them, that they receive rations and they will receive fair treatment, but the promises are never fulfilled (93, 158, 174). After the Massacre of the Marias, it becomes clear that the treachery of the white man knows no limits. The cavalry slaughters Heavy Runner’s band, even though they were after Owl Child of Mountain Chief’s band. Not only did they retaliate on the wrong band, but their leader Heavy Runner had documents to proof his band’s alliance to the whites (383–84). According to Owens (1992, 160–61) the documents Heavy Runner had are a detail based on actual eye witness reports of the massacre. Although the image of the white man in *FC* resembles the reversed stereotypes found in *LR*, they are not as easily interpreted as stereotypes because of the historicity of the events, down to intricate details. At the same time, however, the novel suggests that treacherousness is an essential characteristic shared by all white men; standing at the smoking ruins of the massacre site, Fools Crow tells the survivors the important lesson to share to future generations:

> It is good that you are alive. You will have much to teach the young ones about the Napikwans. Many of them will come into this world and grow up thinking that the Napikwans are their friends because they will be given a blanket or a tin of the white man’s water. But here, you see, this is the Napikwan’s real gift (385).

Even the few white men in the novel who first seem trustworthy end up betraying the Pikunis, which is what happens when a white priest visits the Lone Eaters camp and promises them vaccinations (304). Neither he, nor the vaccinations he promised, are never heard from again. The

only unequivocally positive image of a white man in the novel is a brief reference to the role of white anthropologists and historians similar to the ones Welch is relying on; a white man called Long Teeth once lived among the Pikunis and he was the only white man who "wanted nothing from the Pikunis but a knowledge of their ways and the opportunity to paint their faces on thin white skins he kept in his parfleche" (274). However, the example refers to a long-ago past and the whites during the actual events are no longer associated with any positive characteristics.

Actual contact between the Pikuni and the whites is minimal in the novel. In chapter ten, a group of Pikunis visits Riplinger's trading house (98); in chapter thirteen the United States Cavalry visits the Lone Eaters (153–58); chapter fourteen recounts Fools Crow coming across a white man in the Rocky Mountains (169–71); and in chapter twenty-six, a white priest visits the Lone Eaters camp (300–07). The contact that is given most attention is a meeting between a small group of Pikuni leaders with the white "seizer chiefs," including the captain of the cavalry (271–84). Because actual contact with the whites is limited to these brief instances with only a few representatives of the Pikuni present, the Pikuni rely mostly on hearsay as they form images of the white men, similarly to how the images of Indians have been formed in the American imagination. Yellow Kidney (131) has told his daughter that white men "dress like bears," but she does not know whether he is joking or not. One of the Pikunis (141) jokingly tells the others of the mixed breed children of white men and Cree women; "I have seen the offspring—they are pink like the entrails of the slippery swimmers. Even their eyes are pink." Even though most Pikunis rely on rumors to form a picture of the whites, at the same time they know that the white presence is a threat to their way of life.

Similarly to the images of Indians in white imagination, the white men in *FC* are constructed through Pikuni imagination as their counterimage. Welch inverts the traditional roles in the us/them dichotomy by placing the Pikunis at the center; in an interview with McFarland (1986, 4–5), Welch describes his writing process: "I'm writing [*FC*] from the inside-out. The white people are the real strangers. They're the threatening presence out there all the time." The whites are explicitly othered

with Welch's consistent use of the Blackfoot word *Napikwan* for white men, which remains untranslated throughout the novel and is the only Blackfoot word used consistently. In Owens' (1992, 158) words, "[t]he fact that these invaders are defined by Blackfoot language—as 'Napikwans'—underscores the Indians' sense of still controlling their world, of being the privileged center within this world wherein the whites are 'other.'" Indeed, by giving the control to the Pikunis, the novel pushes the Euro-American others to the margins; they are the unfamiliar and the foreign in the novel, the "strange creatures," as Rides-at-the-door describes them (174). By this method of inversion, *FC* is tearing open the discourse on Indianness by exposing the bias at the core of the white conceptions of Indians; by portraying the whites as the other, their position as the unequivocal center is effectively challenged. The strategy Welch is employing parallels postcolonial literary works, including Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* (1958), *Doctor Wooreddy's Prescription for Enduring the Ending of the World* (1983) by Mudrooroo Nyoongah and Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* (1981), which Ashcroft et al. (1989, 34) use as an example of postcolonial works that

> deliberately set out to disrupt European notions of 'history' and the ordering of time. . . . Received history is tampered with, rewritten, and realigned from the point of view of the victims of its destructive progress. . . . In all these texts the perspective changes to that of the 'Other.'

In these novels, the white man becomes "the other" and a position as the center is assumed by the colonized culture. The traditional roles are thus reversed. However, as argued before, the simple inversion of the hierarchy preserves the same binary logic and the status quo remains unchallenged.

FC gives only brief glimpses of the inner workings of some of the white characters' minds. Most notable of these is the episode with the Confederate army deserter mentioned earlier (289–94). For the most part, the white characters remain unfamiliar and unilateral; they are often reduced to symbolic characters that serve to foreground the deceitful and evil nature of the whites. Unlike the Pikunis, their actions often seem unmotivated by anything but their innate evilness; the white man who kills Yellow Kidney, for example, has his desire to "kill an Indian" as his only motivation (244). Welch is employing the same method with his white characters as Alexie often does; as Liu

and Zhang (2011, 111) note, Alexie often portrays his white characters as evil. By reducing the white characters to mere symbols of evilness, combined with the placement of the Indian characters at the center, Welch and Alexie are rendering the whites voiceless. Like Native Americans generally in the white discourse of Indianness, the whites are now muted and deprived of any power. Alexie's white characters are othered through a shift of perspective to the Indians; making the white readers perceive their own race through the eyes of another forces them to rethink themselves (ibid., 106). Similarly to Alexie, Welch forces the white reader to see themselves from the outside-in; the reduction of white characters, in turn, to symbolic archetypes or stereotypes is a way to retaliate the images incorporated in the white man's Indian.

Although *FC* is about reinstating the Pikunis some of the power that is deprived of them through the discourse of Indianness controlled by the white hegemony, the whites in the novel do have power, which functions in subtle ways. In her discussion on Foucault's theories of power, Gandhi (1998, 14) draws attention to the fact that power often needs no physical reinforcement. What Gandhi (ibid., 22) calls "the seductive narrative of power" can operate in a way that seduces the unknowing subject to its agenda, especially when it disguises itself in the form of "cultural enlightenment and reform" (ibid., 14). In *FC*, the Pikunis are faced with the seductive aspects of the white culture. Especially the Euro-American trade items are alluring to them; the white traders possess "the goods that would make their lives easier" (98). The narrator explains that the Pikuni have exchanged vast territories for various trade items, including "cut beads, iron kettles, knives, bells, the ice-that-looks-back ['mirror'], carrot and twist tobacco… blankets . . . Napikwan saddles, the white sand that makes things sweet, the white powder, the bitter black drink" (15–16). The notion that the Pikuni would exchange their lands to cheap trinkets parallels a stereotypical image of Indians, although Welch probably includes it as his approximation of historical facts. It is unquestionable that Welch's Pikunis enjoy bartering and display a fascination with the white commodities, which strongly invokes the Indian as barterer stereotype, especially as Welch connects it with all Pikunis in the example that follows; Riplinger, one of the white traders, is

surprised by Fools Crow's absence when the rest of Rides-at-the-door's family comes to trade, because "He hadn't known a Pikuni yet who missed a trading day" (99). The stereotype is reinforced with the Pikunis' repeated admiration of Riplinger's trade goods; Rides-at-the-door's wives "examined their new goods, sometimes exclaiming their admiration, other times speechless with awe" and his younger son, Running Fisher, was "shooting up his ammunition at things that did not need killing," excited about his new firearm (100). There is an evident reverence among the Pikunis for especially the white men's weaponry, as shown in a Pikuni warrior's account of a group of white men; "We did not wish to get mixed up with them. Their guns are big and sound like thunder. I didn't want any of my youths to piss on themselves. . . . Those guns can make a man's guts want to leave his body" (141).

Indeed, the infiltration of white culture in the Pikuni lives and its seductive effect is implicit in the many white trade items the Pikunis have adopted. Most notable of these is the horse, which was imported already in the 1540s by the Spanish settlers (Lupton 2004, 19). The horse meant profound changes for the Blackfoot culture; not only did it make travel faster and transportation easier, but as Grinnell (2001, 243) points out, because they found that horses were valuable trade items, "the Blackfoot mind received a new idea . . . that it was desirable to accumulate property." There is no mention of the European origins of horses in *FC*, but it is made clear that the accumulation of horses is important for the Pikunis (3). Not only do the Pikunis admire trade goods introduced by the whites and are in awe of their weaponry, but they even begin to question their own beliefs as they are exposed to white knowledge. The Pikunis are told of the great healing powers the white *heavy-singers-for-the-sick* possess; the white men are even able to stop smallpox from entering the body with "a juice" their "medicine men shoot them with" (304). The power of white priests is also undeniable to the Pikunis, who see one as "a holy man, possessor of great power" (306). The more the Pikunis learn about the white men, the more they begin to question their own ways; when a smallpox epidemic hits the Lone Eaters camp, they know that their medicine does them no good; "It was then that Fools Crow knew the ceremonies were futile—the

healing and purifying were as meaningless as a raindrop in a spring river" (366–67). Towards the end of the novel, even their most powerful object, the Beaver Medicine Bundle, loses all its magic and power (367). Their faith is faltered even more when Yellow Kidney's son, Good Young Man, dies the day after Fools Crow's healing ritual (373). At the same time, there are repeated allusions to "the power of the Napikwans" throughout the novel (174). Especially their armed forced is recognized as an unsurpassable threat. The white civilization thus affects the cultural identity of the Pikunis negatively even before physical conflict or execution of governmental policies against the Pikunis.

What makes the white men's weapons especially appealing, is their association with self-sufficiency; with a repeater rifle (*many-shots gun*), White Man's Dog could "bring about his own luck" like the white men do (4). The idea of autonomy is especially alluring to Fast Horse, who becomes interested in gaining wealth as he is seduced by the simplicity of raiding the white miners and settlers; they have better possessions, horses and even more interesting women than any of the Indian tribes (193). As Barry (1991–1992, 10) notes, Fast Horse's actions begin to be driven by his personal ambition rather than the good of the tribe. Fast Horse abandons the Pikuni way of life, which now seems "pointless to him" (193); he "grew bitter and he hated his people and all they believed in. They had no power. They were pitiful, afraid of everything, including the Napikwans, who were taking their land even as the Pikunis stood on it" (71). At the same time, Fast Horse admires the renegade, Owl Child, who has been attacking the white settlements and wagon trains (192). Fast Horse respects Owl Child for his courage to stand up against the white men and because "of all the Pikunis, Owl Child had made the Napikwans cry the most" (60). Fast Horse decides to joins Owl Child's group of renegades because he desires to experience a freedom he could never have among the Lone Eaters. He also wants to accumulate things like *yellow dust* (192, 'gold').

Nevertheless, Fast Horse's new way of life, free from all responsibility, turns out to be unsatisfactory despite its initial appeal and he grows even more bitter and angry. He tries to take his anger on a white rancher that managed to wound him before, but his revenge does not give him the

satisfaction he seeks; "He had wanted the Napikwan to die more, piece by piece. He had been cheated by his own rage" (217). The growing anger in Fast Horse goes together with his adoption of white ideals of individual freedom and accumulating property. These alluring aspects of white culture end up leading Fast Horse into corruption and a complete separation from both his tribe and Owl Child's group. Ultimately, Fast Horse becomes a recluse with no home to return to (331). Fast Horse's undoing functions as a cautionary tale against forfeiting one's tribe and succumbing to the corruptions of the white culture. Welch's makes his strongest counterstatement to "white power" with his deconstruction of the ideal of individualism. Using authors like Welch as example, James Olson and Raymond Wilson (1986, 213) write that "[t]wentieth-century Native American literature . . . clearly shows that Native American values still stand out in sharp contrast to the individualism, acquisitive materialism, and private capitalism of European America."

Indeed, *FC* displays a celebration of values that contradict these Western ideals; in contrast to the liberal belief in the importance of individual freedom that originated in the Age of Enlightenment, in *FC*, the tribal community is valued over the individual. The Lone Eaters value the honor of the tribe over anything else and the characters who indulge in self-sufficiency become outcasts. Both Fast Horse and Fools Crow's brother, Running Fisher, are motivated by self-interest instead of a devotion to the tribe and their actions result in their shameful exiles, which equals with death in its severity as a punishment in the Pikuni community. *FC* thus reflects Krupat's (1989, 231) argument that "kinship relations" in Native American cultures are more important than "the dominant culture's insistence upon singling out the individual." In fact, the Pikuni community shuns individual heroes; the message becomes clear in a speech given by a Fox Eyes; "For those who would be foolish and seek to gain glory only for themselves, let them . . . turn back. In that way there is no profit" (139). As Barry (1991–1992, 4) notes, there is a strong emphasis placed on the importance of "responsibility to the group over individual glory." The Pikunis recognize no individual heroes in the Western sense; the Western hero is often solitary and requires "separation from the familial nexus for the achievement of a unique identity," as Krupat (1989, 231) puts it.

Wong (1992, 14) perceives a fascination in Euro-American conception of a hero with "the isolated, autonomous person" while Native American societies are "more concerned with the group than the individual." This is one of the few generalizations Wong lists as being applicable to all Native American cultures.

In the Pikuni community, respect and glory are gained only when the good of the whole tribe is pursued, which is what ultimately leads to Fools Crow's success. In comparison with *LR*, then, the hero pattern is very different; Fools Crow aims to keep his tribe united and strong, preserving their tradition, while Tonto in *LR* is a solitary hero alienated from his tribe, with no hope of return. Individual ambition, which goes hand-in-hand with the core ideals of Western civilization, freedom and independence, stands for corruption and viciousness in *FC*. At the same time, its seductiveness is felt even by Fools Crow, who

> felt the freedom of being alone, of relying only upon himself. . . . The thought came into his mind without warning, the sudden understanding of what Fast Horse found so attractive in running with Owl Child. It was this freedom from responsibility, from accountability to the group, that was so alluring. As long as one thought of himself as part of the group, he would be responsible to and for that group. If one cut the ties, he had the freedom to roam, to think only of himself and not worry about the consequences of his actions. So it was for Owl Child and Fast Horse to roam. And so it was for the Pikunis to suffer (211).

Individual freedom, therefore, immediately follows suffering for the community, which can be seen as a critique of the founding values of Western thought. In order to become a true hero of the Pikuni community as a whole, Fools Crow must abandon the feeling of individual freedom and embrace "the weight of responsibility" (ibid.).

Although Welch's critique of individualism challenges the ethnocentric notion of Western values as universal, it can be argued that his resistance of the Western norm merely ends up confirming the dominant culture as the privileged center and reinforcing the marginalization of the Blackfeet as the other to the Western norm. In Liselotte Glage's (2002, 328) words, "any 'counter-' remains in a relational position to what it seems to leave behind," which suggests an enduring dependency on whatever it is attempting to counter. If the Pikunis' valorization of the community does not work independently of the devalorization of the Western standard of individualism, the

Pikuni culture in *FC* is indeed defined in relation to Western standards. Ultimately, Welch is reinforcing the individual/community dichotomy and, in this aspect, he fails to challenge one of the binary oppositions at the core of colonial discourse. However, as Ashcroft et al. (1989, 37) note, the mere inversion of certain poles in the colonial discourse "attracts value away from a British [or Euro-American] 'norm' eventually displacing the hegemonic centrality of the idea of 'norm' itself."

Hall (1997b, 271) introduces strategies such as including all kinds of "human shapes" and placement of the stereotyped group in the center as the general strategies used to resist stereotypes. Owens (1992, 29) introduces a similar technique in the Native American context;

> The cardboard cliché that has trod stealthily through American literature from its inception has been replaced by Indian characters with the complexity, depth, and drama of characters we have been taught to think of as 'real'—a distinction reserved usually for nonethnic characters in fiction. . . The stoic, humorless, pancake-flat Indian of fiction and film has given way to a gallery of characters who can laugh at themselves and others, who are fully capable of cowardice as well as heroism, and whose lives can be every bit as tangled and messy as the words scenario dreamed up by a John Updike or Eudora Welty.

My analysis of *FC* shows that Welch effectively challenges the stereotyped portrayals of Indians in mainstream culture by using these methods. By placing the Pikunis at the center, Welch effectively seizes the hierarchical structure of power, and gives the Pikunis control over it while the whites are simultaneously disempowered and pushed to the margins. Most importantly, the Pikunis are no longer defined by the dominant society as the white man's Indian, but Welch allows both Native and non-Native readers imagine the Pikunis from an Indian perspective. Welch's method resembles that of Wilson Harris, as explained by Ashcroft et al. (1989, 35);

> Harris deliberately strives after a new language and a new way of seeing the world. This view rejects the apparently inescapable polarities of language and deploys the destructive energies of European culture in the service of a future community in which division and categorization are no longer the bases of perception.

Welch is thus producing what Tripathy (2009, 45) calls "a contesting field of knowledge." In other words, the cultural and historical assumptions made by Euro-Americans are challenged "by providing alternative ways and restoring denied knowledges" (ibid.).

5 Conclusions

The aim of this thesis was to investigate stereotypes of American Indians found in the primary material with reference to Berkhofer's notion of the white man's Indian. The concept is closely connected to operations of power, which is why I have studied it as part of a subjugating discourse I have called the discourse of Indianness. The colonial stereotype, as defined by Bhabha, seeks to define, produce and control meaning of the colonial subject in order to authorize views of it. Native Americans continue to be defined against the Eurocentric standards of the dominant culture as the white man's Indians. The historical overview of the white man's Indian provided in this thesis demonstrates how the concept has been constructed throughout history and the same imagery used by the early European explorers persists even today. The examination of stereotyping as a representational practice in this thesis demonstrates that the messages conveyed by representations in literature and in the media are not neutral, even when they aim at realism. The study of cultural representation becomes exceedingly important in the postmodern context as the white man's Indian repeats the operating principles in Baudrillard's theory of the simulacrum; because of the repetition of similar images of Indians in representation, the general American public has begun to mistake these artificial simulations as "the real Indian," even though the representations are not in touch with any authentic reality.

As for my primary research material, my inclusion of two different samples from very distinct areas of representation, a blockbuster film by a group of non-Natives representing mainstream popular culture and a novel by a Blackfoot author, revealed that similar patterns and stereotypes are repeated in very distinct art forms. The recognition of these patterns and typicalities in different narrative forms leads to the understanding that all representation is dependent on socially accepted norms that people begin to except in representations. Even though these norms are socially accepted, they communicate the values of the dominant groups and thus reflect hegemony in a given society. Indeed, as I have shown, it is the very purpose of stereotypes to create a sense of shared consensus, even though the views expressed are not shared by all members of a given

society. In any cultural representation, it is therefore important to ask; who gets to be represented and whose beliefs, norms and values are being expressed?

This study shows that the white man's Indian is a concept constructed by non-Natives and it operates through stereotypes. Because the white man's Indian continues to circulate in both mass media and literary representations of Indians, it can be argued that past efforts to resist this stereotyped imagery have failed. The question, consequently, becomes; can the dominant paradigms be challenged? Büken (2002, 48) poses a related question; if Native Americans themselves had no power over the creation of these misconceptions, do they have the power to refute them? Given the persistence of the imagery for centuries, it is difficult to see how American Indians could change the images so firmly engraved in the cultural imaginary of Americans.

Critics like Merskin (1998, 342) call for authenticity and accuracy as a solution to the stereotyped images of Indians that media representations bolster. However, the problem of representation is that it can only achieve a limited level of authenticity. As shown in the analysis section, *LR* at least aims for authenticity in its portrayal of the Comanche. This, however, seems to do the film no good, as it is still scorned for repeating even the "the lamest stereotype of Hollywood Indian." Meanwhile, the positive Comanche response to the film is largely ignored in the public discussion about the film. Indeed, Indians themselves seem to have no say in things concerning Indians, which is the basic operating principle in the concept of white man's Indian. Not only does *LR* aim for authenticity, but it also makes an apparent effort to elevate Tonto from his earlier sidekick status to the role of a hero. Even though the other Comanche in the film remain as dramatic backdrops, a role the Hollywood's Indian has grown accustomed to, the effort to portray a Native American hero, albeit played by a non-Native actor, is certainly an improvement. *LR* also displays an effort to honor Comanche traditions, such as storytelling and ceremony and the film also emphasizes the importance of spirituality in the culture. *LR* also counters some of the common stereotypes associated with the white man's Indian by portraying the Comanche with a sense of humor and giving them eloquence of expression.

However, the film also reinforces many of the imperial polarities at the core of the colonial discourse, including the savagery/civilization dichotomy. By pinning some of the popular stereotypes usually associated with the white man's Indian on the white man instead, the film reverses the roles in the traditional dichotomy. However, the hierarchical valorization system is not thus challenged; by associating the white characters with cannibalism and bloodthirstiness, the film eventually only reinforces the us/them separation at the core of any subjugating discourse. The colonial stereotypes are reinforced in the film's attempt to parody many of the stereotypes familiar from popular representations of Indians. White misconceptions of Indians' inarticulateness, of Native spirituality and of the appearance of Indians, are all ridiculed in turn. The humor in the film relies heavily on audiences' recognition of these stereotypes and *LR* thus encourages participation in the continuing circulation of this stereotyped imagery. The film does not challenge the images by introducing any alternative ways to portray American Indians. Although the film attempts to dismantle some stereotypes, it also explicitly perpetuates in others; the film repeats the Rousseauist ethnostalgia of the dying race, thus establishing a firm belief in a common myth. Ultimately, as a production conducted by non-Native filmmakers, *LR* participates in the ongoing efforts to define Native Americans as "the other." The film's participation in the discourse of Indianness thus reinforces white hegemony and maintains the status quo. Even in its critique of the Western civilization, the film assumes it as the center.

FC, on the other hand, manages to shift attention away from the conflict between the two cultures by focusing on the portrayal of the Pikunis as a group of heterogeneous and complex individuals. Welch's attention to cultural detail produces a sense of the real that, to a certain extent, functions as a counterstatement against stereotyped portrayals. Unlike the white man's Indian, which relies on generalizations, Welch's portrayal of the Pikunis pays careful attention to heterogeneity in the relatively small group. By humanizing the Pikunis and by paying attention to detail, Welch's representation is thus in direct opposition of the methods used in stereotyping. The world created in the novel places the Pikunis in the center and in control of the meanings produced.

Moreover, by using terminology directly translated from the Blackfoot language, Welch draws attention to the way meaning is constructed. By not giving explicit meanings for his loan translations, Welch produces an estrangement effect that emphasizes experience and context over fixed symbols. He thus reverses what Baudrillard calls "the liquidation of all referentials" and returns the gaze to the reality of the object. With the introduction of new vocabulary for concepts familiar from American history and for natural phenomena, the simulacra are pushed to the background. These include the simulacra entailed in the white man's Indian. By using group nominators like "the Pikunis" and "the Lone Eaters," and by not relying on the familiar, fixed symbol of "the Indian," Welch manages to render his version of the Pikuni Indians relatively independent of the connotations that come with the white man's Indian. Welch creates a Pikuni world on the Pikunis' conditions; they are given control over meaning and knowledge, including their definition of the self and their culture; they are no longer defined as the white man's Indians, as "the others" to the ethnocentric norm.

Welch includes authentic Blackfoot history and traditions to emphasize both the novels' historicity and the Pikuni perspective. By employing methods like magical realism, Welch manages to portray an alternative to Western forms of knowledge, including the firm belief in rationalism in Western cultures. Welch's technique of magical realism is especially important as it dismantles the dualistic separation of the world into the real and the spiritual. This liquidation of categories reflects Blackfoot epistemology at a more general level because Blackfoot ways of perceiving the world lean towards Foucault's call for acategorical thought, as I have shown. In the context of the colonial stereotype, because the firm separation of things into fixed categories is at the core of cultural stereotyping, this kind of method that challenges categorical thinking is instrumental in the resistance of stereotypes. Furthermore, Welch's focus on the precolonial past does not accentuate the conflict between the colonizers and colonized and the attention is thus shifted away from the categorical binaries at the heart of colonial discourse. Despite Welch's use of the many strategies of resistance, he nevertheless repeats many of the stereotypes associated with Indians, including

bartering Indians, closeness to nature and the bloodthirsty savage. However, because stereotypes lack theoretical grounding and fixed definition, they are open to interpretation and it is ultimately up to the reader whether Welch's representation is seen as stereotypical. It can also be argued whether Welch has the authority to represent this group, in which he cannot say he belongs because of the group's historicity. Moreover, as my discussion on Welch's representation of the subaltern showed, Welch does not represent the entirety of the group as there are subaltern groups that remain in the margins.

To my final research question—does Welch manage to deconstruct the white man's Indian or the ethnocentric norms integral to the notion?—the obvious answer is no, because the imagery of the white man's Indian still persists. Its persistence throughout centuries means that any past efforts have not been very successful, as noted above. As Hall (1997b, 249) points out, racial stereotypes persist despite the fact that they have always been contested. Is there anything to be done, then, to dismantle the stereotypes? Because there are no fixed or final meanings, there is at least a possibility of change, as argued by Hall (ibid., 270). However, if the only way to contest stereotypes is to contest all meaning, the argument revokes itself because it cannot exist outside the sphere of meaning.

The problem is complicated even further with the simultaneous project of revitalizing subjugated knowledges; as Schweninger (2008, 3) argues,

> there is indeed a situation in which a Native American writer feels himself obligated on the one hand to resist and refute generalizations and stereotypes, yet who at the same time, on the other hand, feels obligated to identify what he feels to be a genuine Native American worldview or philosophy concerning the land that differs significantly from a non-Indian or European American worldview.

Ultimately, a worldview cannot be communicated without resorting to at least some generalizations. Even if a conscious effort was made to avoid stereotypes, they cannot ultimately be escaped because they are integral to the shared culture in any given society. Moreover, as Dyer (2002, 14) argues, stereotypes cannot be avoided, because conceptions of social groups are formed mainly through stereotypes. Indeed, it is impossible to think about every individual member of even the

smallest groups, and therefore categories and stereotypes are necessary unless Foucault's calls for acategorical thought and the liquidation of differences are answered. Perhaps it is to Native American thought, as introduced by Allen, that the gaze should be turned in order to allow at least a certain fluidity between categories.

Welch's response to the stereotyped imagery of the white man's Indian is ultimately his representation of the great variety of individuals that effectively resist any categorizations or generalizations, which are the basic principles in stereotyping and in subjugating discourses that are dependent on binary structures. Welch's reliance on English, however, which is his native tongue, repeats the categorizations inherent in language itself, and as shown in my study of Welch's gender politics, he repeats the patriarchal model of western civilizations. Even if an effort was made to represent a culture as thoroughly as possible, it is never independent of the cultural and political circumstances of its producer. Moreover, any statement about a group of people can be defined as stereotyped, because no one can speak for a heterogeneous group, as argued famously by Spivak.

Most categories involved in the representation of ethnicity resist clear-cut definitions and categorizations in the first place, including terminology such as "culture," "worldview" and "identity," yet, some lines must be drawn between concepts in order to make sense of the world. However, it would be a simplification of complex operations of power, knowledge and representation to assume that American Indian reality can be communicated to audiences and readers; to Berkhofer's (1979, 195) question—"Can the 'reality' of Native American life ever be penetrated behind the screen of White ideology and imagination?"—the answer, then, is an unequivocal "no." Colonial experience of the nineteenth century American Indians is certainly unattainable. However, what Welch manages to show is the *possibility* of other meanings—meanings that do *not* rely on Western universals. Even Welch cannot be a spokesperson for the group of Pikunis he is representing, but his approximation of what the Pikuni life could have been like may cause someone to rethink their own conceptions of history.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

FC Welch, James. 1986. *Fools Crow*. London: Penguin.

LR *The Lone Ranger*. 2013. Dir. Gore Verbinski. Walt Disney Pictures and Jerry Bruckheimer Films. Film.

Secondary Sources

Adler, Jerry. 2013. "Is the New Tonto Any Better Than the Old Tonto?" [Internet] Smithsonian. Available from http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/is-the-new-tonto-any-better-than-the-old-tonto-4833743/ [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Ahmad, Aijaz. 1992. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London, UK: Verso.

Aleiss, Angela. 2005. *Making the White Man's Indian: Native Americans and Hollywood Movies*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Allen, Paula Gunn. 1983. "The Sacred Hoop: A Contemporary Perspective." In *Studies in American Indian Literature: Critical Essays and Course Designs*, ed. Allen, 3–22. New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America.

Allport, Gordon W. 1995. *The Nature of Prejudice*. 25th Anniversary edition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1992. *In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Armstrong, Jeannette C. 1998. "Land Speaking." In *Speaking for the Generations: Native Writers on Writing*, ed. Simon J. Ortiz, 174–94. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffits, and Helen Tiffin. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London, UK: Routledge.

Barry, Nora. 1991–1992. "'A Myth to be Alive': James Welch's Fools Crow." *MELUS* 17, 1: 3–20.

Baudrillard, Jean. 1988. "Simulacra and Simulations." In *Selected Writings*, ed. Mark Poster, 166-84. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. 1979. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Bhabha, Homi. 1986. "The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism." In *Literature, Politics and Theory: Papers from the Essex Conference 1976–84*, ed. Francis Barker et al, 148–72. London, UK: Methuen.

---. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Brennan, Timothy. 1989. *Salman Rushdie and the Third World: Myths of the Nation*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

Breznican, Anthony. 2012. "Johnny Depp reveals origins of Tonto makeup from 'The Lone Ranger'" *Entertainment Weekly*. [Internet] Available from http://insidemovies.ew.com/2012/04/22/johnny-depp-reveals-origins-of-tonto-makeup-from-lone-ranger-exclusive/ [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Brown, Roger. 1965. *Social Psychology*. New York, New York: The Free Press.

Bruchac, Joseph. 2003. *Our Stories Remember: American Indian History, Culture, and Values Through Storytelling*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.

Büken, Gülriz. 2002. "Construction of the Mythic Indian in Mainstream Media and the Demystification of the Stereotype by American Indian Artists." *American Studies International*. XL, 3: 46–56.

Campbell, Lyle. 2000. *American Indian Languages: The Historical Linguistics of Native America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Catch and Release. 2006. Dir. Susannah Grant. Columbia Pictures. Film.

Cella, Matthew. 2010. *American Life and Land: Bad Land Pastoralism in Great Plains Fiction*. Foreword by Wayne Franklin. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press.

Chester, Blanca. 2001. "Western Fictions in Welch's Fools Crow: Languages of Landscape and Culture." In *Telling the Stories: Essays on American Indian Literatures & Cultures*, 93–108. Peter Lang Publishing.

Cook, Barbara. 2000. "A Tapestry of History and Reimagination: Women's Place in James Welch's *Fools Crow*." *American Indian Quarterly*. 24, 3: 441–53.

Cooper, James Fenimore. 1834. *The Last of the Mohicans*. London, UK: Bentley.

Dances with Wolves. 1990. Dir. Kevin Costner. Orion Pictures. Film.

DeLaney Hoffman, Elizabeth. 2012. Introduction. In *American Indians and Popular Culture, Volume 1: Media, Sports and Politics*, ed. DeLaney Hoffman, xi–xviii. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Derrida, Jacques. 1981. *Positions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

---. 2000. "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." In *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, ed. David Lodge, 89–103. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Dixon, Wheeler Winston, and Gwendolyn Audrey Foster. 2011. *21st Century Hollywood: Movies in the Era of Transformation*. New Brunswick, NJ. Rutgers University Press.

Durham, Jimmie. 1992. "Cowboys and… Notes on Art, Literature, and American Indians in the Modern American Mind." In *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance*, ed. M. Annette Jaimes, 423–38. South End Press.

Dyer, Richard. 2002. *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representation*. London, UK: Routledge.

The Elder Scrolls V: Skyrim. 2011. Bethesda Game Studios. Bethesda Softworks. PlayStation 3.

Ewers, John C. 1958. *The Blackfeet: Raiders on the Northwestern Plains*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Constance Farrington. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Flagstaff, Ariz. 2013. "Will Disney's New Tonto Be Any Better?" *Santa Fe Mexican*. [Internet] Santa Fe, NM. Available from http://www.santafenewmexican.com/news/article_6c360684-605e-5f32-8b9f-3c0b2bd2f42c.html [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Fleming, Walter C. 2007. "Getting Past Our Myths and Stereotypes about Native Americans." *Education Digest*. 72, 7: 51–57.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Language*. London, UK: Routledge.

---. 1977. *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

---. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. Ed. and Trans. Colin Gordon. New York, NY: Pantheon.

Frantz, Donald G. 1991. *Blackfoot Grammar*. Toronto, CAN: University of Toronto Press.

Gandhi, Leela. 1998. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Ganje, Lucy A. 2003. "Native American Stereotypes." In *Images that Injure: Pictorial Stereotypes in the Media*, eds. Paul Martin Lester and Susan Dente Ross, 113–20. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Glage, Liselotte. 2002. "Rewriting or Writing Back? Witi Ihimaera's *Dear Miss Mansfield*." In *Crabtracks: Progress and Process in Teaching the New Literatures in English*. Eds. Gordon Collier and Frank Schulze-Engler, 321–329.New York, NY: Rodopi.

Gledhill, Christine. 1997. "Genre and Gender: The Case of Soap Opera." In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall, 337–84. London, UK: Sage.

Grande, Sandy Marie Anglás. 1999. "Beyond the Ecologically Noble Savage: Deconstructing the White Man's Indian." *Environmental Ethics*. 21, 3: 307–20.

Green, Marcus. 2002. "Gramsci Cannot Speak: Presentations and Interpretations of Gramsci's Concept of the Subaltern." *Rethinking Marxism*. 14, 3: 1–24.

Grinnell, George Bird. 2001. *Blackfoot Lodge Tales*. Scituate, MA: Digital Scanning, Inc.

Hall, Stuart. 1997a. “The Work of Representation.” In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall, 13–64. London, UK: Sage.

---. 1997b. “The Spectacle of the ‘Other.’” In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall, 223–79. London, UK: Sage.

---. 2006. “New Ethnicities.” In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffits and Helen Tiffin, 199–202. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Hanna, Jeff. 2013. “W&L Anthropologist Weighs Johnny Depp’s Tonto.” [Internet] Washington and Lee University. Lexington, VA. Available from http://news.blogs.wlu.edu/2013/07/08/wl-anthropologist-weighs-johnny-depps-tonto-audio/ [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Italie, Hillel. 2000. “The Many Lives of Sherman Alexie.” [Internet] The Associated Press. Available from http://www.apnewsarchive.com/2000/The-Many-Lives-of-Sherman-Alexie/id-6140a744c08673d2446bce7d1c4ecc4c [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Jameson, Fredric. 1979. “Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture.” *Social Text*. 1: 130–48.

Kelsey, Penelope Myrtle. 2008. *Tribal Theory in Native American Literature*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Kent, Alicia A. 2007. *African, Native, and Jewish American Literature and the Reshaping of Modernism*. Gordonsville, VA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kilpatrick, Jacquelyn. 1999. *Celluloid Indians: Native Americans and Film.* Lincoln, NE: The University of Nebraska Press.

King, Richard C. 2006. *Contemporary Native American Issues: Media Images and Representations*. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House.

Krupat, Arnold. 1989. *The Voice in the Margin: Native American Literature and the Canon*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

---. 1996. *The Turn to the Native: Studies in Criticism and Culture*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

LaCroix, Celeste C. 2011. “High Stakes Stereotypes: The Emergence of the ‘Casino Indian’ Trope in Television Depictions of Contemporary Native Americans.” *The Howard Journal of Communications*. 22: 1–23.

LaSalle, Mick. 2013. “‘Lone Ranger’ review: Someone rein in this cowboy.” Rev. of *The Lone Ranger*, by Gore Verbinski. *San Francisco Chronicle*. [Internet] San Francisco, CA. Available from http://www.sfchronicle.com/entertainment/article/The-Lone-Ranger-review-Lawman-turns-antihero-4642814.php?t=9ee2720ae147b02379 [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Linn, Travis. 2003. “Media Methods That Lead to Stereotypes.” In *Images that Injure: Pictorial Stereotypes in the Media*, eds. Paul Martin Lester and Susan Dente Ross, 23–27. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Lippmann, Walter. 1965. *Public Opinion*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Little Bear, Leroy, and Ryan Heavy Rain. 1994. "A Conceptual Anatomy of the Blackfoot Word." *Revision*. 26:3. [Internet] Orillis New Media. Available from http://kainaistudies.com/modules/wfdownloads/visit.php?cid=3&lid=5 [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Liu Kedong, and Zhang Hui. 2011. "Self- and Counter-Representation of Native Americans: Stereotypical Images of and New Images by Native Americans in Popular Media." *Intercultural Communication Studies*. XX: 2, 105–18.

Lundquist, Suzanne Evertsen. 2004. *Native American Literatures: An Introduction*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Lupton, Mary Jane. 2004. *James Welch: A Critical Companion*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Mann, Barbara Alice. 2006 "Where Are Your Women?: Missing in Action." In *Unlearning the Language of Conquest: Scholars Expose Anti-Indianism in America*, ed. Four Arrows, 120–33. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

McClintock, Walter. 1910. *The Old North Trail*. London, UK: MacMillan and Co.

McFarland, Ron. 1986. "An Interview with James Welch." In *James Welch*, ed. McFarland, 1-19. Lewiston, ID: Confluence Press.

---. 2000. *Understanding James Welch*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

McLaurin, Virginia. 2012. *Stereotypes of Contemporary Native American Indian Characters in Recent Popular Media*. MA thesis, University of Massachusetts. [Internet] Amherst, MA. Available from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1941&context=theses [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Merskin, Debra. 1998. "Sending up Signals: A Survey of Native American Media Use and Representation in the Mass Media." *Howard Journal of Communications*. 9, 4: 333–45.

Neumaier, Joe. 2013. "'The Lone Ranger' movie review: Even Johnny Depp can't save the day." Rev. of *The Lone Ranger*, by Gore Verbinski. *New York Daily News*. [Internet] New York, NY. Available from http://www.nydailynews.com/entertainment/tv-movies/depp-save-lone-ranger-article-1.1387796 [Accessed 10.5.2014]

O'Connor, John E. 2011. "The White Man's Indian: An Institutional Approach." In *Hollywood's Indian: The Portrayal of the Native American in Film*, 2nd ed, eds. Peter Rollins and John E. Connor, 27–38. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Olson, James, and Raymond Wilson. 1986. *Native Americans in the Twentieth Century*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Owens, Louis. 1992. *Other Destinies: Understanding the American Indian Novel*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Peat, David F. 2002. *Blackfoot Physics*. Boston, MA: Weiser.

Peter Pan. 1953. Dir. Clyde Geronimi, Wilfred Jackson and Hamilton Luske. Walt Disney Productions. Film.

Peterson, Britt. 2013. "In 'The Lone Ranger,' is Tonto Really Speaking Comanche?" [Internet] The Boston Globe. Available from http://www.bostonglobe.com/ideas/2013/07/06/the-lone-ranger-tonto-really-speaking-comanche/KjS0gKbgkdI6IBN9NhmeUL/story.html [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Pocahontas. 1995. Dir. Mike Gabriel and Eric Goldberg. Walt Disney Pictures. Film.

Pulitano, Elvira. 2003. *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Red Dead Redemption. 2010. Rockstar San Diego. Take-Two Interactive. PlayStation 3.

Roeper, Richard. 2013. "'The Lone Ranger' plays out like 'Pirates' in the Old West." Rev. of *The Lone Ranger*, by Gore Verbinski. *Chicago Sun Times*. [Internet] Chicago, IL. Available from http://www.suntimes.com/entertainment/movies/21090365-421/the-lone-ranger-plays-out-like-pirates-of-the-caribbean-in-the-old-west.html [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Ross, Susan Dente. 2003. "Unconscious, Ubiquitous Frames." In *Images that Injure: Pictorial Stereotypes in the Media*, eds. Paul Martin Lester and Susan Dente Ross, 29–34. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Rothman, Lily. 2013. "Johnny Depp as Tonto: Is *The Lone Ranger* racist?" [Internet] Time Entertainment. Available from http://entertainment.time.com/2013/07/03/johnny-depp-as-tonto-is-the-lone-ranger-racist/ [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Rowlandson, Mary. 2007. *Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*. Minneapolis, MN: Filiquarian.

Ruppert, James. 1996. "Theory, Discourse, and the Native American Literature Class." *Modern Language Studies: Colorizing Literary Theory*. 26, 4: 109-117

Said, Edward W. 1987. *Orientalism*. London, UK: Penguin.

Samuels, Allison. 2013. "'Lone Ranger' Remake and Johnny Depp's Casting, Never a Good Idea." Rev. of *The Lone Ranger*, by Gore Verbinski. *The Daily Beast*. [Internet] Available from http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/07/05/lone-ranger-remake-and-johnny-depp-s-casting-never-a-good-idea.html [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1963. Preface. In *The Wretched of the Earth*. By Frantz Fanon. Trans. Constance Farrington, 7–31. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Schweninger, Lee. 2008. *Listening to the Land: Native American Literary Responses to the Landscape*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press.

Seiter, Ellen. 1986. "Stereotypes and the Media: A Re-evaluation." *Journal of Communication/International Communication Association*. 36, 2: 14–26.

Sequoya-Magdaleno, Jana. 1995. "Telling the *différance*: Representations of Identity in the Discourse of Indianness." In *Ethnic Canon: Histories, Institutions, and Interventions*, ed. David Palumbo-Liu, 88–116. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Shakespeare, William. 2006. *The Tempest*. Ed. Burton Raffel. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shanley, Kathryn. 1991. "Time and Time-Again: Notes Toward an Understanding of Radical Elements in American Indian Fiction." In *Transforming the Curriculum*, ed. Johnnella Butler, 243–57. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Shklovsky, Viktor. 1988. "Art as Technique." In *Modern Criticism and Theory*, ed. David Lodge, 16–30. New York, NY: Longman

Shohat, Ella. 1992. "Notes on the Post-Colonial." *Social Text*. 31/32: 99–113.

Siegel, Tatiana, and Pamela McClintock. 2013. "Why 'The Lone Ranger's' Johnny Depp Joined the Comanche Nation." *The Hollywood Reporter*. [Internet] Los Angeles, CA. Available from http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/why-lone-rangers-johnny-depp-435652 [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Smoke Signals. 1998. Dir. Chris Eyre. Miramax Films. Film.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1994. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, 66–111. New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Stigler, Allison. 2013. History vs. Hollywood: Does 'The Lone Ranger' Accurately Represent Native Americans? [Internet] Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati. Available from http://www.uc.edu/news/nr.aspx?id=18092 [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Storey, John. 2003. *Cultural Studies and the Study of Popular Culture*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Torrente, Ria Kristina. 2013. "'The Lone Ranger' Gets Mixed Reviews: Is Johnny Depp's Tonto Racist?" *International Business Times*. [Internet] New York, NY. Available from http://au.ibtimes.com/articles/486393/20130704/lone-ranger-johnny-depp-racist-lena-dunham.htm#.U2SRIk1WHcs [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Tripathy Jyotirmaya. 2009. "Postcolonialism and the Native American Experience: A Theoretical Perspective" *Asiatic*. 3, 1: 40–53.

The Twilight Saga: New Moon. 2009. Dir. Chris Weitz. Summit Entertainment. Film.

Vizenor, Gerald. 1989. "A Postmodern Introduction." In *Narrative Chance: Postmodern Discourse on Native American Literatures*. Ed. Vizenor, 3–16. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Washburn, Wilcomb E. 2011. Foreword. In *Hollywood's Indian: The Portrayal of the Native American in Film*, 2nd ed, eds. Peter Rollins and John E. Connor, ix–xi. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Weaver, Jace. 1997. *That the People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Weiss, Jeffrey. 2013. “Review: ‘The Lone Ranger’ remake thrashes Christianity.” Rev. of *The Lone Ranger*, by Gore Verbinski. *Salt Lake Tribune*. [Internet] Salt Lake City, UT. Available from http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/lifestyle/56572481-80/ranger-movie-lone-christianity.html.csp [Accessed 10.5.2014]

White, Allon. 1987–1988. “The Struggle over Bakhtin: Fraternal Reply to Robert Young.” *Cultural Critique*. 8: 217–41.

Winn, Ryan. 2013. “Words Are Mightier Than Colonialism.” *Tribal College Journal*. [Internet] Available from http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=3&sid=5b24fd45-7b23-47bb-b208-8877431670ac%40sessionmgr112&hid=125&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBlPWNvb2tpZSxpcCx1aWQmc2l0ZT1laG9zdC1saXZlJnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3d#db=aph&AN=87455691 [Accessed 10.5.2014]

Wong, Hertha D. 1992. *Sending My Heart Back Across the Years: Tradition and Innovation in Native American Autobiography*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

Xie, Shaobo. 1997. “Rethinking the Problem of Postcolonialism.” *New Literary History*. 28, 1: 7–20.

Young, Skip Dine. 2012. *Psychology at the Movies*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Zacharek, Stephanie. 2013. “*The Lone Ranger* Is an Extravagantly Squandered Opportunity.” Rev. of *The Lone Ranger*, by Gore Verbinski. *Village Voice*. [Internet] New York, NY. Available from http://www.villagevoice.com/2013-06-26/film/the-lone-ranger-2013-movie/ [Accessed 10.5.2014]