

3-22-2013

Peripheral Envisioning: The Frontier of Indian Policy and Religion, 1880-1934, and Beyond

Isaiah Ellis

Trinity University, iellis@trinity.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/infolit_usra



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Ellis, Isaiah, "Peripheral Envisioning: The Frontier of Indian Policy and Religion, 1880-1934, and Beyond" (2013). *Undergraduate Student Research Awards*. 14.

http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/infolit_usra/14

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Information Literacy Committee at Digital Commons @ Trinity. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Student Research Awards by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information, please contact jcostanz@trinity.edu.

Isaiah Ellis
Native American Religions
Dr. Tarango
Due 14 December, 2013

***Peripheral Envisioning:
The Frontier of Indian Policy and Religion, 1880-1934, and Beyond***

Intro: Native Americans as peripheral

Native Americans exist on the American periphery. As part of the physical frontier and imagined wilderness of post-contact North America, natives quickly became subjects of Euro-American political and conceptual domination. Lee Irwin documents the federal government's attempts to enter into Indian legal and economic life, starting with the "Indian Proclamation" of the First Continental Congress in 1783, where Congress retained "the sole and exclusive right and power of regulating trade and managing all affairs with the Indians."¹ Attempts made by whites to control 'Indians' as a *concept* have an even longer history, beginning with the Boston Tea Party in 1773. In this well-choreographed incident, several white people wearing regalia and war-paint boarded a British trade ship carrying a cargo of heavily-taxed tea, and chucked it all into the harbor. This and many other moments where non-Natives have "played Indian" indicate shifting popular conceptions of 'authentic Indianness' and from the beginning showed Americans' desire to "redefine themselves as something other than British colonists."² The political and conceptual control Euro-Americans try to enact over Indians links inextricably and originally to the definition of "American."

Using Indians to define Euro-American culture becomes confusing, mostly because Euro-Americans have always judged native character, life, and religion by mixing reality and fantasy. The assumptions whites make ultimately produce judgments about who natives are and what they want. Vine Deloria, Jr., calls this the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness," whereby bureaucratic and legal discourses "are tested not by comparison with reality, but by comparison

with abstractions.” This mentality, Deloria argues, led to the creation of an inconsistent and biased body of abstractions called “federal Indian law.”³ Because Indians exist on the physical and conceptual “periphery” in America, the pretense that Euro-Americans see them ‘concretely’ is especially misplaced. Gerald Vizenor similarly argues that the processes of Euro-American “surveillance, separation, and dominance” create clearly-displayed “*indians*” (italics his), which are images and “aesthetic ruins” lacking the presence of real “natives.”⁴ To the extent that Euro-Americans have ever seen “natives,” they have seen them *peripherally*.

Peripheral vision involves seeing movement, location, and being fleetingly. The anxious Euro-American bureaucrat or culture-warrior has often endeavored to see the Indian as completely as possible, but their gaze is limited because the specific realities of Indian culture and religion ultimately escape their understanding. When natives become subject to the U.S. government’s control, the white policy-maker must ‘*envision*’ Indians’ role in their agenda, ultimately relying on ‘peripheral’ vision. In the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries especially, politicians, institutions, and individuals – modernists, assimilationists, and feminists alike – made concerted efforts to implement these peripheral visions in policies and cultural campaigns. The turn of the twentieth century promised great progress for those who embraced industrial modernity and great anxiety for those who lamented it,⁵ while the strong Protestant establishment highlighted both parties’ concern for the ideals and values they considered truly ‘American’. As part and parcel of these historical forces, native religious practices, and the broader idea of native culture, became an essential subject of American *peripheral envisioning*.

Peripheral envisionings are the processes by which Euro-Americans refer to native people and especially native religious practices in order to make judgments, promote agendas, and craft policies with the aim of affecting or defining native culture. They are necessarily based

on this mixture of fantasy and reality predetermined by natives' status as 'frontier people'. This process is important, because it occurs at the legal and bureaucratic level, as noted by Vine Deloria, Jr., *and* at the level of the individual, most notably the white culture-warrior. Particularly in the context of Indian dances, the process of *peripheral envisioning* also complicates existing ideas of native sovereignty, and highlights trends in the form and authority of Indian policy during this 'age of uplift.'

Sovereignty, Imagination, and *Envisioning*

In order to understand the complex ways in which *peripheral envisionings* work on American minds and Indian bodies, it is important to understand the political mechanism of "tribal sovereignty." The concept was birthed by the United States government, primarily as a tool by which Congress and other political bodies could clarify their control over Indian spaces, actions, and religions. In other words it is "every right of self-government that has not been taken away or altered by Congressional action."⁶ This definition is not all-encompassing. Natives struggle for sovereignty in other ways, in some cases by performing certain kinds of native identity – though not always voluntarily – to white audiences in order to garner sympathy and express their views.⁷ The political and performed character of sovereignty created a situation in the early-twentieth century where the imagined native was either envisioned from afar, or brought to American audiences who expected and relished an exotic Indian performance.

Around the turn of the twentieth century, "the costumed Indian" became "a familiar figure in American pageantry."⁸ Natives were put up on stages to exhibit their frontier lifestyles (think Buffalo Bill), and often were presented as "antagonists in the frontier struggle for control of the country."⁹ In events intended for national audiences, Indians were generally portrayed as "happily joining the march of American progressive civilization," while in local pageantry, often

intended to be “historical,” natives generally “reced[ed] into a mythic past to make way for the material realities of white progress.”¹⁰ Both represent “a unified vision of the orderly movement of American experience toward some fixed point.”¹¹ This fixed point, Lucy Maddox argues, represents “citizenship” in its ideal form.¹² Both the assimilation-based national pageants, and the local pageants which mourned and justified the loss of the frontier Indian, represented the domination of the frontier being, and *envisioned* a native role as either a born-again companion or doomed villain in America’s future.

These performances entered the political realm and began to affect native religious sovereignty when protests flared regarding the New Mexico legislatures’ Bursum Bill (1922), which proposed to divide up the Pueblo Indians’ legally-possessed land in favor of newly-arrived white settlers who had claimed the land as their own. John Collier, a New York City social worker who romanticized Pueblo communities and religious activities mobilized New York’s literary and radical community to protest the bill.¹³ Based on a visit to New Mexico and a love for nature, Collier *envisioned* Southwestern natives’ religions’ role in remaking a world broken by World War I and modern industrialism. He attended the Pueblo Council in 1922, and convinced them not only to travel to Washington to argue for their land and religion, but also to stop in Chicago and New York City where, wearing headdresses, blankets, and moccasins, they would convince audiences to denounce the Bursum Bill through the beauty of their traditional song and dance. Though it is doubtful that the audience members understood the significance of the dances, they nonetheless flooded Washington with letters demanding that they “kill the Bursum bill.”¹⁴ They did not really know what they were seeing on stage, but they wanted the show to go on. Collier, along with several colleagues, would go on to rally significant

opposition to the Bursum Bill, and would in the coming years successfully oppose the BIA in the controversy over Pueblo dances.

The controversy over the Bursum Bill, and its temporal successor Circular 1665, which attempted to strictly regulate Indian dances, gives the impression that the BIA only began trying to regulate Indian religious sovereignty in the 1920s. In reality, Indian policy had focused on changing Indian religious behaviors since the 1880s, when it served the broader purpose of corralling natives into American lifestyles.¹⁵ It is important to note that while dances are not the only ways natives express their religious beliefs, they were the only public expressions of native religion that officials seemed to recognize as such. BIA officials mythologized the content and significance of real native spiritual expressions, linking them together with idleness and sexual promiscuity to promote the opposite values of hard work and restraint as authentically ‘American.’ Real native spiritual elements were generalized, mythologized, and used by whites with all manner of political and cultural agendas and dominated Euro-American *peripheral envisionings*.

In the late-nineteenth century, bans on Indian dances were largely connected with concerns about religious and cultural savagery, and the threat of seemingly-imminent frontier violence before the conclusion of the ‘Indian wars.’ Indian Commissioner Hiram Price, in his 1882 annual report, expressed his pride in the “Christian labors” carried out on Indian reservations” designed to “stop sun dances, snake worship, and other debasing forms of superstition and idolatry.”¹⁶ Secretary of the Interior Hon. Henry M. Teller, in his own annual report a year later, wanted to systematically criminalize certain Indian activities under the assumption that “the purpose of the Government is to civilize the Indian.”¹⁷ Teller argued that “Indians must be compelled to desist from the savage and barbarous practices that are calculated

to continue them in savagery” because “the old heathenish dances... are intended and calculated to stimulate the warlike passions of the young warriors of the tribe.”¹⁸ While both of these bureaucrats desired intensely to get rid of Indian dances, Price, a prominent Methodist layperson, seemed primarily concerned about idolatry and ‘religious savagery.’ Meanwhile, Teller occupied a different political role that called for more concern about the “warlike passions” of Indian tribes around the United States. In their combination of terms evoking religious fervor and American identity, these two officials presume that Christianity, modernization, and ‘American’ lifestyles interconnect such that betrayal of one means exclusion from the others.

The BIA’s inquiries into banning Indian dances through the turn of the twentieth century suggest a shift in the BIA’s *peripheral* vision to account for the cultural battles about sexuality and modernity emerging in the 1910s and ‘20s. Commissioner Edgar B. Merritt was concerned in 1915 about the “sufficiency of clothing worn by [dance] participants,” and Special Commissioner Herbert J. Hagerman broadly assessed Indian dances as having a “libidinous promiscuity which I cannot describe on paper.”¹⁹ These concerns remained strong in the 1920s. Other Commissioners like Robert G. Valentine simply opposed “any old time practices which help keep [Indians] in ignorance and poverty.”²⁰ Even Commissioner Charles C. Burke, the author of Circular 1665, wanted to “get the Indian headed toward... an ambition to work and save and find pleasure in ways that will not interfere with his self-support.”²¹ Commissioner Francis Leupp revealed the extent of the BIA’s concern with the Protestant work-ethic when in 1908 he ironically requested that his superintendent stop a group of Santee Indians from attending Christian convocation services during the harvesting season.²² In all of these cases, the Commissioners’ arguments tell us more about Euro-American concerns than they do about Indians’ religious thought or actual economic success. The Commissioners endeavored to enact

their own ideals about the ‘good’ in American life – hard work, wealth, sexual modesty, and proper management of time and space – by regulating Indian spirituality and thus taming the frontier.

The orders to ban dances came from Washington – a place where policies often use distant subjects to promote ideals and values – the *peripheral envisionings* of high officials. Often reservation superintendents felt that actual reservation conditions qualified those values. As a result, BIA directives to ban Indian dances often went unenforced or partially enforced. In 1908, Commissioner Leupp’s Pawnee agent wrote to him to express his concern that he “did not have the authority” to prevent Pawnees from dancing according to their customs.²³ Superintendents and Indian agents were also often unsure if the dances in question actually constituted “savage debauchery,” and they often found themselves stuck in tense situations with little real authority or desire to stop the dances.²⁴ In these cases, the practical realities of reservation life exposed the fallacy inherent in the ideals of assimilation: reliance on *peripheral vision* to judge Indian religious practices. Institutions like the BIA are not monolithic entities or things unto themselves. They are simply arrays of offices populated by individuals. Institutional agendas are only set by the *envisionings* of those who compose, edit, and publish them. The purveyors of policies, in turn, *envision* in tune with their cultural concerns.

Pueblo Dances and the Culture Wars

The “roaring twenties” were a time of profound tension between old-guard American patriots, romantics who mistrusted industrial modernity, and artists and activists searching for a unique American identity on the frontier. While these nebulous but powerful forces had already begun to formulate around Indians, they became especially embattled during the Pueblo dance controversy. In that context, political and cultural groups set their *peripheral envisionings* not up

against the reality of Indian dances, as the BIA had for most of the early-twentieth century, but against other *envisionings*. Culture warriors of all stripes, rather than trying to understand Pueblo dances on their own terms, used their *peripheral* notions of Indian dances – mixing reality and fantasy – to elucidate values they already held about social justice, moral correctness, and American destiny. Ultimately, even the Pueblos themselves tried to enter the ideological fray by adopting the “category of religion” to recover their voice in what was essentially a battle over American identities.

The controversy centered around, and perhaps began because of, the ‘sexual’ content of the Pueblo dances. In fact the controversy began over the “Secret Dance Files,” a report on the supposedly sexually deviant nature of the dances, which was released in 1915.²⁵ This may have prompted Commissioner Burke's circular, which severely limited when Indian dances could occur and who could participate. Before then, reports on Pueblo affairs contained few if any references to their dances.²⁶ Women’s rights activists and feminists took up sexuality as a central theme of the dances in order to positively promote them as sexually liberated, or on the other hand to depict them as degrading to women.²⁷ Assimilationist observer Mary Disette complained that “the [Pueblo] male is supreme and all that contributes to his comfort and pleasure is his by right of his male supremacy.” In the same letter, she excoriates Hopi women that engage happily in these promiscuous “sex” acts within the context of dance performances.²⁸ Such complaints about sexual acts in the dances were almost never refuted – those who engaged in the discussion were centrally concerned with what the sexuality *meant* vis-à-vis the current state and future direction of white culture.

Women who championed Pueblo spirituality generally defended the dances by appealing to the values of “equal rights” and cultural preservation.²⁹ The BIA’s complaints about sexuality

and feminists' interest in the matter reflect tensions about female sexuality in the U.S. – by the time the dance controversy ended, many people from all sides would point out that the dancing prevalent in white 'jazz' culture was equally risqué.³⁰ They also reveal how both government officials and feminist groups tried to alter future attitudes and actions regarding female sexuality – their claims were moral rather than descriptive, and in fact opposing groups of female and feminist culture warriors rarely seemed to disagree about, or fully understand, the nature of sexual imagery in the dances.

In the governmental and religious arenas, whites endeavored to change, or hold constant, labels and descriptions regarding Pueblo life to strategically promote political and cultural agendas. Supporters of the Bursum Bill, which still threatened the Pueblos after the dance controversy had erupted, tried to justify land seizures by referring to the savagery of their dances. Ironically, in 1913, the Supreme Court had described the dances similarly in order to justify government wardship over an undivided Pueblo territory.³¹ Assimilationists who sought to divide and allot Pueblo lands connected the Pueblos' "savagery" to a lack of industry, which the white settlers – prototypical, if thuggish, frontiersmen – possessed.³² Meanwhile, Collier and his group promoted and celebrated the Pueblos "fundamental pagan[ism]," which imbued them with "gay and fierce passion" on their noble spiritual path fraught with white danger. Theirs was "a way which might lead us white men far if we wished or were constituted to travel it."³³ Collier framed Pueblo spiritual and moral superiority to white society by comparing them to a "medieval Chartres," had it survived unchanged to the present day.³⁴ With this argument Collier tried to assert that Pueblo religion had produced morally superior subjects to contemporary Christianity, and that Pueblos' agrarian community was superior to modern industrialism. More importantly, it implies that Pueblo culture – and by extension all Indian cultures – were monolithic and

stagnant, betraying Collier's own *peripheral envisioning* wherein Pueblos would potentially save the white world from the brokenness of modernity.

Collier's romantics hide the Pueblos' complex internal struggles to maintain sovereignty over their spiritual practices. Complaints about the dances came not only from whites but also from some Pueblos, mostly those recently returned from boarding schools where they were taught Euro-American religious and social norms as well as academic disciplines and menial job skills.³⁵ Some of these 'returnees' invoked the concept of 'religious freedom' in order to avoid participating in the old 'pagan' ceremonies they had been taught to detest at school.³⁶ The divide between these and more traditional Pueblos was fundamentally one of world-view, but they both adopted the term 'religion' – which previously did not exist in their vocabularies – to protect something called 'sovereignty' from assimilationist *envisionings*. Initially, the Pueblos did not describe the dances as 'religion.' Instead, they simply insisted that "their own 'customs' were not immoral and had never interfered with their livelihood."³⁷ Through a gradual process, Pueblos of assimilated and traditional stock began to describe their ceremonies using that terminology to defend themselves against those who implied that their dances were merely savage entertainment rather than cosmically significant,³⁸ and because this seemed to present the only option to "invalidate the central argument for suppressing their ceremonies."³⁹ Using the term 'religion' framed the dances in ways that Euro-Americans could partially understand – it appealed to modern notions of cultural relativism,⁴⁰ and ultimately allowed them to move past the dance controversy, though not without further complications.

The category of 'religion' is unstable as it applies to Pueblos and Euro-Americans, even though they both use it to signify certain values – like individual freedom or 'sovereignty.' Tisa Wenger, in her many works on the Pueblo dance controversy, focuses intently on the points at

which the Pueblos began to use the “category of religion” to describe their dances. She notes especially that the term ‘religion’ is of European origins, and through its etymology and use came to describe textual and theistic traditions like Judaism and Christianity. Thus the term itself and the concepts that reside within it do not inherently apply to Pueblo ceremonies and dances.⁴¹ In a sense, Puebloan people *performed* the category of religion, perhaps not fully understanding it, in order to either safeguard their sacred land and customs, or to avoid them.

As the Pueblo dance controversy shows, Indians “adopted and sometimes co-opted” the roles whites expected, or forced them to perform based on *peripheral* vision. In doing so, Indians “tacitly acknowledge[d] that the best way to gain the attention of the people who had power over [their] lives was through carefully orchestrated performances.”⁴² Indian performances thus took on a self-conscious, theatrical, and anti-authoritarian quality,⁴³ and thus in some sense attested to a critical “presence” of *real*, rather than *peripherally envisioned* natives.⁴⁴ To further nuance discussions of native sovereignty, religion, and colonial dominance, we turn to the idea of native resistance and presence, of which sovereignty should be considered a “trace,” not a “cause.”⁴⁵

Conclusion: Performing and Possessing the Indian

If the United States government has the sole power to grant sovereignty to native tribes, and if *peripheral envisionings* largely determined official and public opinion regarding the validity of native religions, then at the turn of the twentieth century native people were largely absent in their own sovereignty. Natives displayed in pageants and observed at dances seductively signified “traditions” to which whites referred in order to advance specific cultural agendas. This process, which I have called *peripheral envisioning*, has allowed Euro-Americans

to extrapolate essences, imagine qualities, and make judgments from which to construct their ideal America. It has also allowed whites to appropriate Indian culture because, by virtue of colonial dominance and close surveillance translated into *peripheral envisioning*, Indian religion expressions and all expressions thereof became something Natives possessed.⁴⁶ It could thus be easily taken and passed through white America without becoming something other than “Indian.” White people who “play Indian” by donning regalia and enacting native ceremonies at new-age festivals and Indian camps⁴⁷ ‘commodify’ Indians based on *peripheral envisionings*, and in so doing push native people farther to the margins of livable existence in North America.

To function for real natives, the term *sovereignty* in some sense demands activity and motion, rather than merely the survival of a legal body with legal boundaries. While the sheer force of continual colonial dominance and *peripheral envisioning* may have relegated native people forever into the white imagination, the way natives resist and co-opt the roles to which whites relegated them in the early-twentieth century embodies the possibility of sovereignty. If the stage is inescapable, natives must strike “fugitive poses” which frankly admit “that the play is *not* real,” and thus “underline, rather than destroy, its basic affinity with reality.”⁴⁸ That reality is colonial dominance, forcible performance based on *peripheral* vision, and the resulting absence of natives from contemporary conceptions of the ‘Indian.’ In other words, natives’ imaginary counterpart the “Indian” lives on in the white imagination – if natives always live in relation to this ‘Indian,’ they must re-construct that image to reflect back at Euro-Americans the colonial dominator, usurper of native tradition, *peripheral envisioner*, who built the stage.

In recent years, a growing independent native cinema moves natives toward victory over a particular kind of stage. Movies like *Smoke Signals* blatantly confront the Indian stereotype and try to undermine it with realistic and unromantic depictions of reservation life, and deeply

personal stories that do not rely on the *envisioning* of an old tradition, but on the construction of a new one based on modern realities.⁴⁹ When natives gain sovereignty over the stage – whether literally in terms of film or metaphorically in terms of their peripheral status in white culture, they have the power to inform and reform white perspectives, and make at least one small step in undermining the imaginary Indian. Natives need sovereignty over the stage.

Bibliography

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.

Irwin, Lee. "Freedom, Law, and Prophecy: A Brief History of Native American Religious Resistance." In *Native American Spirituality: A Critical Reader*, edited by Lee Irwin, 295-316. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.

Jacobs, Margaret D. "Making Savages of Us All: White Women, Pueblo Indians, and the Controversy over Indian Dances in the 1920s." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* Vol. 17, No. 3 (1996): 178-209.

Limerick, Patricia. "The Persistence of the Frontier." *Harper's Magazine*, October 1994.

Maddox, Lucy. *Citizen Indians: Native American Intellectuals, Race and Reform*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Medcalf, Linda. *Law and Identity: Lawyers, Native Americans, and Legal Practice*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd., 1978.

Philp, Kenneth R. *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform, 1920-1954*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1981 [1977].

Prucha, Paul Francis, Ed. *Documents of United States Indian Policy, 2nd Edition, Expanded*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1990 [1975].

Treglia, Gabriella. "The Consistency and Inconsistency of Cultural Oppression: American Indian Dance Bans, 1900-1933." *The Western Historical Quarterly* Vol. 44, No. 2 (Summer 2013): 145-165.

Vizenor, Gerald. *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

Wenger, Tisa. "Land, Culture, and Sovereignty in the Pueblo Dance Controversy." *Journal of the Southwest* Vol. 46, No. 2 (Summer 2004): 381-412.

----- . *We Have a Religion: The 1920s Pueblo Indian Dance Controversy and American Religious Freedom*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

Wilkins, David E. *American Indian Sovereignty and the U.S. Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1997.

¹ Quoted in Lee Irwin, "Freedom, Law, and Prophecy: A Brief History of Native American Religious Resistance," in *Native American Spirituality: A Critical Reader*, ed. Lee Irwin (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2000): 297.

² Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 2.

³ Quoted in David E. Wilkins, *American Indian Sovereignty and the U.S. Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1997), 1.

⁴ Gerald Vizenor, *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998): 31.

⁵ P. Deloria, 107-8.

⁶ Linda Medcalf, *Law and Identity: Lawyers, Native Americans, and Legal Practice* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd., 1978): 47.

⁷ For example, Historian Tim McLoughlin notes that the Cherokee tribe self-consciously set up a bicameral legislature in the style of the United States government, and attempted to publicize the fact that many Cherokees lived and worked like Euro-Americans, in order to avoid harassment by the government. See Tim McLoughlin, *Cherokees and Christianity, 1794-1870: Essays on Acculturation and Cultural Persistence*, ed. Walter H. Conser, Jr. (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2008 [1994]).

⁸ Maddox, 20.

⁹ Lucy Maddox, *Citizen Indians: Native American Intellectuals, Race and Reform* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005): 3.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹² *Ibid.*, 40.

¹³ Collier often described Indian religions in general as overflowing with "beauty, joy," and "comradeship." See Kenneth Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform, 1920-1954* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1981 [1977]): 3.

¹⁴ Philp 38-9.

¹⁵ Wilkins, 66.

¹⁶ Paul Francis Prucha, Ed, *Documents of United States Indian Policy, 2nd Edition, Expanded* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1990 [1975]): 158.

¹⁷ Teller wanted to establish "Courts of Indian Offenses" that would punish Indians for taking part in dances or giveaways by jailing them or withholding federal rations for periods generally no longer than ten days.

¹⁸ Prucha, 160.

¹⁹ Quoted in Gabriella Treglia, "The Consistency and Inconsistency of Cultural Oppression: American Indian Dance Bans, 1900-1933," *The Western Historical Quarterly* Vol. 44, No. 2 (Summer 2013): 148

²⁰ quoted in Treglia, 149.

²¹ quoted in Treglia, 151.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Treglia, 154.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 155, 158.

²⁵ See Margaret D. Jacobs, "Making Savages of Us All: White Women, Pueblo Indians, and the Controversy over Indian Dances in the 1920s," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* Vol. 17, No. 3 (1996): 182. Information given to BIA agents by assimilationists like Clara True were essential in the compilation of the "Secret Dance Files"

– the unpublished report on the undoubtedly imagined sexual perversity of certain Pueblo ceremonies. Those documents caused the initial moral outrage about the Pueblo dances, despite few people ever having seen them. See also Wenger, *We Have a Religion*, 152-153.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Jacobs 180.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 185.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 186.

³⁰ *Ibid.* Jacobs takes the title of her article, “Making Savages of Us All” from a cultural critic of the era who remains unnamed in the article and notes. This person referred to white culture in this comment. The full quote reads: “one touch of jazz makes savages of us all” (186). By this time the signifier ‘savage’ referred primarily to Indians, but also probably to blacks (see p. 204, n. 46), or at least to the author’s imagination of who these dark-skinned people were.

³¹ Tisa Wenger, *We Have a Religion: The 1920s Pueblo Indian Dance Controversy and American Religious Freedom* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2009): 114.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Quoted in Wenger, *We Have a Religion*, 118.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 119.

³⁵ Jacobs, 182.

³⁶ Wenger, *We Have a Religion*, 100.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 146. Wenger discusses in detail the idea that in white culture, ‘religious freedom’ is a kind of sovereignty granted to each individual, whereas for traditionalist Pueblos the foreign idea of ‘religious freedom’ indicated a kind of sovereignty wherein they were free to practice their religion as an entire community without interference from the BIA.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 155.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 158.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 160.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 5-13. Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *The Meaning and End of Religion*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991 [1962]. Wenger uses Smith extensively to analyze how the term ‘religion’ came to its present meanings, and how it presumes a Euro-Christian worldview.

⁴² Maddox, 7.

⁴³ See *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁴ Vizenor, 23.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 16-7.

⁴⁷ See Phil Deloria, *Playing Indian* for a historical overview of whites who “play Indian.” Also see the excellent documentary *Reel Injun* (2009), which contains a segment about an ‘Indian’ camp where campers stay in woodland cabins, do woodland activities, identify with the names of certain tribes, and are taught various kinds of war-whoops.

⁴⁸ Vizenor, 2. Emphasis his.

⁴⁹ See *Smoke Signals*, directed by Chris Eyre (1998; Shadowcatcher Entertainment), DVD. The plot follows Victor and Thomas, an unlikely pair of Ceour D’Alene Indians living on a reservation. They go on a journey, to claim the possessions of Victor’s wayward, alcoholic, and abusive father who has died. It is a moving story about forgiveness, trauma, and humor carried out in the setting of modern Indian life, with all its problems and delights. In one scene in particular, Victor tries to tell Thomas, who has a lovable but rather nerdy-grandmother look about him, how to ‘look Indian.’ He invokes the stereotype of the stoic Indian who hunts buffalo, even though, as Thomas points out, the Ceour D’Alene are historically a fishing tribe. The film gets its Indian flavor not by referring to tradition or displaying Indian dances or religion, but by displaying modern native places and concerns, personal journeys, and the strangeness of the white world.