

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Native American Responses to the Western

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0gr3s3rb>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 19(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Leuthold, Steve M.

Publication Date

1995

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Native American Responses to the Western

STEVEN M. LEUTHOLD

Efforts by Native Americans to control their own public image result, in part, from a desire to counteract five hundred years of white people's imagery of Indians, including consistent misrepresentation in Hollywood Westerns. This paper, which focuses on Native American responses to Westerns, relates to a larger research project that examines the re-presentation of Indians by natives themselves in film and video documentaries.¹ Although I present native responses to portrayals of Indians in recent Westerns, I do not pretend to "speak for" Native Americans in this paper. Rather, I have researched the topic in order to discover some of the potentials and pitfalls of the role of visual communication in intercultural relations. Because the paper concerns general issues of representation, I often refer to Native Americans (and whites) in general terms. Both of these populations are, of course, quite diverse. Therefore, exceptions exist for each of the general statements that I make, but the issue of cross-cultural representation is so important in native media and scholarship that a general discussion seems warranted.

Issues in cross-cultural visual representation are part of the broader problem of racism. Euro-American culture has incorporated negative attitudes toward many ethnic groups, subcultures, and other nationalities. The process has been systematic alienation: Cultural resources are used to make poor people and those

Steven M. Leuthold is an assistant professor in the School of Art and Design, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

of non-European ethnicity feel inferior and separate. Several consequences emerge from this estrangement between ethnic minorities and Euro-American culture. Negative attitudes lead to deleterious treatment of members of other cultures. Frequently, the negative beliefs themselves contradict fact, but the danger is that these beliefs will be internalized by the members of the ethnic minority; for example, some Indians internalize white stereotypes of the "drunken," "savage," or "lazy" Indian. Alcoholism and unemployment result from cultural dislocation and economic deprivation, but the process of systematic alienation shifts the responsibility for these socially unacceptable behaviors to the victims themselves.

A subtle ideology is internalized over a period of generations. Seemingly "harmless" narratives in Western films and novels are linked to form a "seamlessly perfected system of internal colonization"² that works precisely because of its "naturalness." Because of the historical weight of negative attitudes, they change slowly and with difficulty. For example, as late as the 1970s, American Indians were consistently portrayed as savages in popular culture—a stereotype that validated the dominant culture's self-perceived "cleanliness," "godliness," and "civility." Only recently has this portrayal been modified in some films.³ An indigenous documentarian, George Burdeau (Blackfoot), who spoke at the Two Rivers Native Film and Video Festival in Minneapolis in October 1991, explained how, as a child, he first became aware of media stereotyping of Indians:

When I was about nine or ten years old, I lived in Muskogee, Oklahoma, and I went to a movie theater in town on a Saturday morning, and there was a film called *The Searchers*, the John Ford film . . . I sat in that theater completely captivated by this incredibly powerful drama—beautifully written, shot, conceived. And throughout the course of that film, I became more and more aware of the fact that I had some conflicts that were beginning to arise inside of me. They were beginning to come apart because the villain in this film was the loathsome Indian. He was a character that was absolutely inhuman. And I remember that, as I walked home that afternoon, being a little more comforted by the surroundings that were more familiar to me, I began to try to figure out how to [cope] with what I had just got through seeing. Does this mean that all Indian people are bad?

You have to understand that I was what many of us know as an urban Indian; I grew up in the city. Both of my parents were Indian, and, yet, they were raised in such a manner they did everything in their power to assimilate into mainstream society. So I had very little knowledge of my own cultural heritage. They didn't share it because they felt it was outdated. Now I know this is a story that has been heard by many of you. But the conflict that I felt that afternoon—and when I went home and I was talking to my mother and I asked her about this, she said, "Well, that was a long time ago . . ." But, it still didn't solve the conflict that I had inside of me.⁴

Burdeau's recollections point to the powerful appeal of dramatic Westerns for Native American as well as Euro-American children. The strength of that appeal derives from not only from the cinematic and narrative aspects of these films but from a denial of Indianness by members of an older generation of Indians who had assimilated into the mainstream society. Assimilation includes seeing film images of Indians as part of a distant past that is largely irrelevant and therefore harmless to the lives of contemporary natives. This denial of the importance of media imagery failed, however, to address the emotional conflict felt by younger Indians like Burdeau, especially those who matured in the civil rights era of the late 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. (In a producer's forum, Burdeau tied the growth of native-produced media to the affirmative action policies that resulted from the civil rights struggle.)

A desire to counteract mainstream imagery, then, is what motivates Native American scholar-activists and pioneer native directors such as Burdeau and Phil Lucas, who began making films in the seventies. Often, when members of minorities or subcultures become aware of the dominant society's negative attitudes toward them, they respond by asserting their own cultural identity. The growth of indigenous media illustrates how conventional portrayals of the cultural "other" can be challenged through the presentation of alternative portraits. Frequently, cultural members confirm the existence of oppressors and call on members of the group to "share the identity of the martyrs and to admit the implications of their identity."⁵ Any further repressive action attests to the relationship between the culture's martyrs and the oppressors. The history of a group may be rewritten to confirm the relation of oppressor and oppressed. The struggle for control of identification occurs through processes of re-presentation, a process that includes not only what is portrayed but also

how it is portrayed. Native Americans are currently engaged in this process of re-presentation through native-produced film and video documentary.

The notion of “otherness” might not be problematic if it were not frequently accompanied by reductionist and, therefore, stereotyping tendencies in accounts based on a mechanical, dualistic understanding of intergroup relations. As du Preez suggests, this mechanical representation of other groups often emerges through aesthetic and media practices.⁶ Outsiders often represent a culture in an iconic and reductionistic way. Both of these characteristics contribute to stereotyping. Iconic images carry emotional and value connotations beyond their physical appearance; they communicate beliefs and values related to the larger culture’s attitudes about the subculture. Reductionistic images represent the essential or core elements of the outsider’s perception of a culture, thereby limiting a more complete understanding of the culture. Reductionistic images fix a meaning about the subculture in the minds of the audience. For example, previous research has pointed to the way toys, books, advertisements, and television programs reinforce existing stereotypes—fixed images—of American Indians in young children.⁷

Many of these stereotypes of Indians were examined in a five-part documentary, *Images of Indians* (1980), by native producer/director Phil Lucas (Lummi) and Robert Hagopian that deconstructed images of Indians found in Westerns.⁸ The amount of effort devoted to this production, revealed in both the depth and breadth of the supporting research, indicates the centrality of the issue of stereotyping in mainstream media for Native American film- and videomakers such as Lucas. During three years of research, the film’s producers viewed more than five hundred Westerns.⁹ I noted earlier that this paper relates to a larger research project that examines the re-presentation of Indians by natives themselves; the Lucas documentary is an important aspect of this investigation, because it was the first thorough critique of white stereotypes by a native documentary director. I also will discuss reactions to some films that have appeared since 1980, when *Images of Indians* was made, in order to discover native perceptions of consistency and change in white filmmakers’ representations of Indians.

At Salish-Kootenai College, a tribal college on the Flathead Indian Reservation in western Montana, where I conducted part of this research, *Images of Indians* is part of the instructional media

for a class of the same name that has been offered annually for several years. Some of the comments that appear in this paper were drawn from this class, which included both native and nonnative students and was led by Corwin Clairmont (Salish). A similar class, but one that employed different films, was led by John Dyer (Oneida) at University College of Syracuse University in fall 1992. Dyer's comments and ideas also inform this paper.

Many of the native producers' comments cited in this paper were drawn from speeches and panel discussions at a 1991 conference of Native American media professionals.¹⁰ This timely conference, which occurred immediately before the quincennial year that led to a re-evaluation of contact between Western and indigenous peoples, provided a forum for native producers and directors to discuss the state of their profession at the beginning of a new decade. Other ideas in this paper were drawn from personal interactions with native videographers at the Salish-Kootenai College media center.¹¹ Although it is affiliated with the college, the media center serves the needs of an extended community by developing local programming and broadcasting national educational programs; therefore, it acts as a tribal media center. I gathered additional material from books and articles written by both Native Americans and nonnatives about films. The comments in this paper may not reflect the most recent thoughts of individual native producers, directors, and scholars but do indicate the general concerns of native media professionals and critics in the early 1990s.

In researching, I consulted various sources: conversations, films, classes, seminars, books, and articles. With the exception of students' classroom comments, most of these sources reveal the ideas of Native American "opinion leaders," those individuals for whom film portrayals of Indians are salient aspects of the debate surrounding the cross-cultural representation of Indians. Just how much can these opinion leaders' ideas be generalized to the interpretations of broader Native American publics? Some theories of communication posit that leaders help guide the opinions of broader publics. For example, a "two-step flow" model of communication argues that media representations affect viewers only indirectly, filtered through the influence of interpersonal relations and opinion leaders.¹² In this model, the ideas of opinion leaders may affect the diffusion of information in important ways; they help viewers frame the information that they receive from mass-mediated sources. Some theories shift the agency of inter-

pretation more heavily to communities of viewers, regarding audience members as active processors of information. For example, uses and gratifications, reader-response, and reception theories¹³ argue for the existence of diverse communities that interpret media representations according to their own needs. This paper rests on the theoretical assumption that media images do not directly affect viewers; rather they affect viewers indirectly through a complex process of diffusion consistent with a "limited effects" model.¹⁴ Elements of socialization such as parent-child systems, educational systems, as well as broader economic and political conditions will affect viewer interpretations. In this sense, opinion leaders may play an important role in the diffusion of media information in many social settings.

At the beginning of his classic *Custer Died for Your Sins*, Vine Deloria noted the persistence of enduring mainstream stereotypes of Indians as grunting, fierce enemies, decked out in feathers.¹⁵ In the 1960s and 1970s, the stereotypes of the "savage warrior" and "unknown primitive" continued to abound in contemporary films. These stereotypes persisted despite the disappearance of the "low-grade Western" of the second quarter-century of American film.¹⁶

The Hollywood Western has influenced the public's perceptions of Indians more than any other communication form. Westerns incorporate narrative traditions from the nineteenth century dime novel that perpetuate deeply seated white stereotypes of Indians. Films embrace the images of the Indian that were prevalent in these earlier forms because commercial filmmakers have historically attempted to reach the same youthful, lower- and middle-class audiences (who cannot afford expensive entertainments and may not comprehend sophisticated drama) to whom the earlier representational forms appealed.¹⁷ Part of the power of Westerns results from their pervasiveness: more than two thousand Westerns have been made and seen throughout the world.¹⁸

In addition, the Western form has influenced other movies ostensibly unconcerned with Indians. Phil Lucas describes how the plot of Martin Scorsese's *Taxi Driver* (1976) is taken from John Ford's *The Searchers* (1956).¹⁹ According to Lucas, John Ford is Scorsese's favorite director, and *The Searchers* is his favorite film. In *The Searchers*, the character played by John Wayne hunts for a young girl who has been kidnapped by Indians. Similarly, in *Taxi Driver*, Robert DeNiro plays a taxi driver who tries to save an eleven-year-old girl who has been captured into prostitution. At

the beginning of the movie, DeNiro's character is called "Cowboy." By contrast, the girl's pimp wears long, dark hair and an Apache headband. In one verbal reference, the pimp, played by Harvey Keitel, tells DeNiro, "Go back to your own tribe." When DeNiro finally goes after the girl in a violent onslaught, he cuts his hair into a Mohawk and symbolically "becomes an Indian." According to Lucas, this scene is so violent that the movie was originally rated "X"; the color of the blood had to be toned down from red to brown in order for the film to be released with an "R" rating.

Lucas believes that *Taxi Driver* perpetuates the stereotype of Indians as violent people, even though it is not "about" Indians. He adds that this violent stereotype contradicts central Native American symbols such as the sacred circle and pipe, the eagle, green corn, and other plant symbols, and rituals such as the sweatlodge, all of which express peace and spirituality. He notes, by contrast, that almost any courthouse lawn in mainstream America displays a cannon or statue of soldiers with guns—images that stand in stark opposition to Native American public symbols. The degree to which natives are stereotyped as violent in the Western and the ways in which this stereotype is reinforced in other film genres constitute one concern of native viewers such as Lucas.

The creators of Hollywood Westerns ignored distinctions between tribes in order to create an easily recognizable, hostile enemy. Plains and Apache Indians became the universal Indian for white audiences.²⁰ The typical Western showed little concern for accuracy in the portrayal of Native American culture. Instead, according to Vine Deloria, Indians functioned as "dramatic gimmicks" to advance a plot based on conflict.²¹ With their emphasis on action and conflict, Westerns reductively emphasized the warrior image of Indians to the detriment of a fuller portrayal of the culture and usually represented Indians as losers in battle, which, as Deloria states, misrepresents history.²² Thus, one value that native viewers use to judge Westerns is their degree of historical accuracy.

Another glaring Hollywood practice that undermines the credibility of many films is the prevalence of non-Indians in Indian roles. Whether it is Burt Lancaster playing the outlaw Masai in *Apache* (1954), the blue-eyed Chuck Connors starring in *Geronimo* (1962), Anthony Quinn as Crazy Horse in *They Died With Their Boots On* (1941), or Trevor Howard as the dying yet heroic grand-

father in the more recent film *Windwalker* (1980), the appearance of white actors in Indian roles undermines these films' credibility. Casting whites as Indians limits the ability of Native Americans to benefit economically from films depicting their cultures and makes it difficult for them to control the image of Indians shown to the public.²³ The use of white actors in central Indian roles is a result of Hollywood's star system, which developed as early as 1910. Stars attract paying audiences and financial backers for films.²⁴ This type of casting only strengthens the impression that the film industry is less concerned with "giving something back" to native communities than with turning a profit for itself. Another value that natives bring to film representations, then, is a desire to extend the economic benefits of film to native artists and communities. Thus native filmmakers counteract the tendency of Hollywood to commodify the image of Indians for its own profit.

The casting of whites as Indians reinforces a long tradition in American drama and popular culture of "playing Indians" and allows whites to insist on certain aspects of Indian personality, culture, and behavior.²⁵ This play-acting also is evident in roles where whites "go native," such as the Natty Bumppo character in James Fenimore Cooper's *Last of the Mohicans* in which a Western white is represented as half Indian in dress and manner.²⁶ Suspicion regarding whites playing Indian roles helps account for the inability of some native viewers to take the most recent film version of *Last of the Mohicans* seriously.²⁷ But this convention extends beyond the example of *Last of the Mohicans*; several of the films discussed at length in this paper, including *Dances with Wolves*, *Jeremiah Johnson*, *Little Big Man*, and *A Man Called Horse*, feature central roles where whites "go native" to some degree. The question of whites in Indian or half-Indian roles extends beyond potential economic benefits to include the issue of who has the power to control the portrayal of Indians.

Even when filmmakers do strive for historical accuracy and employ Native American actors and advisors, as in the case of Kevin Costner's *Dances with Wolves* (1990), writers and directors usually depict Indian cultures as they appeared in the late nineteenth century. Several students in the "Images of Indians" class at Salish-Kootenai College recounted incidents of visiting the East Coast and being approached on the street by curious whites inquiring whether they were Indian and lived in a tipi. Another student expressed frustration about an opinion held by some whites: "If you want to be Indian, why don't you go live in a tipi

in the hills like in the old days?"²⁸ Just as contemporary Inuit people do not want to be thought of as nose-rubbing igloo dwellers,²⁹ many members of the Plains and Plateau tribes do not want to be stereotyped as nomadic tipi dwellers. Hollywood's constant repetition of the nineteenth century Plains Indian image insures that only the "Hollywood Indian" is visible to the general non-Indian population today.

The manufactured Hollywood Indian is surprisingly similar to an earlier manufactured image, the "cigar store Indian." An entire industry produced these figures that stood in front of and on the counters of tobacco shops, especially during the decades between 1850 and 1880. Carvers rarely used models for their figures, and realism was not especially valued by them³⁰—another parallel with the highly stylized representation of Indians in the Western. Thus, in order to sell a product or image, industrial-scale production fosters the reduction of portrayals to a few highly identifiable characteristics. In film, the lives and problems of contemporary Native Americans are ignored in favor of the readily identifiable nineteenth-century Indian. It is almost as if Indians and the popular understanding of them were frozen in time a century ago; this predicament contributes to the invisibility of contemporary Indians for the larger public.³¹ By fixing the image of Indians in the past, Hollywood overlooks the complexity of contemporary native realities. Thus Native Americans judge films partly on the complexity and sensitivity with which they represent contemporary Indians' lives.

A handful of recent feature films set in the West, including *Powwow Highway* (1988), *War Party* (1988), and *Thunderheart* (1991), portray contemporary Indians. Each of these films, however, employs white/Indian conflict as a plot element, echoing the basic plot structures of the dime novel and the Hollywood Western. This treatment is heavily reinforced in the plot of *War Party*, a contemporary Western that emphasizes that little has changed in more than one hundred years of white-Indian interaction.

The opening scene of *War Party* leads the viewer to believe that the story is set in the late nineteenth century, but, in an edit from breakaway Indian ponies to an Indian youth in his Ford pickup, we are transported into the modern era. The young Indian is one of the central characters in the film; the plot revolves around the centenary reenactment of a cavalry battle. Thus, the tone is ironic from the outset, because it situates Indian-white relations in the battle scene, a representational form encapsulated in white imagi-

nations by film and poster images of Custer's Last Stand. The youths are being asked by the town leaders to take part in a reenactment of Indian "savagery" for the benefit of a paying white audience. The father of the central character heads the tribal council, a position that the son regards as little more than "yes-man" to the white mayor of the town. However, the youth and his other friends agree to go along with the battle reenactment, which the mayor has cooked up for the sake of "maximum tourist pull." The reenactment becomes a scene of bloodletting in its own right when a local white man shoots an Indian in revenge for being cut in a bar fight over a pool game bet. Violence quickly escalates when an Indian shoots the white man in retaliation. Soon, the Indian youths become prey for a local posse determined to avenge the shooting of the white man.

Native viewers may respond to films based on the degree to which the films empathize with Indians in their struggle against white racism and mistreatment. *War Party* differs from many earlier Westerns in its filmic empathy with the young Indian renegades rather than the white townspeople. Portraits of drunken rednecks; inept, cruel posse members; apathetic police; hypocritical politicians; and piranhic media personnel create an unfavorable image of the whites in this film. By contrast, the Indians are represented as struggling heroically to regain something of their past. They form a "war party," kill a scout from the Crow tribe (traditional enemies of the Blackfeet) who is working with the posse, and travel deep into the mountains that their ancestors considered sacred. Finally, when they are trapped at a sacred place near the Canadian border and the posse has demanded their surrender, one of the youths seeks the advice of a local medicine man. Based on his counsel and their own fear of the white-controlled prison system, they refuse to surrender. The concluding scene ennobles the youths by turning them into martyrs. This movie martyrdom further reinforces the idea that Indians have "disappeared" in the face of the white onslaught. Although it makes heroes of the Indian youths, *War Party* (1988) retains one premise of the traditional Western: the inevitability of white "progress" at the expense of Indian land and culture. The film's valiant but ill-fated native heroes are an extension of the earlier stereotype of the Indian as a noble anachronism—a character of natural virtue whose race is doomed by the oncoming white culture.³²

Some Indian people stand behind the film as a realistic portrayal; for them, Indian-white relations are charged with hostility,

and *War Party* tapped their anger.³³ The view that *War Party* attempts a more accurate and honest portrait of Indian-white relations than other recent films has received some critical support. Jean Fisher, a critic and curator who has worked closely with native artist Jimmie Durham, writes that, as a "dialectic between the past and the present," *War Party* "offers a commentary on the kind of commodification of both native cultures and history that *Dances with Wolves* represents."³⁴ For Fisher, the film is unlike the liberal Westerns, made since the early fifties, that simply "invert conventional stereotypes—'good' Indians/'bad' Anglos . . ."³⁵ However, with its consistent portrayal of evil whites and its emphasis on violence as the central component of Indian-white relations, the film can also be interpreted as belonging to this same tradition of reductionistic reversals on the themes of the old Westerns.

For a number of natives, the film was unnecessarily inflammatory in its emphasis on hostilities between whites and Indians. Although there is no consensus on *War Party's* trueness to life, there is little doubt that it exploits the historical conflict between whites and Indians for the sake of dramatic conflict. In this sense, it contains the same underlying premise as did the generations of Westerns that preceded it.

One native who lived on the Blackfeet reservation during the filming of *War Party* felt that one real source of Blackfeet identification with the film was the satisfaction of seeing the surrounding, well-loved countryside on the screen. It is hard to disavow a product made in your own community, even if you do not completely agree with it. Another source of viewer empathy is the participation of many local community members in the filmmaking.

Many natives are concerned about the role models that films may provide for Native American youths. A middle-aged Blackfeet man expressed concern with a scene early in the film showing the young Indian lead setting off for a picnic with two sixpacks of beer under his arm; the man felt that this scene reinforced an image that Indians today are trying to change. In addition, instead of learning about their culture through the traditional channels of tribal communication, young Native Americans imitate movie portrayals of Indians; thus life imitates fiction. "In our tribe, we have certain customs now that actually have been transformed by film We're doing stuff out of film now: face painting, for instance. Youths . . . are painting their faces, not in the traditional

way we did that—by clan, by family, by color—but they're doing it out of what they see in the damn movies."³⁶

As discussed at length elsewhere, the central conflict in Westerns is between advancing "civilization," represented by the frontier town and, especially, the educated white woman, and threats to civilization, usually represented either by outlaws or "savage" Indians.³⁷ In this ideology, wilderness must first be discovered, then tamed, and Indians are convenient symbols for the untamed elements of the wilderness.³⁸ The "discovery" and settlement of new land received the blessing of organized religion, which saw potential converts to Christianity in the land's original inhabitants. According to native film director Phil Lucas, manifest destiny was rooted in the Catholic Church's "divine doctrine of discovery," a doctrine that Lucas considers very confusing, because it masks the actual experience of conquest in favor of the more palatable concept of discovery.³⁹ Thus, another criterion that natives use to judge films is the degree to which the film reinforces notions of progress associated with the ideology of Western colonialism.

In the popular imagination, Indians have been stereotyped as violent opponents of whites' inevitable progress. Even supposedly pro-Indian films like *Soldier Blue* (1974), which depicts the Indian massacre of a paymaster's wagon and cavalry detail, still justify white action to some degree by depicting Indian acts of terror.⁴⁰ The documentary *Images of Indians* explains that, at the turn of the century, academics reinforced this notion of inevitable white progress with their "frontier thesis," which held that westward migration and settlement were the primary forces shaping American history. The Indians presented an obstacle to white settlement; their domination became a central ingredient of white society's national identity. It was not until the middle of the twentieth century that this reading of history was seen to reflect ideology as much as actual experience. The redefinition continues to be debated down to the present, as scholars discuss whose version of history should be told in the classroom.

The traditional historical narrative of white "progress" rests on an overriding assumption, by traditional historians such as Arthur Schlesinger, of a common, even singular American culture. This assumption has not gone unnoticed by Native Americans: in part 5 of *Images of Indians*, series narrator Will Sampson notes the powerful white bias present in both fiction films and academic history and offers the example of Schlesinger's complete omission

of the Trail of Tears (the forced displacement of Eastern tribes to Oklahoma) in his *Age of Jackson*.

If white progress is an unquestioned premise in the dominant society's historical understanding, then the inevitable disappearance of Native American culture—encapsulated in the title of Zane Grey's serial novel, *The Vanishing American* (1920–22)—is the counterpoint to progress. This viewpoint is transparently expressed in earlier Westerns such as *Apache* (1954), in which the entire plot is based on the struggle of an Indian outlaw against encroaching civilization. *Apache* is replete with stereotypes pointing to the eventual disappearance of "real" Indians: the disillusioned, alcoholic chief, Santos, of Masai's band; the army scout, Hondo, and other Indians who have "sold out" to the army in order to advance in a white man's career; and an Indian wife who values settling down over a nomadic lifestyle. The theme of the vanishing Indian, depicted in *Apache* in a romantic last stand against civilization, is a projection of white values and attitudes onto Indians.⁴¹

The assumption that whites were civilized and Native Americans were not does not hold up under closer examination. Many of the Southwestern tribes, including the Hopi and other Pueblo Indians, already were agriculturalists before they encountered whites. In fact, corn—a symbol of white agriculture in *Apache*—was introduced to Europeans by Native Americans and acts as a sacred, central entity in Southwestern cultures.⁴²

If progress toward a white-sanctioned way of life is not inevitable, how can the mass destruction of buffalo and the genocide of indigenous peoples be rationalized? The rationale and the consequences of white attitudes toward indigenous peoples are remarkably like Nazi ideas about Jews. This parallel has rarely been drawn, however, because American popular culture contains contrasting attitudes toward Indians and Jews. The power of the contrast was expressed by John Dyer (Oneida) during the recent quincentennial celebration. Dyer noted that, for Native Americans, Columbus Day celebrations make about as much sense as a celebration of "Hitler Day" might make for Jews.

Ward Churchill (Creek/Cherokee-Métis) writes that one effect of Westerns has been to popularize the childhood game of "cowboys and Indians," where the goal of the sport is to kill all the Indians; in these games, even Indian children want to be the cowboys. He pointedly asks, "What if the game were called 'Nazis and Jews'?"⁴³ However, in American popular culture, whites can

readily assume the role of the Indian, an aggressive, antisocial position that allows the role-player to play "dirty," in contrast to the cowboy, who is the "good guy." This symbolic playing Indian may help Euro-Americans rationalize their assumptions that led to the genocide of Native Americans—assumptions that parallel those held by Nazis toward Jews. In each case, there was an underlying notion of cultural superiority. Indians were forced to adopt the white way of life because whites believed that their way was superior to the Indian way. In each case, additional land was needed in order for the destiny of the superior culture to be fulfilled. Whether expressed by Hitler's doctrine of *lebensraum*, the American concept of manifest destiny, or the phrase elbow room taught to millions of children on Saturday morning television,⁴⁴ the underlying assumption is consistent: Cultural superiority warrants territorial expansion. In each case, the effect on the victims was consistent: forced displacement from traditional homelands, cultural annihilation, and death through genocide. Is it any wonder that many Native Americans protested the quincentenary (1992) glorification of Columbus?⁴⁵

Some native viewers judge motion pictures based on the way the films acknowledge or conceal the genocide and forced displacement of Native Americans. This is part of a more encompassing question: Does the film reflect a native cultural and historical perspective? The expression of native views ranks high in the priorities of indigenous videomakers and other spokespeople. This alternative perspective may include acknowledgment of the fact that many American principles of government, such as confederation and sovereignty, have been influenced by the social organization of indigenous communities. During her presentation at the Two Rivers Native Film and Video Festival in 1991, writer/activist Suzan Harjo (Cheyenne/Muscogee) discussed the roots of American principles in traditional Indian cultures:

We have a huge image mythology to overcome: things that are so ingrained that people do not even question them. Why is it that the history of Native America is called prehistory in science, in history, in education of America and Europe? Prehistory means we didn't really have a history. We don't exist except in relationship to the Europeans. And the things that happened before were prehistoric . . . we were nothing. We had no jurisprudential systems, just the one we gave to the United States. No governance systems, just the ones we gave to the United States. Where do they get these

notions of confederation? Confederation had been impossible in Europe. The Natchez Confederacy of forty-eight nations, the Iroquois Six Nations Confederacy: those had not existed in those forms in Europe; it had not been possible. They had only been able to ally in wartime and had not been able to make the peace with each other: to ally, to confederate. That's where confederation came from.

And where did the notion of individual sovereignty come from? . . . It came from here; it did not exist in Europe. In Europe, it was sovereignty flowing from God . . . to the king, to some of the people some of the time and most of the people none of the time. Here, the individual was sovereign and select[ed] representatives for a time and a purpose: not to make heroes; not to make mythic figures, but for functional leadership. This is a very important thing that we have to give to the world: a way of having heroes who are leaders, having leaders for their own time, for their own purpose, for their own function. If we approached things like that, we would have not only better leaders—then it wouldn't matter if they were flawed in some areas—people would accept that everyone is flawed in some way and maybe people are flawed in every area except one and then they should shine. But we would build better followers.⁴⁶

Harjo's argument that the American confederation is based on the Iroquoian model is open to debate;⁴⁷ other possible sources for the concept of confederation include the ideas and writings of the Scottish philosophers of the time and the Swiss model of confederation. But her speech does point to the existence of complex forms of political organization in some indigenous societies and their influence on American political life. I have quoted Suzan Harjo at length, because her position and those of other Native Americans who put forth an alternate image of indigenous peoples call into question the assumption of the "vanishing American" and argue for the inclusion of contemporary native perspectives in film.

Perhaps it could be argued that the continued existence, even the renewal of native cultures, is an accepted fact today—a foregone conclusion. Yet, is this really the case? Have popular representations of Indians really shifted to reflect continuing change in Native American cultures, or are they stalled in pre-twentieth-century, often fatalistic understandings of Indians? Harjo opened her talk by pointing to the dilemma of the representation of Indians as some sort of peculiar exception to the rule of

progress. After she shared with the audience a button that read, "Fuck Columbus. He was lost," she stated,

Well, Columbus was lost. We aren't talking simply about the matter of semantics—you say 'new world,' we say 'our world'—we're talking about something that goes much deeper, although it must start with words and images, which is one reason that I felt it was very important to be here where many people are putting forth images of ourselves and of our world, which is our shared world, and trying to do something to bring us into the modern era, not just as an anomaly, which is how we are perceived by the general population—that we exist today is seen as anomalous—but as real living people who are part of a cultural continuum.⁴⁸

Until the present, Native Americans have not been able to acquaint the larger public with contemporary Indian life, which incorporates both traditional and contemporary elements. Although inroads have been made through the limited distribution of documentaries, the mass representation of Indians is still completely in the hands of white writers, directors, and producers. As native filmmaker Bob Hicks has noted, no feature-length film has been made or directed by a Native American as of the early 1990s.

Why is this problematic? Some people may feel that there has been a trend toward greater accuracy in the portrayal of Indians by whites over the last twenty years. In addition, it could be argued that the civil rights era and subsequent emergence of a counterculture during the late 1960s and early 1970s led to a more sympathetic portrayal of Indians, a portrait that even incorporates, in some cases, a native point of view. However, as Berkhofer has argued at length, "the countercultural use of the American Indian does not equal a realistic portrayal but merely a reversal of judgement upon the standard stereotype."⁴⁹ Even in sympathetic films made by Euro-Americans, the motivations assigned to Indians merely reverse the historically negative stereotypes. Countercultural images of Indians during the 1960s and 1970s served a function similar to the portraits of the "noble savage" during the Enlightenment and the Romantic era: They acted to criticize the dominant social institutions of contemporary industrial society. In contrast to the fragmented, decentered, spiritually bankrupt, and ecologically destructive culture of the capitalist West, elements of native cultures represent a spiritually rich,

ecologically balanced, socially integrated alternative for members of the counterculture.⁵⁰

Some Native Americans feel that the loss of a spiritual center in Euro-American cultures has led whites to take an increased interest in native religion and thought.⁵¹ For whites, Indians may represent the parts of themselves that have been lost in a competitive, materialistic, destructive society. Many Native Americans realize that even the sympathetic, comparatively more accurate depictions of Indians in recent years follow from an understanding of Indians by negation; Indians represent what Euro-American culture does not have. Thus, one evaluative question asked by some native viewers will be whether a film presents a picture of an idealized, simplistic Indian life that serves the spiritual and economic needs of whites or a truer, more complex portrayal of native cultures.

Early examples of Westerns that supposedly are sympathetic toward Indians include *Little Big Man* (1970), *Soldier Blue* (1974), and *A Man Called Horse* (1970). *A Man Called Horse* is the most insidious of these films, because, in an introductory leader, the filmmakers claim historical accuracy and then misrepresent the Indian culture(s) they portray. However, *A Man Called Horse* is similar to *Little Big Man* and *Soldier Blue* in its incorporation of the captivity narrative. Each of these films opens by focusing on a central character who has been either captured or just released by Indians.⁵² *Little Big Man* and *Soldier Blue* reverse the traditional captivity narrative, because the central character in each of these films voluntarily returns to the camp of his captors late in the story in order to warn of a pending attack by whites. This device of voluntary return illuminates the Indians' fundamental humanity and the whites' inhumanity; in returning to the camps of their former captors, the lead characters are rejecting the cruelty and hypocrisy of the outside world.

By contrast, *A Man Called Horse* perpetuates the classic captivity narrative and its moralistic tone, because it presents a character who is captured violently and who, for the most part, repudiates the values of his captors. (The narrative is somewhat atypical of this tradition in that the captive is a male.) In a prologue, the filmmakers (Elliot Silverstein, director; Sandy Howard, producer; Jack DeWitt, screenplay) claim to base their narrative, especially the sequence depicting the sun vow ritual, on the paintings of the early artist-explorers George Catlin and Karl Bodmer. However, according to Native Americans, the film contains many inaccura-

cies in its presentation of rituals; for example, the film version of the sun vow takes place indoors, in a large, crowded lodge, when, in actual practice, the ritual usually occurred outside. Ward Churchill has argued that the filmic treatment of the sun vow converts the sacred ritual into a "macho exercise in 'self mutilation,' a 'primitive initiation rite.'"⁵³ In another scene, a woman is shown entering a sweatlodge in the middle of the camp; in actuality, the sweatlodge embodied a private ritual away from the public life of the camp. That the scene focuses on the sexuality of the woman more than the religious import of the ritual also undermines the credibility of the film; instead, it ties the film to a tradition of portrayals that includes sexual references for native females even when tribal dress and practice contradict the reference.⁵⁴

Several scenes portraying the social life of the Sioux have been questioned by critics of the film.⁵⁵ In two incidents central to the plot, the filmmakers depict the tribe abandoning elderly Indian women after their warrior sons have been killed in battle. In one of these cases, the portrayal is reinforced by shots of the woman wandering outside during a blizzard and finally succumbing to the elements. This image of intentional neglect of old people directly conflicts with the respect accorded to elders in most Native American cultures.

Most regrettably, *A Man Called Horse* was presented as historically accurate; viewers unfamiliar with historical Native American cultures—which includes most nonnatives and many natives as well—are invited to believe that the filmic account reflects "the way it was." The ideological framework implicit in the captivity narrative formula becomes transparent under this guise of historical authenticity.⁵⁶ And it was the guise of authenticity that led some viewers to see this film as a sympathetic portrayal of Indians, in contrast to the more obviously contrived images of Indians in earlier Westerns. In a recent article, Jean Fisher defends the film on the basis that it "manages to convey some sense of a people whose difference from modern Euro-American ideas includes a value system alien to humanism."⁵⁷ Fisher's defense of the film is rooted in her distrust of the valorization of liberal humanism in other recent Westerns. But defending a portrayal of Indian cultures on the grounds of "difference" alone is unacceptable, given the film's serious inaccuracies.⁵⁸

Little Big Man (1970) and *Soldier Blue* (1974) invert the traditional captivity narrative that *A Man Called Horse* perpetuates. In

their opening prologue and epigraph, the makers of *Soldier Blue* (Ralph Nelson, director; Harold Loeb and Gabriel Katzka, producers; John Gay, screenplay) also present their narrative as based on a true story—that of the Sand Creek Massacre—and a testament to the dark side of the human spirit. However, their focus on the love relationship between the white woman, newly released from captivity by the Cheyenne and played by Candace Bergen, and her comically noble-hearted soldier-protector, played by Peter Strauss, quickly dispels any sense of historical accuracy, even though it may heighten the entertainment value of the film for some audience members.

Significantly, it is the white woman, Cresta Marybelle Lee, and not a Native American, who articulates the Indian perspective in the film. This gives rise to a curious disjunction in the film's structure. In an early scene, Indians swoop down on the paymaster's detail, which is also escorting the white woman to her fiancé at a nearby fort; the Indians massacre the entire column of soldiers, except for Honus (Strauss), who becomes the woman's inept escort. In the aftermath of this massacre, Cresta admonishes Honus that it was whites who taught Indians to scalp and that she had been in Indian camps attacked by soldiers and had seen women and children brutally killed. Thus, the film attempts to reverse the savage stereotype by making the white soldiers the true savages. Although the "Indian perspective" is worked into the script, the action, including the early massacre and the unfolding love story, frames the events in typical Hollywood style. Not until the final scene of the movie, which portrays the atrocity of the Sand Creek Massacre, does the film solidly empathize with the Native American victims of genocide. "The editors of *Awkwesane Notes* thought that the massacre was depicted properly enough but that the rest of the film was 'junk.'"⁵⁹ Unfortunately, the graphically violent concluding scene is largely framed by a comic love story and seems oddly out of place in the context of the movie.

Although *Soldier Blue* depicts the Sand Creek Massacre as a hypocritical and barbarous act by whites, commentators have noted that the film actually functioned to address concerns about America's involvement in the Vietnam War.⁶⁰ The My Lai massacre of 16 March 1968 had set off a debate about war crimes, the responsibility of soldiers within a chain of command, and the general nature of U.S. military efforts in Vietnam. *Soldier Blue's* producers used the historical example of the Sand Creek Massa-

cre to comment on the ethical problems associated with the United States' involvement in Vietnam. The film may have been more a commentary by disaffected whites about American policy than an attempt to understand Native Americans; Indians were used only as a vehicle for criticizing society.

The creators of *Little Big Man* (Arthur Penn, director; Stuart Millar, producer; based on the novel by Thomas Berger) avoided some of the problems of *Soldier Blue* and *A Man Called Horse* through their sympathetic casting of Chief Dan George as the Indian grandfather of the central white character (played by Dustin Hoffman). The chief symbolizes wisdom, acceptance, and generosity (and comes dangerously close to the Hollywood stereotype of a wise, sanctimonious old chief), in contrast to the stereotyped, self-centered whites in the film. Little attempt is made to present this story as an account of actual events; rather, it is a parody of such an account told through the voice of a survivor of the Battle of the Little Bighorn.

As in *Soldier Blue*, the central character's experience as a captive of the Indians affords him a different perspective of the white culture of the era. After his separation from the Cheyenne, the plot unfolds as a series of vignettes, each satirizing the dominant institutions and social conventions of the era, from religion to gunfighting to hustling snake oil. Thus, while *Little Big Man* succeeds as satire and effectively incorporates Chief Dan George into a central role, it still primarily uses the Indian perspective as a means of commenting on the hypocrisy, materialism, and egotism of whites.

Another Western from the 1970s, *Jeremiah Johnson* (1972) is of special interest for this paper, because a Salish spiritual and community leader, Johnny Arlee, was a consultant and technical director for the film. Also, Robert Redford, who starred as Johnson, has continued to make films with Indian themes and Indian participation, as reflected in his most recent effort, *The Dark Wind*. Nevertheless, the creators of *Jeremiah Johnson* mythologize the past, particularly the figure of Johnson himself, who was a ruthless character, according to historical records.⁶¹ In the film, Johnson is portrayed as a solitary, sensitive mountain man attempting to learn the ways of nature, a man forced to kill Blackfeet Indians to avenge the slaughter of a frontier family and the theft of another mountain man's horse. As in *Soldier Blue*, the violent actions of a white man are justified by ruthless, "unprovoked" attacks by Indians. Johnson does not want Indian blood on his hands, but he

has it. His partner, who has been collecting Blackfeet scalps, slips them onto Johnson's saddlehorn as they approach a group of unknown Indians. Fortuitously, these Indians turn out to be Flathead; since they were traditional enemies of the Blackfeet, they treat Johnson as a hero.

After he casually offers Blackfeet scalps and captured horses to the Flathead chief, Johnson ends up accepting the chief's daughter as a gift. In this middle sequence of the film, he learns Indian ways of fishing and hunting, builds a cabin, and settles down with his Indian wife and an orphan boy from the massacred family. Unfortunately, from this point, the film dissolves into an endless series of fights with the Crow. Although *Jeremiah Johnson* contains variations in Indian-white relations such as trading/direct contact, cautious distance and observation, "bribery" for passage through Indian land, gift exchange, peaceable coexistence and exchange of knowledge, and outright murder motivated by revenge, it is the final violence and the fear it engenders that leave the greatest mark on the viewer. As the most dramatic of the interactions, violent conflict occurs at various intervals and particularly toward the film's conclusion to heighten the tension. Thus, even in films that depict a variety of interactions, dependence on violence for dramatic purposes can overshadow other qualities of interracial relations.⁶²

The violent outcome of *Jeremiah Johnson*, which inevitably reinforces the stereotypical image of the savage warrior, is all the more disconcerting in the light of Indian involvement in the film's production. In a videotaped presentation to an Images of Indians class session at Salish-Kootenai College in 1990, Johnny Arlee reminisced about his role as technical advisor and actor in the film. During the filming, Arlee balked at some of Sidney Pollack's directing decisions. For example, during the Flathead scene, Pollack filmed the chief presenting his daughter to Johnson as if she were an animal—displaying her strong teeth and so forth. Arlee strongly objected to this misleading portrayal of Indian men's attitudes toward women and threatened to quit as consultant if Pollack shot the scene this way. When Arlee stayed away from this particular shoot, his close friend who was playing the chief asked why. The actor went to Redford with the problem, who then discussed it with Pollack. The scene was reshot without the offensive display. Arlee stated that he believed his friend's subsequent inability to find work in Hollywood may have been due to his confrontation with Pollack.

For Arlee, this incident demonstrates some major problems. The presence of a Native American as a technical consultant does not mean that the native's advice will be heeded. Having a Native American review a script is even riskier, because the script is often changed during the actual shooting. Thus another criterion used by some native respondents in judging a film is the degree and quality of native participation in the artistic process, including producing, directing, consulting, and writing, in addition to acting.

According to Arlee, one pitfall of Native Americans in the film business lies in the temptation to be "in it for themselves." Arlee now wishes that he had helped more natives become involved in *Jeremiah Johnson*. He did not express regret over his selection of a Cajun woman for the role of Swan, Johnson's Flathead wife, because she worked very hard to prepare for the role and "looked real Indian." But Arlee consciously strove for more Indian participation during his later role as a consultant for *Winterhawk* (1976) which was shot partially in western Montana. He came through the experience with a new respect for Robert Redford, who he felt acted as a helper for Indians. He noted that Redford's involvement with Indians continues, indicated by the recent efforts of Redford, Pollack, and Indian writer/director Larry Littlebird to form film workshops involving Native Americans.

Jeremiah Johnson pointed to the possibility of increased native involvement in feature filmmaking but also to the pitfalls inherent in that involvement. Instead of directly affecting a production in a significant way, the Native American may be limited to the role of technical advisor concerned with accuracy of detail and avoidance of the most blatant of cultural affronts. Hollywood formulas for portraying Indians seem relatively intransigent. It is the conflict embedded in the typical Western's narrative structure that leads to the exacerbations of racial differences and reductionistic stereotyping. Until the formula changes, the rest may be window-dressing. Especially destructive are the simplistic plot formulas in accounts of the historical past. Although filmmakers usually deny accountability as historians, their "fictional" stories often are perceived as historical accounts.

Perhaps children are the most susceptible audience for white "histories" of Indian-white contact in film and on television. Episode 2 of *Images of Indians* (1980), "How Hollywood Wins the West," opens with an excerpt from Saturday morning television entitled "Elbow Room." Sampson comments on the irony of

reducing the powerful historical drama of westward European expansion—through the medium of a very short, colorful, musical cartoon—to the seemingly innocent need for elbow room. In the next scene of episode 2, Sampson turns off the television Western that a group of Native American children are watching and shows them a map in order to discuss what really happened as Europeans moved West.⁶³ This scene reveals one of the most powerful motivations of native videomakers: to teach their children history from the Native American point of view. As Images demonstrates, Native American children are just as susceptible as white children to the desire to root for the “good guys”—represented as white cowboys, cavalrymen, or lawmen. Vine Deloria notes that Indian children are presented with two models: the Indian they learn about through the electronic media and the Indian they encounter through their everyday experience. Deloria sees the conflicts between electronic and tribal authority as “tremendously detrimental” to the development of young Native Americans.⁶⁴

Another group consistently maligned or ignored in mainstream film is Native American women. Although Native American males such as Chief Dan George and Will Sampson have been cast in roles that afford at least some chance to humanize images of Indians, similar opportunities have not been afforded to Native American women. The stereotype of Indian women as dim-witted servants to males—either lustful and seductive or fat and unattractive—has yet to be challenged. In *Images of Indians*, actress Lois Red Elk comments that she is never even given a name in the movies she acts in.⁶⁵ She believes that producers completely overlook the role of Indian women in Native American cultures and that “few Indian women are given an opportunity to act.” Lee Piper, an Eastern Cherokee actress, states that the consistent portrayal of Indian women as squaws—as slaves to Indian or white men—is counter to the truth in many Native American cultures where equality is the norm. She explains that, traditionally, women have had the right to vote in councils, even to the point of declaring war.⁶⁶ Some Native American cultures, such as the Iroquois and Hopi, are matrilineal; women are central to the continuity of cultural traditions in a way that is never represented in mainstream media.

The true social role of Native American women is overlooked, while the old stereotypes are consistently reinforced, even in supposedly sympathetic portrayals of Indian culture. In *Little Big*

Man, for example, Dustin Hoffman's character is urged by his young wife to sleep with her sisters, who have lost their own husbands in battle. After first resisting her suggestion, he gives in, enters the tipi, and makes love to each of the women; all are portrayed as eager for his sexual attention and jealous of the other sisters. The scene contains humor, but the lack of character development and the portrayal of Indian women as lusting after white men perpetuates an image that has a long history.⁶⁷ As cultural and sexual "others," Indian women represent a release from ethical codes governing sexual relations in Euro-American culture.

The Indian princess stereotype has had an intermittent presence in the Western genre. With its roots in historical and legendary figures such as Pocahontas, Minnehaha, and Sacajawea, the screen version of the Indian princess takes its cue from Wild West posters, dime novel covers, and "Land O' Lakes" style product advertisements depicting large-eyed, full-breasted, fetchingly posed young women. A set of implicit, covert standards in Anglo-American society demands that Indian women be represented as lighter-skinned and more Caucasian-looking than Indian men, even when they appear in the same picture.⁶⁸ This stereotype is perpetuated in the representation of women in *A Man Called Horse*. The Indian princess is the female counterpart of the romanticist's *belle sauvage* tradition,⁶⁹ evoking an Arcadian closeness to the natural world, simplicity, and removal from the artificial conventions of European civilization.

Equally prevalent is the image of the Indian woman as helpless, requiring the protection of the valiant white male. Most of the films viewed for this study perpetuated this image: from the pregnant young woman saved and later married by Dustin Hoffman in *Little Big Man*; to the helpless old lady mercifully saved by Richard Harris in *A Man Called Horse*; to the chief's daughter scorned and beaten, then married by Burt Lancaster in *Apache*; to the chief's daughter given to Robert Redford and later murdered by the Crow in *Jeremiah Johnson*. Thus, a popular variation of the Pocahontas stereotype is the Indian maiden "doomed to a tragic love for a white man."⁷⁰ The only film that included an active, willful woman was *Soldier Blue*, but she was a white woman.

The message in these films seems to be that Indian women are vulnerable to violence and neglect—a message reinforced by the eventual deaths of the wives in *Jeremiah Johnson* and *A Man Called*

Horse. Two lessons can be drawn: (1) Indian women are expendable dramatic devices, and (2) the death of the wife strengthens the resolve and justifies the action of the male lead. In fact, the loss of the woman may be necessary in those dramas where the lead male is white and is likely to return to white society. Although marriage to an Indian woman may elevate the status of the white husband while he remains with the tribe, the storyteller may run into trouble if he or she attempts to return the hero to the larger society with an Indian wife, because interracial marriage is a controversial subject. Thus, as in much other fiction, the woman is portrayed as a weak victim in order to advance a plot that revolves around the male hero as savior. After serving this function, she is forgotten or discarded.

Has the portrayal of Indian women changed in more recent films? In her comments on *Dances with Wolves*, Suzan Harjo says that it has not:

[A]s a friend of mine, Robert Bray always said, we have never gotten past the B.C.s We used to have just 3 BCs to deal with before *Dances with Wolves*: Before Christ, Before Columbus, Before Custer. And now we have Before Costner. I loved *Dances*, I really did. I laughed and cried. It is a wonderful Western, and I think it's important to show a lot of America and the world the beauty of America: how gorgeous the prairies are

But, for a Western—it is a Hollywood Western, no doubt about that; did it make you feel warm and fuzzy?—it does have exactly the same punchline and leave the same stereotypes as the most offensive of the John Wayne movies, even though it is done with a good heart and a good mind and it employed a lot of Indian people and we saw some good Indian acting. Those things are all to the good. It humanized the Lakota people. It showed that we had children, at least, boys. Think about it. Where were the little girls? If it were the only movie you were seeing (about Indians), what would it tell you, and it is, in fact, the only movie a lot of the people of this time will have seen.

It tells you there were no Indian little girls and that the Indian women, while they spoke, only do so in whispers in the ears of Indian men, and only if they were the chief's wife. So the sexist stereotype remains in that film I do think it's a good idea that the white woman and the white man ended up with each other. It is, in the worst of movies, portrayed that Indian women trail after white men. Now, my deep apologies to all you good-looking, fine white men in this

audience, but we don't lust after you. But, from Pocahontas to Land O' Lakes Indian butter maiden, the image is that we do.⁷¹

Harjo's comments point to the difficulty of producing fundamental change in the imagery of Indian women. However, other native commentators responded differently to the presentation of gender relations in *Dances*. In *Ms. magazine*, Marilou Awiakta (Cherokee/Appalachian) writes of the character Pretty Shield, "Her countenance is strong, weathered with adversity—yet calm, joyful and capable. The face of a Mother of the Nation." She adds, "For the first time, a highly commercial film portrays Native Americans as individuals—intelligent, complex, humorous. Civilized. True, Dunbar tells the story, and men are primary. But the Lakota tradition of strength and tenderness for both sexes is evident."⁷² The issue of gender representation in film images of Indians goes beyond accuracy in the portrayal of women's social roles to questions of whether women are depicted with a full sense of humanity, another criterion that native viewers have used to judge recent films.

Perhaps no other film representation of Indians has had a more varied reception in recent years, in both native and nonnative communities, than *Dances with Wolves*. Certainly it was recognized by Native Americans as a vast improvement over previous film images of Indians. Even before it was shot, Tim Giago, editor of the *Lakota Times*, noted a fundamental difference between *Dances* and preceding films, "The one unique thing about this movie is that much of the dialogue will be in Lakota (Sioux) with footnotes [subtitles] in English. Costner himself will be required to learn many words and complete sentences in Lakota."⁷³ Given the emphasis on preservation and reintroduction of native languages on many reservations, incorporating the Lakota language—which required a great deal of time and effort for the actors and the Lakota community alike—was an important aspect of *Dances*. Marilou Awiakta emphasizes, "The essential point is: the Lakota themselves endorse the integrity of Kevin Costner and the film he produced Most important for viewers to remember is that Lakota scholars and advisers shaped this film portrayal of their people."⁷⁴ Two tribal scholars, Doris Leader Charge and Albert White Hat, translated the script into Lakota.

Other important authentic elements in the film included the realistic staging of the buffalo hunt, minute accuracy in costuming and sets, reverent visual imagery of the traditional Lakota Plains

homeland, and a central focus given to the horse and other animals that symbolize the spirit of the Lakota. Although the movie includes a "clichéd portrayal of the Pawnee people as savage and barbaric, complete with stereotyped music to match," the Lakota themselves are humanized for the first time in movie history.⁷⁵

For the first time ever, in the history of Hollywood, Native Americans are real people. Costner's screen shows us laughing, speaking, listening, and loving. We are portrayed as thinking and compassionate people. Tender. And strong.

The director's detail is true. Especially as put forward by Graham Greene, who plays the holy man, Kicking Bird. Thoughtful and wise, Greene's acting does more to destroy the stereotyped Indian image than any film role to date. His sincerity and warmth strike the heart.⁷⁶

Even though there are flaws in the film, native viewers have responded positively to the believability of the Indian characters. *Dances* is one of very few Westerns to allow Indian audiences to identify with the native characters on the screen, although the reviewer's statement that it is the first example of a humanized representation of Indians in Hollywood history may be an exaggeration of its importance. In any case, part of this humanized portrayal emerges from the filmmakers' acknowledgment that Indians grappled with the complexities of cross-cultural contact.

Far from depicting a thoughtless, violent response to white encroachment on the part of the Sioux, Costner and the Lakota who aided him give a sense of the grave debate that took place in Indian communities as to how to respond. One way that the humanity of natives can be developed in film is by representing the full range of actions and emotions experienced by Native Americans in the process of intercultural contact, conflict, and change: They were active, thoughtful, humorous, angry, and so on. Contact involved a range of emotional and cognitive responses, including deliberation and reflection, along with mistrust and violence. Through the character of John Dunbar, Costner questions Euro-American stereotypes that supported the nineteenth-century characterization of Indians (and the stereotype common in earlier Westerns): "Nothing I have been told about these people is correct. They are not beggars and thieves. They are not the bogeymen they have been made out to be." Dunbar also empathizes with Indian perspectives and acknowledges respon-

sibility for the senseless actions of whites. On the way to the buffalo hunt, the band passes through a field littered with slaughtered carcasses of buffalo. Dunbar asks, "Who would do such a thing? The field was proof enough that it was a people without a soul, with no regard for Sioux rights. The wagon tracks leading away left little doubt, and my heart sank as I knew it could only be white hunters. Voices that had been joyous all morning were now as silent as the dead buffalo left to rot in this valley, killed only for their tongues and the price of their hides." This admission of white responsibility for the senseless decimation of Indian lives sets *Dances* apart from the majority of other Westerns, although a few earlier films did focus on white mistreatment of Native Americans.

Costner and the Lakota indeed made great strides in their sympathetic portrayal of Indian culture; as Harjo notes, however, these strides were still taken within the framework of a romanticized Western plot, reinforced by the film's conclusion and an epilogue—"thirteen years later, their homes destroyed, the buffalo gone, the great horse culture was gone, soon to pass into history"—that recapitulates the deeply ingrained idea of the vanishing American. Also, because it follows the personal quest of a white man, it is still history as experienced by whites.

Dunbar's venture has been interpreted variously as a "mythical descent," a quest for meaning that results in Dunbar's "assuming a new consciousness,"⁷⁷ and an example of a "late modern middle-class man with a liberal conscience" assuaging his guilt: a latter-day hippie, internalizing "White America's Indian Other."⁷⁸ The first of these responses by white scholars implicitly acknowledges the Euro-American perspective of *Dances* by placing it in a rich, Western storytelling tradition. The second is more accusatory, finding in *Dances* a false consciousness that obscures the real-life challenges faced by contemporary natives: "America's discovery of native harmony and spirituality introduces the 'green' Indian, a revamped version of the 'red' Indian as noble savage, and the latest obfuscation of the material realities, the desires and aspirations, of native peoples themselves."⁷⁹ This statement is supported in part by the comments of native scholars, including Harjo, Roger Buffalohead, and Ward Churchill.⁸⁰ On the other hand, this position downplays the interest generated in native communities, not only by the image of natives in the film but by the degree and nature of their participation in its making. It may be true that "the native culture is not so much alien as an idealized

Other" in *Dances*,⁸¹ but this idealization does not serve only the national aims and purposes of whites; there is evidence that natives also identified with the film. *Dances* raises the possibility that some natives view the idealization of native culture as a positive aspect of representation, because it serves as a counterweight to negative stereotypes. If nothing else, the varied responses to *Dances* within the native community point to the dangers of a reductionistic understanding of native interpretations of recent films. Responses in the native community may have been as varied as those found in the larger culture.

Like *Dances with Wolves*, *Powwow Highway* (1988) attempts to portray Indians accurately but ultimately succumbs to Hollywood's romanticizing tendencies. Some Indians responded positively to both of these films; the characters in each had a believability, a recognizability that was lacking in earlier images of Indians. Of the character Philbert in *Powwow Highway*, one student in the Images of Indians class commented, "I know people just like that." Another student added that Philbert was a character "you wanted to like."⁸² This attraction may be due in part to the comical nature of the character, a rare display of Indian humor in film. The characters and many of the events in *Powwow Highway* relate to everyday life on a reservation, and the film touches on contemporary economic issues such as endemic reservation poverty and the pressure from the outside world on reservation resources.⁸³ Reactions to the film's ending were mixed; for some students, it "wasn't believable" and "seemed hokey." For another, the ending "brought tears to my eyes."⁸⁴ Again, there does not seem to be a consensus among Native American viewers about *Powwow Highway* (and there is no reason to expect one), but there is some general agreement that the filmmakers were creating broad-based entertainment and that, although it contains important references to contemporary Indian life, the film was thrown off-track by Hollywood commercialism.

One aspect of *Powwow Highway* was particularly disturbing for some viewers. The central plot revolves around Philbert's trip across the Plains states to the Southwest—a joy ride that ends up having a mission. For the trip, he purchases his "war pony"—a rundown old car—with a bag of pot, a bottle of booze, and some loose cash. One middle-aged student in the Images of Indians class felt that there might be generational differences in viewing the film. For her generation, the spur-of-the-moment road trip with a couple of six packs of beer, an old "beater" car, and five

dollars in the pocket is too painful a memory to be treated lightly. As this student explained, she has seen too many friends take off on a joy-ride and not come back alive. For her, then, the film reinforced the image of a lifestyle that she hopes is changing.

If we take the responses to *Dances with Wolves* and *Powwow Highway* as a whole, they reveal no consensus among Native Americans about recent film images of Indians, but they do point to a continuing discomfort with Hollywood's portrayal of Indians. This unease has not been clearly expressed by Indians themselves. Roger Buffalohead explains that a kind of "aura of sanctity surrounds these films," a "reluctance to be critical" that may stem from "our cultural habit of mind of avoiding conflict with our friends."⁸⁵ Buffalohead believes neither film transcends Hollywood commercialism.

The commercial Indian in *Powwow Highway* is the Indian connected with the booze and alienated from the new ways . . . The highway is a metaphor for an Indian version of Jack Kerouac's *On the Road*. In *Dances with Wolves* the commercial Indian is the Indian of natural wisdom (and) spirituality . . . He speaks to the "new age" American and their desperate search for spirituality.⁸⁶

Buffalohead's comments support the position that improving the accuracy of images of Indians is not enough; improved accuracy does not guarantee that deeply seated stereotypes will be overcome in filmmaking. Buffalohead also raises the possibility that many native viewers are not critical enough about recent film images of Indians. He implies that some native viewers accept positive images of native Americans on screen, whether those images are accurate or not. Perhaps this desire for any positive image is a natural outcome of decades of negative representations. Positive images can act as powerful role models for Indian youths who have seen few favorable media likenesses of Indians in the past. However, a more accurate account of current native lives might reveal social problems or internal disagreements. Perhaps, then, one reason for the lack of consistency in native viewers' opinions is their differing valuations of positive imagery and critical accuracy in film representations of Indians.

One recent film that acknowledges conflict within native communities is Michael Apted's *Thunderheart* (1992), a fictional account of the FBI's intervention in Indian affairs on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota during the 1970s. Val Kilmer plays

a mixed-blood FBI agent who reluctantly enters into a process of self-discovery during the investigation. As in *Powwow Highway* and *Dances*, some of the characters in this film, notably those played by Graham Greene, Sarah Brave, and Chief Ted Thin Elk, possess a believability that was lacking in earlier representations of natives.⁸⁷ Several of the issues presented in the film—including the visual representation of “the third world slapdab in the middle of America”; the attitude by FBI agents that Indians are “a conquered people”; and the violent conflict between tribal “goons” and the supporters of AIM—are relevant to the lives of Native Americans today. For example, economic problems, political sovereignty, and issues of internal divisions between tribal factions have repercussions in the recent political and economic turmoil in the Akwesasne (Mohawk) and Onondaga territories in New York State. However, as in *Powwow Highway*, *Thunderheart* presents a “happy Hollywood ending” that lacks believability.⁸⁸ Despite the many powerful elements of this film, including good acting, writing, and photography of the South Dakota setting, *Thunderheart*’s Hollywood conventionalism works against an authentic representation of contemporary native life. (By contrast, Apted’s own documentary, *Incident at Oglala* (1992), presents a more accurate picture of the events that are treated fictionally in *Thunderheart*. More research is needed to discover the response of native audiences to differences between the two films.)

Native Americans have tried to convince people in Hollywood to change the way they depict Indians. In 1966, Jay Silverheels led the formation of two Los Angeles groups, the Indian Actors Guild and the Indian Actors Workshop, to teach acting to natives and promote the use of native people in native roles.⁸⁹ In the early 1980s, Dennis Banks stated that Indians had tried many times, with little success, to persuade network executives and organizations like the Screen Actors Guild to change the pervasive stereotyping of Indians into a more understanding portrayal.⁹⁰ Although this lobbying of producers, directors, and writers may have led to a more authentic portrayal of Indians in recent years, true understanding of Indian cultures has been slow to follow, if it has occurred at all.

The reasons for this slowness are probably rooted in white America’s own processes of self-definition. Humanizing Native Americans entails acknowledging the genocide not of “ignorant savages” but of fellow human beings. Many whites refuse to

recognize that history—equated with manifest destiny in their high school textbooks—from an ideological perspective and continue to hold that westward expansion was a natural and inevitable outgrowth of Western progress. Romanticizing the Indian is as close as the dominant culture comes to acknowledging the viability of indigenous ways of life, but this romanticism often just reflects the dissatisfaction of whites with their own social institutions.

The motives of native film- and videomakers as expressed in *Images of Indians* and by prominent Indian spokespeople are to debunk Hollywood myths and stereotypes that have their origins in centuries of white imagery of Indians. These myths are a distortion of reality: The focus on battles and violence in Westerns leads to the exclusion of other aspects of Indian culture; although there is frequent emphasis on conflict, genocide often is treated lightly. Even recent filmmakers, more sensitive in their portrayals of Indians, tend to reinforce the myth of the vanishing American. When Indians are portrayed in plot sequences that do not involve conflict, they often are seen as natural or mystical Indians in stereotypes drawn from romantic conceptions of the Noble Savage and the New Age interest in native spirituality and ecology. In Hollywood's terms, this means that Indians are reduced to historical fantasy. For the most part, filmmakers have fixed the image of Indians in earlier eras, such that contemporary Indians are still invisible to the larger population. Non-Indians continue to be cast in Indian roles, further undermining credibility. False legends are still invented, and social practices that run deeply against the grain of native cultures are portrayed.

These specific issues identified by native viewers reflect some of the questions and values that native critics employ in responding to film representations of Indians. They include (1) the degree of historical accuracy; (2) the potential benefit of the film, economic or otherwise, to native communities; (3) the tendency of Hollywood to commodify the image of Indians; (4) the determination of who has the power to control the representation of Indians; (5) the complexity and sensitivity with which films represent contemporary Indians' lives; (6) the degree to which films empathize with Indians in their struggle against white racism and mistreatment; (7) the role models that films provide for Native American youths; (8) notions of historical progress; (9) the idealization of Indian life and whether this is a positive or negative aspect; (10) the degree and quality of native participation in the

artistic process; (11) issues of gender representation; and (12) the presence of a native perspective. Some of these critical categories may conflict others. For example, a film with a high degree of historical accuracy may not present idealized portrayals of Indians that would serve as role models for youth. My own view is that films that reflect a native perspective and have been created with a high degree of native participation are more likely to satisfy the other critical variables identified here. Films are more likely to empathize, to benefit native communities, to reflect native views of history, and to reveal native understandings of gender if they are made by Native Americans themselves.

Native stories still have not been told in the mainstream media; only in isolated cases have native beliefs been taken seriously. At this point in time, Native Americans have not gained access to the resources needed to tell their own story through feature films. This need remains. Indians know that, in addition to counteracting non-Indian portraits of their cultures, the media can help them communicate among themselves: "Ultimately, how American society views our history and culture and contemporary life is less important than how we view it ourselves."⁹¹ In attempting to overcome the harmful effects of mainstream media stereotypes on their own populations and on the larger culture, Native Americans have turned to the financially accessible documentary. However, it will take many documentaries to counteract the stereotypes still perpetuated in Hollywood epics. Now is the time for Native Americans themselves to tell their own stories through the medium of feature film.

NOTES

1. This paper relates to research conducted by the author for a book on Native American documentary film and video to be published by the University of New Mexico Press.

2. Ward Churchill, *Fantasies of the Master Race: Literature, Cinema and the Colonization of American Indians*, ed. M. Annette Jaimes (Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 1992), 246.

3. Roy Harvey Pearce's *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (1953; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) is a pioneering work that traces the origins and development of the idea of the savage in American life and literature. Film images follow from a long cultural tradition in which the idea of the savage has been central to Americans' self-definition.

4. George Burdeau, "Pathways to Understanding—Native Participation in the Film Industry," (speech presented at Two Rivers Native Film and Video Festival, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 11 October 1991).

5. Peter du Preez, *The Politics of Identity: Ideology and the Human Image* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980), 4.

6. Ibid.

7. Arlene B. Hirschfelder, *American Indian Stereotypes in the World of Children: A Reader and Bibliography* (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1982).

8. Phil Lucas, *Images of Indians* (Seattle: KCTS/9, 1980). *Images of Indians* was one of the first series of native-produced films that Roy Bigcrane (Salish), a native documentarian, suggested I view.

9. Lucas (videotaped speech, Arts Conference, Missoula, Montana, 1981).

10. Two Rivers Native Film and Video Festival.

11. Research at the media center at Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, Montana, which includes a low-power public broadcasting station, was conducted from fall 1991 through spring 1992. I wish to thank the Annenberg School of Communication, University of Pennsylvania, and Salish-Kootenai College for helping to make this field research possible.

12. Steven Chaffee, et al. "Mass Communication in Political Socialization," in *Handbook of Political Socialization: Theory and Research*, ed. Stanley Rensou (New York: Free Press, 1977).

13. R.C. Holub, *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction* (London: Methuen, 1984).

14. Diffusion theory builds on the idea that interpersonal networks lead people to filter media messages. Thus, the relation of an individual to groups of interacting individuals affects the individual's interpretation and evaluation of media. Effects of media are limited by social variables such as stratification or centralization, which will affect the flow of media influence.

15. Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), 2.

16. Michael Marsden and Jack Nachbar, "The Indian in the Movies," in *Handbook of Indian-White Relations, Vol. 4*, ed. William E. Washburn (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1988), 607.

17. Ibid., 609.

18. Lucas, *Images*, part 4.

19. Phil Lucas's comments in this paragraph are from the videotape of the 1981 speech. According to Marsden and Nachbar, "The Indian in the Movies," p. 614, it is true that *The Searchers*, along with Sam Peckinpah's *Major Dundee* (1964) and Robert Aldrich's *Ulzana's Raid* (1972), all present "horrendously destructive Indian killers, but all three films use the image to illustrate a parallel destructive image in the Indian's White pursuers."

20. Lucas, *Images*, part 2; Marsden and Nachbar, "The Indian in the Movies," 607.

21. Lucas, *Images*, part 1.

22. Ibid.

23. Two Rivers Native Film and Video Conference.

24. Marsden and Nachbar, "The Indian in the Movies," 607.
25. Rayna Green, "The Indian in Popular American Culture," in *Handbook of Indian-White Relations*, Vol. 4, 600.
26. *Ibid.*, 601.
27. Lucas (speech at State University of New York, Cortland, spring 1993).
28. Images of Indians class comments (Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, Montana, 1992).
29. *KYUK Notes, 20th Anniversary Issue* (Bethel, AK: KYUK, September 1991), 17.
30. Green, "The Indian in Popular American Culture," 594.
31. Deloria "Custer," 1; *Images of Indians* 1980; Churchill, *Fantasies*, 232.
32. Marsden and Nachbar, "The Indian in the Movies," 609.
33. Roy Bigcrane, personal interviews, Salish-Kootenai College, Pablo, Montana, fall 1991).
34. Jean Fisher, "Dancing with Words and Speaking with Forked Tongues," *Third Text* 14 (Spring 1991): 40.
35. *Ibid.*, 29.
36. Dan Jones, "Producer's Forum 4: Realizing our Visions" (symposium at Two Rivers Native Film and Video Festival).
37. See Robert Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage, 1978), 97, and Pearce's *Savagism and Civilization*.
38. Marsden and Nachbar, "The Indian in the Movies," 611.
39. Lucas, videotaped speech, 1981.
40. Lucas, *Images*, part 2.
41. Masai exemplifies the "noble anachronism" stereotype that forms the basis for the more contemporary "doomed hero" stereotype discussed in relation to *War Party*.
42. *Hopi: Songs of the Fourth World*, film produced and directed by Pat Ferrero, 1983.
43. Churchill, *Fantasies*, 240. Churchill's comments are supported by Green's research into American popular culture ("The Indian in Popular American Culture," 602), which has not turned up games in which players assume the role of "Jew" or "Negro."
44. Lucas, *Images*, part 2.
45. Berkhofer, in *White Man's Indian*, pp. 5-8, notes that the underlying assumptions of cultural and religious superiority that led to expansionism and the exploitation of indigenous peoples for forced labor and wealth are clearly evident in Columbus's and Vespucci's own writings.
46. Suzan Harjo, "Negative Portrayals of Native People, from Columbus to the Hollywood Western" (speech at the Two Rivers Native Film and Video Festival).
47. Elizabeth Tooker, "The United States Constitution and the Iroquois League," *Ethnohistory* 35:4 (Fall 1988): 305-36. Tooker gives a detailed account of the idea that the League of the Iroquois provided a model for the development of the United States Constitution but concludes that there is no historical support for this position.

48. Harjo, "Negative Portrayals."
49. Berkhofer, *White Man's Indian*, 104.
50. An important source for understanding the historical antecedents of defining Indians by negation is Richard Slotkin's *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600–1860* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973). Slotkin's analysis of myth provides a framework for understanding the mythical power of Westerns and how countercultural identification with Indians is a central ingredient of American myth.
51. George Horse Capture (workshop comments, Montana Indian Arts Conference Workshop, Helena, Montana, September 1991).
52. Slotkin discusses the captivity narrative as an archetypal myth of Puritan New England related to the theological framework of this culture. He writes of the captive, "The sufferer represents the whole chastened body of Puritan society To partake of the Indian's love or of his equivalent bread and wine was to debase, to un-English the very sou." (*Regeneration*, 94). More recent works discuss the captivity narrative tradition as it developed from the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries in the context of ethnic and gender relations. See, for example, June Namias's *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
53. Churchill, *Fantasies*, 238.
54. Green, "The Indian in Popular American Culture," 593.
55. Images of Indians class comments, 1992.
56. For a detailed analysis of the ways that captivity narratives expressed and encapsulated an ideological framework in early American narrative, see Pauline Turner Strong's "Captivity in Red and White" in *Crossing Cultures*, ed. Daniel Segal (Tucson: University of Arizona Press), 79. According to Strong, captivity narratives suppressed historical and cultural contexts, especially the ways that these contexts included a convergence of Indian and European practices. They served a hegemonic function by typifying and abstracting the representation of the Indian and the captive: the captive as a vulnerable white female and the captor as a threatening red male. Meanwhile, the white male redeemer became ever more prominent. The central character in *A Man Called Horse* functions symbolically both as captive and redeemer.
57. Fisher, "Dancing with Words," 32.
58. See Churchill, *Fantasies*, pp. 237–39, for a full discussion of these inaccuracies.
59. Raymond Steadman, *Shadows of the Indian: Stereotypes in American Culture* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982), 222.
60. Corwin Clairmont, Images of Indians class comments, 1992.
61. *Ibid.*
62. This tendency of recent Westerns to depend on violent conflict as their central dramatic device is not surprising, given the traditional role that violence has played in the frontier myth that formed the core of Euro-Americans' self-definition from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. For a detailed analysis of this mythic tradition, see Slotkin, *Regeneration*.
63. Lucas, *Images*, part 2.

64. Deloria in Lucas, *Images*, part 1.
65. Red Elk in Lucas, *Images*, part 4.
66. Piper in Lucas, *Images*, part 4.
67. Green, "The Indian in Popular American Culture," 593. The author notes that the portrayal of Indians as aggressively sexual is expressed uniquely in the joke genre. This scene from *Little Big Man* incorporates this aspect of American popular culture.
68. Ibid.
69. Steadman, *Shadows*, 17–31.
70. Marsden and Nachbar, "The Indian in the Movies," 610.
71. Harjo, "Negative Portrayals."
72. Marilou Awiakta, "Red Alert! A Meditation on 'Dances with Wolves,'" Ms.1 (1991), 70–71.
73. Tim Giago, Mary Cook, and Gemma Lockhart, "They've Gotten It Right This Time," *Native Peoples* 4:2 (1991), 8.
74. Awiakta, "Red Alert," 70.
75. Giago, Cook, Lockhart, "They've Gotten It Right This Time," 11.
76. Lockhart in Giago, Cook, Lockhart, "They've Gotten It Right This Time," 13.
77. Amanda Smith and Thomas Loe, "Mythic Descent in *Dances with Wolves*," *Literature Film Quarterly* 20:3 (1992): 201.
78. Fisher, "Dancing with Words," 32.
79. Ibid., 30.
80. Harjo, "Negative Portrayals"; Roger Buffalohead, "Film and Its Effect on Native Communities" (Two Rivers Native Film and Video Festival); Churchill, *Fantasies*, 243–48.
81. Fisher, "Dancing with Words," 33.
82. Images of Indians class comments.
83. Clairmont, Images of Indians class comments.
84. Images of Indians class comments.
85. Buffalohead, "Film and Its Effect."
86. Ibid.
87. John Dyer (class comments, University College, Syracuse University, 1992).
88. Ibid.
89. Marsden and Nachbar, "The Indian in the Movies," 614.
90. Lucas, *Images*, part 5.
91. Buffalohead, "Film and its Effect."