DOI 10.17953/aicrj.42.2.humud

The "Authentic Indian": Sarah Winnemucca's Resistance to Colonial Constructions of Indianness

Sarah Bonnie Humud

In the late-nineteenth century, crowds of excited white Americans gathered all over the United States to see a touring, real-life, Indian princess.[1] She dressed in fringed, beaded buckskin and a princess crown, a perfect replica of the cartoon Indians found on posters and cigar boxes. Newspapers had reported the charming gibberish of other Indian performers, with one recent speech transliterated as "Rub-a-dub, dub! Ho-daddy, hi daddy!"[2] The waiting crowds expected their Indian princess to similarly entertain them. However, when this Indian princess opened her mouth, audiences heard neither amusing chanting nor the standard recitation of a "Pocahontas" love story. This speaker informed the audience of a genocide. Born in 1844, Sarah Winnemucca lived through a period of massive upheaval. Her lectures, and the autobiography in which she recorded them, chronicle the early encroachment of white settlers, the atrocities committed against the Northern Paiutes, and the calculated negligence of the US government's Indian policies.[3] To the Euro-American onlookers, Sarah Winnemucca—Thocmetony, or "Shell Flower"—looked like an "authentic Indian princess," but she certainly did not sound like one.[4]

To fight for Paiute survival, Winnemucca had chosen to spread awareness, which meant that somehow she had to secure the attention of white audiences, a group deeply invested in the silencing and erasure of Indigenous peoples. To succeed, she first had to convince them she was an "authentic Indian," a favorite figure in the nineteenth-century entertainment industry. Though a full-blooded Paiute and the daughter of a

A doctoral candidate in English at the University of Maryland, Sarah Bonnie Humud holds a BA from Tufts University and an MA from New York University. Her research focuses on twentieth-century multiethnic American literature, Native American literature, and postcolonial, feminist, and critical race theory. Her dissertation is titled "The Invented Indian: Race, Empire, and National Identity in Twentieth-Century US Literature."

headman, Winnemucca's "Indian authenticity" was a performance in that her public image mimicked Indian princesses of Euro-American fairy tales.[5] Ironically, because she met expectations for how Indians should look by touring in this Indian princess costume, she appeared more authentic in the eyes of her white audiences. "Indianness," writes Vine Deloria, Jr., "has been defined by whites for many years. Always they have been outside observers looking into Indian society from a self-made pedestal of preconceived ideas coupled with an innate superior attitude toward those different from themselves. . . . 'Indianness' never existed except in the mind of the beholder."[6] For the American general public, this invented Indianness displaced and replaced real Native people. This "Indian," a biopolitical construct and colonial myth, was uncivilized, ahistorical, and apolitical. It did not read or write; it did not participate in United States politics. The Indian fought on the American plains, not in the courtroom. If Native Americans engaged in resistance in the political or literary arena, they were often accused of no longer being "authentic Indians."[7] Their activism could be disregarded, since clearly they did not, and could not, speak for "real Indians."

Native American and settler colonial studies scholars, including Maureen Konkle, Elizabeth Povinelli, Joanne Barker, Paige Raibmon, and Patrick Wolfe, have made important strides in theorizing the ways that an invented Indian authenticity has been used to limit Native people's political agency.[8] This essay adds to this field by exploring the role Indian authenticity played in settler biopolitics. Taking into account the silencing and depoliticizing fictions of Indianness in both US Indian policy and US nationalism, Winnemucca's accomplishments cannot be overstated. She was, in her own words, "the first Indian woman who ever spoke before white people."[9] She was the first Native American woman to publish a book-length autobiography and tribal history.[10] She is also the first Native American woman to publish in English. Before she published her 1883 autobiography, *Life Among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims*, she was among the first Native American women to advocate on a national level and take her fight to the federal government.[11] Winnemucca's book documents Northern Paiute suffering and resistance to Euro-American colonial policies of Indian eradication. From stories of rape and removal, to scenes of burning stores and the withholding of reservation supplies, to accounts of starvation and massacres, Winnemucca's text bears witness to genocide.

While doing all the things "authentic Indians" cannot do—from writing and speaking fluent English to political activism—what tools did Winnemucca use to maintain her image of authenticity? Settler-colonial constructions of Indianness appear in both Winnemucca's lecture series and her autobiography, a fact that suggests these were deliberate rhetorical choices. A close reading of her autobiography, which was based on the content of her lecture series, can offer some clues as to how this Paiute activist managed to manipulate her audiences' biopolitical fictions to her benefit. The invented Indian princess costume she wore during her lectures lent her credibility and marketability. The autobiography did not share the benefit of this simple disguise. In this article, I argue that Winnemucca's autobiography—which draws on the standard racist imagery and characterizations of the day—at first mimics, then subverts, the dominant cultural discourse, in much the same way as her touring costume had done

during her performances. As an author, lecturer, interpreter, and army scout, Sarah Winnemucca exploited the biopolitical fiction of Indian authenticity to claim a political, activist space for herself and her agenda. By mimicking fictions in her costume and word choice, she could then undermine them. Her work constitutes a challenge to Indigenous authenticity as a strategy of settler biopolitics.[12]

Winnemucca's mimicry of Indianness in both her lecture series and autobiography has generated a great deal of controversy over the last century. Her princess costume has been called "the most detrimental public relations strategy she could have adopted."[13] The autobiography has similarly agitated modern readers, my students included, for the blatant racist imagery employed within its activism. The childlike naiveté of the Paiutes, the praise of white culture, and the apparent resignation to white rule and concomitant abandonment of the political objective of sovereignty give the impression of deep internalized racism, as Winnemucca and other Paiute characters in the text appear to admit the superiority of the white man.[14] The text is not this straightforward, however, and literary scholars have begun to acknowledge the text's powerful syncretism and activism.[15]

Nevertheless, racist episodes remain. Uncertainty over how to receive Winnemucca's racist stereotypes has led some critics to dismiss Winnemucca for her "acculturated" bias,[16] while others set aside these awkward images, focusing instead on the antiracist elements of the text.[17] Still others note how the racist tropes "neatly echo" those informing Indian policy of the time.[18] These previous critical analyses leave room for deeper exploration into the particulars of Winnemucca's anticolonial work. Neither the generous nor the dismissive analyses yet deal effectively with the key role such racist stereotypes played in Winnemucca's activism. In writing back against the settler-colonial fictions of the Indian, Winnemucca is one in a long history of Native American writers who have taken part in a centuries-long project of survivance.[19] Winnemucca gained agency by strategically appropriating the stereotyped roles and images that were available at the time. She is an early example of a tradition that continues into the twenty-first century, a fact that powerfully suggests both the efficacy of narratives of Indian authenticity to disempower Native people and the importance of theorizing such settler-colonial constructs as performances of biopower.[20]

Assessing Winnemucca's reproduction of, or divergence from, "traditional" or "authentic" attire only reproduces restrictive binaries. Winnemucca engages with authentic Indian stereotypes that are so intrinsic to Euro-American biopower that it is counterproductive to analyze her lecture series or her autobiography from a reductive binary of assimilation/tradition.[21] Rather, her costume can help reveal the dominance of discourses of authenticity within her own era. Likewise, responses to her costume, both in her time and in ours, can underscore the continued domination of "Indian authenticity" to frame critical reception of her work. In addition, such a dichotomous approach precludes investigation into how deeply Euro-American society needs these stereotypes. Rather, unpacking this biopolitical history will help move beyond questions of Indian authenticity, which are themselves a manifestation of the procedures of biopower that preclude Indigenous peoples from political participation. The racist

elements of Winnemucca's advocacy do not only echo settler-colonial culture; they recreate it within a performance of Indianness that defamiliarizes that which has become essential to colonial culture.

Winnemucca's Performances: The Indian Princess

Late-nineteenth-century Euro-Americans had an insatiable craving for the Indians that their culture invented. These "Indians" symbolized an "authentic American past" rooted in the frontier. At the same time, they spoke to a bright imperial future envisioned as a natural extension of America's manifest destiny. A symbol for how far the United States had come and how much their empire had already achieved, images of invented Indians proliferated across the late-nineteenth-century United States. At the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, Indian people, scenes, and wares were put on display for excited white audiences to enjoy as they dreamed of overseas expansion.[22] Official US currency was emblazoned with Indians alongside US presidents, Wild West shows dominated the commercial entertainment industry, and, as baseball became the country's national pastime, Indians were chosen to represent many of its teams.[23] Indianness came to represent a particular form of Americanness, and Euro-American consumers flocked to see real-life Indians for themselves as a way to ritualistically participate in their culture. As such, Indian performances became wildly popular. Buffalo Bill's Wild West show drew unprecedented crowds and was praised as an "inculcator of patriotism."[24]

As "Indians" became part of Euro-American nationalism, Euro-Americans used their Indian misrepresentations as mirrors by which to understand themselves, their nation, and their place in the world. By performing as a fictional figure, Winnemucca stood in the place of the mirror to reflect a different image. In her costume, she personified for her audiences all that the Indian meant to them: she was nature's child, America's past, the seductive champion of conquest, and the pitiable disappearing Indian. She looked like the ahistorical "Indian princess," but she refused to play the part of white America's seductress, opposite, or past. She offered Euro-American audiences not a view of themselves, as they would have expected, but a view, instead, of the genocide next door. Winnemucca informed her audiences of her people's suffering, but, importantly, she never surrendered to the myth of Indian desolation. Neither purely "traditional" nor assimilationist, Winnemucca used select Indian misrepresentations to dismantle the most damaging misconception about the Paiute. Indians, she affirmed, would not inevitably disappear.

Winnemucca's early life gave her unique points of entry into the colonizers' culture. In early childhood, she learned English and Spanish fluently when she was sent to live with several white families.[25] As a young adult, she performed along with her father and siblings in a series of "Indian" shows in Nevada and California. These performances were first attempts by the Winnemuccas to garner awareness and sympathy for their people. To be profitable, the shows catered to their audiences' demands and consisted of Wild West tableaux and recitations of the Pocahontas story.[26] These

tableaux reinforced stereotypes, but they also gave Winnemucca the opportunity to learn more about what would elicit positive responses from white audiences.

As an adult, Winnemucca gained celebrity through newspaper reports about her work as an acclaimed interpreter and scout for the US army. As accounts of her supposed affinity for Euro-Americans spread, Winnemucca built on her cultural knowledge and generally positive celebrity to start her lecture series to advocate for her people.[27] Winnemucca had gathered insight into both the deep-seated prejudices against Native Americans and their importance to her Euro-American audiences. Because they cared more about the myth than reality, she lamented, white audiences "don't know what the Indians have got to stand sometimes."[28] For five years, between 1879 and 1884, Winnemucca traveled the United States from coast to coast delivering three hundred lectures, informing army officers, politicians, and the general public of her people's starvation, theft, suffering, and death.[29] Delivering unscripted speeches to sold-out venues, Winnemucca drew tears from audience members before circulating a petition for Indigenous rights and protections, which was signed by almost five thousand people.[30]

For each performance, Winnemucca donned a costume of her own creation that catered to her audiences' stereotyped assumptions of who and what they were going to see. While Paiute women in this era tended to wear skirts made of rabbit hide or woven sagebrush bark, Winnemucca's costume was made of cloth or buckskin, to which she attached ready-made fringe used on lampshades and curtains. Around her neck she wore an assortment of yarn, sequins, and beads. In lieu of the leggings popular among Paiute women, Winnemucca sported studded stockings. Most incongruous of all, she wore a crown upon her head.[31] The iconography in the costume was central to Winnemucca's performance. Not only did she wear a costume for each of her three hundred lectures, she also had a series of formal portraits taken to circulate the imagery to even wider audiences.

Winnemucca's costume reproduces settler-colonial imagery of Indian "authenticity," but this does not mean her performances were "inauthentic." As Paige Raibmon argues, "Moments of Aboriginal self-essentialization, strategic or otherwise, are less instances of fake 'put-on' culture than they are examples of how culture representation works." Winnemucca's engagement with these fictions is not strategy alone, nor is it a "fake" performance of culture. All cultures, Raibmon emphasizes, involve representation and performance, and "authenticity" is not a stagnant category. Rather, across vastly asymmetrical power dynamics, non-Indigenous peoples and Indigenous peoples both create and adapt discourses of authenticity to restrict, or gain, access to resources. To gain even more power from the Indian princess imagery, Winnemucca promoted the tale that her father was the head chief of the Northern Paiutes, which would make her the Paiute princess. She not only dressed the part, but also claimed to be an authentic incarnation of the icon Euro-Americans knew so well. While her father was indeed a headman, there were several headmen for various Paiute families, and he was just one of many. Her promotion efforts did help them gain access to white power structures, which treated him as a head of state and garnered her the title of princess.[32]

Joanna Scherer insists that Winnemucca would have thought that Indian princesses were "associated with royalty, which would facilitate their reception as citizens in Euro-American society,"[33] but, more likely, Winnemucca would have realized that while associated with royalty, Indian princesses were not associated with governance. The colonial invention of Indianness depoliticizes Indigenous peoples by casting them as either brute savages or prelapsarian "noble savages," who, for better or worse, live outside the bounds of civilization.[34] Marking the frontier of civilization in the nineteenth century and long before, invented Indians were beyond the borders of civilization's politics by definition.

The figure of the Indian princess, particularly, was known in European and Euro-American tales for her pliant, apolitical character. We are right to wonder at Winnemucca's decision to pretend to be an Indian princess. Sympathetic toward white men, the figure is almost always a Christian convert, who eventually must become a traitor to her people when she saves "good Christians" from "bad Indians." She certainly would never have been associated with activism. Submissive and seductive, she invites masculine conquest of her body and the land, and ultimately advances the Euro-American tale of the vanishing Indian.[35] Modern critics have deplored Winnemucca's choice, noting that this sexualized, depoliticized figure fuels the colonial ideology of inevitable white male domination.[36] In her time, she was both vilified and praised in the media. One contemporary critic commended her for illustrating the "better traits of the Indian character,"[37] surely referring to her self-presentation as an assimilated Noble Savage. Many, then and now, have maintained that she is a "white man's Indian,"[38] a remark that has been employed to both compliment and disparage her.

Among the Northern Paiutes, her reputation remains in dispute, with many stressing the fictitiousness of her position, since her father was one headman among many.[39] Nevertheless, the powerful fiction persists over a century after Winnemucca's death; even the book jacket of the 1994 reprinting of her autobiography describes her as a "Paiute princess." The Indian princess sells just as well today as it did in Winnemucca's time, yet the stereotype is, to borrow Scherer's words, "incompatible and even in conflict with" political activism.[40]

Criticism of Winnemucca's princess play tends to focus on the Indian princess as a mythic colonial construct, defined only through its relationship to white settler-colonial politics. Of note, however, is that relationship's inverse: settler-colonial politics also needs its princesses. The figure of the Indian princess legitimates settler colonialism. As I have argued, when Winnemucca performs the role of the authentic Indian princess, she adopts a restrictive script in order to modify it.[41] Among the many Indian princess myths popular in the nineteenth century was that of the national legend Pocahontas, which Winnemucca knew well from her early performances with her father. In the Euro-American imagination, Pocahontas welcomed colonialism, converted to Christianity, conceded to the superiority of Euro-American cultural mores, and married a European, which thereby relinquished to her husband the deeds to America. Indian princesses are not only imagined to seductively welcome and encourage European colonization; they are also made the original ancestor in a fictional lineage that makes natives of Euro-Americans.[42] Indians were reimagined as

white American patrimony. As Indians inevitably disappeared, the nineteenth-century mind-set went, they would be replaced by their white descendants: the new authentic "native" Americans.[43] In the guise of the figure that confirms the authenticity of white inheritance, Winnemucca instead advocated Native American self-determination.

In an attempt to secure her people's survival that turned out to be misguided, Winnemucca fought for property rights, which eventually took the form of the heinous 1887 Dawes Act. This policy resulted in yet another colonial land-grab that caused the loss of another ninety million acres of land. Winnemucca supported the ownership of land in severalty to prevent further abuses within the ward system. From her perspective, she was fighting for self-determination, though unfortunately the result was anything but empowerment. In addition to her land advocacy, she demanded the reunion of families that had been torn apart across multiple reservations. She exposed the policies and neglect that had brought about so much suffering and death, and she called upon the US government to uphold the promises it had made to the Northern Paiutes, who had upheld all of theirs. Winnemucca's political message was irreconcilable with the apolitical, ahistorical Indian princess icon that voiced it, and yet, there she stood before her white audiences: a timeless, imaginary figure demanding recognition of the specific political realities of the Northern Paiutes. Her speeches were delivered in English and thus could not be transliterated into gibberish, preventing her message from being received as mere entertainment as others had. Linda Bolton explains Winnemucca's calculated transformation from fiction to subject: "In the guise of the Indian princess, she placed her face in the mind and memory of an American public that was resolved to deny Native peoples both the legitimacy of their historical past and the contemporaneity of the present, in which recognized subjects live and speak."[44]

How Winnemucca managed to accomplish this remains in debate. Winnemucca both dressed as an Indian princess—the ideal noble savage—and spoke as one. A San Francisco reporter labeled Winnemucca "Nature's child," emphasizing the "natural, unconstrained language" she used in her unscripted speeches.[45] Electing to dispense with notes, Winnemucca presented herself as the "unlettered savage," that last survivor of a lost golden age before civilization spoiled "natural man." This prelapsarian figure had been a staple of European and Euro-American critical self-reflection for centuries.[46] To criticize Euro-American society, I argue that Winnemucca took up the preexisting role they had created to judge themselves. The invented Indian justifies white supremacy, but it also reflects Euro-America's anxieties and aspirations. Winnemucca chooses not to reverse the stereotype; instead, she joins it and exploits it as a vehicle of critique.

In what ways and to what extent her work may have confirmed stereotypes of Native women remains an issue worth considering. Certainly, as a Native woman public speaker, and as newspaper reports illustrate, Winnemucca had entered a gendered and racialized minefield. A reservation agent responsible for many of the cruelties inflicted on Paiute reservations used racist, misogynist stereotypes of Indian women's promiscuity to discredit Winnemucca. He publicly accused her of being an "Indian woman of questionable virtue" with "low, unprincipled" character.[47] Again, Winnemucca was able to counter one stereotype about Native women by exploiting another, the fictive

Indian princess. Since the qualities associated with the Indian princess figure included chastity, docility, coquettishness, and deference, these worked to mitigate the negative stereotypes associated with outspoken women.

Newspaper reports tended to emphasize her appearance to assure audiences that this was a bona fide Indian princess, the daughter of a chief and bearer of a "proud head dress of eagle's feathers." At the same time, the princess costume produced her intended effect of "seducing" audiences likely to resist her political message. Her princess attire was described erotically as draping over her "beautifully-rounded brown" body. If only afterward did articles in the press turn to her key political message, ultimately that political message was disseminated to a wide public, which other shows, such as her father's, had failed to do.[48]

Because the Indian princess was so culturally important to her Euro-American audiences, Winnemucca's Indian princess act enticed crowds, but some critics have argued that the performance destroyed Winnemucca's credibility with the government. Drawing from evidence that Winnemucca failed to achieve many of her goals, that several government officials actively campaigned to discredit her in the media, that a government blacklist prevented Winnemucca from working any longer as an interpreter or teacher, Scherer concludes that Winnemucca's Indian princess performance "must have held little attraction to politicians involved with Indian issues."[49] The costume and performance, however, did not cause Winnemucca's failures; they made her dangerous. The government certainly took notice of Winnemucca's massive popularity, and, recognizing the threat Winnemucca represented, launched its own campaigns to discredit and ostracize the Indian princess the public loved so well. Her advocacy was so successful that she gained an audience with the highest-level officials, including members of congress, President Hayes, and Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurtz, who begged Winnemucca to stop lecturing and promised, "the government is going to do right by your people now. Don't lecture now; go home."[50] Acquiescing to each of her demands, Secretary Schurtz provided Winnemucca with a letter confirming his department's intentions to aid the Paiutes. The letter, dated January 24, 1880, granted the Paiutes who had been forcibly removed to the Yakima reservation the right to return home and rejoin their people in Nevada. Each family and each single man was allotted 160 acres of land, and, as a gesture of good faith, one hundred canvas tents would be sent for general distribution. Winnemucca's lectures succeeded in bringing public opinion to bear on the US government. She returned home triumphant.

The tents, however, never arrived. It was winter, and the people began to starve. Winnemucca wrote to Schurtz, who offered just one solution: take her starving people three hundred miles through ice and snow to the Malheur Reservation, where they would find no supplies, food, or land available to them.[51] The Paiutes again faced death due to the calculated negligence of the US government. Undeterred, Winnemucca recorded her lectures in the form of an autobiography, which named names and included a petition to change Bureau of Indian Affairs policies and promote Paiute independence.

Counternarratives: Performances of Indianness in Winnemucca's Autobiography

Copies of Winnemucca's 1883 autobiography, *Life Among the Piutes*, sold for a dollar, and for a mere fifty cents more, subscribers would receive an autographed picture of the "princess."[52] Clearly, in marketing the autobiography Winnemucca employs strategies analogous to those used in her performances that leveraged the princess stereotype. From the start, the text fuels stereotypes as it draws audiences through a heart-wrenching, sentimental narrative of Indian suffering on the frontier. On the surface, *Life* does not seem to challenge Euro-American presumptions about Indians. Indeed, the book's language seems to cater to her contemporary white audiences so fully that it fails to meet the expectations of modern audiences. These moments that indulge her contemporary white audiences, along with the elements of romantic sentimentality in her writing, as Andrew McClure explains, do not "*sound* 'Indian.'"[53] Her book is full of subtleties that evince a clear understanding of her mostly white audience's cultural assumptions. From her position as a Native author, she explains cultural details and terms ("We call heaven the spirit land") and directly addresses other, "civilized" readers ("our hearts' delight . . . whom in civilized life you call beaux").[54] Winnemucca documents Paiute stories, traditions, and experiences, however, not just to entertain or assist Euro-Americans in seeing the Paiutes as fully human beings; she does so to announce Paiute survival. *Life* does not document a dying tribe. At every turn, Winnemucca insists the Paiute will survive. She depicts some stereotypes and she contradicts others. Her text's return to this strategy underscores the argument for reading her book as an activist response to colonial fictions rather than a regrettable illustration of internalized racism.

The first chapter narrates the history of Paiute first contact with Euro-Americans emigrating west. It opens with a scene featuring Winnemucca's grandfather, introduced as "chief of the entire Piute nation," which in turn announces the narrator as a beloved Indian princess (5). Despite the hardships caused by cruel settlers, Winnemucca's grandfather remains hospitable and hopeful, especially after receiving an extraordinary piece of "talking paper" from some members of the US military, men he calls his "white brothers" (22). For him, writing attests to the white men's greatness. The chief's adoration escalates to the absurd: he kisses the paper and wears another gift upon his head—a plate—and defends the rapacious Euro-American settlers at every turn, often citing the extraordinary paper in their defense. In effect, the chief's admiration of writing recalls the racist trope of the Indian enthralled by the genius of the presumably superior white Western culture. The homage to literacy in the autobiography mirrors the unscripted character of the lecture series that inspired media accolades for "Nature's child." In Winnemucca's time, authentic Indians could not write by definition. In these opening scenes with her grandfather's beloved paper, Winnemucca, a writer, can divert her audience from the "unspeakable contradiction," to borrow Barry O'Connell's phrase, of an Indian writing.[55] Winnemucca ensures that her Indian authenticity remains intact, so her message will not be silenced before it begins.

Euro-America imagined its "Indians" as civilization's incompatible outside. An utter lack of writing, with all its attendant associations—primitivity, a lack of history, unmitigated mobility, and even semi-humanity—had been equated with Indians since they were first invented in European colonial biopolitics.[56] Compounding this, in 1879, the first federal Indian boarding school had opened with the express purpose, through education, of "killing the Indian to save the man," as the founder of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, Richard Henry Pratt infamously put it. If Euro-Americans saw the teaching of English literacy as a means of "killing the Indian," they imagined that, once literate, Native Americans would no longer fit within the prescribed limits of authentic Indianness, an assumption that reveals how Indian authenticity is deployed as a settler-colonial tool of disempowerment that even extends to genocide.

As in her lecture series, Winnemucca appeals to her Euro-American readers' expectations and lulls them into a sense of security, and then over the course of the text, reveals that it is not the lone cruel settler or the single negligent reservation agent who are responsible for the genocide, or even the US government and the racist culture of the United States; rather, her audiences are themselves to blame for not dismantling their own ignorance. The root cause of her people's suffering is their belief in the racist stereotypes that she has evoked. In the same way as she inhabited an Indian princess costume so that her speech could effectively engage and deconstruct a racist Euro-American nationalism predicated on the disappearance of the Indian, her autobiography inhabits a cultural discourse based in stereotypes in order to shake the bedrock of American ideals.[57]

In one chapter, the Paiutes kill a group of cannibals and are attacked themselves by cruel white settlers (74). With the Paiutes as the civilized heroes of the chapter, Euro-Americans are cast as the real savages. With subtlety, while she calls her people "we savages," Winnemucca questions who the real savages are. Winnemucca's autobiography carefully and quietly works toward her final, blatant condemnation of Euro-American barbarity. In the end, she angrily demands that her white readers recognize their own hypocrisy: "Yes, you, who call yourselves the great civilization . . . your so-called civilization sweeps inland from the ocean wave; but, oh my God! leaving its pathway marked by crimson lines of blood, and strewed by the bones of two races" (207). Speaking directly to readers, she demands each one—"yes, you"—see their role in this genocide.

Resistant in Both Content and Form

Autobiographies tend to be read as "authentic" or "true" narratives without recognition that they are also rhetorical constructions. This is especially a problem for Native American authors, whose writing is expected to convey authentic Indian culture and a singular, spiritual Indianness.[58] Native American autobiographies, Winnemucca's included, are valuable for articulating experiences that are often ignored or spoken over. When Native Americans are so routinely supplanted by fictive representations of Indians, these autobiographies provide critical counternarratives. However, they

should not be regarded as objective representations of reality. They are valuable for their literary form as well as historical content.

While generous close readings can unveil some of the activist work undertaken by *Life Among the Piutes*, its mix of anthropological discourses, autobiographical storylines, elements of romantic sentimentality, direct activism, and overt pandering to Euro-American racism has confused modern audiences. It includes newspaper clippings, a poem Winnemucca wrote herself, a verse from a poem by Longfellow, and Paiute legends (96, 153, 164). Part autobiography, part history, part ethnography, *Life Among the Piutes* nebulously combines multiple genres. If read as an activist text, the portrayal of the Northern Paiutes as implausibly naïve, together with the elements of sentimentality that draw on romanticized constructions of womanhood and Indianness, at best seem out of place, and at worst an expression of internalized racism and sexism.[59] The activism itself does not quite fit the genre of the autobiography, nor does the anthropological gaze. If it is meant to be an autobiography, perhaps it is a failed one. But if we consider it "failed," then the question is, according to whose standards?

Life Among the Piutes does not attempt to mimic traditional Euro-American autobiography. It shares few attributes with that genre, such as a lack of any stories of Winnemucca's formative years, for example. She shares little information about her personal life, instead keeping the focus on her accomplishments as an interpreter, scout, and leader.[60] But what if we think of Winnemucca's writing, not as a failed version of a Euro-American genre, but as a text of her own creation that skillfully maneuvers through her audience's expectations to effect real change? She does not meet expectations; she negotiates them. This would offer an additional means of understanding her exploitation of stereotypes. She does not use the oppressive tools of American racism outright. Her tools share only superficial characteristics with the racist tropes created by Euro-American culture.

Although Winnemucca does not adhere to the form of the Western autobiography, Andrew McClure notes that other early Native American authors did, including Samson Occom (Mohegan) and William Apess (Pequot).[61] They too wrote for predominantly white audiences. Using Euro-American tools to communicate with their Euro-American audiences was a shrewd rhetorical choice, and they both wrote texts that modern scholars have recognized for their literary achievements. I argue that as an author, Winnemucca likely recognized that because of her audience's perception that "Indians do not write," she would already be challenging Euro-American romanticized conceptions of Indianness in writing at all. William Apess notably met with such criticism from his contemporaries: William Joseph Snelling wrote of William Apess, "If he writes, it is in the character of a white man." Notably, *if* Apess writes, which is left in question, his writing does not sound "Indian enough" to merit attention.[62] Given this reception of Native American writing, why would Winnemucca aim to "master" Euro-American literary forms when to do so would undermine her "authenticity" and consequently, her activist objectives?

It is important, however, as Raibmon argues, not to overemphasize "the extent to which Aboriginal people lived in reaction to white society,"[63] and that Winnemucca's

choices to use or refuse colonial paradigms were not simply reactive. H. David Brumble argues that Winnemucca's *Life* follows the model of Native American "coup tales," which inform the audience of personal and collective achievements, and tell a tale not about an individual, but about a member of a group.[64] Viewed as following this formal tradition, Winnemucca's childhood fear of white people is a synecdoche for the sentiments of the Northern Paiute toward the Euro-American settlers that would terrorize them; her success as a scout and translator is a sign aimed toward her white audiences that given the opportunity, all Northern Paiutes would work with white society, not against it. If *Life* is about a member of a larger group, we can see the chapter that turns an anthropological gaze onto the larger group not as a deviation from the larger narrative, but as an integral part of it.

Audra Simpson has written that autoethnography can "interrupt anthropological portraits of timelessness, procedure and function that dominate representations of their past and, sometimes, their present."[65] Winnemucca's performance of authenticity was one way to interrupt dominant discourses, but, as Simpson's argument continues, refusing to share information can also be valuable and generative. Why represent this information? Simpson asks. Who benefits from knowledge about Indigenous affairs and cultures? Ethnographic refusal can be powerful, and there is a great deal Winnemucca chooses not to share, including details about ceremonies or religious practices that likely would have excited her Euro-American audiences and may have even boosted sales. Winnemucca did navigate the pressures of the assimilation era, but she also wrote on behalf of the Paiutes, not just for white audiences. While the conventions of contemporary anthropology produced depictions of American Indian cultures as monolithic, unchanging, and dying, Winnemucca's autoethnography depicts the Paiutes as a dynamic and diverse people with an evolving culture that responds to the needs of its time.

Because *Life* takes such a different form from the traditional Euro-American autobiography, many have assumed Winnemucca was not well-read. Brumble argues that "aside from the hymns she quotes occasionally, it is unlikely that Winnemucca was much aware of literary influences at all."[66] McClure agrees, noting that Winnemucca writes in her autobiography that she had trouble reading an army captain's letter: "It took me some time to read it, as I was very poor indeed at reading writing; and I assure you, my dear readers, I am not much better now" (82).[67] In the midst of a narrative that has regularly paid its respects to writing and has consistently performed Indian authenticity, the direct address to her readers reassuring them that she has not mastered their culture nor lost her Indian authenticity, even as the evidence of her writing lies before them, appears suspect.[68]

Frederick Hoxie has noted that Winnemucca did not consider herself a "literary figure," and wrote only to further her activism.[69] Setting her intentions aside, the author's literary skill warrants that a close reading of *Life* will be productive, although it has not yet prompted a significant corpus of literary analysis. Winnemucca may not have been a scholar, but perhaps she was better informed than she has typically been given credit for. Winnemucca was well versed in both cultural and literary representations of Indians. She also clearly evokes narrative models of white middle-class

femininity and conventions of Euro-American sentimentalism.[70] Her descriptions of herself as anything but a "literary figure" should be read with a notion of their self-awareness. She is still playing the Indian princess.

Throughout, Winnemucca toys with stereotypes to manipulate the white gaze. For example, calling the Paiutes "we savages" in tender emotional scenes, she adopts colonial terms while undercutting their meanings (101). At other times she directly panders to white racism and portrays the Paiutes as naïve and optimistic children in need of a kind parent to care for them. Winnemucca discusses their only kind agent at length: "[Mr. Parrish] then said, 'How many of you want to go out hunting?' They said, 'We would all like to go.' 'Well, you can go, and don't stay too long, because your potatoes will be ready to be dug.' So he gave each man a can of powder and some lead and caps, and also to each one a sack of flour. Oh, how happy my people were!" (112). In this sweet, domestic scene between a father and his children, Mr. Parrish generously allows his adult Indian children their toys and fun, but gently reminds them of their chores, which they are happy to come home to do.

Although it is easy to cringe at the overt pandering to stereotypes and lack of any attempt to point out their unreality, Winnemucca is deploying the same tactic that prompted her princess costume. She is fueling the fire of the stereotypes that made Indians out to be noble, royal, or childlike. These Indians might be subhuman, but it is because they are children in need of care and not unredeemable cannibals, as illiterate Indians were sometimes represented. These Indians appear to be more like Euro-American children, who were also construed as savages in nineteenth-century domesticity narratives.[71]

We might ask, Is Winnemucca far too conciliatory to a racist audience? Is she fueling stereotypes that prevent real progress? Has she given up on a dream of self-determination? I argue that if we consider the text in its entirety, the answer to these questions must ultimately be no. Reading this autobiography closely makes clear that Winnemucca's activism is a layered, labyrinthine balancing act that did not actually espouse white paternalism. Indeed, her book managed to threaten the establishment to such a degree that government officials worked tirelessly to assassinate her character in the media. The paternalism in the text may make modern readers cringe, but for Winnemucca it carried a second meaning. Winnemucca explains the use of father and mother as a traditional Paiute practice: "Now, my dear reader, there is no word so endearing as the word father, and that is why we call all good people father or mother; no matter who it is—negro, white man, or Indian, and the same with the women" (39). Malea Powell notes that this practice in the text "neatly echoes the paternalistic slant of Indian policy of the time,"[72] but as Winnemucca explains, this form of address accords equal respect to people across race and gender lines. This is significantly different from the racial politics of Euro-American governance.

Other textual details also substantiate that Winnemucca is deliberately distinguishing between paternalism and other forms of caregiving in her book. Notably, she describes one of the agents abusing a child: "to my horror saw our agent throw a little boy down on the ground by his ear and kick him. He said, '. . . I will beat the very life out of him. I won't have any of the Indians laughing at me. I want you to tell them

that they must jump at my first word to go. I don't want them to ask why or what for'" (128). Here, she portrays the risks of being in a child-parent relationship; the agent's savage, outrageous response signifies the dangers of a paternalistic system in which those in positions of authority are themselves the savages.

Further explicating her complicated political stance, at one point in the text Winnemucca explains herself directly to her detractors, white and Paiute alike, who accused her of collaborating with the military against Indigenous peoples. She writes, "Can you wonder, dear readers, that I like to have my people taken care of by the army? It is said that I am working in the interest of the army, and as if they wanted all this care. It is not so."[73] With an ambiguous "they," she is able to make a statement about both the army and her people at once: they do not want care. Her people seem like naïve children throughout her text because in this genocidal climate, she believed it was better for her audience to see her people as children who should be protected and saved rather than savages destined for extermination. Nevertheless, in subtly including the fact that they never "wanted all this care" in this passage, she sends a message about the self-determination for which she fought more openly in her activism.

Whether or not her rhetorical strategies were effective, it is clear that by speaking the language of the colonizer—variously evoking, deconstructing, or pandering to stereotypes—Winnemucca hoped to alter the biopolitical landscape that codified the Indian race as destined for extinction. More importantly, however, Winnemucca's autobiography also serves as an important documentation of Northern Paiute resistances, large and small. She documents the political organization of the Paiutes, their activist coalitions, their negotiations with BIA agents; she documents the rescue of kidnapped Native children from white settlers and the anguish felt by the survivors of massacre. For all these reasons, her book cannot be termed a "fake" simulation of Indianness. Its performances of Indian authenticity are much more complex.

Conclusion

Settler-colonial politics arise out of the historical conditions and methods of producing the state through the toxic production and regulation of the state's others. Colonialism simultaneously produces and is a product of these biopolitical processes. Indians were a fundamental part of white US identity. Winnemucca "exploited the very racial ideologies that threatened . . . their dying tribe" because in doing so she would be recognizable, marketable, and credible as an authentic Indian, to borrow Noreen Groover Lape's words.[74] Indian authenticity proved a valuable device because settler-colonial culture "required" its Indians to fit its narrative—meaning it both "insisted" and "relied upon" their "authentic" Native Americans. Indians were what made Americans unique from Europeans; Indians marked the frontier by which "America" defined itself;[75] Indians were even the metaphor used to understand Euro-American child-rearing.[76] The fictions of the Indian were so deeply embedded in settler-colonial culture that they had become utterly naturalized. Winnemucca did not exploit these fictions as if she were wearing any costume or taking part in any clown show. She exploited fictions of Indianness so she could explode the fictions at the heart of US nationalism, fictions

that naturalized the settler-colonial state and demanded the eradication of Native American culture, history, and lives.

Critics have consistently criticized or praised Winnemucca since she entered the public sphere as a performer, activist, and writer over a century ago. It is tempting to attribute each of Winnemucca's choices to conscious strategy, but more likely many of her choices developed out of necessity, the necessity for ticket sales and book sales. Nevertheless, her manipulation of stereotypes produced powerful results, allowing her to briefly personify the fiction so that she could engage the critical perspective "Indians" were created in part to stimulate. Whether she is judged as a traitor, a bastion of anti-racism, or a complex amalgam of the two who negotiated the limits of her position as a woman and a Native American in the late-nineteenth century, Winnemucca's text is a formidable example of writing back against a dominant settler-colonial paradigm.

Winnemucca may deploy stereotypes throughout her writing, but she does not conclude her text with a pitiable reflection on the declining state of the Indians, as most nineteenth-century sentimental literature about Indians did—Indians who could have done so much for white people. Feeling bad is not the point. Rather, Winnemucca closes her text with overt political engagement. Included in the final pages was a petition to Congress to end the arbitrary separation of the Northern Paiutes onto two reservations. With this petition, she provided her readers with the opportunity to take direct political action. Leslie Marmon Silko (Laguna Pueblo) has written, "books were and still are weapons in the ongoing struggle for the Americas."[77] This is certainly true in the case of Winnemucca's powerful reversals of fictions that had justified genocide. Indian stereotypes in Winnemucca's text and lectures serve as tools of manipulation for her Euro-American audiences. The depoliticized "Indian" is made a driver of political change. Giving voice to a silenced genocide, her narrative concludes with her own forward march: "[my people] urged me again to come to the East and talk for them, and so I have come" (246).

Notes

1. Although many people refer to themselves as Indians, when I use the term "Indian" in this article, I rely on the work of Native American scholars like Gerald Vizenor (Anishinaabe), who defines *Indian* as a colonial construct: "*postindian* is the absence of the invention, and the end of representation in literature; the closure of that evasive melancholy of dominance." Gerald Vizenor, *Manifest Manners: Narratives of PostIndian Survivance* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 11. Jodi Byrd writes of the term Indian: "There was a violence embedded in the naming. And slavery. And genocide. It is today a marker of that legacy. . . . It is an 'Orientalism' transplanted and remapped onto the indigenous peoples of the Americas, and it carries with it all the discursive attempts to control and to narrate the place of peoples into an already established world." Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2011), 72–73. When I use the term Indian, in other words, I generally use it to discuss a construct created and perpetuated to justify settler colonialism and disparage, disenfranchise, and condemn immensely diverse groups of peoples by minimizing the differences between them.

2. This is not what Old Winnemucca, Sarah Winnemucca's father, said. The mistransliteration appeared in *Daily Alta California*, "City Items," October 23, 1864, 1. For an extended discussion of

contemporary newspaper articles on Winnemucca, see Gae Whitney Canfield, *Sarah Winnemucca of the Northern Paiutes* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983).

3. Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins, *Life Among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims* (Reno: University of Nevada, 1994).

4. Indian authenticity is not a fixed category. I explore its meanings and tensions throughout the rest of the article, as well as Winnemucca's uses of the stereotypes that defined Indian authenticity in her time. In reality, of course, there is no one way to live authentically or express one's culture authentically: there is no "real" Indianness against which to measure Winnemucca.

5. There is a long, violent, racist history of Euro-Americans playing Indian. From the Boston Tea Party to Hollywood, from white people taking scholarships reserved for Native students to white shamans leading "authentic Indian retreats" for the wealthy, to this day questions of authenticity are a real problem for Native Americans, whose cultures are regularly appropriated by Euro-Americans perpetuating racist stereotypes through false representations staged as truth. While questions of authenticity are important for American Indians for many reasons, from finance to social justice, Euro-Americans have consistently evoked questions of Indian authenticity to disempower Native people who deviate from the racialized script of Indianness. See Philip J. Deloria's seminal text on this issue, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

6. Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, 1988), 265.

7. For a thoughtful meditation on this, see Maureen Konkle, "Indian Literacy, U.S. Colonialism, and Literary Criticism," in *Postcolonial Theory and the United States* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2000), 151–75, https://doi.org/10.2307/2928211.

8. See, for example, Konkle, "Indian Literacy"; Elizabeth Povinelli, *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002); Joanne Barker, *Native Acts: Law, Recognition, and Cultural Authenticity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011); Paige Raibmon, *Authentic Indians: Episodes of Encounter from the Late-Nineteenth-Century Northwest Coast* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005); and Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* (2006): 387–409, https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240. Wolfe thoughtfully argues that "the style of romantic stereotyping that I have termed 'repressive authenticity,' which is a feature of settler-colonial discourse in many countries, is not genocidal in itself, though it eliminates large numbers of empirical natives from official reckonings and, as such, is often concomitant with genocidal practice" (402).

9. *San Francisco Chronicle*, November 14, 1879; see also Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 162.

10. Catherine S. Fowler, "Foreword," in Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins, *Life Among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims* (Reno: University of Nevada, 1994), 3.

11. Sally Zanjani, *Sarah Winnemucca* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2001), 197.

12. Paige Raibmon writes, "Although there has never been an official policy called 'authenticity,' shared assumptions have functioned as such in many respects. Official policies could not have developed as they did without widespread agreement on these assumptions." To interrupt the fictions and engage with those in power, Aboriginal peoples have often taken up performances of authenticity. This is because, Raibmon notes, subaltern groups do not create the rules of engagement or the terms of the discourse. Rather, "Aboriginal people were far less likely to gain access to this public sphere when they did not 'play Indian.'" Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 8, 11. See also Scott Lauria Morgensen, "The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now," *Settler Colonial Studies* 1, no. 1, (2011): 52–55, https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2011.10648801; Mark Rifkin, *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014); and Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism."

13. Joanna Cohan Scherer, "The Public Faces of Sarah Winnemucca," *Cultural Anthropology* 3, no. 2 (1988): 196, https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1988.3.2.02a00040.

14. I use the term *characters* in reference to the literary quality of the text examined in this article.

15. See, for example, Cari Carpenter, "Tiresias Speaks: Sarah Winnemucca's Hybrid Selves and Genres," *Legacy* 19, no. 1 (2002): 71–80, https://doi.org/10.1353/leg.2003.0004; Margo Lukens, "Her 'Wrongs and Claims': Sarah Winnemucca's Strategic Narratives of Abuse," *Wicazo Sa Review* 13, no. 1 (1998): 93–108, https://doi.org/10.2307/1409031; Andrew McClure, "Sarah Winnemucca: [Post]Indian Princess and Voice of the Paiutes," *MELUS* 24, no. 2 (1999): 29–51, https://doi.org/10.2307/467698; and Malea Powell, "Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians Use Writing," *College Composition and Communication* 53, no. 3 (2002): 396–434, https://doi.org/10.2307/1512132.

16. Gretchen Bataille and Kathleen Mullen Sands, *American Indian Women: Telling Their Lives* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 21.

17. See, for one example, Danielle Tisinger, "Textual Performance and the Western Frontier: Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins's 'Life Among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims,'" *Western American Literature* 37, no. 2 (2002): 170–94, https://doi.org/10.1353/wal.2002.0031. I am indebted Tisinger's work on Winnemucca's activism. The focus on Winnemucca's antiracist message has proved a significant recovery of her as a historically criticized and underrepresented nineteenth-century Native American woman, author, and activist. I build on, rather than criticize, this earlier scholarship for its reclamation of Winnemucca's work.

18. Powell, "Rhetorics," 411.

19. Vizenor, *Manifest Manners*.

20. For example, just a few decades after Winnemucca's performances, Yankton Dakota author, teacher, musician, and activist Zitkala-Ša also wore her own pan-Indian creation when she deemed it to be politically expedient. When asked to perform a piano solo in "Indian dress," she made the politically conscious choice to acquiesce, noting, "No doubt, there may be some, who may not wholly approve of the Indian dress. . . . Even a clown has to dress differently from his usual citizen's suit" (Zitkala-Ša, xxiii). Here I emphasize her choice of words that like a "clown," she "has to" wear such a costume. For more on the critical reception of her dress, see the introduction to Zitkala-Ša, *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Writings*, ed. Cathy N. Davidson and Ada Norris (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), xxiii–xxiv. The list of Native American activists is inexhaustibly long, although Paiute artist Gregg Deal is a pertinent twenty-first-century example of this ongoing tradition. While dressed as a stereotypical Indian, he carries politically provocative signs that say things like, "My spirit animal is white guilt."

21. See Mark Rifkin, "Finding Voice in Changing Times: The Politics of Native Self-Representation during the Periods of Removal and Allotment," in *Routledge Companion to Native American Literature*, ed. Deborah Madsen (New York: Routledge, 2015), 154.

22. For an in-depth study on the ways in which "Indianness" facilitates US imperial projects, see Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*.

23. Shari Huhndorf, *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2001), 59–60; Richard Slotkin, "Buffalo Bill's 'Wild West' and the Mythologization of the American Empire," in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 164.

24. Slotkin writes: "The leading figures of American military history, from the Civil War through the Plains Indian wars, testified in print to the Wild West's accuracy and to its value as an inculcator of patriotism"; ibid., 166. Buffalo Bill's Wild West show used Indigenous participants.

Though it too claimed to represent reality, the show was steeped in American myth about the frontier and Indigenous peoples, as Slotkin's analysis demonstrates.

25. Carpenter, "Tiresias Speaks," 73.

26. Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 39–40.

27. For more on Winnemucca's biography, see Canfield, *Winnemucca*; and Zanjani, *Sarah Winnemucca*.

28. *San Francisco Chronicle*, November 14, 1879. See also Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 162.

29. Zanjani, *Sarah Winnemucca*, 2–3; Linda Bolton, *Facing the Other: Ethical Disruption and the American Mind* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), 150.

30. Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 209. Because her speeches were unscripted, we do not have access to any single speech, but her autobiography expands on the points she made in her lectures.

31. Scherer, "Public Faces," 179–80.

32. Ibid., 190–91.

33. Ibid., 188.

34. The idea that Indigenous peoples had no civilizations is, of course, nonsense. The narrative of US national identity is delivered out of the destruction and denial of Indigenous nations. Nation-to-nation treaties legitimated the establishment and international recognition of the US government. The trail of broken treaties signifies that Europe and the US acknowledged the existence and sovereignty of American Indian nations, only to later pass laws and policies with the express purpose of dismantling Native communal, political, and territorial ties through the denial of their very existence.

35. Scherer, "Public Faces," 185–88. For more on the invention of the Indian princess and its origins in the iconography of the Amazonian queen, see Rayna Green, "The Pocahontas Perplex: The Image of Indian Women in American Culture," *The Massachusetts Review* 16, no. 4 (1975): 702–04, https://www.jstor.org/stable/25088595.

36. For one example, see Scherer, "Public Faces." Notably, such criticism attends only to Euro-American fictions of Indian princesses and ignores contemporary tribal princess pageants, in which politics is a central element. In just one example, the Choctaw Indian Princess "serves as an ambassador for the Tribe for one year. During her reign, she travels around the country, many times with the Tribal Chief, to promote awareness of the Tribe"; see The Choctaw Indian Reservation, *Choctaw Indian Fair*, 2018, http://www.choctawindianfair.com/pageant.

37. *San Francisco Morning Call*, January 22, 1885; see also Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 222.

38. For more on this, see Catherine S. Fowler, "Sarah Winnemucca," in *American Indian Intellectuals of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*, ed. Margot Liberty (St. Paul: West Publishing, 1976), 34.

39. Carpenter, "Tiresias Speaks," 72.

40. Scherer, "Public Faces," 178.

41. Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 13. She explains further at 11, "Through self-representations that conformed to colonial expectations, Aboriginal people also gained access to an international public forum, where they could make dynamic assertions of identity, culture, and politics to White audiences. For indigenous people, the very act of entering this international public sphere contradicted the colonial cast of them as 'backward cultural conservators' and challenged their exclusion from modernity."

42. Vine Deloria, Jr. rails against the habit of white Americans to invent an Indian princess grandmother in his manifesto *Custer Died for Your Sins*. He asks, "why is a remote Indian princess grandmother so necessary for many whites? Is it because they are afraid of being classed as foreigners? Do they need some blood tie with the frontier and its dangers in order to experience what it means to be American?" The answer, it seems, is yes. Deloria, *Custer Died*, 3-4.

43. For more on this, see Huhndorf, *Going Native*, especially chapter 3.

44. Bolton, *Facing the Other*, 150.

45. *Daily Silver State*, November 28, 1879; see also Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 163–64.

46. Michel de Montaigne, for example, criticized Europe through the cannibal figure that had none of the common vices of Europeans corrupted by civilization, such as greed, deception, and treachery.

47. See Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 163.

48. *Daily Silver State*, November 28, 1879. See also Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 163–64.

49. Scherer, "Public Faces," 193.

50. Winnemucca, *Life*, 221.

51. For more on this history, see Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 174–76.

52. Canfield, *Winnemucca*, 211–12.

53. McClure, "[Post]Indian Princess," 32.

54. Winnemucca, *Life*, 15, 46. Subsequent citations will appear parenthetically in the main text.

55. Barry O'Connell, "Introduction," *A Son of the Forest and Other Writings by William Apess, a Pequot* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997), xviii.

56. For more on literacy's meanings to European and Euro-American cultures, see Walter Mignolo, *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2003); Mathew Restall, *Seven Myths of the Spanish Conquest* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Gordon Brotherston, *Book of the Fourth World: Reading the Native Americas through Their Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 1992); Konkle, "Indian Literacy"; and Birgit Rasmussen, *Queequeg's Coffin: Indigenous Literacies and Early American Literature* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012).

57. Paige Raibmon articulates why people might choose to engage toxic stereotypes: "For Aboriginal people on the late-nineteenth-century Northwest Coast, authenticity was a structure of power that enabled, even as it constrained, their interaction with the colonial world"; see Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 10–11. Philip J. Deloria also examines the play with the myths and stereotypes of Indianness. He writes, "Native people have always acted from imperatives formed in the meeting of tribal cultures and the social, political, economic, and environmental wreckage and opportunity generated by colonial encounters"; see Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2004), 7.

58. Powell, "Rhetorics of Survivance," 405–06.

59. Carpenter, "Tiresias Speaks," 75.

60. McClure, "[Post]Indian Princess," 35–36.

61. Ibid.

62. Quoted in Konkle, "Indian Literacy," 151.

63. Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 12.

64. H. David Brumble III, *American Indian Autobiography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 65–66.

65. Audra Simpson, "On Ethnographic Refusal: Indigeneity, 'Voice' and Colonial Citizenship," *Junctures* 9 (2007): 68, http://junctures.org/index.php/junctures/issue/view/11/showToc.

66. Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography*, 62.

67. McClure, "[Post]Indian Princess," 36.

68. In his introduction to the works of William Apess, O'Connell notes that William Apess also makes the claim that his literacy was limited. O'Connell convincingly argues that Apess clearly developed a much greater command of literacy in English than he claims; I argue the same is true for Winnemucca. For a recent article on the work of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody and Mary Peabody Mann to help Winnemucca mediate assimilation-era pressures, see Katharine Rodier, "Authorizing Sarah Winnemucca? Elizabeth Peabody and Mary Peabody Mann" in *Reinventing the Peabody Sisters*, ed.

Monika M. Elbert, Julie E. Hall, and Katharine Rodier (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2006), 108–25.

69. Frederick E. Hoxie, "Denouncing America's Destiny: Sarah Winnemucca's Assault on US Expansion," *Cultural and Social History* 9, no. 4 (2012): 554, https://doi.org/10.2752/147800412X13434063754526.

70. Cari Carpenter provides a thoughtful analysis of Winnemucca's appeals to sentimental femininity in her article "Tiresias Speaks." Carpenter argues that Winnemucca caters to her audience in both what she says and what she does not say. Knowing that white audiences would be partial to monogamy, *Life Among the Piutes* does not include any information about Winnemucca's father's alleged other wives, nor does it detail her own multiple marriages and divorces. Accommodating white middle-class sensibilities about proper behavior for women, she does not mention her legal troubles or her bar fights. These details were discussed in local newspapers, though, where she was accused of being a liar and a schemer. Probably to reframe that image, in the appendix of *Life Among the Piutes* she includes several letters of recommendation by recognized white male authority figures.

71. See Kaplan, "Manifest Domesticity," in *The Futures of American Studies*, ed. Donald E. Pease and Robyn Wiegman (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 115.

72. Powell, "Rhetorics of Survivance," 411.

73. Ibid., 93.

74. Noreen Groover Lape, "'I would rather be with my people, but not live with them as they live:' Cultural Liminality and Double Consciousness in Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins's *Life Among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims*," *American Indian Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (1998), 270–71, https://doi.org/10.2307/1184813.

75. Frederick Jackson Turner's "frontier thesis" famously argues American democracy was forged from its frontier; see *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1921 [1893]).

76. For more on the Indian in nineteenth-century Euro-American domesticity narratives, see Kaplan, "Manifest Domesticity," 111–34.

77. Leslie Marmon Silko, *Yellow Woman and a Beauty of the Spirit* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), 155.