

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Hollywood Addresses Postwar Assimilation: Indian/White Attitudes in Broken Arrow

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9j89975j>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 11(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Aleiss, Angela

Publication Date

1987

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

Hollywood Addresses Postwar Assimilation: Indian/White Attitudes in *Broken Arrow*

ANGELA ALEISS

The release of Delmer Daves's *Broken Arrow* in 1950 represented a turning point in Hollywood's portrayal of American Indians. Often cited as Hollywood's first sound film to depict the American Indian sympathetically, *Broken Arrow* appealed to an ideal of tolerance and racial equality that became prominent in later Westerns. The film took a major step in the breakdown of conventional stereotypes, and in doing so made an emphatic statement about America's racial attitudes.

The motion picture industry has traditionally portrayed Native Americans in a variety of stereotyped roles. The silent films offered both positive and negative images, since movie stereotypes were still forming and there was more diversity among tribes depicted and roles of Indians in the story. Titles such as *Attack on Fort Boonesboro* (1906) and *The Renegades* (1912) suggest that negative stereotypes began early. The silent film era, however, showed a significant number of pro-Indian movies: during the early 1900s, the noble Indian often preceded the cowboy as the Western screen hero. Some of the silents were especially sympathetic to Indians, and while their depictions had a childlike simplicity, they touched upon crucial issues in race relations and government policies. D. W. Griffith's *Ramona* (1910) pointed toward white hostilities and injustice; *Heart of an Indian* (1913) depicted an Indian woman's grief over her deceased child;

Angela Aleiss of New York City is a writer on contemporary American Indian cultural topics. She studied film and literature at Columbia University.

and Cecil B. DeMille's *The Squaw Man* (1914) showed the tragic fate of an Indian/white marriage. These films, as well as later silent features like *The Vanishing American* (1925) and *Redskin* (1929), acknowledged the Native American's social plight but demarcated differences between Indian and white cultures.

The stereotypical portrayals of Native Americans during the thirties and forties flagrantly defended traditional racism. A popular film like John Ford's *Stagecoach* (1939) epitomized Hollywood's depiction of Indians as a menace to white civilization, attacking wagon trains and burning homes. The film's opening titles warn of the Indians' "savage struggle" to oust white invaders and of the name Geronimo that struck terror into the hearts of white travelers. *Stagecoach's* references to Indians are consistently ominous: characters remark how Apaches burn every ranch in sight, and one even warns that these Indians strike like rattlesnakes. In a particularly disturbing scene, the charred remains of a house lie smoldering with a woman's body hunched over a burnt chair, her head partly scalped. The final attack upon the stage with the cavalry's fortuitous appearance (similar to *Union Pacific's* (1939) military rescue) suggests that the frontier will be safe only when its marauding natives vanish forever.

The pattern of established stereotypes hit against a wave of films more conscious of harmonious racial relations during the postwar era. John Ford's trilogy of *Fort Apache* (1948), *She Wore a Yellow Ribbon* (1949), and *Rio Grande* (1950) depicted cavalry life on the western frontier, while striving toward a mutual understanding between Indians and whites. In *Fort Apache*, perhaps the most popular of Ford's early pro-Indian movies, the villain is a Custer-like army colonel who is more concerned with preserving his image than with protecting his country. When advised by an experienced captain to respect Cochise's word and honor the chief's offer to negotiate, the colonel denies that honor can exist between an army officer and an Apache. Ford explores deep-rooted hostilities between Indians and whites; thus, a soldier's description of Apaches as "ungrateful dogs" and "savages" emerges as acceptable and yet disturbing. The colonel's attitude toward the Apaches results in an embarrassing blunder as the Indians ambush his men, outnumbering them four to one. The film occasionally looks inside the Apaches' life and offers a glimpse of history from the Indians' point of view,

even explaining that their attacks are a response to white betrayal. The captain's glorification of the colonel's last battle (echoing *Liberty Valence's* message that "when legend becomes fact, print the legend") is a painful reminder that traditional American history until recently has been written at the Indians' expense.

It was no coincidence that *Fort Apache* and *Broken Arrow* appeared at the peak of Hollywood's attention to postwar racial issues. Historian John Lenihan has pointed out that the relevance of the Indian theme in Westerns of the fifties and sixties must be viewed in the same light as the black racial question in America.¹ The American Indians' status in Hollywood (and in the United States) underwent a significant change during these years, for the very issue of racial differences seemed blanketed by the attitude that beneath every black or Indian lay a human being with a nature much like that of a white person. It was precisely this point that *Broken Arrow* stressed.

The publication of Elliott Arnold's epic novel *Blood Brother* in 1947 provided the basis for *Broken Arrow's* message of racial reform. Much of the story's milieu of intertribal relations and Mexican-Apache wars had to be eliminated to condense the novel's 558 pages into 93 minutes of screen time. *Broken Arrow's* central theme, according to its producer Julian Blaustein, would be the friendship between Thomas Jeffords and the Apache Indian chief Cochise, which would serve as a basic structure for the story's Indian/white relations.² *Blood Brother* covers nineteen years of southwest history, from 1855, when the whites acquired the land south of the Gila River in what is now Arizona, to 1874, the year Cochise died. The film *Broken Arrow*, however, de-emphasizes the novel's historical setting, eliminating many references to past events which led to current conflicts, and focuses instead upon the relationship between Jeffords and Cochise. The part of Jeffords' female companion is minimal; the film consequently becomes more weighted toward a mixture of races by excluding a rival to Sonseeahray (the Apache Indian girl whom he marries). The film's elimination of Cochise's two brothers reduces the "tribal" nature of Indian culture and spotlights the Cochise/Jeffords relationship as primary.

Broken Arrow sets a tone of racial equality early in the film. While inside a wickiup, Jeffords asks Cochise if they might live together as brothers. A few moments later, Cochise says: "Walk

with me so my people will see us together." Later, Cochise tells Jeffords: "Maybe someday you will kill me or I will kill you. We will not spit on each other." Neither man regards race or color as a barrier to friendship.

The film's deliberate avoidance of awkward speech patterns and broken dialect reduced a distinct difference between whites and Indians. Daves believed that *Broken Arrow* broke the "racial barrier" by indicating at the outset (in Jeffords' opening narration) that the Indians would speak in customary English so the audience could understand them.³ The goal of understanding, Daves reasoned, could be achieved by eliminating the broken English of the typical Hollywood Indian and replacing it with a more conventional style. The only problem appeared to be the obvious distinction between the English of Indians and whites, as indicated in a studio memo:

When, however, the writer calls attention to language differences and occasionally resorts to broken English, it destroys the illusion the screenplay otherwise seeks to establish and gives rise to a degree of confusion and inconsistency.⁴

The main concern was that both races not only speak the same language but also sound alike. The studio took a major step: by replacing the traditional broken style with conventional English, the film presents the Indians not as ignorant natives but as intelligent beings. In short, Blaustein said, none of the film's Indians say "Ugh!"⁵

The casting of unfamiliar actors as main characters strengthened the film's thematic message. Although whites portrayed leading Indian roles, the film's use of an unknown actor for Cochise added dimension to his characterization. In *Blood Brother*, the major characters represent an embodiment of social ideals, and their respective races emerge as irrelevant to the broader concepts of friendship, tolerance, and justice. Producer Blaustein followed Arnold's story when he explained:

By using unfamiliar faces in all except the Jeffords' part, we might make them [the Indians] acceptable as human beings.⁶

The choice of Jeff Chandler as Cochise fit the requirement. The young actor had earned a minor reputation for radio shows and

several films, but he remained relatively unknown to movie audiences. Daves himself explained that he never considered a star name for Cochise, since actual Indians would play scenes with well-known actors who were obviously not Indians.⁷ The idea of using a relative newcomer bypassed the usual star syndrome of a Boris Karloff or an Anthony Quinn playing an Indian chief. Drawing attention to the star himself, rather than to the Cochise character, would only defeat the story's message.

The film's idealistic conclusion preserves the concept of an eternal brotherhood between both individuals and their races. Jeffords' agreement with Cochise to allow mail riders to pass safely through Apache territory leads to General Otis Howard's request for a permanent peace treaty with the Indians. Cochise and his warriors agree to a ninety-day trial period, although several Indians dissent and leave the tribe, naming Gokliya (later known as Geronimo) their leader. Several renegade Indians later attack a stagecoach, and, likewise, a group of white miners (who view Jeffords as a traitor) ambush Jeffords and Cochise, killing Sonseeahray in the struggle. As Jeffords holds his dead wife, he vows revenge upon the whites but Cochise reminds him:

Geronimo broke the peace no less than these whites.
And as I bear the murder of my people, so you will
bear the murder of your wife. I am Cochise! I do not
betray my people or their children. And no one on my
territory will open war again—not even you.⁸

In the final scene, Cochise consoles Jeffords: "The arrow is broken forever, Tall One, and cast to the winds. . . . Know that you will always have a home with us, for we are brothers."⁹ A "broken arrow" symbolically represents a permanent peace: Jeffords' narration explains that the murder of Sonseeahray put a final seal on the peace agreement between whites and Apaches.¹⁰

Blood Brother minimizes the effect of Sonseeahray's death. Jeffords drifts aimlessly for months through the desert and eventually becomes an Apache scout. The murder of Sonseeahray fails to create any profound change. Arnold's main point, however, is that despite antagonistic circumstances Cochise and Jeffords remain close friends. The bond between the two men endures all social repercussions, yet ceases to reduce widespread tension and animosities within the two societies. In contrast,

Broken Arrow's message of racial tolerance penetrates the thick wall of social bigotry and professes peaceful coexistence between Indians and whites. The film demands that whites reexamine their prejudices, and in the end the Indian—not the white—emerges as the hero.

Broken Arrow's theme of tolerance and integration served as an indication of America's evolving policies toward Indians. The years immediately following World War II provided a catalyst for black integration, which sparked awareness of civil rights and political equality toward other minorities as well. President Harry S. Truman's efforts in assigning blacks to government positions and attempts to eliminate segregation in the federal bureaucracy symbolically reaffirmed racial equality overall while recognizing "blacks as individual citizens."¹¹

Beneath the drive toward integration and the attention to civil rights, however, lay an attitude of conformity. America was slowly becoming a more "homogenous" nation: the number of first- and second-generation Americans gradually decreased and many institutions that maintained an ethnic identity lost their vitality. Deviating from white conformity was suspect: the activities of Senator Joseph McCarthy made the label "un-American" dangerous to individuals or groups who differed.¹²

The American Indians' situation paralleled the stride toward integration. The government's proposal to terminate all federal responsibility toward Indian welfare was, in part, a conservative reaction to John Collier's 1934 Indian Reorganization Act. Collier's main objective of preserving traditional native culture and community life later become the target of criticism; opponents argued in particular that federal trusteeship over tribal lands resembled Soviet collectivist programs. As the Second World War progressed, defense expenditures mounted, and congressional conservatives recommended that the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) trim its programs to help balance the budget. The Senate Indian Affairs Committee proposed to transfer the Bureau's function to corresponding federal and state agencies "so that the Indians would be treated no differently than the whites."¹³ The solution was, quite plainly, assimilation: to absorb Indians into dominant white society, erasing tribal culture and status and eliminating their special wardship with the federal government. This proposed policy of Termination would subject Indians to the same state laws and jurisdiction that ap-

plied to other citizens. The message was clear: Indians were to be placed on exactly the same basis as the rest of the population, and thus made to conform to white expectations.

The goal of assimilation initially created a paradox. While congressional advocates forced the Bureau to shift toward assimilationism, the Bureau clung to Collier's concepts of cultural pluralism. This difference between Congress and the BIA only widened the gap over federal Termination. The failure of Collier's program and the new emphasis upon a homogenized society left liberals with an incoherent philosophy for Indian affairs: those who supported black integration could hardly advocate what in postwar years seemed to be the segregation of Indians.¹⁴ Cultural pluralism and assimilation, then, existed as two incompatible aspects of Indian policy.

The concern for Indian identity and culture permeated much of Daves's film. *Broken Arrow* stressed the need for racial identity, inasmuch as it attempted to distinguish differences between Indian and white societies. Twentieth Century-Fox Studios delved into anthropological sources in order to portray Apache culture: production notes indicate citations regarding the jewelry of Apache men and the games played by Apache children.¹⁵ The social dance, an informal opportunity for a man and a woman to become acquainted, was depicted with relative accuracy. The gesture is initiated by the woman, who chooses her male partner in the dance by tapping him on the shoulder.¹⁶ When Sonseeahray touches Jeffords, Cochise reminds him that it would be an insult to refuse, since in Apache culture he is expected to dance.

Other minor, though significant, cultural details are portrayed within the film's story. *Broken Arrow* depicts portions of the girls' Puberty Rite: Sonseeahray wears the traditional buckskin dress, the Apaches construct the ceremonial teepee, and Cochise attributes curative powers to the young girl. In another scene, Cochise finishes eating and wipes the grease on his arms. When Jeffords explains that whites wash away the grease, Cochise replies, "What a waste!" In Apache custom, a man rubs grease on his legs after meals, a gesture believed to feed the legs just as food gives nourishment to the body.¹⁷ The film not only introduced another traditional (although modified) practice, but it humorously alluded to cultural differences.

The studio's faithful description of the wedding scene in *Blood*

Brother became a point of critical controversy. *Broken Arrow* duplicated Arnold's passages regarding the wedding: the shaman makes a small incision on Jeffords' right hand and Sonseeahray's left hand and ties both together. As their blood mingles, the shaman recites, "There are two bodies but now there is but one blood in both of them." Historians attacked the marriage ceremony and wedding night rituals as Hollywood fantasy, however, and data on Apache culture reveal no evidence of these customs.¹⁸

The mingling of blood illustrates the symbolic unison of both races. *Broken Arrow's* wedding ceremony emerges as a metaphorical theme: it is the "blood brother" ritual displaced into marriage. While two individuals merge to create a social unit, they retain their own separate cultures and identities. The marriage represents a "model" of racial coexistence, yet creates a tension between two distinctly different ideologies.

Broken Arrow's release in 1950 coincided with the threshold of federal efforts to implement assimilationist policies. While the postwar years provided the foundation for racial equality and civil rights, they produced no immediate effect upon Native Americans. The move toward Termination initially was gradual: in 1946, Commissioner William A. Brophy began transferring responsibilities from the BIA to other agencies; by 1948, Commissioner William Zimmerman, Jr. had prepared a long-term program of capital investments that would lure industries to Navajo and Hopi reservations and relocate families to urban areas; and in 1949, the federal government launched the Hoover Commission report, which advised terminating the government's relationship with Indian tribes and recommended integrating them into the general population.¹⁹

The year 1950 witnessed the initiation of the government's full-scale effort to bring about Termination. Interior Secretary Oscar L. Chapman argued that during the Cold War period of anti-communist impulse, cultural pluralism could no longer command a place in the nation's conventional wisdom. Two years later, Commissioner Dillon Seymour Myer ordered Termination to proceed at full speed, and he even seemed to suggest that Indians should abandon their old ways and customs. Myer's proposals established an essential concept in American Indian policy: national unity and individualism were not inconsistent,

but indeed were complementary.²⁰ Civil rights would end discrimination and simultaneously free individuals from group identity, allowing them to compete on an equal basis within society.

Broken Arrow did more than simply "echo" government attitudes: it indicated the film industry's response to the Indian's evolving role in society. The Association of American Indian Affairs [AAIA] stated that *Broken Arrow* discarded traditional Hollywood stereotypes and treated both Indians and whites as human beings. When commending *Broken Arrow* for "its bold, honest treatment of Indian history," the AAIA went one step further: the film proved that the American Indian must be considered a first-class citizen.²¹ The Association's statement seemed to hint at the Indians' new role in American society—a role which ultimately would lead to assimilation by according Indians the same opportunities as whites. The Association's long-time president, Oliver La Farge, indicated that cultural pluralism was almost passé when he said:

Our basic overall theory of policy is that Indians must become absorbed into the general population. In thus being absorbed, they may or may not be able to retain enriching elements of their own culture. We do know, as an inescapable fact, that no minority of 400,000 can survive among 150,000,000 of another culture, and retain its identity forever.²²

Broken Arrow represented to La Farge the inevitable solution to Native American survival.

Broken Arrow's immediate successors implied that assimilation was an inescapable and even preferable condition. Jeff Chandler duplicated his Cochise role in George Sherman's 1952 film, *Battle at Apache Pass*. The story actually occurs many years before Jeffords' meeting with the Apache chief, when Cochise was wrongly accused of kidnapping a white boy, and Lieutenant Bascom hanged his relatives in retaliation. Cochise and an army major both want peace between whites and Apaches; others, namely Bascom and Geronimo, believe that fighting is the only solution to racial problems. Peaceful coexistence remains more of a ideal than a reality: the army's use of powerful cannons (previously unknown to Cochise) at a mountain pass signals that ultimately Apaches must submit to white demands. The film's

conclusion suggests that the final peace talk is more of an Apache surrender, as Cochise loses men against the cannons and his wife is seriously injured in the same battle.

Douglas Sirk's 1954 film *Taza, Son of Cochise* preaches the same ideals as its predecessor. The story immediately follows Cochise's death, when the dying chief asks his two sons to continue his teachings. One of the sons, Taza, works to achieve the same sort of ideal peace as his father, but both his brother and Geronimo harshly resist. Taza even agrees to settle the Apaches on the San Carlos Reservation, but his adaptation to white ways (he dons a military uniform to patrol the Indians) causes much criticism among his own people. When Taza kills his brother and asks the army to relocate Geronimo to an eastern reservation, he admits that peace is finally possible. Yet Taza pays the price of assimilation, and in his conformity to white culture he must abandon some of his own heritage.

Walk the Proud Land (1956) offers the strongest plea for racial assimilation. The film recounts the story of agent Clum and his adventures on an Apache Indian reservation. The struggle between the U.S. Army and the Interior Department is illustrated when Clum tells the army to stop exterminating the Indians and to make them into useful citizens instead. Clum's goal is to assimilate Indians into white culture: he advises an Apache boy to learn the white man's ways because "it's his world and you must learn to live in it." And in a special ceremony similar to the wedding sequence in *Broken Arrow*, Clum and an Apache Indian are joined together as brothers. The film's attempt to achieve racial cooperation becomes almost coercive when Clum asks Geronimo and his warriors to surrender and put themselves "under the mercy of the U.S. government." While *Walk the Proud Land* proposes that assimilation is a long-term solution to racial problems, it simultaneously suggests that loss of racial identity is the price.

Gradually, however, 1950s Westerns became less optimistic about racial goals and more critical of white attitudes. The later postwar Westerns shed some of their idealism while examining white beliefs. In Otto Preminger's *River of No Return* (1954), a priest observes, "I came here to administer to the Indian. I think the white man will need me more." And in Delmer Daves's *The Last Wagon* (1956), a white girl expresses her disgust when she remarks, "I hate Indians," but later is indebted to a half-breed

for saving her life and helping her "grow up." These films and others seem to hint that white attitudes need reform before racial coexistence can be achieved.

The problem of racial prejudice emerges as a critical comment on white attitudes in John Ford's *The Searchers* (1956). Ford's vision of a unified society with strong familial ties typically remains hopeful in this Western, but his focus is upon the fanatic racism of his protagonist, Ethan Edwards. While Ethan is an otherwise noble individual, he possesses a blind hatred toward Comanches for killing his family and abducting his niece. Ethan's racism is first apparent when he sneers that his nephew (who is part Cherokee) can easily be mistaken for a half-breed. The brutal murder of Ethan's family unleashes his fury: he shoots out the eyes of a dead Comanche; he slaughters the buffalo in order to deplete the Indians' winter food supply; he scalps the Comanche chief who killed his family; and, worst of all, he is determined to kill his niece for becoming the chief's squaw. If Ford seems to justify Ethan's behavior as revenge for his family's deaths, he simultaneously implies that savagery is innate to both races. The final reconciliation between Ethan and his niece suggests that racial boundaries are defined more by learned attitudes than by inherent differences.

Broken Arrow's successors demonstrated that assimilation was gradually becoming a dominant goal. *Walk the Proud Land* and other 1950s Westerns suggested that cultural pluralism and racial assimilation were two incompatible ideals, and the prevalence of one implied the sacrifice of the other. Yet the affirmation of white values demanded a more critical examination of white attitudes, and a film like *The Searchers* (and later Westerns) suggested that racism has been and always will be part of the American tradition. No doubt Hollywood had come a long way from the debasing images in *Stagecoach* to the more respectable portrayals in *Broken Arrow*. John Lenihan remarked that while Daves's film seemed to offer an apology for the industry's previous stereotypes, it nonetheless showed that no real basis exists for treating one race as inherently different from, and hence inferior to, another.²³ When examined in this light, the film marked a turning point for both white attitudes and Native American images.

NOTES

1. John H. Lenihan, *Showdown: Confronting Modern America in the Western Film* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1980), 58.

2. "Magnitude, Theme Lend Importance to Coming Movie," Pressbook for *Broken Arrow*, New York Public Library at Lincoln Center, New York City.

3. Delmer Daves, Letter to Thomas Cripps, 2 March 1971.

4. Michael Abel, Inter-Office Correspondence: "Final Screenplay of *Broken Arrow*" to Darryl Zanuck, 1 July 1949, Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation. Production notes courtesy of John E. O'Connor of the New Jersey Institute of Technology.

5. Philip K. Scheurer, "Indians' Culture Captured in Film," *Los Angeles Times*, 21 May 1950.

6. Scheurer, *ibid.*

7. Joseph Taft, ed., "Dialogues with a Director," *Persimmon Hill*, 5, No. 2 (1975) 46. I am grateful to the Northern Arizona University Special Collections Library for their help in securing the Taft interview.

8. *Arrow*, Final Script, The Delmer Daves Papers (M192), Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries, 20 May 1949. All treatments of the script were obtained from the Delmer Daves Papers at Stanford University's Special Collections Department.

9. *Broken Arrow*, Revised Final Script, Retakes and Added Scenes, 21 October 1949. Initially, the script had Cochise nickname Jeffords "Tall Arrow" but this was subsequently changed to "Tall One." In *Blood Brother*, Cochise affectionately called Jeffords "Tagliato," the Apache word for "red beard." The chief later referred to Jeffords as "Sheekasay," which means "brother."

10. A note on the Revised Final Script indicates that the previous title was *Warpaint*, which suggests a somewhat hostile tone. The title was later changed to *Arrow*, perhaps referring to Cochise's original nickname for Jeffords. The resulting title *Broken Arrow* conveys the antithesis of *Warpaint*.

11. John Brooks, *The Great Leap: The Past Twenty-Five Years in America* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), 287-289; Barton J. Bernstein, ed., *Politics and Policies of the Truman Administration* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1972), 275, 278; and Robert D. Marcus and David Burner, eds., "To Secure These Rights—The President's Committee on Civil Rights, 1947," *America Since 1945*, 2nd ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1977).

12. Murray L. Wax and Robert W. Buchanan, eds., *Solving "The Indian Problem": The White Man's Burdensome Business* (New York: The New York Times Company, 1975), 68.

13. Clayton R. Koppes, "From New Deal to Termination: Liberalism and Indian Policy, 1933-1953," *Pacific Historical Review*, 46, No. 4 (1977), 555-556 and Larry J. Hasse, "Termination and Assimilation: Federal Indian Policy, 1943 to 1961," (Ph.D. Diss.: Washington State University 1974), 42-48.

14. Hasse, *ibid.*, 64.

15. "Jewelry of Apache Men," and "Games Played by Apache Children," typed 12 May 1949 from Morris Edward Opler's *An Apache Life-Way* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), 21, 53-54, 395-396, Delmer Daves Papers, Stanford University.

16. Opler, *ibid.*, 123-124 and James L. Haley, *Apaches: A History and Culture*

Portrait (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1981), 143. Opler also refers to this custom as the "partner" dance, an integral part of the girl's Puberty Rite.

17. Haley, *Apaches: A History and Culture Portrait*, 130.

18. John E. O'Connor's *The Hollywood Indian: Stereotypes of Native Americans in Films* (Trenton: New Jersey State Museum, 1980), 54 was especially critical of the fictitious wedding ceremony. Interestingly, in an oral history account, Ace Daklugie (son of Juh, Chief of Nednhi Apaches) stated that while Arnold seemed to know a good deal about Apache Indians, there was no marriage rite in Apache culture such as that described in *Blood Brother*. See Eve Ball, *Indeh, An Apache Odyssey* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1980), 31. Ball claims that the novel is valuable for historical authenticity, except for a few details.

19. U.S. Department of the Interior, *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1946* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949), 346-347; *Annual Report, 30 June 1948*, 369; and Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government, *Indian Affairs* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office: 1949), 63-66.

20. Hasse, "Termination and Assimilation: Federal Indian Policy, 1943 to 1961," 108, 110 and Koppes, "From New Deal to Termination: Liberalism and Indian Policy, 1933-1953," 556.

21. AAIA Endorsement of *Broken Arrow*, released June 12 and distributed to newspaper syndicates, *Broken Arrow Pressbook*.

22. Oliver La Farge, "AAIA Restatement of Progress and Policies in Indian Affairs," 8 February 1950, "AAIA, 1950" Papers of Philleo Nash, Truman Library, as quoted from Hasse, "Termination and Assimilation: Federal Indian Policy, 1943 to 1961," 114.

23. Lenihan, *Showdown: Confronting Modern America in the Western Film*, 61.