

Malea Powell

## Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians Use Writing

---

In this story I listen closely to the ways in which two late nineteenth-century American Indian intellectuals, Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins and Charles Alexander Eastman, use the discourses about Indian-ness that circulated during that time period in order to both respond to that discourse and to reimagine what it could mean to be Indian. This *use*, I argue, is a critical component of rhetorics of survivance.

---

**T**his is a story.<sup>1</sup>

In *Ceremony*, Leslie Marmon Silko offers some advice about stories: “They aren’t just entertainment. / Don’t be fooled. / They are all we have, you see, / all we have to fight off illness and death”; stories are carried in the body, in the belly where they live and grow (2). Stories are “more than survival, more than endurance or mere response”; they have the power to make, re-make, un-make the world (Vizenor, *Fugitive* 15). Stories are the “vital layers of a transformative process” that Jacqueline Jones Royster cites as necessary for the construction of “new histories and theories” in this discipline of composition and rhetoric (35). The stories I tell here are offered in order to focus on the written responses

CCC 53:3 / FEBRUARY 2002

to colonization produced by two nineteenth-century American Indian intellectuals—Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins and Charles Alexander Eastman. It is my hope that by offering these stories, this essay will help in the construction of new histories and theories here at “the C&R ranch” (Lyons 458). But I worry that, in fact, the work that I’m doing here on “the ranch” will be ignored and/or erased inside that great, long story that our discipline tells about itself. The turn to Native peoples’ writings is still an odd project in composition and rhetoric. There is little work on American Indians being done in our discipline and much of it suffers from the burdens of a colonial mindset and a general lack of understanding about the diversity of American Indian cultures and histories on this continent. While the papers I hear at conferences are increasingly written by Native scholars and are frequently attuned to the discursive intricacies of being/studying “Indians in America,” published scholarly work on American Indians in composition and rhetoric, as Scott Lyons points out, often portrays Indians as primitives, depends on an uncritical acceptance of the oral/literate binary, and “present[s] readers with Indian stereotypes, cultural appropriation, and a virtual absence of discourse on sovereignty and the status of Indian nations” (458–61).<sup>2</sup>

In short, as a discipline, we’ve done a pretty good job of not doing a very good job of critically engaging with Native texts. That alone makes the attempts of Native scholars in composition and rhetoric both necessary and quite difficult. And that is what makes me agree with Lyons when he claims “I suspect all talk on rhetorical sovereignty will likely happen away from the university” (466). The hope that I hold, the hope that persuades me to tell these stories here, rests on the continuously reflective, rethinking, revisionary feel of the teachers and scholars who hang out at the C&R ranch. Even so, what has become clear to me as a participant in the discipline of composition and rhetoric is that whether “we” are focusing on cultural and intellectual history or on pedagogical and institutional history, “we” are still often doing so in regards to The Rhetorical Tradition. Typically this Tradition begins with the Greeks, goes Roman, briefly sojourns in Italy, then shows up in England and Scotland, hops the ocean to America and settles in. Additions to the Tradition are rare, though the Tradition itself is often supplemented by writings from Other rhetorical traditions so that we end up with a sort of smorgasbord of traditions distinct and whole unto themselves who nonetheless sometimes “visit” the big house of Tradition for a night or two. While I readily acknowledge the complicated politics of canon formation in any discipline and the recent challenges by women and scholars of color that both support “adding” others to the canon

as a tactical curative for the homogenous focus of much college curriculum, I also don't see this "additive" approach as more than a quick fix for a much more structurally embedded problem, that is, the Western Eurocentric focus of the American academy.<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere I have accused the discipline of composition and rhetoric of deliberately unseeing its participation in imperialism, both that of Great Britain and the United States.<sup>4</sup> In my mind, that critique is not meant to demean the real and productive work done by traditional scholars in composition and rhetoric; it is, instead, a way to make visible the fact that some of us read and listen from a different space, and to suggest that, as a discipline, it is time we all learned to hear that difference.

For example, one of the important canonical texts for the study of nineteenth-century American rhetoric is Gregory Clark and Michael Halloran's edited collection *Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*. In their introduction to the collection, Clark and Halloran tell a story about the transformation of oratorical culture in the nineteenth century in which the emphasis on public citizenship shifts to a preoccupation with individualism and professionalism. Clearly they are primarily referring to Euroamerican oratorical culture here. In telling their story, they make the observation that the "seemingly unlimited landscape made the individualism for which the liberal philosophy of the eighteenth century had argued appear 'natural' and materially necessary" (10). Just to hear that phrase "the seemingly unlimited landscape" used so matter-of-factly is disturbing, but it raises an even more critical question; that is, "necessary" to whom? The subjects implied in this phrase are

**This is the space of absent presence, the space where the rhetorical tactics of folks like Winnemucca and Eastman can be put into conversation with Euroamerican "oratorical culture" as a way to complicate its so-called transformations.**

clearly members of the Euroamerican mainstream. The equally implied absence of others for whom the privileges of "individualism" and "liberal philosophy" were far outside their daily material and rhetorical struggles for survival points to a space, an absence, in a particular conceptual understanding of the nineteenth century. This is the space of absent presence, the

space where the rhetorical tactics of folks like Winnemucca and Eastman can be put into conversation with Euroamerican "oratorical culture" as a way to complicate its so-called transformations. This conversation is sometimes painful, almost always awkward, but of absolute necessity to those of us who are teachers and scholars of writing and rhetoric. Even so, this essay offers no quick fix, no teacherly anecdotes or pedagogical advice; it is, instead, an invitation to re-learn and to re-listen, to reconsider the question implicit in the "after the

colon” space of Lyons’s earlier *CCC* essay—“Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?”—by paying attention to how two nineteenth-century American Indians *used* writing.

### **A paracolonial tale**

The story I tell here is an invitation to a new imagining, not particularly of the “real” or the “true” but of the *possible* hearings and tellings of Winnemucca’s and Eastman’s texts.<sup>5</sup> In his now-classic essay, “The Man Made of Words,” N. Scott Momaday offers this advice: “We are what we imagine. Our very existence consists in our imagination of ourselves. Our best destiny is to imagine, at least, completely, who and what, and *that* we are” (103). Momaday’s words make sense to me in a theoretical way. Scholarship is an act of imagination and of telling the stories of that imagining, stories about how the world works. Imagination, for Gerald Vizenor, is “disheartened” in the manifest manners of “documentation and the imposition of cultural representation” by many Euroamerican scholars (*Manifest* 76). What Vizenor is talking about specifically is a sort of imaginative liberation of indigenous peoples from the stories being told about them that insist on nobility or ignobility, that cannot afford to see Indian peoples as humans. These “manifest manners,” then, are the insistences of colonizers, colonialism, and empire. They are the refusal to understand Indian people as anything but “savage brutes who deserved to be exploited, tortured, and exterminated” or members of idyllic, utopian societies—both a result of “paternalistic mythology” (Warrior 16). These manners are the “historical requirement of an imperial process” (Jaimes 1). And because the processes of colonization have continued unremitted in Indian country for over 500 years, it is difficult to describe American Indians as either “postcolonial” or “neocolonial” peoples. The occupying force has not been, nor will it ever be, withdrawn. So in understanding the relationship between colonizer and colonized in North America it is essential to understand our situation in what Vizenor describes as “paracolonial” terms, a colonialism beyond colonialism, multiple, contradictory, and with all the attendant complications of internal, neo- and post-colonialism (*Manifest* 77).

In *The Rhetoric of Empire*, David Spurr claims that there are “particular languages” that belong to “the historical process of colonization” and that such languages—both generative and enabling—“are known collectively as colonial discourse” (1). Spurr’s rhetoric is made up of forms, like surveillance, classification, eroticization, and others, through which the colonized “other” is created and maintained in discourse as well as in materiality. Spurr’s rhetorical

focus, like much work in postcolonial studies, is on the strategies of European colonizers. The anti-paracolonial project represented in this article takes as its primary focus the tactics and the stories of the “other.” In listening to the tellings of Winnemucca and Eastman, I pay close attention to the language of survivance (survival + resistance) that they, consciously or unconsciously, use

**In listening to the tellings of Winnemucca and Eastman, I pay close attention to the language of survivance (survival + resistance) that they, consciously or unconsciously, use in order to reimagine and, literally, refigure “the Indian.” It is this use that I argue transforms their object-status within colonial discourse into a subject-status, a presence instead of an absence.**

in order to reimagine and, literally, refigure “the Indian.” It is this *use* that I argue transforms their object-status within colonial discourse into a subject-status, a presence instead of an absence. My understanding of presence and absence in the creation of both “the Indian” and in the maintenance of an Indian identity is much indebted to the theoretical stories of

Vizenor. Vizenor anchors his articulations of the trickster and of Native survivance in two European theoretical constructs: the Barthesian deconstructive sense of the striptease, where the excessive hiding of the thing is removed and the absence of the thing being hidden is demonstrated, and the Baudrillardian notion of simulation as the absence of the real. He does so not to pay homage to European postmodern theory and theorists but to tease the very manners through which “the Indian” was created, a trickster alliance as the basis for a new French and Indian War.<sup>6</sup> Vizenor’s postindian—“the absence of the [occidental] invention”—“renounces the inventions and final vocabularies of manifest manners,” and is a trickster *par excellence* (*Manifest* 11, 167).

The presence of “the Indian” signals the absence of the postindian; the postindian refigures “the Indian,” teases the manners that maintain this simulation as authentic, and strips “a sovereign striptease” (Vizenor, “Socioacupuncture” 180). The striptease “ruins” representation by undermining its claims to be something valuable and “real,” and these “ruins of representation”—the revelation of absence—are also the site of an excess of meaning, a “something else” that is the presence of material Indian peoples. Survivance is “simulated” because the striptease of “the Indian” has ruined representation. In order to prevent the same process from undoing the presence of Indian peoples, that presence has to self-consciously include a critique of its own semiotic construction, which is why Vizenor insists that tribal identity is always ironic. It must be in order to counter the simulations of the “authentic Indian” in the

manners of dominance. Naanabozho, the Woodlands trickster, is Vizenor's metaphor for that ironic presence in stories that translates simulations of dominance into liberation. A scholarly practice that self-consciously engages with the power of that metaphor is his "trickster hermeneutic," a tease that allows us access to the ironic, not tragic, presence of the tribes, a practice that is survivance (*Manifest* 15). For Vizenor, and for myself, this means not only reimagining the possibilities for existence and ironic identity within Native communities, but also reimagining a scholarly relationship to writings by Indian peoples, one that hears the multiplicities in those writings and in the stories told about them.<sup>7</sup> So, my own reimaginings of Eastman and Winnemucca, my methodological attempt to "tease" those manners and to imagine "a new tribal presence in the very ruins of representations of invented Indians," begins with an important rhetorical context: the relationship of these early Native intellectuals to the audiences of their time.

### **This problem is not an Indian**

Commonly referred to as "the Indian problem" or "the Indian question," the issue that became more and more pressing in the United States during the nineteenth century was intimately related to a vision of America as abundant and bountiful, ripe for the enactment of the desires of those who constituted the new nation. This vision depended on settlers having access to as much land as they desired. The "problem," then, became the indigenous peoples who already lived on the land that had been, at least ideologically, declared empty and available to white settlers. This "problem" has its rhetorical beginnings in the beliefs of the seventeenth-century colonists, in "the Ideas, Symbols, and Images of Savagism and Civilization" that were imposed by Europeans and, later, Euroamericans as a way to make sense out of the seeming chaos of the "new World" (Pearce xviii, 3). In *Savagism and Civilization*, Roy Harvey Pearce connects these "beliefs" to European philosophical thought. He writes:

**The "problem," then, became the indigenous peoples who already lived on the land that had been, at least ideologically, declared empty and available to white settlers.**

The colonial concern with the savage Indian was a product of the tradition of Anglo-French primitivistic thinking—an attempt to see the savage, the ignoble savage, as a European manqué. When, by the 1770's, the attempt had obviously failed, Americans were coming to understand the Indian as one *radically different* from their proper selves. . . . [so they] worked out a theory of the savage which

depended on an idea of a new order in which the Indian could have no part. (4, emphasis added)

Pearce further links this new “theory” about Indians to a burgeoning American nationalism and emphasizes that this new “American” came to “know who and what he was and where he was going, to evaluate the special society in which he lived and to know its past and its future” most effectively through comparison with “the Indian who, as a savage, had all past and no future” (135).

This system of either/or identity-building in which liberation from the past is a central component for the construction of the myths of “America” and “American-ness” is also theorized in Richard Slotkin’s *Regeneration through Violence* and Richard Drinnon’s *Facing West*. Slotkin sees newly arrived European colonists as “preoccupied with defining, for themselves and for others,” the nature of their relationship with a “primitive” indigenous culture (15–16). This “defining” ultimately resulted in “violence” through which, Slotkin claims, “America” was constructed as a utopian space, able to offer European settlers the opportunity to “regenerate their fortunes, their spirits, and the power of their church and nation” in order to create a *radically different thing/nation* than had been created before (3–5; emphasis in original). For Drinnon this is an “ongoing process of empire-building” on the part of the United States in which the primary goal is destroying memory: “they sought to cut off the Remembrance of them [Indian peoples] from the Earth” (Captain John Mason, qtd. in Drinnon xii). Pearce, Slotkin, and Drinnon all tell very similar stories

**“The Indian” (whatever that may be) must disappear so that “America” can live.**

about “the Indian” as a figure against which “the American” can be rendered from the raw materials of “the Euro-colonist,” and rendered most effectively by making “the Indian” a

thing of America’s past. In short, “the Indian” (whatever that may be) must disappear so that “America” can live. While it is impossible within the scope of this essay to even begin to explain the breadth of U.S.-Indian policy in the nineteenth century, the general movement was from a strategy of extermination and/or removal to one of assimilation by the latter half of the century. Under the “peace policy” instituted during President Ulysses Grant’s administration (1870), the attempt was made to force all Indian nations, even those exempt from removal, onto reservations for their own “protection,” and religious groups (Quakers, Catholics, Methodists, etc.) were allowed to control both Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) appointed offices and the Board of Indian Commissioners in an attempt to disrupt the unfair policies visited upon reservation commu-

nities by corrupt BIA officials. Christian agents were also to provide the “proper” example of piety, private property, and agrarian work ethic necessary to convince Native peoples of the values of civilization. Indian reformers throughout the nineteenth century most certainly believed that the salvation of the tribes meant the sacrifice of the “savage” to Christianity and civilization, but prior to 1879, the reform movement “lacked the direction and leadership to implement Indian reform policies,” a state of affairs that changed with the intense public interest in the Ponca tour (Mathes 6).<sup>8</sup>

The Ponca tour marks an important rhetorical moment in Indian reform, one that sets the stage for later “public Indians” like Winnemucca and Eastman. In 1868, the federal government had created the Great Sioux Reservation and, in doing so, inadvertently included land previously reserved for the Poncas. The Poncas were then forced away from these lands and moved to Indian Territory (Oklahoma) where there was little food or housing. After two years and the death of his son, Standing Bear, a Ponca leader, tried to return to the Dakotas, only to be stopped by federal troops and returned to Indian Territory. The former abolitionist Thomas Tibbles heard about Standing Bear and quickly publicized his predicament in the Eastern press. By August of 1879, Tibbles had arranged an East coast lecture tour for Standing Bear. The Ponca episode is doubly significant. First, it marks the entrance of “the Indian” into the public arena of Indian reform. Like the slave testimonies of the abolition movement, authentic Indian voices lent credence and urgency to reformist arguments and put a human face, one that could thus be made the object of pity and censure, on governmental policy decisions. No longer was the Indian simply “imagined” by the audiences of Eastern reformers; the Indian was present, a presence that signified the absence of thousands of others who had been removed from the arena of daily American life. Second, the Ponca tour not only generated a flurry of reform activities from already established organizations like the Indian Hope Association, the American Missionary Association, and the Reform League, it also prompted the formation of new groups like the Boston Indian Citizenship Committee (BICC), the Philadelphia-based Women’s National Indian Association (WNIA), the Indian Rights Association (IRA), and the Lake Mohonk Friends of the Indian conference. It would be these new organizations, formed with a different rhetorical and material relationship to the presence of Indians in the reform community, that would participate in creating a series of reform policies that represented “the high point of paternalism” (Prucha 610).

While these new reform groups bore a passing similarity to previous groups in that “they were driven by a sense of Christian mission,” their work



took on a critically different stance—they wanted to “dismantle the reservations” (Hoxie 12). Instead of operating as separate groups, they worked together to “revolution[ize] the relations of Indians with the rest of the nation,” forcing Congress into a program of rabid anti-tribalism and private property reform (Prucha 609). They “flood[ed] the nation with press reports and pamphlet propaganda, lobb[ie]d in Washington for specific measures, investigat[ed] the actual conditions of the Indians in the West” and used exemplary Indians like Winnemucca to shore up their pro-allotment arguments (Prucha 609). The BICC’s first investigative report demands “recognition of the Indian as a person and as a fellow citizen,” a task easily fulfilled through “individual allotments of land to Indians” (*The Indian Question*, qtd. in Prucha 612). The demands of the WNIA’s first petition are parallel: that the government make provision for reservation schools “sufficient for the education of every child of every tribe,” that it “allot 160 acres of land in severalty to every Indian,” and that it grant Indians full rights under the laws of the United States while implementing programs that would encourage Indians in industry and trade (Quinton 382n). The Indian Rights Association, in their *Second Annual Report* published in 1885, blatantly stated that their intent was to secure “for the Indian” three things: “Law,” “Education,” and “a protected individual title to land . . . the entering-wedge by which tribal organization is to be rent asunder” (43). That same year, in the *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners*, Merrill Gates, who presided over the Lake Mohonk Conference for several years, wrote that “the aim of legislation for the Indian should be to make him as soon as possible an intelligent, useful citizen” and that “Indian reservations . . . insulate Indians from civilization, cultivate vice, and [are] a domain for lawlessness licensed by the United States” (55–56). The culmination of the work of these reform groups came in the passage of the General Allotment Act, also known as the Dawes Act, of 1887.<sup>9</sup>

It should be clear, even from this abbreviated rhetorical and historical narrative about reform, that American discourses of imperialism in the form of anti-tribal pro-private property advocacy were seen as appropriate responses to the problems created by earlier American discourses of imperialism (i.e., Removal), and that such “solutions” were being written in the public sphere. I am less interested, at least in this article, in the degree and detail to which the imperial discourses existed as I am in the *uses* to which indigenous peoples like Eastman and Winnemucca put those discourses, the ways in which they imagined new possibilities for Native resistance and survival in the face of vio-

lent assimilation strategies. In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Michel de Certeau argues for the importance of studying the *use* to which groups and individuals put the representations and behaviors of the society in which they live. This use, or making, is “a production, a poiesis,” hidden and “scattered over areas defined and occupied by systems of ‘production’” and imposed upon by “a dominant economic order” to such an extent that the methods of possible consumption, the ways of using, are themselves controlled, limited (xii-xiii). In de Certeau’s configuration there are strategies and tactics. Strategies are “circumscribed as *proper*,” actions delimited by the propriety of the system (xix). Tactics, contrarily, are “calculated action[s] determined by the absence of a proper locus,” a production of knowledge determined, like Vizenor’s postindian, by its absence, not its presence, in discourses of power (de Certeau 37). The place of the tactic, then, is “the space of the other,” able to insinuate itself into systems of dominance without consuming those systems entirely (de Certeau 37, xix). Imperialism is a strategy; survivance, a tactic.

In the stories that follow, I listen to the texts of Winnemucca and Eastman as productions in which both writers are participants in their own making and remaking, fully human subjects capable of tactical refigurings. To hear them as subjects, then, is to understand their writings as *use*, texts in which they “consume” and reproduce nineteenth-century “beliefs” about Indians in order to create “something else,” a new kind of Indian-ness which allows them to “maintain their difference in the very space that the occupier” has organized (de Certeau 32). For Winnemucca, that difference is used very specifically to argue for changes in Indian policy that will benefit her peoples, the Northern Paiutes. For Eastman, that difference is used more broadly to argue for a synthesis of Euroamerican and Native cultural values. For both, however, the use of Euroamerican understandings about “the Indian” is a primary component of their performance of a category in between, that of the civilized Indian.

### **Writing the civilized Indian: Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins’s *Life among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims***

The 1883 publication of Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins’s *Life among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims* (hereafter referred to as *Life*), marks her as “the only Indian woman writer of personal and tribal history during most of the nineteenth-century” (Ruoff 261). The autobiographies of American Indian writers are especially problematic; most often these writings are read as “authentic”

**Part ethnohistory, part adventure story, part autobiography, *Life* doesn't so much tell about Winnemucca's life as it does present a version of her life in order to persuade her audience to help the Paiutes.**

expressions of Indian cultures in which the writer simply presents a particular objective reality. These writings are rarely seen as deliberately rhetorical, consciously and selectively interpretive with a specific audience's needs in mind. My listening in this section assumes that *Life* is much more than a simple presentation of events. Part ethnohistory, part adventure story, part autobiography, *Life* doesn't so much tell about Winnemucca's life as it does present a version of her life in order to persuade her audience to help the Paiutes.<sup>10</sup> Winnemucca uses the events of her life to create a believable argument and, as a result of her purpose, must perform a kind of civilized Indian-ness which would appeal to her late nineteenth-century reformist audience.

Most biographies chronicling Winnemucca's life, whether two pages or two hundred pages long, begin as her own text begins, with her birth around 1844 near the sink of the Humboldt River.<sup>11</sup> Born the granddaughter of Truckee, self-proclaimed chief of all the Paiutes, Winnemucca spent her life as a spokesperson and advocate for the Northern Paiute peoples. She experienced her first contact with Euroamericans when she was about four years old. Winnemucca was terrified of the "white" men she saw because, with their beards and light eyes, they resembled owls, the form taken by a Paiute bogeyman known as the "Cannibal Owl," who was rumored to carry off bad children, pound their flesh into a pulp, and happily eat them (Canfield 5). Winnemucca gradually overcame many of her childhood fears and spent much of her life living and working within Euroamerican culture, learning Spanish as a young girl during an extended stay with her grandfather in Santa Cruz, and teaching herself to read and write in English while working as a domestic servant in Virginia City. She also worked as an interpreter for the Army and various Indian Agents, and as a teacher at several "Indian" schools. Winnemucca had especially close contact with government officials, particularly Indian agents, who, in her mind, often mistreated the Paiutes for their own selfish gain. It was this mistreatment that prompted her first public lectures in San Francisco in 1879 in which she directly criticized the practices of a particular Indian agent—William V. Rinehart—who was stationed at the Malheur Reservation in eastern Oregon where the Paiutes were reserved.

Rinehart's behavior has been cited as one of the major causes of the Bannock War of 1878, when Paiutes joined with Bannocks and, because of the deplorable conditions on the reservations, literally took to the surrounding

hills to hide from the government, periodically borrowing supplies from nearby settlers and reservation stores. When the army was called in, General Oliver Otis Howard contacted Winnemucca and asked that she serve as liaison with these “renegade” Paiutes. For her service and peacekeeping efforts, the army gave her \$500, which she promptly spent to travel to San Francisco where her public lectures concerning Indian agency corruptions were a great success.<sup>12</sup> Within a month, Winnemucca, her brother Natchez, and her father Old Winnemucca were called to Washington DC for a meeting with Carl Schurz, the Secretary of the Interior in charge of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and with President Hayes. During this trip Winnemucca was introduced to Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, who offered to finance a series of East coast lectures. Winnemucca was even more of a success in the East than she had been in San Francisco. In her “Indian Princess” beaded-buckskins, she delivered over 300 lectures from April 1883 to August 1884.<sup>13</sup> In order to broaden her audience, Winnemucca decided to write a book composed of her lectures—*Life among the Piutes* was published, with Peabody’s financial support and Mary Mann’s unobtrusive editing, in 1883. Following its publication, the BIA launched an extensive campaign to discredit Winnemucca.<sup>14</sup> Ultimately, she returned to Lovelock, Nevada, and began, again with Peabody’s financial support, a school for Paiute children.<sup>15</sup> Winnemucca died from tuberculosis in 1891.

Throughout *Life*, Winnemucca constructs herself as a *civilized Indian*, and she does so by textually representing herself as a literate practitioner of Euroamerican discourse at the same time as she clearly represents herself as a Paiute. These representations can be most clearly heard by listening to some of the ways her writing uses the generic desires of her nineteenth-century audience. As I pointed out earlier in this article, one of the primary focuses of Indian reform at this time was the destruction of tribalism and the instantiation of individualism, a shift best signified in reformers’ minds through the holding of private property, a concept that *Life* argues for both in Winnemucca’s critique of corrupt Indian agents and in the solution she posits: that the Paiutes “can enjoy lands in severalty without losing their tribal relations, so essential to their happiness and good character, and . . . citizenship, implied in this distribution of land, will defend them from the encroachments of the white settlers, so detrimental to their interests and their virtues” (247). Further, Winnemucca’s writing carefully balances reform

**Winnemucca constructs herself as a *civilized Indian*, and she does so by textually representing herself as a literate practitioner of Euroamerican discourse at the same time as she clearly represents herself as a Paiute.**

beliefs about individualism and the need to be heard by reformers as a part of a tribal community in order to authenticate herself as a representative for the Paiute peoples as a whole. Winnemucca negotiates this tricky rhetorical exigency narratively through the use of direct-address techniques (the “dear reader” that is such a staple of many other sentimental texts from the time period) and through a grammar of representation that emphasizes the writer as an individuated self within the narrative as well as an observer of the events in the narrative.

One example of this tactic occurs when Winnemucca introduces the story of her grandfather’s death. In the following passage, Winnemucca invites her readers into the text then links a moment of individuation with a representation of herself as a part of the tribe *and* as a presenter (a translator) of events for her Euroamerican readers.

But how can *I* describe the scene that followed [Truckee’s death]? Some of *you, dear reader[s]*, can imagine. . . . *Every one* threw themselves upon his body, and their cries could be heard for many a mile. *I* crept up to him. *I* could hardly believe he would never speak to me again. *I* knelt beside him, and took his dear old face in my hands, and looked at him quite a while. *I* could not speak. *I* felt the world growing cold; everything seemed dark . . . *I* think if he had put out his hands and asked me to go with him, *I* would gladly have folded myself in his arms. . . . Such *a scene* *I* never had seen before. *Everybody* would take his dead body in their arms and weep. (69–70, emphasis added)

Winnemucca begins as the observer here; then almost immediately she casts the Paiute people gathered at her grandfather’s deathbed as participants in her grief while she also draws herself as a member of the tribe, as a participant in the community’s grief; then she textually delineates her grief as individual. And the whole scene stands as presented, translated for her audience, especially when she moves immediately to a detached description of Paiute burial procedures (which include burying the deceased’s possessions with him) and directly addresses her audience: “Now, my dear readers, *I* do not want you to think we do this thing because we think the dead use what we put in. . . . No, no; but it is the last respect we pay for our dead” (70).

Winnemucca’s writing shows a clear sense of the values of her Euroamerican audience. Winnemucca was first exposed to Euroamerican religious practices while with various white families during her own family’s trip to California when she was just a child. However, she probably received her most significant exposure to discourses of Protestant Christianity<sup>16</sup> once she became companion to Lizzie Ormsby, Major William Ormsby’s daughter, while living

with that family in Mormon Station (Genoa), Nevada.<sup>17</sup> This period, which began in 1857, was also when Winnemucca learned to read and write in English, having already learned to speak Spanish in Santa Cruz. An 1879 *Daily Alta California* report on her San Francisco lectures characterized her “sententious sentences” as “bear[ing] a striking similarity to the poetry of Holy Writ,” attributing the similarity to her claims of Methodism and to “her reading of the Old Testament” (qtd. in Canfield 166–67). In this often-quoted passage from *Life*, her adeptness at negotiating Protestant Christian discourse is clear:

Oh, for shame! You who are educated by a Christian government in the art of war; the practice of whose profession makes you natural enemies of the savages, so called by you. Yes, you, who call yourselves the great civilization; you who have knelt upon Plymouth Rock, covenanting with God to make this land the home of the free and the brave. Ah, then you rise from your bended knees and seizing the welcoming hands of those who are the owners of this land, which you are not, your carbines rise upon the bleak shore, and your so-called civilization sweeps inland from the ocean wave; but, oh, my God! leaving its pathway marked by crimson lines of blood and strewn by the bones of two races, the inheritor and the invader; and I am crying out to you for justice. (207)

In this passage, she uses the “Christian” roots of European immigration both to remind her audience of the “greatness” of their “forefathers” and to let them know that she is knowledgeable about white people in a way that they are not knowledgeable about Indian peoples. The positioning here is delicate. She does not flatter her audience when she points out the destruction their “civilizing” has initiated. What I find most significant about this passage is that she cites the damage done to “two races,” insinuating that the violence done to Indian peoples by Euroamerican settlers is as much a problem for the whites who will read her book as it is for the Indians she claims to represent. Her plea for justice emphasizes this “double jeopardy” situation—if those to whom she is speaking/writing do not help her (and, by association, all Indian peoples) attain some sort of “justice,” then they will be on the side of violence and bloodshed, not on the side of peace and humanity. White audiences could gain “salvation” through supporting Winnemucca’s cause. And the way to justice was made easy—in the back of *Life* there was a

**Her plea for justice emphasizes this “double jeopardy” situation—if those to whom she is speaking/writing do not help her (and, by association, all Indian peoples) attain some sort of “justice,” then they will be on the side of violence and bloodshed, not on the side of peace and humanity.**

copy of her petition to Congress on behalf of the Paiutes.<sup>18</sup>

This use of her reader's beliefs about Indian-ness permeates her story. She very carefully plays on the Eastern ladies' Christian sympathy through her attack on the "bad" Christian agents who dealt blow after blow to the Paiutes, and she balances this with representations of the hard work and honesty of the Paiute people. In *Life*, Paiutes are stereotypically simple and childlike Indians, who need their honest agent Mr. Samuel Parrish: "You are my children," Parrish says to the Paiutes, "I have come to show you how to work" (106); Old Winnemucca answers, "We will all work at whatever our white father says we must work at" (108). Winnemucca represents the Paiutes as grateful and happy to be taught how to work by Parrish and declares that he is "the best father we ever had in all our lives" (109). Winnemucca attributes the use of the name *father* as a traditional Paiute practice reserved for men who deserve respect; however, it neatly echoes the paternalistic slant of Indian policy of the time and the underlying beliefs system that configured Native cultures as less developed versions of Euroamerican culture.

Winnemucca works hard to create a sense of sympathy and similarity between herself—a civilized Indian woman—and her white audience. *Life's* first chapter, "First Meeting of Piutes and Whites," emphasizes Winnemucca's childhood fear of white men, who she had been told "were killing everybody and eating them" (11). She gives many accounts of violence against the Paiutes perpetrated by white men but offers two events that caused her "to love the white people" (33). The first event came during her first journey to California when the traveling Paiutes encountered a group of settlers who were also traveling West.

I saw them give my brother and sister something white. My mother asked her father what it was, and he said it was Pe-har-be, which means sugar. Just then one of the women came to my mother with something in her hand, and grandpa said: 'Take it, my child,' then I held out my hand without looking. That was the first gift I ever got from a white person, which made my heart very glad. (23)

The second event occurred later in the journey when Winnemucca grew ill from poison oak. She writes, "My face swelled so that I could not see for a long time, but I could hear everything. At last some one came that had a voice like an angel. I really thought it must be an angel" (31). Once Winnemucca regains her sight, she meets the white woman who brought her the medicine that helped make her well: "The first thing she did was put her beautiful white hand on my forehead. I looked at her; she was, indeed, a beautiful angel. . . I began to get

well very fast, and this sweet angel came every day and brought me something nice to eat" (32).

Winnemucca clearly and immediately constructs white men as frightening, a representation that is repeated throughout *Life*, and white women as "angels" who bring gifts, a characterization that would have appealed to the gender beliefs of her nineteenth-century audience. And Winnemucca was aware of the importance of gender, both her own and that of her audiences, in the reform arena. During her San Francisco trip in 1879, she told a *San Francisco Chronicle* reporter that "I have just been thinking how it would do for me to lecture upon the Bannock War. . . . I would be *the first Indian woman* who ever spoke before white people" (qtd. in Canfield 162, emphasis added). Also, the second chapter of *Life*, "Domestic and Social Moralities," is clearly aimed at a female audience and is an adaptation of a lecture Winnemucca often delivered to women-only audiences during her tour in the East. In that chapter, she writes, "mothers are afraid to have more children, for fear they shall have daughters, who are not safe even in their mother's presence" (48). During her descriptions of the Bannock War, Winnemucca refers again and again to places where she was afraid to stay overnight: "We did not stay long, because I was afraid of the soldiers" (84). Winnemucca explains this fear clearly in the final chapter of *Life*, "The Yakima Affair." Winnemucca and her sister Elma had been staying with a cousin for a few days because heavy snow kept them from traveling. When it is time to leave, the cousin insists on accompanying them, claiming "there were very bad men there," and "sometimes they would throw a rope over our women and do fearful things to them" (228). Though the presence of a family friend at the "horrible place" protect Sarah and Elma during the night, they are followed by "three men coming after us as fast as they could ride" (228–29). One of the men claims to be a friend of Natchez so they leave the sisters unmolested. That night, they stayed at the farm of a Mr. Anderson, a U.S. mail contractor whom Winnemucca had known for years. Though they slept in Anderson's own room, one of the eight cowboys staying with him tried to molest Winnemucca during the night (231).

Winnemucca clearly attributes her vulnerability to the fact that she is an Indian woman and to the fact that there were "no white women" present to regulate the moral conduct of the men. At the end of this descriptive section, Winnemucca directly addresses her audience again: "thanks be to God, I am so proud to say that my people have never outraged your women, or even insulted them by looks or words" (244). She then asks if the same can be said for white men: "they do commit some most horrible outrages on your women, but



you do not drive them round like dogs” (244). What I see Winnemucca doing here is engaging in common late nineteenth-century beliefs about “women’s roles.” My claim here is that Winnemucca was more than familiar with an un-

**Winnemucca was more than familiar with an understanding of women as the “moral eye of the state” (Ginzberg 174) and she used this to build equivalencies with her female readers.**

derstanding of women as the “moral eye of the state” (Ginzberg 174) and that she used this to build equivalencies with her female readers. Again, as part of her chapter on “Domestic and Social Moralities,” she talks about the importance of women

in Paiute society: “The women know as much as their advice is often asked. We have a republic as well as you. The council-tent is our Congress, and anybody can speak who has anything to say, women and all” (53). At the bottom of that same page, she writes: “If women could go into your congress I think justice would soon be done to the Indians” (53). This is a sentiment that Peabody echoes in an 1885 letter to Rose Cleveland: “You and I must have *another* hour of conference on this [Indian] matter and who knows but we may begin a new era? Women’s *wit* is need in administration—” (Ronda 423). Winnemucca’s attention to her audience’s beliefs about women is significant to understanding her extensive knowledge about her audience, especially given Peabody’s assessment that Winnemucca’s public lectures “never failed to arouse the moral enthusiasm of every woman that heard it, and seal their confidence in her own purity of character and purpose” (*Sarah* 28).

Finally, Winnemucca uses letters to create herself as a subject who is not only “literate,” but who, as a translator of words, must also be a translator of cultures. Early in *Life*, Winnemucca writes about the Paiutes’ reaction to a letter Chief Truckee received from his “white brothers” during the time he worked as a guide for settlers traveling through the Sierras.

He then showed us a more wonderful thing than all the others that he had brought. It was a paper, which he said could talk to him . . . He said, “This can talk to all our white brothers, and our white sisters, and their children. Our white brothers are beautiful, and our white sisters are beautiful, and their children are beautiful. He also said the paper can travel like the wind, and it can go and talk with their [white] fathers and brothers and sisters, and come back to tell what they are doing, and whether they are well or sick.” . . . our doctors and doctresses said,—“If they can do this wonderful thing, they are not truly human, but pure spirits. None but heavenly spirits can do such wonderful things.” (18–19)

Notice how Winnemucca’s telling of this story reinforces the goodness of white people, a goodness she represents her grandfather as feeling deeply. The spir-

its here are “heavenly,” the white family is “beautiful” (19). Though his people protest his version of whites by pointing out that “their blood is all around us, and the dead are lying all about us, and we cannot escape it,” their protestations “did not go far with [Winnemucca’s] grandfather” (19).

For the Truckee that Winnemucca presents to us in *Life*, the letter, which Truckee calls his “rag friend,” is a symbol of the goodness and powerfulness of white people and of their high regard for him as a true and loyal friend. “Just as long as I live and have that paper which my white brothers’ great chieftain has given me, I shall stand by them, come what will. He held the paper up towards heaven and kissed it, as if it was really a person. ‘Oh, if I should lose this,’ he said, ‘we shall all be lost’” (22). The spirit of contract with whites that the letter represents is crucial in Winnemucca’s re-creation of her grandfather as a character in her story. And the “rag friend” becomes a prime signifier of Winnemucca as a subject, an Indian who is able to decode and mediate Euroamerican knowledge.

Winnemucca’s position as an interpreter, as a speaker and reader of the language of the “white father,” is how she defines her value to the Paiutes and to the white government and Army officials in *Life*; but her English language literacy is also what sets her apart from all of

**Winnemucca’s position as an interpreter, as a speaker and reader of the language of the “white father,” is how she defines her value to the Paiutes and to the white government and Army officials in *Life*; but her English language literacy is also what sets her apart from all of them, Paiute and white, since she is the one who speaks “both” languages, and who is expected to convey the difference in cultural values in both directions.**

them, Paiute and white, since she is the one who speaks “both” languages, and who is expected to convey the difference in cultural values in both directions.

The rhetorical problem of Winnemucca’s subjectivity—her civilized Indian-ness—is especially highlighted in the last chapter of the *Life*. Winnemucca, her father (Old Winnemucca), and her brother (Natchez) have been called to Washington to meet with Secretary Schurz and with President Hayes. The Secretary gives them a *paper, a letter*, that allows some of the Paiutes (bands who have been held as prisoners of war at Yakima since the Bannock War) to return to the Malheur Reservation. When the Winnemuccas arrive back in Lovelock, Old Winnemucca tells the Paiutes: “They [the White Father] have given us a paper which your mother [Sarah] will tell you of” (225). As Winnemucca goes from place to place, trying to convince the Paiutes to return to Malheur, she refers to the letter as “the beautiful paper that the Great Father gave me” (227). When she at last reaches Yakima, Father Wilbur, the Indian agent there, en-

treats her to be silent about the contents of the letter: “I don’t want you to tell them of this paper or to read it to them” (234). Wilbur offers to pay her fifty dollars plus the money he owes her for interpreting, and he offers to request that she be able to stay on at Yakima as an interpreter, if she “will not tell them [the Paiutes]” what the letter “says” (234). Winnemucca writes: “I did not promise, and went away. I did not say anything for five or six days” (235). To the Paiutes, her silence was seen as a sign of her dishonesty, and Winnemucca’s telling of this story reinforces the Paiute belief in the power of the written word: “We are told that she has a paper, which has been given to her by the mighty Big Father in Washington, and she has burnt it or hid it, so we don’t know . . . Our paper is all gone, there is nobody to talk for us” (235). It is the paper, the printed/written text, that has power—Winnemucca’s position is that of a mediator and decoder, similar to the position of a traditional healer who has the ability to “communicate with the spirits” (19). She maintains a position within the tribe through her ability to interpret the dictates of the “spirit” within the “rag friend,” the magical voice of the white father. Winnemucca, the civilized Indian, is written by her ability to interpret Euroamerican discourse *and* by her commitment to her Paiute community: “I promised my people that I would work for them while there was life in my body” (241).

However, though Winnemucca occupies the space of “knower” in relation to a highly symbolic Euroamerican artifact—the letter—her knowledge in this scene is highly contingent. Yes, the Paiutes had permission to leave Yakima, but the government didn’t provide them with the means (rations, money, supplies, wagons) to do so, and there is quite a bit of conflict between Agent Wilbur and the B.I.A. about whether the Paiutes should leave Yakima at all. Winnemucca clearly writes herself as trying to protect her people by refusing to read the letter and involve them in yet another conflict between the desires of an Indian agent and the orders of the BIA. But her refusal reasserts her difference and distances her even further from the Paiutes at Yakima. In other words, as long as she shares her “magical gift” of English language literacy with the Paiutes, she is one of them. When she withholds that gift, she becomes an outsider. Her acceptance, even within the cultural community of her birth, is contingent upon her Euroamerican literacy. Further, Winnemucca is translating this entire episode for an audience of Euroamerican reformists, giving them a glimpse not only of “real Indians,” but also of the complicated interactions between Indians and whites. She *uses* letters here—her willingness to translate marks her as a “real Indian” for the Paiutes and her ability to translate marks her as “really civilized” for her white audience—in much the

same way as she *uses* the beliefs (about women, about Indians, about civilization) of her nineteenth-century audience. And she is conscious of this use as a tactic for engagement with Euroamericans—midway through *Life* she writes: “I have lived a long time with white people, and I know what they do. They are people who are very kind to any one who is ready to do whatever they wish” (113). Though the Paiutes often seem to be stereotypical victims in the story of *Life*, Winnemucca emerges as a subject who is anything but a victim. The “proof” of the immediate effectiveness of Winnemucca’s rhetorical tactics can be seen in the many claims that Winnemucca’s text and her lectures (many in the homes of folks like Emerson, Whittier, and Senator Dawes himself) were instrumental to the passage of the Dawes Act. Eventually, the single piece of policy that had been so important to Winnemucca and her father—a reservation for the Paiutes on the traditional lands near Fort McDermitt—did come to pass in July of 1889. Winnemucca’s *use* of writing marks an important moment for those of us who study composition and rhetoric as well, insofar as it displays Vizenor’s trickster hermeneutic in her ability to both engage in and critique beliefs about authentic Indian-ness that her nineteenth-century audience clearly held to be true. Winnemucca’s text insists on the survival of Native peoples, and it does so both by representing the complexity and “the critical importance of the role of negotiator, someone who can cross boundaries and serve as guide and translator for Others” (Royster, “When” 34) and by using the very imperial discourse that would doubt her subjectivity in order to create herself as a subject, not a victim, and as a very different kind of Indian than it could ever imagine.

**Winnemucca’s use of writing marks an important moment for those of us who study composition and rhetoric as well, insofar as it displays Vizenor’s trickster hermeneutic in her ability to both engage in and critique beliefs about authentic Indian-ness that her nineteenth-century audience clearly held to be true.**

### **Writing the Indian citizen: Charles Alexander Eastman’s *From the Deep Woods to Civilization***

Charles Alexander Eastman was, by all accounts, “the most prominent American Indian of the early twentieth century” (Hauptman 389). Born in 1858 on the Santee Sioux (Dakota) reservation in Minnesota,<sup>19</sup> Eastman was the great-grandson of Cloud Man (Mahpiya Wichasta), one of the “earliest converts to the civilization programs among the Santees” (Wilson 11). He was also the grandson of the noted artist Captain Seth Eastman and Stands Sacred (Cloud Man’s daughter), and the son of their daughter, Mary Nancy Eastman, and Many

Lightnings (later Jacob Eastman). Most accounts of Eastman's life, including his own in *Indian Boyhood* and *From the Deep Woods to Civilization*, mark his isolation from Euroamerican culture during the first eleven years of his life despite his maternal family's clear relationship to whites. Eastman, his grandmother (Uncheedah), and his uncle (Mysterious Medicine) fled to Canada after the Great Sioux Uprising of 1862.<sup>20</sup> Eastman's father, Many Lightnings, one of the Indians who participated in that resistance movement, was imprisoned but pardoned and spent three years at the federal penitentiary in Davenport, Iowa, where he converted to Christianity. It was he who returned as Jacob Eastman, took young Charles (then Ohiyesa) to Flandreau and enrolled him in the Santee Normal School in 1875. Eastman spent the rest of his life learning about "whites" and finding ways to synthesize Euroamerican cultural beliefs

**He observed firsthand the dissonance between "white" and "Indian" cultural values. His writings (several articles and eleven books) can generally be characterized as commentary on this cultural dissonance in which Eastman seems determined to build an "uneasy alliance" through "consolidat[ion of] Christian and Sioux values."**

with those of the Santee as he worked his way through Beloit College, Knox College, Kimball Union Academy, Dartmouth College, and Boston University Medical School. Throughout his career of service as a doctor and inspector for the Indian Bureau (BIA), a spokesman for the Boy Scouts, and as an officer in the Soci-

ety of American Indians, he observed firsthand the dissonance between "white" and "Indian" cultural values. His writings (several articles and eleven books) can generally be characterized as commentary on this cultural dissonance in which Eastman seems determined to build an "uneasy alliance" through "consolidat[ion of] Christian and Sioux values" (Wong 142). Even if we only see Eastman as the reformers of his time did—as a perfect example of what an Indian could accomplish (the civilized savage)—or as his biographers often have—as the stereotypical man torn between two worlds—he would still stand as "a seminal figure in the development of contemporary native American intellectualism and literature" (Churchill, "Review" 152).<sup>21</sup>

Like Winnemucca, Eastman was subject to the policies that reformist organizations had worked so hard to institute; unlike Winnemucca, Eastman experienced firsthand the wide discursive changes in Indian reform and Indian policy that characterize the early twentieth century in America. One of these changes took place at the level of Indian education. Originally conceived as a way to "kill the Indian and save the man," public disillusionment with the ability of boarding schools to transform Native students into completely as-

simulated Christian citizens led to a new approach. Boarding school curricula began to emphasize manual training, and Native children were discouraged from believing they would ever be anything but workers, farmers, and wives. This change parallels shifts in dominant Euroamerican understandings of difference and the ideological creation of a “new status” in which “non white minorities could be granted partial membership in the nation,” a shift that began to occur as early as the 1890s “as the nation was evolving into an industrial state and the stream of immigrants was growing in diversity” (Hoxie xii). This “new status” served the increasingly imperialist American society well. By allowing these “partial members” to be incorporated “into society’s bottom ranks,” the influx of “others” that so threatened the American ideological apparatus could now, instead of threatening dominant culture, serve that culture “without qualifying for social and political equality” (Hoxie xii). By the second decade of the twentieth century, the reform project of “raising” the Indian to the demands of civilization had become a thoroughly entrenched bureaucracy whose goal was to keep Indian peoples suspended in their marginal economic existence. The demands of assimilation itself had changed. Instead of Indians “becoming” like Euroamericans, assimilation now became “simply a label for the process by which aliens fit themselves into their proper places in the ‘white man’s’ United States” (Hoxie 210).

Amidst even these changing and differently damaging policies and ideas about Indians, some Indian peoples were speaking for themselves. One of the earliest of those was Charles Eastman. In November of 1890, at the age of 32, he arrived at the Pine Ridge Agency, South Dakota, to accept his appointed post as physician. By January (1891) he was caring for those Lakota who had survived the massacre at Wounded Knee. Eastman clashed with the Indian agent there and was eventually harassed into resigning his post. He moved to St. Paul and by 1893 his essays were being published in magazines like *Nicholas* and *Harper’s*, and he had delivered a speech, “Sioux Mythology,” at the World Columbian Exposition. Through his writing, Eastman would gain the reputation as an Indian intellectual. From St. Paul Eastman’s path is complicated—he worked for a while as an international secretary for the YMCA, then went to Washington DC to advocate for the restoration of Santee treaty rights (abolished after the 1862 uprisings), then in 1899 accepted a temporary job as an agent for Captain R.H. Pratt at the Carlisle Indian School. In 1902 his first book, *Indian Boyhood*, was published. Shortly afterwards, Hamlin Garland, who was in charge of a massive “renaming” program to obtain “standard” last names for Indian people as a way to protect their property rights, appointed Eastman as

his renaming clerk, a position he held until 1909. In 1910, Eastman obtained a grant from the University of Pennsylvania museum to study and collect Indian folktales and artifacts. While studying the Ojibway (Anishinaabe), his writings became more nature-centered, more philosophical—a “renewed” Eastman wrote *The Soul of the Indian* in late 1910. In 1916, the other half of his autobiography, *From the Deep Woods to Civilization* (hereafter referred to as *Deep Woods*), was published. In 1923 (following a slew of financial problems and the dissolution of his marriage), Eastman was appointed to the office of U.S. Indian Inspector by the Coolidge administration. As a part of his duties, Eastman was ordered to investigate several rumors surrounding the existence of Sacajewea (Lewis and Clark’s supposed “Indian guide”). Fired from that position, he moved to Chicago in 1925 (to be near the Newberry Library collections) and began working on a new manuscript. In January of 1939 Eastman suffered a severe heart attack. He died January 11, 1939, and was buried in Detroit’s Evergreen Cemetery. His grave still lies unmarked.

My listenings to Eastman in this section focus on the text that most clearly represents his acculturation, *Deep Woods*.<sup>22</sup> My claim here is that Eastman *uses* late nineteenth-century “beliefs” about Indians in order to imagine a new kind of Indian-ness in which those beliefs are both invoked and destabilized. In the foreword to *Deep Woods*, Elaine Goodale Eastman invites readers to “read between the lines” to hear “much that cannot be told” of Charles’s “whole story” (xviii). It is this invitation that I honor as I listen for Eastman’s deployment of figures of authentication (the Indian, the civilized man) as the means whereby he becomes a subject who can be heard inside Euroamerican discourses that inscribe particular gender- and class-marked behaviors for a citizen of the nation. I listen for the ways in which

**In offering us a version of a crossblood subject who is “authentic” as both an Indian and a citizen (Euroamerican), he offers us a reimagined Indian-ness.**

Eastman, like Winnemucca, authenticates himself as Indian in the terms of the dominant culture while he simultaneously authenticates himself as civilized; in doing so he participates in a rhetoric of survivance in which his practice of what I’m calling tactical authenticity is what enables his survival as an Indian/Dakota person. And, in offering us a version of a crossblood<sup>23</sup> subject who is “authentic” as both an Indian and a citizen (Euroamerican), he offers us a reimagined Indian-ness.

Eastman becomes a “real” Indian immediately. As *Deep Woods* opens, readers are directed to his previous work, *Indian Boyhood*, both in the foreword and in the first paragraph of the first chapter where he explicitly refers to

the event that closed *Indian Boyhood*—the arrival of his father and the beginning of Eastman’s “long journey” into Euroamerica (*From* 1). This connection seems important to me since Eastman tells the story of his own Indian-ness in *Indian Boyhood*, a book that begins by asking: “what boy would not be an Indian for a while when he thinks of the freest life in the world?” (3). That boyhood story is briefly retold in *Deep Woods*: “From childhood I was consciously trained to be a man,” “to adapt myself perfectly to natural things,” to “have faith and patience” and “self-control and be able to maintain silence,” “to do with as little as possible and start with nothing most of the time, because a true Indian always shares whatever he may possess” (1–2, emphasis added). This retelling is important since this time, in *Deep Woods*, the story of his Indian-ness will be told alongside and in relation to the story of his acculturation to white society. Eastman clearly sets out to view this process of acculturation, and of the Euroamerican society whose values he encounters, through his understanding of Indian-ness.

Eastman displays this mixed way of seeing and understanding, whether he is describing Indian or White cultural practices. In describing his traditional Indian upbringing, Eastman tells us that his “tribal foes” are mere rivals like those of a college athlete, that he had “no thought of destroying” them (2). He emphasizes his qualifications as a man: “Thus I was trained thoroughly for an all-round out-door life and for all natural emergencies. I was a good rider and a good shot with the bow and arrow” (5). To an audience still deeply attached to the romance of the frontier, this rugged preparedness would have marked him clearly as masculine, both in terms of their imaginings of what Indian people valued as well as in terms of their own Euroamerican gender values. At fifteen, Charles Eastman was poised on the edge of “a man’s life” when his father, the recently converted Jacob Eastman, appeared and paints for him “a totally new vision of the white man, as a religious man and kindly” (7). Through the weight of “filial duty and affection,” Eastman agreed to take the “perilous journey” that his father required of him (9). Eastman attends school in Flandreau, at first “an object of curiosity” who cuts his hair and adopts the clothing of the other schoolchildren (21). He does so in an effort to accept his father’s challenge to become a different kind of warrior, one who sees the English language and books as “the bows and arrows of the white man” (16), who finds that learning the English alphabet is like his “bird’s track and fish-fin studies” (23). Eastman puts the most powerful equivalencies between Indian-ness and white-ness into his father’s voice: “‘The way of knowledge,’ he continued, ‘is like our old way of hunting’” (29); “Remember, my boy, it is the



same as if I sent you on your first war-path. I shall expect you to conquer” (32). These early equivalencies especially reinforce Eastman’s representation of himself as a “real” Indian, for even as he undergoes the “civilizing” process, he does so to remain Indian, to carry out the duty of a warrior, to obey his father “to the end” (50).

Even so, though, “a mingling of admiration and indignation” creeps into Eastman’s texts when he offers his father’s seemingly wonder-filled descriptions of Euroamerican culture (8):

But here is a race which has learned to weigh and measure everything, time and labor and the results of labor, and has learned to accumulate and preserve both wealth and the records of experience for future generations. You yourselves know and use some of the wonderful inventions of the white man, such as guns and gunpowder, knives and hatchets, garments of every description, and there are thousands of other things both beautiful and useful. (8)

Consider, for a moment, that Eastman has just told us how wonderful and whole his childhood was, a childhood lived in harmony with nature, characterized by contact with the physical world and by a reverent sense of spirituality (2). Stereotypes of nature and Indians aside, Eastman posits here, in the words of his father, a culture utterly different than that of the Dakotas—a material culture whose inventions are weapons of “the white man’s warfare for spoliation and conquest” (2). It is just a few pages until Eastman’s descriptions of the “strange appearance of [the] schoolchildren” at Flandreau who are dressed in some of these “wonderful inventions” (8, 21). And it is this very material Euroamerican culture that Eastman himself will critique throughout *Deep Woods*: “evidently there were some disadvantages connected with this mighty civilization, for we Indians seldom found it necessary to guard our possessions” (62). Given even these small pieces of textual evidence, it becomes less and less possible to read Eastman as only complicit with assimilationist beliefs. Further, many of Eastman’s early observations can be read as commen-

**At the same time as Eastman acknowledges that Indians are the objects of a Euroamerican gaze, he also establishes himself as having the ability to look back.**

tary on how Euroamericans conceived of Indians. For example, of encountering the schoolchildren for the first time at Flandreau, Eastman writes: “I realized for

the first time that I was an object of curiosity, and it was not a pleasant feeling. On the other hand, I was considerably interested in the strange appearance of these school-children” (21). While it’s certainly possible to read this as straight

explication, I hear, instead, its doubleness. At the same time as Eastman acknowledges that Indians are the objects of a Euroamerican gaze, he also establishes himself as having the ability to look back. Since this falls in the early part of *Deep Woods*, one can almost see in it an admission that although many may buy his book to read about Indians, there will also be an Eastman reading back at his readers.

This doubleness works both ways. Because Eastman poses as the “Indian informant” in his text, it is necessary that his audience find him to be “civilized” as well in order to believe his positive representation of Indian people and culture. Again, the use of equivalencies between Indian and Euroamerican culture works to construct him as knowledgeable about the workings of civilization. One can read his long education narrative—after all, he does become a doctor—as one way to convince Euroamerican readers that he is, in fact, civilized since he is successful in the terms of the dominant culture. Eastman also shores up his status as “civilized” by linking himself to important and influential white people. One of the first instances of this occurs while Eastman is at Yankton:

Next to my own father, this man [Dr. Alfred Riggs] did more than perhaps any other to make it possible for me to grasp the principles of true civilization. . . . Associated with him was another man who influenced me powerfully toward Christian living. This was the Rev. Dr. John P. Williamson, the pioneer Presbyterian missionary. (48)

Both Riggs and Williamson are missionaries, the sons of well-known early Presbyterian missionaries Stephen R. Riggs and Dr. Thomas S. Williamson.<sup>24</sup> In fact, it was with the help of Dr. John Williamson that the group of Indians that included Jacob Eastman had been able to establish the settlement at Flandreau in 1869. Dr. Alfred Riggs was the superintendent of the Santee Normal Training School, the school that Eastman was attending in 1871, also where Eastman’s brother, John, worked as a teacher. So what Eastman does in this passage is to offer his tutelage under the supervision of two of the most successful Indian acculturationists of the time as proof of his inculcation in Christian values. He learned “civilization” from the best of men.

Further, Eastman writes Riggs as a surrogate father figure in the above passage, a significant representation given that Jacob Eastman died in 1876 as Charles was preparing to enter Beloit College, a move made possible through the recommendation and support of Riggs. Eastman links descriptions of both events in two contiguous paragraphs at the end of the third chapter of *Deep*

*Woods*. The first paragraph describes how Eastman felt when offered the chance to attend Beloit: “This was a great opportunity, and I grasped it eagerly, though I had not yet lost my old timidity about venturing alone among the white people” (50). The very next sentence, the first in the following paragraph, tells of his father’s death. Eastman writes: “This was a severe shock to me, but I felt even more strongly that I must carry out his wishes” (50). Eastman’s text links the efforts of Riggs to offer him a larger, though still intimidating, participation in the world of civilization through education with the dying wishes of his father for him to “set [his] feet in the new trail” (50). Eastman follows the trail marked out for him by his father and Riggs and, as a result, is able to construct an almost five-page resume of his own philanthropic deeds. In the final chapter of *Deep Woods*, Eastman writes that he “was invited to represent the North American Indian at the First Universal Races Congress in London, England, in 1911” (189) and refers to his “work for the Boy Scouts” (193). He combines this with a litany of the important peoples that he has met and/or corresponded with: “a very pleasant occasion of my meeting men and women distinguished in literature was the banquet given to Mark Twain on his seventieth birthday” (190); “had the honor of acquaintance with many famous and interesting people” followed by a page-long listing of public figures and clergymen whose “large circle not so well known to the public, but whose society has been to me equally stimulating and delightful” (192). This affiliation tactic helps to mark Eastman’s class status as well. Despite the fact that he suffered from financial troubles for most of his life, Eastman had status as a public figure and was aware of himself as living “more or less in the public eye” (192). This status gains him credibility in the eyes of his nineteenth-century Euroamerican audience who can be assured that he is “like them” in some respects because he circulates easily amongst people who are not only “like them” but who are role models for them.

Thus far I have listened to the textual and symbolic affiliation tactics that were an important part of Eastman’s process of authorizing himself, not just as a “civilized Indian,” but also as a highly regarded member of elite Euroamerican society. The use of linkage and affiliation with this elite society, combined with his textually displayed knowledge of Indian-ness, are the central components of Eastman’s tactical authentication. Interestingly enough, it is this tactic of affiliation that has often lessened his credibility among Native scholars as anything but a “repre-

**The use of linkage and affiliation with this elite society, combined with his textually displayed knowledge of Indian-ness, are the central components of Eastman’s tactical authentication.**

sentative of sell[ing]-out and assimilation” (Churchill, “Review” 152). This label of sell-out is confusing, I think, especially in light of Eastman’s persistent critiques of the very characteristics of Euroamerican culture that were argued to be primary components in “saving” the Indian. Eastman’s direct critiques are most potent when they are aimed at the Euroamerican obsession with material wealth and at the institution of Christianity. In the final chapter of *Deep Woods*, “The Soul of the White Man,” Eastman speculates on the problems with “civilization.”<sup>25</sup> He writes: “when I reduce civilization to its lowest terms, it becomes a system of life based upon trade” (194). He links what he sees as the Euroamerican focus on making money to an American desire for supremacy in the very next sentence: “The dollar is the measure of value, and might still spells right; otherwise, why war?” (194). It is wise to keep in mind that *Deep Woods* was published in 1916, in the midst of World War I and during a time of intense neo-imperial rivalry. Put next to Eastman’s earlier commentaries about tribal rivalries, that Indians had “no thought of destroying a nation, taking away their country or reducing the people to servitude” (2), this simple observation becomes a powerful critique of early twentieth-century American imperialism.

Eastman’s diagnosis of Christianity as it is practiced by most Euroamericans is even more biting. He calls it “a machine-made religion . . . supported by money, and more money . . . too many of the workers [are] after quantity rather than quality of religious experience” (141). His linking of white religious practices to the desire for money and that desire to the conditions of war is more than passingly interesting. In all of Eastman’s commentary about Christianity and capitalism there is a single argument running underneath—that the Indian way was better. Though he regularly admits the necessity of Native people learning about white cultural values, it is his own synthesized version of bicultural education that appears again and again. So although he is sharply critical of Euroamericans’ inability to practice the tenets of Christianity—“how is it that our [Indian] simple lives were so imbued with the spirit of worship, while much church-going among whites [Christians] led often to such very small results” (141)—he doesn’t lay the blame for that inability on the religion itself. He writes that “it appears that they [whites] are anxious to pass on their religion to all races of men, but keep very little of it themselves,” but tempers that critique with the observation that “the white man’s religion is not responsible for his mistakes” (193–95). The

**In all of Eastman’s commentary about Christianity and capitalism there is a single argument running underneath—that the Indian way was better.**

blame is on the desire for material wealth, a desire that Eastman locates when he writes: “we also know that many brilliant civilizations have collapsed in physical and moral decadence” (195).

Eastman’s critiques are not all as explicit as the ones above. For example, he juxtaposes a penetrating description of Beloit College—“The college grounds covered the site of an ancient village of mound-builders”—with a historical bookmark—“it must be remembered that this was September, 1876, less than three months after Custer’s gallant command was annihilated by the hostile Sioux”—plus a reminder of his Indian-ness—“I was especially troubled when I learned that my two uncles whom we left in Canada had taken part in this famous fight”—alongside a surprising image of white civilization—“when I went into town, I was followed on the streets by gangs of little white savages” (52–53). This two-page series of juxtaposed observations has a powerful effect. Eastman represents here the significance of where he is (on ancient Indian lands), how he got there (by leaving so-called savagery behind him), and what he finds there (white savages). In doing so, he simultaneously inhabits more than one “authentic” position and, in doing so, critiques the cultural beliefs that create those authenticities. He links himself to “real” Indians through his uncles, and participates in being “civilized” in his representation of Custer as “gallant” and in his being “troubled” at finding his relatives involved in the Little Big Horn incident. At the same time, though, his close relationship to the Natives who fought against Custer is highlighted alongside his observation of “white savages.” In “subvert[ing] the language usually limited to describing Native Americans and appl[ying] it to Euro-Americans” (Wong 149), he surfaces the complicatedness of the stories being told and retold about Indians, implicitly critiquing the intertwined nature of beliefs about savagism and civilization, whether Indian or white.

Even more so, Eastman’s ironic descriptions of Dartmouth offer a stunning critique of Euroamerican imperialism, most effective in the “gentleness of polemic” he displays (Churchill, “Review” 152). Of Dartmouth he writes: “thinking of the time when red men lived here in plenty and freedom, it seemed as if I had been destined to come view their graves and bones” (65). While some may read this as further proof of Eastman’s belief in discourses of Manifest Destiny and the Vanishing Indian, I hear this as his establishing a connection to a past and a people that those “red men” couldn’t have imagined. His musings about Dartmouth and Indians quickly move towards outright resistance: “No, I said to myself, I have come to continue that which in their last struggle they proposed to take up” (65). Eastman’s text here is clear—the in-

digenous peoples of New England have been killed off, but he will continue their struggle, he will become “a sort of prodigal son of old Dartmouth. . . the New England Indians, for whom it was founded, had departed well-nigh a century earlier, and now a warlike Sioux, like a wild fox, had found his way into this splendid seat of learning” (68). It’s a trickster move that Eastman makes when he drops these “innocent” remarks on his journey from the “deep woods” to “civilization,” remarks that clearly reveal Eastman not only as not helpless in the face of civilization, but also as purposefully using its tools in order to continue an indigenous struggle against Euroamerican imperialism. In *using* dominant discourse, Eastman marks himself as a subject within it, not just as a victim subject to it. In doing so I hear him imagine a new Indian-ness, one that is not “a fictional copy of the past” (Eastman, *Indian* vi), but an Indian-ness in which he encounters his enemies “with the same courage in literature” as his ancestors “once evinced on horses” (Vizenor, *Manifest* 4).

This reimagining begins in *Deep Woods* with Eastman’s representation of his father’s views about civilization, that “there was no alternative for the Indian” (16), and quickly becomes his own: “it was the new era for the Indian” (33). While Eastman does not flinch from describing the injustices perpetrated against Indian peoples by whites, neither does he paint his acquisition of the accouterments of civilization as a thing to be mourned, nor does he claim that acquisition as a mark of the “inevitable” disappearance of indigenous peoples. In fact, he sees it as a way to maintain the Indian, although not the same “Indian” as Euroamericans might want to see:

I wished that our [Sioux] young men might at once take up the white man’s way, and prepare themselves to hold office and wield influence in their native states. Although this hope has not been fully realized, I have the satisfaction of knowing that not a few Indians now hold positions of trust and exercise some political power. (65–66)

Further, in *Deep Woods*, Eastman complicates the Euroamerican notion of “the Indian” by representing the theatricality of ethnicity with a story about his “Armenian friend” who “conceived the scheme of dressing me in native costume and sending me out to sell his goods. When I wore a jacket and fez . . . I

**It’s a trickster move that Eastman makes when he drops these “innocent” remarks on his journey from the “deep woods” to “civilization,” remarks that clearly reveal Eastman not only as not helpless in the face of civilization, but also as purposefully using its tools in order to continue an indigenous struggle against Euroamerican imperialism.**

did very well. For business purposes I was a Turk” (70). One couldn’t get further from Brumble’s claims about social Darwinism than this ethnic “performance” that seems to underline Eastman’s knowledge about the arbitrariness of racial categories. This is a performance that is replicated in the frontispieces to *Deep Woods* and *The Soul of the Indian*. First published in 1911, *The Soul of the Indian* has as its frontispiece a picture of a bare-shouldered Charles Eastman in a full Siouxan warbonnet staring into the distance. Titled “The Vision,” the likeness works to authenticate the stories it accompanies, explanations of “Indian” religion, and to mark the teller of those stories as a “real” Indian. Contrarily, the frontispiece in *Deep Woods* is a picture of Eastman in a starched white-collared shirt and suit, a likeness that works similarly to authenticate him as civilized.

I read these simultaneous habitations as tactical in that through them Eastman successfully navigates the simple binary contradiction between savagism and civilization. He understands Indian people as people, not victims. Shortly after the “Armenian” scene in *Deep Woods* is an explicit display of that understanding. Eastman is walking around Northfield with Mr. Moody who points out a roadside stone—“this stone is a reminder of the cruelty of your countrymen two centuries ago. Here they murdered an innocent Christian” (74). Eastman’s reply is ironic enough: “it might have been better if they had killed them all. Then you would not have had to work so hard to save the souls of their descendants” (74). What I hear in this passage is two-fold: Eastman following the logic of extermination to its final conclusion—they should have killed them all—but also a reply to the abiding concern of the Indian Reform Movement—how to save the man within the “savage.” Underneath both of those is a denial of the myth of the inevitability of the disappearance of the Indian; as Eastman points to here, the disappearance of the Indian has been deliberate.

Eastman’s final comments in *Deep Woods* are often cited as proof of his “struggle” with civilization. What I hear, instead, is that Eastman’s final representation of himself in *Deep Woods* was as a practitioner of survivance.

I am Indian; and while I have learned much from civilization, for which I am grateful, I have never lost my Indian sense of right and justice. I am for development and progress along social and spiritual lines, rather than those of commerce, nationalism, or material efficiency. Nevertheless, so long as I live, I am an American. (195).

For Eastman’s new Indian, being Indian and American is not a contradiction. It is not easy, and there are no rules for negotiating the confluence of the discourses from which this new Indian arises, but it is a new imagining, a way to

move “from the earlier inventions of the tribes” and to “surmount the scriptures of manifest manners with new stories” (Vizenor, *Manifest* 5). Eastman’s text, *From the Deep Woods to Civilization*, does offer us some ways to begin our own reimagining: his willing participation in multiple discourses, his awareness of how those discourses work, and his surfacing of the imposed belief systems of those discourses through simple commentary and observation. This participation becomes *use* when he injects a doubleness of narrative awareness into his retellings and then engages in a tactics of linkage and textual and symbolic affiliation combined with experiential tellings that reveal his familiarity with Indian and white culture and that also deploy irony and simple questioning as ways to break open even the most familiar stories. Eastman’s writings do all of this. For me, this is the beginning of a rhetoric of survivance—Eastman helps me, then, to imagine a new mixed Indian subject through his creation of a crossblood intellectual.

### **Reimagining . . .**

Despite hundreds of years of pressure, first from European colonists then from Euroamericans, American Indians did not disappear. And though our visibility has been repeatedly erased in American discourses of nationhood, we have, just as insistently, refigured ourselves and reappeared. In the Euroamerican insistence upon our absence we have become permanently present. One of the greatest ironies of federal assimilation policy over the past couple hundred years is that instead of creating a homogenous society, it made space for the preservation of native cultural traditions. Native peoples have taken advantage of the “peripheral status” that evolved through twentieth-century Indian reform policies and have used that status to reinvest in community values and traditional beliefs, to “carry on [a] war with homogeneity” (Hoxie 244). A further irony can be found in the trajectory of enforced education policies: Eventually they created Indian doctors and lawyers, activists and politicians, scholars and teachers. Instead of being at the mercy of white translators, Indian lawyers understand the intricacies of the legal ties that bind us and are invested by the system of Euroamerican justice with the authority to do something about it. As Lyons so rightly argues, sovereignty is again the word of the day among Native peoples. It is “an ideal principle, the beacon by which we seek the paths to agency and power and community renewal. . . . the pursuit of sovereignty is an attempt to revive not our past, but our possibilities” (Lyons 448). And now, because of decades of Euroamerican insistence on assimilation, we have the power to, as Lyons points out, imagine those possibilities for ourselves.



My point is that even though we received the tools of Euroamerican cultural participation in a less than generous fashion, Native peoples have *used* the very policies and beliefs about “the Indian” meant to remove, reserve, assimilate, acculturate, abrogate, and un-see us as the primary tools through which to reconceive our history, to reimagine Indian-ness in our own varying and multiplicitous images, to create and re-create our presence on this continent. That doesn’t mean that we don’t keep on critiquing the system of education in the United States as “locked firmly into a paradigm of Eurocentrism, not only in terms of its focus, but also in its discernible heritage, methodologies, and conceptual structure” (Churchill, “White” 271). What it means is that we have a language, a system of participation, a rhetoric, with which to articulate that critique. My own *use* throughout this essay has been to listen to instances of that *use* in the texts of Winnemucca and Eastman. So what do we, teachers and scholars of composition and rhetoric, do with these stories? Do we simply lift the listenings and the methodology that informs them, turn them into pedagogies and present them to the students in our writing, rhetoric, and literature classrooms? Do we simply reapply the methodology to other texts

**My hope is that we can begin to reimagine ourselves, our pedagogies, our scholarship, our discipline in relation to a long and sordid history of American imperialism.**

by Native peoples, creating a canon of Native rhetoricians and a ruler by which to measure entrance of texts into some idealized American Indian Rhetorical Tradition? Or do we, can we, take what we do best as a discipline—reflect, rethink, revisit, and revise the stories that create who we are? My hope is that we can begin to reimagine ourselves, our pedagogies, our scholarship, our discipline in relation to a long and sordid history of American imperialism. That we will not shirk from the hard work implied by the stories—the new histories and theories—being offered by scholars like Lyons and myself. That as a community we can learn from the ways in which folks like Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins and Charles Eastman *use* writing to come to some new *uses* of our own, that in coming to terms with our relationship to the colonizing consequences of writing in our past, we will begin, indeed, to tell new stories of “who and what, and *that* we are” (Momaday 103).

This is a survivance story.

### **Acknowledgements**

*I want to thank Marilyn Cooper, Ralph Cintron, and Diana George for their generous advice and help with this essay. I also want to apologize to my elders for any mistakes I have made here and to thank them for the gift of their support and counsel.*

## Notes, or Other Stories

1. There are those in academia who would ask me to lay claim to storytelling, and to its centrality in my work, as a manifestation of “Native American” cultural practices. And while I don’t deny the importance of storytelling to the Native peoples of the Eastern Woodlands community of which I am a part, neither would I want to overlook the way storytelling works in both the rural midwestern farm community in which I was raised, the “postmodern” academic communities in which I participate, and the dominant narratives used to create and imagine “America.” In other words, storytelling isn’t just an “Indian” thing for me; it is essential in the creation of all human realities.
2. My comments here do not reflect the growing body of work in the discipline being done by Native scholars like Scott Lyons, Resa Crane Bizzaro, Joyce Rain Anderson, Virginia Carney, Jim Ottery, Stephen Brandon, myself, and others. The entry of “Indians who study Indians” in composition and rhetoric is similar to the same phenomenon in other disciplines—history, literature, anthropology, etc.—except that we are decades behind in matters of theorizing and curriculum development.
3. For a more elaborate indigenist critique see Ward Churchill’s “White Studies: the Intellectual Imperialism of U.S. Higher Education.”
4. See Powell, “Blood and Scholarship: One Mixed-Blood’s Story” in Keith Gilyard’s *Race, Rhetoric, and Composition* (Heinemann/Boynton-Cook, 1999).
5. To accomplish this task completely requires much more than can be included within the confines of this essay—the history of Indian-White relations (including but not limited to treaties and battles and policies), a rhetorical history of the reform movements engaged in by Euroamerican participants who considered themselves “friends of the Indian,” more complete biographical and textual readings of Winnemucca and Eastman, and the inclusion of all of the Native intellectuals who wrote and spoke and interacted with Euroamerican reformers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.
6. For those unfamiliar with Native histories, during the early years of colonization and America-making, Native peoples of the Eastern Woodlands often allied with the French. This happened during the French and Indian War (1754–1763) and during the War of 1812. The alliances were so devastating to the British and American forces, respectively, that the Treaty of Ghent (1814), which ended the Napoleonic Wars, specified that no European nation could make separate compact with tribal nations in the U.S.
7. An important critical component of the larger project from which this essay is drawn is looking at how the texts of nineteenth-century Native intellectuals have been read and received, how they have been used, by the scholarly community in English studies and American Indian studies—an exercise in listening for manifest manners.
8. For more information on Indian reform, see Christine Bolt’s *American Indian Policy and American Reform* (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987), Henry Fritz’s *The Movement for Indian Assimilation, 1860–1890* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1963), Frederick Hoxie’s *A Final Promise* (see works cited), Robert Keller, Jr.’s *American Protestantism and United States*

*Indian Policy, 1869–1892* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1983), Robert Mardock's *The Reformers and the American Indian* (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1971), Valerie Mathes's *Helen Hunt Jackson and Her Indian Reform Legacy* (Austin: U of Texas P, 1990), and Francis Paul Prucha's *The Great Father* (see works cited).

9. The Dawes Act was designed to allot a quarter section of 160 acres to the head of each Indian family. Indians who refused or failed to select an allotment would have one selected for them by the Secretary of the Interior. The new land “owner” would not, however, receive a patent for the land until it had been held in trust for twenty-five years by the Office of the Secretary of the Interior; the land could not be sold or its title encumbered by its “owner.” Further, when the land patent was finally issued, the landowner became subject to state and federal laws, and was granted U.S. citizenship if it could be proven that they had “resided separate and apart from the tribe” and had “adopted the habits of civilized life,” thus eradicating treaty obligations and cultural distinctiveness in one fell swoop. All reservation lands left over after the initial allotment were to be purchased by the government, the moneys from that purchase being held in trust “for the education and civilization of the former tribe members” (Berkhofer 174). Unfortunately, an 1891 legislative act enabled allotted lands to be leased for agriculture, mining, and lumbering while other provisions of the act—reservation courts/police and citizenship for “reformed” Indians—did not come about in any substantial manner before the 1930s. Before the Dawes Act went into effect, Native nations held 138 million acres. Sixty percent of that land was lost through sale of “surplus” lands, 20 percent was lost through “disposal of allotments,” and an unknown amount was leased in perpetuity (Berkhofer 175).

10. Though Winnemucca often talked generally about the need for allotment of lands in severalty and education for Indians, she was arguing for specific policies in relation to the Paiutes—she lobbied for the return of a specific band of Paiutes, held at Yakima after the Bannock War, to Malheur and the removal of Rinehart as agent at Malheur. Also, she and her father wanted the government to establish a reservation on lands near Fort McDermitt for Paiutes whose traditional lands were nearer there than Pyramid Lake or Malheur.

11. Though there are several biographical essays and more than one book-length biography of Winnemucca, including the recently released *Sarah Winnemucca* by Sally Zanjani, the most meticulous of the lot is Gae Whitney Canfield's *Sarah Winnemucca of the Northern Paiutes*.

12. This isn't the first time that Winnemucca appeared in public. During 1864, Winnemucca, her sister, and her father appeared in Virginia City and in San Francisco in a series of “tableaux vivants illustrative of Indian life” accompanied by “a descriptive lecture and appropriate music” (notice, qtd. in Canfield 36–39). They did so in order to raise money to feed Old Winnemucca's band of Paiutes.

13. Though many refer to Winnemucca's costume as “traditional” Paiute beaded buckskins, the traditional dress of Northern Paiute women was simply a skirt of tulle fiber with nothing above the waist—though by 1850, Paiute women combined this traditional skirt with Eu-

ropean-style mens shirts and shortly thereafter began to wear European-style womens skirts as well (Canfield 6–7).

14. The documents surrounding this campaign appeared mostly in *The Council Fire*, a reform newspaper founded by former BIA superintendent Alfred Meacham. Winnemucca's direct response to the charges took place during her speaking engagement at Soldiers' Hall in Boston. Though the rhetorical interplay here is fascinating, it is also well beyond the scope of this essay. For more information, see Powell, "Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins: Her Wrongs and Claims."

15. Peabody published two writings about Winnemucca's school and in both she is completely supportive of Winnemucca's bilingual pedagogy.

16. I specify Protestant Christianity here because Winnemucca was undoubtedly also exposed to Catholicism during her early childhood, when she is rumored to have received religious instruction from the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur at Santa Clara, and after her grandfather's death in 1860 when she and her sister probably attended the San José mission school for a few months. The details of Winnemucca's early formal education are sketchy, though it definitely had to occur while the Winnemuccas were in California Mission territory.

17. Major Ormsby founded Carson City in 1858 and introduced the Winnemuccas to Frederick Dodge, the first Indian agent in western Utah. Dodge argued early for provisions and a land reserve for the Paiutes, claiming that hostilities were easier to avoid if the local Indians weren't starving. The Paiutes considered Dodge a true friend and ally. Ormsby, on the other hand, was not seen in such a complimentary light. He regularly sided with questionable white claims against the Paiutes and was finally killed in 1860 while escorting a group of thirty whites who were seeking revenge against the Paiutes for the murder of two men who had been found with two young Paiute girls held captive in the cellar of a whisky shop. A small group of Indians "ambushed" the group and Ormsby was killed.

18. Mann added a note to the petition, asking that anybody "interested in this little book" could aid Winnemucca "by copying the petition and getting signatures to it" (*Life* 247). Mann also refers to the Appendix of *Life*, a twenty-page collection of letters vouching for Winnemucca's character and upholding her version of the events she describes in *Life*.

19. The common name *Sioux* was used to encompass three geographically related but culturally different indigenous nations—the Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota. Eastman was Santee, which would also make him Dakota.

20. In 1862, a group of Santees went to Yellow Medicine Agency to collect the rations and annuities due them by treaty. The agent there claimed that he could not release the rations due to a bureaucratic detail but, in fact, the rations had been "borrowed" by several unscrupulous agents and there was no food for the Santees. Chief Little Crow led an "uprising" which was really a series of raids on white settlers in Minnesota in which the Santees in question "borrowed" enough food and supplies to survive. Ultimately, 303 Santees were

sentenced to hang. Those who converted to Christianity were spared by President Abraham Lincoln's order. Thirty-seven Santees were actually hanged (the largest public hanging in U.S. history) in Mankato, Minnesota.

21. The only book-length biography of Eastman is Wilson's.

22. For an extended version of this reading, see Powell, "Imagining a New Indian."

23. In the American Indian community, discourses of blood, in particular of blood quantum, are highly contentious. I use the word "crossblood" here in Vizenor's sense of the word, the "double others" who are "the discoveries of the ecstatic separations of one another from the simulations of the other in the representations of an 'authentic' tribal culture" (*Manifest* 45). Crossbloods are "a postmodern tribal bloodline" (Vizenor, *Crossbloods* vii-viii) who participate in what W.E.B. DuBois called "double consciousness"—"always looking at one's self through the eyes of others" (45).

24. Stephen Riggs and Thomas Williamson were Presbyterian missionaries sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to minister among the Santee. Williamson established one of the most successful missions among the Santee at Lac qui Parle. Riggs became an authority on Siouan languages (he wrote and published *The Grammar and Dictionary of the Dakota*, 1852). Their sons, John Williamson and Alfred Riggs continued their work among the Santees. Alfred Riggs's Santee Normal Training School was one of the first educational institutions that taught in both English and Native languages (in this case, Siouan). Riggs was much criticized for this bilingual approach to civilizing.

25. There are definite philosophical connections between DuBois's *The Souls of Black Folk* and Eastman's *The Soul of the Indian*, a link that Eastman's final chapter of *Deep Woods* tropes in its title "The Soul of the White Man." DuBois and Eastman both spoke during a session of the First Universal Races Congress in London, England (1911). I believe that Eastman saw his work, and that of the Society of American Indians, as similar to the work of DuBois in the establishment of race intellectuals within the mainstream of American culture.

## Works Cited

- Berkhofer, Robert F. *The White Man's Indian*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Canfield, Gae Whitney. *Sarah Winnemucca of the Northern Paiutes*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1983.
- Churchill, Ward. Rev. of *Ohiyesa: Charles Eastman, Santee Sioux*, by Raymond Wilson. *Western American Literature* 19 (1984): 152-54.
- . "White Studies: The Intellectual Imperialism of U.S. Higher Education." *From a Native Son: Selected Essays on Indigenism, 1985-1995*. Boston: South End, 1996. 271-93.
- Clark, Gregory, and S. Michael Halloran, eds. *Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-Century America: Transformation in the Theory and Practice of Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: SIU P, 1993.

- De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.
- Drinnon, Richard. *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire Building*. 1980. New York: Schocken, 1990.
- DuBois, W.E.B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. 1903. New York: Dover, 1994.
- Eastman, Charles Alexander. *From the Deep Woods to Civilization*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1916.
- . *Indian Boyhood*. 1902. Alexandria, VA: Time-Life, 1993.
- . *The Soul of the Indian*. 1911. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1980.
- Eastman, Elaine Goodale. "Foreword." *From the Deep Woods to Civilization*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1916. xvii–xviii.
- Gates, Merrill E. "Land and Law as Agents in Educating Indians." *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners*. 1885. Rpt. in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880–1900*. Ed. Francis Paul Prucha. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973. 53–56.
- Ginzberg, Lori D. *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth Century United States*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1990.
- Hauptman, Laurence M. Rev. of *Ohiyesa: Charles Eastman, Santee Sioux*, by Raymond Wilson. *Pacific Historical Review* 53 (1984): 389.
- Hopkins, Sarah Winnemucca. *Life Among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims*. Boston, 1883. Bishop, CA: Chalfant P, 1969.
- Hoxie, Frederick E. *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1984.
- Indian Rights Association. "Statement of Objectives." *Second Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Indian Rights Association*. 1885. Rpt. in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880–1900*. Ed. Francis Paul Prucha. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973. 42–44.
- Jaimes, M. Annette, ed. *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance*. Boston: South End, 1992.
- Lyons, Scott Richard. "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want From Writing?" *College Composition and Communication* 51 (2000): 447–68.
- Mathes, Valerie Sherer. *Helen Hunt Jackson and Her Indian Reform Legacy*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1990.
- Momaday, N. Scott. "The Man Made of Words." *Literature of the American Indians: Views and Interpretations*. Ed. Abraham Chapman. New York: Meridian, 1975. 96–110.
- Peabody, Elizabeth Palmer. *The Piutes: Second Report of the Model School of Sarah Winnemucca*. Cambridge: John Wilson & Son, UP, 1887.
- . *Sarah Winnemucca's Practical Solution of the Indian Problem: A Letter to Dr. Lyman Abbot of the "Christian Union"*. Cambridge: John Wilson & Son, UP, 1886.
- Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988. Rev. ed. of *The Savages of America*. 1953.
- Powell, Malea. "Imagining a New Indian." *Paradoxa* 15 (2001): 211–26.
- . "Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins: Her Wrongs and Claims." *Native American Rhetorics*. Ed. Ernest Stromberg. Carbondale, IL: SIU P, forthcoming.

- Prucha, Francis Paul. *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*. 2 vols. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1984.
- Quinton, Amelia Stone. "Care of the Indian." *Woman's Work in America*. New York: Holt, 1891. 373–91.
- Ronda, Bruce A. *Letters of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, American Renaissance Woman*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1984.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones. "When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own." *College Composition and Communication* 47, (1996): 29–40.
- Ruoff, A. LaVonne Brown. "Three Nineteenth-Century American Indian Autobiographers." *Redefining American Literary History*. Ed. A. LaVonne Brown Ruoff and Jerry W. Ward, Jr. New York: MLA, 1990. 251–69.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon. *Ceremony*. New York: Penguin, 1977.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600–1860*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1973.
- Spurr, David. *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1996.
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Crossbloods: Bone Courts, Bingo, and Other Reports*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1976.
- . *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1998.
- . *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance*. Hanover, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1994.
- . "Socioacupuncture: Mythic Reversals and the Striptease in Four Scenes." *The American Indian and the Problem of History*. Ed. Calvin Martin. New York: Oxford UP, 1987. 180–91.
- Warrior, Robert Allen. "The Columbus Quincentennial Is Nothing to Celebrate, But Five Hundred Years of Native People's Resistance Is." *Without Discovery: A Native Response to Columbus*. Ed. Ray Gonzalez. Seattle: Broken Moon, 1992. 15–18.
- Wilson, Raymond. *Ohiyesa: Charles Eastman, Santee Sioux*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1983.
- Wong, Hertha Dawn. *Sending My Heart Back Across the Years: Tradition and Innovation in Native American Autobiography*. New York: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Zanjani, Sally. *Sarah Winnemucca*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001.

## Malea Powell

Malea Powell is a mixed-blood of Indiana Miami, Eastern Shawnee, and Euro-american ancestry. She is an Assistant Professor of English, Women's Studies, and Native American Studies at the University of Nebraska (Lincoln) where she teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in American Indian rhetoric and literature, the history of rhetoric, and postcolonial theory. She is also the editor of *SAIL: Studies in American Indian Literatures*, the only scholarly journal in the United States to focus on writings produced by Native peoples.