

Robert Stam

Preface

Countless films from the Americas (and some from Europe) display the process whereby white characters “go native,” even if usually superficially and without benefit to indigenous peoples themselves. In historical terms, this “going native” was not just a fantasy; to some participants, it was a reality. The “real epic of America,” Felix Cohen wrote, “is the yet unfinished story of the Americanization [i.e., the Indigenization] of the white man” (180). Already in the 17th century, at the heights of the puritanical regime in New England, the rebellious Thomas Morton, who danced and traded arms with the Indians, argued in *The New English Canaan* that the native way of life was more satisfying and less frantic. “According to humane reason, guided onely by the light of nature, these people leades the more happy and freer life, being voyde of care, which torments the mindes of so many Christians: They are not delighted in baubles, but in useful things” (177). The very title, *New Canaan*, betokens a Canaanite alternative to the “New Israel” grid of the Puritans. Pierre Biard, a Jesuit in “New France” in Canada, pointed out that “Unlike Europeans, [the Indians] are never in a hurry. Quite different from us, who can never do anything without hurry and worry...our desire tyrannizes us and banishes peace from our action” (Tully 76).

In this essay, I would like to talk about the “White Indian,” first in Hollywood films, but more significantly, beyond. Hollywood films like *Little Big Man* (1970), *A Man Called Horse* (1970), and *Dances with Wolves* (1990), similarly, give expression to the white desire to “become Indian” through idealized stories of whites who assimilate to native ways. Arthur Penn’s *Little Big Man* (1970), based on the Thomas Berger novel, portrays the Cheyenne as the good guys and the U.S. Army soldiers as the villains. The narration contrasts largely symbolic Indigenous style of warfare with the massive violence of western-style warfare, asking the question: where is the courage when one side has all of the weapons? The film stages a paradigmatic recognition scene found in many of the White Indian films, the scene where the indigenized white is at first misrecognized as Indian by fellow whites and then exposed. The film

THE TRANS- NATIONAL “WHITE INDIAN”

An adapted excerpt from Robert Stam's forthcoming book, *Indignity and the Decolonizing Gaze: Transnational Imaginaries, Media Aesthetics, and Social Thought*

draws subliminal allegorical parallels between the U.S. cavalry invading Indian country with the U.S. military invading Vietnam, an equation made almost explicit in real life through soldierly colloquialisms describing Vietnam as “Injun Country.” Just as the Dustin Hoffman character was siding with the Indigenous enemy in the movie theatres, anti-war protestors were chanting “Ho, ho, ho Chi Minh, the NLF is gonna win” in the streets, and hundreds of U.S. towns and cities were signing Peace Treaties with the Vietnamese.

Kevin Costner’s *Dances with Wolves* offers another “White Indian” in the form of U.S. Army Lieutenant John Dunbar, who joins the Lakota in their struggle. He begins by respecting the “enemy” and ends up taking their side. The character becomes Indian, but only in order to rediscover his implicitly white “true self.” In the “misrecognition” scene where he is captured by his own people, the military first think he’s an Indian, and when they discover he is not, remark: “turned Injun, didn’t you ... I don’t know whether to salute him or shoot him!” The film’s final intertitles inform the spectator of the historical outcome, the closing of the frontier in 1893. The net effect is a past-tense compliment, an

elegy for a vanished civilization. The film also falls into the old Manichean trap of binaristic oppositions, not only the good Dunbar versus the bad whites, but also the good Sioux versus the bad Pawnee. With all its innovations, its positive portrayals and tributes to Indigenous dignity, the film is ultimately all about the white “us,” and only secondarily about the Indigenous “them.” Dunbar is in some ways, if not better, at least as good as the Indigenous warriors, who are relegated to supporting roles. The racial transformations are asymmetrical: the white men can become Indians and thus ennobled, but Indians cannot become White without losing their dignity and their souls.

The related tropes of “going native,” the “White Indian,” and “playing Indian” have a constant presence in the cultural history of the Americas. In 1997, Vine Deloria Jr. noted a kind of inversion. Just as Native Americans “were looking increasingly like middle-class Americans,” middle-class Americans were trying more and more to look like Indians, “convinced they are Oglala Sioux Pipe carriers and on a holy mission to protect Mother Earth” (1). In *Playing Indian*, historian Philip J. Deloria suggests that the tropes reflect the anxieties and aspirations of non-Indigenous Americans in relation to an Indian figure both admired and feared. The Boston Tea Party, where American rebels dressed up as Mohawks and protested British rule is for Deloria “a catalytic moment, the first drumbeat in the long cadence of rebellion through which Americans redefined themselves as something other than British colonists” (2). Indian masquerade allowed white Americans to be simultaneously insiders and outsiders, citizens and traitors, rebels and conformists. In this same vein, Deloria refers to a metaphorical “White Indian Treaty” in 1794, a collection of speeches by the heads of the “Six United Nations of *White Indians*” (emphasis mine), linking the American revolution to “the political strategy of actual Indian People” (42).

Deloria gives myriad examples of the constantly morphing identities and identifications of whites “playing Indian:” the white Hobbyists, the pow-wow tourists, the counter-cultural leftists whose headbands evoked both Geronimo and Che Guevara, part of a long tradition of Americans “imagining and claiming an Indianness that was ultimately about being free, white, and male” (146). The American counter-culture of the 1960s fused oppositional politics with Indianness as a latter-day iteration of the redface Mohawks of the Boston Tea Party. “Playing Indian,” he writes, “replicated the contradictory tensions established by the Revolution. An interior Indianness that’s signified national identity clashed with an exterior

Indianness linked with the armed struggle to control the continent” (162). Since the social circles of anti-war activists, the hippie counterculture, and coalitionary racialized resistance (Black Panthers, American Indian Movement, the Young Lords) at times came physically and ideologically close together, including in protest allies with their frequent assemblage of activists of color, it was almost inevitable that indigenous symbolism would enter the discursive and performative arena. These convergences of intensities reached a zenith in “The Gathering of all Tribes for a Human Be-In” in San Francisco in 1967, featuring Allen Ginsburg and LSD guru Timothy Leary.

Modern formulations of “going native,” according to Shari Huhndorf (Yup’ik), reveal ambivalence about modernity as well as anxieties about the terrible violence marking the nation’s origins, demonstrating the “changing relationship of the dominant, colonizing culture to Native America’s and remain connected to more explicit and familiar modes of colonialism” (14). In this highly gendered account, the White Indian films give expression both to a historical reality – many whites did switch sides and joined the Indians or at least sympathized with them – and to a white desire to “become Indian” through idealized stories of white men – always men – adopting to native ways. However, the “White Indian” trope does not only appear in productions of the past. Many critics, and internet parodists and remixers, have noted the parallels between commercial productions like *Dances with Wolves*, *Pocahontas* (1995) and the futuristic space epic *Avatar* (2009).

The *Avatar* story is set in the year 2156 on Pandora, one of the moons of the Polyphemus planet, in a region covered by bio-luminescent foliage and literally “peopled,” not unlike the xipari-peopled forests of the Yanomami, with mythologically inflected fauna and flora. In *Avatar*, the avatars of Hindu mythology meet the avatars of “Second Life” meet the “White Indian” heroes of the revisionist western. In its palimpsest of genres – romance, animation, western, bildungsroman, colonial adventure film, anti-colonial film, sci-fi, and internet game – each genre brings its ambiguous ideological and aesthetic baggage in relation to indigenous peoples. In political terms, the film forms a kind of Rorschach screen, on to which diverse spectators project their own ideologies and discourses; indeed, the film has been read in different ways by every possible ideological current. The film instantiates Hollywood populist marketing, premised on appealing to an assemblage of disparate constituencies: a White Messiah figure for ethnocentric conservatives; ecology

for the environmentalists; a critique of the military-industrial-complex for leftists; critical allusions to U.S. imperialist wars for pacifists; cyber technologies for the techno-nerds; multi-chromatic casting for the multiculturalists; and spectacular militaristic violence, simultaneously denounced and fetishized, for the devotees of blockbuster action films.

Critics of *Avatar*, such as Shari Huhndorf, rightly argue that the film “reinforces the racial hierarchies it claims to destabilize, and thus serves another primary function of [the] going native” genre (3). For Slavoj Žižek, “the film enables us to practice a typical ideological division: sympathizing with the idealized aborigines while rejecting their actual struggle” (Žižek). As an ideologically contradictory film, *Avatar* is clearly anti-imperialist on one level, yet the production also incarnates an efficient, hierarchical, and domineering Hollywood production style not unlike that of an industrial army. The film offers a mismatch of production and representation: the anti-ecological Hollywood style of the production is out of synch with the pro-ecological message of the film. The kind of society that *produced* the film – competitive, greedy, arrogant – is nothing like the harmonious and nature-loving Na’vi society portrayed in the film. It is also worth pondering the social implications of such huge budgets: how many thousands of Indigenous or critical films could have been made with those 237 million dollars? The film also promotes new media technologies and an array of products made to the taste of those that Davi Kopenawa calls “the People of Merchandise” (4).

While not an Indigenous film – in fact as a Hollywood cyber-blockbuster it in most ways constitutes Indigenous media’s polar opposite – M. Elise Marubbio still links *Avatar* to roughly contemporaneous key victories for indigenous people such as the Second International Decade of the World’s Indigenous People (2005–2015), the election of an Indigenous president (Evo Morales) in Bolivia, the United Nations’ adoption of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the 2010 Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth. For Marubbio, *Avatar* highlights the “process of global recognition of Indigenous rights, sovereignty, decolonization movements and environmental justice [which] represent centuries of Indigenous resistance to ongoing systems of subjugation, racism and colonialism” (167). Cameron’s Pandora reflects real-world struggles by foregrounding Indigenous resistance to genocide and ecocide. Relying on revisionist and neo-Western formulae, Cameron, for Marubbio, weaves together anti-militarism and

anti-imperialism, environmentalism, pro-Nativism and Indigenous sovereignty into an allegorical critique of Manifest Destiny and settler nations’ relationships with Indigenous people.

The portrayal of the Na’vi people condenses myriad allusions to mythologies and spiritualities linked to Indigenous peoples. The Na’vi practice customs, beliefs, and traditions that are closely tied to the land as the source of sustenance and inspiration. Among the Indigenous tropes: the typical self-naming of the Na’vi as “the people;” the idea of nature as alive; the concept of Native people as the custodians of the land; the rejection of an instrumental, mechanical, and extractivist approach to nature; the levelling and mixing of the animal and the human in a kind of all-embracing personhood. For Brazilian cultural critic Ivana Bentes, *Avatar* can be read as a conversion of instrumental reason and the body/mind dualism to a “thought of the body”, in which the “bodily point of view radically changes our identity and subjectivity,” and where “lifestyles are totally subject to the holistic laws of nature” (76). For Bentes, *Avatar* is inspired by the Indigenous cosmologies in the mold of Amerindian perspectivism proposed by Viveiros de Castro (1996), a concept that emerges from Lévi-Straussian-inspired concepts such as “savage thinking” (Lévi-Strauss 353) and has gained another meaning with the “ontological turn” in Anthropology defined as a “way of thinking that rejects dualisms typical of Western-modern thought” (Neto et al. 177). Thus, perspectivism is the conception common to many peoples in the Americas, according to which “the world is inhabited by different kinds of subjects or persons, human and non-human, who apprehend it from different points of view” (de Castro 115).

Avatar proliferates in references to American imperialist wars, first against the Indian then against the neo-Indians like the Vietnamese (raided with “Apache” helicopters) and the Iraqis (targeted with “Tomahawk” Missiles). The film is anti-imperialist in its portrayal of a colonial situation led by racists whose pejorative idioms of “pagan” and “voodoo” betray their retrograde attitudes. The Sully character obviously represents a younger generation’s version of the “White Indian” figures from *Little Big Man* and *Dances with Wolves*. Like the other Hollywood “going native” films, *Avatar* pits the hyper-violent American military against an admirably courageous Indigenous society. While the Na’vi have elements of the noble savage, this time they are ecological and trans-human in their capacities. Cameron was quite explicit about the film’s anti-colonialist character: “*Avatar* is a science fiction

retelling of the history of North and South America in the early colonial period. *Avatar* very pointedly made reference to the colonial period in the Americas, with all its conflict and bloodshed between the military aggressors from Europe and the indigenous peoples, the native Americans are the Na'vi. It's not meant to be subtle" (Acuna).

Like a shape-shifting anthropologist, Jake spends three months of field research learning the ways of the Na'vi and undergoing the rites of initiation; he learns to ride, hunt, respect and love, and in turn wins their respect. Indian land, meanwhile, becomes the site of redemption for the tired imperial warrior. Like many "White Indians" from philosophy, literature, and cinema, he begins to question his own Western values, learning to "see" and "feel" through the eyes of another culture. Despite all the well-considered critiques of the film as an aggregation of clichés, many indigenous people, especially in South America, have recognized an idealized version of themselves in the Na'vi and a lucid, if hyperbolic, account of the machinations of colonialism and their impact on Indigenous people (see Marubbio). Evo Morales, the first Indigenous president of Bolivia, praised *Avatar* for its "profound show of resistance to capitalism and the struggle for the defense of nature" ("Evo Morales praises Avatar"). Native activists and supporters were less moved by the "White Savior", one suspects, than by the depiction of the high-tech aggressions mobilized against them in the name of such substances as Unobtanium – a shifter-word made to suit any extractable mineral. The scenes of powerful machines tearing up the earth reminds us of Davi Kopenawa's denunciation of the "earth eaters" (263) wrenching minerals out of the earth, thus provoking the fall of the sky.

While *Avatar* exemplifies the outlandish potency of Hollywood in production and distribution, such power can also be resisted, refunctioned, appropriated, and transformed at the point of reception through what Ella Shohat and I, and many others, call "media jiu-jitsu," (31) i.e. using the power of imagery produced by the dominant but this time against domination, i.e. assuming the strength of the dominant discourse but redeploying that strength in the interests of oppositional praxis. Meanwhile, Henry Jenkins speaks of "Avatar activism," (Jenkins) or the convergence of established media such as Hollywood film with new media activism through the language of participatory culture. After its release, as Emma Mitchell has pointed out, many activists, from Canada to Australia to Palestine to Peru, deployed the imagery of the film as part of their own struggles, donning Na'vi costumes

in an effort to attract media attention and enliven their demonstrations (see also Wade). In 2010, Aboriginal rights protestors against uranium mining in South Australia painted themselves blue in honor of the Na'vi. In India, the Non-Government Organization, *Survival*, appealed to Cameron to help the Dongria Kondh tribe in their struggle against the threat of mining. A similar tactic was repeated by a coalition of fifty First Nations and environmentalist groups campaigning against the Alberta oil sands in Canada. The groups placed a punning full-page notice in *Variety*, headlined "Canada's AvaTar Sands," to support *Avatar's* Best Picture nomination.

Outside of Hollywood, the "going native" character appears in many Latin American films. Cultural crossing over was a common occurrence during the first centuries of conquest: in Mexico, for example, Gonzalo Guerrero, a Spaniard kidnapped by Indians in the Yucatan, became a *cacique* with "face tattooed and ... ears pierced" (141). The Mexican film *Cabeza de Vaca* (1989), in the same vein, tells the story of Alvar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca, the shipwrecked Spaniard who traveled by foot from Florida to Texas. The film's source text, Alvar Nunez's *Relacion de los Naufragios* (Story of the Shipwrecked), is an early recounting of the Conquest as a story of failure. Inverting the usual roles, Nunez portrays the Spaniards as vulnerable, as losing control, weeping, and supplicating. And while a phantasmatic cannibalism usually serves to justify European exploitation, here it is the Spanish who cannibalize one another and the natives who watch in horror. Although the film portrays the Indians as menacing, even freakish, it does expose the underside of European religious proselytizing, and it dares to suggest that the conquistadors, not the natives, might have been the real cannibals.

The Venezuelan film *Jerico* (Jericho, 1990), meanwhile, treats the case of a European who "goes native." The film concerns a Franciscan priest, Santiago, the lone survivor of a sixteenth-century expedition led by the conquistador Gascuina in search of the mythic Mar del Sur. Although Santiago hopes to conquer the Indians spiritually, he is in fact spiritually conquered by them: as their captive, he comes to question his European attitudes toward religion, the body, the earth, and social life, and finally renounces his evangelical mission. In the end, he falls back into the hands of Spaniards, who regard his "going native" as a form of madness and heresy. What makes this revisionist captivity narrative so subversive is that it transforms the indigenous culture that official Europe regarded with fear and loathing into a seductive pole of attraction for

Europeans. The real purpose of the Inquisition was not to force the indigenes to become Europeans, but to keep the Europeans from becoming indigenes. The film largely adopts the indigenous perspective and shows extensive knowledge of the languages, histories, and cultural styles of the indigenous groups portrayed. While most Hollywood films have the Indians speak a laughable pidgin English, here the natives laugh at a European's garbled attempt to speak *their* language.

The global appeal of the Hollywood Western has made it fodder for infinite adaptations, remediations, and transmutations. Within this context, many countries seem to have fantasized their own Indian, whether as a kind of imaginary friend, or symbol of a romanticized *ailleurs*, or as fantasy ally. The "Indian" first became a major figure in international cinema, already in the silent period, through adaptations of Indianist literary classics. Multitudinous films adapted the hugely popular 19th century Indianist novelists in various countries – James Fenimore Cooper in the U.S., Jose de Alencar in Brazil, Karl May in Germany, and so forth. In the U.S. alone, the adaptations of *The Last of the Mohicans* go at least as far back as the 1912 silent version by James Cruze, on to a 1920s version, two 1930s versions, one 1940s version (*Last of the Redmen*, 1947), to a 1950s version (*The Iroquois Trail*, 1950), two 1960s versions, on to the 1992 version by Michael Mann starring Daniel Day-Lewis.

Europeans, as Christopher Frayling points out, have had a longstanding love affair with the Western genre. In France, between 1850 and 1870, Novelist Gustave Aimard published some 50 stories for children, with titles like *Les Outlaws du Missouri* and *Les Trappeurs de l'Arkansas*. The stories, revolving around French heroes and their Indian friends, inspired many silent films a few decades later. Some of the earliest American westerns made more money in France than in the home market. European Westerns, (aka Euro-westerns), are as old as filmmaking itself. Just one year after the first public screenings of films in 1895, Gabriel Veyre shot *Repas d'Indien* ("Indian Banquet") for the Lumiere Brothers. In France, Gaston Melies himself filmed a series of French Westerns featuring Indians between 1907 and 1913. In 1918-1919, the Winnebago director James Young Deer made short Westerns for the Pathe Brothers in France.

In Germany, meanwhile, *Der Letzte de Mohikanes* featuring Bela Lugosi as Cooper's Chingachgook, formed the second part of the two-part *Lederstrumpf* film released in 1920. Over four decades later, the 1965 West German/Italian/Spanish co-production *Der Letzte Mohikaner* directed by Harald Reini, set

its story in the post American Civil War era. The East German film *Chingachgook die Grosse Schlange* (Chingachgook the Great Serpent, 1967), starring Gojko Mitic as Chingachgook, meanwhile, became popular throughout the Socialist Bloc. Various European countries developed their own competing allegorical Indians. In Italy, for example, well-established stereotypes such as those of the "ecological Indian," the "victim Indian," and the "warrior Indian" surfaced in cultural discourse, remediated and reaccentuated for the purposes of local politics (Mariani "The Red and the Black"). In the 1970s, the *Indiani Metropolitani* (the Urban Indians of Milan) appropriated the Native American for anarchist purposes. Updated avatars of Rousseau's "*sauvages faits pour les villes*," ("city-ready savages") as a laudatory term, their manifestos mingled the savage howls of Allen Ginsberg's poetry with homages to the rebel Indian. In a manifesto entitled "We shall never bury the hatchet again!," the *Indiani* denounced the forked-tongued oppressors of the new Italian "urban Indians." As Giorgio Mariani puts it: "The 1876 Little Big Horn battle came to replace the Paris Commune or the Russian Revolution as an early example of revolutionary struggle, while General Custer was regarded as a prototype of American imperialism" ("Was Anybody More" 585-598).

In Europe, Germans, especially, have claimed a special relationship to the Indian as cultural alter-ego (see Feest 612). Germans have been writing about the natives of the Americas ever since the time of Hans Staden, the German soldier taken captive at the time of France Antartique, whose story formed the basis for the plot of *How Tasty was my Frenchman*. Thanks to their advanced post-Gutenberg publishing networks, the Germans began publishing books on the Brazilian Indian already in the first decades after Columbus, and have never stopped doing so. More typically, however, the German fascination was with the Indians of North America, and especially with the Plains Indians. Many Germans have seen the Indian as a benevolent doppelgänger. Frantz Kafka, for example, famously wrote a one-sentence story on the "Wish to be a Red Indian" (908), published in 1913. The flirtation with the Indian as secret sharer of the German soul reached a paroxysm with the Indianophile novels of Karl May (1842-1912), whose more than 30 novels recounted the adventures of Old Shatterhand and his Apache blood brother chief Winnetou the Warrior. May's Apache hero came to incarnate the German reader's desire to re-enchant the world through a vicarious "Native" experience. Translated into over thirty languages, the May novels have sold hundreds of millions of copies

worldwide. May's sources included the novels of writers like James Fenimore Coper, encyclopedias, and books on Apache culture. Indeed, May based some of Winnetou's traits on the Apache chief Cochise.

May's "Western novels" chronicled the adventures of two paired *Übermenschen* – Old Shatterhand, the white Teutonic hero, and Winnetou the red Apache chief. Scholars like Frank Usbeck, Susanne Zantop, Colin Calloway, Hartmut Lutz, H. Glenn Penny, Christian Feest and others have stressed the historically layered complexities of this form of cross-cultural identification. Rather than revisit issues already thoroughly examined by these scholars, I would like to place figures like Shatterhand within a broader spectrum of representations. To schematize shamelessly, Anglo-American and German treatments of the Indian tend toward the homosocial and even the homo-erotic, centered around blood-bonding between indigenous and western men.

The Karl May novels, in this sense, offer latter-day iterations of a theme introduced by Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, with its romanticized relationship between Crusoe and Friday, who himself could be seen as a model for Rousseau's "noble savage." We find a similar kind of non-explicit homo-social desire in the relation between Shatterhand and Winnetou. Here is May's presentation of their first encounter:

His hair was so long and heavy that it cascaded down his back. Certainly many a woman would have envied him this magnificent bluish-black adornment. ... We scrutinized each other with long, searching glances, and then, I believe, I noticed that that his solemn dark gaze with its velvety sheen was briefly illuminated by a friendly light, as if the sun were sending a message to earth through an opening in the clouds (Zantof 1).

And later: "I admired his courage and strength. His face seemed sincere. I thought I could love him" (Zantof 1). Such barely sublimated homo-eroticism fits well into the atmosphere of homo-social institutions like the army, which perhaps also explains Hitler's fascination with Karl May's heroes. The ambiguous cultural fascination with the Indian, in sum, is not exempt from the mysterious workings of Eros (see Bird).

The Indian Hobbyists

Karl May is cited as part of a Nazi parlor game in Tarantino's *Inglorious Basterds* (2009), a reference that reminds us of the intriguing case of the "Indian

hobbyist clubs" dotting the German landscape, where Germans reenact their conception of an "Indian life style" in teepees on weekends. The "Indian clubs" trace their genesis to the cultural frisson engendered by Karl May's novels as well as by carnivals, Wild West shows, and Hollywood films. The movement excites hundreds of thousands of adherents, continuing today in the form of festivals, museums, pow-wows, plays, rodeos, sweat lodges, and clubs. In this context, Germans can become pretend Indians by impersonating Lakota, Blackfeet, or Pawnee.

In political terms, the shape-shifting German Indian could be enlisted in virtually any cause, nationalist or anti-nationalist, Communist or anti-Communist, pro-American or anti-American. May's novels triggered the affection of an ideologically varied group that included Albert Schweitzer, Herman Hesse, Ernst Bloch, and Adolph Hitler. Sometimes the love for the Indian was accompanied by scorn for other ethnic groups, as when Hans Rudolf Rieder asserted that only the Indian, unlike the Black, had the requisite qualities to merit German friendship (see Feest 459). In the postwar period, the communist East and the capitalist West Germany film industries fabricated distinct images of the Indian. The East German Indian films bypassed the Karl May novels, seen by the Communist regime as symptomatic of a reactionary blood-and-soil romanticism. Films such as *Die Söhne der Grossen Barin* (1966), meanwhile, fused the "Red" of Communism with the "Red" of Native American by having the Indians outwit greedy white settlers.¹ While films from both East and West Germany heroicized the Indians and demonized the Whites, they did so from distinct national/ideological perspectives.²

This felt affinity between Germany and their imaginary Indians was a discursive palimpsest combining numerous elements: a common tribal feeling of a nation that became a nation-state relatively late, in 1871; a shared heritage of folklore and legend; the transcendental mystique of Nature; the German love of hiking and the outdoors; the desire of the

1. Information drawn from the VTape publication about the Conference/Festival.

2. In *Playing Indian*, Philip J. Deloria stipulates two types of Hobbyism: "people Hobbyism" and "item Hobbyism." Indian item hobbyism goes back to Montaigne who collected Tupinamba memorabilia. Some "item hobbyists" in other countries occupy the upper strata of the cultural and political sphere; French president Jacques Chirac, for example, was the proud collector of "primitive" indigenous artifacts (see Price).

disillusioned western citizen to revel in a bucolic pre-modern past; the appeal of masculinist notions of military courage; homo-erotic attraction to handsome “Indian men” in films played by handsome white men; a sense of inferiority stemming from military defeat; and a feeling of victimization by other Europeans and therefore identification with putative fellow victims. At the same time, Indian enthusiasm betrays a longing to be a colonizer like the other Europeans, the desire, as Hartmut Lutz put it, to be “both superior tribespeople and superior colonizers” (167). Finally, the narcissistic pleasure and *schadenfreude* of a genocide committed by another country; the idea of a colonizer loved by the colonized; “Indianthusiasm” suggested that Germans would be better and more kinder imperialists than the “Anglo-Saxons,” because they genuinely cared about and identified with native culture. (An irony here is that the Angles and the Saxons were originally German tribes).

The documentary *Forget Winnetou! Loving in the Wrong Way* (2017) directed by Red Haircrow, meanwhile, offers Native perspectives on cultural appropriation. The film argues that a philo-indigenist “Wrong-Way Loving” has reinforced the attitude that Europeans and neo-Europeans can unilaterally appropriate whatever and whoever they want for their own solipsistic self-gratification. In the U.S. context, the Elders councils of the many Indigenous groups like the Cheyenne, Hopi, Lakota have denounced New Age misappropriation of their immaterial legacies, rejecting “the expropriation of [their] ceremonial ways by non-Indians” (see Ward 276). Many see the New Age movement as either not fully understanding, or trivializing, or deliberately distorting indigenous ways of life. A parallel critique is addressed to those individuals from within the Indigenous communities who become “white man’s shaman,” or “plastic shamans,” and they who “are prostituting our spiritual ways for their own selfish gain, with no regard for the spiritual well-being of the people as a whole” (see Ward 276).

Although “Winnetou” is a Haudenosaunee word for “spirit,” May’s Winnetou is an Apache, as are the characters in the DEFA (Deutsche Film Aktiengesellschaft) production *Apachen* by Gottfried Kolditz in 1973. Apaches are featured not only in German films, and in Hollywood films like the 1950 *Broken Arrow*, but they also appear in some surprising places. In the wake of the American film *Fort Apache the Bronx* (1981), Franco-Maghrebian director Nassim Amaouche, in his film *Des Apaches* (The Apaches, 2009) analogizes the Native American group to the racialized and discriminated immigrant inhabitants of the

Parisian *banlieue*, neighborhoods roughly equivalent to the U.S. “projects.” Significantly, the banlieue rebels and their radical allies in France gave their movement a boomeranged indigenous name “*les Indigenes de la Republique*,” thus reverse-engineering the colonialist *code indigene*. Meanwhile, in Brazil, black *Afro-bloco* carnival groups in Salvador, Bahia call themselves “Apaches” and “Comanches,” in homage both to the “braves” of Hollywood and the *bravos guerreiros* of Brazil, as well as to the feathered, peace-pipe smoking *caboclos* of the Afro-Brazilian religion *Umbanda*. A difference from other kinds of appropriation here is that black Brazilians are often part indigenous themselves, just as many indigenous people in Brazil, conversely, are partially black, as becomes obvious in the physiognomies of the activists seen in the videos by the present-day Tupinamba.

Conversely, Germans have become characters in Native American novels by writers like Louise Erdrich (herself of German-Indian descent), Emma Lee Warrior, and Tomson Highway. A hallmark of some APTN (Aboriginal Peoples Television Network) productions in Canada, meanwhile, is irreverent humor. An APTN “Threes Company” becomes “Crees Company.” Drew Hayden Taylor, as half Ojibwe and half Caucasian, calls himself “Special Occasion.” One episode of “Mixed Blessings” lampoons German Indianphiles. A Cree waitress and her Ukrainian husband, in a gesture of hospitality, invite a German-accented Indianist to dinner, where he berates his hosts for not having teepees and sweat lodges and not cooking caribou in the culturally correct manner. As the meal becomes a competition in authenticity as imagined by a German wannabee, he finally explodes in disgust: “In Germany, we have names for people like you. We call you ‘Coca Cola Indians.’” Locking them into an allochronic prison of his own making, he declares: “You have been corrupted by the 20th and the 21st century. I think, no, I actually know, I am more Indian than all of you!” After he leaves, the whole family reacts to his pretensions with uproarious laughter.³

The White Indian meets Indigenous Media

The title of Tiago Torres-Campos’ documentary *O Mestre e o Divino* (*The Master and the Divine*, 2013) refers to the two characters whose relationship structures the film – the “Master,” an eccentric German-speaking Silesian monk named Adalbert Heide, who has been

3. For more on Karl May and the Hobbyists, see Jace Weaver’s *The Red Atlantic* and Philip J. Deloria’s *Playing Indian*.

filming the Xavante for decades, and “Divine,” a Xavante named “Divino,” a former altar-boy with Father Heide, and now a well-known filmmaker. Multiply reflexive, *The Master and the Divine* is not only a film about filmmaking but also a film about the fraught yet friendly dialogue between three filmmakers – Torres-Campos, Divino, and Heide – representing distinct backgrounds and cultures. On one level, the film is a “process film” (Claudia Mesquita) in that much of the film involves negotiations between Torres-Campos, the actual director, together with Divino, consultant and director of some of the clips included in the film; and Adalberto, a prolific maker of films about the Xavante, some of which are included in the film. Reflexive on every level, the film discusses such issues as pre-production, research, negotiations, archival materials, aesthetic choices and so forth. After arriving in Mato Grosso in 1957, Heide spent 60 years filming the daily life of the Xavante, edited into short films where he portrays himself as a modernizing and Christianizing force. The key motive for making the new film was the discovery by Divino and Torres-Campos that Adalberto’s numerous films about the Xavante were housed in a Silesian archive in Germany. Just as Divino and Torres-Campos needed access to Adalberto’s films which Torres-Campos was willing to bring back to Brazil, Adalberto had needs of his own– 1) that Torres-Campos make digital copies of the films, and 2) that Torres-Campos includes a ten-minute sequence showing Heide hunting with the Xavantes.

The German master is a colonizer who Christianizes the natives and corrects their “pagan” beliefs and unproductive ways. Yet he is not your ordinary colonizer. He is fluent in Xavante, knows Xavante culture, defends some Xavante customs, and is on some levels accepted by them. The name gifted to him by the Xavante (*tsa amri*), means the “white man who became an Indian.” Heide is, in short, the *colonisateur sympathique* who adores Indigenous culture, but only in its ideal “primitive” and proselytizable *tabula rasa* form. At the same time, Divino respects Heide as a person and one-time mentor. The relationship is one of affectionate kidding, tinged with colonial resentment and subtle competition. The film also shows a wrestling over access to the archive, one that resonates with indigenous struggles to repatriate sacred objects and even the images made about them. Adalberto’s entitled assumption of full rights to his images of the Xavante, as Kathryn Lehman points out, forms part of a colonial “eminent domain” logic that traces back, ultimately, to Conquest and Discovery Doctrine (33).

Commenting on Heide’s films, director Torres-

Campos notes that Heide “constructs himself as a hero.” Heide sees himself as a mini-God, the self-described *factotum* (etymologically, he who “does everything”) who schools the Xavante in the love of God and Labor. In his own mind, he embodies a pantheon of western culture heroes – at once Prometheus and Prospero, pastor, pedagogue, and boss. Presented on a German TV program as a white adventurer in the tropics, Heide is a self-declared “white Indian,” a European who has “gone native” to the point of sporting war paint and a Xavante head-dress. Heide’s relation to the Xavante is strangely ambivalent; he loves them, but mainly as they were in the past. He is disappointed that present-day Xavante have not maintained their customs in a way he would have liked. At the same time, he senses a power shift. As the Xavante are taking over the institutions, he no longer wields the same charismatic power as before.

The dialogue between the Master and Divino stages a battle of two (or more) cultures and two (or more) aesthetics. But rather than a Manichean struggle, the battle reveals a number of paradoxes and ambivalences. Ironically, it is the filmmaker-priest who cultivates a “positive” image of the Xavante – one steeped in primitivist narratives and iconography – while Divino has no qualms about showing negative Xavante behavior such as drunkenness and tribal dissension. While Heide sweetens everything in an epic-romantic style, Divino prefers a self-reflexive critical realism which foregrounds the tensions not only between the Xavante and the whites, but also among the Xavante themselves. While the priest prefers pastoral shots of traditionally attired Indians rowing canoes on pristine creeks, underscored by Andean flutes, the supposedly nature-loving Indian prefers talking heads, especially those of elders like his father who can provide vital information about Xavante history.

In a kind of phantasmatic Indigeneity, the older European filmmaker imagines himself as “protecting” the image of the Xavante, and seems threatened by the indigenous upstart who might end his imagistic and cognitive monopoly. When Heide needles Divino for having forgotten traditional skills such as head-dress making, Divino responds that although he has personally forgotten how to make them, any Xavante can learn how to make them by seeing his films. More high-tech than the “Master,” Divino mocks Heide for his slow computer and lack of Final-Cut-Pro. The “Indians” are answering back, giving as good as they get, as they probably always have, even if that backtalk did not usually make its way into the official histories. Divino’s father too has a slightly aggressive kidding relationship with Heide, reminding him of the co-construction

of knowledge, saying of the priest that “I taught him everything he knows. I taught him how to speak Xavante.” If Divino’s desire to make a different kind of film represents an Oedipal break with the colonial father (*padre*), the same Oedipalism does not operate in relation to his own father, to whom Divino pays warm homage. The film does not pit an essential colonizer against an essential colonized, but rather shows a constant process of redefinition and renegotiation of roles. Divino is at ease with indeterminacy, and never decides whether the Christian God exists, nor chooses between Christianity and indigenous spiritism, thus illustrating what the early missionaries lamented as the “inconstancy of the savage soul.” At the same time, he disputes Heide’s idea that the Xavante worship a Sun God, explaining that the Sun was not a god but rather an embodiment of energy.

Not only does the figure of Heide as a “White Indian” go far back into cultural history, so too does the Divino-Heide relationship. Overdetermined by a complex web of images and tropes, their relationship reincarnates the German Shatterhand’s alliance with Winnetou in the Karl May novels (and their film adaptations). At one point Heide even jokingly calls Divino “Winnetou,” just as the German film about Heide features the “Winnetou theme” harmonica music from the Karl May films. Their friendship recalls those already discussed cross-race homosocial “bromances” between European and indigenous men that have marked literary and filmic history: Crusoe and Friday in *Robinson Crusoe*, Ishmael and Queequeg in *Moby Dick*, the Lone Ranger and Tonto in the TV Western. The Winnetou character (a white actor in redface), is decidedly the “good” Indian ready to die for the whites. Indeed, in the Karl May film that Heide projects for the Xavante, the Winnetou character actually does sacrifice his life for his German blood brother.

The “White Indian” and even the “Blonde Pop Star Indian” have formed part of Brazilian mass-mediated culture. On Brazilian television, even Indians get to “play Indian,” as we see in a climactic sequence that shows Divino appearing on Globo TV as a child responding to the siren call of blonde TV star Xuxa – attired in a Sioux warrior headdress – singing, as if in homage to Philip J. Deloria, “Vamos brincar de Índio” (Let’s Play Indian). To the accompaniment of putative “Indian war cries,” Xuxa leads the children in a happy song featuring fake Indian-speak lyrics:

Let’s play Indian, but without anyone to capture me!

Come, join my tribe? I’m chief and you’re my partner.

Indian make noise. Indian have pride.

Come paint your skin so the dance can begin...

In a stagey show of *mauvaise foi*, Xuxa plays the putative “White Indian” defender of Indian rights, like Heide but with even less reason to make the claim. In Hollywood-style Injun-speak, she sings “Indian need land.” Ironically, she is better at playing Indians on TV than the Indians themselves; she has to teach them to become themselves. As Xuxa drags the frightened-looking Xavante boys into her photogenic circle of fun, they look stiff and reluctant. With their body paint, they become Hollywood-style “spearchuckers” in a film where she plays the starring role and they play the “extras.” The sexualized icon of eternally young white beauty tries to teach them to be good little Indians, but they are not really good at “becoming Indian,” and in a kind of sullen opacity, refuse to perform her caricatural image of themselves.⁴ At this point in the film, the non-indigenous co-director’s voice over informs us that as a child he probably saw that Xuxa show, and that he probably sang along with “Let’s Play Indian,” blithely unaware of its racist implications, yet now he is a collaborator/ally/friend of Divino, an indigenized Euro-Brazilian culturally transformed by the knowledge of people like Divino.

Transformational Becomings

The “White Indian” trope is haunted by Deleuze and Guattari’s fecund yet problematic concept of “becoming Indian,” developed in *What is Philosophy*, that “the philosopher must become Indian.” In the tenth plateau of *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari reach new heights as the theorists of a multitude of “becomings” – “becoming intense,” “becoming animal,” “becoming woman,” “becoming minor,” “becoming Indian,” and so forth. As we shall see later, the problem in the Deleuze/Guattari formulations is not the foregrounding of becoming, but rather the insufficient recognition of the *rappports de force* which structure the “becomings.” At the same time, Deleuzian thought was influenced by the anthropological corpus concerning Amazonian peoples. Thus Deleuzian concepts are strangely appropriate to Amazonian Indigenous culture, and especially in its love of transformations of all kinds.

4. For an excellent analysis of the Xuxa show, and of the role of the Indian within the Brazilian imaginary generally, see Tracy Devine Guzman’s *Native and National in Brazil: Indigeneity after Independence*.

Davi Kopenawa's *The Falling Sky*, for example, is replete with transformative tropes, and expressions like "I became other," or "she became a jaguar." The goal of Kuikuro aesthetics, for Carlos Fausto, "is to depict extraordinary beings: humans who become jaguars, rhythm batons that become spirits, artifacts that speak, words that cure and so on," (15) all serving as exempla of extra-ordinariness as "manifested in the multiplication of identities in continuous transformation" (167). The "generative impulse," for Fausto, "is to imagine the transformational flux characteristic of other-than-human beings" (21).

Trans-species concepts are not at all alien to Native thinkers in North America. In the context of Indigenous erotica, Melissa K. Nelson (Anishinaabe, Cree, Metis [Turtle Mountain Chippewa]) speaks of the propensity of native women to "fall in love with other-than-human beings" ("Getting Dirty" 237) – one is reminded of the lovable sea-monster in del Toro's *The Shape of Water* – and points out that "interspecies and trans-species sex are common occurrences in Native Oral literature" (239). At the same time, it would be a disservice to center this project on Deleuze and Guattari, as the concept of "becoming Indian," while rich in suggestion, is also fraught.

In a broader historical context, the most massively dramatic case of "becoming-other" came in the wake of the "long 1492," as millions of Indigenous people, Africans, Europeans, and Asians in the Americas were variously dispossessed, othered, advantaged, oppressed, and generally transformed by asymmetrical contact with people from elsewhere. These power-laden encounters left manifold traces in cultural life, generating a wide range of terms for the mixing that resulted in diverse etymological, historical, and disciplinary genealogies, whether religious (syncretism), biological (miscegenation), botanical (hybridity), linguistic (creolization), cultural (indigenization), political-cultural (assimilation, transculturation) and even culinary-musical (fusion). Each form of asymmetrical difference offers diverse, intersectional modalities, crudely summarized as top-down, bottom-up, lateral, and the like. These protean "becomings" form part of the afterlives of Conquest, resulting in the millions of natives who "became Indians" because of Columbus' mistaken assignation; the French *truchements* who become Tupinized in Brazil, or Ojibwe-ized in Canada; Indigenous people becoming Christian through forced conversion or coercive indoctrination; kidnapped Europeans adopted by Indians and taking on Indigenous ways; Boston Tea Party rebels masquerading as Mohawks; Hollywood

actors donning redface; characters in films like *Dances with Wolves* "becoming Indians" through reverse assimilation; the shapeshifting Brazilian Macunaima ("hero of his people") becoming Indian and Black and White; Woody Allen's Zelig, Black, Indian, and Jewish and thus a "triple threat" to the KKK; French popular singers assuming an Indian identity ("Je suis l'Indien"); Afro-Brazilians in trance possessed by an indigenous "*caboclo*" as part of *candomblé*; black "Apaches" and "Comanches" in Bahia's carnival; the Black Mardi Gras Indians in New Orleans, celebrating their historical alliance with the Seminole.

On rare occasions, Indigenous people have invited their proven allies to become honorary Indians as when radical lawyer William Kunstler, defender of Leonard Peltier and the AIM activists at Wounded Knee, was posthumously drummed into the Lakota tribe as an honorary member.⁵ Finally, there are the cases of Indians themselves "becoming Indians," whether in Massachusetts or the Amazon, by coming out officially as self-identified Indians, or as Leanne Betasamosake Simpson puts it: "endlessly creating our indigenous selves" (83). Indeed, Indigenous activists speak about "re-nativization," and the "re-indigenization" of the peoples of the planet (see Nelson *Original Instructions*). Davi Kopenawa's *The Falling Sky*, finally, offers a festival of polymorphous becomings: shamans becoming jaguars, jaguars becoming crocodiles; human beings becoming other under the influence of sacred plants like ayahuasca or yâkoana; Indigenous shamans whose ancestors were humans who became animals and never stopped transforming themselves in a kind of Heraclitan stream, wherein no one can step into the same identity twice.

Individual and collective self-shaping are arguably at the very kernel of world history generally, but especially of the history of the Americas with its relatively recent mix of indigenous peoples and shape-shifting Europeans, Africans, and Asians. After 1492, Indigenous peoples throughout the Americas were obliged to "become White" and "become Christian" and "become slaves" and "become workers." On the other side, some Europeans "went native," married native women, learned Indigenous languages, and partially adopted Indigenous ways. This nativizing trend was often condemned by officials, leading to laws forbidding "Indianizing." As a result of this jagged history, very diverse people, as performance artist Guillermo Gómez-Peña puts it, fantasize "about

5. William Kunstler's memorial took place at The Cathedral of St. John the Divine on Nov 20, 1995.

wanting to escape their own race and ethnicity... whites wanting to be Black or Latino, Latinos wanting to be blonde or Spanish, blacks wanting to be white, everyone wanting to be Native American. The desire to become Indian is a quintessential American desire... as much as they hate “real” Indians, they’d love to become Indian warriors or shamans” (43).

The becoming-other formulations are appealing because they seem to move away from a paternalistic tolerance toward a warm embrace of the other, to the point of partially becoming the other. The utopian dream is to be whoever one wants to be, as occurs with a carnival *fantasia* or Halloween costume. At the same time, the concept has more than a whiff of the unilateral chameleonism of the privileged, where entitled white, male, straight, middle-class, western individuals play with identity in a way unavailable to their historically otherized counterparts. The question could be summed up as: when does Deleuze’s “becoming Indian” turn into Deloria’s “playing Indian?” The question is also the reverse side of the coin: what about all the Indians virtually forced to “become white,” “become Christian,” and “become English speakers?” “Become Americans,” or “become Brazilian?” Within the quiet normativities of domination, the empowered enjoy the privilege of “occupying” and “settling into” subaltern identities. The dominant pole is silent but present; the empowered masquerade as the disempowered: whites become Indians, and so forth, in a one-way process that risks reproducing historical hierarchies and the *faits accomplis* of colonial domination. Historically, it is Indigenous people and people of color who had to whiten themselves to become worthy subjects, women who were prodded to internalize the male gaze, and LBGTQ+ people who had to cower in the closet and conform to a threatening hetero-normativity. Hybrid and syncretic becomings, as Deleuze was doubtless aware, are power-laden. Racially-advantaged global elites can easily traverse borders without suffering the usual real-world consequences.

It is no surprise, then, that some feminists have criticized the notion of “becoming woman,” while some native and non-native scholars have questioned the notion of “becoming Indian.” In her reading of *A Thousand Plateaus*, Sara Ahmed, in the persona of a self-declared “skeptical feminist,” interrogates the Deleuze-Guattari text. For her, the “fascination with woman as radically other to masculinity/femininity,” and all the dualisms that this carries with it, can be seen as implicated in a long history of fascination with women as a figure of alterity within Western Philosophy, becoming “a phantasy of the very necessity

and impossibility of philosophy itself through figuring of its other” (55). She compares the philosophers’ “becoming Indian” to the “becoming Indian” of Dunbar in *Dances with Wolves*, noting the double process by which Dunbar distances himself from his own society and unlearns anti-Indian stereotypes and the colonialist perspective. Dunbar’s “becoming Indian,” she notes, is closely related to his “becoming animal” as manifested in his performative renaming as “dances with wolves.” But as the blurb on the video proclaims, in the end he “found himself,” and his “discoveries” – he is a Columbus to himself – “allow the reassertion of the agency of the dominant subject” (60).

Analysts like Amy Herzog, meanwhile, remind us that Deleuze/Guattari’s purpose is to dismantle binary notions of gender, race, and so forth. For Deleuze, identity is always in a state of flux, always in motion, with a collective dimension of not simply representing pre-existing groups but rather of shaping new subjectivities, solidarities, intensities, affiliations, and identifications. For Deleuze, it is not a question of representation of a pre-constituted group but rather a dynamic process of what Ranciere would call political subjectification. Indigenous media, in this sense, could be seen as a mediatic movement for political subjectification. For Deleuze, “becoming” (*devenir*) is not an imitation or reproduction of a pre-existing group but rather an exit, a line of flight from the dominant, not an arrival but a “movement toward.” (An ambiguity in the hyphen in *devenir-minoritaire* creates doubts as to whether it should be translated as “becoming-minoritarian” or “minoritarian becoming;” the first implying one-way role-playing from above while the latter suggests a collective dynamism from below). At the same time, a radical thinker like Deleuze cannot be reduced to a conservative. In a wonderfully evocative phrase, Deleuze speaks (in his *ABCdaire*) of the “assemblage of all the minoritarian becomings,” a phrase that intimates a rhizomatically multiple alliance of social becomings in an emancipatory direction. In this sense, one might speak of catalyzing new constituencies and intensities of affiliation and solidarity, reminiscent of Simpson’s “constellations of co-resistance” (211).

The idea of “becoming Indian” has been received with a certain reticence by some Indigenous intellectuals. In contemporary academic life Indigenous intellectuals dialogue with, but also talk back to, non-Indigenous intellectuals and even the consecrated *maitres a penser*. Chickasaw scholar Jodi A. Byrd, in *The Transit of Empire* (2011), offers a rigorous, doubly “insider” critique of Deleuze-Guattari notions of “nomadism,” “becoming Indian” and “Indians without

ancestry.” Inhabiting while questioning Deleuzian language, Byrd argues that within poststructuralist theories “the Indian functions as a dense presence that cannot be disrupted by deconstruction or Deleuzian lines of flight, because the Indian is the ontological prior through which deconstruction functions” (35). The Deleuzian version of a rhizomatic American as a site of constant transformation is not so different, for Byrd, from that posited by Frederick Jackson Turner. “As a philosophical sign,” she writes:

...the Indian is the transit, the field through which pre-signifying polyvocality is re/introduced into the signifying regime, and signs begin to proliferate through a series of becomings—becoming-animal, becoming-woman, becoming-Indian, becoming-multiplicity – that serves all regimes of signs. And the Indian is a ghost in the system, an errant or virus that disrupts the virtual flows by stopping them, redirecting them, or revealing them to be what they are and will have been all along: colonialist (9).

While Byrd acknowledges the generally progressive drift of the Deleuze/ Guattari concepts, she finds them compromised by the legacy of colonial *realpolitik*. It is as if some “post”-theorists, however progressive and even radical in other respects, have baked colonial power arrangements into the historical and discursive cake, evading the foundational question of indigenous dispossession as profoundly shaping capitalism, modernity, postmodernity, and post-theory.

And what is the desire that speaks in such becomings? Many Indigenous people reluctantly become “white but not quite” as a melancholy necessity and acknowledgement of real power situations. Many Indigenous writers, from Paul Chatt Smith to Davi Kopenawa, insist that they have no desire to become white, although they have no objections to using “white” technologies or theories at their own discretion. And Ailton Krenak, at a conference on Indigenous cosmologies in Brazil when someone used the phrase “becoming Indian,” sarcastically pointed out: “OK, I get it. All you whites become Indians. That means, ‘Voilà: no more Indians.’ If everyone is an Indian, no one is an Indian!”⁶

6. Krenak made the remark on a panel on “Indigenous Cosmologies,” held June 10-14, 2020, at The International Literary Festival in Parati (FLIP).

- Ahmed, Sara. “Phantasies of Becoming (the Other).” *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1999, pp. 55. 47-63.
- Bentes, Ivana. “Eu vejo você: antropologia reversa em Avatar, ciber-índios, pós-cinema ou como arrancar um pensamento complexo dos clichés.” *Avatar: o futuro do cinema e a ecologia das imagens digitais*, edited by Erick Felinto and Ivana Bentes, Sulina, 2010, pp. 76-85.
- Bird, Elizabeth. “Gendered Construction of the American Indian in Popular Media.” *Journal of Communication*, vol. 49, no. 3, 1999, pp. 61-83.
- Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire*. University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- Churchill, Ward, editor. *Indians Are Us? Culture and Genocide in Native North America*, Common Courage Press, 1994.
- Cohen, Felix S. “Americanizing the White Man.” *The American Scholar*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1952, pp. 177-191.
- de Castro, Eduardo Viveiros. “Os pronomes cosmológicos e o perspectivismo ameríndio.” *Mana*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1996, pp. 115-143.
- Deloria Jr., Vine. *Red Earth: White Lies*. Fulcrum, 1997.
- Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. Yale University Press, 1998.
- “Evo Morales praises Avatar.” *Huffington Post*, 12 January 2010, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/12/evo-morales-praises-avata_n_420663.html. Accessed 7 March 2010.
- Fausto, Carlos. *Art Effects: Image, Agency, and Ritual in Amazonia*. University of Nebraska Press, 2020.
- Feest, Christian F., editor. *Indians and Europe: An Interdisciplinary Collection of Essays*. University of Nebraska Press, 1999.
- Gómez-Peña, Guillermo. *Conversations across Borders*. Seagull, 2011.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. University of Chicago Press, 1991.

- Guzman, Tracy Devine. *Native and National in Brazil: Indigeneity after Independence*. University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- Huhndorf, S. M. *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination*. Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Jenkins, Henry. "Avatar activism: Pick your protest." *The Globe and Mail*, 18 September 2010, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/avatar-activism-pick-your-protest/article4190179/>. Accessed 23 November 2020.
- Kafka, Frantz. "The Wish to be a Red Indian." *The Complete Stories*, Schocken Books Inc., 1971, pp. 908.
- Kopenawa, Davi. *The Falling Sky: Words of a Yanommi Shaman*. Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Lehman, Kathryn. "Beyond Academia: Indigenous Media as an Intercultural Resource to Unlearn Nation-State History." *Revistas Tempos e Espacos em Educacao*, vol. 10, no. 21, 2017, pp. 29-40.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *La Pensée sauvage*, Librairie Plon, 1962.
- Lutz, Hartmut. "German Indianthusiasm: A Socially Constructed German National(ist) Myth." *Germans and Indians: Fantasies, Encounters, Projections*, edited by Colin G. Calloway, Gerd Gemunden, and Susanne Zantop, University of Nebraska Press, 2000, pp. 167-184.
- Mariani, Giorgio. "Was Anybody More of an Indian than Karl Marx?: The 'Indiani Metropolitani' and the 1977 Movement." *Indians and Europe: An Interdisciplinary Collection of Essays*, edited by Christian F. Feest, University of Nebraska Press, 1999, pp. 585-598.
- . "The Red and the Black: Images of American Indians in the Italian Political Landscape." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, vol. 53, no. 1, 2018, pp. 327-345.
- Marubbio, M. Elise. "Decolonizing the Western: A Revisionist Analysis of Avatar with a Twist." in M. Paryz, J.R. Leo eds., *The Post-2000 Film Western: Contexts, Transnationality, Hybridity*, edited by Marek Paryz and John R. Leo, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, pp. 167-190.
- Mitchell, Emma. *Seeing Blue: Negotiating the Politics of Avatar Media Activism*. 2011. University of Sydney, Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for an Honours degree. Core, <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/41235981.pdf>.
- Morton, Thomas. *New English Canaan*. 1637. The Project Gutenberg, 2017.
- Nelson, Melissa K., editor. *Original Instructions: Indigenous Teachings for a Sustainable Future*. Bear & Company, 2008.
- . "Getting Dirty" *Critically Sovereign: Indigenous Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies*, edited by Joanne Barker, Duke University Press, 2017, pp. 229-260.
- Neto, Aristóteles Barcelos, et al. "Abaeté, rede de antropologia simétrica: entrevista com Marcio Goldman e Eduardo Viveiros de Castro." *Cadernos de Campo*, vol. 15, no. 14-15, 2006, pp. 176-190.
- Price, Sally. *Paris Primitive: Jacques Chirac's Museum on the Quai Branly*. University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Shohat, Ella, and Stam, Robert. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. Routledge, 1994.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
- Tully, James. *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Wade, Matt. "Indian hill tribe scores 'Avatar' victory." *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 August 2010, <https://www.smh.com.au/environment/conservation/indian-hill-tribe-scores-avatar-victory-20100827-13vym.html>. Accessed 23 November 2020.
- Weaver, Jace. *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000-1927*.

University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Zantof, Susanne. "Close Encounters: Deutsche and Indianer." *Germans and Indians: Fantasies, Encounters, Projections*, edited by Colin G. Calloway, Gerd Gemunden, and Susanne Zantop, University of Nebraska Press, 2000, pp. 1-12.

Žižek, Slavoj. "Avatar: Return of the Natives." *The New Statesman*, 4 March 2010, <https://www.newstatesman.com/film/2010/03/avatar-reality-love-couple-sex>. Accessed 23 Nov. 2020.



Venue Rental at The Cinematheque

Host a private screening, film premiere, community event, or conference at The Cinematheque's 153-seat theatre, located in downtown Vancouver.

Available daytime and Tuesday evenings
\$150-200/hour

For more information, contact
theatre@thecinematheque.ca
604 688 8202

thecinematheque.ca 1131 Howe Street, Vancouver