

Economic and Psychic Exploitation of American Indians

Gretchen M. Bataille and Charles L.P. Silet

Two general points can be made about Euroamerican exploitation of American Indians: first, whatever level of exploitation they have experienced by the motion picture industry, it is part of a long tradition which dates back to the earliest contacts between white Europeans and Indians; and second, that the exploitation has taken on two forms—economic and psychic. Just how Indians have been taken advantage of economically is relatively clear. Euroamerican history texts happily record the ways in which the native inhabitants of the American shores were bilked, with the \$24 worth of beads, for Manhattan Island and with equally inequitable arrangements for the rest of their lands. Perhaps less obvious, and more damaging, is just how these same people have been exploited for emotional and psychological reasons. Although economic exploitation takes away one's goods, psychic exploitation robs one of dignity and self-esteem, which is the more devastating of the two. Economic exploitation in America is psychic exploitation as well, for in a society which places so much emphasis on the material aspects of existence to be without money or to have been robbed of it is to place oneself in a precarious position vis-a-vis one's place in that society. This article is concerned with clarifying the interplay of economic reality and the development of psychic myths concerning Euroamerican images of Indians. One of the most effective ways to show the dual exploitation is to examine how "the Indian" was created by Hollywood and fixed onto the silver screen and in the minds of Euroamericans as a cultural artifact. But Hollywood received its cues from a culture wrestling with a frontier history, and it is within this broad social and historical context that we begin this examination.

Historical Context

When Europeans first came to the American continent they were faced with a dual problem: what to do with the "wilderness," and what to do with those who inhabited it. The first colonials believed their task was to subdue the wilderness and bring order to the newly found

chaos. They wanted to create a civilized society much like the one they had just left. One of the impediments to their progress was Indians. So, the early European colonists had a plan for civilizing the “savages.” Unfortunately, the Puritan settlers exorcised their intense psychological and social anxieties by violent confrontation with the *dark forces of nature and humanity* of which “the Indian” became the focus.

The Puritans established a set of national attitudes and traditions based on the hunter/hero struggling in a savage new land in order not only to claim the land but also to displace the Indians. European colonists relied on their confrontations with Indians to support the definition of the settler who was to become an “American.” The initial impulses of the colonists were at least well intentioned. They wanted to bring Indians into the emerging Euroamerican social order. But the Indians were unwilling to accommodate the expectations of the Europeans.

By the end of the 1770s, however, the American Revolution demanded a commitment from the colonists to a new world vision, one in which Indians would play no part. The original notion of the noble savage gave way to the realization that Indians were bound inexorably to a primitive past, a primitive society, and a primitive environment. Consequently, Indians became unfortunate obstacles in the path of progress after the dawning of the American Republic.

The new society, which white Americans built for themselves, demanded the assurances of power and superiority—and Indians became the point of comparison. Europeans who settled in North America brought with them all the trappings of western culture, including its need to know the past and future. The “historyless antiquity” of Indians was beyond the comprehension of Europeans. Indians had no past and no future in western terms and thereby fell out of society and history. So, Indians had to disappear.

The transition in mental attitudes of whites from assimilation to annihilation was not an abrupt one, but by the beginning of the nineteenth century there was public recognition of both the failure in theory and in practice of the white attitude toward Indians. Since they would not conform to the ways of white society, and since they could not or would not be civilized, then they had to be destroyed.

Europeans had learned about the inherent goodness of natural man and the simple life from Rousseau, and white Americans inherited the noble savage as part of their literary tradition. With the rise of an

indigenous literature, writers were forced to modify the noble savage image of Indians into a white American one—to be pitied and censured. To pity the Indians was easy enough, especially after their fall from grace, but it was also necessary to destroy their nobility. One could not wipe out a noblerace without justification, and so the blood-thirsty noble savage was created. Indians were reduced to a set of contradictions: noble and ignoble, pitied and praised, censured and celebrated.¹

Economic Exploitation

Economic exploitation of Indians has a long tradition in the United States, dating back to the first settlement of this continent by colonists of the sixteenth century. The Puritan English who settled the area around Boston did so with the intent of displacing those already inhabiting the lands. The Virginia Company, which financed the colonists in the tidewater South, advanced the capital in the anticipation of profit, profit derived from the exploitation of the land of the natives. In fact it was the direct exploitation of Indians by both colonial groups which helped them survive the early years. In Virginia, for example, the English colonists traded goods with local Indians for the very food they ate. And during periods of scarcity the whites actually forced the Indians to trade with them at gun point—an early example of American “free” enterprise!

The most noteworthy and glaring product of economic exploitation perpetrated by white society has been the expropriation of Indian lands. What land was purchased was generally done so at greatly reduced value. In cases where Indians refused to concede to the sale, they were normally forced to do so.

The second means of white exploitation was the entertainment value of Indians. As early as the fifteenth century, the first travel narratives, illustrated by lurid woodcuts, showed American Indians performing acts of cannibalism and parading naked before the white explorers. The merchants of entertainment quickly learned the value of Indians as a curiosity.²

An ambivalence toward Indians was reflected in the earliest accounts of life in America, however. In the journals of explorers such as Christopher Columbus and John Smith, then later in histories by government officials such as William Byrd and William Bradford, descriptions of Indians depicted varying qualities of generosity, barbarousness, or piety.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the captivity narratives reinforced the existing Puritan explanation of Indians as sub-human or inspired by the devil. The Puritan view remained a pervasive theme and, although the hope of “civilizing” the Indians was often expressed, ultimately Euroamerican religious orientation demanded that the confrontation between the groups result in Indians capitulating to white domination. Individual Indians could be “good,” but the group had to be depicted as “bad” to justify the existing exploitation by government and religious authorities.

James Fenimore Cooper, relying on existing documents and stories, created both the noble and ignoble savages as stock characters in American literature. Cooper’s *The Leatherstocking Tales*, however, were preceded by a number of other nineteenth century works that drew on the conventions of the English historical romance of Walter Scott as well as the prototypes created in earlier frontier accounts. Robert Montgomery Bird’s *Nick of the Woods* (1837) and William Gilmore Simms’s *The Yemassee* (1835) reinforced existing attitudes. These works of fiction were bolstered by the epic sweep of such historical studies as Francis Parkman’s *Oregon Trail* (1849), which solidified white attitudes about manifest destiny and the role of Indians in the expanding nation.³

The single attempt to reconcile the races in literature appears in literary attempts to use “the half-blood” as a transitional figure between civilization and savagery, but there seems to have been a psychological barrier which prevented such a mythical figure from providing an acceptable social model which could reconcile the claims of savagism and civilization. Whereas the *idea* of savagism determined the obligatory treatment of the red race, the *factual* existence of North and South American half-bloods was relatively free from similar long-standing beliefs other than a sometimes vague, sometimes pronounced contempt for miscegenation. Some writers devised works which treated half-blood Indians in radically different ways than they had treated full-blood Indians. Some writers pictured half-bloods as retaining the worst traits of both races; others saw half-bloods as embodying the best traits of both races. In either case there was normally an ambivalence about half-bloods which reflected a pervasive social value in white American society, the unreceptiveness to assimilation of people unlike themselves.

Half-bloods objectified in their very being the conflict between the red and white races, and their portrayal in American fiction of the nineteenth century emanates from uncertainty as to their malign or

benign relation to white society and to their connections with the promise of the American nation. The central question underlying the literary portraits of mixed-blood Indians was do they represent a new, wonderful link between the red and white races or do they represent a degenerate, abnormal amalgamation of the worst vices of both races which threatened the promise of a new world civilization? The question remains unresolved as the twenty-first century approaches.⁴

Entertainment Value

By the end of the nineteenth century, Indians were stereotyped most often as blood-thirsty savages, an image which was perfected in the dime novel and transferred to the Wild West Show. Buffalo Bill was not only the most popular of the dime novel heroes but he was also an extremely successful showman; his Wild West Show toured throughout the world. Included among the exhibits in the show were Indians whom Buffalo Bill paraded around in front of the audience and used in mock battle scenes he staged between the white settlers and the savages.

Buffalo Bill, Pawnee Bill, and Colonel Frederick T. Cummins all used Indians as entertainment, reenacting their own visions of the "taming of the west." At the same time Indians were being paraded before white people in small towns and villages to sell a variety of medicines and potions, all guaranteed to be "genuine" Indian remedies. Repeatedly, Indians were coopted to make money for white entrepreneurs.

By the time Buffalo Bill and the transient vendors were through, Indians were firmly established as figures of entertainment like the stage Irishman and the comic Jew. To transfer the melodramatic use of Indians as an all around foil for white heroes onto celluloid was easy. And that is precisely what happened. The themes of the dime novels and the traveling shows were adapted to provide the ideas and scripts for the one-and two-reel Western movies and the image of "the Indian" was transferred wholesale to the screen.

What Hollywood did was to fix firmly those stereotyped images of Indians and, of course, to spread them widely. Where dime novels reached millions of readers, the early films reached tens of millions, including the vast influx of newly arrived immigrants, many of whom could not read English and derived much of their knowledge of the United States from the movies. Movies gave filmmakers enormous power to influence public opinion and form attitudes about the native peoples. In the process the moviemakers made money from the films

they produced and distributed. "The film-Indian" became a staple item not only of the Saturday afternoon serial but also provided one of the central icons of the film industry's most prosperous indigenous product—the Western.

The appeal of the traditional western movie is that it provided values which led to clear, simple solutions to complex problems and the inevitability of triumph. The winning forces of civilization provided ready-made material for films, and the static image of "the screen Indian" was an easily exploitable commodity. Quickly and unambiguously recognizable in war paint and breechclout, astride his pinto pony, "the Indian" became the necessary fallguy for the hero, the impediment to progress overcome by the settlers, and finally on the emotional level, the repository of all those age-old western European bugaboos: irrationality, bestiality, savagery. Indians became the ultimate Hollywood stereotype—easily recognized and emotionally necessary—one which provided a universal theme by satisfying the universal fears and uncertainty of the audience, an enormously profitable combination.

By the time of World War One the image of Indians was well established in popular films and for the next three decades, with some minor exceptions, that image remained constant. The moviemakers expressed the same ambivalence that the dime novelist had. The ignoble, noble savage remained. There was one major difference though; because of the visual nature of the new medium, Hollywood had more opportunity to distort the image of Indians.

The writers of pulp fiction sketched in the settings and described the "red men," but Hollywood actually showed them. The resulting confusion was symptomatic of white ignorance of the people they had dispossessed. Indians of the Northeast were shown wearing clothing of the Plains Indians and living in dwellings of Southwestern people. Hollywood created the instant Indian: wig, warbonnet, breechclout, moccasins, Hong Kong plastic beadwork. The movies did what thousands of years of social evolution could not do, even what the threat of encroaching whites could not do: Hollywood produced the homogenized American Indian, devoid of tribal characteristics or regional differences.⁵

Hollywood used the standard images of Indians as savage, warlike, often noble but vanishing and pathetic, forever locked into an historical past as integral to the Western experience. For generic purposes it was necessary to keep Indians frozen in the stereotype. So much of white America's mythos was contained in the legends of the West and

its “taming” and “conquest” that it was emotionally threatening to portray Indians in any other way. The very experience of the westward movement, the very rationale for the subjugation of the continent, depended on the adversary relationship between whites and Indians.

Indians had a multiple image and at the same time a partial image. *The Indian*—no tribe, no identity, almost always male—was either noble (still savage, but noble nevertheless) or bloodthirsty and vicious. There were variations of the stereotypes—the drunken Indian, the heathen, the lazy native—but still it was a picture of a creature less than human without religion and lacking in morality and virtue. Usually he was viewed apart from wife or children or any family relationships; he was an isolated figure, one with a pinto pony, gliding across the plains of America, viewed always as an Indian first and an individual last. He combined all the noble virtues expressed in a Catlin painting with the savagery of a Beadle novel.

From the beginnings of the film industry most Indian roles in movies were played by whites. This was especially true once the audience came to recognize the various actors who helped to foster the star system. The lead parts in films became extremely important for the salability of the property, and practically all leads went to white actors.

Audience recognition was important from the onset. The really savage Indians were often played by white horror film characters such as Bela Lugosi, Lon Chaney, Jr., or Boris Karloff. Indians in comic roles were often played by white movie stars the audience would recognize as humorous—the Marx Brothers, Buddy Hackett, Joey Bishop, and Buster Keaton all played Indians. Indians have been played by Latins—Ricardo Montalban and Delores DelRio, by blacks—Woody Strode, by Japanese—Sessue Hayakawa, and by a variety of whites who were box-office giants—Rock Hudson, Elvis Presley, Richard Harris, and Raquel Welch. Indian women have usually been portrayed by white stars who would gain some measure of sympathy from audiences—Mary Pickford, Loretta Young, Katherine Ross, Debra Paget, Audrey Hepburn, Julie Newmar, and Donna Reed. Notable examples of using “real” Indians such as Jim Thorp, Chief Wachtel, Red Wing, or Chief Thundercloud (the first Tonto) were the exception rather than the rule.

With some of the early films, notably those of William S. Hart, the filmmakers tried for a realism, a grittiness which led to the employment of Indian actors as extras to provide background atmosphere.

But even this trend was not to last for long and during the height of the studio days Indians were notably absent from films altogether, having been replaced by Hollywood extras hired in and around the studios. What location shooting was done was infrequent.

Director John Ford, who had a love affair with Monument Valley in Utah and for years shot his westerns in this locale, employed Navajos to play the Indians in those films which required them. In spite of the close working relationship between the director and the cast, Ford perpetuated and helped to further develop the exploitative stereotype. He finally broke with the Hollywood tradition of simply using Indians as part of the scenery in *Cheyenne Autumn* (1963).

The image of Indians that is a part of the history of the motion picture industry evolved from stereotypes created by the earliest settlers and chroniclers of this country. The contradictory views of Indians, sometimes gentle and good and sometimes terrifying and evil, stem from the Euroamerican's ambivalence toward a race of people they attempted to destroy. Contemporary screen images descended from the captivity narratives of the eighteenth century, the romances of James Fenimore Cooper, and the Beadle dime novel tradition. *The treatment of Indians in the movies is the final expression of white America's attempt to cope with its uneasiness in the face of a sense of cultural guilt.*

The psychic shock of Viet Nam and its consequences finally jolted Hollywood out of its long tradition and forced the film industry to examine, however clumsily, the stereotypes of Indians. Although they have long been exploited economically, Indians were also exploited psychically for much longer and to a much greater extent. Even *before* white settlement in North America, Europeans had definite concepts of the "savages" they would find inhabiting the "wilderness" into which they were moving; the sixteenth century concept was vitally important then, and has remained so for the last 400 years, that Indians appear as the savage, opponent of civilization and technological progress, backward and primitive in religion and morality, part devil and minion of dark forces of the human soul. They provided the point of comparison against which the more "civilized" European, *himself* only lately emerged from a state of semi-savagism, could be measured.

Contemporary Issues and Prospects

What *is* the current "mythology" of Indians? Certainly there are many mythologies about the people who were the first to walk the

forests, climb the mountains, and plant corn in what is now America. The savage of Beadle dime novels, the romantic nomad of the forest created by Rousseau, the Indian princess with roots in Jamestown and branches as far as Dame Judith Anderson's portrayal in *A Man Called Horse*, the drunken Indian, the stoic cigar store vendor, the old chief with the secrets of the ages in ancient mythology and oral tradition all have remained as variations of the mythic images of Indians.

Hollywood managed to destroy and stereotype almost every ethnic group, but Indians seem particularly frozen in time. Although some recent films use a twentieth century setting, the Indians of film usually exist in a world somewhere between the landing of the Pilgrims and the end of the nineteenth century, the primary focus being on the period between 1850 and 1900, the time when Indian people were desperately trying to hold on to their land and were fighting for their lives. Because the second-half of the nineteenth century represents a time of victory for white Americans, of overcoming obstacles in the way of progress, it is a glorified time. To justify mass slaughter and land grabbing, the movies were forced to portray Indians as savage and illiterate, not suited for "modern" civilization. The few who were descendents of Chingachgook, Pocahontas, or Squanto were "good" Indians. They either "vanished" or were transformed into the Tontos who knew their role in the changing society.

What will happen to the image of Indians in film in the future is impossible to predict. If the past is any guide, films will find or develop another stereotype, one that will accommodate a new popular image. Mass arts tend to the allegorical (which allows them a broader or more universal appeal) preferring surfaces and types to essences and individuals. Although Indians will probably be portrayed more sympathetically and with greater historical accuracy, the popular film-Indian will nonetheless remain as one-dimensional as all other types.

Recent films depicting Indians have tended to muddy the traditional stereotype, to reverse, in some cases, the white mythology itself. That is not to say, however, that the same old images are not presented from time to time, only served up in new ways and packaged in new forms. A shift in attitudes has nonetheless occurred, largely brought about by U.S. involvement in Viet Nam and the national soul-searching which that war occasioned. The idea that the government could conceivably commit genocide in Southeast Asia led some people to reconsider the treatment of Indians, the home-territory genocide. Close examinations produced some interesting and at times thought-

ful, if flawed, films. They also generated new ideas to be exploited and as things “Indian” became fashionable what was left of Hollywood moved-in by way of *Billy Jack*, *White Buffalo*, and *A Man Called Horse*; and all to a degree raised the old spectre of economic and psychic exploitation.

After decades of discriminatory portrayals of Indians and other minorities in motion pictures, a systematic study was conducted in 1968 to ascertain the extent of stereotyping and the degree to which ethnic minorities were discriminated against in the entertainment media. In 1969 the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission held a series of hearings in Los Angeles and concluded that discriminatory practices existed in both employment and portrayal of minorities and women. In 1977 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights issued a report, *Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities in Television*, stating that “minorities and women continue to be underrepresented on local and network forces.”⁶ In its 1979 *Update* the Commission found that there had been no improvement as did the expanded study prepared by the Annenberg School of Communications and released by the Screen Actors’ Guild.⁷

The California Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission convened in 1976 to study the participation of minorities in the entertainment industry, focusing this time on representation in the motion picture studios.⁸ The Advisory Committee studied the work forces of the seven major studios, concluding that the representation of minorities remains proportionately lower than their numbers in the total work force.

Although the study showed American Indian representation in the motion picture work force in 1975 was .5%, close to their percentage of the population as a whole, other statistics are more revealing. For example, there were no Indians selected for the training programs which including training and apprenticeships as assistant directors, camera assistants, and other skilled positions during the period April 1974 to February 1977. The apparent equitable representation is skewed not only because Indians are a small minority numerically but also the lack of training programs for them suggests no commitment to affirmative action on the part of the studios. Further, the on-screen portrayals of Indians in westerns have outnumbered other ethnic minorities through the years. There were always roles for Indians, but the parts have not been played by Indian actors.

There has been no similar follow-up study of minority employment behind the scenes of the industry, but in 1983 the Screen Actors’ Guild,

long active in the cause of minority employment in motion pictures and television, released a study of minority employment in leading and supporting roles. *Minority Casting Summary Report* finds that for the period between July 1981 and the end of September 1982, ethnic minorities continued to be underrepresented in motion pictures. During this period there were no American Indian women in leading roles, although there were .3% in supporting roles. Indian men did better, nearly equalling their .6% of the population in leading and supporting roles. Still, white males received 89.9% of the leading male roles and white females captured 93.5% of the leading female roles.⁹

All of the studies of the past decade and a half lead to similar conclusions: Ethnic minorities are not being fairly represented either on the screen or working behind the scenes. The generalizations spawned by statistics are illuminated by specific recent examples, examples which suggest that there has been little change despite pledges to increase minority participation and equally strong assurances that the federal government would enforce civil rights legislation.

Movies have introduced a number of Indian actors during the past decade—Chief Dan George, Will Sampson, Ray Tracy, and Geraldine Keams, to name a few. But what of the roles they are consigned to play? Will Sampson, the nearly-mute Indian of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* played the reverse of the Indian side-kick and showed that anyone could be a victim in contemporary society. Perhaps his role was more a result of Kesey's vision than of Hollywood's because in *White Buffalo* Sampson played a stereotypical role. Chief Dan George became an instantly popular and believable figure in *Little Big Man* and he was basically non-stereotyped in *The Outlaw Josey Wales*, yet in the film the audience was expected to believe that George, playing a Cherokee, could understand the language spoken by the Navajo Geraldine Keams. Keams praises Clint Eastwood for the changes he allowed in the film script, changes which gave more legitimacy to the Indian roles, but despite the changes, the film still has its share of misrepresentation.

Indian people continue to find themselves compromised or compromising in the entertainment industry. If they want to work they must accept the roles offered to them. If they protest too much there will be no work. Such is the case with *Mystic Warrior*. This television mini-series is an offshoot of the controversial novel by Ruth Beebe Hill, *Hanta Yo*, and has parts for eighty to one hundred Indians, but almost all of the parts have been assigned to Hispanics. Because the Indian people in this country had raised so many questions about the

script, taken from the novel, they had protested themselves out of jobs. The studio was tired of listening, so “look-alikes” were hired to play the roles. A similar situation occurred with *Running*, the story about Billy Mills. The Blood people of Alberta put up money for the film, but when the lead was chosen, Robbie Benson got the part.

In *Legend of Walks-Far-Woman*, Raquel Welch plays the leading female role while Indian actors such as Geraldine Keams play minor parts. In *Windwalker*, generally a sensitive film which used Crow language subtitles and many fine Indian actors, the lead was played by Trevor Howard. Certainly such “names” meet the studios’ need for “bankability” but one wonders just when Indian leading roles will be given to Indian people. Geraldine Keams believes that only when there are more Indian writers will we begin to see some changes. Her fantasy film is to show the “cowboy and Indian” movie from the view of the Indians.¹⁰ Such a reversal would be shocking to most audiences, but would, if successful, make them realize that the worldview of the filmmakers has always determined what image would be projected onto the silver screen.

Conclusions

Economic and psychic exploitation of Indians by Euroamericans is woven into the fabric of U.S. history—from explorers’ journals through dime novels and Wild West Shows to the films of this century. All of these forms of entertainment have been exported so that “cowboys and Indians” is well recognized as a childhood game the world over. The challenge is no longer merely to recognize the stereotypes but to begin to do something about changing them. Indian peoples—their culture, their clothing, and their languages—have been exploited to produce profits for the entertainment industry and other commercial enterprises with little concern for the impact that such misrepresentation has had on the psyche of the people themselves. The continued economic and psychic exploitation of Indian people as well as the mythic interpretation of U.S. history does a disservice both to truth and the integrity of the white American vision of its past.

The Indians portrayed on the silver screen will remain a twentieth century anachronism, perpetuating what Jack Forbes calls the “‘never-never’ land of mythology,”¹¹ unless Indian self-determination becomes a reality and all people join in demanding realistic images from media. It is the responsibility of educators, politicians, and, indeed, all citizens to ensure that the same old images are not merely repackaged for the next generation.

Notes

¹For a fuller discussion, see Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1965); Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973); Leslie Fiedler, *The Return of the Vanishing American* (New York: Stein and Day, 1969); Bernard Sheenan, *Savagism and Civility: Indians and Englishmen in Colonial Virginia* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

²See, for example, Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man's Indian* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979); Raymond William Stedman, *Shadows of the Indian: Stereotypes in American Culture* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982).

³Louis K. Barnett, *The Ignoble Savage: American Literary Racism* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1975).

⁴William J. Scheick, *The Half-Blood: A Cultural Symbol in 19th Century American Fiction* (Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1979).

⁵Additional information about the development of the Indian image in film can be found in Gretchen Bataille and Charles L.P. Silet, *The Pretend Indians: Images of Native Americans in the Movies* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1980); Ralph and Natasha Friar, *The Only Good Indian . . . : The Hollywood Gospel* (New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1972).

⁶United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities in Television* (Washington, DC: USGPO, 1977).

⁷United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Window Dressing on the Set: An Update* (Washington, DC: USGPO, 1979); George Gerbner and Nancy Signorielli, *Women and Minorities in Television Drama, 1969-1978* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, The Annenberg School of Communications, 1979).

⁸California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Behind the Scenes: Equal Employment Opportunity in the Motion Picture Industry* (Washington, DC: USGPO, 1978).

⁹David Robb, "Minorities' Minority PIC-TV Roles." *Variety* 199, 21 (4 April 1983) 1, 14.

¹⁰Geraldine Keams. Interview. (Ames, IA: April 9, 1983).

¹¹Jack Forbes. *Education of the Culturally Different: A Multi-Cultural Approach*. (San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1969) 51.

Critique

Perhaps the most valuable contribution that Professors Bataille's and Silet's treatise makes is to connect the images of the American Indian in movies with antecedent images. The scope of their investigation predates Columbus, includes critical American historical imagery production, takes the reader to the very beginnings of the movie industry, and brings us up-to-date on the effects of the "Great Society" outfalls for both image and employment of American Indians in the screen entertainment establishment.

The two modes of exploitation presented as primary, economic and psychic, are solid assumptions on which the article revolves because each is operationally defined to include other dimensions of the human experience, for example, the political and artistic. The text is replete with specifics that contribute to understanding and sustaining interest. For example, the discussion of the idea of "wilderness" is accurate, complete, and continues to be pivotal in American affairs. The idea of the "noble savage" is valuable information not only in the context of this paper, but because of events in South America, the Philippines, and elsewhere as culturally-different peoples are being confronted by the Western industrial world. A discussion of the place of half-bloods reveals that there was never even the hint of a "New American" as there was for a time in Brazil when the mixing of Europeans, Native Americans, and Africans was to lead to a "New Brazilian," better in all ways to the progenitors.

A specific that harkens back to Phineas T. Barnum's adage that "a sucker is born every minute," was the merchandising of medicines and potions because they were "genuine" Indian remedies. The current fad of "natural" is simply that magnified electronically.

Aside from one gratuitous reference to "free" enterprise, a modern ideological phrase, Professors Bataille and Silet have produced a terse, well-documented, and accurate work. It could well be used as a guide to illustrate the treatment of any group in any media by any conquering or dominant people in attempts to cope with its unease in