

Chapter One-Introduction

The perspective that characterizes anthropology today is the post-modernist discourse (Trawick 2002:ix). James Clifford, Michael Fischer, Roger Keesing, George Marcus, Stephen Tyler, and others (Coombe 1991; Crapanzano 1986; D'Andrade 1995; Lewis 1998; Polier and Roseberry 1989:246) apply post-modernist theory to anthropology. It is a perspective centered on deconstructing the work done by past ethnographers in order to find what errors ethnographers made in the past, and to promote sensitivity among ethnographers to their role in the discourse (Polier and Roseberry 1989:246).

Some post-modernists simply point out these errors and suggest ways in which anthropologists can improve their writing (Polier and Roseberry 1989), but the fundamentalists proclaim that past ethnography is so full of misrepresentations and falsehoods, especially in relation to objectivity, which post-modernists claim is impossible and oppressing, that they suggest past anthropological work is expendable and should be ignored (D'Andrade 1995:557-566). From their perspective, the world of human interaction is so complicated and multifaceted that no person could ever write a "true" ethnography. Thus, all work produced is fiction: pieces of a collage tied together by the objective views of the anthropologist (Polier and Roseberry 1995:255). By seeing these arguments by post-modernists about the faults inherent in ethnography, I wonder why if ethnography should be conducted at all if the falsehoods embedded within it are so great, and others have wondered the same (McGee and Warms 2000:519).

Scholars particularly criticize photography as an ethnographic method (Edwards 2001:185, 211). From the post-modernists' perspective, photos always show only what the photographer chooses to show, framed to cut-off activities they choose not to represent. Especially in the past, photography was restricted, in that it was not useable at all times of the day due to lighting (Edwards 2001:171).

Photographs also do not show dynamic processes in time. The single snapshot removes the subject from the context of the other activities going on directly before and after the photographed event. Finally, I know from experience that the photograph can be manipulated during printing, to burn images in that would otherwise be lost; to crop images in or out of the photograph; and to touch-up the photograph, which allows the complete removal of images, but does not remove the image's context. Photographs, therefore, are not objective recording instruments that portray the "authentic." While the artist's hand is not immediately visible, photographs are manipulated works subject to the photographer's desires and bias (Sontag 1977:5-7).

I believe that Edward Sheriff Curtis is a prime target for post-modernists due to his extensive, blatant, subjective manipulation of his photographs. Though he was a salvage ethnographer who worked with the support of the Bureau of Ethnology (Gidley 1998:17-18, 87, 120, 122), he was a photographer first (Lyman 1982:51). He took his photographs to be aesthetically pleasing, posing his subjects, using re-enactment, using props, and wholly applying his subjective views of Native Americans as "noble savage" in his work (Lyman 1982:76; Makepeace 2001:38). Some of his contemporaries did not use these methods. Documentary photographers Walter McClintock, who recorded Blackfoot reservation life, and Fred E. Miller, who recorded life on the Crow

Reservation, avoided romanticism, and instead tried to capture both the traditional and white elements in Native American life (Fleming and Luskey 1986:75). However, many of Curtis's contemporaries did use the same methods he used, such as DeLancey Gill of the Bureau of Ethnology, who took pictures of Crazy Bull and of Chief Joseph as a young man, both remarkably similar to Curtis's work (Fleming and Luskey 1986:178, 180, 190-191). Others who practiced methods similar to Curtis's were Alfred Cort Haddon (Edwards 2001:165-7, Gidley 1998:157-9), Frank La Roche and Frank H. Nowell (Gidley 1998:64).

Curtis was primarily self-taught in photography, and initially specialized in landscape photography (Makepeace 2001:23, 30-3). His first photographs of Native Americans were romantic pictorials, not intended to be of ethnographic value (Lyman 1982:43). But his interactions with George Grinnell spurred his interest in Native Americans and salvage ethnography (the process of recording the traditional ways before they disappeared) (Fowler and Homer 1972:13; Makepeace 2001:41). Curtis believed that photography was a fusion of art and science (Lyman 1982:39) and his goal through his salvage ethno-photography of Native Americans was to complete a set of volumes entitled *The North American Indian*. When the first volume of this set was published in 1907 (Makepeace 2001:99), it was seen as an example of "good" ethnography (Gidley 1998:87). The final set was twenty volumes in length (Fowler and Homer 1972:14-5) and cost as much as \$4700 for the entire set by 1925 (Gidley 1998:110). When Curtis died in 1952, very few were interested in his photographs, but in the 1960s and 1970s, his photographs were resurrected due to their aesthetically pleasing mystical attributes, and

interest in his photos has come and gone in the form of recompilations of his work ever since (Lyman 1982:12).

It is clear through both research and statements made by photographers, that despite the two different methods of photography used in the early 1900s, the romantic and the documentary (Fleming and Luskey 1986:75), neither was considered wholly inappropriate or inaccurate during the time period (Edwards 2001:169-172). These men were considered to be doing something profoundly important and truthful (Edwards 2001:164-5). Roosevelt praised Curtis's work, calling it "a monument to American constructive scholarship and research of a value quite unparalleled" (Lyman 1982:60). Thus, taken within the context of the practices of the early 1900s, Curtis's methods were not seen as inappropriate, and he did not purport that his photographs were absent of props and posing. Quotes of Curtis discussing his work show that he was quite comfortable with what he did (Lyman 1982:65, 67).

In my opinion, the post-modernist would conclude that Curtis's work is the epitome of all that has been wrong with ethnography in the past. His photography treats individuals as representatives of the whole, as exotic "others," and employs stereotypes that the white community had about the Native American population. These are all post-modern critiques of past ethnography (Lewis 1998; Polier and Roseberry 1989). Theorists such as Baudrillard and Eco have argued that the process of re-enactment has obscured any validity of the original action (Edwards 2001:160). Critiquing Curtis's work from a post-modernist perspective can help to deconstruct the subject matter and remove his subjective influences.

To deny any value at all to Curtis's work, however, would be an error unprecedented. Curtis may not have followed what we now deem the "correct" method of ethnography, but we must also realize that anthropologists of his day in no way deemed him misrepresentational in his methods. There are fundamentalists in every theoretical point of view (in this paper I have chosen the theoretical positions of Roger Keesing [Lewis 1998] and James Clifford [Polier and Roseberry 1989]), and these post-modernists would discredit work like Curtis's entirely. Others, such as Roy D'Andrade (1995), Herbert Lewis (1998), Nicole Polier and William Roseberry (1989), suggest that these fundamentalists are out-of-line in stating that past ethnographies have nothing to offer.

When examining Curtis's work through a post-modernist lens, I will present the views of the critics of the fundamentalists (D'Andrade 1995; Lewis 1998; Polier and Roseberry 1989). These are the writers who have identified why the points made by the fundamentalists are good, but they also note that the works of the past have details to offer from a first-hand point of view that current ethnographers have no way of reconstructing in the same context. I believe this perspective is a useful one to apply to Curtis's work because it helps identify and remove Curtis's subjective views, and reveals elements of Native American lifeways in the early 1900s. While numerous ethnographies containing information about Native American lifeways do exist for this time period, evaluating Curtis's work and showing how it compares to the data in these ethnographies provides a framework for analyzing photographs of peoples for which few other records exist.

Many of the fundamentalist post-modernists have made strong claims that past works should be deconstructed and reassembled into new collages, providing information deemed more relevant in today's discourse (Polier and Roseberry 1989:255). Yet it seems that very few have taken this step with past works. Many are performing modern ethnography from this new theoretical perspective, but ignoring the benefits that deconstructing past work could have on the current body of anthropological knowledge. By deconstructing Curtis, I aim to show the validity of past ethnography so that other works can be evaluated in the future by similar methods.

Using Curtis's work as an example, this paper will closely examine selected aspects of his work and demonstrate how a careful analysis to extract cultural information can be done with other past ethnographies. Curtis is an excellent candidate for analysis, not only because of his methods, but also due to his popularity. Curtis called his photographs art-science: thus encompassing aspects of both disciplines (Lyman 1982:17) and we still find this dichotomy in photography today, using photographs to inform us of "facts" as well as appreciating them as art in galleries (Sontag 1977:5-9, 51-3). Curtis called himself primarily a photographer, but he hoped for more than that. He hoped that the combination of text and photograph would "be presented as a broad and luminous picture" (Lyman 1982:76).

This paper will first present Edward Sheriff Curtis as photographer, showing how he began, his primary interests in the discipline of photography, and his development into a professional photographer. I will then outline his beginnings in the field of salvage ethnography, detailing his photography of Native Americans solely for aesthetic appeal and his interest in combining the documentary photograph with aesthetic appeal in *The*

North American Indian as part of the salvage ethnography movement in the early 1900s. Many of his methods will be presented, such as re-enactment, posing and props, along with his justification and reasoning for using these methods.

Next photography and re-enactment will be discussed; and the problems that have arisen due to the combined “authentic” and “artistic” qualities of the photograph will be considered. I will also present the use of re-enactment by other anthropologists and the prevalence of re-enactment in cultures in order to contextualize the issues that are relevant in discussing Curtis’s photographs.

I will then present and apply the critiques of past ethnography by post-modernists to Curtis’s photographs to identify which aspects of Curtis’s photographs would make post-modernists disregard his photography as a “valid” ethnography. The views of the more moderate post-modernists will be introduced in order to develop a framework for why the post-modernist critique is valid and should be taken into consideration, and why past works like Curtis’s should not be wholly disregarded. These critiques will show that while many of Curtis’s methods may have obscured the “reality” of his subjects, we can identify and look past the methods he used in order to derive relevant cultural information from the photographs.

Lastly, this paper will attempt to derive cultural data from the photographs by removing the subjective methods in Curtis’s work. This analysis will focus on selected groups of photographs, arranged according to subject matter. Through comparison, I will draw conclusions, or offer hypotheses, about Native American cultural traditions in the early 1900s based on Curtis's photos. The analysis will then focus on comparing these

conclusions or hypotheses with other ethnographic data in order to determine their accuracy.

The goal of this paper is to show that through recognizing problems as outlined by post-modernists and acknowledging the subjectivity of photography, we can retrieve relevant cultural data from past works. Curtis's photographs are a good case to study, because comparisons are available through other ethnographic works. Analyses of photographs can be done and can provide relevant information in areas of the world for which there is little outside ethnographic work.

Chapter Two-Background on Edward Sheriff Curtis

Edward Sheriff Curtis was born in 1868 on a small farm near Whitewater, Wisconsin. The only formal education he received was in a one-room schoolhouse when the family moved to Cordova, Minnesota in 1880. Curtis's first interest in Native Americans surfaced when he was a child, for the first book he remembered reading was about the Minnesota massacre where Sioux had killed hundreds of encroaching settlers and some of the Sioux were sentenced to hang (Makepeace 2001:19-21). Battles raged between the American troops and Native American groups throughout Curtis's childhood (Makepeace 2001:22).

As a young child, Curtis developed a curiosity about photography. He built his first camera when he was only twelve years old, utilizing a lens his father brought back from the Civil War in a "wooden box inside another wooden box" type of camera construction. When Curtis was 17, he began working in a photography shop in St. Paul, Minnesota where he learned the ins and outs of professional methods for developing and printing (Makepeace 2001:23). Later he moved to Seattle, and bought a partnership for \$150 in a photography shop. The shop was shortly renamed after himself and his partner as Rothi and Curtis, Photographers (Makepeace 2001:25).

In 1892, he moved into a new partnership with Thomas Guptil. Curtis and Guptil became the place to go for photography. They were frequently praised in newspapers and magazines, and were even called the leading photographers of Puget Sound. They invented the photograph on a gold or silver plaque, which was probably the predecessor to Curtis's "Curt-tone," which created beautiful sepia-gold images (Makepeace 2001:26).

Guptil left the partnership in 1897 and the shop became “Edward S. Curtis, Photographer and Photoengraver” (Makepeace 2001:30).

Curtis’s first Native American subject was Princess Angeline, as the whites of Seattle liked to call her. She was the aged daughter of Chief Seattle and earned money from digging up clams and mussels near her shack on the waterfront. The city had repeatedly threatened to tear down her shack, to which she protested loudly. Despite her temper, Curtis won her over in 1895 and paid her a dollar for each picture he took. She died the following year, but in 1898, two of Curtis’s photographs of Princess Angeline, along with a photo entitled *Homeward*, of Native Americans paddling to shore in a dugout canoe, were chosen for an exhibition sponsored by the National Photographic Society. *Homeward* won the exhibit’s grand prize (Makepeace 2001:29). It is important to note that these first photographs Curtis took of Native Americans made no claims to be ethnographic documents. “They were romantic pictorials, which incidentally included Indians as subject matter, and they were presented as such” (Lyman 1982:43).

Curtis began to publish his own ideas about photography in local magazines, urging people to use their own individual style and to study landscape paintings (Makepeace 2001:30-3). He believed that photography was a fusion of art and science, contrary to the critics who claimed that photographs could not express artistic feeling (Lyman 1982:39). He specialized in landscapes and scenic views, largely due to his hobby as a mountain climber. Curtis was often the guide for climbing parties. He became famous after leading a party to the summit of Mount Rainier, only to have some men decide they did not want to spend the night, which resulted in one death and a dramatic rescue. The event made headlines in Seattle, and when prospectors arrived,

Curtis's fame helped land him jobs in expeditions to the Klondike, during which he took numerous photos (Makepeace 2001:30-3).

C. Hart Merriam invited Curtis to be the official landscape photographer in 1899 for The Harriman Expedition in Alaska (Makepeace 2001:36). Railroad tycoon Edward Henry Harriman, John Muir, the founder of the Sierra Club, and nature writer John Burroughs, among a host of other writers and scientists, also were members of the expedition (Makepeace 2001:36). It was through Curtis's travels with these men that he first began taking photographs of Native Alaskan villages (Makepeace 2001:38). However, Curtis was not responsible for the official ethnographic photographs that resulted from the expedition (Lyman 1982:42).

The cementation of Curtis's interest in Native American ethnographic photographs occurred with George Grinnell's invitation to a Sun Dance in Montana. Curtis wrote that the experience was "wild, terrifying, elaborately mystifying...It was the start of my concerted effort to learn about the Plains Indians and to photograph their lives, and I was intensely affected" (Makepeace 2001:41).

The truth is that Curtis was caught up in the movement of the time: salvage ethnography. Curtis noted that his work "represents the result of a personal study of a people who are rapidly losing the traces of the aboriginal character and who are destined ultimately to become assimilated with the 'superior race'" (Fowler and Homer 1972:13). In the late 1800s and early 1900s, anthropology had not yet been recognized as a formal discipline. Thus, people received the title of "ethnographer" who had no formal training. Instead, they came from a variety of backgrounds, and Curtis's background of commercial and artistic photography made him a candidate for "ethnographer" (Lyman

1982:51). During the period of Curtis's work on Native Americans, from roughly 1898-1930, other scholars such as Lewis Cass, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, Lewis Henry Morgan, George Bird Grinnell and John Wesley Powell were interested in salvaging information on the cultures of the "Vanishing Savages" (Fowler and Homer 1972:9). Beginning in 1900, anthropologists from the Smithsonian Institute's Bureau of Ethnology were recording the ways of the Native Americans "before it's too late" (Fowler and Homer 1972:9).

Curtis did not begin taking photos of native peoples with the intent of producing the work for which he is now famous. At first, he sold prints to the public and even published a series of postcards. Because Curtis's initial work with Native peoples was more of a financial pursuit than an ideological one, he began by concentrating on the tribes of the Southwest and the Great Plains, the groups with which his consumers would be more familiar (Lyman 1982:55).

Curtis developed an idea for a compilation work entitled *The North American Indian*. By 1905, his pursuit of publicity in order to financially back this project finally paid off, and he even met with President Theodore Roosevelt (Lyman 1982:59). In 1906, Curtis sent a written proposal for a loan to fund his compilation to J. Pierpont Morgan. It outlined a twenty-volume document with 1500 full-page plates of pictures, and included 700 of the more important pictures (Lyman 1982:60-1). Curtis received the grant from Morgan, and began working on *The North American Indian*.

In his work, Curtis included text with his photographs. His assistants wrote most of the text, but Curtis reviewed the work and chose those passages that would be included in his volumes (Lyman 1982:21). Curtis's aim in *The North American Indian* was "to

picture all features of the Indian life and environment—types of the young and old, with their habitations, industries, ceremonies, games and everyday customs” (Fowler and Homer 1972:13). Curtis did not completely fulfill this aim. To begin with, he only focused on Native Americans living west of the Mississippi River. He also never composed a complete ethnography on any one group (but this task is not possible in any circumstance, because there is always too much to record to ever be “complete”). In an argument with Edward Ayer, Ayer told Curtis that he was attempting too large of a task, saying that Curtis was “trying to do fifty men’s work” (Gidley 1998:135).

Curtis finished *The North American Indian* in 1930. It was composed of twenty portfolio volumes, each almost 300 pages long. The twenty portfolios contained a total of over 2,200 photographs (Fowler and Homer 1972:14-5). Curtis presented the work by tribe, beginning with the Apache and concluding with a chapter about the Alaskan Eskimos, signifying the completion of the full circle of his journey (Makepeace 2001:15). For the first photograph in his portfolios, he chose *The Vanishing Race-Navaho, 1904* (Figure 1), and wrote “Feeling that the picture expresses so much of the thought that inspired the entire work, the author has chosen it as the first of the series” (Lyman 1982:80). It is an excellent example of how he “changed” his images: the photograph was enhanced in numerous ways: the sticks in the lower right-hand corner were enhanced with a stylus; the shapes of the Indian riders were defined by highlights using a negative retouching pencil; and the aura of light running along the horizon was retouched (Lyman 1982:80).

At the start of Curtis’s project, many were interested and fascinated by the idea of *The North American Indian*. When the first volume was published, others saw Curtis’s

Figure 1

work as an example of a “good” ethnography (Gidley 1998:87). During the time of the compilation of *The North American Indian*, Curtis was well known among photographic, artistic, and ethnographic circles. His wealthy sponsors included such people as President Theodore Roosevelt and his sister Corinne Roosevelt Robinson; Mr. and Mrs. Harriman; Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, wife of the editor of *Century* magazine; and J. Pierpont Morgan (Gidley 1998:68-9, 109). While Curtis’s work was well known among the elite, artistic, and scientific circles due to his constant search for subscribers and funders for his project, he spent little time, if any, popularizing his series to the general public (Gidley 1998).

Curtis’s work soon lapsed into obscurity. The Great Depression made the twenty-volume set which had initially cost \$3000 or \$3850 per set depending on the paper type, which rose to \$4200 or \$4700 by 1925, an item few could afford (Gidley 1998:110; Lyman 1982:147). Views about “the vanishing race” were changing, with most holding a stereotypical view of Native Americans, in terms of racial hierarchies and the unavoidable extinction of indigenous people (Berkhofer 1978:56; Lyman 1982:125). When Curtis died in 1952, his photographs were of interest to very few (Lyman 1982:12). This was due, in part, to their high cost, but the optimism in the postwar years also played a role. The public was interested in looking forward to the future, to a great and glorious America, and had no longing for the past (Lyman 1982:12).

In the 1960s and 1970s, publishers and the public resurrected Curtis’s work due to the public’s interest in his talent for applying aesthetically pleasing mystical attributes in his photography (Lyman 1982:12). Commentators, Curtis’s family, exhibition organizers, and anonymous and semi-anonymous dealers in photographs who promoted

this “revival” intended to present the images as a new and sympathetic portrayal of Indian lifeways (Gidley 1998:11).

The stolid Indians...expressing their disbelief in the universe...brought home to the malcontents the social and political disruptions of the last century, and symbolized for many the survival of human values in a universe gone mad with materialistic greed (Lyman 1982:12).

Revivals have continued since then, shifting focus according to who presented the material and if they presented it in a romanticized or critical fashion (Gidley 1998:11).

There was an awakening pride in minority heritage: people would find a trace of Indian blood in their family tree and try to become one with the past glories of such a ‘noble’ people (Lyman 1982:11-12).

Hidden Faces (1996b) and *Great Plains* (1996a) compiled by Christopher Cardozo in 1996 are two prime examples of the ways in which Edward Curtis’s photographs have been reproduced for the public. Both of these books measure a mere 4” x 6” and contain a meager introduction with no description about the accuracy of the photographs or Curtis’s history. These books were clearly published solely for the photographs, for even the text with each photograph is minimal, telling only the tribal affiliation of the subject and the scene that was photographed. Other recently published works which are clearly geared for a general public include *Curtis: Portraits of Native Americans 2003 Calendar* (Browntrout Publishers 2002), *Edward S. Curtis: Portraits of Native Americans, A Book of Postcards* (Pomegranate Artbooks 1996), and *Edward S. Curtis (American, 1868-1952): Chief Joseph* (Pomegranate Communications n.d.), which is a bookmark.

Chapter Three-Photographs and Controversy

Photographs have a long and intricate history. They were first used to present evidence, as surveillance tools, by police in Paris in 1871 (Sontag 1977:5). The photograph furnished proof, and while people acknowledged the distortions, the idea lingered that the “reality” had to be similar to that presented in the photograph (Sontag 1977:5). The photograph, however, is an interpretation, just as paintings and drawings are, and this idealism is present even in the 1840s and 1850s, which mark the first two decades of photography (Sontag 1977:6-7).

Curtis’s first purchased camera was a 14” x 17” large-view camera, and unlike many of his contemporaries, he rejected the cheap and lightweight Kodak film for the large-format, glass-plate negatives that produced better clarity and resolution (Makepeace 2001:25). Curtis carried this heavy equipment and a tripod everywhere he went, sometimes using mules as transport (Makepeace 2001:43).

During the time Curtis was working, a controversy about whether or not to consider photography an art was in progress (Wells 1997:20-24). Curtis contributed an aesthetic eye to all of his pieces (Makepeace 2001:38), and frequently manipulated the camera. Sometimes he left the camera slightly out of focus to give the photograph an impressionistic feel. Other techniques included removing unwanted detail during retouching, and burning in the sky during development (Lyman 1982:76). Curtis believed his work was art and science combined, contrary to those who felt the nature of photography made artistic endeavors impossible (Lyman 1982:39). Susan Sontag claims that “Photography expresses the American impatience with reality” (Sontag 1977:65),

and claims that the rush into the West to photograph Native Americans was a predatory act, violating their privacy and desires (Sontag 1977:64). This implies that Curtis's work was a rushed and invasive act, looking solely towards his goals without considering the value that taking his time and considering Native American desires would have contributed.

What has caused so much controversy about Curtis's photographs are the techniques he used of re-enactment, posing, props, and construction of the photographs. The photographs' status as "found objects—unpremeditated slices of the world" makes some view these techniques as deceitful (Sontag 1977:69). As such, there is much debate about the "validity" of his photographs. Even this is complicated, as the notion of "validity" is contested by Elizabeth Edwards, who states that it is impossible to judge re-enactment from a value judgment such as "fake" (Edwards 2001:157). His work represented the assumptions of the dominant culture in the early 1900s (Gidley 1998:11) and thus is not what we today consider "ethnographic." It has also been said that, "Curtis trumpeted the need to catch real 'Indianness' quickly before it 'vanished.' But he *knew* that much of what he thought of as 'Indianness' did not exist, and in that knowledge, his work tended toward deception" [emphasis original] (Lyman 1982:148). The same critic also contends that "Curtis frequently confused his biases with objective facts" (Lyman 1982:148). Thus, we encounter a difficulty even deciding the definitions of concepts like "valid" and fake."

Cultural anthropologists collect their data through fieldwork. To be a successful ethnographer is to be fully engaged in participant observation and to be objective in making observations. This is seen as a process of becoming part of the culture under

study. The key is “thick description,” as Geertz (1973) would propose: the process of observing every minute detail of a culture, and slowly peeling back the layers to get to the real issues behind events. However, through this process, you are simply observing. Only that which happens without initiation of the ethnographer is “true” to the culture. Considering this definition of “truth” contextualizes the reasons for the criticisms of Curtis’s work by Gidley (1998) and Lyman (1982). Because much of Curtis’s photography involved posing or re-enactment, modern scholars see these techniques as contaminating the culture, reifying events through photography that did not happen “naturally.”

Elizabeth Edwards in *Raw Histories: Photographs, Anthropology and Museums*, discusses the place of re-enactment in anthropologically significant photography. She discusses the problems anthropologists typically hold within the context of using re-enactment and posing in ethnographic photographs, such as the issue of “true” and “fake” once current notions of authenticity developed, and the issue of the ethnographer becoming active in the performance of the culture (Edwards 2001:159, 169). She states,

anthropological truth value has been grounded in a cultural representation, extracted from real time, authenticated through real-time observation, captured and stilled through the action of the camera. Within this, images that depart from real time have been deemed as somehow epistemologically flawed in terms of the scientific morality of the discipline (Edwards 2001:157).

She investigates the method of the use of re-enactment and comes to some conclusions about the practice.

Edwards defines re-enactment as “a performative reconstruction of social action outside normal or natural contexts and constitutive happenings” (Edwards 2001:157). She also notes that re-enactment is citational, referring back to social action. It has been

used as a tool to record scientific data, the same way instruments are used in a lab. She focuses on re-enactment done between the years 1885 and 1925, the time during which Curtis was most active. She notes that photography was linked to historically specific notions of intellectual validity, objectivity and scientific method.

Photography was used extensively in the context of salvage ethnography, of which Curtis was a part, focusing on recording things not only before they were lost, for much already was, but before the cultural traditions were forgotten so that they could no longer even be re-enacted (Edwards 2001:158). The anthropologists of the time thought it imperative that information be recorded while there was still time, including Curtis who felt he would have to work quickly before the culture of the Native Americans “became invisible forever” (Gidley 1998:31). “‘The authentic’ was a central trope in salvage ethnography” (Edwards 2001:159), which thus justified representational practices.

Yet, Malinowski lamented the way in which the object of ethnographic study disappeared at the moment of its scientific recognition (Edwards 2001:160). Malinowski himself used re-enactment in his writing and photography (Stocking 1992). In Malinowski’s famed writings of the kula expedition, he gives a definite impression that he was present for the entire expedition---that he witnessed it first- hand (Malinowski 1922). The truth is that Malinowski attempted to go on a kula expedition, but a storm blew up and the passengers of the boat were nearly lost. Attributing this misfortune to Malinowski’s presence, the kula participants in New Guinea never allowed him to go on a trip. Thus, his account of kula expeditions is based on observations as groups left, as other groups arrived, and the actual boat trip from other’s accounts. Yet he never

acknowledges this in his writing: he writes with the purpose of making the account seem first-hand (Stocking 1992). Thus, he effectively re-enacts an event through writing.

Malinowski used re-enactment in his photography as well, specifically in his photos of war magic, and he advocated and justified the use of re-enactment in photographic work, stating, “if you know a subject matter well and can control native actors, posed photographs are almost as good as those taken *in flagrante*” (Edwards 2001:170). However, unlike in his writings, he was very careful to label his photographs, indicating whether they were posed or not, and placing much more value on those photographs of the actors doing the event in real time without his initiation (Stocking 1992). I believe the reason for this is that Malinowski did his fieldwork after the development of Boasian anthropological theory, which was dominant by World War I, where the actual was stressed over the contextual (Berkhofer 1978:62-3), as opposed to the not-yet-scientifically-recognized field of ethnography of Curtis’s time.

Edwards says that to evaluate photographs, we need to ask how they were made, what practices were involved, and what claims were made by them and of them (Edwards 2001:158). The process of re-enactment in the late 1800s and early 1900s came out of the natural sciences, where the concept of the experiment was dominant. Scientists were re-enacting natural processes or reactions in a closed environment, and then documented them so that the results could be salvaged (Edwards 2001:162). Because many anthropologists had come out of other scientific disciplines, like Malinowski and Boas, they found it quite logical to apply these similar methods to the new science of anthropology.

For many reasons, photography was the salvage tool *par excellence* (Edwards 2001:165). “Objectification, in terms of representation, places the salvage of people and the salvage of objects on a visual continuum of focused vision and scientific gaze....Through photography, a perceived cultural essence, an authenticity, was reified” (Edwards 2001:164). Photography also was a science first. Only later did people consider it an art. Its purpose was to serve as a support instrument for scientific inquiries (Wells 1997:20-1).

“Salvage ethnography” implies the recording of what is still extant, before its disappearance. However, oftentimes, what the ethnographers desired to record no longer existed, but the moral urgency of the times demanded that they record the practices before the knowledge was lost (Edwards 2001:168-169). In Edward Curtis’s photographs of Native people, he was using a widely accepted technique. When interviewed for the *Seattle Times*, he recounted in detail how he acquired photos of the Navajo Yebechai Dance. He described how he convinced a small group to re-enact the dance for him, despite the protests of many other Navajo, and that he had made the costumes himself (Lyman 1982:65, 67). In his salvage ethnography work, he recorded those things that were already present, in real time as it were, but he was also trying to photograph the way things were before the arrival of the white colonists.

Edwards also says that salvage ethnography opened the way for metaphor, allegory and the possibility of theatre. She notes that, like performance and theatre, photographs focus seeing and attention in a certain way. However, in performance and theater the audience is well aware that what they are watching is being enacted, but this awareness is not present in the viewer of a photograph (Edwards 2001:169). The

photographer chooses what part of an act to photograph, perhaps because it is the most important to him, perhaps the most important to the actors, or maybe it is simply the most aesthetically pleasing. He also chooses his angle and framing, perhaps cutting off other activities going on that would either be distracting, non-contextual, or aesthetically unpleasant. Curtis used all these methods in his photographs, and in some of his captions, described the metaphor he was trying to create. In *The Vanishing Race, 1904* (Figure 1), his caption reads “[t]he thought which [it is] meant to convey [is] that the Indians as a race, already shorn of their...strength and stripped of their primitive dress, [are] passing into the darkness of an unknown future” (Curtis in Gidley 1998:21). Thus photographs often lose the provenience of their occurrence, and some would say lose their value as well, as one would say of archaeological artifacts without their provenience. Edwards observes that, “the ethnographer here becomes, through re-enactment, envisioner or director of continuity, active in the performance of a culture” (Edwards 2001:169). The photographer is the director or artist, creating a work that is subjective to his own desires, although the artist’s hand may not be immediately recognizable in the work.

Edwards also justifies the practice of re-enactment by noting the presence of re-enactment innately in many cultural groups, in acting-out creation myths or telling stories down through the generations: in effect, re-enacting the history of the people. She says “Re-enactment and performance are powerful social tools in many cultures, and mimesis is deeply embedded in the cognitive process of the preservation of cultural elements and forms the basis of the incorporation of collective experience” (Edwards 2001:173).

Edwards addresses Curtis’s work saying,

The documentary validity of re-enactment, originating in scientific practice, was perhaps responsible for the ambiguous scientific identity of some more popular projects. For instance, Edward Sheriff Curtis's great photographic work on Native American cultures relied heavily on reconstruction, re-enactment and construction of a historical past, informed by a sense of nostalgia and salvage desire (Edwards 2001:171).

This reasoning shows why photographers of the early 1900s felt that re-enactment was an acceptable technique. This is not to say that they saw such re-enactments as 'real', or that all re-enactments carried the same truth-value. However, "re-enactment fulfilled both scientific demands and a judgement of the credible and convincing within certain cultural parameters" (Edwards 2001:172). Thus as long as either the producer or the audience recognized the photos' quality of being a re-enactment, photographs still had much to offer to the discipline of anthropology.

However, as noted before, for the vast majority of Curtis's photographs published for the general public during and after the 1960s, there was little accompanying text, and *Prayer to the Great Mystery: Edward S. Curtis* (Hausman and Kapoun 1995), was the only instance I found where the text was in Curtis's own words. The removal of the text from the photographs removes the acknowledgment of Curtis's intentions when he took the photographs: as salvage ethnographic work combined with aesthetic appeal (Lyman 1982:19). Hence I believe it is the republishing of the work, in addition to Curtis's initial methods, which caused problems.

Edwards mirrors the observation that validity becomes a problem when the basis for inquiry changes, when she quotes Winston (1995):

re-enactment, and by extension the whole notion of the 'posed photograph', became problematic only when veracity and authenticity as they are now perceived became technically possible, and sources were interrogated from a different basis, so doubts concerning authenticity and authority became differently premised (Winston 1995:120-123).

This quote implies that this occurred after the 1980s, when new theories developed about evaluating past work, and suggested new ideas about the possibilities of interpretation (Edwards 2001:177). These photographs did have the power to authenticate, as it was part of the authority of the scientist and the anthropologist (Edwards 2001:160). Hence we see that the problems centering on slippage between reality and re-enactment are extremely complex.

In order to apply all of the above discussion on re-enactment photographs to Edward Curtis's work, we must go back to the questions Edwards says we need to ask when looking at such photographs. We need to know how the photographs were made. It is clear that Curtis often asked others to pose for him, sometimes paying them, in order to record the desired circumstance (Lyman 1982:101). We know that Curtis used native actors in his work, and that they had input into the final product, and that he used props and camera tricks (Lyman 1982:67-8).

We also need to know about the claims being made by and of the photographs. Ethnographers claimed they were accurate recordings of Native American ways of life, occasionally acknowledging in the accompanying texts that the photographs portrayed these people as they used to be, not as they were in the present (Hausman and Kapoun 1995). During the early 1900s, scholars believed that "Indians" were only "Indians" when they acted "Indian;" once they changed and acculturated, they were no longer "Indian" (Lyman 1982:50). This issue of the claims being made by the pictures needs to be evaluated during the 1960s later on when these photographs became generally popular, which makes answering it much more complex. For the later mass-published works containing Curtis's photographs, each compiler had his own agenda in presenting Curtis's

photographs, and thus the pictures make different claims. This is the nature of photographs: their rawness makes any one interpretation subjective to the agenda represented by the presentation of the context.

Chapter Four-Post-Modernist Critique

Introduction to Post-Modernist Critiques

Post-modernism is one of the newer schools of anthropological theory, and as with all new theories, is gaining followers, and critics, quickly. Many post-modernists believe because anthropologists represent the “other” and act as translators, their research does not represent an accurate account of other cultures. The fundamentalists accentuate this fault so greatly, that simply acknowledging that a work is a partial viewpoint is not good enough, and they say that anthropology is useless (Trawick 2002:ix-x). Critics of post-modernist anthropology fear that post-modernism has marginalized anthropological pursuits, and may result in a loss of important knowledge for those who want to learn about human behavior, to which I concur (Lewis 1998:726). However, critics also believe that all subjective judgments have objective foundations that can be evaluated once the subjective views of the anthropologist have been identified so that the evaluator can look past them (D’Andrade 1995:552-553).

This paper uses critiques of post-modernist theory, as opposed to the original works, in order to develop a better framework for contradicting the post-modernists’ claims that anthropology is “useless.” The goal of this post-modernist examination of Curtis’s work is to reveal the subjective bias and purpose he imposed on his photographs, but then acknowledge that these things were part of the framework of anthropology during the time he took his photographs. This post-modernist deconstruction of Edward Curtis’s work will reveal the subjective lenses, permitting an evaluation of the

photographs in order to discover information about Native American lifeways of the early twentieth century.

The post-modernist perspective in anthropology does not aim to describe a “culture” in whole due to many factors. One of these is the ever-present question in anthropology: What constitutes a culture? (Lewis 1998). One of the most frequently quoted definitions of culture is by Sir Edward Burnett Tylor, who asserts that, “Culture or Civilization...is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Tylor 1871:27). Post-modernists hold that many people who live together in the same “culture,” as defined by anthropologists, actually constitute many different cultures, and that each individual is a part of many different cultures. From this perspective it thus becomes impossible to describe a whole culture, not only because of the confusion involved with trying to map out numerous cultures, but also because each person is a part of numerous cultures that will differ from other individuals in the community (Crapanzano 1986; D’Andrade 1995; Lewis 1998; Polier and Roseberry 1989). From the post-modernist perspective, we could not consider Edward Curtis’s work a complete ethnography, because no ethnography has ever been “complete.”

According to post-modernists, to write an accurate ethnography that describes a whole culture, an ethnographer would need to interview every person in the community, because one or a group of people cannot stand for the whole. Even if the ethnographer accomplished this feat, post-modernists assert that people react differently and will answer questions differently at different times and under different circumstances due to the vast number of cultures to which they belong (Coombe 1991; Polier and Roseberry

1989). Thus post-modernist fundamentalists consider the goals of the ethnographer unattainable.

Post-modernists also draw attention to the fact that no culture is isolated (Lewis 1998). In essence, post-modernists believe that culture alternates on a cline. Thus not only would research have to be done on the cultural unit as defined by the ethnographer, but also on all cultures interacting with the culture under consideration, making the research base extremely large. Curtis pursued salvage ethnography through his photographs of numerous different Native American groups in the Alaskan region and the area west of the Mississippi. He distinctly labeled his photographs by tribe, and his ethnographic accounts give succinct “histories” and “views” of each tribal group (Hausman and Kapoun 1995). From a post-modernist perspective, however, dividing up the groups in this manner misrepresents the interaction of the groups and the individuality of those within the defined groups. Thus while Curtis labels his photographs being a “type” of a particular tribe, post-modernists would argue that what the people chose or are made to wear in their portraits, and how they chose or are told to act in a re-enactment, could have been different according to the context in which they were asked, and to whom the request was made, so Curtis’s “types” are not even an accurate representation of the individual they portray. In addition, his work glosses over the fact that the different tribes had interacted with one another on numerous occasions over the course of many years, had gone through diffusion and integration processes, and had interacted with and been influenced by European culture. Thus Curtis’s photographs portray Native American life as stagnant relics rather than dynamic modern peoples.

Post-modernists' views of ethnography come from a literary critique background, and the post-modernist school of thought advocates a type of ethnography that is a literary collage. The ethnographer must research individual pieces of the whole, describe each in detail, and draw connections between them (Polier and Roseberry 1989:255). Then according to James Clifford, he or she must fully recognize and discuss that this is not an objective "whole" picture of the culture being studied (Polier and Roseberry 1989).

The ties are subjective and dependent upon the ethnographers' bias, which post-modernists proclaim every person possesses, and which I have noted, Curtis possessed. They believe that any bias or purpose influencing the ethnography, such as political or social interest, distorts the account of the culture (Crapanzano 1986). Thus, even intentions like Curtis's (to salvage information about a culture before its disappearance) misrepresent the culture.

While anthropology has frequently acknowledged the presence of a partial perspective in ethnographic work, post-modernists assert that ethnography is entirely subjective and thus equivalent to a work of fiction or an incomplete translation (Polier and Roseberry 1989). Because the ethnographer is not an "actor" within the culture, he or she is attempting to translate the action for their cultural audience, making the work subjective, because all discourse loses content in the translation (Polier and Roseberry 1989:253).

Curtis as photographer was the translator for Native American groups, and because he was not an "actor" in these groups, post-modernists would consider his work "fiction." Curtis also was acting as a translator for the rest of the world through his

photography, and he framed and posed pictures according to his aesthetics or interests in the culture. Greatly affecting his choices was his fascination and respect for Native American peoples, and his desire to record those aspects that characterized them as “Indian.” He was interested in promoting this interest in the rest of the populace, or at least to those in power (Gidley 1998:109-129). The subjects posed as he imagined the Native Americans to have once been, thus capturing their “Indianness.”

In addition, the post-modernist perspective of ethnography as a collage that the ethnographer ties together, has interpretive value relative to Curtis’s work. Each of his photographs is a brief account of one subject in time, posed or unposed. Through the publication of *The North American Indian*, he chose how to weave these photographs together and how to present them to his audience. He chose to compile them by tribal group rather than by activity, time of year, or type of person portrayed within the photograph. Thus his work is a collage, an ethnographic work, in post-modernist terms.

Some post-modernists believe that the driving force of anthropology has been oppression, and that the subjective views of cultures submitted by ethnographers help continue that oppression (D’Andrade 1995:552-3). Evaluating this statement with respect to Curtis’s work is a complicated one. Curtis had great respect for Native Americans, saying this of the treatment of these people:

As the years pass on and we are able to see this subject as history, stripped of its little local prejudices, we will be found guilty as a nation, under the manipulations of crafty, unscrupulous politicians, of having committed more than the “crime of the century.” In all our years handling the Indians we have taught them one thing—the white man seldom told the truth (Curtis in Lyman 1982:79)

These words were a premonition, but they were also self-condemning. For while he was correct that today, many people scorn the government’s treatment of Native Americans,

his work was not the “reality” it presented, due to his use of re-enactment, posing and props, but was it an act of oppression?

Evaluations of Curtis’s work are complicated, in that people continue to reorganize and republish his photographs, taking his photographs and recompiling their presentation for different purposes. Thus we find books that focus exclusively on Curtis’s photographs of Indians of the Plains (Cardozo 1996a); ones that focus on women in Curtis’s photographs (Day 1997); books that focus on rarely published photographs (Hausman and Kapoun 1995); works that focus solely on his work as a portrait photographer (Browntrout Publishers 2002); and books that either do or do not show an interest in revealing to the audience the intricacies of Curtis’s photographs, allowing us to see how he posed his subjects or retouched the photos (Cardozo 2000; Lyman 1982). Photographs lend themselves so well to reorganization that others can easily change the intent of the original ethnographer, whether the original interpretation was culturally relative or not.

Application of Roger Keesing’s Post-Modernist View

In the essay “The Misrepresentation of Anthropology and Its Consequences,” Herbert Lewis outlines the post-modern anthropologist Roger Keesing’s arguments against the anthropology of the past (Lewis 1998). Keesing argued that anthropology first treats the people it studies as “radically alter” or “exotic;” second that anthropology has always been ahistorical; and third that anthropologists treat cultures as isolated units (Lewis 1998).

It can be instructive to apply Keesing's critique of ethnography to Curtis's photographs to illustrate what problems post-modernists see in works similar to Curtis's. First, Curtis did portray his subjects as "radically alter," shown in the fact that many of his photographs emit the aura of the noble savage, as those who live off the land and follow ancestral ways. Often when he took his photographs, Curtis requested that the subjects dress in traditional garb, which sometimes were props that Curtis carried with him, rather than the "western" clothing which was the style many Native peoples wore (Lyman 1982). He was very particular about the presence of "western" influence in his photographs during much of his photographic career. In his photograph, *Fiesta of San Estevan, 1904* (Figure 2), Curtis retouched parasols out of the photograph taken at Acoma Pueblo (Lyman 1982:71-2). While some Native Americans still used traditional style lodging, close inspection of the photograph *Assiniboin Camp on Bow River, 1926* (Figure 3) reveals that these "teepees" were made from machine-woven fabric, possibly feed sacks, and product labels were retouched out of the photograph (Lyman 1982:72). By removing these elements of "western" culture from the photographs, Curtis portrays them as "exotic," without influence from outside cultures.

In order to assure that his subjects retained their aura of "Indianness," Curtis often carried around props: wigs, "traditional" headdresses, and "traditional" clothing. This can be illustrated by juxtaposing photographs of the same man: one of Curtis's entitled *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figure 4a) and another entitled *A.B. Upshaw-Interpreter, 1898* (Figure 4b) credited to F.A. Rinehart, although probably taken by Curtis's assistant, A.F. Muhr (Lyman 1982:90). The one credited to Rinehart was made approximately seven years prior to Curtis's, and depicts Upshaw as he normally appeared (Lyman 1982:90-3).

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

In Curtis's photograph, however, Upshaw, who acted as an interpreter for Curtis, donned a costume so as to appear more "Indian," the headdress especially serving to cover up acculturation, since Upshaw had short hair, which did not portray "Indianness" (Lyman 1982:90-3).

There are details about the images themselves that also differ in these two pictures, which I believe illustrate the different purposes of these two photographers. In *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figure 4a) by Curtis, has an extensive amount of contrast, meaning that less shades of gray were allowed, which would imply the use of a high filter (Hilton 1999). *A.B. Upshaw-Interpreter, 1898* (Figure 4b) attributed to F.A. Rinehart, is not highly contrasting: there are a few parts that are true white or black, with most of the photo encompassing the gray scale in-between. I learned that using higher contrasts in photography allows the figure to seem hyper-real.

Figure 4b also uses classic posing, cutting off the figure at the waist and elbow joints, rather than in the middle of body parts; however, Figure 4a cuts Upshaw's arm off mid-bicep, and then allows the hand to float back onto the image. Proper portrait photography concludes that if limbs are not wholly included, you must stop them at the joint, otherwise the impression on the viewer is that the subject looks disjointed.

Lastly, *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figure 4a) shows Upshaw filling the entirety of the image, so much so that the top of his headdress extends beyond the framing. The fact that Curtis cuts his arms out of the picture at the bicep makes it look like he was too large to fit in the picture, again portraying him as hyper-real, as bigger than life. The angle also shoots him at a slightly upward angle, allowing him to tower over the viewer. His eyes are straight forward, and his pose is completely symmetrical, again portraying him

as a solid, strong figure. In *A.B. Upshaw-Interpreter, 1898* (Figure 4b), there is empty space above and beside Upshaw in the shot, his averted eyes and held pose do not portray him as a strong, stolid “Indian.”

The separate agendas of these two portraits are strikingly clear. Curtis intended to represent Upshaw as a “true” and “stolid” Native American, while Rinehart intended to portray Upshaw as a member of the “civilized” society. They represent two different subjective purposes, neither one more “correct” than the other, but Curtis’s reflecting the intent to show Upshaw as radically alter, and Rinehart’s reflecting the intent to show Upshaw as an identical part of “civilized” society.

As mentioned previously, Curtis made the costumes for the Navaho people who had agreed to reenact the Yebechai Prayer Dance for him. Their agreement was highly controversial amongst the Navaho, because the dance was supposed to be sacred. In order to avoid a confrontation with the other Navajo, the Navaho who had agreed to the reenactment demanded that Curtis make the costumes, because their own costumes had religious significance, and they did not want to be sacrilegious. In addition, it is highly likely that they did not perform the dance correctly for Curtis, so as to make the act more secular (Lyman 1982:67-9). Curtis’s insistence on finding a way to photograph an event that was so controversial among the Navajo, shows his determination to photograph the events that would identify the Native people as “radically alter.”

Another example of Curtis portraying Native Americans as radically alter is in one of his frequent subject matters, that of “warrior” or “war parties.” Many later books that recast Curtis’s photos present these pictures without any captioning to explain them. Therefore the republications lead the audience to believe that these Native people were

photographed on their way to wage “war,” which reinforced the public’s views of Native Americans as hostile peoples (Lyman 1982:102). In reality, all of Curtis’s pictures of war parties or warriors were posed, such as in *Ready for the Charge-Apsaroke, 1908* (Figure 5) (Lyman 1982:87-8). James Mooney, an anthropologist whom Curtis respected, objected to Curtis’s use of the term “warrior” when describing Indians, because they were not actually engaging in war. Curtis, however, continued to use the term frequently (Lyman 1982:105). Curtis claimed he wanted to focus on topics that not previously covered by other scholars, and also noted the picturesque nature of “warrior” photographs (Lyman 1982:91, 104, 109). His writings, which mentioned the “hostilities” of the Native Americans, however, also made frequent references to “hostile” behavior on behalf of the “whites” (Lyman 1982:104), indicating that while his photographs depicted the Native peoples as “radically alter,” he saw similarities between them and the “whites.”

In response to Keesing’s second critique, Curtis does present his subjects as ahistorical by removing items of Western influence. Careful inspection of the photos reveals that some Western influence remains, especially when coupled with previous knowledge of Native Americans. Many times, the re-enactments that Curtis requested were those that were common in the past, although not in the present. Unfortunately, without the text or a detailed caption to accompany the photograph, the viewer would not know this. In Curtis’s writings, he went into great detail on the history of the people. For the Lakota Sioux, for example, he traced their historical movement across the country by comparing folktales and the Lakota Sioux’s recording of years by winters (Hausman and Kapoun 1995:138-9). He was thus able to determine that the Lakota Sioux, who were

Figure 5

then living in the Black Hills and Central Montana, had originally come from the Great Lakes region, and possibly the Atlantic seaboard (Hausman and Kapoun 1995:138-9). In this way, he shows an awareness of the Native American history, as this was certainly part of the salvage ethnography discourse of which he was a participant. The salvage ethnographers' concern, other than recording the modern ways of the Native Americans before they disappeared, was to record vestiges of their past before there was no one left who could remember the stories of their history (Edwards 2001:164, 171).

Keesing's third critique of ethnographic work was that ethnographers treat their subjects as isolated units, which Curtis certainly did. Today, anthropological research focuses largely on globalization, in the present and in history (Wolf 1982:13-9). Eric Wolf's book, *Europe and the People Without History* (Wolf 1982) is one of the best-known examples of this research. It focuses largely on globalization, and shows that no culture was isolated, and that constant diffusion and integration was a part of all cultures. By the time Curtis began taking his photographs, Native Americans had not only interacted with each other through trade, and had integrated and diffused for millennia, but they also had interacted with people from numerous European nations steadily for at least 400 years. The Native American societies of the Plains and West did not acquire the horse, which is so prominent in many of Curtis's photographs, until 1630-1730 (Wolf 1982:176). Native peoples had been driven off their land, many had been lost in the smallpox epidemics and the demand for furs and pemmican had greatly changed their lifeways (Wolf 1982:178). Many societies that had once been organized around either ascribed or achieved status were abruptly altered. As the groups became more dependent on European goods, many young men found that they could earn status and wealth

through selling the most furs and collecting the most money for which to obtain goods (Wolf 1982). This drastic change in lifestyle greatly affected the Native Americans as a whole. Yet despite all of these changes, Curtis portrayed his images as being the “true” Native Americans, continuing traditions that were remained unchanged, despite the reality.

One of the most poignant examples I found of Curtis purposely treating his subjects as isolated from others, as well as “radically alter” and ahistorical, is a photograph entitled *Lodge Interior – Piegan, 1910* (Figures 6a and 6b). Two versions of this photograph exist. In one, the original, the photograph of Little Plume and his son Yellow Kidney shows an alarm clock between the two, placed as a symbol of luxury. In the photograph that Curtis published in *The North American Indian*, this evidence of contact with western civilization has been retouched and removed from the photo (Makepeace 2001:174). Coarseness in the grain of the published photograph revealed through either careful scrutiny, or a comparison with the original photograph, illuminates the efforts taken by Curtis to mask contact with the “western” world.

Curtis masked evidence of frequent contact with the “western” world in other ways as well. In his photograph entitled *Snake Dancers Entering the Plaza, 1921* (Figure 7), all those present whom a viewer would assume are other Hopi viewing the Snake Dance are actually tourists. Curtis purposefully utilized a large aperture when taking the photograph to blur the more distant subjects, the tourists, in the image (Lyman 1982:121). By masking evidence of the tourists, he presents the Native Americans as part of a pristine culture, isolated from the “western” influences.

Figure 6

Figure 7

Curtis often grouped and labeled his photographs solely according to tribal affiliation. Presenting the photographs in this way eliminated any implication of interaction between groups, which he certainly could have shown through photographs of people of multiple tribal affiliations or presenting the photographs according to subject matter instead of tribal group. Some of his text does mention the interaction between Native American groups and Europeans (Hausman and Kapoun 1995), but this is not present in the photos he published in *The North American Indian*. This leads the viewer to believe that they are seeing a pure, isolated and unique group of people who have remained as they were for centuries. This form of isolationism in ethnography is common when researchers are discussing the “primitive,” to give a pristine account of that culture and that culture alone (Edwards 2001:164). This does not mean, however, that this was done intentionally. For Curtis’s purposes, it made more sense to record groups separately, for they defined themselves as separate peoples, and thus it made sense that he treat them as such. He was trying to record the unique differences and cultures of particular groups for salvage ethnography, and thus he ignored cultural interactions.

If Curtis’s text had accompanied his photographs in the various modern republications of his photos, we might have a different outlook on his work. He notes in his ethnographies, for instance, that the Piegan, Bloods and Blackfeet all originated from Algonquian stock who migrated from the Atlantic seaboard (Hausman and Kapoun 1995:117). However, when others present his photographs without his text, these relations are not immediately apparent without an extensive knowledge of tribal histories.

Application of James Clifford and Marcus Fischer's Post-Modernist Views

For the post-modernist analysis, I felt it was necessary to present the critiques of multiple post-modernists in order to obtain a more complete view of their theories. Polier and Roseberry (1989) present another summary and critique of post-modernism that identifies problems the post-modernists James Clifford and Marcus Fischer see in ethnography. Polier and Roseberry (1989) identified the main criticisms of anthropology by Clifford and Marcus: first, that social movement is represented as structural stasis; second that disorder is portrayed as order; and third that individuals are used to represent the whole (Polier and Roseberry 1989).

I partially addressed their first criticism in my consideration of Keesing's critique that Curtis treated these different tribal groups as isolated units. Curtis presents Native Americans as being structurally static by focusing specifically on rituals and lifeways of the people that identify them as "Indian." He does not portray those events that show social movement of the group very often, the changes that have occurred due to their interactions both with other Native Americans and with Europeans. Frequently during the time in which Curtis worked, Native American groups moved in order to comply with the United States government's demands, but photographs of "changing camp" are not presented in this way. Curtis portrays their movement as a static cultural relic rather than a product of changing and morphing elements of culture.

The second criticism of ethnography by Clifford and Marcus, is that ethnography portrays disorder as order, which is also applicable to Curtis's work (Polier and Roseberry 1989). A large portion of Curtis's work is portraits of particular individuals. These portraits are posed, the bodies rigid, and the background purposefully chosen. The

purpose of these anthropometric portraits was to make them useful to both the critical scientist and the artist, and while Curtis's photographs did not adhere to the rigid methods introduced in the mid-1800s (Edwards 2001:135, 138), they reflect definite similarities. The photographs that do portray events and movement include changing camps, dances and war parties. These photographs are of planned events; no photograph portrays a chaotic event. This calmness in the photographs helps to promote Curtis's purpose of portraying Native Americans as a people adhering to preordained cultural traditions, as relics worth saving (Lyman 1982:80-1). This is not to say that all of the photographs, in reality, were planned or show smoothly running events. Because we are the outside observers of a culture with which we are unfamiliar, the still-frame photograph presents an aura of calm monumentality for events (Lyman 1982:90-1).

For example, in Curtis's photograph *Atsina War Party, 1908* (Figure 8), he shows numerous men riding on horseback, clearly at barely a trot, across a small hill on the Plains. This photograph does not communicate to us whether or not the men feel outnumbered, whether or not their success will affect their status back at home, or even whether or not it is normal for the Atsina to even have a war party. All of this information is lost in the still-frame photography, thus portraying order, where there, in fact, may be much disorder.

The third post-modernist critique of anthropology by Clifford and Marcus as identified by Polier and Roseberry (1989), is that ethnographers use individuals to represent the whole. Curtis was attempting to give a succinct history and cultural account of entire tribal groups. He makes the individuals he chose to photograph represent the entirety of the group, and he often used photographs to illustrate a "type" that tribe. *The*

Figure 8

Apache, 1906 (Figure 9) reinforced the common ideals held about Native Americans as a “race,” invoking romantic aesthetic styles (Lyman 1982:82). *A Yuma Type, 1907* (Figure 10) produced a little later in Curtis’s career, holds more to the tradition of anthropometric photography. From its caption, it is evident Curtis made this man represent the Yuma as a whole, and he posed and paid the man to be in this photograph (Lyman 1982:85).

In addition to Curtis portraying individuals as types of a tribe, groups he subsumed under the same tribal label in his photographs, often did not live together in one community, and often had distinct customs and differences of opinion. Whether Curtis only photographed one of these groups or many and represented them as being definitively part of the same culture could greatly affect the viewers’ interpretations of the people, portraying an individual not only as a representative of his group, but of multiple groups.

Beyond the representation of each tribal group, one individual seemed to come to represent all Native Americans. This person was *Chief Joseph, 1903* (Figure 11) of the Nez Percé. Curtis produced numerous photographs of Chief Joseph in his life, and thus *Chief Joseph, 1903* (Figure 11, also see Figures 22 and 23), as a noble savage, brave leader, headdress adorned Plains Indian, came very much to represent Native Americans as a whole to much of the public. Photographs of Chief Joseph are featured in a multiplicity of sources, including bookmarks, calendars, postcards, and compilation books. Chief Joseph was well known for his involvement in Indian affairs across the country and his willingness to speak out against the taking of the people’s lands and about how his people had been treated by the U.S. government (Hausman and Kapoun 1995; Makepeace 2001). This popularity probably contributed to the interest in his image.

Figure 9

Figure 10

Figure 11

Thus Curtis was not the only one using an individual to represent a complete picture of Native Americans.

Reaction to and Deconstruction of the Post-Modernist Critique

These post-modern critics seem to agree that anthropologists are unable to derive an objective description of a culture. Post-modernists believe that in the past, subjective lenses, which they proclaim were often intentionally set into place, tainted ethnography. Contradictorily, post-modernists also believe that objectivity dehumanizes the subjects (D'Andrade 1995). This is apparent in Curtis's photographs, with his posing, costuming and framing. One author states that "He (Curtis) is overrated....because his view of Native Americans is just that: *his* view. Romanticized and lyrical, it has become ours as well" (Buckland 2001:34).

I believe that the critiques by post-modernists are flawed. One of the central tropes in anthropology is to evaluate groups from a culturally relative point of view. This means that actions taken in a culture should not be evaluated from the morals and rules of the investigator, but rather from the rules of proper conduct within the culture, and I believe this should apply to our critiques of anthropological work as well. Curtis was correct in evaluating the culture according to the accepted methods of his time. Props, posing and re-enactment were accepted methods in salvage ethnographic photography, practiced by others such as DeLancey Gill (Fleming and Luskey 1986:178, 180, 190-1), Alfred Cort Haddon (Edwards 2001:165-7, Gidley 1998:157-9), Frank La Roche and Frank H. Nowell (Gidley 1998:64).

Post-modernists raise an important question: can we evaluate past anthropological work in terms of our current methods, or do we need to be culturally relative when critiquing past anthropological work? If we choose the first option, and evaluate work according to our current rules and methodology in anthropology, we will determine that many past anthropological works were “flawed.” This can teach us how our theories and methods have developed and “improved” over time, and can also make us aware of where our bias might be in current anthropological work and help us overcome them. However, if we come to the conclusion that the past work is “flawed” and therefore not viable in our collection of work, we lose primary sources of information from the past. If we choose the second option and take a culturally relative stance in critiquing past anthropologists, we learn what views and goals shaped anthropological work, and is possibly still shaping our own. By knowing what framework the anthropologists were building on, we can extract the framework, and look at the information that is left, and apply our own interpretative methods to the material. This paper aims to reinterpret the material that Curtis gathered, and show how past work can be informative, rather than losing these valuable primary resources.

The post-modernist critique of anthropology as a form of oppression brings forth the issue of evaluating his work from the viewpoints of his era. He was continuing a widely accepted tradition (Edwards 2001:169-172), and despite his respect for indigenous people, Curtis himself was also quite racist. He was often derogatory of Native Americans’ abilities and intelligence, but he also respected and was in awe of the “noble savage” in touch with nature. For example, Curtis wrote in *The North American Indian*: “Physically the Mohave are probably superior to any other tribe in the United States.

Man and women alike are big-boned, well knitted, clear skinned. Mentally they are dull and slow—brothers to the ox” (Curtis quoted in Lyman 1982:83). He also states, “It is true that advancement demands the extermination of these wild, care-free, picturesque Indians...however...we can scarcely justify the method used in this extermination” (Curtis in Lyman 1982:79). This is important to realize when viewing Curtis’s photographs in order to understand why he felt posing and re-enactment were necessary. If “Indians” were only “Indian” when acting in absence of “Western” influence, and these “Native” traditions were disappearing, then a salvage ethnographic work would only include the photos of the disappearing “Indian” qualities.

So, was Curtis oppressing, or helping the Native Americans? He was oppressing them, in that he did propagate stereotypes that Native peoples were simple, unchanging and inferior people. However, through his work he also raised interest in Native Americans and their situation among powerful people. One of the most prominent of these was President Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt wrote in a letter to Curtis in December, 1905:

You are doing a service which is much as if you were able suddenly to reproduce in their minute detail the lives of the men who lived in Europe in the unpolished stone period. The publication of the proposed volumes and portfolios, dealing with every phase of Indian life among all tribes yet in primitive condition, would be a monument to American constructive scholarship and research of a value quite unparalleled (Roosevelt in Lyman 1982:60).

Roosevelt still held degrading and stereotypical views of Native Americans as primitive, but the important part of this quote is that he sees *value* in the work Curtis was doing. By helping Roosevelt see Native Americans as a type of resource, Curtis helped change Roosevelt’s opinion of Native Americans, whereby he had said, “I don’t go so far as to think that the only good Indians are the dead Indians, but I believe nine out of every ten

are, and I shouldn't inquire too closely into the case of the tenth" (Roosevelt in Lyman 1982:59). While Roosevelt was still racist, and saw the Native Americans as a resource and not as people, it raises the question as to whether it was better for him to see them as vermin or as a profitable commodity. By endearing Roosevelt to his work, Curtis may have prevented even harsher treatments of Native peoples during the westward expansion. For example, when Charlie Day and Daniel Holmes Mitchell wrote to Roosevelt complaining of infringement of Navajo peoples' rights, the unjustly imprisoned Navajos, were soon released (Gidley 1998:85-6). Perhaps Curtis's photos played a small part in this, despite the fact that Curtis himself was not influential publicly during this time.

In the emotionally turbulent sixties, the youth of the nation resurrected Curtis's photographs in their search for the true American experience, and the interest in his photographs would wax and wane over the next decades. Romanticized views of Native peoples became common. Curtis's prints donned the walls of people's homes as they "connected" with the discontent that the Native Americans must have felt (Lyman 1982:12). Native American reactions to this renewed interest were conflicting. Some saw it as an opportunity to "universalize the nobility and wisdom suggested there and claim it as a natural, sometimes even a genetic, Indian trait" (Lyman 1982:13). Others believed that this pristine view of Native peoples was harmful to their cause, knowing that in the past, interest in Native issues had risen only to fall again sharply as people failed in their promises (Lyman 1982:13). This point is driven home when one author, intent on making a film about Curtis's work, met with some members of the Piegan tribe

to gain permission. She was asked, “How come people like you come here with such good intentions but what they make is such shit?” (Makepeace 2001:191).

Application of and Concluding Remarks about Post-Modernism

Post-modernists think anthropologists need to be more sensitive to the role their ethnographies play (Polier and Roseberry 1989:246). Post-modernists believe that anthropologists have made themselves the experts on cultures and given themselves power, thus tainting what should be the goal of anthropology, which is to provide an informative fiction of a culture (Polier and Roseberry 1989). The post-modernists believe that objective models are dehumanizing and that they proclaim to be the “truth” when none exists (D’Andrade 1995:556-7).

Many of the post-modernists’ criticisms of anthropology are well-founded. Post-modernism is the dominant theory in current anthropology (Trawick 2002:ix-x). Without addressing Curtis’s work in relation to these critiques, they can easily discard his work and any valuable content is lost. However, the postmodernists seem to spend most of their time saying that past ethnographies are irrelevant, rather than trying to deconstruct them as they say is possible, and deducing what has been beneficial. I found that Stocking (1992) does this to an extent with Malinowski’s work, as does Kramer (1996) with respect to the Hopi potter Nampeyo, but neither one does it in a reactionary method to post-modernist critique. Not only do post-modernists seem fixated on discrediting past works, but not nearly enough effort has been spent producing modern ethnographies from a post-modernist perspective that might illustrate the benefits of their perspective.

The post-modernists' critiques of anthropology actually destroys their own theoretical discourse. The purpose of anthropology has been to portray cultures as accurately as possible, while acknowledging that the perspective is only partial (McGee and Warms 2000:520). If post-modernists say that objectivity is impossible and dehumanizing, and that the only solution is to use "dialogic" writing, which is fiction, then, the work produced is completely subjective (Polier and Roseberry 1989:253-6). Thus the work is no longer ethnography, and has the same flaws as the work of previous anthropologists: it is a work guided too much by the goals and influences of the anthropologist. If their critiques indicate that a flaw of Curtis's work is that it is subjective and fictional, then their argument is teleological and suggests that Curtis did nothing wrong by applying his subjective views to his photographs.

Post-modernists also promote using a "collage" method to portray a culture (Polier and Roseberry 1989). Yet they argue that, in the past, anthropologists focused too much on individuals as representations of the whole. If they simply use "fragments" to produce their "collage," post-modernists are doing exactly the same thing they accuse others of doing. If the post-modernists think that the only way to conduct a proper ethnography is to use "fragments" (i.e. individuals) and collage them, then their critique of Curtis representing the whole of a culture through individuals is contradictory.

Despite these critiques, post-modernism does bring forth important things for anthropologists to consider. Avoidance of presenting societies as though they are static is an important consideration when writing ethnography. While the ethnographer can only observe what is occurring at a particular moment in time, it would be inaccurate and demeaning to present a group of people as though they are preserved relics of the past,

which Curtis does in his work by removing evidence of “western” influence and primarily photographing people in “Indian” attire rather than their “western” dress. It is also beneficial for ethnographers to keep in mind that not everything is purposeful and done according to a set plan; disorder in society does occur. Also, the individual cannot be portrayed as the whole. Numerous interviews should be done, and while not all participants in a culture can be included (especially because some voices clamor for attention more than others), it is important to give a broad range of data and to openly admit that the way this person does something is not the way that everyone does it. While Curtis took multiple photographs of people, thus giving a broader range of perspective than the individual, he purposely omitted certain categories of images. These include the “western” style of living, wage labor and utilization of modern transportation.

Post-modernism is an important theoretical perspective that can be used effectively in ethnography, but I conclude that anthropologists need to avoid taking the theory too far. They cannot completely ignore past ethnographic research simply because it was not done according to their preferred theory. If they ignore Curtis’s work they are ignoring the history of anthropology, despite the fact that these same post-modernists say that the ethnographer should never ignore the history of the culture being studied (Lewis 1998:722-3). Application of the post-modernist theory to Curtis’s photographs needs to occur if post-modernism is going to help further the discipline of anthropology. If anthropologists apply these models to Curtis’s work, information can be derived that is beneficial to understanding Native American lifeways in the early twentieth century.

Chapter Five-Reconstruction

Introduction to Reconstruction

This section focuses on utilizing Curtis's photographs to see what ethnohistorical data we can draw from them. The purpose of this analysis is not only to show value in Curtis's photographs alone, but also to show how an analysis of any ethnographic work can produce informative details. Despite all of Curtis's efforts to remove "western" culture from his photos, and our knowledge of the vast amounts of props used, careful scrutiny can reveal whether or not elements were props, and in this way can provide information about Native Americans living in the early twentieth century. I will do this by comparing multiple photographs and contrasting their presented elements in an attempt to remove the layers of subjectivity imposed by Curtis. I will base an analysis on these results, and then compare my findings to other ethnographic information to assess the accuracy of the analysis.

I have evaluated the "faults" of Curtis's photographs from a post-modernist ethnographic perspective to show why current anthropologists can be so quick to discard his work. As noted previously, however, we should not disregard these photographs based on these criticisms. This paper proposes that in order to derive useful cultural information from Edward Curtis's photographs, it is necessary to "peel back the layers" to remove Curtis's interpretation and influence over the photograph (which according to post-modernism, is a moot point because objectivity does not exist) (Crapanzano 1986). However, we learn nothing about cultures if we discard every work with which critics find "faults". We need to critically evaluate Curtis's photographs in order to discover the

kinds of contributions they can give to our understanding of Native American cultures within their historical context. We need to recognize that re-enactment and posing in ethnographic photographs during the late 1800s-early 1900s was connected to intellectual validity, objectivity and the scientific method (Edwards 2001:158). Thus, Curtis as photographer was doing work “correctly” for his time period. Also, careful scrutiny of the photographs to determine which elements can be peeled back can reveal evidence of the different elements that Curtis so rigorously sought to exclude from his photographs, elements that show the changing nature of Native American peoples in the early twentieth century.

In order to pursue this reconstruction of Curtis’s photographs, I first found it necessary to consider Curtis’s photographs according to subject matter. I deem this essential because, by comparing photographs of similar subject matter, we can determine what elements are consistently present and what elements are consistently absent.

I found that Curtis’s photographs fall chiefly into one of six major categories, with subcategories of “posed” and “natural” for each subcategory: portraits, ceremonies, “everyday life,” housing, scenery, and travel. For the purpose of this analysis, I will discuss selected images from two categories: portraits and “everyday life.” The high frequency of props and re-enactment used in these photographs makes them more difficult to deconstruct and at the same time, more revealing to reconstruct. By critically evaluating the photographs, Curtis’s subjective influences can be revealed and removed to show details that give us information about the life of Native Americans in the early 1900s.

Portraits

Curtis was well-known for his portraits of Native Americans. Posed, with grand lighting effects and soft expressions, the portraits are thought to have given a face to Native peoples (Adam 1999:37). They were very popular with the public-at-large once interest in his photographs exploded in the 1960s (Lyman 1982:11-2). In order to examine in detail what Curtis's photographs can actually reveal about Native Americans, I will compare them with each other and scrutinize them individually to draw conclusions.

I will conduct this analysis by comparing photographs sometimes by tribal group as Curtis defined them, and sometimes across groups to compare similar elements of clothing across a broad range of his photographs. My theory here is that similar or dissimilar elements in style of dress within a particular group should reveal what was an indigenous cultural element, and what was a prop used by Curtis. Similar stylistic clothing elements that are identifiably not the same piece, will suggest that particular element is indigenous. Similarly, elaborate clothing elements that can be shown to match other stylistic elements within that culture, and that do not appear in Curtis's photographs of other tribes, also will suggest that the clothing item is an indigenous part of that culture's tradition in the early 1900s. It should be noted that although this analysis may reveal that clothing worn in a portrait is part of the cultural tradition when the portrait was taken, it does not imply that the clothing is a cultural relic. Conversely, comparisons will be done to show that, while a design may be unique to a culture, similarities to clothing worn by other groups may suggest that the wearer adapted the clothing in order to appear more "Indian" to a white audience. If the clothing is particularly unique to a

group, it will suggest that it is an indigenous part of that group. If the analysis shows similarities between clothing in different groups, it will suggest contact with groups has affected stylistic preferences. Conversely, extreme decorative differences within a culture will suggest that the different item is a Curtis prop.

I chose portraits due to their prominence in republished works of Curtis's photography for the general public and their portrayal of a "stereotypical Indian" (Berkhofer 1978). This analysis of these portraits will show that, while initially they appear to represent the "stereotypical Indian," upon closer inspection, they contain relevant data pertaining to Native American life in the early 1900s.

Wishham Portraits (Figures 12-13, 15-17)

Portraits of the Wishham, also known as Wishram or Tlakluit, their name for themselves (Dictionary 1993), form the first group of analyzed photographs. One of the most frequently encountered portrait of a person identified as Wishham by Edward Curtis is entitled *Wishham Bride, 1910* (Figure 12). A similar and also frequently encountered photograph is entitled *Wishham Girl, 1910* (Figure 13). While the photographs are clearly of two different Wishham women, they are wearing very similar headdresses, shirts and necklaces. The headdresses, in particular, could not be conclusively determined to be different items. They are identified as being composed of shells, shell beads, commercial beads and Chinese coins (Coleman and McLuhan 1972:xv). The text says that girls between the age of puberty and marriage wore these headdresses for special occasions (Coleman and McLuhan 1972:xv). We know that such coins reached the Columbia River region at an early date (Coleman and McLuhan 1972:xv), thus

Figure 12

Figure 13

justifying their quality of “Indianness.” Questions arise, though, with knowledge of Curtis’s frequent usage of props in photographs: was the headdress truly a part of Wishham culture, or was it a prop?

When Curtis used props, he was not always particular about which tribes wore which items. An example is in Curtis’s photographs *Sitting Owl-Hidatsa, 1908* (Figure 14a) and *Little Dog-Brulé, 1907* (Figure 14b), in which these two men from different tribes are wearing the same buckskin outfit that Curtis carried around with him on his photographic tour (Lyman 1982:94-5).

However, the elaborate headdresses shown on the Wishham women do not reappear in any of Curtis’s other photographs. I found a total of twenty-one photographs of Wishham peoples on a website run by the Library of Congress, which proclaims to provide access to all of the photographs Curtis published in *The North American Indian* (Library of Congress 2001). The headdress did not appear on any of the other Wishham peoples. I also searched the database to find if the headdress appeared on any woman with other tribal affiliations, and it did not.

Evidence that this headdress was indeed an authentic piece of Wishham culture comes from a photo entitled *Wishham Child, 1909* (Figure 15), which is less frequently encountered in collections of Curtis’s photographs. In this photograph, a small child wears a sash of beadwork and coins made in the same style as the headdress, shirts and jewelry worn by the women. This sash does not seem to reappear in any of Curtis’s other photographs. Therefore, I suggest that this type of beadwork and usage of coins was, in fact, a part of Wishham culture. This may not have been an item of everyday wear

Figure 14

Figure 15

though, for even Curtis noted that the Wishham reserved the headdress for special occasions (Coleman and McLuhan 1972:xv).

This conclusion drawn from viewing Curtis's Wishham photographs can be validated from other sources. Edward Sapir did his initial field work on the Wishham in 1905, shortly prior to Curtis's photographs, and published an ethnography with Leslie Spier on the group in 1930. According to Sapir and Spier (1930: 27) the Wishham did decorate their hair with trade beads, dentalium shells and Chinese coins, although I found no specific mention of bridal headdresses. The *Encyclopedia of American Indian Costume* describes numerous tribes' traditional clothing. This resource acknowledges the change in clothing over time, showing the authors' attention to the changing nature of traditional dress, and tracing changes through contact with other Native American groups and Europeans. This resource cites Sapir and Spier's work as being one of its primary sources, and under "Wishram" and the subtopic of "Headgear," the *Encyclopedia* notes that

Beautiful wedding caps were made of multicolored beads and dentalium shells...from a velvet crown the beads and shells were festooned in long strands down the back and at the sides. Worn with the cap was a wedding veil, also of beads and dentalium shells, as well as bells, coins and other trinkets (Paterek 1994:233).

In addition to this description, which matches Curtis's photographs, the *Encyclopedia* illustrates Wishram dress with Curtis's photograph *Wishram Bride, 1910* (Figure 12). This, combined with the unlikely event that Curtis would use Chinese coins in a prop because they would not appear "Indian," suggests that the headdresses were part of the Wishham culture in the early twentieth century.

Additional investigation of Curtis's photographs through both books and

mainly the *Library of Congress* (2001) website supports the conclusion that the headdresses are part of indigenous Wishham culture. The shirts worn by some of the Wishham women are of similar design or style as the headdresses. These could be a prop of Curtis's, however, if the detailed designs on the shirts are different, but the style of the overall shirt is the same, it suggests that the shirts were individually made items that were part of Wishham culture.

I selected four photographs in which three women of the Wishham tribe wear this style of shirt: *Wishham Bride, 1910* (Figure 12), *Wishham Girl, 1910* (Figure 13), *Wishham Maid, 1909* (Figure 16), and *Wishham Girl-Profile, 1910* (Figure 17). *Wishham Girl, 1910* (Figure 13) and *Wishham Girl-Profile, 1910* (Figure 17) are two angles of the same woman. *Wishham Girl-Profile, 1910* (Figure 17) instead of *Wishham Girl, 1910* (Figure 13) in this discussion. In order to determine whether or not these garments were the same in each photograph, the beadwork pattern from the shoulder, down over the top of the arm, was compared; and this is more visible in *Wishham Girl-Profile, 1910* (Figure 17). This part of the shirt has the most intricate visible patterns of the garment, thus lending itself best for comparison. While there are other features of the garment that could be discussed, the purpose of this analysis is solely to show whether the shirts these three women wore are the same or different. Thus a comparison of only one detailed part of each shirt is needed to come to a definite conclusion.

In the first photograph, *Wishham Bride, 1910* (Figure 12), very little can be seen of the top arm piece of the garment, but from what can be seen, it is clear that the pattern involves patterns of beads that are outlined all the way around with light beads, and the

Figure 16

Figure 17

center composed of dark beads. In *Wishham Maid, 1909* (Figure 16), the beaded top of the sleeve is patterned light and dark colored beads, with a single color per row, in a rough triangular shape, over a dark background. In the third photograph, *Wishham Girl-Profile, 1910* (Figure 17), the patterns of these beads are horizontal and linear. The pattern alternates between approximately fifteen rows of light colored beads, to a space that might be either leather or dark beads, to two rows of light beads, to the dark space and then repeats with fifteen rows of light colored beads. A large piece of triangular cloth borders this line of beads on either side.

In *Wishham Bride, 1910* (Figure 12), the beads are not in solid color rows, but form outlines and filled-in parts of what appear to be geometric shapes. In *Wishham Maid, 1909* (Figure 16), the beads were in patterned solid color rows, but in geometric triangular shapes. In *Wishham Girl-Profile, 1910* (Figure 17), all the beads are organized in alternating patterned solid color rows.

From this examination of the beaded shirts it appears that these garments are not the same. I did not find these garments on any of Curtis's non-Wishham subjects, and it is highly unlikely that Curtis would have used three different intricately patterned over-shirts as props in a single two-year span, because other evidence suggests he reused props. It seems likely that these women are wearing their own clothing and these garments were part of the Wishham cultural tradition of the time.

Sapir and Spier's work gives more definitive information on these "shirts" than the headdresses. He says that the women wore long dresses made out of buckskin and "A heavy beaded yoke...crossing the shoulders and extending down on breast and back. The dress was gathered with a beaded belt" (Sapir and Spier 1930:206-7). Especially when

looking at the photograph *Wishham Maid, 1909* (Figure 16), this “shirt” does appear to be a yoke overlaying a dress. Using the *Encyclopedia of American Indian Costume* again, this conclusion is verified. As mentioned, the *Encyclopedia* uses Curtis’s photograph *Wishham Bride, 1910* (Figure 12) as an example of traditional Wishham dress and cites Sapir and Spier’s work. Under “Women’s basic dress” it reads, “Later, reflecting Plains influence, the women wore an ankle-length dress of tanned leather in the two-skin style, with the deer tail retained in the yoke...The yoke was heavily beaded in a lazy-stitch technique” (Paterek 1994:233). This quote is important because it identifies the beaded “shirts,” which we now know were part of a dress, as part of the Wishham culture. Interesting to note is that the *Encyclopedia* acknowledges the Plains as the source of this style of Wishham clothing. In the future, it would be interesting to note similarities between the beaded outfits of the Wishham with any styles that may occur with Plains tribes.

Portraits with Headdresses (Figures 18, 20-31)

As previously mentioned, Curtis was well-known for using props in his portraits. Headdresses were and are considered stereotypical Native American dress elements (Newcomb 1974:91) because the “generic tribesman of the Plains” had become “the new quintessential image of the Native American in White eyes” by the late 1800s (Berkhofer 1978:97). We know that Curtis used at least two headdresses or “bonnets” as props in his photographs (Lyman 1982:110, 143). One, illustrated in Figure 19a, was used in two photographs, *Yellow Bull-Nez Percé, 1905* (Figure 18a) and *Nez Percé Warrior, 1905* (Figure 18b). The second one was used in the photographs *Pipe Stem-Oto, 1927* (Figure

Figure 18

Figure 19a

Figure 19b

Figure 19c

Figure 19d

20a) and *Wakonda-Oto, 1927* (Figure 20b). While the Oto headdresses are mentioned here as an example of reusing a headdress in two photographs, they will not be discussed in the following analysis because it may be a prop, and the fact that no other Oto portraits are common in the republication of Curtis's photographs, making comparison difficult.

However, questions remain concerning the use of these "bonnets" as props. Were the "bonnets" that Curtis used in these photographs Curtis's "props" or were they headdresses that the Native American men themselves owned? The two bonnets were reused only within the same Native American group, so it is possible that the bonnet was a piece the tribal group owned. Alternatively, Curtis may have been sensitive to the manner in which people were going to receive his photographs, so he purposefully reused bonnets only within a single tribe. A second question is: were the bonnets/headdresses used in his photographs a historical relic of the tribe, a developing style through the tribes' decisions and interactions with other groups, or did these men adapt them to appear more "Indian?"

As with the previous analysis of the Wishham portraits, this analysis of headdresses will focus on determining if other headdresses Curtis used in his portraits are the same or different, and if different headdress associated with the same tribe have similarities that suggest stylistic elements particular to that tribe. Only one blatant difference needs to be identified to determine if two headdresses are different. When identifying what elements are similar within or between groups, I will consider multiple decorative elements.

In order to compare these photographs, headbands were focused on as well as the feathers or other items attached to the headdress. These headbands have detailed, visible

Figure 20

patterns and shades of color that particularly lent themselves to comparison. Aside from the original photos, schematic drawings were made of headband design and additional information for the headdresses worn by Native American men discussed in this paper, in Figure 19 for ease of comparison.

I chose a total of fifteen portraits for this comparison. They were chosen due to their frequency in republished books of Curtis's work, and due to the visibility of the detail of headdresses in the photographs. These photographs span eight different tribal groups by Curtis's labels, but later analysis using outside resources will show that many considered two of these groups to be the same.

First I will compare the Nez Percé bonnets, because portraits of Nez Percé men wearing bonnets are frequently encountered in republished works, and the presence of the "prop" shown in Figure 18, peaks curiosity if all of the Nez Percé bonnets were props. Because multiple Nez Percé portrait photographs are found in republished works, there are ample photographs with which to compare the "prop" headdress. In addition, the prominence of Chief Joseph in the public eye raises curiosity as to whether he dresses according to the Nez Percé manner, or according to what the public expected.

Next, I will discuss the Apsaroke bonnets. They also were chosen due to the frequent appearance of headdresses on Curtis's Apsaroke subjects, but also because of the previous discussion of *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figure 4a) and *A.B. Upshaw-Interpreter, 1898* (Figure 4b) which show him both in stereotypical "Indian" dress, and in "western" dress, which raises curiosity if in *Upshaw* (Figure 4a) he had donned a prop owned by Curtis, or one he himself owned. In addition, as later discussion will show, the

Apsaroke were a part of the Crow, whom many scholars considered to have invented the “warbonnet.” If they supposedly invented it, was it still a part of their culture?

Lastly, additional tribal groups will be introduced to compare styles across groups to help determine if the warbonnets were individually styled according to tribe, or if they were extremely similar and either Curtis “props” or headdresses the men had adapted in order to appear more “Indian.” I chose these photographs due to the frequency they appeared in republished works of Curtis’s photographs, and based on how clearly I could see the details of the headdresses.

Five portraits were used in the comparison of Nez Percé: *Yellow Bull-Nez Percé, 1905* (Figure 18a) and *Nez Percé Warrior, 1905* (Figure 18b), the details of which are illustrated in Figure 19a; *A Typical Nez Percé, 1910* (Figure 21, details in Figure 19b); *Chief Joseph Nez Percé, 1903* (Figure 22, details in Figure 19c); unidentified Nez Percé in *Chief Joseph, Edmund Meany, and Unidentified Nez Percé, 1903* (Figure 23, details in Figure 19d).

In all but the repeated design in Figure 19a (Figure 18), the headdresses share the following characteristics: the feathers closest to the headband are white with bound bottoms; and in designs of Figures 19c and d (Figures 22-23) and apparently those in Figure 19b as well (Figure 21), the feathers are distinctly eagle feathers. The design of the headbands comprise of small beadwork with relatively simple geometric designs, involving versions of crosses, pyramids and diamonds. In the designs of Figures 19c and d (Figures 22-23), white and dark feathers, smaller than the larger feathers on the rest of the headdress, hang from either side of the headband in front of the wearers’ ears. In the

Figure 21

Figure 22

Figure 23

design of Figure 19b (Figure 21), strips of light colored fur hang from either side of the headband in front of the ears.

In contrast to these characteristics, the design in Figure 19a (Figure 18) has fur strips hanging from the headband, but are attached far in the back, noticeably far behind the ears. No bound feathers are present at the top of the headband, and the feathers that are attached are neither white nor large. Instead, attached to the headband, is a row of medium colored, short feathers, preceded by a row of slightly longer, dark feathers. In both photographs, Curtis positioned the person and cropped the picture in such a way that the rest of the headdress beyond the headband is not visible. Thus the viewer does not know if the rest of the bonnet consists of long eagle feathers like in many of the other photographs, or if the headdress simply consists of a couple of rows of short feathers.

Important to take into consideration is the design of Figure 19a (Figure 18) in comparison to the designs of Figures 19b, c, and d (Figures 21-23). The headband is very wide around the forehead, and consists of a much “busier” design than those on the other headbands. Multiple geometric styles are used, and the headband appears to be composed of both beadwork and ribbon or thread work. This ribbon or thread is at the uppermost portion of the headband, and appears to be a plaid design utilizing multiple colors.

Based on these comparisons, it appears that the headdress worn by the men in Figures 18a and 18b (Figure 19a), was indeed one of Curtis’s props, and perhaps not even a Nez Percé bonnet. The style of the headdress is completely different from those worn by the other Nez Percé men: it has a busier and more colorful headband utilizing styles other than beadwork; it lacks the bound large white feathers at the top point of meeting

with the headband; and feather or fur strips are placed on the sides of the headband behind the ears.

The other three headdresses, on the other hand, do not appear to have been part of Curtis's prop wardrobe: Figure 19b (Figure 21) displays pyramid, rectangle and cross patterns; the design in Figure 19c (Figure 22) displays pyramid and diamond patterns; and the design in Figure 19d (Figure 23) displays solely cross patterns. The overlapping usage of the same basic geometric designs suggests that these headdresses were all made within the same cultural context. This is in addition to the usage of the similarly bound white eagle feathers, and the placement of décor on the sides of the headbands in front of the ears of the subjects. All of these similarities suggest these were headdresses of individual design made within the Nez Percé stylistic tradition, not props from Curtis.

Figure 19 also illustrates the designs of the headbands and other details of the “stereotypical” headdresses worn by Apsaroke men, illustrated in Figure 19e (Figure 24), Figure 19f (Figure 25) and Figure 19g (Figure 26). These designs come from the portraits *Fog in the Morning-Apsaroke, 1908* (Figures 19e and 24), *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figures 19f and 25) and *Bull Chief-Apsaroke, 1908* (Figures 19g and 26). I chose headdresses worn by the Apsaroke men for comparison for two major reasons. The first is that in his photograph, Curtis shows Upshaw as stereotypically “Indian,” but in a photograph by Rinehart, Upshaw appears in “western” dress (See Figure 4). This raises the question of whether or not the headdress Upshaw wears is his own, or one of Curtis's props. Second, the name Apsaroke is what the Crow Indians call themselves (Dictionary 1993), and outside research indicates that some scholars believe that the Crow invented the warbonnet (Paterek 1994: 109). If the Apsaroke invented the warbonnet, was it still a

Figure 24

Figure 25

Figure 26

part of their cultural tradition, or had the tradition of headdresses been lost and then “rediscovered” in order to appear more “Indian?”

The two Apsaroke headdresses in *Fog in the Morning, 1908* (Figures 19e and 24) and *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figures 19f and 25) are extremely similar in design. Both are composed of designs of small beads. The design is virtually the same, depicting three triangles/pyramids of a darker colored bead against a background of a very light colored bead. One triangle/pyramid rests on the center of the forehead, and the other two are evenly spaced on either side. Both headdresses show fur strips on either side of the headband, hanging in front of the ears. The feathers of the headdress are not bound, as was the case in many of the Nez Percé headdresses, but rather, the feathers meeting at the headband are downy feathers and are very textured, as opposed to the smooth feathers of the Nez Percé headdresses.

However, these two Apsaroke headdresses are not the same. While both display triangle/pyramid geometric designs, the triangles/pyramids in *Fog in the Morning-Apsaroke, 1908* (Figure 19e and 24) have very wide bases, with small spaces left between the separate triangles/pyramids. In the design from *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figure 19f and 25), the triangles have much smaller bases, with more space between them on the headband. In *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figure 19f and 25), at least seven fur strips are present on one side of the headband, while in *Fog in the Morning, 1908* (Figures 19e and 24), there appear to be only two. Thus it seems clear that these headdresses were not the same, and that there may have been stylistic preferences amongst the people of the Apsaroke tribe. This suggests that rather than these headdresses being props of Curtis’s, they were Apsaroke.

The headdress in *Bull Chief-Apsaroke, 1908* (Figures 19g and 26), differs in style from those worn by the other discussed Apsaroke photographs. A small beaded headband is topped by long fur and two buffalo horns. The photo is cropped and staged so that the back is not visible. However, the headband is comparable to the two other Apsaroke headdresses: it is composed of small beads and triangles/pyramids. There are more triangles/pyramids (n=5) visible on this headband than on the other two (n=3). The triangles have wide bases like those in *Fog in the Morning, 1908* (Figure 24 and Figure 19e), but are even wider, so that the bases of each triangle touch those of the neighboring triangle. Once again, the triangles are a darker colored bead, while the rest of the headband appears to be white beads, suggesting that at least this stylistic element was common among headdresses worn by Apsaroke men and that the horns and fur present in *Bull Chief-Apsaroke, 1908* (Figure 26 and Figure 19g) denote that he possesses a different status from the others or that this headdress fulfilled a different purpose than the others. This suggests that the Apsaroke men were wearing headdresses that were part of their cultural tradition because it is unlikely that all headdresses served the same purpose, and that differences would be present in the headdresses to show this. However, the continuation of the stylistic elements in the headbands shows that each headdress still carried similar elements of stylistic preference.

This analysis does not, however, indicate that these headdresses were cultural relics. Headdresses were symbols of a man's experience and success, and sweeping feathered designs were the most common (Newcomb 1974:91). Through other further comparisons, it will become clear that this style of headdress was common among many tribes who lived far distances from one another when Curtis was taking photographs.

This is being shown to illustrate through the photographs, the possibility that headdresses had been adopted by multiple tribes so to appear more “Indian” to the whites.

In order to ascertain from Curtis’s photographs whether headdresses were an indigenous cultural item, or were only worn to make the wearer appear more “Indian,” I analyzed portraits of men in headdresses from other tribes. If the details of the headdresses are extremely similar, this will suggest that the headdresses were adapted in order for the men to appear more “Indian,” but if I find significant differences, it will suggest that the tribe made each headdress using stylistic preferences privy to the tribe. Other tribal groups represented wearing headdresses in Curtis’s photographs in addition to the Nez Percé and Apsaroke, are the Cheyenne (Figure 19h and Figure 27), Brulé/Ogala/Teton Sioux (Figure 19i, 19j, 28 and 29), Jicarilla (Figure 19k and 30), and Piegan (Figure 19l and 31).

In the headdress worn in *The Old Cheyenne, 1927* (Figure 19h and 27), the headband is composed of small beads and is decorated by “step pyramids” and rectangles. The background of this design appears to be white beads. Bound eagle feathers, tipped in horsehair, adorn the headdress. Attached at the side of the headband are numerous strips of fur.

The Dictionary of Indian Tribes of America (1993) indicates that both the Ogala and the Brulé were sub-bands of the Teton Sioux, so I will discuss these together. There are two photographs for the Brulé/Ogala/Teton Sioux. These are *Crazy Thunder-Ogala, 1907* (Figure 19i and 28) and *High Hawk-Brulé, 1907* (Figure 19j and 29). In *Crazy Thunder* (Figure 19i and 28), the headband is composed of small beads on a background of light beads, and is patterned by triangles and rectangles. Downy feathers are attached

Figure 27

Figure 28

Figure 29

Figure 30

Figure 31

to the headband, but whatever succeeds those are cut-off in the photograph. On the sides of the headband, feathers are attached which hang down. In *High Hawk-Brulé, 1907* (Figure 19j and 29), the headband appears to be small beads, but the design is triangles composed of squares on a dark background. Attached to the headband are bound eagle feathers, tipped in horsehair, and feathers hang from the sides of the headband.

The "whites" called the Jicarilla by the name Apache, but the Jicarilla lived at the intersection of Apache, Pueblo and Plains peoples (Dictionary 1993). In the photograph *Chief Garfield-Jicarilla, 1904* (Figure 19k and 30), the headband appears to be made of dark leather or cloth, and attached are what appear to be "cotton-balls." The headdress is composed of eagle feathers, and from the angle of the picture, they seem to stand at an upwards angle, around the entire headdress. On many headdresses from other tribes, it was clear that the feathers at the back hung downwards. Since this photograph is a straight shot, his face symmetrical in the portrait, the orientation of the feathers is not definitive.

The Piegan tribe is a sub-band of the Blackfeet (Dictionary 1993), and the last headdress that will be used in this analysis is from *Weasel Tail-Piegan, 1900* (Figure 19L and 31). This headdress also has a headband that is composed of dark leather or cloth, and large studs decorate it. Eagle feathers without binding, adorn the headdress, appearing to stand straight up, but again, the angle of the photograph does not make this definitive. Attached to the sides of the headband are many strips of fur.

Table 1-Stylistic Elements Apparent in Headbands

*S=Solid, F=Filled, L=Light, D=Dark

Figure #	18	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	
Design Fig #	19a	19b	19c	19d	19e	19f	19g	19h	19i	19j	19k	19l	Total
Small Beads	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			10
Ribbon	X												1
Leather/ Cloth											X	X	2
Geometric Figures	Tri- angle/ Pyr- amid	S					X	X	X	X			4
		F		X	X				X	X	X		5
	Squar e/ Rec- tangle	S		X					X	X	X		4
		S		X		X							2
	Dia- mond	F			X								1
Alt. Color in one row		X							X				2
Alt. Color in Different Rows	X												1
Zig-Zag	X												1
Plaid	X												1
Back- ground	L		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				8
	D									X	X	X	3
Cotton-ball											X		1
Studs/ Large Beads												X	1
Feathers/ Headband			X	X					X	X			4
Fur/ Headband	X	X			X	X		X				X	6
Eagle Feathers			X	X				X		X	X	X	6
Binding		X	X	X				X		X			5
Horse Hair				X				X		X			3
Downy Feathers					X	X			X				3
Dark/ Short Feathers	X											X	2
Bells		X											1
Buffalo Horns- Top							X						1
Fur on Top							X						1

19a-Nez Percé, *Yellow Bull 1905* and *Nez Percé Warrior 1905*

19b-Nez Percé, *A Typical Nez Percé 1910*

19c-Nez Percé, *Chief Joseph 1903*

19d-Nez Percé, *Unidentified Nez Percé 1903*

19e-Apsaroke (Crow), *Fog in the Morning 1908*

19f-Apsaroke (Crow), *Upshaw 1905*

19g-Apsaroke (Crow), *Bull Chief 1908*

19h-Cheyenne, *The Old Cheyenne, 1927*

19i-Ogala (Teton Sioux), *Crazy Thunder 1907*

19j-Brulé (Teton Sioux), *High Hawk 1907*

19k-Jicarilla (Apache), *Chief Garfield 1904*

19l-Piegan (Blackfoot), *Weasel Tail 1900*

The headdresses in *Chief Garfield-Jicarilla, 1904* (Figures 19k and 30) and *Weasel Tail-Piegan, 1900* (Figures 19L and 31) are especially interesting. Small beads compose the headbands of all of the other headdresses shown in this analysis from the Nez Percé, Apsaroke, Cheyenne, and Brulé/Ogala/Teton Sioux. These two headbands are leather or cloth, with items attached to it, making the stylistic difference interesting. All of the details that have been mentioned in this discussion are illustrated in Table 1 for closer comparison, and further analysis.

In order to illustrate which elements of headdresses were frequently similar and which were uncommon, the frequency of design elements are shown in Table 1. From an inspection of Table 1, it is clear that five elements are more common than others in the headdresses: the use of small beads in the main design of the headband (n=10); the use of simple geometric figures in the headband (n=9), with triangles/pyramids most common (n=8); a light colored background on the headband (n=8); the use of fur strips attached to the side of the headband (n=6); and the use of eagle feathers in the headdress (n=6). All of these elements are present in the Cheyenne image (Figure 19h and 27). All but the fur strips attached to the side of the headband are present two of the Nez Percé images (Figures 19c, 19d, 22, and 23). In one of the Nez Percé images (Figure 19b and 21) and in two of the Apsaroke images (Figure 19e, 19f, 24, and 25), all but the eagle feathers are present.

The conclusion I draw from this analysis of Curtis's photographs is that extensive contact happened between many groups prior to Curtis's work so that they exchanged stylistic elements, that they all shared cultural elements due to similar lifestyles on the Plains, or many tribal groups adopted similar headdress styles in order to appear more

“Indian.” Thus, I hypothesize that all the discussed headdresses were part of the cultural tradition of the individual’s tribe, except for the Nez Percé headdress shown in Figures 18 and 19a.

Further research indicates styles of headdresses worn by these groups. Little was found indicating the precise geometric designs of the headbands, but other details were found. One resource indicated that the Nez Percé had borrowed the eagle feather headdresses of the Plains Indians (Haines 1955:44). Alice Fletcher and Jane Gay’s notes from being with the Nez Percé between 1889-92 include a photograph that shows a Nez Percé man wearing a large eagle feather and horse hair bonnet which trails to the ground (Gay 1981:insert), which is very similar in style to the headdresses worn in Curtis’s photographs of *Chief Joseph-Apsaroke, 1903* (Figures 19c and 22), the Unidentified Nez Percé in *Chief Joseph, Edmund Meany, and Unidentified Nez Percé, 1903* (Figures 19d and 23), and probably in *A Typical Nez Percé, 1910* (Figures 19b and 21), although all of this headdress is not visible in Curtis’s photograph.

Other references said that the Nez Percé wore headdresses that were “stand-up” warbonnets, with eagle feathers set in a beaded leather band and strips of ermine fur hanging on the sides (Paterek 1994:228). This is interesting to note because while the designs in Figures 19a and 19b (Figures 18 and 21) have fur strips hanging at the sides, long white eagle feathers are not evident. The designs in Figures 19c and 19d (Figures 22 and 23) use eagle feathers, but have feathers at the side instead of fur. Three of the four Nez Percé designs have beaded headbands, excluding only Figure 19a (Figure 18).

I would strongly suggest from these comparisons that the headdresses worn in Figures 21, 22 and 23 (Figures 19b, c, and d) were a part of the Nez Percé cultural

tradition of the early 1900s and that due to the extreme difference in design of those in Figure 18 that it was a Curtis prop. However, I found the caption that was included by Curtis with *Yellow Bull-Nez Percé, 1905* (Figure 18a and 19), and it read, “The war-bonnet of eagle-feathers, with pendant weasel-skins, as well as the otter-fur wrappings of his hair braids, indicates the extent to which the Nez Percés were influenced by the Indians of the prairies” (Library of Congress 2001). I find it difficult to believe that this vastly different styled headdress used twice in Curtis’s photographs is part of the Nez Percé cultural tradition. What this indicates to me, is that the headdress worn twice in Figures 18a and 18b (Figure 19a), was a prop owned by the Nez Percé men for the sole purpose of appearing more “Indian,” and that the Nez Percé headdresses in Figures 21, 22, and 23 (Figures 19b, c, and d) had some meaning in their design within the cultural context, and were a part of the cultural tradition, not solely worn to appear more “Indian.”

The Apsaroke, or Crow, wore warbonnets, and in an ethnography by Robert H. Lowie, published in 1912, in the midst of the time Curtis was taking his photographs, Lowie says that for some occasions, they wore buffalo horn headdresses, in combination with eagle feathers (Lowie 1912:202) and at other times men wore buffalo heads as masks (Lowie 1912:189). Lowie’s text mentions Crow wearing war-bonnets, but he gives no further details on them. Some scholars claim that the Crow invented the warbonnet (Paterek 1994:109). It may have been more characteristic for them to wear high-crown (stand-up) headdresses, entailing a circlet of feathers attached to a leather headband, and at times they attached buffalo or antelope horns with a long trail of feathers (Paterek 1994:109). The three examples of Apsaroke headdresses in this paper represent this diversity of design. *Fog in the Morning-Apsaroke, 1908* (Figures 19e and

24) and *Upshaw-Apsaroke, 1905* (Figures 19f and 25) are both wearing “stand-up” warbonnets, and *Bull Chief-Apsaroke, 1908* (Figure 26) is wearing buffalo horns attached to the headdress. Given this background information, and the before noted similar characteristics in geometric designs on the three headbands in these photographs, it can be concluded that the three evaluated Apsaroke headdresses were part of Apsaroke cultural tradition at the time they were photographed, and that the differences between the headdresses represent personal preference and differing status in the community.

In a Cheyenne ethnography published by George Grinnell in 1923, he states that some older men of the Cheyenne wore war-bonnets. They used the down feathers of eagles at the scalp, and regular eagle feathers in the rest of the headdress. Grinnell notes that they made the feathers stand upright around the head, and sometimes attached two long “tails” of feathers, so long that they trailed the ground. Horse hair was also used to tip the feathers (Grinnell 1923:222-3). This description seems to match *The Old Cheyenne, 1927* in Figure 27 (Figure 19h), even though Grinnell does not mention the fur strips shown in Figure 27 (Figure 19h), this ethnographic information suggests that this headdress was a part of Cheyenne cultural tradition of the early 1900s.

In reviewing ethnographies about the Brulé/Teton Sioux/Ogala, I came across conflicting accounts. An article by Wissler (1912) mentions numerous styles of war-bonnets/headdresses, but none match the Curtis photographs. Another resource said they wore huge warbonnets (headdresses), each feather representing a great deed that the man had done, and the greatest men wore buffalo horns on their headdress (Paterek 1994:138). This description matches *High Hawk-Brulé, 1907* (Figures 19j and 29). It may also match *Crazy Thunder-Ogala, 1907* (Figures 19i and 28), but this is difficult to determine

conclusively because the photograph is cropped too close to see the entire headdress. I can not draw a decisive conclusion due to inconsistencies in the ethnographic data.

The headdress of the Jicarilla (Apache) are said to have been in the typical Plains bonnet type (Paterek 1994:166), those which match the most common characteristics shown in Table 1, which are large, trail down the back, and use eagle feathers. However, the photograph *Chief Garfield, 1904* (Figures 19k and 30) does not match this description. His headdress has “cotton-balls” instead of beadwork, and has eagle feathers but no fur or feather decoration on the side. Additional research in past-ethnographies did not reveal any data for headdress styles of the Jicarilla Apache. Thus, I can not draw a conclusion about the accuracy of the headdress worn in Figure 27 (Figure 19k).

Clark Wissler wrote an ethnography published in 1913 on the Blackfeet. His text mentions war-bonnets frequently, but on one occasion he includes an illustration drawn by a Blackfoot known as Big-Brave. This headdress shows large studs/circles mounted around the headband, and feathers standing straight up (Wissler 1913:407). An additional illustration in Wissler’s ethnography of a headdress worn in the Horn Society is almost identical to the one worn in *Weasel Tail-Piegan, 1900* (Figures 19l and 31), only missing the large studs on the headband. Otherwise the feathers, fur, and other details in this illustration are identical to Figures 19l and 31 (Wissler 1913:414). This research proves conclusively that the Piegan headdress was part of the cultural tradition when Edward Curtis took his photograph in 1900.

From this analysis I can state with certainty that the headdress worn by the Piegan/Blackfoot man (Figures 19l and 31) was definitely a part of the Blackfoot cultural tradition in the early 1900s. It would also seem from these analyses that three of the four

Nez Percé headdresses (Figures 19b, 19c, 19d, 21, 22, and 23), all three Apsaroke (Crow) headdresses (Figures 19e, 19f, 19g, 24, 25, and 26), and the Cheyenne headdress (Figures 19h and 27) were probably part of their cultural tradition, but more research would be needed to say this with certainty. The analyses on one of the four Nez Percé headdresses (Figures 18 and 19a), both Brulé/Ogala/Teton Sioux headdresses (Figures 19i, 19j, 28 and 29), and the Jicarilla (Apache) headdress (Figures 19k and 30) are inconclusive due to minimal or conflicting ethnographic data to compare the stylistic elements against. However, it would seem from the numerous similarities between the headdresses of all the tribal groups discussed, and the stylistic differences present despite similarities, that either these groups had extensive contact with one another so that they exchanged stylistic elements, or that their similar lifestyles in the Plains contributed to similarities in headdress design.

“Everyday Life”

Hopi Pottery (Figures 32-40)

Many of Curtis’s photographs depict what he presented as the “everyday life” of the various Native American tribes he photographed. The photographs cover a wide range of subjects, from cooking and gathering food, to getting water, and doing skilled artisan activities. Taken alone, these photographs can tell us a good deal about Native American lifeways in the early twentieth century, especially if we can remove Curtis’s interventions to determine that the Native peoples are really doing what the photograph shows they are doing. In these images, as with the portraits, the analysis will show that

the task shown is part of the cultural tradition if elements of the task repeat themselves in numerous pictures.

I will analyze Curtis's photographs depicting "traditional" Native American artisan activities. Some of the possible artisan activities to evaluate include pottery making, basket weaving, blanket weaving, and painting. I selected photographs of pottery, pottery usage, and pottery making by the Hopi Indians because of Curtis's immense interest in the Hopi. He dedicated all of Volume 12 of *The North American Indian* to the Hopi (Makepeace 2001:15). Also, this volume contains many images of Hopi pottery making. Showing the process of production as well as pottery usage or pottery still-lives, gives greater support for the possibility that the pottery was a part of the Hopi cultural tradition. My working hypothesis here is that by comparing some of the forms and decoration of pottery, along with the methods of pottery making, similarities between photographs should be revealed. These similarities should show that the forms, decorations, and methods were indigenous parts of the Hopi cultural tradition in the early twentieth century.

I initially conducted some outside research because of an apparent contradiction in labeling of some of Curtis's photographs as "Hopi" and sometimes as "Walpai." The research revealed that Walpai or Walpi was a village that was occupied by Hopi people, not a different tribe (Kramer 1996).

Seven photographs were chosen for comparison due to their frequent occurrence in republished Curtis photographs, and the clarity with which the pottery could be seen: *The Potter-Hopi (Nampeyo), 1906* (Figure 32), *The Potter Mixing Clay – Hopi, 1921* (Figure 33), *Untitled (Nampeyo Painting)-Hopi, 1900* (Figure 34), *The Piki Maker –*

Hopi, 1906 (Figure 35), *Untitled (Girl with Jar) – Hopi, 1900* (Figure 36), *Evening in Hopi Land, 1906* (Figure 37), and *East Mesa Pottery-Hopi, 1921* (Figure 38). To begin the comparison, I analyzed pottery form, absent of any decoration. Figure 39 shows illustrations of the outlines of these forms as an aid in comparison. Rather than analyze exact size of vessels, more emphasis was placed on vessel proportion and the ratio of height to width, because scholars identified this ratio as relating more to vessel function (Rice 1987:215-7). Occasionally, however, the analysis will refer to size in general terms of small and large.

From Figure 39, it can be seen that the most frequent form in these seven photographs was Form A. This form was found in four of the seven photographs. This vessel form has a rather large orifice, a half to a third the width of the jar, with no independently applied lip to the orifice. From the orifice, the neck goes straight down, sloping in slightly to give the orifice a defined neck. This straight slope goes on for approximately an eighth of the jar's total height. The jar walls then slope outward to form broad shoulders. Form A at its widest point appears to measure approximately twice or triple the width of the orifice and the height to width ratio is 5-6:7. The sides then slope down from the shoulders to a flat base, which is slightly larger or the same size as the orifice. This jar form can appear in multiple sizes. In *Untitled Girl with Jar, 1900* (Figure 36), the opening of the jar appears to be at least the size of her hand, and the shoulders of the jar appear to be at least the width of her body. In *The Potter (Nampeyo), 1906* (Figure 32), however, the whole jar fits in her hand.

Other pottery pieces in these photographs have very similar forms, only except that they have smaller lips or none at all. These forms are shown in Figure 39B and C.

Figure 32

Figure 33

Figure 34

Figure 35

Figure 36

Figure 37

Figure 38

Figure 39a

Figure 39b

Form B has a much shorter neck than Form A, and the ratio of height to width shows a greater variation at 3-4:7. Form C has no neck and the height to width ratio is 3:7. Figures 39D, E, F, and G illustrate the next common form, in which the sides of the vessel only extend slightly from the orifice, making the orifice nearly as wide as the width of the jar itself. The height of the jar is not great, and at the closest ratio is 3:7 in Form E, and at its furthest is 1:4 in Form G. This form of jar has a flat bottom and can occur with no lip or a small lip.

Illustrated in Figure 39H is one of the two remaining forms. This vessel form is unique. The vessel is circular with a flattened base, but with a small protruding orifice, not nearly as large for the size of the jar as in other forms, with a ratio of 1:4-5 for the width of the vessel. The length of the neck of the jar is in a near 1:1 ratio with the width of the orifice. This form also has an applied handle on at least one side. The difference in form of this jar may be attributed to its use in the photograph, *Evening in Hopi Land, 1906* (Figure 37), which depicts women gathering water at a nearby source. The small orifice of this style of jar may make it the preferable way to get water, because it would prevent large amounts from spilling while carrying (Rice 1987:226). The handle would also allow the jar to be dipped easily into the water (Rice 1987:226).

The last form, depicted in Figure 39I, is also different from the other forms. For this form, the orifice is wider than the rest of the vessel, and hence, is unrestricted. The opening slopes in slightly to give a protruding lip and rim to the vessel, and then continues on to a fairly rounded, shallow vessel form, with a height to width ratio of about 1:2, which classifies this vessel as a bowl (Rice 1987:216).

These comparisons show that forms of pottery in different photographs exhibit similarities, suggesting that they are part of the Hopi cultural tradition in the early twentieth century. To further investigate this possibility, I will now discuss the use of the vessel forms. Curtis shows only three of the mentioned forms being used in the photographs. These forms are shown in Figure 39E, H, and I. Form E (Figure 35 and Figure 39E) is used to mix ingredients for baking in the photograph. Form I (Figures 33 and 39I) is being used to mix dry ingredients for pottery production. Both of these forms have unrestricted orifices with minimal lips and rims, no neck, and shallow depth. This form of pottery seems excellent to mix dry ingredients because it allows for easy access of the ingredients. These vessels seem like they would have been utilized in day to day activities and not for storage, due to the difficulty in covering the unrestricted orifice to protect the contents from water and fauna.

According to formal pottery classification schemes, the height to width ratio indicates that both forms E and I are bowls (Rice 1987:216). Shallow forms with unrestricted orifices (bowls) are also classified as vessels whose contents are for immediate use and easy access (Rice 1987:225). Hence the conclusion that they were excellent for mixing ingredients, but not for storage, is accurate. Forms D, F and G (Figures 32, 38, 39D, F, and G) are not shown being used in Curtis's photographs, but their form closely matches Forms E and I (Figure 33, 35, 39E and I), so they would be used for the same tasks.

The use of Form H (Figures 37 and 39H) was probably to transport water. This vessel has the smallest orifice of any of the vessel forms, a long neck, and a large volume due to its spherical shape, allowing the transportation of a maximum volume of water

with minimal spillage. Form H is a jar by classification schemes (Rice 1987:216), and the capacity, stability, accessibility and transportability of Form H indicates that the Hopi would use it for transporting liquids (Rice 1987:225-6). In addition, pottery instead of containers made out of reed or gourd, would be used for liquids in short and long term situations (Rice 1987:208).

None of the other vessel forms were shown in use, so their use can not be determined from Curtis's photographs alone. Vessel Forms A, B, and C (Figures 32, 34, 36, 38, 39A, B, and C) were not shown in use, but forms A, B, and C are all classified as jars (Rice 1987:216-7). The jars would have high stability due to their squat profiles (Rice 1987:225). In addition, the restricted orifices in each of the vessels would allow easier protection of the contents for storage (Rice 1987:225). There is a high probability that the reason they are not shown being used, is that they were not "day to day" cooking or eating containers, but rather they were used for storage.

This next discussion will focus on the decoration motifs of these pottery forms. The decoration of vessel forms reflects individual behavior patterns, and if this patterning or style repeats among many vessels, it also reflects group behavior patterns (Rice 1987:244-5). This would indicate that the different Hopi potters were working from a common cultural form. For this comparison, I will omit the vessel forms in Figures 39E and H (Figures 35 and 37). Not enough decoration is visible due to the quality of the photograph and position of the vessels for them to be analyzed.

Vessel decoration is present on the outside of the vessel when the orifice is smaller than the width of the vessel. The decoration is on the inside of the vessel when the orifice is as large as the vessel, or larger. Figure 40, which juxtaposes the ceramic

Figure 40

vessels from the photographs, shows the similarities of the stylistic motifs on the vessels. The vessels all have a dark band at the top, and the vessels with smaller orifices and protruding lips or rims have an additional dark band on the inside. Those vessels with necks have decoration on the neck distinctive from the decoration on the rest of the vessel. Dark bands of solid color separate these bands of decoration. Vessels with smaller orifices have additional third and fourth bands of decoration on the body of the vessel.

The decoration has varied elements, but none solidly geometric. Steps, arrows, swirls, animals/anthropomorphic figures, and zig-zags are all frequently used components, combined in a multitude of compositions. The vessels with large orifices have one large, anthropomorphic figure decorated on the inside of the vessel, with no other design elements other than solid bands of color around the rim. Of all the components mentioned, steps and arrows occur most often in the vessels with small orifices (Figure 40). While the design on the vessels with large orifices is one large figure, it is composed of these common stylistic elements.

The purpose of this analysis is to show that some basic stylistic elements repeat in the photographs of Hopi pottery, and research indicates that the repeated use of components indicates cultural continuity (Rice 1987:248-9). Thus Curtis's photographs are not showing pottery that he carried around as props, but rather were true pieces of Hopi ceramic technology in the early twentieth century. The photos showing the vessels in use make it clear that the Hopi used the pottery on a regular basis.

The photographs also indicate that Hopi people made this pottery, and not an outside source. *The Potter Mixing Clay, 1921* (Figure 33) shows an elderly woman

mixing dry ingredients from a bowl (the bowl previously determined to be of Hopi origin) with other ingredients in a lump on the side on a board. Other resources indicate that the lump of ingredients is natural clay from the area, and the dry ingredients are a temper that will insure that the bowl will not shatter during firing (Rice 1987).

The photographs *The Potter-Hopi (Nampeyo), 1906* (Figure 32) and *Untitled (Nampeyo Painting)-Hopi, 1900* (Figure 34) show the same woman, painting pottery six years apart. Details from these photographs suggest that this was a task she did and was not a Curtis posing. In *Untitled (Nampeyo Painting), 1900* (Figure 34), there are bowls of water or other liquid sitting near her, possibly used for mixing pigment. In both photographs, even though six years apart, they show her using the same basic tools for dispersing paint. In the bottom center of *Untitled (Nampeyo Painting), 1900* (Figure 34) and *The Potter, 1906* (Figure 32), Nampeyo uses a rock slab, covered in paint in order to decorate the pottery. The diverse shades of color apparent in *The Potter, 1906* (Figure 32) suggest that this was her mixing board for creating different colors.

In order to determine with certainty that these conclusions about pottery making being a part of the Hopi cultural tradition during the early 1900s, I will now present outside research. An archaeological investigation conducted at a Hopi site identified as belonging to the Pueblo IV period (1200s-1400s A.D.) outlines numerous pottery forms and decorative motifs found at the site. The Forms B, D, E and G, that I identified, are in the report (Hays 1991:27, 32, 46). Archaeological forms similar to my Form A were recovered, but the widest points of the shoulders of those vessels were in the middle of the jar (Hays 1991:32), while in my Form A, the shoulders were closer to the vessel opening.

The decorative motifs presented in the archaeological report are also similar to those depicted in Curtis's photos. These utilize dark solid color bands to separate bands of design, and use motifs of steps, swirls, zig-zags, arrows and anthropometric/animal figures (Hays 1991:27, 32, 46). In addition, the report shows large anthropometric figures on the inside of vessels where the orifice is the widest point of the vessel (Hays 1991:46), just like the ones shown in Curtis's photographs. In addition, the archaeological text identifies some of these styles as Sitkyaki Polychrome (Hays 1991:27), and an informant revealed that the pottery styles in Figure 38 were of the Sitkyaki Polychrome style (William Y. Adams, personal communication, 2003).

However, this archaeological report does not address the water jars. An autobiographical ethnography written by Helen Sekaquaptewa, a Hopi woman, makes mention of jars used for transporting water. She describes them as having narrow necks so that water did not spill, a handle on either side for carrying the jar, and a flattened side so the women could carry the jars against their backs (Sekaquaptewa 1969:18). The first two elements are ones I noted before, and closer inspection of Figure 37 reveals that the jars have a flattened side. From this evidence, it is clear that all of the pottery styles and forms shown in the figures were part of the Hopi cultural tradition.

These factors indicate that the making and painting of pottery was indeed a cultural tradition of the early twentieth century; however this is not to suggest that this was a cultural relic, and went unchanged over time. There are differences between those forms from the Pueblo IV era and those found in Curtis's photographs, including evidence of Zuni influence in decorative motifs (William Y. Adams, personal communication, 2003). There is a published book entitled *Nampeyo and Her Pottery*

(Kramer 1996) which describes Nampeyo's life and her tradition of pottery making. Nampeyo learned the art of pottery making from her mother (Kramer 1996:9) and many of her designs came from visiting ancient villages and copying designs she found on sherds (Kramer 1996:28). She eventually sold her pottery as souvenirs (Kramer 1996). While Nampeyo's pottery was in a cultural revival style concurrent with many of her contemporaries, Nampeyo was a master in her styles and there were many Hopi potters who were jealous of her skills (Kramer 1996:76). Her mastery of pottery was what drew Curtis, among numerous others, to photograph her during her artistic endeavors (Kramer 1996:77-96).

Curtis's photographs helped continue the cultural tradition of Hopi pottery making (Makepeace 2001:199). Nampeyo, the pottery painter featured in two of Curtis's photographs, has helped in the revival. Dextra Quotskuyva's great-great grandmother was Nampeyo, who is featured in the photographs, and who based her designs on ancient potsherds she found below First Mesa (Makepeace 2001:199). Nampeyo and other Hopi women helped revive the art of pottery making and inspired future generations, like Dextra and her daughter Camille, who are now internationally famous Hopi potters, continue this cultural tradition (Makepeace 2001:199).

First I hypothesized whether the Hopi pottery in Curtis's photographs was part of the Hopi cultural tradition, and then hypothesized whether the uses of pottery in these photographs was accurate. By then comparing these hypotheses to ethnographic and archaeological information, it was determined that this analysis was correct in its conclusions. This shows that we can obtain accurate information about cultural traditions from Curtis's photographs, and therefore, the photographs of other anthropologists. With

further research into the methodology of comparisons within one photographic collection, anthropologists could apply these methods to photographs of cultures where little other ethnographic literature is available.

Chapter Six-Conclusion

This paper began by introducing Edward Sheriff Curtis: how he became a photographer; what his aesthetic interests were in his photography; and how he became a part of the movement of salvage ethnography, combining the documentary and the aesthetic into what he termed an “art-science.” Curtis was primarily a photographer, but he hoped that through the combination of his photographs and text, those who read his twenty volumes of *The North American Indian* would obtain a broad understanding of the Native people discussed (Lyman 1982:76). He used re-enactment, props and posing in his photographs, but during the early 1900s when Curtis worked, these methods were widely used and accepted, and Curtis readily acknowledged his methodology (Edwards 2001:169-172; Lyman 1982:65, 67).

Curtis’s romantic appeal spawned interest among the public in the 1960s and 1970s, and this interest continues today (Lyman 1982:147), resulting in numerous publications geared towards the general public (Browntrout Publishers 2002; Cardozo 1996a, 1996b; Day 197; Hausman and Kapoun 1995; Lewis 1982; Lyman 1982:12; Pomegranate Artbooks 1996; Pomegranate Communications n.d.). These publications usually present the photographs alone, without the context provided by Curtis’s text. Thus, this paper has focused on what the photographs can provide to anthropological knowledge on their own, in absence of their contextualizing text.

I have examined issues of the “authentic,” “artistic,” and “reality” in photography, to show that photographs are interpretations (Sontag 1977:5-7). Thus, I presented the analysis of the uses of photography, especially in re-enactment, in order to contextualize

both Curtis's justification of his methods and the objections post-modernists have of these methods.

The photographs were critiqued using a post-modern perspective due to the fact that this perspective characterizes anthropological discourse today (Trawick 2002:ix), and because some of the fundamentalists proclaim that re-enactment negates any validity of the original action (Edwards 2001:160). Thus some suggest that past ethnographies should be ignored (D'Andrade 1995:557-566), and that all ethnographies are fiction due to the subjective links that the anthropologist has imposed (Polier and Roseberry 1995:255). When the views of post-modernists like Roger Keesing (Lewis 1998), James Clifford, and Marcus Fischer (Polier and Roseberry 1989) are applied to Curtis's photography, it is clear that the flaws they see in past ethnography are present in Curtis's photos. While these post-modernist views can be helpful in deriving information from past ethnographic works, I have aimed in this paper to show that Curtis's choices in the presentation of his photographs were acceptable during the time he did his work, and are not flaws, but a relevant partial perspective.

Yet reactionaries to the post-modernists say that the critiques of the fundamentalists are teleological. They say that, while the post-modernists' views are relevant and should be considered, discrediting past works because methods deemed correct today were not in use in the early 1900s disregards many valuable works and treats anthropology as ahistorical (D'Andrade 1995; Lewis 1998; Polier and Roseberry 1989). I concur with this critique: our theories and methods in anthropology need to help further our understanding and enlarge our anthropological database so when we consider issues of globalization, culture change, and the history of a people, we have ample data

from which to draw. I feel that we treat our discipline as ahistorical by discrediting the works of the past. Discarding these past works also treats the cultures of the people we study as ahistorical, because we have tossed aside past information on their people due to a garrulous theoretical debate.

Many of the fundamentalist post-modernists suggest that past ethnographic works can be deconstructed and reassembled to derive cultural information relative to the time in which the work was done (Polier and Roseberry 1989:255). Very few seem to have done this, however, and if they are going to critique the work, the post-modernists need to put their own theories into action. Thus, this paper analyzed groups of Curtis's photographs in order to determine what cultural information I could reveal once I removed Curtis's subjective views (as defined by post-modernists).

First, I compared portraits of Wishham peoples to one another (Figures 12-13 and 15-17). In two of the portraits, women appeared to be wearing the same headdress, making it a possible "prop." By comparing the style of beadwork and ornamentation of the headdress to styles of beadwork and ornamentation in other items of clothing in Wishham portraits, and the use of Chinese coins in the headdresses which would have seemed non-"Indian" to Curtis, I hypothesized that the headdress was part of Wishham culture. Then, I compared the yokes that women wore in the portraits to see if they were the same item, because they were composed of the same style of beadwork as the headdress. I concluded that these yokes were different items, and due to the unlikelihood that Curtis made a multitude of these detailed yokes for "props," and the fact that the style of beadwork was consistent with the headdress, I concluded that both the yokes and the headdress were part of the Wishham culture in the early twentieth century. I then

compared these conclusions to complementary ethnographic records of Wishham peoples, and I confirmed my conclusions.

The next section of reconstruction focused on headdresses worn by men in Curtis's portraits (Figures 18 and 20-31). Headdresses worn by the Nez Percé, Apsaroke (Crow), Cheyenne, Brulé/Ogala/Teton Sioux, Jicarilla (Apache), and Piegan (Blackfoot) were examined. By comparing the stylistic elements of the various headdresses, I hypothesized that eleven of the twelve headdresses discussed were part of the individual's cultural tradition. Comparison with complementary ethnographic data gave conclusive evidence that the Piegan (Blackfoot) headdress was in the style of the Piegan (Blackfoot) cultural tradition. Ethnographic evidence showed that three of the four Nez Percé, all three of the Apsaroke, and the Cheyenne headdress, were probably part of their ethnographic traditions. The caption given by Curtis for the photograph of the other Nez Percé led the reader to believe that the headdress was authentic, but this is inconclusive, and due to the headdress's appearance in two photographs of different Nez Percé men, I believe it was a "prop," either of Nez Percé or Curtis's construction. The ethnographic comparison for the two Brulé/Ogala/Teton Sioux and one Jicarilla (Apache) headdress was inconclusive. I believe that this analysis may show that the problem people see with Curtis's use of props is that they have difficulty determining when he used them and when he did not.

In the last section of Chapter Five, I selected photographs of the Hopi peoples that included pottery in order to determine if the pottery was part of the cultural tradition of the Hopi, or if it was a prop (Figures 32-38). By comparing vessel form, vessel decorative motifs, vessel production, and the use of the vessels, I hypothesized that the

vessels in the seven photographs were part of the Hopi cultural tradition of the early twentieth century. I tested this hypothesis by using both ethnographic and archaeological records. I concluded that the Hopi pottery vessels in the photographs were indeed part of their cultural tradition when they were photographed.

This paper shows that we can use the post-modernist critique to determine the subjective views of ethnographers in the past, without taking the views of the fundamentalists who would disregard past works. Through the application of this knowledge and the filtering out of some degree of subjectivity, we can obtain culturally relevant information from the examination of past ethnographic works such as Curtis's. This analysis implies that people can evaluate other past ethnographies in a similar manner to derive cultural information that was not necessarily the intent of the ethnographer. I used Curtis's work precisely because other complementary, written ethnographies about the groups he photographed are available for comparison and evaluation of his photos.

My purpose in writing this paper is to react against the fundamentalist post-modernists because I am opposed to ignoring past ethnographies. While I realize that the methods they used are not equivalent to those we promote today, it does not mean that their work was irrelevant. Past ethnographies are our primary resources about the histories of a people. I believe by ignoring these, we, in turn, treat the cultures they studied as ahistorical, as though we can go back to that culture today and record exactly the same things that the ethnographers of the past witnessed. We know in anthropology that this is not the case: cultures are dynamic and change through time. If we disagree

with the methods, analyses like these should be conducted to determine the ethnographers' methods, and derive the information that we desire.

References Cited

- Adam, Hans Christian. *Edward Sheriff Curtis 1868-1952*. Benedikt Taschen Verlag GmbH, Hohenzollernring, 1999.
- Berkhofer, Robert F. Jr. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, NY. 1978.
- Browntrout Publishers. *Curtis: Portraits of Native Americans: 2003 Calendar*. Browntrout Publishers, San Francisco, CA. 2002.
- Buckland, Gail. "Photographer." *American Heritage*. September. Pp. 34. 2001.
- Cardozo, Christopher. *Edward S. Curtis: Great Plains*. Callaway Editions, Inc., Hong Kong. 1996a.
- Cardozo, Christopher. *Edward S. Curtis: Hidden Faces*. Callaway Editions, Inc., Hong Kong. 1996b.
- Cardozo, Christopher ed. *Sacred Legacy: Edward S. Curtis and the North American Indian*. Simon & Shuster, New York, NY. 2000.
- Coleman, A.D. and T.C. McLuhan Introduction from *Portraits from North American Indian Life: Edward S. Curtis*. Outerbridge & Lazard, Inc., New York, NY. Pp. V-XII. 1972.
- Coombe, Rosemary J. "Encountering the Postmodern: New Directions in Cultural Anthropology." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*. 28(8). Pp 188-205. 1991.
- Crapanzano, Vincent. "Hermes' Dilemma: The Masking of Subversion in Ethnographic Description." 1986. In *Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History 2nd*

- Edition*. Edited by R. John McGee and Richard L. Warms. Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, CA. Pp. 535-550. 2000.
- D'Andrade, Roy. "Moral Models in Anthropology." 1995. In *Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History 2nd Edition*. Edited by R. John McGee and Richard L. Warms. Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, CA. Pp. 551-568. 2000.
- Day, Sara, ed. *Heart of the Circle: Photographs by Edward S. Curtis of Native American Women*. Pomegranate Artbooks, San Francisco, CA. 1997.
- Dictionary of Indian Tribes of the Americas, 2nd edition*. American Indian Publishers, Inc., Newport Beach, CA. 1993.
- Edwards, Elizabeth. *Raw Histories: Photographs, Anthropology and Museums*. Berg, Oxford. 2001.
- Fleming, Paula Richardson, and Judith Luskey. *The North American Indians in Early Photographs*. Harper & Row Publishers, New York, NY. 1986.
- Fowler, Don D. and Rachel J. Homer. *In a Sacred Manner We Live: Photographs of the North American Indian by Edward S. Curtis*. Barre Publishers, Barre, MA. 1973.
- Gay, E. Jane. *With the Nez Percés: Alice Fletcher in the Field, 1889-92*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebraska. 1981.
- Geertz. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight." In *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books, New York, NY. 1973.
- Gidley, Mick. *Edward S. Curtis and the North American Indian, Incorporated*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY. 1998.
- Grinnell, George Bird. *The Cheyenne Indians: Their History and Ways of Life, Volume 1*.

- Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut. 1923.
- Haines, Francis. "The Nez Percés: Tribesmen of the Columbia Plateau." *Civilization of the American Indian, Series; V.42*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK. 1955.
- Hausman, Gerald and Bob Kapoun, eds. *Prayer to the Great Mystery: Edward S. Curtis, The Uncollected Writings and Photography of Edward S. Curtis*. St. Martin's Press, New York, NY. 1995.
- Hays, Kelley Ann. "Ceramics." *Homol'ovi II: Archaeology of an Ancestral Hopi Village, Arizona*. Edited by E. Charles Adams and Kelley Ann Hays. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ. 1991.
- Hilton, Jonathan. *People in the Environment: Photography*. RotoVision SA, East Sussex, UK. 1999.
- Kramer, Barbara. *Nampeyo and Her Pottery*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, NM. 1996.
- Lewis, Herbert S. "The Misrepresentation of Anthropology and Its Consequences." *American Anthropologist*. 100(3) September. Pp. 716-727. 1998.
- Library of Congress. "Edward S. Curtis's North American Indian." *American Memory*. <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/award98/ienhtml/curthome.html>. Last updated April 25, 2001.
- Lowie, Robert H. "Societies of the Crow, Hidatsa and Mandan Indians." *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. XI, Part III*. Order of Trustees, New York, NY. 1913.
- Lyman, Christopher M. *The Vanishing Race and Other Illusions: Photographs of Indians*

- by Edward S. Curtis. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 1982.
- Makepeace, Anne. *Edward S. Curtis: Coming to Light*. National Geographic, Washington, D.C. 2001.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. "The Essentials of the Kula." From *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. 1922. In *Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History: 2nd Edition*. Edited by R. Jon McGee and Richard L. Warms. Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, CA. Pp. 161-176. 2000.
- McGee, R. Jon, and Richard L. Warms, Eds. *Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History: 2nd Edition*. Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, CA. 2000.
- Newcomb, William W. Jr. *North American Indians: An Anthropological Perspective*. Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., Pacific Palisades, CA. 1974.
- Northwestern University Library. *Edward S. Curtis's 'The North American Indian': the Photographic Images*. <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/award98/ienhtml/curthome.html>. 2001.
- Paterek, Josephine. *Encyclopedia of American Indian Costume*. ABC-CLIO, Inc., Santa Barbara, CA. 1994.
- Polier, Nicole and William Roseberry. "Tristes Tropes: Post-Modern Anthropologists Encounter the Other and Discover Themselves." *Economy and Society*. 18(2) May. Pp. 245-261. 1989.
- Pomegranate Artbooks. *Edward S. Curtis: Portraits of Native Americans*. Library of Congress, San Francisco, CA. 1996.
- Pomegranate Communications, Inc. *Edward S. Curtis (American, 1868-1952) Chief Joseph*. (Bookmark). The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical

- Gardens. N.d.
- Rice, Prudence M. *Pottery Analysis: A Sourcebook*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL. 1987.
- Sapir, Edward and Leslie Spier. *Wishram Ethnography*. 1930. Published in *The Collected Works of Edward Sapir, VII*. Edited by William Bright. Mouton deGruyter, New York, NY. Pp. 378-518. 1990.
- Sekaquaptewa, Helen. *Me and Mine: the Life Story of Helen Sekaquaptewa*. University of Arizona Press, Tuscon, AZ. 1969.
- Sontag, Susan. *On Photography*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, NY. 1977.
- Stocking, George W. Jr. "The Ethnographer's Magic: Fieldwork in British Anthropology from Tylor to Malinowski." In *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI. Pp. 114-177. 1992.
- Trawick, Paul B. *The Struggle for Water in Peru: Comedy and Tragedy in the Andean Commons*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA. 2002.
- Tylor, Sir Edward Burnett. "The Science of Culture." From *Primitive Culture*. 1871. In *Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History: 2nd Edition*. Edited By R. Jon McGee and Richard L. Warms. Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, CA. Pp. 27-41. 2000.
- Wells, Liz, ed. *Photography: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge, New York, NY. 1997.
- Winston, Brian. *Claiming the Real: Documentary Film Revisited*. British Film Institute, London, England. 1995.
- Wissler, Clark. "Societies and Ceremonial Associations in the Ogala Division of the

Teton-Dakota.” *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol XI, Part I*. Order of Trustees, New York, NY. 1912.

Wissler, Clark. “Societies and Dance Associations of the Blackfoot Indians.”
Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. XI, Part IV. Order of Trustees, New York, NY. 1913.

Wolf, Eric R. *Europe and the People Without History*. University of California Press, Los Angeles, CA. 1982.