

From the Tomahawk Chop to the Road Block

Discourses of Savagism in Whitestream Media

DANIEL MORLEY JOHNSON

It's the job of the Canadian government's mainstream media to help the RCMP and OPP to use whatever means necessary to conjure up early European images of uncivilized crazed "lawless" savages. These images are then hopefully meant to get the public's attention as this is what they are taught in school and images most Canadian citizens and new immigrants are familiar with. Even if they are not true, Canada will do what they can to sway minds so we will not be supported. Canada then criminalizes our right to stand up and protect our very existence. Is that in accordance with the Rule of Law?

Janie Jamieson (Six Nations of the Grand River)

Since early colonial times, Indigenous peoples on Anówarakowa Kawen-note—"Great Turtle Island" in Kanienkeha (the Mohawk language)—have been represented via the imaginations of the invading European settler-colonists. Not surprisingly, such typically distorted representations have long been a part of the popular press and news media in the United States and Canada. In 1996 the report of Canada's Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples asserted, "When the media address Aboriginal issues, the impressions they convey are often distorted."¹ In a statement to the Commission, the Canadian Association of Journalists stated:

Canada's Aboriginal peoples are, in general, badly served by national and local media. . . . The country's large newspapers, TV and radio news shows often contain misinformation, sweeping gener-

alizations and galling stereotypes about Natives and Native affairs. . . . The result is that most Canadians have little real knowledge of the country's Native peoples, or of the issues which affect them.²

Typically, the news media have tended to portray Natives as a conquered people, a poor minority in a rich country, militant activists, remnants of an ancient North American past, and so on. As Canada's Royal Commission pointed out, media outlets continue to perpetuate stereotypes and inaccurate generalizations about Indigenous peoples, and aside from a few independent and Indigenous-owned media sources, the misinformation continues mostly unchallenged and unabated. This essay will explore the use, perpetuation, and legitimization of anti-Indigenous rhetoric (discourses of Savagism) in media with regard to two major flashpoints of misrepresentation: racist sports imagery and anticolonial Indigenous protest.

ALL IN GOOD FUN: RACISM, SPORTS, AND THE MEDIA

As an undergraduate in aboriginal studies, I first read Ward Churchill's "Let's Spread the 'Fun' Around," in which the author proposes groups other than Native Americans be similarly "honored" with mascots and team names.³ Churchill likens the use of Indigenous imagery for sports teams as analogous to contemporary Germans using Jewish caricatures in a similar way, which should underscore for us the psychologically and historically perverse nature of mocking those peoples and nations whom some European Americans have tried to exterminate. In his usual style, Churchill offers a number of team names that might pay similar tribute to other communities, making the point that the practice of "honoring" people with tomahawk chops, pep rally war whoops, half-time powwows, and similarly grotesque misappropriated images and names is a treatment unique to Indigenous peoples. We might understand this as part of the European American obsession with naming, a symbolic act that requires the self-appointed authority to name (both people and places) and, in this case, the power to ridicule and create an Other that is ridiculed in schools and in the professional sports industry. European colonizers have proclaimed for themselves the right to name (and hence claim) most of the world and the world's peoples—so the team nicknames "Redskins" and "Chiefs" share a genealogy with those nations and people who were renamed in the minds of invading Euro-

peans.⁴ And, as I will soon elaborate, such bizarre imagery and naming is part of the “Savagist” discourse developed over time as part of European colonialism, such that many teams deploy certain imagery to summon a whole catalog of “tribal” and athletic ferocity. But, as Churchill and others remind us, when these images are used “all in good fun,” we might be led to believe that the underlying racism is no longer existent, which, of course, is not the case. This imagery becomes engrained, accepted, and normalized to such a degree that most North Americans accept it unquestioningly, whether it be in the form of a sports mascot, a speech by a politician, or a story in the news.⁵

Many writers on the mascot issue have asked why the practice is acceptable for Indigenous people but not any other ethnic or gender identity.⁶ Churchill refers to the popular whitestream belief that Indigenous peoples have been conquered and pushed to the margins:

Indians are (falsely) perceived as being too few, and therefore too weak, to defend themselves effectively against racist and otherwise offensive behaviour. The sensibilities of those who take pleasure in things like the [Tomahawk] Chop are thus akin to those of schoolyard bullies and those twisted individuals who like to torture cats. At another level, their perspectives have much in common with those manifested more literally—and therefore more honestly—by groups like the [N]azis, Aryan Nations, and Ku Klux Klan.⁷

Characterizing this behavior as related to bullying and racism firmly situates Savagist imagery in terms of the racialized violence of colonialism. Martinican author Frantz Fanon reminds us that racism is “one element of a vaster whole: that of the systematized oppression of a people.” Fanon was well aware of the psychological effects of colonialism, and we might think of North American anti-Indigenous rhetoric as what he would call an “attempt to decerebralize a people.”⁸ We should consider the psychology behind the white misappropriation leading to caricature mascots; what is it about European Americans that causes many of us to be so arrogantly oblivious or ignorantly in denial of how colonialism continues to be reenacted (and on the athletic field, of all places)? Theorist Ashis Nandy has illustrated the ways in which colonialism disfigures everyone in society, not just the colonized, where the “victors are ultimately shown to be camouflaged victims, at an advanced stage of psychosocial decay.” He writes of the colonizer as a “self-destructive

co-victim” alongside the colonized, where the oppressor is as badly deformed by the colonialist society.⁹ We might thus think of dancing half-time mascots or Ted Turner and Jane Fonda doing the tomahawk chop at an Atlanta Braves game (all in good fun, right, Jane?) as a symptom of our European American culture succumbing to a self-inflicted mental disorder.¹⁰ Taiaiake Alfred (Kanien’kehaka from Kahnawake) writes: “Colonial culture, for both the victims and the perpetrators, is fundamentally a denial of the past and its moral implications.” One of the effects of the rabid disease of colonialism is complacency: “The perpetrators know that it is wrong to steal a country and to deny it is a crime; the victims know that it is shameful to accept defeat lying down. Yet, complacency rules over both because the thought of what might come out of transcending the lies is too . . . fearsome.”¹¹ The present essay hopes to gesture toward transcending the lies inherent in colonialist anti-Indigenous discourse through a critical investigation of some of its manifestations in whitestream media.¹²

As a non-Indigenous scholar—and now university instructor—in academic Indigenous studies, I am always aware of my position and distance relative to the topics I study and teach. Team mascots do not directly mock and humiliate my family or home community. I am not Haudenosaunee, I have no relations at Six Nations, I have not participated in ceremonies, nor do I speak a Haudenosaunee language. Therefore, with humility, I attempt to survey the evidence to the best of my knowledge and ability and focus my efforts on deconstructing and addressing the misguided research, policies, and rhetoric of my fellow European Americans. I agree with Nandy and Alfred, that colonialism disfigures both colonizer and colonized (though, of course, in very different ways). Thus, symbols that caricature Indigenous peoples, government policies (for better or worse, it’s my government), and anti-Indigenous rhetoric *are* my concerns, and I think the best way I can responsibly make use of my education and privilege is to try and identify, critique, and mend the damage done by my ancestors and contemporaries, all of us occupiers on stolen Indigenous land. I preface my essay in this way to openly state my allegiances and to acknowledge the limits of my knowledge and the potential flaws of my interpretations. As I have written elsewhere, many scholars reveal their ignorance by the assumptions they make (and I am no doubt guilty of this here); however, I would rather admit up front my relationship to the knowledge about which I am writing.¹³

While the onus is obviously on schools and teams to discontinue the use of racist mascots and names, media outlets are also complicit both in legitimizing and perpetuating their use and by not encouraging critical debate about such imagery (e.g., by not taking seriously the perspectives of Indigenous people). Author and filmmaker Jay Rosenstein cites broadcast contracts and uncritical local coverage of the home team as reasons why “the sports and media industries have become so entangled, they are practically one and the same.”¹⁴ For example, media outlets may sponsor pep rallies for local teams with offensive mascots and hence will not rigorously criticize the practice, and newspapers and broadcasts that reproduce racist team imagery visibly condone its use. In 2002 I wrote to the editor of the *Toronto Star*, urging the paper to stop employing racist images in its sports reporting: I forwarded the newspaper a statement issued by the Native American Journalists Association (NAJA). My letter read: “We ask that you eliminate the use of racist words and images to strengthen the quality of media coverage. No other race of people is used as mascots or tokens of luck for sports. If another race were used as mascots, we know that the media would not support nor perpetuate this racism by using these words and images in reporting.”¹⁵ Don Sellar, the *Star*’s ombudsperson, publicly responded to my letter in a column that pointed out other newspapers, such as the *Minneapolis Star-Tribune*, that had stopped referring to racist team names. Sellar failed to engage with the issue at hand and instead trivialized the matter with patronizing language by crediting his colleagues in Minneapolis with “creating phantom pro sports franchises . . . when they banished legal names such as Washington Redskins or Cleveland Indians from the paper. Replacing them are generic references to ‘the Washington football team’ or ‘Cleveland baseball team.’”¹⁶ Sellar appears to relish writing the words “Redskins” and “Indians,” and his reference to the *legality* of the racist names has a sort of “just following orders” air about it, as though the newspaper would be somehow breaking a law if they deviated from the trademark team name.¹⁷ Sellar arrogantly refers to the principled stand of some newspapers as “political correctness run amok,” which is a typical pseudocritique of antimascot movements. Scholar C. Richard King suggests this defense stems from misrecognition linked to anti-Indianism:

Supporters of mascots argue that mascots do not constitute a problem because they are just names and images that are not meant to harm or offend. Supporters, moreover, argue that critics should

“get over it,” “get a life,” “get real,” “grow up,” and otherwise worry about more pressing issues. . . . When all is said and done, anti-Indigenism often hinges on *an unwillingness and/or inability to see*.¹⁸

Sellar continued his defense of the *Star*'s practice: “Newspapers are in the reality business. If a sports franchise decides to call itself something dumb or offensive that fact is to be reported and debated. Not suppressed.” Note that he is deflecting the issue from colonial racism against Indigenous peoples to a vague category of *offensiveness*. Sellar himself suppresses the issue by claiming newspapers only re-present pure, unmediated “reality.” Tim McGuire, editor of the *Minneapolis Star-Tribune*, addresses such arguments with regard to his paper's practice:

It is as if [editors] don't make hundreds of subjective decisions each week, such as choosing not to use the F word, or not calling people certain names that other people might call them or not printing the names of rape victims. They don't hesitate to make those calls at all and I see little difference between those decisions and the decision not to use offensive nicknames.¹⁹

It would seem the *Toronto Star*'s response is really just a refusal to take a principled stand on an issue of colonialist racism. It is clear that in North America media outlets have a great deal of power in shaping—not just reflecting—public opinion, and, as such, media outlets must bear some of the responsibility of perpetuating racist images wherever they occur, either in the sports or in the political arena. Or, for that matter, where the two converge, such as during the 1991 World Series between Minnesota and Atlanta, when ABC News ran a story in which former president Jimmy Carter stated his intention to do the tomahawk chop, and Atlanta mayor Andrew Young also supported the practice.²⁰ Or consider former Toronto mayor Mel Lastman's public remarks in lobbying for the 2008 Summer Olympics regarding a proposed campaign visit to Africa: “What the hell do I want to go to a place like Mombasa? I just see myself in a pot of boiling water with all these Natives dancing around me.”²¹ In this essay I use the issue of racism and sports as a starting point for a critique of whitestream news media representation of Indigenous peoples through Savagist or anti-Indigenous discourses. In particular, I will examine print news coverage of the reclamation of land at Six Nations/Kanenhstaton that began in February 2006.

DISCOURSES OF SAVAGISM AND
ANTI-INDIGENOUS RHETORIC

Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (Crow Creek Lakota) has defined what she calls anti-Indianism, the North American form of racialized hatred comparable to anti-Semitism. Cook-Lynn defines anti-Indianism as “the sentiment that results in unnatural death to Indians” in that this belief system “suggests that Indian nationhood (i.e.: tribalism) should be disavowed and devalued. . . . Anti-Indianism is that which denigrates, demonizes, and insults being Indian in America.” Anti-Indigenous rhetoric is a mechanism that attempts to denationalize and eradicate the political and cultural sovereignty of Indigenous peoples and nations. Anti-Indianism uses “historical event and experience to place the blame on Indians for an unfortunate and dissatisfying history . . . [and] exploits and distorts Indian cultures and beliefs.” Those schools and sports teams that employ caricature mascots are dysconsciously relying on racist anti-Indigenous discourses, as does the news media in reporting on Indigenous protest; the use of this discourse “[conspires] to isolate, to expunge or expel, to menace, to defame.”²²

Cornel Pewewardy (Comanche and Kiowa) refers to dysconsciousness as “uncritical habit of mind (i.e., perceptions, attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs) that justifies inequity and exploitation by accepting the existing order of things as given.” Pewewardy identifies dysconscious racism as a justification of the subordination of people of color and as a contributing factor to the acceptance of offensive mascots and symbols: “If you have seen the racial antics and negative behaviours portrayed by Indian mascots hundreds of times for most of your life, you may become numb to their presence. This is dysconscious racism.”²³ The same might be said for the coverage of—and the public’s response to—Indigenous issues in the news media. Scholar Howard Adams (Métis) referred to this in his 1975 book, *Prison of Grass*: “It was easy for colonizers to standardize and propagate these distorted myths because they had control of the communications media. Perverted images were paraded before the public to help justify and legitimize the incarceration of the entire population of native people. . . . Mockery and ridicule were brutally employed and still are today.”²⁴

Published in 2001, Cook-Lynn’s analysis resonates even more in what has become our post-9/11, post-Patriot Act sociopolitical and cultural

milieu. She insightfully, almost prophetically, writes: “Most often [anti-Indigenous] sentiment has not only worked to expel Indians from specific geographies, but it has also enabled its proponents or practitioners to see Indians and Indian tribal histories and identities as antithetical to the well-touted democratic ideals of the Founding Fathers of the United States; in other words, as Anti-American.”²⁵ As Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz has recently written, the language of modern US imperial warfare is still encoded in terms of Manifest Destiny and frontier war:

“Indian Country” is a military term of trade, a technical term, such as “collateral damage” and “ordnance,” which appears in military training manuals and is used on a regular basis. “Indian Country” is the military term for “behind enemy lines.” Its current use should serve to remind us of the origins and development of the U.S. military, as well as the nature of our political and social history: annihilation unto unconditional surrender.²⁶

So it is no coincidence that vocally opposing colonialism at home or abroad is deemed unpatriotic, an accusation that blinds us to other, more important matters, such as the critique of oppression or imperialism. This manifests itself even more subtly in Canada, where our imperial acts or levels of public racism are compared mostly to the United States such that the Canadian state, looking *relatively* benevolent in its treatment of Natives and other people of color, can be held up as a model of egalitarian multiculturalism. Our national origin story and identity—constructed on what Thomas King (Cherokee) calls “a kinder racism . . . infused with a suffocating paternalism that can gently strangle the life out of a people”—obscures issues of land theft, genocide, sexual conquest, forced assimilation, displacement, the outlawing of religious practices, residential schools, imposed governments and laws, the extreme intrusions on basic human rights, and numerous other colonialist policies and historical but ongoing occurrences.²⁷ This history is downplayed and nearly erased in favor of stories about national unity and equal rights, such that news media do not for the most part seriously present an extensive or critical discussion of Indigenous issues, deciding instead to fall back on the prevailing and far simpler anti-Indigenous rhetoric. Just one damaging consequence of this is that most settlers have no concept of Indigenous nations *as nations*, hence obscuring the legally binding treaties, the distinct guarantee of Aboriginal and

treaty rights in Section 35 of the Canadian Constitution, the history of the Crown's nation-to-nation relationship with First Nations, and the responsibility that Canada has *agreed* to uphold that relationship. Political philosopher Dale Turner (Anishinaabe) asserts: "Canadians need to be convinced that the nation-to-nation relationship is *the* just form of political relationship with Aboriginal peoples; generating cogent and useful defences for this position is one of the most difficult challenges facing those who support Aboriginal rights in Canada."²⁸ We cannot expect true reconciliation or even a clear and accurate assessment of the present situation if the government and news media rely on uncritical neoliberal multiculturalism and easy tropes without any sustained or widespread challenge to these myths.

What I have been referring to as discourses of Savagism is another way of thinking about anti-Indigenous rhetoric. The term derives from Roy Harvey Pearce's landmark work of criticism, *Savagism and Civilization* (1953), which traces the history of European Americans' identification of themselves as civilized in opposition to Natives, who are by corollary known to be savage. This binary began in North America with the English Puritans and the French on the east coast and was refined and articulated through Manifest Destiny and westward expansion; the key was finding evidence to support the hypothesis that Indigenous peoples were savage and in need of civilization (which in turn justified colonialism). Pearce writes: "The idea of savagism was at best an hypothesis which called for proof. Proof required first-hand observation and then close analysis, classification, and summing-up of what had been observed." After these pseudoscientific observations and analysis, "the hypothesis was proved in fact; the savage proved savagism; a symbol bodied forth an idea."²⁹ Emma LaRocque (Plains Cree Métis) has similarly referred to this as "the civ/sav dichotomy," tracing this "formula" to ancient Greek and Roman ideas of the Barbarian Other, which influenced later Europeans (as did the latter's conception of the wild man) as they colonized the Western Hemisphere. LaRocque notes how ethnographic, historical, and popular fiction texts propagated this binary of civilization and savagery in North America, a way of thinking that has saturated the Canadian school curriculum.³⁰ Howard Adams writes: "The books I read at school said that my ancestors were cruel, sadistic savages who had not even reached the early stages of civilization, and I felt that I was constantly being reminded of the direct link between my-

self and my ‘barbarian’ ancestors.”³¹ The role of the educational system in promoting misinformation about Native peoples to European Americans cannot be underscored enough, as Canadians (despite a somewhat more “sensitive” curriculum) continue to dysconsciously learn Savagist discourse from an early age and filter their worldview through this lens; evidence of this can be seen in the next section on Canadians’ hostile response to Indigenous protest.

Palestinian critic Edward Said put forth a related argument in his seminal work, *Orientalism* (1978), which exposes the similarly constructed binary opposition of Europe and “the Orient.” Writing later than Pearce, Said was able to draw on poststructuralist theory to define Orientalism as what Michel Foucault calls a “discursive formation.” Foucault states that discourses are “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak”; therefore, a discursive formation is

a complex group of relations that function as a rule: it lays down what must be related, in a particular discursive practice, for such and such an enunciation to be made, for such and such a concept to be used, for such and such a strategy to be organized. To define a system of formation in its specific individuality is therefore to categorize a discourse or a group of statements by the regularity of a practice.³²

Said defines Orientalism as one such discursive formation, typified by the West’s intellectual authority over “the Orient”: “[Authority] is formed, irradiated, disseminated; it is instrumental, it is persuasive; it has status, it establishes canons of taste and value; it is virtually indistinguishable from certain ideas it dignifies as true, and from traditions, perceptions, and judgments it forms, transmits, reproduces. Most of all, authority can, indeed must, be analyzed.”³³ Said’s explanation of the constructed intellectual authority of Orientalism—which encompasses a long history of collected and repeated authoritative statements—applies to my reading of Pearce’s concept of Savagism (which I have capitalized in keeping with Said’s convention). I have elaborated several points to redefine Savagism in light of Foucault and Said:

1. Savagism stands for the pattern of relative strength (power relations) between Colonized Native and the Colonizer, and the discourse about the Savage that this power relation enables (the Colonizer never loses the upper hand in this discourse).

2. From early formulations of the Savage emerged a “Native America” that could be studied in the academy for what Said calls “theoretical illustration in anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial, and historical theses.”
3. Savagism, like Orientalism, illustrates Said’s assertion that “political imperialism governs an entire field of study, imagination, and scholarly institutions” that extends to public discourse and media.
4. Savagism is governed by the belief that Savages cannot represent themselves, and so the West must represent the Savages.
5. Savagism is “a system for citing works and authors”; hence, images and ideas are cited, reproduced, and engrained uncritically over time.
6. The subjects of Savagist discourse are not Indigenous people but Savages-as-known through European American “knowledge.”
7. Savagism places limits on what can be known about Indigenous peoples.
8. Savages were inherently violent, and contemporary militancy constitutes terrorism against the nation-state.³⁴

For Pearce, Savagism is the consequence of “a tension between recalcitrant human data which will simply not be brought into proper focus and a mind which is sure that it has brought them into focus.”³⁵ The unreflective Savagist author-academic does not even realize that he or she has misrepresented or misunderstood.³⁶

C. Richard King and Charles Springwood identify several anti-Indigenous tropes that have emerged in whitestream culture, such as the violent, sexualized, and drunken caricatures with which those of us who reflect on them are all too familiar. In the context of mascots, King and Springwood recognize that these caricatures “freeze Native Americans, reducing them to rigid, flat renderings of their diverse cultures and histories.” Additionally, these invented mascots are products of the writing and rewriting of European American identity “in terms of conquest, hierarchy and domination” such that Indigenous peoples are inscribed only in terms of submission, that is, being conquered and dominated. While sports teams, via mascots and related images, may wish to honor Indigenous peoples, they do so “by allowing white America to simultaneously enact its grief for and consecrate the memory of the Indian. It is a celebration of the Indian sacrifice in the name of imperial progress in

the name of Manifest Destiny.”³⁷ Media willingly celebrate the American conquest, holocaust, and occupation by endorsing Savagist images and refusing to challenge the legitimacy of the colonial state and the state’s inherent racism.

SAVAGISM IN MULTICULTURAL CANADA: MEDIA
REPORTING OF THE SIX NATIONS LAND RECLAMATION

The remainder of this essay examines discourses of Savagism with regard to news coverage of anticolonial direct action and the reclamation of land by sovereign Indigenous peoples and nations. Media complicity in the mascot issue is in part caused by its inability to critically assess the reality of colonialism, as the media fail to convey that at some level pro-Canadian rhetoric is concurrently anti-Indigenous. In her history of Indigenous peoples in the news media, Mary Ann Weston writes of the danger inherent in the practice of recycling Savagist discourse:

[The] repetition of inaccurate images, which runs counter to the press’ ideal of fair and factual reporting, has been a consequence of the news process itself. The practices, traditions, and forms of journalism, rather than challenging the stereotypes in popular culture, have repeated and reinforced them. By doing so, the press has given these images the weight of factuality. By reporting them and incorporating them into purportedly factual accounts of events (i.e.: news), the news media give them another dimension.³⁸

Anthropologist Sandra Lambertus has explored media portrayals of the “standoff” between the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) and protesters at Gustafsen Lake in British Columbia in 1995. She looks particularly at how the RCMP manipulated the Canadian public through media by challenging the credibility of the protest and the people involved—the authorities in Ontario have engaged in similar practices with regard to the Six Nations land reclamation. Lambertus writes: “One of the primary ways to legitimize violence in response to minority resistance is to criminalize minority behaviour without examining the history and the context of the issues from the minority perspective.” Though I disagree with conceptualizing Indigenous peoples as “minorities” because this obscures the unique nation-to-nation relationship affirmed by treaties with the Crown, Lambertus does usefully remind us

that media can be complicit in the colonial state's violent response to Indigenous dissent. In the case of Gustafsen Lake, the RCMP admitted to using the press to discredit the Indigenous protest—one RCMP sergeant apparently stated on video during an official meeting that “smear campaigns are our specialty.” Lambertus asserts, “The RCMP’s use of information control helped them to . . . maintain the dominant perspective in the news narrative, and to ensure positive public support. . . . The RCMP presented the protesters as unworthy of public sympathy and themselves as showing restraint and acting in a justifiable manner.”³⁹

As we will see, news coverage of the Six Nations reclamation promotes similar dominant perspectives through discourses of Savagism and unquestioning allegiance to the colonial state. Susan M. Hill (Kanien’kehaka from Ohswe:ken) notes that Canadian media typically ignore the complexity of Native issues and as such “are unfamiliar with the community and unable to distinguish between legitimate spokespeople and individuals with isolated points of view.”⁴⁰ Add to this the attraction of news media to extreme viewpoints and brief, highly mediated, decontextualized soundbites, and it is not difficult to see how the public remains misinformed. Michael Orsini, who covered the resistance at Kanehsatake in 1990 for the *Montreal Gazette*, partly attributes the problem to unprepared journalists whose educational training “presents a romanticized view of the journalistic craft and rarely pauses to ask journalists to reflect on their own reporting and the impact it might have on others.”⁴¹

The beginning of this particular action against Canada’s occupation of their territory began on October 25, 2005, when the Six Nations community held an information picket at the Douglas Creek construction site, where Henco Industries had been building a residential subdivision.⁴² The construction site is located near the Six Nations community, outside the Ontario towns of Brantford and Caledonia, about twenty-four miles from Hamilton and sixty-two miles from Toronto. On February 28, 2006, Six Nations people and supporters reoccupied the land, naming it Kanenhstaton (“the protected place”) and setting up to stay indefinitely. According to Hill, citizens were reoccupying land that falls under the Plank Road Claim, officially filed with the Canadian government’s Specific Claims Branch in 1987 disputing an 1841 “surrender” that Six Nations asserts was illegal.⁴³ The land is also part of the approximately 950,000-acre Haldimand Tract inhabited by the Six Nations af-

ter the British Crown recognized their support during the US War of Independence. The Haldimand Proclamation of 1784 promised to forever protect the Haudenosaunee land rights in the Grand River Territory, asserting they “take Possession of, & Settle upon the Banks of the River called Ours or Grand River, running into Lake Erie, allotting to them for that purpose Six Miles deep from each side . . . *which them & their posterity are to enjoy for ever.*”⁴⁴ According to legal scholar Sidney L. Haring, “It seems clear that the [Haudenosaunee] wanted to hold a huge tract of land, sufficient to maintain their traditional way of life.”⁴⁵ According to Hill, Haudenosaunee leaders were petitioning Crown representatives to address land claims problems only three years after the 1784 Proclamation, while the Crown dispossessed the Haudenosaunee of over 600,000 acres during the early 1800s. By 2001 Six Nations controlled only about 5 percent of the original tract.⁴⁶

On March 9, 2006, Ontario Superior Court judge David Marshall issued a permanent injunction stating that the people reoccupying their territory were in criminal contempt of the Canadian court. On March 17 an enforcement order was issued stating that any Six Nations people or supporters who did not leave the construction site by March 22 would be forcibly removed and charged, with a possible thirty-day sentence. Six Nations Clan Mothers, who are the titleholders in Haudenosaunee society, issued a statement on March 20 outlining their reasons for the reclamation:

The Canadian Government knows this land is subject to litigation resulting from fraudulent and dubious practices. Canada has allowed permits to be given out to Indian land it does not have title to. Gen. Haldimand confirmed that Britain would affirm the right of the Six Nations to a tract of land six miles deep on either side of the Grand River running from its mouth to its source. None of this land was ever legally surrendered. Most of this land was lost through a variety of frauds perpetrated or condoned by the colonial governments. Canada knows it violated the law when it deposed the traditional government in 1924. Canada is presently in negotiations to rectify these past injustices. Offering non-native people title to this land is a deliberate attempt to mislead and act in bad faith. Henco Industries is part of “sharp” practice on the part of the Crown in Right of Ontario and/or Canada which knows that it cannot grant legal title to these lands.⁴⁷

The Clan Mothers also asserted the illegitimacy of the colonial Indian Act government (forcibly imposed by Canada in 1924) and placed their grievance in terms of international law, Six Nations sovereignty, and the nation-to-nation relationship affirmed by treaties and their long history of international relations with the Crown: “The elected Six Nations Council of Grand River set up under the Indian Act does not represent the Rotinoshon’non:we [Haudenosaunee] according to standards established under international law, including The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.”⁴⁸ The statement clearly defines the illegality of Canada’s claim to the land and the legal purpose of the reclamation.

Protesters continued the reclamation in defiance of the Canadian court’s claim to jurisdiction, peacefully remaining within the bounds of the site. However, before dawn on the morning of April 20, the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) swarmed the camp with batons, tear gas cannons, and tasers and arrested a number of Six Nations citizens. Yet the Onkwehonwe managed to push the police back and subsequently erected roadblocks across a major artery through the town of Caledonia, the first time the action spread to outside the construction site.⁴⁹ After the initial police raid, some of the day’s action was televised live, launching intense public interest and media coverage following April 20.

Throughout the reclamation at Six Nations, I have written lengthy letters to different levels of the Canadian government in which I reminded our politicians about Canada’s treaty obligations and this country’s breach of international law and the recommendations made by our Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, which called for Indigenous self-determination and autonomy. A few weeks after the OPP invaded the reclamation site, I helped transport a carload of supplies and spent two nights at the site meagerly and quietly helping in the cookhouse—in fact, I’d be surprised if anyone remembered me. Although I had sought out and made contact with a Six Nations organizer and an elder beforehand and was received with great hospitality, I felt extremely uneasy being a white person at the site. Later, my feelings were confirmed when I read an article by Zainab Amadahy (Cherokee and African American) about the role of settlers in Indigenous struggles. Amadahy quotes one Native activist’s impression of non-Native protesters: “It’s as if they’re hoping for trouble so they’ll have something to do with themselves.” She confirms what I felt in my very brief time at the site, that some non-Native protesters might be drawn to Six Nations because of its historical

importance and potential for action, perhaps seeing it as a place to cut their activist teeth. Amadahy admits that although settler supporters are indeed necessary to Indigenous movements, their efforts are often misguided or misdirected and do not take into account issues of accountability and responsibility. She asks an important question: “Are staffing the barricades, spooning out canned spaghetti lunches to the warriors or chopping firewood the best ways that white settlers can support our struggles?”⁵⁰ However, writing of similar duties during the Oka resistance, Donna Goodleaf (Kanien’kehaka from Kahnawake) states: “I believe that when a nation of people are at war with the state, kitchen duty is a form of political action. It is viewed as an essential support system for the Rotiskenrahkete [warriors] who are putting their lives on the line.”⁵¹

Personally, I think I can be of better use deconstructing my own European American culture’s deception, misrepresentation, and willful amnesia about the colonization of North America. I make a better researcher than cook, and I agree with Amadahy that settlers should be responsible for our own education and decolonization. What follows, then, is an analysis of whitestream news media stories about the Six Nations reclamation, limited to a small fraction of the coverage between late February 2006, when Onkwehonwe reclaimed the land, to June 2006, after barricades were removed and the issue, though unresolved, no longer garnered significant media attention.⁵² This period of high-visibility coverage of the reclamation set the parameters for future understanding of and reference to this and other Indigenous sovereignty issues. I will identify particular Savagist themes and phrases that are recurring and illustrative of anti-Indigenous bias in media as well as the subtle ways in which publications suppress serious engagement with history and ongoing colonialism and use rhetoric to support the current colonial relationship between the settler nation-state and First Nations.

Early reports of the reclamation established the vocabulary for both the public’s understanding and the frame of future news reporting. Take, for example, this line from a March 9 report in the *Hamilton Spectator*, the largest daily newspaper in the Six Nations region: “Describing the action as a ‘land reclamation,’ the protesters say the subdivision is on land that was stolen from the Six Nations reserve.”⁵³ This sentence subtly questions the legitimacy of the action by putting land reclamation in quotes; similarly, the wording “the protesters say” implies that

the theft of Six Nations land is not an actual occurrence but rather a subjective opinion—this news article does not attempt to verify these apparent “claims.” This soon became a convention in reports on the reclamation: “Protesters *say* the disputed land is part of the original tract granted to the Six Nations people more than 200 years ago. They *say* the land was never sold, transferred or surrendered to non-natives.”⁵⁴ “Six Nations natives moved to reclaim the land, which they *say* was stolen from them.”⁵⁵ “Six Nations natives now occupy less than 5 per cent of the area and *claim* the rest was stolen by non natives.”⁵⁶ Such reporting does little to encourage critical thought about how Canada has come to be established on Indigenous lands. The history of this tract of land is documented and verifiable—Canada’s parliamentary record affirms the special status of Six Nations land along the Grand River, and reporters could have cited this record if they were skeptical of protesters’ “claims.” During a House Committee meeting to amend the Indian Act in 1914, Frank Oliver, then the former superintendent-general of Indian Affairs and himself responsible for encouraging the surrender of huge tracts of reserve land in western Canada, stated:

The Six Nation Indians located on the Grand river in Ontario . . . are in a different legal position from any Indian bands who are native to the country. These Indian bands on the Grand river had their original home in the United States. At the close of the war of the revolution they emigrated to Canada and were given lands under a special treaty, not as subjects of Great Britain, but as allies of Great Britain, and I maintain that the holding of these Six Nation Indians on the Grand river is of such a kind that this Parliament has no right to interfere with it. . . . This Parliament has no right to interfere with a treaty made between the Imperial Government and the Six Nation Indians.⁵⁷

Oliver’s statement, made ninety-five years prior to the reclamation, confirms Canada’s nation-to-nation relationship with the Six Nations Confederacy and the importance of protecting the land delineated as the Haldimand Tract.⁵⁸ News reports failed to note that the land in question was part of a nearly twenty-year-old land claim filed with the government of Canada.

One of the most obvious forms of anti-Indigenous rhetoric in media is the use of particular adjectives to describe Onkwehonwe, particu-

larly information that is irrelevant to the reclamation. For example, two separate reports about the action authored by journalist Paul Legall described reclamation spokesperson Dawn Smith as “a single mother who recently moved back to the reserve,” implicitly commenting on Smith’s credibility but using information irrelevant to the reclamation.⁵⁹ The statement does little to recognize the importance of women to Haudenosaunee governance and treaty matters. *Hamilton Spectator* reporter Daniel Nolan, describing the scene behind the barricade, wrote: “Some people sit by a campfire banging drums and chanting,” hardly a respectful way of referring to ceremonial singing; in fact, the phrase is loaded with Savagist overtones.⁶⁰ Colonial officials and the news media use Savagist discourse to legitimize a violent response to what was and is peaceful dissent against colonization. Prior to the events of April 20, when armed police invaded Kanenhsatón, the news media subtly fostered a Savagism-Civilization binary, portraying the government and police as hoping for peace and Six Nations citizens and their supporters as deviating from the law. *Spectator* writer Wade Hemsworth wrote in a March 27 article: “Caledonia is a place where citizens of two sovereign nations and very distinct cultures have mingled peacefully for generations.”⁶¹ Yet Hemsworth went on to refer to Onkwehonwe at the site as “occupiers” (ironic, is it not?). This particular article highlights the apparent unity felt by Onkwehonwe and non-Natives and the hope that violence would not take place, yet it glosses over the very issues referred to by the Clan Mothers and others at the reclamation site. This is an example of using the past to ignore present political controversy while distracting readers from the actual history of land theft—a subtly selective and all too common misuse of the past. Headlines, which are the most likely part of news coverage to be recalled by the audience to define the situation at a later time, support this binary: “Defiant Protester Stands Firm” (March 9), “Warrants Issued for Subdivision Occupiers” (March 29), “Natives Vow to Stand Their Ground,” “Aboriginals Ignore Court Order” (March 30), “Police, Government Talk of Peaceful End to Standoff” (April 3), “Joint Federal/Ontario Proposal for a ‘New Understanding’” (April 14), “Activist Defies Court’s Authority” (April 22).⁶² Casting the Six Nations citizens as ignoring the rule of (colonial) law established the parameters—that is, created the Savagist discursive formation—within which media outlets would later discuss the reclamation.

Though some non-Native residents expressed support for the recla-

mation, others were quoted in the press expressing fear of and anger toward the Onkwehonwe action. Such statements ran the spectrum of anti-Indigenous rhetoric, exposing these Canadians' lack of empathy and understanding of the historical context that led to the reclamation: "I'm not against native rights, but what about my right to go about my life, and drive down the road without getting turned back at a road-block?" asked one anonymous non-Native resident in an article that ran the day after the April 20 police raid.⁶³ Focusing on the inconvenience felt by non-Natives serves only to misdirect attention from issues of Six Nations sovereignty and does not raise the public's awareness of why the protest is occurring.⁶⁴ Another local non-Native resident, a nurse, told the *Toronto Star*: "The government needs to come in, bring in the army and clean it up. . . . This is not going to be solved peacefully."⁶⁵ This resident's subtle call for violence cannot be separated from the Canadian government's armed offensive response to Haudenosaunee resistance at Kanehsatake/Oka in 1990 and the murder of unarmed Anishinaabe protester Dudley George by the OPP at Ipperwash Provincial Park in 1995.⁶⁶ Considering the trauma caused by these military actions against Indigenous communities—as with the use of offensive team names—I wonder why it is that the news media would repeat such anti-Indigenous sentiments, which obviously are not useful in terms of reconciliation or public education and sincere "multicultural" coexistence.

Statements by other residents in the days following April 20 do not serve as evidence of the peaceful relations that had apparently previously existed in the area: "If these people [Onkwehonwe] are not Canadians then they're bloody terrorists," said one non-Native resident at a rally held by opponents of the reclamation.⁶⁷ Others yelled, "Get those outlaws out of there," once again legitimizing colonialist law and order and playing on Savages-as-outlaws and Wild West themes. At a non-Native rally on April 28, the *Spectator* reported: "A 25-year-old man held a sign that asked: 'Where are you John Wayne when we need you?' and 'Someone call the Duke,'" referring, no doubt, to Wayne's typical Indian-fighting characters. The young man told a reporter, "I'm not trying to inflame anything. Take it as you want it." Left at that, we are to assume no offense should be taken; these statements are, once again, all in good fun, *not* supportive of violence against Onkwehonwe. Another woman told the newspaper, "I am fighting for my town. It's time to get our town back."⁶⁸ Again, consider the irony that from another perspec-

tive the town of Caledonia is illegally squatting on unceded land. At another rally the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, a national daily newspaper, reported: “Furious residents waved Canadian flags as they chanted ‘Let us through’ and urged police to ‘Open the road.’”⁶⁹ The use of patriotic symbols by these antireclamation non-Native protesters only highlights the divisions between the two communities, and mobilizing these Canadian patriotic symbols in protest against Indigenous land claims promotes the Civilization/Savagism colonialist binary.

Portraying Onkwehonwe as militant outlaws allowed the OPP to justify its violent response to the reclamation, even doing so by claiming that the police showed restraint. At a press conference on April 20, OPP deputy commissioner Maurice Pilon said, “We felt the risk to public safety was heightening and thus we decided we should move [into the site] today. I would like to emphasize that I believe our officers showed tremendous restraint and were focused on peacefully removing protesters.”⁷⁰ Reportedly, Pilon would not elaborate as to how “the risk to public safety was heightening.”⁷¹ The police, who entered Kanenhstaton before dawn, unannounced and with weapons drawn, had the power to represent themselves as protecting the public (implying the Onkwehonwe were a threat) and to amend their own actions in terms of peaceful removal and restraint. Yet Onkwehonwe who were attacked by police suggest otherwise: “The police just completely swarmed the territory,” protester Mike Desroches told Hamilton’s CHCH Television, “incredibly quickly with overwhelming force.”⁷² Reclamation spokesperson Hazel Hill wrote an e-mail on April 20 that offers another perspective:

The OPP have been continuously reporting that they did not use any weapons other than pepper spray, that our people were armed etc., but when they moved in, the people were resting, some of them awakened from sleep and [were] told to move out. We maintain that we did not break the Peace, the OPP crossed the line and came into our lands fully packed with guns and other weapons with the intent to use them.⁷³

Six Nations citizens continually reminded the public that they were unarmed at Kanenhstaton, making the OPP’s response appear overly forceful and justification for it nothing but Savagist rhetoric. Yet such rhetoric is powerful in garnering Canadian support for the Canadian government and appears to have antagonized relations in the Six Na-

tions region; violence erupted between mobs of non-Native opponents (reportedly numbering at times in the several hundreds) and Onkwehonwe at Kanenhstaton on April 24, May 22, June 4, and June 9, and skirmishes occurred between individuals and smaller groups on other occasions. Reporting of these events took the form of an early colonial captivity narrative a month later, when Ron Desroches, an eighteen-year-old non-Native military reservist, sped through Kanenhstaton with an empty pellet gun and army fatigues in his car before being stopped and questioned by Onkwehonwe at the site. “I figured that was it. They were going to kill me. That’s what they were telling me they were going to do,” Desroches told the *Toronto Sun* in an article under the headline: “Teen: Natives Held Me Captive, ‘They Were Going to Kill Me.’”⁷⁴ However, the *Hamilton Spectator* quoted Onkwehonwe security worker Brian Skye: “At first [Desroches] treated it like a joke. He was smirking,” despite claiming to be lost and fearing for his life at the hands of the angry (and deadly) Natives!⁷⁵

Public officials—on whom the news media rely for the “official story”—engaged in explicit anti-Indigenous Savagist rhetoric, exposing the dysconscious racism that is apparently ingrained in the minds of politicians and police and that accidentally enters the public record to reveal the true attitude of some officials regarding the rights of Indigenous nations. One well-publicized example is Haldimand County mayor Marie Trainer’s April 25 comments on a national news network, insinuating that Onkwehonwe at the reclamation are welfare recipients. Referring to the economic impact of the road closure on the community, Trainer said: “They [non-Natives] don’t have money coming in automatically every month. . . . They’ve got to work to survive and the natives have got to realize that.”⁷⁶ After a confrontation with angry Six Nations citizens about her remarks, Trainer defended herself to reporters: “They needed to know what the Caledonia people thought. . . . I have to stick up for my people, just like they’re sticking up for themselves.”⁷⁷ Trainer confidently made the assumption that she was representing the majority opinion of the town of Caledonia—a Savagist opinion—as well as presuming that her colonialist stance is somehow akin to Six Nations citizens reclaiming their land and defending their sacred law! The news media failed to significantly analyze Trainer’s remarks; the *Spectator* published a brief opinion piece with the supportive headline, “Trainer’s a Political Survivor,” and a separate news article in which Mayor Trainer again

defended her words: “I’m in a glass house and every word I say is pulled apart and analyzed. All I can do is apologize. It was not meant to be racist. . . . There was only one person who was perfect and He was crucified. I hope they realize I’m human and it was not meant that way to hurt people.” As Trainer begged for absolution, deflecting the issue from racism to simple human error, she claimed martyrdom as part of her defense (“I’m in a glass house,” I’m not perfect, no mortal human is), and, despite the town council’s hope that she would step out of the spotlight, she reminded the public who is boss (perhaps channeling John Wayne himself?): “I’m still the head of the Corporation of Haldimand County.”⁷⁸ Sounds like a meaningful apology, does it not?

Trainer was not the only public official to rely on Savagist discourse to misinform the public about the reclamation. Following a violent altercation between cameramen from a local TV station and Onkwehonwe at Kanenhstaton, Ontario premier Dalton McGuinty held a press conference to “express sympathy and concern for those injured [i.e., the cameramen]” (a gesture that, to my knowledge, the premier did not extend to those tasered by the OPP on April 20). He also placed the onus for negotiation on First Nations: “We’re asking the First Nations leadership to ask themselves why it is our government should continue in good faith and out of good will to try to negotiate.”⁷⁹ McGuinty uses an isolated and comparatively minor incident to ignore international law (e.g., treaties) in order to portray “negotiation” as a gift to First Nations rather than a legal responsibility and, basically, to defile Onkwehonwe, many of whom distrust the government’s own lack of good faith to begin with and are defending their own rightful sovereign territory. Days later, McGuinty helped set the tone—via whitestream media—that Onkwehonwe are threatening, dangerous, and in opposition to “the rule of law.” After the Ontario government purchased the subdivision land from Henco Industries for \$12.3 million, McGuinty played on citizens’ fear by engaging in discourses of Savagism: “The continuing occupation is just not helpful, and it really constitutes the remaining potential for danger,” McGuinty told the press. In a separate statement, Marie Trainer’s deputy mayor, Tom Patterson, agreed with McGuinty: “If they [Onkwehonwe] were to leave, people in Caledonia would certainly feel less anxious.”⁸⁰ In just a few paragraphs, this one newspaper story does a great deal to privilege Canada’s position of power (and Savagism is, of course, about power relations): compensating the builders instead of

Six Nations ignores the Crown's treaty obligations and implies the land is Henco's to sell; suggesting that the reclamation (the "occupation," according to McGuinty) might lead to "danger" casts Onkwehonwe as violent Savages and plays on non-Native residents' apparent fears of further altercations; suggesting Onkwehonwe should abandon the site negates their responsibility to protect the land and ignores Canada's responsibility to Six Nations on a nation-to-nation basis. The failure of the news media to analyze these statements and actions by the governments of Canada represents a failure of the press to objectively document political events. In such instances the press fails its reading or viewing public by allowing politicians to make false Savagist statements, by not holding Canada responsible for its negation of treaties and other international agreements, and by fostering future violence because they have cast Onkwehonwe as violent savages upon whom more colonialist violence is acceptable. Thus, a frontier mentality continues, fostered by an unrepentant colonial government and an uncritical corps of journalists committed to preserving the status quo.

CONCLUSION

Ironically, media did serve to undermine Savagist discourse on a very few occasions. Reporting on the April 20 police raid, the Canadian Press cited an interview with Norma General, an Onkwehonwe woman whose son was arrested: "The police come in—without any warning, they come and raid our village—that's their tactic, they always come in when nobody's aware."⁸¹ Norma General's comments cleverly reverse the whitemainstream image of the late-night raid performed by "ruthless Savages" on early colonial settlements. The news media also served as a platform for expressions of Onkwehonwe sovereignty. The *Hamilton Spectator* likened security checks of non-Natives entering the camp to "an international border inspection," which is, in essence, what it was.⁸² But these two examples, and the few others like them, are far outweighed by the reliance of the government and news media on Savagist discourse and their unwillingness to deeply analyze the situation or even consider challenging the status quo colonialist assumption that Canada is the sovereign and rightful owner of Onkwehonwe land. Despite this, the Six Nations Onkwehonwe have won major victories: the elected (or imposed) Indian Act Band Council has recognized the Confederacy as the body

that should negotiate this matter on behalf of the entire community, and the federal government has committed itself to negotiations with the Confederacy over this matter for the first time since 1924. Doreen Silversmith spoke on behalf of the Clan Mothers and represented Six Nations at the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous People in May 2006.⁸³ These developments should serve as precedents for future Indigenous claims in Canada.

As with the issue of racist sports mascots and related imagery, we must question the role of print and broadcast media in perpetuating the government's anti-Indigenous rhetoric and promoting its validity. We must examine whitestream media and ask how we can possibly expect Canadians to become educated on issues of Indigenous sovereignty, the complexity of treaties and land claims, if the news media filter reports through uncritically Savagist frames while claiming not to be filtering at all. How does such clearly biased reporting, which is often so subtly Savagist in language and dysconscious intent, work to restore Indigenous faith in Canada's rhetoric of multiculturalism and equality? How can this continued approach promote sincere negotiation and reconciliation? Perhaps it is because many European Americans have not felt consciously disempowered that they are unable to feel empathy for those whose lands have been invaded and occupied, whose children have been stolen, after hundreds of years of violence and violations. Perhaps that is why with so little grace or humility we continue to mock and denigrate, all the while saying we don't have to stop. We can clearly see that the Savagism-Civilization binary is quite alive in the minds of many non-Indigenous settler-colonists, which legitimizes the ongoing use of racist sports symbolism and Savagist discourse in media reporting of complex Indigenous issues. My hope is that this too-brief deconstruction of a few public anti-Indigenous manifestations can lead to a more sustained public debate about journalistic practice, decolonization and whitestream media, and the importance of independent, truly democratic, noncorporate, and anticolonial media.

NOTES

I am grateful to my friend Daniel Heath Justice (Cherokee Nation) for a conversation over high tea that reminded me of how the Savagism-Civilization binary might be applied to coverage of the Six Nations reclamation. I learned a

great deal about the reclamation at a panel of papers by Onkwehonwe scholars Susan Hill, Rick Monture, and Theresa McCarthy at the Native American and Indigenous Studies meeting at the University of Georgia, April 12, 2008 (day 774 of the reclamation). I would like to acknowledge Rebecca Houwer, my companion at the reclamation, who has supported me through this journey. My hope is this article will be of some use to Six Nations communities: "Nia:wen."

Epigraph: Janie Jamieson, speech to the Law Society of Upper Canada, August 21, 2007, <http://reclamationinfo.com/?p=62>.

1. Canada, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* (Ottawa: Canadian Communication Group, 1996), 5:103. See also 3:621–47 for a detailed discussion.

2. Canada, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Report*, 5:103–4. The Royal Commission recommended that Canadian broadcasters hire Indigenous reporters and give greater priority to covering Indigenous issues and that media representing Indigenous perspectives be made available nationally.

3. Ward Churchill, "Let's Spread the 'Fun' Around: The Issue of Sports Team Names and Mascots," in *From a Native Son: Selected Essays on Indigenism, 1985–1995* (Boston: South End Press, 1996), 439–43.

4. See also C. Richard King and Charles F. Springwood, "Imagined Indians, Social Identities, and Activism," in *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascot Controversy*, ed. King and Springwood (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 6–7.

5. The seminal work on non-Natives appropriating *indian*/Indigenous identities is Philip J. Deloria (Lakota), *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998). See also an article by Reyna Green, who is of Cherokee descent: "The Tribe Called Wannabee: Playing Indian in America and Europe," *Folklore* 99 (1988): 30–55.

6. In addition to Churchill and the essays in King and Springwood's collection, *Team Spirits*, see Carol Spindel, *Dancing at Halftime: Sports and the Controversy over American Indian Mascots* (New York: New York University Press, 2000) and Jason Edward Black, "The 'Mascotting' of Native America: Construction, Commodity, and Assimilation," *American Indian Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (2002): 605–22.

7. Churchill, "Let's Spread the 'Fun' Around," 442.

8. Frantz Fanon, *Toward the African Revolution*, trans. Haakon Chevalier (1964; New York: Grove Press, 1969), 33, 53.

9. Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983), xvi, xv.

10. On Turner and Fonda doing the tomahawk chop during the 1995 World Series even after Fonda promised American Indian Movement protesters that she would cease performing the offensive gesture, see King and Springwood, "Imagined Indians," 12–13.

11. Taiaiake Alfred, *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom* (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2005), 120–21 (ellipsis in original).

12. Scholars have used the term *whitestream* when referring to the North American mainstream in order to underscore the reality that the dominant-dominating culture (i.e., the self-appointed “mainstream”) remains inextricably linked to whiteness. See, for example, Sandy Grande (Quechua), “Whitestream Feminism and the Colonialist Project: Toward a Theory of Indigenista,” in *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), 123–57. Grande uses the term to signify the differences between white mainstream feminist theory and theorizing by radical women of color. Luis Urrieta Jr. uses the word in a Chicano/a context in his article, “Dis-Connections in ‘American’ Citizenship and the Post/Neo-Colonial: People of Mexican Descent and Whitestream Pedagogy and Curriculum,” *Theory and Research in Social Education* 32, no. 4 (2004): 433–58.

13. See also Daniel Morley Johnson, “(Re)Nationalizing Naanabozho: Anishinaabe Sacred Stories, Nationalist Literary Criticism, and Scholarly Responsibility,” in *Troubling Tricksters: Revisioning Critical Conversations*, ed. Deanna Reder and Linda Morra (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2010), esp. 200–204.

14. Jay Rosenstein, “*In Whose Honor?*, Mascots, and the Media,” in King and Springwood, *Team Spirits*, 243–44.

15. A 2002 press release on the mascot issue by the NAJA is archived at http://www.naja.com/news/releases/021101_mascots/.

16. Don Sellar, “Let Teams Take Heat for Nickname Insults,” *Toronto Star*, May 25, 2002.

17. In fact, the Washington Redskins football team had its trademark canceled by the US Patent and Trademark Office’s Appeal Board in 1999 “on the grounds that the subject marks may disparage Native Americans and may bring them into contempt or disrepute.” See Suzan Shown Harjo (Cheyenne and Hodulgee Muscogee), “Fighting Name-Calling: Challenging ‘Redskins’ in Court,” in King and Springwood, *Team Spirits*, 189–207.

18. C. Richard King, “Defensive Dialogues: Native American Mascots, Anti-Indianism, and Educational Institutions,” *Studies in Media and Information Literacy Education* 2, no. 1 (2002), <http://www.utpjournals.com/simile/issue5/kingfulltext.html> (emphasis added).

19. Quoted in NAJA press release.

20. Rosenstein, “*In Whose Honor?*” 249.

21. CBC News, “Lastman Apologizes to African IOC Member,” http://www.cbc.ca/world/story/2001/07/12/olympics_lastman010712.html.

22. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, *Anti-Indianism in Modern America: A Voice from Tatekeya’s Earth* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001), x.

23. Cornel Pewewardy, "From Enemy to Mascot: The Deculturation of Indian Mascots in Sports Culture," *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 23, no. 2 (1999): 176.
24. Howard Adams, *Prison of Grass: Canada from a Native Point of View* (1975; Saskatoon: Fifth House, 1989), 38.
25. Cook-Lynn, *Anti-Indianism*, 4.
26. Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, "Annihilation Until Conditional Surrender," *Counterpunch*, October 11, 2004, <http://www.counterpunch.org/ortiz10122004.html>.
27. Thomas King, *The Truth about Stories: A Native Narrative* (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2003), 145.
28. Dale Turner, *This Is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 94 (emphasis in original).
29. Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (1953; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 105.
30. See Emma LaRocque's comprehensive analysis in *When the Other Is Me: Native Resistance Discourse, 1850–1990* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010), 37–58. See also her critique of the Canadian educational system in *Defeathering the Indian* (Agincourt, ON: Book Society of Canada, 1975). Olive Dickason documents the European intellectual history of the savage or wild man and how these ideas carried to the Americas in *The Myth of the Savage and the Beginnings of French Colonialism in the Americas* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1984).
31. Adams, *Prison of Grass*, 17.
32. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (1969; London: Routledge Classics, 2002), 54, 82.
33. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (1978; New York: Vintage, 2003), 19–20.
34. See Pearce's chapter 4, "The Zero of Human Society: The Idea of the Savage," in *Savagism and Civilization*, 105–34. For Orientalist equivalents used in my definitions, see Said, *Orientalism*, 6–7, 23, 62, 75. These Savagist examples are modified from my own unpublished essay, "'After All the Indian Is a Savage': Discourses of Savagism and the Development of United States Government Ethnology."
35. Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization*, 127.
36. Three oft-cited books on "Othering" in the Americas are Robert Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage, 1979); Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980); and Daniel Francis, who provides a Canadian context in *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1992).

37. King and Springwood, "Imagined Indians," 8–9.
38. Mary Ann Weston, *Native Americans in the News: Images of Indians in the Twentieth Century Press* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 2.
39. Sandra Lambertus, *Wartime Images, Peacetime Wounds: The Media and the Gustafsen Lake Standoff* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 10, 121, 126.
40. Susan M. Hill, "Conducting Haudenosaunee Historical Research from Home: In the Shadow of the Six Nations–Caledonia Reclamation," *American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (2009): 480.
41. Michael Orsini, "The Journalist and the Angry White Mob: Reflections from the Field," in *This Is an Honour Song: Twenty Years since the Blockades*, ed. Leanne Simpson and Kiera L. Ladner (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010), 250–51.
42. See "Developer Warned Four Months Ago about Six Nations Land," *Hamilton Spectator*, March 9, 2006.
43. Hill, "Conducting Haudenosaunee Historical Research," 481, 483.
44. Haldimand Proclamation, quoted in Sidney L. Harring, "The Six Nations in Upper Canadian Legal History: Canadian Law and the Struggle for Tribal Sovereignty, 1784–1860," in *Earth, Water, Air, and Fire: Studies in Canadian Ethnohistory*, ed. David T. McNab (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1998), 185 (emphasis added). See also Hill, "Conducting Haudenosaunee Historical Research," 483–84.
45. Harring, "The Six Nations in Upper Canadian Legal History," 186. Hill affirms the desire of the Haudenosaunee to "[reestablish] their families, clans, Nations, and the Confederacy along the banks of the Grand River" (Hill, "Conducting Haudenosaunee Historical Research," 484).
46. Hill, "Conducting Haudenosaunee Historical Research," 483–86. See also Hill's forthcoming monograph, *The Clay We Are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, in print).
47. Clan Mothers' statement archived at <http://sisis.nativeweb.org/actionalert/updates/060320clanmothersstatement.html>.
48. Clan Mothers' statement. The 1924 raid by the RCMP and overthrow of the Six Nations government is documented in *Basic Call to Consciousness* (Mohawk Nation via Roosevelttown, NY: Akwesasne Notes, 1978), 18–33. During the raid, Canadian officials reportedly stole wampum belts that documented the nation-to-nation agreements between Six Nations and the Crown (*Basic Call*, 22, 24).
49. Onkwehonwe means "the original people" in Kanienkeha, the Mohawk language, and is used as a synonym for Six Nations Haudenosaunee people as well as other Indigenous supporters.
50. Zainab Amadahy, "The Role of Settlers in Indigenous Struggles," *Canadian Dimension* 41, no. 3 (2007): 6, 7.

51. Donna Goodleaf, *Entering the War Zone: A Mohawk Perspective on Resisting Invasions* (Penticton, BC: Theytus Books, 1995), 34.

52. At the time of writing, an extensive archive of news reports during the same period is available on the website of Settlers in Support of Indigenous Sovereignty, <http://sisis.nativeweb.org/actionalert/index.html#newsarchive>.

53. Paul Legall, "Defiant Protester Stands Firm," *Hamilton Spectator*, March 9, 2006.

54. Paul Morse, "Court Orders Protesters Out," *Hamilton Spectator*, March 6, 2006.

55. Paul Legall, "Native Protesters Dig in for Long Haul," *Hamilton Spectator*, March 11, 2006.

56. Paul Legall, "Judge Continues Hearing," *Hamilton Spectator*, March 17, 2006.

57. Susan Hill affirms: "Some people erroneously assert that Governor Haldimand 'gave' the Six Nations this land when in reality he was reaffirming promises made by the British eighty-three years prior" in the Albany (Nanfan) Treaty ("Conducting Haudenosaunee Historical Research," 483–84). Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *House of Commons Debates (Hansard)*, 12th Parliament, 3rd sess., 116:3537.

58. I do not want to valorize Frank Oliver, who as a newspaper editor and later as a federal politician used editorials and journalism as well as his political influence to advocate for and then to legislate the illegal removal of Indigenous peoples in western Canada, notably, the Papatash Cree band in his home constituency of Edmonton. Oliver's own anti-Indigenous rhetoric is documented in part in Linda Goyette, ed., *Edmonton in Our Own Words* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2004), 97–98, 156. I have discussed this in a conference paper, "Rhetorical Removals in South Edmonton: Media Representations of the Papatash Cree First Nation," at "Continuities and Innovations: Popular Print Cultures—Past and Present, Local and Global," University of Alberta, August 30, 2008. I elaborate Oliver's role in dispossessing Cree peoples of their lands in my forthcoming PhD dissertation.

59. Paul Legall, "Natives Halt Construction Work," *Hamilton Spectator*, March 1, 2006; Legall, "I'm 'Caught in the Middle' of Land Dispute: Developer," *Hamilton Spectator*, March 2, 2006.

60. Daniel Nolan, "A Look at What's behind the Barricade," *Hamilton Spectator*, April 28, 2007.

61. Wade Hemsworth, "Keeping the Peace in Caledonia," *Hamilton Spectator*, March 27, 2006.

62. On the importance of headlines in news coverage of Indigenous action, see Lambertus, *Wartime Images*, 16.

63. Katie Harries, with files from Timothy Appleby, "'We Were Upholding Our Law,'" *Globe and Mail*, April 21, 2006.

64. This particular news theme has become popular in Canada, especially when Onkwehonwe have blocked rail lines and “inconvenienced” passengers, as occurred on April 21, 2006, when Kanien’kehaka supporters blocked the passenger and cargo line between Toronto and Montreal. Joel Kom and Peter Brieger, “Protest Strands 3,500 Rail Travellers, Freight,” *National Post*, April 22, 2006.

65. Peter Edwards and Pinjo Gombu, “Standoff at Caledonia,” *Toronto Star*, April 21, 2006.

66. On Kanehsatake/Oka and Haudenosaunee nationalist politics, see Taiaiake Alfred, *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism* (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 1995). See also Goodleaf, *Entering the War Zone*; Linda Pertusati, *In Defense of Mohawk Land: Ethnopolitical Conflict in Native North America* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997); and Abenaki director Alanis Obomsawin’s 1994 film *KANEHSATAKE: 270 Years of Resistance* (National Film Board of Canada). On the murder of Dudley George, see the articles and final report of the Ipperwash Inquiry (2007), archived at <http://www.ipperwashinquiry.ca>.

67. Gregory Bonnell, “Mob of Angry Ont. Residents Confront Native Protesters, Held at Bay by Police,” *Canadian Press*, April 25, 2006.

68. Daniel Nolan, “Peaceful but Persistent,” *Hamilton Spectator*, April 29, 2006.

69. Kate Harries, “Townsppeople Boo Speaker from OPP; 500 Rush Police Line near Occupation Site,” *Globe and Mail*, April 25, 2006.

70. Katie Rook, “Native Protesters Push Back after Raid,” *National Post*, April 21, 2006.

71. Harries, “We Were Upholding Our Law.”

72. Jennifer Graham, “Police End Occupation, but Natives Remain,” *Canadian Press*, April 20, 2006.

73. Hazel Hill’s statement is archived at <http://sisis.nativeweb.org/actionalert/updates/060420hazelhill.html>.

74. Brodie Fenlon, “Teen: Natives Held Me Captive, ‘They Were Going to Kill Me,’” *Toronto Sun*, May 20, 2006.

75. “Eighteen-Year-Old with Pellet Gun Sparks Disturbance at Barricades,” *Hamilton Spectator*, May 19, 2006.

76. See “CBC News in Depth: Caledonia Land Claim,” <http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/caledonia-landclaim>.

77. CBC News, “Mayor’s Comments Anger Aboriginal Protesters in Caledonia Standoff,” April 25, 2006, <http://www.cbc.ca/story/canada/national/2006/04/25/caledonia-protest-060425.html>.

78. Paul Legall and Daniel Nolan, “Mayor Lands in Hot Water, Apologizes to Natives,” *Hamilton Spectator*, April 26, 2006.

79. CTV News, “McGuinty Condemns New Violence in Caledonia,” <http://>

www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20060610/camera_injuries_060610?s_name=&no_ads=.

80. John Burman, "Henco Gets \$12.3m for Land, McGuinty Implores Native Protesters to Leave Douglas Creek Estates Property," *Hamilton Spectator*, June 23, 2006.

81. Graham, "Police End Occupation."

82. Paul Legall and Daniel Nolan, "Protesters Use Barricade to Screen Non-Native Visitors," *Hamilton Spectator*, April 27, 2006.

83. The text of Silversmith's address is available on numerous Internet sites, including <http://canadiandimension.com/articles/2006/05/16/482/>.

Copyright of American Indian Quarterly is the property of University of Nebraska Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.