



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

Zitkala-Ša and the Problem of Regionalism Nations, Narratives, and Critical Traditions

Totten, Gary.

The American Indian Quarterly, Volume 29, Number 1&2, Winter/Spring
2005, pp. 84-123 (Article)

Published by University of Nebraska Press
DOI: 10.1353/aiq.2005.0070



For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/aiq/summary/v029/29.1totten.html>

Zitkala-Ša and the Problem of Regionalism

Nations, Narratives, and Critical Traditions

GARY TOTTEN

Although Yankton Sioux writer Zitkala-Ša (Gertrude Bonnin, 1876–1938) was, as P. Jane Hafen notes, “virtually unknown for many decades” (*Dreams* 165), much critical work has appeared since Dexter Fisher’s 1979 article, “Zitkala-Ša: Evolution of a Writer.” Some critics desiring to bring Zitkala-Ša into the conversation about turn-of-the-century American women writers have done so recently under the auspices of literary regionalism. Martha Cutter has demonstrated Zitkala-Ša’s problematic relationship to autobiographical conventions, concluding that Zitkala-Ša’s life-writing “violates” traditional patterns of autobiography because “it does not put forth a model of triumph and integration, nor does it emphasize the importance of language in the overall process of self-authentication” (31). If, as Cutter argues, we cannot, in the context of autobiography criticism, “expect her writing to legitimate the very institutions (the English language, writing, culture, and ‘civilization’) which have suppressed her” (31), then how can we expect her texts to conform to traditional expectations for regionalist texts?

Critics approaching Zitkala-Ša as a regionalist fall into two camps: those reading her work within a regionalist framework and those reading her work in terms of how it expands our conception of regionalism and the regionalist canon. Including Indigenous texts in the canon is crucial, but without a change in critical paradigms, such an effort ignores the dissonance between Indigenous texts and traditional critical categories and, ultimately, fails to transform the study of American literature. In her analysis of American realism and canon change, Elizabeth Ammons argues that critical terminology must transform to reflect the pluralism of American literature and argues against relying on “precon-

ceived inherited theories about American literature” (103) in criticism. While critical work on regionalism has moved toward a discussion of cultural difference (for example, recent articles by Sandra Zagarell and Cynthia Davis on otherness in Jewett or Stephanie Foote’s *Regional Fictions*), white writers and texts often remain at the center of such analyses. Even when writers from outside the dominant culture are included in the regionalist canon, this inclusion is often accomplished through the “inherited theories” Ammons mentions, rather than with critical approaches appropriate to Indigenous literatures.¹

Various critics have responded to the need for appropriate critical approaches to Indigenous literatures.² In *The Voice in the Margins*, Arnold Krupat observes, similar to Ammons, that critical poetics must be reformulated to account for American Indian literature and that “[t]o urge the inclusion of Indian literature in the canon of American literature . . . is not only to propose an addition but a reevaluation of what ‘American literature’ means” (98). Unfortunately, as Elizabeth Cook-Lynn observes, characterizing Indigenous texts as the voice “at the margin” or at the “center of the margin,” as John Beverley does in his essay, “The Margin at the Center,” further negates “what it is that natives have had to say” (Cook-Lynn, “How Scholarship Defames the Native Voice” 81). Cook-Lynn further concludes that

[c]ontemporary American Indian Fiction is sustained as such by non-Indian publishers and editors, critics and scholars for Euro-Anglo canonical reasons (some might even suggest imperialistic reasons) rather than for either the continuation of indigenous literary traditions and development of nationalistic critical apparatuses or for the sake of simple intellectual curiosity. (“The American Indian Fiction Writer” 35)

To counter such imperialistic literary practices, Paula Gunn Allen envisions a “critical system that is founded . . . on actual human society and relationships rather than on textual relations alone” (309), suggesting that critics cannot simply look for overlaps between canonical texts and the themes and concerns of Indigenous texts. Craig Womack, who views the Native and American literary canons as separate (7), further resists such an overlap and argues that Indigenous peoples should have an “increasingly important role in evaluating tribal literatures” (1), emphasizing, as Elizabeth Cook-Lynn argues, that “the right to speak for oneself

and one's people . . . is as fundamental as food and decent housing" ("How Scholarship Defames the Native Voice" 80). Womack seeks a Native literary criticism that privileges "Native critical centers," works "from within the nation, rather than looking toward the outside" (12), "emphasizes Native resistance movements against colonialism, confronts racism, discusses sovereignty and Native nationalism, seeks connections between literature and liberation struggles, and . . . roots literature in land and culture" (11).³ Clearly, dominant literary and critical traditions provide an inadequate paradigm for the study of Indigenous texts; indeed, the works of Zitkala-Ša and other Indigenous writers are more responsibly read and taught as counter-critical and counter-cultural to such a paradigm.

The "problem" of regionalism in my title refers to this disjunction between dominant critical paradigms and Indigenous texts. In his study of the problem of American realism, Michael Davitt Bell suggests that though the ideas of realism and naturalism "may be little more than figments of our literary-historical imaginations," they have been "thoroughly functional" ideas, serving various purposes for both nineteenth-century writers and current critics (4). I wish to propose a semantically similar but ideologically different inquiry and ask what purposes traditional literary-historical classifications have served in the literary criticism and histories of Indigenous texts; such a study highlights, particularly for non-Indigenous critics, the ethnocentric nature of American literary history and critical paradigms.⁴ Zitkala-Ša's *Old Indian Legends* (1901), the essays and fiction of *American Indian Stories* (published in 1921, but containing pieces written as early as 1900), and her later political writings are not just expansive or disruptive (in terms of the canon) but defy the nationalistic agendas and colonizing effects of aesthetic categories and critical assumptions, specifically in relation to theories of American regionalist writing, and expose the complexity and contradictions of critical paradigms.

THE CRITICAL USES OF REGIONALISM

American literary regionalism owes much of its problems to the ways it has been defined and used. Regionalism is a sloppy and contested term at best and has been stretched beyond its limits to accommodate various writers and texts. In her 1956 essay, "Place in Fiction," Eudora Welty

refers to “regional” as a “careless term, as well as a condescending one. . . . ‘Regional’ is an outsider’s term; it has no meaning for the insider who is doing the writing, because as far as he knows, he is simply writing about life” (548). Welty’s argument challenges regionalism’s critical distinctiveness; indeed, according to Welty’s statement, everything in fiction could be said to originate in the local. Recent critical studies of regionalism tend to emphasize a more positive reading of the term’s openness, looking, as Richard Brodhead does, for ways it opens up literary access to a wider range of writers (118). Stephanie Foote notes that regionalism “provided a way for ethnic writers and subjects to enter into the mainstream of American literature,” for example, Sui Sin Far (Edith Maude Eaton), Charles Chesnutt, and Abraham Cahan (“Cultural Work of Regionalism” 37), although this view also allows critics to assimilate such literature into the mainstream, rather than acknowledge the culturally specific criticism required for its interpretation. In their introduction to *Breaking Boundaries: New Perspectives on Women’s Regional Writing*, Sherrie Innes and Diana Royer view regionalism as a critical category that evolves along with critical theory and academic disciplines. However, if we consider the nature of regionalism’s evolution in relation to non-white writers, we observe that this change usually occurs as an effort to include more writers of color as regionalists, rendering the term even more careless, rather than as an actual change in thinking about regionalism. If issues of race and culture influence readings of regionalist writers, then theories of regionalism must reflect that influence as well. Charles L. Crow begins to reflect this awareness in his introduction to *A Companion to the Regional Literatures of the America*, where he notes that, in addition to geography, regionalism is about the “major problems and concerns of national history,” including “slavery,” “the place of indigenous people,” and “women’s rights.” Sometimes, Crow notes, the “regional approach . . . even challenges the wisdom of studying literature packaged according to nation-states” (2). However, beyond simply asking, as Crow does, “Is there really an American literature, or . . . only a collection of regional literatures?” (2), we must investigate the implications of such a question for Indigenous culture and literary production.

Despite regionalism’s supposed theoretical latitude, criticism of regionalist texts fails to respond to the dynamic nature of Indigenous culture and identity. Werner Sollors observes that the dominant culture constructs ethnicities and nationalisms as stable and timeless ideas to

serve dominant ideologies (xiii–xiv); criticism of regionalist literature produces a similar effect by representing local life as knowable (i.e., stable and timeless) and ethnic difference within a region as simply another fixed idea. Considering this tendency in relation to Zitkala-Ša's work, it is clear that she is writing neither a fixed ethnicity nor a stable and timeless region, for the culture and place that she writes about are, during the very moment she writes about them, undergoing dramatic changes. Elisabeth Luther Cary, in a 1902 review of Zitkala-Ša's autobiographical *Atlantic* essays, emphasizes the essays' belatedness, noting how Zitkala-Ša highlights "the finer aspects of the old order—which, for [her], . . . has changed forever" (21). Zitkala-Ša registers this cultural change even before she leaves for the eastern boarding school. When her brother, Dawée, comes home after three years of boarding school, his return influences Zitkala-Ša's mother to "take a farther step from her native way of living" ("Impressions" 45), indicated through changes in her home: "[f]irst it was a change from the buffalo skin to the white man's canvas that covered our wigwam. Now she had given up her wigwam of slender poles, to live, a foreigner, in a home of clumsy logs" (45). As a child in this "clumsy" and foreign home, Zitkala-Ša hangs on her mother's knee, naively hoping that she, too, might travel away to the land of "red apples" (46) where she will experience further cultural change. By the time Zitkala-Ša writes her autobiographical essays, the changes are even more pronounced, and her mother has embraced what Zitkala-Ša refers to in "Why I Am a Pagan" as "the new superstition" of Christianity" (803), though Zitkala-Ša would convert to Catholicism later in her life and placed her son, Ohiya, in a Midwestern Catholic boarding school in 1913 (Hafen, *Dreams* 126). Because Zitkala-Ša is writing about a way of life that has survived rapid change, she interprets identity, geography, and everyday reality in response to such change, a form of textual, cultural, and psychological work which explicitly works against the universalizing tendencies of dominant ideologies and which white regionalists do not undertake in their texts.

Contemporary criticism of Zitkala-Ša's work often veils these important differences between white and Indigenous writers through a process of cultural-critical appropriation. By examining the effects of criticism that reads Zitkala-Ša as a regionalist, my intention is not to disparage the work of other critics. These critical appraisals represent needed debate and scholarship about Zitkala-Ša's work. Indeed, as Patricia Okker ar-

gues, more scholarship on Indigenous writers such as Zitkala-Ša is crucial to the understanding and approach to such texts, both critically and pedagogically (98). But a metacritical perspective on this scholarship can also alert us to the ways in which traditional interpretive paradigms and assumptions perpetuate the appropriation of Indigenous texts.

For example, in an article comparing Sarah Orne Jewett and Zitkala-Ša, D. K. Meisenheimer Jr. notes Zitkala-Ša's resistance to the "elegiac ethnography of the regionalist genre," which eulogizes regions and cultures and is a prevalent device in Jewett's fiction (121) but ultimately inscribes Zitkala-Ša's work within theories of literary regionalism. He suggests that both writers utilize "[o]ne of regionalism's most distinctive topoi[,] . . . people and landscape, culture and nature, as functions of each other" (110), but argues that Zitkala-Ša circumvents regionalist genre expectations (which, he suggests, she used to satisfy the audience of her *Harper's* and *Atlantic* pieces) by embracing an "immanent" spirituality (119).⁵ Though Zitkala-Ša appears to challenge more regionalist characteristics than she sustains in Meisenheimer's reading, a regionalist framework finally allows Meisenheimer to read Zitkala-Ša as "region embodied, the cultural-natural aspects of her native region [being] embodied in her own person as an inherently movable quality" (121). If this reading grants Zitkala-Ša a certain physical and social mobility, and, as Meisenheimer argues, supports the "Indian view of a nondichotomous spirit-body [which] sees her presence as spiritually and culturally rooted regardless of her whereabouts" (119), it also places her in the problematic position of representative Sioux woman. Furthermore, while Meisenheimer's reading might liberate Zitkala-Ša's texts and self from the eulogized region, to read her as "region embodied" does not account for the significant cultural (as well as textual) consequences of Zitkala-Ša's "whereabouts" in relation to the taking of Indian lands or acknowledge how, as Kathryn Shanley notes, the "effort to retain land bases, recover lost territories, and hang on to hunting, water, mineral, and other rights associated with living in a particular place" is a central political issue for Indigenous peoples ("Born from the Need to Say" 3).

Other critics, such as Donna Campbell, demonstrate, perhaps unintentionally, the incompatibility between Zitkala-Ša's texts and the white regionalist aesthetic. In *Resisting Regionalism*, Campbell briefly acknowledges Zitkala-Ša's important contribution to early-twentieth-century women's literature as a writer of color who offers a new perspective on

American experience, but, perhaps because Zitkala-Ša's work does not lend itself to the careful formulas of regionalism that Campbell lays out, Zitkala-Ša does not appear in Campbell's extended analysis of mostly white women regionalists.

Campbell distinguishes the women local colorists from the male naturalists through three chief characteristics. First, through this fiction, women writers stage a "quiet rebellion" against the "destructive . . . forms imposed by an idealistic male culture (represented often by ministers) upon a community of women" (24). Writing in her autobiography of her Christian boarding school experience and, in her essay "Why I Am a Pagan," of her encounter with an Indigenous preacher, Zitkala-Ša also registers the destructive nature of regulatory patriarchal institutions and practices, but not solely in terms of their effects on female communities. In the autobiography, for example, she rebels against the dominant culture's destructive practices through her outrage when, during a college oratorical contest, the opposing team displays a banner bearing the image of a "forlorn Indian girl" with the word "squaw" below ("School Days" 194). Zitkala-Ša's anger stems as much from the banner's racist message as from its misogynist language. She claims that the banner represents, for her, the "strong prejudice against my people" (193) and a visual counterpart to the "slurs against the Indian that stained the lips of our opponents" (193). To effectively rebel against such racist discourse, she must master and then effectively wield the English language of her oppressors; ultimately, she demonstrates linguistic power by winning a prize in the oratorical contest and penning her version of the event in the autobiography. In "Why I Am a Pagan," she rebels more subtly against Christianity's attempts to obliterate Indigenous belief by reminding her readers that "the pale-faced missionary and the hoodooed aborigine are both God's creatures" (803) and by imagining what was unthinkable at the time: a multicultural nation in which all races co-mingle as a "living mosaic of human beings" (802).

Zitkala-Ša's work responds in similar ways to the other characteristics of women's local color fiction, which Campbell identifies. Campbell argues that female local colorists affirm "self-denial and acceptance not only as necessary survival tactics but as the means of creating a genuine, if attenuated, satisfaction in life" (24). Additionally, through the motif of storytelling, female local color writers emphasize "a homogeneous, empathic audience, insisting that stories are incomplete until they are

shared” and preserved (24); storytelling builds and sustains community. Zitkala-Ša clearly does not accept or value cultural loss, and her refusal to do so gives the autobiography the melancholy tone, unconventional form, and dissatisfying ending that, as Cutter notes, distinguishes the text from traditional autobiographies in form and content. Zitkala-Ša insists that the boarding school’s “iron routine” threatens to destroy her culture and individuality and that the “melancholy of those black days” overshadows her life long after she leaves the school. The “sad memories rise above those of smoothly grinding school days,” expressed through her mournful voice “which is only for those ears that are bent with compassion to hear” (“School Days” 190) this story that refuses to celebrate self-effacement and cultural loss.

In relation to the motif of storytelling, Zitkala-Ša, like white women local colorists, celebrates storytelling as a means of communal sharing and cultural preservation; she and her friends imitate their mothers, behaving as storytellers and listeners in the manner that they have learned from their mothers, and saying “only those things that were in common favor” (“Impressions” 41). However, when speaking to the broader audience beyond childhood friends, Zitkala-Ša does not take for granted the empathy of her mostly white reading audience, many of whom, like the “pale-faces” she first encounters at the boarding school, have “ears . . . [that] could not hear [her]” (“School Days” 186). Indeed, her boarding school story is meant to document the cultural destruction inflicted by her audience rather than to celebrate a shared experience with her audience, and the trope of storytelling as preservation in her fiction, for example “The Trial Path,” which I further discuss below, must be understood in light of such threats to Indigenous culture and, thus, as serving a different cultural function than that in the work of white women writers.

That language functions in a communal way in both white regionalist texts written by women and in American Indian culture seems to have allowed a critical appropriation of Indigenous texts into a tradition of regionalism more readily than, as Cutter’s argument demonstrates, into a tradition of autobiography. Within a regionalist context, Campbell observes that the motif of storytelling as communal sharing manifests itself in terms of domestic acts such as “knitting, making quilts, braiding rugs, distilling essences, and putting up preserves” (41). In contrast, Susan Bernardin demonstrates how Zitkala-Ša, by employing the domestic, “debunks the premises of the Americanization project” (232). Bernardin

maintains that by focusing her story on the domestic themes of home life and family relationships while simultaneously and “subversively engag[ing] with the indoctrination of sentimental ideology in boarding schools and on reservations” (218), Zitkala-Ša “selectively” utilizes the discourse of domesticity to critique “sentimental ideology’s foundational role in compulsory Indian education” and its corresponding “participation in national efforts to ‘Americanize’ the Indian” (213). Given the differences between the use and meaning of the domestic, communal sharing, and the storytelling in white women’s texts and Zitkala-Ša’s texts, Campbell is quite right not to submit Zitkala-Ša’s work to her critical paradigm for women’s regionalist works, for such a Eurocentric reading would, as Elaine Jahner argues, “force American Indian literature into a non-Indian frame of reference,” and, as is often the effect of such an analysis, create the impression that Indigenous works are somehow “lacking” (“Critical Approach” 212).⁶

Zitkala-Ša’s uneasy relationship with regionalism is most apparent in Judith Fetterley and Marjorie Pryse’s 1992 Norton anthology of *American Women Regionalists, 1850–1910*. Fetterley and Pryse argue that Zitkala-Ša shares with other women regionalists a concern about how place and her relationship with her mother shape her identity. Granted, Zitkala-Ša does link her mother with her left-behind region and, ultimately, with her identity, but, as Hafen notes, “American Indian authors write about land with an imperative that goes beyond establishing setting or creating a descriptive backdrop for action and characters. Land gives life, identity, and wisdom to tribal communities. Land is the center of language, culture, and existence” (“Indigenous Peoples” 169). Indeed, the image of her mother, “on the Western plains . . . holding a charge” against her (“School Days” 194) fuels the cultural estrangement and identity crisis that haunts Zitkala-Ša through the remainder of her autobiography. This image underscores, in Hafen’s words, an “imperative” underlying issues of region and identity (both self and cultural) for Zitkala-Ša that white women writers and characters do not share and emphasizes her difficult task of negotiating an identity while she is unwelcome and isolated in the dominant culture’s educational and social systems, estranged from her mother, alienated from her culture and lands, and obliged to communicate in a language other than her own if she wishes to be heard.

Fetterley and Pryse also align Zitkala-Ša with Sarah Orne Jewett’s representative regionalism, suggesting that the “grandmother-storyteller”

and “granddaughter-listener” in her story “The Trial Path” might “re-mind” readers of the relationship between narrators and listeners in Jewett’s work (534). In addition to the different cultural meanings associated with the two writers’ narrative strategies and with their respective narrators and narratees, the details surrounding the publication of Zitkala-Ša’s story also highlight the differences between them. Published in *Harper’s Monthly* in October 1901, “The Trial Path” appeared in the same issue as an installment of Woodrow Wilson’s serialized article, “Colonies and Nations: A Short History of the United States,” in which Colonel George Washington arrives at Congress and is consulted about “question[s] of military preparation,” including “the protection of the frontier against the Indians” (792). In the previous month’s issue of the magazine, James Mooney’s article, “Our Last Cannibal Tribe,” details the supposed cannibalism of various American Indian tribes, particularly the Tonkawas near San Antonio, using “evidence” that is often secondhand or hearsay. While Wilson’s piece emphasizes American Indians’ problematic relationship to U.S. nation-building, the article by Mooney, who also challenged Zitkala-Ša’s view of peyote use and accused her of being a fraud in his testimony before the Senate subcommittee on peyote, exposes white culture’s unreasonable fears of the Other and propagates the racism and misunderstanding with which Indigenous writers were contending in literary print culture and in the larger culture of the United States, forces which did not affect Jewett.

Within the story itself, Zitkala-Ša’s narrative strategies establish an ideological position on the acts of storytelling and listening that, contrary to Fetterley and Pryse’s claims, differs dramatically from that of Jewett and demonstrates, as Jahner argues, that “American Indian writing need not always be the object of critical inquiry . . . [but] can also generate critical positions” (“Metalanguages” 178). Zitkala-Ša marks the ideological difference between her text and white regionalist texts through shifts in verb tense, emphasizing how the story is brought into present being and, thus, contemporary significance, through the grandmother’s retelling. The story begins in past tense, with the third-person narrator establishing the setting through the opening phrase, “It was an autumn night on the plain” (741), but as the grandmother rises from her prone position to tell her story to her twenty-year-old granddaughter, the immediacy of the act is reflected in the change to present tense: “Though once she had lain down, the telling of a story has aroused her to a sitting posture. Her

eyes are tight closed. With a thin palm she strokes her wind-shorn hair” (741). The responses of the granddaughter-listener are also given in present tense to emphasize the cultural significance of the story to the present life of the granddaughter. However, the “soft rich voice” of the granddaughter “floats through the darkness[,] . . . passes into the ear of the toothless old [grandmother],” the narrator recounts, and then flies across time, “over many winter snows, till at last it cleaves the warm light atmosphere of her grandfather’s youth.” From this place in the past, the narrator says, “her grandmother made answer” (741). Although the grandmother lapses into past tense at two points in her tale, she narrates the actual trial-path experience of the story’s murderer and his eventual reconciliation with the victim’s family in the present tense. Whenever the grandmother pauses, the narrator describes the scene of the telling in the past tense, since the story itself has become the present, and once the story ends, the tense again shifts to the past. By simultaneously placing the grandmother and granddaughter in the story’s past and present, bringing the past to the present through the story’s verb tense, and using the grandmother as the vehicle through which the granddaughter’s voice (by passing into the grandmother’s ear) can also exist in the past, Zitkala-Ša emphasizes the ways in which Indigenous culture is transmitted and preserved through the telling of and listening to stories.

“The Trial Path” reveals the importance of storytelling and listening in Indigenous culture, but the literary context of the story raises questions about the ability of the *Harper’s* audience, similar to Zitkala-Ša’s white teachers at the boarding school, to receive or “listen” to an Indigenous voice. However, as Vanessa Holford Diana observes of Zitkala-Ša’s writing in *American Indian Stories*, she “play[s] . . . [with] her white audience’s expectations and pre-existing world view” (155) in order to make her point at the end of “The Trial Path.” At the conclusion of the tale, the grandmother finds her granddaughter asleep, and exclaims, “Hinnu! hinnu! Asleep! I have been talking in the dark, unheard. I did wish the girl would plant in her heart this sacred tale” (744). The changing verb tenses of “The Trial Path” not only highlight the grandmother’s relationship to the events she narrates, but also emphasize, through the present tense of the story and the granddaughter’s response, the importance of the oral tradition to the Sioux present (in terms of cultural identity) and future (in terms of cultural preservation). Though the granddaughter fails to receive the entire story and, by falling asleep, threatens the preser-

vation of the tale, the grandmother drifts off to sleep under a “guardian star,” which “beamed compassionately down upon the little tepee [*sic*] on the plain” (744), suggesting the story’s ultimate protection. Lost stories are serious matters in Indigenous culture, and Zitkala-Ša’s storytellers and listeners have much more to lose than Jewett’s storytellers and listeners. Indeed, Jahner notes that “in a minority context where history has been kidnapped by conquerors and its voices muffled in an effort to induce an emptiness that could be filled by the dominant people’s past[,] . . . the act of listening to the past is approached with extraordinary care,” and the links to the past created through re-tellings of myths, histories, and stories “requires an intellectual response that allows the act of listening to the past to achieve its communicative potential” (“Metalinguages” 162). Ultimately, “The Trial Path” attempts to establish the cultural significance of the oral tradition for readers apathetic, if not opposed, to its meaning and significance. By playing with the disparate views of her white readers and the Indigenous characters in the story, Zitkala-Ša critiques her readers’ ignorance and dismissal of Indigenous stories and emphasizes her concern about whether any compassionate ears will hear her own story.

The appearance of Zitkala-Ša’s autobiographical and fictional work in major literary magazines also raises the issue of her facility with the English language. Fetterley and Pryse suggest that by attaining the language that could have given her a career as a prominent regionalist writer, Zitkala-Ša loses the connection to her place and region. However, she forfeits that career (the promise of such indicated by the “regionalist elements” in her work) by deciding to be a reformer and a political activist. According to this logic, however, Zitkala-Ša never could have made the choice to be a regionalist; she cannot be a regionalist if the attainment of a literary language (English) compromises her connection to a region, yet she has to write in English if she is to be accepted by the literary community as a bona fide regionalist. The effects of learning and using English emphasize Zitkala-Ša’s problematic relationship to a region and culture experiencing dramatic change, including the threat to Indigenous language. Although her peers on the reservation speak English at their social gatherings (“School Days” 192) and she uses English as a form of resistance throughout her writings, her autobiography suggests that attaining the language does not bring her acceptance among them, but further distances her from her home, family, and culture. She wants to

burn the Indian Bible that her mother offers her as consolation, and calls the book “a perfect delusion to [her] . . . mother” who has now accepted its tenets (192). In the autobiography, Zitkala-Ša’s culture slips away from her faster than her faith in it, as symbolized by the magic roots she takes with her to school, of which she writes, “before I lost my faith in the dead roots, I lost the little buckskin bag containing all my good luck” (192). As symbols of the cultural loss sustained while attaining the power of the “white man’s papers” and ways (“Indian Teacher” 386), the lost buckskin bag and her alienation from her peers and family not only call attention to the contradictions that Zitkala-Ša must embrace in order to resist white culture, but also emphasize her problematic relationship with regionalism. Without culture, language, or region she cannot be a regionalist, and by using the English language she cannot be a regionalist. Either way, Zitkala-Ša’s literary production falls short, made “lacking,” as Jahner would argue, in a “non-Indian frame of reference” (“Critical Approach” 212), and demonstrating the complications produced by criticism that attempts to establish Zitkala-Ša as a potential, if not full-fledged, regionalist writer.

NATION/NARRATION

Zitkala-Ša’s relationship to regionalism is further complicated by regional literature’s relationship with U.S. nationalism. In one sense, regionalism seems to work against nationalism and hearken back to an earlier sectionalism; however, in glorifying prototypical American regions, manners, and characteristics, regionalism celebrates the stability and timelessness of local American values as a projection of national values. Foote notes that through its emphasis on rural life and characters, “regional writing constructs a common national past for readers,” a phenomenon which is common in “consolidating nations” (*Regional Fictions* 6). However, Foote also suggests that a critical reevaluation of regionalism demonstrates that, rather than “representing a common national past,” regionalism helps “construct” such a past “in the face of, and out of the raw material of, the increasing immigration and imperialism of the nineteenth century” (13).

In this light, regionalism has functioned as a way to write national literature and culture into existence. When William Dean Howells considered the question of a national American literature in his November 1891

“Editor’s Study,” he suggested that the closest we get to national literature (at least from the perspective of European critics) is Walt Whitman, whose work Howells characterizes as formless. Because literary forms have all been invented by the Europeans, Howells claims that American writers resort to a representative formlessness (963), a situation that generates a sort of national identity crisis; for if nations long for form through their narratives, depending, as Timothy Brennan argues, “for their existence on an apparatus of cultural fictions in which imaginative literature plays a decisive role” (49), then the formlessness of America’s literature also calls the status of the nation into question. Regionalism responds to this anxiety about a national literary form, and thus a national identity, by filling a need for a distinctive American literary form.

In December 1895 an *Atlantic Monthly* reviewer of Hamlin Garland’s *Crumbling Idols*, containing essays on local color in art, notes the nationalist zeal of the pieces and describes the essays as “so many explosions of literary Jingoism” (“New Figures in Literature and Art” 840). Echoing previous works such as Emerson’s “The American Scholar” or Whitman’s “Democratic Vistas,” in *Crumbling Idols*, Garland calls for authentic and local American art. He bemoans the lack of attention to the “mighty West” in literature, blaming the American propensity for hard work and lack of leisure time for having “calloused the perceiving mind” to the “art-possibilities of common American life” (16). The implicit link between nation and region made earlier in the book becomes explicit when he later explores the question of Pacific-Coast literature, noting that when the “real Pacific literature” appears, it will be “a literature as no other locality could produce, a literature that could not have been written in any other time,” the “test,” says Garland, of a “national literature” (26). Similarly, Garland argues that while America’s early literature, imitative of European art (the “crumbling idols” that he warns writers not to worship [124]), had little “national color,” writers eventually “felt the influence of our mighty forests and prairies.” As the frontier disappeared and “men softened in speech and manner,” the way was prepared for local literature to become art (51), and, Garland observes, “local color means national character” (53).

Countering Garland’s local color aesthetic, Mary Austin posits a view of national literature that privileges the contribution of Indigenous writers. In an unsigned 1919 *American Indian Magazine* article reproducing part of an Austin interview, Austin is quoted as noting the “distinct

genus” of “Indian verse” and recalling how, in a 1903 lecture, she “predicted,” correctly, that American literature would eventually return to this free verse form. Like Garland, Austin also draws connections between literary forms and national character: “I believe we owe the Indian not only many elements in our art and language, but certain codes of behavior and ideals that had their part in developing American character” (“What Mary Austin Says About Indians” 181). Of course, Garland’s definitions of national literary form and character, which implicitly deny an Indigenous influence, have proved more culturally acceptable than Austin’s. Local writing will “redeem American literature,” Garland claims (*Crumbling Idols*, 59), and, perhaps more provocatively, it will redeem America: “[t]he physical conformation of our nation will change. It will lose its wildness, its austerity” (65). This statement not only suggests regional literature’s ability to affect a geographical change, but also a cultural change, responding to late-nineteenth-century concerns about the supposed “wildness” of Indigenous culture and supporting the assimilating and civilizing agendas of Indian education. Indeed, by the time he writes that “[t]o know Shakespeare is good. To know your fellow-men is better” (144), there seems little room for “fellow” American Indian writers in Garland’s national literary landscape.⁷

Contemporary critics observe similar connections between regionalism and nationalism.⁸ James Cox notes the problems created for all American writers by the issue of a national language and literature: “The nation was from the beginning and through its life but a dialect, a region, of the English language. . . . The difficult issue facing the American writer was the effort to make a national literature for a country without a native language, just as the chief difficulty for scholars and literary critics has been to distinguish between American and English literature” (762). Yet, Cox notes that such challenges served to unify American writers, for “however many dialects existed within the nation, from the perspective of England—an outside perspective—all writers were American” (763).⁹ Zitkala-Ša, as an American Indian woman in the early twentieth century, is excluded from such fraternal and national orders of citizenship. In fact, her region and native language are threatened by the acquisition of the English language and a formal education, and her narratives emphasize her alienation from these aspects of her life, as well as her sense of social exclusion from the dominant “American” culture.

Narrating her boarding school experience and her tenure as a teacher

at Carlisle Indian School, Zitkala-Ša emphasizes her feelings of alienation from others, first as a loneliness and despair through which even the presence of other American Indian students cannot penetrate, and finally as a profound sense of exclusion unbridgeable through mere intellectual and professional affinity with her colleagues. She emphasizes the alienating experiences of assimilationist ideology in her poem, "The Indian's Awakening," where she writes, "From you my own people, I've gone astray. / A wanderer now, with no where to stay" (lines 18–19), and also near the end of her third autobiographical essay, when, sitting alone in the "white-walled prison" of her room as an Indian teacher at an Indian school, she reflects that she has "made no friends among the race of people I loathed" ("Indian Teacher" 386). Through her individualized experience of loneliness, she invokes the ongoing devastation of first contact, registered by threats to land, language, and culture. Amy Kaplan argues that nineteenth-century texts envision nationalism by enacting "a willed amnesia about founding conflicts, while they reinvent multiple and contested pasts to claim as the shared origin of national identity" (242). Zitkala-Ša revives the memory of such conflicts by living and narrating the experience of exclusion and loss through her melancholy and thus conventionally disruptive autobiographical voice, revealing what Homi Bhabha refers to as the "cultural temporality" and "transitional social reality" of the nation, which disrupts the historical certainty of national origins (1). Criticism which designates her as a token American Indian regionalist relegates Zitkala-Ša to the status of a racial Other against whom to posit ideas of U.S. nationhood, rather than the anamnesis of Indigenous genocide and colonization, which constitute the repressed side of national history. It is simply easier for critics from the dominant culture to envelop her work in what Eric Sundquist terms local color's "nostalgically charged" vision coinciding with the "nation's inexorable drive toward cohesion and standardization" (509), than to confront the particular aspects and ongoing effects of the national history she illuminates and live with the cultural conscience she disturbs.

Perhaps the greatest drawback of attempting to reconcile Zitkala-Ša's work with dominant national history through a regionalist aesthetic is the way such an approach ignores issues of Indigenous nationalism. Current approaches to Zitkala-Ša's work illustrate that our approach to regionalism, despite Foote's arguments to the contrary ("The Cultural Work of American Regionalism" 40), still functions to sustain national-

istic agendas, and one way criticism has sustained such agendas is by ignoring the issue of tribal sovereignty in favor of other themes that align Zitkala-Ša with the tropes of mainstream regionalist writers. While Zitkala-Ša seldom addresses Indigenous nationalism explicitly in her work, often preferring to think of American Indians as citizens within the larger United States, an important trajectory in her work during the first decades of the twentieth century anticipates a sentiment more closely resembling Indigenous nationalism. This particular strain in her writing marks an important aspect of her resistance to the nationalistic agendas of regionalist literary criticism and can be traced from her autobiographical writing to her later political texts.

RESISTING REGIONALISM

To borrow a phrase from Donna Campbell, Zitkala-Ša “resists regionalism” and its nationalistic impulses by joining other American Indian writers who, as Cheryl Walker notes, grapple with the idea of Indigenous nationalism and a multicultural society before it was fashionable to do so (205), “contest the notion that the past had to take the shape it did,” and “imagine a nation (or multiple nations) committed to a policy of mutual accommodation” (40). While Zitkala-Ša’s texts often promote equality and citizenship within the larger United States, a concept that, as Mary Paniccia Carden notes, contradicts Indigenous notions of group identity (64), a form of Indigenous nationalism also evolves in her autobiographical and later political writings. Perhaps an emphasis on tribal sovereignty is less overt in her work because of an uncertainty among earlier American Indian writers, as Womack observes, “about whether a Native voice, a Native viewpoint, the narration of tribal life, or even a Native future was possible” (6). However, as Zitkala-Ša narrates her own experience of self-determination, she eventually arrives at a position where she can argue for her people’s right to self-determination and reimagine the relation between national histories and U.S. and Indigenous nationalisms.

The first section of her autobiography epitomizes the freedom and self-determination she experiences on the plains, and she inculcates her “wild freedom and overflowing spirits,” qualities which are her “mother’s pride” (“Impressions” 37), into her sense of self. Zitkala-Ša is free to develop as an individual on the prairie through the respect she enjoys from her elders. Her mother’s reactions to her efforts and mistakes while learn-

ing beadwork make Zitkala-Ša “feel strongly responsible and dependent upon . . . [her] own judgment.” Her mother treats her “as a dignified little individual” (40). And when, in an attempt to honor the tribal custom of hospitality, Zitkala-Ša serves a visiting warrior a tepid mixture of muddy water and coffee grounds, both her mother and the warrior treat her “best judgment, poor as it was, with the utmost respect” (43).

But even from within these scenes of self-development and self-determination, Zitkala-Ša invokes images that threaten personal and cultural freedom. In one instance, Zitkala-Ša reinterprets the meaning of westering and the freedoms of the frontier in the context of American Indian genocide and the loss of Indigenous lands. Her mother depicts the region in which they find themselves as the place to which they have been driven by the “bad paleface . . . a sickly sham” (37), who has taken away their lands and been instrumental in the deaths of Zitkala-Ša’s sister and uncle, both of whom died upon reaching the “western country” (38). By the time Zitkala-Ša writes of her experience, what Ward Churchill refers to as the “subjugation” of the West, begun around 1850, was well underway (338). Churchill argues that the campaign of extermination and “re-settlement” waged against American Indians led to a loss of land and lives and an ensuing dispersal of Indigenous populations that is most accurately termed an American Indian diaspora (330–32). In addition to government-sanctioned action against Indigenous people, to which an 1894 Census Bureau report attributed a minimum of 45,000 deaths, there were a great deal more instances in which “Angloamerican citizens . . . kill[ed] Indians, often systematically, under a variety of quasi-official circumstances” (339). One such instance, related to Zitkala-Ša’s cultural history, occurred in the Dakota Territory capital of Yankton during the 1860s, where a two-hundred-dollar bounty was placed on Sioux scalps and General Alfred Sully arranged to have a pair of Teton Sioux skulls put on display in the city (Lazarus 29). Zitkala-Ša herself specifically refers to Indigenous genocide in a 1923 article, “The California Indians of Today,” from the *California Indian Herald*, where she notes that the California Indians were reduced from “210,000 to 20,000 during the siege of seventy cruel winters, repeated evictions and the spread of the white man’s diseases among them” (10).

In addition to genocide, the officially sanctioned taking of lands accomplished through the General Allotment Act of 1887, further threatened Indigenous culture and, as Churchill notes, “destroy[ed] what was

left of basic indigenous socioeconomic cohesion” (341). Churchill notes that by 1930, allotment had reduced “native land holdings in the U.S. . . . from approximately 150 million acres to a little over 50 million” (342), and the paired programs of extermination and relocation negated Indigenous ability, physically and structurally, to sustain “any meaningful residue of national status” (340). Zitkala-Ša alludes to the debilitating effects of genocide and allotment on the tribal nation as she details allotment’s impact on individual lives in her 1921 story, “The Widespread Enigma Concerning Blue-Star Woman,” and in the autobiographical essays, where we find her and her mother living with the corruption of allotment and other instances of the exercise of federal plenary power over American Indians, a power “exercised in its most virulent and unabashed form” in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (350), according to David Wilkins.¹⁰ In 1881, George Canfield argued that “an Indian is not a person within the meaning of the Constitution”(28) and used the idea of absolute federal plenary power to argue against tribal rights and to defend Congress’ right to prevent American Indians from leaving a reservation, to deprive American Indians of “liberty,” “property,” and “life,” and to break treaties (33, 35). “[D]efrauded” of their lands and rights through the sort of process that Canfield describes, Zitkala-Ša and her mother reside in the provisional space of the Yankton Reservation, drawing water from rivers which her mother assumes the paleface will soon take away, as well (“Impressions” 37–8).

In addition to the loss of land and rights essential to Indigenous culture and sovereignty, Zitkala-Ša’s autobiography indicates that federal Indian policy also erodes the cohesion of family ties. The Christian missionaries’ promise of red apples compels Zitkala-Ša to sever her ties with her mother and journey from West to East, literally from the tribal nation to the foreign nation of the United States, where, according to non-Indigenous wisdom, the saving and civilizing of the American Indian would be accomplished through education and assimilation in eastern boarding schools.¹¹ Although she finds herself becoming increasingly estranged from her mother while she attends college, Zitkala-Ša still yearns for the West and its promise of nourishment through her mother’s love (“School Days” 193) and also, implicitly, the nourishment of land and tribal nation. Because her mother has still not forgiven her defiance, Zitkala-Ša uses her hands to produce Indian handicrafts which will hopefully earn her the “white man’s respect” (193) rather than using her

hands to write letters to her mother, for which she claims she has no time, a choice which further alienates her from her culture and lands.

Although she refuses to write to her mother, she uses her facility with the English language to reflect on the legacies of manifest destiny, and, ultimately, to win second place in an Earlham College oratorical contest. In this essay, "Side by Side" (published in *The Earlhamite* in 1896), Zitkala-Ša argues that the bad faith of early settlers and the vices of civilization have devastated her people in whose hearts patriotism is as keen a virtue as in the "Saxon" heart (178). In light of these developments, Zitkala-Ša wonders if "America's first-born" has "forfeited his birthright" to America's "boundless opportunities" (179), and she pleads with the country that has instituted a "successful system of Indian education" (179) to make room for her people. While Zitkala-Ša refers to opportunity and self-determination as an American Indian "birthright," her conclusion anticipates the compromise of Booker T. Washington's Atlanta Exposition speech: "Seeking your skill in industry and in art, seeking labor and honest independence, . . . seeking by a new birthright to unite with yours our claim to a common country, seeking the Sovereign's crown that we may stand side by side with you in ascribing royal honor to our nations' flag" (179). Although such a passage explicitly works against the idea of an autonomous tribal nation and seeks a place for Indigenous peoples within the national borders of the United States, it is also an important early example of the ways in which Zitkala-Ša uses her facility with the English language to resist dominant culture through her insistence on equal access to the privileges of U.S. national culture for Indigenous peoples. In her later autobiographical narratives and political writing, Zitkala-Ša ultimately resists the compromise implicit in her "Side by Side" speech and the nationalist paradigm that excludes American Indians.

Indeed, she further complicates the U.S. nationalist paradigm as the third installment of her autobiography begins. She sends a message to her mother in the West, telling of her plans to teach in an eastern Indian school (Carlisle), further distancing herself from the region in which she lived as a girl. Her superiors eventually send her West, turning her "loose to pasture" to recruit Indian pupils for the school ("Indian Teacher" 383) and, in essence, convince others like herself to relinquish their freedom, disrupting her own as well as dominant interpretations of the western frontier. But not only has she lost the West, the East also holds little hope

for her success. The useless eastern education of her brother, Dawée (384), and the failure of his experience cause her to exclaim, “The Great Spirit does not care if we live or die!” (385). She recognizes that eastern education for the Indian “included [white] self-preservation quite as much as Indian education” (385), and she ends her autobiography with the disturbing realization that the docility and industriousness of the Indian students is comforting for the white visitors to Indian schools because it confirms their project of cultural preservation (386). By remembering her mother’s stories of the “encroaching frontier settlers” (“Indian Teacher” 386) and by resisting the white-preservationist gaze of those favoring Indian education, in the final installment of her autobiography, Zitkala-Ša ultimately resists the designs of U.S. nationalism.¹² However, to reach this conclusion, she has given up nature for the “white man’s papers” and has become a “cold bare pole . . . planted in a strange earth” (386), dispossessed of the western lands of her youth and opposed to the ideologies of the East.¹³

Zitkala-Ša is critical of dominant paradigms in “An Indian Teacher Among Indians,” but her tone is dispirited and the events related in the installment end on a negative note with her estrangement from land and culture. In *Old Indian Legends*, however, she finds a critical space and place from which she can more positively resist conventional narratives of U.S. nationalism and literary criticism. Within a regionalist framework, Fetterley and Pryse suggest that Zitkala-Ša’s “desire to tell Indian legends and stories in an Indian voice, demonstrat[es] . . . the impulse shared by regionalist writers to shift the center of perception to the native speaker” (534). However, given Zitkala-Ša’s relationship to issues of Indigenous language, English, and cultural genocide, the American Indian speaker in her stories occupies quite a different position than the Native speaker of the white regionalist text. Sharing the legends of the oral tradition in writing (and in English) is obviously an act of translation into a non-Indigenous form, but these legends still represent, as Karen Kilcup maintains, a cultural perception, a communal worldview and a desire to transmit American Indian values (295) rather than a deliberately regionalist strategy to “shift” narrative perspective to a Native speaker, as Fetterley and Pryse suggest.

In the preface to *Old Indian Legends*, Zitkala-Ša acknowledges the communal nature of these stories and their retelling within an Indige-

nous context: "Under an open sky, nestling close to the earth, the old Dakota story-tellers have told me these legends. In both Dakotas, North and South, I have often listened to the same story told over again by a new story-teller" (v). Responding to and envisioning past and future critics who worry over America's lack of a native language, she states that she has "tried to transplant the native spirit of these tales . . . into the English language, since America in the last few centuries has acquired a second tongue" (vi). In what could be seen as a deliberate undermining of her boarding school education, Zitkala-Ša asserts the primacy of Indigenous language and stories by casting English as the nation's second language and entertains alternative visions of nationhood accomplished through a multicultural society by claiming that "[t]he old legends of America belong quite as much to the blue-eyed little patriot as to the black-haired aborigine" (vi).¹⁴ Placing her retelling of these legends in a regionalist context reinscribes her within a national narrative that has excluded Indigenous writers and texts for purposes of self-definition, or sought, as Amy Kaplan notes, "'others' against which to imagine American nationhood" (242). Clearly, Zitkala-Ša's retelling of these legends resists such appropriative strategies.

Zitkala-Ša achieves a similar form of resistance in her essay, "Why I Am a Pagan." Sidonie Smith wants to read Zitkala-Ša's return to the reservation in "Why I Am a Pagan," not as a return to a "disempowered place" (Smith 137), but as a place from which she "turns cultural literacy into cultural critique" (137). I prefer to think of her strategy as a resistance to and even reinvention of nationalist narratives rather than a critique. In "Why I Am a Pagan" she invokes the stories of *Old Indian Legends* and resists the authority of the dominant culture's narratives by celebrating the natural world of the "Stone-Boy" (802) legends and the unity of all "God's creatures" (803). She refers to herself as "a wee child" (803) in nature's wonderland, reverting back to the images of freedom and individuality that characterize the first section of the autobiography. By reintroducing the idyllic childhood experiences of the autobiography, she counters the effects of her boarding school experience while, through the contrast between these idyllic scenes and the horrors of the boarding school, she emphasizes a cultural oppression that lies well outside white experience and white texts, revealing the ways in which she uses the autobiography and an essay such as "Why I Am a Pagan" to write against

the colonizing discourses of assimilation and genocide, narrating a reality inconsistent with the community building and preservation of the dominant culture celebrated in white regionalist texts, and creating in the autobiography of her boarding school experience what Shari M. Huhndorf refers to as a “reverse captivity narrative” (189 n. 39).

Zitkala-Ša continues this resistance in her later political writings, many of which appeared in *American Indian Magazine*, where she worked on the editorial board (1916–18), as editor of the journal (1918–20), and as secretary-treasurer of the magazine’s sponsoring society, the Society of American Indians. This resistance takes a surprising form through Zitkala-Ša’s insistence that American Indians learn English. Although this position opposes her earlier strategy to resist the motives of Indian education and characterize English as the nation’s second language and contradicts the idea that English alienates her from her people, Zitkala-Ša uses English as another way to resist U.S. nationalism.¹⁵ An early example of her intention to use English as a tool of resistance appears in “School Days” when she notes that after learning some English, she is “possessed” by a “mischievous spirit of revenge” (188), but her clearest statement on the importance of English to American Indians appears later in “Letter to the Chiefs and Headmen of the Tribes” (1919) to which she appends a footnote asking readers who understand English to “do a kind act by reading and explaining it to an Indian who cannot read or speak English” (196). She suggests that if it is important for new (white) immigrants to learn English, then it is “even more worth our while to renew our efforts to speak English” (197).

While the white emphasis on teaching immigrants English was partly designed to quell fears about the supposed threat immigrants posed to the American way of life and fulfill assimilative desires, Zitkala-Ša uses the idea to promote the preservation and self-determination of Indigenous culture. In her 1901 story, “The Soft-Hearted Sioux,” she raises the question of what assimilation and white education cost Indigenous peoples, but in her “Letter to the Chiefs and Headmen of the Tribes,” she suggests that Indigenous solidarity will result from the ability to communicate with one another in English: “I could . . . profit by your advice in many things, and you would know you were not forgot” (197). In “Heart to Heart Talk” (1924), from the *California Indian Herald*, she further emphasizes the need to “think and act together” and, thus, with-

out the interference of outside voices or agencies, “organize and work together in one powerful unit” (3). English facilitates this project of self-determination.

She also ties the learning of English to the retaining of American Indian lands, an integral component of Indigenous self-determination. In the “Letter to the Chiefs and Headmen of the Tribes,” she expresses concern about the rate at which American Indians are selling their inherited lands, writing, “though we may become educated in the White man’s way and even acquire money, we cannot really be happy unless we have a small piece of this Out-of-Doors to enjoy as we please. For the sake of our children’s children we must hold onto a few acres” (197). That she considers English-speaking and the retaining of Indian lands the two most important issues she could discuss with her people also alludes to the ways in which white America used the inability of some American Indians to communicate in English as a way to gain possession of Indian lands. Clearly, Zitkala-Ša uses English, a “tool” of the dominant culture to, as Carden suggests, make it “visible *as* [one of the] tools” (73) used to oppress Indigenous peoples and then turn it into a tool of resistance. Indeed, she petitions F. P. Keppell, Third Assistant Secretary of War, in a letter published in the Autumn 1918 *American Indian Magazine*, to keep the Carlisle Indian School from being turned back into military facilities because of the government’s “honor bound obligation to educate the Indian” and the “loss of educational opportunities [for American Indian children] only Carlisle can give” (“Secretary’s Report inn Brief” 123). Despite Zitkala-Ša’s own negative experiences as a student in the boarding school system and as a teacher at Carlisle, when considered in relation to “Letter to the Chiefs and Headmen of the Tribes,” her earlier argument that the loss of Indian land will negatively affect the “future children of our race” (197) implies that education and learning English offers a way to preserve and protect Indigenous lands and a distinct culture, a way to resist a dominant national future and maintain the integrity of an Indigenous future. In fact, she suggests in her letter to Keppell that the education of American Indians, and all that it entails for an Indigenous future, is implicitly more important than the military uses to which Carlisle could be put to win the war.

However, Zitkala-Ša also utilizes the war, particularly American Indian participation in World War I, and patriotism as tools of resistance.

American Indian patriotism is not rewarded, as it should be, with full enfranchisement, as her 1917 poem, “The Red Man’s America,” reveals:

My country! ’tis to thee,
Sweet land of Liberty,
My pleas I bring.
Land where our fathers died,
Whose offspring are denied
The Franchise given wide,
Hark, while I sing. (lines 1–7)

In a 1919 article, “America, Home of the Red Man,” she expresses similar sentiments as she relates her encounter with a fellow traveler en route to Pierre, South Dakota, who, noticing a pin Zitkala-Ša is wearing, asks her if she has a family member in the war. When Zitkala-Ša answers that her husband, “a member of the great Sioux Nation, . . . is a volunteer in Uncle Sam’s Army” (165), the stranger replies, “Oh! Yes! You are an Indian! Well, I knew when I first saw you that you must be a foreigner” (165). Zitkala-Ša reacts against this insinuation of outsider status by musing to herself, as she does in other pieces such as “The Secretary’s Report in Brief,” her “Editorial Comment” in the Autumn 1918 and Summer 1919 issues, and “Indian Gifts to Civilized Man,” that the American Indian is as fiercely patriotic and committed to the cause of democracy as any other group, despite being denied the privilege of U.S. citizenship. At the same time, she also emphasizes American Indians’ problematic relationship to the ideals of U.S. democracy by noting that “The Red Man of America loves democracy and hates mutilated treaties” (“America, Home of the Red Man” 165). “As America has declared democracy abroad, so must we consistently practise [*sic*] it at home,” she notes in Autumn 1918, for if the American Indian “is good enough to fight for American ideals he is good enough for American citizenship now” (“Editorial Comment” 114). In “America, Home of the Red Man,” a procession of images illustrating the injustices of disenfranchisement flash into her mind, including an aged grandmother who donated most of her life savings to the Red Cross, relief efforts undertaken by American Indian women to provide moccasins for French orphans, and a Senate resolution, introduced by an American Indian senator, to make Indian funds in the U.S. Treasury available to the war effort (166). To the white traveler in South Dakota, she points out recent articles that challenge the perceived outsider status of American In-

dians (167). Although the essay is ostensibly a conversation between her and the man she meets while traveling, her efforts to educate the white traveler serve as a model, reminding American Indians of the political imperative to correct misconceptions about Indigenous peoples. Indeed, less than a year earlier, in her "Secretary's Report in Brief," she notes that it is the duty of the Society of American Indians to "convey its intimate knowledge of Indian matters to the American public," the group ultimately "responsible for the final fulfillment of government treaties with Indians" (122).

Zitkala-Ša clearly recognizes the connection between a positive future for American Indians and their ability to take control of how they are represented in popular culture. Sometimes couched within popular stereotypes, these ideas serve as further examples of her ability to, as Carden notes, "rewrite narratives of assimilation" (64). In "Indian Gifts to Civilized Man" (1918), she notes that American Indian soldiers, "[b]eing . . . so much at home in the out-of-doors, . . . may be an invaluable guide to our boys born and bred indoors" (116), a perspective which seems to coincide with the nineteenth-century ideology of the noble savage. She also notes that American Indian soldiers may gain as much or more "practical white man's knowledge from first hand experience" with white soldiers than from book learning (116). While these statements appear to place Indigenous soldiers in an inferior position, the passage is better understood in relation to Zitkala-Ša's assertion of American Indian identity and other rhetorical acts which overturn narratives of assimilation, such as her privileging of "the gift of individual consciousness" (as celebrated in her poem, "An Indian Praying on the Hilltop" (line 1) and implied in her essay "Why I Am a Pagan") and the courage to think for oneself, which, along with living on the reservation, she notes in her Summer 1919 editorial, may contribute as much to the definition of heroism as dying in battle (62). The notion of taking such a stand, indeed, to stand on one's own feet, makes an early appearance in "School Days," when she is insulted as a white woman tosses her in the air and wishes the woman would "let [her] . . . stand on [her] . . . own feet" (186). In her Spring 1919 editorial, Zitkala-Ša connects the idea of standing on one's feet to specific political action and argues that the Sioux Nation (a term she does not generally use) must procure its own legal counsel in the legislative battle for the Black Hills (6), a stance which clearly resists government paternalism and the agenda of the Indian Bureau and privileges Indigenous

self-determination. In her Summer 1919 “Editorial Comment” she reminds readers about the early Europeans’ desire for self-determination as they “fled from the autocracy of Europe to the open arms of the Red Man” (63). It is the American Indian who now desires the same self-determination, she observes in her 1921 pamphlet, *Americanize the First American: A Plan of Regeneration*: “Give [the American Indian] . . . those educational advantages pressed with so much enthusiasm upon the foreigner[, such as] . . . freedom to do their own thinking; to exercise their judgment; to hold open forums for the expression of their thought, and . . . to manage their own personal business” (4, 6). In “Indian Gifts to Civilized Man” and “Letter to the Chiefs and Headmen of the Tribes” she refers to another version of standing on one’s feet when, through her insistence on the importance of the “out-of-doors” to Indigenous peoples, she again emphasizes the cultural necessity of retaining Indigenous lands, bringing her argument back to the connection between self-determination and land rights in the context of the contributions of American Indian soldiers, through and against the notion of the noble savage.

One of Zitkala-Ša’s most compelling statements on tribal sovereignty, however, appears in her 1919 article, “The Coronation of Chief Powhatan Retold,” in which she invokes narratives and histories of first contact. While in her earlier autobiographical work, she often expresses self-determination in terms of her individual experience and identity, even, as Dexter Fisher notes of her renaming and writing of self, “creating her own name and essentially her own oral history” (231), her discussion of Powhatan’s reaction to colonization engages Indigenous sovereignty on a larger scale. Zitkala-Ša begins the article by reversing the narratives of first contact. She notes the “remarkable coincidence” in the fact that the first lady, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, a “lineal descendant of Pocahontas,” and her husband are so well received by Europe’s royal families prior to the world Peace Conference, given that Pocahontas, “[s]pringing from the tribal democracies of the new world . . . was the first emissary of democratic ideas to cast-ridden Europe” when she was received by the King and Queen of England (179). By figuring Indigenous peoples as the originators of democratic ideals, Zitkala-Ša is also able to rewrite the meaning of Powhatan’s encounter with colonizers. The colonizers considered Powhatan to be “whimsical . . . because he was more interested in trifling trinkets and bright colored beads which appealed more to the artistic eye

of the aborigine” (180) than the royal crown, sent as a gift from King James I (179). Powhatan was “grossly ignorant of the world’s rank and power associated with particular pieces of the white man’s articles of dress and decoration,” Zitkala-Ša writes (180), illustrating Taiaike Alfred’s argument about the incompatibility of Indigenous and “dominant Western” paradigms of sovereignty (58–59).

Zitkala-Ša emphasizes the difference between Indigenous and European definitions of power and symbol and, in an Indigenous context, the problematic relationship between kingly symbols of sovereignty and the struggle for Indigenous lands. She observes that pondering white incursions into Indian territory might have led Powhatan to “question the real significance of these King’s garments and crown. To the liberty loving soul of Powhatan, this royal camouflage was no comparison to the gorgeous array of Autumn in that primeval forest where he roamed at will” (180), a passage that again suggests the image of the noble savage, but which, as we have come to expect, Zitkala-Ša is able to wield in her resistance to dominant paradigms. Although Powhatan eventually permits himself to be “dragged into” the king’s garments for a coronation ceremony, “[a]fter hours of reassurance that the . . . garments would not injure him,” he refuses to kneel before the colonizers to be crowned and reacts with anger and surprise to a royal musket salute (180). Powhatan’s suspicion of the European symbols of sovereignty, his resistance to colonial authority, and the fact that the colonizers must resort to trickery to make him kneel (leaning “hard upon his shoulder to make him stoop a little” [180]) allude to the vexed histories of national origins and the ongoing devastation of first contact. While the “royal camouflage” of the colonizers is inferior to the “gorgeous array of Autumn” and Indigenous democracies are precursory to European versions, the larger significance of the colonizer’s trickery, as it relates to Indigenous land and sovereignty, is obviously apparent to Zitkala-Ša, making the retelling of Powhatan’s coronation both an empowering narrative for Indigenous peoples and an ominous reminder of ongoing threats to Indigenous sovereignty.

NATIONS, NARRATIVES, AND CRITICAL TRADITIONS

By resisting both U.S. nationalism and literary regionalism, Zitkala-Ša uncovers the contradictions of both dominant American culture and American literary criticism. Demonstrating regionalism’s problematic

relationship with national identity, Philip Fisher argues that “[c]ultural life in America swings like a pendulum between a diversity of sectional voices and an ever-new project of [national] unity . . . and each rewon unity involves not a return to a lost identity but a new plane of association (241). Although Fisher’s argument ignores Indigenous concerns, the passage is helpful for emphasizing how a clearer sense of this “new plane of association” must prevail between traditional critical assumptions and Indigenous texts. Unfortunately, as Philip Fisher points out, “[r]egionalism is always, in America, part of a struggle within representation. It is seldom or never a matter of tolerance” (243). This struggle within representation plays itself out in Zitkala-Ša’s appropriation into regionalist studies, where critics exercise the license that Katherine Shanley warns against by “creating metaphors from living Native American traditions,” “speaking for American Indians,” and claiming “more power for literature than it deserves” (“Metacritical Frames” 225–26). We should not expect, Shanley continues, that the “end result will bring us into ‘one mind,’” but rather hope for “productive and respectful exchanges” (226), or, as Catherine Rainwater suggests, recognize the “counter-colonial” and “reappropriative” strategies of Indigenous texts that aim for changes in “a reader’s habits of interpretation” (30–31). Critics must learn to read the resistance to regionalism in Zitkala-Ša’s texts, to see how her narratives work against the cultural nostalgia and national forgetfulness through which Indigenous texts are incorporated into a regionalist and nationalist discourse that ignores Indigenous sovereignty.

Destabilizing such discourses and revising sentiments such as those expressed in 1896 that American Indians wish to “stand side by side” with other Americans “in ascribing royal honor to our nation’s flag” (“Side by Side” 179), Zitkala-Ša rewrites the final paragraph of “Why I Am a Pagan” and retitles the essay “The Great Spirit” for inclusion in *American Indian Stories* in 1921. In her revision, she creates what Roumiana Velikova calls an “eclectic poetic abstraction” (61) by catching the “spangles” and “stars” of the American flag in the fringes of the Great Spirit’s “royal mantle” (*American Indian Stories* 107). She performs a similar feat in her essay on Powhatan when she traces the first lady’s lineage (and the presidency’s and country’s democratic ideas) to Pocahontas, and in her speech “A Dacotah Ode to Washington,” presented at the Washington Monument on June 22, 1922, where she celebrates the memory of Washington, “who disdained kingship . . . and preferred to be a servant of the

people[,] . . . [and] over all his glorious achievements upheld our sacred emblem, the eagle, pointing to its meaning in all his noble acts” (*Cong. Rec.* 12162). Although one could argue that these images represent Zitkala-Ša’s continuing desire for a unified U.S. nation that includes American Indians through the compromise implicit in her Earlham essay, thus absorbing American Indian identity into a dominant American identity and threatening Indigenous sovereignty, they actually function as tools of resistance. Because the symbols of the American flag are caught in the fringes of the Great Spirit’s mantle (rather than vice versa), because Pocahontas and Indigenous democracies predate the founding of the United States, and because the eagle is an Indigenous symbol before and even during its function as a national U.S. symbol, these images also manage to establish, in Philip Fisher’s words, a “new plane of association” between nations, narratives, and critical traditions by challenging conventional notions of nationhood and preparing the way for later Indigenous texts that will further challenge dominant theories and practices of nationalism.¹⁶ Zitkala-Ša constructs a complex and challenging cultural and national landscape and her texts demand a critical discourse that seeks not to fulfill the needs of dominant U.S. culture and criticism, but responds appropriately to aesthetic, cultural, and national difference.

NOTES

1. Kate McCullough’s *Regions of Identity* exemplifies literary criticism that responsibly engages otherness. Although she does not include American Indian writers in her analysis, she suggests that critics can comprehend the “complications and nuances of discourses of national identity” by approaching such discourses “from the perspectives of writers variously situated, considering the different ways in which their representations of region and nation are specifically inflected in relation to specific categories of otherness” (6).

2. In *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*, Elvira Pulitano outlines the critical approaches adopted by Indigenous writers and critics: Paula Gunn Allen’s woman-centered perspective, Robert Allen Warrior and Craig Womack’s emphasis on Indigenous intellectual sovereignty, Greg Sarris and Louis Owens’s dialogism, and Gerald Vizenor’s focus on liberation and survivance through a hermeneutics of the trickster.

3. The issue of Indigenous sovereignty has been debated by various critics. Taiaiake Alfred argues that “sovereignty is an exclusionary concept rooted in an adversarial and coercive Western notion of power” (59); thus, to argue for “in-

digenous nationhood” using the non-Indigenous concept of sovereignty is “self-defeating” (58), and an “[a]cceptance of ‘Aboriginal rights’ in the context of state sovereignty represents the culmination of white society’s efforts to assimilate indigenous peoples” (59). Menno Boldt and Tony Long contend that “adopting the European-Western ideology of sovereignty” “legitimiz[es]” its “associated hierarchy” and “constitutes a complete rupture with traditional indigenous principles” (548). However, Vine Deloria Jr. argues that restricting sovereignty to its “legal-political context” is “limiting” because it retains the adversarial meanings of the term (124). While the term initially referred to the “absolute power of a nation to determine its own course of action with respect to other nations” (118) and “originated as a means of locating the seat of political power in European nations,” Deloria contends that “it has assumed the aspect of continuing cultural and communal integrity when transferred to the North American setting”(122). Deloria insists that sovereignty involves this “continued cultural integrity” rather than “political powers” for American Indians, and “to the degree that a nation loses its sense of cultural identity, to that degree it suffers a loss of sovereignty” (123). Deloria looks to the Indian community to assert Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination rather than to congressional law, and argues that “[a] self-disciplined community that holds itself together and acts with a unified vision possesses sufficient sovereignty to confront and resolve any difficulty” (123). See David E. Wilkins and K. Tsianina Lomawaima’s *Uneven Ground* for an accessible legal overview of Indigenous sovereignty.

4. Many scholars have expressed opinions on the issue of non-Indigenous critics researching, teaching, and writing about American Indian literatures. While Womack and Cook-Lynn, among others, claim that non-Indigenous criticism of American Indian texts perpetuates the colonization of Indigenous peoples, others, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, argue for the critical participation of non-Indigenous scholars. As a non-Indigenous scholar Arnold Krupat insists, a “double bind” exists when non-Indigenous scholars are criticized for not including Indigenous works in their teaching and scholarship and accused of “colonial appropriation” when they do include such works (*Turn to the Native* 11). Duane Champagne argues that “[a]n open and free forum for discussion among Indian and non-Indian scholars benefits everyone who seeks to produce accurate, substantial, and significant studies of Indian peoples” (181). Wendy Rose notes that white critics “have as much prerogative” to speak about Indigenous cultures as American Indians have to speak about white culture. “The question is,” Rose continues, “how this is done and, to some extent, why it is done. . . . Many non-Indian people have—from the stated perspective of the non-native viewing things native—written honestly and eloquently about any number of Indian topics” (416).

Rose’s remarks emphasize the need for non-Indigenous critics to explicitly

situate themselves and their perspectives outside Indigenous culture and not attempt, as William Young notes, “to pass off their work as *authentic* representations” of Indigenous culture and traditions (3). As a non-Indigenous scholar, I write out of respect for and interest in Indigenous literature and culture and, as this article’s topic reveals, seek ways to more responsibly read and interpret Indigenous works. See Devon Mihesuah’s introduction to *Natives and Academics* for a discussion of various perspectives that have been expressed on the subject.

5. In her 1932 essay, “Regionalism in American Fiction,” Mary Austin makes a similar claim about the links between geography and American Indian identity: “everything an Indian does or thinks is patterned by the particular parcel of land which is his tribal home” (104). Austin maintains that land exerts more influence than race in people’s lives. See Noreen Groover Lape’s essay, “There Was a Part for Her in the Indian Life,” for a discussion of the problematic nature of Austin’s perspective.

6. Patricia Okker observes the same effect when the narrator of Zitkala-Ša’s “The Soft-Hearted Sioux” is read against conventional elements of naturalist fiction. As Okker argues, while readers are able to remain emotionally detached from the inevitable death of Old Koskoosh in Jack London’s “The Law of Life” because he conforms to the “stereotype of the dying and stoic Indian,” Zitkala-Ša overturns naturalistic conventions by explaining the death of the narrator and his father “as a result of white greed and imperialism” (93) and by portraying the narrator’s “emotional detachment from his own fate as a sign of cultural displacement . . . while demanding the reader’s own emotional involvement” (94). Okker suggests that the story’s “critical neglect” may be a result of its failure to sustain popular romanticized Indian stereotypes (93).

7. Garland does, however, portray American Indians in a somewhat sympathetic light in his 1923 text, *The Book of the American Indian*. These stories, written between 1890 and 1905, are based on Garland’s firsthand observations of reservation life and interviews with American Indians. Although the stories sustain the stereotypes we might expect of a white writer in the nineteenth century, Garland also, as Keith Newlin notes, “respects Native Americans as people with developed cultures that ought to be preserved and protected from exploitation and racial eradication” (xlv). Newlin suggests that Garland’s “considerable compassion for others ‘less advanced,’” his attempts to use his writing to “make conditions better for all people,” and his own “intimate acquaintance” with Indigenous peoples, “separates his fiction from that of other white writers, who tended to demonize the Indians” (xii–xiii).

8. In “Not in the Least American,” Fetterley argues from a gender studies standpoint that women’s regionalist writing has been marginalized because of its un-American nature, but does not pursue the connections between race and nationalism.

9. Mary Austin counters this idea, somewhat, when she suggests in 1932 that a “genuine regionalism” would present “not one vast, pale figure of America, but several Americas, in many subtle and significant characterizations” (98). However, her focus on the importance of geography to literary regionalism allows her to assume that language, culture, or politics exert much less force on literary production. Responding to critics who characterize regionalism as a new and surprising development in American literature, Austin observes that “[t]he really astonishing thing would have been to find the American people as a whole resisting the influence of natural environment in favor of the *lesser* influences of a shared language and a common political arrangement” (98, emphasis added). The work of Indigenous writers indicates that language and politics exert much more influence on literature than Austin realizes.

10. Wilkins defines “absolute” federal plenary power as “power which is not limited by other textual constitutional provisions” and is “unlimited regarding congressional objectives” (355). When Congress exercises federal plenary power “as the voice of the federal government in its relation with tribes, and is acting with the consent of the tribal people involved, it is exercising legitimate authority,” according to Wilkins (355).

11. See also Susan Bernardin’s discussion of the connections between sentimental ideology and the meaning of the American West in Zitkala-Ša’s texts in “The Lessons of a Sentimental Education.”

12. Ruth Spack similarly notes how Zitkala-Ša reinvents the field of anthropology by subjecting the visitors to the Indian school to the scientific and disinterested scrutiny that anthropologists have always directed toward Indigenous people (25).

13. Meisenheimer suggests that we read the “cold bare pole” more positively as a reference to the Sun Dance pole, “the center of spiritual power in Dakota ceremony” (118) and, thus, symbolizing Zitkala-Ša as “firmly rooted in the very center of Dakota culture” (119).

14. For further discussion of how Zitkala-Ša uses rhetorical strategies to resist narratives of Indian education, see Jessica Enoch’s “Resisting the Script of Indian Education.”

15. Hafen suggests that Zitkala-Ša “invok[es] the very constructs she critiques as an impetus for reform and moral conduct” (“Sentimentality and Sovereignty” 31). Carden notes that Zitkala-Ša’s mother uses a similar strategy, which reveals her awareness that American Indians can utilize “the master’s tools,” including language and education, to challenge dominant culture, even as she recognizes how white ways “erod[e] the ground of ‘real Dakota’ identity” (65). Carden observes in her analysis of the autobiographical essays how Zitkala-Ša uses language “to critique [the master’s] . . . coercive system, while simultaneously ac-

knowledging that she has been marked into the text of his dominance by the apparatus designed to produce compliant colonial subjects” (66). Cathy Davidson and Ada Norris add that “[w]hether or not . . . we agree with Zitkala-Ša’s choice[s], many of which, from a contemporary view, seem politically incorrect, “what is clear is that she made [these choices] . . . with political consciousness” (xxiii–xxiv).

16. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn suggests that Leslie Marmon Silko’s *Almanac of the Dead*, despite failing to “take into account the specific kind of tribal/nation status of the original occupants of this continent” (“American Fiction Writer” 34) because of its Panindian focus on history, is (in 1993) the “foremost Indian novel in which we see the clear and unmistakable attempt to describe Indian Nationalism in modern terms” (33).

WORKS CITED

- Alfred, Taiaiake. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Allen, Paula Gunn. “‘Border’ Studies: The Intersection of Gender and Color.” In *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, edited by Joseph Gibaldi, 303–19. New York: MLA, 1992.
- Ammons, Elizabeth. “Expanding the Canon of American Realism.” In *The Cambridge Companion to American Realism and Naturalism: Howells to London*, edited by Donald Pizer, 95–114. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Austin, Mary. “Regionalism in American Fiction.” *English Journal* 21 (1932): 97–107.
- Bell, Michael Davitt. *The Problem of American Realism: Studies in the Cultural History of a Literary Idea*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Bernardin, Susan. “The Lessons of a Sentimental Education: Zitkala-Ša’s Autobiographical Narratives.” *Western American Literature* 32, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 212–38.
- Beverly, John. “The Margin at the Center: On *Testimonio* (Testimonial Narrative).” *Modern Fiction Studies* 35, no. 1 (Spring 1989): 11–28.
- Bhabha, Homi, ed. “Introduction: Narrating the Nation.” *Nation and Narration*, 1–7. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Boldt, Menno and Tony Long. “Tribal Traditions and European Political Ideologies: The Dilemma for Canada’s Native Indians.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 17 (1984): 537–53.
- Brennan, Timothy. “The National Longing for Form.” In *Nation and Narration*, edited by Homi Bhabha, 44–70. New York: Routledge, 1990.

- Brodhead, Richard H. *Cultures of Letters: Scenes of Reading and Writing in Nineteenth-Century America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Campbell, Donna. *Resisting Regionalism: Gender and Naturalism in American Fiction, 1885–1915*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1997.
- Canfield, George F. “The Legal Position of the Indian.” *The American Law Review* 15 (January 1881): 21–37.
- Carden, Mary Paniccia. “‘The Ears of the Palefaces Could Not Hear Me’: Languages of Self-Representation in Zitkala-Ša’s Autobiographical Essays.” *Prose Studies* 20, no. 1 (April 1997): 58–76.
- Cary, Elisabeth Luther. “Recent Writings by American Indians.” *The Book Buyer: A Monthly Review of American Literature* (February 1902): 21–25.
- Champagne, Duane. “American Indian Studies is for Everyone.” In *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians*, edited by Devon A. Mihesuah, 181–89. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Churchill, Ward. *Struggle for the Land: Native North American Resistance to Genocide, Ecocide and Colonization*. Winnipeg, Man.: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 1999.
- Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. “The American Indian Fiction Writer: Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism, the Third World, and First Nation Sovereignty.” *Wicazo Ša Review* 9, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 26–36.
- . “How Scholarship Defames the Native Voice . . . and Why.” *Wicazo Ša Review* 15, no. 2 (Fall 2000): 79–92.
- Cox, James M. “Regionalism: A Diminished Thing.” In *Columbia Literary History of the United States*, edited by Emory Elliott, 761–84. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Crow, Charles L., ed. Introduction. *A Companion to the Regional Literatures of America*, 1–4. Malden MA: Blackwell, 2003.
- Cutter, Martha. “Zitkala-Ša’s Autobiographical Writings: The Problems of a Canonical Search for Language and Identity.” *MELUS* 19, no. 1 (Spring 1994): 31–44.
- Davidson, Cathy N., and Ada Norris, eds. Introduction. *Zitkala-Ša: American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Writings*, by Zitkala-Ša, xi–xxxv. New York: Penguin, 2003.
- Davis, Cynthia J. “Making the Strange(r) Familiar: Sarah Orne Jewett’s ‘The Foreigner.’” In *Breaking Boundaries: New Perspectives on Women’s Regional Writing*, edited by Sherrie A. Innes and Diana Royer, 88–108. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1997.
- Deloria, Jr., Vine. “Self-Determination and the Concept of Sovereignty.” In *Native American Sovereignty*, edited by John R. Wunder, 118–24. New York: Garland Publishing, 1996.
- Diana, Vanessa Holford. “‘Hanging in the Heart of Chaos’: Bi-Cultural Limbo,

- Self-(Re)presentation, and the White Audience in Zitkala-Ša's *American Indian Stories*." *Cimarron Review* 121 (October 1, 1997): 154–73.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "The American Scholar." 1837. *Nature; Addresses and Lectures*, 49–70. Boston: J. Munroe, 1849.
- Enoch, Jessica. "Resisting the Script of Indian Education: Zitkala-Ša and the Carlisle Indian School." *College English* 65, no. 2 (November 2002): 117–41.
- Fetterley, Judith. "'Not in the Least American': Nineteenth-Century Literary Regionalism as UnAmerican Literature." In *Nineteenth-Century American Women Writers: A Critical Reader*, edited by Karen L. Kilcup, 15–32. Malden MA: Blackwell, 1998.
- , and Marjorie Pryse, eds. *American Women Regionalists, 1850–1910*. New York: Norton, 1992.
- Fisher, Dexter. "Zitkala-Ša: The Evolution of a Writer." *American Indian Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (August 1979): 229–38.
- Fisher, Philip. "American Literary and Cultural Studies Since the Civil War." In *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn, 232–50. New York: MLA, 1992.
- Foote, Stephanie. "The Cultural Work of American Regionalism." In *A Companion to the Regional Literatures of America*, edited by Charles L. Crow, 25–41. Malden MA: Blackwell, 2003.
- . *Regional Fictions: Culture and Identity in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001.
- Garland, Hamlin. *The Book of the American Indian*, edited by Keith Newlin. 1923; reprint, Acton MA: Copley, 2002.
- . *Crumbling Idols: Twelve Essays on Art Dealing Chiefly With Literature, Painting and the Drama*, edited by Jane Johnson. 1894; reprint, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Hafen, P. Jane, ed. *Dreams and Thunder: Stories, Poems, and The Sun Dance Opera*, by Zitkala-Ša. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- . "Indigenous Peoples and Place." In *A Companion to the Regional Literatures of America*, edited by Charles L. Crow, 154–70. Malden MA: Blackwell, 2003.
- . "Zitkala-Ša: Sentimentality and Sovereignty." *Wicazo Ša Review* 12, no. 2 (Fall 1997): 31–42.
- Howells, W. D. "Editor's Study." *Harper's Monthly* 83 (November 1891): 962–66.
- Huhndorf, Shari M. *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Inness, Sherrie A., and Diana Royer, eds. Introduction. *Breaking Boundaries: New Perspectives on Women's Regionalist Writing*, 1–16. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1997.

- Jahner, Elaine. "A Critical Approach to American Indian Literature." In *Studies in American Indian Literature: Critical Essays and Course Designs*, edited by Paula Gunn Allen, 211–24. New York: MLA, 1983.
- . "Metalanguages." In *Narrative Chance: Postmodern Discourse on Native American Indian Literatures*, edited by Gerald Vizenor, 155–85. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989.
- Kaplan, Amy. "Nation, Region, and Empire." In *Columbia History of the American Novel*, edited by Emory Elliott, 240–66. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Kilcup, Karen L. "Zitkala-Ša." In *Native American Women's Writing, c. 1800–1924: An Anthology*, 294–95. Oxford UK: Blackwell, 2000.
- Krupat, Arnold. *The Turn to the Native: Studies in Criticism and Culture*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.
- . *The Voice in the Margins: Native American Literature and the Canon*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Lape, Noreen Groover. "'There Was a Part for Her in the Indian Life': Mary Austin, Regionalism, and the Problems of Appropriation." In *Breaking Boundaries: New Perspectives on Women's Regional Writing*, edited by Sherrie A. Innes and Diana Royer, 124–39. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1997.
- Lazarus, Edward. *Black Hills, White Justice: The Sioux Nation versus the United States, 1775 to the Present*. New York: HarperCollins, 1991.
- McCullough, Kate. *Regions of Identity: The Construction of America in Women's Fiction, 1885–1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Meisenheimer, D. K., Jr. "Regionalist Bodies/Embodied Regions: Sarah Orne Jewett and Zitkala-Ša." In *Breaking Boundaries: New Perspectives on Women's Regional Writing*, edited by Sherrie A. Innes and Diana Royer, 109–23. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1997.
- Mihesuah, Devon A., ed. Introduction. *Natives and Americans: Researching and Writing About American Indians*, 1–22. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Mooney, James. "Our Last Cannibal Tribe." *Harper's Monthly* 103 (September 1901): 550–55.
- "New Figures in Literature and Art." *Atlantic Monthly* 76 (December 1895): 840–44.
- Newlin, Keith. Introduction. *The Book of the American Indian*, by Hamlin Garland, xi–xlvi. Acton MA: Copley, 2002.
- Okker, Patricia. "Native American Literatures and the Canon: The Case of Zitkala-Ša." In *American Realism and the Canon*, edited by Tom Quirk and Gary Scharnhorst, 87–101. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994.
- Pulitano, Elvira. *Toward a Native American Critical Theory*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003.

- Rainwater, Catherine. *Dreams of Fiery Stars: The Transformations of Native American Fiction*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Rose, Wendy. "The Great Pretenders: Further Reflections on Whiteshamanism." In *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance*, edited by M. Annette Jaimes, 403–21. Boston: South End Press, 1992.
- Shanley, Katherine. "'Born from the Need to Say': Boundaries and Sovereignties in Native American Literary and Cultural Studies." *Paradoxa: Studies in World Literary Genres* 15 (2001): 3–16.
- . "Metacritical Frames of Reference in Studying American Indian Literature: An Afterword." In *Native American Representations: First Encounters, Distorted Images, and Literary Appropriations*, edited by Gretchen M. Bataille, 224–26. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- Smith, Sidonie. "Cheesecake, Nymphs, and 'We the People': Un/National Subjects About 1900." *Prose Studies* 17, no. 1 (April 1994): 120–40.
- Sollors, Werner. "Introduction: The Invention of Ethnicity." In *The Invention of Ethnicity*, edited by Werner Sollors, ix–xx. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Spack, Ruth. "Re-visioning Sioux Women: Zitkala-Ša's Revolutionary *American Indian Stories*." *Legacy* 14, no. 1 (1997): 25–42.
- Sundquist, Eric. "Realism and Regionalism." In *Columbia Literary History of the United States*, edited by Emory Elliott, 501–24. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- U.S. Congress. *Congressional Record*. 67th Cong., 2nd sess., 1922. Vol. 62, pt. 12: 12162.
- Velikova, Roumiana. "Troping in Zitkala-Ša's Autobiographical Writings, 1900–1921." *Arizona Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 49–64.
- Walker, Cheryl. *Indian Nation: Native American Literature and Nineteenth-Century Nationalisms*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.
- "What Mary Austin Says About Indians." *American Indian Magazine* 6, no. 4 (Winter 1919): 181.
- Welty, Eudora. "Place in Fiction." In *A Modern Southern Reader: Major Stories, Drama, Poetry, Essays and Reminiscences from the Twentieth-Century South*, edited by Ben Forkner and Patrick Samway, 537–48. 1956; reprint, Atlanta: Peachtree Publishers, 1986.
- Whitman, Walt. *Democratic Vistas: and Other Papers*. London: Walter Scott, 1888.
- Wilkins, David E. "The U.S. Supreme Court's Explication of 'Federal Plenary Power': An Analysis of Case Law Affecting Tribal Sovereignty, 1886–1914." *American Indian Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (Summer 1994): 349–68.
- , and K. Tsianina Lomawaima. *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.

- Wilson, Woodrow. "Colonies and Nation: A Short History of the People of the United States." *Harper's Monthly* 103 (October 1901): 791–807.
- Womack, Craig S. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Young, William A. *Quest for Harmony: Native American Spiritual Traditions*. New York: Seven Bridges Press, 2002.
- Zagarell, Sandra A. "Country's Portrayal of Community and the Exclusion of Difference." In *New Essays on The Country of the Pointed Firs*, edited by June Howard, 39–60. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Zitkala-Ša. "America, Home of the Red Man." *American Indian Magazine* 6, no. 4 (Winter 1919): 165–67.
- . *American Indian Stories*. 1921; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.
- . *Americanize the First American: A Plan of Regeneration*. N.p., pamphlet, 1921.
- . "The California Indians of Today." *California Indian Herald* 1, no. 3 (July 1923): 10.
- . "The Coronation of Chief Powhatan Retold." *American Indian Magazine* 6, no. 4 (Winter 1919): 179–80.
- . "Editorial Comment." *American Indian Magazine* 6, no. 3 (Autumn 1918): 113–14.
- . "Editorial Comment." *American Indian Magazine* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1919): 5–9.
- . "Editorial Comment." *American Indian Magazine* 7, no. 2 (Summer 1919): 61–63.
- . "Heart to Heart Talk." *California Indian Herald* 2, no. 5 (May 1924): 2–3.
- . "Impressions of an Indian Childhood." *Atlantic Monthly* 85 (January 1900): 37–47.
- . "Indian Gifts to Civilized Man." *American Indian Magazine* 6, no. 3 (Autumn 1918): 115–16.
- . "An Indian Praying on the Hilltop." *American Indian Magazine* 7, no. 2 (Summer 1919): 92.
- . "An Indian Teacher Among Indians." *Atlantic Monthly* 85 (March 1900): 381–86.
- . "The Indian's Awakening." *American Indian Magazine* 4, no. 1 (Spring 1916): 57–59.
- . *Old Indian Legends*. 1901; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.
- . "Letter to the Chiefs and Headmen of the Tribes." *American Indian Magazine* 6, no. 4 (Winter 1919): 196–97.

- . *Old Indian Legends*, v–vi. 1901; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.
- . “The Red Man’s America.” *American Indian Magazine* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1917): 64.
- . “The School Days of an Indian Girl.” *Atlantic Monthly* 85 (February 1900): 185–94.
- . “Secretary’s Report in Brief.” *American Indian Magazine* 6, no. 3 (Autumn 1918): 122–24.
- . “Side by Side.” *The Earllhamite* 2, no. 12 (March 16, 1896): 177–79.
- . “The Soft-Hearted Sioux.” *Harper’s Monthly* 103 (October 1901): 505–8.
- . “The Trial Path.” *Harper’s Monthly* 103 (October 1901): 741–44.
- . “Why I Am a Pagan.” *Atlantic Monthly* 90 (December 1902): 801–3.
- . “The Widespread Enigma Concerning Blue-Star Woman.” 1921. *American Indian Stories*, 159–82. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.