University of Massachusetts - Amherst
ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Commonwealth Honors College Theses and Projects

Commonwealth Honors College

8-25-2011

The American Indian Mascot

Carol Huben
University of Massachusetts - Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/chc_theses

Recommended Citation
Huben, Carol, "The American Indian Mascot" (2011). *Commonwealth Honors College Theses and Projects.* Paper 13.
http://scholarworks.umass.edu/chc_theses/13

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Commonwealth Honors College at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Commonwealth Honors College Theses and Projects by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN MASCOT

A Capstone Manuscript Experience

Presented by:

Carol Huben

Completion Date:

May 3rd, 2011

Approved By:

_____

Kathleen A. Brown-Pérez, Commonwealth Honors College

ABSTRACT

Title: **The American Indian Mascot**
Author: **Carol Huben**
CE Type: **Capstone Course Thesis**
Approved By: **Kathleen A. Brown-Pérez, Commonwealth Honors College**

The issue of American Indian mascots is one that has generated much controversy. This research aims to show that these mascots are harmful to American Indian people and others, and that the refusal to discard these offensive caricatures is the result of a complete disregard for native cultures and ways of life, generated in part by mainstream America's ignorance in regards to modern American Indians. This ignorance is partially due to the cultural appropriation practiced extensively throughout the United States from the colonial period up to the present day. This research aims to show that, because of the damaging effects of mascots and their degree of offensiveness to native peoples, their usage should be discontinued.

ABSTRACT

Title: **The American Indian Mascot**
Author: **Carol Huben**
CE Type: **Capstone Course Thesis**
Approved By: **Kathleen A. Brown-Pérez, Commonwealth Honors College**

The issue of American Indian mascots is one that has generated much controversy. This research aims to show that these mascots are harmful to American Indian people and others, and that the refusal to discard these offensive caricatures is the result of a complete disregard for native cultures and ways of life, generated in part by mainstream America's ignorance in regards to modern American Indians. This ignorance is partially due to the cultural appropriation practiced extensively throughout the United States from the colonial period up to the present day. This research aims to show that, because of the damaging effects of mascots and their degree of offensiveness to native peoples, their usage should be discontinued.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract…….....i

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

The American Indian Mascot…….....…...1

Claims Justifying the Mascots- Positivity ……1

Claims Justifying the Mascots- Accuracy …….…2

Claims Justifying the Mascots- Appropriation ……..2

Claims Not Justifying the Mascot ……..3

Chapter Summary …….....….....3

CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review

CHAPTER THREE: Methods and Goals

Research Methods …….....….....16

Goals …….....….....16

CHAPTER FOUR: Cultural Violence

Cultural Violence……...17

Definitional Violence……18

Social Stratification……...……21

Historical Erasure…..……23

Chapter Summary….……25

CHAPTER FIVE: Harm Caused by Stereotyping

Stereotype Threat……...27

The Effects of Stereotype Threat …….…….....28

Stereotypes of American Indians …….....….....30

The Effects of "Positive" Stereotyping …….....….....30

The Effects of Stereotyping on Other Groups …….....….....32

Chapter Summary …….....….....34

CHAPTER SIX: The Mascot as a "Positive" Representation

Positive Mascots …….....….....36

Savages…….. …….....….....36

The Text/ Context Difference ……...…….....…..37

Chapter Summary …….....….....39

CHAPTER SEVEN: White Privilege and Authenticity

The American Indian Voice ……..…….....…….40

Media Characterizations of American Indians ……..….…….....……40

The Vanishing Indian ……...…….....……...41

Mainstream America and Modern American Indians ……...43

Authenticity of Present-Day American Indians …….....44

Chapter Summary …….....….....45

CHAPTER EIGHT: Cultural Appropriation

Cultural Appropriation …….....……...47

Profound Offense …….....…….....47

The Entitled American …….....……47

White America Privileged Over Native America ……..…...48

Assimilation …….....…….....49

"Red" on the Outside, White on the Inside …….....…….....50

The Vanishing Indian as Justification for Appropriation …….....51

Claims of Indianness …….....…….....51

The Mascot's Role…….....…….....52

Chapter Summary …….....….....53

CHAPTER NINE: Other Arguments Used

Monetary Objections …….…….....….....54

Tradition …….....….....54

Chapter Summary …….....….....56

CHAPTER TEN: Conclusions and Implications for Further Research

Summary …….....….....57

Conclusion …….....….....57

Implications for Further Research …….....….....57

The Practical Elimination of Mascots …….....….....58

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The American Indian Mascot

American Indian mascots are stereotypes commonly accepted by mainstream American culture. This kind of racism towards American Indians is considered acceptable because mainstream America is unfamiliar with Indians and tribes, as it has no understanding of their present-day ways of life or their histories beyond that which they have absorbed through the caricatures surrounding them.

These mascots have been shown to have harmful effects on the American Indian population and should certainly be discontinued. The harmful effects of stereotyping on a population are addressed in Chapter Five. The reasons that they have not been discontinued are many and varied, and include the following claims.

Claims Justifying the Mascots- Positivity

First is the claim that mascots have only positive qualities and are thus inoffensive. As is shown in Chapter Six, this assumption of positivity is based on a white-centric view of American Indian cultures and does not take into account cultural factors that may cause mascots to be seen as offensive.

All too often, white America sees only the text of the mascot- that is, that the mascot has positive characteristics- and not the context in which these mascots are used. For instance, this context may include being portrayed in the same frame of reference as animals after an attempted genocide of American Indian peoples and cultures, or being portrayed as bloodthirsty warriors when this claim (that the Indian was a savage addicted

to war) was one of the reasons used to justify their extermination. Thus, there is a sharp divide between the perceived positivity of mascots based on this text/ context difference.

Claims Justifying the Mascots- Accuracy

Another common assumption on the part of mascot defenders is that mascots are accurate portrayals of Indians, and that, thus, their use is justified. This is caused by mainstream America's general lack of exposure to present-day American Indians, and their over-exposure to Hollywood "Indians." Because of these differing degrees of exposure, mainstream America now possesses a deep-seated belief that all true Indians are the kind found in Hollywood films- horse-riding, war-whooping, spear-brandishing savages.

Unsurprisingly, current-day Indians often fail to meet these white expectations- the expectations that they resemble the portrayals of Indians from the days when they fought cowboys, for instance. When this failure to meet expectations occurs, modern American Indians are seen as not living up to the standards of their ancestors, even though these standards are in large part contrived by movie producers. Because of this, their perceived inauthenticity is thought to invalidate their objections to "true" Indian representations.

Claims Justifying the Mascots- Appropriation

The third large claim made when defending mascots is that American Indian cultures are the rightful heritage of white America, and that thus the use of American Indian mascots is not something in which indigenous America should have any say. This belief is widely held, and stems in part from the myth of the vanishing Indian, a

fabrication from early in United States history that claimed that the Indian was a vanishing breed (Dippie 10).

This claim of the vanishing Indian allowed white America to justify their appropriation of the land and resources of the Americas and their insistence on assimilation. The continuing belief in this claim now justifies the appropriation of the cultures of the indigenous peoples of these continents. As the Indian peoples are dying out, the logic goes, the only way to honor and preserve their cultures is for white culture to assimilate it. This, fueled in part by the perceived inauthenticity of modern American Indians (another indication that "real" Indians have all died out), has resulted in the incredible amount of ignorant and unwarranted appropriation of indigenous cultures.

Claims Not Justifying the Mascot

These, then, are the main points that this research addresses. There are various other arguments often used by mascots' supporters, which are also briefly addressed. These include arguments that changing the mascots would cost too much, and that doing so would upset the long-standing traditions of the universities and teams that makes use of them.

However, in this paper, these arguments have not been given much weight, as they can mostly be dismissed as petty concerns. Indeed, the author personally thinks that it would be fair to view these as grasping attempts to justify continued oppression of a people when all evidence recommends its discontinuation.

Chapter Summary

In summary, this research seeks to address all of the above claims, including the claims that mascots are positive, and thus inoffensive; accurate, and thus justified; and

the rightful heritage of white America, and thus none of indigenous America's business. This research aims to show that the continued use of these mascots is not only damaging and demeaning, it is also symptomatic of an underlying racism towards American Indians, and that these offensive, stereotypical representations should be discontinued with all due haste.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The issue of American Indian mascots is one that has provoked much controversy and generated a substantial amount of literature. Almost all the scholarly sources available argue for the elimination of mascots, citing various reasons such as the damage done to American Indian youth and the improper beliefs that lead to claims of "honoring" American Indians. Included in these beliefs are the ideas that all "real Indians" have died out and that mascots are positive, realistic representations of American Indian culture. These mistruths lead supporters of mascots to disregard the negative effects that mascots have on American Indian youth (and adults), such as decreased self-efficacy, which is a factor leading to the massive disparity in wealth, health, and education between American Indians and Euro-Americans.

To demonstrate the connection between stereotypes and self-efficacy, we can turn to Fryberg et al.'s article "Of Warrior Chiefs and Indian Princesses." This article consists of a series of four studies conducted to examine the effect of exposure to stereotyping on American Indian students' senses of self-worth, community worth, and possible selves. The studies found that, while there were positive associations generated by images such as Pocahontas and Chief Wahoo (a mascot used by the "Cleveland Indians"), after exposure American Indian students reported depressed levels of self-confidence in all the above areas. The article goes on to say that this suggests American Indian mascots have harmful consequences for those caricatured, whether or not they have "positive" content.

If, of course, a stereotype has negative content, there is no question as to whether or not it can have an adverse effect on the groups it portrays. "Stereotype threat" is a

term that refers to the concern in negatively stereotyped groups that they will be evaluated based on the stereotype (Myers and Spencer 443), and is a disruptive influence on performance, as Walton and Spencer's article "Latent Ability: Grades and Test Scores Systematically Underestimate the Intellectual Ability of Negatively Stereotyped Students" shows. This article documents two meta-analyses done of various latent-ability tests, and finds that when students were tested in ways that did not allow stereotype threat to affect the process, their performance improved markedly. This article claims that:

> The observed effect sizes suggest that the SAT Math test underestimates the math ability of women like those in the present sample by 19 to 21 points, and that the SAT Math and SAT Reading tests underestimate the intellectual ability of African and Hispanic Americans like those in the present sample by a total of 39 to 41 points for each group. Insofar as the overall gender gap on the SAT Math test is 34 points and as the overall Black-White and Hispanic-White gaps on the SAT (combining math and reading) are 199 and 148 points, respectively (The College Board, 2007), these differences are substantial (Walton and Spencer 1137).

If, then, the *idea* that Hispanic students aren't as good at math as white students causes by itself a quarter of the observable difference, what effects could the exaggerated stereotypes attendant in sports mascots be having?

Brian Armenta's article, "Stereotype Boost and Stereotype Threat Effects: The Moderating Role of Ethnic Identification" gives some hints as to the answer. It claims that an individual is more susceptible to stereotype threat when they identify more strongly with their ethnic group, and that stereotype threat has a corollary in 'stereotype boost.' For example, when Asian American students are primed with the idea that they

are good at math, they tend to do better than when not primed; this is proof that stereotyping can cause a tendency towards the stereotype in a positive or negative direction. Thus, it can be seen that there will be a shift towards the stereotype in an individual who identifies more strongly with the group, no matter whether a negative or positive stereotype.

One must examine, then, the negative and positive features of sports mascots, and one comes to see that the mascots are almost always either blood-thirsty and battle-ready or stupid, grinning clowns. Neither of these are positive things for the American Indian population to internalize. Something that could be seen as positive, such as martial prowess, in the context of a football game is not something that real-life people necessarily will benefit from internalizing, and though the comic-relief character is often well-loved, it is insulting to apply it to a culture as a whole. The fact that the stereotypes made available by sports teams are violent and stupid (uncivilized) could be taken as a direct cause for the poverty and crime so prevalent on reservations. Important to note is the fact that *those who identify most strongly with their native culture are more likely to internalize these ideas*, meaning that those American Indians most invested in their culture are the ones most affected.

In addition to harming those caricatured, mascots can increase the tendency to stereotype other groups. Kim-Prieto et al.'s article, "Effect of Exposure to an American Indian Mascot on the Tendency to Stereotype a Different Minority Group," documents two studies done to determine whether exposure to a stereotype increases willingness to stereotype a different group. The studies were specifically designed to test different stereotypes (martial prowess in American Indians and social awkwardness in Asian

Americans), one of which was positive and one of which was negative. The results showed that in this case as well, exposure to the "positive" stereotype of martial prowess resulted in a negative result- that is, willingness to accept mascots as indicative of American Indian culture primed students to believe that Asian Americans were socially inept.

The question becomes, then, why these mascots are supported despite their demonstrated harmful impact. The only argument brought up to counteract this by supporters of mascots is the almost universal claim that that team's mascot is honoring American Indians. Despite Kim-Prieto et al.'s article, cited above, which shows that stereotyping of any form can increase willingness to believe in other stereotypes, and is thus harmful to any group with any kind of negative stereotype about them, we will nonetheless go on to show why mascots are not positive stereotypes.

Jason Black's article, "The "Mascotting' of Native America: Construction, Commodity, and Assimilation" sums up the "positive" argument perfectly: "the universities have appropriated the Indian to mean honorable, brave, and courageous" (610). When put like that, of course it sounds like the mascot is respecting the people it claims to- it is full of positive characteristics. The problem, Black goes on to say, is that what the mascot represents as "Indian" is almost entirely a construction of the dominant white culture. Even those mascots that claim to represent a certain tribe (like the Seminoles, as Black discusses) are dressed in Plains Indian clothing (the style of dress seen in Hollywood movies) and use "inaccurate war chants, tomahawks, crooked noses, smoke signals, tepees, leather-fringed pants, and western movie-style war drums (611)." None of these are respectful towards the Seminole tribes, because none of these *represent*

these tribes. Lumping all Indians together under the non-descript header of "Indianness" results in stereotypes that disrespect American Indians who do not fit into the Hollywood Indian box.

This point is expanded on in David Prochaska's article, "At Home in Illinois: Presence of Chief Illiniwek, Absence of Native Americans." He describes the differing views of mascots as a difference between viewing the text and the context. Though the text of the University of Illinois's mascot, Chief Illiniwek, is positive- he is solemn, and serious- the context of his actions is negative. Thus, the dance, which is seen as dignified in its text, is, when taken in context, a secular dance done in religious regalia, and thus offensive. Defenders of mascots persist in seeing only the text, a positive representation, and not the context, through which the mascot becomes a negative representation (173).

Oftentimes, however, the supporters of mascots are not even so careful as to actually be respectful of American Indian people. Virtually any campaign to retire a mascot faces immense opposition (see Harjo 2001; Cummings 2008; Davis-Delano 2007; Davis and Rau 2001; Hofmann 2005, "The Elimination of Indigenous Mascots"; Machamer 2001), and many require legislation to force to the team to make the change. When these teams claim to be honoring the American Indian, how do they justify ignoring the opinions of the very tribes they represent? Andre Cummings' article, "Progress Realized? The Continuing American Indian Mascot Quandary" documents in brief multiple attempts by American Indians to eliminate mascots from play, and the almost comedic lengths that the teams have gone to in order to preserve them.

As well as not respecting the opinions of the people supposedly represented by the mascots, sports teams seem to have an underlying belief that these mascots do not in

fact represent these people, for various reasons that will be gone into later. This is shown in C. Richard King's essay, "Uneasy Indians: Creating and Contesting Native American Mascots at Marquette University." This essay documents the creation of the First Warrior, conceived by American Indian students as a symbol replacing the mascot previously found at the university. As an actual symbol of Indianness, the First Warrior dressed in authentic and accurate clothing, was played by an American Indian student, and danced traditional dances only, refusing to pander to the audience or demean himself for laughs. This creation did not, however, enjoy much success, and was eventually retired. Notably, the athletic director, Bill Cords, is quoted as saying on the First Warrior's retirement that it "was seen as more of a symbol of American Indians than of the school" (Russo 1991). This is an example of the belief that an American Indian mascot represents not American Indians, but the white players and fans of the team. This is blatant cultural appropriation, and the fact that it goes unrecognized is dangerous and unacceptable.

Ellen Staurowsky's article, "'You Know, We Are All Indian': Exploring White Power and Privilege in Reactions to the NCAA Native American Mascot Policy" addresses this cultural appropriation. Quoted in this article is a comment by a director of the American Football Coaches Association and former coach, who says "You know, we are all Indian. At least those of us from McMurry anyway. We all are McMurry Indians, and we always will be" (64). This appropriation of American Indian identity is common and usually goes unremarked upon. Staurowsky goes on to say that "when viewed through the expanse of history, the taking up and taking on of American Indian identity by Whites has paralleled the taking of land and the taking over of the land mass now

commonly referred to as the North American continent" (65).

Anne Marie Machamer also comments on this form of cultural appropriation in her article, "Last of the Mohicans, Braves, and Warriors: The End of the American Indian Mascots in Los Angeles Public Schools." She says that mascots "are symbols of dominance and superiority and expose feelings of entitlement not only to our land and resources but also to our religions and identities" (220). It is certainly the case that the usage of mascots parallels the appropriation of land- taken when the Indians couldn't fight back due to disease and the encroaching settlers, the land passed into the hands of white people, and now mascots, established when American Indians couldn't fight back due to the assimilationist policies in place, are as hard to remove as the entrenched Euro-Americans.

We can again go to Black's article, "The 'Mascotting' of Native America: Construction, Commodity, and Assimilation" for more on this. As Black says, "The antimascot movement seeks continually to remind the American public that Native identity is situated within Native America, not in some caricatured version supported by Euramericans" (609). He goes on to say that, in the example of such tribes as the Illini, who were killed off by disease, what little was preserved of their culture has now been overrun by the false, Hollywood-inspired stereotypical representations put forth by the University of Illinois mascot.

Sudie Hofmann's article, "The Elimination of Indigenous Mascots, Logos, and Nicknames: Organizing on College Campuses" shows another facet of this. As she says on page 169, "Arguments for retaining American Indian mascots and nicknames will often cite examples such as 'What about the Dutchman?' 'What about the Fighting Irish?' The

differences that exist in these cases are that Germans chose Dutchmen (Deutchman) and Irish chose Irish as an institutional nickname." The fact that it appears to be acceptable for white Americans to use American Indian culture in the same way that they would their own is another example of the way American Indian ethnicity is perceived as being available for anyone's use.

This is, of course, not limited to mascots' usage of American Indian culture. Pauline Strong and Laurie Posner's article "Selves in Play: Sports, Scouts, and American Cultural Citizenship" documents the cultural appropriation practiced by the YMCA, Boyscouts, and Camp Fire Girls, to name a few.

Another common instance of cultural appropriation is New Age usage of indigenous religious practices, as Lisa Aldred discusses in her article "Plastic Shamans and Astroturf Sun Dances: New Age Commercialization of Native American Spirituality." She discusses the whole-hearted embrace of indigenous religion by white New Agers, even when the practitioner is aware of the objections of many native peoples to the practice, and often with disregard for the traditional ways of practicing the religion.

Christina Welch's article "Appropriating the Didjeridu and the Sweat Lodge: New Age Baddies and Indigenous Victims?" also addresses this subject, as well as the reasons that New Age thinkers claim to honor their American Indian inspirations. These reasons are often close to the mascot method of claiming to preserve traditions, but mascot supporters do not often get overly invested in the specifics behind their 'traditions,' whereas New Agers are often extremely invested in the legitimacy of their appropriations. As Welch says on page 26, "appropriating indigenous intellectual and cultural property is validated by the West's perceived need to save such valuable

information for posterity."

Of course, the only way to legitimize the above claim would be to prove that the American Indian will soon disappear, and thus show that the only way to preserve the knowledge that they hold would be to disseminate it to other races. However, mainstream America sees no need to prove this to be the case, because it is an idea already firmly held by the population. As Brian Dippie says in his book, *The Vanishing American*, the notion that the indigenous population is dying out and will become extinct soon is one that has been widely accepted from at least 1814 (10). This belief has justified centuries of crimes against the American Indian population, by giving the white population free rein to do anything it wants in order to stave off the impending extermination of the Indian race. This is one of the arguments that justified the Indian Removal Act- a belief that, as Dippie says on page 60, "only removal could save the Indian from racial extinction."

Jean O'Brien's book, *Firsting and Lasting; Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* also addresses the persuasive myth of the vanishing Indian, starting in the 1820s. When researching old town records, she found records of births and deaths that spoke to a vibrant Indian population in towns that claimed to have lost all Native peoples, and her book also addresses the reasons that white people have tended to insist that the Native peoples of the Americas have died out.

This theory is certainly not relegated to the past, either, as Mary Landreth comments in her article, "Becoming the Indians: Fashioning Arkansas State University's Indians." She claims that "a deficient education system… has created generalizations about Native Americans in the minds of the American public. The essence of these

generalizations is that all Indians were alike and that there are no more ‘real’ Indians” (52). This disbelief in the existence of American Indians legitimizes the use of their culture, because who could be offended, if they’re all dead?

This is not a theoretical or unconsciously held opinion, either- in “Playing Indian and Fighting (for) Mascots: Reading the Complications of Native American and Euro-American Alliances” Charles Springwood covers the controversy over the use of the Huron name for a sports team. On the subject of the Huron people (approached for support of the name only after the controversy began), he records: “indeed, one restoration member confessed that he was not even aware that Huron people existed anymore, admitting ‘I thought they were extinct’” (309).

We can now look to Elizabeth Delacruz’s comment in her article "Racism American Style and Resistance to Change: Art Education's Role in the Indian Mascot Issue,” in conjunction with Jason Black’s in his article, “The ‘Mascotting’ of Native America: Construction, Commodity, and Assimilation,” to cap our explanation. Delacruz claims that “most Anglo-Americans actually know little if anything about the beliefs, values, cosmology, or cultural practices of any Native Americans, past or present” (18), and Black claims that “public notions of culture arise through representations of ethnicity, group relations, and media accounts- often derived from incorrect ‘scholarly’ versions of tribal histories and cultures- of customs and traditions. The ‘mascot’ is one such representation” (608). Delacruz claims that mainstream America has an extremely limited understanding of indigenous culture, and Black claims that Americans learn incorrect notions from popular culture- combining these, we can see that most knowledge mainstream America has comes from media accounts.

And, as King et al. say in their article "Of Polls and Race Prejudice: Sports Illustrated's Errant 'Indian Wars,'" "One of the reasons why most Americans find the mascots unremarkable and do not turn a critical eye toward the mascots is because of the prevalence of similar images throughout U.S. popular culture" (391). The mainstream American population, which has only ever been exposed to Indianness through stereotypes, would of course not find anything offensive about a stereotype, because as far as they know, the stereotypes are all true. This is the crux of the matter, and is the reason that most people do not consider mascots offensive.

Thus, it can be seen that the literature already forms a cohesive explanation for why mascots should be removed, and also has a thorough understanding of why the white population, entrenched in its entitled superiority, refuses to acknowledge this. The main argument against removal of mascots has been shown multiple times to be irrelevant, for despite all the talk of "honoring," the only important thing is whether or not the mascot offends those who it caricatures, and American Indian people are certainly offended. Additionally, mascots and other stereotypes have been shown to be harmful whether or not they honor their targets, and thus should be unconditionally eliminated.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS AND GOALS

Research Methods

This research has been conducted primarily through a review of the academic literature available on the subject. The sources used are peer-reviewed articles from scholarly journals and books published within the last thirty years. The data have been collected over the span of nine months, and consist in large part of current research.

Goals

This research aims to provide a thorough understanding of the situation involving the use of the American Indian mascot. It seeks to address both the reasons given for discontinuing usage of mascots, and those commonly given for keeping mascots in play, and the relative merits of both sets of arguments. It includes, at the end, a recommendation for discontinuing the use of mascots.

CHAPTER FOUR

CULTURAL VIOLENCE

Cultural Violence

Cultural violence is an important factor in considering the use and retention of American Indian mascots. Cultural violence consists of those aspects of culture that serve to legitimize direct or structural violence (Galtung 291; Bulhan 120-121; Sluka 26), and it permeates the issue of the sports mascot.

Cultural violence serves as justification for two things: direct violence and structural violence. Direct violence is that which is physical, that which we normally think of as violence: murder, assault, rape. Structural violence is institutionalized violence: higher death rates due to disease and starvation for the poor; slavery; women being denied the vote. Structural violence prevents those affected by it from meeting their basic needs. As Johan Galtung says, addressing the violence of sanctions,

> to some, [effecting sanctions] is 'non-violence,' since direct and immediate killing is avoided. To the victims, however, it may mean slow but intentional killing though malnutrition and lack of medical attention, hitting the weakest first, the children, the elderly, the poor, the women. By making the causal chain longer the actor avoids having to face the violence directly (293).

Thus, structural violence results in many of the same deficient, abusive, and unhealthy situations for those affected as does direct violence; however, it is often not recognized as doing so.

The reason it is not recognized is cultural violence. Cultural violence serves to mask the violence inherent in many actions. For instance, whipping of children was

justified as being for the child's own good- teaching them discipline, showing them their place. The whipping was direct violence; the idea that whipping was the best way to correct a child was cultural violence.

Examples of cultural violence related to race and social status include the concept of caste, in India and other countries; the portrayal of Jewish people as vermin in Nazi Germany; and the idea of the helpless negro, unable to manage for himself unless watched over by a kindly white benefactor, to name a few. Though it would not be correct to say that, for instance, Jewish people being portrayed as vermin led to the Holocaust, one of the ways in which the genocide was justified to Germany's population was through such images; in this way, this form of cultural violence allowed the genocide to continue.

In much the same way, historical portrayals of Indian peoples (as savages, stupid, bloodthirsty, or drunk) were used to justify their extermination. Current-day portrayals of American Indians in art, literature, movies, and many other areas, including sports mascots, put forth an image of American Indians that has changed a startlingly small amount from those images; perhaps it is time to consider whether these outdated, violent stereotypes of a group of peoples are really appropriate to be inundating our children and society with.

Definitional Violence

The examples given above, such as the casting of the Indian as a savage, or of the black person as a child-like creature, are all examples of definitional violence, a sub-type of cultural violence. Definitional violence is the defining of a group by those outside the group (Miller 238; Mummendey and Otten 146; Jenefsky 136; Bulhan 103-04). This does

not have to be a legal definition; the characterization of black people as childlike, for instance, was not necessarily official, but rather something that was used to justify the legal definition of African Americans as slaves. Enslaving people who are intellectual, cultural, and moral equals to oneself is difficult; claiming that a race is stupid, uncivilized, and lazy makes it much easier to abuse them and take away their freedoms. Thus, definitional violence consists of not only written, legal definitions, but also of widely promulgated claims that certain groups are inherently inferior, superior, or simply different- claims that are, almost exclusively, used to justify direct and structural violence towards these groups.

The definitional violence done to American Indians can be seen throughout history. From the first meetings of Europeans and indigenous peoples, Indians were classified as "savages" and "heathens," in need of instruction in the way of God, proper dress, and European farming practices. These claims of inferiority were used to justify the attempted assimilation or extermination of the indigenous peoples and the appropriation of their land, both of which have arguably continued up to the present day, as addressed further below. A specific example of past definitional violence was the sordid picture painted by European explorers of cannibalistic feasts taking place in the Carib's homelands- a tale that was spread, not because it reflected the truth of this tribe's way of life, but rather because, under Spanish law, cannibals could be legally enslaved (Ferguson 111).

While the definitional violence applied to American Indians today does not outright state that Indians should be killed or enslaved in order to make way for the white man, it is heavily implied in the dialogue surrounding issues such as the mascot that they

should be anywhere but in the white man's business. White America acts as if American Indian people have no right to involve themselves in issues such as Indian mascots, despite the fact that the teams are using caricatures of Indians. As addressed in Chapter Eight, mainstream America appears to believe that not only the land but also the cultural practices of American Indian peoples are its rightful heritage, and shows a somewhat confused response to American Indians who assert their identity and connection to their culture.

Mainstream America has been waiting for the "Indian Problem" to disappear since the idea first surfaced in the 1810s that the Indian was dying off, and the idea of a continent free of non-Europeans became feasible. The vague bewilderment white America shows when American Indians make their presence known demonstrates the belief that the Indian has passed on, and the refusal to listen to Indian opinions shows the assumption that, if white America ignore the voices of Indians and tribes long enough, the problem will just go away- as will the Indian.

This defining of a people out of existence is an extremely potent form of definitional violence. As addressed in more depth below, blood quantum is a current-day standard used to reduce the number of "actual" American Indians, so that white society will have to deal with fewer and fewer unassimilated groups. This attempted elimination of identity and culture is undeniably violent, as it allows the group in power to completely ignore the group they have deemed to be non-existent, making it impossible for that group to protest any kind of rights violation.

In the words of David Miller, "tribal governments not having complete control over the definitions of their membership are necessarily faced with the continued threat

of ethnocide" (240). Without the ability to legally define their groups, tribes are constantly faced with the threat of dissolution by the United States government, and there is an equally great threat to tribal existence when the ability to define themselves socially and culturally is denied them.

This lack of power is visible in the form of the sports mascot. However hard American Indians may fight, white America is always ready to deny their concepts of who they are with the same offensive caricatures, and is never willing to accept the fact that these caricatures do not accurately represent Indianness. Thus, white America continues to maintain its definition of what it means to be an Indian, to the detriment of Indian peoples themselves.

Social Stratification

Required for the above forms of violence is social stratification, or differing degrees of power in a society, the institutionalized form of which is an example of structural violence (Sluka 31; Farmer 317; Ember and Ember 10; Barsh 193; Alder 115; Ferguson 110; Miller 240). As Alder notes, "income inequality (the degree of relative poverty) is a better determinant of crime than absolute poverty" (115). Not as important, here, is lack of resources; rather, it is the struggle to provide food for one's family when certain elements of society buy new cars every year with the money they make off one's labor that can ferment into violence.

Violence and social stratification are intimately linked (Sluka 31; Ember and Ember 10), as social inequality is a form of structural violence; and, in the words of Johan Galtung, "violence breeds violence" (295). Both direct and structural violence create needs-deficits, the results of which can often be direct violence (Galtung 295;

Farmer 308), whether against the dominant society or against other equally disadvantaged people (Fanon 166).

In this way, someone denied a role in society- someone who has been refused the ability to vote, for instance- may have no recourse to address the structural violence against them, and fulfill the needs-deficits that have been created, other than direct violence. This violence is often demonized by the dominant society- a form of victim-blaming, in which those protesting their abuses (in race riots, for instance) are portrayed as aggressors, attacking a peaceful society, and the violence perpetrated by the society, which originally provoked the reaction, is hidden.

As such, the only way that this victim-blaming can continue is when dominant society's cultural violence functions to cover up the structural violence. Thus, for instance, the idea of "pulling one up by one's bootstraps" can be used to justify the structural violence against those in poverty in the United States, by claiming that wealth is available to anyone who works for it. With this, the idea of institutional inequality is erased, leaving those at the bottom of the social ladder unable to petition for aid of any sort, as poverty has been effectively categorized as a social ill affecting only those who deserve it. The means to continue repressing those in the lower economic classes have varied over the years, and include the idea of privilege being granted by, for instance, God (Galtung 297), market forces (Farmer 313), or one's hard work (as with the current bootstrap theory), all of which serve to send one message: those without wealth don't deserve it.

And indeed, this ability of those in power to define those not in power as the unwanted and undesirable elements of society is, perhaps, one of the most invasive kinds

of social stratification. In the case of the sports mascot, as mentioned above, American Indians are denied the right to define themselves; instead, they are required to submit to mainstream America's (inaccurate) images of who and what Indians are. This form of social stratification is not as obvious as the extreme disparities in wealth between Indian and non-Indian people in the United States; however, it has much the same effect. Social stratification that is not material, but instead exists in the differing degrees of influence one's opinions can have, can have an extremely potent effect on those who are affected by it.

Historical Erasure

Often overlooked in debates over the use of mascots is the fact that the current-day situation of American Indians is due to the attempted genocide of their peoples through the 19th century, in the form of direct killings (such as the well-known distribution of blankets infected with smallpox) and through acts of structural violence such as Indian removal and governmental buying of Indian scalps. This attempt to destroy Indian peoples has arguably continued into the 1960s and 1970s, in the form of forced sterilization of American Indian women (Lawrence 400). Though not, in the end, successful, it is important to note that, for a very, very long time, a proudly stated goal of the American government was the extermination of the American Indian.

That, of course, is only attempted physical extermination; there has also been a consistent attempt to define the Indian out of existence, as shown in the current use of blood quantum, a practice encouraged by the United States government, which requires a person to have a certain percentage of Indian blood in order to legally qualify as an

Indian.[1] Another form of elimination was the attempt to assimilate American Indian peoples into white society, whether by allotment of their lands or by eradication of their culture- the latter of which is shown perhaps most graphically in the form of Indian boarding schools. These, well into the 20th century, forcibly took children from American Indian families and enrolled them in distant schools, where they were forbidden to speak their languages, practice their religions, visit their families, or be seen to retain any aspects of their culture.

These practices were horrible, but equally problematic is our refusal to acknowledge them. A common kind of cultural violence is this defining away of past offenses (Farmer 308; Sluka 26), which justifies a refusal to make any form of reparations (West 179; Marable 187). In this way, the dominant culture often refuses to acknowledge historical injustices that led to structural inequality (for instance, the forced removal of American Indian peoples from their homelands to deserts, whereupon they became poorer and poorer while the white people farming their plentiful lands got richer and richer).

When some federally recognized American Indians today are given small amounts of aid by the government (made, often, off land and resources that the government manages for them), it is looked at as being an outrageous violation of the rights of white America. In the same way that a victim of attempted murder, who sued

---

[1] This serves as an interesting contrast to the "one-drop" rule that the government historically applied to African Americans, whereby if one had an ancestor of African descent, no matter how far back, one was classified as black. When taking into consideration the differing motivations behind defining Indians and African Americans- an interest in having *fewer* Indians, so there would be more land for white people, and *more* black people, so that there would be more slaves to work without pay- the logic behind the seemingly contradictory one-drop and blood quantum rules begins to make a kind of horrible sense.

their attacker and was awarded money for their damages, would seem to be getting unfair reparations if one pretended the attempted murder never happened, so, too, does this seem unfair if one does not consider the damages suffered previously by American Indians and tribes, including the theft of their lands and resources.

By denying these aspects of the past, white America sheds all responsibility for its actions, and in doing so, justifies continuing these same actions, and maintaining the prejudice that results from doing so. White America's reactions to mascot protesters often include surprise that they could be thought to be offensive- after all, they have been used for years. Surely, mascot supporters seem to think, someone would have objected before now, if they were really inherently offensive. This point of view, of course, does not take into account the social oppression that American Indians have been (and still are) undergoing, such as the fact that American Indians were not extended the right to vote in all states until 1948, making it very difficult indeed to take legal action against offensive things.

Chapter Summary

Thus, as seen, cultural violence is strongly intertwined with the American Indian mascot. The mascot serves as a form of definitional violence, by means of which mainstream America can control what the image of an Indian is. The fact that mainstream America, and not native America, seems to have the greatest say in this definition is an example of social stratification and the privileging of white America over native America, and is symptomatic of the power disparities present in current-day relations between white America and American Indians.

The blatant disregard of mainstream America for the past, as well, is a form of cultural violence. This erasure of history practiced throughout the country allows white America to disregard its contribution to native America's problems, and thus exempts it from any responsibility towards fixing them. Likewise, it allows white America to ignore American Indian objections to mascots, with the justification that the native peoples are just making too much of a little thing; and mainstream America does not acknowledge that there are deeper issues underlying the objections to mascots.

As that which serves to justify structural and direct violence, cultural violence should be eliminated wherever possible; the hardest part of this is making clear what it is that cultural violence consists of. Because it functions invisibly, only through careful examination of issues such as the American Indian mascot can the violence begin to be seen; and since it serves to make it seem unproblematic to discriminate, it is very hard to acknowledge.

Throughout the remaining chapters, I discuss in less theoretical terms the reasons for elimination of the American Indian mascot, including the measurably detrimental effects of stereotyping, the most specifically offensive and inaccurate aspects of the mascots, and the defensive belligerence of white America. Viewed through the lens of cultural violence, all of these can begin to be seen as not only rationales for elimination, but also as side-effects of deeper, underlying problems with white America's perceptions of American Indians.

CHAPTER FIVE

HARM CAUSED BY STEREOTYPING

Stereotype Threat

It is well documented that negative stereotyping of an ethnicity can result in a drop in performance (Steele and Aronson 797; Armenta 94; Katz, Roberts, and Robinson 53; Walton and Spencer 1132). This tendency, called stereotype threat, means "that anything one does or any of one's features that conform to it make the stereotype more plausible as a self-characterization in the eyes of others, and perhaps even in one's own eyes" (Steele and Aronson 797). The result of stereotype threat is that when a negatively stereotyped ethnic group does something for which that stereotype applies, their performance is negatively affected.

Studies done to investigate stereotype threat often use scores on tests such as the SAT, comparing these to scores on the same set of problems when the problems are identified as testing a skill unrelated to the stereotype (Steele and Aronson 799; Armenta 95; Katz, Roberts, and Robinson 53). For instance, one study tested African American subjects' performance when an IQ subtest was presented as a test of hand-eye coordination (Katz, Roberts, and Robinson 53).

This study found that the subjects' scores improved markedly when the IQ test was relabeled; when it seemed to be testing a skill that stereotypes did not apply to, stereotype threat did not affect their performance, and they were able to improve their scores. Thus, since their performance was not affected when performing in an area that stereotype threat did not apply to, it was shown that it is the stereotype itself that causes the reduction in scores.

The Effects of Stereotype Threat

The effects of stereotype threat are difficult to guard against. They are not caused by outside factors, such as discrimination by the instructor, but rather by an awareness that one is thought of as being unskilled in an area. Thus, merely eliminating immediate, in-classroom threats will not serve to do away with stereotype threat. It is not something that can be gotten rid of with a simple fix, but is, rather, a long-lasting side effect of stereotyping.

The effect of stereotype threat is not insignificant; as Walton and Spencer's article shows, when students are tested in ways that do not allow stereotype threat to affect the process, their performance improves markedly. The results of the two meta-studies they did suggest

> …that the SAT Math test underestimates the math ability of women like those in the present sample by 19 to 21 points, and that the SAT Math and SAT Reading tests underestimate the intellectual ability of African and Hispanic Americans like those in the present sample by a total of 39 to 41 points for each group. Insofar as the overall gender gap on the SAT Math test is 34 points and as the overall Black-White and Hispanic-White gaps on the SAT (combining math and reading) are 199 and 148 points, respectively (The College Board, 2007), these differences are substantial (Walton and Spencer 1137).

The fact that one-half of the gender gap and one-fourth of the Hispanic/Caucasian gap can be attributed to stereotype threat is an indication that its effect is very strong indeed. The appraisal of these groups by others as being bad at math is shown by this meta-study to account for between 20% and 62% of the overall gap, and this implies a great deal

about the inherent abilities of genders and races (Walton and Spencer 1137). In truth, this meta-study only shows the differences made obvious by various studies' best attempts to level the playing field.

The studies used included ones that, in attempts to eliminate stereotype threat, either "refuted the validity of the stereotype (portrayed the test as yielding no group differences), severed its relevance to the test (portrayed the test as nonevaluative of the stereotyped ability), or provided participants an identity-relevant antidote to stereotype threat (e.g., a value affirmation)" (Walton and Spencer 1134). These methods were all used to create a "safe condition," in which stereotype threat would not apply. Not included in this meta-study were studies "whose safe condition simply portrayed the test as evaluative of the stereotyped ability," as "people link evaluative tests to negative stereotypes automatically" (1134).

Thus, this meta-study controlled as best it could for safe conditions that were not completely safe; however, the fact that, as stated above, "people link evaluative tests to negative stereotypes automatically" (Walton and Spencer 1134) makes it difficult to believe that these studies all managed to completely eliminate the effects of stereotype threat. Indeed, had the studies been even more carefully designed, it is easy to believe that there could have been an even larger improvement in scores. And it is entirely possible that the *entire gap* between genders and ethnicities on the SAT could be shown to be unsubstantiated. As the SAT is often thought of as indicative of true academic capability, the fact that its apparent affirmation of white supremacist, patriarchal values can be shown to be erroneous is a truly vital idea for understanding how latent racism can lead to real-world differences, even when no underlying differences exist.

Stereotypes of American Indians

What, then, does this say for American Indians? What stereotypes are there that apply to them? Though most of the research on stereotype threat has been done on groups with more easily testable stereotypes, there are certainly also studies examining American Indian stereotypes specifically. There are not as many stereotypes that correlate directly to specific tests, but there are nonetheless a number of negative stereotypes that apply to American Indians. One of the most common is that Indians living on reservations are subjected to the highest rates of crime, drug and alcohol abuse, lowest education rates, and lowest standards of living in the United States. While this is, in fact, the case, it is entirely possible that part of the reason that this holds true is the same as the reason that Asian and Caucasian men constantly outperform other groups on the SAT math tests: because they are expected to.

But how do these stereotypes relate to mascots? Surely mascots do not put forward the claim that American Indians are poor and uneducated, or directly state that American Indians will become roadside bums, drinking their lives away and unable to support themselves. They offer no stereotypes of that sort!

Though it is the case that there are not many stereotypes of the exaggerated sort proposed above present in mascots, a stereotype which mascots are certainly involved in promoting is the idea that Indians are warriors. Ah, but one might argue, that is a positive stereotype- it claims that American Indians are skilled in certain areas, not that they are unable to do certain tasks. How could such a stereotype negatively affect them?

The Effects of “Positive” Stereotyping

Fryberg et al. conducted a series of studies to determine whether so-called "positive" or "neutral" stereotypes (such as Pocahontas and Chief Wahoo) could have negative effects on self-esteem. These studies showed that when exposed to common American Indian stereotypes, native high school and college students reported lower rates of self-esteem and community worth, and fewer achievement-related possible selves. Interestingly, the two non-negative stereotypes- Chief Wahoo and Pocahontas- depressed self-esteem *more* than the "stereotypically negative outcome," that is, a short paragraph describing the problems that reservation American Indians face (216).

Why, one might wonder, is this the case? Why are these "positive" stereotypes, showcasing American Indians in powerful roles as popular, mainstream characters, causing youth to feel low self-esteem?

A viable answer to this question is that "there are relatively few alternate characterizations of American Indians" available in mainstream America, and that "American Indian mascots thus remind American Indians of the limited ways in which others see them" (Fryberg et al. 216). When American Indians are stereotyped as being good at only certain things- in the case of mascots, waging war and scalping innocent whites- it implies that they are good at nothing else, thus allowing for their performance in areas other than war-waging and scalping to be depressed. Needless to say, the call for these things in America nowadays is not very high. If the only thing assumed to be appropriate for one to do is wage war and claim scalps, and there is no job opening for such, it is not strange to think that one would have a harder time finding a job than one might if thought to be talented in multiple fields.

While performance in life itself- rather a broad topic- is harder to measure than

performance in math or English, a self-evaluating questionnaire can certainly cast some light on the emotional effects of this sort of stereotyping. The results generated in Fryberg et al.'s studies show something that is no surprise at all, when one takes into consideration stereotype threat and its tendency to cause those stereotyped to move in the direction of the stereotype. It shows that students tend to believe that they can accomplish less *after being exposed to stereotypes that imply that their fields of success are limited* (216). As a matter of fact, this result is *exactly* what one might expect from the vast number of studies done on stereotype threat.

The other thing important to note is that the results generated by this study- that is, that American Indian youths' self-esteem, community worth, and achievement-related possible selves all took a hit when exposed to stereotypes- were caused in part specifically by those stereotypes which this paper discusses, American Indian mascots. These are the same mascots which are often claimed to be positive, and thus to do no damage to American Indian youth. When presented with a study that directly contradicts the claim that "good" stereotypes- as if there were such a thing- cannot hurt people, it would almost be laughable to watch supporters of mascots continue to use the same outdated arguments to defend them, if some did not still believe them.

The Effects of Stereotyping on Other Groups

Another set of studies that specifically addresses stereotyping in American Indian mascots and the harm that it can have is described in Kim-Prieto et al.'s article "Effect of Exposure to an American Indian Mascot on the Tendency to Stereotype a Different Minority Group." As the title implies, the studies primed non-American Indian subjects with a picture of an American Indian mascot (Chief Illiniwek) and then tested their

willingness to stereotype another group. Specifically, it "assessed our study participants' endorsement of stereotypes of Asian Americans as lacking in social ability and being overly competitive" (539).

Notably, this study was specifically designed to be done using two completely different stereotypes. The two stereotypes used were martial prowess, which was generated by the mascot, and social awkwardness in Asian Americans. Not only were the stereotypes different, they applied to different groups, and one was positive and one negative. If there were unrelated stereotypical representations, then, these should be as close to them as possible.

As might be expected, however, the results showed increased willingness by subjects to stereotype Asian Americans after exposure to mascots (Kim-Prieto et al. 545). This is an extremely important result- it shows that the willingness to stereotype does not limit itself to one subject, but that instead it can apply to multiple unrelated groups. It also shows that the kind of stereotyping is irrelevant. Martial prowess and social awkwardness are not closely related, and yet one kind of stereotyping affects the other.

And indeed, the fact that exposure to a positive stereotype- martial prowess in American Indians- increased willingness to form a negative stereotype- social awkwardness in Asians- is a clear warning that stereotyping of any sort can be harmful. Stereotyping is limited no more by quality of stereotyping than by topic, so no claim that "good" stereotyping is harmless can be taken seriously.

When a seemingly positive association between American Indians and martial prowess acts as a catalyst for a negative association between Asian Americans and awkwardness, it becomes obvious that stereotyping in general has the potential to be

harmful. It also becomes clear that a so-called “good” stereotype does not, in fact, have no damaging effect at all. Indeed, the “good” stereotyping can cause “bad” stereotyping to be much more easily accepted, something that cannot be held to be harmless under any circumstances.

Because of this, it is safe to say that stereotyping can be harmful not only to those it applies to, but also to separate, unrelated groups. Even if all mascot-related stereotypings of American Indians were positive and did not affect them at all, these stereotypes would still have an effect on other populations, causing them to be more easily stereotyped. As this is *not* a positive result, there is no way to say that stereotyping of a certain group is an acceptable thing- it can always cause damage, whether to that group itself, or to another.

Chapter Summary

Thus, as has been shown, stereotyping can have damaging effects, not only when stereotyping negatively (Steele and Aronson 808; Armenta 97; Katz, Roberts, and Robinson 53), but also when presenting a “positive” stereotype (Fryberg et al. 216). It has also been shown that stereotyping can have an effect on a group to which it does not apply, by increasing willingness to stereotype other groups (Kim-Prieto et al. 545).

With this being the case, it is impossible to claim that stereotyping, positively or otherwise, has no negative effect on those that it applies to or others. And, as mascots are undeniably stereotypical representations of American Indians, it is ludicrous to assert that they are harmless and cause no damage to the American Indian (and general mainstream American) psyche. Not only has general stereotyping been proven to be detrimental (Steele and Aronson 808; Armenta 97; Katz, Roberts, and Robinson 53), studies done

specifically using American Indian mascots have also shown that these forms of stereotyping are harmful (Fryberg et al. 216; Kim-Prieto et al., 545), so it cannot be claimed that American Indian stereotypes are somehow the exception to the rule.

CHAPTER SIX

THE MASCOT AS A "POSITIVE" REPRESENTATION

Positive Mascots

Given the overwhelming amount of data available supporting the idea that stereotyping is harmful, why do supporters of mascots claim that it is not? The first justification many use is that their mascots are positive. "The universities have appropriated the Indian to mean honorable, brave, and courageous," so "why make an issue out of something so positive, they might argue" (Black 610).

Ignoring the points mentioned earlier, which showed that even positive stereotyping can be harmful, not only to those groups to which it refers, but also to others, this paper shall address the claims of "positive" mascots. Though they are claimed to be flattering and to honor those they portray, is this really the case? Can these representations really be considered positive?

Savages

Unfortunately, these mascots are often seen as anything but positive by the people they supposedly represent. "To Native Americans, these mascots are a reminder of the historical tendency to depict them 'as wild, bloodthirsty savages. . . .' a trend which renders their oppression 'justified or even glorious'" (Vanderford 8).

Since early on in American history, white settlers have claimed that the natives of the Americas were savages without culture or godliness, and they have used this as justification for their appropriation of land and resources (a form of definitional violence, as discussed in Chapter Four). Thus, a representation of American Indians as bloodthirsty fighters is something that has a long historical backdrop, and must be looked at through

this lens. A portrayal of Indians as fighters, while positive from mainstream America's viewpoint, is not necessarily one that all American Indians would find appropriate, considering the long history of depictions of them as vicious, unruly natives liking nothing more than to kill white settlers for fun. When put in this context, a mascot imbued with such "positive" qualities seems much more offensive.

Indeed, this refusal to look at the history behind current-day circumstances is another form of cultural and structural violence (Farmer 308; Sluka 26; Fanon 165; West 179; Marable 187), as addressed in Chapter Four. It is a form of redefining the past, one that is often used by dominant groups in a society to oppress disadvantaged groups (Sluka 26; Farmer 309; West 179; Marable 187). The refusal to address the historical acts of violence against American Indians can be seen as a form of this violence, one that allows for the idea that American Indians have nothing to complain about, and should just accept the use of mascots.

The Text/ Context Difference

Indeed, this is one of the main sticking points when the mascot debate is brought up. Something that can be seen as a positive trait when viewed from a certain standpoint can, when viewed from another, be extremely offensive. A solemn dance, done with great dignity, may seem to be respectful to spectators at a sports match; however, to an American Indian, the fact that the dance is secular and being done in religious regalia is disrespectful (Prochaska 173).

Indeed, when actions often performed by mascots are looked at in terms of other religions, as in Sudie Hofmann's article "Pushing Some Buttons," they seem extremely offensive to the mainstream American reader. When, in regards to the Catholic faith, it is

suggested that “nuns could be cheerleaders in nice short black skirts,” “we could swing rosaries for crowd camaraderie,” and “we could have buttons that say we crucify our opponents” (Hofmann, “Pushing Some Buttons”), suddenly something that had seemed like a positive use of diverse culture becomes unappealing.

Supporters of Catholic mascots might argue that they are emphasizing attractiveness (short-skirted nuns), camaraderie (rosary-swinging as a group bonding activity), and martial prowess (dominating other teams by crucifying them) with these actions. These are all good things, in theory, but for those actually of the Catholic faith these actions and representations are not at all positive- indeed, they are blasphemous. It is not that attractiveness, camaraderie, and martial prowess themselves are not positive; it is the context in which they are used that is found to be offensive and demeaning.

“We could sell grape juice at the concession stand with Ritz crackers and jalapeno cheese dip” (Hofmann, “Pushing Buttons”) is another particularly relevant thought, as it addresses the common misunderstandings and misrepresentations of American Indian religions. In the same way that drinking grape juice and eating Ritz crackers is here thought to be equivalent to taking communion, appropriated American Indian religious ceremonies are often grossly distorted. Though mascots may do things thought to be representative of American Indian religions, they never have the verisimilitude they pretend to.

When dancing in religious regalia, without fail mascots will dance a made-up style not practiced by any American Indian tribe, usually while accompanied by a pep band. Though mainstream America does not perceive this as disrespectful, there can be little doubt, when looking at the context in which this occurs, that this is something that is

often legitimately offensive to a great many American Indians. As “taking mass” by eating Ritz crackers and singing hymns with the lyrics changed to be more peppy would be offensive to those of the Catholic faith, so is the blatant misuse of their religions objectionable to a number of American Indians.

Chapter Summary

Thus, it can be seen that much of the debate over the positive and negative qualities of American Indian mascots stems from this text/ context difference. While mainstream America perceives only the text of the mascot (martial, dignified, a crowd-pleaser), American Indians perceive the context of the mascot. That is, they perceive the fact that, after centuries of oppression, American Indians are still relegated to the category of bloodthirsty savages, their religions are misrepresented, they are used as mascots, which are otherwise played by animals, and their objections to such things are constantly ignored.

CHAPTER SEVEN

WHITE PRIVILEGE AND AUTHENTICITY

The American Indian Voice

Since the offensiveness of these mascots is not visible to mainstream America, it is not so surprising that schools in the past have adopted such mascots. The surprising part of the mascot controversy is that those schools have not been willing to listen to American Indians who object to their use of caricatures. When it should be obvious that those whose cultures are being used should have more say in when a representation is offensive than someone not from those cultures, why are American Indian voices being so thoroughly ignored?

The answer is complicated, and begins with mainstream America's complete lack of exposure to modern-day American Indians (Fryberg et al. 216; Delacruz 18). As a large number of American Indians live on reservations or in rural areas, not many people of mainstream America have direct contact with American Indians, and those who have often do not realize their ethnicity. Due to this, "the views of most Americans about American Indians are formed and fostered by indirectly acquired information (e.g., media representations of American Indians)" (Fryberg et al. 209).

Media Characterizations of American Indians

Notably absent from television programs and movies are normal, everyday American Indians. This lack of representation of real American Indians in the media results in "most Anglo-Americans actually know[ing] little if anything about the beliefs, values, cosmology, or cultural practices of any Native Americans, past or present" (Delacruz 18).

This is not, of course, to say that American Indian characters are not represented in the media; on the contrary, it could be said that they are very well represented. However, these representations are almost exclusively stereotypical representations thrown together to show what the mainstream, white, public consumers expect an "Indian" to be. Because of this, mainstream Americans are almost never exposed to accurate portrayals of American Indians.

Indeed, the mainstream view of American Indian cultures is produced by exposure to frequently inaccurate sources. As Jason Black states, "public notions of culture arise through representations of ethnicity, group relations, and media accounts- often derived from incorrect 'scholarly' versions of tribal histories and cultures- of customs and traditions" (608). Unfortunately, the cultures of actual American Indian peoples often has trouble competing with the power of this "knowledge" with which mainstream Americans have been inundated since an early age.

Nearly every single media representation of an American Indian is straight out of a fabricated past, a made-up age when all Indians wore Plains Indian clothing and rode horses, kidnapping white children and fighting with cowboys for no reason at all. Though these portrayals may appear accurate to an uneducated observer, they are merely Hollywood's construction of what Indianness is. They are in large part unrelated to actual, historical Indians, and are almost completely unrelated to modern-day American Indians. Thus, there are many Pocahontases, Indians in the Cupboard, and Tontos; however, almost nowhere can one find an American Indian that might exist in present-day America.

<u>The Vanishing Indian</u>

Not surprisingly, in large part because of this misrepresentation of American Indians, there is a tendency to think of Indians as a bygone race, all of whom have long since died out. In the words of Mary Landreth: "the visual images of these peoples in the media [have] created generalizations about Native Americans in the minds of the American public. The essence of these generalizations is that all Indians were alike and that there are no more 'real' Indians" (52).

When the only Indian one ever encounters is something that cannot exist in the present (where would they find cowboys to fight? How could they scalp young white children without us hearing about it?), it is not surprising that mainstream America assumes that they have passed on and disappeared from the land. It is not uncommon to find people who are unaware that a particular tribe they claim rights to (by having them as a mascot, or having a place named after them) is still extant (Springwood 309).

However, this belief is not a new thing; in fact, the "vanishing Indian" is a myth that has persisted since at least 1814 (Dippie 10). "The American Indian has been disappearing and is doomed to extinction": this fabrication acts to justify the extermination of that race perpetrated by the white colonists. For, if the Indian is dying out anyway, all the land and resources left behind are unused, and therefore is only reasonable to make use of them.

Indeed, the eagerness of white America to eliminate Indians, even if only in theory, from their newly conquered land was such that while colonial New England bemoaned the loss of the noble Indian in its rhetoric, the special commissioner to the Indians published a census showing over 1000 Indians living in the area (O'Brien 117). Though it directly contradicted the facts in front of them, the idea of nostalgia for a

bygone race was so appealing that it was vigorously seized by a great number of people, a state of affairs that has continued since (Dippie 351).

Mainstream American was (and continues to be) so invested in this idea of the Indian passing silently away and making room for white civilization that even when this theory directly contradicts facts in front of them, they continue to use it as justification for their actions. For instance, as Brian Dippie says: "the conviction that Indians were doomed to die if they remained where they were gave removal its humanitarian veneer" (70). Here, he is addressing how the myth of the vanishing Indian helped to justify removal. The idea that the Indian would be overrun, albeit unintentionally, by white society and eventually die out if not removed from harm's way was used to justify the hideous process of removal.

Mainstream America and Modern American Indians

Thus, mainstream America is heavily invested in this idea of the Indian as a thing from a bygone era; however, when presented with the incontrovertible evidence of real, live American Indians, one must assume that mainstream Americans realize that their suppositions were incorrect, and that American Indian people are still alive today. Unfortunately, this realization is not always accompanied by the respect for the people that it deserves, nor the admission of error for which one might hope.

The myth of the vanishing Indian, together with the frankly misleading, if not altogether fabricated, representations of Indianness present in the media, has caused an uncomfortable state of affairs. Because mainstream America believes so strongly in the Indian as something from a bygone day, it is unwilling to reevaluate what being an Indian is.

This unwillingness continues even when presented with an example of an authentic, breathing person of American Indian descent who is familiar with and knowledgeable about their culture and history. Why is this the case? Why does the mainstream American- for instance, a sports fan that supports the use of a mascot- not defer to the superior knowledge of American Indian cultures held by one of its actual members?

The answer to this question is this: Since mainstream America "knows" what an Indian is, due to their exposure to Hollywood, anything that does not fit in that category cannot be real. And, as the categories for Indians presented by Hollywood and the rest of the media are fairly narrow (they mostly involve wearing headdresses, riding horses, and brandishing spears), when present-day American Indians do not do these things, they fail to live up to the standards of Indianness that white society has ethnocentrically set for them. Because of this, mainstream America tends to see present-day Indians as inauthentic.

This is a form of definitional violence. Definitional violence consists of the defining of a group by those outside of the group (Mummendey and Otten 146; Jenefsky 136; Miller 238; Bulhan 103-04; Fanon 160), which almost invariably takes place without regard for the practices, thoughts, or customs of the group members themselves, as addressed in Chapter Four. This refusal to accept a culture's own definition of themselves is undeniably violent.

Authenticity of Present-Day American Indians

In the words of Mathew Beaudet, quoted in Elizabeth Delacruz's article, "Indian mascots promote the premise that everything 'real or valuable' about Natives belonged to

a long lost era, before the race was overtaken by manifest destiny" (Delacruz 19). This premise, that "real" Indians were admirable and that current-day ones have lost the nobility of their ancestors, is highly prevalent in American culture, and is not only insulting, but also repressive.

Because mainstream America believes that its imaginary representations of Indianness are more accurate than present-day American Indians are, American Indians are seen as not having the legitimacy to protest when a mascot shows these "authentic" characteristics. As Mary Landreth says, in reference to the over-the-top brandishing of spears and war whooping practiced by various mascots: "to the spectators, this action is something that Indians do; therefore, it is authentic" (53). Thus, anything that has been portrayed in the media for a long period of time, no matter how inaccurate or frankly offensive it may be, cannot be gainsaid, as no "genuine" Indian would object to those sorts of "accurate" representations.

This, then, is the cause of mainstream America's dismissal of American Indian objections to mascots and other caricatures. Though it would be logical to defer to the knowledge of those whose cultures are being used, America does not see present-day American Indians as part of the same culture as that which mascots use. They see modern American Indians as watered-down versions of their great ancestors, failing to fulfill the noble roles their predecessors once did, and they see white America's use of these mascots as a fitting way of preserving the true cultures that American Indians do not see fit to keep alive.

Chapter Summary

Thus, as we have seen, mainstream America legitimizes its use of inauthentic representations by recharacterizing them as genuine, using as its proof Hollywood and other media representations. To their minds, the actions that the mascots undertake- threatening to scalp enemies, brandishing spears, war whooping, covering themselves in any kind of paint, playing war drums- are all actions that real Indians do. Because they think that these actions are authentic, they cannot understand the objections to things that make such an accurate portrayal. Only when brought out into the open does this line of thought fall flat, when one realizes that no current-day Indians, nor past ones, have made a practice of doing all these things in the way that mascots represent them.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CULTURAL APPROPRIATION

Cultural Appropriation

As mentioned above, the tendency of mainstream America to feel a certain right towards other cultures, especially American Indian cultures, does not occur in isolated cases. Rather, this impulse towards cultural appropriation is extremely common.

Adoption of other cultures' practices is not always a bad thing- in fact, it is often something considered good by both cultures. However, there are certain instances in which certain manners of adoption are profoundly offensive, and these are what should be objected to.

Profound Offense

"A profound offense… strikes at a person's core values or sense of self." It is something that "is offensive even when unwitnessed." Thus, swastikas being paraded in a largely Jewish neighborhood can cause profound offense. This should be distinguished from regular offense, as caused by, for instance, inappropriate touching by a couple in public. In the case of the couple, their actions in general are not the problem, just the place in which they are doing them, and thus the offense is not profound (Young 135).

It is entirely fair to say that certain types of American Indian cultural appropriation cause profound offense. This is not to say that all cultural appropriation causes profound offense in all American Indian people, but rather to say that some are extremely offended.

The Entitled American

The effects that this appropriation of American Indian cultures has on white America's arguments for keeping mascots cannot be exaggerated. The viewpoint commonly held is that mainstream America is entitled to all aspects of American Indian cultures (Machamer 220; Hofmann, "Elimination of Indigenous Mascots" 169; Black 605; Staurowsky, "You Know, We Are All Indian" 66). Thus, mascots' supporters see objections to their usage of mascots and other stereotypes as taking away certain rights that they are already in possession of.

It is important to note that this assumption of ownership is not only unfounded but indicative of a greater tendency towards white privilege. As Machamer says, "[mascots] are symbols of dominance and superiority and expose feelings of entitlement not only to our land and resources but also to our religions and identities" (220). With this being the case, the supporter of a mascot will usually expect the objector to provide evidence for why they should not be allowed to use any American Indian identity they choose. The burden of proof usually rests with the American Indian.

For instance, in Hofmann's words, "Arguments for retaining American Indian mascots and nicknames will often cite examples such as 'What about the Dutchman?' 'What about the Fighting Irish?' The differences that exist in these cases are that Germans chose Dutchmen (Deutchman) and Irish chose Irish as an institutional nickname" ("Elimination of Indigenous Mascots" 169). The fact that white America has the same feelings of entitlement to American Indian cultures as Germans and the Irish do to their own cultures is a very clear example of how deeply ingrained are its feelings of ownership.

<u>White America Privileged Over Native America</u>

And indeed, the fact that white culture not only feels entitled to use these representations of American Indian cultures but also expects the mascots to be accepted as valid by those whose culture has been appropriated is even more indicative of just how privileged it assumes itself to be. As mentioned previously, white America expects American Indians to defer to it in being told what is and what is not offensive, as well as in what is and is not an accurate representation of American Indian cultures. Not only does white culture seem to think it has a claim on all forms of this culture, it also thinks that it better represents and respects them than American Indians themselves do.

This kind of social stratification is dangerous, in that it forms classes based on race. As addressed in Chapter Four, social stratification is a form of structural violence, which can often lead to direct violence.

This, then, is what those who object to mascots have to struggle against. As Black says, "the antimascot movement seeks continually to remind the American public that Native identity is situated within Native America, not in some caricatured version supported by Euramericans" (609). It is surprisingly difficult to get the white-centric, privileged, mainstream culture to look at this from any other point of view. Mainstream America simply has no reason to try; white America has all the power in society, and thus has never been forced into understanding under another culture's views.

Assimilation

This is the reason, as well, for the assimilationist policies' continuance: mainstream America simply cannot conceive of another culture being as good as their own, and, in fact, often doesn't actually realize that other cultures exist. When the public objects to Indians not having to pay taxes on cigarettes, they object to just that- Indians

not having to pay taxes on cigarettes. They assume that being an Indian is just like being any other citizen of the United States, except with separate, unearned privileges.

It completely escapes them- indeed, to be fair, they have probably never been taught- that American Indians are not being singled out for special treatment, but have, rather, been forced into conformity in almost every way with Euroamerican society. What they do not realize is that what they are objecting to- indigenous fishing rights, greater ability to regulate gambling- are the few remnants of control American Indians have been able to preserve over their own governance, and that they are contributing to the pressure to discard all of their own culture and assimilate to white society.

In the same manner as mascots, in fact, the text/ context difference causes many of the problems here. When looking from a present-day viewpoint, with no background, at American Indian rights, it would surely seem as if they were unfairly biased towards American Indian people. If one were to look at the history of these rights, however, one would find that the rights of the indigenous peoples of the Americas have been brutally trampled upon. Along with multiple attempts to exterminate the people, there have been just as many attempts to exterminate the culture, especially in such a way that allowed the outward forms of it to be plastered onto white culture- a reverse whitewashing, one might say.

Because of this, mainstream America has a tendency to not pay attention to the viewpoints of other cultures. This is what allows it to appropriate what it wishes, often plastering this exotic idea onto white culture- a move that appears to condone diversity, but actually eliminates it.

<u>“Red” on the Outside, White on the Inside</u>

When an outward appearance of diversity is maintained, but only white social values and norms are accepted for the underlying values, claims that this is respectful of the culture can be immediately dismissed. And indeed, this appearance of diversity is exactly what is achieved by the use of mascots. It is clearly shown in the very form of the mascot, in fact: a white student, dressed up and painted as an "Indian," using made-up "Indian" culture to entertain other white students. The mascot embodies, in a way that no other appropriation does quite so clearly, the idea that Indianness is only appropriate when overlaid as an interesting varnish on proper, white culture.

When no genuine Indianness occurs in something claiming to honor the Indian, it is easy to see that the purpose of the mascot is not, in fact, to do so, but rather to entertain other whites by adding exotic flavor to a comfortingly white idea- in this case, the idea of the sports mascot. To put it simply, the American Indian mascot is cultural appropriation at its clearest.

The Vanishing Indian as Justification for Appropriation

As Staurowsky says, "When viewed through the expanse of history, the taking up and taking on of American Indian identity by Whites has paralleled the taking of land and the taking over of the land mass now commonly referred to as the North American continent" ("You Know, We Are All Indian" 65). This material and cultural appropriation has been justified by the use of the idea of the vanishing Indian- as the Indian was disappearing, the only way to preserve its culture and keep its land in use was for white America to adopt them.

Claims of Indianness

Of course, as the American Indian has continually failed to softly and suddenly

vanish away, this line of reasoning can be seen as invalid. This invalidity makes it all the more ludicrous when, for instance, a director of the American Football Coaches Association and former coach from McMurry University can be quoted as saying "You know, we are all Indian. At least those of us from McMurry anyway. We all are McMurry Indians, and we always will be," as Staurowsky records in her article ("You Know, We Are All Indian" 64).

Imagine if someone was taken to task for anti-semitism, and said "it's okay, we're all Jewish here." The reaction to this statement would be disbelief and confusion. How could one claim to be Jewish, without following their practices, having any connection to their culture, or even having a basic understanding of their beliefs? This is especially difficult to justify when one is misrepresenting the culture and acting in a manner demeaning and offensive to practicing Jews. The incredulous dismissal of such an inane claim that would be certain to occur in the context of anti-Semitism does not occur in the case of American Indians. This is another example of how Indian cultures are regarded as not being equal with other cultures.

The Mascot's Role

The fact that this kind of privileged comment claiming ownership of Indianness occurs in the context of mascots is also telling. As Staurowsky says,

> In this sense, Native American mascots serve as primers of White privilege, where taking without asking or regard is not socially impolite, morally corrupt, educationally harmful, or legally criminal but an acceptable mode of behavior for masses of Americans educated in schools believed to possess, according to Hoftstadter (1963), the moral conscience of the society ("You Know, We Are All

Indian" 66).

As she says here, the fact that this practice of taking from other cultures is not regarded as outrageous is symptomatic of a larger disregard for American Indian cultures and rights. It serves to inoculate students with the belief that this practice is acceptable and even commendable, and the belief that one can "become" Indian, thus justifying their usage of all cultural practices pertaining to American Indians, while attending all-white football games and cheering on a white male dressed up in contrived clothing. This, then, is one of the often-overlooked dangers of mascots: their implied endorsement of cultural appropriation as positive and suitable for the American public.

Chapter Summary

Thus, as we have seen, cultural appropriation is one of the driving forces behind the justification of mascots. White America not only sees itself as having a greater understanding of Indian cultures than American Indians themselves do, it also sees itself as having an equal or greater right to usage of those cultures. In this way, white privilege continues to undermine the rights of American Indians by allowing mainstream America to appropriate any form of culture they find to their liking, whether or not they have any actual relation to it.

CHAPTER NINE

OTHER ARGUMENTS USED

Monetary Objections

Monetary concerns are often raised when the idea of eliminating mascots is brought up (Staurowsky, "You Know, We Are All Indian" 71; Dolley 28). Though they should not be included in a discussion of discrimination, they are nonetheless often cited, appearing in claims that support from alumni would decrease, that it would cost too much to tear down all the murals and installations featuring the mascot (Staurowsky, "You Know, We Are All Indian" 71), or even, in certain cases, that a monetary donation is directly tied to the preservation of the mascot (Staurowsky, "You Know, We Are All Indian" 62).

However, these claims, though mostly factual, are not a good reason to fail to address the problem. The United States Commission on Civil Rights, Society of Indian Psychologist of the Americas, Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs, Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes, American Psychological Association, and Eagle and Condor Indigenous Peoples, to name a few, have all issued statements condemning American Indian mascots and recommending their removal.

It is no longer a valid option to contend that the best course of action is to ignore the problem in the hope that the controversy will blow over. Those colleges still using mascots already know that mascots are harmful, and claiming that monetary reasons are a sufficient excuse to justify continued oppression is not only unbelievable, but also offensive.

Tradition

Another interesting argument brought up to justify continued use of American Indian mascots is tradition. Colleges will often state that their mascots are symbolic of a tradition dating back many years, and that it is unfair to ask them to discard them out of hand, as it would cause them to lose some of their school's culture. In order to support this, they will often make up origin stories for their mascots out of the whole cloth (Fisher 35; Staurowsky, "Sockalexis" 96; Prochaska 162).

In certain cases, they will go so far as to fabricate an event, such as the infamous "discovery" of the Saltine Warrior (Fisher 35). This discovery was one in which Syracuse University's newspaper claimed that American Indian artifacts had been found in an archeological dig on campus. This claim was later revealed to be a complete fabrication, with which they nonetheless had attempted to justify the continued use of their mascot, with the claim that it had historical relevance.

Despite these no doubt venerable claims to tradition, it is important to note that, as Dolley says:

> Supporters [of mascots] seek to preserve an athletic icon, at most a symbol of school culture dating back anywhere from thirty to one hundred years. Opposers, on the other hand, seek to preserve the heritage of an entire human culture, dating back as far as 10,000 years. It seems clear that sports culture would continue to thrive without the use of Indian mascots; it is not so clear that Native American culture could do so without the benefit of respect from whites for the integrity of their traditions and a concomitant recognition that Native Americans are not tomahawk-brandishing, face-painted warriors, to be used for boosting the entertainment pleasure of the sports fan (37-38).

While these claims of tradition, then, require that the American Indian honor a school culture dating back as much as a century, they completely ignore the traditional culture of the people whose image they appropriate, whose traditions date back for millennia. And indeed, the importance of maintaining an American Indian mascot cannot ever seriously be thought to be more important than maintaining basic respect for an entire ethnicity. That schools even attempt this shows that they do not understand the implications of their "traditional" mascots.

Chapter Summary

Thus, we have seen that there are often other objections made to the discontinuation of American Indian mascots, including monetary and tradition-related objections. These were included in this chapter because they were considered less relevant to the subject than those given their own chapters, as these are more easily dismissed, for the following reasons.

Many mainstream Americans truly believe that stereotypes are not harmful, or that mascots are positive, friendly representations of Indianness. However, there is almost no one who thinks that "it would cost a lot to change" is a good reason to continue doing something racist. A claim of tradition of a hundred years, as well, is obviously something not as important as a claim of millennia of tradition. Thus, the aforementioned arguments were included in this chapter, not in order to represent them as valid, but in order to address thoroughly the arguments being made in the mascot debate.

CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

As has been shown previously, the continued use of American Indian mascots is demonstrably harmful and should be discontinued. The reasons that these have not been done away with include misunderstandings of the extent of the mascots' offensiveness (Chapter Six), a belief in the inauthenticity of modern-day Indians and tribes (Chapter Seven), and an assumption of white privilege and ownership as relates to the usage of other cultures (Chapter Eight). All of these are caused in part by lack of exposure to present-day American Indians on the part of mainstream America, which allows for such complete misunderstanding as to what actually constitutes American Indian identity.

Conclusion

Because of these factors, mascots continue to be used today, despite their harmful effects and the efforts of those campaigning against them. This continuing use of the mascots indicates nothing so much as mainstream America's disinclination to acknowledge its own privilege and embedded racism. When the last of these mascots are eliminated and "it would cost a lot to change it" is no longer regarded as a good reason to retain racist imagery, we will truly have made a step forward as a nation.

Implications for Further Research

Interestingly, when conducting this research, the author noticed that, in large part, every argument that could be made to dissuade supporters of American Indian mascots had already been made. The lack of change being effected, it seems, is not due to the lack of data showing that these stereotypes are harmful, or lack of articles pointing out white-

centric, discriminatory beliefs' role in their retention. Instead, it is due to a stubborn refusal to acknowledge or even take the time to learn about these results on the part of sports management, perhaps caused, as mentioned above, by a belief that making money really is more important than equality.

The Practical Elimination of Mascots

Because of this, it seems to be the case that, if one were to have the goal of eliminating American Indian mascots, the best method to take in addressing this issue would be not to increase the amount of scholarly research being done, but rather to promulgate the already-known information about the harmful effects and cultural context of mascots. With this method, it is possible that change could actually be enacted.

The mascot-supporting side has already taken this step with its *Sports Illustrated* issue on American Indian mascots, in which a poll (the logistics of which were never released to the public) came up with the rather suspect claim that the vast majority of American Indian citizens had no objection to mascots and thought they should be retained (King et al. 381). This claim has been widely accepted as completely legitimizing usage of mascots.

If those aiming for the discontinuation of mascots could find such a popular source in which to publish some of their findings (which the author feels justified in claiming are rather better-substantiated than the *Sports Illustrated* poll of undisclosed methodology), they would have a much better chance of getting people to acknowledge the problems caused by American Indian mascots. And perhaps, with this method, they could actually be eliminated.

This, then, is likely the best step to be taken in furthering this research: not, in

fact, furthering the research itself, but rather communicating it to the general public in such a way that they can no longer ignore the effects of American Indian mascots and the problems they cause. Thus, the author recommends a widespread publication of the results of this research- mainly, that mascots are harmful, offensive, and based on a long-used system of white superiority- in order to expose mainstream America to the truth behind their creation, use, and abuse.

WORKS CITED

Alder, Christine. "Violence, Gender, and Social Change." *International Social Science Journal*. 44.132 (1992): 267-276. Print.

Aldred, Lisa. "Plastic Shamans and Astroturf Sun Dances: New Age Commercialization of Native American Spirituality." *American Indian Quarterly* 24.3 (2000): 329-352. Web. 7 Nov 2010.

Barsh, Russel. "Indigenous Peoples, Racism and the Environment." *Meanjin*. 49.4 (1990): 723-731. Print.

Armenta, Brian. "Stereotype Boost and Stereotype Threat Effects: The Moderating Role of Ethnic Identification." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 16.1 (2010): 94-98. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 4 Nov. 2010.

Black, Jason. "The 'Mascotting' of Native America: Construction, Commodity, and Assimilation." *American Indian Quarterly* 26.4 (2002): 605-622. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Oct. 2010.

Bulhan, Hussein. *Frantz Fanon and the Psychology of Oppression*. New York: Plenum Press, 1985. Print.

Cummings, Andre. "Progress Realized? The Continuing American Indian Mascot Quandary." *Marquette Sports Law Review* 18.2 (2008): 309-335. Web. 11 Oct 2010.

Davis, Laurel and Malvina Rau. "Escaping the Tyranny of the Majority: a Case Study of Mascot Change." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. 'Ed'. C. Richard King. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001. Print.

Davis-Delano, Laurel. "Eliminating Native American Mascots: Ingredients for Success."

Journal of Sport & Social Issues 31.4 (2007): 340-373. Web. 11 Oct 2010.

Delacruz, Elizabeth. "Racism American Style and Resistance to Change: Art Education's Role in the Indian Mascot Issue." *Art Education* 56.3 (2003): 13-20. *JSTOR.* Web. 11 Oct. 2010.

Dippie, Brian. *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy*. Lawrence: U P of Kansas, 1991. Print.

Dolley, Jeff. "The Four R's: Use of Indian Mascots in Educational Facilities." *Journal of Law and Education* 32.1 (2003): 21-39. *LexisNexis Academic*. Web. 7 Nov. 2010.

Ember, Carol, and Melvin Ember. "Violence in the Ethnographic Record." *Troubled Times: Violence and Warfare in the Past*. Debra L. Martin and David W. Frayer. Amsterdam: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1961. Print.

Farmer, Paul. "An Anthropology of Structural Violence." *Current Anthropology*. 45.3 (2004): 305-325. Print.

Ferguson, Brian. "Tribal Warfare." *Scientific American*. Jan. 1992: 108-113. Print.

Fisher, Donald. "Chief Bill Orange and the Saltine Warrior: a Cultural History of Indian Symbols and Imagery at Syracuse University." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. Ed. C. Richard King. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. Print.

Fryberg, Stephanie, Hazel Markus, Daphna Oyserman, and Joseph Stone. "Of Warrior Chiefs and Indian Princesses: The Psychological Consequences of American Indian Mascots." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 30.3 (2008): 208-218. *InformaWorld*. Web. 11 Oct. 2010.

Galtung, Johan. "Cultural Violence." *Journal of Peace Research*. 27.3 (1990): 291-305. Print.

Harjo, Suszan Shown. "Fighting Name-Calling: Challenging ‘Redskins’ in Court." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. 'Ed'. C. Richard King. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001. Print.

Hofmann, Sudie. "The Elimination of Indigenous Mascots, Logos, and Nicknames: Organizing on College Campuses." *American Indian Quarterly* 29.1&2 (2005): 156-177. *Project Muse*. Web. 11 Oct. 2010.

---. "Pushing Some Buttons: Helping Students Understand the American Indian Mascot Issue." *National Coalition on Racism in Sports and Media*. American Indian Movement, 12 July 2005. Web. 8 Dec. 2010.

Jenefsky, Cindy. "Andrea Dworkin’s Reconstruction of Pornography as a Discriminatory Social Practice." *Violence and Its Alternatives*. Nancy Lind, Manfred Steger, ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999. Print.

Katz, Irwin, S. Oliver Roberts, and James Robinson. "Effects of Task Difficulty, Race of Administrator, and Instructions on Digit-Symbol Performance of Negroes.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2.1 (1965): 53-59. Web. 20 Nov. 2010.

Kim-Prieto, Chu, Lizabeth Goldstein, Sumie Okazaki, and Blake Kirshner. "Effect of Exposure to an American Indian Mascot on the Tendency to Stereotype a Different Minority Group." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 40.3 (2010): 534-553. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 11 Oct. 2010.

King, C. Richard. "Uneasy Indians: Creating and Contesting Native American Mascots at

Marquette University." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. 'Ed'. C. Richard King. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001. Print.

King, C. Richard, and Charles Springwood. *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascot Controversy*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. Print

King, C. Richard, Ellen Staurowsky, Lawrence Baca, Laurel Davis, and Cornel Pewewardy. "Of Polls and Race Prejudice: Sports Illustrated's Errant 'Indian Wars.'" *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 26.4 (2002): 381-402. Web. 11 Oct 2010.

Landreth, Mary. "Becoming the Indians: Fashioning Arkansas State University's Indians." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. Ed. C. Richard King. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. Print.

Lawrence, Jane. " The Indian Health Service and the Sterilization of Native American Women." *American Indian Quarterly* 24.3 (2000): 400-419. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 Apr 2011.

Machamer, Anne Marie. "Last of the Mohicans, Braves, and Warriors: The End of the American Indian Mascots in Los Angeles Public Schools." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. Ed. C. Richard King. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. Print.

Marable, Manning. *Speaking Truth to Power: Essays on Race, Resistance, and Radicalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996. Print.

Miller, David. "Definitional Violence and Plains Indian Life: Ongoing Challenges to Survivial." *Violence, Resistance, and Survival in the Americas: Native Americans and the Legacy of Conquest.* William B. Taylor and Franklin Pease G.Y.

Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994. Print.

Mummenday, Amelie, and Sabine Otten. "Aggression: Interaction Between Individuals and Social Groups." *Aggression and Violence: Social Interactionist Perspectives*. Richard B. Felson and James T. Tedeschi. Washington: American Psychological Association, 1998. Print.

Myers, D. G., & Spencer, S. J. (2006). Social Psychology. p. 443. Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson.

O'Brien, Jean. *Firsting and Lasting; Writing Indians out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2010. Print.

Prochaska, David. "At Home in Illinois: Presence of Chief Illiniwek, Absence of Native Americans." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. Ed. C. Richard King. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. Print.

Russo, Erica. "Marquette Remains without Mascot." Marquette Tribune 4 Dec. 1991. Print.

Sluka, Jeffrey. "The Anthropology of Conflict." *The Paths to Domination, Resistance, and Terror*. Carolyn Nordstrom and JoAnn Martin. California: U of California Press, 1992. Print.

Springwood, Charles Fruehling. "Playing Indian and Fighting (for) Mascots: Reading the Complications of Native American and Euro-American Alliances." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. Ed. C. Richard King. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. Print.

Staurowsky, Ellen. "'You Know, We Are All Indian': Exploring White Power and Privilege in Reactions to the NCAA Native American Mascot Policy." *Journal of*

Sport & Social Issues 31.1 (2007): 61-76. *Sage*. Web. 11 Oct. 2010.

---. "Sockalexis and the Making of the Myth at the Core of Cleveland's 'Indian' Imagery." *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. Ed. C. Richard King. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. Print.

Steele, Claude, and Joshua Aronson. "Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69.5 (1995): 797-811. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 7 Nov. 2010.

Strong, Pauline, and Laurie Posner. "Selves in play: Sports, scouts, and American cultural citizenship." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 45.3 (2010): 390-409. Web. 11 Oct 2010.

Vanderford, Heather A. "What's in a Name? Heritage or Hatred: The School Mascot Controversy." *Journal of Law and Education* 25 (1996): 381-388. *HeinOnline*. Web. 7 Nov. 2010.

Walton, Gregory, and Steven Spencer. "Latent Ability: Grades and Test Scores Systematically Underestimate the Intellectual Ability of Negatively Stereotyped Students." *Psychological Science* 20 (2009): 1132. *Sage*. Web. 4 Nov. 2010.

Welch, Christina. " Appropriating the Didjeridu and the Sweat Lodge: New Age Baddies and Indigenous Victims?" *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 17.1 (2002): 21-38. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Dec 2010.

West, Cornel. *Race Matters*. New York: Vintage, 1994. Print.

Young, James. "Profound Offense and Cultural Appropriation." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 63.2 (2005): 135-146. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Dec 2010.