'Living Signs of Themselves': A Research Note on the Politics and Practice of Exhibiting Native Americans in the United States at the Turn of the Century*

Jo Ann Woodsum**

Preamble

In their 1992-3 performance piece, Coco Fusco and Guillermo Gomez-Peña impersonated newly discovered aboriginal people being exhibited in a cage. Each dressed in polyglot outfits comprised of stereotypical 'native' clothing including feathered headdress, bone necklaces, and grass skirt. The cage was furnished with modern furniture and electronic equipment including a television and laptop computer. Fusco and Gomez-Peña pretended not to understand any language except their own 'native' language. Attached to the outside of the cage was an excerpt from an encyclopedia describing the aboriginal group to which the caged individuals belonged.

Fusco and Gomez-Peña performed this piece in several locations: Irvine, Madrid, London, Sydney, Washington, D.C., Minneapolis and Chicago. In each locale they were visited by numerous folks, more than half of whom assumed that Fusco and Gomez-Peña were 'authentic' aboriginals:

> A sign tells the crowd that these are members of a 'mythical' people; another sign lists historical incidences of Europeans and white Americans exhibiting indigenous peoples as exotic oddities.
>
> 'You'd think with the technology, the absurdity of the premise, how over the top it all is, that people would realize this is a performance,' Gomez-Peña says. 'But to our surprise, and even a little horror, most people believe we're real human

> specimens from this island. And they don't see anything wrong with our being exhibited that way.'
>
> 'We knew we'd get a strong reaction to the piece', Fusco says. 'But that people would believe it was unanticipated. The point wasn't to fool people or make people believe it was real, but to show the absurdity of it. We meant to parody, to explore notions of the 'other.' That still happens, but what we realized we've also done is tap into a huge colonial wound.
>
> 'People with a heritage of colonialism have fantasies about taming the savage, about controlling somebody else's world. We become the fantasy version of that desire - that's what's scary.'[1]

Of those who did not understand the nature of the performance, most were not concerned that native peoples were being displayed in this manner.[2] In describing this project, Fusco argued that the people who accepted the 'authenticity' of what they were seeing were participating in a cultural tradition dating back to Columbus. In her historiography of the practice of exhibiting indigenous peoples, Fusco pointed out that Columbus returned to Europe with several Arawak Indians to display at the Spanish court.[3]

Introduction

This research note was inspired by Fusco and Gomez Peña's cage piece and Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* in which Foucault argued that social institutions and their disciplinary functions can best be understood as forming a caracel archipelago.[4] In the caracel archipelago, the prison system was merely the inner most circle of concentric circles of power modeled on the prison system.[5] Foucault argued that all social institutions—hospitals, schools, laboratories—operated on the same principles as that of the prison.

In *Discipline and Punish,* Foucault traced the origins of the prison system to the end of the eighteenth century with particular

emphasis on Jeremy Bentham's panopticon. Bentham, one of the earliest theorists of the prison system, published his work on the Panopticon in 1791. The prison based on the panopticon principle was organized with a central guard tower set in the middle of a circle of prison cells. The goal of the panopticon was to optimize surveillance, the guard could see all, but the prisoner in his cell could not see other prisoners, indeed could not see individual guards merely the tower. In the words of Foucault, each prisoner "is seen, but does not see; he is the object of information, never the subject of communication."[6]

Bentham argued that the panopticon was superior to the older prison system in several respects. First, it required fewer guards due to the centrality of the guard tower. Second, it eliminated the ability of prisoners to communicate with each other which reduced the chance of escape. Most importantly, however, the panopticon was superior to the old prison system in the quality of its discipline. The prisoner was always conscious of being watched and thus of the hierarchy of power which kept him imprisoned. In essence, each prisoner became responsible for his own discipline.

Bentham claimed that panoptic institutions required few of the heavy locks, chains and bars which had been characteristic of the old fortress-like prisons.[7] Foucault explained the psychology of this new system:

> He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes the power relation which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection. By this very fact, the external power may throw off its physical weight; it tends to the non-corporal; and, the more it approaches the limit, the more constant, profound and permanent its effects: it is a perpetual victory that avoids any physical confrontation and which is always decided in advance.[8]

In the panoptic prison, most of the responsibility for security had been transferred from the guards to the prisoner by virtue of constant surveillance.

Foucault pointed out that Bentham believed that his Panopticon had many useful purposes apart from prisons. Michael Ignatieff in *A Just Measure of Pain*, a study of the British penitentiary system, noted that the public played an important role in the panopticon. Members of the public were allowed to visit the central inspection tower in order to make sure the guards were performing their duties properly.[9] Foucault suggested that the public was encouraged to visit prisoners in order "to learn how the benefits of the law are applied to crime—a living lesson in the museum of order."[10] By viewing punishment through the panopticon, citizens could be made aware of the hazards of criminal behavior.

The Panopticon was also an excellent model for any situation in which a small group of people wished to organize the world around them for study:

> It makes it possible to draw up differences: among patients, to observe the symptoms of each individual, without the proximity of beds, the circulation of miasmas, the effects of contagion confusing the clinical tables; among school children, it makes it possible to observe performances (without there being any imitation or copying), to map aptitudes, to assess characters, to draw up rigorous classifications.[11]

Foucault and Ignatieff each pointed out that over time the panoptic model became common place for numerous social institutions during the nineteenth century. So common, in fact, that after the intense debates about the panopticon at the beginning of the nineteenth century, by the 1850s people no longer questioned the validity of this model. Ignatieff concluded that the panopticon as penitentiary "took its place within a structure of other institutions so interrelated in function, so similar in design, discipline, and language of command that together the sheer massiveness of their presence in

the Victorian landscape inhibited further challenge to their logic."[12]

Exhibiting People

In this research note I explore the common heritage of the politics of the prison system and that of exhibiting indigenous peoples. In particular, several characteristics of the Panopticon can be seen in the display of indigenous peoples. As in the panopticon, the person(s) on display are under constant surveillance and therefore participate in their own discipline before the omnipresent gaze of the colonial eye. In addition, indigenous people were displayed so as to teach the lessons of colonization, i.e. that indigenous peoples lived in a state of savagery which justified European conquest—just as in the panopticon where the prisoner provided the public with a 'living lesson in the museum of order'.

Using Foucault's model of the caracel archipelago, I argue that the display of indigenous peoples which frequently began in the prison system spread in concentric circles from exhibition in jail cells to world's fairs to museums and that all of these modes of display are informed by the panoptic principle as described by Foucault. In her wonderful article entitled "Objects of Ethnography", Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett noted that, "it was not uncommon in the nineteenth century for a living human rarity to be booked into a variety of venues—theaters, exhibition halls, concert rooms, museums and zoos—in the course of several weeks or months as part of a tour."[13] The circulation of indigenous peoples among these various venues—including prisons—had a certain logic for Victorian Euro-Americans which meant that the politics of display were rarely interrogated.

At the same time that the modern prison system was being institutionalized, England and the United States were engaged in imperial conquest. The display of newly colonized subjects was one way in which England and the United States (as well as other imperial nations such as Germany, France and Spain) rationalized and justified their conquest. During the second half of the nineteenth century, anthropology emerged as a discourse justifying and rationalizing colonialism.[14] Anthropologists were also attempting

to professionalize their own discipline. One way in which they demonstrated their role in the social sciences was to participate in the construction of ethnological displays at world's fairs and in museums.

In this research note, I briefly review the lives of two of the most famous Native Americans who were on display in the United States at the turn of the century: Geronimo and Ishi. Geronimo, a Chiracahua Apache, and Ishi, a Yahi, both travelled between actual prison cells where they were on view to the public to other institutional settings for display. Geronimo was displayed at numerous world's fairs while Ishi was displayed for several years at the University Museum in San Francisco.

Geronimo: America's Fiercest Enemy

After the end of the Civil War, the United States began settlement of the vast territory acquired from Mexico in 1848. In addition to rangelands suitable for ranching, the southwest was full of mineral resources. Mines were established throughout the territory. Settlers and miners ignored the land claims of Apache and other indigenous groups. In order to protect the settlers and miners flooding the region, the U.S. government established military posts throughout the region and began a policy of rounding up indigenous peoples and confining them to reservations.[15]

One of the most popular human exhibits at the turn of the century was Geronimo, a Chiracahua Apache and U.S. prisoner of war. Geronimo was born in 1829 in what is today the southwestern United States.[16] He led a relatively peaceful life until 1858 when his mother, wife and three children were murdered by Mexicans.[17] In 1876, the U.S. government told Geronimo and the Chiracahua Apache to leave their traditional homelands, and move to the San Carlos reservation recently established in southeastern Arizona. Geronimo refused and fled with his people. For the next ten years, Geronimo would fight for the right to remain off the reservation. Finally, in 1886 his band reduced by deprivation and suffering, he surrendered.[18] During these ten years, Geronimo was known as the terror of the Southern Plains. He admitted to having 'made war' on

the United States, but it also appears that he became a scapegoat for all Indian (and many non-Indian) depredations of the day.[19]

The U.S. government informed Geronimo and his band that they had to go to prison for a few years to pay for resisting U.S. colonization. The more than 390 men, women and children of Geronimo's band and related Apache groups were sent by train to an old Spanish fortress in Florida where they were imprisoned.[20] During their stay in Florida, the army guards permitted visitors to view the prisoners. The army officer in charge reported that in 1887, he usually received 20 visitors a day and sometimes as many as 40.[21] The army officers quickly capitalized on the exotic nature of their prisoners and advertised Apache rituals, inviting the public to attend.[22] After Florida, the band was relocated to an old army fort in Alabama and then to Fort Sill, Oklahoma. During this time (ultimately 27 years), the U.S. considered the members of the band to be prisoners of war. The only way to leave the prison was to die or to agree to be exhibited at a World's Fair or Wild West Show.[23]

World's fairs served multiple purposes in turn-of-the-century America.[24] In addition to the explicit goal of educating men and women in the newest developments in commerce and the fine arts, fair organizers stated that they wished to demonstrate the progress of mankind. For example, the organizers of the St. Louis World's Fair in 1904 declared that the Fair was in honor "of the greatest peaceable acquisition of territory the world has known!"[25] Clearly, history was being re-written as the phrase 'peaceable acquisition' ignored the centuries of pitched warfare required to wrest the continent from Native Americans.

One of the primary demonstrations of progress, was the display of colonial subjects. According to Paul Greenhalgh's study of world's fairs:

> Between 1889 & 1914, the exhibitions [world's fairs] became a human showcase, when people from all over the world were brought to sites in order to be seen by others for their gratification and education. The normal method of display was to create a

> backdrop in a more or less authentic tableau-vivant fashion and situate the people in it, going about what was thought to be their daily business. An audience would pay to come and stare. Through this twenty-five year period it would be no exaggeration to say that as items of display, objects were seen to be less interesting than human beings, and through the medium of display, human beings were transformed into objects.[26]

Geronimo was exhibited at several world's fairs. In 1898, he was exhibited along with a few members of his band at the Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition in Omaha.[27] During the Exposition, he made money by selling buttons from his coat (he had brought a large supply) as well as pictures of himself.[28] He next appeared at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo in 1901 for which he was paid $45 a month.[29] In 1904 Geronimo agreed to be exhibited at the St. Louis World's Fair. At the Saint Louis Fair, an 'Apache village' had been constructed and Geronimo lived there with other Apaches.[30]

In her biography of Geronimo, Angie Debo notes that several interested entrepreneurs requested permission from the U.S. government to exhibit Geronimo in Wild West Shows and at Madison Garden. But these requests were turned down.[31] Debo points out that the War Department "made a distinction between purely commercial exhibitions and official celebrations."[32] Geronimo's principal attraction to exhibitors and fair-goers was his former status as America's most hated and feared enemy.[33] One contemporary commentator described the Indians (including Geronimo) who were gathered at the 1898 Omaha Exposition:

> All of the tribes that are of any interest from an aboriginal standpoint are represented at the Congress [i.e. Exposition]. Some of them have become civilized, like the Creeks, Choctaws, Cherokees and Seminoles, that their presence would add little interest from an ethnological point

> of view, so the government did not assemble its most civilized proteges at Omaha, *but the tribes it has conquered with the greatest amount of bloodshed are the most important to the congress.*" [emphasis mine][34]

The exhibition of Geronimo and other former enemies of the United States such as Sitting Bull served as a touchstone of American progress.[35] Americans could gaze on their vanquished enemies with a twofold purpose. First, to acknowledge their triumph over a terrible obstacle on the road to progress. Second, as a way of reconciling the bloody nature of that triumph of empire with the foundation of the country as a democratic republic.

Ishi: The Greatest Anthropological Treasure Ever Captured[36]

The Yahi Indian who came to be known as Ishi was the last survivor of his tribal group. Through murder, disease, and devastation to food supply, Ishi's people had slowly been killed off until by 1908, he was alone in the world. For the next three years, he survived by avoiding white people until one day in bitter despair spawned by his near starvation and total isolation, he wandered into the town of Oroville, California. Upon being sighted by some townspeople, the sheriff was called and Ishi was taken to the local jail.

While in jail, the townspeople discovered that Ishi spoke a language which no one understood. The sheriff contacted the local expert on California Indians, Alfred Kroeber. The sheriff also contacted the Bureau of Indian Affairs requesting direction on what to do with Ishi. While in jail, Ishi was viewed by hundreds of visitors.

Ishi was later transferred to the custody of Alfred Kroeber and the University Museum in San Francisco where he lived until his death in 1916. During his years at the Museum, Ishi was on view on Sunday afternoons.[37] While on view, Ishi usually "demonstrated stringing a bow, or he made fire with the fire drill, or he turned out a chipped arrowhead. ... The chipping became the favorite demon-

stration because Ishi would afterward graciously present the finished arrowhead while the visitors watched."[38]

Ishi's chief appeal was his scientific designation as the last wild man in America. Theodora Kroeber, Alfred's wife, explained Ishi's value to twentieth century science as follows:

> Ishi was the last California Indian—and so far as we know the last Indian in the United States, perhaps in North America—to have lived his whole life up to his capture without modification of his indigenous Stone Age culture, house, clothing, tools, food; all he did and how he did it, as well as his religion, his code, his social values, his judgments, remained within the ancestral Yahi specialization of the aboriginal pan-Californian life-pattern.[39]

As in the case of Geronimo, numerous entrepreneurs approached Ishi's 'handlers' with offers to exhibit Ishi in various venues.[40] A number of the filmmakers wished to film Ishi and exhibit him in his 'aboriginal state' after the showing of the film.[41]

Conclusion

In examining the sources for this research note, I detected a shift in the politics of displaying indigenous peoples at the end of the nineteenth century. During most of the nineteenth century, native others were frequently displayed as freaks. Sander Gilman points out that in Western culture those who are different from white, middle class, heterosexual males are considered pathological.[42] Difference was equated with pathology and pathology holds a special fascination in Western culture. Thus, in nineteenth century culture the category of freaks included giants, dwarfs, bearded ladies and indigenous peoples. The exotic was treated like a deformity like being born without arms or legs. In his book *Freak Show*, Richard Bogdan explains the links between pathology or freakishness and the display of indigenous peoples:

> Display of non-Westerners in freak shows was not intended as a cross-cultural experience to provide patrons with real knowledge of the ways of life and thinking of a foreign group of people. Rather, it was a money-making activity that prospered by embellishing exhibits with exaggerated, bogus presentations emphasizing their strange customs and beliefs. Showmen took people who were culturally and ancestrally non-Western and made them freaks by casting them as bizarre and exotic: cannibals, savages, and barbarians.[43]

At the same time, a mood of imperialist nostalgia underlay the politics of display.[44] Imperialist nostalgia, a term coined by anthropologist Renato Rosaldo, describes the longing of the conqueror for the period at the beginning of contact with the native other. The colonizer longs for the time when the colonized had not yet been subjugated. In other words, the colonizer pines for the good old days when the native other was more dramatically native and other. Rosaldo points out that "the peculiarity of their yearning, of course, is that agents of colonialism long for the very forms of life they intentionally altered or destroyed."[45]

Epilogue

In addition to Gomez-Peña and Fusco's 'Couple in the Cage' described in the preamble to this essay, a number of contemporary native artists problematize the history of displaying indigenous peoples in their art. James Luna, a Luiseño/Digueño Indian, directly addressed the problematic of museums and native display in his "Artifact Piece". In the "Artifact Piece", Luna put himself and some of his personal possessions on display in typical, museum-style glass cases in the Indian section of San Diego's Museum of Man. Signs on the cases indicated various features of the 'artifacts' on display:

> Having been married less than two years, emotional scars from alcoholic family backgrounds

> were cause for showing fears of giving, communicating and mistrust.
>
> Skin callus on ring finger remains, along with assorted painful and happy memories.[46]

Luna's "Artifact Piece" deconstructs the colonial display of Native Americans. Jean Fisher, artist and critic, points out that part of the impact of "Artifact Piece" was the suspense created by the fact that Luna could open his eyes and return the colonial gaze:

> There is a diabolic humor in this parody of the 'Indian' in the realm of the 'undead.' But Luna's work does not look back in any literal sense; it does not simply *reverse* the gaze. (To do so would be to accept the terms of established structures of power, which was a limitation of political activism in art of the 1970s.) If the purpose of the undead Indian of colonialism is to secure the self-identity of the onlooker, the shock of his real presence and the possibility that he may indeed be watching and listening disarms the voyeuristic gaze and denies it its structuring power.[47]

By playing with the historical practice of displaying native peoples, Luna effectively reclaims his subjectivity thereby decoding/subverting/exploding the panopticon.[48]

---

*My title is taken from Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's article "Objects of Ethnography" in which she describes the problematic nature of displaying human beings. "It is one thing, however, when ethnography is inscribed in books or displayed behind glass, at a remove in space, time and language from the site described. It is quite another when people themselves are the medium of ethnographic representation, when they perform themselves, whether at home to tourists or at world's fairs, homeland entertainments, or folklife festivals—when they become *living signs of themselves*." [emphasis mine] Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "Objects of Ethnography" in *Exhibiting*

Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display eds. Ivan Karp & Steven Lavine (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1991): 386-443, pp. 387-88.

**Jo Ann Woodsum is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History at UCLA. Her dissertation is entitled "The Cultural Construction of Zuni Women's Identity, 1870-1920".

Acknowledgements: This paper was inspired by a lecture given by Coco Fusco as part of the Getty Center for the Art & Humanities year-long series "Shifting Boundaries/Contested Spaces" on June 15, 1992 [hereinafter referred to as "Fusco 1992"]. I would like express my sincere appreciation to Michelle Meyers and Michael Salmon for their careful reading of this paper and their support for this project. I also want to thank Eric Monkkonen for providing a seminar on 'crime and poverty' for which I wrote the first draft of this paper.

1. Achy Obejas, "Pushing the Borders of Art: Caged Players Reach Across Cultural Chasms" *Chicago Tribune*, January 28, 1993, p. 1 of Tempo section.

2. See, generally, Rick Vanderknyff, "Artists Behind Bars; Exhibit at UCI Puts Caged Aborigines in Their 'Natural Habitat'", *Los Angeles Times*, March 3, 1992, p. F1; Cathy Cutiss, "A Safe Look At Aborigines in Captivity; 2 'Specimens' Are Displayed Behind Bars for Crowd Attending 'Year of White Bear' at UCI" *Los Angeles Times*, March 5, 1992, p. F2 ("They were simply the latest in a long line of curious specimens from outlandish spaces to be displayed for the edification and curiosity of Westerners. A wall chart outlined a number of these public showings, from an Arawak Indian left on display for two years in the Spanish Court in 1493 (he died of 'sadness') to the 13 Ubangis (including 'the nine largest-lipped women in the Congo') proudly presented to the paying public in 1931 by the Ringling Brothers."); Jan Breslauer, "Cultural Politics; Happy Quincentennial, Christopher Columbus!..." *Los Angeles Times*, October 11, 1992, p. C5 ("In Spain, where there is little tradition of such site-specific performance and where the event wasn't pre-announced, as is usually the case with artworks, the majority of visitors 'believed it was an ethnographic display,' Gomez-Peña says. 'Even in Minneapolis, a good 30%-40% believed it. And the really shocking thing is they don't complain."); Pamela Sommers, "The Couple in the Cage", *The Washington Post*, October 20, 1992, p. E3; Achy Obejas, "Live Art Framed by Bars; Cage Comes to Field Museum" *Chicago Tribune*, January 18, 1993, p. 14 ("Although clues abounded to the true nature of the show, most onlookers believed Gomez-Peña and Fusco were really human subjects.")

3. In addition to newspaper accounts, the preceding account is taken from Fusco 1992. Fusco and Gomez-Peña include the cage piece as part of a larger multi-media project for the Quincentenniary she and Gomez-Peña are working on entitled "The Year of the White Bear". Walker Art Center Catalogue, "Guillermo Gomez-Peña and Coco Fusco: The Year of the White

Bear". See also, C. Carr, "Is It Real or Is It? Identity and the Beholder" *LA Weekly*, July 3-July 9, 1992, p. 37.

4. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (New York: Vintage Books, ed. 1979).

5. Ibid, p. 298.

6. Ibid, p. 200.

7. Ibid, p. 202.

8. Ibid, pp. 202-203.

9. Michael Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), p. 78.

10. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, p. 112.

11. Ibid, p. 203.

12. Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain*, p. 214. At the beginning of the 19th century, Bentham's panopticon was rejected by Parliament as a model for England's prison system. After an initial period of rejection, a number of British prisons were built using a modified version of the panopticon. Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain*, p. 112. However, the panopticon was embraced by the United States at the beginning of the 19th century and prisons continued to be built based on this model until 1929. For additional information on the relationship between the American prison system and the Bentham panopticon, see Norman Johnston, *The Human Cage: A Brief History of Prison Architecture* (New York: Walker and Co., 1973); Blake McKelvey, *American Prisons: A History of Good Intentions* (Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith, 1977); David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., revised ed. 1990), especially Chap. 4: "The Invention of the Penitentiary", pp. 79-108.

13. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "Objects of Ethnography", pp. 402-403. One of the most famous of the early cases of indigenous peoples being exhibited is that of the so-called "Hottentot Venus" who was first exhibited in a cage suspended over a stage in London in 1810. Richard Altick, *The Shows of London* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 1978), pp. 268-272. Saartjie Baartmen, aka the Hottentot Venus, was a servant of Dutch farmers in South Africa. A relative of Saartjie's employer came up with the idea of displaying her in Europe. His interest in displaying her was due to her pronounced buttocks. This condition, called steatopygia, was not uncommon in Khoi-san people (termed Hottentot by the Europeans). Saartjie was promised half the profits from her exhibition, money which she apparently never received. After a grand tour of England, she was also exhibited in France where she died of small pox in 1815. See Sander Gilman, *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), chap. 3. Khoi-san women were also known for a sexual anomaly of their genitalia. Saartjie refused to be exhibited naked and so during her life this aspect of her body was not available to the public or scientific gaze. However, after death the famous French anatomist Cuvier dissected Saartjie and wrote and published a report on the autopsy. After the

dissection, Saartjie's genitalia were placed in a jar and put on display in the Musse de l'Homme in Paris (where they still reside today). Gilman, *Difference and Pathology*, p. 88; Stephen Jay Gould, *The Flamingo's Smile: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Norton, 1985), pp. 291-305. That which she prided herself on protecting in life, had been literally ripped from her was (and is) available for all to see. After Saartjie's death, other African women were exhibited in Europe under the title "Hottentot Venus". Gilman, *Difference and Pathology*, p. 88.

14. Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 86-88.

15. Angie Debo, *Geronimo: The Man, His Time, His Place* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976), pp. 59-94.

16. Debo points out that Geronimo said he was born in June 1829, however, other evidence suggests that he may have been born a few years earlier. Debo, *Geronimo*, p. 7.

17. Ibid, p. 35.

18. Ibid, pp. 95-298.

19. Ibid, p. 270.

20. For several months, Geronimo and his fellow [male] warriors were quartered separately from the women and children at Fort Pickens, Florida. Ibid, pp. 320-329.

21. Ibid, p. 326.

22. Ibid, pp. 330-331.

23. The preceding account is taken from Eve Ball, *Indeh: An Apache Odyssey* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, ed. 1988), and Debo, *Geronimo*.

24. For additional information on world's fairs and the exhibition of indigenous peoples, see Burton Benedict, "The Anthropology of World's Fairs" in *The Anthropology of World's Fairs: San Francisco's Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915* Burton Benedict, ed., (London & Berkeley: The Lowie Museum of Anthropology, 1983), pp. 1-65; John Findling, ed., *Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 1851-1988* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990); Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester University Press, 1988); Robert Rydell, *All the World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984).

25. J.W. Buel, ed., *Louisiana and the Fair: An Exposition of the World, Its Peoples and Their Achievements* (Saint Louis, MO: World's Progress Publishing Co., 1905), 10 vols, vol. 1: p. 7.

26. Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas*, p. 82.

27. Debo, *Geronimo*, p. 400.

28. Ibid, pp. 404-405.

29. Ibid, p. 407.

30. Ibid, pp. 410-411.
31. Ibid, pp. 407-408.
32. Ibid, p. 408.
33. Jay Mechling's work on authentic Seminole tourist villages demonstrates that one of the primary attractions of the villages was the myth of the Seminole as 'America's last undefeated Indian tribe.' Jay Mechling, "Florida Seminoles and the Marketing of the Last Frontier", unpublished paper presented on November 8, 1992 at the Annual American Studies Meeting in Costa Mesa, California.
34. "The Omaha Exposition and the Indian Congress", *Scientific American*, October 15, 1898, pp. 248-249, p. 248.
35. Richard Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1992), pp. 63-87.
36. This phrase comes from a 1911 newspaper article about Ishi: 'They [the anthropologists] have put Ishi—'the Man'—under the microscope out at the Affiliated Colleges. The professors are gloating, for he opens a new world to them. He is the greatest anthropological treasure they have ever captured." Philip Kinsley, "Untainted Life Revealed by Aborigine" *San Francisco Examiner*, September 6, 1911, p. 101 reprinted in *Ishi the Last Yahi: A Documentary History*. Lest we comfort ourselves with the knowledge that these words express attitudes which are in the distant past, a reviewer of the 1978 made-for-television movie about Ishi described Ishi as "a living casebook of the American past for the anthropologist who befriended him." Tom Shales, "Haunting, Artful 'Ishi': Striking Drama of the Last of the Yahi", *The Washington Post*, December 20, 1978, p. E1.
37. Theodora Kroeber, *Ishi in Two Worlds: A Biography of the Last Wild Indian in North America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), p. 136.
38. Kroeber, *Ishi in Two Worlds*, p. 136.
39. Robert Heizer & Theodora Kroeber, *Ishi the Last Yahi: A Documentary History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), p. 2.
40. Heizer & Kroeber, *Ishi the Last Yahi*, p. 105.
41. Kroeber, *Ishi in Two Worlds*, pp. 131-132.
42. Gilman, *Difference and Pathology*.
43. Robert Bogdan, *Freak Show: Presenting Human Oddities for Amusement and Profit* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 177.
44. Renato Rosaldo, *Culture & Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989), pp. 68-87. My thinking in this area has been greatly influenced by the writing of bell hooks. In particular, her essay "Revolutionary 'Renegades': Native Americans, African Americans, and Black Indians" in bell hooks, *Black Looks: race and representation* (Boston, Ma: South End Press, 1992), pp. 179-194.
45. Rosaldo, *Culture and Truth*, p. 69.

46. James Luna, "The Artifact Piece", *Fiction International*, 18 (1987): pp. 38-42. Luna also performed this piece at the Studio Museum in Harlem as part of "The Decade Show: Frameworks of Identity in the 1990s" in New York City in 1990. *Art in America*, 79 (January 1991): pp. 56-62.

47. Jean Fisher, "In Search of the 'Inauthentic': Disturbing Signs in Contemporary Native American Art" *Art Journal*, vol. 51 (Fall 1992): 44-50, pp. 48-49.

48. An extended analysis of Luna's 'Artifact Piece' is beyond the scope of this paper, but will be the subject of a future project. However, I would like to make two points: (1) the 'Artifact Piece' does not just comment on historical displays of native peoples—it is also a statement about contemporary displays of native peoples and objects in museums and contemporary native lives on reservations; (2) as with the display of Ishi at the museum and Geronimo at World's Fairs, no one has ever asked indigenous peoples how they feel about being on display. To my knowledge, no one has ever asked James Luna what it felt like to perform the 'Artifact Piece'. He has said that it was physically painful and psychologically demoralizing. James Luna, "James Luna: Greatest Hits, Volume I", Performance for the Biannual Native American Art Studies Association Meeting, November 5, 1993, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Bibliography

Richard Altick, *The Shows of London* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 1978).

Eve Ball, *Indeh: An Apache Odyssey* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, ed. 1988).

Burton Benedict, "The Anthropology of World's Fairs" in *The Anthropology of World's Fairs: San Francisco's Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915* Burton Benedict, ed. (London & Berkeley: The Lowie Museum of Anthropology, 1983), pp. 1-65.

Robert Bogdan, *Freak Show: Presenting Human Oddities for Amusement and Profit* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988).

Jan Breslauer, "Cultural Politics; Happy Quincentennial, Christopher Columbus!..." *Los Angeles Times*, October 11, 1992, p. C5 .

J.W. Buel, ed., *Louisiana and the Fair: An Exposition of the World, Its Peoples and Their Achievements* (Saint Louis, MO: World's Progress Publishing Co., 1905), 10 vols.

Cathy Cutiss, "A Safe Look At Aborigines in Captivity; 2 'Specimens' Are Displayed Behind Bars for Crowd Attending 'Year of White Bear' at UCI" *Los Angeles Times*, March 5, 1992, p. F2.

Angie Debo, *Geronimo: The Man, His Time, His Place* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976).

John Findling, ed., *Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 1851-1988* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990).

Jean Fisher, "In Search of the 'Inauthentic': Disturbing Signs in Contemporary Native American Art" *Art Journal*, 51 (Fall 1992): 44-50.

Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (New York: Vintage Books, ed. 1979).

Sander Gilman, *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).

Stephen Jay Gould, *The Flamingo's Smile: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Norton, 1985),

Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester University Press, 1988).

Robert Heizer & Theodora Kroeber, *Ishi the Last Yahi: A Documentary History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979).

bell hooks,"Revolutionary 'Renegades': Native Americans, African Americans, and Black Indians" in bell hooks, *Black Looks: race and representation* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1992), pp. 179-194.

Michael Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

Norman Johnston, *The Human Cage: A Brief History of Prison Architecture* (New York: Walker and Co., 1973).

Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "Objects of Ethnography" in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* Ivan Karp & Steven Lavine, eds. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1991): 386-443.

Theodora Kroeber, *Ishi in Two Worlds: A Biography of the Last Wild Indian in North America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961).

James Luna, "The Artifact Piece", *Fiction International*, 18 (1987): pp. 38-42.

Blake McKelvey, *American Prisons: A History of Good Intentions* (Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith, 1977).

Jay Mechling, "Florida Seminoles and the Marketing of the Last Frontier", unpublished paper presented on November 8, 1992 at the Annual American Studies Association Meeting in Costa Mesa, California.

Achy Obejas, "Pushing the Borders of Art: Caged Players Reach Across Cultural Chasms" *Chicago Tribune*, January 28, 1993, p. 1 of Tempo section.

Achy Obejas, "Live Art Framed by Bars; Cage Comes to Field Museum" *Chicago Tribune*, January 18, 1993, p. 14.

Saxton T. Pope, "The Medical History of Ishi" *American Archaeology & Ethnology*, vol 13, no. 5, May 15, 1920, pp. 175-213.

Renato Rosaldo, *Culture & Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).

David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., revised ed. 1990).

Robert Rydell, *All the World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984).

Tom Shales, "Haunting, Artful 'Ishi': Striking Drama of the Last of the Yahi", *The Washington Post*, December 20, 1978, p. E1.

Richard Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1992).

Pamela Sommers, "The Couple in the Cage", *The Washington Post*, October 20, 1992, p. E3.

Rick Vanderknyff, "Artists Behind Bars; Exhibit at UCI Puts Caged Aborigines in Their 'Natural Habitat'", *Los Angeles Times*, March 3, 1992, p. F1.