“‘Real Live’ Indian’:
Sitting Bull’s Performance of Self in Buffalo Bill’s Wild West
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“Spectacle . . . is not an image but a series of social relations mediated by images.”
Diana Taylor, after Guy Debord

Between 1883 and 1916 Buffalo Bill's Wild West company staged a construction of America for an international audience. Cody's performance site presented a binary opposition between the widely disseminated idea of America's Manifest Destiny of westward expansion to the Pacific Ocean, and the "savage" bodies that stood in the way of this goal. Scholarship in recent decades has treated Cody's intriguing and problematic strategy of incorporating real Native Peoples into Buffalo Bill's Wild West as a way to establish the spectacle as an authentic representation of the American West. In particular both L.G. Moses and Joy S. Kasson have explored the Indians' own use of that space as they negotiated performances of "themselves" under the gaze of spectators. With Dakota Sioux Chief Sitting Bull's appearance in the spectacle as an authentic war chief, and therefore a dramatic foil to Buffalo Bill's performance as an American Hero, Buffalo Bill's Wild West played out both the displayed Native body's affirmation of Manifest Destiny, and a contestation of it. What we suggest in this essay is that by bringing emergent critical theory from performance studies to bear on this discussion, largely informed by social and cultural history to this point, new insights will emerge. The closest any study has come to doing what we propose is Sarah Blackstone's semiotic approach to the subject in her 1986 book, Buckskins, Bullets, and Business: A History of Buffalo Bill's Wild West. Building on Blackstone's work we hope to offer some additional ways of looking at the subject vis-à-vis performance theories. Specifically, we depart from existing work by first inventorying the facets of the performative landscape in which Cody and Sitting Bull emerged and performed. We then employ Pierre Bourdieu's notion of habitus to briefly meditate on the ways in which Sitting Bull's body on display in the arena served as a site that both interiorised the American public's perceptions of the Noble Savage and the frontier, and exteriorised contrapuntal elements of Sitting Bull's agency and autonomy in ways that were not allowed in the more heavily-policed "arena" of the reservation. We thus argue that despite its often-racist portrayals, Buffalo Bill's Wild West became a counter-site to a mythical American West (a heterotopia in Foucault's terminology), in which Sitting Bull and other Native performers used their "spectacular" status to tactically operate within a changing political field of ethnic stereotypes and oppression. They could then use this performative status in a manner keeping with Diana Taylor's notion of the repertoire, to work for agency and justice outside the Wild West arenas in the "real" space of the American frontier.
Before commencing with the argument proper, we will situate our discussion of Native performance in general, and Sitting Bull’s performance in particular, within the recent literature about Buffalo Bill Cody’s spectacles. While the discourse on Cody continues as a fruitful field of study, the showman’s relationship with and use of Native Americans, particularly Sitting Bull, has not drawn as much focus or yielded as much scholarship in recent years. Nevertheless, there are still a couple of works from the last decade that deserve attention.\(^5\) Glenda Riley examines both Cody and Annie Oakley’s performances in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* and assesses the impact of their “incalculable impact on viewer’s attitudes and beliefs.”\(^6\) Riley argues that Oakley and Cody “not only validated imperialistic principles, but stereotyped American Indians as primitive ‘others,’” though she also suggests that neither Oakley nor Cody intended to perpetuate the attitudes of white exceptionalism or racialised stereotypes in their performances.\(^7\) While we agree that white performances in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* communicated notions of Manifest Destiny and racial stereotypes, we believe that the performance of Sitting Bull and other Native Americans within Cody’s shows were more complex than what Riley describes as “one-dimensional, cardboard characters who appeared to have lives only in relation to white settlers.”\(^8\)

Robert Bridger joins the discussion regarding Sitting Bull’s role(s) in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* with his book, *Buffalo Bill and Sitting Bull: Inventing the Wild West*.\(^9\) Bridger presents Cody as a friend to the Plains Indians, including Sitting Bull, and as one who sought to preserve Native American culture, partly through Native performances within *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West*. Bridger claims that critics’ portrayal of Cody as an exploiter of Native Americans is too harsh and therefore unhelpful. He suggests instead that “understanding the unique relationship” between Cody and the Native Americans with whom he worked, “could prove to be the beginning of healing some of this confusion” surrounding Cody’s interaction with Sitting Bull and other Native Americans.\(^10\)

Both Bridger and Riley illustrate the varying interpretations of Sitting Bull’s involvement in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West*, as well as that of other Native Americans. These perspectives continue to overlap and collide whenever one seeks to reconcile the relationship between Sitting Bull and Cody: was this relationship one of symbiotic benefit? Was it one of exploitation? Was it one of empowerment? As we contribute our own voice to the ongoing discussion, we do not purport to solve these questions once and for all. We believe, however, that our additional perspectives will offer further nuance and understanding to the provocative and complex nature of these players and their performances.
Representations of the frontier

_Buffalo Bill's Wild West_ always featured sharp-shooting and demonstrations of horsemanship, but its other major draw for both American and European audiences was its reenactments of recent historical events associated with the American frontier, featuring “real life westerners” like Annie “Little Sure Shot” Oakley. In keeping with the attitude of the times, these performances frequently comprised spectacular battle scenes depicting Indians attacking peaceful settlers, and the United States Cavalry conquering “brutal savages” in retribution. Buffalo Bill himself always appeared in the reenactments as an influential person intimately connected to the events, even if he had never actually participated in the original referents. In addition to the staple “Custer’s Last Fight” (a reenactment of the defeat of General George Armstrong Custer by Lakota and Cheyenne Indians at the Battle of Little Bighorn, in which Cody would appear at the last minute with the words “Too Late” appearing on the cyclorama overhead), Cody incorporated reenactments of skirmishes he had experienced as a scout for the U.S. Cavalry. These performances carefully reified Cody’s signature position and what Richard Slotkin and others have described as the frontier mythology of the American West, even though the depicted events had only a tenuous connection to the actual Indian Wars. “The Duel with Yellow Hand” is a particularly striking example. Ten days after Cody received news of Custer’s defeat, the battalion with which Cody was serving caught up with an off‐reservation band of Cheyenne Indians. Purportedly, Cody (dressed in his stage costume in anticipation of a confrontation) shot and killed, then scalped, the minor chief of the band, Yellow Hair. The event of the “Duel with Yellow Hand” (a mistranslation of the chief’s name) was portrayed thereafter in the _Wild West_ as “The first Scalp for Custer,” even though Yellow Hair had not been associated with Little Bighorn, and was not a war chief. The relatively unimportant skirmish with Yellow Hair was assigned weighty meaning through theatrical performance which in turn gave the event an authenticity and accuracy that meshed with the narrative of Manifest Destiny and signalled poetic justice for its mainly white audiences.

While Yellow Hair did not live to participate in the reenactment of his encounter with Cody, _Buffalo Bill’s Wild West_ did excel at incorporating some of the most notorious native “warriors” to “portray themselves.” Examples include Geronimo, Black Elk, and Rain-in-the-Face (the falsely accused Sioux immortalised by Longfellow as the warrior who killed Custer and afterwards cut out his enemy’s heart and ate it). Cody’s inclusion of native performers has been variously viewed in scholarship as an indicator of Cody’s philanthropy, or, more recently, as a means of taking advantage of disenfranchised people for economic gain. L.G. Moses points out that without the requisite Indian attacks, the shows would have remained raucous but “hardly wild,” and contends that “[I]t is the “wildness” of the _Wild West_ that appears either suspect or offensive.” Perhaps the most infamous of Cody’s
acquisitions was Sitting Bull (*Tatanka Iyotake*), the Sioux leader who was inextricably linked by popular narrative to the defeat of Custer's army.

Cody had courted James McLaughlin, the Indian Agent overseeing Sitting Bull and the Standing Rock Reservation to which he was restricted, for an extended period before the chief was allowed to join the company for the 1884-85 season. McLaughlin's reluctance to give Cody permission stemmed from McLaughlin's belief that Sitting Bull was prone to misbehavior and immune to social improvement beyond domestication on the reservation. The Indian Agent feared that exposure to the big cities would negatively influence Sitting Bull, to the extent that he might return to the reservation more difficult to regulate than ever. In defense of his claims, McLaughlin cited a disastrous recent trip to St. Paul, Minnesota. In answer to Cody's requests, McLaughlin wrote that to let Sitting Bull off the reservation would undo the social reform work he had thus far overseen, and he could not accept "any such proposition at the present time when the late hostiles are so well disposed and are just beginning to take hold of an agricultural life." Cody, however, pressed McLaughlin's superiors with a rigorous letter-writing campaign, enlisting the help of General William Tecumseh Sherman and Colonel Eugene A. Carr. Finally, Secretary of the Interior, Henry M. Teller gave approval for Sitting Bull to contract out for theatrical appearances with Cody.

The terms of the contract with *Buffalo Bill's Wild West* were generous considering the era and Sitting Bull's cultural status. The chief received $50 per week with a $125 signing bonus. The company granted him and his fellow tribesmen reimbursement for travel expenses back to the Standing Rock Reservation upon expiration of their contracts. In addition, Sitting Bull received sole rights to selling his own autograph and photographs. Cody allowed the Native performers to show their war dances and tribal rituals "without distortion" and gave Sitting Bull several silent moments alone on stage in "heroic posture" tableaux. The amount of performative agency the Native Americans retained in their contracts with Cody may seem generous, especially given the brutalities of the frontier conflicts between whites and natives and the fact that the American Indian Movement was nearly a century off. Perhaps this is true. Before we continue we will situate Cody's historical pageantry-cum-ethnographic display into a historical and spatial context for readers less familiar with the history of westward expansion in the United States.

*Frontier mythology*

*Buffalo Bill's Wild West* shows created, revised, and disseminated popular narratives of the American West for more than thirty seasons. These were the years that saw the effective closure of the frontier with the Dawes Allotment Act in 1887...
and the massacre of 150 Lakota Sioux by U.S. Cavalry at Wounded Knee in 1890. This was a crucial time for the construction of America’s identity both domestically and abroad, in that the nation needed to secure and perpetuate a motivating image around which it could construct what Benedict Anderson might call an “imagined community.” That motivating image needed to relate to the wild frontier, even as the frontier was disappearing through the very procedures prescribed by Manifest Destiny. Thus, America’s “impression management” needed to be built, for the most part, on a piece of simulacral cultural imaginary. Buffalo Bill’s Wild West not only reinforced this simulacrum—the Myth of the Frontier—but also shaped that myth in public conception. Cody’s performed frontier boasted a fidelity to an actual place when in reality the referent was more easily found in the fabulations of stage melodramas and dime novels featuring Cody as a character. In other words, Buffalo Bill’s performances reified and affirmed an imagined notion of the frontier for his spectators, that is, a savage space in need of taming by the forces of civilisation, even while having a hand in constructing that notion. As a result, the Buffalo Bill-style frontier subsequently became a symbol for America’s understanding of itself as an imperial power.

In this sense, Cody’s Wild West was a spatial and temporal “living panorama” of America’s recent history. Susan F. Clark situates the years during which Buffalo Bill’s Wild West performed at the chronological “end” of the frontier. According to Clark, the Wild West was most popular when the issue of the frontier was all but decided. It was clear by this time who the “victors” would be in the conflict over Manifest Destiny and America was ready to proclaim its heroes. These perceptions allowed “the frontier” to function both as a physical landscape and a chronological period or era, simultaneously at their end. The frontier had been a contested space and the fight for its ownership had generated an overwhelming amount of violence and cultural genocide. But given the perceived manifestation of progress and the desire to colonise this terrain, the closing of the frontier meant that its status as a borderland had expired. Therefore, by appealing to the sense of loss the idea of the West became much more marketable because the West was now a vanishing entity. Not only could it be romanticised by Cody’s Wild West, it could be charged with nostalgia as a time and space that would soon be gone and that, for the moment at least, was being preserved for exhibition.

It is a widely circulating notion in academic discourse that “the West” is an imaginary concept—that it was invented by the machinery of popular culture but was nevertheless powerful enough to shape the consciousness of several generations. The notion of the frontier, with its attendant qualities of American character and freedom, charged the nation’s imagination and influenced its domestic and foreign policies. Almost a decade after Sitting Bull appeared in the Wild West, Frederick Jackson Turner articulated the importance of the image in The
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Significance of the Frontier in American History, in which he aligned the frontier with what he considered to be the uniquely American traits of “dominant individualism,” a “practical, inventive turn of mind,” and the “buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom.”  

Significantly, Turner delivered his remarks to the American Historical Association at its annual meeting in 1893 (the year the U.S. Census Bureau declared the frontier closed) on the grounds of the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago, while outside the gates of the fairgrounds Cody and his company performed these recognisable frontier tropes. Many scholars have pointed to the simultaneity of these events, notably Richard White who has described them as “a happy coincidence for historians.” White examines why each figure’s stories have became such widely-accepted hallmarks of the American West. Attributing the success to both Cody and Turner’s mastery of iconography, White analyses the symbolic images used by each, arguing that the imagery mobilised by Turner and Cody communicated messages of frontier closure and validation for the conquering of this space.

Slotkin examines the idea of the west in several articles and three major volumes in which he constructs the frontier as a “myth” that motivates the consciousness of the nation in economics, culture, and international and domestic diplomacy. One of the main items on Slotkin’s agenda is a call for the demystification of the myth of the frontier by rehistoricising its subjects like Buffalo Bill. Efforts to do so range from social history accounts of the late-19th century border conflicts, to revisionism in popular culture media. William G. Simon and Louise Spence use Arthur Kopit’s play Indians, and Robert Altman’s 1976 film adaptation Buffalo Bill and the Indians: or Sitting Bull’s History Lesson (starring Paul Newman) as an example of the rehistoricisation of Buffalo Bill Cody. And, while not treating Cody in particular, the recent HBO series Deadwood has, in a related manner, sought to wrestle high-profile western figures like Calamity Jane and Wild Bill Hickok from their mythological status by painting them with a much grittier brush. Simon and Spence have observed that by showing a more “human” depiction of Cody, grounded in biographical research and portrayed in the context of the sociological and political ideas of the time, this kind of revisionist history attempts to separate the “man” from the “myth” in order to show a more accurate version of history. That being said, it would seem that the use of the “myth” concept should be critically interrogated also if it is not to become another deterministic formula like “the West.” The term “myth,” in Slotkin’s use, implies a homogeneous super-entity, under which several different discourses can be categorised, then extracted and applied to other events not necessarily linked beyond their metaphoric value: the Cold War or Space Race, for example. Therefore, rather than suggesting Buffalo Bill was a product of the frontier myth, it would be safer to say that the field of discursive formations of the West determined the particular conditions in which an event like Buffalo Bill’s Wild West was able to emerge.
Furthermore, we should not be quick to assume that the *Wild West* “myth” was an appealing image that motivated all American individuals, especially *vis-à-vis* the ways in which Native people, the main subject of this essay, fit into this narrative. A prudent example can be found in the use of the scalp and regalia of Yellow Hair in storefronts to advertise *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West.* Some members of the New England clergy and press decried the use of Yellow Hair’s scalp as a token of Cody’s “cruelty and cowardice.” While demystification as a strategy of revisionism in history is appropriate in order to challenge the popular notions of Cody as a hero, it is perhaps more important to look at the way the constructed image of Buffalo Bill operated as a figure of authenticity at the time of his performances, in order to understand the ways in which the imaginary idea of the Wild West was more real to its audiences than any lived experience.

**Representation and authenticity**

The management of *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* specifically and deliberately chose to avoid referring to the historical reenactments, demonstrations, and tableaux as a “show.” Instead, the performance was carefully billed as an entertaining and educational experience that exposed a factual account of events in “actual life.” The 1888-89 season billboard posted their stand:

Differing as it does from all other exhibitions, BUFFALO BILL’S WILD WEST AND CONGRESS OF ROUGH RIDERS OF THE WORLD stands as a living monument of historic and educational magnificence. Its distinctive feature lies in its sense of realism [...]. It is not a “show” in any sense of the word, but it is a series of original, genuine and instructive object lessons in which the participants repeat the heroic parts they have played in actual life upon the plains, in the wilderness, mountain fastness and in the dread and dangerous scenes of savage and cruel warfare.

By refraining from defining the *Wild West* as a “show,” Cody’s company implied that the depictions were not fictionalised performances but objective, “genuine” enactments of real events. Through such objective portrayal, audiences were assured that they were seeing staged pictures as good as the real thing, especially given the presence of the real bodies who lived the events, and not play actors who were separated from those events by representational distance. This mingling of the “real” and the “representational” is further complicated by the presence of performance accoutrement in “actual” events, such as the earlier-mentioned example of the show costume Cody donned when killing Yellow Hair. In such an environment where “actual” artifacts and bodies from “real-life” events could be seen in a performance space and “representational” artifacts and bodies from
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“performative” events could be seen in a real-life space, it is not surprising that audiences’ perceptions of authenticity could be shaped and manipulated. Of course, this is not to say that the space in which actual blood was shed should be conflated with the commercial arena spectacle, or that they were conflated in this way by spectators; rather, the blurred lines between “actual” and “performative,” serve to highlight how such ideas were used to attract and keep audiences’ attention.

Cody's *Wild West* capitalised on purveying a touristic encounter with “authentic,” “full blooded” Indians, formerly experienced by audience members only through dime-novels, plays, and press accounts of the events of the frontier. By means of a voyeuristic dynamic, audiences attending the *Wild West* could, in their minds’ eye, play out their own fantasies of adventure and taming of the wilderness. In this manner, one might easily compare the *Wild West* entertainments to similar exploitative ethnographic displays in the late-19th century, from P.T. Barnum’s exhibits of so-called Zulus and Wild Men of Borneo to the Midway Plaisance, the mile-long thoroughfare entertaining spectators with exotic human displays at the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair. Indeed, it could be just part of a legacy of such display dating from shortly after the first moment of contact between colonisers and the so-called new World (a legacy performance artist and scholar Coco Fusco inventories in great detail.) This was, however, no simple encounter between voyeur and “other.” We would suggest that the layered quality of the Native Americans’ performance of their selves allowed access to a particular constructed reality, one which differed intrinsically from both the lived experience of the Native performers, and the fictionalised Indian images of popular culture. As we will explain, through the *Wild West*, the natives both engaged in performance that affirmed 19th-century stereotypes and resisted those stereotypes through counter performance as they negotiated a path between autonomous self-identity and one that conformed to the audience’s gaze. As we indicated earlier, by its own definition, *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* achieved its success by virtue of its display of the “real” versus the simulated. A January 1888 press report from Manchester, England, picks up on this distinction, commenting specifically on the presence of the Native Americans:

The company is not composed of the ordinary actors, who in their time play many parts. The Indians are “real live” Indians, who have fought for their lives and rights; the cowboys have seen service on the “wide rolling prairie”; the scouts have suffered innumerable hardships and passed through thrilling adventures in the Wild West. The remarkable realism thus imparted to the unparalleled series of tableaux arranged for our enjoyment—and may we not add education—has never yet been approached by any other combination.
The statement that real cowboys, real Indians and real heroes were employed to play themselves in *Buffalo Bill's Wild West* is charged with several representational dilemmas: the cowboys and Indians in *Buffalo Bill's Wild West* were not simply characters as much as they were performed and embodied notions of race, identity, and gender. The audience required no exposition in order to discern who were the good guys and who were the bad guys. As with the contemporary genre of melodrama, the good and evil elements were clearly distinguished, allowing a racialised character to perform himself, but not without performing a stock character of an already firm category. In the battle scenes depicting raids on peaceful settler villages by violent savages, the cowboys and Rough Riders who came to the rescue were cheered upon entering the arena, while the “savages” were booed and hissed. Yet the staged identity of the Indian was never homogeneous. In an almost schizophrenic maneuver, the *Wild West* forced conflicting identities upon the Indians: dark, incomprehensible, heathen savages in the fight scenes, noble savages in other parts—specifically the *tableaux* of Sitting Bull striking silent and noble poses for the enjoyment of the audience.

Furthermore, the notion that Native performers “play themselves” when they perform in costume, as opposed to taking on the gestures and costumes of separate characters like other performers, is overly simplistic, and has been challenged by scholars like Rosemarie K. Bank, Philip J. DeLoria, Laura Peers, Joseph Roach, Joy S. Kasson, L.G. Moses, and practitioners like Marge Bruchac, coordinator of Native programming at living museums in the American Northeast. Speaking of the Native performers in *Buffalo Bill's Wild West*, Kasson has observed that the “tragedy” is that these individuals were forced to enact a drama “in which their fictional demonisation had profound implications for their own lives and the future of their people.” Kasson continues to describe the ways in which the performers were expected to conform to these roles outside the arena:

Stage actors can walk away from the parts they play, but the Wild West confounded distinctions between ‘reality’ and ‘representation,’ and just as Cody was considered a ‘real’ hero because of his dramatic enactments, the American Indians in his company were identified with the villainous roles they played in the show. When the Wild West traveled, its American Indian performers were encouraged to walk about the streets in costumes. In a Venetian gondola or a New York opera house, these men and women in blankets and feathers were a walking advertisement for the show, and the fact that they appeared the same whether on- or offstage seemed to endorse the Wild West’s claim to authenticity and its view of history.

Thus, at no point should we assume the Native performers were merely “playing
themselves.” Rather, their roles in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* “confounded” the boundary between self and character in such a way that their “selves” at key moments outside the arena may merely have been an extension of the spectacle.

Recognising the semiotic and ontological dilemmas of performed and lived Native identity articulated by these scholars and practitioners, and aligning our own discourse among their own, we suggest that these dilemmas were negotiated by Native performers in particular through the incorporation of performative and counter-performative tactics in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West*. It is helpful, here, to look to the work of Pierre Bourdieu, especially his notions of the *habitus* and its exteriorisation. The Native performers in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* were, at any given moment during the show, exteriorising, through performance, a particular *habitus* comprising the visible field of relationships at that moment: the treatment of the Indians by the rest of the *Wild West* staff, individual histories, contracts, audience perception of the Indians, the Indians’ perception of the audience, the performers’ role in the constructed narrative, *et cetera*. Their performance, then, was an exteriorisation of a complicated alignment of various relationships: the Native performers had the structures of American nationalism, Manifest Destiny, and 19th-century scientific views of their race as inferior imposed upon them. They were the dark race: the exotic other that stood in the way of Progress, engaged in strange and incomprehensible behavior and ritual, and gave the cavalry a run for its money as an almost insurmountable obstacle in the way of Manifest Destiny. In short, the Native people interiorised and complied with the structures imposed upon them, becoming the exoticised other, and exteriorised these structures in performing that other.

**Native performers, their habitus, and agency**

Now, it may be argued at this point, and rightly so, that we may be committing an act of scholarly catachresis here by imposing a late-20th century theoretical template on a moment of 19th-century performative action. But a brief examination of performance theory contemporary with *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* reveals that it need not be such a stretch to apply such a theoretical lens. While we are indeed reading Bourdieu’s theory and terminology into late-19th century spectacle, the notions of exteriorising the internal identity through posture, gesture, costume, and voice, while perhaps not on the minds of the spectators, would certainly not have been lost on theatre practitioners, including those serving on Cody’s artistic staff: the correspondence between interior states and external signification were articulated by Honoré Balzac in his 1830 *Traité de la vie élégante* and François Delsarte’s popular system of voice training in 19th-century France, which were introduced to America by Delsarte’s student Steele Mackaye in the 1870s and further disseminated by Genevieve Stebbins’s work on physical
training and expression. Mackaye, of course, would have been working on Cody’s *Drama of Civilization*, which would premier the following year and feature the most spectacular stagings of Indian to that point. A key difference, however, between Delsarte and Mackaye’s 19th-century concept of an objective, transferable interiority and Bourdieu’s *habitus* is that, in the postmodern condition, we can recognise that there *isn’t*, nor does there have to be, a stable interiority to which a state of authenticity may be assigned. With Bourdieu, the *habitus* is always in flux.

For example, Sitting Bull’s *habitus* and those of his fellow Native performers might very well have toggled in compelling ways as they moved in and out of the *Wild West* arena. For, in addition to having some agency in constructing the way they were perceived in the spectacles, they could also use their performative status as an opportunity to escape the strictures of reservation life. Laura Peers writes, in *Playing Ourselves: Native Histories, Native Performances and Living History Sites*:

> One could wear recognisably Native clothing and perform Native dances, both of which were at times either illegal or discouraged by Indian agents. One could also speak one’s own language with other performers, at a time when Native people were being forced to learn English in schools. Sometimes whole families went on tour, offering parents the opportunity to pass on traditional skills and knowledge to their children in their own language.

As Bourdieu argues, and as Peers points out above, those oppressed by a system can also manipulate that system’s structures and use them to their advantage. Here, the Native performers could operate tactically within a limited range in order to challenge ethnic and political ascription. As performers, they could engage in war dances or other rituals in an autonomous space, not choreographed by Bill Cody, Steele Mackaye, or other *Wild West* staff. Sitting Bull had sole rights over his image and autograph and was allowed stage time in order to stand in place, not inserted into the melodramatic spectacle of good and bad forces battling for land, or in an idyllic, pastoral *tableau* as a noble savage. While these autonomous performances collated with the more unhelpful ones—the portrayals of battle scenes that always started with the unprovoked attack upon unsuspecting, innocent white settlers, and which never showed U.S. Cavalry raids on unsuspecting Indian villages—they did allow, at least for a few moments, the Native performers’ bodies to become visible in a culture devoted to marginalising them.

It may certainly be argued that Sitting Bull’s acts of posing made his body vulnerable, both to ideological perception and to physical consequences. As a gazed-upon subject, the eyes of thousands of white spectators constructed him as the exotic other, noble, savage, heathen, extinct, proud, the stock villain of the captivity
narrative, the “Native American” who needed to be programmed and acculturated by forced education in order to recognise the common-sense practices of leaving his heathen ways and embracing mainstream American life. As a physical commodity, Sitting Bull’s body was at risk: despite attempts to portray him in noble terms, the chief was often derided by American audiences. On more than one occasion during his tour with the company he was attacked by relatives of soldiers killed at Little Bighorn.\textsuperscript{51}

Perhaps for these reasons, though records will not corroborate, Sitting Bull’s engagement with Cody’s company was quite brief: the chief was called back to the reservation after a single season. McLaughlin the Indian Agent cited his own reasons for ending the run, and, furthermore, to never let Sitting Bull off Standing Rock Reservation to participate in show business thereafter.\textsuperscript{52} In a letter to Cody, McLaughlin wrote that he considered Sitting Bull, upon his return after the 1884-85 season, to be obstinate, spoiled, and a “fabricator of lies.” He saw Sitting Bull as having wasted, in a short period, all of the money he brought back from his tenure with the \textit{Wild West} on feasting with his fellow Indians.\textsuperscript{53} “I, however, have him under control again,” McLaughlin wrote, “and would dislike to run similar risks.”\textsuperscript{54} Sitting Bull’s behavior on the reservation, though, may tell a different story. Just as he did within the arena, Sitting Bull tactically maneuvered through the space to which he was confined—ostensibly reserved for him, but not truly his own—and while McLaughlin viewed it as squander, Sitting Bull used his earnings for feasting, an honorable activity, rather than investing it in a bank owned by his captors. And it may be that a lot of the money was well spent before it even made it back to Standing Rock. \textit{Wild West} regular Annie Oakley purported that Sitting Bull distributed much of his earnings to ragged street children in the cities on his tour, a move that Oakley may have intended for the mutual benefit to both party’s reputations.\textsuperscript{55}

In this way, it is possible to suggest that the agency and autonomy Sitting Bull modeled, however briefly, in the arena, was not only informed by his own \textit{habitus} as a performative subject, but continued to exist as embodied potentiality, as an “episteme, a way of knowing”\textsuperscript{56} in the world outside the \textit{Wild West}. Here, it is helpful to draw on Diana Taylor’s notion of the repertoire, especially given the way in which she mobilises the concept to discuss the ways in which performance, as “a way of knowing” can be a more efficacious way of preserving meaning systems than the written archive for those who traditionally have not had access to written discourse (e.g., the economically disenfranchised, subaltern groups, and so-called semi-literate peoples like the Lakota Sioux). For, as Taylor writes, “[i]f performance did not transmit knowledge, only the literate and powerful could claim social memory and identity.”\textsuperscript{57}
Given this notion of performance as that which can conserve and consolidate memory and identity, per Taylor’s definition of the repertoire, we suggest that the performative status that Sitting Bull constructed and actualised in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* was reactivated in the following years as a way to continually contest the fallout of Manifest Destiny and the frontier on the reservation. While kept from Show-Business-Proper, five years later Sitting Bull would use his performative status not only as a religious leader and war chief, but also as a former star of *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West*, to challenge and resist the white structures imposed upon him and his people. His part as a spiritual leader and advocate for anti-assimilationist ideology within the tribe, especially with the practice of the “ghost dance” (perceived by many as an anti-white ritual), perturbed the order of Manifest Destiny and for a time kept Native practices from being erased. In a strange twist fitting for one of his own spectacles, Buffalo Bill Cody was called upon to use his own performative genealogy as a peace-making diplomat to Sitting Bull’s anti-assimilation faction at Standing Rock, in hopes that his former association with Sitting Bull would be an influential factor in getting the chief to desist his activities. Like his fictive rescue mission to save General Custer at Little Big Horn, though, Cody was “Too Late.” Cody and Sitting Bull never met, and Sitting Bull was killed by federal agents resisting arrest at his own home. In one last bit of representational jumbling, the horse on which Sitting Bull was mounted when he was gunned down had been a gift from Cody: a show horse from the *Wild West* performances. The animal, accustomed to gun shots in the *Wild West* arena, “pranced” around as the Indian Agents fired at its rider, just as if it were still performing in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West*. Glenda Riley re-tells the story, explaining that: “Reportedly, during the gunfire, the gray trick horse that Cody had given the chief sat down and raised its front leg to shake hands, just as it had been trained.”

The massacre of Native Americans at Wounded Knee by U.S. troops would follow shortly after Sitting Bull’s demise—the last armed conflict of the Indian Wars, but a powerful incitement to Native resistance and activism that continues today. Thus, in the end, while Sitting Bull’s presence in *Buffalo Bill’s Wild West* promised, but did not by any means guarantee, the spectacle’s authenticity, it did challenge spectators’ wholesale touristic consumption of the narrative of Manifest Destiny in the arena, and may have ultimately made it that much more difficult to actualise it as a lived doctrine in the geographic space of the Nation’s frontier.

---
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