

Sanitized History and Institutional Identity

In the process of establishing Miami University during the early 18th century, Ohio settlers appropriated not only the name of the Miami tribe, but also its land and historical legacy in order to construct an institutional identity that legitimized the civilizing of the American frontier. The early Ohio republic used education, as well as physical settlement as a means to define territory and promote white civilizations. Civic institutions, like Miami University, actively mediated physical conflicts between Indians and white settlers. This process of appropriation, education, and mediation on the part of Miami University ignored the legitimacy of the Miami tribal identity in an attempt to sanitize history and create a presence within the Ohio Valley.

The convergence of French traders and missionaries with early Ohio settlers and Native peoples complicated early Miami tribe identity by creating a variety of monikers. The Atchachakangouen, a band of the Illinois division of the Algonquin-speaking Miami tribe, referred to themselves as “Twa-h-twa-h,” an imitation of the alarm cry of the sand hill crane.¹ Early French traders like Jean Nicolet in 1634 called these individuals the “Crane People” while the Chippewa tribe referred to them as “Oumamik” or peninsula dwellers.² These contradictory titles were influenced by the transitory nature of the Miami tribe. Father Gabriel Dreuilletes,

¹ Miami University, *The Miami Connection*, brochure, 15 June 1991. “Twa-h-twa-h” is alternatively spelled “ta-way” and will be used here synonymously.

² Bert Anson, *The Miami Indians* (Norman, Ok: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 3. Karen Alexander, “Miami Tribe of Oklahoma: Past, Present, Future,” Miami Tribe, Miami University Nickname and Mascot Papers, Miami University Archives, 1 HST Box 1.

traveling in 1658, mentioned a band of Indians living at the tip of Green Bay. Jesuit Agent Jules Tailhan and New France royal agent Bacqueville de La Potherie refuted this, claiming that the Miami lived on a portage sixty miles north of Wisconsin Bay and near the mouth of the Fox River, respectively.³ The large amount of territory covered by the seasonally moving tribe dictated these sightings. The Miami probably occupied the peninsula areas west, south, and east of the lower Lake Michigan as well as southward from the Wabash Valley to the three rivers area of what is currently known as the Miami Valley.⁴ Father Claude Allouez, a Jesuit missionary, began recording these encounters and history in 1669.⁵ By 1673 Jesuit missionary Father Jacques Marquette, during a trip with two Miami warriors, had altered the Oumamik name to its French pronunciation “me-aw`me.”⁶ Through common usage and recording over time, the French spelling fell to the English “mi-am`-e” or Miami. This name replaced “Twa-h-twa-h” and remains the name to this day.⁷

The name and subsequent identity of the Miami tribe revolved around the clan system. With fifteen to eighteen clans, the Miami tribe was believed to be about 4,500 strong in 1695.⁸ The early Miami lived in rush wigwams that were replaced by log structures at the turn of the eighteenth century and traveled outwards from seasonal settlements for the purposes of hunting.

³ Bert Anson, *The Miami Indians* (Norman, Ok: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 4.

⁴ Harvey Lewis Carter, *The Life and Times of Little Turtle*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 20.

⁵ Anson, *The Miami Indians*, 5.

⁶ Anson, *The Miami Indians*, 5. Karen Alexander, “Miami Tribe of Oklahoma: Past, Present, Future,” Miami Tribe, Miami University Nickname and Mascot Papers, Miami University Archives, 1 HST Box 1.

⁷ Philip R. Shriver, *Miami University: A Personal History*, ed. William Pratt (Oxford, OH: Miami University Press, 1988), 32.

⁸ Alexander.

Traveling by foot, the Miami believed “in an overall deity called the Master of Life” and gave special attention to a sun-king who helped their farming prosper. Farming was supplemented by the income from trading and trapping with the Dutch and the French. As an oral history culture, the Miami relied on memory and special aids like belts and pipes to recall tribal history. Colonel Josiah Harmer burned these artifacts, and much of the history they recalled, in 1790 during a skirmish with American troops.⁹ The destruction of the artifacts was both symbolic of the destruction of Miami Tribe history and a physical act of degradation. As a result of the loss of their artifacts, the overwhelming identity of the Miami tribe is post-1783 and directly correlates to the encroaching white civilizations. Miami identity then is not about how the Miami defined themselves as much as it is about how white settlers, trappers, and traders defined their experiences with the Miami. These experiences overwhelmingly memorialize trading and warfare as they were central to the interaction between white settlers and the Miami tribe.¹⁰

America in the late 1700s expanded from the civilized Eastern seaboard in response to individual desire for land along with governmental needs to secure trade, timber, and the possible wealth available for the new nation in the West. The Western territories ceded by New York, Virginia, and Massachusetts from 1781 to 1786 conjoined with land relinquished by Connecticut, New Hampshire and New York in 1791 to form the body of the Northwest Territory.¹¹ Inhabited by rough-and-ready trappers, traders, and Indians, these individuals viewed the trickling of white settlers intent on constructing a civilization as an imminent threat to their own lifestyle and property. The formation of the state of Ohio, derived from the land of the Northwest Territory,

⁹ Alexander.

¹⁰ Anson, *The Miami Indians*, 5.

¹¹ Steven M. Gillion and Cathy D. Matson, *The American Experiment: A History of the United States*, vol. 1 (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002), 257.

relied on these illegal settlers and frontier woodsmen to meet standards for admission to the Union in 1803. These individuals had fled the comforts of urbanized life to pursue financial opportunity on the frontier. In the process they faced economic hardships along with concerns over Indian attack.

The perceived savagery of the land and the settlers was mitigated by the notion of the pristine, unsettled wilderness promoted by companies like the Ohio Company, who worked to convince easterners to move westward. Historian Carl F. Kaestle writes of this manner of settlement and subsequent education, “although easterners shared a negative image of the brutalizing tendencies of the frontier, they also expressed, in theory at least, the optimistic vision of an unspoiled civilization starting over again in a new environment.”¹² This optimism was best expressed through the formation of educational institutions in Ohio. Educational institutions formed an integral part of settlement due to easterners desire to educate their children and land speculators longing to make their lands as attractive as possible to potential buyers.¹³ Education marked an individual as “civilized” and the presence of a school in the nascent state legitimized the perception of taming the frontier into a respectable place. Further, schools formalized government control over social and political structures while providing for individual improvement. “Congress had to establish a new republican social order in a lawless wilderness

¹² Carl F. Kaestle, “Public Education in the Old Northwest: “Necessary to Good Government and the Happiness of Mankind,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 99, no.1 (1988): 64.

¹³ James H. Rodabaugh, “Miami History,” 9 November 1949, James H. Rodabaugh Papers, Miami University Archives, 1: 1.

where semi-savage settlers reputedly defied all restraint. In effect, Congress's territorial system would have to "educate" westerners to be law-abiding, productive citizens."¹⁴

The Northwest Ordinances formed the backbone of the territorial system in the West. The Ordinance of 1785 determined how settlers should support education, namely through the income derived from leasing one section of each township to settlers.¹⁵ Township income would build, sustain, and improve the local schools. The 1787 Ordinance defined the scope of education in the territory. Manasseh Cutler, founder of the Ohio Company, penned the divisive clause known as Article Three:

Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and, in their property, rights, and liberty, they shall never be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity, shall from time to time be made preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them.¹⁶

Importantly, Cutler acknowledged the republican sentiments of the time. Religion and morality were integral to the collective well being of the nation by creating laws for an orderly society.¹⁷ Order in turn secured prosperity personally, morally, and throughout the community. Ohio Constitutional author Thomas Worthington elaborated on Cutler's ideals of an educational mission when he warned that "uneducated children would be 'unable to manage with propriety,

¹⁴ Peter S. Onuf, "The Founder's Vision: Education in the Development of the Old Northwest," in *Schools and the Means of Education Shall Forever Be Encouraged*, Paul H. Mattingly and Edward Stevens, eds. (Athens: Ohio University, 1987), 9.

¹⁵ Kaestle, 60.

¹⁶ U.S. Congress, "Northwest Ordinance," 13 July 1787.

¹⁷ Kaestle, 64.

their private concerns, much less take any part in the management of public affairs,” because they would be “unacquainted with those religious and moral precepts and principles, without which they cannot be good citizens.”¹⁸ Cutler and Worthington effectively linked public responsibility and welfare to personal responsibility by acknowledging the importance of “preserving peace” between Indian tribes and white settlers.

Manasseh Cutler’s 1787 Ordinance argued that “good faith” and responsibility was integral to the relationship between Congress and the tribes. Cutler failed to acknowledge the blemished history of the relationship between Indian tribes and Congress. Paving the way for the Northwest Ordinances, Congress had secured ownership of the Ohio territory using guile and force. Only three years prior at Fort Stanwix, the Iroquois were forced at gunpoint to sign treaty papers. By delineating a paternalistic relationship between the government and the tribes, Cutler believed the government would protect the tribes physically and mentally in order to “prevent wrongs” and “preserve peace.” This relationship between government and tribe removed tribal ability to define their own identity and placed it with a group of individuals intent on colonizing territory and preserving white beliefs, religions, and social structures. Not only was the tribe unable to continue its existence on the physical land but also the Miami were deemed as illegitimate historians of their own past. This distanced the Miami from the present conflict with white settlers while at the same time hindering historical memory. While Cutler’s intent may have been to secure peace between tribes and settlers so that religion, morality, and knowledge could flourish, he actually legitimated white America in determining the role of Indians.

¹⁸ Andrew R. L. Cayton, *The Frontier Republic: Ideology and Politics in the Ohio Country, 1780-1825* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1986), 142-145, quoted in Carl F. Kaestle, “Public Education in the Old Northwest: “Necessary to Good Government and the Happiness of Mankind,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 99, no.1 (1988): 65.

Civic institutions actively mediated complex issues of territory and settlement into a social hierarchy that confirmed the right of settlement. Miami University, founded in 1809 as part of the Northwest Ordinance and the Symmes Purchase, effectively sanitized conflict between Native Americans and settlers as well as neutralizing concern over frontier life. The name, Miami acknowledged the “Twa-h-twa-h” Indians on whose land the university was located. From its founding, Miami University began to position and authenticate itself as a civic institution engaged in the process of civilizing the frontier. The University consciously chose to legitimate its existence on Miami tribal land by appropriating the Miami name. This intentional choice to connect to the past created a vibrant tradition that provided the institution with stability. In effect, it positioned the institution as descended from both the physical land itself and the accumulated history of the Miami Indians.

The process of settlement, defeat, and naming illustrates the common process of colonial domination over Native Americans. Settlement of the frontier relied on colonizing previously inhabited territory. Settlers, like Thomas Worthington ignored Native American claims to territory by convincing themselves that Native Americans and the frontier needed to be “civilized.” Miami University’s original charter recognized this primacy of white culture. The university intended to “promot[e] good education, virtue, religion and morality,” echoing the cumulative effects of the Northwest Ordinance, in an effort to create a legitimate present. The identity of Miami University and the Ohio Valley was, by 1809, decidedly romanticized based on this corruption of historical events. Lying hidden within the rhetoric of the charter and the institution itself was the moral ambiguity of the sanitized past. Article III of the Northwest Ordinance and the Miami University Charter had validated a white Christian society that marginalized Miami Tribe identity by ignoring the multiplicity of Miami experiences in the Ohio

Valley. In other words, because the Miami lacked a valid history in the settler's eyes, the University and the state of Ohio was able to co-opt historical memory. The conflict between these "civilized" Christian communities and the Miami tribe relied on the categorization of dominant and submissive groups in white memory. Social science scholar Michael Banton in *Ethnic and Racial Consciousness* discusses the role of naming in assigning power. "The scientific procedure would be to define the category first and then to choose a name for it, but in social life the availability of a name often leads people to recognize a category."¹⁹ By labeling and categorizing the Miami tribe as an identity submissive to white experience, Ohio colonists, like Manasseh Cutler justified territorial expansion and conquest in the American frontier.

Miami University reinforced notions of possession and ownership over the land and the tribe Miami by negating conflict and legacies of violent occupation. President George Washington had declared war against the Confederacy of Miami, Shawnees, Potawamis, Ottawas, Kickapoos, Wyandots, Delaware, and Huron Indians in 1790 using Article III of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787.²⁰ The Northwest Territories were largely marked by small skirmishes that had challenged the authority of the government and threatened the safety of white American settlers. Securing land allowed Washington to safeguard settlements, control trade and wealth, and push Indians further into the interior. From 1790 to 1794, the war between the Miami tribe and the government roiled across the territory. In the worst defeat of the American army by Native Americans, the Miami Confederacy decimated Governor Arthur St. Clair at the

¹⁹ Michael Banton, *Ethnic and Racial Consciousness*, (New York: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd., 1988), 7.

²⁰ U.S. Congress, "Northwest Ordinance," 13 July 1787, Article III.

Battle of Wabash in 1794. Even with this victory, the Confederacy was defeated and signed the Treaty of Greenville, surrendering much of the present State of Ohio in 1795.²¹

The romantic images of a peaceful Miami past that welcomed settlement used by the state of Ohio and Miami University contradicted everyday experience on the Ohio frontier. In 1824, as the Miami Indians were forcibly settled on land “northward of the river Ohio, eastward of the Mississippi, and westward and southward of the Great Lakes” as dictated by the Treaty of Greenville, Miami University welcomed its inaugural class.²² The university and the surrounding town hoped to provide an education to young men in the Miami Valley of Ohio based on strong religious and moral principles derived from a classical curriculum.²³ From 1824 to 1873, educational pursuits occupied all of the student’s day.²⁴ These years saw the creation of literary societies, fraternities, and McGuffey readers, and virulent debates about slavery in America.

The physical presence of the Miami tribe disappeared from the Ohio Valley while vestiges of their perceived identity and past remained firmly entrenched at Miami University. The tribal legacy and history was imagined through the lens of white settlers and university officials in a way that belied the complex economic interactions between settlers and the Miami tribe prior to 1783 and discounted the rich cultural history. The university and the Ohio settlers denied the actual existence of the Miami tribe in favor of a romanticized past that allowed them to determine the landscape and experience of Ohio settlers. The appropriation of the Miami name combined with the educational rhetoric of religion, morality, and virtue positioned Miami University identity as a legitimate presence in the Ohio Valley.

²¹ Shriver, *Miami University: A Personal History*, 31.

²² U.S. Department of State, “Treaty of Greenville,” 3 August 1795, Article 4.

²³ Philip R. Shriver, “Founding Miami,” Miami University, 9 September 1998.

²⁴ Philip R. Shriver, *Miami University: A Personal History* (Oxford, Ohio: Miami University Press, 1998), 70.

Appropriating the name Miami allowed settlers to reaffirm their domination over the defeated Miami. This process of reaffirmation is reliant on what historian Eric Hobsbawm has termed of “invented tradition.” Hobsbawm states, “invented traditions...[are] essentially a process of formalization and ritualization, characterized by reference to the past” that inculcate the present with values and norms of behavior that imply continuity with a suitable historical past.²⁵ These references then create a contemporary identity that is authenticated based on inaccurate representations of the past. In other words, Miami University and the Ohio settlers were able to emotionally disconnect from their recent defeat to create a positive history for the new institution. Miami University then sanitized both the physical land itself by altering the topographical structure and the legacy of territorial conflict by assuming the very identity the settlers worked to destroy. In effect, they worked to mask physical and ideological conflict with Native Americans by appropriating the Miami name.

From its inception as a unnamed school in 1787 to 1824, the university worked to distance itself from the physical reality of the Miami existence relying instead on a romantic past that offered a sense of far-off danger. The university removed all vestiges of the Miami presence on the land by destroying mounds and other Indian markers on the land while at the same time supporting the growing physical conflict between the government and the Miami tribe in the nascent state of Ohio. The Miami tribe, virulent in its defense of the land it had inhabited for over two hundred years, was continually being turned westward as white society expressed concern over the “savage” Indians. In the East, this concern merged with the growth of Indian schools that “civilized” the lingering native population. Like Cutler, early university

²⁵ Eric Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions,” *Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1-3.

administrators adhered to divided ideologies. The Ohio government, combined with Ohio settlers like those who were part of the university, physically slaughtered the tribe and moved remaining members away from white settlements out of fear of Indian attack. At the same time, the University accepted 5 Indian youths from a Connecticut mission school onto the university rolls. Louis Rogers, Stephan Van Rensaler, Robert Monroe, Julius Villemont, and Ursin Villemont of the Osage tribe of Nebraska arrived in early fall of 1827 at Miami University. Miami trustees wrote, “unwearied efforts continue to be made by the government of the United States for improving the condition of the native tribes of Indians.”²⁶ Between 1828 and 1832, eight other Indian youths enrolled in the University. Importantly, none of these individuals were of local or regional tribes who challenged Ohio settlers and none of the original five received a degree from the University. The inconsistent behavior on the part of the University reinforced the larger constructions of noble savagery that will be examined in the next chapter.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Miami University actively sustained an institutional identity that capitalized on the demise of the Miami Tribe. As an institution devoted to the settlement of the Ohio Valley and the education of its citizens, Miami University appropriated the name of the Miami Tribe as well as its land and historical legacy. This process resulted in the formation of an institution actively engaged in civilizing the Ohio frontier. Importantly, at the turn of the century, Miami University invented traditions that sanitized the history of Native Americans in the Miami Valley to facilitate the growth of its institution.

²⁶ Walter Havighurst, “Miami University Redskins, 1830,” Walter Havighurst Papers, Walter Havighurst Special Collections, Miami University Libraries.

Noble Savages, Popular Culture, and Sports Mascots

“To understand the identity of imagemakers, one has to explore not only the meanings of their images, but also the way those images were assembled.”²⁷ From 1888 to 1933, Miami University defined its own sporting identity through inaccurate representations of the Miami tribe based on historical ignorance. Specifically, the “Redskin” name and logo was authenticated through popular perceptions based on demeaning stereotypes of the noble savage. Privileging the perspective of white America, the general university and larger society ignored Native Americans as legitimate possessors of their own identity.

University identity and Indian identity in the nineteenth century was distinctly modeled after eastern civilization. Trustees and administrators worked doggedly to tame the land surrounding the university as well as the students enrolled. President Andrew Jackson’s 1840 treaty at the “Forks of Wabash” dictated 5 years for the Miami tribe to vacate westward. As this date came and went, university administrators worked to Christianize the small Indian population enrolled in the school by determining apparel, church attendance, and social experiences on campus. While portions of the tribe on reservations in Indiana were allowed to remain, the bulk of the Miami in 1846 were driven to Miami County, Kansas. The six-year delay was attributed to the debts of the tribe as well as their refusal to assemble for removal.²⁸ Arriving in Kansas, the tribal rolls certified 323 individuals with the Indiana Miami retaining about 370 individuals.²⁹ These initial rolls were of paramount importance in the mid-20th century in determining who is a legitimate possessor of Indian identity. The Kansas members traveled continually westward

²⁷ Philip Deloria, *Playing Indian*, (New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press, 1998), 20.

²⁸ Anson, *The Miami Indians*, 220.

²⁹ Anson, *The Miami Indians*, 226.

through the Unorganized Indian Territory from 1847 to around 1855. Eventually, they moved to Miami, Oklahoma where they remain today.

At the end of the nineteenth century the belief that strong bodies encouraged strong minds developed as part of a larger trend in higher education. This belief encouraged the promotion of athletics as an extension of academics and Miami University students and professors began informally to play football.³⁰ The university maintained the unique connection between academics and athletics through the university president, Ethelbert Dudley Warfield. A successful football player at Princeton prior to his arrival at Miami University, Warfield initiated the first organized football game in Ohio on December 8, 1888. Participants from Miami University and McMicken University (the modern University of Cincinnati) included not only students, but also faculty.³¹ The combined priorities of academics and athletics lured young men from all over the United States to rural Oxford. As student enrollment rose to over 1500 students at the turn of the century, the university rapidly built classrooms and added academic programs such as the School of Fine Arts and the School of Education.³² By 1910, Miami University joined its first athletic conference, the Ohio Athletic Conference (OAC). Basketball, baseball, track, cross-country, tennis, golf, boxing, and wrestling were added to the list of university-sponsored athletics shortly thereafter.³³ Despite the admission of women in 1887, from 1910 to 1931, men dominated both the university and athletics.

³⁰ Philip R. Shriver, "Athletics at the University," Miami University, 28 October 1998.

³¹ Albert A. Moore, "Development of Intercollegiate Athletics at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio" (Master's Thesis, Miami University, 1949), 8.

³² Walter Havighurst, "A Full Grown College," in *The Miami Years: 1809- 1984* (New York: Putnam Press, 1984).

³³ Shriver, "The Hughes Era," in *Miami University: A Personal History*.

Miami University's growth relied on economic changes within the United States. The growth of railroads and communication networks mapped the country with an easily traveled transportation system. Combined with technological advancements in factory production and line management, material goods became standardized and were produced at a higher rate than ever before. The mechanization of rural America advanced farming and created a wealth of raw materials for urban industry, staffed by low class men, women, and immigrants. Competition between companies and products then created a fledgling consumer culture that relied on product loyalty.³⁴ Simultaneously, education was commodified as a means of achieving the American dream. Higher education prior to the 20th century was regarded with suspicion for a perceived role in creating an aristocracy.³⁵ As free public education backed by democratic ideals grew, lower and middle class Americans saw education as a means to financial security. The demand for education spurred on fledgling state-controlled free universities into financially solvent entities that relied on marketing to defeat competing institutions. The business ethic and bureaucracy of America in the early 1920s positioned education as a commodity to be bought and sold.³⁶

Sports mascots emerged to function as an easily recognized symbol of these expanding institutions. Although sports had existed on campus since 1824, the university maintained only one affiliation with respect to its athletic teams. Varsity athletic winners were members of the "M" men, an athletic club. The "M" was in reference to the university name which, in itself, was

³⁴ C. Richard King and Charles Fruehling Springwood, eds., *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascots Controversy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 91.

³⁵ John S. Brubaker and Willis Rudy, eds. *Higher Education in Transition*, 4th ed. (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1997), 155.

³⁶ Christopher J. Lucas, *American Higher Education: A History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 191.

already complicated by over a hundred years of colonial domination over Native Americans. The only logo was a red “M” each man received.³⁷ By 1920, the “M” men had become the “M” association and athletic teams were referred to as the “Big Red.”³⁸

The construction of the “Redskin” name and mascot reflects evolving generalizations about Indian identity. The January 1928 issue of the student newspaper, *The Miami Student*, headlined, “Bearcats Come to Oxford Saturday Seeking Hides of Big Red-Skinned Warriors.”³⁹ The article further proclaimed, “the Big Reds are out to add one more scalp to their collection, and it must be done.” Sporting victory was tied not only to the defeat of their competition but also to the practice of scalping, a vicious form of warfare. According to the 1930 *Alumni Newsletter*, “members of the athletic department went into a huddle not long ago and decided that Miami teams had a moniker [Big Red] and a symbol [M]. As the very name Miami is taken from an Indian tribe and the term ‘Big Reds’ smacks of Redskins and the warpath, an Indian brave in war lock and feathers was thought a suitable insignia.”⁴⁰ Linguistically, the term Redskin dates to 1699 and references the superficial assessment of the physical appearance of Native Americans.⁴¹ Explorers and colonizers coming to America described the individuals they encountered using “Redskin,” “Red Men,” and “Red Devil.”⁴² Importantly, all three terms fails

³⁷ Miami University, *Recensio*, 1915.

³⁸ Miami University, *Recensio*, 1920.

³⁹ Miami University, *The Miami Student*, “Bearcats Come to Oxford Saturday Seeking Hides of Big Red-Skinned Warriors,” January 11, 1928.

⁴⁰ Miami University, *Alumni Newsletter*, 1930.

⁴¹ Irving Lewis Allen, *Unkind Words: Ethnic Labeling from Redskin to WASP* (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1990), 1.

⁴² Irving Allen, *Unkind Words*, 18.

to recognize physical, social, and political diversity among Indians and easily categorize them as one cohesive group. In reality, hundreds of separate tribes existed in North America representing a wide variety of physical, social, and political structures.

Generalizations about Native American identity were part of a larger trend leading up to 1930. Walking the Columbian Exposition in Chicago, Illinois in 1893 reflected the complex perceptions of Native American identity. Situated outside of the fair grounds on the streetcar line was Buffalo Bill's Wild West, a staged show that simulated the fierce interactions between white men and Indians. William Cody and his performers enacted the fight for the frontier to a full house three to four times daily. Popular from the 1880s to the mid-1920s, the Wild West show relied on a nostalgic presentation of the American west. Over the course of the show, the famous Cody, Annie Oakley, and "real" Indians recreated the settlement of the west. Repeatedly, Indians died at the hands of Cody and his soldiers thereby reaffirming white manifest destiny. According to Cody, each reenactment was based on real life experiences of him and his men.⁴³ Outside the show resided the anthropology exhibit that framed the gates to the Exposition. "Students who traveled to Chicago to see the fair not only perused the artifacts in glass cases; they also saw living exhibits- Seneca, Navajo, Kwakiuti, Pueblo, and Inuit people, among others, who drummed, danced, and demonstrated handicrafts in their camps outside the grounds."⁴⁴ These displays lauded the exotic primitivism of Native Americans.

⁴³ Carol Spindel, *Dancing at Halftime: Sports and the Controversy over American Indian Mascots*. (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 108.

⁴⁴ Carol Spindel, *Dancing at Halftime: Sports and the Controversy over American Indian Mascots*. (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 51.

The Exhibition depicted violent, ultimately defeated Indians at the Wild West and categorized encampments presenting the new science of anthropology.⁴⁵ Offering living exhibits of human beings that promoted the exotic nature of American Indians, the Columbian Exposition consciously provided a sense of excitement and danger to the fairgoers:

Toward the end of the Midway was a little encampment of Sioux Indians. Foreigners must have been surprised when informed that among this band were men who had waged a bitter war against the United States, and who, unpunished, tented upon the most famous arena of peace that world had ever seen. History is not so old, nor memory so weak, as to permit the Custer Massacre in 1876 to be forgotten; yet Chief Rain-in-the-Face, whose picture is above, was a prominent actor in that massacre. His presence secured him an admiring audience, the recollection of his atrocities being no bar to that sentiment of adulation that transforms murderers into heroes.⁴⁶

The above, underneath a photo of an Indian man, was entitled “A Professional Scalper.” Chief Rain-in-the-Face participated in a sideshow-like atmosphere that was part of a larger movement in America to mythologize and romanticize conquest. Native Americans were separated into two distinct groups, those like Chief Rain-in-the-Face and the Miami Tribe who were seen as a threat to white society and those capable of assimilation. Like the scripted performance of the Wild West Show, the anthropology exhibit was designed to embody the contemporary stereotype of the time: the noble savage.

The concept of the noble savage was central to perceptions of Indian identity. Native American images developed by 18th century colonists simplified complex interactions between white men and Indians into two overarching constructs: savagery and nobility. Colonial America romanticized the primitive wilderness of America and the individuals who inhabited it. Native Americans were seen as violent individuals that lived outside the boundaries of society. This lack

⁴⁵ Spindel, 51.

⁴⁶ Spindel, 52.

of perceived civility combined with the exotic image of the warrior offered colonists cautionary tales that rigidified social and behavioral norms. The vicious Indian was everything the white man fought against. He was primitive, ill mannered, and without a moral compass. Americans could easily use Native Americans as abhorrent figures that justified the right of colonial expansion. Historian Robert Berkhofer Jr. framed this issue in his discussion of the origins of the terms Indian and savage. He argued in *The White Man's Indian* that the term Indian, a derivative of the Spanish *indios*, functioned in contemporary society as a single entity that “denies or misrepresents the social, linguistic, cultural differences among the peoples so labeled.”⁴⁷ Originally, Indian had a positive connotation as did savage, which meant “man of the woods”. When competition for land and resources between the English and Indians in America increased, though, the “man of the woods” became associated with violent conflict. Combined then, from the mid-1600s, the savage Indian functioned as an exclusive identity based on negative experiences between colonists and Native Americans.

The American Revolution and new Enlightenment thinking, according to Native American historian Philip Deloria, encouraged a second conceptual framework: nobility. As colonial America pulled away from Britain and established itself as a distinct entity, creating a national identity was of paramount importance. In this new identity, Native Americans became an inclusive part of America instead of an exclusive other. Deloria has written in *Playing Indian*: “increasingly inclined to see themselves in opposition to England rather than to Indians, they [colonial Americans] inverted interior and exterior to imagine a new boundary line of national

⁴⁷ Robert F. Berkhofer Jr., *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), 3.

identity.”⁴⁸ For Americans, the Indian was savage or noble, good or evil. In Europe, however, these two constructs combined into the noble savage. Following primitivism, a theory prominent in art, literature and painting, the noble savage was embodied by a “person dwelling in nature according to nature, existing free of history’s burdens and the social complexity felt by Europeans in the modern period, and offering hope to mankind at the same time that they constituted a powerful counter-example to existing European civilization.”⁴⁹ Europe embraced Native Americans as idealistic people who attempted utopist civilizations.

The subsequent growth of the United States as well as the American Revolution brought the noble savage concept from Europe to America. In its popularized image, the noble savage was an individual inextricably linked to a dignified past who was capable of fulfilling nature’s edicts. The American noble savage, depicted in painting, is most famously rendered in Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s poem *The Song of Hiawatha*, published in 1855. Hiawatha is alternately stoic and emotional. He lauds nature and animals, yet a sense of foreshadowing indicates the possibility of violence is not far off. The Indian, exemplified by Hiawatha, was brought out of a simplistic, idealistic past by the inevitable coming of white civilization. Berkhofer states, “American authors preached...about the inevitability of civilization superceding savagery, regardless of nobility...” and that denied the continued existence of Native Americans.⁵⁰ This cohesion between savage and noble erected a fluid identity where Americans could use Indian identity for their own social and political uses. When convenient, colonists represented America as a collective identity while at other times they could position

⁴⁸ Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 21.

⁴⁹ Berkhofer, *The White Man’s Indian*, 72.

⁵⁰ Berkhofer, *The White Man’s Indian*, 92.

Native Americans as marginal. Indians could be a positive presence to aid America and when, in agreement with white society, were noble beings. Conversely, when settlement interactions between Native Americans and white America occurred, then Indians were savage people to be eradicated or, at the very least, pushed westward away from white civilization. Native Americans were destined and forced to give way to white settlement.

Assimilation featured prominently in the 1893 Exhibition. The Office of Indian Affairs, created in 1883, contributed to the overhaul of the Native American image by erecting an Indian schoolhouse complete with young children. Situated inside the gates near the “white city”, the Office of Indian Affairs worked diligently to promote a picture of civilized law-abiding Indians that could be assimilated into larger white society. Historian Frederick E. Hoxie writes of the U.S. program of assimilation, “in a complex, modern country, with its hierarchy of experts, managers, and workers, ‘aliens’ could most easily and efficiently be incorporated into society’s bottom ranks. In this way minorities could serve dominant culture without qualifying for social and political equality.”⁵¹ Native Americans were forced to accept white society and dictates at the cost of their own cultural and social heritage. Over two million people viewed these three contradictory images of violence, reformed nobility, and assimilation by the fair’s end. Perhaps the faculty and students of Miami University boarded the train and took the short voyage to Chicago to participate in the event and later remembered these images during the formulation of the moniker and insignia.

Sociologist Ellen Staurowsky draws a clear parallel between institutional identity and the images in popular culture, “as a characteristic of the era, images of barbarism and conquest in

⁵¹ Frederick E. Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), xii.

advertising served as an implied affirmation of the civilized status of consumers.”⁵² The anxiety of the changing world combined with the extreme growth of materialism functioned as a platform that reassured the white consumer of their individual and collective power and worth. Across America, products with Native American images were being produced and consumed in mass quantities. Travelogues and dime-store novels featured broad-shouldered longhaired Indian men barely clad in loincloth and moccasins. The images once seen at the Wild West show now appeared on advertising trade cards. Professor Jeffrey Steele analyzes these images as examples of white hegemony. “Many advertisements created a sense of white, middle-class consumer solidarity at the expense of subordinate groups...”⁵³ Inevitably the images used followed the noble savage concept. Products depicted disparately gendered meanings. Indian maidens were peaceful and noble giving way to white progress while Indian men were violently challenging manifest destiny.⁵⁴

The evolving advertising joined with the larger effort by American government and white society to civilize Native Americans. The 1893 Columbian Exposition exhibits depicted Indians as exotic and curious. Yet, following the World Fair, the American government and white society worked diligently to eradicate Indian culture and begin assimilating Indians into white America. Although President Andrew Jackson in the 1840s advocated the separation of Native

⁵² Ellen J. Staurowsky, “Sockalexix and the Making of the Myth at the core of Cleveland’s “Indian” Image,” in *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascot Controversy*, ed. C. Richard King and Charles Fruehling Springwood (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 91.

⁵³ Jeffrey Steele, “Reduced to Images: American Indians in Nineteenth-Century Advertising,” in *Dressing in Feathers: The Construction of the Indian in Popular Culture*, ed. S. Elizabeth Bird (Boulder, Co: Westview Press, 1996), 47.

⁵⁴ Steele, 58-62.

Americans from the white population, with the declared “Closing of the American Frontier” by Historian Frederick Jackson Turner at the Columbian Exposition, Americans believed that Indians were “vanishing” and should be aided in adapting to white life. The school exhibited at the fair became part of a larger movement. “By 1895 the reform drive of the previous decade had produced an impressive educational program. The national government was spending over \$2 million annually to support two hundred institutions.”⁵⁵ In the same manner that schools were used to encourage white settlement in the Ohio Valley, education now assisted in the movement of Native Americans into white society. The sentiments of Jackson and others who believed in the innate inferiority of Indians impeded the process of assimilation. Superintendent of Indian education Estelle Reel, in 1898, encouraged teachers to train students for jobs, not to educate them in traditional forms of scholarship.⁵⁶ Thus by 1930, the educational system taught subservience and menial labor skills instead of advanced learning. Smoothing the way for the educational system was the technological innovations that moved product advertising onto film.

Images captured by Photographer and Anthropologist Edward Curtis documented the process of the “vanishing Indians” and further limited white understanding of Native Americans. Curtis, an ethnographer, depicted Indians as primitive beings who were exotic others. He did not photograph actual life for many Indians. Instead he was interested only in specific cultural ceremony and appearances that followed the noble savage framework. Historian Leah Dilworth writing of the relationship of Native Americans to modernity at the turn of the century states, “for its practitioners, primitivism is a source of authority, a gesture that demonstrates the essential nature or the primacy of their notions, because the primitive is imagined as a state

⁵⁵ Hoxie, *A Final Promise*, 191.

⁵⁶ Hoxie, *A Final Promise*, 197.

somehow previous to modernity and therefore more real, more authentic.”⁵⁷ Dilworth goes on to argue that Curtis was one of the most prolific producers of these images that, in turn, reified white hegemony. The modern white world, then, was inundated by romanticized images of Native American in photography, art, and literature while the modern Indian world received messages of limited achievements, white superiority, and a lack of control over one’s own destiny. Early twentieth century film catered to these messages. Unlike many films of the time period featuring Native Americans in fictional situations, Edward Curtis attempted a more documentary approach to *In the Land of the Head-Hunters*, produced in 1913. “It is the opinion of Mr. Curtis that the real life of the Indian contains that parallel emotions to furnish all the necessary plots...”⁵⁸ In reality, according to Cinematographer Allison Griffiths, the intertribal feud portrayed by Curtis presented sensationalized images of war and ceremony that were akin to popular trade cards. Curtis, the most prominent example of this trend, was in the company of advertisers, musicians, playwrights, painters, and the larger white society in their efforts to reproduce the noble savage type as primitive.

These messages of primitivism and authenticity coalesced for universities in the form of Indian logos. From 1900 onward, institutions like Syracuse and the University of Michigan joined with Miami University in formulating a distinct symbol of Native American identity. Syracuse’s “Saltine Warrior” and the University of Michigan’s “Indian” club were symbols of student involvement and allegiance. The function of logos as a sign of institutional allegiance was part of a larger political and social trend during this period. With American involvement in

⁵⁷ Leah Dilworth, *Imagining Indians in the Southwest* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1996), 4.

⁵⁸ Alison Griffiths, “Science and Spectacle: Native American Representation in Early Cinema,” in *Dressing in Feathers: The Construction of the Indian in Popular Culture*, ed. S. Elizabeth Bird (Boulder, Co: Westview Press, 1996), 88.

the growing world markets and the subsequent World War, patriotic images dominated American popular culture. From liberty cabbage to rationing, logos and symbols encouraged allegiance to the federal government and its goals. The success of these marketing practices evolved post-1918 into university logos and symbols. Anthropologist Rosemary Coombe analyzes the power of these symbols:

It [trademarks] figures more often as a harbinger of homogeneity or irrevocable social transformation than as one cultural resource among others. Intellectual properties are, however, significant cultural forms in contemporary public arenas. Endlessly reproduced and circulated by mass media, they are identified with by subaltern groups who use them to construct identities and communities, to challenge social exclusions, and to assert difference. Their ubiquity in commercial culture makes them particularly available for the signifying activities of others, and the fact that they are everywhere the same seems to invite others to use them to inscribe social difference.⁵⁹

For Miami University, the red “M” symbol acted a sign of membership by college students, faculty, and the larger public. At the same time as it included a specific group of people it also excluded those who were not legitimate possessors, namely lower economic classes as well as minorities including African-Americans, Native Americans, and women. Symbols and logos, like Miami University’s, are vague in origin and evolution.

The designation “Redskin” and logo for Miami University athletic teams has multiple possible origins: the 1928 Miami Student headline, the 1930 meeting among athletic

⁵⁹ Rosemary J. Coombe, “Embodied Trademarks: Mimesis and Alterity on American Cultural Frontiers,” *Cultural Anthropology* 11 (May 1996): 204.

administrators, or two separate individuals. Coach Charles Pittser, a football coach at Miami University, purportedly called his athletes “Redskins” in 1931.⁶⁰ Frank Games, a university student, attributes the name to his design. Following the 1929 football win against Transylvania University, halfback Frank S. Games attended his fraternity mixer. A member of the Delta Kappa Epsilon fraternity, Games began a conversation with University President Alfred H. Upham, also a fraternity member:

President Upham: “The name Big Red is no longer appropriate for Miami teams. The papers refer to you as the Pony Backfield and surely there must be a better name that Big Red!”

Games: “Well, this is Indian country and they have been part of the folklore. The Indian tribe and the rivers are all named Miami. Why not use the words Redskins as the designation for Miami athletic teams?”

Upham: “I like your suggestion and at the right time I will place it before the Board of Trustees.”⁶¹

The lack of material evidence surrounding the creation of the moniker hints at two complications surrounding the “Redskin” invented tradition. First, the logo and moniker had manifold meanings. Historians Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger argued in *The Invention of Tradition* that there are three overlapping types of invented traditions, “a) those establishing or symbolizing social cohesion or the membership of groups, real or artificial communities, b) those establishing or legitimizing institutions, status or relations of authority, and c) those whose main

⁶⁰ Miami University, Office of the Student Body, “Miami University and the “Redskins”: An Analysis,” 11 March 1993.

⁶¹ The Origin of the Designated Name for the Miami University Athletic Teams, Walter Havighurst Collection, Miami University, Box 10, 9 October 1981.

purpose was socialization...”⁶² The “Redskin” name and logo provided a status symbol for athletes at Miami University that provoked a belief in physical, mental, and social superiority. For the student population, the logo was portrayed proudly on notebooks, t-shirts, and posters and signaled belonging to the University community. As a marketing symbol, the name and logo were easily recognizable and reproduced. These multiple meanings evolving out of invented traditions were a convergence of popular sentiments about Native Americans in white society. Secondly, the origin of the moniker was not easily traced to a concrete referential point in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Of the four origin points, only those of the Miami Student headline and the Alumni Newsletter are documented. Pittser and Games’ speculation were recollections justified, legitimized, and authenticated over thirty years after production. There is no evidence to support Coach Charles Pittser’s claim nor is their corroborating evidence for Frank Games. No university or student publication used the name “Redskins” until 1933, two years following Games’ graduation and Pittser’s alleged designation. Further, the 1930 Alumni newsletter does not specifically name “Redskins” as the athletic name. In all likelihood, influenced by popular Native American imagery, students probably altered “Big Reds” to “Redskins” during conversation about their sport teams.

The original Miami depiction of the term “Redskin” was accurate in its depiction of the Miami Indian. Men of the Miami tribe were heavily tattooed across the face, chest, arms, and legs. They wore animal skin shirts, leggings, and moccasins during the winter and a breechclout during the summer.⁶³ Importantly, the men wore their hair short with sections loose in front of

⁶² Hobsbawm and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, 9.

⁶³ Anson, *The Miami Indians*, 19.

and behind their ears.⁶⁴ The first depiction used a silhouette image of one of the most famous Miami Indians, Little Turtle. In 1932, however, the freshman handbook, or “M book”, featured the Indian head silhouette alongside the “Scalp Song.” The “Scalp Song” reads in part, “The tribes go forth to war/their scalp-songs ring afar/bright the blood-red camp-fires gleaming/ mad with thirst the war-hawks screaming...”⁶⁵ The vicious imagery evoked in the song combined with the silhouette obviously failed to honor the Miami Tribe. Initiated in 1931 as an “invented tradition,” the silhouette logo achieved institutional status within two short years. The Miami University yearbook, the *Recensio*, acknowledged this status: “Miami University-Athletic teams are known as Redskins, honoring the fierce Tribe Miami Indians of early Ohio history.”⁶⁶ Football players received tomahawk stickers to affix to their helmets to recognize superior athletic achievements.⁶⁷

Miami University was not the only institution to use Indians as logos and nicknames. Syracuse, Arkansas State, Central Michigan, the University of Illinois, Florida State, Stanford, the University of Oklahoma, and Dartmouth also used Indian mascots as symbols of university identity. Thousands of primary and secondary school mascots adopted Chiefs, Indians, Braves, and other monikers to embody sport success in the early 20th century. In the most visible examples, professional baseball teams like Cleveland and Washington used the Indian and “Redskins” to represent their sport.⁶⁸ Representing a contemporary identity with a romanticized image of the past replicate behaviors that conditioned society to one-dimensional images of

⁶⁴ Anson, *The Miami Indians*, 21.

⁶⁵ Miami University, “M Book”, 1933.

⁶⁶ Miami University, *Recensio*, 1933.

⁶⁷ ⁶⁷ Miami University, Miami University and the “Redskins”: An Analysis, 11 March 1993, 9.

⁶⁸ Staurowsky, 90.

Native Americans as fierce and noble savages. These static images combine with elaborate rituals and performances to form a physical presence on the sporting field.

In 1946, as thousands of young men and women returned from war, the physical manifestation of the “Redskin” name and logo was created. The Miami Tomahawk, the student magazine of “campus life” published its first edition in February with sections including “The Chief Says” and “Smoke Signals.”⁶⁹ The Tomahawk acknowledged the centrality of the “Redskin” logo in a tribute to the men returning from war. Franklin McKensie Shanos, class of 1945, published a drawing of three men representing the U.S. Navy, the Army, and the Air Force. A sweater-clad male is situated prominently in the rendering with his “M” letter sweater. An imposing figure positioned slightly behind and above the men rides horse. The figure, a three-dimensional version of the logo, wears only a loincloth. Underneath the image is a four-verse poem that recognizes the emotional events of World War II and their effects on Miami men. Underneath the image is a four-verse poem that recognizes the emotional events of World War II and their effects on Miami men.⁷⁰ By March, the realistic depiction of the Miami Indian had given way to “Off the Reservation,” a regular feature that sported a white man clad in a tuxedo and a Sioux bonnet.⁷¹ The content of the column included gossip as well as commentary on world events. The magazine, in its December issue of the same year, initiated a quest for a literary mascot. The name, “Hiawabop” was contributed by senior John McDowell, who “said the reason why he slapped this collection of letters on [Hiawabop] was because he once knew an Indian whose name was Hiawatha.”⁷² The visual image, a cartoon rendering of the “Redskin”

⁶⁹ Miami University, *Miami Tomahawk* 1, no. 1 (February 1946), 2.

⁷⁰ Miami University, *Miami Tomahawk* 1, no. 1 (February 1946), 6.

⁷¹ Miami University, *Miami Tomahawk* 1, no. 2 (March 1946), 3.

⁷² Miami University, *Miami Tomahawk*, 1, no. 11 (December 1946), 6.

logo featured a short man with a large belly and a loincloth with a block “M” on it. Interestingly, the “Hiawabop” image sported glasses as well as a large hooked nose, a cartoon distinct from the official university logo. The comedic nature of “Hiawabop” intersected with athletics on the October 1948 cover celebrating football victory. “Hiawabop” carried a football and wore a round ribbon proclaiming, “Sun Bowl Champs.”⁷³ He is surrounded by the mascots of the Midwestern Athletic Conference: the University of Dayton, Western Michigan, Case Western Reserve, Marshall University, Ohio University, University of Cincinnati, Xavier University, and Virginia. Collectively, the images of the Miami Tomahawk, demonstrate an increasing sense of irreverence towards Native Americans and the Miami logo specifically.

The growing derision relating to Indian symbols and logos transformed sporting events into expressions of white hegemony. The first sports mascot appeared in the 1954 *Recensio* under the name “Redskin Indian.”⁷⁴ A white male student dressed in the traditional headdress of the Plains Indian, face paint, and a band uniform played the “Redskin Indian”. At this instant, Miami University’s use of the “Redskins” logo and nickname transformed for a legitimate physical embodiment of the Miami Tribe to the contemporary stereotype of Native American identity in the early twentieth century, the Plains Indian. The Plains Indian image as a monolithic image originated from President Thomas Jefferson’s early interest in the paintings of Charles Willson Peale and Charles Balthazer Fevret de Saint-Memin. Each, during their time with the Osage and Pawnee tribes respectively, sent paintings to Jefferson and ultimately furthered the use of the Plains Indian as a national symbol. This achievement is best represented by the Indian-head penny, which became national currency during this time. Seen widely across

⁷³ Miami University, *Miami Tomahawk*, 3, no. 9 (October 1948), cover.

⁷⁴ Miami University, *Recensio*, 1954, 172.

America, the penny and images like it contributed to the growing number of painters, writers, and scholars fascinated with Plains Indians.⁷⁵

The Plains Indian image appeared alongside blackface minstrels in popular culture. Blackface minstrelsy arose in the nineteenth century as entertainment that echoed public sentiment around Native Americans. White men would don black paint and represent their perceptions of black culture. There were multiple meanings within the performance. White Americans appropriated and expressed elements of black culture like music and language thereby celebrating its “folk authenticity.”⁷⁶ At the same time, though, blackface presented emotions, appearances, and relationships in a distinctly white construct wherein racial inequality is inscribed. Today, the negative imagery associated with the cartoon-like performance, according to Historian Eric Lott, “seems a transparently racist curiosity, a form of leisure that, in inventing and ridiculing the slow-witted but irrepressible “plantation darky” and the foppish “northern dandy Negro,” conveniently rationalized racial oppression.”⁷⁷ Lott’s nineteenth century comparisons continued into the twentieth century. In the same way that film depicted blackface minstrelsy, “playing Indian” featured prominently in the movie house.

American film in the early twentieth century celebrated the Wild West. In his analysis of the Western, Berkhofer argues that there were two major portrayals of Native Americans in

⁷⁵ John C. Ewers, “The Emergence of the Plains Indian as the Symbol of the North American Indian,” in *American Indian Stereotypes in the World of Children*, ed. Arlene B Hirschfelder (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1982), 16-32.

⁷⁶ Eric Lott, “Blackface and Blackness: The Minstrel Show in American Culture,” in *Inside the Minstrel Mask: Readings in Nineteenth Century Blackface Minstrelsy*, eds. Annemarie Bean, James V. Hatch, & Brooks McNamara (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1996), 19.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, 3.

Western literature: the savage or the noble savage. In the first portrayal, the Indian was “often crazed, seeking vengeance or just malicious fun at the expense of innocent Whites, especially women.”⁷⁸ Conversely, the noble savage acted loyally and morally to aid white men. Although the Western originated in the late 1840s, its heyday began with the nickelodeons and penny arcades. From *The Great Train Robbery* in 1903 to the Lone Ranger and Tonto in the 1930s, Native Americans or whites playing Indians reinforced the noble savage concept. Philip Deloria explains in *Playing Indian* the underlying motivations behind fluid identities: men and women are able to violate social and cultural mores without fear of repercussions in their ability to escape everyday experience by donning the identity of “exotic” Indian. This masking signals a dual identity wherein rebellion and savagery are embraced thus legitimating white identity. White Americans were civilized creatures whereas Native American identity represented a history of violence and aggression. The act of performance degraded Native American identity by suggesting that savagery was the only “type” of Native American behavior. By “playing Indian” and enacting representations of noble savagery, individuals transcended the boundaries of their own identity. Under the guise of the celebrating Native American identity, men donned costumes and performed elaborate rituals that reinforce and legitimize their identity as virulent, strong men. These costumes and rituals were appropriate during the limited time of the performance. Once ended, the actor and the filmgoers were expected to leave the theatre and return to his place within society taking the images of conquest with them. By “playing Indian,” white men were able to enact exotic representations of the other while confirming their own whiteness and male identity. “Redskin Indian” performed dances, beat a drum, carried a spear

⁷⁸ Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, 98.

and generally encouraged fan participation at sporting events.⁷⁹ By assuming this role, in the words of C. Richard King and Charles Fruehling Springwood, noted anthropologists, “Redskin Indian” and other sports mascots like him “allow[ed] white America to primitively reimagine itself as a partial embodiment of Indianness” that validated “the formation of a “shared” American consciousness.”⁸⁰

Mascots, like blackface minstrelsy, were intentionally chosen to evoke a romantic past that stereotyped actual African-American and Indian identity. Iconography from paintings, literature, theatre, and film vaulted onto the sports field. From the establishment of the university name to the creation of a sports mascot, the intent of the university had been to justify territorial conquest and settlement by aligning their identity with a romanticized, sanitized past that simultaneously appropriated and erased Native American inhabitants who had previously occupied the land. The prevalence of Native American imagery on film translated into the intense fascination by several generations of individuals with Native American culture. The Boy Scouting movement, which began at the turn of the century, inculcated thousands of young men with stereotypical portrayals of Indian identity. From the war bonnet, pow-wow, and nature trips, the young men who attended Miami participated in disseminating cultural ignorance.

In his book, *American Historical Pageantry*, scholar David Glassberg relates public rituals such as historical plays, pageants, and by extension sporting events to belief in future progress. “Its [historical pageantry’s] combination of elite, popular, and ethnic cultural forms depicting images of a “common” past would break down social and cultural barriers between local residents, triggering the release of their underlying emotions and the revitalization of their

⁷⁹ Robert Schmidt, Miami University Archivist, February 2001.

⁸⁰ King, *Team Spirits*, 8-9.

overarching civic commitments.”⁸¹ Through the pageantry of “Redskin Indian” Miami University’s continued portrayal of a shared past with the Miami tribe functioned as a way to encourage a uniform loyalty to the institution and its educational goals.

Combined, these constructions-- the logo, the mascot “Redskin Indian,” and “Hiawabop”-- all function as symbols of authenticity and power. Richard Handler, in an article entitled “Authenticity” attributes the use of cultural constructs, like the Miami symbols, to a Western notion of authenticity that replaces the ideal of individual sincerity.⁸² Authenticity, Handler argues, is a construct that is “original to its possessors, [and] exists only with them...”⁸³ Miami University students and fans did not possess Native American identity; rather they appropriated it as a way to reaffirm their identity in a rapidly changing world. Tying illegitimate representations of Native Americans to sports mascots allowed Miami University to legitimate its own collective identity by projecting “Indianness” through its portrayal of the Miami. In reality, the images and behaviors of community members depersonalized the actual and replaced Indians with a carefully constructed perception of cultural difference.

The use of “Redskins” nickname and silhouette capitalized on conventional white beliefs about Native American identity. Miami University had, until 1954, presented a coherent, physically accurate portrayal of the Miami Indians. With the creation of the literary icon “Hiawabop,” the “Redskin Indian” and the mascot “Hiawabop,” Miami University no longer attempted to provide an accurate representation of Miami Indian identity. In privileging white stereotypes of Native American, the University positioned itself as culturally uninformed. The

⁸¹ David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 284.

⁸² Richard Handler, “Authenticity,” *Anthropology Today* 2 (1), February 1986.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 2.

ignorance of the University about the effects of these portrayals would, in the latter part of the twentieth century, lead to controversy and change.

Inauthentic Representations and Sports Controversy

In the late twentieth century, Miami University actively confronted its invented traditions that furthered the noble savage stereotype. The inauthentic mascot and the stereotypical representation of the logo were evaluated as part of a larger trend in American culture that challenged social, political, ethnic, and gendered inequalities. Even as Miami University worked to mediate concerns over white hegemony and authenticity, in reality, it repositioned popular culture stereotypes of the 1920s and 30s as commercialized symbols of inauthentic Indian identity.

Miami University through late 1950s and early 1960s remained at its core a conservative university that was dedicated to indoctrinating middle class men and women with specific gender roles. Sports functioned as a liminal space that allowed men to enact physical confrontations within regulated structures. The “Redskin Indian” mascot dancing and drumming at Miami University dictated physical space to enact racial stereotypes. The mascot allowed white students to reinforce individual and university identity through sport victory. Sports and the mascot privileged male gendered behaviors that contributed to power hierarchies. Although female athletes were still members of “Tribe Miami,” they were largely ignored in the construction of these sporting mascots. Importantly though, all logos and portrayals were created and played by a white Miami student.

Sports arenas through were not the only spaces engaged in disseminating gendered relationships at Miami University. During World War II, a temporary student center was used as a gathering space for students on campus to receive information relating to the ongoing war effort. The building, named “The Redskin Reservation” by these students, functioned a

community space that included eating establishments and study rooms.⁸⁴ A squaw, or female Indian, was drawn in cartoon for the ladies restroom door with a brave painted on the men's.⁸⁵ With the end of the war and the increased enrollment due to the G.I. Bill, a permanent student center was erected and named, the "University Center." For the students on campus, that building was a new "Res" and maintained many of the same symbols including cartoon depiction of Native Americans.⁸⁶

Trends in the American economy influenced the explosion of spending power. Historian Charles C. Alexander argued in "Affluence and Anxiety" that the main factors behind the economic prosperity of the nation were increased public spending, the use of private credit, and emergence of service industries.⁸⁷ The escalation of American commercialism originated in the 1930s and 1940s under Roosevelt's New Deal. The explosion of bureaucracy mandated by Roosevelt created new agencies to oversee social programs that would benefit the lower and middle-classes. Programs like social security, unemployment compensation and veteran's benefits encouraged the mobilization of the middle class into a consumer force by the late 1940s. The economic developments of the 1950s by extension assisted in the creation of suburbs as well as the sudden increase in mass media outlets. Mass media elucidated the commercial preoccupations of middle class America with its own identity. The accumulation of material goods became an indicator of social hierarchies. A college education functioned as a sign of affluence for middle class whites. At Miami University, prosperity translated into a sense of

⁸⁴ Philip R. Shriver, *A Personal History*, 202.

⁸⁵ Miami University, *Recensio*, 1954, 231.

⁸⁶ Shriver, *A Personal History*, 202.

⁸⁷ Charles C. Alexander, *Holding the Line: The Eisenhower Era, 1952-1961* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1975), 89.

isolation that separated college students from the growing economic disparities among social and ethnic classes.

In 1950s America, while the white middle-class individuals flourished, minorities faced increased discrimination. During World War II, thousands of African-American men enlisted in support of the United States overseas. They fought to sustain the values and beliefs of democracy and freedom. Upon their return to the US, though, African-Americans were denied the equal rights and access granted to their white counterparts. The movement for African-American equality was spearheaded by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). In 1954, *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* shattered the legal segregation of African-Americans in education. The Supreme Court declared that the “separate yet equal” doctrine advanced in 1896’s *Plessy v. Ferguson* was unconstitutional. All public institutions were required to integrate “with all deliberate speed.”⁸⁸ *Brown v. Board of Education* initiated the larger Civil Rights Movement of the late 1950s and early 1960s. The Montgomery Bus Boycott in December 1955 had over 50,000 participants who avoided the Alabama transit system as a way to force equal seating arrangements and access. Sit-ins and protests across the American South brought national media attention to the plight of African-Americans. Mainstream America viewed images of violence and degradation during the evening news. . Twenty-five thousand Native American veterans, who experienced the same isolation in society, shared the sense of frustration of African-Americans. “One young veteran wrote, “I was

⁸⁸ U.S. Supreme Court, *Brown versus Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. 344 U.S. 141; 73 S. Ct. 124.

good enough to fight for my country, I am good enough to own property and support my family.”⁸⁹

College students formed an integral part of the protest movement in the late 1960s.

University President Philip Shriver described the atmosphere of the early 1960s:

When we first came the fraternities would dress in their different outfits... They would have hats, straw hats, and all of them would go up [to town] together wearing their straw hats. When you went out on campus you heard singing everywhere... it was an atmosphere that I would call an atmosphere of joy and lightheartedness. A sense that the weight of the world was not on the shoulders of each teenager, each college student.⁹⁰

At Miami University, the protest movements of the sixties took shape in a growing disillusionment with the rules associated with being a college student. The idea that one could shape the future chafed against the strict regulations about opposite-sex visiting hours, curfews, and vocal protest. Students found solace in the new Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). SNCC, along with the Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), banded together forming a core constituency of young men and women willing to challenge the status quo. At the same time, the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley spread to Oxford, Ohio. Students challenged university administrators. Students in jackets and hats singing proudly became protesters lamenting the lack of personal freedom. President Lyndon B. Johnson recognized the importance of the college students of America in his 1964 address at the University of Michigan:

For better or for worse, your generation has been appointed by history to deal with those problems [urban revitalization, environmental concerns, and education] and to lead America toward a new age... So, will you join in the battle to give every citizen the full

⁸⁹ A. K. Wiley to Harry S. Truman, 6 August 1946, Indian Claims Commission Papers, box 6-AA, Harry S. Truman Presidential Library, in *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy 1945-1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986),

⁹⁰ Philip R. Shriver, interview by author, Miami University, February 2002.

equality which God enjoins and the law requires, whatever his belief, or race, or the color of his skin?⁹¹

Johnson acknowledged the battle for racial equality that was waged by individuals and the government alike.

The relationship with the Miami Tribe on the part of the university was derivative of the increased interest in minority experiences. Miami University-- its students, faculty, and staff-- recognized that in an era that gave rise to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and liberation movements, racial, political, and social oppression existed on the campus. Western College for Women, a female academy situated on the outskirts of the Miami University campus, hosted the SNCC 1964 voter training. During Freedom Summer, hundreds of young men and women came to Oxford to learn not only how to register black voters in the South but also how to defend themselves against physical aggression. From Selma, Alabama, to Oxford, Ohio the impetus behind racial equality grew stronger. Native American issues, though, remained largely ignored in mainstream America until the late 1960s.

The American Indian Movement (AIM) formed in July 1968 to provide economic, political, and social support for the “red” population.⁹² Specifically, AIM formed to counter the effects of the federal programs of the 1930s, 40s, and 50s: the reclamation of Indian lands and relocation. “Between 1945 and 1960 the government processed 109 cases of termination affecting 1,369,000 acres of Indian land and estimated 12,000 Indians.”⁹³ In this process

⁹¹ Lyndon B. Johnson, “Remarks at the University of Michigan, May 22, 1964.” Available from:

<http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/johnson/archives.hom/speeches.hom/640522.asp>.

⁹² Peter Mattheissen, *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse* (New York: Penguin Books, 1992), 34.

⁹³ Donald L. Fixico, *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy 1945-1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986), 183.

implemented by the federal government, the supervisory relationship established at the turn of the century was dissolved. The federal government purchased these individual and tribal lands and subsequently Indians moved into urban areas. The social activism associated with the movement lent itself to large-scale political cohesion agitating for jobs, housing, and educational access. Termination and relocation fashioned a dual problem for Native Americans. First, the remaining lands and reservations still faced impoverishment with a lack of federal aid. Secondly, Indians part of the relocation movement were forced into urban schools and society and dealt with extreme social segregation. AIM, led by Dennis Banks, created a political superstructure to lobby local, state, and federal governments on behalf of Native Americans. Using strategies pioneered in the Civil Rights Movement, AIM functioned as a both a violent and non-violent organization. These early socio-political forays led to a program of re-education wherein AIM worked to revise American history to include Native American culture.

The increasing interest in racial equality including the AIM movement ushered in a group of scholars devoted to minority history. Hamilton, Ohio resident and writer George Standafer visited the Miami Indian Reservation in Oklahoma to investigate life on the reservation in 1961.⁹⁴ Standafer, having recently completed a narrative on the Miami-Erie Canal, questioned the specific effects of the AIM movement on the Miami Indians. During his visit to Oklahoma, Standafer met Chief Forest Olds. Olds and Standafer began a friendship that moved from Oklahoma to Ohio. Olds came to the Miami Valley and in the course of his visit was introduced Miami University. The initial campus visit resulted in the formal recognition of a relationship between the University and the Tribe in the early 1970s.

⁹⁴ Raymond Standafer, "Letter to President Shriver, Miami University Archives, Ready-reference file: Mascot.

Miami University, for the first time, attempted to establish relations with the Oklahoma tribe. The impetus behind the formal relationship was not only the changing cultural awareness of the time but also the growing concern over Native Americans stereotypes. According to Shriver:

Students began to question [the use of the “Redskins” name] and in the early 1970s [the university] asked the tribe. And the tribe responded there’s no problem as long as you revere the name, honor the name, take pride in the name, it’s no problem. It’s when you derogate the name, are ashamed of it, look down on it, that we are concerned.⁹⁵

Standafer expressed his concern over the inauthentic mascot considering the recently acknowledged relationship between the Miami tribe and the university. The “Redskin Indian” combined with Tomahawk’s literary icon, “Hiawabop” in the early 1960s to form a more elaborate mascot, “Hiawabop.” The 1960s mascot no longer wore a band uniform. Instead, “Hiawabop” dressed in a fringed loincloth and headdress. The physical performance of Native American identity brought attention to the growing dissonance in American culture about stereotypes.

Viewing performances encouraged faculty and students to evaluate the message of the “Redskin” name, logo, and “Hiawabop.” Professor George Fathauer brought his concerns to The Miami Student. He argued that the increasing insurgency relating to Native American issues demanded the university evaluate its use of an Indian logo and mascot. Shriver responded to Fathauer’s concern, which was supported by the Student Affairs Council and Student Senate, by soliciting the opinion of the Miami Tribe’s General Council in 1972 about the name “Redskin.” The Miami Tribe responded to this tension stating:

⁹⁵ Philip R. Shriver, interview by author, Miami University, February 2002.

It is our [the Miami peoples] council that the name Redskins is a revered and honored name in the eyes and hearts of the people of Miami University, and that it signifies to them as to us the qualities of courage, self-discipline, respect, kindness, honesty, and love exemplified by generations of young athletes, therefore know all peoples, that we of Miami blood are proud to have the name Miami Redskin carried with honor by the athletic representation of Miami University... We, the Miami Redskins of Indian blood, and our namesake, the Miami University Redskins, have a mutual and cherished heritage...⁹⁶

This resolution, passed in 1972, was problematic for three reasons. First, the name “Redskin” was not revered and honored by Miami University. It was adopted precisely because it embodied the image of a savage people. Secondly, the Miami tribe did not, at this time, project one collective identity. During the 1840 removal, portions of the tribe had settled in Indiana, Illinois, and eastern Oklahoma. More importantly, members of the tribe chose to, or were forced to, assimilate into white society prior to the 1970s. The U.S. government under the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act recognized that Native American tribes were informal corporations that could maintain individual charters, laws, and membership rolls. The impetus behind the Indian Reorganization Act was the realization that the assimilation effort of the 1920s and 30s had failed to create an inclusive society. In reality, according to Native American historian Frederick Hoxie, “missionaries and school teachers failed to stamp out tribal languages and ceremonies.”⁹⁷ Thus, the sixty-nine respondents just quoted spoke only for those who remained on tribal rolls after 100 years and supported this use of the term “Redskin.” To imply that Miami University and the Miami tribe had a “mutual and cherished heritage” in the Ohio Valley was blatantly false.

⁹⁶ Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, “September 9, 1972 resolution”, Miami University Archives.

⁹⁷ Hoxie, 243.

The legitimization of the “Redskin” name by the Miami Tribe temporarily placated student and community concerns and allowed Miami University a chance to investigate the effect of the term “Redskins.” The Ad Hoc Committee wrote:

there is an increasing militancy, especially among young Indians, over what is felt to be historic and unfeeling exploitation of Indians by the non-Indian population. As part of this militancy, some Indian spokesmen have called attention to and denounced in vigorous terms the gratuitous usage by white institutions (particularly athletic teams) of Indian names.⁹⁸

The Committee’s concern over the “militancy” of young Indians referenced the seizure of Alcatraz Island in November 1969 by a group of Indians, the “Trail of Broken Treaties,” and the siege at Wounded Knee, South Dakota in 1973. The two-year occupation of Alcatraz Island brought media attention to the plight of all Native Americans and forced the federal government to create policies that actively combated the racial divide. Federal troops surrounded a portion of the Pine Ridge Reservation at Wounded Knee in 1973 to prohibit an AIM press conference. During the seventy-one day blockade, AIM members were isolated without supplies and access to the media.⁹⁹ The violent confrontation between AIM and U.S. troops, the Federal Bureau of Investigations, and Bureau of Indian Affairs Police resulted in one death. In the three years following over 69 Native American individuals were killed in confrontations on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

The awareness of the social injustices of the 1970s challenged power hierarchies and exacerbated the Native American issues by questioning institutional and governmental authority.

The events of the 1970s awakened Americans to a growing sense of anger towards the federal

⁹⁸ Miami University, “Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate the University’s Identification with the Miami Indians and with the use of the term “Redskins,” 29 August 1972. Miami University Archives.

⁹⁹ Ward Churchill, “Renegades, Terrorists, and Revolutionaries: The Government’s Propaganda War Against the American Indian Movement,” in *Native American Voices*, ed. Susan Lobo and Steve Talbot (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2001), 220.

government. The Civil Rights Movement, the AIM movement, and American involvement overseas in Vietnam effectively destroyed the sense of confidence Americans had held in the 1950s. With images of death and destruction at the dinner table, the platitudes of the federal government concerning the involvement overseas rang hollow. In 1970, 720 colleges and universities ceased operations due to concern over student protests and violence. In Oxford, students hosted sit-ins at the Naval ROTC building as well as a “flush-in” that emptied the city’s reservoir. The cumulative effects of these events and the conscious raising led to a debate on the “Redskin” logo and “Hiawabop” mascot:

I think the Vietnam War caused a lot of inward searching about customs, habits, and nicknames. And people began to ask would you adopt the name yellow-skin if you had a Chinese mascot? Or black-skin with an African-American. And the response was always, well redskin has been with us 200 years, it’s not something that’s been newly coined...¹⁰⁰

Importantly, Shriver located the invented tradition of the “Redskin” not to 1928 but instead to the original founding of the university in 1809. Miami University suspended the use of “Hiawabop” at football games in response to AIM complaints about sports mascots in 1975 and 1976. They revived the portrayal in January of 1977 when the Miami Tribe agreed to help create a new mascot. Miami University replaced “Hiawabop” with “Chief Miami,” an approved representation of the Miami Indians.¹⁰¹ Mascot and fan behavior played an important role in the Miami University shift from “Hiawabop” to “Chief Miami.” The eclectic Indian garb, coupled with the “war cry” and “tomahawk chop” impressed on fans the idea of violent aggressive Miami Indians. “Hiawabop” rode a horse during the opening of the games as well as during halftime.

¹⁰⁰ Philip R. Shriver, interview by author, Miami University, February 2002.

¹⁰¹ Miami University, “Miami University and the “Redskins”: An Analysis,” Office of the Student Body President, 11 March 1993, 11.

The cheerleading squad and the football team accompanied him and mimicked the behavior of the mascot. Fans responded by painting their faces, donning feather headdresses, and imitating the mascot. However, Chief Miami remained inaccurate. Although the portrayal has tribe “approval and training” the white student is still “playing Indian” and perpetuating stereotypes. In many instances, student responses include inappropriate behavior like the tomahawk chop.

The move to reposition the mascot as a legitimate Indian identity functioned as a way to mediate concerns over derogatory images of Native Americans. The tribe donated genuine buckskin regalia described as “fancy dancer”, which included a headpiece and the two feather bustles.¹⁰² In a weeklong visit to Miami, Oklahoma Senior Wayne Breakfield studied Miami dancing and pow-wow rituals. For the first time since the university adopted Indian logos and the mascot, the physical representation was close to actual Miami Indian appearance. Included in the donation was an offer by the Miami Tribe to train “Chief Miami” about the appropriate dances and behaviors associated with role.¹⁰³ Contrary to previous student portrayals, a Native American descendant played “Chief Miami.” In press releases by the University, this fact was prominently highlighted along with the training received by the student from the Miami Tribe. Despite these attempts to address issues of authenticity and Native American identity, “Chief Miami” still perpetuated stereotypes of the noble savage by portraying one type of Native American identity.

Fan culture forms an integral piece of the discussion of sports mascots. Cultural theorist Lawrence Grossberg argues in *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media* that fans and the images they see are constantly being repositioned. “For the fan, certain forms of popular culture become taken for granted, even necessary investments. The result is that, for the fan,

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Miami University, “Chief Miami Debuts Today”, 27 January 1977.

specific cultural contexts become saturated with affect...The fan gives authority to that which he or she invests in, letting the object of such investments speak for and as him or her self.”¹⁰⁴ Miami University and its fans believed in the identity of “Hiawabop.” He could inspire feats of greatness on the part of the athletes and the audience. Grossberg, although correct in the relational qualities of fandom, neglects the power hierarchies among fans. He argues that fans are empowered by popular culture. They can escape into popular culture and have positive experiences. Popular culture is not an escape for everyone. Instead it reaffirms power hierarchies of race and gender. In effect, the mascot has multiple meanings between audience members. The relationship between the mascot and fan works on an individual and collective level. Every fan sees the same image but each individual relates to the image differently. Individual response can then vary over time. For some Native Americans mascot images degrade and make them feel powerless and ashamed. For mascot supporters the image instills pride. Stereotypical images then communicate contradictory emotions.

Stereotypes of marginalized identities effect adult and youth viewers. Bill Yellowtail, a Dartmouth student who worked to change the school’s mascot, questions the perceptions of youth. “I’ve often wondered to myself if the people who owned these teams ever stopped to think what goes through the mind of a 10-year old Indian kid on a reservation in North Dakota when he picks up a sports page and reads a headline, ‘Redskins Scalp Chiefs?’”¹⁰⁵ The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the Indian Health Board, and the United States

¹⁰⁴ Lawrence Grossberg, “The Affective Sensibility of Fandom,” in *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media*, ed. Lisa A. Lewis (New York: Routledge Press, 1992), 59.

¹⁰⁵ Marty Ralbovsky, “An Indian Affair: America Indian Students Concerned about Nicknames, Mascots in Sports,” in *American Indian Stereotypes in the World of Children*, ed. Arlene B. Hirschfelder (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1982), 213.

Department of Justice have all found a link between derogatory images and mental and physical health. Native Americans have the lowest high school graduation rates than any ethnic group.¹⁰⁶ Substance abuse, including alcoholism and drug abuse, is 500 percent higher than the United States average.¹⁰⁷ Indians are two and a half times more likely to be a victim of violent crime. Over half of the time their attackers are white.¹⁰⁸ In a survey of the readers of *Indian Country Today*, the leading newspaper on Native American issues, seventy-three percent of the respondents indicated that “American Indian mascots create a racially hostile educational environment.”¹⁰⁹

Universities like Miami University and Stanford, in the 1970s, recognized the inappropriate comedic Native American representations and instituted guidelines to guard against such behavior. Across America, institutions faced the same tension between authenticity and stereotyping. At Dartmouth, the Indians became the “Big Green,” while the Stanford Indians became the “Cardinal.” Syracuse’s “Chief Bill Orange” was retired one year after the invented tradition behind the mascot was revealed as fiction. Editor of the student newspaper, Seaman Jacobs created the “alleged discovery of archeological remains” to facilitate university

¹⁰⁶ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Statement on the Use of Native American Images and Nicknames* (April 2001), 1.

¹⁰⁷ Philip A. May, “The Epidemiology of Alcohol Abuse among American Indians,” in *Native American Voices*, ed. Susan Lobo and Steve Talbot (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2001), 437.

¹⁰⁸ Carol Spindel, *Dancing at Halftime: Sports and the Controversy over American Indian Mascots* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 16.

¹⁰⁹ *Indian Country Today*, 27 August 2001, 1.

identity.¹¹⁰ Arkansas State University's Runnin' Joe, and Florida State University's Seminoles faced challenges by Native American activist groups based on the use of Indian images as sports mascots. The increasing concern by Native American groups in the 1980s was derived from two factors. First, AIM worked to restore traditional ways of life and religious belief. This movement bolstered concern over representations of Native Americans in popular culture and by the early 1980s encouraged the massive re-examination of stereotypes. Secondly, the dire financial and living conditions experienced by many Native American groups created a groundswell of grassroots political movements that challenged stereotypes in popular culture.

The media of the late 1980s embraced Native American mascots as representative of a larger problem: social equality. The University of Illinois became the centerpiece of the media frenzy. Graduate Student Charlene Teters, arriving in Illinois in 1989, was dismayed to see the proliferation of comedic images surrounding the university mascot, "Chief Illiniwek."¹¹¹ Teters, a Spokane Indian, was advised by friends to ignore the mascot. Attending a basketball game in 1988, though, Teters viewed the mascot through the eyes of young children, who acted ashamed of their Spokane heritage during Chief Illiniwek's performance. Those moments of shame, Teters argued, spurred her to protest at sporting events carrying a placard that read, "American Indians are human beings not mascots."¹¹² Local media televised the protest, which initiated

¹¹⁰ Donald M. Fisher, "Chief Bill Orange and the Saltine Warrior," in *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascots Controversy*, ed. C. Richard King and Charles Fruehling Springwood (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 34-35.

¹¹¹ *In Whose Honor? American Indian Mascots in Sports*, prod. Jay Rosenstein, 47 min., New Day Films, 1997, videocassette.

¹¹² *In Whose Honor? American Indian Mascots in Sports*, prod. Jay Rosenstein, 47 min., New Day Films, 1997, videocassette.

response from AIM and the local community. AIM believed Teters and the Chief Illiniwek issue could bring attention to the ongoing battle for Native American rights.¹¹³ Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, the University of Illinois stressed the intent behind the mascot: to honor. The community was largely divided. For every supportive letter Teters received, a negative response was given. The debate, however, expanded to a national level when AIM supported Suzan Shown Harjo in her suit against the Washington Redskins.

The children of the 1960s and 1970s matured into a group of people in the 1980s concerned with fair treatment, power, and equality. As a result of these interests in 1988, the Michigan Civil Rights Commission set the precedent that redefined the issue of Native American sports mascots across the nation. In effect, the Commission decided that the use of all nicknames, logos, and mascots depicting Native Americans were in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and thus all institutions receiving state funding were to immediately cease usage of these items.¹¹⁴ The 1964 legislation stated, “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.”¹¹⁵ Michigan’s decision influenced the Minnesota State Board of Education who called for the removal of all “mascots, emblems, or symbols depicting American Indian culture

¹¹³ Carol Spindel, *Dancing at Halftime: Sports and the Controversy over American Indian Mascots* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 142.

¹¹⁴ Michigan Civil Rights Commission, “Report on the Use of Nicknames, Logos, and Mascots Depicting Native American People in Michigan Education Institutions,” Michigan Department of Civil Rights, October 1988.

¹¹⁵ U.S. Congress, *Civil Rights Act of 1964*, Title VI.

or race.”¹¹⁶ The individual state decisions based on civil rights legislation could only suggest change within their domain. Attempting to enact change across the nation, Native American activist groups brought suit against the most visible example of racial stereotyping, the Washington Redskins professional football team.

Merchandising and trademarks were central to the court challenge issued in *Harjo et al. v. Pro Football, Inc.*¹¹⁷ Suzan Shown Harjo, president of the Morning Star Institute, a Washington D.C. based Indian-right group, and six other prominent Native Americans petitioned the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office for “the cancellation of federal registrations for “Redskins,” “Redskinettes” (their cheerleaders), and associated names of the team in the nation’s capital” under the Trademark Act of 1946, more commonly referred to as the Lanham Act.¹¹⁸ It reads in part:

No trademark by which the goods of the applicant may be distinguished from the goods of others shall be refused registration on the principal register on account of its nature unless it: a) Consists of or comprises immoral, deceptive, or scandalous matter; or matter which may disparage or falsely suggest a connection with persons, living or dead, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into contempt, or disrepute...¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ National Congress of American Indians, “Timeline of Change,” 2. Available from: www.ncai.org

¹¹⁷ Suzan Shown Harjo, “Fighting Name-Calling: Challenging “Redskins” in Court, in *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascots Controversy*, ed. C. Richard King and Charles Fruehling Springwood (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 189.

¹¹⁸ Suzan Shown Harjo, “Fighting Name-Calling: Challenging “Redskins” in Court, in *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascots Controversy*, ed. C. Richard King and Charles Fruehling Springwood (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 189.

¹¹⁹ *Lanham Act*, U.S. Code, vol. 15, sec. 1052 (1934).

Harjo et al. argued that the continued use of the offensive trademark had negative effects on the welfare of Native Americans. The “Redskins” name first appeared in professional football in 1933 in Boston, Massachusetts. After moving to Washington in 1937, the Boston Redskins became the Washington Redskins. First registered by Washington in 1967, the name and logo were used prominently in the National Football League (NFL) merchandising through the 1970s and 1980s. Names and logos can be trademarked under Lanham thereby controlling the reproduction and dissemination of the text. In other words, federal registration gives power to the author to create a cultural hierarchy. Only those who are legitimate in the eyes of the originator can claim physical and emotional rights to the text. In the case of the “Redskins” name and logo, Harjo alleged that continued use of “Redskins” and its variations would substantially benefit team owners while simultaneously degrading Native American image and culture.

The sale of goods that bear the sports logos are a multi-million dollar business of which Native American tribes received no percentage. T-shirts, hats, coats, mugs, pennants, foodstuffs, bumper stickers and even license plates appeared with the “Redskins” logo. Pro Football, Inc defended themselves based on thirteen affirmative premises. Specifically, the use of the “Redskins” name was not inflammatory or damaging to Native Americans, the plaintiffs were not the group of Native Americans who had legal standing, and that the amount of time elapsed since the trademark registration invalidated any suit. The U.S. Patent and Trade Office rejected Pro Football’s defense and ultimately decided to cancel the “Redskins” trademark April 2, 1999.¹²⁰ The national media attention received by Harjo et al. v. Pro Football, Inc. spurred the

¹²⁰ Suzan Shown Harjo, “Fighting Name-Calling: Challenging “Redskins” in Court, in *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascots Controversy*, ed. C. Richard King and Charles Fruehling Springwood (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 205.

Portland Oregonian, the Washington Post, and the Washington D.C. radio stations, WASH and WTOP to cease all use of the derogatory Native American terms including “Redskins.”¹²¹ It also created a growing network of media outlets, activist organizations, individuals, and state and federal institutions that supported the end of Native American sports mascots.

Miami University, once secure in its use of “Chief Miami,” faced increased pressure from Native American activists, faculty, students, and community from 1989 to 1996. In April of 1991, the Miami University Faculty Conference recommended to University Senate Executive Committee Chair Susan Kay that complete removal of all references to Indian peoples as mascots. Included in their recommendations was the implementation of an educational program about Native Americans because, “for one people to use another as a mascot is arrogant and contradicts Miami’s commitment to cultural diversity.”¹²² The Miami Student Editorial Board argued in March 1991 and again the next year that “Redskin” should be eliminated as the mascot. Miami President Paul Risser, following former President Shriver’s example, sought the counsel of the Miami Tribe about the use of “Chief Miami” by sending a university delegation to Miami, Oklahoma. This was unique because most institutions were not directly affiliated with an actual tribe. The “mutual and cherished heritage” of the two groups created an avenue for Miami to legitimate its name and mascot by receiving tribe approval. Chief Floyd Leonard encouraged an open discussion between Miami University and the Tribe in all matters relating to the term “Redskin” and all performances related to this nickname.¹²³ The Miami Tribe wrote, “the Tribe

¹²¹ National Congress of American Indians, “Timeline of Change,” 2. Available from: www.ncai.org

¹²² Robert Zwirn to Susan Kay, 10 April 1991, in “The Redskins Analysis,” Miami University, Office of the Student Body, 11 March 1993, 14.

¹²³ Miami University, Office of the Student Body, 11 March 1993, “The Redskins Analysis,” 12.

feels this is a University decision and respects the ability of University officials to reach a decision on this issue...¹²⁴ Miami's attempt to authenticate its usage of the "Redskin" name failed due to the Tribe's neutral stance. With the amplified public pressure, Risser and the Ad Hoc committee appointed to discuss the mascot issue suggested a change of "Redskins" mascot back to "Tribe Miami" and urged the discontinuance of "Chief Miami."¹²⁵ During the next eight months, Miami University faculty, staff, students, and community members offered their own opinions on the change. The Office of the Student Body President traced the origins of the mascots and offered a sixteen-page critique of the University presentation of the "Redskins." It argued:

We cannot celebrate diversity on the one hand and scream racial slurs on the other. The point is not that anyone does anything intentionally racial when they scream "Redskins" or when they wear a t-shirt that says "Miami Redskins." It is, though, that some people may hear that as a racial slur. It may be a prospective student. It may be a potential employer of one of our graduates...It is no longer acceptable to expect others to read what is in our hearts or minds when we use certain language. Rather we must make sure that our behavior- speech, visual signals, etc.- are consistent with what we want people to understand about us.¹²⁶

Miami University moved to cement ties with the Miami Tribe even further by instituting a "Miami Indian Scholarship" and the "Miami Indian Rooms."

The scholarship program initiated July 31, 1991 by President Risser provoked conversation in and of itself. According to the policy, the University supports up to five students who are documented members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma including instructional fee

¹²⁴ Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, "Untitled memo on "Redskins" mascot," 13 April 1993, Miami University Archives.

¹²⁵ Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, "Statement of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma with respect to the term "Redskins," 23 April 1993, Miami University Archives.

¹²⁶ Miami University, Office of the Student Body President, "Miami University and the "Redskins": An Analysis," 11 March 1993, 15.

waivers and out-of-state tuition, with other need-based financial aid available. Miami University enrollment topped over 10,000 students and only 5 spots were allocated to descendants of the Miami Tribe. If Miami University was so proud of the Native American heritage that the “Redskin” mascot was supposed to represent why limit the enrollment figure to less than one percent of the student body? The Indian Scholarships, known as the Miami Heritage Award, fails to recognize the settlement patterns of the Miami Tribe during federal removal. It does not address the issue of Indiana Miami enrollment nor does it target other Native American groups. The Miami Indian Rooms also represent a further effort to tighten ties to the Miami Tribe. In the Philip Shriver Center, formerly known as the “Reservation”, two rooms were set aside to display Native American artifacts. Between the two rooms, displays include the seals of both Miami University and the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, prints of the John Ruthven portraits of the Miami Indians, and various re-prints of important Miami Chiefs. These rooms, though, have dual functions. The Admissions Office appropriated one room for presentations and the remaining room was remodeled to make room for a student study area.¹²⁷ The ceremonial buckskin dress sits in a glass case outside of both rooms with a brief paragraph describing its uses.

In short, the University repositioned tradition and authenticity by instituting “Chief Miami,” initiating dialogue with the Miami Tribe, creating scholarships, and delineating physical space for Miami Tribe artifacts. Authenticity was derived, for the first time, by the presence of Native Americans on campus, whether students or Miami Tribe delegates. This presented conflicting images of Miami Indians and Native Americans in the larger culture. As a sports mascot, “Chief Miami” bred loyalty to the institution and to constructions of noble savagery. Opening dialogue with contemporary Miami Indians should have encouraged an evaluation of

¹²⁷ Ibid.

the projected stereotype of the mascot. Were Miami Indians to be observed from behind glass walls, followed into battle on the sports field, or talked to in classrooms? The university community, however, continued to perpetuate one-dimensional static images of a romanticized past.

The storm of controversy following the University's decision to remove the mascot ignited students, faculty, community members, and the media. Students like Todd Weaver understood the controversy as a problematic representation of a contemporary identity:

If we [Miami University] wish to be seen as a top-notch university, the use of a racially offensive mascot is not a prudent way to carry on. The most striking and serious need for improvement at Miami is more diversity on this campus, both in its population and its thinking. Yet, it would seem that it would be difficult to draw a more diverse student body with a mascot that offends a minority group. What kind of image does this exhibit? How do we want to be seen?¹²⁸

Weaver recognized the goals of the university community, to educate and diversify, and then noted how the mascot tradition reifies false identities. Diversity had, and continues to be, a key word in the Miami University community. Miami University in the mid-1990s encouraged minority enrollment and instituted various committees to study ways to increase enrollment. Culminating in 1997 with the "Diversity Plan", Miami University acknowledged the role sports mascots have in defining university identity. Further, the University and its students recognized the effect of ethnic and racial stereotypes in a place where:

The mission of Miami University is to preserve, add to, evaluate, and transmit the accumulated knowledge of the centuries; to develop critical thinking, extend the frontiers of knowledge, and serve society; and to provide an environment conducive to effective and inspired teaching and learning, promote professional development of faculty, and encourage scholarly research and creativity of faculty and students. Miami's primary concern is its students...Miami is committed to serve the community, state, and nation. It

¹²⁸ Todd Weaver, "Scalp the Redskin," *Arena*, 11 November 1992.

offers access to higher education, including continuing education, for those who can benefit from it, at a reasonable cost, without regard to race, creed, sex or age.¹²⁹

The perception of the “Redskins” mascot as negative was not consistent. University President James Garland acknowledged, “with regard to the term “Redskin,” it has been used with honor and respect. There is no need to apologize, but we need to recognize the need for change. Trustee William Gunlock declared, “I am a graduate of Miami. I played guard here 1947-1951 and was a coach for ten years. I will always be a “Redskin.”¹³⁰ Miami Student Debbie Haney wrote:

For a final project in [Educational Leadership] 204, a cultural studies course for education majors, our group studied the controversy concerning the university’s position on changing its nickname. We studied the Redskin logo, and feel that it symbolizes both the tradition of the school, which is important to its students, and a sense of history with the Miami Indian tribe. This is a mascot which does not mock, but shows pride. Miami is unique in identifying with a real group as our mascot, a group that is dignified and strong. The name “Redskins” is a positive statement about multiculturalism. In a society where a person’s skin color should not be looked on as anything more than a description, the term Redskin should also be viewed as such. The students at Miami are proud of their ties to Native Americans. Is this issue simply a reaction to the popularity of political correctness, or is there real justification for making such a drastic change? From our study, we believe there is no real justification for this change. Let’s keep the Miami Redskins alive and thriving in the Miami Valley, not just another forgotten tribe.¹³¹

Other students echoed Haney’s perspective. Sophomore Cori Shade said, “I feel the University caved in to politically correct terms. So did the tribe, for that matter. It sucks.”¹³²

Division within the Miami University community reflected discord across the nation.

Former President Jimmy Carter said, “he [did] not see the symbol as an insult, but as a way of

¹²⁹Miami University, “Mission of Miami University,” <http://www.muohio.edu>, 1.

¹³⁰Todd Snyder, “Redskins Reign Over, Redhawks Emerge,” *The Miami Student* 124, no. 50 (25 April 1997), 1.

¹³¹ Debbie Heaney, et al. “Redskin Part of a Respectful Tradition,” *The Miami Student*, 18 April 1997. I have added italics here for emphasis.

¹³² Catherine Schmid, “Go Redhawks?,” *The Miami Student* 124, no. 50 (25 April 1997).

showing that Indians, like the Atlanta Braves, are ‘brave, successful, and attractive’.”¹³³ Chief of the Cherokee Tribe of North Carolina Johnathan Ed Taylor stated, “We don’t think there’s anything wrong with any of it...The Redskins name doesn’t bother us. It gives our people recognition.”¹³⁴ Leigh J. Kuwanwisiwma, director of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, declared in *Sports Illustrated*, “I take the middle ground. I don’t see anything wrong with Indian nicknames as long as they’re not meant to be derogatory...I don’t mind the tomahawk chop. It’s all in good fun. This is sports, after all. In my living room, I’ll be watching a [Atlanta] Braves game and occasionally do the chop.”¹³⁵ At the University of Illinois, the Board of Trustees reaffirmed a 1990 decision to maintain Chief Illiniwek. In 1996, Illinois State Representative Rick Winkel headed a campaign that ultimately passed the following resolution, “consistent with a long-standing, proud tradition, the General Assembly hereby declares that Chief Illiniwek, is and may remain, the honored symbol of a great University, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.”¹³⁶ Florida State University continued to use their nickname “Seminoles” after consulting with the Seminole Tribe.

These sentiments reveal the complex nature of the mascot debate. In 1990, the Native American community consisted of over 500 federally recognized tribes with 1.96 million members.¹³⁷ There is disagreement within and among tribes concerning the use of Native

¹³³ Laurie Petrie, “Fans Prod at Heart of A People,” *Cincinnati Post*, 24 October 1991, 5A.

¹³⁴ Leonard Shapiro, “Offensive Penalty is Called on Redskins,” *The Washington Post*, 3 November 1991.

¹³⁵ S.L. Price, “The Indian Wars,” *Sports Illustrated*, 4 March 2002, 69.

¹³⁶ Louis B. Garippo, “The Chief Illiniwek Dialogue,” University of Illinois. Available from:

http://www.uiuc.edu/dialogue/report_files/toc.html.

¹³⁷ John Anner, “To the U.S. Census Bureau, Native Americans are Practically Invisible,” in *Native American Voices*, ed. Susan Lobo and Steve Talbot (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2001), 53.

Americans as logos, nicknames, and mascots. Sports Illustrated polled 351 Native Americans for its 2002 article, “The Indian Wars.” Eighty-three percent of those when asked if professional teams should cease use of Indian mascots replied in the negative.¹³⁸ When placed in comparison to the number of individuals who had in 1990 identified themselves as Native Americans, the polling group was only .02 percent of the Indian population. Indian Country Today responded to the Sports Illustrated article with its own survey. It revealed that seventy-five percent of those surveyed believed that “the use of Indian mascots at non-Indian schools, colleges, and universities” is in violation of anti-discrimination laws.¹³⁹ Indian Country Today did not provide the number of individuals polled nor did they distinguish between tribal groups. The language used in the survey question suggests a further question about the results. Indian Country Today differentiated between the use of stereotypes by Indians versus non-Indians. Do the individuals surveyed support the continued use of Indian mascots, logos, and nicknames by Native American schools? Is it okay if a Native American wore a “Redskins” t-shirt in public and offensive if a white American did it? Can Native Americans reclaim stereotypical portrayals as a form of empowerment? For Miami University, the entire “Redskin” mascot and logo had to be removed to assuage community concerns.

The “Redskin” as Miami University mascot was “retired” in 1996 after four years of intense debate. The Miami Tribe recognized “that society changes, and that what was intended to be a tribute to both Miami University, and to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, is no longer perceived as positive by some members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Miami University, and

¹³⁸ Andrea Woo, “Polls Apart,” *Sports Illustrated*, 4 March 2002, 69.

¹³⁹ Editorial, “American Indian Opinion Leaders: American Indian Mascots,” *Indian Country Today*, 29 June 2002.

Available from: www.indiancountry.com

society at large.”¹⁴⁰ The use of the term “retired” signals a positive connotation, as if it peacefully moved on to a new venue. Miami University failed to acknowledge the legacy of the “Redskins” logo, “Redskin Indian,” “Hiawabop,” and “Chief Miami.” In effect, Miami University ignored the past effects of derogatory stereotypes on the University community and the public at large.

Portrayals of Native American identity created in the 1920s and 1930s were challenged by the changing consciousness of Americans in the 1960s and 70s. Miami University repositioned and relocated the authenticity of the “Redskins” logo to the Miami Tribe during its attempts to sustain its sports mascots. Ultimately, the invented nature of these traditions and the derogatory nature of their portrayals were revealed.

¹⁴⁰ Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, “Resolution 96-34,” 6 July 1996, Miami University Archives.

The Role of History in Continuing Traditions

Imagined communities, invented traditions, and authenticity all are based on the historical past and the capacity of memory. David Thelen argues in *Memory and American History* that “memory, private and individual as much as collective and cultural, is constructed not reproduced...this construction is not made in isolation but in conversations with others that occur in the contexts of community, broader politics, and social dynamics.”¹⁴¹ Complicating this is also the role of the historian in “telling history as it really is”.¹⁴² Implicit in the paradigm of imagined community and invented tradition is the place of the historian. In the context of the mascot debate three versions of history appear: traditional top-down history, wherein the Manifest Destiny of colonizers rely on power and marginalization of Native Americans; bottom-up history, where the historian functions as activist and deconstructs power in order to reinforce social, cultural, political, or economic awareness; and lastly, the “middle-ground” historian who mediates between historical past and present mindedness. Miami University, throughout this study, functions as a top-down institutional historian who uses its power to imagine and re-imagine its own identity and that of Native Americans. The movements of the 1960s and 1970s spawned numerous historians who re-interpreted history as periods of agency versus marginalization. Native American activists functioned in this role as they attempted to bring awareness to the rich tradition of their heritage. The “middle-ground” historians evolve from

¹⁴¹ David Thelen, *Memory and American History* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press for the Organization of American Historians, 1989), ix.

¹⁴² “Telling history as it really is” refers to Leopold von Ranke and the debate over truth and accuracy in history. For my purposes telling history as it really encompasses multivalent narratives across disciplinary boundaries.

both of these groups. These individuals question the role of power and re-interpret history, not to give agency to the past, but to recognize how the past shapes agency now.¹⁴³

Memory, constructions of imagined communities, invented traditions, and authenticity dominated, and continue to involve, the role of Native Americans as sports mascots. At Miami University, the more innocuous “Redhawk”, another fictionalized identity, replaced the mascot “Redskin”. Whether a “Redhawk” or a “Redskin”, the perpetuation of stereotypical images of Indianness remain at Miami University. Students, faculty, alumni, and community members persisted in celebrating the “Redskin” tradition. The slogan “Redskins Forever,” “Absolut Redskin,” and the phrase “Proud Miami “Redskin” continued being sold on t-shirts sold at Dubois Bookstore.¹⁴⁴ The 1997 Miami University *Recensio* featured a seven-page article announcing the “End of an Era.”¹⁴⁵ Pi Beta Phi, a national fraternity, donated a thirteen-foot bronze statue, commissioned in 1996.¹⁴⁶ Prior to the statue’s arrival on campus, the University Planning Committee released a statement to faculty that the statue’s intent was “an appropriate symbol of the university’s historic Miami connection.”¹⁴⁷ Faculty and students protested the display of the work on the basis that it reinforced stereotypes. The statue, received in 2000, resides in Millett Hall, the sports arena. It is housed in the Athletic Office Meeting Room, which sits near the entrance to the arena. Miami University continues to stage exhibits of otherness in the form of pageantry by bringing Miami Indians to the university only for special events. Students, faculty, alumni, and community members continue to use the term “Redskin” without

¹⁴³ Agency refers to the ability to determine ones own identity, living conditions, and actions. Agency is always in conversation with community, identity, tradition, and memory.

¹⁴⁴ Miami University is currently in litigation against Dubois Bookstore for its use of the Miami Indian head design, the word Miami, and the use of the term “Redskin.”

¹⁴⁵ Miami University, *Recensio*, 1997.

¹⁴⁶ “The Miami Indian,” Miami University.

¹⁴⁷ Sean Collins, “Tradition Disgraced, *The Miami Student*, 25 February 2000.

thought to the implications of the term. The other invented traditions that arose from the founding of the university (the Miami name) and the use of Native American symbols continue. Miami University claims to promote diversity yet continues to control enrollment, scholarships, and the opportunities for Native American students.

At the University of Illinois, Charlene Teters has been joined in the fight against “Chief Illiniwek” by 740 faculty and over 50 local and national organizations. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in April of 2001, released a position statement calling for an end to all Native American images by non-Indian schools.¹⁴⁸ The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments passed a resolution urging the Washington Redskins to cease use of the name and mascot. The professional baseball teams, the Cleveland Indians and the Atlanta Braves, have been repeatedly picketed. The National Coalition on Racism in Sports and the Media established lists of local, state, and federal organization using derogatory references to Native Americans in violation of the Civil Rights Act. Native American activists have initiated letter-writing campaigns to schools across the nation. American Indian students at the University of Northern Colorado named their intramural basketball team the “Fightin’ Whites to protest the continued use of a local school district’s nickname, the “Fightin’ Reds.”¹⁴⁹ Florida State University continues its use of the “Seminole.” Dartmouth, the first university to abolish its mascot, recently reentered the debate when a group of University students initiated a campaign to bring back their mascot.

The process of appropriation, legitimatization, and debate traced throughout this analysis has been replicated across the country. For Miami University, the debate continues.

¹⁴⁸ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, “Statement on the use of Native American Images and Nicknames,” April 2001.

¹⁴⁹ *Crossfire*, Cable News Network, 13 March 2002.

