

1-1-2000

## Wounded Knee, 1973: Consummatory and instrumental functions of militant discourse

Lucie Moya Melchert  
*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/rtds>

---

### Repository Citation

Melchert, Lucie Moya, "Wounded Knee, 1973: Consummatory and instrumental functions of militant discourse" (2000). *UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations*. 1125.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.25669/a812-n4bc>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact [digitalscholarship@unlv.edu](mailto:digitalscholarship@unlv.edu).

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.**

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.**

**In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.**

**Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.**

**Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.**

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
800-521-0600**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**



WOUNDED KNEE, 1973: CONSUMMATORY AND INSTRUMENTAL  
FUNCTIONS OF MILITANT DISCOURSE

by

Lucie Melchert

Bachelor of Arts  
University of Nevada  
1995

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the

**Master of Arts Degree**  
**Hank Greenspun School of Communication**  
**Greenspun College of Urban Affairs**

**Graduate College**  
**University of Nevada, Las Vegas**  
**May 2000**

**UMI Number: 1399898**

**Copyright 2000 by  
Melchert, Lucie Moya**

**All rights reserved.**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

---

**UMI Microform 1399898**

**Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.**

**All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company  
300 North Zeeb Road  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

**Copyright by Lucie M. Melchert 2000  
All Rights Reserved**



**Thesis Approval**  
The Graduate College  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

April 12, 2000

The Thesis prepared by

Lucie M. Melchert

Entitled

Wounded Knee, 1973: Consummatory and Instrumental Functions of

Militant Discourse

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts, Communication

Examination Committee Chair

Dean of the Graduate College

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative

## **ABSTRACT**

### **Wounded Knee, 1973: Consummatory and Instrumental Functions of Militant Discourse**

By

Lucie Melchert

Dr. Richard Jensen, Examination Committee Chair  
Professor of Communication  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Little academic research exists of the American Indian takeover of the hamlet of Wounded Knee, South Dakota in 1973. This thesis is an analysis of the discourse of the Wounded Knee incident, which served dual purposes for the activists. First, American Indian discourse served as a reinforcing agent to American Indians, both at Wounded Knee and across the country. Second, the rhetoric was meant to effect change within the general American public. This thesis will adopt and expand on Randall Lake's 1983 theory of the consummatory function of rhetoric by dissecting the fascinating discourse that shaped the identity of the Wounded Knee incident and the public perception of American Indians and the American Indian Movement (AIM) during this era.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	11
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY.....	20
CHAPTER 4 HISTORY OF THE EVENTS LEADING TO THE TAKEOVER.....	22
CHAPTER 5 ANALYSIS OF RHETORICAL BEHAVIOR: DISCURSIVE ACTS....	29
CHAPTER 6 ANALYSIS OF RHETORICAL BEHAVIOR: NON-DISCURSIVE ACTS.....	44
CHAPTER7 CONCLUSION.....	58
APPENDIX.....	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	70
VITA.....	76

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my most humble thanks to Dr. Richard Jensen, who has guided me through seven years of my academic career, both graduate and undergraduate. With his support and direction, I was able to explore a fascinating and intimidating topic.

To my committee members—Dr. David Henry, Dr. Thomas Burkholder, and Dr. Hal Rothman—I also extend my gratitude and appreciation for sharing their knowledge and guidance.

Special thanks go to my colleagues and friends, and to my department director and mentor Sharon Segerblom, who always supports my academic and professional endeavors.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my family. To my parents, Raul and Lucila Moya, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for making me what I am today, and for instilling the pride and love that I have for myself, and for my own culture. To my brothers, Marc and Mario, who always challenged me to be a better person (and taught me how to fight!), thank you. To my pups, Daisy and Lilly, thank you for getting me out of the house when I needed it most. And to my beautiful husband Ritch, who endured so many lonely days and nights during my research, and who is the rock that I lean on every day of my life—thank you. I love you.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

On February 27, 1973, members of the American Indian Movement (AIM), with the help of local Oglala Sioux Indians, seized control of the hamlet of Wounded Knee, South Dakota, in a desperate attempt to draw attention to the dreadful living and social conditions on the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation nearby. The three-month standoff that ensued was one of the most prominent social events of the decade and was responsible for the death of thirteen American Indians (Kipp, 1994). Marking the first armed resistance by American Indians since the Wounded Knee massacre in 1890, the event today stands out as a forceful testament to the passion and sincerity of American Indian activism. According to AIM activist Woody Kipp (1994), “the takeover was a response to a century of maniacal oppression by white society, an oppression that goes on today—subtler, smilingly, but it continues” (p. 214).

Formed in 1968 in Minneapolis by ex-convicts Clyde Bellecourt and Dennis Banks, the American Indian Movement labored to protect American Indian civil liberties and treaty rights, create social equality for all Indians living in the United States and promote the sovereignty of Indian reservations within the country. Modeled loosely after the Black Panther Party for Self Defense, AIM staged a number of protests, rallies, and social disturbances in the late 1960s and early 1970s that forged the movement’s identity forever (Gonzalez and Cook-Lynn, 1999; Smith and Warrior, 1996).

AIM activists were passionate about their cause, working tirelessly to change government policy towards American Indians. Arguably the most prominent of those actions was the 1973 takeover of Wounded Knee, South Dakota. This small town carried great historical significance in American Indian history. In 1890, U.S. troops murdered over 200 Sioux Indians, stealing their belongings and taking their land. Since then, many American Indians were bitter that the United States government had never apologized nor offered retribution for its actions. As AIM activist Russell Means said to a reporter covering the Wounded Knee siege: "The white man says that the 1890 massacre was the end of the wars with the Indian, that it was the end of the Indian, the end of the Ghost Dance. Yet here we are at war, we're still Indians, and we're Ghost Dancing again" (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 64).

According to a number of American Indians, Wounded Knee 1973 was a symbolic act performed by noble, well-meaning people (Means and Wolf, 1995). However, the realities of the siege told a different story. American Indian activists believed in their movement, but most were young and politically inexperienced, lacking the knowledge and ability to create governmental policy reform. As Vine Deloria (1994), an AIM activist, recalled on a return visit to a demonstration site:

I walked around the grounds and remembered some of the difficult meetings we had held there and how, several times, we almost had a coalition that could have affected land policy. Unfortunately, most of the people involved in the occupation had no experience in formulating policy and saw their activities as primarily aimed at awakening the American

public to the plight of the Indians. Thus a great opportunity to change federal programs for Indians was lost. (p. 30-31)

A number of articles and texts that discussed Wounded Knee were quick to determine American Indian success or failure in the takeover (Baird-Olson, 1997; Churchill, 1997; Lyman, 1991; Deloria 1994). Most also placed blame or accolade on the person, persons, or circumstance they believed were responsible (Baird-Olson, 1997; Lyman, 1991; Deloria 1994). Deloria (1994) argued that AIM was ultimately unsuccessful in changing government policy because “each event dealt primarily with the symbols of oppression and did not project possible courses of action that might be taken to solve problems” (p. 31). A May 7, 1973 New York Times article also claimed that the Wounded Knee siege suffered serious problems due to a lack of leadership and public relations tactics, bickering and poor communication (p. 5:1). To a number of Wounded Knee observers, it appeared as if the movement was plagued with a number of internal problems.

However, a judgement should not be made as to whether AIM failed in achieving its objectives during this event. In fact, movement members were not the only protestors involved at Wounded Knee. Groups that joined AIM included nonconformist residents from the Pine Ridge reservation itself, as well as radical supporters from around the country. Wounded Knee 1973 was not the undertaking of a single group; it was the collective efforts of various nonconformists from different groups, native or otherwise. The presence of various groups may have also been an influence in the oratory produced at Wounded Knee. Therefore, one must look at each artifact critical to the event and analyze it individually, then collectively as it relates to the event. Each occurrence or

circumstance should be dissected into the individual elements that make it unique, and its effect on the Pine Ridge event as a whole must be evaluated. The artifacts are both discursive and non-discursive. The discursive acts, such as speeches and interviews given during this time and statements — both spoken and written—were instrumental artifacts that attempted to both reinforce Indian values and affect change. The non-discursive acts served consummatory functions for American Indians, helping reinforce their “Indianness.”

This thesis will focus on six artifacts significant to the Pine Ridge incident. These instances or conditions will be divided into two categories—discursive and non-discursive. Analysis of each artifact will discuss strategy, audience and intent. These artifacts are as follows:

#### Discursive

1. Wounded Knee spiritual leader Leonard Crow Dog’s March 21, 1973, speech to dance participants on the eve of the Ghost Dance;
2. AIM leader Dennis Bank’s speech to occupiers on March 22, 1973, regarding the FBI’s media/supply embargo;
3. The public statement made on March 19, 1973, by the Iroquois Six Nation Confederacy (ISNC) in support of the Wounded Knee takeover.

### Non- Discursive

1. AIM chooses to make its stand at Wounded Knee, the site of a U.S. military massacre of Indians eighty years before. Agitators claim that the site has symbolic and spiritual significance for American Indians;
2. The federal government's ultimatum to the protestors, March 6-8, 1973. Protestors prepare as warriors for a showdown;
3. April 4, 1973: a sacred pipe ceremony is held between federal officials and protestor to seal negotiation agreements.

A number of rhetorical considerations were regarded in the analysis of these artifacts. First, many Wounded Knee activists, including leaders, did not speak their tribal tongues, and most tribal elders could not —or *would* not—speak English (Smith and Warrior, 1996, p. 199). When Pine Ridge elders asked AIM for help, AIM found that, for the most part, it could not communicate with elder tribe members. This barrier prevented AIM leaders from collaborating with reservation elders to forge a strategy, and—more importantly—allow the elders to contribute one of their powerful tools: a powerful, influential rhetorical genius that possessed tradition and ceremony, wisdom and ancient knowledge. Using this gift, Lakota orators were able to demand the attention of their audience (Young Bear and Theisz, 1994, p. 35). In contrast, most AIM activists were raised in cities and had become accustomed to the cultural and rhetorical traditions of the general American population. AIM leaders had been deprived of their rich rhetorical heritage:

AIM leaders knew that they were deprived of a rich and powerful heritage: Those things had been denied the shock troops of the movement. To them it burned like the theft of something priceless, irreplaceable, and

with it came a smoldering resentment they felt nearly every waking moment.

(Smith and Warrior, 1996, p. 199)

The loss from the lack of communication between urbanized Indians and the traditional tribes was evident. Journalist John Keats (cited in Lake, 1991) asked, “But who speaks for the Indian? Amazingly his cause is almost without rebels to support it” (p. 126). AIM members’ inability to speak their native tongues was certainly a hindrance to effective, meaningful rhetoric on behalf of their people.

A second rhetorical consideration for this analysis was AIM members’ overall unfamiliarity with Indian (in this case, Oglala Sioux) tradition and culture. Many activists had been raised in cities and few knew the meaning behind, and significance of, various cultural doctrines (Smith and Warrior, 1996). These outsiders included AIM leader Russell Means, himself an Oglala Sioux who was unfamiliar with his own tribe’s precepts and traditions. In his article, “Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric,” Randall Lake (1991) analyzed the importance of tradition and history to protest rhetoric: “(AIM’s) narrative, grounded in time’s cycle, seeks to renew the ties between the past and the present, and thereby enact a future, by characterizing Red Power as the rebirth of traditional tribal life” (p. 129). However, an Indian nation cannot be reborn if its leaders are not in touch with the traditional and cultural roots of that nation. A culture cannot be continued if leaders are merely guessing at what that culture is. In plotting a cultural rebellion, it would seem only natural to believe that the leaders of such a rebellion would understand and practice their culture’s customs and traditions. Unfamiliarity with—and malpractice of—such traditions could have devastating results for the movement and its image. This was the case for AIM and



Wounded Knee. Advised by elder leaders to “go to Wounded Knee to honor” those killed in the 1890 massacre in traditional Indian fashion, AIM leader Dennis Banks instead chose to pile AIM members into cars to forcefully take over the historic site. Banks did not bother with tradition; he wanted simply to take over the town (Smith and Warrior, 1996, p. 201-202). Within moments of their arrival, the village was raided and ransacked, and hostages were taken. Smith and Warrior (1996) recount that these self-proclaimed “warriors” acted instead like drunkard buffoons:

As the...traditional spiritual and political leaders of the Oglalas stood at the cemetery, others in the caravan stormed the store, stripping it bare in moments, seizing guns, ammunition, food, and clothing. Frenzied Oglalas took pleasure in ransacking the place. Pedro Bissonette, the son of Gladys Bissonette who had made such an impassioned speech at Calico, put on a headdress from the museum and jumped on a display case, waving a handgun until he crashed through the glass top. (p. 202)

From the beginning, the incident at Wounded Knee seemed to outsiders to be more of a confused, frenzied exploit than an organized protest. Lake (1983) quoted a critic who went so far as to call the siege “comic, and therefore counterproductive” (p. 127).

Another significant consideration for this analysis was movement leadership, or lack thereof. Leaders are often a vital component of social movement and change. A movement’s leader must be readily identifiable; otherwise, that movement has no recognizable face or voice. Successful movements during this particular era had identifiable leaders such as Cesar Chavez (United Farmworkers Union), Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X (black civil rights movement). Leaders like these possessed the

charisma, pragmatism and prophecy that outsiders could easily identify (Stewart, Smith and Denton, 1994, p. 96). No one leader ever emerged at Pine Ridge, and activists took turns in publicly representing the movement. During its prevalence and particularly during the Wounded Knee siege, a number of AIM activists proclaimed leadership of the group and of its actions. During Wounded Knee, one leader or spokesperson was never identified as the face and the voice of the movement:

The movement's style was freewheeling as ever, with each of its national leaders having a moment in the spotlight, even though the takeover was primarily Russell (Means') show; he was, after all, Oglala. But some days Dennis Banks would be clearly in charge, with Means in the background or having sneaked out of the village. Other times Carter Camp would be talking to the press and leading the nightly meetings, often taking positions more radical than either Means or Banks. (Smith and Warrior, 1996, p. 210-211)

As heads of AIM, Banks and Means had the responsibility of representing the collective voice of the movement. However, they made the conscious decision not to do so. The notion of a spokesperson, or "chief" was one to which American Indians did not agree:

Before the white man came, we Indians had no chiefs. We had leaders, of course, men and women chosen by consensus for their wisdom and courage. The idea of a pyramidal hierarchy with a single person at the top was European. When whites first demanded to speak to a chief, my ancestors didn't quite know how to respond. They pushed somebody out in front as a spokesman—not necessarily the brightest or the bravest guy

around, just someone willing to talk to the strangers and find out what they wanted in our country. But as far as the whites were concerned, he was our monarch, a sort of petty king. (Means, 1995, p. 222)

Though AIM leaders held the belief that no one man could represent a group, it was a belief that did not help their situation. Stewart, Smith, and Denton (1994) argued that leaders are necessary to social movements: “They become the symbols and faces of the movement for members, the public and the media” (p. 106). The unwillingness to appoint such a leader may have greatly depreciated the value of the movement’s rhetoric.

Such considerations were of great significance to this study of Wounded Knee discourse. Scholars have argued that rhetoric has often been the factor that created change (McEdwards, 1968, p. 37 and Wilkinson, 1976, p. 91). AIM’s purpose during its tenure was to make the U.S. aware of the Indians’ plight. AIM hoped that by exposing the injustices against their people, it might have triggered political and social change: “For oral cultures, generally, and for marginalized people, especially, the spoken word possesses the power of community” (Morris and Wander, 1990, p. 186). Wounded Knee agitators did not have the knowledge or ability, or the advantage of knowing their own culture, to communicate their plight effectively to the American people.

Few scholars have ventured into the realm of American Indian activism during the twentieth century. Those who have either reminisce about what was, or dream of what might have been. Few have examined the actions of the movement and analyzed its behavior. This behavior—in particular the discourse—is the link to the innermost details of the movement. By analyzing key elements of this event, critics can decipher strategies and meanings behind American Indians’ actions.

This study is valuable for a number of reasons. First, it will provide insight into the rhetorical strategy of a movement on which little research has been conducted. Few academics have studied the modern American Indian or militant Indian rhetoric. This study will explore a largely ignored event, contributing a valuable study into American Indian protest discourse. It will further plant a seed for future scholars in the study of protest rhetoric. Few have ventured into the analysis of smaller, though important, social movements such as AIM. The study of American Indian activism may provide powerful understanding into protest Indian discourse.

A second reason for the value of this study is the contribution it will make to the field of cultural rhetoric. Although a number of studies have been conducted in a number of cultures including African American, Latino and Anglo American, little research has been done in indigenous American discourse. This study will be a step towards knowledge of Indian rhetorical tradition.

This study will also investigate the specific tactics employed to affect specific audiences. On the surface, it appears as though American Indian activism was unorganized and lacked focus and strategy. Upon closer analysis, however, the study will show that Indian radicals utilized a number of systems and approaches to achieve specific goals. Whether addressing the media, negotiating terms with the government, or reinforcing their culture within themselves, the movement showed purpose in its actions. The challenge will be to decipher the purpose and the audience behind each instance.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Little research has been conducted in the realm of American Indian activism, and even less has been explored in regards to AIM rhetoric. The majority of the literature found on the American Indian Movement was historical, recounting the actions of the American Indian Movement and discussing its social impact. Most of the books and articles were personal accounts written by AIM activists documenting and analyzing their experiences with the movement. These pieces helped lay the foundation of the movement, its birth and its experiences. In addition, the documentation of AIM's actions allowed the researcher to access a particular place in time for analysis, which is a priceless commodity for the historical academic.

Other articles written about the movement analyzed the political strategies and the social impact of the movement. Such research allows exploration into AIM's social and political schema during its zenith. This research was invaluable, as it provides insight into the changes—if any—that occurred as a result of American Indian activism.

Another significant—though scarce—type of research into AIM was rhetorical analysis. Only a few articles have been written about American Indian rhetoric; even fewer existed on American Indian protest rhetoric. The articles written on this oratory compared its style and delivery to that of ancient Indian rhetoric. For the most part, these articles were brief and offered little insight into the fascinating world of militant Indian discourse.

Additionally, fertile topics such as content, context, symbolism, and strategy remained largely unexplored.

### Historical Accounts

Historical texts provided a rich background of the movement. One such book, Like a Hurricane: the Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee, told the story of American Indian protest from the late 1960s to the 1970s. Authors Paul Chaat Smith and Robert Allen Warrior (1996) recounted the triumphs and failures of the movement during key AIM events that took place from November, 1969, through May, 1973. Smith and Warrior (1996), activists in the AIM movement, related the victories, the struggles and the fiascoes during this period. The authors maintained that the events chronicled in this book, including the siege of Wounded Knee, “best illustrate the character and substance of the Indian movement” (p. viii).

Another valuable work was the 1995 autobiography of Russell Means, arguably one of the most hated, feared and celebrated American Indian radicals. Where White Men Fear to Tread is a rich and colorful account of the life of one of the movement’s most prominent leaders. Cleverly written, though at times prejudiced, this book gives a seemingly accurate report of the events leading to and during the siege of Wounded Knee. Means’ accounts of events largely correspond to other historical accounts of the same events. For Means (1995), the incident at Wounded Knee was the symbolic culmination of the endless mistreatment of American Indians:

Wounded Knee would always remain the haunting symbol of the white man’s murderous treachery and of our nation’s stoic grief. At Wounded

Knee, on ground consecrated with the blood of our ancestor, we would make our stand. At Wounded Knee, as nowhere else, the spirits of Big Foot and his martyred people would protect us. (p. 253)

A third historical account of Wounded Knee 1873 was the personal diary kept by the Bureau of Indian Affairs superintendent during the siege. Stanley David Lyman's 1991 book Wounded Knee 1873: A Personal Account narrated the events of Wounded Knee as they unfolded inside the compound, citing "government confusion, bad communication, rivalries for turf, mixed motives, abysmal ignorance, bureaucratic ineptitude, and lack of understanding of the issues and depth of the appeal of those who were besieged" (p. ix) for the siege's failure. This chronicle served as a foil to Means' autobiography, recounting the same events with a different point of view. In his book, Lyman (1991) discussed the factors that weakened the movement and its siege of Wounded Knee.

Two important books chronicled the siege and its effects from a female protestor's view. Co-written by Mary Brave Bird (formerly Mary Crow Dog) and Richard Erdoes, Lakota Woman (1990) and Ohitika Woman (1993) narrated the story of a Lakota woman who not only played a part in the siege, but gave birth during the incident as well. Her accounts provided colorful accounts of what occurred inside the reservation, both during and after the siege.

One of the most important works was the 1974 book, Voices from Wounded Knee, 1873: in the Words of the Participants. Although the book listed no specific authors or editors, its preface stated that the book's Indian authors were present throughout the siege, and chronicled its everyday occurrences. This text was a

compilation of the discourse, media interviews, photos, and documents that define the Wounded Knee incident, and was the primary historical document used in this study. Most of the artifacts used in the study comes from this text, considered reliable due to the short time frame between the event and the book's printing (six months).

Robert Allan Warrior's 1997 article "Past and Present at Wounded Knee" recounted the events of the siege and their public impact: "Then, as now, ongoing developments in the prospects of Native people and communities just aren't interesting to very many people. Editors wanting to include coverage of Native American issues face the very real problem of needing to have stories their readers will read. And Native Americans are a tiny group of about 2 million" (p. 71). Warrior's (1997) article analyzed the media coverage and public perception of the Wounded Knee incident, criticizing the media for judging AIM activists and unfairly reporting the events of Wounded Knee.

### Political and Social Writings

Several politically and socially based articles have been written about the American Indian Movement. Most were analyses of the political and social consequences of AIM actions. One academic journal, the American Indian Culture and Research Journal, dedicated an entire issue (volume 18, issue 4) to American Indian activism, focusing on AIM's 1969-1971 takeover of Alcatraz Island near San Francisco. A few articles in this volume discussed the social significance of AIM's actions at Alcatraz Island. In "The Eagles I Fed Who Did Not Love Me," Woody Kipp (1994) discussed the symbolism and meaning of the Alcatraz takeover, and how it affected later AIM actions, particularly Wounded Knee: "Alcatraz was the call to arms. There were other marches,



protests, walks across the country to keep the native movement visible, but Wounded Knee was the crucible that formed many of today's native leaders, whether or not they were at the siege" (pp. 213-214).

Karen Baird-Olson's "Reflections of an AIM Activist: Has It All Been Worth It?" in the same 1994 issue argued that "AIM was a primary facilitator in bringing rapid change as well as empowerment to many native people and communities" (pp. 233-234). Baird-Olson (1994) maintained that social progress for Indians was slow until AIM was established, and that the movement created a broadly-based public awareness campaign that allowed for both short- and long-range institutional change.

In that same American Indian Culture and Research Journal issue, Ward Churchill (1994) analyzed the events that followed the Alcatraz takeover, focusing mainly on Wounded Knee. "The Bloody Wake of Alcatraz: Political Repression of the American Indian Movement During the 1970s" contends that the federal government "terrorized" AIM activists, at times violating their civil rights and repressing the movement. These injustices, claims Churchill, caused the demise of the movement.

Another article, "From Wounded Knee to Capitol Hill: The History, Achievements and Legacy of the American Indian Movement," by Jeremy Schneider (1976) recounted the roots and major accomplishments of the American Indian Movement, and discussed the movement's influence on modern American Indian activism. Schneider (1976) defended AIM's actions, arguing that "the AIM approach explicitly seeks to find solutions through negotiation and peaceful means. But AIM people feel strongly that they must defend themselves, and help all Indian people defend themselves, from unjust violence and coercion" (p. 2).

An editorial published in the October/November 1998 issue of National Conference of State Legislatures magazine, "From Wounded Knee to Capitol Hill," argued that over the years, American Indian activism has gained more influence, and that "state leaders are learning that it is more productive and mutually beneficial to work with, not against, the tribes" (p. 6). The article, which listed no author, insisted that American Indian tribes were permanent players in the federal system, and that government agencies needed to understand, communicate and collaborate with those tribes in order to change the social and political tide for American Indians in the United States.

### Rhetorical Studies

Little research existed on modern American Indian rhetoric. Studies on this topic primarily addressed the symbolism of American Indian oratory, though they did not discuss content or strategy. Randall Lake's 1991 article, "Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric," examined the characteristics of modern American Indian rhetoric, comparing it to the rhetoric of "traditional" Native Americans. Lake distinguished and examined the differences and similarities of the two, focusing on three characteristics: the characterization of what he called "Euroamerican/native relations," Native American metaphors, and discourse power and limitations.

An earlier study in American Indian rhetoric by Lake (1983) analyzed the "consummatory motives and functions" of American Indian protest rhetoric. Lake's theory of the consummatory function of rhetoric was the basis for this thesis. Lake (1983)

argued that American Indian rhetoric was often mislabeled a failure because the primary audience and functions of this type of rhetoric were often wrongly identified:

For the Indian audience, Red Power rhetoric is persuasive insofar as it serves the consummatory purposes prescribed by traditional Indian religious/cultural precepts. White audiences, which do not share these precepts, remain unconvinced and even alienated; nevertheless, consummatory strategies are necessary and effective techniques of Indian address. (p. 128)

Lake (1983) further contended that the primary audience of “Red Power” rhetoric was the indigenous population, and that the primary purpose of AIM’s rhetoric was to reinforce the traditional and cultural standards within the Native American culture. This thesis will adopt Lake’s theory of American Indian protest rhetoric and expand it to include a second function: instrumental.

John F. Cragen’s 1975 article, “Rhetorical Strategy: A Dramatistic Interpretation and Application,” analyzed the oratory surrounding the 1972 Indian occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs building in Washington, D.C. Using Ernest Bormann’s fantasy theme analysis, Cragen examined the elements of the event and ultimately determined that “the Indian occupation of the BIA building in 1972 was a rhetorical and, as a consequence, a political failure” (p. 11).

Another study in Indian discourse was Morris and Wander’s 1990 article, “Native American Rhetoric: Dancing in the Shadows of the Ghost Dance.” This article focused on modern American Indian rhetoric, and poignantly discussed its realities. Morris and Wander (1990) argued that modern American Indians are, sadly, rhetorically

unrecognizable from their ancestors. Focusing on the incident at Wounded Knee, the researchers maintained that when media outlets sent reporters to cover the protests, the journalists were disappointed and confused when they found that the protest did not involve any “real” Indians. This disappointment led to media cynicism, which adversely affected public support for the movement.

Two social movement rhetoric texts were valuable to this study: Persuasion and Social Movements (third edition) written by Stewart, Smith, and Denton (1994), and The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control (second edition), written by Bowers, Ochs, and Jensen (1993). Stewart et al. (1994) explored persuasion as it applied to social movements, discussing such issues as leadership, life cycles, legitimacy, resistance, symbolism, and language strategies. Arguing that AIM succeeded in calling attention to its cause and pressuring the government, the authors also contended that the takeover adversely affected AIM’s image and “reinforced the stereotype of the painted savage portrayed by Hollywood—the very image they had been trying to erase” (p. 61).

As previously mentioned, this thesis will follow the 1983 theoretical framework provided by Randall Lake. Lake (1983) argued in four steps that American Indian militant rhetoric was misanalyzed by scholars who erroneously labeled the movement’s rhetoric a “failure.” According to Lake (1983), AIM discourse was not directed at the white governing establishment, as some scholars suggest, but rather at the American Indian populace itself (p. 128). Lake (1983) further argued that militant Indian oratory’s consummatory function was to regenerate traditional Indian religious beliefs and restore ancient ways of life. Using this analysis, AIM rhetoric fully succeeded in calling American Indians to action and upholding tradition and beliefs. Lake established a solid

framework for the rhetorical analysis of primary audiences and consummatory

functions of AIM rhetoric. This thesis hopes to build upon Lake's theory, and expand on his claims.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

For use during this study, the definition of rhetoric will be adopted from Bowers, et al. (1993): rhetoric is the “rationale of instrumental, symbolic behavior” (p. 1).

Therefore, discursive phenomena will be analyzed, as will non-discursive symbolic acts.

This thesis will analyze the symbolic behavior demonstrated by American Indian activists (from actual members of the American Indian Movement, Pine Ridge residents, and Wounded Knee supporters) during this event. Six symbolic artifacts will be the focus of the paper. These acts will be divided into two categories, discursive and non-discursive. The acts or instances will be analyzed for symbolism, strategy, and tactic. Adopting Lake’s 1983 theory of consummatory function, it will also expand on the theory, arguing the presence of not one, but two functions. These functions, consummatory and instrumental, service two separate audiences and have different goals. The former function serves to reinforce the traditions and culture of American Indians by reminding them of the importance of what they are fighting for. The latter function serves to affect change within general society (such as the government or the general public).

This will be the first analysis of the siege of Wounded Knee in 1973 using this theoretical framework. Findings in this study reinforce Lake’s argument that American Indian rhetoric serves to reinforce their culture within the movement. Moreover, this thesis will expand Lake’s theory by identifying a second function that is entirely different

from consummatory function. This second function, called *instrumental*, will analyze a different subset of discourse intended for non-Indians. Unlike consummatory behavior, instrumental occurrences aspire to create change outside the movement, whether by inspiring legislation, breaking stereotypes, or gaining sympathy.

This paper will analyze specific symbolic acts considered instrumental to the Pine Ridge event. Each occurrence will be dissected, focusing on its function or functions. Specifically, function will be determined by the following criteria: strategy, audience and motivation/intent. To assure impartiality, the acts to be analyzed will come from various participants in the takeover: members of AIM, Pine Ridge residents and supporters. In addition, content and context will both be factored into the analysis. Each artifact will be weighed against Lake's (1983) theory, thereby proving or adding to the theory.

Through the aforementioned examination, this thesis will uncover specific systems and goals in each symbolic act. It is anticipated that these discoveries will help scholars understand the Wounded Knee event, and will uncover the strategies and objectives of the movement. It is hoped that this paper will enlighten and educate rhetorical, political and social scholars alike.

## CHAPTER 4

### HISTORY OF EVENTS LEADING TO THE TAKEOVER OF WOUNDED KNEE

#### History of the American Indian Movement

The American Indian Movement was born in the very poverty, crime and anger that it sought to eliminate. A number of Indian youth had been imprisoned in Minneapolis and St. Paul for petty crimes. The prison proved a fertile breeding ground for these boys, who learned to hate the very system that imprisoned them. Soon, a number of Indian prisoners began to envision a better life for their people, and upon their release, began working toward this goal. One prisoner, Clyde Bellecourt, took a leave of absence from his blue-collar job in 1968 to work on Indian rights issues in the Minneapolis/St. Paul area. With the help of an older Indian woman named Pat Ballanger (who has since been known as the mother of AIM), Bellecourt began the first AIM chapter.

The first AIM chapter called itself the “AIM Patrol” and roamed the streets armed with tape recorders, cameras and two-way radios. Using the radios, members of the patrol would monitor police calls and arrive at scenes involving police and Indians to assure that Indians were not being mistreated. This aggressive police monitoring made the AIM Patrol infamous with both Indians and local government and police agencies. Soon, the American Indian Movement and its “Red Power!” slogan seemed to appear everywhere:



The movement caught on quickly. AIM was decidedly different, however, from the black movement, the anti-Vietnam War protests, or the San Francisco, Woodstock hippy [sic] generation. AIM was an indigenous, land-based spiritual movement, a call to Indian people to return to their sacred traditions and, at the same time, to stand firm against the tide of what they call European influence and dominance. (Weyler, 1992, p. 37)

Clyde Bellecourt and his partner, Dennis Banks, toured the country seeking support. Traveling to San Francisco in the autumn of 1969, they met Russell Means, an Indian drifter who had taken interest in the movement. Enlisting Means, the trio traveled to various cities, fighting for Indian rights. As Means (1995) recalled: “ I was impressed with AIM’s sense of purpose. The leaders had clear goals and had researched their subject for facts and statistics to back up their assertions. They had brought along a Lutheran minister, Paul Bow, and a lawyer. They knew that they were right, so they would do whatever it took to get their point across” (p. 152).

AIM’s first aggressive action was to seize the abandoned prison site of Alcatraz Island near San Francisco. In 1968 by the federal government declared that Alcatraz Island was to be given to the city of San Francisco as surplus property. Citing an 1868 Sioux treaty with the federal government that gave the Sioux claim to the land, AIM demanded its return to American Indians. Government authorities refused, and the movement began formulating plans to take over the island. For activists, the abandoned prison site was a venue to dramatize their issues (Smith and Warrior, 1996, p. 3)

After two failed attempts, the plan to take over Alcatraz was completed on November 20, 1969. The nineteen-month occupation of the island drew attention to the

plight of Indians, and the fight to save their way of life. AIM leaders spoke out against the government, and proclaimed Alcatraz to be Indian land:

In press statements the Indians said they would pay the U.S. government \$24.00 for the island, mocking the 1626 purchase of Manhattan Island by Dutch settlers. They also said that they would establish a Bureau of Caucasian Affairs to deal with any problems that whites might have in relation to the occupation. (Weyler, 1992, p. 42)

The ensuing takeover was one of the most fascinating—yet one of the most disappointing—social protests of the time. In the months that followed AIM's landing, hundreds of supporters came and went from the island, and tens of thousands of dollars in money, food and supplies poured in from all over the country (Smith and Warrior, 1996.) As the months passed however, activists and supporters grew tired of the stagnancy of the occupation, and public interest waned. By April 1971, the last of the occupiers was removed from the island, and the movement failed to permanently obtain the island from the government.

In 1972, AIM collaborated with several other American Indian rights organizations to stage a caravan of over two thousand Indians from cities and reservations across the nation to Washington, D.C., on the eve of the presidential election. The "Trail of Broken Treaties" caravan intended to present incumbent President Richard M. Nixon with a twenty-point program that would redefine government-Indian relations (Churchill, 1994, p. 258). Protest leaders were aware of the massive national attention the caravan garnered, and readily prepared themselves to face the public with public statements along the way.

According to Ward Churchill (1994), an activist in the American Indian movement during this time, the government reneged on promises made to support the caravan in hopes that protestors would disperse. The decision instead created an infuriated response:

Instead, angry Indians promptly took over the BIA headquarters building on 2 November, evicted its staff, and held it for several days. Russell Means, in fine form, captured the front page of the nation's newspapers and the six o'clock news by conducting a press conference in front of the building, while adorned with a make-shift "war club" and a "shield" fashioned from a portrait of Nixon himself. (p. 258)

Hoping to end the siege quickly, government officials agreed to respond to the twenty-point plan along with money to transport caravan protestors home, if AIM vacated the building. Agitators agreed and abandoned the building, but not before members ransacked the BIA files and took files dealing with BIA leasing practices, and the operation of the Indian Health Service, among others. Citing "every right to know the details of what's being done to us and to our property" (p. 258) Indians took the files and returned them only after they had been photocopied. In the end, the government did provide an official response to the plan, though it was negative, and critical of the movement.

Until early 1973, Indian radicals had staged a number of protest rallies, symbolic acts, and press conferences. Now was the time, radicals believed, to make a stand that everyone would remember. Both movement leaders and Oglalas on the Pine Ridge reservation were sure that Wounded Knee would be the final fight to win Indian rights:

“(Oglalas asked that) the spirit, the fighting spirit, return, so that there would be no reason for Indian people to drink themselves to death, so that there’d be no reason for Indian youngsters to be slashing their wrists,” (Weyler, 1992, p. 76). What ensued was not a symbolic protest, as many had hoped, but rather one of the decade’s longest standoffs between civil rights protestors and the U.S. government.

### History of the Events Leading to the Takeover at the Pine Ridge Reservation

On the morning of February 20, 1972, the body of Raymond Yellow Thunder, a 51-year-old Oglala Sioux from the Pine Ridge reservation, was found in a used car lot in nearby Gordon, Nebraska. His attackers were two local white men known for their common practice of “busting an Indian” (Dewing, 1985, p. 55).

The men were arrested, released without bail, and then charged with second-degree manslaughter. Pine Ridge residents were enraged at the lesser charge, though some believed that the attackers would have been set free: “Even this charge might have been dismissed had not Raymond Yellow Thunder’s family, in the absence of meaningful interest or help from the local authorities or the FBI, made the decision to call on AIM” (Matthiessen, 1991, p. 59). Severt Young Bear, Yellow Thunder’s nephew, made the call to AIM when his family’s urged: “We don’t have no place to turn... You have some friends that are with AIM. (We) wonder if you could go to them, ask them that we want something to be done to the people that killed our brother, and we want a full investigation” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 13).

AIM members came to Pine Ridge to help Yellow Thunder’s family investigate the death. During this time, a new tribal chairman had been elected at the reservation in

what many Indians called a fixed race. Richard (“Dick”) Wilson was brash, outspoken, and ruled the reservation with an iron fist. Following his election, Wilson began appointing friends and family members to well-paying tribal jobs, and firing those who he believed were supporting the “communist organization” AIM (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 15). In November 1972, Dick Wilson hired a squad of gun-toting tribal “security,” calling themselves the Guardians of the Oglala Nation, or “goon squad.”

As the months went on, more injustices occurred on the reservation against those who voiced their opinions against Dick Wilson and the new tribal government. Pine Ridge residents, scared, hungry and broke, believed they had suffered enough. As AIM activist Russell Means recalls, “I could feel pride and excitement and hope in the air and I was thrilled to realize that... just about everybody who lived in Pine Ridge Village was ready to join AIM and start to stand up for their rights” (Means, 1995, p. 201).

A caravan of fifty-four AIM vehicles rolled into the town of Wounded Knee on February 27, 1973, filled with American Indian protestors. Militants stormed the local trading post as well as surrounding buildings. A dozen hostages—mostly Anglo residents—were taken, though they were released within days. AIM delivered a list of demands to a Justice Department operative at the village, ordering a reconsideration of previous U.S./Indian treaties and a full-scale investigation of the BIA and its officers.

For 71 days, the American Indian Movement and members of the Oglala Sioux community controlled the town of Wounded Knee. Firefights, roadblocks and embargoes were normal occurrences during the siege, providing a dangerous venue for militants. During that time, however, protestors governed their own mini-nation, one in which Indians enjoyed sovereignty and independence. That liberty, however, was short lived. In

the end, protestors allowed themselves to be removed from Wounded Knee, in hopes of reaching a settlement with the government. That settlement never came.

## CHAPTER 5

### ANALYSIS OF RHETORICAL BEHAVIOR: DISCURSIVE ACTS

The three-month incident at Pine Ridge yielded a number of public statements, speeches, press conferences, and other verbal displays by movement militants and members of the declared Independent Oglala Nation. Contrary to Randall Lake's theory (1983), a review of a number of these public performances indicated that there were two main audiences in Wounded Knee militant rhetoric, the Indian population and the general, non-Indian public. This paper will analyze three verbal acts during the conflict, focusing on the consummatory function—or functions—of each act. The consummatory function will be determined by the following criteria: strategy, audience, and motivation/intent. It should be noted that the three speech acts to be analyzed were performed by three different participants in the conflict: an AIM activist, a Sioux medicine man, and an empathetic supporter. Analysis of acts performed by three different rhetors should allow for a fair examination of Wounded Knee protest discourse.

According to Lake (1983), all three speeches should have the same single consummatory function: to gather the “like-minded” (p. 128) in order to achieve the basic goal to “regenerate traditional Indian religious beliefs and to restore the ancient ways of life” (p.129). Morris and Wander (1990) pointed out that the Indian struggle to find a cultural identity was not uncommon. They argued that questions of ethnic identity have been raised within a number of cultures over the centuries:

The history of Black Americans, Native Americans, Mexican Americans, Asian Americans and Feminists in this country is a history not only of political struggle, but also of personal strife, of a longing to achieve an integrated self-consciousness, to create a better and truer self by merging a double-self that is at times paralyzed by self-doubt and self-hatred.

(p. 184)

This paper argues that although American Indian protest rhetoric does serve Lake's consummatory function of Indian reinforcement of tradition and self, it also serves a second, more instrumental function, that of gaining sympathy, support, and action from non-Indians, in particular the white establishment. Though the term "second" is used, the instrumental function is by no means less important. Following is an analysis of the three speech acts.

### Act 1: The Medicine Man and the Ghost Dance

In Indian culture, the medicine man is arguably the most significant, influential member of a tribe. The Lakota Sioux in particular believe that Lakota holy men are warriors, and are granted visions from the animal spirits and from the "greater spirits of the Stone, Sun, and Thunder" (Rice, 1998, p. 1). The medicine men of the Pine Ridge reservation at the time, Leonard Crow Dog and Wallace Black Elk, held frequent religious ceremonies to help bring people together in Lakota Sioux tradition. Sacred pipe, sweat lodge, and prayer ceremonies had been held during the first three weeks of the takeover, but Crow Dog and Black Elk decided that on March 22, 1973, that the warriors



fighting for Wounded Knee would become a part of the ultimate Sioux ceremony—the Ghost Dance. As Leonard Crow Dog reminisced:

My great-grandfather's spirit gave me a vision to do this. The vision told me to revive this ceremony at the place where Chief Big Foot's Ghost Dancers, three hundred men, women and children, had been massacred by the army, shot to pieces by cannons, old people, babies.... So I rounded up as many people as I could get a hold of, with the help of Wallace Black Elk. We were going to dance for the sake of the spirits. For our own sake. (Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1995, p. 126)

The Ghost Dance, a ceremonial dance created in the last half of the nineteenth century, became the core of a religious uprising called the Sioux Ghost Dance War of 1890-91. The Sioux believed that the dance would “restore them and their deceased ancestors to a fast-disappearing way of life” (Miller, 1959, p. vii). The central doctrine of this religion was the chronicle of the Indian prophet Wovoka (also known as Jack Wilson, Father, Jesus, *Juses*, and *Kwotisauq*) (Morris and Wander, 1990, p. 167), who said that God told him that the earth would die, and that the white man would die with it. The doctrine taught that the Indian, however, would be saved, and the earth would be reborn:

The earth will come alive again—just as the sun died and was reborn. The land will be new and green with young grass. Elk and deer and antelope and even the vanished buffalo will return in vast numbers as they were before the white man came. And all Indians will be young again and free

of the white man's sicknesses—even those of our people who have gone to the grave. It will be a paradise on earth! (Miller, 1959, pp. 27-28)

At Wounded Knee, Crow Dog and Black Elk welcomed all warriors, Sioux or not, to participate in the Ghost Dance on March 22, 1973. A photo taken days before the dance shows a written sign placed on the press conference podium that reads: "GHOST DANCE AT DAWN. Anyone Want to Ghost Dance See Crow Dog. At 1 A.M. Tonite..." (Photo in Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 89). Warriors from different tribes and ethnic groups, including blacks and Chicanos, were allowed to participate, providing they could piece together ceremonial clothing from what little scraps were available at the camp (Akwesasne Notes, 1974). On the eve of the dance, Crow Dog spoke to the *mélange* of Ghost Dancers, and discussed the advantages of joining together for the Ghost Dance despite personal and cultural differences. In addition, Crow Dog explained the significance of the dance, its history, and what would happen during the dance. By explaining the history of the Ghost Dance and its importance to the militants, Crow Dog revived the dance, creating a bond between the Ghost Dancing generations.

Lake's theory would argue that the primary function of Crow Dog's speech that night was to gather together Indians and restore or strengthen the beliefs and values of the Indian traditions. However, Crow Dog's audience was not *only* Oglalas, nor Sioux, nor American Indians. The people to whom Crow Dog spoke were Indians of all nations, as well as people from other ethnic groups. Minority rights activist Graciano "Chano" Juaraqui (1974) argued that minorities needed to support and participate in the protest at Wounded Knee, regardless of race: "All that are Mexicans, Indians, or whatever, ought to support whatever the brothers are doing in Wounded Knee" (Akwesasne Notes, p. 93).

However, given Lake's theory of the consummatory function of rhetoric, it would be impossible to "restore" American Indian values and traditions in non-Indians. Therefore, Crow Dog spoke to the Ghost Dancers, not as Indians, but as young militants unfamiliar with the dance: "Many of those who danced with me... knew nothing about the old ways and ceremonies.... They had lived all their lives in the white man's big cities, or they came from tribes where the missionaries had destroyed their old religion. Many had never even been in a sweat lodge" (Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1995 p. 128).

Crow Dog's intent was to bring these people together to reinforce their goal: to free Wounded Knee and maintain the Independent Oglala Nation. Speaking to the Ghost Dancers, Crow Dog reiterated the importance of discarding ethnic labels:

We're gonna unite together, no matter what tribe you are. We're gonna be brothers and sisters. Mohawk, Chippewa, whatever you are, we're gonna be together. We're not gonna say, "I'm a different tribe," or "I'm a different man," or "he's a white man," or "he's a black man." We're not gonna have the government, the white man attitude. (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 83)

By rejecting ethnic identifications, Crow Dog brought the participants together as dancers, not Indians. This may have been because Crow Dog wanted to appeal to the various ethnic groups and tribes present. Essentially, Crow Dog pulled the Sioux identity out of Ghost Dance, making it a "dance of all people." He appealed to Indian traditionalists, who knew and understood the dance. He also appealed to Indian militants, who sought to learn more of their own ancient ways. Last, he appealed to non-Indians, who were curious about the experience of Indian traditions. Smith and Warrior (1996)

argued that the only three things needed to Ghost Dance in 1973 were “Courage, stamina...and special clothes” (p. 230). Therefore, Crow Dog tailored his message to include non-Indians, expanding the speech act’s principal function to include instilling a general ethnic pride in non-Indians. This second purpose still performed as a reinforcing agent, as Lake’s (1983) theory outlines. However, this reinforcement occurred not within the Indian, but rather within the non-Indian.

In his speech, Crow Dog (Akwesasne Notes, 1974) delineated rules and expectations for the Ghost Dancers (although some would argue that the regulations that he outlined were set by the white establishment throughout history). He also addressed the apathetic and lazy attitude he saw in young Indians: “Nowadays, you guys walk around, you’re tired. You’re not gonna say, ‘I’m gonna rest.’ There’s no rest, there’s no intermission, no coffee break, we’re not gonna drink water.” By telling them how to behave and what to expect, Crow Dog attempted to change modern attitudes in both Indians and non-Indians. Lake (1983) argued that Indian protest rhetoric was only directed at Indians, though it is evident that Crow Dog addressed both indigenous and non-indigenous people.

Crow Dog (1974) continued to maintain that the Ghost Dance ceremony was an art long forgotten: “Everybody read(s) about the Ghost Dance, but nobody ever seen it.” He then insisted that the tradition be continued: “This hoop has to be not broken—for the whole unborn generations.” With this statement, Crow Dog undertook a lofty goal by attempting to re-instill the Ghost Dance tradition in a generation unfamiliar with the dance. Critics have argued, however, that Indian culture and traditions should only be practiced by indigenous people, and should not be imitated. Tim Giago, the Lakota editor

of Indian Country Today, the country's largest American Indian newspaper, argued that authentic Lakota spirituality cannot be feigned: "It is fashionable by those who would sell out their spirituality to say we are all brothers and we should all share our religion, but don't you believe it. True Indian spirituality can be imitated, but it will never be the real thing" (Giago, 1995, 1).

In this context then, lies the argument of fusing together Indians from various tribes. If the Ghost Dance was open only to American Indians, it would still have been virtually impossible to maintain the distinct identity of the Lakota Sioux culture that was at the crux of this particular dance. Morris and Wander (1990) argued that it is virtually impossible for Indians from different tribes to bond and develop a single identity. In the case of Wounded Knee 1973, the Oglalas compromised their tribal traditions and culture by combining with Indians from other tribes. Morris and Wander (1990) maintained that, "To abandon one's language or one's culture, from this perspective, is to compromise one's identity. Intertribal unity, which requires compromise, is thus problematic from the outset" (p. 167). They continued: "Particularly among 'traditional' Native Americans, who seek to preserve the traditional cultural patterns of their tribe, to join with another tribe is to risk losing tribal identity" (p. 167).

Leonard Crow Dog's comments to dancers on the eve of the ceremony indicated that as a Wounded Knee militant, he attempted to achieve the impossible: he sought to reaffirm the importance of Sioux culture by invigorating Indians of all nations to fight against the white establishment, and attempted to appeal to a larger non-Indian audience at the same time.

## Act 2: The American Indian Movement and the Embargo

Dennis Bank's passionate speech to Wounded Knee militants following the Ghost Dance was one of the strongest illustrations of Lake's (1983) theory of the consummatory function of rhetoric. The speech, intended to reinforce the reasons for the siege and rekindle Indian indignation, is a clear example of Lake's (1983) assertion that Indian protest rhetoric reaffirms the movement's "Indianness."

After the Ghost Dance, occupiers held their nightly meeting at the trading post. The week prior, Assistant Attorney General Harlington Wood and U.S. Marshals Director Wayne Colburn left Wounded Knee not having negotiated any terms with protestors. AIM member Dennis Banks spoke out against the government's roadblock and embargo and resolved to bring supplies into Wounded Knee on the backs of supporters. Banks' statements were aimed at the protestors within the compound and were intended to cause contempt for the government and a rededication to the fight.

Banks (Akwasasne Notes, 1974) began by telling occupiers that the roadblock was preventing some of the most important people from coming into Wounded Knee: the media. "They're stopping all the news media," Banks said, adding that lawyers and supplies were also being kept from the compound. The day before, members of the media were ordered to leave the area by 4:30 p.m. every day, preventing them from attending the movement's nightly meetings (Akwasasne Notes, 1974). Lake (1983) contended that militant Indian rhetors refused to assimilate to white society, instead advocating a return to "traditional tribal values" (p. 129). However, Dennis Banks (1974), addressing fellow protestors, discussed the removal of the media, which inherently threatened the dissemination of their protest message and their safety. "By providing national and

international coverage of the protest, the media not only served as a buffer against a possible government attack, as the protestors hoped they would, but also insured that the protestors' expressed desire to form coalitions with other groups would reach an impressive array of audiences" (Morris and Wander, 1990, p. 174).

By 1973, television, radio and print had become the principal means of disseminating the news. These channels of communication—which were largely products of “white” news agencies and journalists—were threatened at Wounded Knee. Realizing that media were the most vital link to the outside, Banks created an urgency to keep the fight alive. Ward Churchill (1994) argued that prior to the FBI’s roadblock, AIM attempted to attract as much media attention as possible at Wounded Knee, going so far as to act as guides for reporters:

A two hundred AIM contingent was sent to the symbolic site of Wounded Knee to prepare for an early morning press conference; a much smaller group was sent back to Rapid City to notify the media and to guide reporters to Wounded Knee at the appropriate time. (p. 261)

If Lake’s assertions were wholly true, and AIM intended to disassociate itself with white society, then the FBI’s interruption of media coverage would not have been a key issue for the protestors. However, Banks’ *first* point of contention was the FBI’s interference with media. This argument leads to the discourse’s second role—instrumental. By contending that the FBI’s roadblocks impeded media coverage, Banks (1974) inherently stressed the need to actively contest the blockade. With this statement, Banks intended to create change, thus asserting the instrumental function of the rhetoric.

Later in the speech, Banks (1974) declared, “Tonight *we* close the doors.

Tonight *we* dictate who goes through those doors. Tonight our own phase I has already begun.” Using a tactic called “polarization” (Bowers, Ochs and Jensen, 1993, p. 34), Banks (1974) blanketed the speech with “them” and “us” terms. By doing so, he created a clear division between the federal and movement sides, reaffirming militant commitment to the siege. Banks’ (1974) choice of words supported Lake’s contention that consummatory language reinforced the division between Indians and the white establishment.

The intent of Banks’ speech was to stimulate action on the part of the Wounded Knee agitators. In addition, Banks’ motivations were basic: the FBI roadblocks and embargo were reinstated, little food and few supplies remained, and there was little media coverage. Without these essentials, the movement risked a collapse. Banks knew he needed to fan the flames of passion and action within the movement.

Another strategy Banks used to reinforce Indian commitment to the siege was that of storytelling. A means of altering listeners’ perception to the present, storytelling was used to “intensify stories and claims” (Stewart, Smith and Denton, 1994, p. 48). Banks (1974) declared: “This man here, who weighs 140 pounds, last night he packed 80 pounds of food to us, 15 miles. I’m sure it was more like 50 miles to him. We had one man who started out Saturday and walked for three days, 50 miles, to get here.” By telling impressive stories of activists who endangered themselves to pack food in for their fellow activists, Banks hoped to move the Indians into action. After weeks of stagnancy, the movement had grown listless and disheartened, and Banks believed he could reunite protestors and revive their commitment to the movement. Dewing (1985) argued that “it



had been quite clearly established that a great deal of infighting between various factions and personalities took place.... Also, it was well known that the situation at Wounded Knee regarding food, fuel, ammunition, and other needed supplies was growing desperate”(p. 187).

Banks’ final words provoked what Vine Deloria, in a 1990 video documentary, called “Indian perception of duties and responsibilities” (Dubois and McKiernan, 1:06:13). Banks (1974) declared, “We’ve got 50 tons of groceries waiting out there. We want 11 volunteers and 11 backpacks for them. Now they’re empty. You’re going to bring them back full.” Banks held the rebels accountable for their own fate by making them responsible for their own food and supplies. Vine Deloria (1990) argued that according to Indian culture, “If you can’t fulfill (your) responsibilities, then the rest of creation starts to become alienated because you’re not doing your part,” thereby contributing to the ongoing social problems of the Indian (1:08:14). Again, Banks’ words supported the dual-function theory. In his speech that night, Dennis Banks reinforced the precepts of Indian duties and responsibilities (consummatory), and at the same time advocated change (instrumental).

### Act 3: Support from the Iroquois Six Nation Confederacy

Randall Lake (1983) argued that critics wrongly assumed that “militant Indian rhetoric attempts to change white attitudes” (p. 128). However, statements made by the Iroquois Six Nation Confederacy proved otherwise. The first official statement from the newly-declared Independent Oglala Nation (ION) asked for the “support and recognition” of the Iroquois Six Nation Confederacy (ISNC) (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 94). Morris

and Wander (1990) argued: "By calling on the Iroquois to support and recognize their actions, the protestors demonstrated their concern for legitimizing their protest by forming coalitions with other groups and for insuring that representatives of the federal government would not be their only audience" (pp. 173-174).

On March 19, 1973, an ISNC delegation walked through the federal roadblock and addressed the media at ION's nightly press conference. An ISNC grand council spokesperson read a prepared statement written exclusively for the white establishment. Lake (1983) argued that Red Power rhetoric is addressed only secondarily to the white establishment. However, the ISNC's statement firmly contradicted Lake's theory. The allegations made in the statement appeared to provoke the American government into initiating political and social change.

American Indian activists have admitted that, like all other Americans, they depend on the programs and services of the government: "(Indians) fully realize that with no funds for investment in social services they are dependent upon the federal government for services which the ordinary citizen provides for himself and which other poor do not receive except under demeaning circumstances" (Deloria, 1969, p. 125). Therefore, it would be sensible to attempt to arbitrate these programs and services with the dominant society's government:

Whether explicitly or implicitly, the protestors understood that the legitimacy of their protest and their ability to form coalitions with other groups, to plead their case to diverse audiences, to maintain unity, to hold the interest of the media, and to speak for most, if not all, traditional and new traditional Native Americans hinged on their ability to define

themselves in such a way that their identity would transcend cultural differences. (Morris and Wander, 1990, p. 174)

Attempting to induce sympathy, the spokesperson declared, “There must be some one among you who is concerned for us, or if not for us, at least for the honor of your country.... The solution is simple: be honest, be fair, honor the commitments made by the founding fathers of your country. We are an honorable people—can you say the same?” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 94). The audience in this statement was clearly the white establishment, which supports the dual-function theory. Once again, the rhetor (in this case, the ISNC) serviced the consummatory role for Indians while also enacting the instrumental function for the white establishment.

The ISNC then gave the government the choice to negotiate or take responsibility for the bloodshed that would result: “The balance of the ledger is up to you. Compare the damage of the BIA and Wounded Knee against the terrible record and tell us that we are wrong for wanting redress. We ask for justice, and not from the muzzle of an M-16 rifle. Now what is to occur?” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 95). This question—which urged the government to react—enabled the oratory’s instrumental purpose.

In a final attempt to impel the white establishment to react, the ISNC attempted to reason with the public and justify AIM’s actions:

We have not asked you to give up your religions and beliefs for ours. We have not asked you to give up your ways of life for ours. We have not asked you to give up your government for ours. We have not asked that you give up your territories to us. Why can you not accord us with the same respect? For your children learn from watching their elders, and if

you want your children to do what is right, then it is up to you to set the example. (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 95)

The ISNC (1974) asked these questions of the U.S. government, and on a larger scale, the general U.S. population. “Here, they set up a contrast between the dominant and the dominated, and then reversed it to point out obvious disparities between what the dominant society apparently expects of Native Americans and what it expects of itself. They also contrasted the values and the actions of a dominant society” (Morris and Wander, 1990, 176). By “turning the tables,” the ISNC was able to assert their claim that the takeover of Wounded Knee was not the violent act of agitators, but rather a response to white oppression. The underlying message: *you would do the same thing if it happened to you.*

The ISNC’s message was intended for a non-indigenous audience, and more specifically for the white establishment. Lake (1983) incorrectly surmised that “(Red Power rhetoric) is addressed only secondarily to the white establishment” (p. 128). Contrary to Lake’s theory, the white establishment was the principal audience in this militant Indian rhetorical artifact. More specifically, the ISNC attempted to reason with the federal government (white establishment) in order to obtain sympathy and secure reaction.

Undoubtedly, discursive acts are the primary basis for rhetorical analysis. However, there is an entire subset of rhetorical artifacts that warrant analysis and discussion: non-discursive (symbolic) acts. These acts, though unspoken, convey intense message and meaning. A simple gesture or movement can transmit a message in and of itself. Therefore, symbolic acts (refer to Bowers, Ochs and Jensen’s definition of

rhetoric, page 20) will be analyzed as rhetorical artifacts. Following is an examination of three non-discursive acts during the siege that expressed powerful messages to its audiences.

## CHAPTER 6

### ANALYSIS OF RHETORICAL BEHAVIOR: NON-DISCURSIVE ACTS

The second element to the rhetorical behavior at Wounded Knee is that of the non-discursive act. These are acts that, as Lake (1983) reasoned, may “proscribe the address of white audiences, (but) also generates a consummatory alternative which both respects traditional religious precepts and enables the movement to achieve a measure of success by addressing Indians themselves” (p. 135).

The non-discursive acts performed at Wounded Knee may have appeared “consummatory” on the surface because, overall, the acts were able to reinforce the Indian values and precepts they fought to restore. Behavior such as sweat lodge rituals, dancing, storytelling, and smoking the sacred pipe were ancient rituals performed by indigenous Americans through generations. However, many of these symbolic acts were also performed at Wounded Knee with an auxiliary purpose: to reinforce protestors’ “Indianness” to the white establishment. In addition, AIM’s choice to make their stand at Wounded Knee sent a powerful message to the white establishment. Following is an analysis of three symbolic artifacts at Wounded Knee.

#### Artifact 1: AIM Chooses to Make Its Stand at Wounded Knee

AIM, movement leaders recognized instantly the tremendous impact they could make at Wounded Knee. Ward Churchill (1994) maintained that contrary to popular belief, it was the Oglala elders who decided to bring attention to Wounded Knee: “It was decided by the elders that they needed to draw public attention to the situation on the reservation” (p. 261).

The site of a U.S. military massacre eight decades before, Wounded Knee was the perfect setting for a showdown with the government that oppressed them. At “The Knee,” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974) AIM could realize three goals: forcibly take back the town that sat on Indian land, send the white establishment a dynamic message, and reinforce American Indian ideals and values.

Since 1890, Wounded Knee remained a sobering reminder of the injustices that Indians had suffered over the years. Though the government had issued a formal apology to Indians everywhere for the tragedy at Wounded Knee, many could not—or would not—forget. As Russell Means (1995) recalled:

Wounded Knee would always remain the haunting symbol of the white man’s murderous treachery and of our nation’s stoic grief. At Wounded Knee, on ground consecrated with the blood of our ancestors, we would make our stand. At Wounded Knee, as nowhere else, the spirits of Big Foot and his martyred people would protect us. (p. 253)

However, Means admitted earlier that the significance of Wounded Knee was two-fold:

The part I am most proud of is one, Wounded Knee was and is the catalyst of the rebirth of our self-dignity and pride in being Indians. The second part of that is, it alerted the entire world that American Indians are still

alive and will with traditional beliefs and we are still resisting colonization.

(Little Eagle, 1993, p. A-1)

This is evidence of the dual function serving both Indians and non-Indians. First, Wounded Knee was the symbol of the renewal of Indian culture and pride. By choosing this site, agitators reaffirmed their sense of “Indianness.” In fact, for a number of Sioux AIM activists, Wounded Knee was a personal part of their past. As Mary Crow Dog, an Oglala AIM activist maintained:

Wounded Knee is part of our family’s history. Leonard’s great-grandfather, the first Crow Dog, had been one of the leaders of the Ghost Dancers. He and his group had held out in the icy ravines of the Badlands all winter, but when the soldiers came in force to kill all the Ghost Dancers he had surrendered his band to avoid having his people killed.... Thus he saved his people just a few miles away from where Big Foot and his band were massacred. (Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1990, pp. 24-125)

For activists like Mary Crow Dog, coming back to Wounded Knee was a fundamental step in rerouting the course of history for Indians. As one of the great Lakota ceremonial chiefs Frank Fools Crow (as quoted in Mails, 1979) said, “Coming to Wounded Knee was just the most natural thing in the world to do” (p. 128).

Death was also considered, and expected. Activists knew that there was a chance that Indian lives might be lost at Wounded Knee. For activist and spiritual leader Leonard Crow Dog (1990), however, the chance to die at this sacred place seemed almost too glorious: “I am not afraid to die. If I die at Wounded Knee, I will go where Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull and our grandfathers are” (p. 128). In American Indian culture, death is



an admirable part of life: “The attitude of the Indian toward death, the test and background of life, is entirely consistent with his character and philosophy. Death has no terrors for him; he meets it with simplicity and perfect calm, seeking only an honorable end as his last gift to his family and descendants. Therefore, he courts death in battle” (Eastman, 1911, p. 149).

The second empowering purpose of AIM’s choice of Wounded Knee was the forceful message it sent to the white establishment of American Indians’ willingness to defy the government. As Desmond Smith (as quoted in Warrior, 1997) argued, “Wounded Knee was an example of a new and expanding strategy of political manipulation that neatly circumvents the ordinary processes of government. Its essential element is that it makes a direct and powerful appeal to the public” (p. 73).

By virtue of choosing such a site, this small group of radicals was able to intimidate and challenge the strongest government in the world. Wounded Knee was, in a matter of speaking, the government’s “Achilles heel” in American Indian relations. Knowing this, AIM chose this site to reaffirm to outsiders that American Indians were determined to fight: “For AIM, Wounded Knee represented a stand for all Indian people, everywhere” (Smith and Warrior, 1996, p. 209).

### **Artifact 2: The Warrior Ceremony**

By the second week of the takeover, little progress had been made during negotiations between militants and the government. Protestors knew that a fight would

soon ensue between Indians and government agents. Days into the siege, protestors began calling themselves “warriors.” Although most of these “warriors” knew little about their own Indian culture, some rationalized that their devotion to the restoration of the Indian way of life was the prerequisite to being a modern warrior. Dennis Banks argued, “AIM is the new warrior class of this century, bound by the bond of the drum, who vote with their bodies instead of their mouths; their business is hope” (as quoted in Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1995, p. 159). Another self-professed AIM warrior stated: “Warrior society means the men and women of the nation have dedicated themselves to give everything they have to the people. A warrior should be the first one hungry and the last one to eat. He should be the first one to give away his moccasins and the last one to get new ones” (Indian Nation, 1976, p. 5).

On March 6, 1973, the government gave protestors an ultimatum to end to the week-old conflict. Federal negotiator Ralph Erickson stated, “Negotiations cannot be made at gunpoint...I call upon them to send the women and children out of Wounded Knee before darkness falls March 8” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 51). Officials did not want to be responsible for injury or death to any of the youngsters or females occupying the site, and believed that the government stood a greater chance of ending the siege if the number of protestors was decreased.

Protestors were undeterred as Russell Means replied to the ultimatum: “We came here and bet our lives that there would be historic change for our nation. The government can massacre us, or it can meet our basic human demands. Either way, there will be historic change” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 51). Pedro Bissonette, speaking for the Oglalas, said, “One hundred sixty-seven have volunteered to remain and fight with us

until we get more top officials in here to negotiate” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 51).

Protestors were determined, and prepared for a fight.

Spiritual leaders held a ceremony for the Indian warriors in preparation for a battle with federal agents. “Inside Wounded Knee, a religious ceremony was held and warriors came forward to have their faces painted by the medicine men, signifying their acceptance of the possibility of death” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 51). This warrior ceremony has, to date, been a highly debated topic among critics. Some argue that the ceremony was meant for the Indian warriors, as a way of validating their Indianness and reminding themselves of the severity of the fight. There are also those who believe that the warrior ceremony was simply for show, that it was the protestors’ way of promulgating their Indianness to outsiders, particularly the press.

In his 1995 memoir, Russell Means was adamant as to the ceremony’s primary audience and the intent of the ceremony. He argued that it was the media that distorted the ceremony’s purpose. He described the media’s response to warrior ceremonies:

The reporters went into a feeding frenzy. That was exactly how they wanted to show Indians, circling a blazing fire, chanting and singing and putting on paint. Later, reporters and commentators who had not been at Wounded Knee said we had staged that for the cameras. Nonsense! We “staged” it for ourselves, the way a Catholic stages Mass or a Jew stages Yom Kippur or a Muslim stages a pilgrimage to Mecca. Of course it was dramatic and solemn. We were all pledging to die for our beliefs. (pp. 274-275)

For Means, and for Wounded Knee protestors, the warrior ceremony was a spiritual one, one in which a warriors called upon this spiritual side: “He will put on his sacred paint, use the sacred symbols he received in his visions, and call on all the spiritual assistance he has earned over his life as a man. If he is killed by the enemy, then he will have a direct line for going into the spirit world and be accepted” (Young Bear and Theisz, 1994, p. 80).

Devotion to the movement—even in the face of death—was the ultimate commitment for Indian militants. Activist Carter Camp said of the impending battle, “We in no way think we can whip the United States government, but we have every intention of selling our lives as dearly as we can” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 51). Oglala leader Severt Young Bear (1994) expressed that a Lakota warrior embodies two cultural traditions: a warrior has half his mind on his spirituality, the other half on being a fighter. This way, argues Young Bear, the spiritual warrior can be fearless and effective, and can be in touch with the spirit of death: “The most courageous thing a warrior can do is walk hand in hand with death. We call that *nagi gluha mani*, walking with the spirit” (Young Bear and Theisz, p. 79).

The understanding that death was a strong possibility in this takeover implied the gravity of the situation. Reverend John Adams, of the United Methodist Church, a National Council of Churches representative on the scene at Wounded Knee, emphasized the seriousness of the ultimatum:

Now I tell you that was a war there. There were people who felt that that was another scenario, a charade of some sort. But it wasn't. It was a war.... It was a serious matter. And there were lives at stake. And if

people thought that those who said they were ready to die were just playing, they were wrong. They were ready at that point—not to commit suicide—but to let their deaths be as strategic as possible. (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 53)

Eyewitnesses such as Reverend Adams were certain that the Wounded Knee warriors were determined to die for their cause. The ceremony, then, was consummatory in that it stimulated Indian determination and pride. By declaring themselves “warriors” and daubing their faces with war paint, protestors proved to themselves their commitment to the fight.

Critics, however, argue that the ceremony was simply for spectacle. Reporters on the scene were quick to point out its exaggerated qualities, confirmed by a March 19, 1973 Time article that jeered: “From the start, the confrontation...between militant Indians and local, state and federal authorities had all the elements of bad theatre. The Indians insisted on outmoded make-up (war paint) and melodramatic lines (‘Massacre us or meet our human needs’)” (p. 16). This sarcasm, some argue, is the result of “media framing”: “The belief that an SMO (social movement organization) will receive a fair hearing, or that belief that an SMO can control the media process is somewhat naïve. The very process of news gathering and framing issues suggests that a distorted and incomplete picture of a movement’s message and goals will result from media coverage” (Baylor, 1996, p. 251).

Allowing the media to cover the warrior ritual is a move that appears to be deliberate, and strategic. Although the “warriors” performed the ceremony for themselves, it is clear that by allowing journalists—who could carry their message to the

outside world—to record the rite, the Indians would let the public know that they are proud, they are ready to fight, and that they are ready to die for their cause. “It is now entirely possible for a small group of people to intimidate the strongest of governments. It is quite clear from this that such individuals can seize upon a real political grievance, stage it imaginatively, bring in the media, and proceed that their own particular solution must be accepted by everybody else” (Warrior, 1997, p. 72).

Morris and Wander (1995) expressed their concern for the displacement of tribal identities in favor of the “Indian.” Under these circumstances, reporters covering the siege were “disappointed and confused when they discovered the protest did not involve any ‘real Indians’” (Morris and Wander, 1990, p. 165). The dominant society’s expectations of modern Indians are far-fetched, the researchers argued. The implication is clear: if Indians cannot talk and act like their ancestors, then they must not be real Indians. Therefore, if you are not a real Indian, immersing yourself in Indian ways is merely for exhibition. This attitude is clearly displayed in the lamentations of one reporter present at Wounded Knee: “If only someone would say ‘when the moon comes over the mountains and the leaves fall off the trees when the cherries turn red, we will attack with long rifles. (But) all I hear is, ‘Yeah, man—cool it...’ and ‘we will study this procedural matter tonight’” (p. 165). The assumption that Indians were not “real” if they did not appear to conform to ancient Indian precepts is ignorant, at best: “Forget that (Indians) were, at best, 100 years distant from their ancestors who hunted bison” (Warrior, 1997, p. 72).

The warrior ceremony then, served a dual purpose for the militants. As an agent of self-reinforcement, it brought Indian protestors in touch with their spirituality and

readied them mentally for battle. The ceremony also helped Indians realize that this conflict was genuine, and would bring with it genuine consequences. The ultimate of these consequences—death—was celebrated and supplicated as the greatest honor to be bestowed upon a warrior.

The ceremony also conveyed to the white establishment that Indians were sincere in their commitments, though some criticized the Indians for performing the media-friendly rite. Most, though, saw the ritual as an Indian showing of power and determination to the outside world. In many ways, this ritual was one of the strongest messages that Indian protestors could send to their adversaries. Again, the movement's symbolic actions lend themselves to the dual-function theory, addressing both Indians and non-Indians.

### Artifact 3: The Sacred Pipe Ceremony with Federal Officials

On April 4, 1973, federal negotiators Kent Frizzell and Richard Hellstern had essentially agreed to AIM's ten-point proposal, including the requests for government audits and investigations of the tribal government and tribal officials, and a preliminary meeting the next Saturday with the White House to plan for later meetings between the White House and Sioux chiefs (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 145). Later that day, the Oglalas held a signing ceremony, at which media representatives were witnesses, and both Oglalas and government officials adjourned to the tipi to smoke the sacred pipe.

The pipe ceremony is considered one of the most sacred rituals in Sioux culture: "This simple ceremony is the commonest daily expression of thanks or 'grace,' as well as an oath of loyalty and good faith when the warrior goes forth upon some perilous

enterprise” (Eastman, 1911, p. 82). Henry Crow Dog, a great spiritual Lakota leader and father of Leonard Crow Dog, said, “The most sacred thing for us Lakota is the *chanupa*, the holy pipe. The pipe and the Indian go together. They can not be separated” (Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1995, p.133). The sacredness of the pipe and the importance of the negotiations make this particular act powerful. In one of the Lakota’s most consecrated ceremonies, adversaries smoke the pipe together to create understanding.

The Oglalas’ intent with the pipe ceremony was two-fold. Both intents served two different audiences, and two different functions. First, the Oglala spiritual leaders wanted to present the agreement to the Great Spirit—also known as Tunkashila, the Grandfather Spirit or Wakan Tanka—the father of all being (p. 133). This gesture of humility and gratitude was symbolic of the American Indians’ understanding that they surrendered to the Indian powers that are greater than all Indians. This gesture, immersed in Indian religious tradition, clearly reaffirmed the protestors’ “Indianness.” Though the protestors negotiated in the “white way,” they yielded to the powers of the *wakan*, the holy.

The second objective was to enter into the agreement with the government in Indian tradition and demonstrate to their oppressors that Indians were willing to forgive past promises that were broken: “Considering how many treaties have been broken that were made with smoke, you can get a very clear idea of what the value of those treaties were, the difference in perception of making treaties with smoke” (Townsend, 1999, p. 3). By inviting officials to become part of the ceremony, the militants were able to bind negotiators to the agreement in Indian tradition. Written treaties are contraptions of Anglo society; for Indians, the highest means of sealing an agreement is with smoke, which cannot be broken.



Performing the pipe ceremony with representatives from the white establishment was a strategic choice. By using a sacred Lakota ceremony, and smoking the pipe with their “white brothers,” the Oglalas made their guests understand the gravity of this sanctified agreement:

When we make smoke, it allows our souls to be evaluated in the sense that it allows us to be completely opened up. If you and I are making an agreement, it’s not just between you and me, it’s an agreement with the Creator who is listening when you make smoke or an offering. It’s an incredibly binding agreement that goes beyond what you can cross out on a treaty, or what you can destroy with fire, because that agreement has already been made between two people and their Creator. (Townsend, 1999, p. 3)

By pulling the federal negotiators into their spiritual realm, militants were able to re-infuse the serious nature of the agreement. Throughout the ritual, negotiators were continually reminded that they were not the first whites to smoke the pipe, and that their white predecessors had broken many treaties. During the ceremony, medicine man Leonard Crow Dog stated, “So many hundred years ago, the white man and Indians smoke the pipe. Now, today, they’re gonna smoke the pipe again” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 146). After Crow Dog, Lakota elder Gladys Bissonette spoke: “We smoke the sacred pipe here with our white brothers. And we hope this will bring peace. Because in the past there were a lot of violations of the sacred treaties and honors. This is real” (p.147). The warning that negotiators received was clear; the Indians remembered the

long history of white lies and oppression, and they were not about to let the government forget either.

The pipe ceremony, then, addressed two audiences. First, the ceremony re-affirmed the occupiers' Indianness and celebrated the American Indian race and culture. As the holy pipe remained a sacred Lakota ritual, so remained the importance to celebrate and revere the Indian race. For Wounded Knee spiritual leaders, the pipe was a way of bringing the Indian spirit back to modern Indians: "The pipe lifted up in prayer forms a link between man and *Tunkashila*. It's a spiritual bridge to the Great Spirit. With the pipe I can communicate with *Tunkashila*" (p. 133). By smoking the pipe, Indian militants could reaffirm the importance of Indian culture and tradition, as well as tap into their spirituality. In this manner, modern Indians were able to link the pipe with the culture they were trying to save.

The sacred pipe ceremony had a second audience: the white government officials present at the ceremony. Lakota leaders wanted negotiators to know that both parties were entering into a sacred agreement with the pipe. Violating an agreement sealed with the pipe was the ultimate dishonor; an honorable man could not call himself such if he violated the pipe (Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1995). In the case of the negotiators, breaking the pact would mean that the negotiators were as dishonorable as their forefathers. Negotiators were aware of the sanctity of the pipe for the Indians, and promised to uphold their promises. Federal Negotiator Kent Frizzell asserted his determination in keeping his promises: "I pray to our Father in heaven, as you do to your spirit, that the treaty we are—the agreement—we are about to sign is not full of empty words, and that men of

good faith have entered into it. And I commit myself and my government to the extent that those promises are fulfilled” (Akwesasne Notes, 1974, p. 147).

Some argue, however, that allowing non-Indians to participate in Indian ceremonies can create problems. Lake (1983) argued that it is inherently dangerous to “contaminate” Indian culture with white culture. To do so, claimed Lake, would mean that Indian culture and reverence for the truth would be corrupted with the influence of white culture and lies. With Lake’s conjecture in mind then, “traditional” Indians—as well as militants—agreed to hold sacred rituals with whites not only in attendance, but also as participants. It appears as though Wounded Knee protestors were not concerned for the preservation of their culture and spirituality; otherwise, they would have denied non-Indians access to those sacred Lakota rites. Indian militants chose to include their white adversaries in their rituals, thus directly addressing the white establishment. As Crow Dog (1995) explained, smoking the pipe with the “white man” was unavoidable. He hoped that the pipe would be the first step in bringing peace to Indians all over the nation: “At Wounded Knee I lifted up my pipe for survival, not for the survival of us who had come to that place, but for the survival of all our Indian people” (Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1995, p. 133).

## CHAPTER 7

### CONCLUSION

The results of this research outline a theory that enhances, and adds to, Randall A. Lake's 1983 theory of the consummatory function of rhetoric. Although it is true that Red Power protestors sought to create a cultural and spiritual resurgence in their communities through their rhetoric, it can also be said that these protestors also wanted to create bureaucratic change for their people, which could *only* be done by addressing the culture that dominated the bureaucracy, namely the "white establishment."

In some instances, militants addressed Indians primarily and the white establishment secondarily. In others, the audiences were reversed. In others still, messages were tailored to address both Indians and whites equally. Nonetheless, the messages remained consistent: Protestors sought to renew their ethnic and tribal identity, as well as create governmental change for aboriginal Americans. These objectives remained at the forefront of the Red Power rhetoric at Wounded Knee, both in their discursive acts and their symbolic behavior.

Lake (1983) argues that militant Indian rhetoric "is more appropriately viewed from a perspective which examines its significance for Indians themselves" (p. 128). Although this statement may be true, it completely ignores an audience that, at times, is *directly* addressed. This study has exposed a second audience for American Indian protest discourse. Certainly, this finding does complicate Lake's theory, in that this discourse

played a dual intent rather than the easily explained single purpose. Whether in their spoken words, or in their actions, American Indians at Wounded Knee made it clear that they were determined to create change. Many times, creating change required the reinforcement of their Indian culture, which would remind protestors of what exactly they were fighting for. Much of the rhetoric displayed by militants was intended to reinforce Indian precepts, both religious and cultural. However, the second function that has emerged is equally directed at, and intended for, the non-Indian audience: the white establishment. Through this second function, Indians were able to generate a social consciousness that would ultimately create change for indigenous people. This second function is equally significant to the rhetoric's consummatory function, although its motivation, strategy and audience are entirely different.

This second function by no means weakens American Indian protest rhetoric. In fact, this duality suggests a crafty strategy on the part of the rhetors. Not only did American Indian militants attempt to revive their own lost culture, but they also endeavored to instill a cultural awareness and compassion in white society in an effort to create social change.

Throughout history, ethnic groups have formed coalitions and movements to fight against the oppression and suffering of their people. This was the purpose of the American Indian Movement. However, this study revealed that there is a common misconception among critics of the American Indian Movement that is not necessarily present with critics of other movements of the time. It appears that it is this fallacy that derides the efforts of the movement, misanalyzing its actions and labeling Red Power protest a "failure." Unlike other movements, AIM has been the target of ridicule by its

detractors, being labeled a “mock movement” of sorts, a movement that seeks only to exaggerate its culture in a grandiose show of bravado and smugness.

The reality is that the American Indian Movement was just like many other social collectives of the time. It sought to change a system that smothered the survival of their people, through whatever means it believed could create change. For some unknown reason, modern American Indians have been burdened with the unrealistic duty of adhering to a culture that, under the cover of oppression, has become a faint memory in their lives. These people have been asked to do the impossible; they have been asked to revive a culture that for many years had been stripped from their people in an effort to “civilize” them. It is only fitting then, to pose this assertion: over the years, the image of the “Indian” has been romanticized, characterized, satirized, scrutinized, and dissected by white society to the point that it is *highly doubtful* that that white society could properly identify—much less *recognize*—the American Indian identity.

True, American Indian militants at Wounded Knee were not particularly familiar with the culture that they sought to preserve. This may account for the awkward displays of “Indianness,” from the clumsy rhetorical displays to the staged symbolic exhibitions of Indian tradition. Sophomoric performance notwithstanding, the rhetorical acts displayed by the American Indian protestors at Wounded Knee certainly affirm Lake’s (1983) theory of the consummatory function of rhetoric. The acts also demonstrate the existence of a second function, one that sought to reconstruct Indian rights and liberties. With these two motivations in mind, Indian militants utilized what little resources and rhetorical training they had at their disposal to achieve their goals.

Therefore, American Indian protest rhetoric is the antithesis to the claims charged by its critics. It was not—in a matter of speaking—“aimless.” Though the speakers were inexperienced, excitable and unruly, they nonetheless achieved their rhetorical intentions. Employing the passion and determination that made the movement so infamous, protestors were able to direct their rhetoric at the two audiences it endeavored to reach: American Indians and the white society that oppressed them.

For years, the American Indian Movement has been branded a failure, a flop, and a comedy of errors. But an analysis of its discourse, as well as the discourse of those who supported it, showed that—at the very least—during the siege of Wounded Knee, they were *not* failures. This study proves important for two reasons. First, it substantiates Lake’s theory of rhetorical function, and adds a second layer to his theory. The theory, still in its infancy, has yet to be thoroughly explored and dissected by scholars. This paper acts as a springboard to further research in consummatory function.

Second, this paper negates criticism from the scores of faultfinders, many of whom are very clearly unfamiliar with American Indian culture. In this vein, it is only appropriate to assert that this researcher *in no way* alleges to have aggregate knowledge of this ancient culture. In fact, one of the most genuine realizations gained during this research was that there is little, if any, chance that anyone who has not lived in the traditional Indian way, and who thoroughly immersed him or herself in Indian tradition and culture, could purport to be an Indian “expert.” There is no such thing. As such, it seems nonsensical—even juvenile—for an outsider to judge a cultural movement.

American Indian activism in the 1960s and 1970s was a crucial first step in exposing the injustices that indigenous Americans suffered at the hands of their

oppressors. It is necessary, then, to analyze the elements and actions meant to create change. In turn, this analysis uncovers the reasons why that change did, or did not, occur.

It has been noted—and it must be reiterated—that little research exists on Red Power protest rhetoric. This paper serves as an important step in opening avenues of research in this type of discourse. American Indian protest rhetoric is fascinating, inviting further analysis. Perhaps further research could include analyses into the consummatory functions of the rhetoric, particularly during other occurrences, such as AIM's takeover of Alcatraz Island or the takeover of the BIA building. Analyses into these incidences could outline an overall Red Power rhetorical strategy during that era. Analyses could also be done on current AIM rhetoric, which would advise scholars of whether this dual strategy exists today.

Other research could include analysis of the rhetoric of other cultural collectivisms, either during the politically charged '60s and '70s, or in recent years. Such research could uncover some of the hidden motives and audiences behind certain rhetoric acts. Using this theory, researchers may uncover the strategies of these movements.

With all the possibilities at hand, it is obvious that academia has barely scratched the surface, both in American Indian rhetoric research and consummatory function theory. Perhaps this study will serve as a call to scholars to explore the largely uninvestigated world of American Indian protest rhetoric.



## APPENDIX

### RHETORICAL ARTIFACT TEXTS

(OBTAINED FROM AKWESASNE NOTES' VOICES FROM WOUNDED KNEE

1973: IN THE WORDS OF THE PARTICIPANTS)

Speech Act 1: Delegation Leader Oren Lyons, Reading the Statement Made by the  
Iroquois Six Nation Confederacy in Support of Wounded Knee

The Six Nation Iroquois Confederacy stands in support of our brothers at Wounded Knee. We are a free people. The very dust of our ancestors is steeped in our tradition. This is the greatest gift we gave to you, the concept of freedom. You did not have this. Now that you have taken it and built a constitution and country around it, you deny freedom to us. There must be someone among you who is concerned for us, or if not for us, at least for the honor of your country.

In 1976 you are going to have a birthday party proclaiming 200 years of democracy, a hypocritical action. The people of the world would find this laughable.

The solution is simple: be honest, be fair, honor the commitments made by the founding fathers of your country. We are an honorable people—can you say the same?

You are concerned for the destruction of property at the BIA building and at Wounded Knee. Where is your concern for the destruction of our people, for human lives? Thousands of Pequots, Narragansetts, Mohicans, thousands of Cherokees on the Trail of Tears, Black Hawk's people, Chief Joseph's people, Captain Jack's people, the Navajos, the Apaches, Sand Creek massacre (huddled under the American flag seeking the protection of a promise), Big Foot's people at Wounded Knee. When will you cease your violence against our people? Where is your concern for us?

What about the destruction of our properties? The thousands of acres of land, inundated by dams built on our properties, the raping of the Hopi and Navajo territories

by the Peabody strip mining operations, timber cutting, power companies, water pollution, and on and on. Where is your concern for these properties?

The balance of the ledger is up to you. Compare the damage of the BIA and Wounded Knee against the terrible record and tell us that we are wrong for wanting redress. We ask for justice, and not from the muzzle of an M-16 rifle. Now what is to occur?

Remove the marshals and the FBI men. They are hostile, and eager to exercise the sanctions of the United States to subjugate the Indian people. Do not prosecute the Indians for the methods used to gain your attention, for the fault actually lies with the government of the United States for ignoring Indians for so long.

We have not asked you to give up your religions and beliefs for ours. We have not asked you to give up your language for ours. We have not asked you to give up your ways of life for ours. We have not asked you to give up your government for ours. We have not asked that you give up your territories to us. Why can you not accord us with the same respect?

For your children learn from watching their elders, and if you want your children to do what is right, then it is up to you to set the example. That is all we have to say at the moment. *Oneh.*

Leonard Crow Dog on the Eve of the Ghost Dance

Tomorrow—ghost dance. Nowadays, you guys walk around, you're tired. You're not gonna say, "I'm gonna rest." There's no rest, there's no intermission, no coffee break, we're not gonna drink water. So that's gonna take place whether it snows, rains.

We're gonna unite together. No matter what tribe you are, we're gonna be brothers and sisters. Mohawk, Chippewa, whatever you are, we're gonna be together. We're not gonna say, "I'm a different tribe," or "I'm a different man," or "He's a white man," or "He's a black man." We're not gonna have the government, the white man attitude.

If one of us gets into the power—the spiritual power—we will hold hands. If he falls down, let him—on the other side of the ring, or inside the ring. So anybody that gets into the spiritual power, looks like he's gonna get into convulsions—don't be scared. We won't call a medic; the spirit's gonna be the doctor. So anything happen like that, back up and keep going. Hold hands.

There's a song that I'm gonna sing. The song is gonna be the spirit, the drum us the Mother Earth. And the clouds will be the visions. And the clouds—the visions—will go into your mind. You will see the visions. We elevate ourself from this world to another world. From there you can see our Grandfather.

We're gonna remember our brothers that been killed by the white man, and we're gonna remember our chiefs. You will see your brothers, your relations that died, you will see them. Ghost Dance Spirit will appear.

The peace pipe is gonna be there. The fire is gonna be there. Tobacco is gonna be there. We're not gonna go on a trip like on drugs. It starts physically... and goes into spiritually... and then you will get the power.

It's gonna start in Wounded Knee in 1973...and it's gonna continue. We're gonna unite together as brothers; we're gonna ghost dance.

Everybody read about the ghost dance, but nobody ever seen it. That was something that the United States of American prohibits. They're not gonna have no ghost dance, no sun dance, no Indian religion.

But this hoop has to be not broken—for the whole unborn generations. So decide tonight if you want to dance with me tomorrow. You be ready.

Speech Made by Dennis Banks in Regards to the FBI Roadblock and Embargo

They're stopping all the news media. They let in our lawyers when *they* want to. They let in a little bag of groceries when *they* want to. If we fail to correct that kind of policy, somebody is going to get shot because we can't divide enough insulin among three or four people, because the Justice Department or the Interior Department restricts the amount of medical supplies coming in. They busted Archie Fire out in California because he was bringing medical supplies, and we're depending on these people to reach here. They're steadily trapping us into a situation that's going to be very dangerous.

Tonight *we* close the doors. Tonight *we* dictate who goes through those doors. Tonight our own phase I has already begun. Fourteen people are already on their way to Manderson and Rosebud to begin trucking in food every night. From now on, we're going to get our bread in here, we're going to get our medicine. We're not going to beg from these people any longer.

This man here, who weighs 140 pounds, last night he packed 80 pounds of food to us, 15 miles. I'm sure it was more like 50 miles to him. We had one man who started out Saturday and walked for three days, 50 miles, to get here. We have another right here in the red blanket, got out of a federal prison last week to come here. We've had three injuries—three wounded men—who are back on duty now. Every one of them are warriors, and we're going to start acting like warriors from now on. If anybody wants to leave, we'll get you safely out of here. You don't have to worry about getting arrested. It's hard to run a community in a military fashion, but those people are out to kill us.

From now on, *we* will dictate our own future, because sooner or later they'd have us fighting because we don't have enough to eat. There have been too many Indian people that have died in back alleys, beaten to death because of promises, because of begging over a loaf of bread, or a dollar bill. We can't let that happen here.

This decision was reached with the Oglalas here, in council with members of the Six Nations. We talked it over and we realized that whatever we do here is not only going to affect the Oglala Sioux and our nation here, it's going to have far reaching effects into the Navajo Nation, the Leech Lake Chippewas, the Winnebagos, the Six Nations.

We've got 50 tons of groceries waiting out there. We want 11 volunteers and 11 backpacks for them. Now they're empty. You're going to bring them back full.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

A crisis for Indians: Wounded Knee Dissention Grows. (1973, March 7). New York Times, p. 5:1.

Armed Indians sieze Wounded Knee, hold hostages. (1973, March 1). New York Times, p. 1:1.

A suspenseful show of Red Power. (1973, March 19). Time, pp. 16-21.

Akwesasne Notes. (1974). Voices from Wounded Knee, 1973: In the words of the participants. Akwesasne Notes, Mohawk Nation: New York.

Baird-Olson, K. (1997). Reflections of an AIM activist: Has it all been worth it? In T. Johnson, J. Nagel, & D. Champagne (Eds.), American Indian activism: Alcatraz to the Longest Walk (pp. 225-241). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois.

Baylor, T. (1996). Media framing of movement protest: the case of American Indian protest. The Social Science Journal, 33. 241-255.

Bowers, J.W., Ochs, D.J. & Jensen, R.J. (1993). The rhetoric of agitation and control (second edition). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Brave Bird, M. & Erdoes, R. (1993). Ohitika Woman. New York: Harper Collins.

Churchill, W. (1997). The bloody wake of Alcatraz: Political repression of the American Indian Movement during the 1970s. In T. Johnson, J. Nagel, & D. Champagne (Eds.), American Indian activism: Alcatraz to the Longest Walk (pp. 242-284). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois.



(Eds.), American Indian activism: Alcatraz to the Longest Walk (pp. 242-284). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois.

Churchill, W. & Wall, J.V. (1990). The COINTELPRO papers: documents from the FBI's secret wars against domestic dissent. Boston: South End Press.

Crow Dog, L. & Erdoes, R. (1995). Crow Dog: Four generations of Sioux medicine men. New York: Harper Collins.

Crow Dog, M. & Erdoes, R. (1990). Lakota woman. New York: Harper Collins.

Curkan-Flanagan, M. (1996). Win the lead!: Television news philosophy and the life cycle of a social movement. Las Vegas, NV: Greenspun School of Communications.

Deloria, V. (1985). Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian declaration of Independence. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Deloria, V. (1969). Custer died for your sins. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma.

Deloria, V. and Lytle, C. (1983). American Indians, American justice. Austin: University of Texas.

Deloria, V. & Lytle, C. (1984). The nations within: the past and future of American Indian sovereignty. New York: Pantheon Books.

Dewing, R. (1985). Wounded Knee: the meaning and significance of the second incident. New York: Irvington Publishers.

Dubois, M. & McKiernan, K. (Producers). (1990). In the spirit of Crazy Horse [Video]. (Available from Pacific Arts Video Publishing, 50 N. La Cienega Boulevard, Beverly Hills, CA 90211).

FBI agent shot as Indians warn U.S. (1973, March 12). New York Times, p. 1:3.

Federal offer is spurned by Indians as talks go on. (1973, March 6). New York Times, p. 30:1.

Fenelon, J.V. (1998). Culturicide, resistance, and the survival of the Lakota ("Sioux Nation"). New York: Garland Publishing.

Forbes, J.D. (1984). Native Americans and Nixon: Presidential politics and minority self-determination 1969-1972. Los Angeles: University of California.

From Wounded Knee to Capitol Hill. (1998) National Conference of State Legislators. (October/November) 6.

Giago, T. (1984) Notes from Indian country, volume 1. Peirre, SD: State Publishing.

Giago, T. (1995). Notes from Indian Country. Indian Country Today. (April) 1-2.

Gonzalez, M. & Cook-Lynn, E. (1999). The politics of hallowed ground: Wounded Knee and the struggle for Indian sovereignty. Chicago: University of Illinois.

Holm, Tom. (1982). Indian Concepts of Authority and the Crisis in Tribal Government. The Social Science Journal, 19. (July 1982) 59-71.

Indians at Wounded Knee free 11 Held for Two Days. (1973, March 2). New York Times, p. 1:3.

Indians given 'till tonight to leave Wounded Knee. (1973, March 8). New York Times, p. 1:5.

Joseph, A.M., Nagel, J & Johnson, T. (Eds.). (1999). Red power: the American Indians' fight for freedom. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

Kifner, J. (1973, March 11). U.S. removes roadblocks in Wounded Knee vicinity. New York Times, pp. 1, 56.

Kipp, W. (1994). The eagles I fed who did not love me. American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 18. (Fall 1994) 213-232.

Kneeland, D.E. (1973, March 10). Accord reported at Wounded Knee. New York Times, pp. 1, 13.

Kurkiala, M. (1997). Building the nation back up: the politics of identity on the Pine Ridge Indian reservation. Uppsala Sweden: Uppsala University Press.

Lake, R.A. (1991). Between myth and history: Enacting time in Native American protest rhetoric. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 77, 123-151.

Lake, R.A. (1983). Enacting Red Power: The consummatory function in Native American protest rhetoric. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69, 127-142.

Lazarus, E. (1991). Black Hills, white justice: the Sioux Nation versus the United States, 1775 to the present. New York: Harper Collins.

Little Eagle, A. (1993). Looking back at Wounded Knee. Indian Country Today, 12, A-1.

Lyman, S.D. (1991) Wounded Knee, 1973: a personal account. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

Mails, T. (1979). Fools Crow. New York: Avon Books.

Marshals trade fire with Indians. (1973, March 4). New York Times, p. 1:3.

Matthiessen, P. (1991). In the spirit of Crazy Horse. New York: Viking.

McGaa, E. (1995) Native wisdom: Perceptions of the natural way. Minneapolis: Four Directions Publishing.

Means, R. & Wolf, M.J. (1995). Where white men fear to tread: the autobiography of Russell Means. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

- Miller, D.H. (1985). Ghost dance. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.
- Morris, R. & Wander, P. (1990). Native American rhetoric: dancing in the shadows of the ghost dance. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 76, 164-191.
- Nagel, J. (1996). American Indian ethnic renewal: Red power and the resurgence of identity and culture. New York: Oxford.
- Oakes, R. (1972). The only good Indian. Ramparts, (December). 33-39.
- Peltier, L. (1999). Prison writings: My life is my sun dance. New York: Crazy Horse Spirit, Inc.
- Powers, W.K. (1984). Yuwipi: Vision and experience in Oglala ritual. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rice, J. (1998). Before the great spirit: the many faces of Sioux spirituality. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.
- Roos, P.D., Smith, D.H., Langly, S., & McDonald, J. The Impact of the American Indian Movement on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, Phylon, (Fall 1977) 89-99.
- Schneider, J. (1976). From Wounded Knee to Capitol Hill: The history, achievements and legacy of the American Indian Movement. Indian Nation, 3:1, 7-14.
- Schultz, T. (1973). Bamboozle me not at Wounded Knee. Harper's Magazine, 246. (June 1973) 46-56.
- Simons, H.W. (1970). Requirements, problems, and strategies: A theory of persuasion for social movements. The Quarterly Journal of Speech. (February 1970) p. 1-11.
- Smith, P.C. & Warrior, R.A. (1996). Like a hurricane: The Indian movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee. New York: New Press.

Starita, J. (1995). The dull knives of Pine Ridge: A Lakota odyssey. New York:

G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Stewart, C.J., Smith, C.A. & Denton, R.E. (1994). Persuasion and social movements (second edition). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

The American Indian Movement. (1976, April). Indian Nation, 3,1. 1-7.

Talbot, S. (1981). Roots of oppression: The American Indian question. New York: International Publishers.

Townsend, L. (1999). Tobacco: Wisdom, respect, leadership. Ojibwe Akiing. (June 30)p. 1-5.

Twin stalemates. (1973, March 26). Time, p. 32.

U.S. issues an ultimatum to Indians. (1973, May 8). New York Times, p. 18:1.

U.S. stands firm in Indian dispute. (1973, March 9). New York Times, p. 14:1.

Warrior, R.A. (1997). Past and present at Wounded Knee. Media Studies Journal, 11. (Spring 1997) 68-75.

Weyler, R. (1992) Blood of the land: The government and corporate war against the first nations. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

When in the course of human events: An interview with Carter Camp. (1973). Akwesasne Notes, 5. p. 11.

Wounded Knee is a tiny armed camp. (1973, March 5). New York Times, p. 1:3.

Young Bear, S. & Theisz, R.D. (1994) Standing in the light: A Lakota way of seeing. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

## **VITA**

**Graduate College  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

**Lucie M. Melchert**

**Home Address:**

**1308 Silver Reef Court  
Henderson, NV 89015**

**Degrees:**

**Bachelor of Arts, Communication, 1995  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

**Special Honors and Awards:**

**Lambda Pi Eta Honors Association**

**Thesis Title:**

**Wounded Knee, 1973: Consummatory and Instrumental Functions of Militant Discourse**

**Thesis Examination Committee:**

**Chairperson, Dr. Richard Jensen, Ph.D.  
Committee Member, Dr. David Henry, Ph.D.  
Committee Member, Dr. Thomas Burkholder, Ph.D.  
Graduate Faculty Representative, Dr. Hal Rothman, Ph.D.**