

**Colonial Audiences and Native Women's Theatre:
Viewing Spiderwoman Theatre's *Winnetou's Snake Oil Show*
from Wigwam City**

Ann Haugo

The colonized cultures are sliding in the space of the colonizer, and in doing so, they are redefining its borders and its culture Whenever and wherever two or more cultures meet—peacefully or violently—there is a border experience.

– Guillermo Gómez-Peña¹

In scripts and performances written over the course of the last century, Native performers and playwrights have re-appropriated popular stereotypes about Native people, attempting to make apparent the colonial assumptions underlying the images. In a calculated resistance of the stereotypes, the performer inhabits the body of the stereotype, revealing and destabilizing the representation accorded “authenticity” by the colonizing power. To borrow a phrase from cultural critic bell hooks, the Indian Princess and the Noble Savage “talk back,” and through the voice of the Native actors inhabiting their bodies and with the words of the Native writers, they change the terms of colonial discourse. Changing the terms of colonial discourse is not as easily done as in the direct act of speaking or of performing; the colonial climate of contemporary American theatre creates a particularly hostile representational context for Native performance. This consideration of Native women's performance as colonial intervention engages both with the intentions for and the context of the performance, in order to ascertain how and to what extent intervention occurs in the theatre. Such a method proposes to analyze performance as a communicative event which requires the artists' and spectators' participation to construct its meaning.²

In the context of Native performance criticism, I propose reception examples as border responses—interactive moments articulated through a dialogue invested in American colonial hegemony. Border encounters are

Ann Haugo completed her Ph.D. in Theatre at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where she currently teaches. Her dissertation entitled “Staging Intervention: Native Women, Decolonization, and the American Theatre” discusses contemporary performances by American Indian women and proposes alternative methodologies for American theatre history and contemporary criticism. Her publications have appeared in *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory*, *The Native Playwrights' Newsletter*, and *American Indian Theater: A Reader* (forthcoming from UCLA).

particularly interesting for what they expose about the hegemonic relationships of colonizer and colonized. In this case, the theatre event as border encounter becomes one avenue for recognizing the critic or audience member's investment in colonial privilege. Some scholars, among them Alan Filewod and Jordan Wheeler, have already begun to evaluate critics' responses to Native theatre in Canada through local analyses.³ Given the increased visibility of Native theatre in the United States, and its relationship in many cases to decolonial perspectives, the Native theatre performance as site of communication provides a microcosmic view of larger colonial interactive patterns.

The present work in its longer version outlines one proposal for a reflexive Native performance criticism which would grow from Native North American intellectual perspectives as well as from bodies of critical theory already largely accepted by the academy.⁴ The argument reprinted here summarizes the latter half of that project. Many post-structuralist and postmodern perspectives address the production and dissemination of racialized regimes of representation; other theories exist which can be adapted to the study of ongoing colonialism and theatre, such as those investigating how intervention in colonizing discourses takes place. In regard to Native women's theatre, any analysis must consider colonialism as one constitutive element in what Bennett and others refer to as the audience member's "horizon of expectations." A reflexive criticism would therefore ask how the script deploys a decolonial aesthetic. To what extent does it intervene in colonial regimes of representation? How does it challenge colonial knowledges? How does it redefine the Euro-American theatre space for decolonial ends?

The analysis and proposal reproduced here uses popular response to address questions of intervention—response not from performance scholars or critics, but from audience members themselves—in this case, the audience members who attended a lecture and partial performance by Spiderwoman of their piece *Winnetou's Snake Oil Show from Wigwam City*.⁵ The analysis rests on Marvin Carlson's assertion that theatre represents an activity of remarkable "semiotic openness," making it "one of the richest and most rewarding areas in the arts for exploring the interplay of art and culture." That section investigates most closely the semiotic openness created by the dynamic body of the actor on stage, the body which Rebecca Schneider has called the "explicit body," in an effort to explore the "explosive literality at the heart of much feminist performance art."⁶ These explicit bodies, however, must be recognized as sites not only of gendered or raced inscriptions, but also of colonial inscriptions.

Resistance or Intervention?

This study does not suggest that all Native performance is necessarily somehow "resistant" or that it even should be, yet in the case of performances

which revise or challenge colonial stereotypes, the critic can safely assume that resistance is one intention for the performance. In the abstract, however, the idea of “resistance” may limit a critic’s analysis for many reasons, as it risks inscribing Native women’s theatre within already-constructed boundaries—a particularly dangerous prescription which would continue to define Native women’s theatre by the colonial conditions in which it operates and, by extension, would encourage a latent ethnocentrism on the part of the critic. Such resistance-as-counterstance implies an almost inescapable reaction to a dominating system. Gloria Anzaldúa observes that this model of oppressor/oppressed is too simplistic: “But it is not enough to stand on the opposite river bank, shouting questions, challenging patriarchal, white conventions. A counterstance locks one into a duel of oppressor and oppressed.” Anzaldúa concedes that a counterstance does accomplish some ends; it is not, after all, complicit with the oppression. “But it is not a way of life.”⁷ Neither is it an effective model from which to build an understanding of the decolonial potential of Native women’s theatre. What is sought here is a nuanced reading of that resistance, one in which the critic does not assume “resistance” to be the appropriate analytical end, but rather understands it to be a political perspective initiating a strategic and multi-faceted deployment of resistant actions—what Foucault refers to as a “plurality of resistances.”⁸ The deliberate nature of performance requires an understanding of “resistance” as far more than an action which is pre-structured by colonial power. Deliberately chosen words and inflection, choreographed movement, patterns of scenes, development of form and style: all of these aspects of performance assume the agency of the individual involved. Victor Turner argued that theatrical events be understood as consciously structured, events “which probe a community’s weaknesses, call its leaders to account, desacralize its most cherished values and beliefs, portray its characteristic conflicts and suggest remedies for them, and generally take stock of its current situation in the known ‘world.’”⁹

What is an “Indian”?

In the fall of 1996, Spiderwoman Theatre spent a week on campus at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The University YMCA, which is known for its fairly progressive programming, had chosen the theme of Women’s Spirituality for their Friday Forum lecture series and had selected Spiderwoman Theatre as one of its presenters, to speak particularly about Plastic Shamanism and their performance piece entitled *Winnetou’s Snake Oil Show from Wigwam City*. Spiderwoman opened their hour-long presentation with a discussion of the problems of Plastic Shamanism, closing the presentation with an fifteen-minute performance of several scenes of the play. During the performance, there was no “mystic gulf,” no darkened house and lit stage, and

because this was basically a lecture/demonstration, the actors remained in street clothes, rather than performing in their costumes. For the audience members in the front row, they were close enough to touch, and for all the audience members, the brightness of the lights conveyed the fact that not only could we see each other, but the performers could see us. The women spoke over each other and through each other's lines in the final scene they presented, as each insisted on her own visibility and her own rights to self-determination: "Discover your own spirituality." "My dances, my songs, my stories, my culture." "Don't take your spirituality out on me." "We are still here. We are not defeated."

Following the performance, there was a short silence, then a hearty round of applause punctuated by a few whoops and "yes" exclamations, and the audience was offered the opportunity to ask questions of the performers. The first questions sought insight into the company's method and purposes. A young woman studying oral traditions in several African cultures asked if the sisters would explain the importance of oral tradition and storytelling to their work. A second woman asked a question about issues of spirituality as cultural property: Is the commodification of Native spirituality inherently bad, she asked, given that it means that those people who are learning about the spirituality might not have learned anything else about Native people? The next 20 minutes of discussion echoed this line of thinking, questioning the issues of cultural ownership brought up by the play and the creative process developed by Spiderwoman. Midway through the discussion, a man in the audience spoke up (the first male to ask a question) in a fairly authoritative manner: "I have a question about the word Indian. I don't know where it comes from, and maybe you know. And I'm curious of what you think about the word." There was a moment of unease, it seemed, among the performers on the stage. Lisa Mayo, characteristically, joked that Columbus needed a better navigator. Gloria Miguel took over, explaining that perhaps the term was too general, that it would certainly be more appropriate to call oneself by the more specific tribal names. And, while Muriel Miguel fidgeted and stared at her shoes, typically a sign that she was either intensely concentrating or perhaps hesitating to say what was on her mind, Gloria Miguel turned to the man: "Does that answer your question?" And, then, with a shrug, "Or, I guess, you *knew* the answer."¹⁰

This example is not meant to undermine the value of questioning labels, or to minimize the importance of non-Native people realizing that "Indian" is indeed a too-general term. Rather, I am interested in the placement of the question, the tone in which it was framed, and the response it engendered. The presentation and performance had been about appropriations of Native identity—about Natives and non-Natives taking elements or emblems of Indianness and commodifying them for self-profit. The discussion and the performance had satirized what non-Indians might think "Indian" is. Further, in

the manner through which the question was posed, it was quite clear that the speaker did know something about where the term “Indian” had come from, or at least where it had *not* come from. The answer was already implied in his question, as Gloria Miguel had pointed out.

The audience member shifted the trajectory of the conversation from political questions of identity and commodification to rather apolitical questions of semantics and labels. The question seemed to be less about learning new information than challenging the performers’ investment in their self-identification as Indian women. My contention is that this particular response and others similar to it are brought about at least in part by audience anxiety, particularly *colonial* anxiety, as a set of “knowledges” which we believe we own are challenged and unseated by the performers. These knowledges are not simply oblique categories of information but knowledges, as Foucault described, which operate in the interests of a dominant order and maintain certain hierarchical structures of power. In the discussion about and performance of *Winnetou*, Spiderwoman destabilized the readability of “Indian” in the performance space, as they ridiculed the representations produced through colonial knowledges—the Noble Savage and the Indian Princess—and asserted cultural ownership of Native spirituality, thereby disallowing its appropriation by non-Native people.

Performance as Intervention

In discussing the postcolonial critics’ response to colonial stereotyping, Homi Bhabha asserts that the goal of intervention should be not to identify the stereotype as positive or negative, but to understand the processes through which colonial discourse fixes the stereotype in representation: the process by which colonial identity becomes reduced to essentials that then stand in for the colonized subjects. The stereotype hinders the recognition of a colonized people *anything other than* the essentialized or “authenticated” images authorized by the colonial discourse. Bhabha locates the possibility for resistance within the ambivalence of colonial signification itself—in the stereotype revealing the operations of colonial power through its very instability: The dominating discourse produces the markers of cultural difference, as it establishes the rules through which “self” and “colonial other” are defined—the binaries of identification. The colonial power cannot maintain within its surveillance all the “proliferating differences” created by the effects of its attempts to contain colonial identity.¹¹

Kobena Mercer writes that in order for intervention to take place, the new representation must “lay bare the psychic and social relations of ambivalence at play in cultural representations of race and sexuality.” That is, it must enact a counter-strategy which, as Stuart Hall has observed, “locates itself within the complexities and ambivalences of representation itself, and tries to *contes*.”

from within." Hall argues that the most effective strategies for contesting a racialized regime of representation are those which "unfix" the stereotype, those that restore identity to an always "open, complex, unfinished game." Such strategies take advantage of those "proliferating differences" to introduce alternative representations.¹²

In *Winnetou's Snake Oil Show from Wigwam City*, Spiderwoman Theatre destabilizes the stereotype at the very site of proliferating difference. As Spiderwoman declares a commitment to challenge the "one-size-fits-all view of feminism," they also challenge the fixity of the "princess" when they occupy theater. The princesses of Spiderwoman enact a menace of deliberately re-appropriated identities; they talk back. As the actors prance about the stage, riding rooms for horses, deliberately mocking the tricks of the Wild West Show, calling themselves by the ridiculously invented names for their princess incarnations, their parody intensifies the disruption of the image.¹³

Foucault has proposed that the body can be read as a text, as "the inscribed surface of events (traced by language and dissolved by ideas), the locus of a dissociated self (adopting the illusion of substantial unity), and a volume of disintegration."¹⁴ Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins add two crucial elements to Foucault's description of the body. First, the body *moves*; the primary signifier of live performance is a mobile and dynamic one. Second, Gilbert and Tompkins propose that the body also be read as the site of *colonial* inscription. This expands on the discourse of representation, taking into account the meanings that a colonial body carries with it onto the stage. They quote Elleke Boehmer:

In colonial representation, exclusion or suppression can often literally be seen as 'embodied'. From the point of view of the colonizer specifically, fears and curiosities, sublimated fascinations with the strange or the 'primitive', are expressed in concrete physical and anatomical images.... [T]he Other is cast as corporeal, carnal, untamed, instinctual, raw, and therefore also open to mastery, available for use, for husbandry, for numbering, branding, cataloging, description or possession.¹⁵

Boehmer addresses not only the voyeuristic meanings attached to the colonial body, but the colonial knowledges projected onto it—the creation of a hierarchal system in which the meanings attached to the colonial body authorize the colonizer's privilege through his ability to use, "brand, catalog, describe, or possess" that body. Boehmer also makes clear that these colonial meanings arise from colonial knowledges and are not originary to the body itself. Gilbert

and Tompkins read Monique Mojica's *Princess Pocahontas and the Blue Spots* in light of a new methodology, arguing that Mojica "manipulates the body's signification for political purposes" through carrying colonial inscriptions juxtaposed to more generally indigenist expressions of subjectivity, all attached to her body.¹⁶ In effect, in Mercer's and Hall's terms, Mojica locates her performance *within* the ambivalences of representation and contests the image from within.

In performance, the stereotype becomes body and not-body, as the actor peels back the layers of colonial signification.¹⁷ In the Spiderwoman performance at the University of Illinois, Muriel Miguel began the peeling as she enacted the "born-again" shamaness, the white woman who woke up one morning to "discover" that she was Indian, looking down in amazement at the suddenly brown skin of her arm. "I'm a shamaness," Miguel exclaimed flirtatiously, as she pranced across the stage. In response to the audience's laughter, she shot a look back over her shoulder: "I AM! Ooh!" The scene exposes the ludicrousness of whites "turning Indian" by underscoring the essentialist notions of Native identity on which born-again Indians predicate their newly discovered character. Once her skin turns beige, Ethel Christian Christianson discovers her Indian soul and meets her one true love (seated on a white buffalo),

. . . a noble savage, naked . . . except for his loin cloth. His skin was the colour of bronze, with just a touch of gold. His hair was the colour of—(*She searches for just the right color name.*) Lady Clairol No. 154, midnight blue. He wore it in long braids, intertwined with rattlesnake skins. And growing out of his skull was an eagle feather, signifying he was a chief. (*As if annoyed that she has to explain the obvious.*) He was a chief, I was a shamaness. (*Again, in response to laughter, glaring at those laughing at her.*) It's true! I'm a shamaness. I AM! (*Greatly offended that the audience would doubt her.*) Ooh!¹⁸

The layering becomes more complicated, as the performance event allows the actor freedom to both portray an identity and invoke another with her words. As Miguel's body—middle-aged, large, and yet fluid in its movements—glide around the stage, cockily asserting her new identity, the first set of layers become evident, as colonial inscriptions grow muddled. Princess? It's the princess that she plays—Ethel Christian Christianson, as she has been introduced to the audience, "a genuine Indian princess"—and she invites the audience along on her fantasy. In Miguel's performance of the princess, the

fakery authorizes the character's identification as princess/shamaness, while the Indian actor asserts her presence through the contorted image, insisting on her own visibility through the elaborate parody of the princess/fake shamaness.

At the same time, Miguel conjures for the audience the image of the beautiful Noble Savage—the Indian male of contemporary romance fiction, with whom sparks fly, “flick, flick, flick.” Summoning the requisite signifiers of romantic Indian nobility—bronze skin and loin cloth, long black hair, braids, and feathers—the actor again establishes the absurdity of the image, whose feathers are said to grow from his skull, and the *inauthenticity* of those “authentic” significations, as she searches for the terms to describe the blue-black hue of his long flowing hair: “Lady Clairol No. 154.”

The actors explode difference in a social space—the American stage—which has historically reified the colonial image, but the deconstruction does not stop there. As Ethel Christian Christianson's body contorts, now jutting sideways, arms shooting into the air, she “channels” Hank Williams. The actors break, breathe, and move into new positions.¹⁹ Mechanically, Lisa and Gloria begin singing another Hollywood Indian tune: “Out of my lodge at eventide,” facing the audience full-front, the Indian tom-tom beat subtly reflected in the rhythm of their melody. In deliberately exaggerated and abrupt movements, Muriel begins to sign the words, in a Hollywood-style simulation of Plains sign language, her movements as artificial as the Indian identity invoked by the song. Once again, the performers have inappropriately occupied the appropriate Indian body, the body deemed authentic by Hollywood, but in this instance, the words of the song and the Hollywood tom-tom beat conjure their own shame. Each performer steps forward and under and over the words of the song, speaks the shame inherited from generations forced to hide or devalue their own identities: “Sell out, sell out, sell out.”

The Native actor's occupation of the sign of the Indian Princess is a challenge enacted with deliberate menace and calculated mimicry, intended to estrange the basis of colonial authority implicated in the continued social production of Indian Princesses. The sisters' performance of *Winnetou's Snake Oil Show from Wigwam City* at the University of Illinois ended with the play's final scene, as Gloria, Muriel, and Lisa turn to face the audience, declaring, voices weaving over, under, and through each other,

Gloria: See me. I'm talking, loving, hating, drinking too much, creating performing. . . (*Turning around, as if showing herself, her real self, to the audience.*)

Lisa: We are not defeated. (*Shaking her head adamantly.*)

All our bones are not in museums. We are still here.

Muriel: (*Hitting her chest with open palms on each phrase.*)

My stories. My songs. My dances. My ideas.

Rendering colonial images invalid through parodic juxtaposition, “peeling back” the layers of colonial signification, the performance demands that the audience see the Native women made visible and hear their words.

As the performance destroys the images in which colonial audiences may be particularly invested, it also proceeds to create resistant boundaries, to say that spirituality cannot be “borrowed” or “shared,” that it has been exploited in the American marketplace of religion. For that reason, it must be protected, and protection means saying “off limits” to New Agers and Plastic Shamans. To return to the question asked of the performers at the University of Illinois, the question circumvented any consideration of images and cultural knowledge, as they had been presented by the performers and, rather, zoomed in on identity—not as it was critiqued in the presentation or performance, but as it was claimed by the performers themselves. Some might argue that this audience member simply had not been engaged—that perhaps the performance and presentation might be interpreted as being less successful because the audience members most reticent to recognize decolonial thought still had not done so. My reading is consequently a resistant one, which challenges the measures through which we accord “success” to political art.

The question explicitly challenged the sisters’ knowledge of their own identity, creating a knowledge hierarchy, of sorts, to return to a Foucauldian interpretation of power and knowledges. The speaker clearly knew that something was troubling about the label “Indian,” something that implied an already inauthentic identity. The question implicitly challenged the sisters’ personal identification as “Indian,” implying that in their continued use of the label, they were perhaps complicit in their own oppression. The audience member did respond to an element of the performance, as his question courted notions of authenticity, but it operated as a recuperation—an attempt to continue reading the signs of cultural difference within the prevailing rules of recognition which the performers had contested. The question sought to restabilize the exploded definitions of Indianness which had permeated the room, to recuperate the audience’s investment in the colonial “knowledges” which had just been rejected. It was, therefore, a response fraught with colonial anxiety, a response which should be understood as a valid measure of a performance’s “success,” rather than an indication that a performance has not done its intended job. In this border encounter, the anxious response itself provides evidence that the performers intervened in and therefore destabilized knowledges built from colonial privilege.

Notes

1. Guillermo Gómez-Peña, "The Multicultural Paradigm: An Open Letter to the National Arts Community," in *Negotiating Performance: Gender, Sexuality, and Theatricality in Latin/o America*. (Durham, North Carolina: Duke UP, 1994) 17, 18.

2. This discussion of audience response rests on dialogism, here translated to the performance event. Bakhtin posed that in any communication the meaning rests somewhere between the speaker and the hearer. In the theatrical context, the "meaning" of any performance is constructed by both the performer and the audience. The critic must examine how "meaning" completes its cultural circuit by being received and decoded by the audience. Meaning, as Bakhtin argued, can never be "fixed;" the performer/playwright can never be entirely in control of the meaning of a performance. See, for example, Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination* (1935; reprint, Austin: U of Texas P, 1981) 293-294. Various theatre scholars have extended the discourse on audience response, most prominently Susan Bennett, *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception* (London: Routledge, 1990), Herbert Blau in *The Audience* (Baltimore, 1990), and Marvin Carlson in *Theatre Semiotics: Signs of Life* (Bloomington: U of Indiana P, 1990).

3. See Alan Filewod, "Receiving Aboriginality: Tomson Highway and the Crisis of Cultural Authenticity," in *Theatre Journal* 46.3 (1994): 363-73, and "Averting the Colonizing Gaze: Notes on Watching Native Theater" in *Aboriginal Voices: Amerindian, Inuit, and Sami Theater*, edited by Per Brask and William Morgan (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins UP, 1992) 17-28; Jordan Wheeler, "Our Own Stories: A Revolution in Aboriginal Theatre," in *Canadian Theatre Review* 66 (Spring 1991): 8-12.

4. Outside of American Indian/Native American Studies, the acceptance of Native intellectual traditions as critical thought is still somewhat tenuous. For Native scholars' commentary on the issue, see *Native and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians*, edited by Devon Miheuah (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1998), a collection of articles originally published in *American Indian Quarterly*. Of particular pertinence is Elizabeth Cook-Lynn's "American Indian Intellectualism and the New Indian Story" (111-138).

5. Published in *Canadian Theatre Review* 68 (Fall 1991).

6. Carlson, *Theatre Semiotics*, 101; Rebecca Schneider *The Explicit Body in Performance*, (London: Routledge, 1997).

7. Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/ La Frontera* (San Francisco: Spinsters/ Aunt Lute, 1987): 78.

8. For statements regarding *Winnetou's Snake Oil Show from Wigwam City*, see Lisa Mayo "Appropriation and the Plastic Shaman" in *Canadian Theatre Review* 68.5 (1991): 5 4-55; "Interview with Lisa Mayo of Spiderwoman Theatre," by Ann Haugo in *Native Playwrights' Newsletter*, Vol. 7: 87-91 and Vol. 8: 45-57; and "Secrets: A Conversation with Lisa Mayo of Spiderwoman Theater," by Judy Burns and Jerri Hurlbutt in *Women and Performance* 5. 2 (1992): 166-183. On the plurality of resistances, see Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley, vol. 1 (1971; reprint, New York: Vintage, 1990) 96.

9. Quoted in Bennett 113, from Victor Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre*, (New York: Performing Arts Journal, 1982) 11.
10. Tape on file.
11. Bhabha *Location* 110-114.
12. In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha introduces the notion of the colonial hybrid and the potential for colonial resistance in what he calls the hybrid challenge -- the display of hybridity, "which terrorizes authority with the ruse of recognition, its mimicry, its mockery." The hybrid challenge changes the terms of colonial discourse, albeit subtly, establishing a new specifically colonial space for the negotiations of cultural authority in which previously "disavowed knowledges" are replayed back at the colonizer in a comic turn which Bhabha calls mimicry, "signs of spectacular resistance." Because Bhabha does not adequately address agency, I prefer Mercer's and Hall's extensions on the problem of intervention. See Bhabha, *Location* 115-121; Stuart Hall, "The Spectacle of the 'Other,'" in *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, Stuart Hall, ed. (London: Sage Publications, 1997) 274; and "New Ethnicities," in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, eds. (New York: Routledge, 1996) 362; and Kobena Mercer, *Welcome to the Jungle* (London: Routledge, 1994) 199.
13. Rebecca Schneider refers to Spiderwoman's performative resistance as "counter-mimicry." Schneider summarizes Bhabha's conceptualization of mimicry as the gaze which produces the primitivization of the Other, and extends the concept of counter-mimicry as the colonized subject's "ricochet" of the colonial gaze. See Schneider, *The Explicit Body* 169-170.
14. Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," translated by D. Bouchard and S. Simon, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, D. Bouchard, ed. (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977).
148. Quoted in Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins, *Post-colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics*. (London: Routledge, 1996) 203.
15. Elleke Boehmer, "Transfiguring: Colonial Body into Postcolonial Narrative," *Novel* 27, no. 2, p. 269, quoted in Gilbert and Tomkins 203.
16. Gilbert and Tompkins 203-209.
17. Schneider 2. Schneider refers to feminist performances of the "explicit body" as "unfolding the body, as if pulling back velvet curtains to expose a stage. . . peeling at signification, bringing ghosts to visibility, . . ." exposing not an originary body but "the sedimented layers of signification themselves."
18. Spiderwoman Theatre, *Winnetou's Snake Oil Show from Wigwam City* 611. Lines are quoted from the published script. Stage directions are my own transcription of the staged lecture/demonstration, 6 October 1996, University YMCA, University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign.
19. Because this was a lecture-demonstration, the performers skipped through some of the scenes in the play, moving from Ethel's vision immediately into "Out of My Lodge," skipping the scene in which they turn an audience member into an "Indian."

