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This article analyzes the writings of William Bittle and Charles Brant concerning “contemporary” Plains Apaches in the 1960s. Specifically, it examines how Bittle (1962) argues for agency among the Plains Apache through his discussion of the Manatidie dance and how Brant (1969) denies agency to the Plains Apache through his introduction to Jim Whitewolf’s life-story. For Brant (1964), the Plains Apache were “disintegrating.” For Bittle, the Plains Apache were creatively responding to outside forces. Ultimately, the lens by which Brant and Bittle approached Plains Apaches was due to their length of research and to their continued or lack of continued contact with Plains Apaches. Their intellectual heritages may have predisposed them to adopt different perspectives concerning Plains Apache agency and creativity.
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This essay concerns how anthropologists construct and represent ideas about Native Americans. This is a topic of much recent discussion (Biolsi and Zimmerman 1997; Kan and Strong 2006; Strong 2005), spurred on, no doubt, by the early critical work of Vine Deloria Jr. (1969). Douglas Foley (1995), for example, has pondered the question of how, as anthropologists, we write about Native peoples. The Heartland Chronicles is a testament to this predicament. Also of concern is how Native American “life-stories” collected by anthropologists are framed (see Cruikshank et al. 1990; Krupat 1985). Specifically, examined here is the way that human agency can or cannot be represented, that is, the ways that Native Americans can be seen as agents and active participants in the world or the ways they become pawns in the actions of powers beyond their control. The former view suggests that Native Americans are coeval (Fabian 1983) with anthropologists and the latter creates the anachronistic Native American, the Native American as victim.

This issue will be investigated through a careful reading of the works of Charles Brant and William Bittle. Both were anthropologists who worked with the Kiowa Apache (now Plains Apache or Naisha). In particular, this reading involves Charles Brant’s introduction to Jim Whitewolf: The Life of a Kiowa Apache Indian originally published in 1969, but also includes materials drawn from a 1964 article titled “White Contact and Cultural Disintegration Among the Kiowa Apache.” This is then compared with William Bittle’s 1962 article “The Manatidie: A Focus for Kiowa Apache Tribal Identity.” This analysis puts in dialogue the works of these two anthropologists, to understand something of the ways that “contemporary” Plains Apache was framed in the 1960s.

These works have been chosen for several reasons. First, Bittle and Brant are writing about Plains Apache at roughly the same time and they

Anthony K. Webster, Department of Anthropology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Mail Code 4502, Carbondale, IL 62901-4502, 618-453-5027, awebster@siu.edu

are describing the Plains Apaches who lived in the same geographic area (Anadarko and Caddo County). They are also talking to some of the same people. There is no ethnographic gap here (e.g., Mead [1928] and Freeman [1983]). Second, both have connections to two influential anthropologists who influenced the ways that Brant and Bittle approached Plains Apaches. Bittle received his Ph.D. from the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) under the direction of Harry Hoijer. Hoijer published extensively on the Southern Athabaskan languages. My own work on Chiricahuas, Lipan, and Mescalero Apache is based on his work (see Webster 1999). Brant received his Ph.D. from Cornell University under the direction of Morris Opler. Opler was, for a long time, the expert on Apachean ethnography. Both Hoijer and Opler had worked together on the Mescalero Apache Reservation in the 1930s. Bittle, under Hoijer, was a linguistic anthropologist. He published a grammatical sketch of Kiowa Apache (Bittle 1963). Brant, under Opler, was an ethnographer. His Jim Whitewolf is clearly modeled after Opler’s Apache Odyssey: A Journey Between Two Worlds. These works (Opler’s and Brant’s) align both in format, a cultural and historical introduction followed by an edited and annotated (though Brant’s annotation is less) autobiography, and in theme. The themes of both works are similar; they both concern Apache men “between two worlds.” Finally, both these publications came out in the 1960s, when American Indians were beginning to assert their voices more publicly and more widely (see Iverson 1998:139–174). For example, Deloria’s Custer Died For Your Sins, with its trenchant critique of anthropologists’ relations with Native Americans, was published in 1969, as was Brant’s Jim Whitewolf. Bittle’s article was published in 1962, though Brant’s introduction shows no trace of having read it seven years later.

The focus here is on how the Plains Apaches are represented by these two anthropologists; that is, how Plains Apaches were framed. By framed, I mean to suggest how Plains Apaches were made recognizable (see Goffman 1974). In what follows I argue that Brant paints the Plains Apache as victims and pawns in a world largely outside tribal members’ understanding. Bittle, in contrast, presents the Plains Apache as active agents in their own assertion of Plains Apacheness (Naisha-ness).

The Plains Apache become, in Bittle’s work, intentional agents that have desires and motivations and also understand the place of anthropologists and their relative usefulness. Associated with this is the amount of time that Brant and Bittle interacted with the Plains Apache. The length and sustained contact between Bittle and individual Plains Apaches allowed him to approach Plains Apaches as (creative) individuals (though they are not named individuals). This differs from Brant, who spent a shorter period of time with the Plains Apache. In some ways, Brant was looking for “Kiowa Apache” culture and Bittle was looking at individual Plains Apaches.

Let me be clear here, the purpose of this paper is to put the writings of Bittle and Brant into dialogue through a careful reading of their respective works. The goal is to see how Bittle and Brant represented Plains Apache society. This work is thus in line with recent work that has attended to the modes of representation of Native Americans and how Native American narratives were framed (see Biolsi and Zimmerman 1997; Clements 1996; Kan and Strong 2006; Krupat 1985; Murray 1991; Strong 2005).

**A BRIEF BACKGROUND CONCERNING THE PLAINS APACHE**

Before moving to the readings of these two anthropologists, a brief background concerning the Plains Apache is presented. The people discussed here as “Plains Apache” and called “Kiowa Apache” by Bittle and Brant now often refer to themselves as Naisha or Apache. For purposes of this paper Plains Apache is used unless the authors are quoted, then their terminology is used. The Plains Apache reside around Anadarko, Oklahoma near Cache Creek and the Washita River in Caddo County. Their arrival in the Plains was, and continues to be, of some discussion (see Perry 1991; see also Webster 2009). Indeed, James Mooney basing his view on the reports by Plains Apaches suggests that the term “Apache” was a misnomer. They were not part of the larger Apachean migration. Rather, the Plains Apache had traveled southward from Canada alone. This view, as Bittle (1962:155) notes, was still common among Plains Apaches. Apaches have an origin, and rejek Southern Athapaskan hand, notes the other Apache are to their own Chiricahua. Tragic analysis (H to the fact thatern Apachean logical shift w 1942). Thus, i and in Plains.
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Plains Apaches when he did field work: "The Kiowa
Apache have an idéé fixé [sic] on their northern
origin, and reject all suggestions of ties with other
Southern Athapaskan speakers." Brant, on the other
hand, notes that when Plains Apache travel among
other Apache peoples, they feel that the Lipan
Apache and Jicarilla Apache languages are closer
to their own language than Mescalero or
Chiricahua. This conforms with Hoijer's linguis-
tic analysis (Hoijer 1956, 1963). It is also related
to the fact that in Plains Apache (as in other East-
ern Apachean languages) there has been a phono-
ological shift whereby /u/ is changed to /k/ (Hoijer
1942). Thus, in Chiricahua there is tó for water,
and in Plains Apache the form is kóô.

As seen in work by scholars from James
Mooney (1907) to J. Gilbert McAllister (1937;
1970), to Charles Brant (1949, 1953), to Wil-
liam Bittle (1971), and to more recent work by
Kay Schweinfurth (2002), the Plains Apache have
long been associated with the more numerous
Kiowa. It was assumed that Plains Apache culture
was derivative of Kiowa practices. Indeed, Brant
(1949:60) argues "that Kiowa-Apache ceremoni-
ality was a weakly-developed imitation of danc-
ing societies...in the Plains." Brant's writings here
are reminiscent of Morris Opler's (1940:5) com-
ments concerning the Lipan Apache: "Lipan cul-
ture is an undifferentiated, unembellished proto-
type of Jicarilla culture. Lipan mythology looks
like a simplified edition of Jicarilla mythology
from which late ceremonial flourishes have been
eliminated." On the topic of the "thingy-ness" of
culture (i.e., culture as object) and its potential
for "disintegration," I think it is important to note
that both the Lipan Apache and the Plains Apache,
according to Opler (1940) and Brant (1949), ap-
pear to have lesser cultures, that is they are der-
ivative, than the Jicarilla Apache and Kiowa.

It was long thought that the Plains Apache
were a simplified version of the Kiowa and, there-
fore, not in need of study. As Mooney (1907:701)
states concerning the Plains Apache, "they are
practically a part of the Kiowa in everything but
language." Language was an important identity
marker. J. Gilbert McAllister (1937:100) reports
from his 1933–1934 fieldwork that "most of the
old Kiowa-Apache knew a little Kiowa, though very
few of the Kiowa had any knowledge of the Kiowa-
Apache tongue." Keren Rice (2004) has pointed
out that Plains Apache shows little phonological
influence from Kiowa. The two languages were
held distinct. Speaking Plains Apache then indexed
a person's identity as Plains Apache and distinct
from Kiowa. Kiowa is a Kiowa-Tonoan language
and is not related to the Athabaskan Plains Apache.
Both McAllister (1937:100) and Bittle
(1962:153) note that sign language was most of-
ten used as the medium between Kiowa and Plains
Apaches. However, Bittle wrote this about the sta-
tus of Plains Apache:

The fact that at the time this data was collected
there were no more than twenty-five persons who
were even partially fluent in Kiowa Apache. The lan-
guage is by now approaching extinction, and even
relatively few of those terms which must have been
widely used in the language (e.g. plant and animal
names, place names, etc.) cannot be recalled by a
majority of the Apaches (Bittle 1979:46).

This contrasts with the estimates of speakers
of Plains Apache given by both Brant and Bittle
in the 1950s and 1960s. As Bittle wrote in 1963:

It has been estimated that there are approximately
400 Kiowa-Apaches, but only 100 people are fluent
speakers of the language. Most of these people live
in Caddo County. In addition, there are perhaps 100
more individuals with a limited speaking knowledge
of the language, though their use of Kiowa-Apache
is limited to a few ceremonial occasions (Bittle
1963:76).

Both Bittle and Brant report on the language
shift from Plains Apache to English that was oc-
curring. One of the ways of indexing identity
through speech was disappearing.

Another feature that set the Plains Apache
apart from the Kiowa concerned their social struc-
ture. McAllister, whose work was "memory eth-
nography" concerning an ideal Plains Apache ca.
the 1860s–1880s (clearly based in the salvage
ethnography tradition), had this to say about how
tribal endogamy helped maintain a distinct Plains
Apache identity: "The whole tribe was bound into
one large kinship unit, and however distant or even
fictitious these ties may have been, they were,
nevertheless, very real to the Kiowa-Apache" (McAllister 1937:165). Both tribal endogamy
and linguistic loyalty were two ways that Plains
Apaches actively maintained their distinctiveness
from the more numerous Kiowa.
A third way that Plains Apaches historically distinguished themselves from Kiowa concerned four dancing societies. The first dancing society was the *Kasowe* society or ‘Rabbit’ society. According to McAllister (1937:139), all Plains Apache children belonged to this society and this was the last dancing society “to cease functioning.” Next was the *Manatidie* society (also known as the Blackfeet society). This was one of two adult male dancing societies. As McAllister notes, during his fieldwork only three elderly men knew anything about the *Manatidie* society. The other adult male society was the *Litidie* society or ‘Horse’ society. This society was composed of very few older adult males. By 1934, McAllister could find no one who had been a member of this dancing society. The fourth dancing society was the *Ituwe* society, which Brant glosses as “Old Women’s” society. Little is known of this society, other than the fact that adult women belonged to it and that the society was a secret society. McAllister (1937) indicates little was known concerning this society by Plains Apache consultants in 1934. As age-graded dancing societies, distinct from Kiowa societies, they were emblematic displays of Plains Apache identity. However, by the time of McAllister’s fieldwork they were but memories, the *Manatidie* society having ceased to function around 1909. As Bittle (1962:154) remarks, “these societies have not been a viable part of Kiowa Apache life for probably more than 50 years.”

**READING CHARLES BRANT’S JIM WHITewolf**

Brant’s introduction to *Jim Whitewolf* is the life-story of a Plains Apache as edited by and mediated through Charles Brant. Whitewolf’s life-story is produced in English, but Brant recorded parts of it in English and parts of it in Plains Apache via Wallace Whitebone, Whitewolf’s nephew, who acted as interpreter (and perhaps audience). It was Whitewolf’s decision to record most of his life-story in Plains Apache. As Brant (1969:viii) notes, Whitewolf could speak “moderately fluent English” but “felt from the onset that he could present some aspects of his story better in his own language.” This was clearly Whitewolf’s decision, as Brant’s description of the language situation ca. 1949–1950 suggests:

Most of the present Kiowa Apache know English. Among those under about forty years of age English is rapidly becoming the major language of everyday affairs. The old people have a lesser command of English and tend to use the native language among themselves. Individuals of the younger generations can understand Kiowa Apache but tend to speak it haltingly and very imperfectly, employing English words freely when they cannot recall native words. Children know only English, and it tends to be merely a matter of time—perhaps another generation or two—before the native language will be replaced entirely by English (Brant 1969:18).

As English was replacing Plains Apache, a distinct identity marker was also disappearing. Brant (1969:19) argues that Comanche had become a *lingua franca* among various American Indian peoples in Oklahoma. Whitewolf, however, chose to indexically link himself with Plains Apache and not other American Indians of the area (on indexicality see Silverstein 2003). This was done through his use of Plains Apache and not Comanche or Kiowa. Yet none of the Plains Apache original is found in the life story. This is an English translation of Plains Apache and the points at which a shift from one language to another occurred were not presented. The dialogue of languages is not presented.

Brant’s *Whitewolf* introduction is a historical and cultural synopsis of the Plains Apache. In section one, there is the obligatory mention of the “extinct” dancing societies. Description of the dance societies is based on McAllister’s (1937) “memory ethnography” conducted in the early 1930s. Brant also spends time describing aboriginal Plains Apache culture. He discusses religion, medicine bundles, witchcraft, subsistence strategies, marriage residences and practices (matrilocal preference and occasional polygyny), and leadership (diffuse and situational). Brant’s rationale for this brief description of Plains Apache aboriginal “memory ethnography” is stated explicitly:

In the foregoing pages we have briefly outlined features of Kiowa Apache society and culture which prevailed in aboriginal times. Although in a state of disintegration by the time of Jim Whitewolf’s birth, they nevertheless provide a meaningful setting for understanding much in his life story (Brant 1969:10).

It is important to recognize Brant’s view of Plains Apache culture as different from the culture as it is presented in this text. By the 1930s, Plains Apache culture had already begun to change, and by the time Brant collected the life-story of Jim Whitewolf, the language situation had changed significantly.
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Plains Apache culture as a culture “in a state of disintegration” (Brant 1964:10). This was not the first time Brant had written of Plains Apache culture as disintegrating. In Brant’s 1964 article “White Contact and Cultural Disintegration,” which makes up most of section two of Brant’s introduction, he had also posited Plains Apache culture as disintegrating. Apparently, according to Brant’s estimation, Plains Apache culture had been disintegrating since at least 1878 when Whitewolf believed he had been born (Brant 1969:39).

It might also be useful to understand the ways such “aboriginal” practices were “meaningful” to understanding Whitewolf’s story and perhaps more importantly, how they were made meaningful by Whitewolf. Was, for example, the life-story a recognizable genre among Plains Apaches? McAllister (1970) would later publish the life-story of Dāvēko as told by Sam Klinekole in 1934–1935, though that narrative was told in bits and pieces over eleven months and not as a unified whole. McAllister (1970:36) also notes that he attempted to retain some of the stylistic features of Klinekole’s narrative, including the use of repetition. Did Whitewolf intend for his nephew to “overhear” his story? What were the dynamics of the real-time interactional, context-bound life-storytelling moment? What poetic and stylistic features might Whitewolf have used?

An important point to remember is that ethnography is about the real-time interactions between socially constituted agents. Whitewolf presented himself and Plains Apaches in certain ways. Brant interpreted those representations in certain ways as well. Clearly, Whitewolf was an influence on the ways that Brant understood “contemporary” Plains Apache, and Whitewolf’s own life would have influenced the ways that Brant thought about Plains Apache “culture.” But this typifying of one person as an emblem of a “culture” was part of Brant’s intellectual heritage.

As pointed out above, section two in Brant’s *Whitewolf* Introduction is essentially a reworking of an earlier article published in 1964. That article, appearing in *Plains Anthropologist* two years after Bittle’s article on the *Manatide* had appeared in the same journal, recounts the supposed disintegration of the Plains Apache from 1837 to 1910. It also discusses the emergence and decline of the Ghost Dance among the Plains Apache. Here is Brant’s discussion of the Ghost Dance in the 1969 introduction:

Within a period of three decades the very foundation of the old way of life of the Kiowa Apache were shattered and in its place the Indians were offered the foreign culture and value system of the white men who engulfed them. In the circumstances it would be indeed surprising if their reaction was not to reassert and reaffirm the values of the old way of life. This they did by means of the Ghost Dance. This messianic, revitalistic religious cult diffused into the area in the early 1890’s and persisted until about 1910, though it waned and faded out gradually after the turn of the century, owing to white pressure as well as the Indians’ disappointment over the failure of its prophecies to materialize (Brant 1969:17).

It is not my purpose here to go into the complex factors behind the Ghost Dance movements, but I would like to suggest a few ways of thinking about the Ghost Dance movements. First, following Jeffrey Anderson (2005, 2006), we need to understand the Ghost Dance not as everywhere the same, but rather as structured by various groups and individuals for various reasons. Anderson (2005, 2006) notes for the Arapaho, the Ghost Dance—and especially the Ghost Dance songs—was an outlet for creative contemplation of things Arapaho. The Ghost Dance songs were poetic ways for Arapahos to imagine. Anderson (2005:260) argues that the Ghost Dance and Ghost Dance songs provided “a new sociality that allowed expression of individual creativity.” Seeing the Ghost Dance as merely a response to external stimuli reduces the agency of those involved. Likewise, following Peter Whiteley’s (1988) discussion of the Oraibi split among the Hopi (a revitalization movement), we need to understand the incorporation of the Ghost Dance as a “deliberate act.” One motivation may have been relative social and economic depredation (see Jorgenson 1972), but other motivations may have also occurred. As W.W. Hill (1944) notes for Navajo reaction to the Ghost Dance, relative depredation can be overridden by other factors, in this case, the Southern Athabaskan ambivalence towards death (an attitude shared by the Plains Apache; see Opler and Bittle 1962). Considering the local factors and interpre-
tations of the Ghost Dance and the relative motivations, I would argue that we need to talk of the Ghost Dance as multiple movements and not a singular movement.

It is also important to note that the Manatidie dance appears to have ceased around 1909 or roughly the same time as the Ghost Dance (though many Plains Apaches had ceased dancing earlier). Brant (1969:17; 1964:13) states:

Ghost Dances were held sporadically until 1910, usually under the sponsorship of a Kiowa faction, but with attendance from the Kiowa Apache. Finally, in disillusion and because of missionary and government pressures, the Indians ceased practicing the Ghost Dance religion.

Luke Lasiter et al. (2002) have made a convincing argument concerning the importance of Jesus among the Kiowa; according to their consultants, Christianity precedes contact with whites. Clyde Ellis (2002:3) quotes the Kiowa Vincent Bointy, “I always said we lost our Christianity because we turned toward the white man’s ways.” Hence, the Jesus road predates white missionary projects and, indeed, it has been white people who have corrupted Christianity. We are left to contemplate the relative weights of such forces as missionary and government pressure versus disillusionment. It is important, then, to note that Brant includes such things as the Ghost Dance in an article purporting to chronicle the “cultural disintegration among the Kiowa Apache” (Brant 1964:8).

Section three of Brant’s introduction presents a portrait of Plains Apache society “today” (Brant 1969:18) or, more precisely, Plains Apache life ca. 1950, when Brant did his research. The today of Brant’s account places even contemporary Plains Apache life nearly twenty years in the past. The Plains Apache are still not coeval with the account written by Brant. The use of the ethno-graphic present tense is prevalent. Brant (1969:19) states things such as, “None of the homes has running water or an inside toilet, and only a small minority have electricity. A few have battery-operated radios and some receive newspapers by rural airplane delivery. None has a telephone.” It is as if the Plains Apache have stood still in the 19 years that have passed since Brant did his fieldwork. Brant is describing the context of the life-story Jim Whitewolf told, but he is not describing contemporary Plains Apache life in any meaningful way. This is especially true of his 1964 article which presents the Plains Apache in a state of “cultural disintegration” without reference to current (i.e., 1960s) Plains Apache activities.

The rest of section three is a litany of social, economic, educational, governmental, and health issues, all of which are presented in the bleakest of terms. Even when Brant suggests potentially positive initiatives by the Plains Apache, his temporal disjuncture between “present” (1949) and “present” (1969) results in that danging of the past as present. For example, Brant (1969:20) discusses the attempt to create a “cooperative farm credit organization” in 1949. Brant (1969:21) outlines numerous potential problems that may arise, including the “longstanding jealousies and ill feelings among individuals and families.” And that is where it ends. Brant refuses to predict, based on events twenty years ago, what will happen to the cooperative. We are simply not told what happened to the cooperative.

Brant concludes this rather bleak portrait of the Plains Apache as follows:

The contemporary picture that emerges from our discussion is not a happy or promising one. It is of a people between two cultural worlds, the old one irretrievably gone and to a large extent forgotten, the new one foreign and little understood, engulfing them, involving them, but not truly embracing them and being meaningfully embraced by them. The present-day Kiowa Apache are a people without a stable pattern of existence (Brant 1969:36).

The Plains Apache, in this strange contemporary-but-not-contemporary world, seem only to look forward to the next “fix” from the Peyote religion they now (that is ca. 1949) belong to. As Brant (1969:37) notes, “the [P]eyote religion is a major means of self-expression...his situation is again bearable, at least until the next Peyote meeting.” The Peyote religion that Brant is referring to is the Native American Church.

According to Brant (1969:36) the Plains Apache do not understand the “complex socioeconomic and technical process...” of “...money in exchange for the right of exploitation of the surface and subterranean riches of his land.” The Plains Apache appear to be pawns in a game they do not understand. They lack “well-defined, meaningful, and valued roles and goals in life" (Brant 1969:36).
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1969:36). Instead, a Plains Apache "subordinated as he is by the white man's world about him, he keeps his inner anxieties and frustrations contained within himself" (Brant 1969:36). Thus, Brant views liquor and the Peyote religion as the Plains Apache releases.

The future, looked at from 1949 as contemporary 1969, is equally bleak according to Brant. He concludes his introduction with the following paragraph:

As long as the Indian is able to eke out a bare living by the land-leasing arrangements, and as long as the younger generation has little prospect for employment of any skills its members might acquire through education, so long, it appears, will the present pattern continue (Brant 1969:37).

That then, according to Brant, is the grim future for the Plains Apache. They seem inextricably locked into a pattern of poverty, disillusionment, and disintegration that they little understand. They do not understand the white world and their old culture is "irretrievably gone." In Brant's view, their current practices do not measure up to the old idealized view, the nostalgic world McAllister documented from the memories of elders nearly twenty years before in 1933–1934. But then, even that memory world had already begun to disintegrate (Brant 1964). Note, finally, that even in the face of evidence that he presents concerning the co-operative, Brant's view of the future (his prediction) is a bleak one. Brant is unwilling to predict about an initiative that is now twenty years in the past, but is willing to predict about the future of Plains Apaches in general.

READING WILLIAM BITTLE’S MANATIDIE REVIVAL

Bittle conducted fieldwork among the Plains Apache between 1952 and 1955 (Bittle would continue to conduct fieldwork with the Plains Apache into the 1970s). During this time he worked on documenting the Plains Apache language and in 1963 published a grammatical sketch of the language. In the summer of 1961 he also conducted fieldwork among the Plains Apache. The topic of Bittle's 1962 article, "The Manatidie: A Focus for Kiowa Apache Tribal Identity," is the revival of the Manatidie dancing society and his own limited role in that revival.

Reading William Bittle and Charles Brant

As discussed above, the Manatidie had ceased to be performed around 1909. There was, however, a brief revival following the end of World War I. The revival did not last. The key question for Bittle, and it would appear for Plains Apaches as well, was how could the Plains Apache display a unique identity? As Bittle (1962:154) notes, "For modern Apache the price of contact and acculturation has been a loss of distinctiveness for them as a tribe." Bittle (1962:154) goes on to relate this to economic issues, "the Kiowa Apache have not attracted the interest of various Chambers of Commerce who see potential in tourist dollars of 'tribal performances' during summer season." The emerging powwow circuit in Oklahoma was not an ideal solution and it did not assert any unique Plains Apache identity. Indeed, Bittle (1962:154) remarks about the confusion of the Plains Apache with the Chiricahua Apache who were held as prisoners-of-war near Fort Sill, Oklahoma; the Kiowa Apache are acutely aware of this confusion, and resist the ethnographic label which is applied to them." Unlike Brant's description of the Plains Apache, Bittle's work sees Plains Apaches as aware of the world around them and of their place in it. They are not passive.

This agency is exemplified in Bittle's description of the revival of the Manatidie dancing society. Here is how Bittle (1962:155) describes it:

Until recently, a solution to the problem of re-establishing the identity of the Kiowa Apache as a functionally separate unit seemed distant, despite the fact that many Apache were actively engaged in the problem. During the winter of 1959–60, however, several of the middle-aged Kiowa Apache men hit upon what they hoped might be a solution.

Note that the "recently" in Bittle's discussion is indeed recent to the time of writing. The Plains Apache are coeval with Bittle. Note further that they are interested in demarcating themselves as distinct from the Kiowa. This is an issue that Plains Apaches are actively engaged in. They are not passive, waiting for the next fix from a peyote meeting. Contrary to Brant (1969:36), who claimed that "contemporary Kiowa Apache spends most of his waking life at Indian dances, in informal conversations and gossip with other Indians, and at the Indian agency." For Bittle, Plains Apaches recognize that they need to assert an independent iden-
Again, it is the initiative of the Plains Apache to approach the anthropologist that brings Bittle into the narrative. Bittle is a resource that the Plains Apaches can use to aid in reviving the *Manatidie* dance.

Bittle goes on to describe how the Plains Apaches raised money for the dance by hosting bingo games and other activities. He also notes that once word spread among Plains Apaches about the goal of reviving the dance, elder members "...began to recall certain facts about the dance; and songs which they had not sung in years were remembered and practiced, and eventually put on tape for distribution to the proposed participants" (Bittle 1962:155). Bittle goes on to recount how the four-day summer dance was positively received by both Plains Apaches and other Oklahoma Indians who invited the Plains Apache to perform for them. Bittle tells us that the Plains Apache had decided that if at all possible they would not refuse such invitations.

Bittle (1962:156) has this to say about the revived *Manatidie*: "The present *manatidie* is a rather remarkable fusion of ethnographic description and modern Kiowa Apache creativity. Where McAllister's account did not tally well with the recollections of the older participants, the versions of the latter generally prevailed." Observe that Bittle calls this revival "remarkable" and notes the "modern Kiowa Apache creativity." This is a qualitatively different picture of "modern" Plains Apache compared to Brant. It does not posit a "dis-integrating" Plains Apache. Rather it sees creativity in—what we might now term—the invention of tradition (Handler and Linnekin 1984; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1992; but see Briggs 1996a for a critical review). However, they are more than inventions of tradition (Briggs 1996a). Such active assertions and expressions are not to be devalued as "mere invention." Instead, such processes are to be understood as expressions of Plains Apache creativity within meaningful frameworks. They are Plains Apache responses to dilemmas faced by modern Plains Apaches. These responses are "indigenous articulations" (Clifford 2001; Rumsey 2006). In this respect, following Alan Rumsey (2006:50), we can see the revival of the *Manatidie* as an indigenous articulation
where people, "...draw selectively on their past to articulate a positively valorised position of difference." Bittle's Plains Apache bear little resemblance to Brant's passive victims who seem to lack creativity and are rather resigned to their "fates." Note also, that as the Plains Apache revived the Manatidie, as an indigenous articulation and an emblem of identity, it (the Manatidie) coincided with a shift from speaking Plains Apache (also an emblem of identity) to using English.

Such creativity, of course, can lead to disagreements concerning the proper form of the Manatidie. But such disagreements, according to Bittle, did not discourage Plains Apaches from participating or attending. It could be argued that it was just such discussions that aided in maintaining the creativity and revival. The Manatidie was something to be actively engaged in, since it allowed creativity and was not reduced to a static form. Bittle (1962:162) notes "even criticism gives them a basis for a common interest in something." Such criticisms and debates then reveal frameworks of meaning that may be contrasting, but also are in compliment. They are discussions about the heterodox and orthodox; the doxa remains unsaid (Bourdieu 1977; Briggs 1996b; Sapir 1985:569–577). The Manatidie is important, though the how of the Manatidie differs.

Bittle then goes on to describe a Manatidie dance that he attended in 1961. He also makes comparisons with the Manatidie as described by McAllister in 1937 based on the memories of Plains Apache elders and with a later performance in 1961 where certain creative changes were made to the dance. He notes that some Plains Apache were upset about the introduction of a fifth staff carried by the North Bull. Here Bittle predicts that the innovation will probably continue in the future. Note, however, that unlike Brant's unwillingness to predict in 1969 what will happen to the cooperative post-1949, Bittle is willing to make a prediction and the events have not already occurred.

Bittle concludes the article by reflecting on the role of the revived Manatidie. He (1962:161) writes: "Although the revived Manatidie cannot, of course, function in all respects as the dance did in pre-contact times, it nonetheless retains the characteristic function of providing an integrating mechanism for the Kiowa Apache." Bittle then turns to an issue that had, apparently, been on the minds of the Plains Apache when they attempted to revive the Manatidie. That issue was economic. Besides creating a distinctive emblematic identity display of Plains Apachesness, another motivation was increased revenues for the tribe. Here is how Bittle (1962:161) discusses that point:

Not only has the manatidie given basic focus to the tribe as viewed by the Kiowa Apache themselves, it has also given these people a revived identity among the other Indians and whites of Oklahoma, an identity which they have desperately sought for some years. The revival has been accompanied by a great deal of publicity, and the Kiowa Apache are fiercely proud of this. They have received, in a 2 year period, more press comment than they certainly have had in the past 50 years.

The Plains Apache are not represented as passive in the onslaught of a world "foreign and little understood" (Brant 1969:34). Rather, they were active participants in that world, not separate from it, but agents within it. The revival of the Manatidie dance ceremony was meant to gain them a more visible place and to secure a unique identity. Those were the goals set out by the Plains Apache themselves (as reported by Bittle).

A third result of the Manatidie society can actually be traced back to McAllister's earlier descriptions. McAllister (1937:153) called the Manatidie a "charitable organization." It was a place where "poor people could come for aid" (McAllister 1937:153). Bittle describes this feature of the revived Manatidie as well. Money is laid on a blanket during a "special" and this money is given then to people in need (Bittle 1962:162).

Bittle (1962:162) writes:

Any Kiowa Apache family in need of assistance for one of its members can be guaranteed some reasonable amount of cash through this device. The Kiowa Apache, though suffering the endemic poverty of the majority of Western Oklahoma Indians, invariably manage to collect a sum of 15 to 20 dollars.

Here we see Bittle explicitly engage in the poverty that was the overwhelming theme of much of Brant's introduction. But in Bittle's piece, the Plains Apache have actively attempted to address the issue, they have not passively accepted their
economic fate and their victimhood. Rather, they have attempted to increase revenues through the four-day Manatidie dance ceremony and have used the Manatidie in what McAllister (1937:153) termed its traditional function as a “charitable organization.”

In a number of papers, Bittle (1954, 1971) discusses the Native American Church and the Peyote religion. Where Brant writes of the Peyote religion as a “fix,” Bittle (1954:78) stresses “that peyote is not habit forming.” This is how Bittle (1971:32) sums up the Native American Church among the Plains Apache:

Peyotism is common among the Kiowa Apache, and there are two “chapters” of the Native American Church among them. This division may well reflect what has apparently been a longstanding schism within the tribe, and one along whose lines the split in the Blackfoot Society took place. Typically, the peyote meetings held by the Kiowa Apache are tribally heterogeneous, and infrequently does a Kiowa Apache often sponsor such meetings.

The Manatidie dance ceremony persists. In 1974, John Beatty published an ethnographic account of Plains Apache dance and song. It was based on research done around 1966. This is how Beatty (1974:26) described the situation (the Blackfeet Society was the founding society for the revived Manatidie dance):

The revived Blackfeet Society functioned as a unit until the summer of 1963, when underlying factionalism flared into disagreement and the Society split into two groups, each claiming to hold on to and preserve the traditions and functions of the original society. Up until the present writing (1966), each society seems strong and viable, with its own roster of singers, dancers, headmen and members. Each group sponsors its own pow-wow, and holds its own dance and benefits.

In 1979, Beatty published an article on the Manatidie where he argued for a prevalent Apachian aesthetic that helps organize various artistic outlets (song and dance). Beatty invokes a Chomskyian-inspired language grammar metaphor, suggesting that aesthetics, like language, share underlying structures that can generate surface forms. In essence, Beatty argues for generative rules for aesthetics. More recently, Kay Schweinfurth discussed the continuation of the Manatidie in her 2002 book, _Prayer on Top of the Earth: The Spiritual Universe of the Plains Apache_. William Meadows (1999) has discussed the Naisha (Plains Apache) military societies and the revival and ultimate split of the Manatidie in great detail. While the original Blackfeet Society—the organization that began the revival—has split into two societies based on precisely the kinds of debates about innovations, the Manatidie dance ceremony has persisted and is now put on by two societies (see Meadows 1999; Schweinfurth 2002). On a side note, both Beatty (1974:iv) and Schweinfurth (2002:xi) were students of William Bittle.

**CONCLUSION: PLACING REPRESENTATION IN PERSPECTIVE**

William Bittle and Charles Brant both did ethnographic research among the Plains Apache. Brant did his research in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Bittle did his research in the early 1950s and continued his research into the 1960s. Both published ethnographic accounts of the Plains Apaches in the 1960s and both framed those accounts as “contemporary.” For Brant, “contemporary” meant 1949, roughly twenty years in the past. For Bittle, “contemporary” meant last winter or last summer. Bittle recognized and acknowledged his limited role in the revival of the Manatidie. For him, the Plains Apache were active agents fully engaged in the world around them and actively seeking solutions to complex problems that were not beyond their understanding. Brant represents the Plains Apache as victims, stuck between “two worlds,” longing for a past world and unable to understand a new world.

Both anthropologists, I would argue, wanted to be sympathetic towards the Plains Apache. For Brant, the sympathy for the Plains Apache lies in their victimhood; for Bittle it lies in their creativity. Brant describes in great detail the magnitude of inequities faced by the Plains Apache ca. 1949. However, by positing them as victims stuck in an atemporal reality, the Plains Apache are acted upon, they are not actors. Bittle, on the other hand, presents the Plains Apache as active agents, as creative actors in their own right. They are contemporary with Bittle in a way that eludes Brant. For Bittle, the Plains Apache are people who take initiativite a Brant, c. 1960. Clearly, the Plains Apache were apprehensive that Plains Apache were in between two worlds and are in a state of conflict.

I want to return to the variation presented by the Plains Apache during the 1960s with respect to the relationship with the Kiowa Apache and the changes in the Kiowa Apache society. Bittle described the Kiowa Apache as being in a state of conflict with the Plains Apache. He also described the Kiowa Apache as being in a state of conflict with the Blackfeet Society. This conflict was manifested in the Kiowa Apache society in the form of a split. This split was caused by the Blackfeet Society's efforts to control the Kiowa Apache society. Bittle also described the Kiowa Apache as being in a state of conflict with the Plains Apache. This conflict was manifested in the Kiowa Apache society in the form of a split. This split was caused by the Blackfeet Society's efforts to control the Kiowa Apache society.
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tiative and seek out information from him. For Brant, contemporary Plains Apaches still live in the past, both figuratively and literally. How did the Plains Apache come out looking so different? Clearly, the Plains Apache were in some measure the "same," though the perspective by which they were approached differed and perhaps the ways that Plains Apaches approached Brant and Bittle differed as well. After all, the Plains Apaches were and are individuals.

I want to conclude by suggesting something of the intellectual influences that may have led to the various ways that both Bittle and Brant represented the Plains Apache. This can be useful because both Bittle and Brant did fieldwork during roughly the same period. Both, also, wrote in the 1960s when anthropology and anthropologists were beginning to confront (as the wider United States was) their own "Indian problem" (Bittle 1971). Bittle continued to do research and pub-

ished his discussion of the Manatidie in Plains Anthropologist two years prior to Brant's publication concerning the "dissintegration" of Plains Apache culture and seven years before Jim Whitewolf. Yet Brant does not mention the revival of the Manatidie, though he does cite McAllister's 1937 description. For Brant, the Plains Apache appear frozen in time—their contemporary moment—unable to affect change and existing within a "thing" that could "dissintegrate." Even documented change was not included. For Bittle, the Plains Apache were creative individuals with agency and motivations. They actively debated and discussed their culture, creating a unique way of asserting cultural identity.

Bittle and Brant have an interesting relationship in the intellectual history of anthropology and in Apachen studies more particularly. Brant was a student of Morris Opler at Cornell University. Opler had been a student of Edward Sapir until Sapir left the University of Chicago for Yale. Opler then became a student of Radcliffe-Brown. As Scott Rushforth and I noted (Webster and Rushforth 2000), Opler seems to have spent his career playing out the tension between Sapir and Radcliffe-Brown. Opler's (1937) first major publication, which also included McAllister's description of Plains Apache social organization, concerned Chiricahua Apache social organization and was included in a collection of essays in honor of Radcliffe-Brown (Eggen 1937). While Opler maintained a distance from Radcliffe-Brown's functionalism, there was always a lingering sense of it in his work. Even his life-history of "Chris" in Apache Odyssey reveals the same historical projection of Mescalero into an atemporal past. Opler's (1941) major monograph An Apache Life-Way is not about Chiricahua Apache culture in the 1930s, but rather Chiricahua Apache pre-reservation culture as it was remembered in the 1930s. Life-histories were a part of this salvage ethnography, revealing not the individual, but rather supposed "typical" emblems (see Cruikshank et al. 1990; Kropat 1985). "Chris" or Jim Whitewolf are not so much interesting as indi-

ciduals in their own right, but as examples of Mescalero or Plains Apache accommodations and conflicts with and between two worlds. They become the "typified life." Brant in many ways reflects Opler's view of culture, which was influenced by Radcliffe-Brown. This view does not look for creative responses, but rather finds disintegration.

Even Opler's (1946a) work on creativity seems to push the focus backwards in time. In Opler's (1946a) "Creative Role of Shamanism" among the Mescalero, while focused on an individual, is also focused on past creativity. It has little to say about the context of the narrative event or how creativity was actively engaged in 1930s Mescalero Apache society. Indeed, Opler had a tendency to discount creativity when it created anything but an idealized culture. Opler was quite explicit in expunging contaminants for the mythologies he collected. This was especially true of the Lipan Apache (see Webster 1999). Opler (1940:10) was "careful to eliminate from this collection stories whose tribal designation is in doubt." Stories that might have Mescalero elements were excluded. Opler was in the business of creating culturally pure Apache groups. In another article, Opler (1946b:215) provides the following motivations for the publishing of a version of a Mescalero narrative: "...the story was collected for linguistic purposes by Dr. Harry Hoijer, but his informant was of Lipan as well as..."
Mescalero ancestry, and the account he gave was neither complete nor exclusively Mescalero in character.” It is within a framework such as this that we can understand Brant’s writings concerning disintegration.

Bittle, on the other hand, was a student of Hoijer at UCLA. Hoijer and Opfer worked together on the Mescalero Apache Reservation in the 1930s. Hoijer’s primary interests lay in linguistics. His descriptions of Chiricahua, Mescalero, and Navajo are still widely respected. Hoijer was, of course, a student of Edward Sapir and was, for a long time, the primary proponent of what became known—via Hoijer—as the “Sapir-Whorf” hypothesis (Hoijer 1954; see also Bittle 1952). Sapir is perhaps most famous for his role in the Sapir (1929) part of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, but Sapir was also deeply concerned about the role of the individual in culture. His articles concerning “Why Cultural Anthropology Needs the Psychiatrist” and “Culture, Genuine and Spurious” (Sapir 1985:308–331, 569–577), speak to his concerns about the individual and the role of creativity in culture (see also Darnell 2001; Handler 1983, 1986 whose works have shown the importance of individual creativity in the thinking of Sapir). While it is not easy to tease out Hoijer’s concern with the individual in his writings (indeed an argument for a certain latent functionalism in his articulation of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis could be made), one need only point to the career arcs of two of Hoijer’s most able intellectual heirs: Dell Hymes and William Bright. Both were early leading figures in the ethnopoetic movement and in recognizing the verbal artistry of individual storytellers (see Bright 1984; Hymes 1981). In many ways, Hymes and Bright (and ethnopoetics more generally) are the successors to Hoijer’s focus on the creative individual as mediated through Hoijer (see especially Hymes 1987 on a discussion of Hoijer’s import to linguistic anthropology and ethnopoetics). Bittle’s focus on agency and creativity among the Plains Apache can be understood within this intellectual framework.

Bittle and Brant were then heirs to their intellectual forefathers (the gender is accurate here). This reading of the works of Bittle and Brant and the ways they represented the Plains Apache has suggested how agency was denied to them on the one hand and fore-fronted on the other. I have suggested that this discrepancy has less to do with the Plains Apache than with the “observers.” Part of this had to do with their respective intellectual histories. Another aspect, and perhaps more important, had to do with the intensity and duration of contact. It is certainly true that Brant and Bittle were influenced by different Plains Apaches. Brant was obviously influenced by Whitewolf. Bittle seems to have been influenced by a wider array of Plains Apache consultants. This has to do, in part, with the intensity, length, and proximity of research.

Brant did his fieldwork and then was gone. He finished his research on Whitewolf’s life-story in the spring of 1949. He never returned to complete Whitewolf’s life-story, which was still a work in progress when Brant left. Brant (1969:139) notes vaguely that Whitewolf died “in the mid-1950s.” It appears that Brant did not continue to interact with the Plains Apache. Indeed, the information concerning the events of Whitewolf’s life after 1949 were obtained, in part, by none other than William Bittle. Brant concludes *Jim Whitewolf* with an epilogue based on information given to him by William Bittle. However, Brant’s conclusion offers an image of bleakness and impotence:

Jim was, in his own way, but a symbol of the anguished protests of numberless men in all parts of the mid-twentieth-century world who look out upon vast social transformations with something less than equanimity (Brant 1969:141).

Bittle, for his part, maintained an active relationship with Plains Apaches. After all, when the Plains Apache needed information on the *Manatide* they sought out Bittle (partly, no doubt, for his proximity at the University of Oklahoma [ironically, Opfer would eventually leave Cornell and move to the University of Oklahoma and Opfer and Bittle (1962) co-authored an article on Plains Apache death practices]). Bittle did his fieldwork in the 1950s and continued to do fieldwork into the 1960s. He was active in helping Plains Apaches with the revival of the *Manatide*. He took a number of students out to work with the Plains Apache, including the Kiowa picture collage of the part world (1971:3).
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including Schweinfurth and Beatty (see also Bittle 1971). In 1971, Bittle wrote “A Brief History of the Kiowa Apache.” In that work, Bittle presents a picture of the Plains Apaches as one of change and continuity, an impression not shared by all (Bittle 1971:33). Bittle (1971:33) concludes, “Recent allegations that the sole anthropological interest in American Indians has been largely exploitative (which I take to mean professionally and academically self-serving) are in large measure true.” Bittle (1971:34) argues for a role for anthropologists to give “practical advice” that is based on “the realities of specific situations” (The kind of advice, we may imagine, that he no doubt offered the Plains Apache individuals who came to see him about the Manatidie). For Bittle, the Plains Apache were legitimately coeval in practice. Contemporary Plains Apache life did not end when he departed the field, it continued as it always does, unless we play tricks with time and remove real people from our time and our place (Fabian 1983). Bittle (1962:162) ends his article on the revival of the Manatidie by quoting a Plains Apache consultant, giving a Plains Apache the last word (Two Crows could not have said it better): “There are a lot of things wrong with the dance, but that’s alright. We haven’t had anything like this for a long time. Now the whole tribe is interested in something.”

EPILOGUE

After this paper was substantially written, I read William Bittle’s (1970) review of Brant’s book in American Anthropologist. On the whole, Bittle gives a positive review. In particular, he notes his interest in the life-story of Whitewolf and the discussions that Whitewolf has concerning religion (the Ghost Dance, Peyote, the Native American Church, and Christianity). However, Bittle does take issue with Brant’s introduction. Bittle (1970:884) writes:

Although a relevant and necessary précis of Kiowa Apache culture, the chapter somewhat unhappily incorporates a number of pages of out-of-date materials on the contemporary conditions of this group...although Brant files something of a disclaimer in a footnote on page 18 as to the accuracy of the data, he ignores his qualification by stating that “it is the writer’s belief that it holds true in all major respects” at the present time.

Bittle concludes his discussion of this introduction this way: “To the extent that such data bear upon his interpretation of contemporary Kiowa Apache culture, they are misleading” (Bittle 1970:884). Bittle’s repeated use of the word “contemporary” (as has mine) echoes with Brant’s (1969:36) use of it in his pessimistic view of Plains Apache prospects. Bittle tries, with a few examples, to counter the view of contemporary Plains Apache life. For Bittle, who had remained in contact with the Plains Apache, Brant’s description of “contemporary” Plains Apache life was misleading. I have argued that based on the lens by which Brant approached the Plains Apache, it was the most likely vision. Bittle (1970:884), on the other hand, states, “The modern condition of the Indians of western Oklahoma, although by no means ideal, contrasts sharply with their situation twenty years ago.” For Bittle, the Plains Apache were not outside time, but for Brant they seemed perpetually to exist as a disintegrated community, outside a coeval “present.”
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NOTES

1. Jim Whitewolf is a pseudonym. For interesting photos of the Plains Apaches ca. 1933–1934 see McAllister (1970). One anonymous reviewer has noted that there is a vast archive of materials collected at the University of Oklahoma's Western History Library. That reviewer also suggests that an analysis of such archives would provide an interesting perspective on Plains Apache views of Bittle and Brant. I agree. However, the goal of this paper is to take a narrow perspective on "reading" Bittle and Brant in dialogue and then suggest how the duration and intensity of their fieldwork and their intellectual biographies may have predisposed them to view the Plains Apaches in certain ways. The reviewer also further notes that "today community members advise caution when reading this life-history." I have tried to avoid citing any of Jim Whitewolf's life-history in this paper. Instead, I have focused on Brant's framing of the life-history and of "contemporary" Plains Apache life ca. 1969. It is quite true that such real-time social encounters between anthropologists and indigenous consultants in the construction of something we might term now "life-histories" were complicated and inexorably enmeshed in the social, historical, and biographical realities of the participants (see Clements 1996; Krupat 1985; Murray 1991). It is possible that Whitewolf presented an image of Plains Apache culture as disintegrating. I would argue, however, that based on Brant's intellectual history, he was predisposed to see culture as an object and as something that could disintegrate.