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This essay reflects on the concepts of religion, worldviews, indigeneity, and identity, through commentary arisen from my reading of three recent above-mentioned works discussing prominent and popular themes in Lakota historiography. While the focus is on the Lakota and the Northern Plains, I will also touch upon larger issues in indigenous studies.¹

In recent years there has been a welcome shift in Native American Studies, and Indigenous Studies in general, to a more in-depth understanding of indigenous perspectives. In his book *Call for Change: The Medicine Way of American Indian History, Ethos, and Reality* (2013), historian Donald Fixico urges for a change in approaches and research paradigms, if we really want to comprehend indigenous people’s lives as lived reality. Recent works, such as Brendan Hokowhitu’s *Indigenous Identity and Resistance: Researching the Diversity of Knowledge* (2010), Maximilian C. Forte’s *Indigenous Cosmopolitans: Transnational and Transcultural Indigeneity in the Twenty-First Century* (2010), Joshua L. Reid’s *The Sea Is My Country: The Maritime World of the Makahs* (2015), or Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (2012), call for new approaches in studying indigenous issues, such as the reconstruction of space, decolonization, and indigeneity around the world.²

To me Indigenous Studies is a prime example of the usefulness of inter- and cross-disciplinary methods. Thus, when studying any indigenous group, one necessarily needs to be familiar not only with history, but with politics, environmental and economic issues, religion, languages, and societal aspects; in short, indigenous worldviews.

A worldview, to put it simply, is a set of ideas, ideologies, and practices that form the basis of a person’s or a group’s identity and can be closely attributed to terms such as religion. Studying indigenous agency in the past or present necessarily requires exploring and respecting indigenous peoples’ ways of looking at the world. The starting point is the connection to a certain place, to land, to nature, and the idea of human-nature relationship. The old stereotype of indigenous people being somehow magically connected to nature and the environment has in recent years been replaced by a more in-depth understanding and respect for what many call an “indigenous way of being.” World-renowned Lakota scholar, Vine Deloria Jr. noted that “Indians do not talk about nature as some kind of concept or something 'out there'. They talk about the immediate environment in which they live. They do not embrace all trees or love
every river or mountain. What is important is the relationship you have with a particular tree or a particular mountain.”

Deloria talks about relationship, deeply connected to kinship and meaning. That meaning could be sacred, or practical, but on a fundamental level indigenous people do not separate themselves from nature and the environment. Rather, they are part of them. For indigenous people, time and place are linked through the connection to land, to places where the ancestors have lived and where they have been buried. It is not only the visible world but also the invisible, spiritual world that manifests itself through and in nature. Religion is not separate from everyday life like it is for most Euro-Americans. Thus, nature, land, and human-nature relationships have very different meanings and significance to people espousing worldviews that are epistemologically very far from each other. Therefore, as scholars in the Western academic tradition, we need to use cultural concepts and societal constructs that derive directly from the indigenous people, hopefully resulting in more thoughtful analysis of indigenous identity and their sense of belonging, and more nuanced interpretations of their history and modernity. Building on this, we need to recognize that Native Americans were not merely passive onlookers to colonialism or American imperialism, but active participants in the events affecting them. One important concept in a quest to understand native agency is religion, which to Native Americans manifests itself through the above-mentioned connections of human-non-human relations as well as history, culture, language, and belief systems. These are the cornerstones for what many consider to be the basis of “peoplehood.”

For example, Lakota mythology explains Lakota origins and the Lakotas’ relationship with the universe. Understanding Lakota views is instrumental in interpreting Lakota behavior, for example, in interactions with the whites. Any study on the Lakotas has to start with the concept of wakȟáŋ, sacred. This, however, requires a completely different mindset than the Euro-American, or Judeo-Christian, perception of God. The Lakotas differentiated between the
everyday world and the superhuman, sacred world, but both worlds were parts of the same experienced universe. For the Lakotas, or Native Americans in general, there was traditionally no single God. Instead, the foundation for Lakota belief is a general spirit force that manifests itself in nature in the visible and the invisible world. This all-encompassing spirit force is known as Wakȟáŋ Tháŋka, sometimes translated as the great spirit or the great mystery. However, neither of these English terms fully captures the essence of wakȟáŋ or Wakȟáŋ Tháŋka. While Wakȟáŋ Tháŋka can be considered as a godlike or divine being, it is more complicated than that. On a fundamental level, wakȟáŋ is everything. Everything that is mysterious or causes awe can be wakȟáŋ, be it a shooting star in the sky or the birth of a human baby. Above all these things is Wakȟáŋ Tháŋka, which encompasses everything wakȟáŋ. Wakȟáŋ also reflects kinship networks, which comprise of human-to-human relationships, human-to-nature relationships, and human-to-sacred relationships. Understanding these kinship relationships is another key to Lakota society, indeed to all indigenous societies. This opens a door into their worldviews and to appreciating their agency in the past as well as their modernities.4

The Lakota belief system, or religion, is a complete social phenomenon that defines who the Lakotas are today. It strengthens their individual and group identity. Religion also manifests itself through kinship relations. Anthropologist David Posthumus has argued that kinship networks extend to the realm of religion in the formation of what he calls “ritual thióyşpayes.” These are an extension of the traditional kinship networks, extended family groups, that are at the core of Lakota society. Lakota religion, or worldview, says Posthumus, is a combination and extension of the kinship networks of the spiritual world, or non-human and the everyday human worlds. These two worlds connect to the self and to the center of universe. Lakota identity and “indigeneity” can be understood as decolonization strategies that seek to maintain and (re)create Lakota identity, tradition, and religion as well as to retain a clear border between
Lakotas and non-Lakotas. For the Lakotas the division to “us” and “others” is an old tradition. All non-Lakotas have been called “common men,” ikčhéwičhaša, whereas the Lakotas are wólakȟota and are related, lakȟólkičhiyapi. Today this separation can be seen as a strategy for decolonization. Decolonization is also connected to land, history, language, and culture, especially religion. Many Lakotas today believe that religion is a Euro-American construction that cannot accurately describe their spirituality. Many accept the word “spirituality” and argue that “Lakota religion” is simply a way of life or a worldview. Thus, “spirituality” as a term implies less hierarchy and fewer structures than the word “religion” and refers rather to an individual’s quest to find the sacred in the universe and the search for something that is mysterious – wakȟáŋ.⁵

Much has been written about Plains Indian, especially Lakota, religious thought. The tradition goes back to early anthropological texts such as James R. Walker’s fieldnotes published in three volumes, Lakota Myth (ed. Elaine Jahner, 1983), Lakota Society (ed. Raymond J. DeMallie, 1992), and Lakota Belief and Ritual (ed. Raymond J. DeMallie & Elaine Jahner, 1980), or to the teachings of Heȟáka Sápa, or Black Elk published in Black Elk Speaks: The Life Story of the Holy man of the Oglala Sioux (1932) by John G. Neihardt and by Joseph Epes Brown in The Sacred Pipe: Black Elk's Account of the Seven Rites of the Oglala Sioux (1953). These books have become the cornerstone of our knowledge of the traditional Lakota belief system. More recently, Sioux Indian Religion: Tradition and Innovation (ed. Raymond J. DeMallie & Douglas R. Parks, 1987) and a plethora of books on Black Elk have further deepened our understanding of Lakota religion, and by extension, Lakota culture and history.⁶

The Ghost Dance religion has also been a subject of much scholarly inquiry. From the very beginning, however, the perspectives of white Americans distorted the study of the Lakota Ghost Dance, and Lakota views were only briefly incorporated into the narratives. The earliest accounts created a tradition of treating the Lakota Ghost Dance as a military, political, or
religious-political movement. Phrases such as “Sioux outbreak,” “Messiah Craze,” and “Ghost Dance war,” so often used in the titles of these works, characterize this approach. The tradition continued into the late twentieth century, when alternative interpretations began to emerge.  

Of the three books reflected upon in this essay, Mark Hollabaugh’s study traces the various interpretations given by scholars of the wakȟáŋ and notes that wakȟáŋ is “the most important unifying concept from Lakota culture for ethnoastronomy.” He maintains that the roots of Lakota ethnoastronomy are “firmly rooted in Lakota culture.” Like the anthropologist Raymond J. DeMallie, I believe that any study of the Lakota must be deeply rooted in Lakota culture, and in this Hollabaugh does an excellent job. Hollabaugh relates major Lakota views that together constitute the Lakota system of belief. His analysis is thoughtful and thorough, and shows deep respect for and knowledge of Lakota life and culture. Hollabaugh interestingly places Lakota spirituality into the context of ethnoastronomy. His work is a great example of how understanding a certain culture can result in a theoretically sound academic work. He does not trivialize Lakota views of the heavens, the universe or the stars, rather he explains what the Lakotas actually saw in the dark skies of the Northern Great Plains, and how those observations are manifested in Lakota ceremonies, culture, and life.

In Hollabaugh’s narrative Lakota stories, legends, and belief system become more comprehensible and accessible to an outsider. Hollabaugh carefully reconstructs stories, wintercounts, religious ceremonies etc., and explains what the natural phenomena actually were that gave birth to Lakota beliefs. Hollabaugh’s approach is fascinating as he never forgets that the foundation for his astronomical analysis is in Lakota culture, in the search of wakȟáŋ. To put it briefly; he uses modern astronomy through a cultural lens. His work is not only exemplary ethnoastronomy but an exemplary piece of ethnohistorical scholarship.
Much of what we know about 19th century Lakota religion is thanks to one man: Black Elk. Of the vast literature on Black Elk and his teachings, the most useful and insightful is The Sixth Grandfather: Black Elk’s Teachings Given to John G. Neihardt. In The Sixth Grandfather, Raymond J. DeMallie carefully analyses the original transcripts of the interviews Black Elk gave to John G. Neihardt, the core of what became Black Elk Speaks. The questions that immediately came to my mind when I received my copy of Joe Jackson’s Black Elk: The Life of an American Visionary were, what is new about this book? Is there a new interpretation? What does the book add to the existing literature? Readers searching for something novel in this book, will be disappointed. Evidently the novel idea here is the attempt to tell Lakota history through Black Elk. There is nothing wrong with that, and at times the book succeeds in producing insights and valuable information, but at other occasions it descends into paternalism. The book starts with the words “extinction loomed in his life from the day he was born. It waited across the horizon like the thunderclouds rolling across the Plains.”11 This, of course, was hardly how Lakotas in the early 1860s viewed their existence. They were still very much in control of their lands and were even expanding their domain. Jackson incorrectly uses the word “clan” to describe both Lakota band structures as well as family groups. Lakota society was not clan based: instead the key societal structure that kept the people together was the extended family group, thíoyšpaye. I wonder why Jackson decides to use the word “clan” as he clearly knows better, discussing thíoyšpayes and other terms later. He also says that holy men “were mediators between God and the tribe.” As noted above, in Lakota belief system there is no single God, there are sacred beings and Wakȟáŋ Tháŋka is the superior power that manifests itself in nature, including human beings. Where Hollabaugh eloquently looks for – and explains – concepts such as wakȟáŋ and Wakȟáŋ Tháŋka, Jackson thoroughly fails in this regard. When this issue arises in the early pages of the work, one starts wondering whether the
author completely missed the point of Lakota religious thinking and if so, what is the narrative he is going to bring about of Black Elk and his “religion”?

Misconceptions of Lakota culture continue throughout the book, which is surprising since Jackson has read most of the relevant literature. In Jackson’s description of the Lakota Sun Dance, a central Lakota ceremony, he writes: “The dancers sacrificed themselves to enter into a direct relationship with the Great Holy and win the favor of the gods. But it was also a communal event. As spectators gathered to watch, they identified with the dancers who suffered with the group. The sacrifice was made so that all (italics original) could receive the blessings of the sun.” Yes, the Sun Dance was surely a communal event, but rather than looking for a blessing of the sun or gods, the ceremony was that of renewal. It was – and still is – a ceremony that looks to ensure the unity and prosperity of the Lakota as a people, the sacred tree connecting the earth, the people, and the spirit world, thus creating a sacred hoop of unity. The sacrifice was made for the people to show that they were pitiful and needed Wakȟáŋ Thàŋka to help them. Jackson creates a picture of worshipping the sun almost as the ancient Egyptians worshipped the Sun God, Ra. And as Hollabaugh noted, the Lakota Sun Dance is not about “worshipping” the sun- Indeed, the word “worship” does not capture the essence of Lakota or Plains Indian spirituality. Jackson continues arguing that the Lakota Sun Dance had “evolved from penance or public sacrifice into a sheer public spectacle of pain – a dance of punishment in which the Sioux demonstrated to themselves and others that they were the most formidable people on the Plains.” There are so many misconceptions in this description that I would really like to know the sources for this interpretation, which Jackson does not provide. This leads me to conclude that the above reflects Jackson’s own understanding – or the lack thereof – of Lakota culture and religion.

I also wonder why Jackson chose to call Black Elk an “American” visionary instead of a Native American or Lakota visionary? Does that make the book more marketable and appealing to a
wider audience, or does he simply want to make Black Elk an all-American hero, elevating him from being merely a Native American to a true American? As if a compliment to the holy man? In either case, I find the title problematic. Throughout his life Black Elk sought to find out what his and his people’s place was in the world, in the universe, and in relation to wakȟáŋ. His life is a story of finding a balance between the traditional world of the Lakota, the world of the white man, and Christianity. In the end he made a synthesis of both worlds, but never seized to be a Lakota first and foremost. His teachings, his religion, and his life are powerful examples of the flexibility of Lakota belief systems, Lakota culture, and Lakota survival and revitalization.

What Jackson has done quite well, though, is weaving his research into an eloquently flowing narrative. This is not surprising considering his background as a novelist, and I understand that some of his sentences and choices of words make the text more appealing and dramatic. Still, searching for drama often caused him to miss the search for wakȟáŋ and the understanding of Lakota culture. I realize that for readers who are not familiar with the Lakota or Plains Indian cultures, the problems I have pointed out here may seem trivial or inconsequential. For those readers, this book presents, despite some problems, an easy, well written glimpse into Lakota history. As such, it probably reaches a wider audience than a more strictly academic work would, and thus serves the purpose of educating the general reader about Native North America. The best section in the book explores Black Elk’s life after Wounded Knee, his experiences as catechist and his co-operation with John G. Neihardt. Still, I would not recommend this book for use in an academic classroom or for people who really want to understand Native American way of life or Native American thinking.

Since the Ghost Dance was a defining event in the life of Black Elk, his story can also serve as our gateway to Louis Warren’s book God’s Red Son: The Ghost Dance Religion and the Making of Modern America. In 1890 a religion known as the Ghost Dance promised the return
of the buffalo by dancing in a certain way. By then the buffalo was almost hunted to extinction by the whites. For the Lakotas the buffalo had symbolically returned to the earth, from where they had once originated together with the Lakota people. When the new religion, which the Lakotas called *wanáği wačhípi kiŋ*, the Spirit Dance, said the buffalo would re-emerge from the earth, this was natural for the Lakotas. And so was meeting with the spirits of the departed during the dance ceremonies. For the whites both ideas were ridiculous and even dangerous. The new religious ceremonies had to be stopped, which eventually led to the Wounded Knee massacre in December 1890.\(^4\) The Ghost Dance sought to find a balance between the old way and the new. If the Ghost Dance is viewed only from the Euro-American perspective, it could appear as a “backward” movement. For the Lakotas, the life they were hoping to get back was better than life on the reservations. The white man’s progress had not yielded prosperity to the Lakotas, so perhaps the Ghost Dance could be seen as a *progressive* religion that sought to find a path to prosperity to the Lakotas as well.

The historian Louis Warren has stated that for many Indians, including some Lakotas, the Ghost Dance also served as an assimilation strategy, a way to justify life on a reservation and working for the white man. The Ghost Dance gave Lakotas and other Indians spiritual authority to take up wage work, education, farming, and church-going, while allowing them to resist assimilation. The new religion helped them accommodate themselves to new realities without giving up Indian identity. Indeed, it provided psychological means to survive.\(^5\)

So, the Ghost Dance, while often looked upon as a backward movement, was in fact looking for ways to adapt and to survive. It looked forward, albeit not to the kind of future that contemporary whites were envisioning for the Lakotas. Perhaps the Ghost Dance should be understood as an innovative way of adaptation to the prevalent situation and as an innovative way to find a path to a better life. In the end, internal divisions within the Lakota people and their problems with the whites, not the Ghost Dance itself, determined the Lakotas’ different
approaches to the Ghost Dance. Internal divisions had long historical, political, economic, and religious roots in the Lakota society. The Ghost Dance brought these conflicts to the forefront.\textsuperscript{16}

Warren’s monograph \textit{God’s Red Son} develops an argument from the native point of view but also places the Ghost Dance into a wider American cultural and historical context. Warren argues that the Ghost Dance was a modern religion and should be seen as an extension of both white and native cultural traditions, not more, not less. Thus, Warren brings the Ghost Dance religion into the ongoing debate of native modernities.

In some quarters the term “modernity” could be viewed as yet another colonial term imposed on Native Americans. For example, why is there a need to create an indigenous modernity, can’t we simply accept indigenous belief systems as what they are, do they have to be “modern?” Does “modernity” lift Indians from “savagery?” If “modernity” is used in such a context it does not work. For example, if the Ghost Dance was a religion that brought together Native tradition and Christian beliefs, what is the part that makes it “modern?” Are the traditional native aspects those that render the Ghost Dance backward and the Christian elements those that make it modern? Why can’t we simply accept the Ghost Dance as an innovation that merged various traditions into something new? As a religion that sought to find a balance between differing worldviews but also a balance between the sacred and everyday life.

I am, however, not arguing that Warren’s concept of the Ghost Dance as a modern religion would be wrong. On the contrary, I think the modernity comes from the Indians’ ability to use telegraph, letter writing, railroads, and other modern marvels to spread the news of the Ghost Dance. And, as Warren notes, in the context of the Ghost Dance modernity also reflects the Indians’ ability and willingness to send their children to school, to take up wage work and farming. By placing the Ghost Dance within the wider framework of the “making of modern
America,” Warren highlights the fact that native peoples were not living in the past as some kind of a backwards people, but were quick to embrace those parts of white society that were beneficial to them, whether it was the use of trade goods in the early 19th century or using letter writing as a way to improve their living conditions on the reservations in the 1880s. This, of course, is again a great example of the flexibility of Lakota and other native societies. Under the tremendous pressure placed upon them by the US government they were able to find ways to adapt and to survive, and often it was their spirituality, or religion that emerged as a key element in this struggle.

Thus, if the Ghost Dance is looked upon as a new innovation and a form of adaptation, using the term modernity moves the Indians from the past to the present and beyond. By placing the Ghost Dance into the discussion of indigenous modernities, Warren nicely taps into what historian Phillip Deloria suggests about indigenous modernities being a “way from the past, to the futures” of indigenous peoples and indigeneity. Perhaps, then, modernity is a tool that bridges the past to the present.17

Today religion and ceremonies are again visible parts of life on all Lakota reservations. Religion and religious identity are common topics of discussion and debate. Individual identity and group identity are inseparable and relate to societal structures such as kinship. These themes, then, are also closely connected to the environment, human-nature relationships, and, thus, are a part of the construction of worldviews.

Like many Plains Indian tribes, the Lakotas are actively seeking to revitalize their culture, language, and religion. Lakota beliefs and Lakota society have always been dynamic and flexible. There is not one religious dogma that everyone needs to follow, rather every individual can contribute to the body of knowledge that constitutes Lakota belief system through his/her own experiences. The development of the ritual thioyŋpayes is another sign of the power and
adaptability of the Lakota as a people. The Ghost Dance sought to bring two different traditions into something new, similarly the Lakota today adapt and innovate, but still at the center are kinship networks, both human and non-human.

Where do we go from here? We may study Native American or Lakota past or present, looking at interactions between them and the whites and explore their relationships through, for example, mutual commerce and warfare. Yet, when emphasizing trade and other Euro-American viewpoints, we easily digress from Lakota, i.e. indigenous, perspectives. For example, although trade and territorial expansion have undoubtedly been important and motivated Lakota agency in the pre-reservation era, it is important to realize that Lakota culture did not, and does not, operate under the same premises as white American culture; acquiring individual wealth is not a driving force for the Lakotas. Thus, even trade and expansion needs to be understood through Lakota culture. Exploiting the environment is not a part of Lakota, or Native American, way of life, and to understand indigenous agency in the current environmentalism and exploitation debate, we need to appreciate indigenous worldviews: Nature is in us and we are in nature; and a river can truly be a person.

At the same time, we must recognize that indigenous people around the world are facing a dire dilemma. Much of the untapped natural resources in the US, for example, are within Native American reservations. People like the Crow, Cheyenne, or Lakota, are faced with the questions: Do we disturb mother earth by mining coal and drilling oil or not? If we do not take up the job ourselves, is someone else going to do it, and all the benefits will be lost to the people? Many tribes throughout North America made compromises. While still espousing traditional worldviews, they have decided to take on the challenges of what could be called the modern world and are operating mines and drilling oil on their reservations. Recently, however, on many reservations on the Great Plains new forms of technology, like solar and wind energy, present new opportunities to the Lakota, and other people. New technologies allow them to
harness energy with much less infringement into the environment. Thus, solar and wind power are much closer to traditional worldviews and many see them as a way forward into self-reliance on the reservations. Even if the prospect of being energy self-sufficient in a way that fits well into Native cultures and worldviews is still a distant dream for most Native American nations, it would certainly be an economic asset, and a welcome addition to Native peoples’ decolonization processes, and would strengthen tribal sovereignty, identity, and peoplehood.

This brings us back to worldviews, traditions, adaptation, and modernities, and to the question of how we as academics should incorporate native worldviews and knowledge into our teaching and research. We may frame our research around some decolonization methods or other current theoretical frameworks, but perhaps it is our turn to listen, learn, and adapt. I would suggest that instead of writing histories focusing on Euro-American worldviews and practices, and imposing those ideas on indigenous agency, we should seek increasing collaboration with indigenous communities in our search to understand indigenous perspectives, identity, and indigeneity. Maybe we can start by searching for the wakȟáŋ.
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