

Native American Resistance to Euro-American Hegemony in Momaday's *The Moon in Two Windows*

Dr. Shahbaz Afzal Bezar

Assistant Professor, Head of English Department
Govt. Graduate College Satiana Road, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan

Email: shahbazaf@gmail.com

Zareena Qasim

Assistant Professor, Department of English

University of Sargodha, Sargodha

Email: zareena.qasim@uos.edu.pk

Sana Saheer

MPhil English (Linguistics), Department of English Linguistics

The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

Email: ctn.sanasaher@gmail.com

Abstract

This study analyzed N. Scott Momaday's screenplay *The Moon in Two Windows* in order to bring the marginalized Native Americans and their literature into the centre and to explore Native American resistance to Euro-American hegemony through Dollimore and Sinfield's model of cultural materialism. There are four traits of Dollimore and Sinfield's model: historical context, close textual analysis, theoretical method, and political commitment. Cultural materialism expresses power relations in the text written in the past in order to interpret the texts within the context of contemporary power relations. It studies the hegemony of the structure of power for identifying the co-occurrence of the subordinate and oppositional cultural forces. It tends to challenge the hegemony of the dominant Euro-American culture and ideology. This qualitative study explores how Euro-Americans exercised their hegemony over the Native Americans and how Native Americans resist the Euro-American cultural hegemony through the imaginative revival of Native culture in the mainstream American society that has been explored from *The Moon in Two Windows*. Native American Studies and cultural materialism will get benefit from this work.

Keywords: Native Americans, U.S., Hegemony, Resistance, Dollimore and Sinfield

Introduction

There were many differences between Native Americans' and the settlers' cultural values. If quietness, simplicity and patience are hallmarks of the Natives, impatience, manipulation and bluntness are the characteristics of the white men. The difference between the Natives and the whites is the

difference of non-materialistic orientation/ spirituality and materialistic orientation. If individualism, the land owned by the individuals, conquest over Nature, and use of animals for materialistic pursuits are the salient traits of the whites, mutualism, hunting, fishing, the land belonged to the whole community, harmony with Nature, and animals used as teachers/ spiritual guides/ protectors are the characteristics of the Natives. Feather and Robinson (2003) note some positive characteristics of the Native Americans: "humility, love of neighbor and Creation, obedience, and love and joy in their spirituality. Other positive traits are "contrition, purity of spirit, courage, patience, perseverance, hope, and knowledge and in the rightness of things" (Feather & Robinson, pp.58-59). These differences produce hegemony and unequal power relationship between the Native and Euro-Americans.

Euro-Americans represent Native Americans as a primitive race in their historical and literary accounts. Momaday's works challenge this representation and signify Native Americans especially Kiowa, Navajo, and Pueblo, their literature and their identity in order to bring the marginalized sections into the centre. In order to bring the marginalized Native Americans and their literature in the limelight and to explore Native American resistance to Euro-American hegemony, Momaday's *The Moon in Two Windows* needs to be analyzed from the perspective of cultural materialism especially Dollimore and Sinfield's model of cultural materialism discussed in *Political Shakespeare* (1985).

The domination of the U.S. power and their hegemony over the Native Americans rests in the very centre of Native American Studies. Despite a lot of research on Momaday as a representative writer of the Red Indian Renaissance, his works both fictional and non-fictional have not yet received due attention in the realm of cultural materialism especially Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield's model of cultural materialism. This study is important because it seeks to demonstrate how the Native Americans can live a purposeful life in mainstream American society, how the marginalized and weaker sections are brought into the centre, and how the existing cultural reality of the Native Americans can be changed.

The objectives of the study are to:

- i. determine to what extent does Momaday's *The Moon in Two Windows* represent cultural materialism;
- ii. demonstrate how the Native Americans resist Euro-American hegemony.

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

- i. How does Momaday resist Euro-American hegemony through the revival of Native Americans' culture in order to bring their marginalized literature and identity into the centre?

- ii. Q.2 How does Momaday challenge Euro-American hegemony through the boarding schools in his play *The Moon in Two Windows*?

Literature Review

Native American literature underwent a Renaissance around 1968 with the publication of Pulitzer-Prize-winner writer N. Scott Momaday's *House Made of Dawn*. A precious body of literature has been published on Native American literature. Different research scholars (Jilek, 1978; Lincoln, 1983; Kuipers, 1991; Vizenor, 1995; Ortiz, 1998; Royster, 2003; Kelsey, 2003; Blasingame, 2006; Thamarana, 2015; Murtaza and Bhatti, 2015; Murtaza et al. 2016; Shehzad and Bhatti, 2017) have accomplished their scholarly works on Native American literature from different perspectives. But a lot is still required in order to bring Momaday's works especially *The Moon in Two Windows* under the umbrella of cultural materialism.

Several scholarly works (Shahrezaee and Ladani, 2014; Barathi, 2016; Shahrezaee and Ladani, 2014; Gheytsi, 2018, etc.) have been conducted on cultural materialism from different perspectives but a lot is still required in order to bring Native American literature especially N. Scott Momaday's works under the umbrella of culture materialism especially its notion of hegemony. There is a need to analyze Momaday's works especially *The Moon in Two Windows* from the point of view of Euro-American hegemony and Native American resistance to hegemony.

Prior research scholars (Dombroski, 1989; Hearn, 2004; Banik, 2016) have accomplished their studies on hegemony from different perspectives but they have overlooked the exploration of Euro-American hegemony from *The Moon in Two Windows* that this study endeavors to investigate. The relation of literature with ideology and hegemony is very deep. Different researchers have accomplished their works on it. Dombroski (1989) explores a relationship between ideology, hegemony, and literature. For him, in Marxian use of the term 'ideology' refers to a systematically biased body of thought that represents the requirements of social groups in universal terms. It is thought of as 'false thought' or 'false consciousness' but it is considered 'false' because it exhibits the limitations of thought itself, namely, its abstract character which keeps it distinct from the material base of human labor. The distinction between ideology and science has been made: the former is 'justificatory', 'the apologetic one' and the latter is 'diagnostic', the critical, dimension of culture. Ideology refers to the structures of value underlying human discourses within a constituted society and smaller elements of social groups such as the family, the Church, and the educational system that reflect social and political values. As an element of hegemony, the literary text portrays the relations of domination and subordination in a particular system of cultural exchange. The researcher has accomplished his work in theoretical terms

but does not explore these notions i.e. ideology, hegemony and literature from any other literary text that this study will attempt to explore from Momaday's *The Moon in Two Windows*. Hearn (2004), employing an exploratory approach, deconstructs the hegemony, power, authority of men in relation to women, children, and other men. For the researcher, Gramsci's concept of hegemony is not strictly dependent on Gramscian economic class-based cultural economics or economic culturalism but it can be reformed or re-formed in theoretical practice i.e. Critical Studies on Men (CSM). Banik (2016) sorts out the rewriting of history to challenge its hegemony through replacing Western hegemony of historical narratives with myth and storytelling.

Prior studies analyzed Momaday's *Three Plays: The Indolent Boys, Children of the Sun and The Moon in Two Windows* from different perspectives. Teuton (2008) explores the theme of education of the Native Americans from *The Indolent Boys*. Allen (2009) investigates Momaday's moving the power of oral tradition into the genre of stage. Haladay (2009) sorts out the Native students' subversion and creative resistance from *The Indolent Boys* and *The Moon in Two Windows*. The previous body of literature published on Momaday's plays plays a significant role in the understanding of his plays but a lot is still required in order to analyze his plays from cultural materialist perspective that this study will endeavor to accomplish.

Theoretical Framework

Cultural materialism has been "under the sway of Althusser" who was a French Marxist philosopher and professor at École Normale Supérieure in Paris (Liu, 1989, p.736). Althusser's (1971) ideologies that have a material existence in 'state apparatuses' i.e. the schools, the families, the media, and the churches have contributed to cultural materialism. Belsey (1999) has echoed Althusser in "stressing the materiality of ideology, [wherein] beliefs are inscribed in practices, particularly ritualistic practices" (p.6). Unlike Gramsci's proletariats, Althusser's workers did not rise up because they were completely in thrall to capitalist ideology but the focus of the latter was on material existence of ideologies through Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs). He makes a distinction between Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) and Ideological State Apparatus: the former is used on the part of the state when it is forced into action physically to control or subdue its subjects and the latter dominates its subjects through their own thought processes making natural or 'second nature' which has been learned (Parvini, 2012a). The Churches, the parties, the Trade Unions, the families, some schools, most newspapers, and cultural ventures are ISAs. These ISAs help to interpellate individuals fully and maintain the illusion that individuals are free but they are not. For Althusser (1971), the subjects perform the function of ideology and they "work all by themselves" to maintain the condition of the state (p.123). In

this way, Althusser's subjects are not free and autonomous like Gramsci's individuals.

Although Michel Foucault proved to be more acceptable for new historicists and post-structuralists, cultural materialism was also influenced by his philosophical notions of 'analytics of power' and refutation of traditional history. His criticality towards analyses of traditional history, psychiatry, clinical history of the Classical Age, criminology, and mechanism of power are based on cultural materialism. Like cultural materialists, Foucault (1969) follows a radical and disruptive approach to history: switching the historian's gaze from the ideology of continuity to discontinuity, rupture, limit, series, and transformation (Parvini, 2012). His approach to history paves the way for Dollimore and Sinfield's (1985) notion of 'genuine dissidence' and subversion. For Foucault (1975), discourses are not univocal but contain the points of confrontation and risks of conflict: they "cannot be localized in a particular type of institution or state apparatus . . . these relations go right down into the depths of society...They are not univocal; they define innumerable points of confrontation, focuses instability, each of which has its own risks of conflict, of struggles, and an at least temporary inversion of power relations" (p. Foucault's concept of 'discontinuity' played a significant role in the evolution of cultural materialist notion of dissidence and subversion. Dissidence that comes from subcultures is an attack on the hegemonic power from the subordinate people. It is in fact thinking in new ways. In the same way, Foucault (2002) defines 'discontinuity' as "within the space of a few years a culture sometimes ceases to think as it had been thinking up till then and begins to think other things in a new way" (p.56). Thinking in new ways through 'discontinuity' and 'dissidence' makes room for the subordinate cultures and the marginalized sections in cultural materialism. Hence, eminent theorists and philosophers i.e. Geertz, Gramsci, Althusser, and Foucault played their significant role in the evolution of cultural materialism.

The phrase 'cultural materialism' was coined by Raymond Williams in *Marxism and Literature* (1977) in order to challenge the liberal humanism of F.R. Leavis in English literary studies. Cultural materialism is a theory in cultural studies that traces its origin to the works of the Welsh left-wing (neo-Marxist) critic, Williams. In *Marxism and Literature* (1977), Williams used the term 'cultural materialism' in order to study literature within the analytical frameworks of Marxist theory as the new approach of "the specificities of material cultural and literary production within historical materialism" (p.5).

Cultural materialism privileges power relations as the most important context for interpreting text within the context of contemporary power relations. For John Brannigan, "new historicists deal with the power relations of past societies, cultural materialists explore literary texts within

the context of contemporary power relations” (1998, p.9). Cultural materialism contains a more political agenda because it is in favor of changing existing reality. According to Ryan Kiernan, it deals with “literature of yesterday to change the world today” (1996, p. xv).

Cultural materialism contains attentiveness to the political and ideological significance of all cultural productions. Dollimore and Sinfield (1985) claim that cultural materialism “registers its commitment to the transformation of a social order which exploits people on the grounds of race, gender and class” (1985, p.viii). Culture in cultural materialism is material rather than ideal. It is material “because it implied a determined radical politics” (Dollimore & Sinfield, 1990). Social and political engagements that have been taken for granted are restored in cultural materialism (Sinfield, 2006).

Cultural materialism recovers the subordinated voices or the marginalized sections of society. Neema Parvini presents the tendency of the cultural materialists as they “tend to be concerned with the subjects that have been marginalized by the dominant culture” (2012, p.130). The focus of cultural materialism is on “oppressive representations in terms of class, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation” (Sinfield, 2006, p. 25). Partiality or bias is a salient trait of cultural materialism. Scott Wilson claims that “cultural materialism.... does not pretend to neutrality but declares its partiality or bias” (1995, p.16).

Cultural materialism contains a political stance because it uses past texts to challenge the present conservative consensus. According to Kiernan Ryan, “cultural materialism seeks actively and explicitly to use the literature of yesterday to change the world today” (1998, p. xv). If history is ‘a remote subject in new historicism, cultural materialists write “in the moment”’ (Felperin, p.157). Materialist methodology of cultural materialism is based on radical character, social change, and “resistance and renewal” (Holderness, 1992, p. 42).

Cultural materialism exposes the hegemony of the structure of power in order to identify the co-occurrence of the subordinate and oppositional cultural forces. It identifies a constant struggle between power and subversion. For Sinfield (1992), Raymond Williams argued the co-occurrence of subordinate, alternative and oppositional cultural forces alongside the dominant. According to him, cultural materialism seeks to discern “politics of class, race, gender, and sexual orientation, both within texts and in other roles in culture” (1992, p.9).

Antonio Gramsci’s notion of ‘hegemony’ deals with a dominant class or group in society that makes compromises, forges alliances, exerts moral and intellectual leadership and creates a network of institutions and social relations with all classes and sections of society. For cultural materialist critics, power of ideology works in language and it exists in material form through institutions such as the church, the school, the

university, etc. Cultural materialist practices enable us to examine literary texts as part of a wider context of cultural and political institutions (Brannigan, 1998). According to cultural materialists, texts always have a material function within contemporary power structures. In the eyes of cultural materialists, canonical texts and authors are used to validate contemporary political and cultural traditions. For example, the appearance of the head of Dickens of £ 10 notes in English currency and the hologram image of Shakespeare on certain cards have prompted cultural materialists to be alert to the political and cultural appropriations of literary texts and authors (Brannigan, 1998).

Research Methodology

The present study was qualitative in nature because the researchers analyzed text of Momaday's *The Moon in Two Windows* in the paradigm of cultural materialism by using Dollimore and Sinfield's model of cultural materialism (1985/1994) that contains four traits i.e. 'historical context', 'close textual analysis', 'political commitment', and 'theoretical method'.

Non-empirical approach was used in data collection because the data were collected from published books, journals, theses, and interviews. Four steps of the procedure of the analysis were followed for this study. In the first step, different books were studied. In the second step, the lines and paragraphs from Momaday's this play were highlighted in which Euro-American hegemony was reflected. In the third step, the paragraphs were marked out in which Native American resistance was reflected. In the final step, with the help of Dollimore and Sinfield's model, the marked out paragraphs were analyzed from the perspective of Euro-American hegemony and Native American resistance.

Analysis and Discussion

This section deals with the analysis and discussion with regard to research questions of Momaday's screenplay *The Moon in Two Windows*. In order to bring an analysis of a Native American writer, Momaday, under the umbrella of cultural materialism, to bring the marginalized Native American literature into the limelight, and to expose Euro-Americans' exercise of their hegemony over the Natives through the boarding schools, his play *The Moon in Two Windows* (2007) was studied from the perspective of cultural materialist notion of hegemony by using Dollimore and Sinfield's model (1985).

In *The Moon in Two Windows* (2007), Momaday returns to themes he first explored in *The Indolent Boys*. Set in the early 1900s, the screenplay *The Moon* centers on the children of defeated Indian tribes who are forced into assimilation at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, where the government established the first off-reservation boarding school, the Carlisle Indian Industrial School (1879-1918), by a career soldier, Richard Henry Pratt, a driven and enigmatic figure whose motto was to "kill the Indian, and save the Man" (Momaday, 2007, p.109). *The Moon* moves

beyond the Kiowa world to brilliantly stage and evoke the people and events surrounding the creation, opening, and legacy of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School. Told with a voiceover by the Carlisle graduate, author, and Sioux chief Luther Standing Bear, historical figures such as Richard Henry Pratt, Etahdleuh, and Carlisle students come alive (Teuton, 2008). For Allen (2009), *The Moon* is set in 1912 when Luther Standing Bear (Lakota), one of the first graduates of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, brought his young son to watch the famous football game played that year between Army (West Point) and Carlisle. In the stands, Luther has a reunion with the school's founder, Henry Pratt, whom he has not seen for many years. The screenplay juxtaposes this brief encounter with Luther Standing Bear's remembered childhood: his introduction to Pratt at the age of twelve in 1879; his journey starts from the Rosebud Reservation to attend Carlisle; and his and other students' experiences there as adolescents. Similar to the character John Pai (*The Indolent Boys*), Momaday's Luther Standing Bear is the voice of defiant Indian survival.

With the help of 'historical context' of Dollimore and Sinfield's model of cultural materialism, historical significance of devastation for Indian people has been explored through *black screen* of *The Moon in Two Windows*. The screenplay starts with *black screen*, *Indian flute*, and then *the sound of the flute is replaced by footsteps, the sound of cleats on concrete*. *Black screen* provides the context in which the screenplay is written. For Momaday (2007), the tenure of the school coincided with a time of devastation for Indian people. They had been utterly defeated and they were in effect prisoners of war. *Indian flute* manifests Native American culture and *the sound of the flute is replaced by footsteps* provides the historical context of crushing Indians by the *footsteps* of the federal government i.e. military and law. Momaday in 'about the screenplay' provides the historical context of the Carlisle Indian School that was found just three years after General George Armstrong Custer was killed at Little Big Horn. Public sentiment against the Indians was extreme. Nor were the Indian wars ended. The Ghost Dance and the massacre at Wounded Knee were yet to come. The reservations were concentration camps and contagious colonies in which disease and despair were epidemics. The hegemony of the Federal Government of the U.S. that is exercised by the boarding school is reflected in the historical context of the Carlisle Indian School.

Through 'close textual analysis' of Dollimore and Sinfield's model, hegemony of the boarding schools has been sorted out from cultural materialist perspective from the voiceover of Luther Standing Bear. The boarding schools that were modeled on Fort Marion prison were new colonial institutions that were established to exercise Euro-American hegemony over the Native Americans. For Dunbar-Ortiz (2014), during the Grant administration, the United States began experimenting with new

colonial institutions, the most pernicious of which were the boarding schools, modeled on Fort Marion prison. In 1875, Captain Richard Henry Pratt was in charge of transporting seventy-two captive Cheyenne and other Plains Indian warriors from the West to Fort Marion, an old Spanish fortress, dark and dank. After the captives were left shackled for a period in a dungeon, Pratt took their clothes away, had their hair cut, dressed them in army uniforms, and drilled them like soldiers. "Kill the Indian and save the man" was Pratt's motto. This "successful" experiment led Pratt to establish the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania in 1879. The Carlisle Indian Industrial School was like a prison in which indigenous boys and girls were confined in order to change their identity. In the voiceover of the screenplay, Luther's discourse is in passive voice that manifests hegemony of the U.S. Government that forced the Native parents to send their kids to the boarding school:

"I am a man, but I remember the child I was. I was sent away from my home to do a brave thing. I did not know what I was to do, but I prepared my heart. I was taken far away from my home, to a school in Pennsylvania" (Momaday, 2007, p.111).

Native American resistance to Euro-American stereotypes used for the Natives has been explored from the description of *interior* with the help of 'political commitment' of Dollimore and Sinfield's model. Native Americans have been presented as 'savage', 'uncultured', 'nomadic', etc. For Dunbar-Ortiz and Gilio-Whitaker (2016), popular culture has a long history of portraying stereotyped and blatantly racist images of American Indians, especially in film and even the Native American stereotypes are playing out over and over again in the classrooms and textbooks of American schoolchildren, generation after generation. In *The Moon*, Momaday with a political agenda of removal of Native American stereotypes represents the dignity of the marginalized Natives. In *Interior*, he describes the glorification of the Carlisle Indian team, "these young men seem poised on the edge of history, about to enter into a moment of extreme exertion, a moment that will determine who and what they are" (Momaday, 2007, p.111). He says about Glen Pop Warner, Indians' coach, who removes the stereotypes of the Indians, "he has come to know that his Indians have no "killer" instinct. They care more for honor and bravery than for winning" (p.112).

Historical background to brutality of the army of Federal Government has been investigated from discourses of Warner from cultural materialist perspective. In cultural materialism, culture is viewed as a productive process; art is translated as social use of material means of production; and arts i.e. literature are placed within historical context. Discarded or silenced historical aspect of genocide of the Native Americans by the military of U.S. has been explored from *The Moon*. For Warner, Indian coach, the players of the Army team are "the sons of the

soldiers who fought your fathers at Sand Creek, the Washita, Wounded Knee” (Momaday, 2007, p.112). In this screenplay, Warner’s resistance to hegemony of the army is reflected in his discourses when he is motivating his players saying, “but today they have no superiority in weapons or in numbers, and they are not taking you by surprise. Today the Army meets on a level field, even eleven men against eleven men” (p.112). And further says, “army is Army. You are the Indians, and you are the enemy. Army will take no prisoners today. It will do everything it can to defeat you, physically, mentally, morally” (p.112).

With the help of textual analysis, this study investigates Native American resistance to Euro-American hegemony from discourses of Spotted Tail¹¹ from *The Moon in Two Windows*. The settlers were the killers of the bison and plunderers of gold. Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) asserts that the history of the United States is a history of settler colonialism—the founding of a state based on the ideology of white supremacy, the widespread practice of African slavery, and a policy of genocide and land theft. In the screenplay, Pratt trains his vision on Native chief, Spotted Tail, when he visited him for taking native children to the Carlisle Indian School. Native American resistance to Euro-American colonialism is reflected in the chief’s discourses when he says thief and liar to the white man:

“We have come to know the white man. He is a thief and a liar. He kills the buffalo, so that we starve. He takes the land, so that we cannot roam and hunt. He takes gold from the ground, so that the earth is gutted. This is shameful. We do not want our children to learn the ways of shame” (Momaday, 2007, p.116).

With the help of ‘political commitment’ of this model, hegemony of the Carlisle Indian School and Native American resistance to it has been explored from *The Moon in Two Windows*. Being dissident, Momaday challenges hegemony of the boarding schools and exposes hidden or silent aspects of the first boarding school. During the nineteenth and twentieth century, American Native children were forcibly abducted from their homes to attend Christian and the U.S.Government-run boarding schools as state policy. According to Dunbar-Ortiz (2014), “corporal punishment was unknown in Indigenous families but was routine in the boarding schools. Often punishment was inflicted for being ‘too Indian’-the darker the child, the more often and severe the beatings” (p.212). In the screenplay, Etahdleuh was chained when he was taken from his home to the boarding school: “it is what I did when you chained me and put me on the train to Fort Marion. I marked the way in my head, but I did not return” (p.124). Hence, Momaday exposes the atrocities of the Carlisle Indian School.

Hegemony of the bureaucracy is reflected in Pratt’s conversation with Anna, his wife. Bureaucracy is one of the repressive apparatuses of the state. For Gramsci (1971), the state, by creating its repressive apparatus

(administrative, bureaucratic and even police), encompasses the whole society (pp.104-106). The Carlisle Indian School was in the hands of bureaucracy and the bureaucratization of the school fulfilled the design of changing identity of the Native children. Pratt expresses his anger at poor administration of the bureaucracy:

“Goddamned bureaucracy! Nothing, nothing has arrived—except that Goddamned organ...No beds, no bedding, no clothing, no food. And there is no heat...They were driven like lambs to the slaughter into those huge empty rooms in the middle of the winter night, and there is no heat!” (p.128).

Native American resistance to Euro-American hegemony through unity of the Indian students in the boarding school has been explored from *The Moon*. Unity of the Native students in the first days at Carlisle is a way of challenging hegemony of the boarding schools. According to Luther, they came from different places, spoke different languages, and observed different customs but they were all Indians and they were of one heritage. Being young people, they had the spirit of play. They played because play overcame fear and uncertainty. He further says, “in a little while we became one tribe, one family; we were all brothers and sisters. We might have carried one flag, one shield. Our strongest loyalty was to each other” (p.129). Native Americans have harmony with not only with fellow human beings but also with the animals and the landscape. LaDuke (1999) says, “Native American teachings describe the relations all around—animals, fish, trees, and rocks—as our brothers, sisters, uncles, and grandpas” (p.2). The Indians’ harmony with the Indians is reflected in Luther’s discourses.

With the help of ‘close textual analysis’, Euro-American hegemony through giving new names to the Indian students of Carlisle has been sorted out from cultural materialist perspective from *The Moon*. Analysis of discourses of naming to Indians on a literal and social level manifests hegemonic treatment of the settlers with the Natives. Katanski (2005) states that the Indian boarding schools, led by Carlisle, brought together children from many tribes, who were forbidden to speak native languages, wear traditional clothing, or practice ancestral religions. The purpose of the boarding schools was to change the identity of the Native Americans because the first assault of culturally genocidal policies of the boarding schools was on the identity that they changed by giving new Christian names to the native students. In the screenplay, Miss Mather stands at the blackboard and on the blackboard are two columns of girls’ names. She addresses the students, “we are going to choose names from the board. Each one of you will choose a name, and that name will be yours from this day forward” (p.130).

With the help of textual analysis of boy’s dormitory, Native American resistance to Euro-American hegemony has been investigated from cultural materialist perspective. Being dissidents, the Indian students

of Carlisle challenge the hegemony of the school through the formation of a cadre, a kind of camp. *The Moon in Two Windows* is a dissident reading of the Carlisle Indian School because it breaks the mold of nineteenth-century colonialism and challenges tribal stereotypes. In the screenplay, the native students gather after curfew, secretly, taking care not to be found out. Being dissidents, they have evolved a secret society, complete with ritual elements. They formed a subculture in the boarding school. There is an opening prayer in one of their native languages. Pollack has an eagle-bone whistle. He places one end into a vessel of water and blows into the other that makes the sound of a bird warbling. He blows in each of the four directions. Furthermore, Native American resistance to hegemony of the boarding school is reflected in the discourses of Plenty Horses, another Indian member of the secret cadre. He speaks in Lakota and Luther interprets him. He says,

“I am Lakota. I am meant to be a warrior, but there are no warriors here. There is not a place for warriors. I will have my name, Plenty Horses, and I will have no other. The whites say they are going to cut my hair. They are going to make me eat boiled leaves. I will keep my long hair, and I will not eat leaves. I do not like to talk through the mouth of another” (p.134).

Native American resistance to Euro-American hegemony of Christianity has been sorted out from interior narration of the Church. Luther and Ernest stare at a large stained glass window in the Church at Carlisle. It is a scene of Cavalry, Christ bleeding on the cross. On literal level, symbolic significance of Christ bleeding on the cross varies from the Christians and the Natives. It is an appalling sight to the Natives. It is entirely outside their frame of reference and they are repulsed by it. Being dissident, Momaday through the Indian students challenges hegemony of the Church and answers to white man who cannot understand Native culture because the Indians also cannot understand white man's Church and its doctrines. He uses negative adjectives for Bishop Whipple for the political purpose of rejecting hegemony of the Church. He describes Bishop as “an aged and doddering, and he speaks with a lisp. His rheumy eyes burn with zeal, and he is very pale, seemingly bloodless” (p.145). Furthermore, humiliation of the Native Americans is reflected in the sermon of Bishop Whipple who associates his whiteness with the whiteness of God's glorious hair:

“You are souls who have been lost in darkness. The shadow of the heathen wilderness lies upon you. You have seen not the face of God, but the face of the savage fiend...You will be cleansed of the squalor and misery of the wilderness” (p.146).

Cultural materialist notion of dissidence has been investigated from Luther's discourses in the tent of Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show. According to Maddra (2006), William Frederick Cody (Buffalo Bill) had

risen to national fame as an Indian scout and buffalo hunter, but it was his role as a showman with Buffalo Bill's Wild West that brought him international renown. The shows included such stock acts as bronco busting, horseback riding, trick shooting, roping, hunting, shootouts, and exciting skirmishes with Indians. Many Indian chiefs including Sitting Bull performed in these shows. Sitting Bull becomes a famous actor in Wild West Show and says to Luther in the screenplay, "I am chief of the arena. I kill Custer every night and twice on Sunday" (p.170). Luther also starts to work in the show and he is getting dressed and made up for performance when Pratt enters. He says to Luther that he is disappointed to see him dressing up like an Indian. Being dissident, Luther replies, "the irony is that I am an Indian" (p.171). He says to Pratt, "you taught me to dress like a white man. But I did not therefore become a white man" (p.171). Pratt discourages Luther as an actor of show, saying, "...The Wild West Show", is nothing but a crude imitation of that former world, the West as it was for your father...I was a young soldier facing real enemies, not actors, doing my duty for my country, not performing for a crowd of hooting spectators" (p.171). Luther challenges hegemony of Pratt and Native American resistance is reflected in his discourses:

"I had to pretend there (Carlisle) that I was not who I am. I am tired of that pretension...But at least we are Indians in the arena, men who under their poster paint and cotton buckskin are Indians, real Indians. And I am one of them" (p.171).

Civilized and forgiving attitude of the Native Americans through Jim Thorpe is a way of resistance to Euro-American hegemony and white man's atrocities imposed on the Natives in myriad massacres. For Feather and Robinson (2003), courage, patience, perseverance, and hope are positive traits of the Native Americans. At the end of *The Moon in Two Windows*, the football match is over and the scoreboard shows: CARLISLE 27. ARMY 6. Thorpe says to Dwight Eisenhower, "we will not pursue you, and we will not kill your horses" (p.173).

Native American resistance to hegemony of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School has been explored from Luther's remarks at the end of the screenplay. For Luther, the school at Carlisle was a kind of laboratory in which the Natives' hearts were tested. They were all shaped by that experience and some of them were destroyed and some were made stronger. White man considered to bring the Indians into school was to bring them into light and civilization but for the Indians it was "a passage into darkness" (p.176). He further says, "it was a kind of quest, not a quest for glory, but a quest for survival" (p.176). For Luther, the students of Carlisle were brave and did a brave thing. Those who died on the journey were especially brave and "theirs is the sacrifice that makes sacred this ground" (p.176). White man tries to kill Indianess but the Indians try to survive their culture and have a quest for survival because they are brave

and they love to do something brave. At the end of the screenplay, Luther challenges Euro-American hegemony through his resistance to the assimilated world of the white man:

“And again if my father told me to go away from my Indian home into an alien world that I could not have imagined, I would do it. I would go, as all of us did, with all the love and courage in my heart. I would do a brave thing” (pp.176-177).

In this section, with the help of Dollimore and Sinfield's model of cultural materialism, *The Moon in Two Windows* has been analyzed from cultural materialist perspective to expose the settlers' exercise of their hegemony over the Native Americans through the boarding schools. Euro-American hegemony through Pratt and Native American resistance to the whites' hegemony through the discourses of dissidents i.e. Luther, Spotted Tail, Plenty Horses, and Grass have been investigated from *The Moon in Two Windows* from cultural materialist context

References

- Allen, C. (2009). [Three plays: *The indolent boys*, *Children of the Sun*, *The moon in two windows*, by N.S. Momaday]. *Western American Literature*, 43(4), 413-414.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and the Ideological State Apparatus. In F. Jameson (Ed.), (trans. Ben Brewster), *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Banik, S. (2016). Deconstructing the hegemony of history: A study of postcolonial Resistance in the Indian and African perspective English literature. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 6(2), 703-706.
- Barathi, S. (2016). Cultural materialism in the selected short stories of K. V. Dominic: A critique. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, 3(2), 1845-1848.
- Belsey, C. (1999). *Shakespeare and the loss of Eden*. London: Macmillan.
- Brannigan, J. (1998). *New historicism and cultural materialism*. UK: Macmillan Education.
- Dollimore, J. & Sinfield, A. (1985). *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Dollimore, J. & Sinfield, A. (1992). History and ideology, masculinity and miscegenation: The instance of Henry V. In *Faultlines: Cultural materialism and the politics of dissident reading*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Dombroski, R.S. (1989). Ideology, hegemony, and literature: Some reflections on

- Gramsci. *Forum Italicum: A Journal of Italian Studies*, 23(1-2), 105-117.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, R. (2014). *An Indigenous Peoples' history of the United States*. Boston: Boston Press.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, R. & Gilio-Whitaker, D. (2016). *All the real Indians died off: And 20 other Myths about Native Americans*. Boston: Boston Press.
- Feather, F. D. & Robinson, R. (2003). *Exploring Native American wisdom: Lore, traditions, and rituals that connect us all*. Franklin Lakes: New Page Books.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *The order of things: An Archaeology of the human sciences*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gheytsi, S. (2018). Black identity and struggles for survival. *Journal of English Literature and Cultural Studies*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, (Trans.). New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Haladay, J. (2009). [N. Scott Momaday. *Three plays: The indolent boys, Children of the Sun, The Moon in two windows* review]. *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 21(3) 95-98.
- Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory*, 5(1), 49-72.
- Holderness, H. (1985). *Shakespeare's History*. New York, NY: St Martin's.
- Jilek, W. (1978). Native Renaissance: The survival and revival of Indigenous therapeutic ceremonials among North American Indians. *Transcultural Psychiatric Research Review*, 15 (2), 117-147.
- Katanski. A.V. (2005). *Learning to write "Indian": The boarding-school experience and American Indian Literature*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Kiernan, R. (1996). *New historicism and cultural materialism: A reader*. London: Arnold.
- Kuipers, B. J. (1991). Understanding the evaluation criteria for American Indian Literature. In *American Indian Reference Books for Children and Young Adults* (pp.5-26). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- LaDuke, W. (1999). *All our relations: Native struggles for land and life*. Cambridge: Mass South End Press.
- Lincoln, K. (1983). *Native American Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Liu, A. (1989). The power of formalism: The new historicism. *ELH*, 56(4), 721-771.
- Maddra, S.A. (2006). *Hostiles? The Lakota Ghost Dance and Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Momaday, N.S. (2007). *Three plays: The indolent boys, Children of the Sun, The moon in Two windows*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Murtaza, G., Salim, A.S. & Amjad, M. (2016). Native American approach to the relationship between culture and nature in *Rolling thunder* by Doug Boyd. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 174-187.
- Ortiz, S. (1998). Introduction. *Speaking for the generations: Native writers on writing*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Parvini, N. (2012a). *Shakespeare and contemporary theory: New historicism and cultural materialism*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- Ryan, K. (1998). Introduction. In J. Brannigan (Ed.), *New historicism and cultural materialism*. UK: Macmillan Education.
- Shahrezaee, M.A. & Ladani, Z. J. (2014). Toni Morrison's *Beloved* and *The bluest eye*: A cultural materialistic approach. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 30, 17-23.
- Shehzad, A. & Bhatti, S. A. (2017). Traces of postmodern dismantling of Euro-American Truth claims in Gerald Vizenor's *The Heirs of Columbus*. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), 224-234.
- Sinfield, A. (2006). *Shakespeare authority, sexuality: Unfinished business in cultural materialism*. London: Routledge.
- Teuton, S. (2008). *Red Land, Red Power: Grounding knowledge in the American Indian novel*. Durham: Duke UP.
- Vizenor, G. R. (1995). *Native American literature: A brief introduction and anthology*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, S. (1995). *Cultural materialism: Theory and practice*. Oxford: Wiley.