

**Jeannine BELGODERE**

English Department, Université du Havre  
Affaires Internationales  
25 Rue Philippe Lebon, BP 420  
76057 Le Havre Cedex, France  
jbel7613@yahoo.fr

UDK 7.031.4(081/=87)

341.485(=97):7.03

**Prethodno priopćenje**

Primljeno: 27. rujna 2016.

Prihvaćeno: 22. studenoga 2016.

## THE PURPOSE OF ART: INTELLIGENT DIALOGUE OR MERE DECORATION?

### Summary

This article includes a presentation of the Chiricahua Apache sculptors Allan Houser and his son Bob Haozous, as well as a synthesis of two interviews I conducted with Bob Haozous in Santa Fe, New Mexico, in July 2013 and 2014. In this interview, upon which I will comment when I feel necessary, Bob Haozous voices his opinion of his father's artwork, which, to his mind, conveys a romanticized view of Native Americans. According to him, Allan Houser's portrayal of dignified and beautiful Indians cannot be divorced from a specific economic and political context. He also critiques the Indian Market as being the portrait of a romanticized history. Indeed, art that reflects the real plight of Natives is missing from the works exhibited at Indian markets, especially the one that is held in August in Santa Fe, New Mexico. For Bob Haozous, Native artists should use art as both an internal dialogue and as a political statement. His particular view of Indian identity as a philosophy, and not as a genetically-determined identity, is also groundbreaking, as is his artistic critique of Indians who have become 'cultural zombies.'

**Keywords:** Allan Houser, Bob Haozous, the Apaches, Indian Market, Apache holocaust, political statement

### Acknowledgements

I am particularly grateful to Mr. Bob Haozous for enlightening me on the works of his father, Allan Houser, as well as on his own artwork, and for his warm welcome over successive summers in Santa Fe. I would also like to thank Mr David Rettig for his invaluable time and unwavering support ever since I started researching the artwork of Allan Houser. Mr David Rettig was a personal acquaintance of Allan Houser. He is the Curator of the Collections for the Allan Houser Estate in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

I will first provide a short biography of the Chiricahua Apache sculptors Allan Houser and Bob Haozous, emphasizing the main themes, as well as formal aspects of their artwork. Then I will present a synthesis of the interviews with Bob Haozous, which I conducted in July 2013 and 2014. In this interview, the artist expresses himself on his father's works, which, in his opinion, reveal a romanticized view of Native Americans. He further provides the economic and political context, which explains why his father presented this beautiful but uncritical image of Indians.<sup>1</sup> Some of the issues he addresses deal with his conception of art as a cultural statement and his impression of the Indian Market as based on romance and decoration, as well as profit. He also discusses what it means to be Native American and further elaborates on the idea that if Indians are alive, they are also very damaged. His zombie sculptures are symbolic of Indians eating their own culture and feeding the enemy. When necessary, I elaborate upon Bob Haozous's viewpoints, bring forward my own stance, and complete some of his unfinished points.

## I. Presentation: Allan Houser and Bob Haozous

The Chiricahua Apache artist Allan Houser (1914-1994) studied painting at the Santa Fe Indian School, as a student of Dorothy Dunn between 1934 and 1939. As a sculptor, he was a self-taught artist since he never received any formal training in this field. In 1948, he gained recognition as a sculptor with his first stone carving *Comrade in Mourning*, a monumental work in which he paid homage to Native American students who died in World War II. From 1962 to 1975, he taught at the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe where he trained generations of students. Until his death, he created hundreds of representational and abstract works in bronze, wood, steel, and stone.

Houser's formal language includes Narrative Realism, Archaism, Expressionism, Surrealism, and a Classicism fuelled by his Apache heritage—childhood reminiscences including Apache women dancing around the fire of the *Gaan* dance and stories that his father, Sam Haozous, Geronimo's nephew, handed down to him, describing the freeing of the Chiricahua Apaches after 27 years of imprisonment at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

Apache warriors cast in heroic and defiant postures, massive and protective mothers, figures showing the symbiosis between mother and child, humanity and nature, proud and forceful powwow singers, and Buffalo and *Gaan* dancers recur throughout Houser's works. The artist's sculptures, as

well as his paintings, mirror the history, traditions, and lifeways of Native Americans, particularly the Apaches, Navajos, Pueblos, and Plains Indians. They highlight dance and music as essential expressions of Native cultural identity. Allan Houser drew on the innovations of the European modernist sculptors who valued organic abstraction and sought nurturance from ancient art forms, including Mesoamerican traditions. In the wake of Henry Moore, he explored the relationship between solid masses and pierced voids.

Bob Haozous is a Chiricahua Apache artist, the son of Allan Houser. In 1971, he received his BFA from the California College of Arts and Crafts. He lives and works in Santa Fe, New Mexico. His works have been exhibited internationally, as well as in many museums in the United States. Some of his monumental sculptures are featured in natural environments like the Allan Houser Sculpture Garden and public places such as the University of New Mexico.

Haozous uses sculpture as an instrument to comment upon society and to denounce what he considers to be unwholesome or despicable. Many of his issues have to do with Indian stereotypes (which he derides), reverence for capitalism (which he stigmatizes through the recurrent dollar sign), the devastating effects of pollution, an intrusive technology, and man's estrangement from nature and utter control over it. His themes include degraded female figures, faceless and limbless, a disquieting representation of the Earth Mother that contrasts with the fertility and power in the sublime embodiment of the archetypal mother, beneficent and nurturing, as she is portrayed by Allan Houser. Haozous addresses such topics as Indian genocide, poverty and suicide, the loss of land and religion, and the violence that confronts Indians in both reservations and urban centers. The use of steel as his favorite material is well suited for bitter comments on man's disrespect for and desecration of the earth and a brutal dehumanized society. Clearly, Bob Haozous steers away from his father's depiction of grand, dignified, and caring Native Americans, showing instead their victimization and fallibilities, focusing on images of alienation and violence.

## II. The Author's Interview with Bob Haozous

JB: Do you consider your father's works as an expression of a romanticized or idealistic view of Native Americans?

Bob Haozous: He was [taught] and he thought that it was very important to show Natives in their best light. He focused on showing people who have

dignity and respect. That is what they were told to do. It is mostly based on economic return. They did not want Native people thinking. He also believed there was more than bravery and that kind of strength, there was a strength of character, of family responsibilities. He tried to bring all of this out (B. Haozous).

J.B: So, your father did convey this beautiful image of Native Americans.

Bob Haozous: Absolutely. He was [taught] to portray that. At the time, we were a very subjugated people. We were not asked to talk about anything beyond that. It is very easy to assume that what I am saying is contradicting or critical of my father. I am not. He was reflective of Indian people. They wanted out of this colonization, but . . . because we accepted the economic goals, we became permanently colonized mentally. Towards the end of his life, the market absorbed all of his work but he was always with Indian people. He grew up with them. He talked and thought like them. They were told the future is dead for our people, so he was trying to remember his father's memories and put that in painting and sculpture. But he was also teaching young people and he always told them: "tell who you are through your art, it's not who you were but who you are" (B. Haozous).

J.B: Do you believe your father created works just for decoration?

Bob Haozous: I think he did both [decorative and innovative], but that was a transition of those people of that time, and now we have no excuse with the environment killing us right now. We have no excuse to run away from that responsibility and yet we are still running (B. Haozous).

## The Author's Comment

It is undeniable that Allan Houser responded to the market's demand. However, he did much more than that. If he conveyed through art his father's memories, it was also because as a child and a teenager he heard about all of his people's stories, the history of Geronimo and his warriors. He grew up with them and as an artist he made it a point to portray them through art so as not to lose the Apache history, to testify to it, and therefore to keep it alive. He also witnessed many Indian dances, including the sacred dance of the benevolent Mountain Spirits,<sup>2</sup> which left a deep imprint on him. To carve his people's traditions was a means of showing the world that Indian culture had

---

2 The Apache Mountain Spirits are called the *Gaan*. They hold the power to ward off disease and protect the Apaches from malevolent influences. The masked dancers who impersonate them appear at dusk in the Girl's Coming of Age Ceremony, the Apaches' major ritual.

not completely been destroyed, even if it had suffered considerable damage. For example, when Houser created *Ready to Dance* (1988), he was honoring a social dance that is still practiced among the Apaches. There is nothing in his numerous carvings and paintings of *Gaan* dancers that suggests a decorative art, nor are these works mere relics that belong to the past. Rather, Houser's abstract and representational renditions of the *Gaan* dancer bear witness to the persistence of Apache religious beliefs and practices in contemporary life. His *Gaan* figures are a testament to a living and vibrant reality. Moreover, through the dynamism of the figures that are firmly grounded and exude defiance, Houser's Mountain Spirits also illuminate the unsubdued spirit of the Apaches and of mankind at large.

Certainly, Houser responded to the market in order to survive, as well as to gain recognition as a Native American sculptor, but there was more to it than mere economic survival and the acquisition of an elevated social status. The strength and beauty of his works, as they express Apache dances, are in themselves a forceful political statement: the *Gaan* dance, as a voicing of Apache religious beliefs, and the Apache *Back and Forth* dance as a sociocultural expression have continued to exist in spite of colonization.

J.B: Do you see some of your father's works as political statements?

Bob Haozous: Yes, he has done some of them [artworks as political statements such as those depicting] the bureaucrats going to Washington, sitting in a bar and drinking and watching the topless dancers. He has done several like that but he steered away from it [that sort of art] because his generation was told to keep away from it and he had a hard time going into it fully. But I went to College—to Berkeley—and there were political riots going on all the time and questions about identity and all of these White people trying to be Indians (B. Haozous).

J.B: Isn't your father's sculpture *As Long as the Waters Flow* a political statement?

Bob Haozous: I do not know. I don't think there was any kind of intent beyond just portraying a beautiful image, because a lot of his works were named by Sandy Greene, Glen Greene's wife.<sup>3</sup> They were naming sculptures very romantic names and very good (B. Haozous).

3 Glen Greene was Allan Houser's agent.

## The Author's Comment

The title of the sculpture here discussed could be “a paraphrase of a proclamation that was made by the Andrew Jackson Administration: as long as the sun shines and the waters flow” (Rettig). Under this proclamation, the land known as Indian Territory (Oklahoma) would belong to Native Americans forever, a promise that was later broken with the passing of the General Allotment Act (Dawes Act) of 1887. In effect, the Dawes Act legally deprived Native Americans of their ancestral tribal lands. *As long as the Waters Flow* (1988) is a monumental bronze sculpture portraying an imposing Plains Indian woman wrapped in a shawl, an eagle feather fan in her hand. This sculpture features more than just a beautiful image: Houser's depiction of a noble and resilient Indian woman who has survived in spite of the policy of colonization, subjugation, deprivation, and extermination is in itself a most eloquent political statement. *As long as the Waters Flow* is a work that runs counter to James Earle Fraser's sculpture *The End of the Trail* (1894), an allegory of the Vanishing Indian. Allan Houser chose not to show Indians as victims, or as bloodthirsty people, but as dignified and resilient people particularly attached to their age-old beliefs. By portraying spirited and tenacious Indians, Houser's works also urge Indians and mankind at large to regain or to embrace such moral qualities as might help them fight against their current plight. Moreover, by showing in many of his works Indians' symbiosis with nature, Houser also prompts them to go back to Mother Earth and renew their keen concern for the environment. In accordance with Apache worldview, the people are part of nature which they must revere; they must preserve the land and take care of all living things.

If we read Houser's works in this light, they do appear as political statements, albeit understated. His compelling political statement mainly lies in his defiant and proud figures that tell us, “look, we have not been completely wiped out. We are still here. Our worldview as well as our cultural traditions have lived on.” We can thus view some of Houser's works as a convincing tool for an indictment of the federal government's policies, as well as a denunciation of man's contempt for nature. Beauty can be a form of protest.

J.B: It seems to me that people tended to believe that Native Americans were not very much alive. How do you feel about this?

Bob Haozous: That is what people believe about Indians. That we were not alive and vibrant and that is what I am trying to address. We are all very vibrant but we are also very damaged and they do not want to hear that. I have been reading *The Open Veins of Latin America* by Eduardo Galeano. He talks about what happened in North and South and Central America and it was all the same. They dehumanized the people that were here. They came to take all

the resources and use the manpower and they kill them. Across the Americas what happened was legal. It was legal because the Church supported it and the countries supported it for native resources and money. Even things like red chile and peppers and cane sugar—they all wanted it in Europe at any cost until they killed everybody. That was common, very common. But America does not want to talk about it because it makes us seem we are as common as the rest of the people. We are. We just kill people. In California, you see an Indian, you shoot him. It was legal. You see an Indian family, you kill them. It is legal because they are rats; they are vermin; they are pests. And so I am trying to talk about my people. I am starting to realize that I represent a huge number of people besides the Apache people. And that's where my father never got to. His education would not let him take the next step (B. Haozous).

J.B: One of your telling sculptures, *Apache Holocaust*, which can be read as a testament to a culture that has been annihilated, shows the extent of the damage: a Chiricahua Apache youth, clad in a traditional outfit and shackled, stands at the top of the vertical column. He is ready to be executed. Of this realistically painted character, you wrote: “His culture is him but he's been hunted down by his people” (qtd. in Lippard 18). Could you enlighten us on this?

Bob Haozous: That is an assumption. I found a picture of two men with steel shackles between their legs and their hands, I think. I researched it and I found that they took the Apaches and put them in Arizona, in a prison camp.<sup>4</sup> John Clum was the man in charge.<sup>5</sup> He was an Indian agent who just hated Apaches. And he hired Apaches to hunt Apaches. That was his claim to fame. . . . These two guys were marked for execution. And you could see it in their faces. They used to say we want you to find so and so and these Indians—the Apache people—were so damaged, and so hurt, and so terrified that they would go out and hunt other Apaches. They [John Clum and his associates] got food for the tribe so that they could stay on the reservation [the San Carlos reservation], but then they would sell it to the cowboys and ranchers and give the Indians the bad food. Spoiled meat, bugs, and the Indians could not survive. The Apaches could not live like that, so these guys had to go out at

4 Bob Haozous refers to the San Carlos Apache reservation that was established in 1872.

5 John Philip Clum (1851-1932) was an Indian agent for the San Carlos Apache reservation in the Arizona territory from 1874 to 1877. He befriended many Apaches and gave the San Carlos reservation a measure of self-government. He set up a Native police force in order to “keep peace among various Apache groups and to apprehend wrongdoers. . . . His Apache policemen proved to be capable and loyal. Native judges appointed by Clum, determined the guilt of individuals charged with crimes and, if guilty, specified their punishments. . . . He truly liked and respected “good” Apaches, those who were peaceful and amenable to his rules and regimentation. The “bad” Apaches, the free spirits who longed for the old nomadic life and the raiding that was an integral part of it, were another matter. Clum regarded these restless renegades as “criminals who should be jailed or hung” (Carmony 5–6).

night and raid a farm, maybe kill somebody to get some food and feed their families. The Apaches could not live there. They never lived in a desert area. They were always in the mountains, with water and animals. They were dying and starving. So they would break out to feed their families. Then they [John Clum and his associates] would use the Apaches, the White Mountain or San Carlos Apaches, to hunt them down to bring them back.

My whole point was if you are of a place then you are of the place, you are like “all my relations.” You are related to the dirt, the air, water, not just people—that’s what the Western man has brought to us. And here are these two men who went out to feed their family, and all of a sudden the Apaches got them, took them back to a White man to pronounce them dead. And all of a sudden they realized that everything that they had was no longer there. They were no longer of that place and they were going to be killed. And that happened to my whole tribe. They suddenly lost everything—the trees, the animals, our relatives—and they were turned on by their own people. And all suddenly was lost. And then they took us to a prison camp and they gave us Christianity.

These two men were captured, probably for killing somebody, or maybe for killing an animal, and they took them back and executed them to show to the other people that “your universe no longer exists.” It is dead. And all my tribe believed that. The old way is dead. The old way is never dead. The old way has to do with the relationship to nature, which is always here. And that’s what they never told us because the White people don’t believe that. These two men got captured and executed, I think. But they had a White guy who was in authority say nothing about what was happening and what had happened to these people, the terror, and the loss of culture, or the fear. It is really outrageous, and yet we let it happen. Nobody in the tribe said—says—anything. I am the only person who has mentioned that, and why is that? What happened to the cultural dialogue? What happened to the cultural art and communication that is supposed to be in any culture? We say: “OK, we will talk about everything” but nothing that scares, nothing that bothers the White people. Or then we are censored. Right now our artwork is censored (B. Haozous).

J.B: What is your intent when you are working on zombies?

Bob Haozous: It was the dumbest idea in the world that is developing into a very important concept. It is completely against the market. Nobody is going to buy them. Nobody cares. But I am putting more thoughts together about this and what happened to us and how we have become our own zombies of our own culture. You know what a zombie does. It is a creature that feeds on human flesh. It does not have a culture; it does not have a past; it does not have a future. It just needs to be fed. That is what people are doing to Indian



people. They are feeding on them; they are using them to make money, and art, and crafts, and prestige, and Indian people are doing it to themselves. We have become zombies of ourselves. But nobody understands that. Nobody even comes close to asking about it.

J.B: What do your zombies represent?

Bob Haozous: One of them is a White guy from Sicily, Chief Iron Eyes Cody.<sup>6</sup> He was not Indian but he claimed to be Indian. . . . My father met him once, and he did not even want to talk to my brother because he [Cody] was a White guy. Those are the kind of people who live off of Indians. He was an old man. He was in the John Wayne's movies. He always looked so Indian that they always used him, you know, all the old hand gestures. He looked good and everybody just let it happen, but he was living off of us and he never even tried to talk to us, whoever us is, whoever represented us. . . . He was the perfect Indian example for all of Hollywood. So I made him one of my zombies. He is feeding off of our flesh (B. Haozous).

J.B: What is your view on the Indian Market?

Bob Haozous: Right now, the goal of the Indian Market is money.<sup>7</sup> That is what the previous director—one of the directors a long time ago—said to me: “The bottom line of any market is whatever sells,” and I have always disagreed though I think it's absolutely true. . . . It is not my goal. I value myself too much.

The Indian Market is not a portrait of our people. It is the portrait of a romanticized history. It also reflects an incredible ability with the craft of making art but it is not an intellectual statement about who we are. It's not an internal dialogue. We are used to an ignorant market. We have [learned] to make what we see, to carve a Buffalo and make some money, but it is hand to mouth survival. But it has nothing to do with our children's future. All our Indian Market is based on is history, romance, and decoration. It is not the truth; otherwise you would see statements about disease, or diabetes, or suicide. You would see it everywhere because we would be talking to each other. That is what two cultures are. It is an internal dialogue. It is not here. So that is what zombies are. They symbolize the fact that we are eating our own culture, our history, and feeding them because that is what the enemy wants. The Indian Market is a good example. Right now, if I walked down to the Indian Market and I wanted to see the best example of Indian people talking to themselves about their own issues, using their own intelligence and their own life experience, I would not find it. What I would find are

6 Iron Eyes Cody (1904-1999) was an American actor who was born in Louisiana. His parents were Sicilian immigrants. He played major parts as an Indian in many Hollywood films.

7 Bob Haozous expresses himself passionately about the Indian Market, especially the one that is held in August every year in Santa Fe.

people looking to art books for history and finding out what we are supposed to look like, and we are doing it for the market. We are not doing it to each other. And that is the big failure of the Native people. We are not using our own intelligence to talk to each other. We are talking to White people. That is why so many of our young people go into the military. That is why so many of the young people are starved and making so much money and [gaining] prestige and advertising for the Indian Market. They want it for themselves. It is not for the people. It is not for the land. That is why so few Indian artists are talking about the environment. No one wants to buy it in the white world, so why should we talk about it? So we have isolated ourselves and we are letting ourselves be censored by a market that does not want us to be who we are, but who they think we are (B. Haozous).

J.B: Who is the enemy?

Bob Haozous: The enemy is ignorance, not White people. We are making ourselves ignorant by eating ourselves. I love this idea of zombies. People still see zombies and they say that is nice, and we are zombies. We have lost our humanity (B. Haozous).

## **The Author's Comment**

Bob Haozous is certainly correct regarding the goal of the Indian Market being money. It is equally true that to make a living, artists have to create what is most appealing to both White and Indian audiences. Moreover, to relate Indian stories and to emphasize the importance of rituals through a refined and powerful art is also part of who Native Americans were and still are—talented storytellers, gifted crafts people with a rich cultural heritage that they portray through their art. Furthermore, what Allan Houser celebrates is also a component of a truthful picture, since ancestral Native cultures have praised the bravery and wisdom of their chiefs and medicine-men. Because of the genocide, many of them were condemned to oblivion. The resilient spirit of such chiefs as Geronimo and Mangas Coloradas, as well as the richness and spiritual dimension of age-old Native American customs, live on thanks to such sculptors as Allan Houser who, through international recognition as artists, can better get their message across.

Moreover, Allan Houser's use of Western stylistic devices, such as pierced voids pioneered by Henry Moore, negative spaces, as well as essential and simplified forms that were largely used by European modernist sculptors including Brancusi, Henry Moore, and Jean Arp, helped him to better reach a White audience. If his forms combine Western devices with "archaic" ones, his message is first and foremost Indian before aiming at humanity at large.

It seems that Houser adopts the conqueror's aesthetic language so as to turn tables and thereby turn domination into the hope of liberation and Native hegemony, in other words, to advocate and raise up Native American ideals. Houser's artistic devices aim at spreading the beliefs, ideas, and forms of the defeated people throughout modern consciousness.

To return to Bob Haozous's viewpoint, Indian artists have overlooked what he considers to be the primary function of art: to be honest and tell the truth, specifically about what has happened to Indian people—about poverty, the ill effects of alcoholism, the loss of land and culture, and the ravages carried out by the federal government. Art that reflects the current plight of Natives and criticizes American values is missing from the works exhibited at the Indian Market. For Bob Haozous, artists should ponder on what has happened to Natives. To what extent has the Indian become the White man by renouncing the respect for and connection to Mother Earth, adopting instead an anthropocentric attitude that reveres the self, money, and technology?

J.B: How do you view art and the mission of an Indian artist?

Bob Haozous: Well, I went through a transition myself. You go to the market, you go to art school, and you try to make art, and that is before you start to realize that you do not 'make art.' Art is something more profound than just something you go in your studio and make. It comes from your heart and mind. And that is something . . . most artists do not want to go there. Maybe it is because the damage is so severe. They do not want to talk about the suicide. I do not either, but I can talk about it in a very sophisticated way. I do not have to show blood and dead bodies, but I can talk about suicide too. And that is the intelligence of Indian people because we can do that but we do not want to because we do not know how to really. . . . We are so used to an ignorant market.

I want to inspire people to change because we are in a deadly place that is the whole world. We should make art for ourselves and I think we have to start making, using art for dialogue, intelligent dialogue rather than just for decoration. So I am giving it to people. But they want to own it. They do not understand that I am giving them the idea, the inspiration (B. Haozous).

J.B: While I was walking through the Sculpture Garden last week, I heard someone say about one of your works: it should be at the MoMA. Would you like your works to be at the MoMA?

Bob Haozous: I would much rather like it if people could see them like in a book and take it home and have discussions with the community about them, because MoMA is based on this [other] idea, "Art is separate," and that Fine Art is a craft in itself. Everybody says, "I am going to New York

and make money and become famous.” New York, like Washington D.C., is not an internal dialogue. It is performance and Fine Arts like at the Venice Biennale. It has nothing to do with the interaction within a person or within his community. That is where art comes from—the communal. It is a cultural statement. But you go to New York and you see what is there, and you go in your studio and you make something [based on what you have seen]; you hear that it looks like it belongs there and all of a sudden you are elevated in the Fine Art level as being one of the better artists, and it has nothing to do with who you are or what you are doing. It is just an intellectual game. That is all. If I can get the young Indian people looking at my art and walking away saying, “What is he saying?,” then I’ve succeeded. I have created a question rather than a satisfaction or an answer (B. Haozous).

## The Author’s Comment

In the above paragraph, Bob Haozous is expressing his conception of Native art as a cultural, communal, and intensely personal experience versus “art for art’s sake.”

J.B: How do you define yourself as an artist?

Bob Haozous: I was at college and somebody said, “If you are an artist and if you are an Indian—well, first of all, if you are an Indian, it is a political statement in this country. If you are an artist, it is also a political statement, or else you are a decorator.” Art that comes from your heart is real art because it cannot replicate anything in the past. Being an Indian, you are making a statement that you are different. And I am both, an Indian and an artist. Everything I do is a political statement. But every day I breathe differently and I think differently (B. Haozous).

J.B: Interestingly, across New Mexico and other states, I have met many Indians who are proud to claim that they are full-blood Indians, even White people who are proud of being one-third or one-fourth Pueblo or Cherokee. From what I have heard, it seems that to be Indian is genetic. I have often pondered the question: is it only a genetically-determined identity, or is there more to it? What does it mean to be Indian?

Bob Haozous: Now I find a lot of artists coming from outside saying that they are Indian only because their blood gives them the requirement that they are genetically Indian, but it [Indian-ness] is a philosophy and not a genetic identity. My father came from that [same position], but he was also somewhere in between because they never had a chance to sit down and say, “What are we doing?” And how is it helping our children in the future?

The Whiteman<sup>8</sup> believes in man's laws, whereas the Indian believes in nature's laws, and nature's laws are always here. My grandchildren can be Apaches if they understand the relationship to nature's law instead of just man's law. And so I can think, "I can make my grand children or my daughter when she has children into Apaches." So, we will not be running around with loincloths, and headbands, and guns, and things like that. But we will be thinking of it. We are all Indians. We are all made of the same "stuff." What makes you Indian? It is not a genetic issue. It is a political issue. The relationship to nature is what makes you Indian (B. Haozous).

### The Author's Comment

Bob Haozous's discourse is groundbreaking. He really questions assumptions about Indian identity as being racial, throwing fresh light on it. In his opinion, Native cultures do not rest on race. Therefore, it is a model for man in general and does not exclude anybody. In other words, it is all-inclusive. Man's awareness of, concern with, and respect for nature and for man, who is part of nature, his willingness to be protective of Mother Earth and consequently of mankind, makes him an Indigenous person beyond genetics and enrollment numbers. Far from acting like a power-hungry Moloch driven by power and profit, who defaces and dominates nature and humanity alike, man should reconsider his humble position within the universe as only one link in the chain of the living. Such a man-centered attitude regardless of the Other is the attitude of the conqueror and colonizer.

Perhaps Allan Houser voices a similar message. Looking at his works, which celebrate the union of man with nature, as well as interdependent relationships of universal kinship that refuse the idea of overbearing and dominated parties, brings home to us what Indian philosophy can be. The time has come to be inspired by it.

### Works Cited

Carmony, Neil B., ed. *Apache Days and Tombstone Nights, John Clum's Autobiography, 1877-1887*. Silver City, NM: High-Lonesome Books, 1997. Print.

Haozous, Bob. Personal interview. July 2013, July 2014.

<sup>8</sup> By the Whiteman, Bob Haozous means all races that have alienated themselves from nature-related concepts to espouse man's related concepts, thus destroying everything around them.

*Allan Houser (Haozous): The Lifetime Work of an American Master*. Dir. Phillip Haozous and Phil Lucas. United States: Allan Houser, Inc., 2005. Film. DVD.

Lippard, Lucy R. "Talking to Ourselves: Indian Art for Indian People." *Bob Haozous: Indigenous Dialogue*. Ed. Joseph M. Sanchez. Santa Fe: Institute of American Indian Arts Museum, 2005. 16–20. Print.

Rettig, David. Personal interview. July 2009.

## SVRHA UMJETNOSTI: INTELIGENTNI DIJALOG ILI PUKI UKRAS?

### Sažetak

---

**Jeannine BELGODERE**

Odsjek za engleski jezik, Sveučilište u Le Havreu  
Međunarodni poslovi  
25 Rue Philippe Lebon, BP 420,  
76057 Le Havre Cedex, Francuska  
jbel7613@yahoo.fr

Ovaj članak prikazuje lik i djelo kipara Allana Housera i njegova sina Boba Haozousa, pripadnike naroda Chiricahua Apache, kroz sintezu dvaju razgovora s Bobom Haozousom vođenih u srpnju 2013. i 2014. godine u Santa Feu u Novom Meksiku. U tim razgovorima, koje ću po potrebi komentirati, Bob Haozous izrazio je svoje mišljenje o očevim umjetničkim djelima koja prema njegovu mišljenju prenose romantizirano viđenje Indijanaca. Za Boba Haozousa Allanov portret dostojanstvenih i lijepih Indijanaca neodvojiv je od određenog ekonomskog i političkog konteksta. On također kritizira Sajam indijanskih kultura kao ogledalo romantizirane povijesti starosjedilaca. Doista, umjetnost koja prikazuje pravu stvarnost i nedaće starosjedilaca nije prisutna u radovima izloženima na sajmovima indijanskih kultura, posebice na onom koji se održava u kolovozu u Santa Feu u Novom Meksiku. Bob Haozous drži da starosjedilački umjetnici ne bi trebali rabiti umjetnost samo kao unutarnji dijalog, nego i kao oblik političke poruke. Njegovo viđenje indijanskog identiteta kao filozofije, a ne genetski određenog identiteta, također je revolucionarno, kao što je i njegova umjetnička kritika Indijanaca koji su postali „kulturalni zombiji“.