Saying It Like Indians:
The Wooster Group’s *Cry Trojans!*, Sa(l)vage Ethnography, and the Politics of “Playing Injun”

*Cry Trojans! (Troilus and Cressida)* by The Wooster Group at St. Anne’s Warehouse, Brooklyn, New York, April 7, 2015
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“We aren’t degrading the Indians, we are participating in a tradition of this team,” said John Brittain, 71, who came to the game wearing a feathered headdress and claimed to being one-fourth Apache. “Part of me being a fan is to wear Indian gear, and that is honoring the Native Americans.” *The Guardian*, April 12, 2015

“Now we hate to subscribe to Benjamin [Franklin]'s belief in a Providence that wisely extirpates the Indian to make room for ‘cultivators of the soil’. In Crevecoeur we meet a sentimental desire for the glorification of the savages. Absolutely sentimental. Hector pops over to Paris to enthuse about the wigwam.

... The bulk of the white people who live in contact with the Indian today would like to see this Red brother exterminated; not only for the sake of grabbing his land, but because of the silent, invisible, but deadly hostility between the spirit of the two races. The minority of whites intellectualize the Red Man and laud him to the skies. But this minority of whites is mostly a high-brow minority with a big grouch against its own whiteness. So there you are.” D.H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, 1923

“It’s a good day to be indigenous.” Randy Peone, in *Smoke Signals*, directed by Chris Eyre, screenplay by Sherman Alexie, 1998

In 2012, as part of the World Shakespeare Festival, The Wooster Group and the Royal Shakespeare Company collaborated on a production of *Troilus and Cressida* in Stratford-upon-Avon and London, with the former playing Trojans and the latter the Greeks. The
two companies rehearsed separately, coming together three weeks before previews to suture their two approaches. The result, by common consensus, was a mess—the RSC is hardly known for experimentalism, the Wooster Group is known for nothing but; the RSC produces polished (if not always all that interesting) productions, while the Wooster Group revels in the show of its seams. To quote Michael Billington, “the union prove[d] strangely infertile … less a collaboration than an awkward stylistic collision.” As Thomas Cartelli notes, “To say that a great many auditors greatly disliked the Wooster’s Group’s share of their RSC collaboration would be a vast understatement, ‘appalling’ or ‘awful’ being the preferred adjective even among (especially among) the majority of Shakespeare scholars who attended performances concurrent with the biannual International Shakespeare Congress at the Shakespeare Institute a few blocks away” (Cartelli, 234–5).

Undeterred, and quite possibly spurred on, by the critical hostility, The Wooster Group returned to the source material to mount Cry Trojans! at the Performing Garage in early 2014, on tour to LA and to Singapore in the Fall, before returning to New York in March 2015. Only this time, the production was no longer a collaboration but rather a haunting: at the beginning of its current iteration at St. Anne’s Warehouse, Brooklyn, actor Scott Shepherd introduced the production as “the story of our encounter with the Royal Shakespeare Company,” with the rest of the actors gathered around the campfire that frequently dominates the center of the stage, as if about to tell a folk story from their own mytho-history. Cry Trojans! focuses on the Trojan characters, for the most exciting the Greeks unless they are necessary. All that remains of the RSC are images of the original production of Troilus and Cressida on the four screens that flank the thrust stage, and the voices of the RSC actors, which are mimicked whenever the Greek characters are on stage.

Cry Trojans! is not the first Wooster engagement with Shakespeare: their 2006 Hamlet was haunted too, a production that staged the “Theatrofilm” version of Sir John Gielgud’s 1964 Broadway production of Hamlet, with the actors re-performing the original, obeying (and often resisting) the commands from the dead (confusingly, and with typical Wooster-ian perversity, their Hamlet was subsequently filmed). Both productions carry the hallmarks of the company’s approach to theatre. Screens flank the stage, scripting actors movement: dialogue is piped in through headsets, affecting the ways in which the actors deliver their lines; and everybody is miked-up, rendering speech flat and largely affect-free. For Hamlet this approach had considerable benefits. As Shepherd, who played Hamlet (or rather played Richard Burton playing Hamlet), commented in a talk back in Dublin in 2012, his predicament as an actor was akin to Hamlet’s: both “have dead ancestors coming back and telling him what he has to do, and he doesn’t want to do it.” What Shepherd experienced was what all actors experience when playing Hamlet—being haunted by the ghosts of Hamlets past—and the Wooster Group’s Hamlet thematized this spectrality.
The haunting of *Cry Trojans!* is much more internalized, however: it is production not haunted by the weight of a theatrical historical past but by the company’s recent past, and recent failure. Even as *Cry Trojans!* mocks the intonations and performance styles of the RSC actors, it also feels like a performance of self-examination of the company’s methods and stakes, and its own status as an American theatre company butting up against British theater traditions. It is the story of their encounter with the RSC, indeed, a production haunted by their experience of voyaging back from the colonies to the metropole (or Stratford-upon-Avon).

Other forms of haunting are at stake in *Cry Trojans!* through the production’s engagement with its own “American-ness.” As they were in *Troilus and Cressida*, all Trojan characters are played as Red Indians. The stage, a thrust with audience on three sides, is white but for a ritual circle inscribed in the middle, while to the back is a ragged tipi. The costuming, designed by Dutch artist Folkert de Jong, is akin to the stylings of the wild west show, with Kate Valk a pig-tailed Pocahontas-like Cressida. The Trojan armour, Styrofoam coats depicting quasi-classical nude male forms, reminds one of scalped and flayed skin, forms of violence long associated with Native American tribes. The actors fight with lacrosse sticks fitted with bayonets (not something that the NCAA or the MLL have adopted, thank goodness). The actors’ hopping movement, halting speech (which renders the text at point unintelligible), and propensity for chanting and atonal song recall Tiger Lily in *Peter Pan* and all manner of offensive renderings of Indians in American movies. A number of people (from drama critics, literary critics, and Native American advocacy groups) have pointed out, this is dangerous ground. As I
write, baseball season is getting underway with news of protests at Chief Wahoo, the mascot of the Cleveland Indians, a movement that has got considerable media attention (and no little support). The Wooster Group’s depiction of Indianness or “Injun-ness” is not far from the “grinning face racism” of the Indians’ mascot. The question is, to what end? Is the production a commentary on Indian appropriations (to some degree, yes) or a perpetuation of those appropriations (to some degree, also yes)?

Figure 2. Casey Spooner as Ajax, Ari Fliakos as Hector, both dressed as Indians. Photo credit Paula Cort.
In the original collaboration, the RSC Greeks were clad in modern-day military fatigues, re-envisioning the plot of *Troilus and Cressida* as the struggle between an indigenous and invading force. This interpretation carries far less weight in *Cry Trojans!*, not least because of the absence of the RSC (the actors wear “primitive” black masks when they are playing Greek characters). Instead, the invading force is arguably the Wooster Group itself. That is certainly how they were seen during the collaboration’s short run in Stratford and London in 2012, and to some degree this is how the Wooster Group positioned itself in the collaboration. De Jong’s costume design of armour-as-classical statuary/corpse was one of many aspects of the production in which the Group positioned itself in relation to European culture, an approach that Steve Mentz, in a neat formulation, calls “extreme mediation” rather than outright antagonism in relation to their hosts, colleagues, and rivals. However, this is not the kind of invasion I am talking about here. If the RSC collaboration somewhat clumsily posited a colonizer-colonized dynamic within *Troilus and Cressida*, then *Cry Trojans!* seems to (only somewhat inadvertently) re-posit that dynamic within the Wooster Group itself.
The Wooster Group has long played with American racial history and politics in its productions. An early production, *Route 1 & 9* (1981) featured white actors in blackface running through chitlin’ circuit routines, while more recently, the title character of Eugene O’Neill’s *The Emperor Jones* (2006) was played by company co-founder Kate Valk in blackface. The Wooster Group’s trouble with race has also been well documented: *Route 1 & 9* was so controversial that the National Endowment for the Humanities ceased to fund the company, although director Elizabeth LeCompte’s casting choice of *The Emperor Jones* was, in *New Yorker* critic Hilton Als’ estimation, a far cannier choice, as it “makes it clear that Brutus Jones is a white man’s idea of a Negro.” *Cry Trojans!* similarly makes it clear that these representations are white ideas of an Indian: their performances are bad approximations of Native Americans filtered through a history of white appropriation and representation. However, the immanent critique of O’Neill (and by extension American theatre) is less clear: O’Neill’s Brutus Jones may be “a white man’s idea of a Negro,” but the Trojans are not Shakespeare’s idea of an Indian.

The line that the Group walks then, is between appropriation and the performance of appropriation. An experimental troupe with deep ties to the New York post-theatrical *avant garde* of Richard Foreman and Robert Wilson, what underpins so much of the group’s work is its engagement with the history of American cultural production, the ways in which it appropriates and cannibalizes pre-existing popular forms (of brows both high and low), and, in its more recent engagement with Shakespeare, how it relates to British cultural production as well. The post-theatrical tenor of these artist’s work regularly tends back to ideas of primitivism, an inheritance which *Cry Trojans!* plays with directly by evoking “primitive” cultures (both Native American and, with the masques worn by the Greek characters, a notion of African “primitivism”). Yet in these engagements, the group, made up of an almost exclusively white acting company (Koosil-ja, who plays Andromache, is Japanese of Korean origin), comes dangerously close to perpetuating theft rather than ironizing and displaying it. If Als is right that the Group’s racial sensibilities have evolved over time in relation to its play with blackface, we might not be quite so convinced by its engagement with “redface,” playing “Injun,” and the history of the representation of Native Americans.

The company’s rationale for adopting Indian guise in *Troilus and Cressida* was, What could be more American to bring to British theatre than Native American? But we might also ask, What could also be more American than Playing Indian? Philip Deloria has famously articulated the white American tendency to “play Indian,” that is, to dress up as Native American in order to claim some form of indigenous American authenticity otherwise lacking in a nation made up of many immigrants. The Wooster Group itself seems to have unironically fallen under this tendency. In an interview quoted by Martin Harries in his critique of the production for the *Los Angeles Review of Books*, Kate Valk traced the origins of the decision to stage the Trojans as Indians as follows:

> We were reading the play and I thought what was wrong with our reading was that we were pretending that we understood what we were saying. I just said, “Oh, we should say it like Indians,” because I was thinking of English as a second language. I don’t know, it just came to me. It’s not like having a problem...
to solve and wondering how we are going to solve it. It was just in the moment. I guess we all grew up on TV and film, an iconography of a formal relationship where someone has to come and meet not their oppressor, but someone who is more dominant.

Leaving aside Valk’s strange comment about the various Europeans with whom North American indigenous cultures being “dominant” but not “oppressors,” it becomes clear that the production choice was born out of the Group’s curious sense of inferiority to their Royal Shakespeare Company counterparts. Shakespeare seemed foreign to them (a strange statement for a company that has already taken on Hamlet). Moreover, the collaboration made them feel dominated by the British half of the collaboration, who speak (Shakespearean) English as a first language and hence have the linguistic advantage. Trying to speak the dominant language left the Group feeling “inauthentic,” because they realized that they didn’t understand what they were saying. To speak like Indians, to play Indian, rendered their experience of performing Shakespeare more authentic to them, an act of both claiming a dominant language and then appropriating it for their own purposes. To forge an authentically American take on Shakespeare, they embodied inauthentic representations of American indigeneity.
The Wooster Group has consistently played with its own authenticity: *Cry Trojans!* is, above all, self-referential, a production about the Group’s “encounter with the RSC” and about its encounter with itself. As Bonnie Marranca argues, the Wooster Group’s “approach highlights process—the artwork and the *work* of art … The Wooster Group takes to heart the idea of theatrical production and reproduction, offering both the performance and its documentation within the same event” (Marranca, 1, 6). The interplay between performance and documentation is evident in *Cry Trojans!* through the actors’ mimicry of scenes from films displayed on the screens. The love scene between Troilus and Cressida runs alongside scenes from Elia Kazan’s melodrama of thwarted young love, *Splendor in the Grass* (1961), with Shepherd and Valk echoing the physical movements of Warren Beatty and Natalie Wood. The film returns later, when Cressida is forced from Troy into the Greek camp, with Valk intoning (in sync with Wood) “I just want to die” multiple times over. Here the Group tap into the cynicism of Shakespeare’s play. Playing the love scene between Troilus and Cressida alongside *Splendor in the Grass* highlights how doomed their love is (at the end of *Splendor in the Grass* both Beatty’s and Wood’s characters are married to other people).
Criticism of the collaborative *Troilus and Cressida* and of *Cry Trojans!* have noted (to quote Harries) how “The Wooster Group’s ‘native Americans’ are native to the Hollywood screen.” However, most of the films employed to undergird much of the action of the production in its current iteration do not conform to the “iconography of the all-American Hollywood ‘Indian.’” Much of the exaggerated, Indianized movements are modeled on both black and white and colour ethnographic films (or “Salvage Ethnographies”) depicting Native American dances and rituals. The actors impersonations of these movements ironize the claims of authenticity of these ethnographies: what were presumably filmed in a bid to capture and preserve Native American “essence” for mass circulation are of course constructs—the rituals are conditioned by the form through which they represented (the camera lens, the film screen), and by the attending structures that produced the film in the first place (the presence of camera crew, who not infrequently were the catalyst for the performance of ritual rather than being bystander eye-witnesses to such rituals)—a problem that afflicts many such films, such as Tim Asch and Napoleon Chagnon’s *The Ax Fight* (1975). The actors bad impersonations, that is, mirror the questionable authenticity of these ethnographic films.

Other scenes are punctuated with scenes from *Smoke Signals* (1998) and *Atanarjuat: The Fast Runner* (2001). Trojans carry basketballs with them, a visual echo of famous scene in *Smoke Signals*; while fight scenes and love scenes are paralleled with analogous moments from *Atanarjuat*. Even the swearing of fealty between Troilus and Cressida is punctuated with the duel scene from *Atanarjuat*, stressing how the play’s language of love and violence are so close together. The sexual violence of *Troilus and Cressida* is exposed through these choices, and becomes particularly effective in the first encounter between the two lovers, when Troilus hoists a distressed Cressida on his shoulders and runs around the camp-fire (a visual echo of a scene from *Atanarjuat*) just prior to one Cressida’s famous question, “Will you walk in, my lord?”

The Wooster Groups’ pastiche is not of Hollywood-ized versions of Native Americans, but of Native American/First Nations self-presentations. *Smoke Signals* is often heralded as the first all-Native American film production; *Atanarjuat* is an Inuit film performed entirely in Inuktitut. Rather than comment on filmic appropriations so common to the Western genre, then, the Wooster Groups commits acts of appropriation, mimicking and arguably also mocking Native American cultural production, placing them at the same level as the questionably authentic depictions of Native American rituals of Salvage Ethnographies. It flattens out very different forms of Native American culture (rolling together Inuit and Spokane/Coeur d’Alene peoples under the catch-all sign Indian, or “Injun”). And it does so for an urban, elite, and almost exclusively white, elite audience.
The production not only mimics and flattens out indigenous North American cultures; it also seems to will their erasure. *Troilus and Cressida* ends with a sense of indeterminacy: Hector may be dead, but the war continues. The Trojan War itself was indeterminate—while defeated, the fall of Troy gave rise to the Roman Empire (and, in one mythic lineage, to a British one too). *Cry Trojans!* without altering much of the closing language of the play, closes off any future for the Trojan-Injun characters. Troilus returns from battle with the Greeks naked but for a loincloth and a blanket. Stirred by his fellow Trojans, he returns to the field, flinging the blanket in disgust at the “broker lackey,” Pandarus. Pandarus’ epilogue, in which he calls for “A goodly medicine for my aching bones” and “bequeath[s]” the audience “my diseases,” is the last of the play’s many allusions to plague and sickness. In the context of Native American history, the coupling of this pox-ridden language with Troilus’ blanket calls to mind (possibly apocryphal) stories of distribution of small-pox blankets to Native Americans as a form of early biological warfare (at, for example, the Siege of Fort Pitt in 1763). *Cry Trojans!* then ends with an image of genocide (emphasized by Greg Mehrten’s Pandarus, who delivers the epilogue sat down in a wheelie chair at the back of the stage before rolling off, leaving a bare stage and an empty tipi).

However, this concluding image of genocide is not born out by what we have seen in the play. At least in two senses in the production, indigenous North American culture does live, despite the historical and continued deprivations leveled at Native American and First Nations peoples. Martin Harries is useful here:

> The Wooster Group’s stance around race has always seemed savvy, but only up to a point: their performances mess with the stereotypes and other technologized clichés that contribute to America’s racial logics. But after that point of savviness something often goes awry: having performed the ways inauthentic representations can nevertheless become effective, and damaging, they haven’t been able to devise a theatrical response to the real force of these constructs.

I think Harries is astute here, but would argue that *Cry Trojans!* “awryness” does offer a theatrical response that underscores how the Group’s own play with “inauthentic performances” become effective in erasing the very cultures whose representation it seems to be wanting to ironize and complicate.

It would be one thing if the films the Group chose to mimic were just the “Salvage ethnographies,” or, for example, *The Lone Ranger* (Jay Silverheels is the likely inspiration for much of the actors’ portrayals)—that is, filmic appropriations of Native Americans that still have currency in Hollywood today (see Jonny Depp’s turn as Tonto in the 2013 reboot). But mimicking Native American/First Nations cultural production and then pronouncing that culture dead by the end of the play squarely replicates the exploitation of Native American/First Nations culture, not only through the genocides of the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, but through the various appropriations in the twentieth and now twentieth first centuries of a so-called dead culture much mourned by white, American culture. Underlying much of the desire to “Play Indian” is a sense of loss of a paradisiacal sensibility of innocence and at-one-ness...
with land and culture which is then transposed onto an Indian culture that can be replicated through various material processes, but which has to have been already-lost. It is the manifestation for a nostalgia for what never was as reimagined in a people who once were but are no longer. Which is of course a nonsense: the Indians imagined in the act of Playing Indian never existed outside the framework of a Euro-American imaginary, but actual Native Americans and First Nations culture exists.  

In his *Indians in Unexpected Places*, Deloria notes that in most American narratives [at the turn of the twentieth century], Indian people, corralled on isolated and impoverished reservations, missed out on modernity—indeed, almost dropped out of history itself. In such narratives, Native Americans would reemerge as largely insignificant political and cultural actors in the reform efforts of the 1920s and 1930s. World War II would force them to engage urbanism, wage labor, and American culture. Though such changes would nudge Indian people toward the modern world, their first and best chances at freedom, reason, equality, and progress had passed them by. Deloria rejects this prevalent thesis by turning to the “significant cohort of Native people [who] engaged the same forces of modernization that were making non-Indians reevaluate their own expectations of themselves and their society” (Deloria, *Unexpected Places*, 6). By contrast, The Wooster Group both ironizes and embraces this thesis, by displaying Native American engagements with modernity and subjecting them to a postmodern mimicry only to pronounce their erasure at the very end, on a stage set littered with the shredded tarpaulin and moss covered car tires of a distinctly post-apocalyptic landscape. Here, then, the production plays Indian not only to play with actorly authenticity and the ghosts of theatrical encounter (with the RSC; with Shakespeare); it also highlights the destructiveness of so doing, by reducing native culture and history to a white, elite history of appropriation and genocide without positing alternative histories of resistance and/or re-appropriation (something which *Smoke Signals* in particular attempts to wrestle with by presenting and then ironizing certain Native American stereotypes). Savvy, as Harries argues, but only up to a point. The Wooster Group seems to be aware of part of these appropriative formulations, and put on display both the work (their adoption of an Indian manner) and the work of art (the acts of appropriation that lead to their adoption of Indian manner): but for a Company so invested in the ironies of post-modernity, they do not in this production seem so aware of the depth of their own unironic complicities.
Fig 8. Scott Shepherd as Troilus, Ari Fliakos as Varlet, with car tire and lacrosse stick. Photo credit James Allister Sprang
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